

The Value of Information from Sell-side Analysts*

Linying Lv

December 31, 2024

Abstract

I examine the value of information from sell-side analysts by analyzing a large corpus of their written reports. Using embeddings from state-of-the-art large language models, I show that textual information in analyst reports explains 10.19% of contemporaneous stock returns out-of-sample, a value that is economically more significant than quantitative forecasts. I then perform a Shapley value decomposition to assess how much each topic within the reports contributes to explaining stock returns. The results show that analysts' income statement analyses account for more than half of the reports' explanatory power. Expressing these findings in economic terms, I estimate that early acquisition of analysts' reports can yield significant profits. Analysts' information value peaks in the first week following earnings announcements, highlighting their vital role in interpreting new financial data.

JEL Classification: G11, G14, G24

Keywords: Sell-side Analysts, Value of Information, Large Language Models, Explainable AI

*Linying Lv is at Washington University in St. Louis (llyu@wustl.edu). I am grateful to John Barrios, William Cassidy, Philip Dybvig, Richard Frankel, Zhiyu Fu, Songrun He, Byoung-Hyoun Hwang, Jared Jennings, Zachary Kaplan, Hong Liu, Semyon Malamud, Asaf Manela, Xiumin Martin, Stefan Nagel, Andreas Neuhierl, Michaela Pagel, Dacheng Xiu, Zilong Zhang, Guofu Zhou, and Qifei Zhu for their valuable comments. I also thank the participants at SoFiE 2024, Wolfe Research 8th Global Quant and Macro Conference, the 1st Workshop on Large Language Models and Generative AI for Finance, and seminar attendees at Washington University in St. Louis for their helpful comments and discussions.

“No one ever made a decision because of a number. They need a story.”

— Daniel Kahneman

1 Introduction

Sell-side analysts play a crucial role in financial markets by producing and processing information for investors. Their research reports, which include both quantitative forecasts and qualitative analyses, are widely used by investors in decision-making (Barber et al., 2001; Kong et al., 2021). This raises a fundamental question: Do the analysts generate value for their clients, or are they merely peddling expensive noise?

Quantifying the value of analyst information, especially that contained in written reports, has been a persistent challenge in finance literature due to the unstructured nature of textual data. Prior studies have shed light on the incremental information value of report text through sentiment analyses (Asquith et al., 2005; Huang et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2018). However, analyst reports are meant to provide contextual information beyond the simple sentiment dimension. The context has been perceived at least as important as the quantifiable outputs. According to the annual survey of *Institutional Investor* magazine, investors consistently rank “Written Reports” as more valuable than earnings forecasts and stock recommendations. Yet, empirical evidence supporting this survey feedback is limited, and it remains unclear what specific discussion holds the most value for investors.

The advent of large language models (LLMs) has significantly enhanced our ability to quantify textual meaning beyond sentiment and topics, allowing us to capture both contextual information and the reasoning logic within the text (Chen et al., 2022; Li et al., 2024). Consider the following two statements: “Reported EPS of \$0.94 miss consensus of \$1.40 and our estimate of \$1.17.” and “Reported 1Q12 MS franchise sales are below our estimate, as sales were negatively impacted by unfavorable distribution channel dynamics.” While both sentences analyze earnings in a negative tone, the latter provides additional contextual information and reasoning. The question now

becomes: do investors disregard obvious facts and figures in favor of details in lines?

I investigate the question through three general steps: analyst output representation, econometric modeling, and value decomposition. Analyst outputs include both quantitative information and qualitative information. The quantitative data consists of numerical forecasts like stock recommendations, earnings forecasts, and target prices. For qualitative textual information, I extract contextualized representations by mapping each report into a structured LLM embedding space.

With structured representation, I evaluate how well analyst information explains stock returns as evidence of information content. A significant challenge in projecting stock returns onto text embeddings is the risk of in-sample overfitting due to high dimensionality. To address this issue, I employ Ridge regressions. The simple model penalizes large coefficients while still preserving the model's ability to capture essential signals that move the market. Additionally, I use out-of-sample R-squared to evaluate model performances.

I find that the textual information generates an out-of-sample R^2 of 10.19% for three-day cumulative abnormal returns ($CAR_{[-1,+1]}$), surpassing the 9.01% explained by numerical information. When both textual and numerical measures are combined, the explainable variation in CAR increases to 12.28%, which is significantly higher than using either information type alone. These findings remain robust across various LLM text representations, machine learning algorithms, and CAR windows, highlighting the distinct and economically meaningful information content embedded in analyst report narratives.

The informativeness of analyst reports varies substantially with forecast changes. Analyst reports accompanied by forecast revisions provide significantly more valuable information to financial markets compared to reiterations. For reports containing recommendation revisions, the combination of numerical and textual information generates an out-of-sample R^2 of 22.63%. In contrast, reports merely reiterating previous earnings forecasts yield statistically insignificant out-of-sample R^2 is not statistically significant, indicating they provide minimal new information to market participants.

Previous research emphasizes analysts' role in information processing around corporate earnings announcements(e.g., [Livnat and Zhang, 2012](#), [Keskek et al., 2014](#), [Kim and Song, 2015](#), [Lobo et al., 2017](#), and [Barron et al., 2017](#)). My analysis on samples during and outside earnings announcement periods reveals that analyst reports' information content peaks in the first week following earnings releases. The finding aligns with [Huang et al. \(2018\)](#), who argue that prompt responses to corporate disclosures provide valuable insights to clients. Using distinct models trained on samples during and outside earnings announcement windows, the out-of-sample R^2 approximately doubles in the first week following earnings announcement dates compared to other periods. The substantial increase highlights the incremental value analysts add by interpreting and contextualizing earnings information for investors.

To address the concern that my results merely capture analysts' "piggybacking" on earnings conference call information or post-earning-announcement drift (PEAD), I control for both earnings surprises and the latest earnings conference call transcripts using text embeddings. The results show that analyst reports provide distinct and valuable insights even after accounting for these alternative explanations.

As raised in the review paper of [Bradshaw et al. \(2017\)](#), identifying the qualitative attributes of analyst reports that investors find most salient remains largely unsolved. I develop a systematic approach to quantify the importance of different report content. By exploiting the additive property of text embeddings and implementing a Shapley value decomposition, I attribute the explanatory power to 17 major topics discussed in analyst reports.

To systematically quantify the importance of different content in analyst reports, I leverage the additive feature of text embeddings and design a Shapley value decomposition approach to fully attribute the explanatory power to 17 major topics discussed in analyst reports. The results reveal that Income Statement Analyses, particularly interpretations of realized earnings, account for over half of the reports' explanatory power in terms of out-of-sample R^2 . These results reinforce the critical role of analysts in interpreting financial data and constructing the narratives and context essential for investment decisions.

To translate statistical measures of information content into economic terms, I adopt [Kadan and Manela \(2024\)](#)'s framework to quantify the dollar value of analyst information for strategic investors. The multi-client framework provides a realistic foundation for analyzing the complex dynamics of analyst reports dissemination. The information value can be interpreted as the total expected profits for strategic investors either because: (1) some investors have early access to analyst views, or (2) they conduct independent research and derive insights comparable to those of analysts. Essentially, the measure is defined as the ratio of the explainable return variance—which quantifies the reduction in uncertainty attributable to analyst insights—to price impact, representing the cost of trading on this information.

The analysis reveals substantial economic value in analyst information. For an average S&P 100 stock over a three-day window, strategic investors' expected profits from early access to analyst reports amount to \$0.34 million from numerical information, \$0.38 million from textual information, and \$0.47 million when combined. Based on an average of 15 report days annually, the aggregate annualized information value reaches \$6.89 million—a conservative lower bound according to [Kadan and Manela \(2024\)](#). This value increases for large-cap stocks, bold analysts, and reports released promptly following earnings announcements.

My paper relates to three strands of literature. It first connects to recent studies of market reactions to security analyst reports ([Huang et al., 2018](#); [Chen et al., 2023](#); [Chi et al., 2024](#)). Earlier investigations primarily rely on manual text coding and sentiment analysis, which are labor-intensive and may overlook nuanced insights. My work demonstrates the superiority of state-of-the-art LLMs in generating contextualized textual representations. Compared to [Huang et al. \(2014\)](#)'s Naive Bayes tone classification, LLMs offer two main advantages: better capture of overall report sentiment and extraction of richer information beyond tone. Moving from simple tone analysis to comprehensive LLM embeddings boosts the R^2 from 3% to over 10%. The substantial improvement in explanatory power highlights LLMs' potential to transform textual analysis. Additionally, the topic decomposition approach provides novel insights into analysts' value by revealing their role in interpreting financial data.

Second, this work contributes to the growing field of machine learning and artificial intelligence in finance. Recent studies like [Chen et al. \(2022\)](#), [Li et al. \(2024\)](#), [Jha et al. \(2024\)](#), and [Beckmann et al. \(2024\)](#) have showcased the potential of implementing LLMs in a financial paradigm. However, the interpretability of LLMs remains an issue, and solutions like prompting can introduce subjectivity and manipulation concerns. By exploiting the additive property of LLM embeddings and developing a Shapley value decomposition approach, my research provides a new framework for explainable AI.

Third, this paper advances the understanding of analyst tipping - the practice of brokerage firms providing early research access to high-commission clients ([Irvine et al., 2007](#); [Christophe et al., 2010](#)). Tipping allows brokerages to offset research costs by earning commissions from clients who benefit from the privileged information. Prior studies, such as those by [Green \(2006\)](#) and [Kadan et al. \(2018\)](#), have explored the short-term profitability generated from early access to analyst recommendation revisions, with typical returns ranging from 1.02% to 1.71%. This paper extends by quantifying the economic dollar value of such privileged information.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces methodology, measures of analyst information value, and interpretation framework. Section 3 describes the data and empirical results. Section 4 concludes.

2 Methodology

This section describes the key methodologies: the use of large language models for topic modeling and text embeddings, estimation of information content and strategic information value, and decomposition metrics for evaluating topic-specific information value.¹

¹The details of machine learning models used to explain contemporaneous stock returns are provided in the Online Appendix C.

2.1 Large Language Models

The analysis of analyst reports leverages three advanced generative AI models. A fine-tuned BERT model classifies sentences according to predefined criteria, ChatGPT extracts and synthesizes major topics through prompting, and LLaMA generates high-dimensional vector embeddings to represent report content.

2.1.1 ChatGPT Prompting

To avoid ad-hoc classification, I employ ChatGPT prompting to extract exclusive and meaningful topics. The goal is to identify primary topics covered in analyst reports and assign each sentence to a single topic category.

In the first step, I use a random sample of 100 analyst reports and request ChatGPT to analyze the content and identify high-level categories with the following prompt:

Prompt 1: Please read the provided text file of sell-side analyst reports carefully. What are high-level mutually exclusive topics covered in these reports? Make sure that each sentence from the text file can be assigned to one of the topics. Here is the report content: {text}.

It ends up with 16 categories defined in Table 1. A category labeled “None of the Above” is included to accommodate sentences that do not fit into predefined topics. To provide a visual representation of the content within each topic, Figure A1 in the Online Appendix presents word clouds for each category. Furthermore, Table A1 offers illustrative sentences extracted directly from analyst reports, providing concrete examples of the discussions typical to each category.

In the second step, a systematic approach is required to assign topic classifications to a large corpus of 6,975,114 sentences. To begin with, I employ the GPT-4-Turbo model to categorize each sentence in a random sample of 17,028 sentences from 100 analyst reports into a single, most relevant topic.

Prompt 2: Please read the following sentence from a sell-side analyst report of the company {firm} ({ticker}) carefully. Determine which category of information it belongs to in the following 17 categories: {categories}. Pay attention to the sentence in the context of the report. Output your response in JSON format. Here is the sentence from the analyst report: {sentence}.

This labeled sample is used to fine-tune a BERT model, which then classifies all sentences in the corpus. The fine-tuned model demonstrates high reliability, achieving an accuracy score of 89% on a testing sample. The distribution of topics is relatively stable across years, as illustrated in Figure 1. Income Statement Analyses and Financial Ratios are the most frequently discussed topics in analyst reports, accounting for 17.23% and 15.65% of all sentences, respectively. These are followed by Risk Factors (8.32%), Valuation (8.10%), and Investment Thesis (7.87%), which collectively form the next tier of frequently discussed topics. Appendices and Disclosures (0.50%), Executive Summary (0.48%), and Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) issues (0.23%) emerge as the least frequent topics.

Several factors contribute to these observed frequencies. The low occurrence of Appendices and Disclosures can be attributed to pre-boilerplate cleaning procedures implemented in the data preparation phase. Executive Summary sections appear infrequently because they are difficult to identify at the sentence level. While ESG discussions are minimal overall, they increase notably after 2020, reflecting growing market interest in sustainability issues.

2.1.2 Text Representations

I need a structured representation of written reports. Unlike traditional NLP methods, the LLM framework begins with a contextual representation of tokenized text, a process that involves several key steps. Prior to tokenization, the text undergoes normalization, which may include converting to lowercase, removing punctuation, and handling special characters. Depending on the strategy, tokenization involves breaking down text into smaller units, which can be words, subwords, or even characters. These tokens are then mapped to unique identifiers based on a predefined vocabulary

learned during model training.

To illustrate this process, consider the following sentence from an analyst report on NVIDIA: “We expect to see more GPU/SmartNIC integration as next-gen workloads grow and CPUs become a bigger bottleneck in the data center.” The LLaMA tokenizer breaks this into 34 sub-word tokens, including “‘We’, ‘expect’, ‘to’, ‘see’, ‘more’, ‘GPU’, ‘/’, ‘Sm’, ‘art’, ‘N’, ‘IC’, ‘integration’, ‘as’, ‘next’, ‘-’, ‘gen’, ‘work’, ‘loads’, ‘grow’, ‘and’, ‘CPU’, ‘s’, ‘become’, ‘a’, ‘bigger’, ‘bott’, ‘l’, ‘ene’, ‘ck’, ‘in’, ‘the’, ‘data’, ‘center’, ‘.’”. This granular approach allows for nuanced interpretation of complex terms. For instance, ‘next-gen workloads’ becomes five separate tokens: ‘next’, ‘-’, ‘gen’, ‘work’, and ‘loads’.

At the heart of LLMs lies the transformer architecture. A core output of the transformer is text embeddings - dense, continuous vectors that capture semantic and syntactic information. Figure [A2](#) in the Online Appendix illustrates how LLMs generate text embeddings for a sentence from an analyst report on Nvidia. These high-dimensional representations allow models to capture complex patterns in text, surpassing traditional word-based techniques.

For this analysis, I used the pre-trained LLaMA-2-13B model and its tokenizer from MetaAI. The input length limit of LLaMA-2 models is 4,096 tokens, which is sufficient for most analyst reports, given their median length of 1,393 tokens and mean length of 2,055 tokens. The resulting contextual embeddings capture nuanced report information and are suitable for downstream tasks like sentiment analysis and economic modeling.

2.2 Information Content

Following [Asquith et al. \(2005\)](#), I consider R^2 as a proxy for information content. To project contemporaneous stock return on analyst information, I train Ridge regression models with the following equations annually using an expanding window:

$$CAR_{[-1,+1],it} = \beta_0 + \beta' y_{ijt}^{AI} + \varepsilon_{ijt}, \quad (1)$$

$$\hat{\beta} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \|CAR_{[-1,+1],it} - \beta_0 - y_{ijt}^{\text{AI}}\beta\|_2^2 + \theta\|\beta\|_2^2 \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where $CAR_{[-1,+1],it}$ is the three-day window cumulative abnormal return of stock i excess to market return surrounding reports' release day t , and y_{ijt}^{AI} denotes the structured information representation extracted from analyst report j for stock i at day t . The initial training sample comprises 60% of the dataset, with out-of-sample testing spanning 2015 to 2023.

Following [Gu et al. \(2020\)](#), I calculate the out-of-sample R^2 using:

$$R_{\text{oos}}^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{(i,t) \in \mathcal{T}} \left(CAR_{[-1,+1],it} - \widehat{CAR}_{[-1,+1],it} \right)^2}{\sum_{(i,t) \in \mathcal{T}} CAR_{[-1,+1],it}^2}, \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{T} is the test set of (i, t) which has not been used in training and validation. R_{oos}^2 aggregates estimation across analyst reports and captures the proportion of return variance attributable to analyst information.

To assess the statistical significance of the R_{oos}^2 , I implement a modified version of the [Diebold and Mariano \(2002\)](#) test for predictive accuracy comparison. Given the strong cross-sectional dependence inherent in the stock-level analysis, I follow [Gu et al. \(2020\)](#) and adapt the Diebold-Mariano (DM) test by comparing the cross-sectional averages of prediction errors.

2.3 Information Value

Following [Kadan and Manela \(2024\)](#), I evaluate the value of information using a measure that approximates information value in a strategic setting where multiple informed investors possess imperfect signals:

$$\widehat{\Omega}_{it} = \frac{r_{it}^2 - \left(r_{it} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \widehat{r}_{ijt}}{N} \right)^2}{\widehat{\lambda}_{it} / p_{it-}}, \quad (4)$$

where $\widehat{\Omega}_{it}$ represents the ratio of explainable realized return variance estimated using Ridge regression to price impact estimated from 1-minute log returns and order flow, and p_{it-} is the closing price on day $t-2$. \widehat{r}_{ijt} represents the estimated cumulative abnormal return $\widehat{CAR}_{[-1,+1]}$ of analyst

report j about stock i issued on day t , and r_{it} denotes the realized $CAR_{[-1,+1]}$. Abnormal returns are calculated as the raw return minus the buy-and-hold return on the NYSE/AMEX/NASDAQ value-weighted market return. N represents the number of analyst reports for stock i on day t .

To estimate the price impact $\widehat{\lambda}_{it}$, I regress 1-minute log returns (r_{itk}) on contemporaneous share order flow (y_{itk}). The order flow is derived from changes in cumulative signed order flows $Y_{it\tau_k}$ over intraday intervals, with trades classified as buys (+1) or sells (-1) based on algorithms from [Lee and Ready \(1991\)](#).² The regression specification is:

$$r_{itk} = \widehat{\lambda}_{it}y_{itk} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (5)$$

where $\widehat{\lambda}_{it}$ represents how sensitive price is to trading volume (or Kyle's lambda). In this regression, $r_{itk} = p_{it\tau_k} - p_{it\tau_{k-1}}$ and $y_{itk} = Y_{it\tau_k} - Y_{it\tau_{k-1}}$, with $p_{it\tau_k}$ denoting the log price of stock i within the window $[t-1, t+1]$ at time $\tau \in [0, T]$. The three-day interval T is partitioned into one-minute segments $\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_K$, yielding 1,170 observations (390×3) per regression.

The measure reflects the ratio of return volatility to price impact and is grounded in the theoretical framework of [Back et al. \(2000\)](#), which is a continuous-time extension of [Kyle \(1985\)](#) model. Under risk neutrality, the equilibrium holds if \tilde{v} is an unbiased signal of asset price. The intuition is illustrated with an extended single-auction Kyle model with incomplete information in [Online Appendix D](#).

I employ the measure for two key reasons. First, the framework is rooted in a general setting of imperfect competition among informed traders, which closely aligns with the reality of financial markets where multiple investors have access to analyst information. Second, this measure provides a conservative lower bound for the value estimation, allowing quantification of the minimum potential value of analyst information without overstating its importance.³

Given that the measure is a ratio of two random variables measured with error, interpretation

²The algorithms from [Ellis et al. \(2000\)](#) and [Chakrabarty et al. \(2007\)](#) are also used in robustness tests.

³[Kadan and Manela \(2024\)](#) argue the measure also serves as an approximate upper bound when informed traders are uncorrelated, which does not apply in the analyst context.

for information value estimation is inherently nuanced. To address this challenge, I apply the delta method to estimate the mean and variance of information value over sample s . The derivation of the first-order estimator using the delta method is detailed in Online Appendix E.

2.4 Shapley Value Decomposition

To quantify the relative contribution of different topics, I implement the Shapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) methodology. SHAP is a solution concept proposed by [Shapley \(1953\)](#) in cooperative game theory that distributes the total payoff generated by a coalition of players among the players themselves. It was later applied for machine learning model interpretation ([Lundberg and Lee, 2017](#) and [Chen et al., 2022](#)). The approach allows for attributing an analyst report’s overall explanatory power to its constituent topics. Leveraging the additive nature of text embeddings, I develop a novel decomposition method to systematically evaluate the relative importance of various topics in analyst reports.

The report-level embeddings are generated as the average of embeddings across all tokens and layers. The report embeddings can be formalized as:

$$y^{emb} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{e}_i, \quad (6)$$

where e_i is the embedding of token i across all the layers, N denotes the total token count of the report. Given the tokens can be classified into distinct topics, the embeddings can be fully decomposed into topic-specific components:

$$y^{emb} = \sum_{p=1}^P y_p^{emb} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^P \sum_{i_p=1}^{N_p} e_{i_p}, \quad (7)$$

where P denotes the total number of topics, y_p^{emb} represents the embedding for topic p , N_p is the number of tokens classified as topic p , and i_p indicates the index of tokens within topic p .

A consideration in the transformer architectures is the self-attention mechanism, which allows

the model to compute relative importance weights between tokens. This architecture enables each token in the input sequence to “talk” with each other. Specifically, the embedding of token i incorporates contextual information from token j , even when these tokens belong to distinct topics. To mitigate this cross-topic attention effect, I process embeddings sentence by sentence to ensure the token embeddings only reflect intra-sentence contextual information. I then take the token-weighted mean of sentence embeddings as the report representation, which I designate as sentence-segment embeddings:

$$y^{emb} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Token_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n Token_i} y_i^{emb}, \quad (8)$$

where $Token_i$ represents the number of tokens in i -th sentence and y_i^{emb} represents the embeddings of the i -th sentence.

The loss in R_{OOS}^2 from full-context embedding to sentence-segmented embedding quantifies the information content of context across sentences.

Subsequently, I compute the Shapley value across topics using sentence-segmented embeddings. The Shapley value is defined as:

$$\varphi_p(R_{\text{OOS}}^2) = \sum_{S \subseteq P \setminus \{p\}} \frac{|S|!(P - |S| - 1)!}{P!} \left[R_{\text{OOS}}^2(y_s^{\text{emb}} + y_p^{\text{emb}}) - R_{\text{OOS}}^2(y_s^{\text{emb}}) \right], \quad (9)$$

where the sum extends over all subsets $S \subseteq P \setminus \{p\}$, including the empty set. y_s^{emb} is the token-weighted sentence embedding of all topics in subset S . The R_{OOS}^2 is calculated for each unique combination of topic embeddings.⁴ This approach fully distributes the total R_{OOS}^2 across topics, revealing their relative contributions to explaining market reactions.

⁴Shapley value requires a defined input for missing X values. I assign a value of zero, treating the embedding as having all dimensions set to zero for model estimation.

3 Data and Empirical Results

In this section, I present the empirical analysis of analyst report information, beginning with an examination of information content and its decomposition across topics. I then quantify the strategic dollar value of analyst information. The results emphasize analysts' income statement analyses following earning announcements.

3.1 Data

I refer to the Mergent Investext database for 223,091 sell-side analyst reports for S&P 100 firms spanning the years 2000 to 2023. The reports, initially in PDF format, are converted to plain text using Adobe Acrobat. The extracted text is then segmented into sentences. To ensure a clean dataset focused on firm-relevant discussions, I fine-tune a BERT model to filter out boilerplate content.⁵

The Mergent Investext Database provides analyst identification and report release dates. To connect Investext with the I/B/E/S database, I first match lead analyst names to their corresponding Analyst IDs (AMASKCD) following [Li et al. \(2024\)](#). I then match individual reports to corresponding EPS forecasts, price targets, and recommendation files in I/B/E/S. Given that multiple reports may be issued between a forecast announcement and its subsequent revision, I adopt [Huang et al. \(2014\)](#)'s approach and define the matching window as spanning from two days before the announcement date to two days after the revision date.⁶ Reports are linked to I/B/E/S forecasts by matching analyst names, firm tickers, and the matching window. Additional firm characteristics are sourced from CRSP and Compustat.⁷ After the matching procedure and excluding reports released on earnings announcement days, the final sample consists of 122,252

⁵Boilerplate segments typically contain disclosures about the brokerage firm and analyst research team and do not reflect analyst opinions. Following [Li et al. \(2024\)](#), I construct a training dataset by randomly sampling one report from each of the top 20 brokerage firms by report volume and manually label each sentence. The BERT model fine-tuned for boilerplate classification achieves a 97.31% accuracy rate on test data.

⁶I/B/E/S records two timestamps for each analyst forecast: the announcement date (ANNDATS) when the new forecast is issued and the old one is revised, and the revision date (REVDATS) when the forecast becomes invalid or undergoes revision.

⁷Detailed variable definitions and summary statistics are provided in [Table A2](#) and [Table A3](#), respectively.

reports covering S&P 100 stocks, produced by 1,305 analysts across 140 distinct brokerage firms.

Table 2 provides summary statistics of analyst reports, including the number of reports, unique brokerage firms, and analysts across years and the Fama-French 12 industries. It also reports average page and token counts per report as measures of report length. The temporal distribution of analyst reports aligns with patterns documented in Bonini et al. (2023), while the average page count per report corresponds with findings in Huang et al. (2014).⁸

Stock-level price impacts are estimated using intraday data from the NYSE TAQ database for an out-of-sample period spanning January 2, 2015, to December 28, 2023. To ensure temporal comparability, all prices are adjusted for inflation using the Consumer Price Index (CPI), normalized to December 2020 as the base period.

To isolate the information value of analyst outputs, I control for alternative information sources available to investors. In Section 3.2.2, I conduct a comparative analysis between earnings conference call content and subsequent analyst reports. Conference call transcripts are sourced from the Seeking Alpha website, which has been collecting the transcripts since 2005⁹. These transcripts provide detailed documentation of executive presentations and manager-analyst interactions during Q&A sessions. I sample transcripts of S&P 100 constituent firms from 2005 to 2023, matching them with ticker and Report Date for Quarterly Earnings (RDQ) data from Compustat. The matching window between Seeking Alpha's publishing date and RDQ is set to two weeks, yielding a final sample of 7,909 firm-quarter-level conference calls.

The set of numerical variables used as input in machine learning models includes:

Report-Level Measures: *REC_REV* denotes recommendation revision, calculated as the current report's recommendation minus the last recommendation in I/B/E/S issued by the same analyst for the same firm. *EF_REV* represents earnings forecast revision, calculated as the current report's EPS forecast minus the prior EPS forecast in I/B/E/S issued by the same analyst for

⁸The data reveals a peak in the number of analyst reports in 2013, followed by a gradual decline. This trend is likely influenced by the regulatory impacts of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform in the United States and MiFID II in Europe (Bradshaw et al., 2017).

⁹Transcripts are available at <https://seekingalpha.com/earnings/earnings-call-transcripts>.

the same firm, scaled by the stock price 50 days before the report release. *TP_REV* measures target price revision, calculated as the difference between current and previous target prices in I/B/E/S for the same analyst-firm pair, scaled by the stock price 50 days pre-release. *Boldness* is a binary indicator set to 1 when revisions are either above both the consensus and previous forecasts or below both. *SR* denotes stock recommendations following the I/B/E/S rating system (1 = Strong Buy, 5 = Strong Sell). *ERet* represents the 12-month return forecast, calculated as the 12-month price target scaled by the stock price 50 days pre-release. *Prior_CAR* measures cumulative abnormal return over [-10, -2].

Firm-Level Measures: *Size* is quantified by market equity. Book-to-Market Ratio (*BtoM*) represents the ratio of book value to market value. Following [Huang et al. \(2018\)](#), Earnings Surprise (*SUE*) is calculated as the actual earnings per share (EPS) minus the last consensus EPS forecast prior to the earnings announcement date (EAD), with *AbsSUE* denoting its absolute value. *Miss* is a binary indicator for positive *SUE*. *TradingVolume* represents the stock's trading volume on recent earnings announcement days, standardized by shares outstanding. Distance to Default (*DD*) is sourced from the NUS Credit Research Initiative (CRI). *Fluidity* measures firms' product market fluidity.

Industry-Level Measures: *IndustryRecession* is a binary indicator set to one if the firm's industry (defined by Fama-French 48 classification) experiences negative monthly returns in the bottom quintile.

Macroeconomic Measures: *TimeTrend* is a temporal variable measuring the number of years since the start of the sample period.

3.2 Information Content of Analyst Reports

This section investigates market reactions to analysts' quantitative and qualitative outputs. I employ the Shapley value decomposition methodology introduced in Section 2.4 to attribute the information content across distinct topics.

3.2.1 Quantitative and Qualitative Information

Table 3 compares the information content embedded in numerical and textual measures. The analysis employs Ridge regression as specified in Equations 1 and 2, with $CAR_{[-1,+1]}$ centered at the report release date serving as the dependent variable. For reports released on non-trading days, I adjust $t=0$ to the next trading day recorded in the CRSP database. The estimation utilizes distinct input configurations with an expanding window approach, where training sets span from 2000 to the year preceding each target year.

Panel A presents the performance of four input configurations: (1) forecast revisions, encompassing analyst revisions on recommendations, earnings forecasts, and target prices; (2) numerical measures, incorporating report-level, firm-level, industry-level, and macroeconomic indicators as detailed in Section 3.1; (3) textual embeddings, 5,120-dimensional full-context representations of each report; and (4) a hybrid input combining revision measures with textual embeddings.

Column (1) reveals an R^2_{OOS} of 9.01% for forecast revision input, consistent with existing literature (Brav and Lehavy, 2003; Asquith et al., 2005; Bradshaw et al., 2013) on the price impact of analyst revisions. The incorporation of additional 14 numerical features in column (2) yields a modest improvement to 9.08% R^2_{OOS} . Both revision and numerical input models significantly outperform the zero benchmark, as evidenced by the Diebold-Mariano test t-statistics reported in columns (2) and (4).

Columns (5) and (6) reveal that Ridge models with text embeddings achieve an R^2_{OOS} of 10.19% with a t-statistic of 8.20, highlighting the substantial information content of report text. The R^2_{OOS} remains stable from 2015 to 2023, except during the 2020 pandemic recession. A DM test comparing revision-only and text-only inputs yields a t-statistic of 1.66, indicating substantial information content of report text relative to forecast revisions.

Addressing the look-ahead bias concern raised by Sarkar and Vafa (2024) regarding pre-trained LLMs, I examine the R^2_{OOS} in 2023. Since the employed LLMs were trained on pre-2023 data, this

period represents true out-of-sample performance, validating the robustness of the main findings.

Columns (7) and (8) examine the model performance when integrating both forecast revisions and text embeddings. This combined approach achieves an R_{OOS}^2 of 12.28%, representing improvements of 3.27% and 2.09% over revision-only and text-only models, respectively. The DM t-statistics of 3.95 and 3.77 for comparisons between combined input versus revision input and text input demonstrate that report text and forecast revisions contain distinct, complementary information sets valued by investors.

The explanatory power might stem from quantitative information embedded in the numbers mentioned within the text. To address this concern, I conduct robustness checks using content with numbers removed. Table A4 presents the performance of models using number-free text embeddings. The resulting R_{OOS}^2 of 10.95% significantly exceeds that of quantitative revision measures (t-statistic = 2.40), suggesting that the superior performance of text-based models is not driven by embedded numerical content.

I examine the scaling law relationship by comparing LLMs with varying parameters, including BERT, OpenAI text-embedding-3-small, and LLaMA-3 models. The LLaMA models feature significantly more parameters than the BERT and OpenAI models. Panel B reports the R_{OOS}^2 and DM t-stats of pairwise comparisons between alternative LLMs and the LLaMA-2 benchmark. The input in Panel B is report text embeddings, comparable to column (3) in Panel A. A positive t-statistic indicates superior performance relative to the LLaMA-2 model. While smaller models like BERT and OpenAI underperform LLaMA-2, the larger LLaMA-3 model shows only marginally better performance with an R_{OOS}^2 of 9.66%, though the improvement is statistically insignificant. These results demonstrate the robustness of analyst report text information content across different LLMs and illuminate the relationship between model scale and performance capabilities.

To validate the robustness of contemporaneous measures, I examine alternative *CAR* windows, including 2-day and 5-day intervals following Huang et al. (2014) and Asquith et al. (2005), respectively. Table A5 shows consistent R_{OOS}^2 magnitudes for $AR_{[0]}$, $CAR_{[0,+1]}$, and $CAR_{[-2,+2]}$, ranging from 6.92% to 7.57% during the 2015-2023 out-of-sample period.

Table A6 presents the cross-industry analysis of analyst report text information content across Fama-French 12 classifications. Five industries exhibit R^2_{OOS} exceeding 10%: Shops, Other, Manufacturing, Chemicals, and Durables. Conversely, Non-Durables, Telecommunications, Energy, and Utilities sectors show significantly lower R^2_{OOS} and DM t-statistics. This pattern, visualized in Figure A3, suggests that industries with complex products and services derive greater value from detailed analyst insights, while those operating in stable or regulated environments benefit less from incremental analyst information.

To evaluate the economic significance, I estimate OLS regressions specified as follows:

$$CAR_{[-1,+1],it} = \alpha + \beta_1 \widehat{CAR}_{txt,it} + \beta_2 \widehat{CAR}_{rev,it} + \varepsilon_{it}. \quad (10)$$

This model incorporates out-of-sample $CAR_{[-1,+1]}$ estimations using either report text embeddings or forecast revisions as input. The estimates for 2015, for example, are derived from Ridge regression models trained on 2000-2014 data. The \widehat{CAR}_{txt} condenses the 5120-dimension text information into a single dimension, while \widehat{CAR}_{rev} is estimated using three forecast revision measures under identical procedures.

Table 4 presents sample summary statistics and regression results. The analysis sample is restricted to observations with valid current and previous stock recommendations, earnings forecasts, and target prices. Panel B's Column (1) confirms that recommendation revisions, earnings forecast revisions, and target price revisions all contribute significantly to explaining contemporaneous abnormal stock return variations, consistent with Brav and Lehavy (2003) and Huang et al. (2014). Column (2) shows that \widehat{CAR}_{txt} alone achieves an R^2 of 10.5%. When both analyst revision measures and \widehat{CAR}_{txt} are included as regressors in column (3), the R^2 increases to 14.9%. In economic terms, one standard deviation increase in recommendation revision, earnings forecast revision, target price revision, and report text favorableness corresponds to 3-day abnormal return increases of 10, 40, 90, and 120 basis points, respectively. Columns (4) and (5) examine \widehat{CAR}_{rev} , which aggregates all revision metrics. The \widehat{CAR}_{rev} -only model achieves an R^2 of 8.9%, while combined inputs reach 14.7%. These findings collectively demonstrate that the information

content of the report text surpasses that of forecast revisions in economic significance.

Columns (6)-(7) introduce *SUE* and *PriorCAR* controls to capture earnings surprises and recent news. The stability of \widehat{CAR}_{rev} and \widehat{CAR}_{txt} coefficients suggests that market-valued analyst information is distinct from recent earnings news and does not merely reflect reactions to past returns.

3.2.2 Earnings Announcements

Building on research examining the interplay between analyst reports and corporate disclosures (Frankel et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2010; Huang et al., 2018), I analyze the information content of sell-side analyst reports surrounding earnings announcements.

Following Chen et al. (2010), I group analyst reports into 13 weekly bins around earnings announcement dates. Panel A in Table 5 presents the R^2_{OOS} and DM t-stats for weekly report samples. Consistent with Huang et al. (2018), analyst reports cluster predominantly in the immediate post-earnings announcement period. The information content only exhibits strong significance only in the first week, achieving an R^2_{OOS} of approximately 10% with a t-statistic of 10.17.

The variation in performance across weekly bins may reflect Ridge models capturing dominant patterns in analyst reports issued around earnings announcements. To address potential temporal variation, I train separate Ridge models on analyst reports released during earnings announcement periods and those issued beyond these periods, allowing the models to extract distinct information content based on report timing. Panel B in Table 5 compares the model performance within and beyond earnings announcement periods using 1-day, 2-day, 3-day, and 7-day windows. Models trained on earnings announcement periods consistently outperform those trained on non-announcement periods. The R^2_{OOS} and t-statistics exhibit a declining pattern as windows lengthen, decreasing from 11.84% to 7.29% over the earnings announcement week, suggesting markets particularly value swift analyst responses to earnings news.

To address concerns that analysts merely restate earnings call information and that market reactions primarily reflect earnings announcements rather than analyst insights, I conduct a comparative analysis of information content between these two sources. I focus on reports released one day after earnings announcements, when analysts would be most likely to simply repackage earnings information.

Column (1) of Panel C presents the R_{OOS}^2 for $CAR_{[-1,+1]}$ using earnings conference call transcript embeddings as input.¹⁰ The R_{OOS}^2 reaches 4.20% with a DM t-statistic of 5.16. Since the conference call transcript data began in 2005, I retrained the Ridge regression model with analyst report text input to align the sample periods. Using report text embeddings from the day following earnings announcements, this analysis achieves an R_{OOS}^2 of 9.72% (column 2), substantially outperforming conference call transcripts alone.

The combination of analyst report and earnings conference call embeddings yields further improvements, with the R_{OOS}^2 increasing to 11.96% (column 3). A comparison t-statistic of 5.12 between transcript-only and combined models demonstrates analysts’ substantial incremental contribution. These findings collectively refute the notion that analysts merely restate earnings information, instead highlighting their distinct and timely value to the market.

3.2.3 What Content in Analyst Reports is Valued?

Having established the significance of report text information, I examine which specific content components most influence market response. I employ the Shapley value methodology to decompose the text-based R_{OOS}^2 across the 17 topics detailed in Table 1. The analysis uses sentence-segmented embeddings as report representations to mitigate cross-topic contextual effects. When switching from full-context to sentence-segmented embeddings, the R_{OOS}^2 decreases by 2.25%, quantifying the magnitude of inter-sentence contextual information.

Figure 2 illustrates the Shapley value decomposition, revealing a clear hierarchy in topic

¹⁰Due to the length of earnings conference call transcripts (median 13,029 tokens), I employ the LLaMA-3-8B model for text embeddings in Panel C, which accommodates 8,192 tokens versus the 4,096-token limit of the LLaMA-2-13B model used elsewhere. Texts are truncated at these limits to maximize information retention.

importance. Income Statement Analyses and Financial Ratio Analyses emerge as the most valuable components, contributing 67% and 45% of text-based R_{OOS}^2 , respectively. Investment Thesis and Valuation form a second tier of importance, with Shapley values of 1.76% and 1.51%. The remaining topics show minimal or negative Shapley values, indicating limited market reactions.

The findings' robustness is supported by several additional analyses. Figure A4 shows that normalizing Shapley values by sentence count and token length maintains Income Statement Analyses' dominance. Figure A5 demonstrates consistency in topic rankings across different industries.

The evolution of text-based R_{OOS}^2 is depicted in Figure A6 of the Online Appendix. While a notable decline in R_{OOS}^2 occurs between 2020 and 2021, likely reflecting COVID-19 pandemic disruptions in financial markets, the scaled Shapley value for Income Statement analysis (shown by the red line) exhibits remarkable stability. This persistence suggests that analyst commentary on income statements maintains its informational value even during market turbulence.

To disentangle whether topic importance stems from analysts' expertise in certain areas (supply effect) or investors' response (demand effect), Figure A7 compares Shapley values across analyst experience levels and brokerage firm sizes. The consistent topic hierarchy across all four subsamples (experienced/inexperienced analysts and large/small brokerages) indicates that topic rankings are not driven by variations in analyst expertise.

I proceed to examine analysts' dual roles in income statement analysis: their discovery role in collecting and generating otherwise unavailable information and their interpretation role in integrating and processing available information into more interpretable signals (Huang et al., 2018; Blankespoor et al., 2020). To facilitate the analysis, I categorize Income Statement sentences based on: (1) Information Acquisition versus Information Interpretation, and (2) Realized Income versus Expected Income. This categorization is achieved through a prompt-based classification system, as detailed in Prompt 3.

Prompt 3: Please read the following sentence from a sell-side analyst report for the company {firm} ({ticker}) and classify it based on two criteria:

Information Type:

Information Acquisition (0): Sentences that directly report quantitative financial data, such as earnings, revenue, expenses, or other metrics. Example: ‘Reported EPS of \$1.40 beat consensus of \$0.94 and our estimate of \$1.17.’

Information Interpretation (1): Sentences that provide analysis, context, or interpretation of the financial data, such as discussing trends, comparing performance to forecasts, assessing market impacts, or considering strategic implications. Example: ‘Biogen reported 1Q12 MS franchise sales below our estimate and the Street, as Avonex sales were negatively impacted by unfavorable distribution channel dynamics.’

Time Reference:

Realized Income (0): Sentences referring to concrete, historical results from completed periods. Example: ‘The company’s revenue for the fiscal year 2022 was \$500 million.’

Expected Income (1): Sentences containing subjective predictions, or expectations for future periods. Example: ‘The company expects to achieve revenue of \$550 million in fiscal year 2023 based on current market conditions.’

Output your classification as two comma-separated numbers: the first for Information Type (0 for Acquisition, 1 for Integration) and the second for Time Reference (0 for Actual, 1 for Forecast).

Output format: InfoType, TimeRef

Sentence to classify: {report_sent}.

Figure 3 provides a granular breakdown of R_{OOS}^2 across 18 topics, including Income Statement subcategories. Income interpretation contributes three times as much to R_{OOS}^2 as income acquisition, suggesting that markets value context and explanation over raw figures. The contribution from realized income discussions is triple that of income expectations, indicating markets place greater value on actual results than forward-looking projections. These patterns

emphasizes that markets particularly value analysts' ability to interpret realized income, beyond mere information reporting or future expectations.

These findings align with the results from section 3.2.2, where analyst reports released immediately after earnings announcements demonstrate the highest information content. Taken together, these results suggest that the market places the highest value on analysts who can rapidly digest earnings announcement information and provide insightful interpretations.

3.2.4 Comparison of Revision Reports and Reiteration Reports

Given the established relationship between market prices and analyst forecast revisions (e.g., Gleason and Lee, 2003; Asquith et al., 2005; Bradshaw et al., 2021), I examine the differential information content between revision and reiteration reports. Following the criteria of Huang et al. (2014), I classify reports as revisions when released within two days of the I/B/E/S forecast announcement date. This classification is applied independently across three forecast targets—recommendations, target prices, and earnings. Therefore, a single report may be classified as both an earnings forecast revision report and a recommendation reiteration report.

Table 6 presents out-of-sample model performance across reiteration and revision samples. The frequency of revisions varies considerably: earnings forecast revisions are most common (56.57% of reports), followed by target price revisions (31.10%), while recommendation revisions are relatively rare (2.29%). Recommendation revisions exhibit particularly strong explanatory power. Quantitative forecast revision measures achieve an R_{OOS}^2 of 14.99% when accompanying recommendation revisions, while report text yields 16.80%. The combination enhances explanatory power to 22.63%. This finding complements the literature that attributes large stock price changes to analysts' recommendation revisions (Loh and Stulz, 2011; Bradley et al., 2014).

Target price revisions, noted for their incremental information value due to the limitations of discrete recommendations (Bradshaw, 2002; Brav and Lehavy, 2003), show marked differences between revisions and reiterations. While reiteration reports demonstrate minimal information content (combined R_{OOS}^2 of 3.58%), revision reports exhibit substantial value ($R_{OOS}^2 = 20.88%$,

t-stat = 11.18).

Earnings forecast revisions show a similar pattern. Reiteration reports yield insignificant R_{OOS}^2 , while revision reports demonstrate significant explanatory power. The combination of numerical and textual inputs for revision reports achieves an R_{OOS}^2 of 16.37% (t-statistic = 11.42), highlighting revisions' superior value over reiterations.

Overall, Table 6 shows that report content carries greater information content when accompanying forecast revisions rather than reiterations, with recommendation revision reports exhibiting the highest value.

3.2.5 Comparison with Analyst Report Sentiment

The sentiment analysis serves two objectives: to evaluate how LLMs perform compared to traditional NLP methods, and to assess the relative information content of embeddings versus tone measures. I compare tone measures derived from both [Huang et al. \(2014\)](#)'s Naive Bayes approach and BERT classification. I manually label 10,000 sentences as training data for both models. After training the models to categorize sentences as positive, neutral, or negative, I average these classifications at the report level to create *Tone_NB* and *Tone_BERT* measures.

Table 7 contrasts the performance of text tone measures against text embeddings. Panel A presents OLS regression results of three-day *CAR* on tone measures. Column (1) shows a coefficient estimate of 0.022 for *Tone_NB*, aligning with [Huang et al. \(2014\)](#)'s reported 0.0208. A one standard deviation increase in text tone favorableness corresponds to a 54 basis point increase in *CAR*, comparable to their reported 41 basis point increase in two-day abnormal returns. Column (2) reveals significantly positive coefficients for tone measures for both Income Statement and non-Income Statement topics. The results remain consistent under firm-fixed and year-fixed effects in column (3). BERT-based tone measures (columns 4-6) demonstrate substantially larger coefficient estimates with higher significance levels. A one standard deviation increase in BERT-based tone favorableness yields a 95 basis point increase in three-day *CAR*. When both measures are included (column 7), Naive Bayes-based tone coefficients become insignificant, indicating BERT's superior

sentiment capture.

Panel B of Table 7 compares the R^2_{OOS} across models. Tone inputs alone achieve R^2_{OOS} ranging from 0.05% to 3.68% in the first four rows. Including forecast revisions and text embeddings improves R^2_{OOS} to 9.49% and 12.27%, respectively. The panel's final rows show that adding tone measures to text embedding models yields no statistically significant improvement in R^2_{OOS} .

The results highlight two key advantages of LLMs over conventional NLP methods: stronger explanatory power for stock returns through better sentiment capture, and the ability to extract richer textual information beyond simple sentiment measures.

3.2.6 Alternative Machine Learning Models

I examine the information content using three alternative machine learning algorithms, following the same procedure of Ridge regressions. Results are presented in Table 8.

PLS regressions extract common components that correlate with the target variable. If text embeddings contain strong common components that correlates with stock returns, PLS should outperform. Using this method, I achieve an R^2_{OOS} of 8.26%, with year-to-year variations similar to Ridge models. DM tests confirm significance at the 1% level across all years.

The XGBoost algorithm, which builds sequential trees to combine weak estimations into stronger ones, allows for testing whether text embeddings contain discrete informational components of varying importance. Despite its ability to capture nonlinear relationships, XGBoost underperforms Ridge regressions with an R^2_{OOS} of 5.97% (DM t-stat = 6.76). This relatively weaker performance suggests that linguistic information is distributed across the embedding space rather than concentrated in specific dimensions.

Neural Network models, which underpin LLMs and transformer architectures, show superior performance. Given their interconnected node structure mirroring human neural networks, these models are well-suited to capture word relationships and contextual information. Using ensembles of five models for each configuration, Neural Networks achieve the highest R^2_{OOS} among

tested algorithms, ranging from 10.42% to 12.12%. Performance improves with network depth, consistent with Kelly et al. (2022)'s virtue of complexity principle.

Two key findings emerge from these experiments. First, the significant R_{OOS}^2 across models demonstrates meaningful information content in report text, particularly given the low signal-to-noise ratio in stock returns. Second, although Neural Networks achieve the highest performance, most of the textual information can be captured by simple linear models like Ridge regressions.

3.3 Information Value of Analyst Reports

To translate the statistical measure R_{OOS}^2 into economic terms, this section quantifies the information value of analyst reports using the methodology established in Section 2.3. This measure captures the economic profit generated from reduced price uncertainty, while incorporating price impact considerations. The measure's construction implies that both higher information content and lower price impact contribute positively to the estimated information value.

Table 9 presents the statistical evidence estimated with the delta method. For S&P 100 constituent stocks, sell-side analysts generate an average three-day window information value of \$0.47 million (SE = \$0.05 million). This value can be decomposed into its constituent components: textual content contributes \$0.38 million, while numerical revisions account for \$0.34 million. Extrapolating from the typical frequency of analyst coverage—approximately 15 report days per year—the annualized lower bound investors would expect to profit from early access to analyst reports on an S&P 100 firm amounts to \$6.89 million. The precision of these estimates is supported by consistently narrow standard errors and confidence intervals across different information value measures. The average price impact ($\hat{\lambda}_{it}/P_{it-}$) is 0.34, suggesting that a \$1 million order pushes the stock price up by 0.034%. The statistics demonstrate that analyst information value is economically meaningful, with both textual content and numerical forecasts contributing significantly.

Figure 4 illustrates the dynamics of analyst report information value. The analysis tracks both

the strategic value of combined numerical and textual information (solid line) and the isolated value of textual information (dashed line). While both measures exhibit substantial temporal variation, they demonstrate an overall upward trend. The consistently higher combined value relative to textual value suggests complementarity between numerical and textual components.

The 95% confidence interval reveals increased variability in information value post-2020, characterized by wider confidence bounds and more pronounced peaks and troughs. The heightened volatility coincides with the COVID-19 pandemic period, which introduced substantial market uncertainty. The patterns demonstrate that the dynamic nature of analyst information value and its sensitivity to market conditions.

The Online Appendix provides additional robustness checks. Table A7 presents alternative information value estimates using high-frequency realized return volatility measures and varied trade-signing algorithms, yielding estimates ranging from \$0.42 million to \$0.64 million. Figure A8 demonstrates that these alternative specifications produce consistent temporal patterns in information value evolution.

3.3.1 The Value of Analyst Information in the Cross-section of Stocks

Analyst information value may vary in the cross-section of stocks. Prior literature suggests that information processing and dissemination costs vary with firm size (Zeghal, 1984), and analyst opinions may trigger larger market reactions for smaller stocks due to their relatively limited public information environment (Stickel, 1995). Figure A9 illustrates this relationship through a scatter plot of information value against stock market capitalization. While the plot reveals a positive association between market equity and information value, the relationship exhibits notable nonlinearities. To formally examine this relationship, I estimate regressions of information value on stock size, incorporating firm and year fixed effects and the book-to-market ratio control.

Table 10 shows that stocks with larger market equity have significantly higher information value from analysts. The economic magnitude is substantial: estimates from column (4) indicate that a 1% increase in market equity corresponds to a 0.864% increase in analyst information value.

Columns (5)-(8) reveal that textual information value exhibits greater size sensitivity compared to the combined numerical and textual information value. To better understand the mechanisms driving this positive size elasticity, I decompose the information value into two components: explained return volatility and price impact. The decomposition can be expressed logarithmically as:

$$\log \widehat{\Omega}_{it} = \underbrace{\log \left[r_{it}^2 - \left(r_{it} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \widehat{r}_{ijt}}{N} \right)^2 \right]}_{\text{log explained return variance}} - \underbrace{\log \frac{\widehat{\lambda}_{it}}{P_{it-}}}_{\text{log price impact}}. \quad (11)$$

Panel B of Table 10 shows that higher analyst information value in larger stocks stems primarily from their greater liquidity. While analyst reports do not better explain return volatility in large stocks, the reduced price impact of liquid stocks enhances their information value.

3.3.2 The Value of Analyst Information in the Cross-section of Analysts

Prior literature suggests that analysts who make bold forecasts incorporate private information more comprehensively than those who herd (Clement and Tse, 2005). This section examines the relationship between information value and analysts' herding behavior.

To analyze cross-sectional variation in analyst characteristics, I estimate regressions of stock-analyst-day information value on forecast boldness indicators, incorporating firm, analyst, and year fixed effects. Following Jacob et al. (1999), who suggests larger brokerage firms provide superior research, I include broker size as a control variable. The analyst-specific information value measure is defined as:

$$\widehat{\Omega}_{ijt} = \frac{r_{it}^2 - (r_{it} - \widehat{r}_{ijt})^2}{\widehat{\lambda}_{it}} \cdot p_{it-}. \quad (12)$$

Table 11 presents the regression results. Panel A, columns (1)-(4), reveals significantly positive coefficient estimates on *Bold*, indicating more strategically valuable information when analysts provide bold forecasts. Quantitatively, information from bold reports demonstrates 29% higher value compared to herding reports—a magnitude that persists when examining textual content alone. The insignificant coefficients for *Brokersize* suggest that broker size is related to analyst

information value.

To understand the underlying mechanisms, Panel B decomposes the relationship between analyst boldness and information value into informativeness and price impact components. As shown in columns (1)-(4), information from analysts who issue bold forecasts explains higher return volatility, supporting the argument of [Clement and Tse \(2005\)](#) that analysts issue bold forecasts when possessing relevant private information. Columns (5)-(8) reveal no statistically significant relationship between boldness and price impact, suggesting that the enhanced value of bold forecasts stems primarily from their information content rather than market microstructure effects.

3.3.3 The Value of Analyst Information around Earnings Announcements

Previous evidence underlines the information content of analyst reports in the first week following earnings announcements. Accordingly, this section evaluates the information value of analyst reports issued promptly following earnings announcements and beyond that.

Figure 5 examines different samples of analyst reports categorized by their timing relative to earnings announcements, from reports released in the first week after earnings announcements to those issued in the 13th week. Reports issued in the first post-earnings week exhibit the highest information value, with a sample mean of \$0.84 million. Reports from subsequent weeks show a sharp decline in value. This pattern again suggests that markets place premium value on timely post-earnings analyst reports.

To formally test the observed pattern, I estimate regressions of log information value on an indicator variable *Week*, which identifies reports released within one week after earnings announcements. Following [Banerjee \(2011\)](#) and [Beckmann et al. \(2024\)](#), I include earnings announcement day trading volume (*TradingVolume*) as a proxy for investor disagreement. The model incorporates an interaction term ($Week \times TradingVolume$) to capture the joint effect of post-earnings timing and investor disagreement on analyst information value. The specification builds on [Chen et al. \(2010\)](#)'s finding that analysts' interpretative role becomes more critical with

increasing financial information complexity. The model includes stock and year fixed effects.

Table 12 presents regression results. Panel A documents significantly higher information value for reports issued within the first post-earnings week, as evidenced by positive and significant coefficients on *Week* across all models. The positive and significant interactions between *Week* and *TradingVolume* indicate that information value increases with trading volume on earnings announcement days. The results are consistent with investors placing greater reliance on analyst interpretations during periods of heightened disagreement.

Panel B decomposes the earnings announcement effects into return variance and price impact, showing significant increases in both components. The coefficient magnitudes indicate that the timing effect is primarily driven by higher explained return volatility, rather than changes in price impact. These findings lead to conclude that investors value the most of analysts' interpretation role during periods of heightened post-earnings uncertainty.

4 Conclusion

This paper examines both the quantitative and qualitative content of analyst reports. I find that report text contains more market-valued information content than quantifiable forecast revisions economically, especially shortly following earnings announcements. A Shapley value decomposition identifies analysts' interpretation of income statements as the most valuable component of written reports.

I further translate the information content into economic terms. Using a measure of explained return volatility relative to price impact, I find that early acquisition of the analyst reports for an average S&P 100 constituent firm yields an annualized profit larger than \$6.89 million. Cross-sectional analysis reveals that the information value from analysts is higher for large stocks, bold forecasts, and reports released in the week following earnings announcements.

These findings have important implications for regulators, particularly concerning the fair distribution of information in financial markets. The substantial potential profits from early access

to analyst reports raise concerns about selective distribution practices—a direct violation of FINRA Rule 2241, which mandates research objectivity and prohibits preferential distribution to certain clients. This study presents a hypothetical scenario for quantifying information value rather than an assessment of market practices. By documenting the magnitude of potential profits from privileged access, my research emphasizes the importance of regulations for fair disclosure.

References

- Asquith, Paul, Michael B Mikhail, and Andrea S Au, 2005, Information content of equity analyst reports, *Journal of Financial Economics* 75, 245–282.
- Back, Kerry, C Henry Cao, and Gregory A Willard, 2000, Imperfect competition among informed traders, *The Journal of Finance* 55, 2117–2155.
- Banerjee, Snehal, 2011, Learning from prices and the dispersion in beliefs, *The Review of Financial Studies* 24, 3025–3068.
- Barber, Brad, Reuven Lehavy, Maureen McNichols, and Brett Trueman, 2001, Can investors profit from the prophets? security analyst recommendations and stock returns, *The Journal of Finance* 56, 531–563.
- Barron, Orie E, Donal Byard, and Yong Yu, 2017, Earnings announcement disclosures and changes in analysts' information, *Contemporary Accounting Research* 34, 343–373.
- Beckmann, Lars, Heiner Beckmeyer, Ilias Filippou, Stefan Menze, and Guofu Zhou, 2024, Unusual financial communication-evidence from chatgpt, earnings calls, and the stock market, *Earnings Calls, and the Stock Market (January 15, 2024)* .
- Blankespoor, Elizabeth, Ed deHaan, and Ivan Marinovic, 2020, Disclosure processing costs, investors' information choice, and equity market outcomes: A review, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 70, 101344.
- Bonini, Stefano, Thomas Shohfi, Majeed Simaan, and Guofu Zhou, 2023, The value of data: Analyst vs. machine, *Machine (December 11, 2023)* .
- Bradley, Daniel, Jonathan Clarke, Suzanne Lee, and Chayawat Ornthanalai, 2014, Are analysts' recommendations informative? intraday evidence on the impact of time stamp delays, *The Journal of Finance* 69, 645–673.
- Bradshaw, Mark, Yonca Ertimur, Patricia O'Brien, et al., 2017, Financial analysts and their contribution to well-functioning capital markets, *Foundations and Trends® in Accounting* 11, 119–191.
- Bradshaw, Mark T, 2002, The use of target prices to justify sell-side analysts' stock recommendations, *Accounting Horizons* 16, 27–41.
- Bradshaw, Mark T, Lawrence D Brown, and Kelly Huang, 2013, Do sell-side analysts exhibit differential target price forecasting ability?, *Review of Accounting Studies* 18, 930–955.

- Bradshaw, Mark T, Brandon Lock, Xue Wang, and Dexin Zhou, 2021, Soft information in the financial press and analyst revisions, *The accounting review* 96, 107–132.
- Brav, Alon, and Reuven Lehavy, 2003, An empirical analysis of analysts' target prices: Short-term informativeness and long-term dynamics, *The Journal of Finance* 58, 1933–1967.
- Cao, Sean, Wei Jiang, Junbo Wang, and Baozhong Yang, 2024, From man vs. machine to man+ machine: The art and ai of stock analyses, *Journal of Financial Economics* 160, 103910.
- Chakrabarty, Bidisha, Bingguang Li, Vanthuan Nguyen, and Robert A Van Ness, 2007, Trade classification algorithms for electronic communications network trades, *Journal of Banking & Finance* 31, 3806–3821.
- Chen, Hailiang, Byoung-Hyoun Hwang, and Zhuozhen Peng, 2023, Revisiting the cross-section of expected stock returns: Evidence from a textual analysis of buy recommendations, *Nanyang Business School Research Paper* .
- Chen, Xia, Qiang Cheng, and Kin Lo, 2010, On the relationship between analyst reports and corporate disclosures: Exploring the roles of information discovery and interpretation, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 49, 206–226.
- Chen, Yifei, Bryan T Kelly, and Dacheng Xiu, 2022, Expected returns and large language models, *Available at SSRN 4416687* .
- Chi, Feng, Byoung-Hyoun Hwang, and Yaping Zheng, 2024, The use and usefulness of big data in finance: Evidence from financial analysts, *Management Science* .
- Christophe, Stephen E, Michael G Ferri, and Jim Hsieh, 2010, Informed trading before analyst downgrades: Evidence from short sellers, *Journal of Financial Economics* 95, 85–106.
- Clement, Michael B, and Senyo Y Tse, 2005, Financial analyst characteristics and herding behavior in forecasting, *The Journal of Finance* 60, 307–341.
- Diebold, Francis X, and Robert S Mariano, 2002, Comparing predictive accuracy, *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 20, 134–144.
- Ellis, Katrina, Roni Michaely, and Maureen O'hara, 2000, When the underwriter is the market maker: An examination of trading in the ipo aftermarket, *The Journal of Finance* 55, 1039–1074.
- Frankel, Richard, SP Kothari, and Joseph Weber, 2006, Determinants of the informativeness of analyst research, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 41, 29–54.

- Gleason, Cristi A, and Charles MC Lee, 2003, Analyst forecast revisions and market price discovery, *The Accounting Review* 78, 193–225.
- Green, T Clifton, 2006, The value of client access to analyst recommendations, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 41, 1–24.
- Gu, Shihao, Bryan Kelly, and Dacheng Xiu, 2020, Empirical asset pricing via machine learning, *The Review of Financial Studies* 33, 2223–2273.
- Hoberg, Gerard, Gordon Phillips, and Nagpurnanand Prabhala, 2014, Product market threats, payouts, and financial flexibility, *The Journal of Finance* 69, 293–324.
- Huang, Allen H, Reuven Lehavy, Amy Y Zang, and Rong Zheng, 2018, Analyst information discovery and interpretation roles: A topic modeling approach, *Management Science* 64, 2833–2855.
- Huang, Allen H, Amy Y Zang, and Rong Zheng, 2014, Evidence on the information content of text in analyst reports, *The Accounting Review* 89, 2151–2180.
- Irvine, Paul, Marc Lipson, and Andy Puckett, 2007, Tipping, *The Review of Financial Studies* 20, 741–768.
- Jacob, John, Thomas Z Lys, and Margaret A Neale, 1999, Expertise in forecasting performance of security analysts, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 28, 51–82.
- Jha, Manish, Jialin Qian, Michael Weber, and Baozhong Yang, 2024, Chatgpt and corporate policies, Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Kadan, Ohad, and Asaf Manela, 2024, Liquidity and the strategic value of information, *Review of Finance* .
- Kadan, Ohad, Roni Michaely, and Pamela C Moulton, 2018, Trading in the presence of short-lived private information: Evidence from analyst recommendation changes, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 53, 1509–1546.
- Kelly, Bryan T, Semyon Malamud, and Kangying Zhou, 2022, The virtue of complexity everywhere, *Available at SSRN 4166368* .
- Keskek, Sami, Senyo Tse, and Jennifer Wu Tucker, 2014, Analyst information production and the timing of annual earnings forecasts, *Review of Accounting Studies* 19, 1504–1531.
- Kim, Yongtae, and Minsup Song, 2015, Management earnings forecasts and value of analyst forecast revisions, *Management Science* 61, 1663–1683.

- Kong, Dongmin, Chen Lin, Shasha Liu, and Weiqiang Tan, 2021, Whose money is smart? individual and institutional investors' trades based on analyst recommendations, *Journal of Empirical Finance* 62, 234–251.
- Kyle, Albert S, 1985, Continuous auctions and insider trading, *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* 1315–1335.
- Lee, Charles MC, and Mark J Ready, 1991, Inferring trade direction from intraday data, *The Journal of Finance* 46, 733–746.
- Li, Kai, Feng Mai, Rui Shen, Chelsea Yang, and Tengfei Zhang, 2024, Dissecting corporate culture using generative ai–insights from analyst reports, *Available at SSRN 4558295* .
- Livnat, Joshua, and Yuan Zhang, 2012, Information interpretation or information discovery: Which role of analysts do investors value more?, *Review of Accounting Studies* 17, 612–641.
- Lobo, Gerald J, Minsup Song, and Mary Harris Stanford, 2017, The effect of analyst forecasts during earnings announcements on investor responses to reported earnings, *The Accounting Review* 92, 239–263.
- Loh, Roger K, and René M Stulz, 2011, When are analyst recommendation changes influential?, *The Review of Financial Studies* 24, 593–627.
- Lundberg, Scott M, and Su-In Lee, 2017, A unified approach to interpreting model predictions, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30.
- Merton, Robert C, 1974, On the pricing of corporate debt: The risk structure of interest rates, *The Journal of Finance* 29, 449–470.
- Sarkar, Suproteem K, and Keyon Vafa, 2024, Lookahead bias in pretrained language models, *Available at SSRN* .
- Shapley, Lloyd S, 1953, A value for n-person games, *Contributions to the Theory of Games* 2, 307–321.
- Stickel, Scott E, 1995, The anatomy of the performance of buy and sell recommendations, *Financial Analysts Journal* 51, 25–39.
- Zeghal, Daniel, 1984, Firm size and the informational content of financial statements, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 19, 299–310.




Figure 1 Analyst Discussion across Topics

This figure shows the distribution of report sentences across 17 topics from 2000Q1 to 2023Q4. The stacked plot illustrates the proportional distribution of sentences across 17 distinct topics over time. The topic categories are Executive Summary, Company Overview, Industry Analysis, Competitive Landscape, Income Statement Analysis, Balance Sheet Analysis, Cash Flow Analysis, Financial Ratios, Business Segments, Growth Strategies, Risk Factors, Management and Governance, ESG Factors, Valuation, Investment Thesis, Appendices and Disclosures, and None of Above.




Figure 2 Shapley Values as Topic Importance

This figure shows the importance of topics discussed in analyst reports, calculated using the Shapley value decomposition method. The summation across these topics precisely equates to the R^2_{OOS} of the sentence-segmented report embeddings. The red line scales topic Shapley values with aggregated R^2_{OOS} .




Figure 3 Shapley Values for Sub-Topics

This figure shows the relative importance of sub-topics within income statement analyses discussed in analyst reports, calculated using the Shapley value decomposition approach. The summation of SHAP values for the 18 topics equals the R_{OOS}^2 of the sentence-segmented report embeddings. The red line represents the SHAP value scaled by the summed R_{OOS}^2 for each topic. Panel (a) categorizes income statement analyses into income acquisition and income interpretation, while Panel (b) categorizes them into income realization and income expectation.




Figure 4 Dollar Value of Analyst Reports over Time

This figure presents the estimated value of information, reported in millions of dollars and adjusted to 2020 dollars, derived from analyst reports between 2015Q1 and 2023Q4. Quarterly mean approximations are calculated using the delta method. The solid line represents the combined strategic value of numerical and textual information from analyst reports, while the dashed line shows the strategic value of textual information alone. The horizontal line marks the sample mean over the 2015-2023 period. The light blue shaded area indicates the 95% confidence interval.




Figure 5 Information Value of Analyst Reports after Earnings Announcements

This figure presents the estimated information value of analyst reports released 1-13 weeks following the most recent earnings announcement. The numbers are reported in millions of dollars and adjusted to 2020 dollars. The sample spans from 2015Q1 to 2023Q4. The vertical axis indicates the value of information, while the horizontal axis represents weeks post-earnings announcements. Each point reflects the average value of both numerical and textual information in analyst reports for the respective week, calculated using the delta method. The solid green line marks the sample mean value of information, with green bars showing the 95% confidence intervals. The red dashed horizontal line represents the sample mean over the 2015-2023 period.

Table 1 Topic Categories and Descriptions

Topic	Descriptions
Company and Industry Overview	
Executive Summary	Provides a high-level overview of the report’s key findings and conclusions; includes a brief description of the company, its industry, and the purpose of the report; highlights the most important points from the analysis, such as the company’s financial performance, competitive position, and growth prospects.
Company Overview	Offers a comprehensive description of the company, including its history, business model, and key products or services; discusses the company’s organizational structure, management team, and corporate governance; analyzes the company’s mission, vision, and strategic objectives.
Industry Analysis	Provides an in-depth analysis of the industry in which the company operates; includes information on market size, growth trends, and key drivers; discusses the regulatory environment, technological advancements, and other external factors affecting the industry; analyzes the industry’s competitive dynamics and the company’s position within the industry.
Competitive Landscape	Identifies the company’s main competitors and their market share; compares the company’s products, services, and pricing strategies with those of its competitors; analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of the company and its competitors; discusses potential new entrants and substitutes that could disrupt the competitive landscape.
Business Segments	Provides a detailed analysis of the company’s various business segments or divisions; discusses the financial performance, growth prospects, and challenges of each segment; analyzes the contribution of each segment to the company’s overall revenue and profitability.
Growth Strategies	Discusses the company’s strategies for driving future growth, such as organic growth initiatives, product innovations, and geographic expansions; analyzes the company’s mergers and acquisitions (M&A) strategy and potential targets; examines the company’s investments in research and development (R&D) and marketing.
Financial Analysis	
Income Statement Analysis	Analyzes the company’s revenue, expenses, and profitability.
Balance Sheet Analysis	Examines the company’s assets, liabilities, and shareholders’ equity.
Cash Flow Analysis	Analyzes the company’s cash inflows and outflows to evaluate liquidity.
Financial Ratios	Discusses key ratios like profitability, liquidity, and solvency ratios.
Strategic Outlook	
Investment Thesis	Summarizes the key reasons for investing (or not investing) in the company’s shares; discusses the potential catalysts and risks that could impact the company’s valuation and stock price performance; provides a target price or price range for the company’s shares based on the valuation analyses and investment thesis.
Valuation	Estimates the intrinsic value of the company’s shares using various valuation methodologies, such as discounted cash flow (DCF) analysis, relative valuation multiples, and sum-of-the-parts analysis; compares the company’s valuation with that of its peers and historical benchmarks; discusses the key assumptions and sensitivities underlying the valuation analyses.
Risk and Governance	
Risk Factors	Identifies and analyzes the key risks facing the company, such as market risks, operational risks, financial risks, and legal/regulatory risks; discusses the potential impact of these risks on the company’s financial performance and growth prospects; examines the company’s risk management strategies and mitigation measures.
Management and Governance	Provides an overview of the company’s management team, including their experience, expertise, and track record; analyzes the company’s corporate governance practices, such as board composition, executive compensation, and shareholder rights; discusses the company’s succession planning and key person risks.

Table 1 – continued from previous page

Topic	Descriptions
ESG	Analyzes the company's performance and initiatives related to environmental sustainability, social responsibility, and corporate governance; discusses the potential impact of ESG factors on the company's reputation, risk profile, and financial performance; examines the company's compliance with ESG regulations and industry standards.
Additional Content	
Appendices and Disclosures	Includes additional supporting materials, such as financial statements, ratio calculations, and detailed segment data; provides important disclosures, such as the analyst's rating system, potential conflicts of interest, and disclaimers; discusses the limitations and uncertainties of the analysis and the need for further due diligence by investors.
None of the Above	Covers any content that does not fall into the specified topics.

Table 2 Summary Statistics of Analyst Reports

This table presents the summary statistics of the distribution of the analyst report sample of S&P 100 firms over the years 2000-2023 and across Fama-French 12 (FF12) industries. Panel A shows the number of reports, brokerage firms, sell-side analysts, average number of pages, and tokens per report each year. Panel B shows the statistics across FF12 industries. The definition of FF12 industries is accessible via https://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/ken.french/Data_Library.html.

Panel A: Sell-side analyst reports between 2000-2023					
Year	Reports	Brokerage firms	Analysts	Pages	Tokens
2000	582	28	78	5	1992
2001	1080	34	116	5	2043
2002	1973	42	167	5	1806
2003	2735	45	192	6	2006
2004	3622	49	262	7	1910
2005	4434	50	269	7	2154
2006	4716	45	234	7	2065
2007	4872	44	243	7	2259
2008	5834	51	279	8	2468
2009	5745	62	326	8	2322
2010	4957	67	313	7	2171
2011	7327	56	381	8	2164
2012	7534	54	379	8	1943
2013	7936	52	403	8	1941
2014	7350	50	407	8	1824
2015	7534	50	380	8	1866
2016	7009	50	374	8	1987
2017	6628	48	344	9	2039
2018	5481	37	282	8	2034
2019	5958	38	305	8	1992
2020	6049	40	299	8	2017
2021	3967	27	196	9	2047
2022	4536	25	210	9	2146
2023	4393	34	212	9	2094

Panel B: Sell-side analyst reports in Fama-French 12 industries					
Industry	Reports	Brokerage firms	Analysts	Pages	Tokens
BusEq	25258	101	411	8	2133
Hlth	20257	66	191	8	2086
Money	19689	63	230	7	1955
Shops	11602	75	186	7	1968
Manuf	10531	57	170	8	1954
Other	9763	79	259	9	2303
Telcm	6022	60	89	9	2149
Utils	5068	30	54	6	1827
Enrgy	5049	41	67	8	1927
NoDur	3862	36	65	8	2209
Durbl	2915	29	40	8	1867
Chems	2236	33	53	8	2141

Table 3 Analyst Quantitative and Qualitative Information Content

This table presents the out-of-sample performance of Ridge regression models in explaining market reactions with both quantitative and qualitative information contained in analyst reports. The analysis employs four distinct input configurations: (1) ‘Revision only’, incorporating three analyst forecast revision measures; (2) ‘Numerical only’, augmenting the revision data with additional numerical measures as described in Section 3.1; (3) ‘Text only’, using analyst report text embeddings exclusively; and (4) ‘Rev + text’, combining forecast revision measures with text embeddings. The DM t -statistic for the R^2_{OOS} is calculated using the procedure outlined by Gu et al. (2020). In Panel A, the benchmark estimation is set to zero. In Panel B, the reported t -statistic compares the estimation of alternative large language models with those of LLaMA-2-13B. BERT denotes the bert-base-uncased model. OpenAI denotes the text-embedding-3-small model. LLaMA-3 denotes the LLaMA-3-8B model.

Panel A: Information content of numerical and textual information											
Year	Revision only	t-stat	Numerical only	t-stat	Text only	t-stat	Rev + text	t-stat	t-stat	t-stat	t-stat
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(5)-(1)	(7)-(1)	(7)-(5)
2015	10.31%	4.27	7.75%	2.59	12.63%	6.39	10.63%	2.98	3.63	0.16	-1.25
2016	14.61%	11.26	15.35%	11.26	11.98%	3.93	17.08%	9.67	-1.15	3.82	2.93
2017	8.99%	6.23	9.99%	6.41	11.11%	6.40	11.98%	7.09	4.99	5.96	2.38
2018	10.05%	3.28	10.52%	3.60	10.87%	5.85	13.64%	5.95	0.87	5.77	4.47
2019	9.94%	20.14	9.97%	14.76	12.16%	17.68	14.44%	26.17	2.68	19.77	4.83
2020	5.52%	3.88	6.10%	4.55	3.82%	5.18	6.34%	6.16	-1.75	1.57	7.11
2021	5.43%	5.83	5.96%	6.82	8.50%	6.21	11.94%	27.16	1.48	7.48	3.28
2022	9.78%	6.03	9.16%	4.97	14.88%	10.34	16.95%	10.09	9.21	8.01	5.30
2023	6.68%	5.48	7.19%	4.00	9.30%	4.17	10.76%	6.09	2.13	4.87	3.08
Overall	9.01%	9.45	9.08%	9.44	10.19%	8.20	12.28%	8.87	1.66	3.95	3.77

Panel B: Information content of textual information using alternative LLMs						
Year	BERT	t-stat	OpenAI	t-stat	LLaMA-3	t-stat
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
2015	7.24%	-13.45	6.76%	-9.97	11.28%	-8.04
2016	6.50%	-2.22	5.94%	-4.05	10.48%	2.23
2017	5.48%	-5.95	5.88%	-7.72	10.25%	0.11
2018	6.94%	-14.05	6.48%	-8.15	10.21%	1.29
2019	6.16%	-13.80	5.41%	-16.94	10.48%	-6.19
2020	3.92%	-0.33	4.10%	0.09	6.07%	6.27
2021	2.63%	-18.53	3.07%	-4.11	6.98%	-1.26
2022	7.75%	-9.93	7.89%	-7.09	13.02%	-2.96
2023	4.18%	-5.65	4.03%	-8.04	8.68%	12.05
Overall	5.72%	-5.54	5.57%	-5.66	9.66%	0.19

Table 4 OLS Regressions of Numerical and Textual Information

This table presents OLS regression results analyzing the information content of analyst reports. Panel A shows the summary statistics of the variables. Panel B reports coefficient estimates and t-statistics. The dependent variable, $CAR_{[-1,+1]}$, represents the three-day cumulative abnormal returns centered on the report release date, with abnormal returns calculated as the raw return minus the buy-and-hold return on the NYSE/AMEX/NASDAQ value-weighted market return. REC_REV denotes recommendation revision, calculated as the current report's recommendation minus the last recommendation in I/B/E/S issued by the same analyst for the same stock. EF_REV represents earnings forecast revision, calculated as the current report's EPS forecast minus the last EPS forecast in I/B/E/S issued by the same analyst for the same stock, scaled by the stock price 50 days before the report release. TP_REV indicates target price revision, calculated as the current report's target price minus the last target price in I/B/E/S issued by the same analyst for the same stock, scaled by the stock price 50 days before the report release. *Prior_CAR* represents the cumulative abnormal return over the period [-10, -2]. *SUE* denotes the earnings surprise. \widehat{CAR}_{txt} is the out-of-sample fitted value of Ridge regression using full-context report embeddings. \widehat{CAR}_{rev} is the out-of-sample fitted value of Ridge regressions using the three forecast revision measures. All explanatory variables are standardized in the regressions. The t-statistics, presented in parentheses, are calculated using a two-way clustering method by stock and year. $*p < .1$, $**p < .05$, $***p < .01$.

Panel A: Summary statistics							
	Mean	Std	p25	P50	P75	N	
$CAR_{[-1,+1]}$	0.002	0.048	-0.019	0.001	0.021	28837	
REC_REV	0.002	0.151	0.000	0.000	0.000	28837	
EF_REV	0.000	0.005	0.000	0.000	0.001	28837	
TP_REV	0.010	0.067	0.000	0.000	0.000	28837	
\widehat{CAR}_{rev}	0.002	0.014	-0.001	-0.000	0.003	28837	
\widehat{CAR}_{txt}	0.002	0.018	-0.009	0.002	0.013	28837	

Panel B: Market reaction to forecast revisions and report text							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
REC_REV	0.001*** (3.26)		0.001** (2.06)				
EF_REV	0.005*** (7.72)		0.004*** (5.39)				
TP_REV	0.012*** (14.95)		0.009*** (11.71)				
\widehat{CAR}_{txt}		0.015*** (24.23)	0.012*** (22.40)		0.012*** (22.30)	0.012*** (19.13)	0.012*** (22.62)
\widehat{CAR}_{rev}				0.014*** (18.29)	0.010*** (14.00)	0.010*** (13.44)	0.010*** (13.35)
SUE						0.001*** (3.97)	0.001** (2.36)
Prior_CAR						-0.003*** (-4.45)	-0.003*** (-5.01)
Constant	0.002*** (3.14)	0.002*** (2.82)	0.002*** (3.09)	0.002*** (3.11)	0.002*** (3.07)	0.002*** (3.41)	0.002*** (3.83)
Year FE	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Stock FE	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
N	28837	28837	28837	28837	28837	23314	20987
Adjusted R ²	0.091	0.105	0.149	0.089	0.147	0.137	0.146

Table 5 Information Content around Earnings Announcements

This table reports the information content of the text in earnings announcement transcripts and analyst written reports. Panel A shows R_{OOS}^2 and t-statistics of analyst report text in 13 weekly bins following earnings announcements. Panel B compares reports issued within and beyond 1, 2, 3, and 7 days after earnings announcements. Panel C examines the information content of both earnings conference call transcripts and analyst reports released one day following earnings announcements. The out-of-sample period is 2015-2023. ‘Transcripts’ means the input contains corporate earnings conference call embeddings. ‘Reports’ implies the input is comprised of analyst report text embeddings. ‘Rev + text’ combines transcript embeddings and text embeddings. The t -statistic for the R_{OOS}^2 is calculated using the procedure outlined by [Gu et al. \(2020\)](#). The benchmark prediction is set to zero. In Panel C column (3)-(1), the reported t -statistics compare models using only the latest conference call transcripts versus those using both transcript and report text.

Panel A: Weekly bins				
Weeks	R_{OOS}^2	t-stat	N	
1	9.80%	10.17	26490	
2	0.60%	-0.08	4586	
3	-8.71%	-2.95	4144	
4	-3.61%	-1.36	4320	
5	0.23%	0.53	3796	
6	-4.07%	-1.53	4230	
7	-4.26%	-1.62	4404	
8	2.88%	1.57	4286	
9	-4.89%	-3.50	3722	
10	2.06%	0.83	3528	
11	2.74%	0.83	4116	
12	-0.02%	-0.42	4764	
13	-0.11%	-0.76	5642	

Panel B: Sub-sample analyses of earnings announcement periods				
Window	Within EA window	t-stat	Beyond EA window	t-stat
1 day	11.84%	3.50	4.59%	2.55
2 days	11.97%	3.38	4.38%	2.47
3 days	11.69%	3.38	4.13%	2.38
7 days	7.29%	2.57	5.08%	2.59

Panel C: Information content of earnings announcement transcripts				
	Transcripts (1)	Reports (2)	Reports + Transcripts (3)	Diff (3) - (1)
R_{OOS}^2	4.20%	9.72%	11.96%	7.76%
t-stat	5.16	3.24	6.42	5.12

Table 6 Information Content of Revision Reports and Reiteration Reports

This table evaluates the information content of reiteration and revision analyst reports from 2015 to 2023. The revision and reiteration reports are labeled following the criteria of [Huang et al. \(2014\)](#). The input types are defined as follows: ‘Revision only’ includes three analyst forecast revision measures; ‘Text only’ consists of analyst report text embeddings; and ‘Rev + text’ combines both revision measures and text embeddings. Panel A presents the R_{OOS}^2 and corresponding t-statistics for reports that reiterate previous predictions. Panel B provides sub-sample analyses of reports with forecast revisions. The t-statistics for R_{OOS}^2 are calculated using zero benchmarks estimation following [Gu et al. \(2020\)](#).

Panel A: Sub-sample analyses of reiteration reports						
Target	Rev only	t-stat	Text only	t-stat	Rev + text	t-stat
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Recommendation	8.71%	9.86	9.85%	8.21	11.76%	9.12
Target price	1.20%	1.63	2.57%	2.26	3.58%	3.40
Earnings forecast	2.89%	2.96	-2.71%	-2.05	-0.66%	0.06

Panel B: Sub-sample analyses of revision reports						
Target	Rev only	t-stat	Text only	t-stat	Rev + text	t-stat
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Recommendation	14.99%	2.92	16.80%	4.8	22.63%	4.83
Target price	16.72%	11.14	17.72%	11.1	20.88%	11.18
Earnings forecast	10.94%	7.48	14.27%	10.9	16.37%	11.42

Table 7 Information Content of Text Embeddings and Text Tones

This table reports the estimation results of CAR to the tone measures and embeddings of analyst report text. $Tone_NB$ is the tone measure for the whole report, constructed using the Naive Bayes approach. $Tone_Income_NB$ is the tone measure for the income statement analyses topic, also constructed using the Naive Bayes approach. $Tone_NonIncome_NB$ is the tone measure for non-income statement topics, constructed using the same Naive Bayes approach. $Tone_BERT$, $Tone_Income_BERT$ and $Tone_NonIncome_BERT$ are corresponding tone measures constructed using the BERT model. Panel A reports the coefficient estimates and t-statistics from OLS regression. The t-statistics, presented in parentheses, are calculated using a two-way clustering method by stock and year. Panel B presents the out-of-sample performance of Ridge regression models in estimating CAR using various information in the analyst report text. The t -statistic for the R^2_{OOS} is calculated following [Gu et al. \(2020\)](#). $*p < .1$, $**p < .05$, $***p < .01$.

Panel A: Market reaction to report tones							
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Tone_NB	0.022*** (15.86)						
Tone_Income_NB		0.006*** (15.02)	0.006*** (12.05)				0.000 (1.12)
Tone_Nonincome_NB		0.014*** (13.10)	0.015*** (11.35)				-0.001 (-1.47)
Tone_BERT				0.035*** (17.71)			
Tone_Income_BERT					0.011*** (15.44)	0.011*** (13.99)	0.010*** (13.57)
Tone_Nonincome_BERT					0.020*** (15.90)	0.021*** (14.94)	0.022*** (15.57)
Constant	-0.008*** (-13.25)	-0.007*** (-13.42)	-0.008*** (-16.31)	-0.008*** (-12.18)	-0.007*** (-10.98)	-0.007*** (-18.23)	-0.007*** (-17.36)
Firm FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
N	99705	99705	99705	99705	99705	99705	99705
Adjusted R^2	0.012	0.011	0.018	0.036	0.034	0.041	0.041
Panel B: Comparison Results for Report Tones and Report Embedding							
Model Input	R^2_{OOS}			t-stat			
Tone (Naive Bayes)	0.05%			-0.30			
Tone (BERT)	3.78%			10.55			
Tone (Naive Bayes) + numerical	9.49%			10.19			
Tone (BERT) + Rev	10.58%			11.11			
Tone (Naive Bayes) + Rev + text	12.28%			8.87			
Tone (BERT) + Rev + text	12.27%			8.91			
“Tone (Naive Bayes) + Rev + text” vs “Rev + text”	0.00%			0.67			
“Tone (BERT) + Rev + text” vs “Rev + text”	-0.01%			-0.79			

Table 8 Information Content of Analyst Reports using Alternative Machine Learning Models

This table reports the R_{OOS}^2 for various machine learning models estimating the information content of analyst report text. The R_{OOS}^2 is calculated annually using a training sample from 2000 to the preceding year. PLS represents the Partial Least Squares regression model, with the number of components tested being 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25. XGBoost (Extreme Gradient Boosting) implements the concept of gradient-boosted decision trees. NN1 to NN5 specify the number of layers in Neural Network models. The Overall row reports the R_{OOS}^2 and t -statistics for the sample period of 2015-2023. The t -statistics for R_{OOS}^2 are calculated using zero benchmarks estimation following [Gu et al. \(2020\)](#).

year	PLS		XGBoost		NN1		NN2		NN3		NN4		NN5	
	R_{OOS}^2	t-stat	R_{OOS}^2	t-stat	R_{OOS}^2	t-stat	R_{OOS}^2	t-stat	R_{OOS}^2	t-stat	R_{OOS}^2	t-stat	R_{OOS}^2	t-stat
2015	12.23%	10.95	8.87%	11.25	15.81%	9.72	13.84%	14.53	15.30%	14.10	11.58%	12.32	16.61%	16.95
2016	10.27%	15.59	6.66%	5.63	12.59%	24.64	11.78%	13.02	10.99%	9.10	12.03%	14.75	12.46%	17.41
2017	6.60%	6.94	4.92%	5.26	9.08%	4.64	10.01%	4.64	9.58%	4.76	8.57%	4.51	10.03%	5.49
2018	8.08%	13.37	5.15%	8.07	10.73%	26.65	10.54%	16.42	10.41%	11.43	9.86%	17.44	11.98%	13.97
2019	11.54%	38.70	6.32%	16.40	13.43%	17.37	15.18%	14.73	15.59%	18.06	15.89%	10.48	15.37%	16.94
2020	3.21%	2.16	3.02%	3.64	4.45%	2.92	4.73%	2.78	3.85%	2.27	4.25%	3.08	5.51%	4.06
2021	2.14%	1.76	4.30%	3.34	4.07%	6.44	5.88%	7.13	9.28%	13.59	8.47%	9.44	8.83%	7.67
2022	11.42%	7.40	10.04%	7.80	13.78%	8.31	15.67%	6.38	16.44%	6.64	17.63%	8.55	17.56%	7.12
2023	8.14%	9.26	4.23%	3.82	9.54%	8.50	12.16%	10.76	11.06%	8.59	12.18%	11.59	11.70%	6.78
Overall	8.26%	6.66	5.97%	6.76	10.42%	8.11	11.04%	7.54	11.18%	7.29	11.05%	6.62	12.12%	7.93

Table 9 Summary Statistics for Analyst Information Value

This table presents the summary statistics for the information values of analyst reports for constituent stocks of the S&P 100 index over the period from 2015Q1 to 2023Q4. The value of information is measured as the explained return volatility divided by the price impact, with the results reported in millions of dollars. All dollar values are adjusted for inflation to reflect 2020 values using the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Panel A reports the dollar value of analysts' information, the information value derived from textual content, and the information value attributable to forecast revisions. Both mean and standard deviation are computed using the delta method. Panel B reports the price impact per billion dollars and the stock price. The price impact is estimated through a regression of one-minute log returns on contemporaneous share order flow, normalized by the closing stock price two trading days prior to report release (t-2), and is reported in billions of dollars. The stock price refers to the closing stock price two trading days prior to the report release (t-2).

Panel A: Dollar value of analysts information						
	Mean	SE	95%CI	99%CI	N	
Information value, \$M	0.47	0.05	[0.38, 0.56]	[0.35, 0.58]	17672	
Information value of text, \$M	0.38	0.04	[0.30, 0.46]	[0.28, 0.48]	17672	
Information value of revisions, \$M	0.34	0.04	[0.26, 0.43]	[0.23, 0.46]	17672	
Panel B: Price impact and stock price						
	Mean	Std	p25	P50	P75	N
Price impact per \$B	0.34	1.29	0.05	0.13	0.31	17672
Stock price	118.49	130.34	51.15	82.0	143.58	17672

Table 10 Value of Analyst Information and Stock Characteristics

This table shows the results of regressing the log information value and its components on stock characteristics. Log information value (text) specifically measures the value of information estimated using analyst report text. The log information value equals log explained return volatility less log price impact, which are used as dependent variables in Panel B. Observations with negative price impact and negative explained return variance are omitted. Variable definitions are presented in Table A2. The t-statistics, presented in parentheses, are calculated using a two-way clustering method by stock and year. $*p < .1$, $**p < .05$, $***p < .01$.

Panel A: Information value from analysts is higher for large firms.								
	log information value				log information value (text)			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Size	0.574*** (8.01)	0.853*** (9.25)	0.573*** (8.33)	0.864*** (9.62)	0.667*** (9.20)	0.922*** (8.45)	0.669*** (9.41)	0.934*** (8.38)
Book-to-market	-0.222 (-1.38)	0.416 (1.27)	-0.139 (-0.94)	0.457 (1.36)	-0.218 (-1.34)	0.326 (0.93)	-0.161 (-1.05)	0.335 (0.92)
Year FE	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Stock FE	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
<i>N</i>	8030	8030	8030	8030	8509	8509	8509	8509
Adjusted R^2	0.072	0.155	0.088	0.168	0.093	0.167	0.103	0.176
Panel B: Price impact is smaller for large firms.								
	log explained return variance				log price impact			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Size	-0.229*** (-5.58)	0.028 (0.53)	-0.228*** (-6.07)	0.044 (0.78)	-0.801*** (-13.15)	-0.831*** (-9.24)	-0.798*** (-13.36)	-0.826*** (-9.46)
Book-to-market	-0.273** (-2.31)	0.153 (0.62)	-0.192* (-1.82)	0.180 (0.70)	-0.059 (-0.51)	-0.260 (-1.26)	-0.060 (-0.56)	-0.274 (-1.33)
Year FE	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Stock FE	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
<i>N</i>	8030	8030	8030	8030	8030	8030	8030	8030
Adjusted R^2	0.015	0.076	0.036	0.092	0.318	0.449	0.318	0.450

Table 11 Value of Analyst Information and Analyst Boldness

This table shows the results of regressing the log information value and its component on analyst features. Log information value (text) specifically measures the value of information estimated using analyst report text. The log information value equals log explained return volatility less log price impact, which are used as dependent variables in Panel B. Observations with negative price impact and negative explained return variance are omitted. Variable definitions are presented in Table A2. The t-statistics, presented in parentheses, are calculated using a two-way clustering method by stock and year. $*p < .1$, $**p < .05$, $***p < .01$.

Panel A: Information value from analysts is higher for bold reports.								
	log information value				log information value (text)			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Bold	0.300** (3.000)	0.305*** (4.150)	0.275*** (3.420)	0.290*** (4.090)	0.240** (2.360)	0.249** (3.120)	0.230** (2.810)	0.248** (3.100)
Brokersize	-0.000 (-0.340)	0.000 (0.760)	0.001 (0.890)	0.001 (0.880)	-0.000 (-0.570)	0.000 (1.180)	0.002 (1.010)	0.002 (1.140)
Year FE	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stock FE	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Analyst FE	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
<i>N</i>	13652	13650	13607	13606	13520	13518	13477	13476
Adjusted R^2	0.003	0.182	0.141	0.201	0.002	0.181	0.141	0.204

Panel B: Explained return volatility is higher for bold reports.								
	log explained return variance				log price impact			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Bold	0.290*** (5.770)	0.241*** (5.960)	0.251*** (5.910)	0.231*** (5.350)	-0.017 (-0.280)	-0.065 (-1.350)	-0.025 (-0.420)	-0.059 (-1.340)
Brokersize	-0.000 (-0.700)	-0.000 (-0.050)	-0.000 (-0.570)	-0.000 (-0.220)	0.000 (0.180)	-0.000 (-1.130)	-0.002 (-1.730)	-0.002 (-1.680)
Year FE	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stock FE	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Analyst FE	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
<i>N</i>	13642	13640	13588	13587	12867	12865	12813	12812
Adjusted R^2	0.004	0.095	0.091	0.122	-0.000	0.416	0.228	0.442

Table 12 Value of Analyst Information and Earnings Announcements

This table shows the results of regressing the log information value and its component on an earnings announcement indicator and the trading volume measure. Log information value (text) specifically measures the value of information estimated using analyst report text. The log information value equals log explained return volatility less log price impact, which are used as dependent variables in Panel B. Observations with negative price impact and negative explained return variance are omitted. *Week* is an indicator variable that takes a value of 1 when the reports are released within 1 week following earnings announcement day, and 0 otherwise. *TradingVolume* is the trading volume of the stock on the earnings announcement day scaled by shares outstanding. The t-statistics, presented in parentheses, are calculated using a two-way clustering method by stock and year. $*p < .1$, $**p < .05$, $***p < .01$.

Panel A: Information value from analysts is higher following earnings announcements, especially when trading volumes are high.								
	log information value				log information value (text)			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Week	0.246*	0.392***	0.225*	0.380***	0.199	0.354***	0.173	0.335***
	(1.910)	(3.560)	(1.880)	(3.540)	(1.550)	(3.200)	(1.450)	(3.190)
Trading Volume	0.003	-0.005	0.003	-0.004	0.000	-0.005	-0.000	-0.004
	(0.770)	(-1.050)	(0.600)	(-0.960)	(0.110)	(-0.940)	(-0.020)	(-0.890)
Week \times Trading Volume	0.018***	0.019***	0.015***	0.017***	0.018***	0.015**	0.010*	0.013**
	(3.390)	(3.540)	(2.740)	(2.950)	(2.720)	(2.510)	(1.970)	(2.130)
Year FE	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Stock FE	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
<i>N</i>	8030	8030	8030	8030	8509	8509	8509	8509
Adjusted R^2	0.013	0.149	0.029	0.158	0.006	0.152	0.017	0.158
Panel B: Explained return volatility is higher following earnings announcements, especially when trading volumes are high.								
	log explained return variance				log price impact			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Week	0.501***	0.491***	0.477***	0.473***	0.243***	0.088**	0.241***	0.083**
	(5.090)	(5.280)	(5.120)	(5.380)	(3.430)	(2.110)	(3.640)	(2.000)
Trading Volume	0.020***	0.004	0.019***	0.005	0.016***	0.009**	0.016***	0.009**
	(5.910)	(1.170)	(5.740)	(1.410)	(3.080)	(2.020)	(3.090)	(2.030)
Week \times Trading Volume	0.014***	0.013***	0.012**	0.011**	-0.003**	-0.005**	-0.002	-0.005**
	(3.120)	(3.160)	(2.530)	(2.410)	(-2.050)	(-2.290)	(-1.350)	(-2.370)
Year FE	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Stock FE	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
<i>N</i>	8030	8030	8030	8030	8030	8030	8030	8030
Adjusted R^2	0.059	0.104	0.073	0.115	0.025	0.393	0.033	0.396

Internet Appendix for
“The Value of Information from Sell-side Analysts”

Not for Publication




Figure A2 Large Language Model Architecture

This figure shows an example of how large language models process a sentence from an analyst report on Nvidia. The model breaks this sentence into tokens, and then generates two types of embeddings: token embeddings and position embeddings. These embeddings then pass through the core of the model - a stack of transformer layers. The output of each transformer layer is a series of vectors representing the tokens in their full context.




Figure A3 Analyst Information Value by Industry

This figure shows the estimated information value of analyst reports for Fama-French 12 industries from 2015Q1 to 2023Q4, quantified in millions of dollars. The solid green line marks the sample mean value of information, with green bars showing the 95% confidence intervals. The horizontal dashed red line marks the sample mean of stocks from all industries. Information value estimates are derived using the delta method and adjusted to 2020 levels using the Consumer Price Index (CPI).




Figure A4 Shapley Values Scaled by Length

This figure presents the SHAP values of topics scaled by the total number of sentences (Panel A) and the total number of tokens (Panel B) for topics with more than 100,000 sentences. The scaling process involves two steps: First, normalize the Shapley value of each topic by dividing it by the number of sentences in that topic. Then, adjust the normalized values to ensure the total sum of SHAP values remains consistent. This ensures that the scaled values reflect the relative importance of topics while preserving the magnitude of total R^2_{OOS} .




Figure A5 Shapley Values for Topic Importance across Industries

This figure shows the relative importance of 17 topics in analyst reports across the Fama-French 12 industries, quantified using the SHAP value. For each industry, the bars represent the SHAP values of different topics, with their sum equaling the R^2_{OOS} of the sentence-segmented report embeddings. The red line shows each topic's SHAP value as a proportion of the total R^2_{OOS} .




Figure A6 R^2_{OOS} of Sentence-Segmented Embeddings by Year

This figure shows the R^2_{OOS} of sentence-segmented report embeddings from 2015 to 2023. The color gradient indicates the magnitude of R^2_{OOS} . The red line represents the SHAP value of the Income Statements Analyses topic across the years. The shaded area marks the pandemic recession in 2020.




Figure A7 Shapley Values for Topic Importance by Analyst Characteristics

This figure illustrates how 17 different topics contribute to the predictive power of analyst reports across four subsamples, measured using SHAP values. The subsamples compare analysts with above-median (Panel A) versus below-median work experience (Panel B), and large (Panel C) versus small brokerage firms (Panel D), with subsamples determined by yearly median. For each subsample, the bars show the SHAP values of individual topics, whose sum equals the out-of-sample R-squared (R^2_{OOS}) from the sentence-segmented report embeddings. The red line indicates each topic's relative importance, calculated as the topic's SHAP value divided by the total R^2_{OOS} .



Figure A8 Alternative Analyst Information Value Estimations Over Time

This figure presents the alternative estimations of analyst information value from 2015Q1 to 2024Q4, reported in millions of dollars and adjusted to 2020 dollars. Quarterly mean approximations are calculated using the delta method. TAQ volatility indicates the explained return volatility is calculated as $\frac{r^2 - (\hat{r})^2}{r^2} \cdot \sigma_v^2$, where σ_v^2 is the realized volatility from one-minute log returns. EMO and CLNV refer to trade-signing algorithms developed by [Ellis et al. \(2000\)](#) and [Lee and Ready \(1991\)](#), respectively.




Figure A9 Analyst Information Value by Stock

This figure shows the estimated information value of analyst reports for individual stocks from 2015Q1 to 2023Q4, quantified in millions of dollars. Estimates are derived using the delta method. Market equity, averaged daily at the time of each report release, is reported in billions of dollars. All values are adjusted to 2020 levels using the Consumer Price Index (CPI).

B. Additional Tables

Table A1 Topic-Specific Sentence Examples from Analyst Reports

Topics	Examples
Executive Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our key takeaways from CEO Jeff Immelt’s presentation at EPG were: Outlook for substantial EPS growth over 2010/12 driven by abatement of credit losses (\$8-9bn in 2010E tapering to \$4bn run-rate) and CRE impair. • Looking ahead, guidance was tightened, essentially framing the Street, and commentary suggests a strong outlook for the balance of 2007. • Key topics: 1) Update on ABTōs portfolio of COVID-19 tests; 2) Libre trends, Libre 2 launch and expectations for Libre 3; 3) Elective surgery trends exiting Q1, expectations for 2021 and an update on recent and upcoming new product approvals; and 4) Global trends and impact on EPD and Nutrition.
Company Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oracle Corporation, founded in 1977 and headquartered in Redwood Shores, California, is one of the largest and most prominent companies in the software space – and a technology bellwether. • As it has grown, Microsoft has expanded into enterprise software with Windows Server, SQL Server, Dynamics CRM, SharePoint, Azure and Lync; hardware with the Xbox gaming/media platform and the Surface tablet; and online services through MSN and Bing. • Altria Group, Inc., is the world’s largest producer and marketer of consumer products, and had revenues of \$80 billion in 2002.
Industry Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to our global Immunology market model, US Psoriasis (PsO) represented a \$7.7B market in 2016 and is expected to grow at a low-teens CAGR to \$11.8B in 2019E and \$13B by 2021E driven by more highly effective therapies. • Despite record prices, oil demand continues to grow, while supply growth lags and spare production and refining capacity is almost nonexistent. • Add to that that some new advertising expectations from PricewaterhouseCoopers of a decline in ad spending of 12% worldwide and 15% in the U.S. for 2009 and continue to decline in 2010.
Competitive Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to Mercury Research, NVIDIA is now the 3rd largest chipset supplier (consisting of desktop and mobile chipsets, and integrated and non-integrated chipsets), shipping 5.4 million units in calendar Q3 for an 8.2% market share, versus Intel’s shipments of 51 million units (62% share), VIA’s shipments of 9.6 million units (14.4% share), SiS’s shipments of 5.3 million units (8% share), and ATI’s shipments of 4.4 million units (6.6% share). • Further, competition in the CDK-4/6 space is rising with Verzenio (abemaciclib) & Kisqali launches placing downward pressure on Ibrance trajectory. • We believe that Accenture has recognized that web services could compete directly with client/server as the new systems architecture.

Table A1 – continued from previous page

Topics	Examples
Financial Statement Analysis: Income Statement Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We also note that Alico cannot dividend any of its 2010 earnings to AIG, implying that the income recognized this quarter and throughout 2010 will benefit MetLife results. • At the respective midpoints, sales of \$8.5 billion would be down 22% annually and 8% sequentially; and non-GAAP EPS would be down 39%. • The growth in operating income from Q1 2009 is largely due to recoveries in partnership income.
Financial Statement Analysis: Balance Sheet Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term borrowings of \$6.59 billion at September 30, 2022 were modest compared to shareholders' equity of \$37.3 billion. • The company finished 2Q16 with \$21.4 billion in cash and short-term investments, up from \$15.6 Growth & Valuation Analysis GROWTH ANALYSIS RISK ANALYSIS billion at the end of 4Q15. • Inventory turns improved to 4.5x in 4Q from 4.4x in the same period last year.
Financial Statement Analysis: Cash Flow Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UPS generated \$2.3 billion in operating cash for the quarter. • Assuming that the company completes a large portion of its current \$1 billion stock buyback plan in 2008, we estimate that cash per share will be about \$6.20 by the end of the year. • We view eBays FCF generation as relatively defensible even in the case of a revenue shortfall.
Financial Statement Analysis: Financial Ratios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The company achieves average scores on our three main measures of financial strength: leverage based on debt-to-cap, profitability and interest coverage. • P/S is at 0.6x and EV/EBITDA is 7.7x. • The index members currently trade at an average of 16.3-times trailing earnings, which is below the five-year average of 19-times.
Business Segments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The company is organized into three businesses, software, representing the majority of the company's total revenues, hardware systems and services. • Results in 2008 also benefited from the absence of the significant level of mark-to-market losses in the company's Gas Marketing segment in 2007. • The company operates five distinct segments: Americas (71% of FY15 profit); Europe, Middle East, and Africa (4% of FY15 profit); China and Asia Pacific (12% of FY15 profit); Channel Development (13% of FY15 profit).

Table A1 – continued from previous page

Topics	Examples
Growth Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visa has been especially active on the acquisition front over the last several months. • Combined with the Horizon assets and an emerging pipeline, there is enough in AMGN's portfolio to offset potential headwinds and allow the company to grow through its patent cycle. • Specific areas where more investment may be needed: Over the past decade, ROK management often claim that Process automation represents the growth opportunity for the company, but its sales in this market have barely grown in recent years, despite its much smaller sales base compared with established incumbents.
Risk Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risks to our BUY thesis have to do with global competition, changing user behavior, global macro uncertainty, and anything else that can affect FB's relationship with members, its advertisers or its publishing partners. • Risks to achieving our price target include: 1) Apple crushing PayPal; 2) increasing competition in the payments space; 3) heavy investment spending on marketing, point of sale, or technology; and 4) legislative action. • In addition to the expenses incurred by patent challenges, product liability and other legal suits could occur and lead to additional liabilities and revenue loss, which could substantially change our financial assumptions.
Management and Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top management changes can be unsettling, and the resulting uncertainty has caused 3M shares to decline. • Chairman, President, and CEO Charles Ergen beneficially owns about 53.6% of DISH's equity securities and has 90.5% voting power. • Bill Johnson, the present CEO of Progress Energy, will become president and chief executive officer of the new company.
Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment of ESG (Environmental, Social & Governance) risks by Baptista Research includes a wide range of considerations that pertain to the long-term sustainability of a company. • Sustainalytics assesses the degree to which a company's enterprise business is affected by ESG issues. • Failure to adequately address social risks like labor disputes and community relations could jeopardize the company's social license to operate in certain regions.
Valuation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our DCF derives an intrinsic value of \$100 for ABBV by discounting cash flows through 2024E, and assuming a -5% terminal growth & 7.6% WACC. • We value MET based on a Sum-Of-The-Parts (SOTP) analysis based on our 2021 EPS estimate and using peer comps across each business segment. • Our target price is based on a five-year discounted cash flow (DCF) valuation that employs a 5% discount rate and 20x terminal-year FCF multiple.

Table A1 – continued from previous page

Topics	Examples
Investment Thesis	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The results for the back half of the year will still be complex and confusing given the purchase accounting impacts and the full quarter of HSBC, but we do believe that there is a pay-off at the end of the road.• As good as it gets: With its record multi-year backlog, Boeing’s revenue profile over the rest of decade is generally considered secure, and expectations for execution and cash already appear high.• Clearly, our Ford Investment Thesis, which was based in large part on our belief that Ford would be able to offset headwinds (slowing cyclical tailwinds in North America, weakness in South America, weak growth in Europe, slowing growth in China, and regulatory cost headwinds), has been thrown into question.
Appendices and Disclosures	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Although the information contained in the subject report has been obtained from sources, we believe to be reliable, its accuracy and completeness cannot be guaranteed.• For a complete discussion of the risk factors that could affect the market price of a company’s shares, refer to the most recent Form 10-Q or 10-K that a company has filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission.• The Benchmark Company, LLC makes every effort to use reliable, comprehensive information, but we make no representation that it is accurate or complete.

Table A2 Numerical Variables Description

This table shows the definitions of numerical measures.

Numerical Measures	Definition and/or sources
Panel A: Firm Level Measures	
Size	The market value equity of the firm ($CSHOQ * PRCCQ$) at the end of the quarter prior to report release.
BtoM	The book value of equity ($SEQ + TXDB + ITCB - PEF$) scaled by the market value of equity ($CSHOQ * PRCCQ$) t the end of quarter prior the report release.
Prior_CAR	The cumulated 10-day abnormal return ending 2 days before release. The abnormal return is calculated as the raw return minus the buy-and-hold market value-weighted return.
SUE	Earnings surprise, calculated as the actual EPS minus the last consensus EPS forecast before the earnings announcement. Consensus EPS is the median value of 1-year EPS forecast within 90-days window of all analysts following the firm. The unexpected earnings is scaled by price per share at the fiscal quarter end.
AbsSUE	Absolute value of SUE, representing the distance between realized EPS and EPS expectation.
Miss	Dummy variable that equals one if the actual EPS is less than the last consensus forecast, and 0 otherwise.
Trading volume	Trading volume at earnings announcement day (or the first trading day post earnings announcement), calculated as $VOL/SHROUT$.
Distance to default	The distance to default calculated following Merton (1974) . The proxy is compiled from the National University of Singapore's Credit Research Initiative (NUS CRI).
Fluidity	A measure of firms' product market competition introduced by Hoberg et al. (2014) . The data is compiled from the Hoberg and Phillips database.
Panel B: Industry Level Measures	
Industry recession	An indicator variable that equals one if the FF-48 industry return is negative and in the bottom quintile of FF-48 industry returns and zero otherwise.
Panel C: Macroeconomic Measures	
Time trend (ttr)	The number of years elapsed from the beginning of the sample.
Panel D: Report Level Measures	
REC_REV	Recommendation revision, calculated as the current report's recommendation minus the last recommendation in I/B/E/S issued by the same analyst for the same firm.
EF_REV	Earnings forecast revision, calculated as the current report's EPS forecast minus the last EPS forecast in I/B/E/S issued by the same analyst for the same firm, scaled by the stock price 50 days before the report release.
TP_REV	Target price revision, calculated as the current report's target price minus the last target price in I/B/E/S issued by the same analyst for the same firm, scaled by the stock price 50 days before the report release.
Boldness	An indicator variable that takes the value of 1 if the EPS forecast revision is above both the analyst's own prior forecast and the consensus forecast, or else below both, and zero otherwise.
SR	Stock recommendation from I/B/E/S rating, with 1 being the most bullish (Strong Buy) and 5 being the most bearish (Sell), based on the ratings provided by the Institutional Brokers' Estimate System (I/B/E/S).
ERet	12-month return forecast by scaling the 12-month price target by the stock price 1-day before release.

Table A3 Sumamry Statistics for Numerical Measures

This table reports summary statistics of numerical measures.

	Mean	Std	p25	P50	P75	N
Miss	0.35	0.48	0.00	0.00	1.00	102776
Trading volume	18.19	21.98	7.24	11.46	20.29	99908
Prior_CAR	0.00	0.05	-0.02	0.00	0.02	122251
Size	2.39	0.11	2.33	2.39	2.46	117534
BtoM	0.46	0.43	0.18	0.32	0.61	117534
Distance to default	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	86693
Fluidity	7.17	3.66	4.40	6.57	9.44	114942
Time trend	13.02	5.71	9.00	13.00	17.00	122252
Industry recession	0.14	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	122252
BrokerSize	71.92	56.71	26.00	53.00	113.00	119233
Firm Experience	7.68	6.72	3.00	6.00	11.00	111192
Number of firms	20.08	17.08	14.00	18.00	23.00	119233
REC_REV	0.00	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	120673
EF_REV	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	90625
TP_REV	0.01	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	84108
ERet	0.19	0.23	0.07	0.18	0.31	84108
Boldness	0.75	0.43	1.00	1.00	1.00	81182
SR	2.77	0.84	2.00	3.00	3.00	122252

Table A4 Information Content of Analyst Reports with Numbers Removed

This table presents the R^2_{OOS} using analyst reports with numbers removed. The input sets include revision numerical measures, text embeddings from number-free report text, and a combination of both. The estimation targets are the three-day *CAR* centered around the analyst report release date. The machine learning model employed is Ridge regression, with training samples expanding yearly. The *t*-statistic for the R^2_{OOS} is calculated following [Gu et al. \(2020\)](#). In columns (2), (4), and (6), the benchmark estimation is set to zero. Columns (3)-(1) and (5)-(3) present pairwise tests comparing the performance of models using revision-only input versus text-only input, and text-only input versus combined text and revision input, respectively.

Year	Revision only	t-stat	Text only	t-stat	Revision plus text	t-stat	t-stat	t-stat
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(3)- (1)	(5)- (3)
2015	10.30%	3.59	13.19%	5.87	11.10%	3.24	3.97	-1.45
2016	15.47%	11.80	13.73%	5.00	17.91%	9.02	-0.81	3.13
2017	9.16%	5.28	11.66%	5.98	12.33%	6.12	10.58	1.56
2018	9.79%	2.98	11.46%	9.12	13.62%	7.97	1.22	4.09
2019	9.76%	15.69	12.61%	14.73	13.90%	15.17	4.26	2.79
2020	5.20%	3.43	4.42%	4.38	6.98%	5.81	-0.70	8.37
2021	5.31%	4.80	8.77%	5.06	10.66%	29.67	1.54	1.56
2022	10.24%	6.16	16.71%	10.47	17.90%	8.94	9.93	2.38
2023	5.09%	3.86	9.27%	3.60	10.39%	5.09	2.60	1.81
Overall	8.93%	8.51	10.95%	7.87	12.51%	8.83	2.40	3.00

Table A5 Cumulative Abnormal Returns with Alternative Windows

This table reports the R_{OOS}^2 of using analyst report text embeddings to estimate CAR with alternative windows. The R_{OOS}^2 is calculated annually using a training sample from 2000 to the preceding year. CAR measures are centered on the release day of analyst reports (T_0). Panel A shows results for the full sample, while Panels B and C focus on periods within and beyond 1-day earnings announcement windows, respectively. The Overall row reports the R_{OOS}^2 and t -statistics for 2015-2023. The t -statistics for R_{OOS}^2 are calculated using zero benchmarks estimation following [Gu et al. \(2020\)](#).

year	AR[0]		CAR[0,+1]		CAR[-2,+2]	
	R_{OOS}^2	t-stat	R_{OOS}^2	t-stat	R_{OOS}^2	t-stat
Panel A: Full sample period						
2015	8.03%	8.53	8.24%	8.36	10.87%	9.40
2016	7.88%	8.27	6.09%	4.68	6.60%	3.11
2017	8.75%	14.35	8.56%	9.29	9.00%	8.78
2018	9.09%	14.95	9.39%	11.26	9.75%	10.54
2019	9.89%	99.70	7.68%	9.45	8.66%	18.93
2020	2.33%	2.33	1.76%	3.15	4.13%	2.14
2021	5.75%	7.32	5.80%	6.62	4.05%	3.57
2022	10.54%	12.32	11.23%	18.20	10.91%	13.65
2023	5.38%	15.44	3.39%	7.00	0.53%	1.48
Overall	7.55%	8.07	6.92%	6.77	7.57%	6.79
Panel B: Earnings announcement period						
Overall	9.78%	5.58	7.87%	5.10	13.14%	8.02
Panel C: Non-earnings announcement period						
Overall	5.77%	5.78	5.62%	5.64	4.96%	4.91

Table A6 Information Content of Analyst Reports across Industries

This table reports the R^2_{OOS} of Fama-French 12 industries, using the definition from Kenneth French's website. The Overall row reports the R^2_{OOS} and t -statistics for 2015-2023. The t -statistics for R^2_{OOS} are calculated using zero benchmarks estimation following [Gu et al. \(2020\)](#).

year	Shops			Other			Manuf			Chems		
	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N
2015	13.27%	6.03	657	17.69%	5.03	585	10.84%	3.19	808	15.05%	1.74	147
2016	10.43%	2.46	556	3.34%	0.48	593	10.37%	5.38	811	23.91%	3.25	111
2017	16.65%	3.49	506	20.45%	2.67	544	25.03%	13.64	722	11.04%	0.59	82
2018	10.86%	4.32	406	21.65%	3.40	405	3.32%	1.55	553	25.80%	1.87	77
2019	21.04%	9.24	394	7.49%	2.37	610	16.25%	12.07	568	5.00%	3.22	106
2020	4.39%	2.55	499	-0.30%	-0.53	499	4.06%	1.41	542	2.65%	1.60	115
2021	10.27%	2.13	312	9.70%	3.66	362	8.66%	4.32	367	1.46%	0.30	102
2022	22.75%	3.83	320	15.98%	2.66	437	14.26%	11.46	420	7.00%	2.10	110
2023	17.78%	1.76	353	3.49%	2.00	339	7.15%	2.71	360	19.31%	6.54	76
Overall	13.88%	6.03	4003	11.27%	3.69	4374	11.39%	5.57	5151	11.35%	3.55	926
year	Durlbl			BusEq			Hlth			NoDur		
	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N
2015	16.83%	5.77	216	15.66%	6.41	1378	5.75%	2.72	1242	0.68%	0.31	241
2016	4.95%	0.79	209	10.24%	6.09	1303	11.07%	2.90	1185	17.14%	5.18	242
2017	-2.17%	-0.30	282	10.36%	3.12	1154	3.37%	2.39	1060	-2.14%	-0.68	278
2018	18.29%	5.57	208	0.32%	0.31	1002	12.47%	6.58	918	1.29%	0.13	324
2019	15.31%	2.26	222	10.17%	6.13	1036	10.02%	7.68	884	18.51%	2.30	277
2020	5.73%	0.79	168	8.11%	4.14	1100	2.86%	1.84	950	-0.37%	-0.28	265
2021	10.01%	5.31	150	11.43%	1.49	731	7.66%	4.58	592	-6.38%	-0.60	195
2022	7.99%	2.58	162	12.08%	4.77	822	12.05%	2.71	850	5.24%	1.11	187
2023	12.05%	2.37	140	10.45%	11.80	962	3.52%	1.32	844	-5.69%	-0.71	158
Overall	11.02%	3.24	1757	9.68%	6.77	9488	7.53%	5.71	8525	7.50%	1.38	2167
year	Money			Telcm			Enrgy			Utils		
	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N	R^2_{OOS}	t-stat	N
2015	18.13%	4.41	1153	1.68%	0.00	403	-4.21%	-1.45	303	18.47%	3.69	401
2016	7.64%	3.53	1108	-10.18%	-1.22	329	15.80%	2.83	252	-1.84%	-0.23	310
2017	1.77%	0.46	1071	8.60%	5.16	307	-18.18%	-8.75	307	-39.46%	-6.99	315
2018	13.55%	8.48	879	10.65%	2.46	219	8.38%	1.29	275	-23.76%	-5.53	215
2019	2.10%	2.25	977	1.53%	0.52	351	-10.28%	-9.07	340	-2.36%	-0.27	193
2020	1.42%	0.76	952	-8.84%	-2.83	360	5.72%	2.62	434	-7.29%	-2.36	165
2021	2.62%	0.47	614	6.15%	3.27	188	-15.04%	-6.83	251	-4.01%	-1.16	103
2022	4.34%	2.13	667	12.84%	3.50	143	16.14%	4.44	286	8.31%	2.71	132
2023	-0.63%	-0.18	569	8.99%	6.89	182	-27.33%	-5.03	290	-6.43%	-1.12	120
Overall	5.18%	3.31	7990	3.32%	1.39	2482	1.90%	0.31	2738	-1.97%	-0.88	1954

Table A7 Summary Statistics for Alternative Analyst Information Value Estimations

The analyst information value is measured as the explained return variance divided by the price impact, with the results reported in millions of dollars. All dollar values are adjusted for inflation to reflect 2020 values using the Consumer Price Index (CPI). The sample comprises analyst reports targeting common constituent firms of the S&P 100 index from 2015Q1 to 2023Q4. Both mean and standard deviation are computed using the delta method. TAQ volatility indicates the explained return volatility is calculated as $\frac{r^2 - (\hat{r})^2}{r^2} \cdot \sigma_v^2$, where σ_v^2 is the realized volatility from one-minute log returns. Intraday denotes that σ_v^2 does not include overnight return volatility. EMO and CLNV refer to trade-signing algorithms developed by [Ellis et al. \(2000\)](#) and [Lee and Ready \(1991\)](#), respectively.

	Mean	SE	95%CI	99%CI	N
Information value (TAQ volatility), \$M	0.47	0.05	[0.38, 0.56]	[0.35, 0.58]	17669
Information value of text (TAQ volatility), \$M	0.47	0.05	[0.38, 0.56]	[0.35, 0.58]	17672
Information value of revisions (TAQ volatility), \$M	0.42	0.04	[0.34, 0.50]	[0.31, 0.53]	17672
Information value (Intraday), \$M	0.42	0.04	[0.34, 0.51]	[0.32, 0.53]	17672
Information value of text (Intraday), \$M	0.38	0.04	[0.30, 0.46]	[0.28, 0.48]	17669
Information value of revisions (Intraday), \$M	0.38	0.04	[0.30, 0.46]	[0.28, 0.48]	17672
Information value (EMO), \$M	0.34	0.04	[0.27, 0.41]	[0.25, 0.43]	17672
Information value of text (EMO), \$M	0.35	0.04	[0.27, 0.42]	[0.25, 0.44]	17672
Information value of revisions (EMO), \$M	0.34	0.04	[0.26, 0.43]	[0.23, 0.46]	17669
Information value (CLNV), \$M	0.34	0.04	[0.26, 0.43]	[0.23, 0.46]	17672
Information value of text (CLNV), \$M	0.31	0.04	[0.23, 0.39]	[0.21, 0.41]	17672
Information value of revisions (CLNV), \$M	0.31	0.04	[0.23, 0.39]	[0.21, 0.42]	17672

C. Machine Learning Models

Ridge Regression

Ridge regression addresses multicollinearity by adding a regularization term to the least squares objective function. The ridge regression estimator is given by:

$$\hat{\beta} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{ \|y_i - x_i^T \beta\|_2^2 + \alpha \|\beta\|_2^2 \}, \quad (13)$$

where α is the regularization parameter that controls the trade-off between fitting the data and shrinking the coefficients.

To find the optimal value of α , cross-validation is used over a grid of values ranging from 10^{-10} to 10^{10} . The cross-validation process ensures that the chosen model generalizes well to unseen data, preventing overfitting while capturing the predictive power of the text embeddings.

Partial Least Square Regression

To mitigate the risk of overfitting inherent in high-dimensional text embeddings, I employ Partial Least Squares (PLS) for dimensionality reduction.

The optimization problem can be expressed as follows:

$$\hat{\beta} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{argmin}} (\|(\Omega^T X_i)\beta - y_i\|_2^2), \quad (14)$$

where Ω is a $K \times P$ transformation matrix that reduces the K predictors in X_i to P lower-dimensional components.

The extraction of the j -th PLS component is guided by the following objective function:

$$\omega_j = \underset{\omega}{\operatorname{argmax}} \operatorname{Cov}(Y, X\omega), \quad \text{s.t. } \omega' \omega = 1, \operatorname{Cov}(X\omega, X\omega_i) = 0 \forall i < j. \quad (15)$$

In essence, this approach sequentially extracts components that maximize the covariance with the outcome variable, while ensuring orthogonality to previously extracted components.

Extreme Gradient Boosting

Tree-based approaches are commonly applied in stock return forecasting literature (see, e.g., [Gu et al., 2020](#); [Cao et al., 2024](#); [Bonini et al., 2023](#)). XGBoost is an advanced implementation of tree-based machine learning models that builds an ensemble of decision trees. In XGBoost, each tree is added sequentially to correct the errors of previous trees. The main idea is to combine the outputs of multiple weak learners (decision trees) to create a strong learner. XGBoost incorporates regularization techniques, such as L1 (Lasso) and L2 (Ridge), to prevent overfitting and enhance model generalization.

In comparison to random forests, which build a multitude of independent trees and aggregate their predictions, XGBoost constructs trees sequentially, with each tree designed to correct the errors of the preceding ones. While random forests rely on bagging, a method that combines the predictions of various trees to reduce variance, XGBoost uses boosting, an approach that aims to reduce both bias and variance by focusing on difficult-to-predict instances in subsequent iterations. This boosting approach allows XGBoost to effectively capture and leverage the nuanced information embedded in textual data, leading to a more accurate estimation of stock returns.

Neural Networks

To extend beyond the linear modeling approach, I explore the use of Neural Networks to estimate *CAR* using text embeddings derived from analyst reports. A Neural Network can capture complex non-linear relationships between the text embeddings and the *CAR*, potentially improving the model's fitting capabilities. Consider a three-layer Neural Network as the prediction model. The prediction problem can be formulated as follows:

$$f(X_i; \theta) = W_3 \sigma(W_2 \sigma(W_1 X_i + b_1) + b_2) + b_3, \quad (16)$$

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the ReLU activation function, W_i and b_i represent the weights and biases for layer i , respectively. The Neural Network architecture consists of an input layer representing the text embeddings, followed by multiple hidden layers. The specific architecture employed includes 32 neurons in the first hidden layer, followed by 16, 8, 4, and 2 neurons in subsequent layers. This structure is flexible and can be adjusted by adding or removing layers as necessary to optimize performance.

The training process involves optimizing the weights and biases to minimize the loss function, which, in this case, is the mean-square loss. To regularize the model and prevent overfitting, early stopping is implemented, halting training once the validation loss ceases to decrease. Additionally,

following [Gu et al. \(2020\)](#), the models are retrained five times, and the final estimation is obtained by averaging the outputs of these five models, forming an ensemble estimation.

D. Theory

I provide an intuition for the measure of strategic value by discussing a simple extension of [Kyle \(1985\)](#) model. In the Kyle model, there is one risky asset with a payoff $\tilde{v} \sim N(p_0, \Sigma_0)$. Three types of traders exist: a strategic trader with insider information, a market maker who sets prices in a perfectly competitive market, and an uninformed trader who trades $\tilde{u} \sim N(0, \sigma_u^2)$, where \tilde{u} is independent of \tilde{v} . Illiquidity is measured by Kyle's lambda (λ). Kyle's lambda depends on private information and liquidity trading. I extend the model by considering a case where ϕ percentage of variance in \tilde{v} is explained by the informed trader's information.

A Single Auction Model

There are two periods, t_0 and t_1 . The asset is traded with asymmetric information at period t_0 , and the value \tilde{v} is realized at period t_1 . I assume without loss of generality that

$$\tilde{v} = P_0 + \tilde{s} + \tilde{\epsilon},$$

where \tilde{s} is a mean-zero signal observed by the informed trader at t_0 , and $\tilde{\epsilon}$ is the combination of residual information and noise. I assume that the signal \tilde{s} and residual $\tilde{\epsilon}$ are uncorrelated, that is, $\sigma_v^2 = \sigma_s^2 + \sigma_\epsilon^2$.

Let

$$\phi = \frac{\text{var}(\tilde{s})}{\text{var}(\tilde{v})} = \frac{\sigma_s^2}{\sigma_v^2}.$$

This measure ϕ is the "R-square" of projecting \tilde{v} on \tilde{s} , or the percentage of explainable variance in \tilde{v} using signal \tilde{s} .

After observing \tilde{s} , the informed trader submits a market order $\tilde{x} = X(\tilde{s})$, and the uninformed trader trades a zero-mean random variable \tilde{z} that is normally distributed and independent of \tilde{v} . The profit of the informed trader is given by: $\tilde{\pi} = (\tilde{v} - \tilde{p})\tilde{v}$. The insider has a rational guess of $P(\tilde{x} + \tilde{u})$ and understands that his order \tilde{x} will move the price against him.

The market maker observes the order flow $\tilde{y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tilde{x} + \tilde{z}$ and determines the equilibrium price $\tilde{p} = P(\tilde{x} + \tilde{u})$ to break even. The assumptions for the market maker are risk neutrality and perfect

competition, which drives the profits for market makers to zero.

Equilibrium

An equilibrium is a set of X and P satisfying

$$E[\tilde{\pi}(X, P) \mid \tilde{s} = s],$$

$$\tilde{p}(X, P) = E[\tilde{v} \mid \tilde{x} + \tilde{u}].$$

The first condition is profit maximization, stating that given the market maker's pricing rule, the insider chooses a strategy X maximizing her conditional expected profit, taking into account the pricing rule. The second condition is market efficiency. Given the insiders' trading strategy, the market maker sets the price to be the expected value of the security.

Conjecture:

$$P(\tilde{y}) = \mu + \lambda \tilde{y},$$

$$X(\tilde{s}) = \alpha + \beta \tilde{s}.$$

The profit of the insider can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} E[\tilde{\pi}(X, P) \mid \tilde{s} = s] &= E[(\tilde{v} - \mu - \lambda(\tilde{u} + x))x \mid \tilde{s} = s] \\ &= (P_0 + s - \mu - \lambda x)x. \end{aligned}$$

Traders take into account that her order flow will move the price against her, which serves to restrain her position size.

Solving for optimal profit, I get:

$$x^* = \frac{P_0 + s - \mu}{2\lambda} = \alpha + \beta v.$$

Hence, I can express α and β :

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= \frac{1}{2\lambda}, \\ \alpha &= \frac{P_0 - \mu}{2\lambda} = (P_0 - \mu)\beta. \end{aligned}$$

When the market maker puts a higher weight on the order flow in setting the price, the trader

puts a lower weight on her information.

I now look at the price-setting rule:

$$\mu + \lambda y = E\{\tilde{v} \mid \alpha + \beta \tilde{s} + \tilde{u} = y\}.$$

Essentially, the market maker observes a normally distributed signal about

$$\begin{aligned} \mu + \lambda y &= E[\tilde{v} \mid y] \\ &= \bar{v} + \frac{\text{cov}(\tilde{v}, \alpha + \beta \tilde{s} + \tilde{u})}{\text{var}(\alpha + \beta \tilde{s} + \tilde{u})} (\beta \tilde{s} - \beta \bar{s} + \tilde{u}) \\ &= p_0 + \frac{\beta \sigma_s^2}{\beta^2 \sigma_s^2 + \sigma_u^2} (y - \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, I can express λ and μ :

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \frac{\beta \sigma_s^2}{\beta^2 \sigma_s^2 + \sigma_u^2}, \\ \mu &= p_0 - \alpha \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

There is a unique linear equilibrium given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= P_0, \\ \lambda &= \frac{\sigma_s}{2\sigma_u}, \\ \alpha &= 0, \\ \beta &= \frac{\sigma_u}{\sigma_s}. \end{aligned}$$

Discussion

Kyle's Lambda The parameter λ is universally known as Kyle's lambda. Formally, it is the impact on the equilibrium price of a unit order. Its reciprocal ($1/\lambda$) measures the liquidity (or depth) of the market. If $1/\lambda = \frac{2\sigma_u}{\sigma_s}$ is larger, then the market is more liquid, either because there is less private information in σ_s or there is more liquid trade in the sense of σ_u .

Value of Private Information Notice that the equilibrium strategy of the informed trader is $\tilde{x} = \beta s$. The unconditional expected gain of the informed trader is

$$\begin{aligned} E[\tilde{x}[\tilde{v} - p(\tilde{x} + \tilde{z})]] &= \beta E[s(\tilde{v} - \mu - \lambda\beta s - \lambda\tilde{u})] \\ &= \beta(1 - \lambda\beta)\sigma_s^2 \\ &= \frac{\sigma_s\sigma_u}{2} \\ &= \frac{\phi\sigma_v^2}{4\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

The expected gain for the informed trader is maximized when she has more private information or when there is more liquidity trading. On the other hand, liquidity traders incur losses equivalent to the informed trader's gains, but they accept these losses due to other motives for trading. The equilibrium price ensures that market makers do not profit or lose in expectation.

E. Delta Method Approximation

I use the delta method to approximate the expected value and variance of a ratio of two random variables. This method relies on a first-order Taylor expansion. Specifically, consider two random variables X and Y with means μ_X and μ_Y , and variances σ_X^2 and σ_Y^2 , respectively. We are interested in the ratio $Z = \frac{X}{Y}$ and want to approximate the mean $E[Z]$ and the variance $\text{Var}(Z)$.

Delta Method Approximation

The key idea is to approximate the function $g(X, Y) = \frac{X}{Y}$ using a Taylor series expansion around the means μ_X and μ_Y . For the function $g(X, Y)$, I use a first-order Taylor expansion around (μ_X, μ_Y) :

$$g(X, Y) \approx g(\mu_X, \mu_Y) + \left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial X} \right|_{(\mu_X, \mu_Y)} (X - \mu_X) + \left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial Y} \right|_{(\mu_X, \mu_Y)} (Y - \mu_Y).$$

The partial derivatives of $g(X, Y) = \frac{X}{Y}$ are:

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial X} = \frac{1}{Y}, \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial Y} = -\frac{X}{Y^2}.$$

Evaluating these at (μ_X, μ_Y) , I get:

$$\left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial X} \right|_{(\mu_X, \mu_Y)} = \frac{1}{\mu_Y}, \quad \left. \frac{\partial g}{\partial Y} \right|_{(\mu_X, \mu_Y)} = -\frac{\mu_X}{\mu_Y^2}.$$

Substituting the partial derivatives into the Taylor expansion, I obtain:

$$\frac{X}{Y} \approx \frac{\mu_X}{\mu_Y} + \frac{1}{\mu_Y}(X - \mu_X) - \frac{\mu_X}{\mu_Y^2}(Y - \mu_Y).$$

Taking the expectation on both sides:

$$E\left[\frac{X}{Y}\right] \approx \frac{\mu_X}{\mu_Y} + \frac{1}{\mu_Y}E[X - \mu_X] - \frac{\mu_X}{\mu_Y^2}E[Y - \mu_Y].$$

Since $E[X - \mu_X] = 0$ and $E[Y - \mu_Y] = 0$, the approximation simplifies to:

$$E\left[\frac{X}{Y}\right] \approx \frac{\mu_X}{\mu_Y}.$$

Using the delta method, the variance of $Z = \frac{X}{Y}$ is approximated by:

$$\text{Var}(Z) \approx \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial X}\right)^2 \text{Var}(X) + \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial Y}\right)^2 \text{Var}(Y) + 2\left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial X}\right)\left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial Y}\right) \text{Cov}(X, Y).$$

Substituting the partial derivatives:

$$\text{Var}\left(\frac{X}{Y}\right) \approx \frac{\text{Var}(X)}{\mu_Y^2} + \frac{\mu_X^2 \text{Var}(Y)}{\mu_Y^4} - 2\frac{\mu_X \text{Cov}(X, Y)}{\mu_Y^3}.$$

Application to Value of Information

In the context of the provided study, I estimate the mean value of information for a subsample s using the delta method.

Let $\widehat{\Omega}_{it} = \frac{\widehat{\sigma}_{it}^2}{\widehat{\lambda}_{it}/P_{it-}} = \frac{r_{if}^2 - \left(r_{it} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \widehat{r}_{ijt}}{N}\right)^2}{\widehat{\lambda}_{it}/P_{it-}}$ be the value of information for stock i on date t . Define the mean and variance over subsample s as:

$$\mu_{vs} = \frac{1}{|s|} \sum_{it \in s} \left(r_{if}^2 - \left(r_{it} - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N \widehat{r}_{ijt}}{N} \right)^2 \right),$$

and the mean price impact per dollar over subsample s as:

$$\mu_{\lambda_s} = \frac{1}{|s|} \sum_{it \in s} \frac{\hat{\lambda}_{it}}{P_{it-}}.$$

Using the delta method approximation for the mean of the ratio, the mean value of information over subsample s is given by:

$$E\hat{\Omega}_s \approx \frac{\mu_{v_s}}{\mu_{\lambda_s}}.$$

The variance of the ratio $\hat{\Omega}_{it} = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{it}^2}{\hat{\lambda}_{it}/P_{it-}}$ over the subsample s is estimated as:

$$\text{Var}(\hat{\Omega}_s) \approx \frac{1}{\mu_{\lambda_s}^2} \left(\Sigma_{v_s} + \frac{\mu_{v_s}^2}{\mu_{\lambda_s}^2} \Sigma_{\lambda_s} - 2 \frac{\mu_{v_s}}{\mu_{\lambda_s}} \Sigma_{v\lambda_s} \right),$$

where Σ_{v_s} , Σ_{λ_s} , and $\Sigma_{v\lambda_s}$ are defined as:

$$\Sigma_{v_s} = \frac{1}{|s|} \sum_{it \in s} (\hat{\sigma}_{it}^2 - \mu_{v_s})^2,$$

$$\Sigma_{\lambda_s} = \frac{1}{|s|} \sum_{it \in s} \left(\frac{\hat{\lambda}_{it}}{P_{it-}} - \mu_{\lambda_s} \right)^2,$$

$$\Sigma_{v\lambda_s} = \text{Cov} \left(\hat{\sigma}_{it}^2, \frac{\hat{\lambda}_{it}}{P_{it-}} \right).$$

This provides a first-order approximation for the mean and variance of the value of information over the subsample s using the delta method.