
General comment. The authors address the important question of how to select a non-redundant set of asset performance measures. They suggest a rank correlation approach which is applied in a variety of different conditions. My opinion is that the proposed methodology constitutes a useful contribution to the research on asset selection criteria.

Point remarks

- For redundant performance measures, the mean of the asymptotic distribution of the sample rank correlation is an increasing function of the length of the series, $T$. In light of this, one should adopt a $T$-dependent redundancy threshold. As an extreme example, consider 1000 series of iid zero-mean gaussian returns of length $T = 4$. The expected Omega/Sharp rank correlation is .65, with a standard deviation equal to .035; for $T = 10$, it is .99, with a standard deviation equal to .006 (values computed via MC methods). For a threshold set to .8, if $T = 4$ one would always accept the null hypothesis of redundant performance measures, whereas, if $T = 10$, one would always reject it. My feeling, indeed, is that for the sample sizes considered by the authors the choice of a common threshold should result in a minor problem. It would be nice, however, to substantiate such a choice by means of some ad hoc empirical and/or theoretical argument.

- I cannot understand the sentence “Eling and Schuhmacher (2007) tested the null hypothesis $R_S \leq p$, and determined the value of $p$ associated with a rejection of the null for all assets” (see p. 11). Please, restate this sentence in a more explicit fashion.

- In table 2 and table 7, “Conditional Sharp” should be replaced by “STARR ratio”.

- Maybe the instability of the Omega/Sharp rank correlation in Fig. 1 appears to be persistent as a fictitious effect of the autocorrelation induced by the rolling window.