

Unreadable Political Trades

ZIMING DONG, NANCY XU, AND XIAOYUN YU

Discussant: Bo Bian
University of British Columbia

ABFER, 2026

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this discussion are solely my own and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, Stefan Zueme (discussant), the audience at the SAIF Annual Conference where I first saw this paper last week, or even my own views after this session.

TO START WITH...

- ▶ This must have been a very fun paper to write — conditional on surviving the enormous data work (and managing a team of 19 RAs)
- ▶ The authors work almost like Sherlock Holmes, piecing together hidden clues from messy disclosure records

DETECTIVE. PROF. DR. YU



BUT EVEN ALL OF THESE CAN FAIL



WHAT DOES THE INVESTIGATION GIVE US?

- ▶ Uncover irregular patterns hidden in disclosure files, and use those clues to speak to first-order questions about **disclosure, political decision-making & informed trading**
 1. Trades in unreadable filings: more profitable, larger, more family-routed, filed less promptly
 2. Pre-enactment trading similarity in unreadable filings reveals a latent cross-partisan network that can predict future bill co-sponsorship
- ▶ Impressive data work and convincing evidence
- ▶ Network part is very creative use of the data

MY DISCUSSION

- ▶ **Comment #1:** Context and contribution
- ▶ **Comment #2:** Identification relies on cross-sectional variation — time-series evidence would strengthen causal claims
- ▶ **Comment #3:** The two parts of the paper feels a bit disconnected: either tighten the bridge or split the paper (and enrich each part)
- ▶ **Additional comments**

COMMENT #1 BIG PICTURE: RETURNS TO POLITICAL OFFICE

- ▶ A central political economy question:

How do politicians extract private economic benefits from public office?

- ▶ Existing literature documents substantial “returns to office”
 - Fisman, Schulz, and Vig (2014): election winners in India accumulate wealth significantly faster than runners-up
- ▶ More recent work shifts attention toward **how** these rents are generated
 - Mostly focus on public equity market
 - Real estate market: Baldauf, Favilukis, Garlappi, and Zheng (2026)

EVIDENCE ON POLITICIANS' EQUITY TRADING IS MIXED

▶ Evidence of outperformance / informed trading

- Ziobrowski et al. (2004, 2011): Senators and Representatives outperform the market
- Tahoun (2014): evidence consistent with quid pro quo connections between political donations and equity purchases
- Karadas (2018): politicians and spouses outperform pre-STOCK Act

▶ Limited or no systematic outperformance

- Lenz and Lim (2009): Rep. do not accumulate wealth faster than matched individuals
- Eggers and Hainmueller (2013): little abnormal performance once extending sample/coverage
- Cherry, Heitz, and Jens (2018): no outperformance pre-STOCK, underperformance afterward
- Belmont, Sacerdote, and Van Hoek (2020): slight underperformance post-2012 except around Covid briefing trades
- Wei and Zhou (2025): leadership members outperform regular Congress members, but absolute alpha remains near zero

▶ Some related nuances

- Eggers and Hainmueller (2014): strong local/home-district tilts in Congressional portfolios
- Karadas (2018): spouses outperform, children underperform

WHAT DOES THIS PAPER ADD?

1. Helps reinterpret mixed evidence on politicians' equity trading
 - Existing studies may understate political trading advantages if the most informative trades are selectively harder to process or disseminate (for researchers)
2. Identifies a specific source of political trading gains
 - Profits are concentrated in opaque, strategically disclosed trades
3. Provides unusually granular evidence
 - Brings analysis from politician level to very granular trade level
4. Reveals a hidden political network with potential downstream consequences
 - Trading links predict future legislative coordination
 - Suggests private financial incentives may be connected to the legislative process
5. Provides ingredients to think about future policy
 - Proposed Ending Trading and Holdings In Congressional Stocks (ETHICS) Act, which prohibits members of Congress from trading in individual stocks (Senate - 12/19/2024)

COMMENT #2: CROSS-SECTIONAL VS. TIME-SERIES VARIATION

- ▶ Readable vs. unreadable comparison, but serious identification efforts:
 - Rich legislator controls: age, seniority, party affiliation
 - Stock and year-month fixed effects
 - FOMC windows + 50 macro surprise controls
 - Continuous AI unreadability measure (Gemini 3 Pro) as robustness
- ▶ Readable vs. unreadable filers are **different legislators**
 - Format choice may be correlated with unobserved trading-relevant traits
 - Examples: wealth, financial sophistication, family background, spouse/children's occupations, use of wealth managers

COMMENT #2: CROSS-SECTIONAL VS. TIME-SERIES VARIATION

- ▶ Readable vs. unreadable comparison, but serious identification efforts:
 - Rich legislator controls: age, seniority, party affiliation
 - Stock and year-month fixed effects
 - FOMC windows + 50 macro surprise controls
 - Continuous AI unreadability measure (Gemini 3 Pro) as robustness
- ▶ Readable vs. unreadable filers are **different legislators**
 - Format choice may be correlated with unobserved trading-relevant traits
 - Examples: wealth, financial sophistication, family background, spouse/children's occupations, use of wealth managers
- ★ Formally analyze the determinants of choosing unreadable filings
 - How much is explainable by observables/controls?
- ★ Consider time-series variation from different sources (see below)

COMMENT #2: (I) SWITCHERS

Several legislators file in both formats: within-legislator variation exists but is unexplored

	Readable	Unreadable	Total
Panel A: Univariate Comparison			
# of PTRs	3,532	1,581	5,113
# of congressional members	201	129	275
Republican	104	67	151
Democrat	95	61	122
Libertarian	1	0	1
Independent	1	1	1

- ▶ 55 legislators (about 20%) appear in both readable and unreadable filings
- ▶ 146 (74) legislators appear only in readable (unreadable) filings
- ▶ When do they switch and why?

COMMENT #2: (II) ELECTORAL CYCLE

- ▶ Election dates are pre-scheduled and exogenous
- ▶ One cost of suspicious unreadable filings being disclosed: **electoral punishment**
 - Pre-election: opposition research, media, watchdogs all more active
 - Mid-term: low scrutiny, low detection risk
- ⇒ Unreadable trading **most aggressive mid-term; suppressed pre-election**
- ★ Examine trading behavior **within** persistent unreadable filers within an electoral cycle
 - Volume/profitability of unreadable trades across the 2-year cycle
 - Composition: shift toward less policy-sensitive stocks pre-election
 - Family account usage: more suppressed pre-election?
 - **Heterogeneity**: competitive districts ≫ safe seats
 - **Placebo**: retiring legislators (discipline vanishes after retirement announcement)

COMMENT #2: (III) WATCHDOG PROCESSING/INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

- ▶ Congressional trades are increasingly processed by external watchdogs and media outlets
 - Quiver Quantitative, Capitol Trades, Business Insider investigations, Campaign Legal Center
- ▶ If the value of unreadable filings comes from **temporary opacity**:
 - Return premium should **decline over time** as OCR, AI, and watchdog coverage improve
- ★ How does the unreadable-trade premium evolve over calendar time? Is the premium realized faster or more slowly after the trade?
- ★ Do legislators reduce unreadable trading after public scrutiny events?
 - Senator Richard Burr DOJ investigation (2020 COVID trades)
 - NYT / WSJ investigations into congressional defense committee trading
 - Business Insider STOCK Act investigations

COMMENT #2: (IV) INCENTIVES FROM SUCCESSFUL TRADES

- ▶ Strategic opacity may become **self-reinforcing over time**
 - Profitable trades that are effectively concealed can strengthen incentives for future trading
 - Legislators update: trades are profitable, concealment strategy works
- ▶ Opacity can lower expected costs of informed trading (scrutiny/reputation)
 - Past concealed profitable trades reveal that these expected costs are low
 - This mechanism is more than trading skill (no concealment update, weaker reinforcement)
- ★ Construct rolling accumulated abnormal profits at the legislator-month level, test if higher past profits predict:
 - larger future trades, broader trading activity
 - more family-member trading
 - more filing near disclosure deadlines
- ★ Are these responses stronger for unreadable filers than for machine-readable filers?

COMMENT #3: STRUCTURE OF THE PAPER

- ▶ The paper contains two ambitious and highly interesting components:
 - 1st half strategic disclosure and (informed) trading
 - 2nd half hidden political networks and legislative coordination
- ▶ 1st part builds into 2nd part, but 2nd part does not circle back
 - Each part is a substantial contribution and potentially publishable on its own
- ★ Two possible directions:
 - Option A: tighten the connection between the two parts in a more unified mechanism
 - Option B: split into two more focused papers and enrich each component separately

OPTION A: TIGHTENING THE CONNECTION

- ▶ Can we link profitable trades to the hidden political networks?
 - Does opacity facilitates **coordinated** informed trading?
- 1 Are **connected legislators driving the return premium**?
 - If the network is economically meaningful, profitable unreadable trades should be concentrated among connected legislators
- 2 Do **more central legislators in the unreadable network earn higher returns**?
 - Centrality should proxy for access to more political information
- 3 Do **network trades cluster before legislative events? Do they generate more profits**?
 - Stronger timing around bill passage would suggest information-based coordination rather than generic stock-picking skill
- 4 Are **these patterns stronger for policy-sensitive or bill-exposed industries**?
 - This would connect the trades directly to the legislative information being generated

OPTION B: ENRICH 1ST HALF

- ▶ Most items in Comment #1 are about 1st half of the paper
- ▶ More explicitly model the legislator's optimization problem
 - What are they maximizing? How does filing format enter?
 - Unreadable filings reduce monitoring effectiveness
 - Unreadable filings themselves may attract attention or suspicion
 - Dynamic/repeated-game considerations
- ▶ Holding periods may be informative about economic source of profits
 - Short holding periods \Rightarrow informational advantage or superior timing around news arrival
 - Longer holding periods \Rightarrow ability to continuously shape and coordinate downstream legislative implementation and policy outcomes
- ▶ Magnitude: is opacity a first-order strategic choice?
 - vs. experience or other proxies of financial sophistication
 - vs. home district firm advantage as in Eggers and Hainmueller (2014)

OPTION B: ENRICH 2ND HALF

- ▶ Address whether the documented network is mechanically generated
 - Unreadable PTRs contain many more transactions: 38.7 vs. 8.9 for readable filings
 - More trades mechanically increase the probability that two legislators overlap in holdings
 - Need normalization holding trading intensity fixed or permutation tests
- ▶ Better characterize the economic content of the network
 - How stable? Does each act reveal similar networks? currently unified vs. divided government
Same dyads repeatedly appearing across acts \Rightarrow standing arrangement
Rapidly changing dyads \Rightarrow opportunistic one-off coordination
 - Who sits at the center and what drives this?
 - Higher-order network structure (formal analysis): clusters, broker nodes, etc.

OPTION B: ENRICH 2ND HALF

- ▶ Explore information hierarchy inside the network
 - Do peripheral legislators trade after central legislators?
 - Does trading propagate through the network over (a short span of) time?
- ▶ The network evidence currently relies on 12 major fiscal acts, expand it?
 - The approach is well motivated and intuitive, but the resulting network is relatively sparse
 - Narrow event definitions may also miss repeated interactions
 - Can the setting be expanded beyond these 12 events? esp. acts with a larger *news* component: more surprising, uncertain, or sensitive to a few legislators' support ex ante
- ▶ Information sharing vs. political capture
 - How critical are these co-sponsorship through network? Are network-linked co-sponsors marginal/pivotal supporters?
 - Downstream consequences of these bills? Is such co-sponsorship costly?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

- ▶ Oster (2019) test
 - Reporting δ and R_{\max} directly addresses the cross-sectional identification concern
- ▶ Sample unit and clustering
 - Five levels of observation across Tables 2–4; clustering also shifts across specifications
 - A brief note on the logic of each choice would improve transparency
- ▶ Sales vs. purchases
 - Which one is more informative? Are the patterns symmetric?
- ▶ How are call/put options treated in the analysis? Are index funds and ETFs all excluded?

WRAP UP

- ▶ Original paper with a clean setting and very crisp findings
- ▶ Three comments/suggestions:
 1. Highlight big picture contribution
 2. Add time-series variation
 3. Bridge or split

A fascinating read — looking forward to the next version