# Pricing anomalies in the Indian corporate bond market

#### Rajeswari Sengupta (IGIDR) and Harsh Vardhan (SPJIMR)

December 15, 2021

Rajeswari Sengupta (IGIDR) and Harsh Vardhan (SPJIMR) Pricing anomalies in the Indian corporate bond market

個 と く ヨ と く ヨ とし

-

## Corporate bond issuance and outstanding

#### Based on Crisil report



Rajeswari Sengupta (IGIDR) and Harsh Vardhan (SPJIMR)

Pricing anomalies in the Indian corporate bond market

#### Credit spreads on 5 Year AAA bonds

#### Aggregate data from Bloomberg



Rajeswari Sengupta (IGIDR) and Harsh Vardhan (SPJIMR) Pricing anomalies in the Indian corporate bond market

### Pricing anomalies in corporate bonds?

- Corporate bonds present 2 risks to investors: credit risk and market risk.
- Price of a bond depends on 2 factors: credit rating and maturity.
- Bonds with identical maturities and credit ratings, issued in close proximity should be priced identically.
- Any difference in their pricing is an anomaly.
- 1. Is there evidence of pricing anomalies in the corporate bond market?
- 2. Can this be established in a robust manner?

#### Data

- Collect data on every bond issued from FY2011 to FY2021 from NSDL.
- Data on issuer, issue size, coupon rate, credit rating, maturity for 13,360 issuances.
- Use data on 7,455 issuances from FY2017 to FY2021.
- Consider highest rating for each bond and assign default probabilities using data from CRISIL, ICRA, and CARE.

くぼう くほう くほう

#### Shares in volume of issuances, FY2017-FY2021



Source: NSDL, Authors' calculation • Created with Datawrapper

Rajeswari Sengupta (IGIDR) and Harsh Vardhan (SPJIMR) Pricing anomalies in the Indian corporate bond market

#### Volumes by rating categories, FY2017-FY2021



Rajeswari Sengupta (IGIDR) and Harsh Vardhan (SPJIMR)

Pricing anomalies in the Indian corporate bond market

æ

7/16

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

### Pricing anomaly, April 2018 to March 2021

Price difference between best priced and worst priced AAA bonds issued within a month, across maturities



# I. Is there evidence of pricing anomalies in bond market?

Maturity of bonds	Pricing difference between best priced and worst priced bonds			
10 years	116 basis points			
5 years	271 basis points			
3 years	167 basis points			

- Best priced bonds are issued by the PSU entities.
- NBFC bonds are best priced when government owned and worst priced when privately owned.

個 と く ヨ と く ヨ と

## II. Can we establish pricing anomalies in a robust manner?

- ► We calculate credit spreads for all issuances.
- Account for market risk by deducting GSec yield of corresponding maturity.
- Credit spreads should be determined solely by default probability.
- Higher the default probabilities (or lower the credit ratings), the higher would be the credit spreads.
- The influence of other factors on credit spreads would point towards pricing anomalies.

▲口 > ▲檀 > ▲臣 > ▲臣 > 二臣 二

-	Dep var: Credit spread		
	Full sample		
Default probability	0.014***	-	
	(0.004)		

Rajeswari Sengupta (IGIDR) and Harsh Vardhan (SPJIMR) Pricing anomalies in the Indian corporate bond market

/// ▶ ▲ 王 ▶ ▲ 王 ▶

	Dep var: Credit spread		
	Full sample		
Default probability	0.014*** (0.004)		
Issue size	-0.003*** (0.001)		
Maturity period	0.0001***		

▲圖▶ ▲ 国▶ ▲ 国▶

	Dep var: Credit spread
	Full sample
Default probability	0.014***
	(0.004)
Issue size	-0.003***
	(0.001)
Maturity period	0 0001***
matching portion	(0.00002)
PCII	2 086***
100	(0.159)
	()
Finance	-1.252***
	(0.097)
 N	7455
Adjusted R-sq	0,12, (2), (2), (2), (2), (2), (2), (2), (2

Rajeswari Sengupta (IGIDR) and Harsh Vardhan (SPJIMR)

Pricing anomalies in the Indian corporate bond market

	Dep. var: Credit spread			
	Full sample	PSU	Non-PSU	
Default probability	0.014***		0.013***	
	(0.004)		(0.004)	
Issue size	-0.003***	-0.0002	-0.004**	
	(0.001)	(0.0003)	(0.002)	
Maturity period	0.0001***	0.0002***	-0.00000	
	(0.00002)	(0.00002)	(0.00002)	
PSU	-2.086*** (0.159)			
Finance	-1.252***	-0.236*	-1.316***	
	(0.097)	(0.124)	(0.109)	
N	7455	662	6797	
Adjusted R-sq	0.12	0.12	0.05	
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01			

Rajeswari Sengupta (IGIDR) and Harsh Vardhan (SPJIMR) Pricing anomalies in the Indian corporate bond market

▲日▼▲□▼▲回▼▲回▼ 回 ろく(?)

	Dep. var:Credit Spread				
	Full sample	PSU	Non-PSU	Finance	Non-finance
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Default probability	0.014***	-0.002	0.013***	-0.008**	0.037***
	(0.004)	(0.037)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.009)
Issue size	-0.003***	-0.0002	-0.004**	-0.004***	-0.003***
	(0.001)	(0.0003)	(0.002)	(0.0004)	(0.001)
Maturity period	0.0001***	0.0002***	-0.00000	0.0001***	0.00004
	(0.00002)	(0.00002)	(0.00002)	(0.00002)	(0.00003)
PSU	-2.086 <sup>***</sup> (0.159)			-1.841*** (0.110)	-2.559*** (0.257)
Finance	-1.252*** (0.097)	-0.236* (0.124)	-1.316*** (0.109)		
N	7455	662	6797	3325	4134
Adjusted R-sq	0.12	0.12	0.05	0.14	0.05
Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01					

Rajeswari Sengupta (IGIDR) and Harsh Vardhan (SPJIMR) Pricing anomalies in the Indian corporate bond market

▲圖 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶

#### Implications

- Raises questions about the credibility of credit ratings.
- PSU issuers enjoy a 'subsidy' in bond pricing.
- Anomalies in pricing of bonds distorts price discovery.

### Ongoing work

- Do pricing anomalies go up during conditions of tight liquidity?
- Do pricing anomalies go up after 'negative' events in securities markets?

Thank You rajeswari.sen@gmail.com harshv89@yahoo.com



個 と く ヨ と く ヨ と