

Options on Initial Public Offerings*

Thomas Chemmanur Chayawat Ornthanalai Padma Kadiyala
Boston College University of Toronto Pace University

Abstract

We examine the determinants and consequences of option listing on the equity of newly public firms. Using a sample of IPOs from 1996 to 2008, we find that options are listed earlier on venture backed firms and IPOs with lower reputation underwriters. We analyze the effect of option listing on IPO long-run stock returns and find significant underperformance immediately after listing, which persists for more than a year. Examining the causes of this equity underperformance, we find a significant and permanent increase in the firm's short-interest ratio when option is listed. We also observe that insiders aggressively sell their shares in the months following option listing. A simple trading strategy of buying newly listed put options on IPO stock yields significant returns of up to 6.3% per month after transaction costs. Overall, our results suggest that option listing corrects the short-run overvaluation in IPO stocks by reducing short selling cost, thereby allowing investors with negative information to contribute to price discovery.

JEL Classification: G14; G12; G24.

Keywords: IPOs; Option listing; Long-run stock returns.

*Thomas Chemmanur can be reached at Carroll School of Management, Boston College, 440 Fulton Hall, Chestnut Hill, MA, 02467; *Phone:* (617) 552-3980; *Email:* chemmanu@bc.edu; Chayawat Ornthanalai can be reached at Rotman School of Management, the University of Toronto, 105 St.George St, Toronto, ON, Canada, M5S 3E6; *Phone:* (416) 946-0669; *Email:* chay.ornthanalai@rotman.utoronto.ca. Padma Kadiyala can be reached at Lubin School of Business, Pace University, Goldstein Academic Center, New York, NY 10038; *Phone:* (914) 773-3620; *Email:* pkadiyala@pace.edu. For helpful comments and discussions, we thank Daniel Bradley, Henry Cao, Peter Christoffersen, Brian Coulter, Jan Ericsson, Bing Han, Jay Huang, and Kent Womack. We also thank seminar participants at the University of Toronto, and OptionMetrics. Financial support from GRI is gratefully acknowledged. We are responsible for all errors.

1 Introduction

A large percentage of firms do not have options listed on their equity. On the other hand, for some firms, options are listed on their equity as early as one week after the initial public offering (IPO). The objective of this paper is to study the determinants and consequences of option listing on IPOs. A number of theoretical papers have argued that the listing of options on a firm's stock can have important economic effects on its equity, and consequently, on the payoffs of firm insiders and outside investors. For example, Danielsen and Sorescu (2001) make use of an extension of the model of Jarrow (1980) to argue that the listing of options on a firm's equity relaxes the short sale constraint on its stock, leading to a fall in the firm's share price in a setting with heterogeneous beliefs among investors (see also Miller (1977)). Similarly, Easley, O'Hara, and Srinivas (1998) develop a model in which the options market provides an important avenue, in addition to the stock market, through which those with private information can exploit this information. Their model shows that there are important linkages between the option and stock markets. It predicts that option demand will contain information about the subsequent stock returns on the underlying stock.

The above hypothesized effects of option listing have two important implications in the context of IPOs. First, while there is some degree of short-selling in the equity of newly public firms (see, e.g. Edwards and Hanley (2010) for recent evidence), it is likely that short-sale constraints are more tightly binding on the equity of newly public firms in the months immediately following their IPOs than on the equity of seasoned firms.¹ Further, it has been argued that the widely documented long-run underperformance of IPOs is partly due to the presence of short-sale constraints (see, e.g., Ritter (1991)).² This means that the relaxation of short-sale constraints due to the listing of options is likely to have much larger effects on the stock returns of newly public firms. Second, investors in the equity of recently public firms are likely to suffer from a much greater extent of information asymmetry during the first few quarters after their IPO compared to the information asymmetry facing investors in the equity of seasoned firms. This is due to the fact that very little credible information about their performance and future prospects (such as audited financial statements) is available to ordinary investors prior to these firms going public. This again means that the listing of options will have a greater effect on the stock returns of newly public firms compared to the corresponding effect for seasoned firms. Surprisingly, however, there has been no paper in the existing literature that studies the economic effects of option listing on the IPO firm's equity.

¹As explained by Geczy, Musto, and Reed (2002), short selling stocks in the IPO aftermarket is difficult due to the following reasons: there are restricted supply of shares in the immediate aftermarket as share allocations are incomplete, the lockup agreement which restricts insiders from selling and lending their shares, the prohibition on banks in the IPO syndicate from lending shares in the first 30 days, and the relatively small public float in most IPOs.

²See Miller (1977) for informal arguments, and Morris (1996) for a formal model.

This paper intends to fill the above gap in the literature. We study four important questions regarding the listing of options on the equity of firms that have recently gone public. First, what factors influence the time-to-list options on a firm’s stock after the IPO? In addition to variables that have been documented to impact exchange’s option listing decision in the case of seasoned firms (see Mayhew and Mihov (2004)), we examine whether characteristics related to the IPO such as venture backing, and underwriter reputation have an effect on the time to option listing. Second, what is the short-term and long-term effect of option listing on underlying stock returns that have recently gone public? A related question is how various IPO characteristics influence the magnitude of price effect that option listing has on the IPO firm’s long-run stock returns.

Third, what are the channels through which the listing of options affects the returns on the IPO firm’s stock? To accomplish this, we analyze the effect of option listing on three variables. The first is the change in the short interest ratio in the IPO firm’s equity around option listing, which allows us to examine whether option listing indeed increases the extent of short selling on IPO firm’s stock by effectively relaxing its short sale constraint, as suggested by Danielsen and Sorescu (2001). Second, we study whether insiders aggressively sell their shares in the IPO firms immediately after options have been listed in anticipation of a potential slide in the firm’s share price.³ The third variable we study is the relative put-call demand of newly listed options on IPO stocks, which allows us to examine whether investors with private information are making use of the options market to exploit their private information. The model of Easley, O’Hara, and Srinivas (1998) predicts that, if informed traders use the options market to exploit their private information on the expected future performance of IPO firm’s stock, put prices should be expensive relative to call prices once options are listed.

Our fourth and final question is whether investors can make abnormal profits after accounting for transaction costs by investing in newly listed options on the IPO firm’s stock. This question is important in its own right, since the existing literature seems to indicate that strategies such as short-selling the stock soon after IPO do not yield abnormal profits: see, e.g., Edwards and Hanley (2010). Answering this question allows us to examine why there may be a significant demand for option listing on the IPO firm’s equity: if trading strategies in the firm’s options yield abnormal profits, the demand for such options is likely to be greater.

We address the above four questions by making use of a sample of IPOs from January 1996 to December 2008 from the Securities Data Corporation’s (SDC) new issues database. We obtain option pricing and other option-related information from the Ivey OptionMetrics

³The “demand curve” hypothesis assumes a downward sloping demand curve for equity. Assuming such a demand curve for the IPO firm’s stock, continued insider selling in the firm’s shares subsequent to option listing will be associated with a permanent decline in the firm’s share price, leading to negative long-run stock returns upon option listing. Further, if this insider selling persists in the months after option listing, the negative stock returns to the IPO firm’s equity will persist in these months as well.

database which, at the time of this writing, has options data till December 2011. We exclude IPOs after 2008 to allow at least 3 years to follow their option listing history.

We now summarize the results of our empirical analysis, organizing them under the four questions that we mentioned above. Our first set of results regard how various IPO characteristics influence when options are listed after the firm has gone public. We apply an extended Cox hazard rate model to analyze the time-to-list options after IPO. We find that, after controlling for the various equity characteristics such as trading volume, volatility, and firm size shown in Mayhew and Mihov (2004) to affect exchanges' listing decision, there are four IPO characteristics that significantly affect the time to option listing: venture backing, underwriter reputation, initial return (IPO underpricing), and IPO proceeds. We find that venture backed firms have options listed significantly earlier (i.e., time-to-list is almost twice shorter) relative to non-venture backed firms in the post-IPO period. Another important factor that significantly shortens the time to option listing is the size of IPO proceeds: greater the IPO proceeds, shorter the time to list. In contrast, IPOs underwritten by higher reputation underwriters and those with larger initial returns are associated with a significantly longer time to option listing, though the economic effect of the latter variable is rather small.⁴

Our second set of results concerns the effects of option listing on an IPO firm's stock. We find that the equity underperforms in the short as well as the longer run in the weeks following option listing. Looking at firms that have options listed on their equity within three years after IPO, we find the cumulative average abnormal returns (CAR) in the event window of [+2,+12] weeks after option listing is -14.51% lower than the CAR in the event window of [-12 to -2] weeks before option listing, which is statistically significant at the 1% level. The IPO firm's equity continually underperforms in the longer run resulting in the CAR of -18.14% in the event window [+13,+52] after option has been listed. Thus, as is evident from Figure 2, which plots the weekly CARs from 12 weeks before to 52 weeks after option listing, the option listing week is roughly when the cumulative abnormal returns to the IPO firm's equity is the greatest. We further split our sample of IPO firms based on when options are listed after their IPO issuance date and find that the above stock return underperformance is greatest for firms which had options listed on their stock within the first six months of going public. Nevertheless, we observe statistically significant equity return underperformance in all subsamples during the [+13,+52] week event window subsequent to option listing.

We also examine the effect of option listing on stock returns and how various IPO characteristics influence the magnitude of this listing effect using a regression analysis. Our dependent variable for this analysis is the weekly return on the IPO firm's stock around option listing, measured over two event windows: a shorter event window of [-12, +12] weeks, and a longer

⁴We find that the time to first lock-up expiration does not have a significant effect on the time to option listing; neither does a dummy variable capturing whether or not a firm's IPO has a lock-up agreement.

event window of $[-12, +52]$ weeks around the option listing date. After controlling for time varying firm-specific variables such as momentum, size, volume, and volatility, we find that option listing has a significantly negative impact on the weekly return on the underlying IPO firm's stock returns, regardless of whether these are measured over the shorter or longer event window. More specifically, results from the baseline regression models suggest that IPO's stock price, on average, decreases by 134-160 basis points per week after option has been listed. Further, two IPO characteristics have a statistically and economically significant effect on the magnitude of this negative option listing effect: venture backing, which results in a more negative option listing return, and IPO underwriter reputation, which results in a less negative option listing return.⁵

In order to control for the possibility that the negative stock returns that we observe following option listing are driven by exchanges' decision to list options on firms with certain characteristics, we apply the propensity score matching analysis. Following the method in Mayhew and Mihov (2004), we construct a control sample of propensity-score matched non-optioned firms for each IPO firm on which options are listed. The propensity-score matching is implemented along the dimensions of size, trading volume, volatility, and momentum. Using the matched sample, we conduct the univariate tests as well as the difference-in-difference regressions. We find that our results are robust to controlling for any potential endogeneity arising from the exchanges' choice of firms with certain characteristics on which to list options.

Our third set of results deal with the three hypotheses regarding the causes of IPO equity underperformance following option listing. As discussed earlier, the three variables we analyze are short interest ratio, insider selling, and relative put-call demand. We find a permanent 200% increase in the short-interest ratio for IPO firms' equity in the month of option listing relative to that of control-group firms, indicating that option listing leads to a significant relaxation of the short sale constraint on IPO firms' equity. We find that, while there is no difference in the relative changes in insider holdings in the IPO firms and the matched control firm in the months prior to option listing, the difference between insider holdings in the two groups become significant after option listing. Thus, the option-listed IPO firms experience a statistically and economically significant decline in insider equity holdings for months after option listing. Under the downward sloping demand curve hypothesis, such a decline is consistent with the long-run IPO underperformance that we observe following option listing. Finally, to analyze relative put-call demand, we use two measures: the adjusted implied volatility spread (IV spread) measure of Cremers and Weinbaum (2010), and the adjusted implied volatility skewness (IV skewness) measure of Xing, Zhang, and Zhao (2010). We find that both the IV spread and IV skewness indicate that put prices are significantly

⁵We do not find that initial return (IPO underpricing) and the time to list options significantly impact the price effect of option listing.

more expensive than call prices for several months after options have been listed on the IPO stock. This suggests that informed traders use put contracts to take short positions in IPO stocks for several months after option listing.

Our fourth and final set of results relates to the profitability of trading in newly listed options on IPO firms' equity. The two option trading strategies that we examine are writing call options or buying put options on IPO firm stock when they are newly listed and holding them to expiration. While we find significant excess returns from buying long-maturity newly listed puts on the IPO firm stock, the average excess return from writing call options are either insignificant or negative. Further, excess put option returns increase as the "moneyness" of these put option contracts increases: i.e., when they are more out-of-the money at the time of purchase. We also make use of a regression analysis to study the effect of various IPO characteristics on the excess returns from buying newly listed long-maturity (6 to 12 months) put options. We find that buying long-maturity puts on venture backed firms and those with higher initial return (IPO underpricing) yield significantly higher excess returns, while buying such puts on firms with longer time to option listing after IPO yield significantly lower excess returns.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses how our paper relates to the existing literature. Section 3 describes our data, sample selection, and provides some summary statistics regarding option listing on IPO firm equity. Section 4 tests for the determinants of time-to-list options after IPOs. Section 5 describes our empirical tests and results on the effect of option listing on IPO firm stock returns. Section 6 presents our empirical analyses on three related hypotheses regarding the possible causes of IPO equity underperformance following option listing. Section 7 presents results on the profitability of trading strategies in the newly listed options on IPO firm equity. Section 8 concludes.

2 Relation to the existing literature and contribution

Our paper is related to two strands of literature. The first is the theoretical and empirical literature on the pricing and performance of IPOs in general, and on the long-run stock return underperformance of IPOs in particular. The first paper to document the long-run stock return underperformance of IPO firms was Ritter (1991). Subsequently, several papers examined various aspects of this underperformance; see Ritter and Welch (2002) for a review. However, the academic literature has been conflicted regarding the reasons underlying this long-run underperformance of IPO firm equity. For example, a number of authors have argued that the long-run underperformance of IPOs is due to market timing of IPOs by firms, where firms and investment bankers take advantage of the periodic deviation of stock prices from fundamental values by selling overpriced equity to investors (see, e.g., Ritter (1991) or Loughran and Ritter

(1995)). Another theory of long-run IPO equity underperformance is based on the assumption of an IPO market characterized by heterogeneity in investor beliefs and short-sale constraints (see Miller (1977) for informal arguments and Morris (1996) for a formal theoretical model). The pricing of IPOs in the above setting reflects only the beliefs of the most optimistic investors (since pessimists' views are not reflected in the pricing of IPOs due to short-sale constraints), with the valuation of equity coming down over time as the short-sale constraints on the IPO firm stock are relaxed (or alternatively, as the heterogeneity in equity investor beliefs is reduced over time with the arrival of additional "hard" information about the firm's post-IPO operating performance). However, empirical tests of this heterogeneous beliefs theory are hard to come by, partly because of the paucity of very good proxies for the heterogeneity in investor beliefs.⁶ While the focus of our paper is not on the long-run underperformance of IPOs in general, our paper provides support for the heterogeneous beliefs hypothesis by showing that the effective relaxation of short-sale constraints on IPO firm equity as a result of option listing is associated with long-run equity underperformance.

The second literature that our paper relates to is the empirical and theoretical literature on the determinants of option listing and its effects of option listing on the underlying stock return. The early empirical literature on the effects of option listing (see, e.g., Conrad (1989)) showed a positive abnormal return of about 2% around option listing. However, a more recent paper by Sorescu (2000) shows that positive listing returns are confined to the period from 1973 to 1980, and that negative abnormal listing returns become more frequent after 1980. Danielsen and Sorescu (2001) use an extension of the model of Jarrow (1980), and show that, since investors can establish short positions using options (and market makers hedge their exposure by shorting the underlying stock), the relaxation of short sale constraints due to option listing will drive down the price of the underlying stock. Cremers and Weinbaum (2010) and Ofek, Richardson, and Whitelaw (2004) study put-call parity violations to determine if informed investors can profit from mispricing in the stock market. Both of these studies find that such violations predict subsequent stock returns. Xing, Zhang, and Zhao (2010) study whether investors can profit from misvaluation in the underlying stock with more complex options strategies. They find that stocks exhibiting the steepest smirks in their traded options underperform stocks with the least pronounced volatility smirks. Finally, Mayhew and Mihov (2004) study the determinants of option listing for seasoned firms, and find that stocks with higher volume and volatility in the 250-day period prior to listing are most likely to be selected

⁶One exception is Chemmanur and Krishnan (2012), who document that IPOs underwritten by higher reputation investment banks are associated with greater heterogeneity in IPO investor beliefs and the consequent higher IPO offer price to intrinsic value ratios predicted by heterogeneous beliefs models. A second exception is Houge, Loughran, Suchanek, and Yan (2001), who test the heterogeneous beliefs hypothesis for the long-run underperformance of IPOs making use of three proxies for the heterogeneity in IPO investor beliefs on the first day of secondary market trading, namely, percentage opening spread, time of first trade, and flipping ratio.

by options exchanges for listing.

Because our paper is the first to study the economic effects of option listing on IPOs, it contributes to the literature in several ways. First, ours is the first paper to document the long-run equity underperformance of firms following option listing. While existing studies have documented short-run listing effects, to the best of our knowledge, there is no paper in the literature documenting a long-run listing effect, even in the context of seasoned firms. Second, while Mayhew and Mihov (2004) study the determinants of option listing for firms in general, ours is the first paper to analyze the IPO characteristics associated with early option listing. Third, while several papers starting with Figlewski and Webb (1993) have documented that option introductions coincide with increased short-selling in the underlying stock, ours is the first paper to document that option listing relaxes the short-sale constraint on IPO firm equity. Fourth, by testing new hypotheses, we are able to develop additional insight into the causes underlying the stock return underperformance of firms following option listing. Finally, we are also the first to analyze the profitability of investment strategies in the options written on IPO firm equity.

3 Data and sample

3.1 Sample selection and descriptive

Information on option prices is collected from Ivey OptionMetrics, which provides end-of-day information on all US exchange-listed equities and market indices starting from January 1996. We obtain US initial public offerings data on ordinary common shares in the period from January 1996 to December 2008 from the Securities Data Company (SDC) New Issues database. At the time of writing this paper, OptionMetrics data ends in December 2011. We exclude IPOs issued after 2008 in order to allow sufficient time (at least 3 years) to follow their option listing history. We exclude closed-end funds, real estate investment trusts (REIT), dutch auction offerings, and issuances that are flagged with "shelf registration" according to SEC Rule 415. We obtain security prices and trading information from the Center for Research in Security Prices (CRSP). Issues that have a trading history in the CRSP earlier than that reported on the SDC database are deleted. Finally, we correct for any remaining errors in the SDC database as suggested by Jay Ritter.⁷ The remaining sample consists of 2,503 firms across 29 industries.

Ivey OptionMetrics report end-of-day option prices as well as standardized option prices calculated using raw information provided to them by Spryware, LLC. We find that information on newly listed option often first appears in the standardized option database, sometimes

⁷<http://bear.warrington.ufl.edu/ritter/SDC%20corrections.pdf>

as early as two weeks, before it is reported in the end-of-day prices database. We hand checked a small sample of 25 new listings on the CBOE website and confirm that the standardized option database is the more accurate source. The date of option listing that we use in this paper therefore corresponds to the date that the firm’s option information first appears in the Ivey OptionMetrics’ standardized option database.

Panel A of Table 1 summarizes the distribution of initial public offerings by issuance year. In each year, we group firms according to when they have options listed relative to their IPO issuance date. As discussed in Ritter and Zhu (2012), the number of firms that went public decline significantly after the tech bubble burst in 2000. Out of the 2,503 initial public offerings in our sample, we observe 1,448 option listings. We find that slightly more than half of the listings occur within the first year after the firms go public. On the other hand, if the IPO firms do not receive option listing within the first year, it is more likely to be listed very late (after 36 months), or never have options listed.

Panel B of Table 1 describes the sample. Conditional on observing an option listing, *days-to-list* is the number of days between IPO issuance and when option is introduced. The mean of days-to-list is 672 days while its median is only 324 suggesting that the distribution of timing of days-to-list is heavily left skewed. The shortest time to option listing is 9 days after the IPO issuance. In total, we observe 12 initial public offerings with days-to-list of 9 days. The longest days-to-list that is 5670 days for Landec Corp (LNDC), a manufacturing firm that went public in February 1996.

Venture backed is an indicator variable equal to 1 if the IPO firm is financed by venture capital, and zero otherwise. Panel B of Table 1 shows that about half of the firms in our sample are financed by venture capital. *Underwriter rep* is the reputational score of the IPO’s lead underwriter. We obtain underwriter reputation ranking from Jay’s Ritter website (see also Loughran and Ritter (2004)) and map the lead underwriter of each offering to the reputational scale of 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). The mean and median underwriter reputation score in our sample is 7.55 and 8, respectively. *First day ret*, a commonly used measure for short-run underpricing, is calculated as the log of return (%) on the offer price to the end of the first trading day. VA Linux system (LINUX) has the highest first day return in our sample of approximately 200% while Echapman Inc (ECMN) has the lowest first day return of -56%.

Proceeds amount is calculated as the log of the total proceeds amount (in \$) from the offering including overallotment options, if exercised. *Total shares offered* is the number of shares issued at the offering in thousands of units. *Lock up agreement* is an indicator variable equal to 1 if the IPO has a share lockup agreement, and zero otherwise. Panel B of Table 1 shows that three-quarters of firms in our sample have shares lockup provision. If a firm has a share lockup agreement, we calculate *days to lockup expiration*, which is the number of days from IPO issuance to the first lockup expiration date. The median number of days to lockup

expiration is 180.

3.2 Option listing date and IPO stock performance

We evaluate the performance of initial public offerings using cumulative average adjusted returns (CAR). Following Ritter (1991), our benchmark is the return of a firm matched by industry and market capitalization to each IPO in our sample. Table 2 reports the first day return and CAR computed over various horizons. We report the results for six IPO groups categorized according to when options are listed relative to their IPO issuance date. The initial return period is defined as month 0, and the aftermarket period includes the subsequent 36 months. We define months as successive 21-trading-day periods relative to the IPO date. For instance, month 1 consists of event day 2-22, and month 2 consists of event day 23-43, and so on. Daily returns data and securities' information are downloaded from the CRSP database.

The matching firm-adjusted return for stock i in event month t is defined as

$$ar_{it} = r_i(t) - r_{im}(t),$$

where $r_i(t)$ is the logarithmic raw return of stock i in event month t , and $r_{im}(t)$ is the logarithmic raw return in event month t of a firm matched to stock i by industry and market value. Matching firms are selected from firms listed on the AMEX, NYSE, and NASDAQ stock exchanges. The matching procedure for each IPO stock i is as follows. We rank firms that have the same three-digit SIC code as firm i according to their market values calculated on the last trading day of the month prior to the IPO issuance date of stock i . Among them, the firm with the closest market value to that of the IPO firm at issuance is selected. If a matching firm in the same three-digit SIC code was not available, we match using the two-digit SIC code.

The average adjusted return on a portfolio of n stocks for event month t is the equally-weighted average of the matching firm-adjusted returns. That is, $AR_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n ar_{it}$. IPOs that are delisted on event month t are excluded in the calculation of AR_t . The cumulative adjusted return from event month 0 to s is then calculated as the sum of average adjusted returns:

$$CAR(0, s) = \sum_{t=0}^s AR_t.$$

Figure 1 plots CARs from event months 0 to 36 for six different IPO groups categorized by when they have options listed. For instance, the top-left and top-right panels plot CAR for the IPO stocks that have options listed in 0-6, and 25-36 months after the IPO issuance date, respectively. The darkened solid line in each panel indicates when options are listed relative to the IPO issuance date.

Figure 1 shows that option listings usually coincide with the period when IPO stocks are performing well. These strong performers appear to underperform after option listing. We arrive at the same conclusion when looking at CAR values in Table 2. We find that option listings occur when the aftermarket CAR of the IPO firms is at its peak. Consider the early-option-listed group corresponding to IPOs that have options listed in 0-6 months after the issuance date. These firms experience a relatively high 6-month CAR value of 38.08%. However, such strong performance does not prevail over the next 6 months resulting in a 12-month CAR value of 27.41%; a drop of more than 10% from its peak. The performance of IPO firms in the early-option-listed group continues to worsen at longer horizons. Table 2 shows that the CARs of these IPOs fall to 13.22% after 36 months which is not statistically significant at a conventional level. Importantly, we observe a similar pattern of IPO underperformance in other IPO groups after options have been listed. For instance, the second IPO group consisting of firms that have options listed in 7-12 months has a peak performance around the same period (i.e. 7-12 months after the issuance), with a 12-month CAR value of 70.73%. These firms eventually underperform after options have been listed with a 24-month CAR value of 52.39%.

In addition, Table 2 reports the average first day return for different IPO groups. We do not observe a monotonic relationship between an IPO's first day return and time-to-list. The largest first day return belongs to the IPO group that have options listed in 7-12 months after the issuance. In fact, these firms exhibit the strongest short-run aftermarket performance (i.e. 6-month CAR) until options are listed.

The first row of Table 2 reports the number of firm-observations in each IPO group. A large fraction of firms in our sample (42%) never eventually have options listed. Although these never-optioned IPOs, on average, have a significant 13.21% first day return, they underperform immediately in the aftermarket. The 6-month CAR of never-optioned IPO firms have a negligible 6-month CAR and a statistically significant negative 36-month CAR of -24.88%. We also find that 43% of firms in this IPO group are delisted from stock exchanges 36 months after going public. This delisting rate is higher than other IPO groups which have 36-month delisting rates between 35-12%. It is likely that these strongly underperforming IPOs are never optioned because a large fraction of them are eventually delisted making them ineligible for option listing.⁸

4 Determinants of time-to-list

This section examines the factors influencing when IPOs are selected for option listings relative to their issuance date. Mayhew and Mihov (2004) study the determinants affecting exchange's

⁸NYSE Amex Rule 915 requires that the security eligible for option listing is actively traded.

decision of which options to list by estimating a logit model. They find that the stock’s volume, volatility and size are positively related to the increase in the firm’s likelihood of having options listed. While Mayhew and Mihov (2004) examine which seasoned stocks are selected for option listing, our focus is on when options are listed after the firm goes public. In keeping with this objective, our dependent variable is the *time-to-list* in unit months. Time-to-list is calculated by dividing the number of days between the IPO issuance date and the option introduction date by 30 and rounded to the nearest integer.

We estimate the extended Cox model commonly used for survival analysis in epidemiological studies (e.g. Platt, Joseph, Ananth, Grondines, Abrahamowicz, and Kramer (2004)). Let t be the current time period, and $T \geq t$ is when option is listed, the conditional probability that option is listed on the IPO firm between time t and $t + y$, $\mathbb{P}(t \leq T < t + y | T \geq t)$, is related to the following hazard-rate function:

$$h(t) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}(t \leq T < t + y | T \geq t)}{y}.$$

In the extended Cox model, the hazard function is represented by

$$h(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}(t)) = h_0(t) \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p_1} \beta_i x_i + \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} \delta_j z_j(t) \right), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{p_1})'$ is a time-independent vector of IPO variables, and $\mathbf{z}(t) = (z_1(t), z_2(t), \dots, z_{p_2}(t))'$ is a time-dependent vector of covariates affecting the hazard rate of having options listed. When $\delta_j = 0$ for all j ’s, the extended Cox model is known as the Cox proportional hazard (Cox PH) model, where $h_0(t)$ is the baseline hazard function. In both the extended Cox model and the Cox PH model, the baseline function is semi-parametric and hence we do not need to define the functional form for $h_0(t)$. Nevertheless, the extended Cox model is more flexible than the Cox PH model in that it allows for time-varying covariates to affect the hazard rate.

We estimate the hazard rate of time-to-list on various IPO characteristics and time-varying covariates. We truncate time-to-list beyond 36 months to focus on exchanges’ listing decision in the IPO aftermarket.⁹ The time-varying covariates include volume, volatility, and size which to varying degrees have been shown in Mayhew and Mihov (2004) to influence exchanges’ option-listing decision. We use one-month lagged covariates to avoid biases induced by contemporaneous relationship between option listing and the time-varying covariates. These lagged covariates are calculated at the monthly frequency to be consistent with the time-to-list variables which is expressed in unit months. *Market cap* is the log of market

⁹Efron (1977) show the Cox model is well suited for handling censored data. For robustness, we extend the truncation up to 60 months and obtain the same conclusions.

capitalization observed at the end of the previous month and captures the firm size. *Shares turnover* represents the stock’s trading volume and is calculated as the average of daily shares turnover (%) over the previous month. *Volatility* is calculated as the average daily standard deviation (%) of raw returns over the previous month. Besides size, volume, and volatility, we include *Cumulative ret* to capture the stock’s momentum; it is calculated as the cumulative daily raw returns over the previous month.

We include IPO characteristics described in the Panel B of Table 1. *Venture backed* is an indicator variable equal to 1 if the IPO firm is financed by a venture capitalist; *Time to lockup expiration* is the number of months from IPO issuance date to the first shares lockup expiration; *High underwriter rep* which is a binary variable equal to 1 if the firm’s lead underwriter is in the highest prestige category (rank=9) according to the ranking published on Jay Ritter’s website; and *First day ret* is the logarithmic return (%) of the offered price over the end-of-first-trading-day price. We control for the IPO size in all the estimations by including *Proceeds amount* calculated as the log of total proceeds amount (in \$) from the offering including overallotment options, if exercised.

Table 3 reports the results from estimating the extended Cox model on time-to-list. Models (1)-(4) examine the impact of each IPO characteristic on time-to-list, while model (5) look at the relative importance of IPO characteristics in explaining time-to-list. We include time-varying covariates in all the regressions. All models are estimated with the industry and year fixed effects. Table 3 shows the coefficients on all time-varying covariates are positive and statistically significant. Consistent with Mayhew and Mihov (2004), we find that increases in the firm’s market cap, shares turnover, and volatility positively increase the firm’s likelihood of having option listed. The positive coefficient on cumulative returns supports the results in Figure 1 that IPOs experiencing positive return momentum are more likely to be selected for option listing.

In all models, the coefficient on *Proceeds Amount* is positive and significant at the 1% indicating that larger IPO firms are more likely to be listed early in the aftermarket. IPOs with large offering proceeds are usually associated with large institutional buyers and high media coverage (Liu, Sherman, and Zhang (2011)), resulting in active aftermarket trading and a substantial level of volatility. The finding that IPO’s proceeds positively correlate with shorter time-to-list supports our previous results that firm’s size, trading volume, and volatility are important determinants of option listing.

Besides *Proceeds Amount*, the other variable that loads significantly positively on the likelihood of time-to-list is *Venture backed*. IPOs financed by venture capitalist therefore receive option listing earlier than non-venture backed IPOs. Table 3 shows the coefficients in models (1) and (5) on *Venture backed* are highly significant and economically large. A more intuitive way to interpret the coefficients in Table 3 is through the hazard ratio. According

to equation (1), the hazard ratio of factor x_i is calculated as $\exp(\beta_i)$ and defined as the change in hazard rates conditional on one unit increase in x_i . Following this interpretation, the hazard ratios for *Venture backed* in model (1) is $\exp(0.546) = 1.66$ suggesting that the time-to-list for venture backed IPO firms is, on average, $\frac{1}{1.66} = 0.60$ times shorter than non-venture backed IPOs. Furthermore, we find that the coefficient on *Venture backed* remains strongly significant and relatively stable once the other IPO characteristics are included in model (5). This suggests a robust finding that venture capital backed IPOs are likely to have option listing relatively early once they go public.

The coefficient on *High underwriter rep* is negative and statistically significant suggesting firms that undergo initial public offering with a prestigious underwriter receive option listing later than those that do not use a prestigious underwriter. Inferring the hazard ratio from the estimates in model (3), we find firms using underwriter with a high reputational ranking (=9) have options listed later by a factor of $1/\exp(-0.161) = 1.17$. Carter and Manaster (1990) show that IPOs that use prestigious underwriters are associated with lower risk offerings. They argue that with less information asymmetry, there is less incentive to acquire information and fewer informed trading. Following their argument, we conjecture the relatively lower risk offerings and informed trading level associated with firms using prestigious underwriter result in lower hedging demand and hence the lesser interests for option listing.

We find that IPO's performance on the first trading day is weakly related with time-to-list. The coefficient on *First day ret* in model (4) is negatively significant at the 10 percent level, although with a relatively small magnitude. Translating this into the hazard ratio shows that one percent increase in the first day return at offering increases the time-to-list by only a factor of $1/\exp(-0.002) = 1.002$. We offer a potential explanation why high IPO's first day return may delay option listing through the view of the market maker. IPOs that experience extremely high first day return are considered severely underpriced and are very volatile. The market making cost associated with extremely underpriced IPO stocks is therefore expected to be very high which may consequently delay the listing. All in all, given the small economic magnitude on *First day ret*, we conclude that IPO's performance on the first trading day has little impact on when options are listed.

We do not find that the time from IPO issuance date to the first shares lockup expiration date affects when options are introduced. We also experiment with other shares lockup variables instead of *Time to lockup expiration* and arrive at the same conclusion. For instance, we use a binary variable equal to 1 if the firm has shares lockup agreement and zero otherwise. We also test whether the percent of shares held under the lockup agreement matter for option listing. Overall, we fail to find that time-to-list are associated with the aforementioned characteristics of shares lockup agreement. Finally, as a robustness check, we repeated our estimations on time-to-list using a logit model instead of the extended Cox model and obtain

similar conclusions.

5 Consequences of option listing

5.1 Main results

5.1.1 Abnormal returns around option listing

In this section, we study the performance of IPO stocks around their option listing dates. We center our event windows around the date of option introduction. We compute abnormal returns at weekly intervals. Each event week return is calculated using successive five trading days. Return on event week 0 is the sum of log daily raw returns over the $[-2,+2]$ trading days relative to the option introduction date. Returns on event weeks -1 and 1 are the sum of log daily raw returns over event days $[-7,-3]$ and $[+3,+7]$, respectively. Similarly, returns on event weeks -2 and 2 are the sum of log daily raw returns over event days $[-12,-8]$ and $[+8,+12]$, respectively, etc. We calculate weekly returns over a long horizon starting on event week -12 and ending on event week 104 relative to the option listing date.

We measure abnormal returns of stock i on event week t using benchmark-adjusted returns, ar_{it} , calculated as the raw return of stock i minus the return of a benchmark for the same event week t . The benchmarks used are: (1) the CRSP value-weighted NASDAQ index, (2) an index of the smallest decile of the New York Stock Exchange, and (3) a listed firm matched by industry and size. The data for the two benchmark indices are downloaded from CRSP and the matched firm is selected using the method discussed in Section 3.2. The calculation of weekly average adjusted return and weekly cumulative adjusted return are identical to those in Section 3.2, with the exception of using weekly benchmark-adjusted returns instead of monthly matching firm-adjusted returns.

Figure 2 plots weekly cumulative adjusted returns (CAR) around option listing for the four IPO groups categorized by when options are listed relative to their IPO issuance date. Weekly cumulative adjusted returns are plotted starting from event week -12. We plot CAR series calculated from the three benchmark-adjusted returns as well as the raw returns. The bottom-right panel in Figure 2 plots CAR for the full sample consisting of IPO stocks that have options listed within 3 years after going public. The other panels in Figure 2 plot CAR series for different subsamples. We include a solid vertical line in each panel to visually indicate when option listing occurs. Overall, these plots convincingly show that IPO firms, on average, experience their peak benchmark-adjusted performance in event week 0, exactly when options are listed. More importantly, Figure 2 shows that IPO stocks continue to underperform once options have been introduced. The results are consistently robust across the four IPO groups although the long-run underperformance are stronger for firms that have options listed within

1 year after going public.

Table 4 reports CAR calculated using matching firm-adjusted returns around option-listing week. We compute CAR for five non-overlapping event windows. The first event window is designed to capture abnormal returns before option is introduced and covers event weeks -12 to -2. We exclude week -1 from the first event window because from hand-searching 25 randomly selected listing announcements on the CBOE website, we find that the announcement date is usually one week prior to the option introduction date. The second event window covers event weeks -1 to 1 and is designed to capture any price effects associated with the announcement of option listing as well as option introduction. The third event window measures the short-run price impact after options have been introduced; it covers event weeks 2 to 12. The fourth event window measures the price impact of option listing over event weeks 13 to 52. Finally, the fifth event window measures the very-long-run IPO performance after options have been listed and covers event weeks 53 to 104.

Table 4 reports CAR for IPOs grouped by when the firms have options listed. There is strong evidence that IPO stocks strongly outperform in the weeks prior to option listing. The results for the full sample in Panel A show that IPOs earn a significant a significant 12.63% CAR in the event window [-12,-2]. The strong positive performance quickly disappears after options are listed resulting in a statistically insignificant CAR value of -1.87% in the event window [+2,+12]. Looking at a longer horizon, the CAR value falls to -18.14% in the event window [+13,+52] and is statistically significant at the one percent level. We find similar abnormal return patterns when looking at Panels B-D, suggesting the impact of option listing is not specific to a certain IPO group. However, the strongest underperformance after option is listed belongs to the IPO group that have option introduced in the first six months (see Panel B).

We next test the hypothesis that IPO stocks underperform after option listing by calculating the difference in CAR between event windows [+2,+12] and [-12,-2]. The last row of each panel in Table 4 reports the result. Overall, we find that CAR significantly decrease after option has been introduced. The difference is largest for IPOs that have options listed in 0-6 months and 13-36 months, respectively. Interestingly, Table 4 shows the difference in CAR is smallest for IPOs that have options listed in 7-13 months (Panel C). We conjecture the result is partly caused by the expiration of IPO shares lockup, which is usually 180 days after the issuance date and is associated with a significant negative abnormal return (see Field and Hanka (2001)). Since options are listed after the lockup expiration date, the CAR value in the pre-option-listing period are affected by the negative price impact of shares lockup expiration Panel C in Table 4 confirms the conjecture. The CAR for this group in the [-12,-2] window is 7.72% which is the smallest relative to the other IPO groups. As a result, the difference in CAR between the pre- and post-option listing periods for this IPO group also has the smallest

magnitude.

5.1.2 Subsample tests

Panel B of Table 1 shows 76% of IPOs in our sample feature shares lockup agreements which prohibit insiders and other pre-IPO shareholders from selling any of their shares before a specified period. The typical lockup period is 180 days. Field and Hanka (2001) report a three-day abnormal return of -1.5% and a permanent 40% increase in trading volume around the unlock days. They further show that insiders sell their shares aggressively after lockups expiration and the effect is stronger for venture backed IPOs. Similarly, Bradley, Jordan, Ha-Chin, and Roten (2001) find a significant negative price impact around lockup expirations and that the loss appear to be concentrated among firms financed by venture capitalist. In the Internet Appendix (Figure IA1), we show that abnormal IPO performance around option listing that we observe is not an artifact of shares lockup expiration.

Existing studies find that the IPO market follows a cycle with dramatic change in the number of issuance and volume per year.¹⁰ We show that our main findings are robust to different subperiods by splitting the sample into four periods according to the IPO issuance year. To save space, we report the results in the Internet Appendix (see Table IA1). Overall, we find that our main findings remain robust to the year when firms decide to go public.

5.1.3 Regression analysis

In this subsection, we use panel regressions to examine IPO performance around option listing. Table 5 reports the results. The dependent variable is weekly matching firm-adjusted return, ar_{it} , calculated relative to the option listing dates, which is event week 0. We run panel regressions on two intervals of weekly adjusted returns. Panel A reports regression results for weekly adjusted returns for a balanced panel starting in event week -12 and ending in event week 12. Panel B reports regression results for the long-run window from event weeks -12 to 52.

We test the impact of option listing on IPO stock performance by regressing weekly adjusted returns on *Optionstat*, an indicator variable equal to 1 in event week 0 or greater, and zero otherwise. We estimate the following regression model for each firm i :

$$ar_{it} = \alpha + \beta Optionstat + \gamma (Optionstat \times IPO\ variable_i) + \delta_1 IPO\ variable_i + \dots \quad (2) \\ + \delta_2 Weekly\ Controls_{it-1} + \varepsilon_{it},$$

where *IPO variable_i* is the IPO variable under examination. Model (1) reports the baseline

¹⁰See for examples, Ibbotson and Jaffe (1975), Ritter (1984) and Loughran and Ritter (1995).

regression results where $\gamma = 0$ in equation (2). In models (2)-(6), we estimate the coefficient on *Optionstat* as well as its interaction with the other IPO variables. The objective of running regression models (2)-(6) is to examine whether the underperformance that we observe after option listing is associated with certain IPO characteristics.

The regression model in equation (2) is useful for interpreting the magnitude of IPO performance around option listing. The intercept α provides an estimate of average weekly adjusted returns prior to option listing. When $\gamma = 0$, equation (2) provides estimates for the baseline regression, where β represents an average change in weekly adjusted returns after option introduction.

Most of the IPO variables that we use in the regressions model are identical to those in Table 3. *Time-to-list* is the number of months from IPO issuance date to the date of option introduction. We define *Shares locked up (t)* as a weekly indicator variable equal to 1 if the firm has an outstanding shares lockup agreement in event week t , and zero otherwise. For IPOs that do not have shares lockup agreement, this variable takes the value of zero for all t 's. On the other hand, for IPOs that have shares lockup agreement, *Shares locked up (t)* is equal to 1 if the firm is still subject to a lockup in event week t and remains unchanged until the lockup expires. The objective of including *Shares locked up (t)* is to remove the price impact associated with the lockup agreement as well as to test whether the impact of option listing differs when insiders cannot off-load their shares to the market.

In addition to the year fixed effects, we include lagged weekly variables, *Weekly Controls* $_{it-1}$, to control for time-varying changes in the firm's momentum, size, volume, and volatility. We control for momentum using the matching firm-adjusted return, *ar* $_{it-1}$, calculated in event week $t - 1$. We control for size and volume using the average daily log market capitalization and daily shares turnover of firm i in event week $t - 1$, respectively. Finally, we control for changes in volatility using the standard deviation of stock i 's daily raw returns calculated in event week $t - 1$.

Panel A in Table 5 shows the coefficient estimates on *Optionstat* are significant and negative for all models reinforcing our main findings that IPO stocks underperform once options have been introduced. Looking at the baseline estimates in model (1), the coefficient on *Optionstat* is -1.34% which is statistically significant at the 1 percent level. This finding suggests that IPO stocks' weekly adjusted returns decrease by 134 basis points, on average, once options have been listed.

Next we look at the results from interacting *Optionstat* with IPO characteristics. Model (2) shows the estimate on *Optionstat* \times *Venture backed* is -1.22% suggesting the impact of option listing is more severe for venture capital backed firms. Interestingly, the estimate on *Optionstat* falls to -0.64% but remains statistically significant at the 1 percent level. All together, these estimates imply that weekly adjusted returns of venture backed IPOs decrease further

than non-venture backed IPOs by 122 basis points. Another IPO characteristic that strongly impacts post-option listing performance is the lead underwriter’s reputation. Model (4) shows a positively significant coefficient on $Optionstat \times High\ underwriter\ rep$ of 1.17%. In other words, weekly adjusted returns in the post-option listing period for firms using a prestigious underwriter is 117 basis points higher than those using a non-prestigious underwriter.

Panel A shows a marginally significant estimate on $Shares\ locked\ up\ (t)$ of 0.72%, suggesting that option listing impacts IPO performance more negatively when there is no shares lockup agreement. IPO lockup agreement prevents insiders and pre-IPO shareholders from selling their shares prior to the unlock day. It is likely that when the shares are locked up, option listing does not depress IPO stock prices as much because such agreement restricts the number of available shares trading, thus slowing down the price adjustment in the post-option listing period. Lastly, in Panel A, we do not find the first trading day return as well as time-to-list to significantly impact post-option listing performance.

Next, we look at the regression results over the [-12,+52] window, i.e. Panel B. All of the coefficients on $Optionstat$ in Panel B are significantly negative indicating that our previous findings hold at a longer horizon. In fact, results from model (1) shows the impact of option listing on IPO underperformance is even stronger over the long run. The coefficient on $Optionstat$ is -1.60% and is statistically significant at the 1 percent level. This translates to lower post-listing weekly adjusted returns of 160 basis points relative to when option has not yet been listed. Finally, the results in Panel B confirm our previous findings on the significance of *Venture backed* and *High underwriter rep*.

5.2 Propensity score matching method

Our results in Tables 4-5 support the conclusion that IPO stocks underperform subsequent to an option listing. However, Table 3 shows there is a selection bias because exchanges tend to list options with high trading volume, volatility, market capitalization, and upward momentum. Further, option exchanges may have superior stock picking ability such that they time their listing to coincide with when the IPO stocks are best performing. We correct for this bias using a propensity score-matched control sample and show that our main finding is not due to exchanges’ ability to time the market.

Following the method set forth by Mayhew and Mihov (2004), we construct a control group of eligible firms based on their likelihood of having options listed. The first step in constructing the control sample is to determine the universe of stocks that are eligible for option listing but do not yet have options listed. As per the 2010 requirement for option listing by the NYSE AMEX Rule 915, the security must be duly registered on a National Market System, i.e. "NMS stock", and characterized by a substantial number of outstanding

shares which are widely held and actively traded. We summarize the trading requirements of stocks eligible for option listing below:

- (1) There are a minimum of 7,000,000 shares of public floats
- (2) There are a minimum of 2,000 holders of the underlying security.
- (3) Trading volume (in all markets in which the underlying security is traded) has been at least 2,400,000 shares in the preceding twelve months.
- (4) The market price per share of the underlying security has been at least \$3.00 for the previous five consecutive business days preceding the date on which the Exchange submits a certificate to the Options Clearing Corporation for listing and trading.

We collect data from various sources to identify the universe of stocks eligible for option listing at any time point from January 1996 to December 2011. The number of stocks in the eligible universe changes monthly depending on their compliance with the listing requirements. We obtain data on share price, volume, number of shares outstanding, exchange listing, and number of common share holders at the end of each month for the all underlying securities in the CRSP database. ADRs, country funds, REIT, and closed-end funds are excluded since they are not considered in our IPO sample. We use data on trading volume, share price, and exchange listing history to filter out stocks that are ineligible for option listing. We use the number of common share holders a conservative proxy to identify ineligible stocks that do not meet the minimum 2,000 share holders requirement. However, we do not find the minimum share holders requirement to be a key binding criteria after removing firms that do not meet the minimum public floats and trading volume requirements.

Finally, the public float criterion states that a minimum of 7,000,000 shares must be owned by persons other than those required to report their holdings under Section 16(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. To establish eligibility based the public float criterion, we calculate the number of shares held by insiders at the end of each month using the data downloaded from Thomson Reuter's Insider Filing Data Feed (IFDF). The number of public float is calculated by subtracting the number of shares outstanding with the number of shares held by insiders. Using the above criteria to define the control sample, we find the number of stocks eligible for option listing varies significantly through time. To save space, we discuss the monthly distribution of our control sample in the Appendix A.

In the next step, we select firms from the universe of eligible stocks that do not have options listed based on their likelihood of option listing. We estimate ex ante probabilities of

option listing for each eligible stock in each month using the following logit model

$$L(List) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Market\ cap + \beta_2 Shares\ turnover + \beta_3 Volatility + \dots \quad (3)$$

$$\beta_4 Cumulative\ returns + \varepsilon,$$

where $L(List)$ is the log-odds ratio that a stock will be selected for option listing during this month.¹¹ The independent variables that we use are one-month lagged time-varying covariates from Table 3 which represent the firm’s size, trading volume, volatility, and momentum. Section 4 discusses the construction of these variables.

We estimate the rolling-monthly logit model in equation (3) from January 1996 through December 2011. In each month, stocks that receive option listing are matched to eligible stocks that are not optioned base on their ex ante probabilities, i.e. propensity score, of having options listed. We use the greedy algorithm for the matching and allow one firm from the control group to be matched to each firm in the treated group. Finally, if the propensity score of the matched pair differs by more than $\pm 5\%$, the matched control firm is excluded. Overall, our matching method yields 575 control firms. To save space, we discuss results of the matching method in the Appendix B.

5.3 Propensity score-matched sample results

5.3.1 Univariate results

Table 6 reports cumulative adjusted returns (CAR) around option listing for the matched sample. We calculate CAR using weekly matching firm-adjusted returns. The treated group consists of IPOs in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. The control group consists of eligible firms that do not have options listed but have the same likelihood of being optioned as one of the firms in the treated group. Adjusted returns for event week t is calculated relative to event week 0 when option is listed. Because firms in the control group do not actually have options listed, their event week 0 corresponds to the option listing date of the treated firm that they have been paired with.

We recall that the matching firm-adjusted return for event week t is calculated as the raw return of stock i in event week t minus the return of a firm matched by industry and size over the same period (see Section 3.2). The market values of firms used in the matching is calculated at the end of the month prior to the IPO issuance. Thus for firms in the treated group, the market values are matched close to their IPO issuance date. As for the control-

¹¹Some of our variables are calculated differently from Mayhew and Mihov (2004) in order to make them more applicable to IPO stocks. We also include cumulative returns as an additional matching dimension in order to capture momentum.

group firms, we use the market values calculated at the end of the month prior to the IPO issuance of the treated firm that they have been paired with for matching.

Table 6 reports CAR for five non-overlapping windows. The results for the treated and control groups are reported side by side. The number of observations in each group represents the number of firms with available data for computing CAR in interval. We note that the number of observations in the control group is less than that in the treated group for two important reasons. First, several observations are dropped because we cannot calculate their matching firm-adjusted returns. Second, we remove firms in the control group that have options listed later in the year.

The last row in Table 6 reports the difference in CAR between the windows $[+12,+2]$ and $[-12,-2]$. We do not find that firms in the control group underperform once option has been listed. On the other hand, firms in the treated group underperform significantly. This finding shows that the underperformance of IPOs after option listing cannot be explained by the timing of exchanges' listing decision.

We find positively significant CAR values in the event window $[-12,-2]$ for the treated as well as the control group, suggesting that both groups experience a strong positive momentum prior to event week 0. Looking at the last column in Table 6 shows the difference in their CAR values is not statistically significant. This finding shows that firms in the treated and control groups firms are similarly matched before option is introduced.

We find CAR in the event window $[+2,+12]$ of the treated group to be 3.06% smaller than that of the control group, though the difference is not significant at a conventional level. However, when we look at the $[+12,+52]$ window, the difference in their CAR values is about -20% and statistically significant at the 1 percent level. Table 6 also shows that the CAR values in window $[+52,+104]$ are insignificantly small and not different between the two groups. We therefore do not find evidence that option listing is associated with IPO underperformance beyond 52 weeks after option has been listed.

5.3.2 Difference-in-difference regressions

Using the propensity score-matched sample, we perform difference-in-difference regression analysis. We estimate a panel regression model similar to that in equation (2) for the matched sample. Table 7 reports the results. The dependent variable is the weekly matching firm-adjusted returns and we report the results for two intervals: $[-12,+12]$ and $[-12,+52]$ relative to the option listing week. However this time, our variable of interest is the difference-in-difference (DID) estimator which measures the effect of option introduction on IPO firms controlling for endogeneity associated with option listing. The regression model that we

estimate is as follows

$$ar_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 Treated + \beta_2 Optionstat + \gamma (Optionstat \times Treated) + \dots \quad (4)$$

$$+ \delta_1 Fixed\ effects_i + \delta_2 Weekly\ Controls_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{it},$$

where *Optionstat* is a binary variable (0 or 1) indicating whether option has been introduced. We introduce a new variable, *Treated* which is an indicator variable equal to 1 if the firm is in the treated group and zero otherwise. The coefficient on the interaction term *Optionstat* \times *Treated* is the DID estimator which measures the difference in adjusted returns after option has been listed for the treated group relative to that for the control group. We also include lagged weekly variables, *Weekly Controls*_{*i,t-1*}, in (4) to control for time-varying changes in the firm’s momentum, size, volume, and volatility.

Panels A-B in Table 7 show the coefficients on *Optionstat* \times *Treated* are negative and highly significant. More importantly, their values are economically large. For instance, the DID estimator in the [-12,+12] regression panel is -0.852 which can be interpreted as follows. Controlling for the price effect associated with exchanges’ listing decision, weekly adjusted returns of IPO stocks, on average, decrease by 85.2 basis points after option has been introduced.

Besides the DID estimator, the regression model (4) provides other useful interpretations for abnormal returns around option listing. For instance, the coefficient on *Treated* measures the difference in adjusted returns between the treated and control groups prior to event week 0. Table 7 shows that the coefficient on *Treated* is statistically insignificant, confirming that our matched samples consists of stocks that perform similarly before option is introduced. We also find that the coefficients on *Optionstat* are insignificant. In our framework, the coefficient on *Optionstat* measures the impact of option listing on adjusted returns for the control group. An insignificant coefficient on *Optionstat* suggests that firms in the control group do not significantly perform worse after event week 0 even though they are likely to have options listed as much as the IPO firms in the treated group.

6 Explaining IPO underperformance post option listing

We evaluate three hypotheses related to the underperformance of IPO stocks after options have been listed. First, we test whether option listing alleviates short sale constraints for IPO stocks. Second, we test whether insiders sell their shares aggressively for months after options have been listed, which could explain why IPO stocks continually underperform for months after options have been listed. Finally, if informed traders use the options market to trade on negative future IPO performance, put options should be in relatively higher demand than calls. Our third hypothesis tests whether put prices are abnormally more expensive than call

prices when option are newly listed on the IPO stocks.

6.1 Short interest

One of the long standing arguments for short-run IPO underpricing is the difficulty of short selling stocks immediately after the firms go public. Under short sale constraints, Miller (1977) argues that prices will reflect a more optimistic valuation of the security because pessimistic investors are kept out of the market by high short-sale costs. D'Avolio (2002) provides institutional details of the short-sale market and show that an important cost related to short selling is the loan fees. An investor who wishes to short sell a stock must find an existing owner who is willing to lend her the shares. Having negotiated a loan cost, she may short sell the borrowed share to any willing buyer. Relying on a proprietary database, D'Avolio (2002) reports the value-weighted mean loan fee for general collateral stocks of 17 bps per annum. However, the fee for stocks that are "special" is significantly much higher (4.69%) and Geczy, Musto, and Reed (2002) argue that IPO stocks are "special" due to the following reasons: the restricted supply of shares in the immediate aftermarket as share allocations are incomplete, the lockup agreement which restricts insiders from selling and lending their shares, the prohibition on banks in the IPO syndicate from lending shares in the first 30 days, and the relatively small public float in most IPOs.

More recently, Edwards and Hanley (2010) question the assumption that short-run IPO underpricing is due to short sale constraints. Using short selling transaction data in 2005-2006, they show that short selling is an integral part of the IPO aftermarket concluding that other factors must be at play. Even though short selling in the aftermarket is not as inactive as previous studies suggested, its cost may still be too high such that several investors who hold negative views on the IPO stocks are deterred from participating in their price discovery. In fact, Edwards and Hanley (2010) show that short sellers, on average, do not appear to earn abnormal profits suggesting insignificant rewards from taking such short positions. In contrast to when options are introduced, we will later show in Section 7 that investors who take synthetic short positions by buying long-maturity put contracts, on average, earn significant positive abnormal returns.

An important cost advantage of synthetic shorting by purchasing puts is the indirect avoidance of the loan fee, which can be substantially high when stocks are "special". Essentially, investors who buy put contracts transfer the burden of locating the borrowed shares as well as the loan fees to the market makers who can hedge their position by short selling the underlying security at a lower cost.¹² Danielsen and Sorescu (2001) provide several reasons why option

¹²The option delta of a put contract is negative. Therefore, hedging a put contract involves short selling the underlying security.

market makers can avoid most of the costs faced by other short sellers. Among those reasons is the market makers' exemption from locating shares to borrow before shorting.¹³ In fact, Evans, Geczy, Musto, and Reed (2009) provide evidence showing that in most hard-to-borrow stocks, the market maker chooses not to borrow and instead fail to deliver stock to their buyers. Following the above argument, the level of short interest should increase significantly when options are introduced reflecting the participation of pessimistic investors in the IPO price discovery. This hypothesis is tested in Table 8 and illustrated in the top panel of Figure 3.

We obtain data for adjusted end-of-month short interest from COMPUSTAT North America. When end-of-month values are not available, we use the reported mid-month adjusted short interest. Because COMPUSTAT's short interest coverage begins in 2003, the sample consists of IPOs in 2003-2008 that have options listed within 36 months. We exclude option listings that overlap with IPO unlock days within +/- 180 days because Ofek and Richardson (2003) show that short interest also increase significantly when IPO lockups expire. The columns under *Rel change* in Table 8 report relative changes in short interest ratio from event months -3 to 6, where event month 0 is when option is introduced. Short interest ratio is calculated as the total number of adjusted short interest divided by the number of shares outstanding. Relative change in short interest ratio is then calculated as a change in short interest ratio relative to event month -4 in percentage term. We exclude firms that do not have available short interest data on event month -4.¹⁴ Table 8 reports across-firm average values of *Rel change* the treated and the control group. Firms in the treated group are IPOs that experience option listing while control-group firms are assigned counterfactual option listing dates identical to their matched pairs from the treated group. The matching is done based on the propensity that the firms will have option listing, as discussed in Section 5.2. The reported average values are winsorized at the 1st and 99th percentile in order to mitigate outliers; this practice does not qualitatively affect our results.

The results in Table 8 and the top panel of Figure 3 clearly show that *Rel change* in the treated group permanently increase by about 300% after options have been listed. More importantly, the largest increase in *Rel change* appears to be on the option listing month. On the other hand, firms in the control group experience about 100% increase in relative short interest ratio. The difference in *Rel change* between the treated and control groups is also significant as suggested by the two nonparametric tests. We use nonparametric tests instead

¹³Regulation SHO, passed in July 2004, requires the broker facilitating a short sale must locate the stock prior to the trade. However, those engaged in bona-fide hedging of market making activity are exempt from this rule

¹⁴This requirement is likely to understate the relative changes in short interest ratio because our sample represents IPOs that have option listed relatively late (i.e., at least after 6 months and on average after one year relative to the IPO issuance date).

of the conventional t-test due to the small sample size as well as the non-normal distributions of *Rel change*. Overall, our results strongly show that option listing is associated with an economically large increase in short interest. Danielsen and Sorescu (2001) also find short interest ratios increase significantly around option listing. Our results further support their finding by showing that short interest ratios significantly increase around option listing after controlling for the endogeneity associated with exchanges' listing decisions.

6.2 Insider selling

Evidence for downward-sloping demand curves for equity has been shown by Shleifer (1986), Bagwell (1992), and Kaul, Mehrotra, and Morck (2000). So, when insiders sell their shares, the share price will fall. Unlike the price pressure hypothesis, the effect of price changes due to the downward demand curve hypothesis is permanent. Thus, the long-run underperformance of IPO stocks after option listing may be associated with the changes in insider ownership. We test this hypothesis.

We obtain insider filing data from Thomson Reuter's Insider Filing Data Feed (IFDF). For each month, we compute the total direct and indirect holding of conventional stock (Table 1 in IFDF) held by the company's insiders with relationship hierarchy level between 1 to 3. This hierarchy cutoff includes 10% block holders, executive officers, board members, and members of the various operational committees. Indirect holdings refer to shares held by insiders' immediate family members while direct holdings are shares held by the insiders.

Table 9 reports changes in insider holdings from event months -3 to 6 relative to event month -4. The bottom panel of Figure 3 also illustrates our results. The procedure for calculating the relative change in insider holdings is similar to that for the relative change in short interest ratios, except the variable of interest is the total insiders' shares held. Firms in the treated group consist of IPOs in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. Control-group firms are assigned counterfactual option listing dates identical to their matched pairs from the treated group. Field and Hanka (2001) find that insiders, especially those that finance venture backed IPOs, sell their shares aggressively after the lockups expire. We therefore exclude listings that overlap with unlock days within one calendar year.

Table 9 shows the relative changes in insider holdings between the treated and control groups do not significantly differ in event months -3 to -1. However, the difference between the treated and control group becomes remarkably clear after option has been listed; this is also evident in the bottom panel of Figure 3. Firms in the treated group continually experience a decrease in insider holding for months after option has been listed. For instance, we find that the total shares held by insiders decrease by 16.54% after option has been listed

for 6 months relative to event month -4. The number of shares sold to public by insiders after option listing is economically large. According to the downward sloping demand curve hypothesis, such unloading of shares in the months after option listing is consistent with the IPO underperformance that we observe.

6.3 Relative put-call demand

According to the asymmetric information model of Easley, O’Hara, and Srinivas (1998), informed traders may choose to trade using their private signals in the option market resulting in a predictable relationship between option demand and subsequent underlying stock returns. In their model, buying a put or selling a call increases the prices of put options relative to call options conveying negative information about the underlying future stock prices. If informed trades use the option market to trade on negative future performance of the IPO stocks, put prices should be expensive relative to call prices when options are introduced.

We use two measures of relative put-call pricing. The first is the adjusted implied volatility spread (IV spread) measure of Cremers and Weinbaum (2010) which represents the deviation to the put-call parity relation. The second measure that we use is the adjusted implied volatility skewness (IV skewness) of Xing, Zhang, and Zhao (2010) which represents the difference between implied volatilities calculated using at-the-money calls and implied volatilities calculated using out-of-the-money puts. Table 10 reports the results. We report the averages of daily adjusted IV spread and daily adjusted IV skewness calculated over each event month. We define each event month as a successive 21-trading-day periods relative to the option listing date. Month 0 is when option is listed and includes event day 0-20 relative to option listing. Month 1 includes event day 21-41 and month 2 includes event day 42-62 relative to option listing, etc.

An IV spread is the difference between implied volatilities of a call and a put options with identical strike price and maturity. For each stock i on day t , the IV spread is calculated as

$$IVspread_{i,t} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} w_{j,t} (IV_{j,t}^{call} - IV_{j,t}^{put}), \quad (5)$$

where $IV_{j,t}^{call}$ and $IV_{j,t}^{put}$ refers to the implied volatilities for the j^{th} pair of call and put options with identical strike price and maturity, N_t is the number of valid put-call pairs, and $w_{j,t}$ is the weight. Note that we drop the i subscript on the variables in the right-hand side of equation (5) for brevity. Following Cremers and Weinbaum (2010), we use the average open interest of each put-call pair as the weight $w_{j,t}$ in (5). Finally, the adjusted IV spread is calculated by subtracting $IVspread_{i,t}$ with $\overline{IVspread}_t$ calculated as an equally weighted average of $IVspread_{i,t}$ across all stocks on day t . Under this definition, adjusted IV spread represents stock i put-

call mispricing relative to the market average. A negative value of adjusted IV spread would suggest that the put price is abnormally more expensive than the call price, while a positive value of adjusted IV would suggest the opposite.

The calculation of daily adjusted IV skewness is as follows. For each stock i on day t , we calculate an IV skewness as

$$IVskewness_{i,t} = IV_t^{ATMC} - IV_t^{OTMP},$$

where $IV_{i,t}^{ATMC}$ is the implied volatility of an at-the-money call, and $IV_{i,t}^{OTMP}$ is the implied volatility of an out-of-the-money put.¹⁵ We use a put contract with moneyness (F/K) closest to 0.95 and a call with moneyness closest to 1. Finally, the adjusted IV skewness is calculated by subtracting $IVskewness_{i,t}$ with $\overline{IVskewness}_t$ calculated as an equally weighted average of $IVskewness_{i,t}$ across all stocks on day t . Similar to the measure of adjusted IV spread, a negative value of adjusted IV skewness suggests the put price is abnormally more expensive than the call price, while a positive value of adjusted IV suggests the opposite.

Table 10 shows that both adjusted IV spread and IV skewness are significantly negative for several months after option has been listed. This finding shows that put prices are significantly more expensive than call prices when they are newly listed. Looking at the adjusted IV spread measure (Panel A) shows the relative mispricing persists for 9 months after option has been listed. We find a similar result when looking at the adjusted IV skewness, although the relative mispricing disappears after 5 months once option has been listed. Overall, we find strong evidences supporting the hypothesis that informed traders, and perhaps speculators, use put contracts to take synthetic short positions on IPO stocks for several months after option has been listed.

6.4 Explaining post-option-listing stock returns

We now study how the variables that we examined in the previous subsections, i.e. change in short interest ratios; change in the level of insider shares holdings; and relative put to call option prices, are associated with subsequent IPO underperformance once option is listed.

First, we examine the factors that explain the magnitude of IPO stock underperformance *when* option is listed. We address this question by estimating the following panel regression

¹⁵We define IVskewness slightly differently from Xing, Zhang, and Zhao (2010). They calculate IV skewness by subtracting the IV of out-of-the-money put with the IV of at-the-money call. Therefore, our IV skewness measure will have an opposite sign to theirs.

of monthly adjusted returns from event months -3 to +12 relative to when option is listed:

$$ar_{it} = \alpha + \beta Optionstat + \gamma (Optionstat \times Q_i) + \delta_1 Q_i + \dots \\ \dots + \delta_2 Fixed\ effects_i + \delta_3 Monthly\ Controls_{it-1} + \varepsilon_{it},$$

where Q_i is the variable under examination. Table 11 reports the results. Monthly adjusted return, $ar_{i,t}$, for firm i in month t is calculated using the return of an industry-matched firm as a benchmark. $Optionstat$ is the monthly indicator variable equal to one when option has been listed, i.e. $t \geq 0$, and zero otherwise. We include, in the regression model, standard IPO variables identical to those reported in Table 3 to control for any IPO fixed effects. For the purpose of our analysis, we are interested in the coefficient estimate on $Optionstat \times Q_i$ which measures the magnitude of IPO underperformance in relation to Q_i when option is listed. We study the magnitude of post-option-listing underperformance in relation to four variables: (i) $IV\ spread(1)$, defined as the average implied volatility spread in event month 1; (ii) $IV\ skewness(1)$, defined as the average implied volatility skewness in event month (1); (iii) $\Delta Short\ interest\ ratio(1)$, defined as the relative change in short interest ratios in event month 1; and (iv) $\Delta Insider\ holding(1)$, defined as the relative change in total insider shares holdings in event month 1. the first month following option listing. The calculation of these variables are explained in the previous subsections.

The results in Table 11 show the coefficient on $Optionstat \times \Delta Short\ interest\ ratio(1)$ is negative and statistically significant. In other words, we find stronger IPO underperformance for firms that experience larger increase in short interest ratios when option is listed supporting the hypothesis that option listing significantly relaxes the short sale constraint on the IPO firm equity. Table 11 also shows the coefficients on $Optionstat \times IV\ spread(1)$ and $Optionstat \times IV\ skewness(1)$ are positive and significant at the 10 and 5 percent levels, respectively. These results suggest the post-option-listing underperformance is stronger for firms that have relatively higher put-to-call option prices; note that the more negative $IV\ spread$ and $IV\ skewness$ are, the more expensive is put price relative to call price. We therefore find evidence supporting the hypothesis that informed use put options to trade on negative future performance of the IPO stocks. We however do not find that the change in total shares held by insiders around option listing month predicts the magnitude of subsequent IPO underperformance. This finding is not surprising because IPO lockup periods often restrict insiders from selling their shares freely to the public. Therefore, the effect of insider selling may not be visible until the lock up period expires, which can be several months after option is listed.

We next examine the variables that are associated with the observed long-run underperformance in the months *after* option has been listed. Table 12 reports results from the following

regression model over event months +2 to +24:

$$ar_{it} = \alpha + \beta Q_{i,t-1} + \delta_1 \text{Fixed effects}_i + \delta_2 \text{Monthly Controls}_{it-1} + \varepsilon_{it},$$

where $Q_{i,t-1}$ is the monthly lagged variable under examination. The use of regression window [+2,12] allows us to focus on the long-run IPO performance after option has been listed. We regress monthly adjusted returns on one-month lagged variables representing the level of IV spread, IV skewness, short interest ratio, and percentage shares held by insiders. Table 12 shows the coefficients on $IV\ spread(t-1)$ and $IV\ skewness(t-1)$ are positive and significant at the 10 and 5 percent levels, respectively, indicating that IPO stock prices usually decline following the period when there is a relatively higher demand for puts than calls. This finding is consistent with Cremers and Weinbaum (2010) and Xing, Zhang, and Zhao (2010) who show that the relative mispricing between put and call options have significant explanatory power on future returns of their underlying stocks.

Table 12 shows the coefficient on $Insider\ holding(t-1)$ is 0.022 and is statistically significant. The magnitude of this coefficient estimate is economically large. It suggests that one percent decrease in the number of shares held by insiders relative to the total shares outstanding is followed by a 2.2% decrease in adjusted returns over the next month. We therefore find strong evidence that IPO stock continually underperforms in response to decreasing insider shares holding in the months after option has been listed. We do not find that the level of short interest ratio affects IPO performance in the months after option has been listed. This finding is consistent with Figure 3 (top panel) which shows the change in short interest ratios that is due to option listing occurs mostly in the event month 0, i.e. when options are introduced. We conclude that the effect of option listing on the IPO firm equity's short sale constraint is confined to the months around the option listing date.

7 Option trading strategies on IPO firm equity

In this section, we examine whether substantial returns can be made by trading newly listed options on IPO stocks. We examine two simple strategies of buying put and selling call options when they become newly listed and hold them to expiration. Before we proceed, we point out two reasons why option trading may not necessarily result in significant returns even though we find overwhelming evidence that IPO stocks underperform after options have been listed on them. First, the payoff of an option contract depends on the underlying stock price. Consequently, option return depends on the raw returns of the underlying and not necessarily the benchmark-adjusted returns which we have primarily used in the previous sections. Second, the newly listed options are usually traded at a premium due to their relatively low liquidity

and high implied volatilities making them too expensive to hold. Further, the bid-ask spreads of newly listed options may be too large for the trading strategy to be profitable.

We downloaded end-of-day option prices and their bid-ask spreads from Ivey Option-Metrics. We keep only newly listed contracts defined as those that are quoted within 30 days relative to the option introduction date. To account for bid-ask spreads, we assume that each contract is transacted at its lowest bid and highest ask prices. Mayhew (2002) and De Fontnouvelle, Fische, and Harris (2003) show that the effective spreads for equity options is typically less than 0.5. Therefore, our assumption that we must transact options at their full bid-ask spreads is quite conservative. Stocks' daily close prices, and their daily highs and lows are obtained from CRSP. We assume that stocks are transacted at their effective bids and asks calculated using the method in Corwin and Schultz (2012). When effective bid-ask spreads cannot be calculated, we take a conservative approach by assuming that the underlyings are transacted at their daily highs and lows.

Table 13 reports average excess returns over the risk free rate from buying put options (Panel A) and writing newly listed call options (Panel B) on IPO stocks. The results are grouped according to the moneyness (F/K) and maturity (τ) of the option contract. We define the moneyness of each contract as F/K where F is the futures price of the underlying and K is the strike price.¹⁶ Each cell group in Table 13 reports the result for a particular moneyness-maturity bin.

The raw return from buying each put option is calculated as

$$R_{put} = \frac{30}{\tau} \left(\frac{\max(K - S_{\tau}^{bid}, 0)}{P^{ask}} - 1 \right),$$

where S_{τ}^{bid} is the bid price of the expiring stock at maturity τ and P^{ask} is the asking price of the put option bought from the market maker. The raw return from writing each call option is calculated as

$$R_{call} = \frac{30}{\tau} \left(1 - \frac{\max(S_{\tau}^{ask} - K, 0)}{C^{bid}} \right),$$

where S_{τ}^{ask} is the asking price of the expiring stock at maturity τ and C^{bid} is the bid price of the written call option sold to the market maker. Option returns are scaled by $30/\tau$ in order to express them in monthly term. Excess return for each option contract is then calculated by subtracting the raw option return with the return of a corresponding riskfree bond.

For each moneyness-maturity bin, average excess return is calculated as an equally-weighted portfolio of excess option returns across firms. Only one observation from each firm is used in

¹⁶The futures price of the underlying is calculated as $F = S_t \exp(r\tau)$, where S_t is the current spot price, r is the risk-free rate, and τ is the maturity of the contract.

the calculation. When there are multiple contracts traded in each moneyness-maturity bin, the contract with the highest open interests is used. For each moneyness-maturity bin, we report the average excess returns, t-statistics, and the number of firms used in the calculation. Table 13 shows that most of the newly listed option contracts have relatively short maturities, i.e. less than 60 days.¹⁷

Panel A of Table 13 shows that there is a significant return from buying long-maturity put options with days to maturity between 6 to 12 months. The profit from buying long-maturity puts is very robust across the moneyness bins. In fact, excess put returns appear to increase as the moneyness level (F/K) increases, that is, when the contracts are more out-of-the-money. Such finding is supported by Coval and Shumway (2001) who theoretically show that expected put returns should increase as the contract become more out-of-the-money. For instance, Panel B shows the profit from buying long-maturity puts that are deep out-the-money ($1.15 < F/K \leq 1.20$) yields an average excess return of 6.35% per month. While we find a significant profit from buying long-maturity puts written on newly listed IPO stocks, Panel B shows that the average excess returns from writing call options are either insignificant or negative. We conclude that there is no profit from writing newly listed call options on IPO stocks.

We next examine the cross-sectional determinants of returns generated from buying newly listed put options on IPO stocks. We focus our analysis only on long-maturity puts, defined as those with 6-12 months to maturity. Table 14 reports the results. The dependent variable is the monthly excess return from buying long-maturity puts. We control for the cross-sectional differences in returns across moneyness by including *Moneyness bin* variable in the regressions. *Moneyness bin* is a discrete variable with a value of 1 to 9 indicating the moneyness bin (from lowest to highest) associated with each option contract. The classification of each moneyness bin is shown in Table 13. For instance, *Moneyness bin* is equal to 1 if the option contract's moneyness falls in the (0.80, 0.85] interval, and *Moneyness bin* is equal to 2 if the option contract's moneyness falls in the (0.85, 0.90] interval, etc.

Regression model (1) in Table 14 reports the baseline estimates. The intercept in model (1) corresponds to the average excess returns from buying long-maturity puts in the lowest moneyness bin, i.e., (0.80, 0.85]. Its value is 2.29% which is roughly consistent with the results in Panel A of Table 13. Model (1) in Table 14 shows the coefficient on *Moneyness bin* is 0.427 and is highly significant. This finding suggests that monthly excess returns from our strategy is increasing in each moneyness bin by about 42.7 basis points.

In models (2)-(6), each IPO variable is added to the regression. We find positive and highly significant coefficients on *Venture backed* and *First day ret.* On the other hand, the coefficient

¹⁷We exclude newly listed options with maturity greater than one year from the analysis because only two firms in our sample have such options traded.

on *Time-to-list* is negative and significant. Our simple strategy of buying long-term puts are therefore related to three IPO characteristics. This finding suggests that we can increase profits by selectively buying put options on certain IPO stocks. More specifically, we find that the profits from our trading strategy are more specific to venture backed IPOs that experience large first day return and have options listed early in the IPO aftermarket.

8 Conclusion

Using a sample of IPOs from 1996 to 2008, we study four important questions regarding the listing of options on the equity of firms that have recently gone public.

First, we analyze the effects of option listing on an IPO firm's stock. We find that the equity underperforms in the short- as well as the long-run in the weeks following option listing. The significant underperformance subsequent to option listing is robustly observed throughout the sample and holds regardless of when options are listed (up to 3 years) after the IPO issuance. We also show that our findings are not an artifact of exchanges' ability to time the market using a propensity score matching analysis and difference-in-difference regressions.

Second, we examine the determinants affecting exchanges' decision of when to list options on a firm's stock after the IPO. In addition to variables that have been documented (in the case of seasoned firms by Mayhew and Mihov (2004)) to have an impact on option listing, we examine whether IPO characteristics have an effect on the time to option listing. The results show that venture backed firms have options listed significantly earlier. Another important factor that significantly shortens the time to option listing is the size of IPO proceeds: greater the IPO proceeds, shorter the time to list.

Third, we test three possible hypotheses that can explain the strong underperformance of IPO equity following options listing. The results show that: (i) The listing of options significantly relaxes short-sale constraints on the firm equity by providing investors with a relatively cheap channel to short sell the underlying shares, (ii) Insiders sell their shares on IPO firms more aggressively after options have been listed further exacerbating the long-run IPO performance, and (iii) Put options remain significantly in greater demand than call options for several months after option listing suggesting that investors are synthetically shorting the underlying IPO stocks through the put contracts.

Finally, we examine the ability to make abnormal profits net of bid ask spreads by investing in newly listed options on the IPO firm's stock. The two option trading strategies that we examine are writing call options or buying put options on IPO firm stock when they are newly listed and holding them to expiration. We find significant excess returns from buying long-maturity newly listed puts on the IPO firm stock.

To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first to study the economic effects of option

listing on IPOs. Consequently, our work contributes to the literature in several ways. First, we document the long-run equity underperformance of firms following option listing. While existing studies have documented short-run listing effects, to the best of our knowledge, there is no paper in the literature documenting a long-run listing effect even in the context of seasoned firms. Second, this paper is the first to analyze the IPO characteristics associated with early option listing. Third, we document that option listing relaxes the short-sale constraint on IPO firm equity. Fourth, by testing new hypotheses, we are able to develop additional insight into the causes underlying the stock return underperformance of firms following option listing. Finally, we are the first to analyze the profitability of option trading strategies on IPO firm equity.

References

- Bagwell, L. S., 1992, “Dutch auction repurchases: An analysis of shareholder heterogeneity,” *The Journal of Finance*, 47(1), pp. 71–105.
- Bradley, D. J., B. D. Jordan, Y. Ha-Chin, and I. C. Roten, 2001, “Venture capital and IPO lockup Expiration: An empirical analysis,” *Journal of Financial Research*, 24(4), 465 – 493.
- Carter, R., and S. Manaster, 1990, “Initial public offerings and underwriter reputation,” *The Journal of Finance*, 45(4), 1045–1067.
- Chemmanur, T. J., and K. Krishnan, 2012, “Heterogeneous beliefs, IPO valuation, and the economic role of the underwriter in IPOs,” *Financial Management*, 41(4), 769–811.
- Conrad, J., 1989, “The price effect of option introduction,,” *Journal of Finance*, 44, 487–499.
- Corwin, S. A., and P. Schultz, 2012, “A simple way to estimate bid-ask spreads from daily high and low prices,” *The Journal of Finance*, 67(2), 719–760.
- Coval, J. D., and T. Shumway, 2001, “Expected option returns,” *The Journal of Finance*, 56(3), 983–1009.
- Cremers, M., and D. Weinbaum, 2010, “Deviations from put-call parity and stock return predictability,” *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 45(02), 335–367.
- Danielsen, B., and S. Sorescu, 2001, “Why do option introductions depress stock prices? A study of diminishing short sale constraints,” *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 36, 451–484.

- D'Avolio, G., 2002, "The market for borrowing stock," *Journal of Financial Economics*, 66(2-3), 271–306.
- De Fontnouvelle, P., R. P. H. Fishe, and J. H. Harris, 2003, "The behavior of bid-ask spreads and volume in options markets during the competition for listings in 1999," *The Journal of Finance*, 58(6), 2437–2464.
- Easley, D., M. O'Hara, and P. Srinivas, 1998, "Option volume and stock prices: Evidence on where informed traders trade," *The Journal of Finance*, 53(2), 431–465.
- Edwards, A. K., and K. W. Hanley, 2010, "Short selling in initial public offerings," *Journal of Financial Economics*, 98(1), 21 – 39.
- Efron, B., 1977, "The efficiency of Cox's likelihood function for censored data," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pp. 557–565.
- Evans, R. B., C. C. Geczy, D. K. Musto, and A. V. Reed, 2009, "Failure is an option: Impediments to short selling and options prices," *Review of Financial Studies*, 22(5), 1955–1980.
- Field, L. C., and G. Hanka, 2001, "The expiration of IPO share lockups," *Journal of Finance*, 56(2), 471–500.
- Figlewski, S., and G. P. Webb, 1993, "Options, short sales, and market completeness," *The Journal of Finance*, 48(2), 761–777.
- Geczy, C. C., D. K. Musto, and A. V. Reed, 2002, "Stocks are special too: an analysis of the equity lending market," *Journal of Financial Economics*, 66(2-3), 241–269.
- Houge, T., T. Loughran, G. Suchanek, and X. Yan, 2001, "Divergence of opinion, uncertainty, and the quality of initial public offerings," *Financial Management*, 30(4), 5–23.
- Ibbotson, R. G., and J. F. Jaffe, 1975, "Hot Issue" markets," *The Journal of Finance*, 30(4), pp. 1027–1042.
- Jarrow, R., 1980, "Heterogeneous expectations, restrictions on short sales, and equilibrium asset prices," *The Journal of Finance*, 35(5), 1105–1113.
- Kaul, A., V. Mehrotra, and R. Morck, 2000, "Demand curves for stocks do slope down: New evidence from an index weights adjustment," *The Journal of Finance*, 55(2), 893–912.
- Liu, L. X., A. E. Sherman, and Y. Zhang, 2011, "Media coverage and IPO underpricing," *Working paper*.

- Loughran, T., and J. R. Ritter, 1995, "The new issues puzzle," *The Journal of Finance*, 50(1), pp. 23–51.
- , 2004, "Why has IPO underpricing changed over time?," *Financial Management*, 33(3), 5–37.
- Mayhew, S., 2002, "Competition, market structure, and bid-ask spreads in stock option markets," *The Journal of Finance*, 57(2), 931–958.
- Mayhew, S., and V. Mihov, 2004, "How do exchanges select stocks for option listing?," *The Journal of Finance*, 59(1), 447–471.
- Miller, E. M., 1977, "Risk, uncertainty, and divergence of opinion," *The Journal of Finance*, 32(4), 1151–1168.
- Morris, S., 1996, "Speculative investor behavior and learning," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111(4), 1111–1133.
- Ofek, E., and M. Richardson, 2003, "DotCom mania: The rise and fall of internet stock prices," *The Journal of Finance*, 58(3), 1113–1138.
- Ofek, E., M. Richardson, and R. F. Whitelaw, 2004, "Limited arbitrage and short sales restrictions: evidence from the options markets," *Journal of Financial Economics*, 74(2), 305 – 342.
- Platt, R. W., K. S. Joseph, C. V. Ananth, J. Grondines, M. Abrahamowicz, and M. S. Kramer, 2004, "A proportional hazards model with time-dependent covariates and time-varying effects for analysis of fetal and infant death," *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 160(3), 199–206.
- Ritter, Jay R., G. X., and Z. Zhu, 2012, "Where have all the IPOs gone?," *Working paper, University of Florida*.
- Ritter, J., and I. Welch, 2002, "A Review of IPO activity, pricing and allocations," *Journal of Finance*, 57, 23–51.
- Ritter, J. R., 1984, "The "Hot Issue" market of 1980," *The Journal of Business*, 57(2), pp. 215–240.
- Ritter, J. R., 1991, "The long-run performance of initial public offerings," *Journal of Finance*, 46, 3–27.

- Shleifer, A., 1986, “Do demand curves for stocks slope down?,” *The Journal of Finance*, 41(3), pp. 579–590.
- Sorescu, S. M., 2000, “The effect of options on stock prices: 1973 to 1995,” *The Journal of Finance*, 55(1), 487–514.
- Xing, Y., X. Zhang, and R. Zhao, 2010, “What does the individual option volatility smirk tell us about future equity returns?,” *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 45, 641–662.

Appendix

A: Control sample of eligible stocks

Figure A1 plots the time series of the resulting sample size from January 1996 to December 2011. The dark solid line indicates the total number of stocks that meet the requirement for option listing. The line marked by '+', on the other hand, indicates the number of stocks that have options listed. The difference between these two lines illustrates the number of non-optioned stocks that are eligible for option listing. The number of stocks eligible for option listing varies significantly through time. There are 2,669 stocks eligible for option listing in January 1996. Among them, 1,260 have already been optioned. By the end of the sample, 1,923 out of the total 2,619 eligible stocks have options listed. Using a similar method, Mayhew and Mihov (2004) construct a universe of stocks eligible for option listing from 1973 to 1996. Our sample therefore starts approximately when their sample ends. Nevertheless, we find that our 1996's sample size of eligible stocks is similar to theirs.




Figure A1. *Control sample of eligible stocks.* The solid line plots the monthly total of number of stocks, meeting the eligibility requirements for option listing. The line marked by '+' represents the monthly total number of stocks that have options listed. The difference between the two lines represents the control sample used in the propensity score-matched analysis.

B: Propensity score matching method

This section discusses the propensity score matching of options listed-IPO firms to non-optioned firms in the control group. Following Mayhew and Mihov (2004), we estimate the firm's ex ante probabilities of options listed in each month using the following logit model

$$L(List_{i,t}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Market\ cap_{i,t} + \beta_2 Shares\ turnover_{i,t} + \beta_3 Volatility_{i,t} + \dots + \beta_4 Cumulative\ returns_{i,t} + \varepsilon_t, \quad (A.1)$$

where $L(List_{i,t})$ is the log-odds ratio that the i stock will be selected for option listing in month t . The independent variables that we use are one-month lagged time-varying covariates from Table 3 which represent the firm's size, trading volume, volatility, and momentum. Section 4 discusses the construction of these variables.

In the Internet Appendix, Table IA1 reports results from the month by month logistic regressions of the regression model (A.1). We exclude months for which we do not observe an option listing. Overall, there are 192 monthly regressions from January 1996 to December 2011. The average pseudo adjusted R-squared of all monthly regressions is 4.09%. The log likelihood ratio tests show that the regression model (A.1) is significant at the five percent level in 172 out of the 192 months suggesting that our independent variables robustly determine the likelihood of option listings. For the propensity score matching, we exclude observations from months where the log likelihood ratio test rejects the model at the five percent significant level.

Using the estimated ex ante probabilities of options listed, each firm in the treated group is matched to eligible firms that do not have options listed (Control group). Overall, our matching method yields 575 control firms. The regression model (1) in Table A1 report results from estimating the logit model in (A.1) on the propensity score-matched pairs using all the months that we find successful matches. The likelihood ratio test do not reject the model at the five percent significant level and none of the coefficients are statistically significant. Overall, the results show that we are not able to distinguish between the treated and control firms based on their propensity of having options listed. For a comparison, we also estimate the logit model on options listed IPO firms (see the regression model (2)). This sample consists of initial public offerings in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. The logit regression include all the month from when the firm goes public to the month when option is listed. In contrast to the "Matched pairs" sample, the log likelihood ratio test shows that the logit model is highly significant.

Table A1. *Propensity score matched firms*

We estimate the firm's propensity of having options listed based on the logistic regression model in (A.1). This table summarizes the results. The regression model (1), titled "Matched pairs", report the results for propensity-score-matched firms from the treated and control groups. The treated group consists of IPO firms in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. Firms in the treated group are matched to eligible firms that do not have options listed (Control group) based on their propensity score of having options listed. The matching is done month-by-month based on size, trading volume, volatility, and momentum. Firms in the control group are assigned counterfactual option listing dates identical to their matched pairs from the treated group. The independent variables that we use are one-month lagged time-varying covariates from Table 3 which represent the firm's size, trading volume, volatility, and momentum. For a comparison, the regression model (2), titled "Option-listed IPOs", reports results for non-matched firms. The sample consists of initial public offerings in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. *Market cap* is the log of market capitalization observed at the end of the previous month. *Shares turnover* is the average of daily shares turnover over the previous month (%). *Volatility* is the average daily standard deviations of raw returns over the previous month (%). *Cumulative ret* is the cumulative daily raw returns over the previous month. Robust t-statistic is reported in bracket below each estimate. Number of observations refers to the number of firm-month used in the estimation. Number of events refers to the number option listings used in the estimation. We report the pseudo adjusted R-squared for each regression model and the p-value from the log likelihood ratio test that the non-intercept coefficients are equal to zero.

	Matched pairs	Option-listed IPOs
	(1)	(2)
Intercept	-1.16 (-1.28)	-19.01*** (-28.21)
Market cap	-0.06 (-1.42)	0.81*** (24.31)
Shares turnover	0.10 (1.44)	0.02* (1.75)
Volatility	-0.01 (-0.55)	0.04*** (3.90)
Cumulative returns	0.26 (1.03)	0.60*** (4.81)
Number of observations	1150	15365
Number of events	575	1087
Likelihood ratio test	0.0984	<.001
Pseudo adjusted R ²	0.68%	4.56%

Table 1. *Summary statistics.*

The sample consists of US initial public offerings on ordinary common shares between January 1996 and December 2008. We obtain option listing dates for 1996-2011 from OptionMetrics and CBOE website. Panel A summarizes the distribution of initial public offerings by issuance year grouped according to their option listing date (in months) relative to their IPO issuance date. Panel B reports descriptive statistics of the IPO variables. *Days-to-list* is the number of days between IPO issuance and when option is introduced, conditional on observing a listing. *Venture backed* is an dummy variable equal to 1 if the IPO firm is backed by a venture capitalist. *Underwriter rep* is the reputational score of the IPO's lead underwriter according to the ranking published on Jay Ritter's website. *First day ret* is computed as the log of return (%) on the offered price to the end of the the first trading day. *Proceed amount* is the log of the total proceeds amount from the offering. *Total shares offered* is the number of shares issued at the offering in thousands. *Lock up agreement* is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the IPO has a share lockup agreement, and zero otherwise. Conditional on having shares lockup agreement, *Days to lockup expiration* is the number of days from IPO issuance date to the first shares lockup expiration.

Panel A: Distribution of time-to-list options after initial public offerings

Year IPO issuance	Months relative to the IPO issuance date							Never optioned	Total
	6 or less	7 to 12	13 to 18	19 to 24	25 to 30	31 to 36	37 or more		
1996	24	53	41	34	29	13	56	278	528
1997	29	35	22	14	8	8	43	199	358
1998	21	38	7	5	7	5	25	118	226
1999	89	103	21	8	5	4	23	133	386
2000	50	57	13	11	3	3	39	123	299
2001	27	11	1	1	1	4	11	10	66
2002	24	4	8	1	2	0	7	14	60
2003	7	6	5	1	1	5	13	16	54
2004	29	19	14	8	12	10	15	47	154
2005	30	9	9	7	5	4	14	37	115
2006	31	16	15	4	3	3	13	38	123
2007	22	24	7	3	9	4	13	39	121
2008	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	13
Overall	390	376	163	97	85	64	273	1055	2503

Panel B: Descriptive statistics

Variable	Nobs	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Days-to-list	1448	672	321	862	9	5670
Venture backed	2503	0.48	0	0.50	0	1
Underwriter rep	2503	7.55	8	1.95	0	9
First day ret (%)	2503	20.21	11.12	30.31	-56.69	207.63
Offer price	2503	13.48	13.00	5.30	4.00	70.41
Proceeds amount	2503	17.83	17.76	1.01	14.58	23.09
Total shares offered (×1000)	2503	6790	4200	12878	365	360000
Lockup agreement	2503	0.76	1.00	0.43	0	1
Days to lockup expiration	1906	194	180	72	30	730

Table 2. *Option listing date and IPO stock performance*

The sample consists of US initial public offerings on ordinary common shares between January 1996 and December 2008, excluding closed-end funds, REIT, Dutch auction offerings, and issuances flagged with “shelf registration”. We report monthly averages cumulative adjusted returns (CAR) grouped by when option is listed after the IPO issuance date. The reported CAR is calculated using matching firm-adjusted returns. Number of firm-observations reports the number of firms available for CAR computation at the start of the sample. Robust t-statistic is reported in bracket below each estimate. The t-statistic for cumulative average adjusted return, $CAR(0, s)$ is calculated as $CAR(0, s) \sqrt{n_s} / csd_s$ where n_s is the number of firms trading with non-missing observations on event month s . The cross section standard deviation, csd_s , is computed as $csd_s = [(s) \cdot var + 2 \cdot (s - 1) \cdot cov]^{1/2}$, where var and cov are the average cross-sectional variance and the first-order auto covariance of the AR_t series from event month 0 to event month 36.

	Months since IPO issuance date to when option is listed					
	< 6	7 to 12	13 to 24	25 to 36	> 36	Never optioned
Number of firm-observations	388	376	258	150	273	1054
First day ret (%)	29.74*** (15.85)	40.94*** (18.98)	14.55*** (10.75)	12.04*** (8.64)	14.70*** (11.48)	13.21*** (19.07)
CAR(0, 6 months) (%)	38.08*** (10.15)	65.36*** (15.25)	34.43*** (7.13)	17.57*** (3.18)	14.18*** (3.31)	-0.46 (-0.19)
CAR(0, 12 months) (%)	27.41*** (5.07)	70.73*** (11.41)	56.58*** (8.22)	20.58*** (2.60)	7.04 (1.16)	-13.99*** (-3.89)
CAR(0, 24 months) (%)	9.50 (1.14)	52.39*** (5.42)	69.96*** (6.77)	54.28*** (4.68)	8.05 (0.90)	-27.91*** (-4.68)
CAR(0, 36 months) (%)	13.22 (1.11)	53.55*** (3.96)	44.14*** (3.02)	77.33*** (4.97)	21.69* (1.85)	-24.88*** (-2.81)

Table 3. Determinants of time-to-list

We report results from running the extended Cox model on time-to-list options on IPO stocks. The sample includes initial public offerings in 1996-2008. The dependent variable, *Time-to-list*, is the number of months between IPO issuance date and the first date of option introduction. Time-to-list beyond 36 months are truncated. The explanatory variables include IPO characteristics and monthly time-varying control variables. *Venture backed* is an dummy variable equal to 1 if the IPO firm is backed by a venture capitalist. *Time to lockup expiration* is the number of months from IPO issuance date to the first shares lockup expiration. *High underwriter rep* is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the firm's lead underwriter is in the highest prestige category (rank=9) according to the ranking published on Jay Ritter's website. *First day ret* is computed as the log of return on the offered price to the end of the the first trading day. *Proceed amount* is the log of the total proceeds amount from the offering. Following Mayhew and Mihov (2004), we include monthly time-varying variables that have been shown to explain Exchange's decision to list options. *Market cap* is the log of market capitalization observed at the end of the previous month. *Shares turnover* is the average of daily shares turnover over the previous month (%). *Volatility* is the average daily standard deviations of raw returns over the previous month (%). *Cumulative ret* is the cumulative daily raw returns over the previous month. Number of observations refers to the number of firm-month used in the estimation. Number of events refers to the number option listings available for the estimation. All regressions include industry and year fixed effects. We report robust t-statistics in bracket below each estimate.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
IPO Characteristics:					
Venture backed	0.506*** (6.78)				0.546*** (7.20)
Time to lockup expiration		0.006 (0.45)			0.005 (0.39)
High underwriter rep			-0.161** (-2.14)		-0.171** (-2.14)
First day ret				-0.230* (-1.80)	-0.004*** (-2.76)
Proceeds amount	0.289*** (5.04)	0.213*** (3.84)	0.234*** (4.13)	0.197*** (3.54)	0.299*** (5.06)
Time-varying covariates:					
Market cap	1.321*** (32.42)	1.326*** (32.03)	1.341*** (32.21)	1.348*** (31.23)	1.387*** (30.72)
Shares turnover	0.102*** (7.29)	0.100*** (7.30)	0.100*** (7.22)	0.102*** (7.40)	0.102*** (7.24)
Volatility	0.021* (1.93)	0.028*** (2.67)	0.028*** (2.66)	0.030*** (2.85)	0.024** (2.18)
Cumulative returns	1.131*** (9.13)	1.138*** (9.14)	1.140*** (9.17)	1.131*** (9.09)	1.130*** (9.11)
Industry and year fixed effects	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Number of observations	52569	52569	52569	52569	52569
Number of events	1087	1087	1087	1087	1087

Table 4. *Abnormal returns around option listing grouped by when options are listed*

We report cumulative average adjusted returns for IPO stocks over the (-12, +104) weekly intervals centered on their option listing date. The sample contains initial public offerings in 1996-2008 that have options listed in 0-36 months (Panel A), 0-6 months (Panel B), 7-12 months (Panel C), and 13-36 months (Panel D) after IPO issuance date. The cumulative average adjusted return, CAR_{t_1,t_2} , from week t_1 to t_2 relative to the option listing date is computed as $CAR_{t_1,t_2} = \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2} AR_t$, where AR_t is the average matching firm-adjusted return on week t . We calculate average matching firm-adjusted return on week t is calculated as $AR_t = \sum_i^{n_t} ar_{i,t}$, where n_t is the number of first trading in week t , and $ar_{i,t}$ is the weekly raw return on stock i minus the corresponding period raw return of a benchmark firm matched by industry and size. We report robust t-statistic in bracket below each estimate. The t-statistic for the cumulative average adjusted return, CAR_{t_1,t_2} , is computed as $CAR_{t_1,t_2} \sqrt{n_{t_1,t_2}} / csd_{t_1,t_2}$ where n_{t_1,t_2} is the number of firms trading with non-missing observations between week t_1 and t_2 . The cross section standard deviation, csd_{t_1,t_2} , is computed as $csd_{t_1,t_2} = [(t_2 - t_1) \cdot var + 2 \cdot (t_2 - t_1 - 1) \cdot cov]^{1/2}$, where var and cov are the average cross-sectional variance and the first-order auto covariance of the AR_t series over the (-12, +104) intervals, respectively. Superscripts ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels for a two-tailed test.

		Grouped by when options are listed after the IPO issuance date							
Event window	Weeks	Panel A		Panel B		Panel C		Panel D	
		0-36 months		0-6 months		7-12 months		13-36 months	
		Nobs	CAR(t ₁ ,t ₂) %	Nobs	CAR(t ₁ ,t ₂) %	Nobs	CAR(t ₁ ,t ₂) %	Nobs	CAR(t ₁ ,t ₂) %
(1)	[-12, -2]	1073	12.63*** (7.74)	345	14.82*** (5.57)	363	7.72** (2.54)	365	16.09*** (16.09)
(2)	[-1, +1]	1109	-0.28 (-0.33)	383	-1.59 (-1.21)	363	-1.25 (-0.79)	363	2.07 (2.07)
(3)	[+2, +12]	1087	-1.87 (-1.15)	381	-5.19** (-2.05)	358	0.96 (0.31)	348	-1.17 (-1.17)
(4)	[+13, +52]	957	-18.14*** (-5.50)	355	-21.04*** (-4.21)	315	-19.18*** (-3.08)	287	-13.88** (-13.88)
(5)	[+53, +104]	745	-10.97** (-2.57)	288	-12.31* (-1.95)	240	-5.60 (-0.69)	217	-15.21* (-15.21)
(3) - (1)			-14.51*** (-8.44)		-20.01*** (-7.66)		-6.76* (-1.84)		-17.26*** (-17.26)

Table 5. *Regression analysis: Weekly adjusted returns around option listing*

We report regression results on weekly adjusted returns around option listing. Weekly adjusted return, $ar_{i,t}$, for firm i in event week t is calculated as the weekly raw return on stock i minus the corresponding period raw return of a benchmark firm matched by industry and size. We report results for two observation windows centered on option listing dates. Panel A reports results for the balanced window $[-12,+12]$, and Panel B reports results for the long-run window $[-12,+52]$. The sample consists of IPO firms in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. *Optionstat* is a dummy variable equal to 1 when event week $t \geq 0$ indicating that option has been listed, and zero otherwise. Model (1) reports the base line regression results. Models (2) -(6) report estimates for the interactions between *Optionstat* and various IPO characteristics. *Venture backed* is an dummy variable equal to 1 if the IPO firm is backed by a venture capitalist. First day ret is computed as the log of return on the offered price to the end of the first trading day. *High underwriter rep* is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the firm's lead underwriter is in the highest prestige category (rank=9) according to the ranking published on Jay Ritter's website. *Shares locked up(t)* is a weekly dummy variable that is equal to 1 if the IPO firm has an outstanding shares is locked up agreement on week t , and zero otherwise *Time-to-list* is the number of months from IPO issuance date to when option is listed. IPO and year fixed effects are included in the all regressions. See text for complete details. Weekly controls consist of the following weekly lagged variables: adjusted return ($ar_{i,t-1}$), average turnover, average volatility, and average market capitalization. Robust t-statistic, clustered at the firm-level, are reported in bracket below each estimate. Superscripts ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels for a two-tailed test.

Table 5 (continued). *Regression analysis: Weekly adjusted returns around option listing*

Panel A: Dependent variable: Weekly adjusted returns [-12, +12]						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Optionstat	-1.335*** (-6.87)	-0.640*** (-2.68)	-1.353*** (-5.99)	-2.033*** (-6.51)	-1.477*** (-6.60)	-1.295*** (-3.88)
Optionstat ×						
Venture backed		-1.220*** (-3.28)				
First day ret			0.041 (0.11)			
High underwriter rep				1.170*** (2.94)		
Shares locked up (t)					0.721* (1.65)	
Time-to-list						-0.003 (-0.14)
Venture backed	0.024 (0.11)	0.680** (2.22)	0.024 (0.11)	0.024 (0.11)	0.036 (0.17)	0.024 (0.11)
First day ret	-0.133 (-0.68)	-0.134 (-0.68)	-0.155 (-0.55)	-0.134 (-0.68)	-0.132 (-0.67)	-0.133 (-0.68)
High underwriter rep	0.169 (0.75)	0.165 (0.73)	0.169 (0.75)	-0.461 (-1.41)	0.161 (0.72)	0.170 (0.75)
Shares locked up (t)	-0.167 (-0.59)	-0.224 (-0.79)	-0.166 (-0.58)	-0.224 (-0.79)	-0.483 (-1.28)	-0.164 (-0.58)
Time-to-list	0.014 (0.92)	0.014 (0.90)	0.014 (0.92)	0.013 (0.88)	0.014 (0.95)	0.016 (0.73)
Intercept	3.156* (1.70)	2.828 (1.52)	3.166* (1.71)	3.950* (1.87)	3.272* (1.75)	3.132* (1.68)
IPO and year fixed effect:	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Weekly controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	25065	25065	25065	25065	25065	25065
Number of clusters	1061	1061	1061	1061	1061	1061
Adjusted R ²	0.81%	0.81%	0.81%	0.85%	0.80%	0.81%

Table 5 (continued). *Regression analysis: Weekly adjusted returns around option listing*

Panel B: Dependent variable: Weekly adjusted returns [-12, +52]						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Optionstat	-1.598*** (-9.34)	-0.960*** (-4.67)	-1.562*** (-8.14)	-2.052*** (-7.65)	-1.688*** (-8.72)	-1.798*** (-4.95)
Optionstat ×						
Venture backed		-1.100*** (-3.47)				
First day ret			-0.083 (-0.28)			
High underwriter rep				0.763** (2.25)		
Shares locked up (t)					0.543 (1.37)	
Time-to-list						-0.007 (-0.33)
Venture backed	-0.074 (-0.53)	0.825*** (2.77)	-0.074 (-0.53)	-0.075 (-0.54)	-0.069 (-0.50)	-0.073 (-0.53)
First day ret	-0.035 (-0.29)	-0.033 (-0.28)	0.032 (0.12)	-0.034 (-0.29)	-0.035 (-0.30)	-0.034 (-0.29)
High underwriter rep	0.129 (1.00)	0.131 (1.01)	0.129 (1.00)	-0.493 (-1.58)	0.123 (0.95)	0.131 (1.01)
Shares locked up (t)	-0.303 (-1.57)	-0.312 (-1.62)	-0.304 (-1.58)	-0.332* (-1.74)	-0.620* (-1.74)	-0.285 (-1.46)
Time-to-list	0.003 (0.43)	0.004 (0.49)	0.003 (0.44)	0.003 (0.42)	0.003 (0.40)	0.009 (0.46)
Intercept	2.795*** (0.42)	2.764** (0.14)	2.292** (0.14)	3.168*** (0.14)	2.883*** (0.14)	2.720** (0.14)
IPO and year fixed effect:	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Weekly controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Numer of observations	63831	63831	63831	63831	63831	63831
Number of clusters	1061	1061	1061	1061	1061	1061
Adjusted R ²	0.77%	0.77%	0.77%	0.78%	0.77%	0.77%

Table 6. *Propensity score-matched sample: Abnormal returns around option listing*

We report cumulative average adjusted returns (CAR) for stocks in the treated and control groups over the (-12, +104) weekly intervals centered on the option listing date. The treated group consists of 1996-2008 IPO firms that have options listed within 36 months after the IPO issuance date. Firms in the treated group are matched to eligible firms that do not have options listed (Control group) based on their propensity score of having options listed. The matching is done month-by-month by running logistic regressions based on size, turnover, volatility, and momentum. Firms in the control group are assigned counterfactual option listing dates identical to their matched pairs from the treated group. The cumulative average adjusted return, CAR_{t_1,t_2} , from week t_1 to t_2 relative to the option listing date is computed as $CAR_{t_1,t_2} = \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2} AR_t$, where AR_t is the average matching firm-adjusted return on week t . T-statistic is reported in bracket below each estimate. The t-statistic for the cumulative average adjusted return, CAR_{t_1,t_2} , is computed as $CAR_{t_1,t_2} \sqrt{n_{t_1,t_2}} / csd_{t_1,t_2}$ where n_{t_1,t_2} is the number of firms trading with non-missing observations between week t_1 and t_2 . The cross section standard deviation, csd_{t_1,t_2} , is computed as $csd_{t_1,t_2} = [(t_2 - t_1) \cdot var + 2 \cdot (t_2 - t_1 - 1) \cdot cov]^{1/2}$, where var and cov are the average cross-sectional variance and the first-order auto covariance of the AR_t series over the (-12, +104) intervals, respectively. Superscripts ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels for a two-tailed test.

Event window	Weeks	Treated		Control		Difference (Treated-Control)
		Nobs	CAR(t_1,t_2) %	Nobs	CAR(t_1,t_2) %	CAR diff
(1)	[-12, -2]	634	9.62*** (4.45)	498	6.25*** (3.30)	3.37 (1.17)
(2)	[-1, +1]	633	-1.50 (-1.32)	497	2.61*** (2.64)	-4.11*** (-2.73)
(3)	[+2, +12]	625	-0.03 (-0.01)	481	3.03 (1.57)	-3.06 (-1.50)
(4)	[+13, +52]	561	-22.49*** (-5.13)	430	-2.29 (-0.59)	-20.20*** (-3.45)
(5)	[+53, +104]	443	-9.23 (-1.64)	255	-9.13 (-1.62)	-0.10 (-0.01)
(3) - (1)			-9.65*** (-3.14)		-3.22 (-1.19)	

Table 7. *Propensity score-matched sample: Difference-in-difference regression*

We report results from difference-in-difference (DID) regressions on weekly adjusted returns around option listing for the matched sample. Weekly adjusted return, $ar_{i,t}$, for firm i in event week t is calculated as the weekly raw return on stock i minus the corresponding period raw return of a benchmark firm matched by industry and size. We report results for two observation windows centered on option listing dates: (i) the balanced window $[-12,+12]$, and (ii) the long-run window $[-12,+52]$. The treated group consists of IPO firms in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. Firms in the treated group are matched to eligible firms that do not have options listed (Control group) based on their propensity score of having options listed. The matching is done month-by-month based on size, turnover, volatility, and momentum. Firms in the control group are assigned counterfactual option listing dates identical to their matched pairs from the treated group. *Optionstat* is a dummy variable equal to 1 when event week $t \geq 0$ indicating that option has been listed, and zero otherwise. *Treated* is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the firm is in the treated group, and zero otherwise. The variable of interest is the DID estimator, $Treated \times Optionstat$. We include year fixed effect and weekly control variables (unreported) in the regressions. Weekly controls consist of the following weekly lagged variables: adjusted return ($ar_{i,t-1}$), average turnover, average volatility, and average market capitalization. Robust t-statistic, clustered at the firm-level, are reported in bracket below each estimate. Superscripts ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels for a two-tailed test.

	Weekly adjusted returns	
	$[-12, +12]$	$[-12, +52]$
Treated \times Optionstat	-0.852** (-2.53)	-0.826*** (-2.97)
Treated	0.302 (1.24)	0.327 (1.35)
Optionstat	0.063 (0.29)	-0.228 (-1.25)
Intercept	0.217 (0.42)	0.069 (0.20)
Year fixed effect	Yes	Yes
Weekly controls	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	22830	57108
Number of clusters	829	829
Adjusted R ²	0.61%	0.68%

Table 8. *Changes in short interest ratio around option listing*

We report changes in short interest ratios relative to event month -4 around option listing date. Short interest ratio is the ratio of short interest to the number of shares outstanding. We obtain short interest levels from COMPUSTAT which reports the number of shares held short at the end of each month. *Rel Change* is the relative percentage change in short interest ratio; it is calculated as $\left(\frac{\text{Short Int Ratio}(t)}{\text{Short Int Ratio}(-4)} - 1\right) \times 100$ where Short Ratio(t) is the short interest ratio observed at the end of the event month t relative to the option listing date. We exclude firms that do not have reported short interest in COMPUSTAT on the event month -4 from the analysis. The treated group consists of IPO firms in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. Ofek and Richardson (2003) find that short interest level increases in the post lock-up period, we therefore exclude IPO firms in the treated group that have shares lockup expiration within 6 months of option listing date. Firms in the treated group are matched to eligible firms that do not have options listed (Control group) based on their propensity score of having options listed. The matching is done month-by-month based on size, turnover, volatility, and momentum. Firms in the control group are assigned counterfactual option listing dates identical to their matched pairs from the treated group. *Diff Rel Change* reports the difference in *Rel Change* between the treated and the control group at each event month. For each event month, we report p-values from the two nonparametric tests: (i) Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test that the distributions of the treated and control groups are equal; and (ii) One-way Wilcoxon signed-rank test that the distribution median of the treated group is greater than that of the control group. The reported values of *Rel Change* are winsorized at the 1 and 99 percentiles to remove outliers.

Month of seasoning	Changes in short interest ratio relative to event month -4 (%)						
	Treated		Control		Treated - Control		Treated > Control
	Nobs	Rel change	Nobs	Rel change	Diff Rel Change	KS Test P-value	Wilcoxon Test P-value
-3	93	24.0	148	31.53	-7.56	0.368	0.354
-2	93	58.1	148	32.88	25.19	0.007	0.012
-1	93	102.2	148	85.08	17.15	0.007	0.007
0	94	312.2	147	88.09	224.10	0.004	>0.001
1	94	306.6	148	100.87	205.73	>0.001	>0.001
2	94	261.2	145	80.88	180.37	>0.001	>0.001
3	93	310.4	143	83.42	226.99	0.009	0.002
4	93	354.1	142	131.74	222.37	0.015	0.004
5	93	318.8	141	134.88	183.88	0.002	0.003
6	92	330.2	141	154.10	176.10	0.008	0.007

Table 9. *Changes in insider holding around option listing*

We report changes in insider holding relative to event month -4 around option listing date. Short interest ratio is the ratio of short interest to the number of shares outstanding. We obtain insider filing data from Thomson Reuter’s Insider Filing Data Feed (IFDF). For each month, we compute the total direct and indirect holding of conventional stock (Table1 in IFDF) by the company’s insiders with relationship hierarchy level between 1 to 3. Rel Change is the relative percentage change in total insider holding; it is calculated as $\left(\frac{\text{Insider holding}(t)}{\text{Insider holding}(-4)} - 1\right) \times 100$ where Insider holding(t) is the total insider holding at the end of the event month t relative to the option listing date. The treated group consists of IPO firms in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. We exclude listings that overlap with lockup expiration days within one calendar year to avoid the bias associated with the IPO lockup agreement (Field and Hanka (2001)). Firms in the treated group are matched to eligible firms that do not have options listed (Control group) based on their propensity score of having options listed. The matching is done month-by-month based on size, turnover, volatility, and momentum. Firms in the control group are assigned counterfactual option listing dates identical to their matched pairs from the treated group. Diff Rel Change reports the difference in Rel Change between the treated and the control group at each event month. For each event month, we report p-values from the two nonparametric tests: (i) Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test that the distributions of the treated and control groups are equal; and (ii) One-way Wilcoxon signed-rank test that the distribution median of the treated group is less than that of the control group. The reported values of Rel Change are winsorized at the 1 and 99 percentiles to remove outliers.

Changes in insider holding relative to event month -4 (%)							
Month of seasoning	Treated		Control		Treated - Control		Treated < Control
	Nobs	Rel change	Nobs	Rel change	Diff Rel Change	KS Test P-value	Wilcoxon Test P-value
-3	378	-0.9518	368	-2.31	1.35	0.797	0.593
-2	378	-3.338	368	-3.92	0.58	0.403	0.330
-1	378	-5.2684	368	-4.19	-1.08	0.301	0.132
0	378	-7.3572	368	-5.64	-1.72	0.057	0.018
1	378	-9.595	367	-6.79	-2.80	0.005	0.002
2	378	-10.3751	364	-5.64	-4.74	>0.001	>0.001
3	377	-12.1128	357	-4.63	-7.48	>0.001	>0.001
4	377	-14.0808	354	-6.26	-7.82	>0.001	>0.001
5	377	-16.2687	352	-7.33	-8.94	>0.001	>0.001
6	375	-16.5419	351	-7.28	-9.26	>0.001	>0.001

Table 10. *Relative put-call demand*

We consider initial public offerings in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. The table reports two monthly measures of relative put-call demand: (i) Adjusted implied-volatility spread (Cremers and Weinbaum (2010)), and (ii) Adjusted implied-volatility skewness (Xing, Zhang, and Zhao (2010)). We report average daily values (in %) calculated over each monthly interval relative to when options are introduced. Event month 0 consists of the first 21 trading days following the option listing date. Adjusted IV spread for the firm i on day t is computed as $IV\ spread_{i,t} - \overline{IV\ spread}_t$, where $IV\ spread_{i,t}$ is the weighted difference between IVs of all put-call pairs quoted on firm i on day t . The market IV spread, $\overline{IV\ spread}_t$, is computed by averaging $IV\ spread_{i,t}$ across all available stocks on day t . Adjusted IV skewness for the firm i on day t is computed as $IV\ skewness_{i,t} - \overline{IV\ skewness}_t$, where $IV\ skewness_{i,t}$ is the difference between IVs of at-the-money calls and out-of-the-money puts for the firm i on day t . The market IV skewness, $\overline{IV\ skewness}_t$, is computed by averaging $IV\ skewness_{i,t}$ across all available stocks on day t . *Nobs* reports the number of firms used in the monthly calculation. T-statistic is reported in bracket below each estimate. Superscripts ***, ** and * indicate significance at 1, 5 and 10 percent-levels for a two-tailed test.

Month of seasoning	Panel A: Adjusted IV spread (%) Cremers and Weinbaum (2009)		Panel B: Adjusted IV Skewness (%) Xing, Zhang and Zhou (2010)	
	Nobs	Mean	Nob	Mean
0	901	-1.40*** (-6.39)	811	-1.61*** (-5.65)
1	974	-1.60*** (-7.00)	900	-1.28*** (-4.45)
2	990	-1.45*** (-7.57)	927	-0.91*** (-2.58)
3	1009	-0.96*** (-5.69)	934	-0.91* (-1.75)
4	1010	-0.73*** (-3.43)	938	-0.98** (-2.08)
5	984	-0.72*** (-3.24)	917	-0.94** (-2.14)
6	956	-0.60* (-1.75)	890	-0.33 (-0.66)
7	944	-0.55*** (-2.61)	870	-0.59 (-1.25)
8	929	-0.41** (-2.00)	848	-0.66 (-1.49)
9	906	-0.43** (-2.16)	831	-0.81* (-1.68)
10	871	-0.20 (-1.01)	794	-0.12 (-1.43)
11	864	-0.40 (-1.58)	776	-0.64 (-1.22)
12	848	-0.37 (-1.35)	758	-0.47 (-0.83)

Table 11. *Explaining abnormal returns around option listing*

We report regression results on monthly adjusted returns from event month -3 to event month +12. Event month 0 consists of 21 trading days centered on the option listing date. Other event months are defined as successive 21-trading-day periods relative to event month 0. Monthly adjusted return, $ar_{i,t}$, for firm i in event month t is calculated as the monthly raw return on stock i minus the corresponding period raw return of a benchmark firm matched by industry and size. The sample consists of IPO firms in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. *Optionstat* is a dummy variable equal to 1 when event month $t \geq 0$ indicating that option has been listed, and zero otherwise. We study factors influencing the magnitude of option listing on IPO underperformance by interacting *Optionstat* with variables calculated in Sections 6.1–6.3. *IVspread*(1) is the average adjusted implied volatility spread observed in event month 1, and *IVskewness*(1) is the average value of adjusted implied volatility skewness observed in event month 1. Δ *Short interest ratio*(1) is the percentage change in short interest ratios in event month 1 relative to event month -4 (see Table 8). Δ *Insider holding*(1) is the percentage change in insider shares held at the end of event month 1 relative to event month -4 (see Table 9). Year fixed effects and various IPO characteristics are included in the regressions. We include one-month lagged adjusted returns and average firm volatility as monthly control variables. Robust t-statistic, clustered at the firm-level, is reported in bracket below each estimate. Superscripts ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels for a two-tailed test

	Dependent variable: Monthly adjusted returns from event months -3 to +12			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Optionstat	-5.588*** (-6.25)	-5.681*** (-6.10)	-4.087*** (-3.80)	-6.357*** (-8.10)
Optionstat \times IV spread(1)	0.334* (1.70)			
Optionstat \times IV skewness(1)		0.233** (2.35)		
Optionstat \times Δ Short interest ratio(1)			-0.003** (-2.50)	
Optionstat \times Δ Insider holding(1)				0.018 (0.56)
IV spread(1)	-0.292 (-1.43)			
IV skewness(1)		-0.179 (1.40)		
Δ Short interest ratio(1)			0.001 (1.14)	
Δ Insider holding(1)				-0.007 (-0.26)
Intercept	11.433** (2.28)	12.616** (2.39)	6.285 (0.74)	9.589* (1.65)
IPO characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Monthly controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Numer of observations	13124	12079	4088	11193
Number of clusters	933	859	270	734
Adjusted R ²	0.96%	1.14%	0.70%	0.70%

Table 12. *Explaining long-run IPO underperformance post-option listing*

We report regression results for long-run IPO abnormal returns in the post-option listing period. The dependent variable is monthly adjusted return from event month +2 to event month +12. We define each event month as a successive 21-trading-day period relative to when option is listed. Monthly adjusted return, $ar_{i,t}$, for firm i in event month t is calculated as the monthly raw return on stock i minus the corresponding period raw return of a benchmark firm matched by industry and size. The sample consists of IPO firms in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. We regress $ar_{i,t}$ on monthly lagged variables calculated in Section 6. $IVspread(t-1)$ is the lagged monthly average value of adjusted implied volatility spread. $IVskewness(t-1)$ is the lagged monthly average value of adjusted implied volatility skewness Section 6.3 explains the calculations of IV spread and IV skewness. $Short\ interest\ ratio(t-1)$ is the lagged monthly level of short interest ratio. $Insider\ holding(t-1)$ is the lagged monthly percentage level of total shares held by insiders. We include year fixed effects and various IPO characteristics in the regressions. Monthly controls consists of lagged monthly adjusted returns and average firm volatility. Robust t-statistic, clustered at the firm-level, is reported in bracket below each estimate. Superscripts ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels for a two-tailed test..

	Dependent variable: Monthly adjusted returns from event months +2 to +24			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
IV spread(t-1)	6.416*			
	(1.67)			
IV skewness(t-1)		6.895***		
		(3.87)		
Short interest ratio(t-1)			-0.034	
			(-0.67)	
Insider holding(t-1)				0.022**
				(2.41)
Intercept	0.441	-1.985	-0.949	2.873
	(0.12)	(-0.52)	(-0.23)	(0.77)
IPO characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Monthly controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Numer of obervations	16450	15534	7943	15790
Number of clusters	1007	1004	440	864
Adjusted R ²	0.60%	0.74%	0.09%	0.74%

Table 13. *Returns from buying puts and selling calls on IPO stocks*

This table summarizes the average monthly returns from trading in newly listed put and call options on IPO stocks. We consider initial public offerings in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. We define newly listed options as those that are quoted within 30 days after the first option contract is introduced. Panel A reports monthly average returns over the risk free rate from a trading strategy that buys put options. Panel B reports monthly average returns over the risk free rate from a trading strategy that writes call options. Option returns are expressed in monthly percentage term and are sorted by days to maturity and moneyness (F/K), where F is the futures price of the underlying spot. We include transaction costs in the return computation by assuming that options and the underlyings are traded at their bid and ask prices. We assume that options are held until their expiration. T-statistics and the number of observations are reported below each estimate. Superscripts ***, ** and * indicate significance at 1, 5 and 10 percent-levels.

Moneyness bins (F/K)	Panel A: Average monthly excess returns from buying put options (%)				Panel B: Average monthly excess returns from writing call options (%)			
	Days to maturity				Days to maturity			
	7 to 60	61 to 120	121 to 180	181 to 360	7 to 60	61 to 120	121 to 180	181 to 360
(0.80 , 0.85]	-4.15	3.14	2.48**	2.22**	1.72	2.34	0.54	1.01
t-stat	(-0.94)	(1.41)	(1.97)	(2.31)	(0.11)	(0.35)	(0.13)	(0.35)
nobs	356	171	210	175	384	329	401	358
(0.85, 0.90]	-2.33	0.61	1.8	2.53***	-6.54	-1.58	-3.79	2.05
t-stat	(-0.49)	(0.28)	(1.44)	(2.76)	(-0.52)	(-0.27)	(-1.04)	(1.06)
nobs	445	222	260	236	499	416	490	447
(0.90, 0.95]	0.6	0.25	2.37*	3.22***	0.86	2.22	-5.08	-0.64
t-stat	(0.10)	(0.12)	(1.91)	(3.59)	(0.09)	(0.55)	(-1.52)	(-0.28)
nobs	549	265	310	295	602	472	511	486
(0.95, 0.98]	3.54	5.73**	4.43***	4.66***	-1.47	2	-0.9	0.24
t-stat	(0.49)	(2.21)	(3.17)	(4.26)	(-0.17)	(0.46)	(-0.39)	(0.11)
nobs	522	263	275	271	621	420	466	415
(0.98, 1.02]	-6.12	5.39**	4.83***	4.46***	-5.39	1.4	-1.71	-0.2
t-stat	(-0.85)	(2.02)	(3.38)	(4.35)	(-0.66)	(0.38)	(-0.64)	(-0.10)
nobs	559	294	327	307	692	448	482	444
(1.02, 1.05]	2.39	5.85*	4.15**	4.4***	-5.98	0.36	-3.24	1.44
t-stat	(0.27)	(1.88)	(2.46)	(3.95)	(-0.69)	(0.09)	(-1.08)	(0.86)
nobs	506	263	311	282	634	351	433	384
(1.05, 1.10]	4.83	6.57*	3.05*	4.24***	-1.67	-1.65	-2.49	0.6
t-stat	(0.47)	(1.91)	(1.84)	(3.89)	(-0.23)	(-0.44)	(-1.02)	(0.35)
nobs	483	321	357	337	663	412	452	442
(1.10, 1.15]	1.49	6.1*	2.1	5.49***	-5.67	-0.22	-1.1	1.92
t-stat	(0.13)	(1.73)	(1.31)	(3.82)	(-0.91)	(-0.06)	(-0.51)	(1.12)
nobs	419	278	345	331	586	359	396	390
(1.15, 1.20]	26.96	12.7***	5.38**	6.35***	3.63	1.97	-5.93*	1.87
t-stat	(1.46)	(2.72)	(2.51)	(4.32)	(0.69)	(0.58)	(-1.78)	(1.06)
nobs	337	226	297	290	494	300	337	330

Table 14. *Regression analysis: Returns from buying long-maturity put options*

We report regression results on monthly excess returns over the risk free rate from buying new listed put options with maturities between 6 months and 1-year. The sample consists of initial public offerings in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. Returns are computed from a trading strategy that buys put options quoted within 30 days after the first option contract is introduced. We assume that put options are held until their expiration and include transaction costs in the return calculation by assuming that options and the underlyings are traded at their bid and ask prices. Monthly excess return is computed by subtracting the put option return with the corresponding riskfree rate and scaling it with $\frac{30}{\tau}$, where τ is the contract's maturity. Model (1) reports the base line regression result. Models (2) -(6) report the regression results of excess put returns on IPO variables. We include *Moneyiness bin* in the regressions to control for differences in excess returns across the contracts' moneyness (see text for full details). *Venture backed* is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the IPO firm is backed by a venture capitalist. *First day ret* is computed as the log of return on the offered price to the end of the first trading day. *High underwriter rep* is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the firm's lead underwriter is in the highest prestige category (rank=9) according to the ranking published on Jay Ritter's website. *Shares locked up* is a dummy variable that is equal to 1 if the IPO firm has an outstanding shares is locked up agreement when option is listed, and zero otherwise. *Time-to-list* is the number of months from IPO issuance date to when option is listed. Year fixed effect are included in the regressions. Robust t-statistic, clustered at the firm-level, are reported in bracket below each estimate. Superscripts ***, **, and * indicate significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels for a two-tailed test.

	Dependent variable: Monthly returns from buying long-maturity put options (%)					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Intercept	2.286*** (2.69)	-0.070 (-0.05)	-0.545 (-0.49)	2.172* (1.69)	2.057** (2.12)	-1.295*** (-3.88)
Venture backed		3.549** (1.97)				
First day ret			6.819*** (4.24)			
High underwriter rep				0.182 (0.10)		
Shares locked up					1.044 (0.47)	
Time-to-list						-0.220** (-2.34)
Moneyiness bin	0.427*** (2.79)	0.430*** (2.82)	3.166* (1.71)	0.425*** (2.78)	0.429*** (2.80)	0.431*** (2.82)
Year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Numer of obervations	2524	2524	2524	2524	2524	2524
Number of clusters	504	504	504	504	504	504
Adjusted R ²	0.27%	1.01%	2.71%	0.23%	0.28%	1.19%




Figure 1. *Option listing and IPO long run returns.* The sample consists of firms that go public in 1996-2008. We plot the long-run cumulative adjusted returns (CAR) of initial public offerings starting from the event month 0 which represents to the first day return. We plot the results for six IPO groups categorized by when they have options listed after the IPO issuance date. CAR series are computed using matching firm-adjusted returns. Darkened solid line in each panel indicates when options are listed relative to the IPO issuance date. Panels in the left column plot CAR for IPO firms that have options listed within 6 months (top), in 7-12 months (middle), and in 13-24 months (bottom), of the IPO issuance date. Top and middle panels in the right column plot CAR for IPO firms that have options listed in 25-36 months (top), and after 36 months (middle), respectively. The bottom-right panel plots CAR for IPO firms that never have options listed.




Figure 2. *Weekly cumulative adjusted returns to option listing.* The sample contains initial public offerings in 1996-2008 that have options listed in 0-6 months (Top-left), 7-12 months (Top-right), 13-36 months (Bottom-left), and 0-36 months (Bottom-right), after IPO issuance date. Cumulative average adjusted returns (CAR) are computed weekly centered on the option listing date. Week 0 refers to the option-listing window and is computed from trading day -2 to day +2 relative to the option listing date. In each panel, we plot four CAR series starting 12 weeks before option listing dates. Four CAR series are plotted: 1) raw returns, 2) CRSP-value-weighted NASDAQ index adjustment (NASDAQ-adjusted), lowest decile of NYSE market capitalization index adjustment (small firm-adjusted), and 4) matching firm adjustment (matching firm-adjusted).




Figure 3. *Relative changes in short interest ratio and insider holding.* The top (bottom) panel plots average monthly changes in short interest ratios (insider holding) relative to event month -4 around option listing date. We plot average values of the winsorized mean (at 1 and 99%) for each event month for the treated and control groups. We obtain short interest levels from COMPUSTAT. Short interest ratio is calculated as the ratio of short interest to the number of shares outstanding. We obtain insider filing data from Thomson Reuter’s Insider Filing Data Feed (IFDF). Insider holding is the total direct and indirect holding of conventional stock by the company’s insiders with relationship hierarchy level between 1 to 3. The treated group consists of IPO firms in 1996-2008 that have options listed within 36 months after the issuance date. Ofek and Richardson (2003) find that short interest level increases in the post lock-up period, we therefore exclude IPO firms in the treated group that have shares lockup expiration within 6 months of option listing date. Firms in the treated group are matched to eligible firms that do not have options listed (Control group) based on their propensity score of having options listed. The matching is done monthly based on size, turnover, volatility, and momentum.