

Schäfer, Dirk; Moro, R. A.; Härdle, Wolfgang Karl

Working Paper

Rating Companies with Support Vector Machines

DIW Discussion Papers, No. 416

Provided in Cooperation with:

German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin)

Suggested Citation: Schäfer, Dirk; Moro, R. A.; Härdle, Wolfgang Karl (2004) : Rating Companies with Support Vector Machines, DIW Discussion Papers, No. 416, Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW), Berlin

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/18111>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Discussion Papers

416

W. Härdle
R. A. Moro
D. Schäfer

Rating Companies with Support Vector
Machines

Berlin, March 2004



DIW Berlin

German Institute
for Economic Research

Opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect views of the Institute.

DIW Berlin

German Institute
for Economic Research

Königin-Luise-Str. 5
14195 Berlin,
Germany

Phone +49-30-897 89-0

Fax +49-30-897 89-200

www.diw.de

ISSN 1619-4535

Rating Companies with Support Vector Machines

W. Härdle¹, R. A. Moro², D. Schäfer³

¹Center for Applied Statistics and Economics, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Spandauer Straße 1, 10178 Berlin; e-mail: haerdle@wiwi.hu-berlin.de; phone: +49(0)30 2093-5630

²Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, Königin-Luise-Straße 5, 14195 Berlin; e-mail: rmoro@diw.de; phone: +49(0)30 8978-9262; Center for Applied Statistics and Economics, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Spandauer Straße 1, 10178 Berlin

³Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, Königin-Luise-Straße 5, 14195 Berlin; e-mail: dschaefer@diw.de; phone: +49(0)30 8978-9162

Abstract

The goal of this work is to introduce one of the most successful among recently developed statistical techniques – the support vector machine (SVM) – to the field of corporate bankruptcy analysis. The main emphasis is done on implementing SVMs for analysing predictors in the form of financial ratios. A method is proposed of adapting SVMs to default probability estimation. A survey of practically and commercially applied methods is given. This work proves that support vector machines are capable of extracting useful information from financial data although extensive data sets are required in order to fully utilise their classification power.

JEL classification: C14; G33; C45

Keywords: Support vector machines; Company rating; Default probability estimation

Bankruptcy Analysis Methodology

The subject of bankruptcy analysis is an old one. It is surprising that statistical techniques were introduced to the field relatively late, only with the publications of Beaver (1966) and Altman (1968). Demand from financial institution for investment risk estimation stimulated subsequent research. However, despite substantial interest, the accuracy of corporate default predictions was much lower than e.g. in the private loan sector largely due to a small number of corporate bankruptcies. Nevertheless, the situation in bankruptcy analysis is changing dramatically. This can be attributed to

- the availability of larger data sets with the median number of failing companies exceeding 1000 (20 years ago the median was around 40 companies) that allow making statistically significant inferences where no conclusion could be reached before.
- the spread of computer technologies and advances in statistical learning techniques that allow the identification of more complex data structures. Basic methods may no longer be adequate for analysing expanded data sets.
- the rapidly increased demand for advanced methods of controlling and measuring default risks in anticipation of the New Basel Capital Accord adoption (BCBS (2003)). The Accord emphasises the importance of risk management and encourages improvements in financial institutions' risk assessment capabilities.

In order to estimate investment risks one needs to evaluate the default probability (PD) for a company. Each company is described by a set of

variables (predictors) x such as financial ratios and its class $y = \{-1, 1\}$, i.e. ‘successful’ or ‘bankrupt’. Initially an unknown classifier function $f : x \mapsto y$ is estimated on a training set of companies (x_i, y_i) , $i = 1, \dots, n$. The training set represents the data for companies which are known to have survived or gone bankrupt. Finally, f is adapted to computing default probabilities (PD) that can be uniquely translated into a company rating.

Usual predictors are financial ratios. Their importance for company analysis was realised more than a century ago. Among the first researchers applying financial ratios for bankruptcy prediction were Ramser and Foster (1931), Fitzpatrick (1932) and Winakor and Smith (1935). However, it was not until the publications of Beaver (1966) and Altman (1968) that the systematic application of the statistical analysis to bankruptcy analysis began. The methods proposed by Beaver and Altman were univariate and multivariate discriminant analysis respectively. Altman’s linear Z-score model became a standard for a decade to come and is still widely used today due to its simplicity. However, its assumption of equal normal distributions for both failing and successful companies with the same covariance matrix was justly criticised. This approach was further developed by Deakin (1972) and Altman et al. (1977).

Later on the centre of research shifted towards the logit/probit models. The original works of Martin (1977) and Ohlson (1980) were followed by Wiginton (1980), Zavgren (1983) and Zmijewski (1984). Among other statistical methods applied for bankruptcy analysis there are the gamblers ruin model (Wilcox (1971)), option pricing theory (Merton (1974)), recursive partitioning (Frydman et al. (1985)), neural networks (Tam and Kiang (1992))

and rough sets (Dimitras et al. (1999)) to name a few.

There are three main types of models used in bankruptcy analysis. The first one is structural or parametric models (e.g. the option pricing model, logit/probit regression, discriminant analysis). They assume that the relationship between the input and output parameters can be described in an *a priori* given logical way. Besides their fixed structure these models are fully determined by a set of parameters. The solution requires the estimation of these parameters on a training set.

Although structural models provide a very clear interpretation of modelled processes they have a rigid structure and are not flexible enough to capture the information from the data. The non-structural or non-parametric models (e.g. neural networks or genetic algorithms) are more flexible in describing data. They do not impose very strict limitations on the classifier function but usually do not provide a clear interpretation either.

Between the structural and non-structural models lies the class of semi-parametric models. These models, like the RiskCalc private company rating model developed by Moody's, are based on an underlying structural model but all or some predictors enter this structural model after a non-parametric transformation. In recent years the area of research has shifted towards non-structural and semi-parametric models since they are more flexible and better suited for practical purposes than purely structural ones.

Statistical models for corporate default prediction have a practical importance. For example, corporate bond ratings published regularly by rating agencies such as Moody's or S&P strictly correspond to company default probabilities estimated to a great extent statistically. Moody's RiskCalc

model for private companies (Falkenstein (2000)) is based on the probit analysis. It is basically a probit regression estimation of the cumulative default probability over a number of years using a linear combination of non-parametrically transformed predictors. These non-linear transformations f_1, f_2, \dots, f_d are estimated on univariate models. As a result, the original probit model

$$E[y_{i,t}|x_{i,t}] = \Phi(\beta_1 x_{i1,t} + \beta_2 x_{i2,t} + \dots + \beta_d x_{id,t}), \quad (1)$$

is converted into

$$E[y_{i,t}|x_{i,t}] = \Phi\{\beta_1 f_1(x_{i1,t}) + \beta_2 f_2(x_{i2,t}) + \dots + \beta_d f_d(x_{id,t})\}, \quad (2)$$

where $y_{i,t}$ is the cumulative default probability within the prediction horizon for company i at time t .

Although modifications of traditional methods like probit analysis extend their applicability, it is more desirable to base our methodology on general ideas of statistical learning theory without making many restrictive assumptions.

The ideal classification machine is based on the so called *expected risk* minimization principle. The expected risk

$$R[f] = \int \frac{1}{2} |f(x) - y| dP(x, y) \quad (3)$$

is estimated under the distribution $P(x, y)$, which is assumed to be known. This is, however, never true in practical applications and the distribution should also be estimated from the training set $(x_i, y_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ that is

an ill-posed problem (Tikhonov and Arsenin (1977)).

In most methods applied today that can be found in any statistical package this problem is solved by implementing another principle, namely the principle of the *empirical risk* minimization, i.e. risk minimization over the training set of companies, even when the training set is not representative. Empirical risk defined as

$$\hat{R}[f] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} |f(x_i) - y_i| \quad (4)$$

is nothing else but an average value of loss over the training set, while expected risk is the expected value of loss under the true probability measure. The loss for *iid* observations is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} |f(x) - y| &= 0, & \text{if classification is correct} \\ &1, & \text{if classification is wrong.} \end{aligned}$$

The solutions of the problems of expected and empirical risk minimization

$$f_{opt} = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (R[f]) \quad (5)$$

$$\hat{f}_n = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\hat{R}[f]) \quad (6)$$

generally do not coincide although converge as $n \rightarrow \infty$ if \mathcal{F} is not too large. This situation is illustrated in Figure 1. \mathcal{F} is the set of classifier functions available to a classification machine.

We can not minimize expected risk directly since the distribution $P(x, y)$ is unknown. However, according to statistical learning theory (Vapnik (1995)),




Figure 1: The minimisation problems of expected and empirical risk generally give different solutions.

it is possible to estimate the so called Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) bound that holds with a certain probability $1 - \eta$:

$$R[f] \leq \hat{R}[f] + \phi\left(\frac{h}{n}, \frac{\ln(\eta)}{n}\right). \quad (7)$$

For linear indicator functions ϕ is given by

$$\phi\left(\frac{h}{n}, \frac{\ln(\eta)}{n}\right) = \sqrt{\frac{h \left(\ln \frac{2n}{h}\right) - \ln \frac{\eta}{4}}{n}}, \quad (8)$$

where h is the VC dimension.

The VC dimension of the set of functions \mathcal{F} in a d dimensional space is h if a function from \mathcal{F} can in a general case separate h objects $x_i, i = 1, \dots, h$, in the d dimensional space in all possible ways. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and f from the class of linear indicator functions VC dimensionality is h if $x_i, i = 1, \dots, h$, can be separated in all 2^h possible configurations and no set $x_i, i = 1, \dots, q$, exists where $q > h$ that satisfies this property. For example, three points on




Figure 2: Eight possible ways of shattering 3 points on the plane with a linear indicator function.

a plane ($d = 2$) can be shattered by linear indicator functions in $2^h = 2^3 = 8$ ways, whereas 4 points can not be shattered in $2^q = 2^4 = 16$ ways. Thus, the VC dimension of the set of linear indicator functions in a two-dimensional space is three (Figure 2).

The expression for the VC bound (7) is a regularised functional where the VC dimension h is a parameter controlling complexity of the classifier function. The term $\phi\left(\frac{h}{n}, \frac{\ln(\eta)}{n}\right)$ introduces the penalty for excessive complexity of a classifier function. There is a trade off between the number of classification errors on the training set and the complexity of the classifier function. If the complexity were not controlled, it would be possible to find such a classifier function that would make no classification errors on the training set notwithstanding how low its generalisation ability would be.

The support vector machine is a method of classification (its application for regression will be left outside this work) that is a practical implementation of the statistical learning theory. It has already been successfully applied to optical character recognition, early medical diagnostics, text clas-

sification, etc. One of the economic applications where SVMs outperformed other methods is energy load prediction (EUNITE (2001)). SVMs produce better classification results than such a popular and widely used technique as neural networks and, in contrast to the latter, have very attractive properties: (i) they give a single solution characterized by the global minimum of the optimized functional and not multiple solutions associated with the local minima as in the case of neural networks and (ii) they do not rely so heavily on heuristics, i.e. an arbitrary choice of the model, and have a more flexible structure.

Importance of Risk Classification in Practice

To date in most countries only a small percentage of firms is rated. The lack of rated firms is mainly due to two factors. Firstly, external rating is an extremely costly procedure. Secondly, until the recent past most banks decided on their loans to small and medium sized firms (SME) without asking for the client's rating figure or applying an own rating procedure to estimate the client's default risk. At best banks based their decision on rough scoring models. At worst the credit decision was completely left to the loan officer.

Since learning to know its own risk is costly and until recently the lending procedure of banks failed to set the right incentives, small and medium sized firms in particular shied away from rating. However, regulation is about to change the environment for borrowing and lending decisions completely. With the implementation of the New Basel Capital Accord (Basel II) scheduled for the end of 2006 not only firms that issue debt securities on the market are in need of a rating but also any ordinary firm that applies for a bank

Rating Class (S&P)	One year PD (%)	Risk Premia (%)
AAA	0.01	0.75
AA	0.02 – 0.04	1.00
A+	0.05	1.50
A	0.08	1.80
A-	0.11	2.00
BBB	0.15 – 0.40	2.25
BB	0.65 – 1.95	3.50
B+	3.20	4.75
B	7.00	6.50
B-	13.00	8.00
CCC	> 13	10.00
CC		11.50
C		12.70
D		14.00

Table 1: Rating grades and risk premia.

loan. If no external rating is available, banks have to employ an internal rating system and deduce each client’s specific risk class. Moreover, Basel II puts pressure on firms and banks from two sides.

First, banks have to demand risk premia in accordance to the specific borrower’s default probability. Table 1 presents an example of how the individual risk class maps into risk premiums (Damodaran (1998)). For small US-firms a one-year default probability of 0.11% results in a spread of 2%. Of course, the mapping used by lenders will be different if the firm type or the country in which the bank is located changes. However, in any case future loan pricing has to follow the basic rule. The higher the firm’s default risk is the more risk premium the bank has to charge.

Second, Basel II requires banks to hold client-specific equity buffers. The magnitudes of these buffers are determined by a risk weight function defined by the Basel Committee and a solvability coefficient (8%). The function

Rating Class (S&P)	One-year DP (%)	Capital Requirements (%) (Basel I)	Capital Requirements (%) (Basel II)
AAA	0.01	8.00	0.63
AA	0.02 – 0.04	8.00	0.93 – 1.40
A+	0.05	8.00	1.60
A	0.08	8.00	2.12
A-	0.11	8.00	2.55
BBB	0.15 – 0.40	8.00	3.05 – 5.17
BB	0.65 – 1.95	8.00	6.50 – 9.97
B+	3.20	8.00	11.90
B	7.00	8.00	16.70
B-	13.00	8.00	22.89
CCC	> 13	8.00	> 22.89
CC		8.00	
C		8.00	
D		8.00	

Table 2: Rating grades and capital requirements.

maps default probabilities into risk weights. Table 2 illustrates the change in the capital requirements per unit of a loan induced by switching from Basel I to Basel II. Apart from basic risk determinants such as default probability (PD), maturity and loss given default (LGD) the risk weights depend also on the type of the loan (retail loan, loan to an SME, mortgages etc.) and the annual turnover. Table 2 refers to an SME loan and assumes that the borrower's annual turnover is 5 million euros (BCBS (2003)). Since the lock-in of the bank's equity affects the provision costs of the loan it is likely that these costs will be handed over directly to an individual borrower.

Basel II will affect any firm that is in need for external finance. As both the risk premium and the credit costs are determined by the default risk, the firms' rating will have a deeper economic impact on banks as well as on

firms themselves than ever before. Thus in the wake of Basel II the choice of the right rating method is of crucial importance. To avoid friction of a large magnitude the employed method must meet certain conditions. On one hand the rating procedure must keep the amount of misclassifications as low as possible. On the other hand it must be as simple as possible and, if employed by the borrower, also provide some guidance to him on how to improve his own rating.

SVMs have the potential to satisfy both demands. First, the procedure is easy to implement so that any firm could generate its own rating information. Second, the method is suitable for estimating a unique default probability for each firm. Third, the rating estimation done by an SVM is transparent and does not depend on heuristics or expert judgements. This property implies objectivity and a high degree of robustness against user changes. Moreover, an appropriately trained SVM enables the firm to detect the specific impact of all rating determinants on the overall classification. This property would enable the firm to figure out in advance to negotiations what drawbacks it has and how to overcome its problems. Overall, SVMs employed in the internal rating systems of banks will improve the transparency and accuracy of the system. Both improvements may help firms and banks to adapt to the Basel II framework more easily.

Lagrangian Formulation of the SVM

Having introduced some elements of statistical learning and demonstrated the potential of SVMs for company rating we can now give a Lagrangian formulation of an SVM for the linear classification problem and generalise




Figure 3: The separating hyperplane $x^\top \cdot w + b = 0$ and margin in a non-separable case.

this approach for a non-linear case.

In the linear case the following inequalities hold for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ points of the training set (here $y_i = 1$ for bankrupt companies and $y_i = -1$ for surviving companies):

$$\begin{aligned} x_i^\top \cdot w + b &\geq 1 - \xi_i \quad \text{for } y_i = 1, \\ x_i^\top \cdot w + b &\leq -1 + \xi_i \quad \text{for } y_i = -1, \\ \xi_i &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which can be combined into two constraints

$$y_i(x_i^\top \cdot w + b) \geq 1 - \xi_i \quad (9)$$

$$\xi_i \geq 0. \quad (10)$$

The basic idea of the SVM classification is to find such a separating hyperplane that corresponds to the largest possible margin between the points of different classes (Figure 3). We also need to introduce some penalty for misclassification. ξ_i is the classification error related to the distance from a misclassified point i to the canonical hyperplane bounding its class. If $\xi_i > 0$ an error in separating two sets occurs. The parameter C characterises the generalisation ability of the machine. The objective function corresponding to penalised margin maximisation is formulated as

$$\frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 + C \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \right)^v, \quad (11)$$

where $v \geq 1$ is a positive integer controlling the sensitivity of the machine to outliers. Under such a formulation the problem is convex. The conditional minimisation of the objective function provides the highest possible margin in the case when classification errors are inevitable due to the linearity of the separating hyperplane. One can show that margin maximisation reduces the VC dimensionality.

The Lagrange functional for the primal problem for $v = 1$ is

$$L_P = \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \{y_i (x_i^\top \cdot w + b) - 1 + \xi_i\} - \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \xi_i, \quad (12)$$

where $\alpha_i \geq 0$ and $\mu_i \geq 0$ are Lagrange multipliers. The primal problem is formulated as

$$\min_{w, b, \xi_i} \max_{\alpha_i} L_P. \quad (13)$$

Then, after substituting the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions (Gale et al. (1951)) into the primal Lagrangian, we will derive the dual Lagrangian as

$$L_D = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j y_i y_j x_i^\top \cdot x_j \quad (14)$$

and the dual problem is posed as

$$\max_{\alpha_i} L_D, \quad (15)$$

subject to

$$0 \leq \alpha_i \leq C, \quad (16)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i y_i = 0. \quad (17)$$

Those points i for which the equation $y_i(x^\top \cdot w + b) \leq 1$ holds are called *support vectors*. After training the support vector machine and deriving Lagrange multipliers (they are equal to 0 for non-support vectors) one can classify a company described by the vector of parameters x using the classification rule

$$g(x) = \text{sign}(x^\top \cdot w + b), \quad (18)$$

where $w = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i y_i x_i$, $b = \frac{1}{2} (x_{+1} + x_{-1}) \cdot w$ and x_{+1} , x_{-1} are two support vectors for which $y_i(x^\top \cdot w + b) = 1$ belonging to different classes. The value of the classification function (the score of a company) can be computed as

$$f(x) = x^\top \cdot w + b \quad (19)$$

Each value of $f(x)$ uniquely corresponds to a default probability (PD).

The SVMs can also be easily generalised for the non-linear case. It is worth noting that all the training vectors appear in the dual Lagrangian formulation only as scalar products. This means that we can apply kernels to transform all the data into a highly dimensional Hilbert feature space and use linear algorithms there:

$$\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{H} \quad (20)$$

If a kernel function K exists such that $K(x_i, x_j) = \Psi(x_i)^\top \cdot \Psi(x_j)$, then we can use this kernel without knowing the transformation Ψ explicitly. A necessary and sufficient condition for a symmetric function $K(x_i, x_j)$ to be a kernel, the Mercer's condition (Mercer (1909)), is that it must be positive definite, i.e. for any data set x_1, \dots, x_n and any real numbers $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ the function K must satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_i \lambda_j K(x_i, x_j) \geq 0. \quad (21)$$

Some examples of kernel functions are

- $K(x_i, x_j) = e^{-\|x_i - x_j\|/2\sigma^2}$ – isotropic Gaussian kernel;
- $K(x_i, x_j) = e^{-(x_i - x_j)^\top a^{-2} \Sigma^{-1} (x_i - x_j)/2}$ – stationary Gaussian kernel with an anisotropic radial basis. We will apply this kernel in our study setting Σ equal to the covariance matrix of the training set;
- $K(x_i, x_j) = (x_i^\top \cdot x_j + 1)^P$ – the polynomial kernel;
- $K(x_i, x_j) = \tanh(kx_i^\top \cdot x_j - \delta)$ – the hyperbolic tangent kernel.

Description of Data

For our study we selected all largest bankrupt companies with the capitalisation of no less than \$1 billion that filed for protection against creditors under Chapter 11 of the US Bankruptcy Code in 2001-2002 i.e. following the stock market crash in 2000 with an exception of few ones for which data were not complete, i.e. altogether 42 companies. They were matched with 42 surviving companies with similar capitalisations and the same US industry classification codes available through the Division of Corporate Finance of the Securities and Exchange Commission (CF SEC (2004)).

From 84 companies 28 belonged to various manufacturing industries, 20 to telecom and IT industries, 8 to energy industries, 4 to retail industries, 6 to air transportation industries, 6 to miscellaneous service industries, 6 to food production and processing industries and 6 to construction and construction material industries. For each company the following information was collected from the annual reports for 1998-1999, i.e. 3 years prior to defaults of bankrupt companies (SEC (2004)):

- S – sales;
- COGS – cost of goods sold;
- EBIT – earnings before interest and taxes, in most cases equal to the operating income;
- Int – interest payments;
- NI – net income (loss);
- Cash – cash and cash equivalents;

- Inv – inventories;
- CA – current assets;
- TA – total assets;
- CL – current liabilities;
- STD – current maturities of the long-term debt;
- TD – total debt;
- TL – total liabilities;
- bankr – bankruptcy (1 if a company went bankrupt, –1 otherwise).

The information about the industry was summarized in the following dummy variables:

- indprod – manufacturing industries;
- indtelc – telecom and IT industries;
- indenerg – energy industries;
- indret – retail industries;
- indair – air transportation industries;
- indserv – miscellaneous service industries;
- indfood – food production and processing industries;
- indconst – construction and construction material industries.

Variable	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
TA	0.367	91.072	8.122	13.602
CA	0.051	10.324	1.657	1.887
CL	0.000	17.209	1.599	2.562
TL	0.115	36.437	4.880	6.537
CASH	0.000	1.714	0.192	0.333
INVENT	0.000	7.101	0.533	1.114
LTD	0.000	13.128	1.826	2.516
STD	0.000	5.015	0.198	0.641
SALES	0.036	37.120	5.016	7.141
COGS	0.028	26.381	3.486	4.771
EBIT	-2.214	29.128	0.822	3.346
INT	-0.137	0.966	0.144	0.185
NI	-2.022	4.013	0.161	0.628
EBIT/TA	-0.493	1.157	0.072	0.002
NI/TA	-0.599	0.186	-0.003	0.110
EBIT/S	-2.464	36.186	0.435	3.978
EBIT/INT	-16.897	486.945	15.094	68.968
TD/TA	0.000	1.123	0.338	0.236
TL/TA	0.270	1.463	0.706	0.214
SIZE	12.813	18.327	15.070	1.257
QA/CL	-4.003	259.814	4.209	28.433
CASH/TA	0.000	0.203	0.034	0.041
WC/TA	-0.258	0.540	0.093	0.132
CA/CL	0.041	2001.963	25.729	219.568
STD/TD	0.000	0.874	0.082	0.129
S/TA	0.002	5.559	1.008	0.914
INV/COGS	0.000	252.687	3.253	27.555

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for the companies. All data except *SIZE* and ratios are given in billions of dollars. $SIZE = \ln(TA)$

Basing on these financial indicators the following four groups of financial ratios were constructed and used in our study:

- profit measures: $EBIT/TA$, NI/TA , $EBIT/S$;
- leverage ratios: $EBIT/Int$, TD/TA , TL/TA ;
- liquidity ratios: QA/CL , $Cash/TA$, WC/TA , CA/CL and STD/TD , where QA is quick assets and WC is working capital;
- activity or turnover ratios: S/TA , $Inv/COGS$.

Computational Results

The most significant predictors suggested by the discriminant analysis belong to profit and leverage ratios. To demonstrate the ability of an SVM to extract information from the data, we will chose two ratios from these groups: NI/TA from the profitability ratios and TL/TA from the leverage ratios. The SVMs, besides their Lagrangian formulation, can differ in two aspects: (i) their capacity that is controlled by the coefficient C in (12) and (ii) the complexity of classifier functions controlled in our case by the anisotropic radial basis in the Gaussian kernel transformation.

Triangulares and quadrangles in Figures 4–7 represent successful and failing companies from the training set. The intensity of the gray background corresponds to different score values f . The darker the area, the higher the score and the greater the probability of default. Most successful companies lying in the bright area have positive profitability and a reasonable leverage TL/TA of around 0.4 that makes economic sense.

Figure 4 represents the classification results for an SVM using locally near linear classifier functions (the anisotropic radial basis is $100\Sigma^{1/2}$) with the capacity fixed at $C = 1$. The discriminating rule in this case can be approximated as a linear combination of predictors and is similar to that suggested by discriminant analysis although the coefficients of the predictors may be different.

If the complexity of classifying functions increases (the radial basis goes down to $2\Sigma^{1/2}$) as illustrated in Figure 5, we get a more detailed picture. Now the areas of successful and failing companies become localised. If the radial basis is decreased further down to $0.5\Sigma^{1/2}$ (Figure 6), the SVM will try to track each observation. The complexity in this case is too high for the given dataset.

Figure 7 demonstrates the effects of high capacities ($C = 300$) on the classification results. As capacity is growing, the SVM localises only one cluster of successful companies. The area outside this cluster is associated with approximately equally high score values.

Thus, besides estimating the scores for companies the SVM also managed to learn that there always exists a cluster of successful companies, while the cluster for bankrupt companies vanishes when the capacity is high, i.e. a company must possess certain characteristics in order to be successful and failing companies can be located elsewhere. This result was obtained *without using any additional knowledge* besides that contained in the training set.

The calibration of the model or estimation of the mapping $f \mapsto PD$ can be illustrated by the following example (the SVM with the radial basis $2\Sigma^{1/2}$ and capacity $C = 1$ will be applied). We can set three rating grades: safe,




Figure 4: Rating of companies in two dimensions. The case of a low complexity of classifier functions (locally near linear functions are used, the radial basis is $100\Sigma^{1/2}$). The capacity is fixed at $C = 1$.




Figure 5: Rating of companies in two dimensions. The case of an average complexity of classifier functions, the radial basis is $2\Sigma^{1/2}$. The capacity is fixed at $C = 1$.




Figure 6: Rating of companies in two dimensions. The case of an excessively high complexity of classifier functions, the radial basis is $0.5\Sigma^{1/2}$. The capacity is fixed at $C = 1$.




Figure 7: Rating of companies in two dimensions. The case of a high capacity ($C = 300$). The radial basis is fixed at $2\Sigma^{1/2}$.




Figure 8: Power curve for the data set. An SVM is applied with the radial basis $2\Sigma^{1/2}$ and capacity $C = 1$.

neutral and risky which correspond to the values of the score $f < -0.0115$, $-0.0115 < f < 0.0115$ and $f > 0.0115$ respectively and calculate the total number of companies and the number of failing companies in each of the three groups. If the training set were representative of the whole population of companies, the ratio of failing to all companies in a group would give the estimated probability of default. Figure 8 shows the cumulative number of defaults as a function of the score. For the abovementioned three rating grades we derive $PD_{safe} = 0.24$, $PD_{neutral} = 0.50$ and $PD_{risky} = 0.76$.

If a sufficient number of observations is available, the model can also be calibrated for finer rating grades such as AAA or BB by adjusting the score values separating the groups of companies so that the estimated default probabilities within each group equal to those of the corresponding rating grades. Note, that we are calibrating the model on the grid determined by $\text{grad}f = 0$ or $\text{grad}\hat{P}D = 0$ and not on the orthogonal grid as in the Moody's RiskCalc model. In other words, we do not make a restrictive assumption of an independent influence of predictors as in the latter model. This can be important since, for example, the same decrease in profitability will have different consequences for high and low leveraged firms.

For multidimensional classification the results can not be easily visualised. In this case we will use the cross-validation technique to compute the percentage of correct classifications and compare it with that for the discriminant analysis (DA). Note that both most widely used methods – the discriminant analysis and logit regression – choose only one significant at the 5% level predictor NI/TA when forward selection is used. Cross-validation has the following stages. One company is taken out of the sample and the SVM

trained on the remaining companies. Then the class of the out-of-the-sample company is evaluated by the SVM. This procedure is repeated for all the companies and the percentage of correct classifications calculated.

The percentage of correctly cross-validated companies (all available ratios were used as predictors) is higher for the SVM than for discriminant analysis (62% vs. 60%). However, the difference is not significant at the 5% level. This indicates that the linear function might be considered as an optimal classifier for the number of observations in the data set we have. As for the direction vector of the separating hyperplane, it can be estimated differently by the SVM and DA without affecting much the accuracy since the correlation of underlying predictors is high.

Cluster center locations as they were estimated using cluster analysis are presented in Table 4. The results of the cluster analysis indicate that two clusters are likely to correspond to successful and failing companies. Note the substantial differences in the interest coverage ratios, NI/TA, EBIT/TA and TL/TA between the clusters.

Conclusion

As we have shown SVMs are capable of extracting information from the real life economic data sets. Moreover, they give an opportunity to obtain the results not very obvious at first glance. They are easily adjusted with only few parameters that makes them particularly well suited as the core technique for a company rating methodology which can be regularly applied for estimating investment risks by financial institutions.

Further on, SVMs are based on very few restrictive assumptions and can

Cluster	{-1}	{1}
EBIT/TA	0.263	0.015
NI/TA	0.078	-0.027
EBIT/S	0.313	-0.040
EBIT/INT	13.223	1.012
TD/TA	0.200	0.379
TL/TA	0.549	0.752
SIZE	15.104	15.059
QA/CL	1.108	1.361
CASH/TA	0.047	0.030
WC/TA	0.126	0.083
CA/CL	1.879	1.813
STD/TD	0.144	0.061
S/TA	1.178	0.959
INV/COGS	0.173	0.155

Table 4: Cluster centre locations. There are 19 members in class $\{-1\}$ – successful companies and 65 members in class $\{1\}$ – failing companies.

reveal effects overlooked by many other methods. They have been able to produce accurate classification results in other areas and can become an option of choice for company rating. However, in order to create a practically valuable methodology one needs to combine an SVM with an extensive data set of companies and possibly turn to alternative formulations of SVMs more suited for processing large data sets. Overall, we have a valuable tool for company rating that can answer the requirements of the new capital regulations.

References

- E. ALTMAN (1968): Financial ratios, discriminant analysis and the prediction of corporate bankruptcy, *The Journal of Finance*, pp. 589–609.
- E. ALTMAN, R. HALDEMAN and P. NARAYANAN (1977): Zeta analysis: a

new model to identify bankruptcy risk of corporations, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, pp. 29–54.

BCBS (2003): Basel Committee on Banking Supervision: the New Basel Capital Accord, third consultative paper, <http://www.bis.org/bcbs/cp3full.pdf>.

W. BEAVER (1966): Financial ratios as predictors of failures. empirical research in accounting: Selected studies, *Journal of Accounting Research*, pp. 71–111, supplement to vol. 5.

CF SEC (2004): Division of Corporate Finance of the Securities and Exchange Commission: Standard industrial classification (SIC) code list, <http://www.sec.gov/info/edgar/siccodes.htm>.

A. DAMODARAN (1998): *Applied Corporate Finance: A User's Manual*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.

E. DEAKIN (1972): A discriminant analysis of predictors of business failure, *Journal of Accounting Research*, pp. 167–179.

A. DIMITRAS, R. SLOWINSKI, R. SUSMAGA and C. ZOPOUNIDIS (1999): Business failure prediction using rough sets, *European Journal of Operational Research*, pp. 263–280.

EUNITE (2001): Electricity load forecast competition of the European Network on Intelligent TEchnologies for Smart Adaptive Systems, <http://neuron.tuke.sk/competition/>.

E. FALKENSTEIN (2000): Riskcalc for private companies: Moody's default model.

- P. FITZPATRICK (1932): A comparison of the ratios of successful industrial enterprises with those of failed companies.
- H. FRYDMAN, E. ALTMAN and D.-L. KAO (1985): Introducing recursive partitioning for financial classification: The case of financial distress, *The Journal of Finance*, vol. 40, 269–291.
- D. GALE, H. W. KUHN and A. W. TUCKER (1951): Linear Programming and the Theory of Games, in *Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation*, T. C. Koopmans (ed.), John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
- D. MARTIN (1977): Early warning of bank failure: A logit regression approach, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, pp. 249–276.
- J. MERCER (1909): Functions of positive and negative type and their connection with the theory of integral equations, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, vol. 209, 415–446.
- R. MERTON (1974): On the pricing of corporate debt: The risk structure of interest rates, *The Journal of Finance*, vol. 29, 449–470.
- J. OHLSON (1980): Financial ratios and the probabilistic prediction of bankruptcy, *Journal of Accounting Research*, pp. 109–131.
- J. RAMSER and L. FOSTER (1931): A demonstration of ratio analysis. bulletin no. 40.
- SEC (2004): Securities and Exchange Commission: Archive of historical documents, <http://www.sec.gov/cgi-bin/srch-edgar>.

- K. TAM and M. KIANG (1992): Managerial application of neural networks: the case of bank failure prediction, *Management Science*, vol. 38, 926–947.
- A. N. TIKHONOV and V. Y. ARSENIN (1977): *Solution of Ill-posed Problems*, W. H. Winston, Washington, DC.
- V. VAPNIK (1995): *The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory*, Springer, New York.
- J. WIGINTON (1980): A note on the comparison of logit and discriminant models of consumer credit behaviour, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, vol. 15, 757–770.
- A. WILCOX (1971): A simple theory of financial ratios as predictors of failure, *Journal of Accounting Research*, pp. 389–395.
- A. WINAKOR and R. SMITH (1935): Changes in the financial structure of unsuccessful industrial corporations. bulletin no. 51.
- C. ZAVGREN (1983): The prediction of corporate failure: The state of the art, *Journal of Accounting Literature*, pp. 1–38.
- M. ZMIJEWSKI (1984): Methodological issues related to the estimation of financial distress prediction models, *Journal of Accounting Research*, vol. 20, 59–82.