

## Investing like Roger Federer

Lorenzo La Posta, CFA, Portfolio Manager

With a professional tennis career spanning over 20 years, Roger Federer won 20 Grand Slam titles, more than 100 ATP single tournaments and north of 1250 matches, spending 310 weeks at the top of the ATP Tour ranking<sup>1</sup>. One of the best, most recognised and esteemed tennis players of all time, he managed to earn \$1.1bn through his career. Not too bad, uh? And yet, the Swiss won only 80% of the matches he played and, even more incredibly, he barely won about 53% of the individual points he played<sup>2</sup> over the two decades (that adds up to more than 230,000). Not what the average person would guess, I'm sure. Successful investing, much like tennis, is about consistency and repeatability of good decision-making, rather than spurious (albeit potentially large) victories, and it's our job to research managers and identify those that we think have a higher chance of delivering outperformance through time.

Literally last week, we were looking at an equity manager that follows a top-down approach, where macroeconomic and thematic thinking informs sector, country and style allocation which ultimately drives stock-selection. I am being simplistic here, but this is the opposite of what we typically look for, which instead is bottom-up stock selectors with a clear philosophy and a distinct style exposure (value, quality, growth, momentum etc...), where the process is structured to identify stocks that should outperform no matter what the macro environment ends up being, and where country and sector allocation is a consequence of stock selection rather than an input. We are evidence-driven investors, and data (alongside our experience) suggest that the latter approach is more likely to lead to stable outperformance than the former. Now, the jury's out on whether that's really the case, or simply anecdotal. It might be that macroeconomic information is more efficiently spread than stock-level fundamentals, hence leaving less room for alpha generation. Or it might be that macro cycles are less impactful on stock prices than one would think. Or it might be that the data we've looked at is simply wrong and biased.

We like to challenge our assumptions quite regularly, keeping ourselves honest, and this time this specific manager seems to be pretty good at what they do. They have a well-structured process, some decent people, and most importantly, they have provided us with data supporting their skills at macro-driven alpha generation. Their track record is long and fairly successful, which might convince a superficial eye, but we are sceptical and we're trying to disprove it. Or rather, we're working on understanding if the successful track record is due to luck or skill, if it is driven by macro-allocation or other factors, and whether it's replicable or not. If at the end of our research we can't prove them wrong, then it might well be that a whole new world of investment opportunities opens to us, but if we can't find any evidence then we'll simply move on to the next item on the research agenda.

Now, the ball is in our court. We have all the data we need, and we'll apply the scientific method to analysing them: formulate some hypotheses, make a few assumptions, agree on a test statistic, and test the hypotheses. For a macro-driven process, the assumptions we make are that the decisions a manager makes are expressed through relative positions (vs benchmark) in terms of country allocation, sector allocation and style allocation, but we'll check stock selection too, for completeness. Both direction (over/underweight) and magnitude (big/small deviation) matter for alpha generation, so we'll have to test both types of decisions, separately.

Another assumption is that each decision is taken monthly, i.e. increasing geographical weight to France in May, and keeping the same relative position in June are two distinct decisions. The hypotheses are four, distinct: the manager is good at country/sector/style/stock allocation. The test statistic, or the metric we'll use to evaluate whether the hypotheses are true, is the 'Hit Ratio', which measures the percentage of calls that were right (a right call is being over/underweight something that out/underperforms and having a larger/smaller relative position in something that moves more/less). Naturally, we'll have to divide the entire history into a few non-overlapping blocks to be able to calculate the Hit Ratio's t-stat and evaluate whether the hypotheses are accepted or rejected.

What's all of this to do with Federer then? Well, if my good friend Roger managed to win so much by having a hit ratio of 53%, then certainly that's good enough also for our macro manager, so we'll accept the hypotheses if the hit ratio is significantly (in a statistical sense) higher than 50%. But also, Federer has been number 1 for so many years because he kept his hit ratio consistent throughout the years, over hundreds of thousands of points played. This is the concept of "breadth", i.e. the number of independent calls a manager makes (or the number of points, that in tennis are all independent, that a player plays). By having many observations (many years of monthly data) and many dimensions (there are 10 sectors, 20+ countries, 2 styles and 1500+ stocks) we have artificially ensured that breadth is large enough, within our assumptions.

If you want to know the results of this research project, check out our factsheets and newsletters in the coming months and you may just see a new addition in our manager lineup.



# Global Matters Weekly

08 July 2024

For more information, please contact your adviser or alternatively contact:

Belvest Investment Services Limited  
研富投資服務有限公司  
9th Floor, Centre Mark II  
305-313 Queen's Road Central  
Sheung Wan, Hong Kong

Tel +852 2827 1199  
Fax +852 2827 0270  
belvest@bis.hk  
[www.bis.hk](http://www.bis.hk)

## Important notes

This communication is issued by Belvest Investment Services Limited and/or Belvest related companies (collectively, and individually Belvest) solely to its clients, qualified prospective clients or institutional and professional investors. Unless stated otherwise, any opinions or views expressed in this communication do not represent those of Belvest. Opinions or views of any Belvest company expressed in this communication may differ from those of other departments or companies within Belvest, including any opinions or views expressed in any research issued by Belvest. Belvest may deal as Distributor or Agent, or have interests, in any financial product referred to in this email. Belvest has policies designed to negate conflicts of interest. Unless otherwise stated, this e-mail is solely for information purposes.

This message may contain confidential information. Any use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information outside the original recipients of this message is strictly prohibited. If you receive this message by mistake, please notify the sender by reply email immediately.

Unless specifically stated, neither the information nor any opinion contained herein constitutes as an advertisement, an invitation, a solicitation, a recommendation or advise to buy or sell any products, services, securities, futures, options, other financial instruments or provide any investment advice or service by Belvest.

No representation or warranty is given as to the accuracy, likelihood of achievement or reasonableness of any figures, forecasts, prospects or return (if any) contained in the message. Such figures, forecasts, prospects or returns are by their nature subject to significant uncertainties and contingencies. The assumptions and parameters used by Belvest are not the only ones that might reasonably have been selected and therefore Belvest does not guarantee the sequence, accuracy, completeness or timeliness of the information provided herein. None of Belvest, its group members or any of their employees or directors shall be held liable, in any way, for any claims, mistakes, errors or otherwise arising out of or in connection with the content of this e-mail.

This e-mail and any accompanying attachments are not encrypted and cannot be guaranteed to be secure, complete or error-free as electronic communications may be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, delayed or incomplete, and/or may contain viruses. Belvest therefore does not accept any liability for any interception, corruption, loss, destruction, incompleteness, viruses, errors, omissions or delays in relation to this electronic communication. If verification is required please request a hard-copy version. Electronic communication carried within the Belvest system may be monitored.