



## How to Find the Best Style ETFs

With an ever-growing list of similar-sounding ETFs to choose from, finding the best is an increasingly difficult task. How can investors change the game to shift the odds in their favor?

[Learn more about the best fundamental research](#)

### Don't Trust ETF Labels

There are at least 159 different All Cap Blend ETFs and at least 692 ETFs across twelve styles. Do investors need 57+ choices on average per style? How different can the ETFs be?

Those 159 All Cap Blend ETFs are very different from each other. With anywhere from 22 to 4,074 holdings, many of these All Cap Blend ETFs have drastically different portfolios with differing risk profiles and performance outlooks.

The same is true for the ETFs in any other style, as each offers a very different mix of good and bad stocks. Large Cap Value ranks first for stock selection. Small Cap Growth ranks last. Details on the [Best & Worst ETFs in each style are here](#).

### Avoiding Analysis Paralysis

We think the large number of style ETFs hurts investors more than it helps. Manually conducting a deep analysis for every ETF is simply not a realistic option, exposing investors to insufficient analysis and missing profitable opportunities. Analyzing ETFs, with the proper diligence<sup>1</sup>, is far more difficult than analyzing stocks because it means analyzing all the stocks within each ETF. As stated above, there can be as many as 4,074 stocks or more for one ETF.

Anyone focused on [fulfilling the fiduciary duty of care](#) recognizes that analyzing the holdings<sup>2</sup> of an ETF is critical to finding the best ETF. More [reliable](#) & [proprietary](#) fundamental data, proven in [The Journal of Financial Economics](#), drives our research and analysis of ETF holdings and provides investors with a [new source of alpha](#). Figure 1 shows our top-rated ETF for each style.

---

<sup>1</sup> Three independent studies from respected institutions prove the superiority of our data, models, and ratings. Learn more [here](#).

<sup>2</sup> Harvard Business School features the powerful impact of our research automation technology in the case [New Constructs: Disrupting Fundamental Analysis with Robo-Analysts](#).

**Figure 1: The Best ETF in Each Style**

Ticker	Name	Investment Style	Assets (\$mm)
VSMV	VictoryShares U.S. Multi-Factor Minimum Volatility ETF	All Cap Blend	\$119
FFTY	Innovator IBD 50 ETF	All Cap Growth	\$114
SDVY	First Trust SMID Cap Rising Dividend Achievers ETF	All Cap Value	\$791
DUHP	Dimensional U.S. High Profitability ETF	Large Cap Blend	\$618
MTUM	iShares MSCI USA Momentum Factor ETF	Large Cap Growth	\$10,127
DLN	WisdomTree U.S. Large Cap Dividend Fund	Large Cap Value	\$3,314
QVAL	Alpha Architect U.S. Quantitative Value ETF	Mid Cap Blend	\$195
BFOR	Barron's 400 ETF	Mid Cap Growth	\$122
LSAT	Two Roads LeaderShares AlphaFactor Tactical Focused	Mid Cap Value	\$140
CALF	Pacer U.S. Small Cap Cash Cows 100 ETF	Small Cap Blend	\$835
JSMD	Janus Henderson Small/Mid Cap Growth Alpha ETF	Small Cap Growth	\$158
SVAL	iShares U.S. Small Cap Value Factor ETF	Small Cap Value	\$142

\* Best ETFs exclude ETFs with TNAs less than \$100 million for inadequate liquidity  
Sources: New Constructs, LLC and company filings

Amongst the ETFs in Figure 1, Alpha Architect U.S. Quantitative Value ETF (QVAL) ranks first overall, Innovator IBD 50 ETF (FFTY) ranks second, and VictoryShares U.S. Multi-Factor Minimum Volatility ETF (VSMV) ranks third. Janus Henderson Small/Mid Cap Growth Alpha ETF (JSMD) ranks last.

### How to Avoid “The Danger Within”

Why do you need to know the holdings of ETFs before you buy?

You need to be sure you do not buy an ETF that might blow up. Buying an ETF without analyzing its holdings is like buying a stock without analyzing its business and finances. No matter how cheap, if it holds bad stocks, the ETF's performance will be bad. Don't just take my word for it, see [what Barron's says](#) on this matter.

#### PERFORMANCE OF FUND'S HOLDINGS – FEES = PERFORMANCE OF FUND

Analyzing each holding within funds is no small task. Our [Robo-Analyst technology](#) enables us to perform this diligence with scale and provide the [research needed](#) to fulfill the fiduciary duty of care. More of the biggest names in the financial industry (see [At BlackRock, Machines Are Rising Over Managers to Pick Stocks](#)) are now embracing technology to leverage machines in the investment research process. Technology may be the only solution to the dual mandate for research: cut costs and fulfill the fiduciary duty of care. Investors, clients, advisors and analysts deserve the latest in technology to get the diligence required to make prudent investment decisions.

### If Only Investors Could Find Funds Rated by Their Holdings

Our [ETF ratings](#) leverage our [stock coverage](#). We rate ETFs based on the aggregated ratings of the stocks each ETF holds.

Alpha Architect U.S. Quantitative Value ETF (QVAL) is not only the top-rated Mid Cap Bend ETF but is also the overall top-ranked style ETF out of the 692 style ETFs that we cover.

The worst ETF in Figure 1 is Janus Henderson Small/Mid Cap Growth Alpha ETF (JSMD), which still gets a Very Attractive rating.

*This article originally published on [July 28, 2022](#).*

*Disclosure: David Trainer, Kyle Guske II, Matt Shuler, and Brian Pellegrini receive no compensation to write about any specific stock, style, or theme.*

*Follow us on [Twitter](#), [Facebook](#), [LinkedIn](#), and [StockTwits](#) for real-time alerts on all our research.*



## ***It's Official: We Offer the Best Fundamental Data in the World***

---

Many firms claim their research is superior, but none of them can prove it with independent studies from highly-respected institutions as we can. Three different papers from both the public and private sectors show:

1. Legacy fundamental datasets suffer from significant inaccuracies, omissions and biases.
2. Only our “novel database” enables investors to overcome these flaws and apply [reliable](#) fundamental data in their research.
3. Our proprietary measures of [Core Earnings](#) and [Earnings Distortion](#) materially improve stock picking and forecasting of profits.

### **Best Fundamental Data in the World**

Forthcoming in [The Journal of Financial Economics](#), a top peer-reviewed journal, [Core Earnings: New Data & Evidence](#) proves our Robo-Analyst technology overcomes material shortcomings in legacy firms' data collection processes to provide superior [fundamental data](#), [earnings](#) models, and [research](#). More [details](#).

Key quotes from the paper:

- “[New Constructs’] *Total Adjustments* differs significantly from the items identified and excluded from Compustat’s adjusted earnings measures. For example... 50% to 70% of the variation in *Total Adjustments* is not explained by *S&P Global’s (SPGI) Adjustments* individually.” – pp. 14, 1<sup>st</sup> para.
- “A final source of differences [between New Constructs’ and S&P Global’s data] is due to data collection oversights...we identified cases where Compustat did not collect information relating to firms’ income that is useful in assessing core earnings.” – pp. 16, 2<sup>nd</sup> para.

### **Superior Models**

A top accounting firm features the superiority of our ROIC, NOPAT and Invested Capital research to Capital IQ & Bloomberg’s in [Getting ROIC Right](#). See the [Appendix](#) for direct comparison details.

Key quotes from the paper:

- “...an accurate calculation of ROIC requires more diligence than often occurs in some of the common, off-the-shelf ROIC calculations. Only by scouring the footnotes and the MD&A [ as New Constructs does] can investors get an accurate calculation of ROIC.” – pp. 8, 5<sup>th</sup> para.
- “The majority of the difference...comes from New Constructs’ machine learning approach, which leverages technology to calculate ROIC by applying accounting adjustments that may be buried deeply in the footnotes across thousands of companies.” – pp. 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> para.

### **Superior Stock Ratings**

Robo-Analysts’ stock ratings outperform those from human analysts as shown in this [paper](#) from Indiana’s Kelley School of Business. Bloomberg features the paper [here](#).

Key quotes from the paper:

- “the portfolios formed following the buy recommendations of Robo-Analysts earn abnormal returns that are statistically and economically significant.” – pp. 6, 3<sup>rd</sup> para.
- “Our results ultimately suggest that Robo-Analysts are a valuable, alternative information intermediary to traditional sell-side analysts.” – pp. 20, 3<sup>rd</sup> para.

Our mission is to provide the best fundamental analysis of public and private businesses in the world and make it affordable for all investors, not just Wall Street insiders.

We believe every investor deserves to know the whole truth about the profitability and valuation of any company they consider for investment. More details on our cutting-edge technology and how we use it are [here](#).



## ***DISCLOSURES***

New Constructs®, LLC (together with any subsidiaries and/or affiliates, "New Constructs") is an independent organization with no management ties to the companies it covers. None of the members of New Constructs' management team or the management team of any New Constructs' affiliate holds a seat on the Board of Directors of any of the companies New Constructs covers. New Constructs does not perform any investment or merchant banking functions and does not operate a trading desk.

New Constructs' Stock Ownership Policy prevents any of its employees or managers from engaging in Insider Trading and restricts any trading whereby an employee may exploit inside information regarding our stock research. In addition, employees and managers of the company are bound by a code of ethics that restricts them from purchasing or selling a security that they know or should have known was under consideration for inclusion in a New Constructs report nor may they purchase or sell a security for the first two days after New Constructs issues a report on that security.

## ***DISCLAIMERS***

The information and opinions presented in this report are provided to you for information purposes only and are not to be used or considered as an offer or solicitation of an offer to buy or sell securities or other financial instruments. New Constructs has not taken any steps to ensure that the securities referred to in this report are suitable for any particular investor and nothing in this report constitutes investment, legal, accounting or tax advice. This report includes general information that does not take into account your individual circumstance, financial situation or needs, nor does it represent a personal recommendation to you. The investments or services contained or referred to in this report may not be suitable for you and it is recommended that you consult an independent investment advisor if you are in doubt about any such investments or investment services.

Information and opinions presented in this report have been obtained or derived from sources believed by New Constructs to be reliable, but New Constructs makes no representation as to their accuracy, authority, usefulness, reliability, timeliness or completeness. New Constructs accepts no liability for loss arising from the use of the information presented in this report, and New Constructs makes no warranty as to results that may be obtained from the information presented in this report. Past performance should not be taken as an indication or guarantee of future performance, and no representation or warranty, express or implied, is made regarding future performance. Information and opinions contained in this report reflect a judgment at its original date of publication by New Constructs and are subject to change without notice. New Constructs may have issued, and may in the future issue, other reports that are inconsistent with, and reach different conclusions from, the information presented in this report. Those reports reflect the different assumptions, views and analytical methods of the analysts who prepared them and New Constructs is under no obligation to insure that such other reports are brought to the attention of any recipient of this report.

New Constructs' reports are intended for distribution to its professional and institutional investor customers. Recipients who are not professionals or institutional investor customers of New Constructs should seek the advice of their independent financial advisor prior to making any investment decision or for any necessary explanation of its contents.

This report is not directed to, or intended for distribution to or use by, any person or entity who is a citizen or resident of or located in any locality, state, country or jurisdiction where such distribution, publication, availability or use would be contrary to law or regulation or which would be subject New Constructs to any registration or licensing requirement within such jurisdiction.

This report may provide the addresses of websites. Except to the extent to which the report refers to New Constructs own website material, New Constructs has not reviewed the linked site and takes no responsibility for the content therein. Such address or hyperlink (including addresses or hyperlinks to New Constructs own website material) is provided solely for your convenience and the information and content of the linked site do not in any way form part of this report. Accessing such websites or following such hyperlink through this report shall be at your own risk.

All material in this report is the property of, and under copyright, of New Constructs. None of the contents, nor any copy of it, may be altered in any way, copied, or distributed or transmitted to any other party without the prior express written consent of New Constructs. All trademarks, service marks and logos used in this report are trademarks or service marks or registered trademarks or service marks of New Constructs. Copyright New Constructs, LLC 2003 through the present date. All rights reserved.