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IN BRIEF

- Investors are becoming increasingly familiar with the concept of factor investing in the equities space—to help enhance return or reduce risk—and increasingly from an alternatives perspective via long-short strategies. Factor investing in single name corporate bonds is the next frontier.
- Our research suggests that the same factors present in other asset classes, such as value, quality and momentum, can be identified and viably captured (net of transaction costs) in corporate credit markets.
- How these factors are included within a portfolio is dependent on the desired outcome (risk reduction or yield enhancement) and the willingness to take tracking error to the benchmark.

EVOLUTION OF RULES-BASED FIXED INCOME INVESTING

Factor investing relies upon a rules-based approach to buy or sell securities based on certain return drivers (such as cheapness or recent returns). The concept of factor investing is supported by decades of academic research and out-of-sample empirical results across a range of geographies and time periods. Practical applications of factor-based investing have also become increasingly common, as investors globally have increased their familiarity with these strategies.

Investors became familiar with value, quality, momentum and size factors in equity markets in the 1990s, and investors broadly understand traditional risk premia in fixed income, such as duration and spread risk. Yet in cash bond markets—and particularly in corporate credit factor investing is a new frontier for many. If investors do have any fixed-income factor exposure, it will tend to be limited to derivative-based investments in cross-asset risk premia strategies.

We believe that this is set to change. The first impetus is investor familiarity. As investors have become more comfortable with investing in factors in equity markets, they are beginning to consider the relevance of factor based investment approaches within their fixed income allocations. The second reason is that the availability of fundamental corporate data which was historically limited and unreliable, is improving in credit markets, thereby making an assessment of these strategies more viable.

Creating a reliable dataset: Entity level mapping

Implementing factor-based investment strategies relies on screening companies or markets based on a number of metrics and systematically investing based on this research. The most common metrics can either be market-based (for example, price momentum) or more fundamental in nature (for example, the price-to-earnings ratio).

In the equities space, obtaining fundamental data is simple: companies issue common stock, and rarely in multiple share classes. In the corporate bond space, however, companies can issue multiple rounds of debt from different subsidiary legal entities and be impacted by corporate actions over time. The lack of a universal firm-level identifier makes mapping each individual bond to the issuing balance sheet very challenging. Furthermore, not only do we need current data to research factors, but we also require clean data going back 15 to 20 years in order to develop a reasonable back-test.

Our research has resulted in the creation of a clean set of data going back roughly 20 years, with good coverage of the underlying universe. Exhibit 1 shows the market coverage that underpins our analysis on factor characteristics in credit markets.

EXHIBIT 1: CREDIT MAPPING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US Investment Grade</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Issues</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>4,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuers</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuers mapped (%MV)</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(86%) (98%)

Source: J.P. Morgan Asset Management, as at 31 December 2017. %MV represents the total percentage of market value of senior issues with mapped equity data.

APPLYING FACTORS IN CREDIT MARKETS

We have been implementing factor-based strategies across asset classes for many years and believe that factors express themselves across asset classes. While the definitions and metrics used need to be appropriate for the asset class in question, the underlying drivers of these factors are the same. We now apply the same factors that investors are more familiar with in equities to the corporate credit market, which additionally serves as a good out-of-sample test for factors in general. The factor definitions have been modified to accommodate the differences between equities and fixed income instruments.

Exhibits 2, 3 and 4 show the central results of our individual factor research in the US investment grade industrials sector. However, the results hold across global credit markets and in both high yield and investment grade sectors. In each performance, issuers in the index are ranked on the respective factor measures, and then divided into quintiles, with Q1 representing the lowest scoring issuers and Q5 the highest scoring. We analyse return generation, risk and Sharpe ratios, demonstrating monotonic improvements in the latter for each factor.

1. In addition, private companies without listed equity can also issue debt, provide another data challenge. In our results below, these are excluded on the basis that private issuers empirically demonstrate a vastly different risk/return profile in aggregate.
**EXHIBIT 2: VALUE FACTOR IN CREDIT**

**VALUE**

**BUY CHEAP SECURITIES**

Cheap securities tend to outperform more expensive securities

**Approach**

In fixed income, we consider a market measure of value, such as option-adjusted spread, relative to a fundamental measure of value, such as the probability of default, to measure the “cheapness” of individual bonds.

**Results**

Relatively cheaper companies tend to generate higher returns and a better Sharpe ratio than relatively more expensive companies, though we do see higher risk associated with higher returns.

**EXHIBIT 3: QUALITY FACTOR IN CREDIT**

**QUALITY**

**BUY HIGH QUALITY SECURITIES**

Higher quality securities tend to deliver stronger risk adjusted returns than lower quality securities

**Approach**

As is the case for equities, in fixed income we fundamentally believe that the core assessment of a company’s quality should be anchored on the financial statements of that company. In fixed income, we consider a number of metrics covering profitability, leverage, default risk and interest coverage ratios.

**Results**

Over the period analyzed, we see that higher quality companies have generated comparable returns to lower quality companies, while generally exhibiting lower levels of risk, thereby achieving stronger risk adjusted returns.

**EXHIBIT 4: MOMENTUM FACTOR IN CREDIT**

**MOMENTUM**

**BUY SECURITIES WHICH HAVE OUTPERFORMED**

Securities which have recently outperformed tend to continue to outperform

**Approach**

We consider both credit momentum as well as the momentum of the bond issuer’s equity, given the academic research suggesting equity markets tend to lead the credit market.

**Results**

Across both metrics, we see an increase in return alongside a decrease in risk as we move along quintiles. Naturally, however, momentum strategies often lead to higher turnover, which is a key consideration we would look to address when developing factor-based strategies.


![Graph showing excess return, volatility, and Sharpe ratio for high quality vs low quality companies from 1998 to 2017.](source)

Past performance is not a reliable indicator of current and future results.


![Graph showing excess return, volatility, and Sharpe ratio for low quality vs high quality companies from 1998 to 2017.](source)

Past performance is not a reliable indicator of current and future results.


![Graph showing excess return, volatility, and Sharpe ratio for losers vs winners from 1998 to 2017.](source)

Past performance is not a reliable indicator of current and future results.
Other factors, such as the size effect or the short maturity anomaly, can also be shown to hold in the cross section of fixed income markets; however, our conclusion is generally that these effects are better incorporated in the portfolio construction process as opposed to being used as explicit factors.

**BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER: A MULTI-FACTOR APPROACH**

Our analysis shows that each individual factor works across sectors and regions in investment grade and high yield corporate credit markets. That said, while each standalone factor brings different benefits, there are also practical considerations investors need to take into account:

- While the value factor can enhance returns, risk is also higher and, when managed as a standalone factor, turnover (a key consideration in fixed income) is relatively high.
- While the primary benefit of the quality factor is to dampen volatility, when managed as a standalone factor, quality may tilt towards lower yielding securities, reducing the yield of a potential strategy.
- While the momentum factor can improve both risk and return, managing momentum on a standalone basis would result in higher turnover and transaction costs, which could erode the value-add of the factor.

Given these key considerations, we also considered the impact of using a multi-factor approach across investment grade and high yield markets, within sectors. To do this, we used an integrated approach, ranking all securities on a series of value, quality and momentum metrics, combining these into an aggregate multi-factor score and rebalancing on a monthly basis.

As shown in Exhibit 5, across investment grade markets we see higher return, lower risk, and thus higher Sharpe ratios for companies with higher aggregate factor scores, comparing those characteristics to the relevant Industrials Index. We additionally show the results for an equivalent process applied within the US High Yield Industrials sector to highlight the broader applicability of factor investing approaches within corporate credit.

**PORTFOLIO IMPLEMENTATION**

Multi-factor scores present an input that allows investment managers to build investment portfolios that can meet their desired outcomes—see Exhibit 6. Two core considerations ultimately determine what the appropriate portfolio construction approach may be:

- The willingness of the investor to take on tracking error relative to the underlying index
- Whether the investor is more concerned with downside risk or yield enhancement


Past performance is not a reliable indicator of current and future results.

**EXHIBIT 5: MULTI-FACTOR RESULTS ACROSS INVESTMENT GRADE AND HIGH YIELD MARKETS**

Source: J.P. Morgan Asset Management as at 22nd October 2018.
In the following example, we illustrate a hypothetical benchmark-aware portfolio, where a balanced multi-factor approach can provide asymmetry relative to the market cap index. The portfolio buys securities from the US investment grade corporate bond universe that score in the top tertile based on the multi-factor score and holds them until they drop into the bottom tertile.

The key portfolio outcome is that the portfolio achieves an upside capture of close to 1, while on the downside the capture is around 0.8 over the longer term (Exhibit 7). This is also manifested in the lower maximum drawdown values for the factor portfolio.

EXHIBIT 7: EXAMPLE STRATEGY RESULTS: US CORPORATES (INVESTMENT GRADE CREDIT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return (%)</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatility (%)</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe ratio</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up Capture (%)</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down Capture (%)</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking Error</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Drawdown (%)</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10.1</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation to equity</td>
<td>Factor index*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Index is Bloomberg Barclays US Corporate Index.


The outperformance of this particular strategy relative to the reference index manifested itself in periods of market stress, such as the 2008/09 financial crisis, or 2016 volatility caused by oil prices movements and fears of recession. These characteristics would therefore be particularly beneficial for investors who are concerned about residual correlation to equities within their investment grade credit allocations. The data in Exhibit 7 indeed demonstrates that the factor portfolio is less correlated to the equity market than its reference index.

The strategy is robust to conservative transaction cost estimates: in our research we applied point-in-time transaction cost estimates to the returns, which are higher than what we would expect to realize in practice. The overall impact of the transaction cost estimates would be to reduce the long-term annualized return of the strategy from 6.9% to 6.4%. This still leaves a healthy excess return relative to the benchmark return (which is gross of fees).

CONCLUSION

The investment industry is increasingly familiar with factor investing within cash equity markets and short-term alternative futures strategies. We believe these factors are asset class agnostic, and our research suggests that the same factors – value, quality and momentum – are present in credit markets.

While the investment example presented here focuses on a balanced multi-factor approach that can help investors achieve an asymmetric exposure to the underlying asset class, investment approaches can be tailored to suit the particular needs of investors.

While hurdles to factor investing in credit relating to data availability may have delayed solutions in the smart beta space, we believe we are about to reach a tipping point where factor investing in fixed income will gain significant traction.

NOT FOR RETAIL DISTRIBUTION: This communication has been prepared exclusively for institutional, wholesale, professional clients and qualified investors only, as defined by local laws and regulations.

The views contained herein are not to be taken as advice or a recommendation to buy or sell any investment in any jurisdiction, nor is it a commitment from J.P. Morgan Asset Management or any of its subsidiaries to participate in any of the transactions mentioned herein. Any forecasts, figures, opinions or investment techniques and strategies set out are for information purposes only, based on certain assumptions and current market conditions and are subject to change without prior notice. All information presented herein is considered to be accurate at the time of production. This material does not contain sufficient information to support an investment decision and it should not be relied upon by you in evaluating the merits of investing in any securities or products. In addition, users should make an independent assessment of the legal, regulatory, tax, credit and accounting implications and determine, together with their own professional advisers, if any investment mentioned herein is believed to be suitable to their personal goals. Investors should ensure that they obtain all available relevant information before making any investment. It should be noted that investment involves risks, the value of investments and the income from them may fluctuate in accordance with market conditions and taxation agreements and investors may not get back the full amount invested. Both past performance and yield are not a reliable indicator of current and future results. J.P. Morgan Asset Management is the brand for the asset management business of JPMorgan Chase & Co. and its affiliates worldwide. This communication is issued by the following entities: in the United Kingdom by JPMorgan Asset Management (UK) Limited, which is authorized and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority; in other European jurisdictions by JPMorgan Asset Management (Europe) S.A. R.L.; in Hong Kong by JF Asset Management Limited, or JPMorgan Funds (Asia) Limited, or JPMorgan Asset Management Real Assets (Asia) Limited; in Singapore by JPMorgan Asset Management (Singapore) Limited (Co. Reg. No. 197605866K), or JPMorgan Asset Management Real Assets (Singapore) Pte Ltd (Co. Reg. No. 201220355E); in Taiwan by JPMorgan Asset Management (Taiwan) Limited; in Japan by JPMorgan Asset Management (Japan) Limited which is a member of the Investment Trusts Association, Japan, the Japan Investment Advisers Association, Type II Financial Instruments Firms Association and the Japan Securities Dealers Association and is regulated by the Financial Services Agency (registration number “Kanto Local Finance Bureau (Financial Instruments Firm) No. 330”); in Australia to wholesale clients only as defined in section 761A and 761G of the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth) by JPMorgan Asset Management (Australia) Limited (ABN 55143632080) (AFSL 376919), in Brazil by Banco J.P. Morgan S.A., in Canada for institutional clients’ use only by JPMorgan Asset Management (Canada) Inc., and in the United States by JPMorgan Distribution Services Inc. and J.P. Morgan Institutional Investments, Inc., both members of FINRA; and J.P. Morgan Investment Management Inc. Copyright 2018 JPMorgan Chase & Co. All rights reserved.

NEXT STEPS

For more information, please contact your usual J.P. Morgan representative.