

## Fake News, Investor Attention, and Market Reaction

### Online Appendix

Jonathan Clarke, Hailiang Chen, Ding Du, and Yu Jeffrey Hu

**Table A1. Investor Attention to Fake News: *ReadCommentDummy***

VARIABLES	(1) <i>Log(ReadComment)</i> OLS	(2) <i>ReadComment</i> <i>Dummy</i> OLS	(3) <i>ReadComment</i> <i>Dummy</i> Probit	(4) <i>ReadComment</i> <i>Dummy</i> Logit
<i>Fake</i>	-0.287 (0.387)	-0.089 (0.072)	-0.122 (0.294)	-0.166 (0.512)
<i>Log(Length)</i>	0.333 (0.315)	0.054 (0.065)	0.460 (0.284)	0.726 (0.499)
<i>%NegWord</i>	-0.051 (0.288)	-0.021 (0.053)	0.008 (0.214)	0.003 (0.359)
<i>Premium</i>	-0.130 (0.304)	-0.075 (0.058)	-0.323 (0.223)	-0.511 (0.378)
<i>EditorPick</i>	-1.130*** (0.383)	-0.221*** (0.079)	-1.292*** (0.454)	-2.211** (0.863)
<i>Log(Comment)</i>	0.434*** (0.133)	0.057** (0.026)	0.073 (0.096)	0.112 (0.158)
<i>%NegFactiva</i>	0.004 (0.401)	0.016 (0.068)	-0.134 (0.228)	-0.209 (0.381)
<i>Factiva</i>	0.566 (0.346)	0.120* (0.068)	0.641** (0.261)	1.075** (0.444)
<i>PosEA</i>	-0.778 (0.611)	-0.258* (0.140)		
<i>NegEA</i>	-0.708 (0.863)	-0.168 (0.146)	-0.415 (0.879)	-0.747 (1.580)
<i>Log(Size)</i>	-0.312* (0.190)	-0.063 (0.043)	-0.539*** (0.153)	-0.900*** (0.275)
<i>Market-to-Book</i>	0.002 (0.002)	0.000 (0.000)	0.048*** (0.018)	0.076** (0.033)
<i>ROA</i>	0.412** (0.188)	0.067 (0.043)	0.188 (0.153)	0.329 (0.262)
<i>LEV</i>	0.099 (0.148)	0.020 (0.034)	0.270** (0.129)	0.447** (0.215)
<i>ARet<sub>-30,-1</sub></i>	-0.703** (0.313)	-0.073 (0.083)	-0.380 (0.299)	-0.661 (0.641)
Constant	-1.248 (2.428)	-0.099 (0.523)	-2.062 (2.052)	-3.115 (3.674)
Sector FE	Yes	Yes	No	No
Quarter FE	Yes	Yes	No	No
Observations	172	172	171	171
Adj./Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.426	0.427	0.179	0.177

Notes: \*, \*\*, and \*\*\* indicate  $p < 0.1$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , and  $p < 0.01$ , respectively. Robust t-statistics are presented in parentheses.

As a robustness test, we construct a dummy variable, *ReadCommentDummy*, to denote whether an article has its comments read by at least one visitor. The mean of this dummy variable is 0.308, which implies that 30.8% of articles have their comments read by at least one visitor. The standard deviation is 0.463, so there is also significant variation in this dummy variable. In Table A1, we present the results from the robustness test that uses this dummy variable as the dependent variable. Columns (2) to (4) present the results for OLS, Probit, and Logit regressions, respectively. Because  $PosEA \neq 0$  perfectly predicts the outcome, so one observation is dropped and *PosEA* is not included in the Probit and Logit regressions (Columns 3 and 4). As a comparison, Column (1) presents the results for when  $\text{Log}(\text{ReadComment})$  is the dependent variable, which are the same as in Column (4) of Table 3 in the paper.

We obtain similar results when the dependent variable is a dummy variable, which has a significant level of variation. In short, we do not observe any significant difference between fake news articles and legitimate news articles in terms of how frequently and whether or not the article comments are read by visitors.

**Table A2. Summary Statistics: Before and After Matching**

Variable	#Obs	Median	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Panel A. Before Matching						
Treatment group						
<i>Log(Size)</i>	322	3.661	3.538	0.729	1.904	4.843
<i>Market-to-Book</i>	322	2.186	-12.075	67.329	-335.723	19.507
<i>ROA</i>	322	-0.662	-3.580	16.562	-144.069	-0.193
<i>LEV</i>	322	0.556	9.647	57.007	0.272	391.310
<i>ARet<sub>-30,-1</sub></i>	322	0.025	0.117	0.347	-0.494	1.487
<i>ConsumerGoods</i>	322	0	0.019	0.135	0	1
<i>Healthcare</i>	322	1	0.724	0.448	0	1
Control group						
<i>Log(Size)</i>	14196	8.829	8.593	2.286	0.638	12.354
<i>Market-to-Book</i>	14196	3.784	10.565	65.443	-4027.244	713.515
<i>ROA</i>	14196	0.061	-0.085	2.337	-154.859	0.496
<i>LEV</i>	14196	0.591	0.660	3.609	0.014	247.099
<i>ARet<sub>-30,-1</sub></i>	14196	0.005	0.022	0.227	-0.907	5.855
<i>ConsumerGoods</i>	14196	0	0.295	0.456	0	1
<i>Healthcare</i>	14196	0	0.182	0.386	0	1
Panel B. After Matching						
Treatment group						
<i>Log(Size)</i>	248	3.968	3.767	0.582	1.904	4.843
<i>Market-to-Book</i>	248	2.186	-2.615	38.621	-335.723	19.507
<i>ROA</i>	248	-0.636	-0.892	1.342	-10.912	-0.193
<i>LEV</i>	248	0.495	0.730	0.782	0.272	6.431
<i>ARet<sub>-30,-1</sub></i>	248	0.038	0.122	0.324	-0.494	1.406
<i>ConsumerGoods</i>	248	0	0.024	0.154	0	1
<i>Healthcare</i>	248	1	0.899	0.302	0	1
Control group						
<i>Log(Size)</i>	248	3.646	3.688	0.978	0.638	7.011
<i>Market-to-Book</i>	248	2.186	-11.679	257.831	-4027.244	470.114
<i>ROA</i>	248	-0.504	-1.072	1.944	-11.526	0.401
<i>LEV</i>	248	0.386	0.796	1.805	0.014	14.375
<i>ARet<sub>-30,-1</sub></i>	248	-0.012	0.129	0.653	-0.756	4.528
<i>ConsumerGoods</i>	248	0	0.016	0.126	0	1
<i>Healthcare</i>	248	1	0.927	0.260	0	1

In Table A2, we present the summary statistics for variables in the matching procedure for the treatment and control groups separately and for both before- and after-matching.