Financialization and Commodity Markets Serial Dependence*

Zhi Da[†] Ke Tang[‡] Yubo Tao[§] Liyan Yang[¶]

Current version: July 2022

*We benefited from the comments and suggestions by Bruno Biais (editor), Shaun Davies (discussant), Prachi Deuskar (discussant), Jun Li (discussant), Christina Nikitopoulos (discussant), Neil Pearson, Marcel Prokopczuk, Jing Wu, Qifei Zhu (discussant), an associate editor, two anonymous referees, and the seminar participants at Auckland University of Technology, Duke University, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Lehigh University, Tsinghua University PBC School of Finance, University of Notre Dame, the 3rd Australasian Commodity Markets Conference, the 3rd JPMCC International Symposium on Commodities, the 7th ABFER Annual Conference, the 8th International Conference on Futures and Other Derivatives, the 2019 Asian Meeting of the Econometric Society, the 2019 China International Conference in Finance, the 2019 Commodity and Energy Markets Association Annual Conference, the 2019 Summer Institute of Finance, and the 2019 University of Oklahoma Energy and Commodities Finance Research Conference. Zhi Da acknowledges financial support from Beijing Outstanding Young Scientist Program (BJJWZYJH01201910034034) and the 111 Project (B20094). Ke Tang acknowledges financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Project No. 71973075 and 72192802). Yubo Tao acknowledges the financial support from the Start-up Research Grant of University of Macau (SRG2022-00016-FSS). Liyan Yang acknowledges the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for financial support (Grants 430-2018-00173 and 435-2021-0040).

[†]University of Notre Dame. Notre Dame, IN, 46556, USA. Email: zda@nd.edu.

[‡]Tsinghua University. 30 Shuangqing Road, Beijing, 100084, China. Email: ketang@tsinghua.edu.cn.

[§]University of Macau. Avenida da Universidade, Macau SAR, 999078. Email: yubotao@um.edu.mo.

[¶]Corresponding author. University of Toronto. 105 St. George Street Toronto, Ontario M5S3E6, Canada. Email: liyan.yang@rotman.utoronto.ca

Financialization and Commodity Markets Serial Dependence

Abstract

Recent financialization in commodity markets makes it easier for institutional investors to trade a portfolio of commodities via various commodity-indexed products. We present several pieces of novel causal evidence that daily exposure to such index trading results in price overshoots and reversals, as reflected in a negative daily return autocorrelations, only among commodities in that index. This is because index trading propagates non-fundamental noises to all indexed commodities. We present direct evidence for such noise propagation using commodity news sentiment data.

JEL Classification: G12, G40, Q02.

Keywords: Financialization; Return autocorrelations; Index trading; News sentiment; ETF arbitrage; Price discovery.

1 Introduction

The financialization of commodity markets has progressed over the past two decades. According to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), investment flows to various commodity indices increased from $15 to $200 billion from 2003 to 2008. Barclays estimated that commodity index investment rose to $360 billion in the first quarter of 2022.[1] The rapid money inflow in commodity markets, especially in 2007 and 2008, has led to heated debate among researchers and policymakers about the influence of financialization on commodity price discovery and return dynamics.

Although theoretical papers such as Basak and Pavlova (2016) and Goldstein and Yang (2021) have analyzed the impact of financialization on commodity futures prices, it is still difficult to empirically identify the impact of financialization on commodity prices. For example, comovement among indexed commodities, as shown in Figure 1,[2] does not necessarily imply that financialization is the cause since indexed commodities could have been endogenously selected into an index precisely because they are exposed to the same fundamental shocks. Instead of focusing on slow-moving return comovements, we examine daily price overshoots and reversals, which are clear signs of non-fundamental shocks and price inefficiency. Our paper aims to provide novel causal evidence that exposure to commodity index trading results in such short-term price inefficiency, even at the index level.

[Figure 1 is about here.]

Daily price overshoots and reversals result in negative daily return autocorrelations. Figure 2 shows a clear divergence in such return autocorrelations between the portfolios of indexed

[1] https://www.barclayhedge.com/solutions/assets-under-management/cta-assets-under-management/cta-industry/

[2] We first calculate an equally weighted index for each sector of indexed and non-indexed commodities and then calculate the average correlation among five sector indices for an annual rolling window. Since there are no non-indexed commodities in the energy and livestock sectors, we take heating oil, RBOB, and lean hogs as non-indexed commodities because of their small weights in the index. Note that the "indexed" and "non-indexed" classification in Figure 1 strictly follows Tang and Xiong (2012) for the replication purpose. In subsequent analyses, we use a more strict commodity classification as defined in the last two columns of Table 1.

and non-indexed commodities. We draw the first-order autocorrelation coefficient of daily returns on commodity indices using a 10-year backward rolling window. We observe a slight increasing trend in the past 38 years in the daily autocorrelation of the equal-weighted non-indexed commodities (NIDX) portfolio returns. In sharp contrast, the daily autocorrelations in two popular commodity indices, S&P Goldman Sachs Commodity Index (GSCI) and the Bloomberg Commodity Index (BCOM), have steadily declined since 2004 when financialization began.[3] They entered negative territory around 2005 and became significantly negative in 2006. The negative (positive) daily autocorrelations on commodity indices (non-indexed commodities) are also economically significant. Trading strategies implementable in real-time to take advantage of these autocorrelations generate substantial profits, even after accounting for direct transaction costs, suggesting that the negative autocorrelation goes beyond the simple market microstructure noise.

[Figure 2 is about here.]

We then construct daily measures of indexed commodities' exposure to index trading at the market-, sector-, and individual commodity-levels and document strong negative relations between such measures and future daily return autocorrelations of indexed commodities. The fact that our analyses are conducted at daily frequency alleviates concerns that some slow-moving unobserved factors are driving such negative relations. In particular, we find that the negative daily autocorrelation among indexed commodities goes beyond one day and becomes stronger during the high index exposure period, regardless of the exact measurement of index exposure. As a placebo test, we do not find any significant relation between autocorrelations and index exposure among non-indexed commodities.

We then present three pieces of causal evidence suggesting that index trading exposure drives negative index return autocorrelations. First, Figure 2 shows some divergence in return

[3] The GSCI was initially developed in 1991 by Goldman Sachs. In 2007, ownership was transferred to Standard & Poor's. The BCOM was originally launched in 1998 as the Dow Jones-AIG Commodity Index and renamed the Dow Jones-UBS Commodity Index in 2009 when UBS acquired the index from AIG. On July 1, 2014, the index was rebranded under its current name.

autocorrelations between the indexed and non-indexed commodity portfolios, even before 2004 when financialization started. While it is important to note that return autocorrelation was rarely negative for indexed commodities before 2004, the pre-2004 divergence does raise concerns that some unobserved factors, unrelated to index trading, could also contribute to the widening gap in autocorrelations between indexed and non-indexed commodities. To address this concern, we construct a better group of non-index commodities by adopting the synthetic matching method proposed by Acemoglu et al. (2016). The gist of this methodology is to construct portfolios of non-indexed commodities that resemble indexed commodities as closely as possible in returns (and therefore also autocorrelations) pre-2004. In other words, the synthetic matching imposes the parallel pre-trends assumption, after which we continue to reach the same conclusion, namely, index trading exposure negatively impacts the return autocorrelation of indexed commodities but has no effect on that of these mimicking non-indexed commodity portfolios.

Our second causal test takes advantage of the fact that the same indexed commodity can receive different weights in GSCI and BCOM. Following Greenwood (2008), each year, we focus on the five commodities that are most overweighted in BCOM relative to GSCI.[4] We verify that these overweighted commodities come from very different sectors and their identities change every year. We show that their daily return autocorrelations are significantly better predicted by their exposures to BCOM than those to GSCI, even after controlling for their levels of liquidity and production that contribute to their overweights in the first place. The result suggests that index trading drives the negative return autocorrelation. It is important to note that the relative weight differences are determined at the beginning of the year and held constant throughout that year. Missing factors that indirectly correlate with overweighting at the beginning of the year are unlikely to drive the subsequent day-to-day relation between index trading and return autocorrelation.

Our third causal test zooms into a specific form of index trading, commodity index ETF arbitrage, which is unlikely driven by slow-moving fundamental factors. When the ETF is

[4]We do not focus on the commodities overweighted in GSCI since GSCI constantly overweighs commodities in the energy sector, i.e., crude oil, and its products (heating oil and gasoline). Therefore, the causality may be driven by energy shocks.

temporarily overpriced relative to its underlying commodity index, arbitrageurs will sell shares in the ETF (create ETF shares) and buy the underlying indexed commodities, thus propagating the positive price pressure from the ETF to the underlying. As the positive price pressure reverts subsequently, we observe lower indexed commodity returns in the future. Following Brown, Davies, and Ringgenberg (2021), we employ commodity index ETF flows to proxy for such arbitrage activity. Consistent with the notion that index trading drives price overshoots and reversals, or negative return autocorrelation, we find commodity index ETF creation (redemption) to predict negative (positive) returns on indexed commodities, but not among non-indexed commodities. This finding also rules out a reverse causality concern that a predictable return reversal in the future causes index trading today—an informed index trader buys (sells) before a positive (negative) return reversal—the opposite to what we find with ETF arbitrageurs.

The above three tests confirm that commodity index trading causes negative index return autocorrelations. But why? To help digest our empirical findings, we develop a stylized model of commodity index trading in the appendix. In the model, index traders propagate both information and noise across commodities in the same index. With a significant presence of index traders, the impact of noise dominates, and the noise gives rise to correlated price overshoots and subsequent reversals among indexed commodities. The model thus corroborates the theoretical hypothesis proposed by Goldstein and Yang (2021) that "a process of increased financialization first increases and then decreases price informativeness."

We are agnostic about the exact nature of the noise. The noise refers to any non-fundamental shocks that affect the trading demand of index traders. It could reflect price pressure propagated by index ETF arbitrage as in our third causal test. It could also come from the liquidity demand of the index traders and their clients. Indeed, we find index trading to be associated with more negative autocorrelations among the more illiquid indexed commodities. Finally, the noise may reflect the sentiment of the index traders and their clients (Baker and Wurgler, 2006). Separating liquidity shocks from sentiment is challenging as they might be interconnected (Baker and Stein, 2004). For example, correlated sentiment can result in correlated trading and liquidity shocks. Nevertheless, the sentiment channel allows a direct test of the noise propagation mechanism featured in the stylized model. To the extent we can measure "sentiment" on commodities, such measure should positively correlate with contemporaneous returns but negatively predict future returns among indexed commodities. Still, it should not predict returns on non-indexed commodities.

Empirically, we examine the news sentiment of articles covering individual commodities. To study the propagation of such sentiment across indexed commodities and to alleviate the impact of sector-specific common fundamental shocks, we compute a "connected" index sentiment measure for each commodity. Taking an indexed commodity, corn, as an example, we compute its "connected" index sentiment by averaging the sentiment measures on other non-grain indexed commodities (e.g., energy, metals).

Consistent with the model prediction, we find that the "connected" index sentiment is positively related to the contemporaneous return of corn, but predicts corn's next-day return negatively and significantly. While the "connected" sentiment may still contain a fundamental component common to all commodities, the fact that such a positive correlation reverts on the next day confirms the existence and propagation of "non-fundamental" shocks. As index trading propagates such shocks across commodities in the same index, it results in synchronized price overshoots and reversals and negative return autocorrelations even at the index level. We confirm that the sentiment propagation results are much stronger during periods in which the commodity markets are more exposed to index trading, and the results are not driven by the global financial crisis in 2008–2009. As a placebo test, we repeat the same tests among non-indexed commodities but find no evidence for the propagation of such "non-fundamental" shocks.

Our study is closely related to two strands of literature. First, it contributes to the debates on the price impact of index investments in the commodity markets. Henderson, Pearson, and Wang (2015) find that the hedging activities of issuers of commodity-linked notes can significantly influence commodity futures prices. Gilbert (2010) and Singleton (2013) show that index investments predict oil price movements. Ready and Ready (2021) find that order flows from index traders influence commodity prices. Chen, Dai, and Sorescu (2021) show that aggregate assets under the management of commodity trading advisors (CTAs) can predict the return correlations between CTAs and the stock market. Mou (2011) and Yan, Irwin, and Sanders (2019) find that index rebalancing causes futures prices to shift significantly. A very recent paper by Han and Kong (2020) employs a machine-learning approach to study the serial dependence of commodity futures returns and finds significant full-sample and out-of-sample predictability. Using a theoretical model, Basak and Pavlova (2016) show that excess correlation among commodities can arise if institutional investors care about outperforming a commodity index. Sockin and Xiong (2015) theoretically show that financial inflows and outflows (through index investing) to commodity markets can be misread as a signal of global economic growth if informational frictions exist in commodity futures markets. Consistent with this study, a recent empirical work by Brogaard, Ringgenberg, and Sovich (2019) shows that inefficient commodity prices can distort the real decisions of a firm. However, Büyükşahin and Harris (2011) and Irwin and Sanders (2012) find little evidence that index position changes are linked to price movements in futures markets. Hamilton and Wu (2015) present mixed results.

In a review article, Cheng and Xiong (2014) call for direct tests of price impacts with clear identification strategies. Our study moves closer to meeting their challenge. By focusing on autocorrelations, our empirical setting allows us to identify the price impact of commodity index trading. In particular, prices of indexed commodities overshoot and reverse subsequently when reacting to non-fundamental shocks, while non-indexed commodities do not show such a reversal pattern. Our paper speaks to price-inefficiency at high frequency (daily to weekly) while the existing literature mostly focuses on price-inefficiency at a lower frequency (a persistent divergence between price and fundamental value). Empirically, low-frequency persistent mispricing is difficult to detect as it requires a precise measure of fundamental value. We contribute to the commodity literature by linking variations in index trading to price inefficiency in indexed commodities at the daily frequency. Price reversal at daily frequency is a clear sign of non-fundamental shocks and price inefficiency, and our analysis at daily frequency helps to rule out slow-moving trends as the main driving forces. The high-frequency price inefficiency is economically meaningful, as it imposes costs on institutional investors who trade often and individual investors who invest in commodities through those institutions. On a more positive note, it also suggests that proactive investors can generate economically significant profits by providing liquidity to index traders on a systematic basis.

Second, our study also speaks to the existing literature that links indexing to side effects, mostly in equity markets, including the amplification of fundamental shocks (Hong, Kubik, and Fishman, 2012), non-fundamental price changes (Chen, Noronha, and Singal, 2004), excessive comovement (Barberis, Shleifer, and Wurgler, 2005; Greenwood, 2005, 2008; Da and Shive, 2018; Baltussen, van Bekkum, and Da, 2019), a deterioration of firms' informational environment (Israeli, Lee, and Sridharan, 2017), increased non-fundamental volatility in individual stocks (Ben-David, Franzoni, and Moussawi, 2018), and the reduced welfare of retail investors (Bond and García, 2021).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the data and variables used in this research. Section 3 delivers the stylized facts on the relation between index trading exposure and index return autocorrelation. Section 4 illustrates three pieces of causal evidence. Section 5 presents tests using news sentiment and return autocorrelations. Section 6 summarizes the results of robustness checks and Section 7 concludes. Appendices provide additional materials and analyses and a stylized theoretical model that formalizes our empirical hypotheses and findings.

2 Data and Variable Construction

In this section, we describe the commodities used in our analyses and introduce the two most popular commodity indices and their construction. We then describe how we measure the exposure of a commodity to index trading. A summary of our key variables and notations is provided in Appendix A.1.

2.1 Commodities and commodity indices

Commodity price data are obtained from Commodity Systems Inc. Following Kang, Rouwenhorst, and Tang (2020), we compute the daily excess return for each commodity using the nearest-to-maturity (front-month) contract and roll positions on the seventh calendar day of the maturity month into the next-to-maturity contract.[5] The excess return r_{it} of commodity i on date t is calculated as

$$r_{it} = \frac{F_i(t,T) - F_i(t-1,T)}{F_i(t-1,T)}, \tag{1}$$

where $F_i(t,T)$ is the futures price on day t for a futures contract maturing on date T. To mitigate the effect of outliers, we winsorize 1% of the returns at the top and bottom 0.5 percentiles each.

Table 1 lists the 27 commodities we examine categorized into five sectors: energy, grains, livestock, metals, and softs. Futures listing exchanges and coverage periods are also provided for each commodity.

[Table 1 is about here.]

The recent financialization makes it easier for institutional investors to trade various commodity indices. A commodity index functions like an equity index, such as the S&P 500, in which its value is derived from the total value of a specified basket of commodities. Currently, the largest two indices by market share are the GSCI and BCOM. These two indices use different selection criteria and weighting schemes: the GSCI is weighted by the world production of each commodity, whereas the BCOM focuses on the relative amount of trading activity of a commodity. Importantly, the weights of both indices are set at the beginning of the year and do not vary during the year. Table 1 provides index membership information for each of the 27 commodities in our sample.

We collect daily price data on the GSCI and BCOM from Datastream and calculate their daily returns as $(P_t - P_{t-1})/P_{t-1}$. We also construct an equally weighted NIDX and calculate its daily returns by simply equally averaging daily returns across non-indexed commodities. Table 2 provides the summary statistics for the daily returns on individual commodities and the commodity

[5] If the seventh is not a business day, we use the next business day as our roll date.

indices during our sample period from 2006 to 2018.

[Table 2 is about here.]

Although the indexed commodities offer relatively low annual Sharpe ratios compared to that in the equity market, their return correlations with the equity and bond market before financialization are fairly low (Tang and Xiong, 2012). As a result, institutional investors have become more willing to invest in commodities to diversify mainstream stock and bond markets, especially since the start of financialization, given the ease of trading commodity indices.

The energy sector, especially crude oil and natural gas, did not perform well in our sample period. Since both the GSCI and the BCOM place heavy weights on the energy sector, both indices suffered losses in the same period. Non-indexed commodities, as a group (i.e., NIDX), earned a small positive average daily return of 2.5 basis points (5% per annum).

2.2 Commodity index exposure

Every Friday, the CFTC releases a weekly Commitments of Traders report with data collected on the previous Tuesday, which includes the total open interest of each commodity and the long/short positions of all types of traders.[6] It also includes a supplemental CIT report that shows the positions of a set of index traders identified by the CFTC since January 3, 2006.

According to the CIT manual, total open interest in the supplementary CIT report can be recovered from the nine components detailed in the report:

$$2(\textit{Open Interest}^{All}) = \underbrace{(\textit{Long}+\textit{Short}+2\textit{Spread})}_{\textit{Non-commercial}} + \underbrace{(\textit{Long}+\textit{Short})}_{\textit{Commercial}} + \underbrace{(\textit{Long}+\textit{Short})}_{\textit{Index Trading}} + \underbrace{(\textit{Long}+\textit{Short})}_{\textit{Non-reportable}}. \tag{2}$$

Naturally, we can define index open interest as the average of the long and short positions of index

[6]Traders are classified into three types: commercial (C), noncommercial (NC), and non-reportables (NR). In the Commodity Index Trader (CIT) report, the CFTC separates the index trading positions (Idx) from the positions of the commercial traders.

traders: $\mathit{Open\ Interest}^{Idx} = (\mathit{Long}^{Idx} + \mathit{Short}^{Idx})/2$. Based on these data, we can estimate the index trader market share of indexed commodity i on day t as the ratio of its index open interest to its total open interest during the prior week:

$$\mathit{Index\ Market\ Share}_{it} = \frac{\mathit{Open\ Interest}^{Idx}_{i,w(t)}}{\mathit{Open\ Interest}^{All}_{i,w(t)}}, \tag{3}$$

where $w(t)$ denotes the Tuesday immediately before or on day t.

The CIT report only contains 13 agricultural commodities (listed in Table 1) but covers no commodities in the energy and metals sectors. Masters (2008) introduces an interpolation method to estimate the position of unreported indexed commodities by taking advantage of the difference in commodity coverage between the GSCI and BCOM. Hamilton and Wu (2015) refine Masters' approach in a regression setting. We thus employ Hamilton and Wu (2015)'s method to obtain each non-reported indexed commodity's estimated index market share. Appendix A.2 describes the methods of Masters (2008) and Hamilton and Wu (2015).

Based on the estimated index market share, we obtain each commodity's index trading volume as follows:[7]

$$\mathit{Index\ Trading\ Volume}_{it} = \mathit{Index\ Market\ Share}_{it} \times \mathit{Trading\ Volume}_{it}, \tag{4}$$

and define the index exposure of commodity i on day t as the standardized version of the detrended index trading volume with the past 250-day average in the spirit of Campbell, Grossman, and Wang (1993):

$$\mathit{Index\ Exposure}_{it} = \text{standardize}\left\{\mathit{Detrended\ Index\ Trading\ Volume}_{it}\right\}. \tag{5}$$

Detrending is useful because commodity trading volumes trended up during our sample period owing to the implementation of electronic trading systems and lower broker charges. Standardization

[7] Since the nearest and second-nearest contracts are the most liquid and considering commodity indices' rolling activity (see, e.g., Stoll and Whaley, 2010; Mou, 2011), we calculate the total trading volume of each commodity as the sum of trading volume on the nearest and second-nearest contracts.

makes it possible to compare trading activities among commodities with different contract sizes. As trading volume is measured by the number of contracts, price information does not enter our measure of index exposure for an individual indexed commodity.

Finally, the total index exposure for the commodity markets is computed as the simple average of the index exposures across all I indexed commodities:

$$Total\ Index\ Exposure_t = \frac{1}{I}\sum_{i=1}^{I} Index\ Exposure_{it}. \quad (6)$$

Total index exposure can therefore be interpreted as the abnormal trading volume on day t that reflects index trading. Figure 3 plots the daily total index exposure. As a measure of abnormal index trading, it does not display any long-term trend. Our subsequent empirical analyses link daily fluctuations in index exposure to daily return autocorrelation measures. Commodity trading volume drops at the end of the year, contributing to the observed seasonality in Figure 3 where the index exposure measure dips predictably. We winsorize the index exposure measures at a 1% level in our empirical analyses to alleviate excessive fluctuations.

[Figure 3 is about here.]

3 Stylized Facts

We conduct two sets of empirical analyses in this section. We first examine trading strategies to evaluate the economic significance of the index-level autocorrelations presented in Figure 2. We then conduct panel regressions at the individual commodity level and confirm that the relation between indexed commodities' return autocorrelations and the index exposure measure is robust.

3.1 Trading strategies

In Table 3, we evaluate the economic significance associated with index autocorrelation patterns reported in Figure 2, using several index trading strategies. For example, we study a contrarian strategy based on the short-term return reversal for the commodity indices (GSCI and BCOM). Specifically, for the contrarian strategy, we sell (buy) the GSCI or BCOM when its returns on the previous trading day are positive (negative). We take a position r_{t-1} so that the daily return of our strategy is simply $-r_t r_{t-1}$. As shown in Column 1, this trading strategy has an annual Sharpe ratio of 0.49 for the GSCI (Panel A) and 0.38 for the BCOM (Panel B) for 2006–2018, consistent with Figure 2, which shows a significantly negative daily autocorrelation for both indices after 2006.

[Table 3 is about here.]

Commodity futures contracts are liquid and easy to trade. Nevertheless, to account for the trading cost, we use the weighted average of one-tick bid-ask spreads for indexed commodities (1.04 basis points for the GSCI and 1.26 basis points for the BCOM) and the weighted average of two-tick bid-ask spreads for non-indexed commodities (7.74 basis points for the NIDX).[8] Column 1 shows sizable annual Sharpe ratios even after transaction costs (0.45 for the GSCI and 0.31 for the BCOM).

Trading strategies implemented during high index exposure periods confirm the pattern that the return autocorrelation for indexed commodities is more negative when their index exposure is high. Since our index exposure measure is constructed using a full-sample standardization procedure, it is not observable in real time. To ensure that our conditional trading strategy can be implemented in real time, in Column 2, we reconstruct a real-time index exposure measure where the standardization procedure is carried out using a backward 250-day rolling window. Using this real-time measure, we find that the annual after-cost Sharpe ratio improves to 0.69 for the GSCI and 0.64 for the BCOM during high index exposure periods.

Panels A and B demonstrate that return reversals among indexed commodities are highly significant economically, especially during the high index exposure period. When we focus on non-indexed commodities, a different yet robust momentum pattern emerges (see Figure 2). To

[8] Arzandeh and Frank (2019) show that the bid-ask spreads of large agricultural commodities are about one tick. In contrast, those of small agricultural commodities are slightly less than two ticks. We take a half tick as the trading cost of indexed commodities and one tick as the trading cost of non-indexed commodities.

evaluate its economic significance, we consider a momentum trading strategy. Specifically, we buy (sell) the equally weighted NIDX portfolio when its return on the previous trading day is positive (negative). We still take a position r_{t-1} so that the daily return on our strategy is simply $r_t r_{t-1}$. Panel C reports the results.

The momentum pattern on the NIDX is also economically significant. Its annual after-cost Sharpe ratio is 0.51 during the full sample period (2006–2018). Interestingly, the after-cost Sharpe ratio changes little when focusing on high index exposure periods (0.48 in Column 2). Overall, the momentum pattern of the NIDX serves as a nice placebo. The momentum here could reflect the continuing under-reaction to common shocks among non-indexed commodities, as they receive little attention from index investors.

3.2 Panel regressions

To formally test the correlation between the return serial dependence and index trading, we directly link the autocorrelation measure to (lagged) total index exposure using panel regressions in Table 4, taking advantage of the high frequency nature of our measure and our large cross-section of commodities. In particular, we regress the commodity return autocorrelations measure, $AC(1)_{it} := r_{it} r_{i,t-1}/\sigma_i^2$, on the lagged total index exposure and other controls:[9]

$$AC(1)_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \textit{Total Index Exposure}_{t-1} + \theta' \mathbf{X}_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{7}$$

[9] As we explain in Section 3.1, one can view our $AC(1)$ measure as the (minus of) day t return to a dynamic short-term reversal trading strategy, where one buys recent losers and sells recent winners, and the weight is based on the magnitude of return on day $t-1$ ($r_{i,t-1}$). In other words, day $t-1$ information determines the strategy weight at the end of day $t-1$ but should not mechanically predict the strategy return in day t.

where σ_i^2 is the sample variance of commodity i's returns,[10] and vector $\mathbf{X}$ contains each commodity's lagged log basis[11] and lagged Amihud's illiquidity as control variables following Nagel (2012), Szymanowska et al. (2014), Bianchi, Drew, and Fan (2016) and Koijen et al. (2018).[12] In particular, we use the log basis to control for the state of inventories (Gorton, Hayashi, and Rouwenhorst, 2012), and choose Amihud's illiquidity to control for liquidity due to its better performance than other low-frequency liquidity measures (Marshall, Nguyen, and Visaltanachoti, 2012). The commodity fixed effects are included in all regressions. Since there could be confounding factors (e.g., production) that affect the commodities' weights on commodity indices, which are determined on a yearly basis, we also check the cases when the year fixed effects are included in the regression.[13] We compute the commodity and day double clustered standard errors to account for potential cross-commodity and cross-time error correlations.

[Table 4 is about here.]

We confirm that the return autocorrelations of indexed commodities become more negative when total index exposure is higher. Specifically, in Column 4 of Panel A, a coefficient of -0.051 means that a one-standard-deviation increase in total index exposure makes its daily return autocorrelations 2.32% more negative for indexed commodities. In contrast, non-indexed

[10]The scaling factor in AC, σ_i^2, is a constant. Statistical inference will not be affected if we drop this constant. Thus our results are not subject to a forward-looking bias. In Table A6, we have shown results with no scaling and with σ_i^2 computed based on pre-financialization period samples. It shows that the our conclusions are robust to choices of the scaling factor.

[11]The log basis is defined as

$$Basis_{it} = [\ln(F_i(t,T_1)) - \ln(F_i(t,T_2))]/(T_2 - T_1),$$

where $F_i(t,T_1)$ and $F_i(t,T_2)$ are the futures prices of the nearest and second-nearest contracts with T_1 and T_2 as their maturities, respectively.

[12]For each commodity, we compute its illiquidity measure according to Amihud (2002):

$$Illiquidity_{it} = |r_{it}|/(\$billion)Trading\ Volume_{it}.$$

To mitigate the effect of outliers and heavily positive skewness, we first winsorize the illiquidity measure at the top 5% and then perform the standardization.

[13]We include year fixed effects instead of day fixed effects, which would have fully absorbed the daily total index exposure. The fact that ETF flows are neither highly persistent nor correlated with contemporaneous returns alleviates the concern of Stambaugh (1999) bias, which may arise from the inclusion of time fixed effects.

commodities do not show such a pattern. The different behavior between indexed and non-indexed commodities is significant, as shown in Columns 3 and 6, consistent with the notion that index trading drives the findings among indexed commodities.[14]

To make sure that the reversals go beyond the bid-ask bounce and other related market microstructure noise that primarily affects the next-day return, we rerun regression (7) using a multi-period return autocorrelations measure after skipping the next day, or $AC(2,5)_{it} := \frac{1}{4}\sum_{k=2}^{5} AC(k)_{it} = \sum_{k=2}^{5} r_{it} r_{i,t-k}/4\sigma_i^2$, as the dependent variable. $AC(2,5)$ captures the average return autocorrelations over the week net of the first day.[15] A coefficient of -0.029 in Column 10 of Panel A implies that a one-standard-deviation increase in total index exposure makes the average return autocorrelations (excluding the first lag) 1.29% more negative. The multi-period negative impact of total index exposure on the return autocorrelations indicates that the short-term return reversals are not simply driven by market microstructure noises.

Due to data limitations and heavy weights in the energy sector, the total index exposure may suffer from serious measurement error issues. This measurement error could generate an attenuation bias that pushes the coefficient estimate from positive and significant (indicating a general commodity return predictability factor) to positive and insignificant. To address this concern, we construct sectoral index exposures by averaging the individual index exposure measures by sectors:

$$Sectoral\ Index\ Exposure_{S,t} = \frac{1}{\#S}\sum_{i\in S} Index\ Exposure_{it}, \tag{8}$$

where S is a set of the commodities within the same sector, and $\#S$ is the cardinality of this set. Then, we reconduct the analysis in Panel A by replacing the total index exposure with the sectoral index exposure. Panel B shows that the sectoral index exposure measure continues to significantly

[14] We acknowledge that the indexed commodities and non-indexed commodities may have distinctive features in the covariates (see summary statistics in Table A2), which may result in the violation of parallel pre-trends assumption. In Section 4.1, we provide a more sophisticated approach to address the issue.

[15] Similar to $AC(1)$, one can also interpret the $AC(2,5)$ measure as the (minus of) day-t return to a dynamic short-term reversal trading strategy, where one buys recent losers and sells recent winners, and the weight is based on the magnitude of returns from day $t-2$ ($r_{i,t-2}$) to $t-5$ ($r_{i,t-5}$).

predict the negative future return autocorrelations while having no impact on the non-indexed commodities. Specifically, the coefficients of -0.039 and -0.012 indicate that a one-standard-deviation increase in the sectoral index exposure is associated with 2.43% and 0.73% more negative $AC(1)$ and $AC(2,5)$ tomorrow, respectively.

4 Causal Evidence

So far, we have documented a large and economically significant daily association between commodity index trading and negative return autocorrelation, which indicates price overshoots and reversals even at the index level. This section conducts additional tests to provide a causal interpretation that index trading results in negative return autocorrelation. These tests also help to address various identification concerns affecting our previous empirical analyses. These concerns include (1) violation of parallel pre-trends assumption, (2) omitted factors, and (3) reverse causality. Below, we explain these concerns and how we address them in detail.

4.1 Synthetic matching

Both Tang and Xiong (2012) and Basak and Pavlova (2016) consider year 2004 as the start of financialization in the commodity markets. However, Figure 2 shows that the return autocorrelation of indexed commodities started to diverge from that of the non-indexed ones even before 2004. The divergence violates the parallel pre-trends assumption and raises concerns that some unobserved factors, unrelated to index trading, could also drive the difference between indexed and non-indexed commodities.

To address the pre-trend concerns and to better construct a control group using non-indexed commodities, we employ the method of synthetic matching, which is first introduced in Abadie and Gardeazabal (2003) and Abadie, Diamond, and Hainmueller (2010), and then extended by Acemoglu et al. (2016). The basic idea behind this method is to construct portfolios of non-indexed commodities that resemble indexed commodities as closely as possible in returns (and therefore also autocorrelations) before 2004. Put differently, the synthetic matching imposes parallel pre-trends on the treatment (indexed commodities) and control (non-indexed commodities) groups.

Following Acemoglu et al. (2016), we construct a synthetic match for each indexed commodity by solving the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\{w_j^i\}_{j\in\mathcal{N}}} \sum_{t\in\text{Pre-financialization}} \left(r_{it} - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}} w_j^i r_{jt} \right)^2,$$

$$\text{s.t.} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}} w_j^i = 1, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$$

where r_{it} is the daily excess return on date t of indexed commodity i, w_j^i is the weight of non-indexed commodity j employed in the optimal weighting for indexed commodity i, and $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ denote the collection of indexed and non-indexed commodities, respectively.[16] According to Acemoglu et al. (2016), it is important that the estimation window does not include the period of intervention (i.e., financialization) and it is typically selected as some period prior to the intervention. Therefore, we use ten years ending one year prior to 2004, namely, from January 1993 to December 2002, as our estimation window. After finding the optimal weights (see Table A4) through iteration for each indexed commodity, the return for the synthetic commodity is constructed as:

$$r_{it}^s = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}} \widehat{w}_j^i r_{jt}, \tag{9}$$

and the return autocorrelation is computed as $AC(1)_t^s = r_{it}^s r_{it-1}^s / \sigma_i^{s2}$ where σ_i^{s2} is the sample variance of commodity i's synthetic commodity's returns.

Figure 4 displays the yearly median gaps in average AC(1) between the indexed commodities and their synthetic counterparts during the period 1993–2018.[17] We extract the trend in daily AC(1) gap by moving average the series with a 10-year backward rolling window. Figure 4 clearly

[16] Following Abadie (2021), we do not impose the "convex hull" assumption by allowing the portfolio weights to be negative. This relaxation is economically meaningful as investors can short the commodity futures easily.

[17] We use the median as it is more robust against outliers than the mean. In addition, we study the cross-sectional average of AC(1)s because it aligns with the panel regression setting in (7) where the coefficient is constant across commodities. The constant coefficient just corresponds to the "mean group" in heterogeneous panels (Pesaran and Smith, 1995).

suggests that financialization had a significantly negative effect on return autocorrelations, and that this effect increased in time.[18]

[Figure 4 is about here.]

To formally verify the parallel pre-trends assumption and alleviate the concern of overfitting, we adopt a cross-validation procedure by iteratively leaving one year out from 1993 to 2002 as our validation sample, and then estimate the portfolio weights with the remaining nine-year sample. Figure 5 displays yearly median of the average AC(1) gaps between the indexed commodities and the synthetic indexed commodities of the validation sample and its corresponding 95% confidence interval.[19] For example, the median gap for year 2000 is estimated using the nine-year sample of 1993-1999 and 2001-2002. The cross-validation result clearly shows that the median gap is not significantly different from zero, or our synthetic matches track the trends of indexed commodities in return autocorrelations sufficiently well over the pre-financialization period, and our results in Table 5 are not subject to overfitting.

[Figure 5 is about here.]

To evaluate the marginal effect of index trading, we replace the non-indexed commodities with the synthetic commodities for the placebo test, we rerun the panel regression analysis in Table 4. Following Abadie, Diamond, and Hainmueller (2010), we exclude all the control variables and year fixed effects in the regressions and summarize the results in Table 5.

[Table 5 is about here.]

Evidently, both market-level and sectoral-specific index exposure exhibit significantly negative impacts on the return autocorrelations of index commodities while showing no effects on the

[18] Since the commodity financialization is a continuing process instead of an event with a specific origination year, its impact is not necessarily to emerge immediately after 2004. Figure 2 also shows that the return autocorrelation coefficients of commodity indices become significantly negative after 2006.

[19] The confidence interval for the median is constructed by following Conover (1999, pp.137).

synthetic commodities. The differences between the coefficients are significantly large and comparable (above 70%) to those in Table 4.

4.2 Weight differences across two indices

Could omitted factors drive this link between index trading and negative daily return autocorrelations? In the past 15 years, institutional investors might have simply become more willing to invest in a basket of certain commodities as an asset class. Such investment demand would result in correlated order flows across these commodities, and thus negative commodity portfolio return autocorrelations regardless of whether commodity-indexed products have been introduced. It may simply be a coincidence that part of that correlated order flow is also satisfied through indexed products (rather than through trading the underlying commodity futures directly). One could even argue that the commodity-indexed products were introduced precisely to cater to correlated demand from institutional investors in trading these commodities (that are chosen to be included in the GSCI and BCOM).

While such a correlated demand story could explain the low-frequency trends, it is harder to justify the high-frequency relation (between the index exposure measure and negative daily return autocorrelations) in Table 4. An increasing trend toward investing in broad commodity baskets is unlikely to be highly correlated with abnormal trading activities in two specific commodity indices on a day-to-day basis. Nevertheless, we conduct an additional test to pin down the causality from index trading to index return autocorrelations.

This test is similar in spirit to those in Greenwood (2008) that take advantage of the different weighting schemes across two Japanese equity indices. Similar to the case of equity indices, the same commodity can receive different weights across GSCI and BCOM. This relative weighting is determined at the beginning of the year and then held constant throughout the year. Therefore, a testable implication of index trading goes as follows: for commodities overweighted in BCOM (relative to GSCI), daily return autocorrelations should be more negatively correlated with the trading measure on BCOM (relative to that on GSCI).

We implement the test by constructing a portfolio ("BCOM OW portfolio") based on the commodity's overweight in BCOM. We first compare commodity i's weight in BCOM, $w_{jy(t)}^{BCOM}$, to its weight in GSCI, $w_{jy(t)}^{BCOM}$:

$$OW_{jy(t)} = w_{jy(t)}^{BCOM} - w_{jy(t)}^{GSCI}, \tag{10}$$

where $y(t)$ is the year of date t. Then, we pick the top 5 overweighted commodities (B5) and take a position of $\varpi_{jt} = -OW_{jy(t-1)} r_{j,t-1}$ on each commodity j on day t and obtain the portfolio return

$$R_t^{OW} = \sum_{j \in B5} \varpi_{jt} r_{jt} = -\sum_{j \in B5} OW_{jy(t-1)} \times r_{j,t-1} r_{jt},$$

where r_{jt} is the return on commodity j. We report yearly B5 components and their corresponding OWs in Table A3. Evidently, these overweighted commodities come from very different sectors and their composition changes every year. It is therefore unlikely that a specific sector or commodity drives the properties of the BCOM OW portfolio. By construction, the BCOM OW portfolio's return is higher when B5 return autocorrelations are more negative.

Next, we compute the selected commodities' GSCI and BCOM exposure separately. Similar to the individual index exposure measure introduced in equation (5), commodities' exposure on a specific commodity index is defined as each commodity's GSCI/BCOM market share times the total trading volume and then detrended with a 250-day backward rolling window. To compute the market share of a specific commodity index, we first employ Hamilton and Wu (2015)'s method to estimate indexed commodities' open interest on that index (see Appendix A.2 for more details). Then, we obtain commodity i's GSCI/BCOM market share as well as its index exposure on GSCI/BCOM as follows:

$$\textit{Index Market Share}_{it}^{p} = \frac{\textit{Open Interest}_{it}^{p}}{\textit{Open Interest}_{it}^{All}}, \tag{11}$$

$$\textit{Index Trading Volume}_{it}^{p} = \textit{Index Market Share}_{it}^{p} \times \textit{Trading Volume}_{it}, \tag{12}$$

$$\textit{Index Exposure}_{it}^{p} = \text{standardize}\left\{\textit{Detrended Index Trading Volume}_{it}^{p}\right\}, \tag{13}$$

where $p \in \{GSCI, BCOM\}$. Then we obtain the portfolio's exposure on GSCI and BCOM by aggregating the selected commodities' GSCI and BCOM exposure measure, respectively, i.e.,

$$Index\ Exposure_t^p = \sum_{j \in B5} OW_{jy(t-1)} \times Index\ Exposure_{jt}^p, \quad p \in \{GSCI, BCOM\}. \tag{14}$$

Finally, we regress the BCOM OW portfolio return on the lagged GSCI and BCOM exposure measures with controls:

$$R_t^{OW} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot Index\ Exposure_{t-1}^{GSCI} + \beta_2 \cdot Index\ Exposure_{t-1}^{BCOM} + \theta' \mathbf{X}_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \tag{15}$$

where $\mathbf{X}$ is a vector of portfolio-level control variables that are aggregated from the commodity-level variables using OW as the weight. Since index weights are based on liquidity and production for BCOM and GSCI respectively, $\mathbf{X}$ includes measures of liquidity and productions to control for forces directly related to BCOM overweights. As it is a time-series regression, we adjust the standard errors using Newey-West covariance estimator that are robust to heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation.

[Table 6 is about here.]

The results in Table 6 strongly support a causal interpretation that index trading drives negative index return autocorrelations. The BCOM OW portfolio returns are significantly positively correlated with the BCOM exposure. This suggests that, for commodities that are relatively overweighted in BCOM, their daily return autocorrelations are indeed more negatively correlated with index exposure to BCOM rather than GSCI (χ^2-statistic of 4.05 and p-value of 0.04). The results still hold after excluding the roll weeks.

In unreported analyses, we find that the results continue to hold using different liquidity measures as the control variables, and during December only. The latter result suggests that it is index trading rather than omitted fundamental factors that is driving negative return autocorrelation. Recall that the relative weight differences are determined at the beginning of the year and held constant throughout that year and the overweighted commodities change every year. This means that the fundamental factors causing the weight differences at the beginning of the year will be less relevant towards the end of the year.

4.3 ETF arbitrage

While the second test exploits differential index trading across two commodity indices, our third test zooms into a specific form of index trading: commodity index ETF arbitrage. When the ETF is temporarily overpriced (underpriced) relative to its underlying commodity index, arbitrageurs will sell/create (buy/redeem) ETF shares and buy (sell) the underlying indexed commodities, thus propagating the price pressure from the ETF to the underlying. As the positive price pressure reverts subsequently, we should observe return reversals among the underlying indexed commodities. Following Brown, Davies, and Ringgenberg (2021), we employ the net creation and redemption activities on the commodity index ETFs or commodity index ETF flows to proxy for such ETF arbitrage activity.

We collect data of four major index-tracking commodity ETFs, i.e., DJP, GSG, USCI, and DBC, from January 1, 2007 to November 6, 2018 from the Bloomberg terminal.[20] We use commodity ETF flows to create a commodity non-fundamental demand index (CNFDI). Specifically, for each ETF i, we calculate its weekly ETF flows as the change in shares outstanding $\Delta_{it} = SO_{it}/SO_{it-1} - 1$. We conduct our analyses at weekly rather than daily frequency because daily creation and redemption activities are potentially measured with errors.[21] Nevertheless, the weekly setting aligns with the multi-period return autocorrelation results in Table 4, and shows return reversal to last up to a week. Finally, we compute the AUM-weighted average of the ETF

[20] The iPath Bloomberg Commodity Index Total Return ETN (DJP) is designed to track the Bloomberg Commodity Index Total Return. The iShares S&P GSCI Commodity-Indexed Trust (GSG) is designed to track the S&P GSCI Total Return. The Invesco DB Commodity Index Tracking Fund (DBC) is designed to track the DBIQ Optimum Yield Diversified Commodity Index Excess Return. The United States Commodity Index Fund (USCI) is designed to track the SummerHaven Dynamic Commodity Index Total Return. While we refer to all four index products "ETFs," strictly speaking, DJP is an ETN, which is a structured product issued as a senior debt note. The difference between ETF and ETN, however, is less relevant for our flow analyses in this subsection.

[21] See Brown, Davies, and Ringgenberg (2021) for a detailed discussion of the measurement issues.

flows as

$$CNFDI_t = \sum_i \omega_{it} \Delta_{it}, i \in \{DJP, GSG, USCI, DBC\}, \tag{16}$$

where $\omega_{it} = AUM_{i,t-1} / \sum_i AUM_{i,t-1}$. By construction, CNFDI measures the aggregate index trading on the underlying commodities coming from ETF arbitrage activities.

Using the CNFDI measure, we conduct the following weekly panel predictive regressions by regressing the week t's excess return on the week t CNFDI and week $t-1$ CNFDI with controls, respectively:[22]

$$r_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot CNFDI_t + \theta' \mathbf{X}_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{17}$$

$$r_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot CNFDI_{t-1} + \theta' \mathbf{X}_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{18}$$

where **X** is a vector of control variables that contains the log basis and Amihud illiquidity.

[Table 7 is about here.]

Table 7 confirms that the non-fundamental demand for commodity ETFs predicts a strong return reversal of indexed commodities. Specifically, a one-standard-deviation increase in CNFDI is associated with an average of 0.48% increase in the current-week indexed commodity returns and an average of −0.10% decrease in the following-week indexed commodity returns. Importantly, no such return reversal is observed among non-indexed commodities. The result suggests that ETF arbitrage, as a specific form of index trading, propagates non-fundamental shocks only to indexed commodities. It is consistent with the findings in Ben-David, Franzoni, and Moussawi (2018) that ETF arbitrage channels serial dependence in ETF products into the underlying securities as liquidity providers hedge their exposure to the index products by taking an offsetting position in the underlying.

Our ETF-based test also rules out a reverse causality concern that the predictable return reversal

[22] To mitigate the outliers, we winsorize 1% of the CNFDI measure at the top and bottom 0.5 percentiles each.

in the future causes index trading today. Crucially, if index trading occurs in order to explore return reversal, we would expect index traders to buy (sell) before a positive (negative) return reversal. This intuition is contradictive to what we have found: ETF arbitrageurs' buying (selling) of the underlying indexed commodities predicts negative (positive) returns on these commodities.

5 Digesting Results and Sentiment Spillover

So far, we have presented novel empirical evidence that index trading exposure results in negative daily return autocorrelations among indexed commodities. To help us digest these empirical facts, we present a stylized model of commodity index trading in Appendix A.3. In the model, index traders propagate non-fundamental shocks to indexed commodities, giving rise to price overshoots and subsequent reversals and so negative return autocorrelations. The model makes a testable prediction. To the extent we can measure the non-fundamental shocks, such shocks should negatively predict the next-period return of indexed commodity. As a placebo test, non-fundamental shocks should not be correlated with future returns on non-indexed commodities. In the third causal test, we focus on a specific form of non-fundamental shock propagated by ETF arbitrage. In this section, we test this prediction more broadly using cross-sectoral news-based sentiment ("connected sentiment") as the non-fundamental shock.

The news data we use come from the Thomson Reuters News Analytics – Commodities data (TRNA-C). TRNA-C data provide three news tones (positive, negative, and neutral) for each piece of commodity news and the sample coverage starts in January 2006.[23] Averaging all the news tones on each piece of news in a trading day for each commodity, we obtain a daily panel of three news tones for each commodity.

For each commodity, we first regress the *minus negative* news tone on its first lag and the

[23] According to the TRNA-C manual, news tones are calculated based on a neural network algorithm and reported accuracy is around 75%.

day-of-week dummies by running the following regression:

$$-Tone_t^{Neg} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot (-Tone_{t-1}^{Neg}) + \beta_2 \cdot Day\text{-}of\text{-}week_t + \varepsilon_t. \tag{19}$$

We focus on *negative* news tones as Tetlock (2007) points out that negative tones are better measured in most of the textual data. We take the minus negative tone to align with the noise signal α in the theoretical model. Wang, Zhang, and Zhu (2018) show that news has a "momentum" effect (i.e., current news sentiment depends significantly on its lagged level). Hafez (2009, 2011) and Healy and Lo (2011) have reported strong seasonality in news flows at various sampling frequencies (e.g., intrahour, intraday, and intraweek). Therefore, we include the lagged news tones and day-of-week dummies to ease the potential momentum effect and seasonality in news tones.

We then treat the residual of the regression ($\widehat{\varepsilon_t}$) as the sentiment measure for each commodity. Table A5 shows the descriptive statistics of our sentiment measure for each commodity. Evidently, crude oil receives more news coverage than other commodities. The sentiment measures have zero means by construction. Their average standard deviation is 0.062 ranging from 0.031 for oat (O-) and rough rice (RR) to 0.112 for orange juice (JO).

The sentiment measure for commodity i likely contains fundamental shocks to that commodity. To study the sentiment propagation across the indexed commodities, we construct a "connected" sentiment measure that mostly captures non-fundamental shocks for each commodity. Take corn (C-) for example. To construct its "connected" sentiment on day t, we take a weighted average of the sentiment measures on all indexed commodities from other sectors on that day:

$$Cnn.\ Sentiment_{it} = \sum_{j \notin S(i)} W_{jy(t)} Sentiment_{jt}, \tag{20}$$

where $S(i)$ is the set that collects commodities within the same sector of commodity i and the weight $W_{jy(t)}$ is defined as

$$W_{jy(t)} = \frac{E_{y(t)}(\$Open\ Interest_{jt}^{Idx})}{\sum_j E_{y(t)}(\$Open\ Interest_{jt}^{Idx})}, \tag{21}$$

with $E_{y(t)}(\$Open\ Interest^{Idx}_{jw(t)})$ being the average of the weekly dollar-valued open interest on index trading in year $y(t)$. In other words, the weight on "connected" indexed commodity j is determined by its average dollar-valued open interest relative to the total dollar-valued open interests across both indices.

In the above definition, the set of indexed commodities "connected" to corn only includes indexed commodities from other sectors such as energy and metals, but not other indexed commodities from the same grains sector such as soybean (S-) and wheat (W-). To the extent that a sentiment measure that includes commodities from the same sector may still contain fundamental factors common to that sector, our "connected" sentiment measure is more likely to be dominated by sentiment or idiosyncratic fundamental shocks from other commodities (α and $\theta_{i'}$ in the stylized model presented in Appendix A.3).[24] It is possible that the "connected" sentiment measure may still contain fundamental shocks common to all commodities (including those off the index), for example, the business cycle factors can influence demand and supply of all commodities. But if such shocks dominate, the "connected" sentiment measure should not negatively predict future indexed commodity returns as fundamental shocks do not revert.

As a placebo test, we also construct the "connected" sentiment measure for non-indexed commodities in the same fashion, except that we use an equal weighting scheme (to replace equation (21)) as in the construction of the NIDX. According to our stylized model, the "connected" sentiment should positively correlate with contemporaneous indexed commodity returns but negatively predict future indexed commodity returns. In addition, it should not predict the returns on non-indexed commodities.

We now test these predictions by running the following day/commodity panel regressions for

[24] As shown by Casassus, Liu, and Tang (2012), different commodities from the same sector are likely to have fundamental relationships of production (e.g., heating oil and crude oil) and substitution (e.g., Chicago wheat and Kansas wheat).

indexed and non-indexed commodities separately:

$$r_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot Cnn.\ Sentiment_{it} + \theta' \mathbf{X}_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{22}$$

$$r_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot Cnn.\ Sentiment_{i,t-1} + \theta' \mathbf{X}_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{23}$$

where **X** is a vector of the control variables including the lagged log basis and lagged Amihud illiquidity. Both the commodity fixed effects and the year fixed effects are also controlled for in the regression. Szymanowska et al. (2014) find that the log basis, volatility, and liquidity might serve as determinants of the risk premium in commodity markets. We thus use these variables as controls. To assess the difference between the coefficients for indexed and non-indexed commodities, we also run the regressions with an interaction term between the "connected" sentiment measure and a dummy variable (1 for indexed commodities and 0 for non-indexed commodities). Table 8 reports the results.

[Table 8 is about here.]

Focusing on Panel A, we confirm the positive and significant contemporaneous relation between the indexed commodity return and its "connected" sentiment measure in Column 1. Our "connected" sentiment measure may still contain "fundamental" information that affects all commodities, explaining why its contemporaneous return correlation is also positive and significant for non-indexed commodities in Column 2, where index trading is not possible. Nevertheless, the positive coefficient (16.089) is significantly larger than that for non-indexed commodities (9.576), consistent with the notion that index trading propagates noise, in addition to fundamental information, across commodities within the same index.

Panel B shows the negative and significant return predictability of the "connected" sentiment measure, but for indexed commodities only. The coefficient of "connected" sentiments is likely to capture the impact of noise propagation. For instance, a predictive coefficient of -1.026 (t-statistic of -2.92) on the "connected" sentiment measure implies that a one-standard-deviation increase in the sentiment of "connected" indexed commodities propagates a noise that reverts by 2.3 basis points the next day. Column 2 in Panel B does not show any significant return predictability among non-indexed commodities. The difference between indexed and non-indexed commodities is also large (-1.588) and statistically significant, as shown in the third column of Panel B.

Turning to the control variables, consistent with Szymanowska, De Roon, Nijman, and Van Den Goorbergh (2014) and Gorton, Hayashi, and Rouwenhorst (2012), the lagged log basis makes a positive prediction (although insignificant) on the commodity returns listed in Table 8, while liquidity showing no significant predictive power for commodity returns on a daily frequency. Consistent with Table 9 in Kang, Rouwenhorst, and Tang (2020), the R^2 of the predictive panel regression is generally small for futures markets, i.e. in the neighbourhood of several tenths of a percent.

If index trading propagates sentiment and creates price pressure at the index level, we should observe a stronger effect when index trading exposure is abnormally high. To test this conjecture, we divide the sample into two subsamples based on the total index exposure measure defined in the previous section. Specifically, we classify a trading day whose total index exposure is above or below zero as a "High" (H) and "Low" (L) index exposure period, respectively. We then rerun the previous regression analyses in the "H" and "L" subperiods separately:

$$r_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \textit{Cnn. Sentiment}_{it} + \theta' \mathbf{X}_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad t \in \{H, L\}, \tag{24}$$

$$r_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \textit{Cnn. Sentiment}_{i,t-1} + \theta' \mathbf{X}_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad t \in \{H, L\}. \tag{25}$$

Both the commodity fixed effects and the year fixed effects are controlled for in the regression. Table 9 reports the results.

[Table 9 is about here.]

Focusing on the sentiment return predictability results in Panel B, we find that the return reversal is only significant during the "High" period for indexed commodities. The coefficient of the sentiment measure is -1.712 (t-statistic of -3.59) on trading days with high index trading. The economic magnitude is large. A coefficient of -1.712 implies that a one-standard-deviation increase in the sentiment of connected indexed commodities propagates a noise of 4.0 basis points. Consistent with the notion that index trading results in price overshoots and reversals, when we focus our attention on non-indexed commodities, we observe no return reversals in either "High" or "Low" index exposure periods. In fact, non-indexed commodities have a significantly negative coefficient in the "Low" index exposure period, indicating a delayed reaction to the negative sentiment that results in momentum instead of reversal.

Our results using news-based sentiment thus support the predictions from a stylized model and provide a concrete economic mechanism that generates negative daily return autocorrelations even at the index level. Specifically, index trading propagates "non-fundamental" noise across commodities in the same index, it creates correlated price overshoots and reversals at a daily frequency.

6 Robustness Checks

In this section, we perform extensive robustness checks of our main results using different regression specifications, different subsamples (excluding the energy sector, financial crisis, or index rolling periods), and different measures.

6.1 Decomposition of indexed trading

Considering our index exposure measure is a detrended product of the total trading volume and index market share, a natural concern is that our results could be driven by the total trading volume component rather than the index market share. To address this concern, we rerun regression (7) by separately including the two components of the index exposure measure (as in equation (4)). In particular, we use the sector-specific index market shares as the explanatory variable for non-indexed commodities and estimate the model with and without the day fixed effects and control variables.

The results in Table A7 show that both components are important for driving the autocorrelation of indexed commodity returns. The economic magnitude of both components is significant: the coefficients of -0.366 and -0.255 in Column 6 indicate that a one-standard-deviation increase in each component results in a decrease in daily return autocorrelations by 4.00% and 2.86%, respectively. Hence, our results are not solely driven by the index traders market share or the total trading volume. Consistent with the previous analysis, both components show no significant impact on the return autocorrelations in non-indexed commodities. This placebo result confirms that our analysis is robust to different specifications of the index exposure measure.

6.2 Individual index exposure

Since individual index exposure is not necessarily high when total index exposure is high, we conduct the following daily panel regression of each commodity's serial dependence measure on the lagged individual index exposure measure and controls for robustness:

$$AC(1)_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \mathit{Index\ Exposure}_{i,t-1} + \theta' \mathbf{X}_{i,t-1} + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{26}$$

where $\mathit{Index\ Exposure}_{i,t-1}$ is the index exposure for commodity i at date $t-1$, and $\mathbf{X}$ is a vector of control variables. We run the panel regression for indexed and non-indexed commodities separately and use total index exposure as non-indexed commodities' index exposure.

Table A8 shows two sets of interesting results. First, we observe negative and significant coefficients of the index exposure measure only for indexed commodities. In other words, abnormally high index trading today implies a more negative correlation between the indexed commodity return today and that tomorrow, consistent with the notion that index trading results in price pressure at the index level today and that such price pressure is reverted tomorrow. The economic magnitude of such an effect is large. In terms of the economic magnitude, a coefficient of -0.023 in Column 2 means that a one-standard-deviation increase in index exposure makes its daily return autocorrelations 2.05% more negative.

Second, to the extent that negative return autocorrelations reflect price overshoots and reversals, we expect it to be stronger when liquidity is poor (see, e.g., Campbell, Grossman, and Wang, 1993; Nagel, 2012). Columns 5 and 6 confirm this conjecture. The coefficients of the interaction term between lagged index exposure and the indicator for high illiquidity are negative and highly significant. In other words, when index investors trade illiquid commodities, their trading more likely generates negative return autocorrelations for those commodities in the index. Columns 7 and 8 again show no such interaction among non-indexed commodities.

6.3 Index rolling activity

Unlike equity index funds that invest directly in underlying assets, commodity index funds trade futures contracts instead, which requires them to unwind maturing contracts before they expire and roll their positions to the contracts with later maturity dates. According to the rolling schedule of the GSCI and BCOM, both indices shift the basket of contracts from the nearest to the second-nearest contracts at a rate of 20% per day on the fifth to ninth business days in each month. This routine rolling activity results in abnormally high index trading volumes during the roll period that would likely affect our index exposure measure. Therefore, it is important to ensure that our results are not driven by these roll dates.

For each commodity, we identify the week containing the roll date of its continuous contract, which is the seventh calendar day of the maturity month. Using this setting, we can cover most of the index roll dates without affecting the return structure of the continuous contract. We then rerun the panel regressions in Table 4 on a sample excluding roll weeks and report the results in Table A9. The results, when excluding roll weeks, are similar to those using the whole sample, suggesting that index rolling is not the driver of our findings.

In addition, we reconduct the analyses in Table A7 and report the results in A10. This table shows that our results are jointly robust to different index exposure definitions and commodity index-rolling activities.

6.4 Energy sector

Since there are zero energy commodities in the non-index sample, one may question whether the results are due to a time-varying energy-specific factor. This is especially concerning because energy carries an enormous weight in the commodity indexes, and energy commodities behaved wildly during the sample period. To address this concern, we reconduct the analysis in Table 4 and A7 by excluding the commodities from the energy sector. The results in Table A11 and A12 exhibit a similar pattern to those using the whole sample, suggesting that our findings are not solely driven by the energy commodities.

6.5 Financial crisis

The financial crisis may drive some of our results. Hence, following Tang and Xiong (2012), we choose the period from September 15, 2008, when Lehman Brothers filed for bankruptcy, to June 30, 2009, the trough of the business cycle identified by the NBER, as the period of the financial crisis. We then rerun the regressions in Tables 4 and 8 excluding the financial crisis period, with the results reported in Tables A13 and A14. Our robustness check results are consistent with those in Tables 4 and 8. That is, through index investment, connected news sentiment leads to a price overshoot and a subsequent reversal and index exposure decreases in futures return autocorrelations. On the contrary, non-indexed commodities do not have such effects.

6.6 Net news tone

In Section 5, we use the minus negative news tone in the regression, and as a robustness check, we rerun the regression in Tables 8 and 9 using net news tone (positive tone minus negative tone). Tables A15 and A16 present the results. Again, using net news tone, we obtain results similar to those with minus negative tones (as shown in Tables 8 and 9).

7 Conclusion

We provide causal evidence of the recent financialization in commodity markets on the return serial dependence of indexed commodities. We first document a striking divergence between the daily return autocorrelation of indexed commodities and non-indexed commodities. While the autocorrelation of non-indexed commodities has become slightly more positive, the autocorrelation of commodity indices had switched to become negative when financialization began. We present novel causal evidence that exposure to index trading results in negative daily return autocorrelations among commodities in that index. The reason is that index trading can propagate non-fundamental noises to indexed commodities, giving rise to price overshoots and subsequent reversals, consistent with the prediction of a stylized model. We present direct evidence for such noise propagation using news sentiment data.

Given the attractive risk-return tradeoff and diversification benefits associated with commodity index investments, the commodity financialization process can be expected to continue. We do not dispute such benefits. Instead, we highlight an unexpected side effect to these benefits, as negative serial dependence in commodity index returns signals excessive price comovements, even at the index level. Price overshooting and the subsequent reversal could impose costs on institutional investors who trade often and individual investors who invest in commodities through those institutions. Our results agree with the theoretical studies Sockin and Xiong (2015) and Goldstein and Yang (2021), which propose that index traders can inject unrelated noise into futures prices and diminish market efficiency. They also suggest that proactive investors can generate economically significant profits by providing liquidity to index traders on a systematic basis.

References

Abadie, A., 2021. Using synthetic controls: Feasibility, data requirements, and methodological aspects. Journal of Economic Literature 59, 391–425.

Abadie, A., Diamond, A., Hainmueller, J., 2010. Synthetic Control Methods for Comparative Case Studies: Estimating the Effect of Californias Tobacco Control Program. Journal of the American Statistical Association 105, 493–505.

Abadie, A., Gardeazabal, J., 2003. The Economic Costs of Conflict: A Case Study of the Basque Country. American Economic Review 93, 113–132.

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., Kermani, A., Kwak, J., Mitton, T., 2016. The Value of Connections in Turbulent Times: Evidence from the United States. Journal of Financial Economics 121, 368–391.

Amihud, Y., 2002. Illiquidity and Stock Returns: Cross-section and Time-series Effects. Journal of Financial Markets 5, 31–56.

Arzandeh, M., Frank, J., 2019. Price Discovery in Agricultural Futures Markets: Should We Look beyond the Best Bid-Ask Spread? American Journal of Agricultural Economics 101, 1482–1498.

Baker, M., Stein, J. C., 2004. Market Liquidity As a Sentiment Indicator. Journal of Financial Markets 7, 271–299.

Baker, M., Wurgler, J., 2006. Investor Sentiment and the Cross-section of Stock Returns. Journal of Finance 61, 1645–1680.

Baltussen, G., van Bekkum, S., Da, Z., 2019. Indexing and Stock Market Serial Dependence around the World. Journal of Financial Economics 132, 26–48.

Barberis, N., Shleifer, A., Wurgler, J., 2005. Comovement. Journal of Financial Economics 75, 283–317.

Basak, S., Pavlova, A., 2016. A Model of Financialization of Commodities. Journal of Finance 71, 1511–1556.

Ben-David, I., Franzoni, F., Moussawi, R., 2018. Do ETFs Increase Volatility? Journal of Finance 73, 2471–2535.

Bianchi, R. J., Drew, M. E., Fan, J. H., 2016. Commodities Momentum: A Behavioral Perspective. Journal of Banking & Finance 72, 133–150.

Bond, P., García, D., 2021. The Equilibrium Consequences of Indexing. Review of Financial Studies, forthcoming.

Brogaard, J., Ringgenberg, M., Sovich, D., 2019. The Economic Impact of Index Investing. Review of Financial Studies 32, 3461–3499.

Brown, D. C., Davies, S. W., Ringgenberg, M. C., 2021. ETF Arbitrage, Non-fundamental Demand, and Return Predictability. Review of Finance 25, 937–972.

Büyükşahin, B., Harris, J. H., 2011. Do Speculators Drive Crude Oil Futures Prices? The Energy Journal 32, 167–202.

Campbell, J. Y., Grossman, S. J., Wang, J., 1993. Trading Volume and Serial Correlation in Stock Returns. Quarterly Journal of Economics 108, 905–939.

Casassus, J., Liu, P., Tang, K., 2012. Economic Linkages, Relative Scarcity, and Commodity Futures Returns. Review of Financial Studies 26, 1324–1362.

Cen, L., Wei, K. C. J., Yang, L., 2017. Disagreement, Underreaction, and Stock Returns. Management Science 63, 1214–1231.

Chen, H., Noronha, G., Singal, V., 2004. The Price Response to S&P 500 Index Additions and Deletions: Evidence of Asymmetry and a New Explanation. Journal of Finance 59, 1901–1930.

Chen, Y., Dai, W., Sorescu, S. M., 2021. A Hiding Place? Diversification, Financialization, and Return Comovement in Commodity Markets. Working Paper (Texas A&M University), Available at SSRN 3287568 .

Cheng, I.-H., Xiong, W., 2014. Financialization of Commodity Markets. Annual Review of Finance and Economics 6, 419–441.

Conover, W. J., 1999. Practical Nonparametric Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, third ed.

Da, Z., Shive, S., 2018. Exchange Traded Funds and Asset Return Correlations. European Financial Management 24, 136–168.

Eyster, E., Rabin, M., Vayanos, D., 2019. Financial Markets Where Traders Neglect the Informational Content of Prices. Journal of Finance 74, 371–399.

Gilbert, C. L., 2010. How to Understand High Food Prices. Journal of Agricultural Economics 61, 398–425.

Goldstein, I., Yang, L., 2021. Commodity Financialization and Information Transmission. Journal of Finance, forthcoming.

Gorton, G. B., Hayashi, F., Rouwenhorst, K. G., 2012. The Fundamentals of Commodity Futures Returns. Review of Finance 17, 35–105.

Greenwood, R., 2008. Excess Comovement of Stock Returns: Evidence from Cross-sectional Variation in Nikkei 225 Weights. Review of Financial Studies 21, 1153–1186.

Greenwood, R. M., 2005. A Cross Sectional Analysis of the Excess Comovement of Stock Returns. HBS Finance Research Paper No. 05-069 .

Hafez, P. A., 2009. Detection of Seasonality Patterns in Equity News Flows. Tech. rep., RavenPack.

Hafez, P. A., 2011. How News Events Impact Market Sentiment. Handbook of News Analytics in Finance pp. 129–146.

Hamilton, J. D., Wu, J. C., 2015. Effects of Index-fund Investing on Commodity Futures Prices. International Economic Review 56, 187–205.

Han, Y., Kong, L., 2020. The Serial Dependence of the Commodity Futures Returns: A Machine Learning Approach. Working Paper (University of North Carolina at Charlotte), Available at SSRN 3536046 .

Healy, A. D., Lo, A. W., 2011. Managing Real-time Risks and Returns: The Thomson Reuters NewsScope Event Indices. Handbook of News Analytics in Finance pp. 73–109.

Henderson, B. J., Pearson, N. D., Wang, L., 2015. New Evidence on the Financialization of Commodity Markets. Review of Financial Studies 28, 1285–1311.

Hirshleifer, D., Lim, S. S., Teoh, S. H., 2011. Limited Investor Attention and Stock Market Misreactions to Accounting Information. Review of Asset Pricing Studies 1, 35–73.

Hirshleifer, D., Teoh, S. H., 2003. Limited Attention, Information Disclosure, and Financial Reporting. Journal of Accounting and Economics 36, 337–386.

Hong, H., Kubik, J. D., Fishman, T., 2012. Do Arbitrageurs Amplify Economic Shocks? Journal of Financial Economics 103, 454–470.

Hong, H., Stein, J. C., 1999. A Unified Theory of Underreaction, Momentum Trading, and Overreaction in Asset Markets. Journal of Finance 54, 2143–2184.

Irwin, S. H., Sanders, D. R., 2012. Testing the Masters Hypothesis in Commodity Futures Markets. Energy Economics 34, 256–269.

Israeli, D., Lee, C. M. C., Sridharan, S. A., 2017. Is There a Dark Side to Exchange Traded Funds? an Information Perspective. Review of Accounting Studies 22, 1048–1083.

Kang, W., Rouwenhorst, K. G., Tang, K., 2020. A Tale of Two Premiums: The Role of Hedgers and Speculators in Commodity Futures Markets. Journal of Finance 75, 377–417.

Koijen, R., Moskowitz, T. J., Pedersen, L. H., Vrugtd, E. B., 2018. Carry. Journal of Financial Economics 127, 197–225.

Marshall, B. R., Nguyen, N. H., Visaltanachoti, N., 2012. Commodity Liquidity Measurement and Transaction Costs. Review of Financial Studies 25, 599–638.

Masters, M. W., 2008. Testimony before Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the United States Senate. Tech. rep., Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

Mou, Y., 2011. Limits to Arbitrage and Commodity Index Investment: Front-running the Goldman

Roll. Working Paper (Columbia University), Available at SSRN 1716841 .

Nagel, S., 2012. Evaporating Liquidity. Review of Financial Studies 25, 2005–2039.

Pesaran, M. H., Smith, R., 1995. Estimating long-run relationships from dynamic heterogeneous panels. Journal of Econometrics 68, 79–113.

Ready, M., Ready, R. C., 2021. Order Flows and Financial Investor Impacts in Commodity Futures Markets. Review of Financial Studies, forthcoming.

Singleton, K. J., 2013. Investor Flows and the 2008 Boom/Bust in Oil Prices. Management Science 60, 300–318.

Sockin, M., Xiong, W., 2015. Informational Frictions and Commodity Markets. Journal of Finance 70, 2063–2098.

Stambaugh, R. F., 1999. Predictive regressions. Journal of Financial Economics 54, 375–421.

Stoll, H. R., Whaley, R. E., 2010. Commodity Index Investing and Commodity Futures Prices. Journal of Applied Finance 20, 7–47.

Szymanowska, M., De Roon, F., Nijman, T., Van Den Goorbergh, R., 2014. An Anatomy of Commodity Futures Risk Premia. Journal of Finance 69, 453–482.

Tang, K., Xiong, W., 2012. Index Investment and the Financialization of Commodities. Financial Analysts Journal 68, 54–74.

Tetlock, P., 2007. Giving Content to Investor Sentiment: The Role of Media in the Stock Market. Journal of Finance 62, 1139–1168.

Wang, Y., Zhang, B., Zhu, X., 2018. The Momentum of News. Working Paper (Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen), Available at SSRN 3267337 .

Yan, L., Irwin, S. H., Sanders, D. R., 2019. Is the Supply Curve for Commodity Futures Contracts Upward Sloping? Working Paper (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), Available at SSRN 3360787 .



Figure 1: Average Return Correlations of Indexed and Non-index Commodities. This figure plots the average return correlations of commodities in the GSCI and BCOM indices (indexed commodities) and those not included in these indices (non-indexed commodities). We follow Tang and Xiong (2012) to compute these correlations. Specifically, we first calculate an equal-weighted index for each sector of indexed and non-indexed commodities, then the average correlation among five sector indices for an annual rolling window. Since there are no non-indexed commodities in energy and livestock sectors, we take heating oil and RBOB and lean hogs as non-indexed commodities due to their small weights in the index. The sample period is from 1980 to 2018.



Figure 2: First-order Return Autocorrelations of Commodity Indices and Equal-weighted Portfolio of Non-indexed Commodities. This figure plots the evolution of serial dependence in index returns from 1980 to 2018. Serial dependence is measured by first-order autocorrelation using a 10-year backward rolling window from index returns at the daily frequency. The indices are GSCI, BCOM and an equal-weighted portfolio of non-indexed commodities (NIDX).



Figure 3: Total Index Exposure. This figure plots the daily total index exposure from 2007 to 2018. The total index exposure is calculated by averaging the individual index exposure, which is the standardized detrended index trading volume.



Figure 4: Return Autocorrelation Gap. This figure plots the yearly median of the smoothed average AC(1) gap between the indexed commodities and the synthetic portfolios based on a 10-year backward rolling window. Each indexed commodity's AC(1) gap is computed with the AC(1)s of indexed commodity subtracting the AC(1)s of the corresponding matched portfolio.



Figure 5: Cross-validated Pre-financialization Return Autocorrelation Gap. This figure plots the yearly median of the average AC(1) gap between the indexed commodities and the matched portfolios using the cross-validated sample in the pre-financialization period. We compute each indexed commodity's AC(1) gap with the AC(1)s of indexed commodity subtracting the AC(1)s of the corresponding matched portfolio. The shaded area is the corresponding 95% confidence interval.

Table 1: Detailed List of Commodities for Analysis

This table provides a detailed list of the commodities studied in this paper and their basic information. The futures contracts of these commodities are all traded in the United States. The commodities that are included in both indices are classified as "Indexed" commodities, while commodities not included in any indices are classified as "Non-indexed" commodities.

Ticker	Name	Full Name	Exchange	Inception	GSCI	BCOM	CIT	Indexed	Non-indexed
Panel A: Energy									
CL	Crude Oil	Crude Oil, WTI / Global Spot	NYMEX	1983/03/30	✓	✓		✓	
HO	Heating Oil	ULSD NY Harbor	NYMEX	1978/11/14	✓	✓		✓	
NG	Natural Gas	Natural Gas, Henry Hub	NYMEX	1990/04/04	✓	✓		✓	
RB	Gasoline	Gasoline, Blendstock	NYMEX	2005/10/03	✓	✓		✓	
Panel B: Grains									
BO	Soybean Oil	Soybean Oil / Crude	CBOT	1959/07/01		✓	✓	—	—
C-	Corn	Corn / No. 2 Yellow	CBOT	1959/07/01	✓	✓	✓	✓	
KW*	KC Wheat	Wheat / No. 2 Hard Winter	CBOT	1970/01/05	✓	*	✓	—	—
MW	Minn Wheat	Wheat / Spring 14% Protein	MGEX	1979/01/02					✓
O-	Oat	Oats / No. 2 White Heavy	CBOT	1959/07/01					✓
RR	Rough Rice	Rough Rice #2	CBOT	1986/08/20					✓
S-	Soybean	Soybeans / No. 1 Yellow	CBOT	1959/07/01	✓	✓	✓	✓	
SM*	Soybean Meal	Soybean Meal / 48% Protein	CBOT	1959/01/07		*	*		✓
W-	Wheat	Wheat / No. 2 Soft Red	CBOT	1959/07/01	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Panel C: Livestock									
FC	Feeder Cattle	Cattle, Feeder / Average	CME	1971/11/30	✓		✓	—	—
LC	Live Cattle	Cattle, Live / Choice Average	CME	1964/11/30	✓	✓	✓	✓	
LH	Lean Hogs	Hogs, Lean / Average Iowa/S Minn	CME	1966/02/28	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Panel D: Metals									
GC	Gold	Gold	NYMEX	1974/12/31	✓	✓		✓	
HG	Copper	Copper High Grade / Scrap No. 2 Wire	NYMEX	1959/01/07	✓	✓		✓	
PA	Palladium	Palladium	NYMEX	1977/01/03					✓
PL	Platinum	Platinum	NYMEX	1968/03/04					✓
SI	Silver	Silver 5,000 Troy Oz.	NYMEX	1963/06/12	✓	✓		✓	
Panel E: Softs									
CC	Cocoa	Cocoa / Ivory Coast	ICE	1959/07/01	✓		✓	—	—
CT	Cotton	Cotton / 1-1/16"	ICE	1959/07/01	✓	✓	✓	✓	
JO	Orange Juice	Orange Juice, Frozen Concentrate	ICE	1967/02/01					✓
KC	Coffee	Coffee 'C' /Colombian	ICE	1972/08/16	✓	✓	✓	✓	
LB	Lumber	Lumber / Spruce-Pine Fir 2x4	CME	1969/10/01					✓
SB	Sugar	Sugar #11/World Raw	ICE	1961/01/04	✓	✓	✓	✓	

*Note: KW and SM are both included in BCOM from 2013. Since SM is included in BCOM from 2013, its position on index trading is reported in CIT report since 2013. BO, KW, FC and CC are neither indexed commodities nor non-indexed commodities according to our classification criteria.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Commodities' Returns

This table provides some descriptive statistics of each commodity/index' daily returns (after winsorization) in columns 2-7. In column 8, we calculate the annualized Sharpe ratio (scaled by $\sqrt{252}$) of each commodity. NIDX denotes the equal-weighted portfolio of non-indexed commodities. The sample is of daily frequency ranging from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018.

Commodity	Observations	Mean	StDev.	Min	Max	AR(1)	Sharpe Ratio
Panel A: Energy							
CL	3,979	−0.03%	0.021	−0.074	0.072	−0.063	−0.222
HO	3,979	−0.01%	0.019	−0.063	0.065	−0.039	−0.046
NG	3,979	−0.13%	0.027	−0.083	0.096	−0.056	−0.780
RB	3,979	0.01%	0.021	−0.072	0.067	−0.034	0.049
Panel B: Grains							
BO	3,991	0.00%	0.014	−0.045	0.050	0.017	−0.016
C-	3,991	0.01%	0.018	−0.055	0.060	0.024	0.120
KW	3,991	−0.01%	0.019	−0.055	0.061	0.027	−0.053
MW	3,991	0.04%	0.017	−0.052	0.058	0.067	0.370
O-	3,991	0.04%	0.020	−0.061	0.067	0.095	0.291
RR	3,991	−0.01%	0.014	−0.040	0.048	0.084	−0.108
S-	3,991	0.04%	0.015	−0.052	0.049	0.015	0.443
SM	3,991	0.07%	0.017	−0.057	0.054	0.028	0.657
W-	3,991	−0.02%	0.020	−0.064	0.067	0.010	−0.116
Panel C: Livestock							
FC	3,981	0.00%	0.010	−0.030	0.030	0.074	0.048
LC	3,981	0.00%	0.010	−0.028	0.029	0.027	0.043
LH	3,991	−0.01%	0.014	−0.043	0.044	0.053	−0.119
Panel D: Metals							
GC	3,979	0.03%	0.011	−0.038	0.036	−0.015	0.398
HG	3,979	0.02%	0.018	−0.064	0.060	−0.061	0.189
PA	3,979	0.06%	0.019	−0.070	0.061	0.046	0.513
PL	3,979	0.00%	0.014	−0.050	0.041	0.029	0.049
SI	3,979	0.03%	0.020	−0.076	0.059	−0.039	0.245
Panel E: Softs							
CC	3,971	0.04%	0.018	−0.060	0.057	0.006	0.332
CT	3,953	0.02%	0.017	−0.056	0.055	0.078	0.145
JO	3,971	0.04%	0.020	−0.066	0.065	0.106	0.297
KC	3,971	−0.01%	0.019	−0.059	0.061	−0.025	−0.119
LB	3,991	−0.05%	0.018	−0.046	0.051	0.090	−0.444
SB	3,971	−0.01%	0.020	−0.066	0.057	0.000	−0.106
Panel F: Commodity Indices							
GSCI	3,992	−0.02%	0.014	−0.083	0.075	−0.040	−0.245
BCOM	3,986	−0.02%	0.011	−0.062	0.058	−0.031	−0.247
NIDX	3,992	0.02%	0.009	−0.047	0.044	0.073	0.420

Table 3: Contrarian (Momentum) Trading Strategy Based on Short-term Return Reversal (Continuation) of GSCI/BCOM (NIDX)

This table presents the descriptive statistics of implementing a time-series contrarian (momentum) strategy based on short-term return reversals (continuation) of commodity indices (non-indexed portfolios). For contrarian (momentum) strategy, we sell (buy) the GSCI/BCOM (NIDX) when the past daily return is positive and buy (sell) the GSCI/BCOM (NIDX) when the past daily return is negative. The daily trading position of each index is $|r_{t-1}^{p}|$, $p \in \{\text{GSCI, BCOM, NIDX}\}$, respectively. The portfolio is rebalanced on a daily basis. To account for the trading cost, we use the weighted average of one tick bid-ask spreads for indexed commodities (1.04 bps for GSCI and 1.26 bps for BCOM) and the weighted average of two ticks bid-ask spreads for non-indexed commodities (7.74 bps for NIDX). The high index exposure refers to the period when total index exposure is above zero. The real-time index exposure is calculated using a window of the past 250 days instead of a full sample for standardization. The averaged daily returns and the standard deviations are reported in basis points. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018.

Panel A: Reverse Portfolio (GSCI)

	Full Sample	High Index Exposure (Real-time)
Mean Return (bf. Cost)	0.093	0.105
Standard Deviation (bf. Cost)	2.977	2.318
Annualized Sharpe Ratio (bf. Cost)	0.494	0.719
Mean Return (aft. Cost)	0.085	0.100
Standard Deviation (aft. Cost)	2.976	2.317
Annualized Sharpe Ratio (aft. Cost)	0.452	0.687

Panel B: Reverse Portfolio (BCOM)

	Full Sample	High Index Exposure (Real-time)
Mean Return (bf. Cost)	0.035	0.052
Standard Deviation (bf. Cost)	1.473	1.187
Annualized Sharpe Ratio (bf. Cost)	0.380	0.695
Mean Return (aft. Cost)	0.028	0.048
Standard Deviation (aft. Cost)	1.472	1.186
Annualized Sharpe Ratio (aft. Cost)	0.305	0.640

Panel C: Momentum Portfolio (NIDX)

	Full Sample	High Index Exposure (Real-time)
Mean Return (bf. Cost)	0.070	0.045
Standard Deviation (bf. Cost)	1.021	0.783
Annualized Sharpe Ratio (bf. Cost)	1.088	0.920
Mean Return (aft. Cost)	0.033	0.024
Standard Deviation (aft. Cost)	1.021	0.782
Annualized Sharpe Ratio (aft. Cost)	0.516	0.479

Table 4: Return Serial Dependence and Commodities' Total/Sectoral Index Exposure

This table presents the results of regressing commodities serial dependence measures on commodities' total index exposure (panel A) and sectoral index exposure (panel B), respectively. We use two serial dependence measures, i.e., $AC(1)$ and $AC(2,5)$. $AC(1)$ is defined as $(r_{it}r_{i,t-1})/\sigma_i^2$ and $AC(2,5)$ is defined as $(\sum_{k=2}^{5} r_{it}r_{it-k})/4\sigma_i^2$. The total index exposure is the average of the indexed commodities' individual index exposure. The index trading share is defined as the ratio of indexed open interest to the total open interest for a certain commodity. The sectoral index exposure is the average of the indexed commodities' individual index exposure by sectors. The index trading volume for a certain commodity is the production of the market trading volume and its corresponding index trading share. The index exposure is thus obtained by detrending the index trading volume with its past 250-day average and then standardizing the time series. "Indexed" is a dummy variable, which equals 1 when the commodity is indexed and 0 otherwise. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t -statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

Panel A: Total Index Exposure

	$AC(1)$						$AC(2,5)$					
Variables	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All
L.Total Index Exposure	−0.036***	0.007	0.007	−0.051***	0.004	−0.007	−0.027***	−0.006	−0.006	−0.029***	−0.010	−0.007
	(−2.99)	(0.43)	(0.43)	(−3.83)	(0.22)	(−0.39)	(−3.74)	(−0.62)	(-0.62)	(−3.54)	(−0.88)	(−0.71)
L.(Total Index Exposure			−0.044**			−0.038*			−0.021*			−0.023*
× Indexed)			(−2.09)			(−1.81)			(−1.70)			(−1.86)
L.Basis				0.578*	3.204***	1.166***				−0.167	−0.704	−0.281
				(1.78)	(3.97)	(3.77)				(−0.78)	(−1.20)	(−1.33)
L.Illiquidity				−0.008	0.030***	0.008				0.004	0.002	0.003
				(−0.85)	(3.10)	(1.19)				(0.78)	(0.44)	(0.82)
Intercept	−0.007	0.073***	0.021***	−0.005	0.080***	0.026***	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.003	0.003
	(−1.43)	(10.21)	(4.90)	(−0.83)	(10.07)	(5.27)	(1.33)	(0.85)	(1.57)	(1.05)	(0.55)	(1.10)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	44,715	23,874	68,589	44,579	23,516	68,095	44,643	23,866	68,509	44,507	23,508	68,015
# of Commodities	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23
Overall R^2	0.17%	0.07%	0.26%	0.24%	0.59%	0.36%	0.06%	0.02%	0.04%	0.09%	0.10%	0.07%

Table 4 (Cont'd): Return Serial Dependence and Commodities' Total/Sectoral Index Exposure

Panel B: Sectoral Index Exposure

	$AC(1)$						$AC(2,5)$					
Variables	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All
L.Sectoral Index Exposure	−0.031***	0.008	0.008	−0.039***	0.014	0.002	−0.012**	0.001	0.001	−0.012**	0.000	0.002
	(−3.55)	(0.55)	(0.55)	(−4.17)	(0.98)	(0.17)	(−2.50)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(−2.20)	(0.02)	(0.33)
L.(Sectoral Index Exposure			−0.038**			−0.037**			−0.013*			−0.015*
× Indexed)			(−2.37)			(−2.26)			(−1.70)			(−1.67)
L.Basis				0.620**	2.687***	1.107***				−0.162	−0.609	−0.252
				(2.04)	(3.60)	(3.81)				(−0.80)	(−1.13)	(−1.27)
L.Illiquidity				−0.009	0.032***	0.009				0.004	0.003	0.003
				(−0.92)	(3.29)	(1.33)				(0.74)	(0.49)	(0.85)
Intercept	−0.007	0.073***	0.021***	−0.005	0.079***	0.026***	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.003	0.003
	(−1.43)	(10.21)	(4.90)	(−0.81)	(9.99)	(5.24)	(1.33)	(0.85)	(1.57)	(1.05)	(0.61)	(1.16)
Sectoral FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	44,715	23,874	68,589	44,579	23,516	68,095	44,643	23,866	68,509	44,507	23,508	68,015
# of Sectors	5	3	5	5	3	5	5	3	5	5	3	5
# of Commodities	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23
Overall R^2	0.13%	0.04%	0.15%	0.21%	0.52%	0.26%	0.03%	0.00%	0.02%	0.06%	0.07%	0.04%

Table 5: Causality Test: Synthetic Matching

This table presents the causality result of regressing the indexed/synthetic commodities serial dependence measure on the lagged total/sectoral index exposure. The serial dependence measure $AC(1)$ is defined as $(r_{it} r_{i,t-1})/\sigma_i^2$ and the total index exposure is the average of the indexed commodities' individual index exposure. For each indexed commodity, its synthetic match is the weighted average of non-indexed commodities that minimizes the mean squared errors between the excess returns over the pre-financialization period. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively. The pre-financialization sample ranges from January 4, 1993 to December 31, 2002. The regression uses the sample ranging from January 3, 2007 to November 6, 2018

	Dependent Variable: AC(1)					
Variables	Indexed	Synthetic	All	Indexed	Synthetic	All
L.Total Index Exposure	−0.036***	−0.007	−0.007			
	(−2.99)	(−0.49)	(−0.49)			
L.(Total Index Exposure × Indexed)			−0.030*			
			(−1.66)			
L.Sectoral Index Exposure				−0.031***	−0.001	−0.001
				(−3.55)	(−0.09)	(−0.09)
L.(Sectoral Index Exposure × Indexed)						−0.030**
						(−2.37)
Intercept	−0.007	0.067***	0.030***	−0.007	0.067***	0.030***
	(−1.43)	(12.71)	(8.09)	(−1.43)	(12.71)	(8.08)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	—
Sector FE	—	—	—	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	44,715	44,775	89,490	44,715	44,775	89,490
# of Commodities	15	15	30	15	15	30
# of Sectors	5	5	5	5	5	5
Overall R^2	0.17%	0.02%	0.21%	0.13%	0.01%	0.04%

Table 6: Causality Test: Overweighted Portfolio and Index Exposure

This table presents the causality result of regressing the BCOM overweighted portfolio return on the portfolio's GSCI and BCOM exposure. The BCOM overweighted portfolio is constructed by the top 5 indexed commodities (B5) with the largest relative BCOM weights ($OW_{jy(t)} = w^{BCOM}_{jy(t)} - w^{GSCI}_{jy(t)}$) at the beginning of each year. We hold a position of $-OW_{jy(t-1)}r_{jt-1}$ of each B5 commodity and the portfolio return is thus given by $-\sum_{j\in B5} OW_{jy(t-1)}r_{jt-1}r_{jt}$. The portfolio's index exposure on GSCI/BCOM is the sum of B5 commodity's GSCI(BCOM) index exposure weighted by OW. Each commodity's GSCI(BCOM) index exposure is the standardized version of detrended GSCI(BCOM) index trading volume with the past 250-day average. GSCI(BCOM) index trading volume is estimated by multiplying its total trading volume by the ratio of GSCI(BCOM) index open interest (see Appendix A.2) to its total open interest. The control variables include the lagged log basis, lagged illiquidity, lagged-year world production quantity (Ly.WPQ) and the lagged-year world production average (Ly.WPA). Each commodity's WPQ is normalized by its year 2000 WPQ and WPA of year $y(t)$ is the average of $\text{WPQ}_{y(t)-8:y(t)-4}$ according to GSCI manual. All the control variables are aggregated to portfolio level based on the OW of each commodity. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis in are based on Newey-West standard errors with optimal lags. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively. The sample ranges from January, 2007 to November, 2018.

	Full Sample		Exclude Roll Weeks	
Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
L.GSCI Exposure	−0.039	−0.040	−0.016	−0.017
	(−0.80)	(−0.82)	(−0.29)	(−0.32)
L.BCOM Exposure	0.124**	0.126**	0.150**	0.152**
	(2.04)	(2.06)	(2.34)	(2.36)
L.Portfolio Basis	21.121*	21.301*	23.582*	23.803*
	(1.94)	(1.95)	(1.77)	(1.78)
L.Portfolio Illiquidity	0.173	0.180	0.204	0.213
	(1.17)	(1.20)	(0.98)	(1.02)
Ly.Portfolio WPQ	0.246		0.338	
	(0.86)		(1.04)	
Ly.Portfolio WPA		0.352		0.422
		(1.09)		(1.21)
Intercept	0.008	−0.015	−0.013	−0.028
	(0.11)	(−0.18)	(−0.15)	(−0.32)
# of Observations	2,985	2,985	2,519	2,519
Adjusted R^2	0.41%	0.42%	0.50%	0.51%
χ^2-Stat. (GSCI = BCOM)	4.05**	4.17**	3.77*	3.90**

Table 7: Causality Test: ETF Arbitrage

This table presents the causality result of regressing the weekly commodities returns (in %) on the contemporaneous or lagged non-fundamental demand index for commodity ETFs (CNFDI). The CNFDI is defined as the AUM-weighted average of the changes in shares outstanding of four index-tracking ETFs, i.e., DJP, GSG, USCI, and DBC. In each regression, CNFDI is standardized to have zero mean and unit variance. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity-month double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively. The sample ranges from January, 2007 to November, 2018.

	All		Indexed		Non-indexed	
Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
CNFDI	0.493***		0.480***		0.518***	
	(11.55)		(8.91)		(7.44)	
L.CNFDI		−0.069*		−0.103**		−0.007
		(−1.66)		(−2.01)		(−0.10)
L.Basis	−0.531	−0.757	−1.741	−2.041	3.373	3.317
	(−0.22)	(−0.31)	(−0.66)	(−0.78)	(0.55)	(0.54)
L.Illiquidity	−0.047	−0.043	−0.055	−0.048	−0.040	−0.041
	(−1.11)	(−1.00)	(−0.91)	(−0.79)	(−0.69)	(−0.69)
Intercept	0.021	0.025	−0.033	−0.028	0.115*	0.117*
	(0.56)	(0.66)	(−0.68)	(−0.58)	(1.82)	(1.83)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	14,181	14,158	9,273	9,258	4,908	4,900
# of Commodities	23	23	15	15	8	8
Overall R^2	2.08%	0.95%	2.12%	1.01%	2.09%	0.92%

Table 8: Spillover Effect of Sentiment on Returns across Indexed/Non-indexed Commodities

This table presents the results of regressing commodities returns (in %) on the "connected" sentiment. We first get each commodity's news sentiment as the residuals from regressing the *minus negative* news tones on its first lag and the day-of-week dummies. We then obtain the "connected" sentiment for an indexed commodity by taking a value-weighted average of indexed commodities from other sectors. For "connected" sentiment of non-indexed commodities, we take a simple average on the sentiment of non-indexed commodities from other sectors. "Indexed" is a dummy variable, which equals 1 when the commodity is indexed and 0 otherwise. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

	Panel A: Contemporaneous			Panel B: Predictive		
Variables	Indexed	Non-indexed	All	Indexed	Non-indexed	All
Cnn. Sentiment	16.089***	9.576***	9.580***			
	(44.98)	(19.15)	(19.25)			
Cnn. Sentiment × Indexed			6.098***			
			(10.03)			
L.Cnn. Sentiment				−1.026***	0.587	0.585
				(−2.92)	(1.20)	(1.20)
L.(Cnn. Sentiment × Indexed)						−1.584***
						(−2.65)
L.Basis	0.278	1.491	0.566	0.330	1.339	0.566
	(0.56)	(1.55)	(1.29)	(0.67)	(1.38)	(1.28)
L.Illiquidity	0.004	0.019	0.007	−0.003	0.016	0.004
	(0.42)	(1.59)	(0.90)	(−0.30)	(1.32)	(0.58)
Intercept	0.006	0.035***	0.016**	0.002	0.032***	0.013*
	(0.69)	(3.20)	(2.41)	(0.22)	(2.86)	(1.87)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	51,784	27,526	79,310	51,770	27,521	79,291
# of Commodities	15	8	23	15	8	23
Overall R^2	4.19%	1.68%	3.30%	0.18%	0.22%	0.19%

Table 9: Spillover Effect of Sentiment on Returns across Indexed/Non-indexed Commodities under High/Low Total Index Exposure Episode.

This table presents the results of regressing commodities returns (in %) on connected sentiment measures under different levels of total index exposure. The total index exposure is the average of the indexed commodities' individual index exposure. The index trading share is defined as the ratio of indexed open interest to the total open interest for a certain commodity. The index trading volume for a certain commodity is the production of the market trading volume and its corresponding index trading share. The index exposure is thus obtained by detrending the index trading volume with its past 250-day average and then standardizing the time series. We characterize the period when total index exposure is above(below) zero as "High"("Low") exposure period. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

	Panel A: Contemporaneous				Panel B: Predictive			
	Indexed		Non-indexed		Indexed		Non-indexed	
Variables	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Cnn. Sentiment	15.843***	16.234***	8.790***	10.193***				
	(31.89)	(31.37)	(12.66)	(14.10)				
L.Cnn. Sentiment					−1.712***	−0.169	−0.561	1.735**
					(−3.59)	(−0.32)	(−0.84)	(2.42)
L.Basis	0.178	0.519	0.734	1.807	0.098	0.707	0.443	1.763
	(0.26)	(0.72)	(0.53)	(1.34)	(0.14)	(0.98)	(0.32)	(1.31)
L.Illiquidity	−0.008	0.024	0.006	0.034**	−0.021	0.024	−0.001	0.035**
	(−0.62)	(1.54)	(0.37)	(2.00)	(−1.59)	(1.50)	(−0.07)	(2.07)
Intercept	−0.007	0.024*	0.063***	−0.000	0.020*	−0.015	0.067***	−0.013
	(−0.55)	(1.87)	(4.06)	(−0.03)	(1.66)	(−1.17)	(4.28)	(−0.82)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	28,136	23,648	14,998	12,528	28,122	23,648	14,993	12,528
# of Commodities	15	15	8	8	15	15	8	8
Overall R^2	3.87%	4.86%	1.34%	2.30%	0.27%	0.49%	0.17%	0.61%

Appendices

Appendix A.1 summarizes the variables and notations used in the paper. Appendix A.2 describes how to estimate the open interest on indexed trading of non-reported indexed commodities. Appendix A.3 provides a stylized model that formalizes our hypotheses and findings. Appendix A.4 reports the additional descriptive statistics to the main variables in the body text. Appendix A.5 presents the robustness results on the decomposition of index exposure, individual index exposure, index rolling activity, energy sector, financial crisis, and net news tone, respectively.

A.1 Summary of the Variables and Notations

Table A1: Summary of the Variables and Notations

Variable/Notation	Definition
$y(t)$, $w(t)$	Year of time t, Week of time t (Tuesday-Tuesday)
$S(i)$, Idx	Sector of commodity i, Set of indexed commodities
$F_i(t,T)$	Futures price of commodity i at time t with maturity T
$Long^{Idx}_{iw(t)}, Short^{Idx}_{iw(t)}$	Index trader's long (short) position of commodity i in week $w(t)$
Return	$r_{it} = (F_i(t,T) - F_i(t-1,T))/F_i(t-1,T)$
Return autocorrelation	$AC(1)_{it} = r_{it}r_{i,t-1}/\sigma_i^2$ and $AC(2,5)_{it} = (\sum_{k=2}^{5} r_{it}r_{it-k})/4\sigma_i^2$
Log basis	$Basis_{it} = (\ln(F_i(t,T_1)) - \ln(F_i(t,T_2)))/(T_2 - T_1)$
Amihud's illiquidity	$Illiquidity_{it} = \lvert r_{it}\rvert/(\$billion)\ Trading\ Volume_{it}$
World production quantity	$WPQ_{iy(t)} = World\ Production_{iy(t)}/World\ Production_{i,2000}$
World production average	$WPA_{iy(t)} = \frac{1}{5}\sum_{s=4}^{8} WPQ_{i,y(t)-s}$
Index open interest	$Open\ Interest^{Idx}_{iw(t)} = Long^{Idx}_{iw(t)} + Short^{Idx}_{iw(t)}$
Index market share	$Index\ Market\ Share_{it} = Open\ Interest^{Idx}_{i,w(t)-1}/Open\ Interest^{All}_{i,w(t)-1}$
Index trading volume	$Index\ Trading\ Volume_{it} = Index\ Market\ Share_{it} \times Trading\ Volume_{it}$
Detrended index trading volume	$Index\ Trading\ Volume_{it} - \frac{1}{250}\sum_{k=1}^{250} Index\ Trading\ Volume_{i,t-k}$
Individual index exposure	$Index\ Exposure_{it} = \text{standardize}\{Detrended\ Index\ Trading\ Volume_{it}\}$
Total index exposure	$Total\ Index\ Exposure_{it} = \frac{1}{I}\sum_{i=1}^{I} Index\ Exposure_{it}$
Sectoral index exposure	$Sectoral\ Index\ Exposure_{it} = \frac{1}{\#S(i)}\sum_{i\in S(i)} Index\ Exposure_{it}$
News sentiment	News tone orthogonal to news momentum and day-of-week effects.
Value weight	$W_{jy(t)} = E_{y(t)}(\$Open\ Interest^{Idx}_{jt})/\sum_j E_{y(t)}(\$Open\ Interest^{Idx}_{jt})$
Connected sentiment	$Cnn.\ Sentiment_{it} = \sum_{S(j)\neq S(i)} W_{jy(t)} Sentiment_{jt}$

A.2 Details on Estimating the Positions of Non-reported Indexed Commodities in CIT Report

Masters (2008) and Hamilton and Wu (2015) proposed to estimate the unreported index trading positions by making use of the reported data and their weights in each commodity index. Taking crude oil (CL) as an example, the general idea of Masters (2008) is to use the fact that both GSCI and BCOM have their own uniquely included commodities, i.e. soybean oil (BO) and soybean meal (SM)[25] in BCOM and cocoa (CC), feeder cattle (FC) and Kansas wheat (KW)[26] for GSCI. Then, note that index traders replicate the index by allocating capital across commodities according to their known weights[27] $\delta_{jy(t)}^{(i)}, i \in \{G, B\}$, we can separately estimate CL's dollar value long/short positions on index trading, $X_{CL,t}$, on GSCI/BCOM trading as below:

$$\widehat{X}_{CL,t}^{B} = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\delta_{CL,y(t)}^{B}}{\delta_{BO,y(t)}^{B}} X_{BO,t}, & \text{if } y(t) < 2013, \\ \dfrac{1}{2}\left(\dfrac{\delta_{CL,y(t)}^{B}}{\delta_{BO,y(t)}^{B}} X_{BO,t} + \dfrac{\delta_{CL,y(t)}^{B}}{\delta_{SM,y(t)}^{B}} X_{SM,t}\right), & \text{if } y(t) \geq 2013. \end{cases} \tag{A1}$$

$$\widehat{X}_{CL,t}^{G} = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{3}\left(\dfrac{\delta_{CL,y(t)}^{G}}{\delta_{CC,y(t)}^{G}} X_{CC,t} + \dfrac{\delta_{CL,y(t)}^{G}}{\delta_{FC,y(t)}^{G}} X_{FC,t} + \dfrac{\delta_{CL,y(t)}^{G}}{\delta_{KW,y(t)}^{G}} X_{KW,t}\right), & \text{if } y(t) < 2013, \\ \dfrac{1}{2}\left(\dfrac{\delta_{CL,y(t)}^{G}}{\delta_{CC,y(t)}^{G}} X_{CC,t} + \dfrac{\delta_{CL,y(t)}^{G}}{\delta_{FC,y(t)}^{G}} X_{FC,t}\right), & \text{if } y(t) \geq 2013. \end{cases} \tag{A2}$$

where $y(t)$ denotes the year of day t. Note that the weights of commodities in an index are determined at the beginning of a year and stay the same during the year. Thus, the dollar-valued position of index trading for commodity i on day t is estimated as

$$X_{it} = Position_{iw(t)} \times ContractSize_{i} \times Price_{it}. \tag{A3}$$

Combining the estimates above, Masters (2008) propose to estimate the dollar-valued position

[25] Soybean meal (SM) is included in BCOM since 2013.
[26] Kansas wheat (KW) is included in BCOM since 2013 while always being included in GSCI.
[27] Both weights reported in the GSCI and BCOM manuals are dollar value weights.

of CL on index trading as:

$$\widehat{X}_{CL,t}^{Idx} = \widehat{X}_{CL,t}^{B} + \widehat{X}_{CL,t}^{G}. \tag{A4}$$

However, as pointed out by Irwin and Sanders (2012), Masters' estimator is severely biased when there is a huge difference between $\frac{\delta^G_{CL,y(t)}}{\delta^G_{CC,y(t)}} X_{CC,t}$, $\frac{\delta^G_{CL,y(t)}}{\delta^G_{FC,y(t)}} X_{FC,t}$ and $\frac{\delta^G_{CL,y(t)}}{\delta^G_{KW,y(t)}} X_{KW,t}$. To deal with this issue, Hamilton and Wu (2015) propose to generalize Masters' method by using all the reported commodities' positions for estimation. Specifically, they choose $\widehat{X}^G_{it}$ and $\widehat{X}^B_{it}$ to minimize the sum of squared discrepancies in predicting the CIT reported value for X_{it} across 12 commodities. Thus, the estimated dollar value positions on index trading for commodity i in day t is given by

$$\widehat{X}_{it}^{Idx} = \begin{bmatrix} \delta^G_{iy(t)} & \delta^B_{iy(t)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \left(\delta^G_{jy(t)}\right)^2 & \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^G_{jy(t)}\delta^B_{jy(t)} \\ \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^B_{jy(t)}\delta^G_{jy(t)} & \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \left(\delta^B_{jy(t)}\right)^2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^G_{jy(t)} X^{Idx}_{jt} \\ \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^B_{jy(t)} X^{Idx}_{jt} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{A5}$$

where $\delta_{jy(t)}$ is the weight of a commodity j in a certain index in year $y(t)$, and the superscripts G and B denote the index GSCI and BCOM, respectively. From equation (A5) we obtain both the long and short dollar-valued long/short index positions for unreported commodities, and thus the index open interest.

In addition, we can easily modify Hamilton and Wu (2015) method to estimate the non-reported indexed commodities' dollar-valued GSCI/BCOM trading position as below:

$$\widehat{X}_{it}^{G} = \begin{bmatrix} \delta^G_{iy(t)} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \left(\delta^G_{jy(t)}\right)^2 & \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^G_{jy(t)}\delta^B_{jy(t)} \\ \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^B_{jy(t)}\delta^G_{jy(t)} & \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \left(\delta^B_{jy(t)}\right)^2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^G_{jy(t)} X^{Idx}_{jt} \\ \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^B_{jy(t)} X^{Idx}_{jt} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{A6}$$

$$\widehat{X}_{it}^{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \delta^B_{iy(t)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \left(\delta^G_{jy(t)}\right)^2 & \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^G_{jy(t)}\delta^B_{jy(t)} \\ \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^B_{jy(t)}\delta^G_{jy(t)} & \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \left(\delta^B_{jy(t)}\right)^2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^G_{jy(t)} X^{Idx}_{jt} \\ \sum\limits_{j\in CIT} \delta^B_{jy(t)} X^{Idx}_{jt} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{A7}$$

A.3 A Model of Commodity Financialization and Return Autocorrelations

We consider an economy with three dates ($t \in \{0,1,2\}$) and three commodities ($k \in \{1,2,3\}$). This is the simplest setting for our purpose. First, we need at least three dates to consider return autocorrelations. As will become clear shortly, all the meaningful interactions happen on date 1 and the key of our analysis is to figure out the date-1 futures prices. Date 2 will be the payoff date and the prices are exogenously given. We introduce private information on date 1, and information arrival causes price variations. On date 0, no information is developed and thus the futures prices are constant. Second, we need at least three commodities to consider index versus non-index commodities. We assume that there exist futures contracts on the commodities, with maturity date 2. Futures contracts 1 and 2 belong to a commodity index, while contract 3 is not included in the index.

For commodity k, its futures' date-2 liquidation value v_k is the commodity's date-2 spot price. We assume that

$$v_k = \theta_k + \varepsilon_k, \tag{A8}$$

where $\theta_k \sim N\left(0, \sigma_\theta^2\right), \varepsilon_k \sim N\left(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2\right)$, and σ_θ and σ_ε are positive constants. Component θ_k is observable by some traders on date 1, while ε_k represents non-forecastable residual uncertainty. We assume that $\{\theta_k, \varepsilon_k\}_{k=1}^3$ are mutually independent. If we interpret spot prices as the fundamentals of futures contracts, then the futures contracts are mutually independent across commodities.

On dates 0 and 1, the futures contracts and a risk-free bond are traded in a competitive financial market. The bond serves as the numeraire, and so its price is always one and its return is zero. We use p_k^t to denote the date-t price of futures contract k for $k \in \{1,2,3\}$ and $t \in \{0,1,2\}$. There is also a tradable futures index composed of commodities 1 and 2 (with weights w_1 and w_2, respectively). No-arbitrage implies that the index's date-2 payoff V and date-t price P^t are, respectively,

$$V = w_1 v_1 + w_2 v_2, \tag{A9}$$

$$P^t = w_1 p_1^t + w_2 p_2^t, \text{ for } t \in \{1,2\}. \tag{A10}$$

On date 0, the futures prices are determined by the trading behavior of a unit mass of buy-and-hold investors,[28] who derive constant-absolute-risk-aversion (CARA) utility over their date-2 wealth with risk aversion $\gamma_B > 0$. On date 1, three groups of traders—informed traders, uninformed traders, and index traders—trade the futures contracts.

Informed traders trade all of the three futures contracts (as well as the index) and derive CARA utility with risk aversion $\gamma_I > 0$. These traders are informed because they observe private information $\{\theta_k\}_{k=1}^{3}$ prior to trading. The mass of informed traders is λ_I. Uninformed traders also trade all of the three futures contracts (as well as the index), but do not have private information. These traders derive CARA utility over their date-2 wealth with risk aversion $\gamma_U > 0$. The population mass of uninformed traders is λ_U. Uninformed traders serve to generate price momentum because they are assumed not to extract information from prices. Essentially, these traders behave in a way similar to the "newswatchers" in Hong and Stein (1999), the "underreactors" in Cen, Wei, and Yang (2017), and the "cursed traders" in Eyster, Rabin, and Vayanos (2019). The literature has motivated this assumption with investors' limited ability to process information in the market (see, e.g., Hirshleifer and Teoh, 2003; Hirshleifer, Lim, and Teoh, 2011).

Index traders only trade the futures index. The mass of this group of index traders is μ_0. They have CARA preference with risk aversion $\gamma_0 > 0$. As argued in Sockin and Xiong (2015) and Goldstein and Yang (2021), index trading injects both information and noise into the futures price system. We therefore assume that index traders observe information $\{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$ and that their trading is affected by a non-fundamental shock α, where $\alpha \sim N\left(0, \sigma_\alpha^2\right)$ and α is independent of other random variables. To generate this non-fundamental-driven demand in our model, we assume that index traders perceive the index payoff V that is given by

$$V = \alpha + w_1 v_1 + w_2 v_2 = \alpha + (w_1\theta_1 + w_2\theta_2) + (w_1\varepsilon_1 + w_2\varepsilon_2). \tag{A11}$$

[28] Alternatively, we can assume that the same investors trade the futures in both periods, so that the investors can balance their portfolios on date 1. This alternative setting complicates the analysis but does not have any effect on our results. Intuitively, on date 0, investors do not have information and thus the equilibrium futures prices must be constant and therefore have no effect on return autocorrelations.

In other words, α captures index traders' private value about the index, which can come from any non-fundamental shocks that affect the trading demand of index traders. For example, it may reflect their sentiment on specific commodities in the index or on the index itself. It may also reflect fund-flow-induced price pressure triggered by their clients' liquidity needs. Importantly, index trading propagates it to all index commodities, along with information. Thus, it will affect date-1 prices of these commodities and their return autocorrelations. Formally, the date-t return on commodity k is $r_k^t \equiv p_k^t - p_k^{t-1}$ (for $k \in \{1,2,3\}$ and $t \in \{1,2\}$), and the sign of covariance $Cov(r_k^1, r_k^2)$ determines whether returns exhibit momentum or reversal, as characterized by the following proposition.

Proposition 1 (Return autocorrelations) *(a) The futures returns of non-indexed commodity* 3 *are positively autocorrelated. That is,* $Cov(r_3^1, r_3^2) > 0$.

(b) For index commodity $i \in \{1,2\}$, *we have*

$$Cov\left(r_i^1, r_i^2\right) < 0 \text{ if and only if } \mu > \hat{\mu}_i \text{ and } \frac{\sigma_\alpha^2}{\sigma_\theta^2} > \frac{\lambda w_{i'}^2\left(w_1^2 + w_2^2\right)}{\left(\lambda+1\right)^2 w_i^2},$$

where $\mu \equiv \frac{\mu_0}{\gamma_0\left(w_1^2+w_2^2\right)\sigma_\varepsilon^2}$ *is normalized mass of index traders, and*

$$\hat{\mu}_i \equiv \frac{\lambda(\lambda+1)\left((\lambda+1)w_i^2+2w_{i'}^2\right)+\sqrt{\left[\lambda(\lambda+1)\left((\lambda+1)w_i^2+2w_{i'}^2\right)\right]^2+4\lambda(\lambda+1)^2\left[(\lambda+1)^2 w_i^2\frac{\sigma_\alpha^2}{\sigma_\theta^2}-\lambda w_{i'}^2\left(w_1^2+w_2^2\right)\right]}}{2\left[(\lambda+1)^2 w_i^2\frac{\sigma_\alpha^2}{\sigma_\theta^2}-\lambda w_{i'}^2\left(w_1^2+w_2^2\right)\right]}.$$

Proposition 1 delivers the return autocorrelations patterns documented in the previous sections. For non-indexed commodity 3, its return autocorrelations are positive, as uninformed traders ignore price information that results in slow information diffusion. For indexed commodity $i \in \{1,2\}$, its date-1 and date-2 returns are

$$r_i^1 = A_i\alpha + B_i\theta_i + C\theta_{i'}, \quad r_i^2 = -A_i\alpha + \left(1-B_i\right)\theta_i - C\theta_{i'} + \varepsilon_i, \tag{A12}$$

where $A_i \in (0,\infty), B_i \in (0,1)$ and $C \in (0,1)$ are endogenous constants defined by equation (A25)-(A27) in the detailed proof at the end. Hence, fundamental news θ_i contributes to positive autocorrelation of commodity i's futures returns, while non-fundamental shock α and fundamental $\theta_{i'}$ contribute to negative autocorrelation. Note that $\theta_{i'}$ plays a similar role as the non-fundamental shock α. This is because a fundamental shock specific to commodity i', when propagated to a different commodity i in the same index, effectively becomes noise to that commodity.

Overall, equation (A12) shows that index traders propagate both information and "noise." The former reduces the positive return autocorrelation caused by slow information diffusion, while the latter introduces negative return autocorrelation. Part (b) of Proposition 1 suggests that the first effect dominates when the mass μ of index traders is small. Figure $A1$ plots the return autocorrelations of indexed commodities for parameter configuration $\sigma_\alpha^2 = 2, \sigma_\theta^2 = \sigma_\varepsilon^2 = 1, \lambda = 0.2$ and $w_1 = w_2 = 0.5$. We observe that as the effective mass μ of index traders gradually increases, the autocorrelations switch from positive to negative. This result is broadly consistent with our empirical findings connecting return autocorrelations with index trading activities (Figures 2; Tables 3 and 4).

[Figure A1 is about here.]

Our stylized model offers an even more direct test based on noise propagation. Non-fundamental shock α, should be correlated with both contemporaneous and next-period returns of each commodity in the index, but not with returns on commodities off the index. We formalize this prediction in Proposition 2.

Proposition 2 (Noise predictiveness) *Non-fundamental shock α is correlated with contemporaneous and next-period returns of indexed commodity futures, but is uncorrelated with contemporaneous and next-period returns of non-indexed commodity futures. That is, $Cov\left(r_i^1, \alpha\right) > 0$ and $Cov\left(r_i^2, \alpha\right) < 0$ for $i \in \{1,2\}$; and $Cov\left(r_3^1, \alpha\right) = Cov\left(r_3^2, \alpha\right) = 0$.*

The intuition behind Proposition 2 is simple. The positive contemporaneous correlation between non-fundamental shocks and index commodity return is due to noise propagation by index trading. Since the shock is non-fundamental, it will be reverted in the future, and as a result, it should negatively predict the next-period return of indexed commodity. As a placebo test, non-fundamental shocks should not be correlated with returns on non-indexed commodities.

Proofs of Proposition 1 and 2

To prove the propositions, we first solve for the equilibrium commodity futures prices. Since futures contracts mature on date 2, we have $p_k^2 = v_k$ for $k \in \{1,2,3\}$.[29] On date 0, a unit mass of buy-and-hold traders trade. Given that they can trade all of the three futures contracts, they can use contracts 1 and 2 to replicate the commodity index, which implies that the index contract is redundant. Thus, a buy-and-hold trader chooses her investment in the three contracts $\{Z_k\}_{k=1}^3$ to maximize her unconditional expected utility, $E\left[-e^{-\gamma_B \sum_{k=1}^3 Z_k\left(v_k - p_k^0\right)}\right]$. Noting that $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^3$ are mutually independent, we can use the CARA-normal feature to compute the demand function as follows:

$$Z_k^* = \frac{E\left(v_k\right) - p_k^0}{\gamma_B\left(\sigma_\theta^2 + \sigma_\varepsilon^2\right)}, \text{ for } k \in \{1,2,3\}. \tag{A13}$$

Combining with the market clearing-condition, $Z_k^* = 0$, we can compute the date-0 equilibrium futures prices

$$p_k^0 = 0, \text{ for } k \in \{1,2,3\}. \tag{A14}$$

We next compute the date-1 equilibrium. Informed traders and uninformed traders trade all of the three commodity futures and thus the index is redundant to them. An informed trader observes information $\{\theta_k\}_{k=1}^3$ and chooses investment in the three futures contracts $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^3$ to maximize her conditional expected utility, $E\left[-e^{-\gamma_I \sum_{k=1}^3 x_k\left(v_k - p_k^1\right)}\middle|\{\theta_k, p_k^1\}_{k=1}^3\right]$. The CARA-normal feature implies the following demand function:

$$x_k^* = \frac{\theta_k - p_k^1}{\gamma_I \sigma_\varepsilon^2}, \text{ for } k \in \{1,2,3\}. \tag{A15}$$

For notational simplicity, we normalize $\dfrac{\lambda_I}{\gamma_I \sigma_\varepsilon^2} = 1$ without loss of generality. Thus, the total demand

[29] When a description applies equally to indexed and non-indexed commodities, we use k to denote a commodity. When the description is specific about indexed commodities, we use i to denote a commodity.

from informed traders is

$$X_k^* = \lambda_I x_k^* = \theta_k - p_k^1, \text{ for } k \in \{1,2,3\}. \tag{A16}$$

Uninformed traders do not observe private information and do not extract information from prices. They choose investment in the three futures contracts to maximize unconditional expected utility. We can compute the uninformed traders' total demand for commodity futures as follows:

$$Y_k^* = \lambda \left[E(v_k) - p_k^1\right], \text{ for } k \in \{1,2,3\}, \tag{A17}$$

where λ is a normalized mass of uninformed traders, i.e., $\lambda \equiv \dfrac{\lambda_U}{\gamma_U\left(\sigma_\theta^2 + \sigma_\varepsilon^2\right)}$.

An index trader only invests in the futures index. She chooses her index demand d to maximize $E_\alpha\left[-e^{-\gamma_0\left(V-P^1\right)d}\middle|\theta_1, \theta_2, \alpha, P^1\right]$, where the operator E_α means that the index trader computes expectation based on her subjective belief (A11). We can compute the demand function as follows:

$$d^* = \frac{\alpha + (w_1\theta_1 + w_2\theta_2) - P^1}{\gamma_0\left(w_1^2 + w_2^2\right)\sigma_\varepsilon^2} = \frac{\alpha + (w_1\theta_1 + w_2\theta_2) - \left(w_1 p_1^1 + w_2 p_2^1\right)}{\gamma_0\left(w_1^2 + w_2^2\right)\sigma_\varepsilon^2}, \tag{A18}$$

where the second equation follows from (A10). Thus, the total demand from index traders is

$$D^* = \mu_0 d^* = \mu\left[\alpha + (w_1\theta_1 + w_2\theta_2) - \left(w_1 p_1^1 + w_2 p_2^1\right)\right], \tag{A19}$$

where μ is normalized mass of index traders,

$$\mu \equiv \frac{\mu_0}{\gamma_0\left(w_1^2 + w_2^2\right)\sigma_\varepsilon^2}. \tag{A20}$$

As in Goldstein and Yang (2021), we can use μ to parameterize commodity financialization. The index traders' futures demand for indexed commodity i is $w_i D^*$ (for $i \in \{1,2\}$).

The market-clearing conditions for the three commodity futures are

$$\text{Indexed commodity } i \in \{1,2\}: \qquad X_i^* + Y_i^* + w_i D^* = 0; \tag{A21}$$

$$\text{Non-indexed commodity 3:} \qquad X_3^* + Y_3^* = 0. \tag{A22}$$

Using the demand function expressions (A16), (A17) and (A19), as well as the above market-clearing conditions (A21) and (A22), we can compute the date-1 futures prices as follows:

$$\text{Indexed:} \qquad p_i^1 = A_i\alpha + B_i\theta_i + C\theta_{i'}, \text{ for } i,i' \in \{1,2\}, i \neq i'; \tag{A23}$$

$$\text{Non-indexed:} \qquad p_3^1 = \frac{1}{1+\lambda}\theta_3; \tag{A24}$$

where

$$A_i = \frac{\mu w_i (1+\lambda)}{(1+\lambda)^2 + (1+\lambda)\mu\left(w_1^2+w_2^2\right)} \in (0,\infty), \tag{A25}$$

$$B_i = \frac{1+\lambda+\mu\left[(1+\lambda)w_i^2+(1-w_i)^2\right]}{(1+\lambda)^2 + (1+\lambda)\mu\left(w_1^2+w_2^2\right)} \in (0,1), \tag{A26}$$

$$C = \frac{\lambda\mu w_1 w_2}{(1+\lambda)^2 + (1+\lambda)\mu\left(w_1^2+w_2^2\right)} \in (0,1). \tag{A27}$$

By (A23), the price of each index component is affected by the fundamentals $\{\theta_1,\theta_2\}$ of all index components and the non-fundamental shock α. This arises because of index trading.

For commodity $k \in \{1,2,3\}$, its date-0 futures price p_k^0 is 0 and date-2 futures price p_k^2 is v_k. Taking first differences in prices generate returns. Computing covariances between returns in period 1 and 2 and between returns and α proves Propositions 1 and 2.



Figure A1: Return Autocorrelations of Indexed Commodity Futures and Mass of Index Traders. This figure plots the return autocorrelations of indexed commodity futures in the model presented in Section A.3. The parameter values are: $\sigma_\alpha^2 = 2$, $\sigma_\theta^2 = \sigma_\varepsilon^2 = 1$, $\lambda = 0.2$, $w_1 = w_2 = 0.5$.

A.4 Additional Descriptive Statistics

Table A2: Contrast of Variables between Indexed and Non-indexed Commodities

This table reports the summary statistics of the main variables for analysis of indexed and non-indexed commodities, respectively. The sample period ranges from January 2, 2003 to November 6, 2018.

Variables	Observations	Mean	StDev.	Min	Max
Panel A: Indexed					
Return	59,693	0.008%	0.019	−17.707%	20.639%
AC(1)	59,595	−0.008	1.089	−6.237	6.330
AC(2,5)	59,233	0.005	0.616	−9.601	8.513
Trading Volume	59,030	89.127	112.133	0.004	1,692.490
Log Basis	59,686	−0.006	0.024	−0.379	0.288
Illiquidity	58,811	0.839	16.859	0.000	2,844.086
Cnn. Sentiment	52,335	0.000	0.024	−0.109	0.084
Index Exposure	44,790	0.000	1.000	−3.995	10.308
Panel B: Non-indexed					
Return	31,884	0.030%	0.018	−12.769%	24.675%
AC(1)	31,854	0.062	1.094	−5.144	6.561
AC(2,5)	31,743	0.000	0.633	−8.734	11.001
Trading Volume	31,904	8.278	16.729	0.001	204.882
Log Basis	31,572	−0.002	0.017	−0.073	0.214
Illiquidity	31,776	55.882	818.663	0.000	62,095.540
Cnn. Sentiment	27,912	0.000	0.022	−0.096	0.084
Panel C: Marketwide					
Total Index Exposure	80,622	0.000	0.452	−1.965	2.262

Table A3: Top 5 BCOM Overweighted Commodities over 2007-2018

This table reports the top 5 BCOM overweighted commodities over 2007-2018 and the corresponding OW in the parenthesis.

Year	1	2	3	4	5
2007	S- (6.31%)	GC (4.99%)	LC (3.53%)	C- (3.51%)	HG (2.78%)
2008	GC (5.63%)	NG (5.61%)	S- (5.49%)	HG (4.00%)	LC (2.93%)
2009	GC (6.16%)	NG (5.47%)	S- (5.40%)	HG (4.29%)	SI (2.65%)
2010	NG (7.31%)	GC (6.19%)	S- (5.60%)	HG (4.01%)	C- (3.84%)
2011	GC (7.65%)	NG (7.02%)	S- (5.50%)	HG (3.88%)	C- (3.61%)
2012	NG (8.74%)	GC (6.74%)	S- (4.45%)	HG (3.82%)	SI (2.28%)
2013	NG (8.40%)	GC (7.82%)	HG (4.00%)	SI (3.41%)	S- (2.87%)
2014	GC (8.73%)	NG (6.86%)	HG (4.29%)	SI (3.70%)	S- (2.83%)
2015	GC (9.48%)	NG (5.60%)	HG (4.42%)	SI (3.94%)	C- (3.83%)
2016	GC (8.14%)	NG (5.21%)	SI (3.80%)	HG (3.78%)	C- (3.13%)
2017	GC (6.78%)	NG (4.66%)	SI (3.57%)	HG (3.53%)	S- (2.06%)
2018	GC (7.74%)	NG (4.11%)	SI (3.15%)	HG (2.73%)	S- (2.30%)

Table A4: Estimated Weights for Constructing Synthetic Matches

This table reports the estimated weights of each non-indexed commodity for constructing the synthetic matches of each indexed commodity. The estimation uses the daily excess returns sample ranging from January 4, 1993 to December 31, 2002.

	Non-indexed Commodities							
Synthetic	JO	LB	MW	O-	PA	PL	RR	SM
C-^{s}	1.2%	2.6%	25.4%	22.1%	0.4%	4.4%	4.9%	39.0%
CL^s	10.8%	9.6%	21.3%	−0.9%	−0.9%	34.3%	14.1%	11.8%
CT^s	12.5%	13.0%	16.9%	2.2%	4.9%	16.2%	14.0%	20.3%
GC^s	8.8%	9.3%	14.3%	−0.2%	1.1%	43.2%	9.0%	14.4%
HG^s	10.1%	13.5%	15.5%	1.6%	3.6%	27.1%	14.9%	13.7%
HO^s	11.7%	8.8%	20.3%	−2.6%	−1.3%	33.5%	14.1%	15.5%
KC^s	9.8%	7.8%	18.7%	−1.6%	1.0%	31.8%	11.3%	21.2%
LC^s	11.9%	12.6%	15.7%	0.5%	2.5%	24.2%	15.3%	17.2%
LH^s	11.2%	12.1%	14.4%	1.7%	−0.3%	26.5%	14.8%	19.6%
NG^s	16.3%	7.3%	19.5%	−1.1%	−1.6%	25.4%	13.5%	20.8%
RB^s	10.6%	9.9%	20.9%	1.1%	−0.7%	34.5%	12.7%	11.1%
S-^{s}	1.4%	0.6%	7.8%	7.8%	0.3%	3.6%	5.1%	73.4%
SB^s	10.4%	11.1%	21.7%	−3.6%	1.6%	28.5%	10.6%	19.7%
SI^s	6.0%	5.0%	10.4%	4.0%	0.4%	56.2%	5.7%	12.3%
W-^{s}	0.0%	0.6%	81.0%	7.7%	0.0%	−2.4%	2.0%	11.3%

Table A5: Descriptive Statistics of Commodities' News Sentiment

This table provides descriptive statistics of each commodity's news sentiment. The news sentiment of each commodity is calculated from the news tones data provided in Thomson Reuters News Analytics. The news sentiment is the residuals from regressing the minus negative news tone on its first lag and the day-of-week dummies. The sample is of daily frequency ranging from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018.

Commodity	Total # of News	Observations	StDev.	Min	Max
Panel A: Energy					
CL	950,046	3,237	0.036	−0.153	0.116
HO	193,888	3,237	0.056	−0.247	0.160
NG	502,532	3,237	0.035	−0.137	0.134
RB	214,529	3,237	0.056	−0.232	0.176
Panel B: Grains					
BO	480,370	3,237	0.035	−0.148	0.095
C-	96,434	3,225	0.086	−0.442	0.308
KW	91,192	2,024	0.073	−0.425	0.312
MW	91,192	2,024	0.073	−0.425	0.312
O-	672,115	3,237	0.031	−0.134	0.095
RR	672,115	3,237	0.031	−0.134	0.095
S-	80,474	2,669	0.102	−0.464	0.323
SM	439,840	3,237	0.041	−0.156	0.126
W-	91,192	2,024	0.073	−0.425	0.312
Panel C: Livestocks					
FC	363,069	3,237	0.046	−0.264	0.171
LC	363,069	3,237	0.046	−0.264	0.171
LH	363,069	3,237	0.046	−0.264	0.171
Panel D: Metals					
GC	264,716	3,237	0.059	−0.226	0.183
HG	58,438	2,024	0.093	−0.380	0.320
PA	264,716	3,237	0.059	−0.226	0.183
PL	264,716	3,237	0.059	−0.226	0.183
SI	264,716	3,237	0.059	−0.226	0.183
Panel E: Softs					
CC	74,909	3,237	0.092	−0.388	0.310
CT	84,897	3,237	0.074	−0.354	0.256
JO	30,535	2,530	0.112	−0.550	0.420
KC	86,895	3,237	0.085	−0.398	0.297
LB	273,051	3,237	0.043	−0.169	0.157
SB	123,291	3,237	0.071	−0.327	0.275

*Note: As Thomson Reuters only provides some news tones up to sector level, we have to use sector news tones for some commodities. Specifically, (1) GC, SI, PA, and PL use scores for "Gold and Precious Metals"; (2) W-, MW and KW use scores for "Wheat"; (3) FC, LC, and LH use scores for "Livestocks"; (4). O- and RR use scores for "Grains".

A.5 Additional Robustness Results

Table A6: Alternative Return Serial Dependence Measures and Commodities' Total Index Exposure

This table presents the results of regressing alternative commodities serial dependence measure on commodities' total index exposure. In Panel A, the serial dependence measure $AC(1)$ is defined as $(r_{it}r_{i,t-1})/\sigma_i^2$ where σ_i^2 is computed using the prefinancialization sample from 1993 to 2002. In Panel B, the serial dependence measure is defined as $(r_{it}r_{i,t-1})$. The regression uses data ranging from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

Variables	Panel A: Normalize by Pre-Financialization Variance						Panel B: No Normalization					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
L.Total Index Exposure	-0.061***	0.012	-0.001	-0.041***	-0.015	-0.013	-0.153***	0.023	-0.023	-0.117***	-0.025	-0.018
	(-2.73)	(0.44)	(-0.04)	(-3.51)	(-1.09)	(-1.00)	(-2.71)	(0.35)	(-0.36)	(-3.86)	(-0.73)	(-0.57)
L.(Total Index Exposure			-0.052*			-0.029*			-0.103*			-0.103**
$\times$ Indexed)			(-1.66)			(-1.75)			(-1.70)			(-2.52)
L.Basis	0.853**	5.034***	1.783***	-0.245	-0.864	-0.372	1.170	9.308***	3.072*	-1.217	-2.305	-1.454
	(2.10)	(3.23)	(3.87)	(-1.14)	(-0.96)	(-1.45)	(0.54)	(3.13)	(1.69)	(-1.09)	(-1.34)	(-1.52)
L.Illiquidity	-0.009	0.035***	0.010	0.003	0.003	0.003	-0.083*	0.094***	-0.007	0.018	0.003	0.011
	(-0.55)	(2.60)	(0.92)	(0.41)	(0.50)	(0.56)	(-1.83)	(2.62)	(-0.22)	(0.99)	(0.18)	(0.87)
Intercept	-0.003	0.095***	0.034***	0.002	0.005	0.003	-0.072**	0.263***	0.053**	0.009	0.005	0.007
	(-0.31)	(8.10)	(4.30)	(0.46)	(0.73)	(0.75)	(-2.49)	(9.33)	(2.56)	(0.70)	(0.35)	(0.69)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	44,579	23,516	68,095	44,507	23,508	68,015	44,579	23,516	68,095	44,507	23,508	68,015
# of Commodities	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23
Overall R^2	0.15%	0.58%	0.25%	0.07%	0.11%	0.07%	0.24%	0.50%	0.32%	0.10%	0.10%	0.08%

Table A7: Return Serial Dependence and Components of Commodities' Index Exposure

This table presents the results of regressing commodities serial dependence measure on the components of commodities' index exposure, i.e., index market share and trading volume. The serial dependence measure $AC(1)$ is defined as $(r_{it}r_{i,t-1})/\sigma_i^2$. The index market share is defined as the index open interest divided by the total open interest. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

Variables	Panel A: Indexed						Panel B: Non-indexed					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
L.Index Market Share	−0.252**		−0.299***	-0.357***		−0.366***	0.222		0.221	0.008		0.052
	(−2.30)		(−2.69)	(−3.03)		(−3.10)	(0.24)		(0.24)	(0.01)		(0.05)
L.Trading Volume		−0.150**	−0.249***		−0.216***	−0.255***		−1.214*	−0.007		−0.317	1.218
		(−2.20)	(−3.06)		(−2.77)	(−2.99)		(−1.88)	(−0.01)		(−0.46)	(1.23)
L.Basis				0.272	0.360	0.261				2.505***	2.524***	2.633***
				(0.93)	(1.34)	(0.89)				(2.93)	(3.88)	(3.01)
L.Illiquidity				0.000	−0.010	−0.003				0.039***	0.048***	0.040***
				(0.03)	(−1.50)	(−0.30)				(3.58)	(5.03)	(3.65)
Intercept	0.044**	0.006	0.078***	0.067***	0.014*	0.094***	0.067***	0.072***	0.067***	0.077***	0.068***	0.068***
	(2.02)	(0.79)	(3.19)	(2.72)	(1.86)	(3.67)	(6.15)	(8.84)	(5.05)	(6.42)	(8.63)	(5.02)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Day FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	48,432	58,845	48,417	48,275	58,625	48,275	24,098	31,845	24,095	23,739	31,413	23,739
# of Commodities	15	15	15	15	15	15	8	8	8	8	8	8
Overall R^2	0.15%	0.13%	0.18%	15.52%	14.82%	15.54%	0.08%	0.06%	0.08%	17.98%	16.61%	17.98%

Table A8: Return Serial Dependence and Commodities' Individual Index Exposure

This table presents the results of regressing commodities serial dependence measure on commodities' individual index exposure. The serial dependence measure $AC(1)$ is defined as $(r_{it}r_{i,t-1})/\sigma_i^2$. $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{Illiquidity}}$ is a dummy variable that equals 1 if a commodity's illiquidity is above its median level over time. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

	Panel A: Baseline				Panel B: Liquidity Provision			
	Indexed		Non-indexed		Indexed		Non-indexed	
Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
L.Index Exposure	−0.020***	−0.023***	0.007	0.004	−0.003	−0.006	0.010	0.007
	(−3.07)	(−3.46)	(0.43)	(0.22)	(−0.54)	(−1.11)	(0.75)	(0.42)
L.(Index Exposure × $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{Illiquidity}}$)					−0.046***	−0.047***	−0.007	−0.006
					(−2.83)	(−2.82)	(−0.19)	(−0.15)
L.Basis		0.611*		3.204***		0.570*		3.204***
		(1.88)		(3.97)		(1.76)		(3.97)
L.Illiquidity		−0.011		0.030***		−0.014		0.030***
		(−1.06)		(3.10)		(−1.35)		(3.09)
Intercept	−0.007	−0.006	0.073***	0.080***	−0.010*	−0.009	0.073***	0.080***
	(−1.43)	(−0.85)	(10.21)	(10.07)	(−1.76)	(−1.23)	(10.17)	(10.01)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
# of Observations	44,715	44,579	23,874	23,516	44,715	44,579	23,874	23,516
# of Commodities	15	15	8	8	15	15	8	8
Overall R^2	0.18%	0.24%	0.07%	0.59%	0.22%	0.29%	0.07%	0.59%

Table A9: Return Serial Dependence and Commodities' Total/Sectoral Index Exposure Excluding Roll Weeks

This table presents the results of regressing commodities serial dependence measure on commodities' total index exposure (panel A) and sectoral index exposure (panel B) in period excluding rolling weeks, respectively. The roll week of a commodity is the corresponding week of the roll date which is the seventh calendar day of the maturity month. The serial dependence measure $AC(1)$ is defined as $(r_{it}r_{i,t-1})/\sigma_i^2$ and $AC(2,5)$ is defined as $(\sum_{k=2}^{5} r_{it}r_{it-k})/4\sigma_i^2$. "Indexed" is a dummy variable, which equals 1 when the commodity is indexed and 0 otherwise. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

Panel A: Total Index Exposure

	Exclude Roll Weeks											
	$AC(1)$						$AC(2,5)$					
Variables	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All
L.Total Index Exposure	−0.049***	0.003	0.003	−0.064***	0.004	−0.010	−0.017**	−0.002	−0.002	−0.018**	−0.006	−0.003
	(−3.70)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(−4.39)	(0.19)	(−0.53)	(−2.26)	(−0.15)	(-0.15)	(−2.10)	(−0.57)	(−0.24)
L.(Total Index Exposure			−0.052**			−0.046**			−0.016			−0.018
× Indexed)			(−2.32)			(−2.08)			(−1.24)			(−1.38)
L.Basis				0.590*	3.541***	1.266***				−0.127	−0.520	−0.218
				(1.70)	(3.86)	(3.71)				(−0.60)	(−0.80)	(−1.00)
L.Illiquidity				−0.005	0.046***	0.016*				0.007	−0.005	0.002
				(−0.35)	(3.39)	(1.72)				(1.24)	(−0.65)	(0.47)
Intercept	−0.008	0.076***	0.022***	−0.006	0.090***	0.030***	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.004	0.001	0.002
	(−1.47)	(10.05)	(4.83)	(−0.77)	(9.59)	(5.00)	(0.79)	(0.63)	(1.01)	(0.91)	(0.24)	(0.71)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	38,421	21,331	59,752	38,329	21,064	59,393	38,362	21,327	59,689	38,270	21,060	59,330
# of Commodities	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23
Overall R^2	0.20%	0.08%	0.29%	0.27%	0.67%	0.41%	0.04%	0.02%	0.03%	0.09%	0.12%	0.06%

Table A9 (Cont'd): Return Serial Dependence and Commodities' Total/Sectoral Index Exposure Excluding Roll Weeks

Panel B: Sectoral Index Exposure

	Exclude Roll Weeks											
	$AC(1)$						$AC(2,5)$					
Variables	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All
L.Sectoral Index Exposure	−0.042***	0.001	0.002	−0.050***	0.009	−0.002	−0.010*	0.005	0.005	−0.009*	0.002	0.006
	(−4.38)	(0.05)	(0.15)	(−4.81)	(0.61)	(−0.13)	(−1.74)	(0.62)	(0.65)	(−1.61)	(0.26)	(0.74)
L.(Sectoral Index Exposure			−0.045***			−0.044**			−0.015*			−0.016*
× Indexed)			(−2.60)			(−2.53)			(−1.64)			(−1.68)
L.Basis				0.660**	3.062***	1.218***				−0.159	−0.474	−0.222
				(2.03)	(3.61)	(3.81)				(−0.80)	(−0.79)	(−1.08)
L.Illiquidity				−0.005	0.048***	0.018*				0.007	−0.004	0.002
				(−0.35)	(3.52)	(1.88)				(1.19)	(−0.59)	(0.51)
Intercept	−0.008	0.076***	0.022***	−0.005	0.089***	0.031***	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.001	0.002
	(−1.39)	(10.10)	(4.91)	(−0.63)	(9.58)	(5.10)	(0.84)	(0.61)	(1.04)	(0.89)	(0.27)	(0.75)
Sectoral FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	38,421	21,331	59,752	38,329	21,064	59,393	38,362	21,327	59,689	38,270	21,060	59,330
# of Sectors	5	3	5	5	3	5	5	3	5	5	3	5
# of Commodities	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23
Overall R^2	0.17%	0.06%	0.18%	0.25%	0.62%	0.30%	0.02%	0.01%	0.01%	0.06%	0.10%	0.04%

Table A10: Return Serial Dependence and Components of Commodities' Index Exposure Excluding Roll Weeks

This table presents the results of regressing commodities serial dependence measure on the components of commodities' index exposure, i.e., index market share and trading volume in period excluding rolling weeks. The roll week of a commodity is the corresponding week of the roll date which is the seventh calendar day of the maturity month. The serial dependence measure $AC(1)$ is defined as $(r_{it}r_{i,t-1})/\sigma_i^2$. The index market share is defined as the index open interest divided by the total open interest. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

	Exclude Roll Weeks											
	Indexed						Non-indexed					
Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
L.Index Market Share	−0.233*		−0.288**	−0.345***		−0.356***	0.454		0.445	0.110		0.167
	(−1.96)		(−2.38)	(−2.64)		(−2.73)	(0.46)		(0.45)	(0.10)		(0.16)
L.Trading Volume		−0.204***	−0.291***		−0.255***	−0.298***		−1.312*	−0.172		−0.398	1.122
		(−2.60)	(−3.08)		(−2.80)	(−2.95)		(−1.87)	(−0.16)		(−0.54)	(1.03)
L.Basis				0.239	0.373	0.231				2.599***	2.922***	2.712***
				(0.75)	(1.26)	(0.72)				(2.67)	(3.99)	(2.73)
L.Illiquidity				0.008	−0.001	0.005				0.056***	0.060***	0.057***
				(0.67)	(−0.10)	(0.42)				(3.70)	(4.68)	(3.74)
Intercept	0.039	0.011	0.079***	0.065**	0.018**	0.096***	0.067***	0.073***	0.068***	0.084***	0.076***	0.076***
	(1.64)	(1.34)	(2.90)	(2.35)	(2.03)	(3.33)	(6.00)	(8.44)	(4.94)	(6.39)	(8.57)	(5.13)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Day FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	41,610	50,579	41,599	41,504	50,424	41,504	21,612	28,427	21,609	21,345	28,098	21,345
# of Commodities	15	15	15	15	15	15	8	8	8	8	8	8
Overall R^2	0.17%	0.15%	0.20%	15.68%	15.14%	15.71%	0.10%	0.08%	0.10%	18.74%	17.47%	18.74%

Table A11: Return Serial Dependence and Commodities' Total/Sectoral Index Exposure Excluding Energy Sector

This table presents the results of regressing commodities serial dependence measure on commodities' total index exposure (panel A) and sectoral index exposure (panel B) without energy commodities, respectively. The serial dependence measure $AC(1)$ is defined as $(r_{it}r_{i,t-1})/\sigma_i^2$ and $AC(2,5)$ is defined as $(\sum_{k=2}^{5} r_{it}r_{it-k})/4\sigma_i^2$. "Indexed" is a dummy variable, which equals 1 when the commodity is indexed and 0 otherwise. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

Panel A: Total Index Exposure

	Exclude Energy Sector											
	Panel A: $AC(1)$						Panel B: $AC(2,5)$					
Variables	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All
L.Total Index Exposure	−0.037***	0.005	0.005	−0.045***	0.013	0.001	−0.021***	0.002	0.002	−0.022**	−0.001	0.002
	(−2.73)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(−3.12)	(0.75)	(0.03)	(−2.79)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(−2.57)	(−0.06)	(0.17)
L.(Total Index Exposure			−0.042**			−0.037*			−0.024**			−0.025**
× Indexed)			(−1.99)			(−1.76)			(−1.98)			(−2.08)
L.Basis				0.866**	3.206***	1.574***				0.071	−0.702	−0.153
				(2.51)	(3.97)	(4.57)				(0.30)	(−1.20)	(−0.64)
L.Illiquidity				0.013	0.030***	0.022***				0.000	0.003	0.001
				(1.34)	(3.15)	(3.17)				(0.06)	(0.47)	(0.31)
Intercept	0.008	0.073***	0.035***	0.014*	0.080***	0.043***	0.002	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
	(1.27)	(10.21)	(7.62)	(1.95)	(10.07)	(8.00)	(0.67)	(0.85)	(1.07)	(0.69)	(0.56)	(0.85)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	32,775	23,874	56,649	32,639	23,516	56,155	32,703	23,866	56,569	32,567	23,508	56,075
# of Commodities	11	8	19	11	8	19	11	8	19	11	8	19
Overall R^2	0.15%	0.07%	0.20%	0.24%	0.59%	0.38%	0.05%	0.02%	0.03%	0.07%	0.09%	0.06%

Table A11 (Cont'd): Return Serial Dependence and Commodities' Total/Sectoral Index Exposure Excluding Energy Sector

Panel B: Sectoral Index Exposure

	Exclude Energy Sector											
	Panel A: $AC(1)$						Panel B: $AC(2,5)$					
Variables	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All
L.Sectoral Index Exposure	−0.023**	0.008	0.008	−0.028**	0.014	0.008	−0.015**	0.001	0.001	−0.014**	0.000	0.002
	(−2.10)	(0.55)	(0.55)	(−2.38)	(0.98)	(0.54)	(−2.33)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(−2.12)	(0.02)	(0.21)
L.(Sectoral Index Exposure			−0.030*			−0.030*			−0.016*			−0.017*
× Indexed)			(−1.74)			(−1.75)			(−1.65)			(−1.72)
L.Basis				0.895***	2.687***	1.458***				0.016	−0.609	−0.160
				(2.68)	(3.60)	(4.40)				(0.07)	(−1.13)	(−0.69)
L.Illiquidity				0.014	0.032***	0.024***				0.001	0.003	0.001
				(1.48)	(3.29)	(3.52)				(0.10)	(0.49)	(0.36)
Intercept	0.008	0.073***	0.035***	0.014**	0.079***	0.042***	0.002	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
	(1.27)	(10.21)	(7.61)	(1.99)	(9.99)	(7.99)	(0.67)	(0.85)	(1.07)	(0.63)	(0.61)	(0.85)
Sectoral FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	32,775	23,874	56,649	32,639	23,516	56,155	32,703	23,866	56,569	32,567	23,508	56,075
# of Sectors	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	4
# of Commodities	11	8	19	11	8	19	11	8	19	11	8	19
Overall R^2	0.08%	0.04%	0.06%	0.18%	0.52%	0.24%	0.03%	0.00%	0.02%	0.05%	0.07%	0.04%

Table A12: Return Serial Dependence and Components of Commodities' Index Exposure Excluding Energy Sector

This table presents the results of regressing commodities serial dependence measure on the components of commodities' index exposure, i.e., index market share and trading volume without energy commodities. The serial dependence measure $AC(1)$ is defined as $(r_{it}r_{i,t-1})/\sigma_i^2$. The index market share is defined as the index open interest divided by the total open interest. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

	Exclude Energy Sector											
	Indexed						Non-indexed					
Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
L.Index Market Share	−0.306**		−0.338**	−0.467***		−0.470***	0.222		0.221	0.008		0.052
	(−2.10)		(−2.29)	(−2.93)		(−2.95)	(0.24)		(0.24)	(0.01)		(0.05)
L.Trading Volume		−0.157	−0.279**		−0.100	−0.141		−1.214*	−0.007		−0.317	1.218
		(−1.50)	(−2.12)		(−0.76)	(−0.95)		(−1.88)	(−0.01)		(−0.46)	(1.23)
L.Basis				0.714**	0.863***	0.706**				2.505***	2.524***	2.633***
				(2.10)	(2.80)	(2.08)				(2.93)	(3.88)	(3.01)
L.Illiquidity				0.021**	0.012	0.020*				0.039***	0.048***	0.040***
				(2.09)	(1.50)	(1.96)				(3.58)	(5.03)	(3.65)
Intercept	0.072**	0.016*	0.101***	0.113***	0.017*	0.125***	0.067***	0.072***	0.067***	0.077***	0.068***	0.068***
	(2.32)	(1.93)	(2.91)	(3.22)	(1.75)	(3.41)	(6.15)	(8.84)	(5.05)	(6.42)	(8.63)	(5.02)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Day FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	35,504	43,701	35,501	35,365	43,491	35,365	24,098	31,845	24,095	23,739	31,413	23,739
# of Commodities	11	11	11	11	11	11	8	8	8	8	8	8
Overall R^2	0.15%	0.11%	0.17%	16.07%	15.35%	16.07%	0.08%	0.06%	0.08%	17.98%	16.61%	17.98%

Table A13: Return Serial Dependence and Commodities' Total/Sectoral Index Exposure Excluding Financial Crisis Period

This table presents the results of regressing commodities serial dependence measure on commodities' total index exposure (panel A) and sectoral index exposure (panel B) in periods excluding financial crisis, respectively. The serial dependence measure $AC(1)$ is defined as $(r_{it}r_{i,t-1})/\sigma_i^2$. "Indexed" is a dummy variable, which equals 1 when the commodity is indexed and 0 otherwise. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. According to Tang and Xiong (2012), the sample excludes the period September 15, 2008 to June 30, 2009. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

Panel A: Total Index Exposure

	Exclude Financial Crisis (2008/09/15 – 2009/06/30)											
	$AC(1)$						$AC(2,5)$					
Variables	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All
L.Total Index Exposure	−0.022**	0.015	0.015	−0.036***	0.003	−0.002	−0.024***	−0.005	−0.005	−0.028***	−0.011	−0.008
	(−1.97)	(0.90)	(0.90)	(−2.91)	(0.15)	(−0.13)	(−3.88)	(−0.53)	(−0.53)	(−4.11)	(−1.08)	(−0.82)
L.(Total Index Exposure			−0.037*			−0.031*			−0.019*			−0.022*
× Indexed)			(−1.85)			(−1.73)			(−1.68)			(−1.91)
L.Basis				0.678**	3.371***	1.264***				−0.258	−0.842	−0.379*
				(2.03)	(3.99)	(3.94)				(−1.21)	(−1.37)	(−1.78)
L.Illiquidity				0.005	0.027***	0.016**				0.006	0.004	0.005
				(0.56)	(2.83)	(2.41)				(1.37)	(0.83)	(1.50)
Intercept	−0.001	0.075***	0.026***	0.005	0.082***	0.033***	0.003	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.002
	(−0.10)	(10.75)	(6.50)	(0.74)	(10.52)	(6.88)	(1.17)	(0.60)	(1.28)	(0.97)	(0.39)	(0.90)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	41,719	22,274	63,993	41,585	21,942	63,527	41,651	22,266	63,917	41,517	21,934	63,451
# of Commodities	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23
Overall R^2	0.18%	0.10%	0.28%	0.27%	0.78%	0.47%	0.07%	0.02%	0.05%	0.12%	0.12%	0.10%

Table A13 (Cont'd): Return Serial Dependence and Commodities' Total/Sectoral Index Exposure Excluding Financial Crisis Period

Panel B: Sectoral Index Exposure

	Exclude Financial Crisis (2008/09/15 – 2009/06/30)											
	$AC(1)$						$AC(2,5)$					
Variables	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All	Indexed	Non-idx	All
L.Sectoral Index Exposure	−0.024***	0.011	0.013	−0.030***	0.012	0.008	−0.010**	0.002	0.003	−0.010**	0.001	0.004
	(−2.84)	(0.81)	(0.97)	(−3.35)	(0.85)	(0.54)	(−2.23)	(0.33)	(0.34)	(−2.04)	(0.10)	(0.51)
L.(Sectoral Index Exposure			−0.038**			−0.036**			−0.013*			−0.015*
× Indexed)			(−2.37)			(−2.26)			(−1.68)			(−1.69)
L.Basis				0.722**	2.856***	1.216***				−0.233	−0.740	−0.335*
				(2.29)	(3.65)	(4.02)				(−1.16)	(−1.31)	(−1.66)
L.Illiquidity				0.004	0.029***	0.017**				0.006	0.004	0.005
				(0.47)	(3.07)	(2.57)				(1.29)	(0.89)	(1.51)
Intercept	−0.001	0.075***	0.026***	0.005	0.081***	0.033***	0.003	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.002
	(−0.09)	(10.74)	(6.50)	(0.74)	(10.45)	(6.86)	(1.05)	(0.56)	(1.17)	(0.87)	(0.39)	(0.85)
Sectoral FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	41,719	22,274	63,993	41,585	21,942	63,527	41,651	22,266	63,917	41,517	21,934	63,451
# of Sectors	5	3	5	5	3	5	5	3	5	5	3	5
# of Commodities	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23	15	8	23
Overall R^2	0.13%	0.05%	0.15%	0.23%	0.68%	0.35%	0.03%	0.00%	0.02%	0.08%	0.09%	0.06%

Table A14: Spillover Effect of Sentiment on Returns across Indexed/Non-indexed Commodities excluding Financial Crisis Period

This table presents the subperiod results of regressing commodities returns on connected sentiment measures. The connected sentiment measure is constructed in two steps. In the first step, we obtain each commodity's news sentiment as the residuals from regressing its minus negative news tones on its first lag and day-of-week dummies. We then obtain the "connected" sentiment for an indexed commodity by taking a value-weighted average of indexed commodities from other sectors. For "connected" sentiment of non-indexed commodities, we take a simple average on the sentiment of non-indexed commodities from other sectors. "Indexed" is a dummy variable, which equals 1 when the commodity is indexed and 0 otherwise. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. According to Tang and Xiong (2012), the sample excludes the period September 15, 2008 to June 30, 2009. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

	Exclude Financial Crisis (2008/09/15 – 2009/06/30)					
	Panel A: Contemporaneous			Panel B: Predictive		
Variables	Indexed	Non-indexed	All	Indexed	Non-indexed	All
Cnn. Sentiment	8.804***	5.339***	5.341***			
	(46.37)	(19.91)	(20.22)			
Cnn. Sentiment × Indexed			3.240***			
			(10.10)			
L.Cnn. Sentiment				−0.511***	0.319	0.280
				(−2.74)	(1.20)	(1.06)
L.(Cnn. Sentiment × Indexed)						−0.770**
						(−2.42)
L.Basis	0.357	1.506	0.626	0.325	1.339	0.565
	(0.73)	(1.57)	(1.43)	(0.66)	(1.38)	(1.28)
L.Illiquidity	0.005	0.018	0.007	−0.003	0.015	0.004
	(0.54)	(1.51)	(0.93)	(−0.31)	(1.31)	(0.56)
Intercept	0.008	0.035***	0.018***	0.002	0.032***	0.013*
	(0.97)	(3.17)	(2.61)	(0.21)	(2.86)	(1.86)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	51,784	27,526	79,310	51,770	27,521	79,291
# of Individuals	15	8	23	15	8	23
Overall R^2	4.46%	1.81%	3.52%	0.18%	0.22%	0.19%

Table A15: Spillover Effect of Sentiment (Net News Tone) on Returns across Indexed/Non-indexed Commodities

This table presents the results of regressing commodities returns (in %) on the "connected" sentiment measure. The "connected" sentiment measure is constructed in two steps. We first obtain each commodity's net news sentiment as the residuals from regressing the net news tones on its first lag and the day-of-week dummies. We then obtain the "connected" sentiment for an indexed commodity by taking a value-weighted average of indexed commodities from other sectors. For "connected" sentiment of non-indexed commodities, we take a simple average on the sentiment of non-indexed commodities from other sectors. "Indexed" is a dummy variable, which equals 1 when the commodity is indexed and 0 otherwise. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

	Panel A: Contemporaneous			Panel B: Predictive		
Variables	Indexed	Non-indexed	All	Indexed	Non-indexed	All
Cnn. Sentiment	8.804***	5.339***	5.341***			
	(46.37)	(19.91)	(20.22)			
Cnn. Sentiment × Indexed			3.240***			
			(10.10)			
L.Cnn. Sentiment				−0.511***	0.319	0.280
				(−2.74)	(1.20)	(1.06)
L.(Cnn. Sentiment × Indexed)						−0.770**
						(−2.42)
L.Basis	0.357	1.506	0.626	0.325	1.339	0.565
	(0.73)	(1.57)	(1.43)	(0.66)	(1.38)	(1.28)
L.Illiquidity	0.005	0.018	0.007	−0.003	0.015	0.004
	(0.54)	(1.51)	(0.93)	(−0.31)	(1.31)	(0.56)
Intercept	0.008	0.035***	0.018***	0.002	0.032***	0.013*
	(0.97)	(3.17)	(2.61)	(0.21)	(2.86)	(1.86)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	51,784	27,526	79,310	51,770	27,521	79,291
# of Individuals	15	8	23	15	8	23
Overall R^2	4.46%	1.81%	3.52%	0.18%	0.22%	0.19%

Table A16: Spillover Effect of Sentiment (Net News Tone) on Returns across Indexed/Non-indexed Commodities under High/Low Total Index Exposure Period

This table presents the results of regressing commodities returns (in %) on connected sentiment measures and controls under different levels of total index exposure. The total index exposure is the average of the indexed commodities' individual index exposure. The index trading share is defined as the ratio of indexed open interest to the total open interest for a certain commodity. The index trading volume for a certain commodity is the production of the market trading volume and its corresponding index trading share. The index exposure is thus obtained by detrending the index trading volume with its past 250-day average and then standardizing the time series. We characterize the period when total index exposure is above(below) zero as "High" ("Low") exposure period. The connected sentiment measure is constructed using net news tone. The data ranges from January 3, 2006 to November 6, 2018. The t-statistics reported in the parenthesis are based on commodity and day double clustered standard errors. ***, ** and * denote statistical significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

	Panel A: Contemporaneous				Panel B: Predictive			
	Indexed		Non-indexed		Indexed		Non-indexed	
Variables	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
Cnn. Sentiment	8.496***	9.070***	4.713***	5.906***				
	(32.17)	(33.06)	(12.82)	(15.02)				
L.Cnn. Sentiment					−0.867***	−0.081	−0.194	0.821**
					(−3.43)	(−0.29)	(−0.54)	(2.07)
L.Basis	0.245	0.567	0.770	1.744	0.093	0.706	0.446	1.755
	(0.36)	(0.79)	(0.55)	(1.30)	(0.14)	(0.98)	(0.32)	(1.30)
L.Illiquidity	−0.007	0.025	0.004	0.033**	−0.021	0.024	−0.001	0.035**
	(−0.55)	(1.59)	(0.28)	(1.96)	(−1.59)	(1.50)	(−0.06)	(2.06)
Intercept	−0.005	0.028**	0.063***	−0.001	0.020	−0.015	0.067***	-0.014
	(−0.44)	(2.26)	(4.07)	(−0.04)	(1.64)	(−1.17)	(4.28)	(−0.85)
Commodity FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
# of Observations	28,136	23,648	14,998	12,528	28,122	23,648	14,993	12,528
# of Individuals	15	15	8	8	15	15	8	8
Overall R^2	3.95%	5.36%	1.38%	2.55%	0.27%	0.49%	0.16%	0.60%