Multiples for Valuation: Go High, Go Low, Ignore the Middle

Javier Estrada

Javier Estrada
is a professor of finance in the Department of Finance at IESE Business School in Barcelona, Spain.
jestrada@iese.edu

AUTHOR-AUTHORIZED COPY FOR LIMITED DISTRIBUTION ONLY

KEY FINDINGS

- Multiples such as the dividend yield (D/P), the price-to-earnings ratio (P/E), and the cyclically adjusted price-to-earnings ratio (CAPE) have long been viewed as being useful to forecast returns over periods of 10 years or so, and this article advances supporting evidence.
- The evidence discussed here further shows that multiples are far more useful when they are relatively high or low than when they are somewhere in the middle of their historical range.
- Relatively high or low multiples are more highly correlated to forward returns in sample, and produce better return forecasts out of sample, than multiples that lie somewhere in the middle.

ABSTRACT

Multiples such as the dividend yield (D/P), the price-to-earnings ratio (P/E), and the cyclically adjusted price-to-earnings ratio (CAPE) have long been viewed as being useful to forecast returns over periods of 10 or so years. The evidence discussed in this article supports this belief and takes it one step further by showing that multiples are far more useful when they are relatively high or low than when they are somewhere in the middle of their historical range. In fact, relatively high or low multiples are more highly correlated to forward returns in sample, and produce better return forecasts out of sample, than multiples that lie somewhere in the middle.

Multiples have been used for stock valuation and, by extension, for forecasting stock returns, at least since the early 1920s. However, after more than a century of debate, there does not seem to be a consensus on how successful they are for this purpose. For that reason, this article does not aim to settle a debate that perhaps just cannot be settled. Rather, it seeks to highlight a condition that makes multiples relatively more useful for forecasting stock returns.

In a nutshell, the evidence discussed here shows that multiples are more useful for stock return forecasting when they take relatively high or low values rather than values in the middle of their historical range. In fact, relatively high or low multiples are more highly correlated to forward returns in sample, and produce better stock return forecasts out of sample, than multiples that lie somewhere in between.

"High" and "low" multiples are defined here as those in the top and bottom quartiles when the sample is sorted by a given multiple, with "middle" multiples being those in the two middle quartiles. To be sure, the results discussed are robust to at least two other definitions of high and low multiples, such as those in the top and

bottom deciles, or those being more than one standard deviation above and below the average multiple.

The rest of the article is organized as follows: The first section introduces the issue and provides a very brief overview of the literature; the next section discusses the evidence; and the third section provides an assessment. An Appendix with exhibits concludes the article.

BACKGROUND

Multiples have been used for stock valuation, and indirectly to forecast stock returns, at least since the early 1920s. In fact, Charles Dow, cofounder of *The Wall Street Journal*, related dividend yields to stock valuation in his classic *Scientific Stock Speculation* (Dow 1920), and Benjamin Graham and David Dodd related price-to-earnings ratios to stock valuation in their classic *Security Analysis* (Graham and Dodd 1934).

However, over a century of debate has not settled the issue of how useful multiples are for forecasting stock returns. The fact that different articles use different variables, time periods, and techniques—and even different countries—obviously does not help. Welch and Goyal (2008) summarize the evidence on this issue as of early 2006 and reach a rather pessimistic conclusion: that most variables (models) used to forecast stock returns are unstable or spurious, and eventually stop working. In fact, they conclude that investors would have done just as well by assuming that the expected equity risk premium would be as it has always been. Goyal et al. (2024) reach a similar conclusion, with evidence extended as of early 2022.

Three multiples are the focus of this inquiry: the dividend yield (D/P); the price-to-earnings ratio (P/E); and the cyclically adjusted price-to-earnings ratio (CAPE).[1] In order to make the results easier to compare to D/P, both P/E and CAPE are inverted so that the analysis ultimately focuses on D/P, E/P, and 1/CAPE, which, from this point on, will be referred to as the *dividend yield* (DY = D/P), the *earnings yield* (EY = E/P), and the *CAPE yield* (CY = 1/CAPE). Therefore, although the discussion throughout refers to multiples, the variables ultimately used here are actually yields.

Beyond Dow (1920), some of the early advocates of using dividend yields to forecast stock returns include Rozeff (1984), Campbell and Shiller (1988), and Fama and French (1988). On the contrary, Goetzmann and Jorion (1993) argue that there is no strong statistical evidence indicating that dividend yields can be used to forecast stock returns, with Welch and Goyal (2008) and Goyal et al. (2024), largely agreeing with their conclusion.

Furthermore, beyond Graham and Dodd (1934), Basu (1977) was an early advocate of using P/E ratios for stock valuation and, therefore, for stock return forecasting. Campbell and Shiller's (1998) influential and prescient article stressed the forecasting ability of both P/E and CAPE, and predicted, toward the end of the dot-com bubble, a decline of 40% in real terms in the stock market over the following 10 years. Weigand and Irons (2007) also report evidence supporting the use of P/E and CAPE to forecast stock returns—in their case, with a less pessimistic outlook for the market than other perspectives at the time.

Estrada (2015) finds that P/D, P/E, and CAPE are related to 10-year forward returns, but also that these multiples are not helpful for determining a dynamic asset-allocation strategy that outperforms a static strategy. Boucher et al. (2023) find, unlike most of the previous literature, that the dividend yield, CAPE, and excess CAPE yield help to forecast short-term 6- to 12-month stock returns. Ma et al. (2024)

[1] As is well known, unlike the P/E, which is based on earnings for a single year, CAPE is based on an average of inflation-adjusted earnings over the previous 10 years.

AUTHOR-AUTHORIZED COPY FOR LIMITED DISTRIBUTION ONLY

run a horse race of models used to forecast returns 10 and 20 years ahead and find that a decomposition of returns that captures the valuation change through the variation in total return CAPE wins the race. Murphy et al. (2025) find that the simple difference between the earnings yield of the stock market and the 10-year Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities real yield can explain one third (one half) of stock returns 5 (10) years ahead.

Finally—and importantly for all of the literature on the ability of different multiples and (more generally) variables used to forecast stock returns—Boudoukh et al. (2019) argue that the standard use of overlapping observations leads to the overestimation of statistical significance. They also argue that some of the usual adjustments, such as Newey–West standard errors, help very little in alleviating this problem. Given this widely accepted argument, the discussions that follow about the significance of the variables considered here should perhaps be thought of as being preceded by "For what it's worth…"

EVIDENCE

Data and Methodology

The data consist of prices, earnings, and dividends for the US stock market, downloaded from Robert Shiller's web page.[2] Returns are quarterly and account for capital gains/losses and dividends. Both nominal and real returns are calculated, the latter taking into account the rate of inflation based on the US Consumer Price Index. The sample period goes from the end of the first quarter of 1871 (1871 Q1) through the end second quarter of 2025 (2025 Q2). Exhibit A1 in the Appendix provides some summary statistics on all the relevant variables in the sample.

As already discussed, the three multiples on which the analysis focuses are D/P, P/E, and CAPE, with the last two inverted. The focus is, therefore, on the dividend yield (DY = D/P), the earnings yield (EY = E/P), and the CAPE yield (CY = 1/CAPE). Both dividends and earnings are lagged by one quarter to avoid any look-ahead bias. Over the whole sample period, the average D/P, P/E, and CAPE are 4.2%, 16.4, and 17.6, respectively, with an average EY of 6.1% and an average CY of 5.7%.[3]

The first step of the analysis consists of calculating nominal and real 10-year forward annualized returns over the whole sample period. The first such return is calculated at the end of 1871 Q2, over the 1871 Q3–1881 Q2 period; and the last one at the end of 2015 Q2, over the 2015 Q3–2025 Q2 period. This yields 577 quarterly (nominal and real) 10-year forward annualized returns, which, for ease of exposition, will be referred to simply as "forward returns" from this point on. Unless otherwise stated, all (forward, expected, and observed) returns in this article are calculated over a 10-year period and expressed in annualized terms.

Given a multiple (DY, EY, or CY) and a type of return (nominal or real), the multiple at the beginning of the sample period is paired with the forward return over the subsequent 10 years. Similar pairings are then made quarter after quarter until the sample runs out, yielding two quarterly series: one for the multiple and the other for its associated forward returns. To illustrate, the DY, EY, and CY at the end of 1871 Q2 are associated to the (nominal and real) returns over the 1871 Q3–1881 Q2 period; and the DY, EY, and CY at the end of 2015 Q2 are associated to the (nominal and real) returns over the 2015 Q3–2025 Q2 period.

[2] See www.econ.yale.edu/~shiller/data.htm. The proxy for the US stock market is the S&P 500.

[3] Only the P/E series has two clear outliers, 135.0 and 139.1, which occurred in the second and third quarter of 2009. A third potential outlier, 88.5, occurred in the last quarter of 2009. These three observations are more than three standard deviations away from the mean.

AUTHOR-AUTHORIZED COPY FOR LIMITED DISTRIBUTION ONLY

This methodology produces quarterly time series of six relationships: DY and forward nominal returns; DY and forward real returns; EY and forward nominal returns; EY and forward real returns; CY and forward nominal returns; and CY and forward real returns. The first step of the analysis is to evaluate the strength of each of these six relationships.

Multiples and Forward Returns: In-Sample Correlations

The second column (All) of Exhibit 1 shows the correlations between each multiple (DY, EY, and CY) and each type of return (nominal and real) for the full sample. The six correlations have the expected sign and are significantly different from zero given a two-tailed test and a 5% level of significance. Forward nominal returns are most highly correlated to EY (0.49) and forward real returns are most highly correlated to CY (0.51).

The use of overlapping observations invites at least two comments. First, as already discussed, the significance of correlations is likely to be overstated. However, that is less relevant for the analysis here, which focuses on relative (rather than absolute) correlations. Second, using nonoverlapping observations produces correlations (shown in square brackets in Exhibit 1), which are rather similar to those reported for overlapping observations.

The finding that multiples and forward returns are strongly correlated is not new. The more novel part of the analysis starts by sorting each multiple and its associated forward (nominal and real) returns from the highest to the lowest multiple, and then splitting the ranking into quartiles. The top and bottom quartiles are then isolated from the two middle quartiles, and correlations are calculated separately for these two groups. For ease of exposition, from this point on, those in the top (bottom) quartile will be referred to as "high" ("low") multiples, and those in the two middle quartiles will be referred to as "middle" multiples.

Correlations between multiples and forward returns for the subsample that groups the top and bottom quartiles (i.e., high and low multiples) are shown in the third column (High + Low) of Exhibit 1, and those for the subsample that groups the two middle quartiles are shown in the fourth column (Middle). The figures in parentheses in the High + Low column indicate the cutoff points for the quartiles; for example,

EXHIBIT 1

Multiples and Forward Returns: In-Sample Correlations

	All	High + Low	Middle
Panel A: DY		(>5.38, <3.20)	
Nominal Returns	0.21* [0.26]	0.30*	0.03
Real Returns	0.36* [0.35]	0.45*	0.09
Panel B: EY		(>8.79, <5.49)	
Nominal Returns	0.49* [0.61]	0.63*	0.11
Real Returns	0.48* [0.57]	0.61*	0.18*
Panel C: CY		(>8.47, <5.01)	
Nominal Returns	0.48* [0.45]	0.57*	0.21*
Real Returns	0.51* [0.51]	0.66*	0.09

NOTES: This exhibit shows correlations between three multiples (DY, EY, and CY) and two types of 10-year forward annualized returns (nominal and real). The correlations in the second column (All) are for the full sample; those in the third column (High + Low) are only for the top and bottom quartiles, when all observations are sorted by a given multiple; and those in the fourth column (Middle) are for the two quartiles in the middle. The figures in parentheses indicate the cutoff points for the top and bottom quartiles. The figures in square brackets are correlations for a sample of nonoverlapping observations. * indicates statistical significance at the 5% level in a two-tailed test. The data are described in Exhibit A1 in the Appendix.

AUTHOR-AUTHORIZED COPY FOR LIMITED DISTRIBUTION ONLY

the top (bottom) quartile for EY consists of all the observations with EY higher than 8.79% (lower than 5.49%).

As these figures clearly show, the correlations in the High + Low column are markedly higher than the respective correlations in the Middle column. In fact, although all six correlations in the High + Low column are significantly different from zero, four of the six correlations in the Middle column are not—only those correlations between EY and real returns (0.18) and CY and nominal returns (0.21) are. Put differently, multiples are far more closely related to forward returns in sample and, therefore, should be more useful for forecasting returns out of sample, when they take relatively high or low values than values somewhere in between.

To elaborate, and to add some precision, DY (EY) [CY] provides a much stronger signal about expected returns when it is roughly lower than 3% (5%) [5%], or higher than 6% (9%) [9%], than when it is somewhere between those figures. Or, put differently, changes in DY within the 3%–6% range, or changes in EY or CY within the 5%–9% range, do not convey much information about changes in expected returns.

Multiples and Forward Returns: Out-of-Sample Forecasting

The results discussed so far suggest that multiples and forward returns are strongly correlated, and that such correlation is stronger when multiples are relatively high or low than when they are somewhere in the middle. These in-sample correlations are obviously useful, but the ultimate test of a model is its ability to make accurate forecasts out of sample. That is the issue addressed in this section.

The analysis is implemented in two steps: First, quarterly series of expected real returns are produced from models based on the three multiples considered here; and second, those expected real returns are compared to observed real returns in order to evaluate the forecasting ability of the models. All forecasts are made from the equation:

$$R_{t+40} = \alpha + \beta \cdot M_t + u_t \tag{1}$$

where R_{t+40} denotes expected real returns; M_t is the value of a multiple (DY, EY, or CY); α and β are coefficients to be estimated; u_t is an error term; and t indexes quarters.[4]

The first alpha and beta from Equation 1 are estimated using the first five years (20 quarters) of data, with the first forecast being made at the end of 1876 Q1 (for the 1876 Q2–1886 Q1 period).[5] After each quarter, alpha and beta are reestimated, progressively adding one new observation, with the last forecast being made at the end of 2015 Q2 (for the 2015 Q3–2025 Q2 period), based on alpha and beta estimated using all previous observations. This methodology involves running 558 regressions (518 for CY), producing 558 estimates of alpha and beta, and generating 558 quarterly real-return forecasts, which are then compared to their respective observed real returns. Exhibit 2 summarizes the results.

Panels A1–A3 of the second column (All) show the correlations between forecasted and observed returns (0.39 for DY, 0.48 for EY, and 0.56 for CY) using all the observations in the sample. For all three models, the correlations have the expected positive sign and are significantly different from zero. Moreover, for all three models, the mean deviation (MD) is less than one quarter of 1% and the mean absolute deviation (MAD) is less than 1%, in both cases in annual terms. These results suggest that DY, EY, and CY provide fairly accurate forecasts of stock returns 10 years ahead.

[4] Forecasts are made and evaluated only for real (not for nominal) returns. Also, as already stated, all returns are calculated over a 10-year period and expressed in annualized terms.

[5] The sample for CY starts later, so the first forecast is made at the end of 1885 Q4.

AUTHOR-AUTHORIZED COPY FOR LIMITED DISTRIBUTION ONLY

Panels B1–B3 of the second column (All) show the last estimates of the intercept (Alpha) and the slope (Beta) from Equation 1, which are used to generate the last forecast made by each model, using all previous available observations.[6] All three betas (0.25 for DY, 0.21 for EY, and 0.21 for CY) are, as expected, positive and statistically different from zero.[7] In other words, changes in the three multiples considered do have a meaningful impact on expected returns. Moreover, the alpha for the model based on DY (0.01) is significantly different from zero, but the alphas for the models based on EY (0.00) and CY (0.00) are not.

Having established in the previous section that multiples and forward returns are more highly correlated when the former are high and low rather than in the middle, panels A1–A3 of the third column (High + Low) of Exhibit 2 show results for forecasts from models based only on high (top quartile) and low (bottom quartile) multiples. As before, the first model is estimated using the first 20 quarters of data. The difference

EXHIBIT 2

Multiples and Forward Real Returns: Out-of-Sample Forecasting

	All	High + Low	Middle
Panel A1: DY			
Rho	0.39*	0.49*	0.21*
MD	–0.18	–0.23	–0.19
MAD	0.94	1.05	0.86
Panel A2: EY			
Rho	0.48*	0.61*	0.10
MD	–0.05	–0.03	0.00
MAD	0.86	0.81	0.92
Panel A3: CY			
Rho	0.56*	0.70*	0.22*
MD	–0.22	–0.33	–0.18
MAD	0.86	0.84	0.93
Panel B1: DY			
Alpha	0.01*	0.01*	0.01
Beta	0.25*	0.25*	0.15
Panel B2: EY			
Alpha	0.00	0.00	0.00
Beta	0.21*	0.21*	0.21*
Panel B3: CY			
Alpha	0.00	0.00	0.01
Beta	0.21*	0.21*	0.11

NOTES: Panels A1–A3 of this exhibit show summary statistics for the relationship between forecasted and observed 10-year annualized real returns. The forecasts are produced from Equation 1, with DY, EY, and CY as explanatory variables. The figures in the second column (All) are for the full sample; those in the third column (High + Low) are only for the top and bottom quartiles when all observations are sorted by a given multiple; and those in the fourth column (Middle) are for the two quartiles in the middle. The summary statistics include the correlation between forecasted and observed returns (Rho), the mean deviation (MD), and the mean absolute deviation (MAD). Panels B1–B3 show the last estimates of α (Alpha) and β (Beta) from Equation 1, which use all the relevant observations. MD and MAD in percent and in annual terms. * indicates statistical significance at the 5% level in a two-tailed test. The data are described in Exhibit A1 in the Appendix.

[6] Recall that alpha and beta are estimated by progressively adding one observation to each estimation, resulting in 558 regressions, and 558 estimates of alpha and beta. Only the last estimates, using all available previous observations, are reported in Exhibit 2.

[7] As done throughout this article, statistical significance is evaluated with a two-tailed test and a 5% level of significance. In addition, in this case, significance is evaluated using Newey–West's heteroskedasticity- and autocorrelation-consistent covariance matrix.

AUTHOR-AUTHORIZED COPY FOR LIMITED DISTRIBUTION ONLY

is that, in this case, the 20 quarters take a longer chronological time to happen because only the quarters with high and low multiples are used. Also as before, the estimation of alpha and beta progressively adds quarters over time.

This methodology generates 269 estimates of alpha and beta, and, therefore, 269 real-return forecasts (251 for CY), which are then compared to observed real returns as before. A similar methodology is implemented for the subsample with multiples in the middle, and the results from comparing expected and observed returns for 270 forecasts (249 for CY) are shown in panels A1–A3 of the fourth column (Middle) of Exhibit 2.

A comparison between the High + Low and Middle columns reveals some interesting results. First, the three correlations in panels A1–A3 of the High + Low column (0.49, 0.61, and 0.70) are markedly higher than the respective correlations in the Middle column (0.21, 0.10, 0.22), with the MD and MADs being rather similar between columns. These results suggest that the stronger correlation between multiples and forward returns when the former are high or low, compared with when they are somewhere in the middle (reported in Exhibit 1), does generate better forecasts.

Second, panels B1–B3 show that the three betas in the High + Low column are positive and significant. Of the betas in the Middle column, however, only the one for EY is significant and those for DY and CY are not. In other words, variations in high and low multiples do have an impact on expected returns, whereas variations of multiples in the middle do not have much of an impact, except in the case of EY.

In short, the overall message from Exhibits 1 and 2, which confirm and reinforce each other, is twofold. First, multiples and forward returns are closely related in sample, which leads the former to be useful for forecasting the latter out of sample. And second, relatively high and low multiples are more highly correlated in sample to forward returns than multiples in the middle, and are, therefore, more useful for forecasting returns out of sample.

Further Thoughts

This section contains some comments on the analysis of the previous two sections, as well as some extensions and caveats. First, the whole analysis is based on sorting multiples and their associated forward returns from the highest to the lowest multiple and, subsequently, slicing the data into four quartiles. The top and bottom quartiles contain high and low multiples (and their associated forward returns), and the two middle quartiles contain the rest of the multiples (and, again, their associated forward returns). That is, of course, an arbitrary way of slicing the data. Exhibit A2 in the Appendix reports results for two alternatives.

Panels A1–A3 in the third column (High + Low) of Exhibit A2 show the results for an alternative in which high and low multiples are those in the top and bottom deciles (rather than quartiles), with results for the remaining 80% of observations shown in the fourth column (Middle).[8] A comparison between these two columns confirms and reinforces the results already discussed for quartiles. More precisely, all six correlations between multiples and forward returns are markedly higher when multiples are high and low (High + Low column) than the respective correlations when multiples are somewhere in between (Middle column).

Panels B1–B3 of Exhibit A2 show results for yet another way of slicing the data. The third column (High + Low) shows results for an alternative in which high and low multiples are those more than one standard deviation away from the mean, with results for the observations in between shown in the fourth column (Middle). Once again, the results point in the same direction: All six correlations between multiples

[8]The results for the All column in panels A1–A3 and B1–B3 of Exhibit A2 are the same as those for the All column in Exhibit 1.

AUTHOR-AUTHORIZED COPY FOR LIMITED DISTRIBUTION ONLY

and forward returns are markedly higher when multiples are high and low (High + Low column) than when multiples are somewhere in between (Middle column).

Finally, a caveat. The whole analysis is based on multiples that use dividends and earnings lagged one quarter in order to avoid any look-ahead bias. However, generating return forecasts for the subsample of high and low multiples on the one hand, and middle multiples on the other, first requires all the observations to be sorted and the data sliced into quartiles, which can only be done after observing the whole sample. To illustrate, a P/E of, say, 25 can be determined as "high" only after observing the whole sample and determining that it is solidly in the top quartile. In other words, forecasts from a subsample of high and low multiples can only be made after observing the whole sample and determining the range of multiples that are high, low, and in the middle.

That said, the whole analysis here can be thought of as a way of building a model (based on a hypothesis subsequently supported by evidence) that can be used to forecast stock returns from this point on. Moreover, as new data become available, the whole analysis could be progressively updated: Multiples and their associated returns could be resorted, parameters for the models based on high and low multiples reestimated, and subsequent forecasts generated from the updated model.

ASSESSMENT

Multiples have long been used to assess the valuation of stock markets, as well as to forecast their return. How successful different multiples have been for this purpose has long been a source of controversy. The evidence points in both directions, with many papers arguing in favor of the forecasting ability of multiples, and perhaps just as many papers arguing against it. In this regard, the jury is out, to say the least.

The goal of this article is by no means to try to settle this debate. Instead, the focus is on determining the conditions that would make multiples relatively more successful for forecasting stock returns. Most academics and practitioners are very likely to view stock returns in the long term (10 years or so) as being more predictable than they are in the short term (1 month or 1 year). That issue is not directly addressed here, but the consensus view is embraced and incorporated into the analysis, which focuses on forecasting returns 10 years ahead.

The argument advanced here is that multiples and forward stock returns are more closely related when the former are particularly high or low than when they are somewhere in the middle. The evidence discussed in this article is consistent with this hypothesis. In fact, the evidence shows that multiples are more highly correlated with forward stock returns in sample, and provide better forecasts of stock returns out of sample, when they are in the top or bottom quartile of a sorting by multiples than when they are in the two middle quartiles.

The stronger correlation between multiples and forward stock returns when the former are relatively high or low is robust to different definitions of "high" and "low" multiples, such as when they are in the top and bottom decile, or when they are more than one standard deviation above or below their historical average. In other words, it is more important to focus on forecasting stock returns mostly when multiples are particularly high or low than to have a precise definition of high and low multiples.

In short, although the jury may be out on the ability of multiples to forecast stock returns, the predominant view, taken as given here, is that stock returns are more predictable in the long term than in the short term. Moreover, the evidence discussed here suggests that multiples are more useful to forecast stock returns when they are relatively high or low than when they lie somewhere in the middle. Thus, although this article neither settled nor aimed to settle a long-standing debate on stock return predictability, it has hopefully established a condition that helps to improve our forecasts of stock returns.

AUTHOR-AUTHORIZED COPY FOR LIMITED DISTRIBUTION ONLY

APPENDIX

EXHIBIT A1

Data: Summary Statistics

	NSR	RSR	Inflation	DY	P/E	CAPE
T	616	616	616	617	617	578
AM	2.6	2.1	0.6	4.2	16.4	17.6
GM	2.2	1.7	0.5			
SD	8.8	8.8	2.2	1.8	9.7	7.4
Min.	–40.3	–38.5	–8.5	1.1	5.1	4.8
Max.	76.2	78.8	14.6	15.5	139.1	44.4
AGM	9.2	6.9	2.2			
ASD	17.5	17.7	4.4			

NOTES: This exhibit shows, for the quarterly series of nominal stock returns (NSR), real stock returns (RSR), and the rate of inflation (Inflation), the number of observations in the sample (T), the arithmetic (AM) and geometric (GM) mean return, volatility (SD), lowest (Min.) and highest (Max.) return, and annualized GM (AGM) and SD (ASD). It also shows T, AM, SD, Min., and Max. for the series of the dividend yield (DY), the price-to-earnings ratio (P/E), and the cyclically adjusted price-to-earnings ratio (CAPE). The sample period is from the end of the first quarter of 1871 (1871 Q1) through the end second quarter of 2025 (2025 Q2). All figures except P/E and CAPE are in percent.

EXHIBIT A2

Multiples and Forward Returns: In-Sample Correlations

	All	High + Low	Middle
Panel A: Deciles			
Panel A1: DY		(>6.61, <1.97)	
Nominal Returns	0.21*	0.45*	0.09
Real Returns	0.36*	0.60*	0.24*
Panel A2: EY		(>10.97, <4.59)	
Nominal Returns	0.49*	0.74*	0.29*
Real Returns	0.48*	0.67*	0.38*
Panel A3: CY		(>10.95, <3.99)	
Nominal Returns	0.48*	0.67*	0.42*
Real Returns	0.51*	0.82*	0.33*
Panel B: Beyond 1 Standard Deviation			
Panel B1: DY		(>6.61, <1.97)	
Nominal Returns	0.21*	0.36*	0.10*
Real Returns	0.36*	0.51*	0.27*
Panel B2: EY		(>10.97, <4.59)	
Nominal Returns	0.49*	0.69	0.19*
Real Returns	0.48*	0.65	0.29*
Panel B3: CY		(>10.95, <3.99)	
Nominal Returns	0.48*	0.64*	0.43*
Real Returns	0.51*	0.81*	0.32*

NOTES: This exhibit shows correlations between three multiples (DY, P/E, and CAPE) and two types of 10-year forward annualized returns (nominal and real). The correlations in the second column (All) are for the full sample; those in the third column (High + Low) are for high and low multiples as defined in each panel; and those in the fourth column (Middle) are for the observations in between. The figures in parentheses indicate the cutoff points for high and low multiples. * indicates statistical significance at the 5% level in a two-tailed test. The data are described in Exhibit A1.

AUTHOR-AUTHORIZED COPY FOR LIMITED DISTRIBUTION ONLY

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Jack Rader for his comments. Pol Delgado provided valuable research assistance. The views expressed and any errors that may remain are entirely my own.

REFERENCES

Basu, S. 1977. "The Investment Performance of Common Stocks in Relation to Their Price-Earnings Ratios: A Test of the Efficient Market Hypothesis." *The Journal of Finance*, 32 (3): 663–682.

Boucher, C., A. Jasinski, and S. Tokpavi. 2023. "Conditional Mean Reversion of Financial Ratios and the Predictability of Returns." *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 137.

Boudoukh, J., R. Israel, and M. Richardson. 2019. "Long-Horizon Predictability: A Cautionary Tale." *Financial Analysts Journal*, 75 (1): 17–30.

Campbell, J., and R. Shiller. 1988. "The Dividend-Price Ratio and Expectations of Future Dividends and Discount Factors." *The Review of Financial Studies*, 1 (3): 195–228.

——. 1998. "Valuation Ratios and the Long-Run Stock Market Outlook." *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 24 (2): 11–26.

Dow, C. 1920. *Scientific Stock Speculation*. Magazine of Wall Street, New York.

Estrada, J. 2015. "Multiples, Forecasting, and Asset Allocation." *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 27 (3): 144–151.

Fama, E., and K. French. 1988. "Dividend Yields and Expected Stock Returns." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 22 (1): 3–25.

Goetzmann, W., and P. Jorion. 1993. "Testing the Predictive Power of Dividend Yields." *The Journal of Finance*, 48 (2): 663–679.

Goyal, A., I. Welch, and A. Zafirov. 2024. "A Comprehensive 2022 Look at the Empirical Performance of Equity Premium Prediction." *The Review of Financial Studies*, 37 (11): 3490–3557.

Graham, B., and D. Dodd. 1934. *Security Analysis*, 1st ed. McGraw-Hill.

Ma, R., B. Marshall, N. Nguyen, and N. Visaltanachoti. 2024. "Estimating Long-Term Expected Returns." *Financial Analysts Journal*, 80 (4): 134–154.

Murphy, A., Z. AlSalman, and I. Souropanis. 2025. "An Investigation into the Causes of Stock Market Return Deviations from Real Earnings Yields." *International Review of Economics and Finance*, 102.

Rozeff, M. 1984. "Dividend Yields Are Equity Risk Premiums." *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 11 (1): 68–75.

Weigand, R., and R. Irons. 2007. "The Market P/E Ratio, Earnings Trends, and Stock Return Forecasts." *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 33 (4): 87–101.

Welch, I., and A. Goyal. 2008. "A Comprehensive Look at the Empirical Performance of Equity Premium Prediction." *The Review of Financial Studies*, 21 (4): 1455–1508.

AUTHOR-AUTHORIZED COPY FOR LIMITED DISTRIBUTION ONLY