

Regulatory Costs of Being Public: Evidence from Bunching Estimation*

Michael Ewens[†] Kairong Xiao[‡] Ting Xu[§]

July 31, 2021

Abstract

The increased burden of disclosure and governance regulations is often cited as a key reason for the significant decline in the number of publicly-listed companies in the U.S. We explore the connection between regulatory costs and the number of listed firms by exploiting a regulatory quirk: many rules trigger when a firm's public float exceeds a threshold. Consistent with firms seeking to avoid costly regulation, we document significant bunching around multiple regulatory thresholds introduced from 1992 to 2012. We present a revealed preference estimation strategy that uses this behavior to quantify regulatory costs. Our estimates show that various disclosure and internal governance rules lead to a total compliance cost of 4.1% of the market capitalization for a median U.S. public firm. Regulatory costs have a greater impact on private firms' IPO decisions than on public firms' going private decisions. However, heightened regulatory costs only explain a small fraction of the decline in the number of public firms.

JEL Classification Codes: G21, G28

Keywords: cost of being public, bunching estimator, capital market regulation, disclosure, governance

*We thank Tara Bhandari, Susan Chaplinsky, Joan Ferra-Mensa, Justin Hopkins, Peter Iliev, Marc Lipson, Xiaoding Liu, Elena Loutskina, Katie Moon, Paul Tetlock, Emily Wang, Joshua White, and seminar and conference participants at the CICF, the Securities and Exchange Commission, UVA Darden, Columbia, Caltech, the Junior Corporate Finance Workshop, and the Junior Entrepreneurial Finance/Innovation Lunch Group for helpful comments. We thank John Graham and Jie Yang for sharing data and Tianchen Zhao for excellent research assistance.

[†]California Institute of Technology and NBER. mewens@caltech.edu

[‡]Columbia Business School. kx2139@gsb.columbia.edu

[§]Darden School of Business, University of Virginia. xut@darden.virginia.edu

A central explanation for the significant decline in the number of publicly-listed companies in the U.S. is the increased burden of disclosure and governance regulations. Indeed, practitioners often point to heightened regulatory costs as the culprit of the disappearing public firms, while recent major de-regulations such as the 2012 JOBS Act were directly motivated by perceived costs of being public.¹ For instance, in the comment letter to the SEC, Morgenstern and Nealis (2004) write that (p.1) “the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 and its implementing regulations have significantly increased the costs and regulatory burdens associated with being a public company.” Understanding the role of regulations in the cost of being public and the decline in the number of public firms can address concerns on possible capital market dysfunction (Weild, 2011, p.1).

Researchers have explored this “regulatory overreach hypothesis”, but the evidence is mixed.² A key challenge faced by the prior literature is that firms often engage in regulatory avoidance in response to regulations, as many public firm regulations trigger only when a firm’s size exceeds certain threshold. Firms seeking to avoid costly regulation can bunch their public float below the threshold. Such manipulation creates a selection bias, which may hinder traditional identification strategies such as difference-in-differences (DID) and regression discontinuity (RD). Furthermore, these reduced-form methods are not well-suited for *quantification* of regulatory costs, so the existing evidence has been mainly qualitative rather than quantitative. As Leuz and Wysocki (2016) write in their survey of the literature (p. 529): “evidence on the causal effects of disclosure and financial reporting regulation is often difficult to obtain and still relatively rare;” “while we have a lot of evidence that is qualitatively useful, we are still far from being able to perform quantitative cost-benefit analyses.”

In this paper, we attempt to advance the literature in two respects. First, rather than facing manipulation as an identification impediment, we follow the bunching estimation literature (Saez,

¹“For business owners who want to take their companies to the next level, this bill will make it easier for you to go public.” President Obama’s remarks at bill signing (<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/04/05/remarks-president-jobs-act-bill-signing>).

²Earlier works such as Gao, Ritter, and Zhu (2013) and Doidge, Karolyi, and Stulz (2013) cast doubt on this narrative by noting that the decline in IPOs precedes major regulatory changes such as Sabranes-Oxley (SOX). In contrast, recent works such as Dambrá, Field, and Gustafson (2015) find that IPO activity partially increased after the regulatory relief of the 2012 JOBS Act, suggesting regulatory burden is an important cost in the going-public decision. Other explanations of the decline in the number of public firms include declining business dynamism (Decker, Haltiwanger, Jarmin, and Miranda, 2016; Doidge, Karolyi, and Stulz, 2017), shifting investment to intangibles (Kahle and Stulz, 2017; Doidge, Kahle, Karolyi, and Stulz, 2018), increased availability of private equity (Ewens and Farre-Mensa, 2020), changing economies of scale (Gao, Ritter, and Zhu, 2013), and changing acquisition behavior (Eckbo and Lithell, 2021).

2010; Chetty et al., 2011; Kleven and Waseem, 2013) and use firms’ endogenous bunching around the regulatory threshold to infer regulatory costs. The central insight of the approach is a revealed preference argument: greater bunching by public firms to avoid financial regulation implies higher regulatory costs. This approach allows us to analyze multiple regulatory changes over 20 years, which provide a more comprehensive understanding of the regulatory costs borne by public firms. Second, this approach quantifies the monetary value of regulatory costs, which allows us to conduct a novel set of counterfactual analyses on the effects of regulation on the choice of public and private status. These regulatory cost estimates can also be used as critical inputs into quantitative cost-benefit analyses by regulators and policymakers.

We begin by documenting three regulatory thresholds on a firm’s public float (i.e., value of trading equity) introduced since 1992. Each regulatory threshold is associated with a set of exemptions from disclosure and internal governance rules. The first threshold is \$25m, which stemmed from the introduction of the “Small Business Issuers” and scaled disclosures in 1992. Firms below \$25m float had less stringent disclosure requirements on financial data, business operation, risk, and governance.³ The second threshold is \$75m introduced in 2002. Firms below \$75m are exempted from the SOX 404 requirement to hire an outside auditor to attest to their internal controls.⁴ The third threshold is \$700m implemented in the JOBS Act in 2012. Newly public firms below this threshold (“Emerging Growth Companies”) receive several financial reporting accommodations, deferred compliance with new accounting rules, and an exemption from SOX 404(b). These regulatory thresholds create variations in the major components of disclosure and internal governance regulations faced by public firms.

Next, we document significant bunching in the distribution of firms’ public float around each regulatory threshold in years the regulations are in place. As shown by Figure 1, the density falls discretely at each regulatory threshold. On its own, such bunching provides compelling evidence that regulations triggered by these thresholds impose significant compliance costs on firms, and that these costs seem to outweigh the regulations’ potential benefits such as lower costs of capital. We find that firms close to the thresholds manipulate their public float mainly by substituting debt

³These scaled disclosures were later expanded to firms with less than \$75m float in 2008 with the introduction of “Small Reporting Companies”.

⁴The \$75m threshold also features the “Non-accelerated filer” introduced in 2002, which allows firms with a float below \$75m to have 10 (15) more days to file their quarterly (annual) reports to the SEC.

for equity, without changing their operations or insider ownership.

The validity of bunching estimation relies on the “smoothness” assumption: the distribution of the public float is smooth in the absence of regulation. Consistent with this identifying assumption, we find no excess mass in years before the regulatory threshold is introduced or after it is eliminated, making it unlikely that other factors are changing at the threshold. We also find no excess mass around placebo thresholds without regulations.

Motivated by the above bunching patterns, we develop a model to guide our estimation. In the model, firms can avoid regulatory costs by reducing their public float to a level below the regulatory threshold. However, bunching distorts firms’ leverage away from the optimum. Hence, firms face a trade-off between regulatory costs and capital structure distortion costs. The optimal bunching choice depends on how far away a firm’s undistorted public float is from the regulatory threshold. Firms that are just above the threshold shrink their public float to avoid regulation because the associated leverage distortion is small. Firms that are far above the threshold do not bunch because the cost of leverage distortion outweighs the cost of regulation. There exists a marginal firm that is indifferent between the two costs and hence bunching or not. We can infer the regulatory cost facing this marginal firm from its leverage distortion cost.

We use the fuzzy bunching estimator developed by Alvero and Xiao (2020) to estimate the undistorted float of the marginal firm for each regulatory threshold.⁵ This estimator infers the marginal firm from the area between the actual cumulative distribution function (CDF) with regulation and the counterfactual CDF in the absence of the regulation. We then translate the estimated float distortion to a dollar value of regulatory costs facing the marginal firm using the leverage distortion cost function from Binsbergen, Graham, and Yang (2010). Finally, we extrapolate the regulatory costs to other firms using the relative share of variable versus fixed costs estimated from SEC surveys (SEC, 2011) and Audit Analytics data.

Our estimates show that the median U.S. public firm spends 0.3% of its EBITDA on enhanced disclosure compliance, 0.9% on tightened internal control, and 2.1% on a combination of disclosure and internal control rules every year. The present value of these regulatory costs represents 4.1% of the median firm’s equity value. Aggregate regulatory costs have increased significantly in the first

⁵Fuzzy bunching estimator is more appropriate than sharp bunching estimator in settings with smaller samples and greater noise in the data. Our setting fits this well as we focus on a few thousand listed firms and stock price fluctuations can add substantial noise to bunching patterns.

few years after SOX, but have been declining since, especially after JOBS Act. Smaller firms bear disproportionate amounts of regulatory costs relative to their size because a large portion of these costs are fixed. Nevertheless, various regulatory exemptions introduced by the SEC substantially alleviated the regulatory burden for firms below the regulatory thresholds.

Using the estimated regulatory costs, we investigate how regulation affects the number of public firms. Doidge et al. (2017) show that the decline in the number of public firms is driven by both low IPO rates and high delisting rates, each explaining about half of the decline. We first examine the effect of regulatory costs on private firms' IPO decisions, using a sample of 21,066 VC-backed firms.⁶ We find that regulatory costs significantly impact these firms' decisions to go public: a one-standard-deviation increase in regulatory costs is associated with a 7% decrease in IPO likelihood. However, our counterfactual analysis shows that major regulatory changes in the 2000s have limited impact on IPO volumes. Removing SOX only increases the average IPO likelihood after 2000 from 0.95% to 0.96%, because many potential IPO candidates are small enough to be exempted from this regulation. Removing all estimated regulatory costs increases the average IPO likelihood after 2000 from 0.95% to 1.4%, which explains only 7.4% of the decline in IPO likelihood from pre-2000 to post-2000.

Next, we examine the impact of our estimated regulatory costs on public firms' decisions to go private. We find that regulation costs do not appear to be a significant driver of going private decisions. This finding is likely to be explained by the fact that some of the regulatory costs are irreversible, upfront costs, which would enter into firms' going public decisions but are sunk costs for their going private decisions. Our result is consistent with Kaplan (1989), Guo et al. (2011), and Bernstein and Sheen (2016), who show that many going-private deals are motivated by financial or operational engineering reasons, rather than to avoid regulatory costs. Our result also echoes Leuz (2007), Leuz et al. (2008), and Bartlett III (2009), who find little evidence on the effect of regulations on going private transactions.

Overall, our findings suggest that regulatory costs affect firms' public-vs-private choice mainly through their going public rather than going private decisions. Nevertheless, quantitatively, regulatory costs only explain a small fraction of the disappeared IPOs, in contrast to the popular claim

⁶Such firms are an important pipeline of IPOs, representing half of the IPO firms in our sample period (e.g., Ritter, 2020; Ewens and Farre-Mensa, 2020).

by practitioners. Instead, our results are consistent with Gao et al. (2013) and Doidge et al. (2013), who suggest that regulatory changes in the early 2000s did not appear to cause the decline of public firms.

Although we believe our estimation approach addresses some limitations in the current literature, our approach requires several assumptions. First, although we study several major regulatory changes over 20 years, the bunching estimator requires that we study threshold-based regulations and thus excludes uniformly implemented regulations (e.g., Reg FD or the introduction of EDGAR). Nevertheless, our analysis covers important regulatory changes that are often attributed to changes in the number of public firms, such as SOX in 2002 and JOBS Act in 2012. Second, our baseline bunching estimation forms the counterfactual distribution using the years before the regulatory threshold is introduced or after it is eliminated. We show that our estimates are robust to dropping the two years before regulation changes to exclude potential anticipation-based bunching, or using a smooth poly-nominal to estimate counterfactual distributions in the bunching samples. Finally, we use the capital structure distortion costs estimated by Binsbergen et al. (2010) to translate observed bunching to a dollar value of regulatory costs. Nevertheless, our main results are robust to alternative parameters to estimate the costs of capital structure distortion or dropping financial and utility firms.

This paper contributes to a growing literature on the disappearing public firms puzzle. Aside from the “regulatory overreach hypothesis” and the aforementioned papers, the literature has also proposed five other major hypotheses: (1) declining business dynamism (Decker et al., 2016; Doidge et al., 2017), (2) shifting investment to intangibles (Kahle and Stulz, 2017; Doidge et al., 2018), (3) increased availability of private equity (Ewens and Farre-Mensa, 2020), (4) changing economies of scale (Gao et al., 2013), and (5) changing acquisition behavior (Eckbo and Lithell, 2021). Using the new bunching estimation strategy developed from the public economics literature, our paper provides an in-depth study of the “regulatory overreach hypothesis” by estimating the regulatory costs of being a public firm, examining the margins through which regulatory costs affect public-vs-private decisions, and quantifying how much of the decline in IPOs can be attributed to heightened regulatory costs. Our study suggests that regulatory costs only explain a small fraction of the decline in public firms; non-regulatory factors seem to be playing a more important role.

Our paper also adds to the extensive literature studying the impacts of disclosure and internal

governance regulations (see Leuz and Wysocki (2016) for a survey). Related to our work, Iliev (2010), Gao et al. (2009), Dharmapala (2016), Alsbah and Moon (2020), and Liu (2020) study the effects of regulatory thresholds on firm outcomes such as earnings quality, audit fees, leverage, and firm value.⁷ We differ from the existing literature by using bunching estimation to quantify regulatory costs from firms' regulatory avoidance behavior. This approach does not require a lack of size manipulation, but rather exploits the manipulation as a source of identification. Our approach complements traditional identification strategies such as DID and RD by expanding the scope of regulations that can be studied. Furthermore, most existing literature has been qualitative (Leuz and Wysocki, 2016). We quantify the net costs for a firm to comply with various disclosure and internal governance regulations. Our estimates are of interest to regulators, who can use these estimates as inputs to cost-benefit analysis on regulations. Our estimates also shed light on the ongoing debate on whether public firms face excessive regulatory burdens (Coates, 2007).

Finally, our application of bunching estimation to public firms adds to a growing literature that uses the bunching technique to study finance topics. Prior applications includes mortgage (DeFusco and Paciorek, 2017; DeFusco, Johnson, and Mondragon, 2020), small business lending (Bachas, Liu, and Yannelis, 2019; Bachas, Kim, and Yannelis, 2020), municipal bonds (Dagostino, 2018), bankruptcy fees (Antill, 2020), and banks (Alvero, Ando, and Xiao, 2020). The prior literature typically uses large administrative data with little noise. Hence, their bunching pattern is often characterized by a sharp density spike at the threshold. Our setting differs in that the sample size is smaller and the running variable contains more randomness (i.e., public float fluctuates with stock prices). As a result, the bunching pattern is much noisier. We address this challenge by using a new fuzzy bunching estimator introduced by Alvero and Xiao (2020). Given that many corporate finance settings feature relatively small samples and noisy data, our methodology can be fruitfully applied to future research in this area.

⁷Relatedly, Chaplinsky et al. (2017), Barth et al. (2017), Dambra et al. (2015), and Dambra and Gustafson (2020) study the impact of JOBS Act on IPO firms; Coates and Srinivasan (2014) surveys the literature on the effect of SOX on firm outcomes; Iliev and Vitanova (2019) study the effect of say-on-pay on compensation and firm value.

1 Data and Institutional Background

1.1 Data Sources

The SEC uses public float to determine firms' compliance status with multiple regulations. Formally, it is defined as the market value of all outstanding common equity (voting and non-voting) held by non-affiliates at the end of the second fiscal quarter.⁸ Firms are required to disclose their public float according to this exact definition at the beginning of their 10-K. We collect public float data for all U.S. listed firms from 10-K filings (including 10-KSB, 10-KT, and 10-K405) using a customized web-crawling script.⁹ We restrict to all fiscal years from 1994 (the year EDGAR starts and financial statements are machine-readable) to 2018. We further require firms to have non-missing sales in Compustat and non-missing public float. These restrictions exclude shell and pink sheet companies. We match these firms to Jay Ritter's IPO database to identify the year a firm went public.¹⁰ To estimate the cost structure of regulatory costs, we obtain audit fees data from Audit Analytics and SOX 404 compliance costs data reported in a SEC survey SEC (2011). Lastly, we use a sample of VC-backed firms from VentureSource to study the impact of regulatory costs on IPO decisions. We also use a sample of public firms that went through going private transactions (identified using 13e-3 filings) to study the impact of regulatory costs on going private decisions.

1.2 Institutional Background

SEC regulations on public firms can be characterized into two major categories: disclosure and governance. In this section, we describe the institutional details surrounding several regulatory reliefs offered by the SEC in the past three decades, which helps shed light on regulatory costs faced by public firms. We focus on four types of regulatory reliefs: scaled disclosure, non-accelerated filing, exemption from SOX Section 404, and Emerging Growth Company benefits. These benefits apply to firms of different sizes as determined by their public float, and sometimes by their revenue. For each rule change, we also provide the SEC's original assessment of costs and benefits. Although our bunching estimation does not rely on the exogeneity of these regulatory changes, we detail their

⁸Before 2002, public float was computed within 60 days of 10-K filing date. Rule 405 defines an affiliate as a "person that directly, or indirectly through one or more intermediaries, controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with," an issuer. Appendix Section A.1.1 provides more details on public float data.

⁹The data on public float is available here: https://michaelewens.github.io/public_float_regulation/.

¹⁰The data can be found here: <https://site.warrington.ufl.edu/ritter/ipo-data/>.

history and potential lobbying or anticipation in Appendix Section A.1.2.

1.2.1 Scaled Disclosure and Small Business Issuers

Enacted in August of 1992, the SEC implemented a new set of rules centered on the SB-2 registration form and refined the class of companies called “Small Business Issuers” (SBI).¹¹ These new rules refined Regulation S-K, a regulation about the information requirements in filings and the now defunct Form S-18.¹² These regulatory changes significantly expanded the set of companies that could take advantage of scaled disclosure from Form S-18. Some of the scaled disclosures included pared down selected financial data, simplified description of business, limited executive compensation information, no disclosure on beneficial ownership and less extensive details provided in annual reports.¹³ Appendix Table A.1 provides the full list of scaled disclosure items.

The 1992 rule change resulted in the introduction of small business annual reports (10-KSB) and quarterly reports (10-QSB). In its simplest form, a company could use the new SBI definition if it had a public float less than \$25m and annual revenues less than \$25m. However, there were some complications. Once a company began reporting with the SEC, it remained SBI until *either* its revenue or public float exceeded the \$25m threshold for two consecutive years (in its 10-KSB).

In 2008, the scaled disclosure regulatory relief was expanded to a broader set of firms called “Smaller Reporting Companies” (SRC), defined as firms with less than \$75m public float and less than \$50m in revenues (see Appendix A.1.3 for details on SRC). With the introduction of SRC, the SEC eliminated all SBI filings as such as 10-KSB and 10-QSB. The \$25m threshold for scaled disclosure thus ends in 2008.

As with all rule changes, the SEC assesses the costs and benefits of scaled disclosure. The SEC collected no data on expected costs and benefits from these changes, but did find some consensus from the majority of public commenters that the changes would result in cost savings for those firms that chose to use the new rules (i.e., it would be costly to have more disclosure).

¹¹See <https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/6949.txt> for the final rules.

¹²Form S-18 allowed qualified users with small offerings less than \$7.5m to avoid significant disclosures.

¹³See <https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/6949.txt> and <https://www.sec.gov/files/reg-sk-disclosure-requirements-review.pdf>.

1.2.2 Non-accelerated Filer

First proposed in 1998¹⁴ and eventually enacted in April 2002, the SEC created a new category of registered firms called “Accelerated Filers.”¹⁵ Such firms were required to file their finalized annual and quarterly reports within 75 and 35 days of the end of the fiscal period, respectively. Before this change, all registered firms had to file these reports within 90 and 45 days. The stated goal was “modernizing the periodic reporting system and improving the usefulness of periodic reports to investors.” (SEC, 2002, sec I.B) Importantly for our purposes, the SEC and public commenters recognized that the burden of accelerating filing may be higher for smaller firms. After the phase-in period, the new rule applied to firms whose public float was \$75 million or more as of the last business day of its most recently completed second fiscal quarter, among other conditions that accelerated filers need to satisfy.¹⁶ Firms that did not satisfy these conditions are “Non-Accelerated Filers.”

The SEC investigated the costs and benefits of this rule change. The primary source of data for the former was a survey from the American Society of Corporate Secretaries. The organization summarized the estimated costs provided by 46 of the surveyed companies with approximately \$75m float:

“These estimates ranged from \$12,500 to \$5,000,000, with a median value of \$125,000. 50% expected on-going annual costs to comply with the proposals. These estimates ranged from \$27,500 to \$250,000, with a median value of \$90,000. 11% of respondents expected both initial and on-going costs to comply with the proposals.”¹⁷

The SEC highlighted other potential costs including risk of lower quality information, increased audit fees, increased compliance costs (e.g. headcount), and general filing complications because there were no “best-practices” for report creation at the time of passage. The SEC weighed these costs against benefits to investors. Here, investors in accelerated filers would benefit because of improved timeliness and transparency of disclosures.

¹⁴<https://www.sec.gov/rules/proposed/337606a1.txt>

¹⁵The final rules are found here: <https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/33-8128.htm>.

¹⁶These conditions include i) The company has been subject to the reporting requirements of Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act for a period of at least 12 calendar months; ii) The company has previously filed at least one annual report pursuant to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act; iii) The company is not eligible to use Forms 10-KSB and 10-QSB.

¹⁷These substantial numbers relative to the size of the surveyed firm (around \$75m float) highlight the potentially large upward bias in firms’ self-reported compliance costs.

1.2.3 SOX Section 404 Exemption

The passage of the Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX) Act in 2002 introduced many new disclosure and governance rules for public companies. Section 404 concerns a firm’s internal controls and is widely considered as the costliest part of SOX (Zhang, 2007; Gao et al., 2009). Expecting a disproportionate burden of this section on small firms, the law provided an initial 5-month extension to both part (a) and (b) to firms with public floats less than \$75m in 2002. The former requires that firms provide a management’s report on their internal controls, while the latter requires that the firm hire an outside auditor to attest to the firm’s internal controls. Firms with floats above this threshold – accelerated filers – had to comply with 404(a) and (b) on or after November 15, 2004. Firms whose public float did not exceed \$75m – non-accelerated filers – in 2002, 2003 or 2004 could choose to not comply with both parts of Section 404. These exemptions were later extended multiple times and then made permanent.¹⁸

Regulators were aware that these new rules would introduce costs on firms. Specifically, the SEC expected that compliance with 404(b) in particular would lead to increased auditing fees and labor hours preparing financial statements. In an August 2006 report, the SEC writes:

“Many public commenters have asserted that the internal control reporting compliance costs are likely to be disproportionately higher for smaller public companies than larger ones, and that the auditor’s fee represents a large percentage of those costs. Furthermore, we have learned from public comments [...] that while companies incur increased internal costs in the first year of compliance as well due to “deferred maintenance” items (e.g., documentation, remediation, etc.), these costs may decrease in the second year. Therefore, postponing the costs that result from the auditor’s attestation report until the second year would help non-accelerated filers smooth the significant cost spike that has been experienced by many accelerated filers in their first year of compliance with the Section 404 requirements.”

A 2009 SEC survey (SEC, 2009) reports the estimated pre-2007 costs of 404 compliance for non-accelerated filers to be an average (median) of \$770K (\$580K). Iliev (2010), Gao et al. (2009) and Dey and Sullivan (2009) each provide empirical evidence for these costs, while arguing that they likely did not outweigh the benefits.

¹⁸The delay in compliance was later extended in September 2005 to 2007 (SEC Release NOS. 33-8731; 34-54295; File No. S7-06-03). In August 2006, non-accelerated filers were given extensions of 404(a) to 2007 and 404(b) to 2008. The SEC notes in that report for both rules, these “deadline[s] could be further postponed.” The exemption from 404(b) continued to be extended until non-accelerated filers were permanently exempt with the passage of the Dodd-Frank Act in 2010.

1.2.4 Emerging Growth Companies

In December 2011, the JOBS Act introduced the “Emerging Growth Company” (EGC) category for firms that went public after December 8, 2011. A company qualifies as an EGC if it has total annual gross revenues of less than \$1 billion (\$1.07 billion after 2017) during its most recently completed fiscal year and, as of December 8, 2011, had not sold common equity securities under a registration statement. A company retains its EGC status until it crosses one of the following thresholds: 1) reaching \$1 billion (\$1.07 billion after 2017) in gross revenue, 2) past the fifth anniversary of its IPO, 3) issuing more than \$1 billion of non-convertible debt within a three-year period, 4) has more than \$700 million public float (i.e., becomes a large accelerate filer). We focus on the last threshold, public float, because it is much harder to manipulate gross revenue, and newly public startups rarely issue more than \$1 billion of non-convertible public debt in the first five years after IPO. Notably, although a firm can transition out of the EGC status, it cannot transition into EGC if it did not elect EGC status during IPO filing.

There are several benefits of being an EGC, which are best summarized as a combination of scaled disclosure and relaxation of some internal governance rules. First, an EGC filer faces less extensive disclosure requirements in initial and subsequent registration statements, particularly in the description of executive compensation and the time periods covered by the MD&A section. Second, EGC filers only need to provide two years’ instead of three years’ of audited financial statements in initial registration statement and subsequent annual reports. Third, EGC filers do not need to provide an auditor attestation of internal control under SOX 404(b). Fourth, these filers can delay compliance with new accounting standards. Lastly, EGC filers can use test-the-waters communications with qualified institutional buyers and institutional accredited investors when issuing securities.¹⁹

1.3 How Significant Are These Regulations?

The regulations detailed above make up important components of a regulations faced by the registered (i.e., public) firm in the U.S. For example, the internal governance provisions of SOX only

¹⁹Being below \$700m float also gives EGCs additional 15 days in filing 10-Ks and 10-Qs relative to large accelerated filers who are above \$700m. However, as documented in both Alsabah and Moon (2020) and our Figure 1, there is no bunching in float below \$700m before 2012, suggesting that the value of this 15-day delay is negligible for firms around \$700m float.

emerged with the law’s passage, and is widely regarded as the costliest part of SOX (Zhang, 2007; Gao et al., 2009). The regulations that we study capture the two fundamental goals of the Securities Act of 1933: 1) requiring that investors receive financial and other significant information, and 2) prohibiting fraud and misrepresentations.²⁰ However, quantifying the importance of these rules relative to *all* public firm regulations is challenging. We attempt one quantification using the Small Business Issuer (SBI) classification introduced in 1992. To do so, we collect all 10-Ks and 10-KSBs from 1994 (availability of EDGAR) to 2007 (when 10-KSBs were eliminated). Annual reports have four parts, each of which we summarize with a simple measure of string length.²¹ Figure A.1 in the Appendix presents the average length of each part by year, split by SBI category. Across all years, SBIs have shorter sections in all but Part III. For many non-SBI 10-Ks, Part III refers the investor to firm’s proxy statement (DEF14A filing), while SBI 10-KSBs are less likely to do this. Next, Table A.3 in the Appendix shows in column 1 that the average SBI annual report file size is 27% smaller than those of non-SBI filings. The remaining columns show that the year-on-year differences in Figure A.1 are robust to controls, including industry, year and standard firm-level controls. Specifically, SBI 10-KSBs have 21% shorter Part Is, 20% shorter Part IIs and 80% shorter Part IVs. Columns (4) and (6) show that while SBIs have longer Part IIIs in their annual reports because they are less likely to refer readers to DEF14A, their DEF14A filings are 25% smaller than those of non-SBIs. Given the likely costs in time, resources and transparency of disclosure in 10-Ks, the differences in size and length between the SBI and non-SBI annual reports are economically meaningful.

Although the regulations we study capture the two fundamental aspects of the Securities Act of 1933, it is important to note that they do not encompass all regulations faced by public firms. For example, we do not study regulations related to securities exchange and trading, which are regulated by the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. We also do not study industry-specific regulations, such as regulations on financial institutions (e.g., Dodd-Frank Act) or mining safety regulations on mining companies. Lastly, our methodology precludes us from studying uniformly implemented regulations that are not threshold-based.²²

²⁰See <https://www.sec.gov/answers/about-lawsshtml.html>.

²¹Although the content and details of each 10-K section change over the sample period, we can summarize them as follows. Part I details the business, properties and legal proceedings. Part II contains financial data. Part III has information on management, compensation and insider transactions. Part IV contains exhibits and footnotes.

²²Appendix Table A.2 provides a list of other major SEC regulations that are not threshold-based.

1.4 Summary of Regulatory Thresholds

Despite the above regulations’ differences, they share a common eligibility criterion—public float. Panel A of Table A.5 summarizes the various regulatory reliefs described above and the associated public float cutoffs. Panel B describes the set of regulatory benefits enjoyed by firms in different public float categories. In particular, the last column summarizes the key thresholds that can be exploited in each time period and the associated benefits if firms stay below the threshold. These variations in cutoffs and their effective periods give us a rich empirical setting to separately identify the value of different regulatory reliefs.

Our empirical design exploits firms’ bunching behavior around three key public float cutoffs: \$25m, \$75m, and \$700m.²³ The bottom of Table 3 summarizes the thresholds and samples used to identify different sets of regulatory reliefs. Specifically, we use the period when the regulatory relief is in place as the bunching period, and the period before the relief is introduced (or after it expires) as the non-bunching period. The non-bunching period acts as the counterfactual distribution of firms’ public float in the absence of bunching incentives. In particular, we will use bunching around \$25m in 1994–2007 to identify the value of scaled disclosure, bunching around \$75m in 2003–2007 to identify the value of SOX 404 exemption and delayed filing, and bunching around \$700m in 2012–2018 to identify the value of EGC benefits. We provide more details on our estimation samples in Section 3.3.

2 Empirical Facts

2.1 Bunching at Regulatory Thresholds

Figure 1 shows the distributions of firms’ public float around the three regulatory thresholds detailed in Section 1.2. The left panels plot the CDFs and the right panels plot the histograms. If there is bunching in public float, the CDF should be steeper before the cutoff and flatter after the

²³The \$75m and \$700m thresholds are also associated with certain benefits in security issuance. Specifically, firms above \$75m float enjoy shelf registration before 2008 (Gustafson and Iliev, 2017), and firms above \$700m float enjoy Well-Known Seasoned Issuer (WKSI) status after 2005 (Clinton et al., 2014), both of which allow firms to streamline and accelerate their security issuance. These regulations may create a reverse incentive to bunch above these thresholds in the corresponding period, introducing a potential downward bias in our estimates. In robustness test, we use 2008–2018 as an alternative treatment period for the \$75m threshold, which is free from incentives to bunch for shelf-registration. Further, our bunching estimation for the \$700m threshold focuses on newly public firms. Given that seasoned security offerings are rare among these firms, WKSI should have a minimal impact on our estimation around \$700m.

cutoff, leading to a bulge in the distribution relative to the counterfactual CDF without bunching. Further, the histogram should also show a sharp drop in density after the cutoff than before it. Figure 1 shows just such a pattern. For all three thresholds, the CDF in bunching years is more concave than that in non-bunching years, generating a clearly visible gap between the two. The histograms also show a sharp drop in the density of firms’ public float after the cutoffs in bunching years and a smooth density around the cutoffs in non-bunching years. In contrast, in Figure 2, we find no bunching nor differences in float distributions across bunching and non-bunching years around three placebo thresholds unrelated to any regulations. These placebo figures suggest that the float distribution in non-bunching years serves as a good counterfactual for the distribution in bunching years.²⁴ Our bunching estimators exploit these bunching patterns to estimate the implied regulatory benefits associated with staying below the regulatory cutoffs.

2.2 Impacts of Regulatory Thresholds on Firms

We examine the impact of regulatory thresholds on firm outcomes in this section, which will inform our modeling choice of the costs of bunching in Section 3.1. Firms can distort their public float downward by increasing share repurchases or dividends. Such actions may in turn lead to changes on three main dimensions: 1) reduced investment; 2) increased leverage; 3) increased inside ownership. The first margin concerns firms’ operations while the latter two concern the financing side of firms’ balance sheet. If a firm scales back equity without increasing debt, its operation (and thus investment) would shrink and leverage would increase. On the other hand, if a firm keeps its operations constant, a shortfall in equity will need to be filled with debt. Alternatively, firms could keep both leverage and investment constant and only adjust the fraction of shares held by insiders vis-à-vis public investors. We test these margins using a (non-causal) difference-in-differences specification. Specifically, we focus on firms with public float within a small window around each of our thresholds and compare firms above and below the threshold, in bunching and non-bunching years. We estimate the following specification:

$$\Delta Y_{i,t} = \gamma_j + \alpha_t + \theta \times \textit{Below threshold}_{i,t} + \beta \times \textit{Below threshold}_{i,t} \times \textit{Bunching years}_t + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

²⁴We examine alternative ways to estimate counterfactual float distribution in Section 5.3

where $Below\ threshold_{i,t}$ indicates a firm’s public float being below one of the three thresholds, $Bunching\ years_t$ indicates treated years as in Table 3, and γ_j and α_t are industry and year fixed effects, respectively. The dependent variable $\Delta Y_{i,t}$ is the change in total payouts, book leverage, investment, or fraction of non-affiliated shares (i.e., one minus the fraction of closely-held shares) from year $t - 1$ to year t .²⁵

Table 2 reports the estimation results where each panel considers a different threshold. Column 1 shows that, across all three thresholds, firms manipulate their public floats down by increasing payouts, which include both dividends and repurchases. Column 2 shows that this public float distortion leads to increases in book leverage. In contrast, the remaining columns show that firms neither alter their investment nor insider ownership around the threshold changes. Column 3 considers the standard CAPEX-based measure of investment. Column 4 uses an alternative measure of investment that incorporates intangibles such as R&D and SG&A (Ewens et al., 2020). The signs are as predicted in some specifications, but lack statistical and economic significance. The final column 5 reports the change in insider ownership result. The evidence in two of the specifications goes in the opposite direction, while the coefficient estimate in Panel C is statistically and economically small. In Section 5.6, we further show that bunching firms do not change other aspects of their operation such as total assets, tangibility, profitability, or asset turnover.²⁶ These results suggest that firms find leverage to be the most cost-effective tool for manipulating their public float, while keeping their operations constant. In the following exercise, we infer the regulatory costs based on the adjustment of leverage.

3 Bunching Estimator of Regulatory Costs

This section lays out the bunching estimator that we use to quantify regulatory costs.

²⁵Since the dependent variables are first differences and most firms only show up for one year in our narrow window sample, we do not include firm fixed effects.

²⁶We further find that bunching firms are more likely to strategically release bad news in Q2.

3.1 Model

A firm chooses the quantity of equity e to issue in the public market relative to the undistorted level z to maximize its payoff:²⁷

$$\max_e -\Phi(e - z) - k\mathbf{1}_{\{e \geq \underline{e}\}}. \quad (2)$$

The first term of the payoff function, Φ , captures the costs that a firm incurs if its actual equity e deviates from its undistorted optimum z . Motivated by the empirical findings in Section 2 that firms mainly substitute debt for equity to bunch, Φ can be interpreted as the capital structure distortion costs. We obtain the functional form of Φ from Binsbergen et al. (2010, 2011):²⁸

$$\Phi(e - z) = \frac{1}{2}\beta\eta qzr^2 \left(1 - \frac{e}{z}\right)^2 \quad (3)$$

where e is the actual equity; z is the optimal equity in the absence of regulatory distortion; β is the slope of marginal cost curve of debt, which is estimated to be 4.733 by Binsbergen et al. (2010, 2011); η is public float-to-book asset ratio; q is Tobin's Q; r is interest rate on debt.

The second term of the payoff function (2), $k\mathbf{1}_{\{e \geq \underline{e}\}}$, is the cost of regulation. If a firm's equity is above a regulatory threshold, \underline{e} , then the firm is subject to that regulation which imposes a cost of k . For now, we treat k as a constant parameter. We will allow k to vary with firm size in Section 3.5.

k capture both the direct costs of regulation, including fees to lawyers and accountants and costs of investing in internal control system, and the indirect costs, including competition effect of disclosing proprietary information, productivity loss from diverting resources from operation to compliance, and any constraints regulations impose on firms operating decisions. The indirect costs are traditionally hard to measure because they are recorded in financial statements. However, the indirect costs affect firms' bunching decision, so they can be estimated via a revealed preference

²⁷Since we find that firms do not manipulate insider ownership, we use equity and public float interchangeably in the model.

²⁸The cost of leverage distortion is the triangular area between the marginal cost and marginal benefit curves of leverage as shown in Figure 1 of Binsbergen et al. (2011), or $\frac{1}{2}\beta(\Delta IOB)^2 v$, where IOB is interest over book assets a and v is firm value. Applied to our setting, the leverage distortion cost for a firm with optimal float z bunching at e is $\Phi(e - z) = \frac{1}{2}\beta(\Delta IOB)^2 v = \frac{1}{2}\beta \left(\frac{r(e-z)}{a}\right)^2 qa = \frac{1}{2}\beta r^2 \frac{z}{a} \left(\frac{e}{z} - 1\right)^2 qz = \frac{1}{2}\beta r^2 \eta qz \left(1 - \frac{e}{z}\right)^2$.

approach. Note that regulations may generate private benefits for firms in compliance with them. For instance, better disclosure can reduce a firm’s cost of capital. Therefore, k should be interpreted as the net cost of regulation, that is, compliance costs net of the benefits from compliance. We do not attempt to separately identify compliance costs and the benefits of compliance, because for firms’ compliance decisions or their public-private choice, what matters is the net costs. It is also worth noting that our net cost estimate does not incorporate the social benefits of regulations, such as the effects on competition, investor welfare, and other general equilibrium outcomes. Instead, our estimate provides a useful input for policy makers to compare against the social benefits of regulations.

Figure 3 shows the optimal choice of equity under different scenarios. Figure 3a shows that, in the absence of the regulation, firms choose the optimal equity amount $e = z$ to minimize capital structure distortion. However, after the regulation is introduced, the payoff function is shifted downward by k in the region where the equity is above the regulatory threshold, as shown by Figure 3b. The discrete jump in regulatory costs create an incentive for firms to bunch. Specifically, firms that are just above the regulatory threshold find it more profitable to reduce their equity to \underline{e} and avoid the regulatory costs. However, bunching is costly because of the costs from sub-optimal leverage, $\Phi(e - z)$. The loss in firm value is an increasing function of the undistorted equity because larger firms need to reduce more equity to bunch below the threshold, thus leading to larger loss in firm value. Figure 3c shows that if a firm’s undistorted equity is far larger than the threshold, then it chooses not to bunch and to instead incur the regulatory costs, k . There exists a marginal firm that is indifferent between bunching and incurring regulatory costs, as shown in Figure 3d. The indifference condition of the marginal firm reveals the regulatory costs. Formally, regulatory costs can be calculated as follows:

$$k = \Phi(\underline{e} - \bar{e}) \tag{4}$$

where \underline{e} is the regulatory threshold and \bar{e} is the undistorted equity of the marginal firm that is indifferent between bunching or not bunching. If we know the size of the marginal firm \bar{e} , we can estimate the regulatory cost parameter k .

3.2 Estimation

We estimate the marginal firm \bar{e} using the fuzzy bunching estimator developed by Alvero and Xiao (2020). The intuition of bunching estimation is illustrated in Figure 4. In the absence of the regulation, the distribution of public float would be smooth around the regulatory threshold, as shown by the blue dashed line in Figure 4. This smooth distribution F_0 is referred to as the “counterfactual distribution” in the literature. In the presence of the regulation, firms in $[\underline{e}, \bar{e}]$ would bunch at the regulatory threshold, \underline{e} , creating a bulge in the actual distribution function F , as shown by the red solid line in Figure 4b. The area of this bulge $A \equiv \int (F(e) - F_0(e)) de$ is referred to as the bunching area. The extent of bunching can be inferred from the bunching area. Intuitively, the bunching area can be approximated by a triangle with a height of $f_0 \Delta e$ and a base of Δe , where $\Delta e \equiv \bar{e} - \underline{e}$. We can then solve the bunching range Δe as $\Delta e = \sqrt{2A/f_0}$.²⁹

In the simple example discussed above, firms in the bunching range $[\underline{e}, \bar{e}]$ all bunch at the threshold so there will be zero density just above regulatory threshold. However, we do observe non-zero density in $[\underline{e}, \bar{e}]$ as shown in Figure 1, which indicates that some firms face optimization frictions and cannot bunch even if they wish to do so. Following the bunching literature, we use a parameter α to capture the fraction of non-optimizing firms (Kleven and Waseem, 2013). The bunching range Δe adjusted for optimization frictions is given by:

$$\widehat{\Delta e} = \sqrt{\frac{2A}{(1 - \alpha)f_0(\underline{e})}}, \quad (5)$$

where α can be estimated using the following formula:

$$\hat{\alpha} = \frac{2(F(\bar{e}) - F(\underline{e}))}{f_0(\underline{e})(\bar{e} - \underline{e})} - 1. \quad (6)$$

Intuitively, greater optimization frictions leads to more mass in $[\bar{e}, \underline{e}]$. We can therefore infer the fraction of non-optimizing agents from the mass in the dominated region, $F(\bar{e}) - F(\underline{e})$.

²⁹An alternative way to estimate the extent of bunching is to use the sharp bunching estimators developed in the public finance and labor literature (Saez, 2010; Chetty et al., 2011; Kleven and Waseem, 2013). The sharp bunching estimators exploit the sharp spike in the PDF as shown in Figure 4a. The extent of bunching is inferred by dividing the mass of the sharp spike (B) at the regulatory threshold with the counterfactual density f_0 : $\bar{e} - \underline{e} = B/f_0$. However, it is difficult to use the sharp bunching estimator in our setting because the bunching pattern is quite diffused, as shown in Figure 1. This is due to smaller sample size in public firm data and the fact that firms cannot perfectly control their public float due to fluctuations in share prices.

3.3 Estimation Samples

We estimate the above bunching model on samples of firms around each of our three regulatory thresholds. For each threshold, we use the years since its introduction as the “bunching sample” and examine the distribution of firms’ public float around that threshold. We also construct the “non-bunching sample” using years before the threshold’s introduction or after its expiration, which gives the counterfactual distribution of firms’ public float in the absence of bunching incentives.³⁰

Specifically, to analyze firms’ bunching below the \$25m threshold, we focus on firms that were small business issuers in the previous fiscal year and will be eligible this year if public float stays below \$25m. These are the firms with less than \$25m gross revenue in the current and previous fiscal years and whose public float is less than \$25m in the previous fiscal year. The sample period to construct the bunching distribution (bunching period) is 1994 to 2007. Since scaled disclosure was extended from firms below \$25m float to those below \$75m in 2008, the \$25M cutoff no longer applies after 2008. The sample period to construct the non-bunching distribution (non-bunching period) is thus 2009 to 2018.³¹

To exploit the \$75m threshold, we focus on non-accelerated filer firms that had less than \$75m public float in the previous fiscal year. We focus on the bunching period of 2003 to 2007 to identify the combined value of SOX 404 internal control exemption plus delayed filing of 10-Ks and 10-Qs. Our non-bunching period is 1994 to 2002.

Last, we analyze firms’ bunching around the \$700m threshold for Emerging Growth Company status. We obtain all IPOs from 1997 to 2018 from Jay Ritter’s website (Ritter, 2020), the Kenney-Patton IPO Database (Kenney and Patton, 2013), and SDC. We restrict to U.S. issuers with a positive public float after IPO. To focus on the firms with the strongest bunching incentives, we restrict to firms that were EGC-eligible in the previous year, i.e., firm-years with less than \$1 billion gross revenue in the previous and current fiscal years,³² and with less than \$700m public float in the previous fiscal year. Additionally, we restrict to the first three years after IPO since firms have the

³⁰Alternatively, we can construct the counterfactual distribution by fitting a smooth polynomial to the density distribution in the bunching sample after excluding the observations around the threshold. In Section 5, we demonstrate the robustness of our results to this alternative estimation of counterfactual distributions.

³¹We exclude the transitioning year 2008 from our non-bunching period because firms could still choose to file as a small business issuer in 2008 if their fiscal year ends after December 15th. Theoretically, we could also use the years before the introduction of this threshold (i.e., pre-1992) as the non-bunching period, but this precedes the introduction of EDGAR, which precludes from collecting public float data.

³²The gross revenue threshold was adjusted to \$1.07 billion from 2017 onward.

strongest incentives to bunch for EGC benefits when they are newly public (Alsabah and Moon, 2020). Our bunching period is from 2012 to 2018 and our non-bunching period is from 1997 to 2011.

We use firms that are just above the float of the marginal bunching firm in the bunching period to parameterize the cost of capital structure distortion, Φ . In Section 5, we show that our estimates are similar if we use firms *around* the float of the marginal bunching firm to obtain these parameters. We do not use data in non-bunching period because these financial ratios can vary significantly with market conditions.

3.4 Estimation Results

Panel A of Table 3 reports the estimates for each of the three regulatory thresholds. We first examine the \$25m threshold in column 1, which identifies the costs of enhanced disclosure. We find that the marginal firm that is indifferent between bunching and not bunching has a \$27m undistorted public float. Bunching of this marginal firm leads to an increase in leverage ratio of 5.6 percentage points. The indifference condition of this marginal firm implies that the annual regulatory costs associated with enhanced disclosure are around \$0.026 million per year. The present value of these regulatory costs account for 0.62% of the marginal bunching firm's firm value.

Column 2 reports the estimation for the \$75m threshold in the 2003–2007 period. This threshold relates to the regulatory costs of SOX 404 and accelerated filing deadlines. Here, the marginal bunching firm has an undistorted float of \$95m. Bunching of this marginal firm leads to an increase in leverage ratio of 10.8 percentage points. The indifference condition of this marginal firm implies that the annual regulatory costs associated with SOX 404 compliance and accelerated filing are \$0.122 million per year. The present value of these annual regulatory costs account for 0.73% of the marginal bunching firm's firm value.

Lastly, column 3 reports the estimates for the \$700m threshold, which identifies regulatory costs of losing EGC status. The estimates show that the marginal bunching firm has an undistorted float of \$838m . Bunching of this marginal firm leads to an increase in leverage ratio of 7.3 percentage points. The magnitude of this leverage change is close to that documented in Alsabah and Moon (2020). The indifference condition of this marginal bunching firm implies that the annual regulatory costs associated with losing EGC benefits are around \$0.71 million per year. The present value of

these annual regulatory costs represents 0.8% of the marginal bunching firm’s firm value.

To further facilitate the interpretation of the magnitude of our estimated regulatory costs, we benchmark these costs against the total assets and profits of the marginal bunching firm. Table 4 report the results. For the marginal firm that bunches for the \$25m threshold, annual enhanced disclosure costs around 0.18% of its total assets and 7.8% of EBITDA. For the marginal firm bunching for the \$75m threshold, annual SOX 404 compliance and accelerated filing cost 0.1% of its total assets, 1.3% of EBITDA, and 6.3% of net income. Finally, for the newly public marginal firm bunching for the \$700m threshold, the annual cost of losing all EGC benefits (a combination of disclosure and internal control reliefs) amounts to 0.13% of its total assets, 2.3% of EBITDA, and 7.1% of net income. These results suggest that small firms as well as newly public firms face particularly high regulatory costs as a percentage of their size and profit.

3.5 Extrapolation

Our approach provides an estimate of the regulatory costs facing the marginal bunching firms. In this section, we extrapolate these estimates to other firms. The extrapolation exploits the extent to which each of these regulatory costs are variable (i.e., proportional to size) versus fixed. If the regulatory costs are all fixed costs, then all firms have the same regulatory costs as the marginal firm regardless of firm size. However, if the regulatory costs are all variable, then the regulatory costs should scale proportionally with firm size. Formally, we can extrapolate the regulatory costs from the marginal bunching firm to a firm of public float e using the following equation:

$$\ln k = \ln \bar{k} + \kappa(\ln e - \ln \bar{e}) \tag{7}$$

where \bar{e} is the float of the marginal bunching firm, \bar{k} is the regulatory costs of the marginal firm estimated in Table 3, and κ is the elasticity of regulatory costs to the public float.

We estimate κ using two sets of data. First, we use surveyed SOX 404 compliance costs from the SEC study (SEC, 2011) to estimate their relationship with firms’ public float.³³ Note that we do not require firms to truthfully report compliance costs in the survey data — the self-reported costs could be biased. We simply require that firms do not bias the variable and fixed components

³³The SEC study only reports the average itemized compliance costs by public float interval and time period. We treat each float interval-period as one observation and weight the observations by the number of responding firms.

differentially, which is a much weaker assumption. Second, we use the relationship between pre-SOX audit fees from Audit Analytics and firms' public float to estimate the cost structure of disclosure compliance. Pre-SOX audit fees mainly capture financial reporting costs and does not include internal control costs. Lastly, we use the relationship between post-SOX audit fees, which capture both disclosure and internal control costs, and firms' public float to approximate the cost structure of EGC benefits.³⁴ We estimate the following relationship between reported regulatory costs and firms' public float:

$$\ln(\text{compliance costs}_{i,t}) = \kappa \ln(\text{public float}_{i,t}) + \delta_t + \epsilon_{i,t}. \quad (8)$$

Table 5 reports the estimates based on equation (8). Panel A reports the results for surveyed SOX 404 compliance costs. Column 1 estimates the elasticity of 404(b) audit fees to public float to be 0.432. We obtain an estimate of 0.456 when looking at the total SOX 404 compliance costs in column 5, which we use as our estimate of κ . Columns 1 and 2 of Panel B reports the relationship between pre-SOX audit fees and public float. Based on the coefficient for audit fees in column 1, we estimate the elasticity of disclosure cost to public float to be 0.412. Although we do not have data on reported values of EGC benefits, we can approximate its cost structure using post-SOX audit fees, which capture both disclosure and internal control costs. Column 3 of Panel B reports the relationship between post-SOX audit fees and public float. Based on the coefficient in column 3, we estimate the elasticity of combined disclosure and internal control cost to public float to be 0.423, which, reassuringly, lies between the elasticity for disclosure costs and that for internal control costs.

3.6 Regulatory Costs across Firms and Over Time

Using the estimated elasticities, we can compute the regulatory costs for companies of any public float in our data. For example, for the median U.S. firm with a public float of \$102m, it faces annual enhanced disclosure costs of \$0.045m, SOX 404 compliance costs of \$0.126m, and combined costs of disclosure and internal governance captured by EGC benefits of \$0.293m. These costs translate to 0.3%, 0.9%, and 2.1% of the firm's annual EBITDA, respectively. Using a 7% discount rate, their

³⁴In both cases, we exclude from Audit Analytics data firm-years that are exempted from the relevant regulation.

present values are respectively 0.6%, 1.8%, and 4.1% of the firms' public float. These regulatory costs are therefore economically meaningful for an average US public company.

We next examine the variations of the estimated regulatory costs across firms and over time. Figure 5 shows a heatmap of annual regulatory costs as a percentage of firm's EBITDA. We find that smaller firms face heavier regulatory burden than larger firms in the early sample period.³⁵ For example, at the beginning of our sample period, firms with \$10m float spend 10.5% of their EBITDA on regulatory costs per year. In contrast, firms around \$1 billion float spend 0.13% of EBITDA on regulatory costs. After SOX in 2002, medium-sized firms (\$75m-\$700m) experienced a large jump in regulatory costs relative to their size and profit. The regulatory burden on medium and small firms were greatly lifted by the 2012 JOBS Act.

Next, we aggregate our identified regulatory costs across all public firms in the U.S. and plot out the aggregate trends. Figure 6 shows the time series for aggregate regulatory costs in dollar and as a percentage of aggregate EBITDA. We find that the aggregate regulatory costs increased from \$2 billion in late 1990s to almost \$4 billion in 2018. There is a substantial jump after SOX, followed by a dip during financial crisis. Regulatory costs as a percentage of EBITDA increased from 0.15% before SOX to 0.23% after SOX. Since 2005, there has been a steady decline. Interestingly, JOBS Act did not lead to a noticeable decline in aggregate regulatory costs, likely because it only affects a small number of newly public firms. By 2018, regulatory costs relative to EBITDA have dropped to their pre-SOX levels.

3.7 Comparing with Existing Estimates

In this section, we compare our estimates with existing estimates from surveys and a few studies in the literature. A few caveats are noted before the comparison. First, existing evidence is limited due to the challenge in accurately identifying regulatory costs so it is often difficult to find an exact counterpart for our estimate. Second, some existing evidence is based on surveys on firms or CEOs. As shown by Parker (2018) and Alvero et al. (2020), firms may have incentives to over-report their compliance costs in surveys in order to seek regulatory relief. Third, our bunching estimator estimates the *net* costs of regulation (i.e., compliance costs minus the benefits of compliance due to lower costs of capital from improved governance). In contrast, existing databases or research often

³⁵Similar patterns hold when we scale regulatory costs by firms' public float as shown in Figure A.4.

report the gross compliance costs.

With the above caveats in mind, we first examine the regulatory costs of the scaled disclosure. Using a structural model, Cheynel and Liu-Watts (2020) estimates an average disclosure costs of about 0.26% of total assets. When applied to the marginal bunching firm's total assets of \$14.7m, this translates to a comparable annual disclosure costs of \$0.038m. Next, the Audit Analytics data provides pre-SOX audit fees, which we use as a proxy for the direct costs of financial disclosure. We focus on the pre-SOX era because audit fees in that period capture expense for financial auditing and not costs for post-SOX internal control compliance. For firms with asset size of the marginal bunching firms, the median audit fee is \$0.078m. Our estimate of \$0.026m for the value of scaled disclosure has the same order of magnitude as these alternative estimates. Our number is smaller because scaled disclosure does not cover all disclosure items.³⁶ In addition, our estimate captures the net disclosure cost after taking into account the potential benefits of enhanced disclosure available to firms.

Second, we estimate the net benefits of SOX 404 exemption to be \$0.122m per year for the marginal bunching firm with a \$94.6m float. Survey results from the SEC (2011) report shows that firms with public float between \$75m and \$250m face a median SOX 404 compliance cost of \$0.51m, out of which \$0.15m are 404(b) audit fees. Alternatively, we can use within-firm increase in audit fees around SOX as another proxy of direct internal control costs. For firms around the size of the marginal bunching firm, the median audit fee increases from 2000-2001 to 2003-2007 is \$0.14m. Using a fuzzy regression discontinuity design, Iliev (2010) finds that SOX 404 increased audit fees by 98%, which, applied to the median pre-SOX audit fees of \$0.135m for firms of similar size to the marginal bunching firm, translates to \$0.132m. Overall, these numbers are larger but have the same order of magnitude as our estimates.

Finally, we estimate the net benefits of EGC status to be \$0.713m per year for a marginal bunching firm of \$838m float. Unfortunately, there are no existing estimates of EGC benefits from surveys or research. The closest study is Lewis and White (2020), who survey a small group of biotech firms that have lost their EGC status. They report an average 404(b) compliance cost of

³⁶One could use our estimate in Table A.3 to scale up our enhanced disclosure cost: All else equal, SBI filers have 10-Ks and DEF14As that are about 25% shorter than non-SBI filers. Assuming homogeneous disclosure cost for all disclosure items, the full disclosure cost for our marginal bunching firm is around \$0.1m per year, or about 2.5% of firm value based on present value. This value is likely a lower bound as it does not incorporate overhead costs that are invariant to disclosure length.

\$0.8m, with \$0.41m in audit fees, \$0.19m in external consultant fees, and \$0.2m in internal labor. Given that 404(b) exemption is a subset of the benefits enjoyed by EGCs (though an important component), our estimate of \$0.713m can be considered as lower, which could again be explained by our measure capturing net benefits and/or firms over-reporting regulatory costs in surveys.

4 Regulatory Costs and the Disappearing Public Firms

In this section, we examine how much our estimated regulatory costs can explain the disappearing public firms puzzle. We explore both the entry to and exit from public market. Doidge et al. (2017) show that each margin accounts for roughly half of the disappearing public firms in the past few decades.

4.1 Regulatory Costs and the IPO Volume

We model the probability for firm i to go public in year t using a logit model:

$$\Pr(\text{IPO})_{i,t} = \frac{\exp(\beta \ln k_{i,t} + \gamma X_{i,t})}{1 + \exp(\beta \ln k_{i,t} + \gamma X_{i,t})}. \quad (9)$$

where $k_{i,t}$ is the regulatory costs borne by firm i in year t if it chooses to go public. The vector $X_{i,t}$ contains firm characteristics that affect the net benefits of IPO.

We estimate the above logit model using maximum likelihood on a panel of 21,066 U.S. venture capital(VC)-backed firms from 1992 to 2018, out of which 1,957 went public. To ensure a clean risk-set of potential IPOs, we track startups from their first VC round until exit or failure. As VC-backed startups are an important source of IPOs (e.g. Ritter, 2020), this sample provides a reasonable risk-set of private firm-years that face going public decisions. We estimate public float upon IPO from last round valuation using the following equation: $Public\ Float_{i,t} = Last\ valuation_{i,t} \times \text{Avg}(\frac{Primary\ shares \times Share\ price}{Pre\text{-}money\ valuation})_t \times \text{Avg}(\frac{Secondary\ shares + Primary\ shares}{Primary\ shares})_t$. We obtain the average ratio of raised amount to pre-money valuation from VentureSource and the average ratio of tradable shares (i.e., primary plus secondary) to primary shares from SDC. Both ratios are estimated at the yearly level. If a startup's valuation is missing in a given year, we linearly extrapolate using two known valuations. Startups with no reported valuations are excluded from

the sample. We control for total financing raised, years since first VC round, and dummies for firms' headquarter state. We also include industry-year fixed effects to absorb sectoral shocks and changes in regulations that apply uniformly to all firms.

Table 6 presents the estimated results. Columns 1 and 2 presents the logit coefficients and the marginal effects, respectively. We find that a one-standard-deviation increase in our estimated regulatory costs is associated with a 7% decrease in the probability of a VC-backed firm going public in a year. We also find that years since first round negatively predicts IPO likelihood. The result that regulatory costs significantly impact private firms' decision to go public echoes the findings in Aghamolla and Thakor (2019) and Lowry et al. (2017). However, we are the first to estimate the sensitivity of IPO decision to the dollar value of regulatory costs, rather than its response to a specific regulatory reform.

Using the estimated model, we conduct a set of counterfactual analyses of IPO outcomes by varying the regulatory costs $k_{i,t}$ after 2000, the period that witnessed dramatically lower numbers of IPOs. Columns 1 and 2 of Table 7 present the IPO outcomes before and after 2000 in the data. Columns 3 to 5 present the IPO outcomes after 2000 in three counterfactual scenarios. First, we consider a counterfactual scenario without SOX.³⁷ Column 3 of Table 7 shows that there is a slight increase in the probability of IPO and IPO volumes. In particular, removing SOX only increases average IPO likelihood post 2000 from 0.95% to 0.96%. The result may appear surprising given that the costs of SOX 404 are substantial. However, further investigation reveals that, in our sample, 82% of VC-backed firm would have a public float below SOX 404 exemption threshold upon IPO, which suggests that most VC-backed firms would be exempted from SOX 404 if going public. This finding is also consistent with Gao et al. (2013) and Doidge et al. (2013), who argue that the decline in IPOs is unlikely to be driven by SOX.

Column 5 of Table 7 considers a scenario where we set all regulatory costs identified in Table 3 to zero. Removing these regulatory costs would increase post-2000 IPO likelihood among VC-backed firms from 0.95% to 1.4%. The average yearly number of VC-backed IPOs over 2000–2018 would increase from 50.2 to 70.6. While the effects are substantial, they still fall short of explaining the dramatic decrease in IPO volume after 2000. Removing all identified regulations increases average IPO likelihood post 2000 by 0.445%, which, compared with the 6% drop in IPO likelihood

³⁷Panel B of Table A.5 summarizes the regulatory burden borne by firms in different size group under this scenario.

from before to after 2000, explains only 7.4% of the decline in IPO likelihood. Similarly, removing all regulatory costs after 2000 increases the average yearly number of IPOs over this period by 20.4, which offsets only 22% of the decrease in yearly IPO volume from pre-2000 to post-2000.

Prior research such as Dambra et al. (2015) shows that the IPO market has partially revived after the JOBS Act in 2012. We examine how much of the recovery in IPOs can be explained by the reduction in the regulatory costs. To this end, we consider a scenario where the JOBS Act is absent in column 2 of Table 7. We show that, had JOBS Act not passed, the average IPO likelihood among VC-backed firms after 2000 would decrease from 0.95% to 0.74%. Further, the total number of VC-backed IPOs after 2000 would drop from 912 to 711, and the aggregate public float of these IPO firms decrease from \$339b to \$314b. The decline in the number of IPOs translates to an average 28.7 fewer IPOs per year over the period of 2012 to 2018, when JOBS Act was in effect. This is somewhat larger than the estimate from Dambra et al. (2015), who show that JOBS Act has led to 21 additional IPOs per year using a very different empirical methodology.

Figure 7 shows our yearly counterfactual estimates for three outcomes: average regulatory costs facing potential IPO firms, IPO probability, and yearly number of IPOs. These figures confirm the limited role played by SOX 404 and the significant impact of JOBS Act on IPO volumes after 2012. Further, as shown in Panels B and C of Figure 7, even when we remove all identifiable regulatory costs after 2000, there is still a strong declining trend in IPO likelihood and volume. This result suggests that regulatory cost itself is unlikely to explain the full magnitude of IPO declines in the U.S. over the past two decades.³⁸ Non-regulatory factors, such as decline in business dynamism (Decker et al., 2016), shifting investment to intangibles (Kahle and Stulz, 2017; Doidge, Kahle, Karolyi, and Stulz, 2018), abundant private equity financing (Ewens and Farre-Mensa, 2020), changing economies of scope (Gao, Ritter, and Zhu, 2013), and changing acquisition behavior (Eckbo and Lithell, 2021) are likely to play a more important role.

³⁸In Section 5.8, we show that our IPO results are similar if we allow firms to make IPO decisions based on the present value of future regulatory costs rather than the annual costs upon IPO.

4.2 Regulatory Costs and the Going Private Transactions

We also estimate the effect of regulatory costs on public firms' decision to go private. We model the probability of going private using the following logit specification:

$$\Pr(\text{GoingPrivate})_{i,t} = \frac{\exp(\beta \ln k_{i,t} + \gamma X_{i,t})}{1 + \exp(\beta \ln k_{i,t} + \gamma X_{i,t})}. \quad (10)$$

where $k_{i,t}$ is the regulatory costs borne by firm i in year t if it stays public. The vector $X_{i,t}$ contains lagged firm characteristics that affect the net benefits of going private, including log public float, book leverage, log total assets, ROA, investment-to-asset ratio, log sales growth, market-to-book ratio, annual stock return, log number of analysts, and institutional ownership. We also include state fixed effects as well as industry-year fixed effects to absorb industry-level shocks and non-threshold-based regulatory changes that apply to all firms.

We estimate the above logit model of going private decisions on a panel of 4,217 U.S. public firms from 1995 to 2017. Following Bharath and Dittmar (2010), we identify going private transactions using 13e-3 filings. We also require that these filings are followed by a filing of Form 15 or Form 25 within the next two years to ensure that the security was indeed deregistered. This yields 949 going private transactions, out of which 674 can be matched to Compustat firms with non-missing control variables.

Table 8 presents the logit regression results. Consistent with the prior literature, lower market cap, growth, valuation, stock return, analyst coverage, and institution ownership predict higher probability of going private, while lower leverage and profitability predict the opposite. However, we do not find regulatory costs to be a significant factor in public firms' going private decisions; if anything, the sign of the coefficient is the opposite: higher regulatory costs slightly reduces the probability of going private. This null result echoes the mixed findings in prior literature on the effect of SOX on going private transactions (Engel et al., 2007; Leuz, 2007; Leuz et al., 2008; Bartlett III, 2009), and could be explained by the fact that some of the regulatory costs are upfront and irreversible (e.g., setting up internal control system). Hence, these costs will be sunk costs for public firms' going private decisions but will enter into private firms' going public decisions. Further, many PE deals are motivated by financial or operational engineering reasons (Kaplan, 1989; Guo et al., 2011; Bernstein and Sheen, 2016), rather than to avoid regulatory costs.

4.3 Summary

Overall, we find that regulatory cost appears to affect firms' public-vs-private choice mainly through their going public rather than going private decisions. However, quantitatively, regulatory costs only explain a small fraction of the disappeared IPOs, in contrast to the popular claim by practitioners. Instead, our results are consistent with the view of Gao et al. (2013) and Doidge et al. (2013), who suggest that the regulatory changes in the early 2000s did not appear to cause the disappearance of public firms. Other non-regulatory factors likely played a more important role.

We caveat our analysis with three notes. First, our results concern the effects of regulations identifiable in our bunching estimation, i.e., threshold-based regulations. Our counterfactual analysis leaves out regulations that are not threshold-based as reviewed in Table A.2. Nevertheless, our analysis covers the major regulatory changes that are often attributed to the decline in public firms, such as SOX. It is worth noting that the presence of non-threshold-based regulations would not bias our estimate of the sensitivity of going public (private) decisions to regulatory costs, because their effects are absorbed by time fixed effects. Second, our counterfactual analysis offers useful comparative statics on the relation between regulatory costs and IPO volumes. However, these regulations may generate social benefits to the overall public market. Our counterfactual analysis should not be interpreted as a welfare analysis of these regulations on the overall IPO market because we only vary the (net) costs of regulation but not their social benefits. Lastly, our IPO counterfactuals are estimated from VC-backed firms, which represent around 50% of all IPOs. Non-VC-backed firms may have different sensitivity to regulatory costs when making their IPO decisions. Caveats aside, the counterfactual exercises provide informative results on the debate on the cause of the disappearing IPO puzzle.

5 Robustness and Further Analyses

In this section, we demonstrate that our results are robust to alternative thresholds, sampling rules, and parameter choices. We also conduct a few further analyses.

5.1 Alternative Bunching Period for the \$75m Threshold

The introduction of “Smaller Reporting Companies” in 2008 increased the threshold for scaled disclosure from \$25m to \$75m. Further, in the same year, SEC eliminated the \$75m public float threshold for shelf registration eligibility.³⁹ The bunching period of 2008–2018 therefore allows us to identify the combined value of 404(b) exemption, delayed filing, and scaled disclosure (see Panel B of Table 1), without a downward bias from potential reverse bunching incentive from shelf-registration.⁴⁰ We report the estimation results in Table A.7. We find that the marginal bunching firm has a \$98m public float and an upward leverage distortion of 12 percentage points. The indifference condition of this marginal firm implies that the annual regulatory costs associated with 404(b) compliance, delayed filing, and scaled disclosure are around \$0.16m per year. This annual cost is 0.13% of the marginal bunching firm’s total assets, 1.7% of its EBITDA and 8.4% of its net income. The present value of all future regulatory costs account for 0.9% of the marginal firm’s total value.

To compare with our main estimates in Table 3, we extrapolate the value of scaled disclosure from the \$25m to the \$75m threshold using equation 7. This yields a value of scaled disclosure of \$0.044m for the marginal firm bunching for \$75m (with a \$94.6m float). Combining this estimate with the estimated value of 404 exemption of \$0.122m yields a combined value of \$0.166m — very similar to \$0.162m estimated above. This result therefore provides a good validation of our extrapolation strategy. It also suggests that the reverse bunching incentives from shelf-registration is likely to be minimal.

5.2 Dropping Financial and Utility Firms

Our main analyses include financial and utility firms because they face the same SEC regulations as other firms and thus have the same bunching incentives, even though they may be subject to other additional regulations. Nevertheless, Table A.8 presents our main estimations dropping financial and utility firms (SIC code 6000-6999 and 4900-4949) from our samples. We find that the cost of

³⁹See the final rule titled “Revisions to the Eligibility Requirements for Primary Security Offerings on Form S-3 and F-3,” SEC Release No. 33-8878, December 19, 2007.

⁴⁰From 2008 to 2018, being below \$75m float only exempts firms from SOX 404(b) but not SOX 404(a). However, this shouldn’t affect our estimation of 404 cost much because 404(b) is the costliest part of 404 and is often associated with heightened 404(a) compliance as well.

full disclosure is the same as our main estimate. The cost of SOX 404 compliance and the cost losing EGC benefits are 22% and 10% smaller than the estimates on the full sample, respectively. This suggests that financial and utility firms face higher internal control costs and (or) higher disclosure costs associated with security issuance.

5.3 Alternative Counterfactual Distributions

We address two potential concerns with counterfactual distributions. First, although bunching estimator itself does not rely on the assumption that the threshold-based regulatory change is unanticipated, anticipation may affect the counterfactual distribution of the running variable estimated from the non-bunching period. To address this concern, we investigate whether our results are robust to dropping the two years before each of the three regulatory changes. Specifically, for the \$75m and \$700m thresholds, we drop the two years before the thresholds were introduced (i.e., 2001–2002 for \$75m and 2010–2011 for \$700m). For the \$25m threshold, we drop the last two years before the \$25m threshold expires. Table A.9 presents the results. We find that the estimates are very similar to our main results, with slightly smaller disclosure cost and EGC benefits, and a slightly higher 404 compliance cost.

Second, one might be concerned that the firm size distribution might be different in the non-bunching period compared with the bunching period. In Figure 2, we showed that the distributions of public float are almost identical across bunching and non-bunching periods around placebo thresholds unrelated to any regulations. This suggests that the float distribution in the non-bunching period provides a reasonably good counterfactual. To further address the concern about counterfactual distribution, we follow the bunching literature to estimate an alternative counterfactual distribution using only the post-regulation period (i.e., the bunching period) (Kleven, 2016). Specifically, we fit a smooth polynomial to the distribution after excluding the observations around the regulatory threshold. Table A.10 presents the results. The estimates are similar to our main results.

5.4 Alternative Parameter Choices

Our main estimation uses firms just above the float of the marginal bunching firm in the bunching period to obtain the undistorted parameters of η , q , and r . Although these firms are uncontaminated

by potential bunching incentives because they are above the marginal bunching firm, one could argue that they are slightly larger than the marginal bunching firm. In Table A.11, we show that our estimates are similar if we use firms *around* the float of the marginal bunching firm to obtain these parameters, though the estimate for EGC benefits is somewhat larger.

We also demonstrate the robustness of our results to alternative estimates of β —the marginal cost of debt. Our baseline β value comes from Binsbergen et al. (2010), who estimate it for all Compustat firms. One may be concerned that firms in our bunching samples may have very different β . We thus re-estimate β following the methodology in Binsbergen et al. (2010) on subsamples of firms around the three thresholds. As shown in Table A.12, the local β is 4.637, 5.130 and 6.192 for firms around each of the three thresholds. These values are not too different from our baseline β value of 4.733.

5.5 Agency Issues

Our model assumes that managers choose whether to bunch to maximize firm value. One may worry that this assumption may be violated for firms with substantial agency issues. A priori, the bias from agency issues can be either positive or negative. On the one hand, entrenched managers may be averse to taking on additional debt to bunch, leading to a downward bias in our estimates. On the other hand, regulatory compliance may be more costly to managers than to shareholders, leading to an upward bias. To address this concern, we re-estimate the regulatory costs excluding firms that may have severe agency issues. In particular, we drop firms in the bottom decile of institutional ownership and firms in the bottom decile of board independence. The results are reported in Table A.13. We find the estimated marginal bunching firms are similar to our baseline estimates.

5.6 Other Impacts of Float Distortion

In this section we examine potential alternative impacts of float distortion: shrinking operations or strategically releasing bad news that depresses stock prices.⁴¹ Table A.14 tests these different margins using the same difference-in-differences specification as in Table 2. Columns 1-4 focus on

⁴¹Theoretically firms can also manipulate their quarterly earnings to influence stock prices. However, 2nd quarter earnings are typically announced after the end of the 2nd quarter (i.e., when public float is computed), making such manipulation infeasible for most firms.

various operational outcomes such as total assets, tangibility, asset turnover, and profitability. We find no significant changes in these outcomes. This lack of operational changes is consistent with no investment changes found in Table 2. Column 5 examines strategic news release using news data from RavenPack. Specifically, we calculate the fraction of bad news released in the second fiscal quarter, where bad news is defined as news with a RavenPack sentiment score below 50.⁴² We find that, in the years where a regulation is effective, firms below the regulatory threshold are more likely to release bad news in the second fiscal quarter to depress their stock prices. As a placebo test, we also show that such finding does not exist for news released in the third fiscal quarter, which is after the date firms calculate public float.⁴³ Overall, these results together with those in Table 2 suggest that firms keep their public float below threshold through increasing payout or releasing bad news and use debt to fill the equity shortfall, while keeping their overall operation constant.

5.7 Comparing Estimates Across Thresholds

In this section, we compare our cost estimates across the three thresholds by extrapolating them to the same public float. For example, we can extrapolate the values of scaled disclosure and SOX 404 exemption from the corresponding thresholds to the marginal firm bunching for \$700m for EGC benefits. This yields a combined value of \$0.44m for the marginal EGC bunching firm. This value is lower than the estimated total EGC benefits of \$0.71m. Such a difference can be attributed to the fact that EGC benefits include not only scaled disclosure, 404(b) exemption and delayed filing, but also shorter financial history disclosure in registration statement, delayed compliance with new accounting rules, and the ability to use test-the-waters communications with investors when issuing securities. Our estimates suggest that these latter benefits could be highly valuable for newly public firms.

⁴²The RavenPack Event Sentiment Score has a value between 0 and 100, with 50 indicating neutral sentiment and higher values indicating more positive news. The score is determined by systematically matching stories categorized by financial experts as having a positive or negative impact, which is then fed into RavenPack's proprietary algorithm.

⁴³It is unclear whether these news releases are short-term or have a long-run impact on firms' equity value. If it is the latter case, firms will presumably need to fill the equity shortfall with debt to keep investment constant, as documented in Section 2.2

5.8 Dynamic Considerations

Our bunching model is static, which implies that firms decide whether to bunch period by period. This assumption is consistent with the fact that it is generally easy for firms to adjust its bunching decisions. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that our fuzzy bunching strategy is robust to dynamic considerations in firms' decisions. For example, if there are adjustment costs, a firm will bunch further below the regulatory threshold to avoid crossing it in the future due to stock price fluctuations. This behavior will be accounted for by the fuzzy estimator because it infers bunching from a wide interval around the threshold, rather than from the density spike just at the threshold.

We also show that our IPO results are robust to firms' dynamic expectations about future regulatory costs. In Panel A of Table A.6, we reproduce the IPO predictive regression using the present value of future regulatory costs, rather than annual costs upon IPO. We project the public float of potential IPO firms for seven years (the average duration IPO firms stay public in our sample) after IPO, using float growth rates estimated from newly public firms. We then calculate yearly regulatory costs based on the corresponding float and the regulations prevailing in the potential IPO year.⁴⁴ Last, we compute the present value of these yearly regulatory costs using a 7% discount rate to arrive at the variable *PV of regulatory costs*. Panel B of Table A.6 shows the simulated IPO counterfactuals. We find results similar to those in Tables 6 and 7. A one-standard-deviation increases in the present value of regulatory costs reduces IPO likelihood by 7.5% relative to the mean. Removing SOX continues to have a minimal effect on IPO volumes while JOBS Act significantly boosted IPOs after 2012. Removing all regulatory costs explains 9.4% of the post-2000 decline in IPO likelihood and 28.3% of the decline in the yearly number of IPOs.

6 Conclusion

This paper studies the connection between regulatory costs and firms' public-vs-private choice by exploiting a regulatory quirk: many rules trigger when a firm's public float exceeds a threshold. We find that firms increase their leverage to move their public float below the thresholds. Rather than being hampered by firms' manipulation of their public float to avoid regulation, we estimate regulatory costs from the extent of this avoidance using a revealed preference approach. We find

⁴⁴Hence, we assume firms extrapolate the current regulations into the future.

that the regulatory costs of being a public firm are substantial: various disclosure and internal governance rules lead to a total compliance cost of 4.1% of the market capitalization for a median U.S. public firm. Regulatory costs have greater impact on private firms' IPO decisions than on public firms' going private decisions. However, heightened regulatory costs only explain a small fraction of the decline in the number of public firms over the last two decades. Our results that non-regulatory factors likely played an more important roles than regulatory factors in explaining the decline in the number of U.S. public firms.

References


- Aghamolla, C. and R. T. Thakor (2019). Do mandatory disclosure requirements for private firms increase the propensity of going public? *Available at SSRN 3428780*.
- Alsabah, K. and S. K. Moon (2020). IPO regulation and initial capital structure: Evidence from the JOBS Act. *Working paper*.
- Alvero, A., S. Ando, and K. Xiao (2020). Watch what they do, not what they say: Estimating regulatory costs from revealed preferences. *Working paper*.
- Alvero, A. and K. Xiao (2020). Fuzzy bunching. *Available at SSRN 3611447*.
- Antill, S. (2020). Are bankruptcy professional fees excessively high? *Available at SSRN 3554835*.
- Bachas, N., O. S. Kim, and C. Yannelis (2020). Loan guarantees and credit supply. *Journal of Financial Economics*.
- Bachas, N., E. Liu, and C. Yannelis (2019). Market power in small business lending. *Working paper*.
- Barth, M. E., W. R. Landsman, and D. J. Taylor (2017). The JOBS Act and information uncertainty in IPO firms. *The Accounting Review* 92(6), 25–47.
- Bartlett III, R. P. (2009). Going private but staying public: Reexamining the effect of Sarbanes-Oxley on firms' going-private decisions. *U. Chi. L. Rev.* 76, 7.
- Bernstein, S. and A. Sheen (2016). The operational consequences of private equity buyouts: Evidence from the restaurant industry. *Review of Financial Studies* 29(9), 2387–2418.
- Bharath, S. T. and A. K. Dittmar (2010). Why do firms use private equity to opt out of public markets? *Review of Financial Studies* 23(5), 1771–1818.
- Binsbergen, J. H. v., J. R. Graham, and J. Yang (2010). The cost of debt. *Journal of Finance* 65(6), 2089–2136.
- Binsbergen, J. H. v., J. R. Graham, and J. Yang (2011). An empirical model of optimal capital structure. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance* 23(4), 34–59.
- Chaplinsky, S., K. W. Hanley, and S. K. Moon (2017). The JOBS Act and the costs of going public. *Journal of Accounting Research* 55(4), 795–836.
- Chetty, R., J. N. Friedman, T. Olsen, and L. Pistaferri (2011). Adjustment costs, firm responses, and micro vs. macro labor supply elasticities: Evidence from danish tax records. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 126(2), 749–804.
- Cheyne, E. and M. Liu-Watts (2020). A simple structural estimator of disclosure costs. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 1–45.
- Clinton, S. B., J. T. White, and T. Woidtke (2014). Differences in the information environment prior to seasoned equity offerings under relaxed disclosure regulation. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 58(1), 59–78.

- Coates, J. C. and S. Srinivasan (2014, September). SOX after ten years: A multidisciplinary Review. *Accounting Horizons* 28(3), 627–671.
- Coates, J. C. I. (2007). The goals and promise of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. *Journal of economic perspectives* 21(1), 91–116.
- Dagostino, R. (2018). The impact of bank financing on municipalities’ bond issuance and the real economy. *Working Paper, University of Rochester*.
- Dambra, M., L. C. Field, and M. T. Gustafson (2015). The JOBS Act and IPO volume: Evidence that disclosure costs affect the IPO decision. *Journal of Financial Economics* 116(1), 121–143.
- Dambra, M. and M. Gustafson (2020). Do the burdens to being public affect the investment and innovation of newly public firms? *Management Science*.
- Decker, R. A., J. Haltiwanger, R. S. Jarmin, and J. Miranda (2016). Declining business dynamism: What we know and the way forward. *American Economic Review* 106(5), 203–07.
- DeFusco, A. A., S. Johnson, and J. Mondragon (2020). Regulating household leverage. *The Review of Economic Studies* 87(2), 914–958.
- DeFusco, A. A. and A. Paciorek (2017). The interest rate elasticity of mortgage demand: Evidence from bunching at the conforming loan limit. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 9(1), 210–40.
- Dey, R. and M. Sullivan (2009). What will non-accelerated filers have to pay for the section 404 internal control audit. *Working Paper*.
- Dharmapala, D. (2016). Estimating the compliance costs of securities regulation: A bunching analysis of Sarbanes-Oxley Section 404 (b).
- Doidge, C., K. M. Kahle, G. A. Karolyi, and R. M. Stulz (2018). Eclipse of the public corporation or eclipse of the public markets? *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance* 30(1), 8–16.
- Doidge, C., G. A. Karolyi, and R. M. Stulz (2013). The US left behind? Financial globalization and the rise of IPOs outside the US. *Journal of Financial Economics* 110(3), 546–573.
- Doidge, C., G. A. Karolyi, and R. M. Stulz (2017). The US listing gap. *Journal of Financial Economics* 123(3), 464–487.
- Eckbo, B. E. and M. Lithell (2021). Merger-driven listing dynamics. *Working paper*.
- Engel, E., R. M. Hayes, and X. Wang (2007). The Sarbanes–Oxley Act and firms’ going-private decisions. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 44(1-2), 116–145.
- Ewens, M. and J. Farre-Mensa (2020). The deregulation of the private equity markets and the decline in IPOs. *Review of Financial Studies* 33(12), 5463–5509.
- Ewens, M., R. H. Peters, and S. Wang (2020). Measuring intangible capital with market prices. *Working paper*.
- Gao, F., J. S. Wu, and J. Zimmerman (2009). Unintended consequences of granting small firms exemptions from securities regulation: Evidence from the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. *Journal of Accounting Research* 47(2), 459–506.


- Gao, X., J. R. Ritter, and Z. Zhu (2013). Where have all the IPOs gone? *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 48(6), 1663–1692.
- Guo, S., E. S. Hotchkiss, and W. Song (2011). Do buyouts (still) create value? *Journal of Finance* 66(2), 479–517.
- Gustafson, M. T. and P. Iliev (2017). The effects of removing barriers to equity issuance. *Journal of Financial Economics* 124(3), 580–598.
- Iliev, P. (2010). The effect of SOX Section 404: Costs, earnings quality, and stock prices. *Journal of Finance* 65(3), 1163–1196.
- Iliev, P. and S. Vitanova (2019). The effect of the say-on-pay vote in the United States. *Management Science* 65(10), 4505–4521.
- Kahle, K. M. and R. M. Stulz (2017). Is the US public corporation in trouble? *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 31(3), 67–88.
- Kaplan, S. (1989). Management buyouts: Evidence on taxes as a source of value. *Journal of Finance* 44(3), 611–632.
- Kenney, M. and D. Patton (2013). Firm database of emerging growth initial public offerings (IPOs) from 1990 through 2010.
- Kleven, H. J. (2016). Bunching. *Annual Review of Economics* 8, 435–464.
- Kleven, H. J. and M. Waseem (2013). Using notches to uncover optimization frictions and structural elasticities: Theory and evidence from pakistan. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 128(2), 669–723.
- Leuz, C. (2007). Was the Sarbanes–Oxley Act of 2002 really this costly? A discussion of evidence from event returns and going-private decisions. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 44(1-2), 146–165.
- Leuz, C., A. Triantis, and T. Y. Wang (2008). Why do firms go dark? Causes and economic consequences of voluntary SEC deregistrations. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 45(2-3), 181–208.
- Leuz, C. and P. D. Wysocki (2016). The economics of disclosure and financial reporting regulation: Evidence and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Accounting Research* 54(2), 525–622.
- Lewis, C. M. and J. T. White (2020). Deregulating innovation capital: The effects of the JOBS Act on biotech startups. *Available at SSRN 3640852*.
- Liu, L. Y. (2020). Long-run economic consequences of firms’ avoidance behavior in the threshold regulation: Evidence from the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. *Working paper*.
- Lowry, M., R. Michaely, and E. Volkova (2017). Initial public offerings: A synthesis of the literature and directions for future research. *Foundations and Trends in Finance, forthcoming*.
- Morgenstern, M. and P. Nealis (2004). The impact of Sarbanes-Oxley on mid-cap issues. <https://www.sec.gov/info/smallbus/mmorgansternmidcap.pdf>.
- Parker, R. (2018). Hying the cost of regulation. *The Regulatory Review*.

- Register, F. (1993). Federal register.
- Ritter, J. (2020). Initial public offerings: Updated statistics. Data retrieved from <https://site.warrington.ufl.edu/ritter/ipo-data/>.
- Saez, E. (2010). Do taxpayers bunch at kink points? *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 2(3), 180–212.
- SEC (1992). Small Business Initiative.
- SEC (2002). Acceleration of Periodic Report Filing Dates and Disclosure Concerning Website Access to Reports.
- SEC (2008a). Changeover to the sec’s new smaller reporting company system by small business issuers and non-accelerated filer companies: A small entity compliance guide.
- SEC (2008b). Smaller reporting company regulatory relief and simplification.
- SEC (2009). Study of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 Section 404 Internal Control over Financial Reporting Requirements. Technical report, Office of Economics Analysis, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.
- SEC (2011). Study and Recommendations on Section 404(b) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 For Issuers With Public Float Between \$75 and \$250 Million. Technical report, Staff of the Office of the Chief Accountant, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.
- Weild, D. (2011). How to revive small-cap IPOs. *Wall Street Journal*.
- Zhang, I. X. (2007). Economic consequences of the Sarbanes–Oxley Act of 2002. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 44(1-2), 74–115.


Figure 1: CDFs and Histograms for Public Float around Regulatory Thresholds




(a) CDF: \$25 mil




(b) Histogram: \$25 mil




(c) CDF: \$75 mil



(d) Histogram: \$75 mil




(e) CDF: \$700 mil




(f) Histogram: \$700 mil

These figures show the cumulative density functions and histograms for firms' public float around regulatory thresholds in bunching and non-bunching years. Bunching years are years when the threshold-based regulation was in place. Non-bunching years are years before the regulation is introduced or after it expires.


Figure 2: CDFs and Histograms for Public Float around Placebo Thresholds




(a) CDF: \$15 mil




(b) Histogram: \$15 mil




(c) CDF: \$60 mil



(d) Histogram: \$60 mil




(e) CDF: \$500 mil



(f) Histogram: \$500 mil


These figures show the cumulative density functions and histograms for firms' public float around three placebo thresholds that are below our actual regulatory thresholds: \$15M, \$60M, and \$500M. The samples are based on the same sample periods and filters as those for our main samples, except for public float range.

Figure 3: Firm Payoff as a Function of Public Float




This figure illustrates the shape and the slope of a firm's payoff as a function of the public float e . Panel (a) illustrates a concave payoff function in the absence of a regulatory threshold. Panel (b) shows a new payoff function when a regulatory threshold is introduced at \underline{e} . The discontinuity in the payoff induces firms whose public float was above the threshold to bunch. Panel (c) shows a firm whose undistorted optimal float is way above the regulatory threshold and therefore who chooses not to bunch. Panel (d) shows a payoff function for the marginal buncher who is indifferent between bunching and not bunching.

Figure 4: Moments of Distribution Functions Used in Bunching Estimator




(a) Probability density function




(b) Cumulative distribution function

This figure shows the probability density function (upper panel) and the cumulative distribution function (lower panel) of public float in the presence of bunching. \underline{e} is the regulatory threshold. \bar{e} is the float of the marginal bunching firm. A is the area between the cumulative distribution functions before and after the regulation. α is the fraction of non-optimizing firms.

Figure 5: Estimated Regulatory Costs Scaled by EBITDA




(a) Firms with public age ≤ 5



(b) Firms with public age > 5


These figures show, by public float and year, the estimated total regulatory costs scaled by firms' EBITDA. Panel A shows it for firms that went public less than 5 years ago. Panel B shows it for firms that went public more than 5 years ago.

Figure 6: Estimated Aggregate Regulatory Costs




This figure shows the estimated aggregate regulatory costs over time for all public firms with a non-zero public float. The dashed line shows the dollar costs in millions of USD. The solid line shows the percentage share of aggregate regulatory costs relative to aggregate EBITDA.


Figure 7: IPO Counterfactual Simulations



(a) Regulatory costs for potential IPO firms (\$m)



(b) IPO likelihood



(c) Yearly no. of IPOs

These figures show counterfactual regulatory costs facing potential IPO firms (Panel A), IPO likelihood (Panel B), and the number of IPOs (Panel C) for four regulatory scenarios after 2000: 1) actual, 2) no JOBS Act, 3) no SOX 404, and 4) zero regulation costs. Estimations are based on the model in Table 6 and counterfactual regulation costs in Tables A.4 and A.5.

Table 1: Summary of Regulatory Thresholds

| Panel A: Key Public Float Thresholds | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Time period | Scaled Disclosure | Non-accelerated filer (NAF) | Exempt from SOX Section 404 | Emerging Growth Company (EGC) |
| 1992–2002 | < \$25 mil | | | |
| 2003–2007 | < \$25 mil | < \$75 mil | < \$75 mil | |
| 2008–2011 | < \$75 mil | < \$75 mil | < \$75 mil | |
| 2012–2018 | < \$75 mil | < \$75 mil | < \$75 mil | < \$700 mil |

| Panel B: Public Float Intervals and Associated Regulatory Benefits | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|--------------|-----------|------------------------------------|
| Time Period | < 25 mil | 25–75 mil | 75–700 mil | > 700 mil | Binding Thresholds |
| 1992–2002 | Scaled disclosure | N/A | N/A | N/A | 25 for SD |
| 2003–2007 | Scaled disclosure + filing delay + 404 exempt | filing delay + 404 exempt | N/A | N/A | 25 for SD 75 for 15d+404 |
| 2008–2011 | Scaled disclosure + filing delay + 404 exempt | | N/A | N/A | 75 for SD+delay+404 |
| 2012–2018 | Scaled disclosure + filing delay + 404 exempt + EGC benefits | | EGC benefits | N/A | 75 for SD+delay+404 700 for EGC |

This table summarizes regulatory thresholds used in our paper. Panel A presents the time-varying threshold for each type of regulatory benefits. Panel B summarize the set of regulatory benefits enjoyed by firms in each public float interval. The last column of Panel B summarizes key exploitable thresholds in each time period and the associated benefits each threshold identifies.

Table 2: Impacts of Regulatory Thresholds on Firms

| Dep. var. | $\Delta \ln(\text{total payout})$ (1) | $\Delta \text{Book leverage}$ (2) | $\Delta \text{Investment1}$ (3) | $\Delta \text{Investment2}$ (4) | $\Delta \text{Non-aff. own.}$ (5) |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Panel A. \$25m threshold | | | | | |
| Below \$25m \times Bunching years | 0.058* [0.033] | 0.113* [0.060] | 0.021 [0.023] | -0.033 [0.038] | -0.149 [0.189] |
| Year FE and SIC2 FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| N | 1492 | 1484 | 1368 | 1296 | 772 |
| Adj. R-sq | -0.015 | -0.003 | 0.026 | 0.026 | 0.046 |
| Mean of dep. var. in level | 0.203 | 0.248 | 0.059 | 0.197 | 0.933 |
| Panel B. \$75m threshold | | | | | |
| Below \$75m \times Bunching years | 0.069* [0.040] | 0.024*** [0.006] | -0.004 [0.010] | -0.013 [0.014] | -0.009 [0.034] |
| Year FE and SIC2 FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| N | 3622 | 3633 | 3531 | 3331 | 2717 |
| Adj. R-sq | 0.019 | -0.005 | 0.002 | -0.001 | 0.002 |
| Mean of dep. var. in level | 0.712 | 0.169 | 0.051 | 0.140 | 0.753 |
| Panel C. \$700m threshold | | | | | |
| Below \$700m \times Bunching years | 0.580** [0.266] | 0.075** [0.028] | -0.004 [0.022] | -0.006 [0.048] | 0.053 [0.048] |
| Year FE and SIC2 FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| N | 215 | 230 | 228 | 222 | 197 |
| Adj. R-sq | 0.061 | 0.065 | 0.11 | 0.091 | 0.002 |
| Mean of dep. var. in level | 1.378 | 0.189 | 0.073 | 0.203 | 0.765 |

This table examines the impacts of regulatory thresholds on firms. Specifically, we examine changes in total payout, leverage, two definitions of investment, and non-affiliated ownership. The three panels correspond to samples around the \$25M, \$75M, and \$700M thresholds, respectively. $\ln(\text{total payout})$ is the logarithm of total payout (i.e., dividends plus repurchases); *Book leverage* is total debt divided by total assets; *Investment1* is capex divided by lagged total assets; *Investment2* is (capex + R&D + γ *SG&A) divided by lagged (total assets + knowledge capital + organizational capital), where γ , knowledge capital, and organizational capital are from Ewens et al. (2020); *Non-aff. own.* is the fraction of shares held by public investors. All dependent variables are year-to-year changes. Samples in the top (middle) (bottom) panel focuses on firms with a public float between \$20M and \$30M (\$60M and \$90M) (\$630M and \$770M). Treated and control years are defined as in Table 3. All panels include year fixed effects and industry (2-digit SIC) fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered by industry and year are in parentheses. * indicates statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level, and *** at the 1% level.

Table 3: Bunching Estimates of Regulatory Costs

| Threshold | \$ 25 mil (1) | \$ 75 mil (2) | \$ 700 mil (3) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Panel A. Estimates | | | |
| Marginal firm (\bar{e}) (\$m) | 27.044 [0.283] | 94.493 [2.380] | 838.313 [5.349] |
| Regulatory costs (k) (\$m) | 0.026 [0.006] | 0.122 [0.025] | 0.713 [0.049] |
| PV(regulatory costs)/Firm value (%) | 0.622 [0.153] | 0.725 [0.147] | 0.772 [0.053] |
| Non-bunching fraction (α) | 0.480 [0.119] | 0.780 [0.047] | 0.530 [0.114] |
| Δ Leverage | 0.056 [0.008] | 0.108 [0.013] | 0.073 [0.003] |
| Panel B. Parameters | | | |
| Public float/Assets (η) (%) | 2.000 | 0.880 | 1.572 |
| Tobin's Q (q) | 2.720 | 1.680 | 3.570 |
| Interest rate (r) | 0.115 | 0.093 | 0.049 |
| Panel C. Samples | | | |
| Bunching sample | 1994-2007 | 2003-2007 | 2012-2018 |
| Non-bunching sample | 2009-2018 | 1994-2002 | 1997-2011 |
| Identified regulation | Scaled disclosure | SOX 404+ filing delay | EGC benefits |

This table presents the bunching estimation results. *Marginal firm* is the public float of the firm that is indifferent between bunching and not bunching. *Regulatory costs* are the estimated annual costs of regulation k . Regulatory costs are in \$ million. *PV(regulatory costs)/Firm value* is the percentage of the present value of all the future regulatory costs over the total firm value. Bootstrapped standard errors are reported in brackets.

Table 4: Benchmarking Estimated Regulatory Costs

| Threshold | \$ 25 mil (1) | \$ 75 mil (2) | \$ 700 mil (3) |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Regulatory costs (k) | 0.026 | 0.122 | 0.713 |
| Identified regulations | Scaled disclosure | SOX 404 + filing delay | EGC benefits |
| Total assets | 14.67 | 126.39 | 556.74 |
| EBITDA | 0.33 | 9.31 | 31.05 |
| Net income | -0.73 | 1.94 | 10.00 |
| k /Total assets | 0.18% | 0.10% | 0.13% |
| k /EBITDA | 7.78% | 1.31% | 2.30% |
| k /Net income | -3.58% | 6.29% | 7.13% |

This table benchmarks the estimated annual regulation costs k against the marginal bunching firms' total assets, EBITDA, and net income. All numbers are in millions of USD except percentages.

Table 5: Cost Structure Estimation

| Panel A: SOX 404 Compliance Costs from SEC Survey | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | 404(b) audit (1) | Internal labor (2) | Non-labor (3) | Outside labor (4) | Total (5) |
| Public float (in \$mil)) | 0.432*** [0.014] | 0.519*** [0.032] | 0.355*** [0.018] | 0.337*** [0.023] | 0.456*** [0.028] |
| Intercept | 10.476*** [0.089] | 10.516*** [0.200] | 9.467*** [0.115] | 10.365*** [0.145] | 11.554*** [0.176] |
| Period FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| N | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Adj. R-sq | 0.813 | 0.85 | 0.946 | 0.833 | 0.852 |
| Dep. var. mean | 13.2 | 13.8 | 11.7 | 12.5 | 14.4 |

| Panel B: Audit Fees from Audit Analytics | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | Pre-SOX | | Post-SOX | |
| | Audit fees (1) | Total fees (2) | Audit fees (3) | Total fees (4) |
| Public float (in \$mil) | 0.412*** [0.027] | 0.524*** [0.027] | 0.423*** [0.019] | 0.434*** [0.019] |
| Intercept | 4.393*** [0.562] | 2.964*** [0.580] | 5.091*** [0.354] | 5.058*** [0.347] |
| Year FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| N | 6836 | 6783 | 60889 | 60995 |
| Adj. R-sq | 0.426 | 0.469 | 0.616 | 0.624 |
| Dep. var. mean | 12.4 | 13.1 | 13.3 | 13.5 |

This table estimates the cost structure of regulatory compliance costs by relating these costs to firm size, proxied by public float. All dependent and independent variables are log transformed from dollar values. Panel A presents the estimated relationship between firms' public float and self-reported SOX 404 compliance costs based on survey data from SEC (2009) and SEC (2011). Panel B presents the estimated relationship between firms' public float and audit fees from Audit Analytics. Columns 1-2 focus on the pre-SOX period during which audit fees only capture financial auditing costs. The sample includes all firm-years before 2002, except those who benefit from scaled disclosure (i.e. with less than \$25 mil in public float). Columns 3-4 focus on the post-SOX period during which audit fees cover both financial auditing costs and internal control attestation costs. The sample includes all firm-years after 2002 except those who benefit from scaled disclosure or 404(b) exemption, i.e. those with less than \$75 mil in public float between 2003 and 2011, and those with less than \$700 mil in public float and age from IPO less than 5 years after 2012 (eligible for EGC status). Each observation is a size group-period in Panel A and a firm-year in Panel B. Standard errors are clustered by period in Panel A and are clustered by 2-digit SIC code in Panel B.

Table 6: Regulatory Costs and IPOs

| | IPO | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | (1) Coefficients | (2) Marginal Effects |
| Regulatory costs (ln) | -0.05607*** [0.01671] | -0.00021*** [0.00006] |
| Imputed public float (ln) | 0.23825*** [0.02493] | 0.00089*** [0.00011] |
| Total funding raised (ln) | 0.87704*** [0.03149] | 0.00328*** [0.00015] |
| Years since founding | -0.06631*** [0.00833] | -0.00025*** [0.00003] |
| Industry-Year FE | Yes | Yes |
| State FE | Yes | Yes |
| Observations | 110,666 | 110,666 |

This table estimates a logit model of the IPO decision on a panel of VC-backed private firms. The sample is a panel of 21,066 VC-backed firms from first VC round to the year before exit or failure from 1992 to 2018. Columns 1 and 2 present the logit coefficients and the marginal effects, respectively. *Regulatory costs* is the compliance costs estimated from Table 3 and extrapolated to all firm sizes. *Imputed public float* is the implied valuation based on the most recent round of VC financing. *Total funding raised* is the cumulative sum of funding raised from VC. We control for state and year fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered by firm.

Table 7: Counterfactual Simulation of Regulatory Costs and IPOs

| | Actual regulation (1) | Actual regulation (2) | No SOX (3) | No JOBS Act (4) | Zero regulation (5) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| | Pre-2000 | | Post-2000 | | |
| Regulatory costs (\$m) | 0.079 | 0.085 | 0.061 | 0.132 | 0.000 |
| Regulatory costs / Public float (%) | 0.509 | 0.274 | 0.266 | 0.509 | 0.000 |
| IPO probability (%) | 6.933 | 0.954 | 0.961 | 0.744 | 1.399 |
| Yearly no. of IPOs | 141.4 | 50.2 | 50.5 | 37.5 | 70.6 |
| Total no. of IPOs | 1044.0 | 912.0 | 918.5 | 711.4 | 1337.9 |
| Total IPO public float (\$b) | 105.5 | 339.4 | 347.5 | 314.0 | 572.6 |

Column 1 shows the actual IPO outcomes before 2000 and columns 2 to 5 show counterfactual IPO outcomes under different regulatory scenarios after 2000. *Actual regulation* is the baseline scenario based on actual regulations. *No SOX* estimates are based on regulatory costs without SOX (see Panel B of Table A.5). *No JOBS Act* estimates are based on regulatory costs without JOBS Act (see Panel A of Table A.5). *Zero regulation* estimates are based on zero regulatory costs after 2000. *Regulatory costs* is the average annual regulatory costs facing potential IPO firms (i.e., VC-backed firms) in the corresponding period. *Regulatory costs / Public Float* is the average ratio of annual regulatory costs relative to public float for a potential IPO firm in the corresponding period. *IPO probability* is the average predicted probability that a potential IPO candidate will go public in the corresponding period. *Yearly no. of IPOs* is the average yearly predicted total number of IPOs, obtained by summing up predicted IPO probabilities withing each year and take the yearly average over the corresponding period. *Total no. of IPOs* is the predicted total number of IPOs, obtained by summing up predicted IPO probabilities across the sample in the corresponding period. *Total IPO public float* is the predicted aggregate public float of IPO firms over the corresponding period, obtained by weighted summing the public float of potential IPO firms weighted by IPO probabilities.

Table 8: Regulatory Costs and Going Private Transactions

| | Going Private | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| | (1) Coefficients | (2) Marginal Effects |
| Regulatory costs (ln) | -0.0422 [0.0294] | -0.0003 [0.0002] |
| Public float (ln) | -0.1546*** [0.0195] | -0.0010*** [0.0002] |
| Leverage | 0.5919*** [0.1276] | 0.0038*** [0.0009] |
| Total assets (ln) | 0.0117 [0.0288] | 0.0001 [0.0002] |
| ROA | 0.6926*** [0.1418] | 0.0044*** [0.0009] |
| Investment-to-assets | -0.6522 [0.4899] | -0.0042 [0.0031] |
| Sales growth | -0.3860*** [0.0991] | -0.0025*** [0.0006] |
| M/B | -0.0141** [0.0057] | -0.0001** [0.0000] |
| Stock return | -0.2915*** [0.0677] | -0.0019*** [0.0004] |
| No. of analysts (ln) | -0.1631* [0.0834] | -0.0010* [0.0005] |
| Institutional ownership | -1.1131*** [0.2513] | -0.0071*** [0.0016] |
| Industry-Year FE | Yes | Yes |
| State FE | Yes | Yes |
| Observations | 43,437 | 43,437 |

This table estimates a logit model of going private decisions on a panel of public firms from 1995 to 2017. The sample includes 674 firms that went private during our sample period and 3,543 firms that were public as of 2018. The dependent variable is a dummy equal to one if a firm goes private in the next year. Columns 1 and 2 present the logit coefficients and the marginal effects, respectively. *Regulatory costs* is the compliance costs estimated from Table 3 and extrapolated to all firm sizes. We control for industry (SIC 1-digit)-year fixed effects and state fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered by firm.

Appendix

A.1 Data and Institutional Details

A.1.1 Public Float Data

The regulations we study all use public float to determine eligibility. Under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, this number is required to be precisely disclosed on the first page of firms' 10-K filings. Formally, public float is defined as the aggregate worldwide market value of a firm's voting and non-voting common equity held by non-affiliates (i.e., large shareholder or top management).⁴⁵ It is computed by multiplying the aggregate worldwide number of shares of voting and non-voting common equity held by non-affiliates by the price at which the common equity was last sold, or the average of the bid and asked prices of the common equity, in the principal market for the common equity.

Before 2002, public float was computed within 60 days of their filing date in accordance with the SEC RIN 3235-AG82.⁴⁶ Since the introduction of accelerated filing in 2002 (SEC RIN 3235-AI33), all companies except small business issuers are required to compute public float as of the last business day of a firm's most recently completed second fiscal quarter.⁴⁷ This amendment was to give companies enough time to prepare for a potential change in filing status. In particular, a company will be able to determine its public float by looking back at the last business day of its most recently completed second fiscal quarter. This allows companies to know further in advance whether they will become an accelerated filer at the end of their fiscal year and allow them to begin making the appropriate preparations.

We scrape public float information from firms' 10-K filings (including 10-KSB, 10-KT, and 10-K405) using a proprietary Python script custom developed for us. This script locates the sentence disclosing public float using keywords and formatting syntax. The script was adjusted to account for different reporting formats over different time periods. We also extract the date on which public float was computed. We then manually check the scraped numbers against the original

⁴⁵Rule 405 defines an affiliate as a "person that directly, or indirectly through one or more intermediaries, controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with," an issuer. The term "control" is defined in Rule 405 under the Act as "the possession, direct or indirect, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of a person, whether through the ownership of voting securities, by contract, or otherwise."

⁴⁶<https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/33-7419.txt>

⁴⁷<https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/33-8128.htm>

filings to verify the accuracy of our data and to further correct a small number of idiosyncratic discrepancies. To the best of our knowledge, this is the largest sample of public float data collected in the literature.

A.1.2 Potential Lobbying and Anticipation of Regulations

Scaled Disclosure and Small Business Issuer. The history of this rule change provides no evidence that the impacted companies significantly lobbied for the new rules well before enactment or during the comment period. The discussion about the changes began in early 1992 when the SEC proposed "Small business initiative." In fact, the SEC itself proposed legislation to both the House and Senate called the Small Business Incentive Act of 1992. The Act⁴⁸ was never passed, but the SEC used its power to update the regulations in the spirit of this act. As with all rule changes, the SEC had an open comment period. In response to the comments, the SEC increased the original revenue threshold but otherwise "Regulation S-B is adopted in substantially the same form as proposed." (SEC, 1992, p. 13)

Non-accelerated Filer. Our study of this rule change's history does not show that any of the firms directly effected lobbied for the change, nor were there specific firms or firm types targeted. It was not implemented in response to legislation and instead stemmed from a standard rule-making change the SEC often performs. The SEC proposed the rule first in 1998, but only in April 2002 was the final rule proposal presented to the public. The rule received over 300 public comments from a range of investors and advocacy groups. The SEC's assessment of these comments was general disapproval:

Most of these commenters believed that any incremental benefit from the speed and extent of acceleration proposed was insufficient to warrant the added burdens on registrants and the risk of diminished disclosure quality, although these commenters generally did not analyze the benefits from the perspective of users of the reports. [...] The most common concern was that the proposed deadlines would negatively affect the quality and accuracy of reports. [...] According to one professional association, two-thirds of its survey respondents expected a reduction in the precision of reported information under the original proposals.

In response to these comments, the SEC lengthened the disclosure windows for annual reports

⁴⁸See <https://www.congress.gov/bill/102nd-congress/house-bill/4938?s=1&r=25>

from an original 60 to 75 days and 30 to 35 days for quarterly reports. The fundamental condition of the accelerated filer definition based on public float did not change and in fact was an artifact of the \$75m float threshold implemented in an amendment to the Form S-3 registration in 1992 (Register, 1993).

Emerging Growth Companies. The timeline of the JOBS Act proposal to passage reveals no concerns regarding endogenous timing. The Act was born out of a host of bills passed by the House in November 2011 (e.g. Small Company Capital Formation (H.R. 1070) and Entrepreneur Access to Capital (H.R. 2930)). The Senate followed the passage of one of the House bills with their own proposals focused on crowdfunding. Each sat in the Senate Banking Committee until March 2012. Only in December 2011 did the ECG features emerge in a bill in the House. In March 2012, all the previously passed bills were consolidated into the JOBS Act, which was signed into law in April 2012. We found no evidence of previous attempts to pass this collection of laws.

A.1.3 Smaller Reporting Companies

Another major regulatory change is the introduction of the “smaller reporting company” SRC in 2008 (SEC, 2008b). Originally proposed in 2005, this new category of registered companies had their own scaled disclosure rules. This rule change was a simplification and consolidation of the scaled disclosure regime and Regulation S-B passed in 1992 (see Section 1.2.1). The simplification came in two parts. First, the SEC eliminated all the “SB” filings such as 10-KSB and SB-1s. Next, the commission moved 12 non-financial scaled disclosure requirements from Regulation S-B into the existing Regulation S-K (e.g. executive compensation, use of proceeds, description of business, etc.). Companies with less than \$75m public float and \$50m in revenue had the option to label themselves a smaller reporting company and selectively disclose the 12 items.⁴⁹ Among many limited disclosure options, such reporting companies need only provide 3 (rather than 5) years of business development activities, only provide compensation information on the CEO and two top-paid executives and produce only three of the seven compensation tables required of larger reporting companies. Smaller reporting companies had less stringent disclosure rules about policies for related party transactions.

⁴⁹See Table A.1 for the list of scaled disclosure items. Item 404 of Regulation S-K is the only place where the scaled requirements can be more rigorous for SRC than for larger companies.

This SEC rule change (not legislation) was the part of a multi-year initiative “to provide responsive solutions addressing the special characteristics and needs of smaller companies and their investors.”⁵⁰ This longer term feature of the rule change mitigates concerns about any lobbying on behalf of the affected firms.

In its report on the rule change, the SEC argued that there would be significance savings in lower compliance costs for smaller reporting companies. The SEC calculated that among those eligible firms that choose to because such a reporting company, the average firm will save over \$60,000/year in “internal burden hours and costs.”⁵¹ Besides these quantifiable costs, the SEC believed that investors in smaller reporting companies may struggle with determining whether a particular firm has changed its information disclosure. As with the other rule changes, the SEC expected benefits such as streamlining regulation, reducing investor confusion about firm reporting type and “providing flexibility to [...] smaller reporting companies to tailor their disclosure to their investors’ needs” would weigh against these costs.


⁵⁰See <https://www.sec.gov/rules/final/2007/33-8876.pdf>

⁵¹The SEC writes:

We assume that approximately 50% of the 1,581 companies (or 790 companies) will use the scaled disclosure requirements. For purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act, we estimate that these 790 smaller reporting companies may save 356,290 internal burden hours and costs in the amount of \$47,479,000 by using the scaled disclosure requirements.


A.2 Figures and tables

Figure A.1: Average Length of 10-K Parts by SBI and non-SBI Filers




These figures show the average length of 10-K parts (Part I to Part IV) by Small Business Issuer and non-Small Business Issuer filers over the period of 1993 to 2007, where both SBI and on-SBI filers existed. Lengths are string length removing html and line breaks.

Figure A.2: Non-Parametric Relationship Between Audit Fees and Public Float




(a) ln(audit fees) and ln(public float) before SOX




(b) ln(audit fees) and ln(public float) after SOX

These figures show the non-parametric bin-scatter relationship between log audit fees and log public float for both the pre-SOX and the post-SOX periods, removing year fixed effects. Firm-years that are eligible for scaled disclosure, 404(b) exemption, or EGC status are excluded.

Figure A.3: Estimated Regulatory Costs in Absolute Dollars




(a) Firms with public age ≤ 5




(b) Firms with public age > 5

These figures show the estimated total regulatory costs (in million dollars) facing firms of various public float size in different years. Panel A shows it for firms that went public less than 5 years ago. Panel B shows it for firms that went public more than 5 years ago.

Figure A.4: Estimated Regulatory Costs Scaled by Public Float



(a) Firms with public age ≤ 5



(b) Firms with public age > 5

These figures show, by public float and year, the estimated total regulatory costs scaled by firms' public float. Panel A shows it for firms that went public less than 5 years ago. Panel B shows it for firms that went public more than 5 years ago.

Table A.1: Scaled Disclosure Items

| Reg S-K Items: | |
|----------------|---|
| Item 101 | Description of business |
| Item 105 | Risk factors |
| Item 201 | Market price of and dividends on registrant's common equity and related stockholder matters |
| Item 301 | Selected financial data |
| Item 302 | Supplementary financial information |
| Item 303 | Management's discussion and analysis of financial condition and results of operations |
| Item 305 | Quantitative and qualitative disclosures about market risk |
| Item 402 | Executive compensation |
| Item 404 | Transactions with related persons, promoters and certain control persons |
| Item 407 | Corporate governance |
| Item 503 | Prospectus summary, risk factors, and ratio of earnings to fixed charges |
| Item 504 | Use of proceeds |
| Item 601 | Exhibits |
| Reg S-X Items: | |
| | Shorter financial history |
| | Relaxed requirement on pro forma and interim financial statements |

This table presents the scaled disclosure items for small business issuers (1992-2007) and small reporting companies (2008-). These companies may choose to comply with scaled or non-scaled financial and non-financial item requirements on an item-by-item basis in any one filing. Where the scaled reporting requirement is more rigorous, however, the company must meet the more rigorous standard. Item 404 of Regulation S-K is the only place where the scaled requirements can be more rigorous than the larger company standard. Source: SEC (2008a)

Table A.2: Major, Non-Threshold Based Regulations

| Regulation Name | Year |
|---|------|
| <i>Regulations on public firms</i> | |
| Rule 415 (Shelf Registration) | 1982 |
| Introduction of Edgar | 1993 |
| Ownership Reports and Trading by Officers, Directors and Principal Security Holders | 1996 |
| Amendments to Rules on Shareholder Proposals | 1998 |
| Amendments to Beneficial Ownership Disclosure | 1998 |
| Regulation of Takeovers and Security Holder Communications | 1999 |
| Amendments to Rule 9b-1 Relating to the Options Disclosure Document | 2000 |
| Selective Disclosure and Insider Trading | 2000 |
| Reg FD | 2000 |
| FASB ends pooling of interests accounting | 2001 |
| Option expensing | 2004 |
| Regulation National Market System | 2005 |
| Say on pay | 2010 |
| <i>Regulations on private firms</i> | |
| Regulation D | 1982 |
| Increased asset threshold for exempt from registration from \$5m to \$10m | 1996 |
| National Securities Markets Improvement Act (NSMIA) | 1996 |

This table presents the time line of other major, non-threshold based regulations not considered in our paper.

Table A.3: SBI Scaled Disclosure: Impact on 10-K and DEF14A File Size

| | 10-K size (1) | Part I length (2) | Part II length (3) | Part III length (4) | Part IV length (5) | DEF14A size (6) |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| SBI | -0.141*** [0.014] | -11.187*** [1.337] | -9.637*** [1.611] | 71.688*** [3.534] | -82.709*** [2.833] | -0.041*** [0.005] |
| Public float (\$m) | 0.008*** [0.001] | 0.574*** [0.079] | 0.332*** [0.096] | 2.110*** [0.267] | 0.285* [0.162] | 0.001*** [0.000] |
| Ln(sales) | 0.031*** [0.007] | 0.810 [0.644] | 2.954*** [0.770] | 0.729 [2.048] | 4.765*** [1.187] | -0.002 [0.003] |
| Leverage | 0.036*** [0.013] | 0.715 [1.037] | 3.970*** [1.346] | 15.419*** [3.512] | 6.303*** [2.343] | -0.000 [0.008] |
| Sales growth | -0.000 [0.009] | 1.105 [0.738] | 0.251 [0.849] | 7.749*** [2.867] | -2.292 [1.453] | -0.007 [0.005] |
| ROA | -0.003 [0.002] | 0.096 [0.172] | 0.087 [0.210] | -1.630** [0.717] | -0.513 [0.313] | -0.003* [0.002] |
| NPPE/Assets | -0.039 [0.028] | -0.373 [2.618] | -2.310 [3.179] | -9.154 [8.450] | 0.367 [4.861] | -0.029** [0.013] |
| Dep. var. mean | 0.508 | 50.4 | 49.4 | 46.5 | 103.3 | 0.162 |
| SIC2 FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Year FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Observations | 10,883 | 10,883 | 10,883 | 10,883 | 10,883 | 6,424 |

This table compares the size or length of 10-K and DEF14A (proxy statement) filed by SBI and non-SBI firms. Columns 1 and 6 examine file size (in MBs), and columns 2 to 5 examine the length of Parts I to IV of 10-K (string length removed of html and line breaks, scaled by 1000). SBI filers are identified by 10-KSB filings and non-SBI filers are identified by 10-K filings. The sample focuses on the common support where both SBI and non-SBI filers exist: firms with less than \$25m float and less than \$25m sales between fiscal years 1993 and 2007. All columns control for industry (SIC 2-digit) fixed effects and year fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered by firm.

Table A.4: Total Regulatory Costs

| Time Period | <25 mil | 25–75 mil | 75–700 mil | >700 mil |
|--------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1992–2002 | ER | ER+SD | ER+SD | ER+SD |
| 2003–2007 | ER | ER+SD | ER+SD+404+delay | ER+SD+404+delay |
| 2008–2011 | ER | ER | ER+SD+404+delay | ER+SD+404+delay |
| 2012–2018 & public age>5 | ER | ER | ER+SD+404+delay | ER+SD+404+delay |
| 2012–2018 & public age≤5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ER+SD+404+delay |

This table aggregates the different types regulatory costs we identify in the paper by time period and public float interval. It is derived from Table 1. 404(b) denotes the costs of SOX 404(b) compliance; 15d denotes the cost of filing 10-K and 10-Q 15 days earlier; SD denotes the costs of full disclosure relative to scaled disclosure; ER denotes residual costs from losing EGC benefits not covered by 404(b), 15d, or SD: 1) shorter financial history in registration statement, 2) delay in compliance with new accounting standards, and 3) the ability to use test-the-waters communications with institutional investors when issuing securities. Therefore we have, total costs of losing all EGC benefits $EGC=ER+SD+404(b)+15d$.

Table A.5: Total Regulatory Costs: Counterfactuals

| Panel A: Without JOBS Act | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Time Period | <25 mil | 25–75 mil | 75–700 mil | >700 mil |
| 1992–2002 | ER | ER+SD | ER+SD | ER+SD |
| 2003–2007 | ER | ER+SD | ER+SD+404+delay | ER+SD+404+delay |
| 2008–2011 | ER | ER | ER+SD+404+delay | ER+SD+404+delay |
| 2012–2018 | ER | ER | ER+SD+404+delay | ER+SD+404+delay |

| Panel B: Without SOX | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Time Period | <25 mil | 25–75 mil | 75–700 mil | >700 mil |
| 1992–2002 | ER | ER+SD | ER+SD | ER+SD |
| 2003–2007 | ER | ER+SD | ER+SD+delay | ER+SD+delay |
| 2008–2011 | ER | ER | ER+SD+delay | ER+SD+delay |
| 2012–2018 & public age>5 | ER | ER | ER+SD+delay | ER+SD+delay |
| 2012–2018 & public age<=5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ER+SD+delay |

This table presents counterfactual versions of Table A.4 without JOBS Act (Panel A) and without SOX 404(b) (Panel B)

Table A.6: Regulatory Costs and Going Public Decisions: Incorporating Dynamics

Panel A: Present Value of Regulatory costs and IPO Decision

| | IPO | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | (1) Coefficients | (2) Marginal Effects |
| PV of regulatory costs (ln) | -0.06498*** [0.01556] | -0.00024*** [0.00006] |
| Imputed public float (ln) | 0.25235*** [0.02508] | 0.00094*** [0.00011] |
| Total funding raised (ln) | 0.87869*** [0.03165] | 0.00328*** [0.00015] |
| Years since founding | -0.06678*** [0.00831] | -0.00025*** [0.00003] |
| Industry-Year FE | Yes | Yes |
| State FE | Yes | Yes |
| Observations | 110,666 | 110,666 |

Panel B: IPO Counterfactuals

| | Actual regulation (1) | Actual regulation (2) | No SOX (3) | No JOBS Act (4) | Zero regulation (5) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| | Pre-2000 | Post-2000 | | | |
| Regulatory costs (\$m) | 0.079 | 0.085 | 0.061 | 0.132 | 0.000 |
| Regulatory costs / Public float (%) | 0.509 | 0.274 | 0.266 | 0.509 | 0.000 |
| IPO probability (%) | 6.933 | 0.954 | 0.963 | 0.726 | 1.514 |
| Yearly no. of IPOs | 141.4 | 50.2 | 50.6 | 36.4 | 76.0 |
| Total no. of IPOs | 1044.0 | 912.0 | 920.6 | 693.7 | 1447.0 |
| Total IPO public float (\$b) | 107.9 | 337.0 | 346.8 | 314.3 | 628.5 |

Panel A reproduces Table 6 using the present value of future regulatory costs instead of the annual cost upon IPO. Panel B shows IPO counterfactuals based on the estimates in Panel A (analogous to Table 7). We extrapolate the public float of potential IPO firms over a seven year horizon (the average number of years IPO firms stay public in our sample period) based on float growth rates estimated from actual IPO firms. We then calculate yearly regulatory costs based on the corresponding float and the regulations prevailing in the year the firm considers IPO. Last, we calculate the present value of these yearly regulatory costs using a 7% discount rate to arrive at the variable *PV of regulatory costs (ln)*.

Table A.7: Alternative Bunching Period for the \$75M Threshold

| Threshold | \$ 75 mil |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <i>Panel A. Estimates</i> | |
| Marginal firm (\bar{e}) (\$m) | 97.414 [1.248] |
| Regulatory costs (k) (\$m) | 0.156 [0.015] |
| PV(regulatory costs)/Firm value (%) | 0.902 [0.087] |
| Non-bunching fraction (α) | 0.750 [0.040] |
| Δ Leverage | 0.121 [0.007] |
| <i>Panel B. Parameters</i> | |
| Public float/Assets (η) (%) | 0.880 |
| Tobin's Q (q) | 1.680 |
| Interest rate (r) | 0.093 |
| <i>Panel C. Sample</i> | |
| Bunching sample | 2008-2018 |
| Non-bunching sample | 1994-2012 |
| Identified regulation | Filing delay + SOX 404 + Scaled discl. |

This table presents the bunching estimation results for the \$75m threshold using an alternative bunching period 2008 to 2018. *Marginal firm* is the public float of the firm that is indifferent between bunching and not bunching. *Regulatory costs* are the estimated annual costs of regulation k . Regulatory costs are in \$ million. *PV/Firm value* is the percentage of the present value of all the future regulatory costs over the total firm value. Bootstrapped standard errors are reported in brackets.

Table A.8: Robustness: Excluding Financial and Utility Firms

| Threshold | \$ 25 mil (1) | \$ 75 mil (2) | \$ 700 mil (3) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Panel A. Estimates</i> | | | |
| Marginal firm (\bar{e}) (\$m) | 27.080 [0.582] | 91.966 [5.553] | 830.673 [8.763] |
| Regulatory costs (k) (\$m) | 0.027 [0.011] | 0.095 [0.043] | 0.642 [0.076] |
| PV(regulatory costs)/Firm value (%) | 0.642 [0.253] | 0.580 [0.264] | 0.702 [0.083] |
| Non-bunching fraction (α) | 0.550 [0.187] | 0.810 [0.201] | 0.500 [0.166] |
| Δ Leverage | 0.056 [0.016] | 0.097 [0.032] | 0.069 [0.005] |
| <i>Panel B. Parameters</i> | | | |
| Public float/Assets (η) (%) | 2.000 | 0.880 | 1.572 |
| Tobin's Q (q) | 2.720 | 1.680 | 3.570 |
| Interest rate (r) | 0.115 | 0.093 | 0.049 |
| <i>Panel C. Samples</i> | | | |
| Bunching sample | 1994-2007 | 2003-2007 | 2012-2018 |
| Non-bunching sample | 2009-2018 | 1994-2002 | 1997-2011 |
| Identified regulation | Scaled disclosure | SOX 404+ filing delay | EGC benefits |

This table presents a robustness check of our main bunching estimation results by dropping financial or utility firms (SIC code 6000-6999 and 4900-4949). *Marginal firm* is the public float of the firm that is indifferent between bunching and not bunching. *Regulatory costs* are the estimated annual costs of regulation k . Regulatory costs are in \$ million. *PV/Firm value* is the percentage of the present value of all the future regulatory costs over the total firm value. Bootstrapped standard errors are reported in brackets.

Table A.9: Robustness: Excluding Two Years Before Regulation Change

| Threshold | \$ 25 mil (1) | \$ 75 mil (2) | \$ 700 mil (3) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Panel A. Estimates</i> | | | |
| Marginal firm (\bar{e}) (\$m) | 26.835 [0.457] | 95.374 [1.945] | 838.133 [6.331] |
| Regulatory costs (k) (\$m) | 0.021 [0.009] | 0.132 [0.022] | 0.711 [0.057] |
| PV(regulatory costs)/Firm value (%) | 0.509 [0.210] | 0.778 [0.128] | 0.770 [0.061] |
| Non-bunching fraction (α) | 0.370 [0.172] | 0.760 [0.043] | 0.540 [0.121] |
| Δ Leverage | 0.050 [0.013] | 0.112 [0.011] | 0.073 [0.003] |
| <i>Panel B. Parameters</i> | | | |
| Public float/Assets (η) (%) | 2.000 | 0.880 | 1.572 |
| Tobin's Q (q) | 2.720 | 1.680 | 3.570 |
| Interest rate (r) | 0.115 | 0.093 | 0.049 |
| <i>Panel C. Samples</i> | | | |
| Bunching sample | 1994-2005 | 2003-2007 | 2012-2018 |
| Non-bunching sample | 2009-2018 | 1994-2000 | 1997-2009 |
| Identified regulation | Scaled disclosure | Sox 404+ filing delay | EGC benefits |

This table presents a robustness check of our main bunching estimation results by dropping firm-years in the two years before a regulation change. *Marginal firm* is the public float of the firm that is indifferent between bunching and not bunching. *Regulatory costs* are the estimated annual costs of regulation k . Regulatory costs are in \$ million. *PV(regulatory costs)/Firm value* is the percentage of the present value of all the future regulatory costs over the total firm value. Bootstrapped standard errors are reported in brackets.

Table A.10: Robustness: Alternative Counterfactual Distribution

| Threshold | \$ 25 mil (1) | \$ 75 mil (2) | \$ 700 mil (3) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Panel A. Estimates</i> | | | |
| Marginal firm (\bar{e}) (\$m) | 26.708 [0.506] | 92.694 [4.064] | 820.222 [27.337] |
| Regulatory costs (k) (\$m) | 0.019 [0.009] | 0.102 [0.035] | 0.550 [0.168] |
| PV(regulatory costs)/Firm value (%) | 0.445 [0.208] | 0.621 [0.212] | 0.609 [0.186] |
| Non-bunching fraction (α) | 0.450 [0.154] | 0.820 [0.099] | 0.670 [0.167] |
| Δ Leverage | 0.047 [0.014] | 0.100 [0.023] | 0.065 [0.015] |
| <i>Panel B. Parameters</i> | | | |
| Public float/Assets (η) (%) | 2.000 | 0.880 | 1.572 |
| Tobin's Q (q) | 2.720 | 1.680 | 3.570 |
| Interest rate (r) | 0.115 | 0.093 | 0.049 |
| <i>Panel C. Samples</i> | | | |
| Bunching sample | 1994-2007 | 2003-2007 | 2012-2018 |
| Identified regulation | Scaled disclosure | SOX 404+ filing delay | EGC benefits |

This table presents a robustness check of our main bunching estimation results using the counterfactual distribution constructed by fitting a smooth polynomial to the bunching sample excluding observations around the threshold. *Marginal firm* is the public float of the firm that is indifferent between bunching and not bunching. *Regulatory costs* are the estimated annual costs of regulation k . Regulatory costs are in \$ million. *PV/Firm value* is the percentage of the present value of all the future regulatory costs over the total firm value. Bootstrapped standard errors are reported in brackets.

Table A.11: Robustness: Alternative Parameter Choices

| Threshold | \$ 25 mil (1) | \$ 75 mil (2) | \$ 700 mil (3) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Panel A. Estimates</i> | | | |
| Marginal firm (\bar{e}) (\$m) | 27.044 [0.283] | 94.493 [2.380] | 838.313 [5.349] |
| Regulatory costs (k) (\$m) | 0.030 [0.007] | 0.120 [0.024] | 0.872 [0.060] |
| PV(regulatory costs)/Firm value (%) | 0.510 [0.125] | 0.750 [0.153] | 0.767 [0.052] |
| Non-bunching fraction (α) | 0.480 [0.119] | 0.780 [0.047] | 0.530 [0.114] |
| Δ Leverage | 0.046 [0.006] | 0.107 [0.013] | 0.069 [0.003] |
| <i>Panel B. Parameters</i> | | | |
| Public float/Assets (η) (%) | 1.684 | 0.920 | 1.445 |
| Tobin's Q (q) | 2.741 | 1.769 | 3.438 |
| Interest rate (r) | 0.133 | 0.088 | 0.057 |
| <i>Panel C. Sample</i> | | | |
| Bunching sample | 1994-2007 | 2003-2007 | 2012-2018 |
| Non-bunching sample | 2009-2018 | 1994-2002 | 1997-2011 |
| Identified regulation | Scaled disclosure | SOX 404+ filing delay | EGC benefits |

This table presents a robustness check of our main bunching estimation results using firms *around* instead of above the float of the marginal bunching firm to obtain parameters q , η , and r . *Marginal firm* is the public float of the firm that is indifferent between bunching and not bunching. *Regulatory costs* are the estimated annual costs of regulation k . Regulatory costs are in \$ million. *PV(regulatory costs)/Firm value* is the percentage of the present value of all the future regulatory costs over the total firm value. Bootstrapped standard errors are reported in brackets.

Table A.12: Robustness: Local Estimates of the Marginal Cost of Debt

| | \$ 25 mil (1) | \$ 75 mil (2) | \$ 700 mil (3) |
|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| IOB | 4.637*** [2.937] | 5.130*** [3.970] | 6.192*** [3.317] |
| COL | -0.022*** [-3.239] | -0.021*** [-2.773] | -0.002 [-0.282] |
| LTA_adj | -0.074** [-2.616] | -0.058** [-2.571] | -0.061** [-2.090] |
| BTM | 0.015** [2.219] | 0.009 [1.244] | 0.007 [0.447] |
| INTANG | -0.026*** [-3.342] | -0.023*** [-3.381] | -0.025*** [-3.410] |
| CF | 0.059*** [12.739] | 0.053*** [8.595] | 0.036*** [5.777] |
| DDIV | 0.104*** [5.176] | 0.075*** [5.973] | 0.067*** [5.236] |
| Observations | 2,492 | 3,313 | 2,594 |

This table provides alternative estimates for the marginal cost of debt following Binsbergen et al. (2010) for subsample of firms around the three public float thresholds. The variable of interest is expenses over book value (IOB), whose coefficient β is used in our quantification of regulatory costs in equation(??). Each column uses a sub-sample of firms with public floats between 0.5 and 2 times of the corresponding threshold. The observed interest expenses over book value (IOB) is instrumented by the area under the marginal benefit curve (AREA). COL is a proxy for firms' collateralizable assets over total book assets, LTA is the log of total assets, BTM is the book-to-market ratio, INTANG is a proxy for firms' intangible assets over total book assets, CF is the cash flows over total book assets, and DDIV indicates whether the firm pays dividends. LTCR indicates whether the firm has a S&P long-term debt rating, STCR indicates whether the firm has a S&P short-term debt rating, and CS is the spread between Moody's Baa rating and Moody's Aaa rating. All control variables, except DDIV, LTCR, and STCR are standardized to have mean zero and standard deviation one. DDIV, LTCR, and STCR are binary variables with values {0,1}. Robust, clustered standard errors are reported in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered by both firm and year as in Thompson (2009) and Petersen (2009). Significance at the 10% level is indicated by *, 5% level by **, and 1% level by ***.

Table A.13: Robustness: Excluding Firms With Agency Issues

| Threshold | \$ 25 mil (1) | \$ 75 mil (2) | \$ 700 mil (3) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Panel A. Estimates</i> | | | |
| Marginal firm (\bar{e}) (\$m) | 27.408 [0.261] | 94.354 [2.305] | 837.345 [5.587] |
| Regulatory costs (k) (\$m) | 0.036 [0.007] | 0.120 [0.024] | 0.704 [0.050] |
| PV(regulatory costs)/Firm value (%) | 0.840 [0.161] | 0.717 [0.143] | 0.763 [0.055] |
| Non-bunching fraction (α) | 0.450 [0.120] | 0.770 [0.047] | 0.530 [0.140] |
| Δ Leverage | 0.065 [0.007] | 0.107 [0.013] | 0.072 [0.003] |
| <i>Panel B. Parameters</i> | | | |
| Public float/Assets (η) (%) | 2.000 | 0.880 | 1.572 |
| Tobin's Q (q) | 2.720 | 1.680 | 3.570 |
| Interest rate (r) | 0.115 | 0.093 | 0.049 |
| <i>Panel C. Sample</i> | | | |
| Bunching sample | 1994-2007 | 2003-2007 | 2012-2018 |
| Non-bunching sample | 2009-2018 | 1994-2002 | 1997-2011 |
| Identified regulation | Scaled disclosure | SOX 404+ filing delay | EGC benefits |

This table presents a robustness check of our main bunching estimation results by dropping firms that may have severe agency issues, that is, those with bottom decile institutional ownership and bottom decile of board independence. *Marginal firm* is the public float of the firm that is indifferent between bunching and not bunching. *Regulatory costs* are the estimated annual costs of regulation k . Regulatory costs are in \$ million. *PV(regulatory costs)/Firm value* is the percentage of the present value of all the future regulatory costs over the total firm value. Bootstrapped standard errors are reported in brackets.

Table A.14: Robustness: Impacts of Regulatory Thresholds on Firms

| | $\Delta \ln(\text{total assets})$ | $\Delta PPE/\text{assets}$ | $\Delta \text{sales}/\text{assets}$ | $\Delta \text{gross profit}/\text{assets}$ | <i>Bad news in Q2</i> | <i>Bad news in Q3</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Panel A. \$25m threshold | | | | | | |
| Below \$25m \times Bunching years | -0.118 | 0.000 | 0.097 | 0.015 | 0.019*** | 0.024 |
| | [0.080] | [0.012] | [0.086] | [0.063] | [0.003] | [0.047] |
| Year FE and SIC2 FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| N | 1492 | 1459 | 1480 | 1475 | 998 | 1004 |
| Adj. R-sq | 0.032 | 0.013 | 0.011 | 0.003 | 0.012 | 0.008 |
| Panel B. \$75m threshold | | | | | | |
| Below \$75m \times Bunching years | 0.011 | 0.005 | -0.01 | 0.015 | 0.037** | 0.02 |
| | [0.032] | [0.004] | [0.021] | [0.011] | [0.016] | [0.024] |
| Year FE and SIC2 FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| N | 3636 | 3556 | 3627 | 3623 | 2824 | 2869 |
| Adj. R-sq | 0.014 | 0.018 | 0.008 | 0.010 | 0.024 | 0.053 |
| Panel C. \$700m threshold | | | | | | |
| Below \$700m \times Bunching years | -0.150 | 0.027 | 0.056 | 0.035 | 0.122** | 0.051 |
| | [0.092] | [0.018] | [0.110] | [0.086] | [0.058] | [0.065] |
| Year FE and SIC2 FE | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| N | 230 | 211 | 230 | 230 | 238 | 244 |
| Adj. R-sq | 0.071 | 0.061 | 0.049 | 0.057 | 0.021 | 0.029 |

This table examines the impacts of regulatory thresholds on firms. Specifically, we examine whether firms manipulate by changing operation such as altering total assets (column 1), tangibility (column 2), asset turnover (column 3), or ROA (column 4). This table also examines whether firms manipulate public floats by strategically releasing bad news before calculating public float (i.e., in the second fiscal quarter). *Bad news* is the fraction of news released in the 2nd (or 3rd) fiscal quarter that has a RavenPack sentiment score below 50. RavenPack event sentiment score has a value between 0 and 100, with 50 indicating neutral sentiment and higher values indicating more positive news. The score is determined by systematically matching stories categorized by financial experts as having a positive or negative impact, which is then fed into RavenPack's proprietary algorithm. The specification is the same as that in Table 2. Samples in the top (middle) (bottom) panel focuses on firms with a public float between \$20M and \$30M (\$60M and \$90M) (\$630M and \$770M). All panels include year fixed effects and industry (2-digit SIC) fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered by industry and year are in parentheses. * indicates statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level, and *** at the 1% level.