SIRRIPA — A Groundbreaking Return Metric to Value Stocks Just Like Bonds

Bringing Bond-Like Precision and Risk Rationality to Equity Valuation

By Rainsy Sam

International Management School Geneva (IMSG)

Date: July 21, 2025

Abstract

Traditional equity valuation tools—such as the P/E ratio, PEG ratio, Dividend Yield, and DCF models—struggle to integrate time, growth, and risk into a unified return framework. In contrast, bond markets rely on yield-based metrics like Yield to Maturity (YTM), which express return in fully time-adjusted, risk-sensitive terms. This paper introduces the **Stock Internal Rate of Return Including Price Appreciation (SIRRIPA)**, a yield-based metric that applies the same logic to equity valuation.

Derived from the **Potential Payback Period (PPP)**, SIRRIPA measures a stock's total expected return by combining discounted earnings and terminal value within a coherent, finite-horizon framework. By interpreting **EPS as equivalent to bond coupons** and the **Exit Price as a redemption value**, SIRRIPA aligns equity valuation with fixed-income standards—enabling direct cross-asset comparison. The paper presents SIRRIPA's mathematical foundations, theoretical rationale, and practical implications, offering a modern, yield-centered approach to stock valuation.

Keywords

Equity Valuation; SIRRIPA; Potential Payback Period (PPP); Internal Rate of Return; Yield to Maturity; P/E Ratio; Gordon-Shapiro Model; Discounted Cash Flow; Risk-Free Rate; Stock Risk Premium; Cross-Asset Comparison; Earnings Yield; Terminal Value.

---

1. Introduction

In financial analysis, valuation is both an art and a science—but increasingly, it must also be a discipline of **comparability**, **consistency**, and **time-sensitive logic**. Investors, analysts, and policymakers are tasked with allocating capital in a world where earnings are volatile, growth is nonlinear, and risk evolves rapidly. Yet the dominant tools used to value equities remain largely unchanged: the Price-to-Earnings (P/E) ratio, the PEG ratio, Dividend Yield, and

variants of Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) models. These metrics, while familiar and widely applied, are **incomplete, fragmented, or static**. They often fail to integrate the critical dimensions of valuation: **growth, risk, and time**.

By contrast, bond markets long ago adopted a yield-centric approach—anchored in **present value mathematics** and standardized by the **Yield to Maturity (YTM)** framework. This allows bondholders to evaluate total expected return over time with clarity and consistency. No equivalent structure has been established in equity markets, despite decades of theoretical and empirical progress. As a result, stock valuation continues to rely on partial indicators, backward-looking multiples, and subjective forecast assumptions.

This article addresses that gap by introducing the **Stock Internal Rate of Return Including Price Appreciation (SIRRIPA)**—a return metric derived from the **Potential Payback Period (PPP)** framework. SIRRIPA enables equity investors to calculate a **bond-equivalent yield** that integrates a stock's earnings growth trajectory, risk-adjusted discounting, and expected terminal value into a single, time-bound rate of return. It offers the internal consistency of DCF logic, the interpretability of a yield-based metric, and the structural comparability needed for multi-asset portfolio decisions.

Building on prior foundational work [19–23], the PPP methodology reconceptualizes the P/E ratio as a special case of a more general, time-sensitive valuation model [1][2][7][10]. From this foundation, SIRRIPA emerges as a natural extension—allowing equities to be assessed and compared in the same way that bonds, real estate, and private investments are commonly evaluated: through **forward-looking, risk-adjusted internal rates of return** [3][4].

The remainder of this article is structured as follows:

- Section 2 critically reviews the limitations of traditional stock valuation metrics;
- Section 3 introduces the mathematical foundation of PPP and derives SIRRIPA;
- Section 4 discusses the central role of the risk-free rate in cross-asset valuation;
- Section 5 draws structural parallels between equity and bond cash flows;
- Section 6 explores the practical, theoretical, and policy implications of adopting SIRRIPA;
- Section 7 concludes by framing SIRRIPA as the transition from static multiples to dynamic, yield-based equity valuation.

By unifying the treatment of return across asset classes, SIRRIPA offers not only a new valuation metric, but a conceptual bridge—one that redefines how stocks are analyzed in the era of integrated financial decision-making.

---

2. The Limitations of Traditional Stock Return Metrics

For decades, equity valuation has relied on a suite of traditional metrics and models—most notably the Price-to-Earnings (P/E) ratio, the PEG ratio, Dividend Yield, Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) models, and the Gordon-Shapiro Model. Each offers a partial lens through which to evaluate a stock's investment appeal. Yet despite their enduring popularity, these tools share important limitations: they struggle to consistently account for the combined effects

of **growth**, **risk**, and **time**, and often yield results that are difficult to compare across companies, sectors, or asset classes.

This section critically examines the structural flaws and conceptual boundaries of these valuation approaches. While each has contributed meaningfully to the development of financial analysis, their shortcomings underscore the need for a more integrated framework— one that measures return with greater precision, aligns with time-based financial logic, and enables direct comparison with other asset classes. These goals motivate the development of the SIRRIPA framework, which is introduced in subsequent sections as a modern solution to the limitations outlined here.

2.1. The P/E Ratio: Static and Growth-Blind

The **Price-to-Earnings (P/E) ratio** expresses how much investors are willing to pay for each dollar of current earnings:

$$\frac{P}{E} = \frac{\text{Market Price}}{\text{Earnings Per Share (EPS)}}$$

While intuitive, the P/E ratio is static. It reflects neither earnings growth nor the time required to recover one's investment. It also fails to adjust for differences in risk across firms or sectors. Moreover, it becomes undefined or misleading for companies with negative or near-zero earnings, rendering it unusable for a significant portion of the market.

As shown in [7], the P/E ratio can be derived as a limiting case of a more general valuation model when both growth and discounting are ignored. While this provides useful intuition, it also reveals how narrowly the P/E ratio is defined—and how little it captures of a stock's underlying economics.

2.2. The PEG Ratio: A Flawed Growth Adjustment

The **PEG ratio** attempts to improve upon the P/E ratio by adjusting for earnings growth:

$$\text{PEG} = \frac{P/E}{g}$$

This heuristic is popular for identifying so-called "growth at a reasonable price" (GARP) opportunities. However, the PEG ratio lacks theoretical grounding. It is dimensionally inconsistent, ignores time value, and assumes that growth has linear, perpetual effects on valuation. It also treats all growth as risk-neutral and equally valuable, which oversimplifies the reality of capital markets.

Without specifying when earnings will grow—or how that growth will be monetized—the PEG ratio offers little in the way of actionable insight. As argued in [5] and [9], its growth adjustment lacks internal consistency and cannot support rigorous valuation under dynamic conditions.

2.3. Dividend Yield: A Narrow View of Returns

The **Dividend Yield** focuses exclusively on cash distributions:

$$\text{Dividend Yield} = \frac{\text{Dividend Per Share}}{\text{Stock Price}}$$

While useful in income-oriented strategies, this metric overlooks retained earnings, which are often reinvested to drive future value creation. It also ignores capital appreciation and fails to account for payout volatility or discretionary changes in dividend policy. In effect, it measures only a subset of total return—and assumes that distributions are more valuable than reinvestment.

As demonstrated in [14] and [15], firms with low or zero dividend yields can still offer strong forward returns when retained earnings are reinvested efficiently. Dividend Yield, though relevant in specific contexts, provides too narrow a lens for evaluating total shareholder value.

2.4. DCF Models: Conceptually Sound, Practically Inconsistent

Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) models attempt to capture intrinsic value by summing the present value of expected future cash flows. While grounded in first principles, they are vulnerable to several structural weaknesses in practice:

- **Discount rates are often arbitrarily assigned**, rather than derived from firm-specific risk profiles.
- **Time horizons are subjectively fixed**, typically without regard to industry dynamics or business cycles.
- **Terminal values are speculative**, and frequently dominate the valuation outcome.

These issues reduce comparability, make DCFs prone to manipulation, and impair decision-making—especially when models are used in isolation.

As discussed in [12], more recent approaches suggest anchoring valuation models in time-based recovery logic, thereby replacing arbitrary inputs with parameters that reflect actual earnings progression and risk-adjusted capital recovery. Such refinements improve the applicability and interpretability of DCF-derived insights, particularly when paired with structurally consistent assumptions.

2.5. No Framework for Unified Comparison with Bonds

The most fundamental shortcoming shared by all the above metrics is their **incompatibility with fixed-income valuation standards**. Bonds are valued using **Yield to Maturity (YTM)**, which integrates periodic interest payments and principal recovery over time into a single, risk-adjusted return.

By contrast, equity valuation tools:

- Lack a unified time dimension,
- Fragment earnings and price appreciation,
- Do not yield a comparable rate of return.

As a result, investors cannot meaningfully compare a stock priced at a 25x P/E to a bond yielding 6%, even if both have similar risk profiles. There is no shared valuation framework.

This asymmetry has long hindered cross-asset portfolio construction. As noted in [3] and [4], the absence of a yield-like return metric for stocks is a critical gap—one that limits rational allocation decisions and prevents coherent multi-asset optimization.

2.6. The Gordon-Shapiro Model: Elegant but Constrained

Among traditional models, one framework has stood out for its theoretical clarity and structured use of discounting: the **Gordon-Shapiro Model**. It integrates growth and required return in a closed-form valuation formula and offers a foundation for understanding intrinsic value. Yet, even this model fails to provide a return-centric perspective or a framework suitable for dynamic or non-dividend-paying companies. Its limitations further underscore the need for more adaptable and time-sensitive approaches.

The **Gordon-Shapiro Model**, or **Gordon Growth Model (GGM)**, offers a closed-form solution for valuing a stock based on perpetually growing dividends:

$$P = \frac{D}{r - g}$$

This model is conceptually elegant and widely taught, yet constrained in application. It assumes:

- **All earnings are paid as dividends**, excluding reinvestment as a driver of value,
- **Constant growth in perpetuity**, which is rarely realistic,
- **No explicit investment horizon**, offering no insight into capital recovery or interim return.

It also becomes unstable as $g \rightarrow r$, leading to disproportionately large or erratic valuations. As discussed in [17], and further elaborated in [18], the model offers theoretical clarity but lacks

operational flexibility in settings where dividend policies are inconsistent, growth is nonlinear, or valuation must be anchored to recovery dynamics rather than perpetual assumptions.

While the GGM may remain useful for mature, high-yielding firms with stable financial profiles, its simplifying assumptions make it increasingly unsuitable for evaluating modern growth companies or for aligning valuation logic with time-based investment decision frameworks.

Conclusion of Section 2

Traditional valuation metrics—though foundational to financial analysis—fall short in capturing the **interdependence of earnings, risk, time, and return**. They tend to:

- Fragment shareholder value into separate components,
- Depend on static or overly simplified assumptions,
- Lack time-based comparability across asset classes.

As a result, they offer incomplete answers to the investor's central question: *What return can I expect, and over what timeframe, given this stock's growth, risk, and valuation?*

These limitations point to the need for a return-centric, time-sensitive framework—one capable of unifying valuation logic across both stocks and bonds. The development of SIRRIPA addresses this need by incorporating capital recovery, discounting, growth, and terminal value into a single, yield-like return measure. Its formal construction begins in the next section.

3. From PPP to SIRRIPA: Foundations of the Metric

The **Potential Payback Period (PPP)** and its associated return metrics—
SIRR and **SIRRIPA**—form the core of a dynamic valuation framework designed to address the limitations of traditional stock valuation tools. This framework introduces time and risk explicitly into the analysis, allowing investors to determine how long it will take for a stock's cumulative discounted earnings to repay its purchase price, and what internal rate of return this implies.

While the P/E ratio remains a useful starting point for assessing valuation, it is static and blind to growth, risk, and reinvestment dynamics. In contrast, PPP generalizes the P/E by embedding these dimensions, and SIRRIPA extends it further by expressing valuation in the form of a **yield-based return metric structurally analogous to bond Yield to Maturity (YTM).**

3.1. The Logic Behind the Potential Payback Period (PPP)

The PPP answers a fundamental question in valuation:

How long does it take for an investor to recover their initial stock purchase through cumulative, discounted earnings per share (EPS)?

The answer depends on:

- The **initial P/E ratio**,
- The expected **earnings growth rate** over time,
- The **discount rate** used to reflect risk and time value of money.

To capture these dynamics, the PPP formula is defined as:

$$PPP = \frac{\log\left[\frac{P}{E} \cdot \frac{g-r}{1+r} + 1\right]}{\log\left(\frac{1+g}{1+r}\right)}$$

Where:

- P/E is the price-to-earnings ratio,
- g is the expected initial earnings growth rate,
- r is the discount rate (typically derived from CAPM).

As demonstrated in [10], the P/E ratio is revealed as a **special case of PPP** when both g = 0 and r = 0. This confirms that PPP is not a rejection of the P/E ratio, but its **dynamic generalization**, extending it into a time- and risk-aware framework.

3.2. The Prudent Assumption of Linearly Declining Growth

A key refinement in the PPP-SIRRIPA methodology is the **assumption that earnings growth declines linearly from the initial rate g to the discount rate r over the PPP horizon**. This assumption is both **realistic** and **prudent**, and it reflects the typical trajectory of a maturing business.

Rationale for this assumption:

- **Empirical realism**: Most companies do not sustain high growth indefinitely. As businesses mature, competitive pressures, market saturation, and diminishing marginal returns reduce growth rates.

- **Theoretical consistency**: As shown in [3] and [4], the linear decline from g to r ensures that the **exit valuation at the end of PPP remains grounded**, reflecting the market's tendency to value mature firms at a P/E consistent with their

risk-adjusted expected return.

- **Valuation stability**: By modeling earnings growth as declining rather than constant, we avoid overestimating terminal earnings and reduce sensitivity to extreme assumptions—common flaws in DCF and perpetual growth models.

Under this assumption, the **average growth rate** $\bar{g}$ over the PPP period is calculated as:

$$\bar{g} = \frac{g + r}{2}$$

This average growth rate is used in projecting future EPS and determining the Exit Price, as detailed below. It effectively replicates the result of earnings growing at a rate that declines linearly from g to r over the PPP horizon.

3.3. Deriving Return Metrics from PPP

Once the PPP is known, two return metrics can be derived:

a. SIRR — Stock Internal Rate of Return (Without Exit Price)

$$\text{SIRR} = e^{\ln(2)/PPP} - 1$$

This metric expresses the average annualized return implied by cumulative discounted earnings alone—**excluding price appreciation**. It is analogous to the yield of a **zero-coupon bond**, where returns stem solely from internal cash flow accumulation.

b. SIRRIPA — Stock Internal Rate of Return Including Price Appreciation

SIRRIPA builds upon SIRR by incorporating both:

- The **stream of discounted EPS**, and
- The **Exit Price**, defined at the end of the PPP horizon.

$$\text{SIRRIPA} = \left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{PPP} \frac{EPS_t}{(1+r)^t} + \frac{\text{Exit Price}}{(1+r)^{PPP}}}{P} \right)^{\frac{1}{PPP}} - 1$$

Where:

- P: Current share price

- EPS_t: Earnings per share in year t, typically growing at rate g

- r: Discount rate (often derived from CAPM)

- PPP: Potential Payback Period

- $\text{Exit Price} = EPS_{PPP} \times \text{Exit P/E}$

- $\text{Exit P/E} = PPP \cdot (1 + r)$

This Exit P/E formulation has two critical properties:

1. **Mathematical Consistency**: When g = r, the PPP formula simplifies—via L'Hospital's Rule—to yield an Exit P/E equal to PPP · (1 + r). This ensures that the valuation framework remains continuous and stable as growth expectations converge toward the discount rate—an essential property for long-term investment analysis.

2. **Financial Realism**: As a company matures, its earnings growth rate typically declines toward the market's required return. At that point, the appropriate P/E multiple contracts to a level consistent with the firm's normalized return on capital and risk profile. The fact that the Exit P/E ratio naturally **contracts to the smaller figure of PPP** when "g = r" is not merely a mathematical artifact—it reflects a **rational, market-aligned valuation outcome**. As shown in [4], this behavior mirrors how mature companies are priced in practice: investors assign lower multiples as growth decelerates and risk-adjusted returns stabilize.

By tying the Exit Price to a time-sensitive, performance-based multiple rather than a speculative terminal value, SIRRIPA reinforces the integrity of the return estimate and avoids overstatement common in traditional models.

3.4. Relationship Between PPP, SIRR, and SIRRIPA

Concept	Metric	Captures	Analogy
Recovery Horizon	PPP	Time to recover capital via EPS	Payback period
Earnings Yield	SIRR	Return from earnings only	Zero-coupon bond yield
Total Yield	SIRRIPA	Return from earnings and Exit Price	Bond Yield to Maturity

3.5. Replacing Arbitrary Inputs with Structured Assumptions

SIRRIPA avoids the weaknesses of conventional DCF models by:

- Using a **discount rate derived from CAPM**, not assumed arbitrarily,
- Establishing a **natural horizon (PPP)** instead of a fixed terminal year,
- Deriving the **Exit P/E** from intrinsic characteristics, not market multiples,
- Modeling **growth as declining** rather than perpetually constant.

This structure removes much of the **subjectivity** found in traditional models and allows for valuation and return measurement that is both **theoretically rigorous** and **empirically grounded**.

3.6. A New Standard for Return-Based Equity Valuation

SIRRIPA is not just a model—it is a reformulation of equity valuation logic. As demonstrated in [3] and [4], it provides:

- A return metric compatible with bond YTM,
- A time-sensitive method applicable to high-growth and loss-making firms [6],
- A foundation for unified asset allocation and risk-adjusted portfolio design.

By generalizing the P/E ratio, embedding declining growth, and aligning with fixed-income logic, SIRRIPA sets the stage for a coherent, modern approach to investment analysis—one capable of handling the realities of today's capital markets.

---

4. The Risk-Free Rate as a Common Benchmark for Bonds and Stocks

A defining innovation of the SIRRIPA framework is its alignment of equity valuation with fixed-income logic through the shared use of the **risk-free rate**—typically proxied by the yield on long-term government bonds such as the 10-year U.S. Treasury. In fixed-income markets, this rate forms the foundation for determining the present value of future cash flows and for calculating risk premiums through yield spreads. In equity valuation, however, traditional metrics such as the P/E ratio or PEG ratio generally operate **without an explicit benchmark**, rendering risk and time largely implicit or absent altogether.

SIRRIPA resolves this inconsistency by anchoring stock valuation to the **same foundational reference point** as bond valuation. By doing so, it enables both **coherent risk pricing** and **cross-asset comparability**, establishing the risk-free rate as a universal benchmark for forward-looking return analysis.

4.1. From Bonds to Stocks: Anchoring Equity Valuation to the Risk-Free Rate

In fixed-income valuation, the **Yield to Maturity (YTM)** reflects the total expected return from a bond, incorporating both periodic coupons and the final redemption value. It is calculated as the internal rate of return that equates the bond's current price with the present value of its future cash flows, all discounted at a rate derived from—or at least benchmarked against—the risk-free rate:

$$\text{YTM} = r_f + \text{credit spread}$$

In equity valuation using SIRRIPA, a similar structure emerges. The stock's earnings stream (analogous to coupons) and terminal Exit Price (analogous to face value) are discounted at a rate derived from the **Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM)**:

$$r = rf + \beta(rm - rf)$$

Here, the discount rate r represents the minimum required return for an investor holding a given stock, and it is explicitly **anchored to the same risk-free rate r_f** used in fixed-income pricing. This shared foundation enables direct comparison of returns across asset classes using structurally analogous logic.

4.2. SIRRIPA and the Risk-Free Rate: A Yield-Based Paradigm for Equities

The SIRRIPA formula calculates the internal rate of return from both earnings and terminal value, discounted using r, which incorporates the **risk-free rate r_f** :

$$\text{SIRRIPA} = \left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{PPP} \frac{EPS_t}{(1+r)^t} + \frac{\text{Exit Price}}{(1+r)^{PPP}}}{P} \right)^{1/PPP} - 1$$

This formulation makes the risk-free rate **r_f** an integral part of the valuation framework:

- **It defines the discount rate r** through CAPM,
- **It shapes the Exit P/E multiple**, via Exit P/E = PPP · (1 + r),
- **It enables the extraction of the equity risk premium** as:

Stock Risk Premium (SRP) = SIRRIPA − r_f

This last point is particularly significant. Just as the credit spread in bonds quantifies the market's pricing of risk over the risk-free baseline, the SRP measures the forward-looking compensation equity investors require—**not based on historical returns**, but derived structurally from valuation inputs and cash flow expectations.

4.3. Why This Alignment Is Transformative

Aligning equity valuation with bond methodology through a shared benchmark yields several powerful advantages:

4.3.1. Unified Return Language Across Asset Classes

SIRRIPA makes it possible to compare a stock with a SIRRIPA of 10.2% and a bond with a YTM of 7.5%, both measured against the same risk-free rate r_f. This supports rational asset allocation, capital budgeting, and performance benchmarking on a consistent basis.

4.3.2. Transparent and Dynamic Risk Pricing

Traditional valuation methods obscure risk by omitting explicit benchmarks. SIRRIPA formalizes the discount rate using observable market inputs (risk-free rate and equity risk premium), which update dynamically with economic conditions and investor sentiment.

4.3.3. Elimination of Arbitrary Discounting

In many DCF implementations, the discount rate is chosen arbitrarily—often defaulting to a static "rule of thumb" (e.g., 10%). SIRRIPA replaces this with a **theoretically grounded**, CAPM-derived rate tied directly to the prevailing interest rate environment.

4.3.4. Cross-Asset Optimization and Risk Budgeting

Institutional investors often struggle to balance equity and fixed-income allocations due to incompatible return metrics. SIRRIPA enables **apples-to-apples comparison**, enhancing portfolio construction, risk parity models, and stress-testing scenarios.

4.4. Empirical and Theoretical Reinforcement

This alignment of discounting logic and benchmark consistency has been validated in several of our prior works:

- In [12], we demonstrate how using CAPM-derived discount rates improves the interpretability and comparability of DCF-based valuations under the SIRRIPA framework.

- In [3], SIRRIPA is shown to provide a bond-like return metric for equities, allowing for real-time comparison between growth stocks and yield-oriented instruments.

- In [17], we show how replacing the fixed assumptions of the Gordon-Shapiro Model with time-sensitive, risk-adjusted logic centered around the risk-free rate significantly improves valuation precision.

Collectively, these studies reinforce that anchoring SIRRIPA to the risk-free rate is not merely a structural choice—it is a conceptual advancement that brings equity valuation into alignment with the broader logic of capital markets.

4.5. A Common Valuation Standard for a Unified Capital Market

As capital markets become more integrated and asset allocators demand more consistent, transparent frameworks, the use of the risk-free rate as a common anchor across asset classes becomes a **baseline requirement**, not an analytical luxury.

The SIRRIPA framework meets this requirement by:

- **Bridging fixed-income and equity valuation through shared assumptions**,
- **Offering a risk-aware, time-dependent return metric**, and
- **Supporting macro-consistent policy, regulatory, and portfolio-level modeling**.

In doing so, SIRRIPA does not simply reform equity valuation; it **harmonizes it** with the broader structure of return-based decision-making across the financial system.

---

5. Comparing the Components of Return: Stocks vs. Bonds

A critical breakthrough enabled by the SIRRIPA framework is the recognition that the return structures of stocks and bonds—while superficially different—are economically and mathematically comparable when viewed through the proper conceptual lens. This section explains two essential equivalences that form the foundation of this comparability, supported by real-world examples and rigorous financial theory.

5.1. Why Earnings per Share (EPS) Are Analogous to Bond Coupons

In bond valuation, **coupon payments** represent fixed, periodic cash flows contractually promised to bondholders. These coupons form the backbone of a bond's **Yield to Maturity (YTM)**—a return measure that incorporates all future cash flows discounted to the present.

In equity valuation, the equivalent flow is not the **dividend**, but the **Earnings Per Share (EPS)**. While dividends represent the portion of earnings distributed, **EPS captures the full economic value generated on behalf of shareholders**, including amounts retained by the company for reinvestment and future growth.

This leads to a fundamental equivalence:

EPS functions as the equity analog of bond coupons, because both represent recurring, value-generating flows that belong to the investor—whether paid out or retained.

Supporting Rationale:

- **Economic Equivalence**: Rational investors are indifferent between receiving earnings via dividends or through retained reinvestment, provided that reinvested earnings yield adequate returns (per the Modigliani–Miller theorem).

- **Discounted Cash Flow Logic**: In SIRRIPA, projected EPS are discounted over the Potential Payback Period (PPP), just as bond coupons are discounted over a bond's life to compute YTM.

- **Growth and Reinvestment**: EPS inherently includes future value creation via compounding, similar to bonds with reinvested coupons.

This conceptual alignment is illustrated in [15], *"NVIDIA Leads in Forward Returns"*, where stocks with modest dividend policies—but strong EPS growth—generate high SIRRIPA values. The analogy holds: reinvested EPS in stocks acts like reinvested interest in bonds. The theoretical foundation for this treatment is elaborated in [9], *"Mathematics of Stock Valuation"*, and is consistent with frameworks found in [19] Damodaran, [20] Penman, and [21] Koller et al.

5.2. Why Exit Price Is Analogous to a Bond's Face Value or Redemption Price

In fixed-income investing, the **face value** (or redemption price) is the terminal payment a bondholder receives at maturity. In calculating YTM, this lump sum is discounted along with the coupons to compute a bond's total return.

In equity valuation under the SIRRIPA framework, a parallel concept exists: the **Exit Price**. It reflects the market value of the stock at the end of the PPP period and is calculated as:

$$\text{Exit Price} = EPS_{PPP} \cdot \text{Exit } P/E \quad \text{with} \quad \text{Exit } P/E = PPP \cdot (1 + r)$$

This approach ensures that the Exit Price:

- **Avoids speculation**, by anchoring the terminal multiple to a function of time and risk.
- **Incorporates growth**, via the projected EPS at the end of PPP.
- **Plays the same role as bond principal**, by representing a final, discounted value that adds to the total return.

This analogy is applied in [14], *"Resolving the Valuation Mystery of Palantir Technologies"*, where an extreme forward P/E is rationalized through long-term earnings growth and a realistic Exit P/E. Despite a current P/E above 500, the SIRRIPA calculation shows how long-term earnings and prudent exit valuation produce a justifiable return—just as a zero-coupon bond trading at a steep discount can deliver competitive YTM.

Similarly, [16], *"The Insolent, Persistent Bull Market on Wall Street"*, demonstrates how upward momentum in stock prices can be explained by retained earnings compounding over time, not short-term multiples—analogous to premium bonds appreciating toward face value at maturity.

5.3. Summary Table: Structural Comparison Between Bonds and Stocks under SIRRIPA

Component	Bond (YTM)	Stock (SIRRIPA)
Periodic Return	Coupon Payment	EPS (not necessarily distributed)
Terminal Value	Face Value / Redemption	Exit Price = $EPS_{PPP} \cdot Exit\ P/E$
Present Value Discount	Based on market yield	Based on discount rate r
Yield Metric	YTM	SIRRIPA
Benchmark	Risk-Free Rate	Risk-Free Rate (via CAPM in r)
Risk Premium	Credit Spread	Stock Risk Premium (SIRRIPA $- r^f$)

5.4. Implication: Structural Equivalence Unlocks Rational Comparability

The above equivalences are not just theoretical—they are transformative. SIRRIPA re-engineers equity valuation into a format that **mirrors fixed-income logic**, making it possible to:

- Compare stocks to bonds **on a common risk-adjusted, time-sensitive basis**.
- Value retained earnings and price appreciation **without speculative projections**.
- Incorporate market-based benchmarks such as the **risk-free rate** and **CAPM-based discounting**.
- Rationalize "irrational" market valuations by **recasting them as time-based earnings realizations**.

This structural equivalence also aligns with traditional and modern valuation thought. As demonstrated in [22] *Graham and Dodd's Security Analysis* and extended in [23] *Value Investing: From Graham to Buffett and Beyond*, sound valuation always rests on linking price to long-term economic fundamentals—precisely what SIRRIPA does by synthesizing periodic earnings and final price into one yield-like metric.

In doing so, **SIRRIPA doesn't just measure return—it unifies equity and bond valuation into a coherent, comparable, and risk-sensitive system.**

6. Implications for Investment, Policy, and Analysis

The emergence of SIRRIPA as a yield-based valuation metric for equities—structurally and mathematically analogous to Yield to Maturity (YTM) in bonds—represents more than a methodological advance. It marks a **paradigm shift** with wide-ranging consequences for portfolio construction, valuation theory, regulatory modeling, and cross-asset capital allocation.

By establishing a time-sensitive, risk-adjusted, and internally consistent return framework rooted in the Potential Payback Period (PPP), SIRRIPA offers a clear and unified lens through which modern equity investments can be evaluated. This section explores the implications of this shift across three interrelated domains: investors, analysts and academics, and public policy.

6.1. For Investors and Asset Managers: A Bond-Like Lens for Equity Portfolios

In institutional and retail investment strategy, the ability to compare expected returns across asset classes is central to portfolio optimization. Bonds are evaluated using forward-looking yield metrics (e.g., YTM, effective duration), while equities are typically assessed using static or partial indicators (e.g., P/E ratios, dividend yield, growth forecasts).

SIRRIPA addresses this asymmetry by:

- Delivering a **comprehensive annualized return metric** for equities,
- Incorporating **earnings trajectory**, **capital appreciation**, and **risk discounting**,
- Enabling **direct comparison with bond yields**, mortgage-backed security IRRs, and even real estate cap rates.

This equips asset managers to:

- Construct more coherent **multi-asset portfolios**,
- **Match liabilities** and forecast cash flows more precisely,
- Allocate capital based on **time-adjusted risk premiums**.

As illustrated in [3] and [4], applying SIRRIPA to stocks enables apples-to-apples comparison with fixed-income products, helping to identify mispriced securities or strategic tilts based on the evolving macroeconomic landscape (e.g., interest rate normalization, inflation cycles, or yield curve shifts).

6.2. For Analysts and Academics: A Return Metric That Restores Internal Consistency

In financial theory, valuation models are often based on discounted cash flows, yet the practice of equity analysis is frequently dominated by ratios that fragment value (P/E, PEG, EV/EBITDA). This creates a disconnect between theoretical rigor and applied metrics.

SIRRIPA resolves this inconsistency by:

- **Synthesizing time, growth, and risk** into one metric,
- Retaining the logic of **present value modeling** while avoiding speculative assumptions,
- Extending foundational valuation frameworks like the **Gordon Growth Model (GGM)** with finite-horizon realism [17, 18].

From a pedagogical standpoint, SIRRIPA offers a powerful teaching tool:

- It bridges the gap between bond math and equity modeling,
- It reorients valuation around **recovery time and yield**, not just valuation multiples,
- It introduces a **stock-specific internal rate of return**, analogous to IRR in project finance and private equity.

For empirical researchers, SIRRIPA offers a more robust measure for backtesting investment strategies, modeling cross-sectional returns, or building factor-based models that integrate **forward-looking valuation with time sensitivity**.

6.3. For Policymakers and Regulators: A Step Toward Unified Financial Standards

The financial system depends on consistent frameworks for evaluating risk and return. Regulators require asset managers, insurers, and pension funds to model solvency and funding status across economic scenarios. Yet, they still face fundamental inconsistencies:

- Bonds and stocks are modeled using **incompatible valuation frameworks**,
- Discount rate assumptions vary widely across sectors and institutions,
- Risk premiums are often estimated **ex post**, rather than derived structurally.

SIRRIPA addresses these challenges by:

- Offering a **standardized, forward-looking return measure** for equities that is **anchored to the risk-free rate**,
- Providing a tool for **stress-testing portfolios** under interest rate or earnings growth scenarios,
- Supporting **cross-asset risk calibration** for policy models (e.g., capital adequacy, ALM models, solvency frameworks).

For sovereign wealth funds, pension boards, and financial stability councils, SIRRIPA can serve as a **framework for risk-adjusted performance benchmarking**, helping institutions assess whether expected returns are aligned with funding requirements, risk constraints, and macroeconomic conditions.

6.4. Strategic and Practical Integration

Adopting SIRRIPA need not require discarding all legacy valuation methods. Rather, it can be integrated into existing analysis as a **synthesis metric**:

- Use alongside DCF models to validate assumptions about capital recovery,
- Compare with P/E or PEG to detect when traditional ratios fail to account for growth timing or risk,
- Overlay with factor models or equity screens to identify misaligned valuation-risk profiles.

As shown across applications in [13], [14], [15], and [16], SIRRIPA is especially valuable for analyzing:

- High-growth or speculative stocks with extreme P/E ratios,
- Loss-making firms that are difficult to evaluate using static ratios [6],
- Interest-sensitive equities in a changing rate environment.

In this way, SIRRIPA becomes not just a new metric, but a **core pillar of a valuation system**—unifying the precision of bond analysis with the growth dynamics of equity investment.

---

7. Conclusion: From Static Multiples to Dynamic Metrics

The dominant tools of traditional equity valuation—such as the P/E ratio, PEG ratio, Dividend Yield, and even the Gordon-Shapiro Model—have served generations of investors and analysts. They are accessible, intuitive, and deeply embedded in financial practice. Yet they are also products of a simpler analytical era—one less attuned to the complexities of reinvestment, variable growth trajectories, cross-asset allocation, and risk-adjusted return modeling.

At their core, these tools share fundamental structural limitations:

- They are **static or one-dimensional**, failing to capture the evolution of earnings over time.
- They are **incomplete**, often separating income from capital gains or focusing solely on distributions.
- They are **incompatible with fixed-income valuation frameworks**, preventing unified analysis across bonds and equities.

The **SIRRIPA** framework—grounded in the **Potential Payback Period (PPP)**—addresses these deficiencies by integrating the four essential dimensions of valuation: **earnings, growth, risk, and time**. It synthesizes them into a single, yield-based return metric that allows equities to be evaluated in the same logic and language long reserved for bonds:

- Just as Yield to Maturity (YTM) reflects both periodic coupons and terminal repayment,

- SIRRIPA integrates **cumulative discounted earnings** and a rational, performance-based **Exit Price**.

This alignment is more than a mathematical innovation—it represents a **conceptual convergence**. It places equity valuation on equal footing with fixed-income analysis, providing a time-aware, risk-adjusted framework for return forecasting, asset comparison, and capital allocation.

By treating **Earnings Per Share (EPS)** as the equity analogue of bond coupons and the **Exit Price** as analogous to a bond's face value, SIRRIPA offers a practical, internally consistent answer to the most fundamental investment questions:

How much will I earn? Over what time? At what risk? Compared to what?

Because the framework is built on first principles—mathematically sound and adaptable to modern financial modeling—it has the potential to integrate seamlessly into academic theory, practitioner toolkits, regulatory guidelines, and fintech platforms.

In a financial world increasingly focused on **comparability**, **transparency**, and **precision**, SIRRIPA is not merely an enhancement of legacy metrics. It redefines how value is measured—moving from static multiples to dynamic, time-based return metrics—and lays the groundwork for a unified valuation methodology across the full spectrum of investable assets.

That said, it is important to recognize the limitations and evolving nature of this approach. As a return metric designed to evaluate a stock's attractiveness on the same basis as a bond—anchored to the risk-free rate as a universal benchmark—SIRRIPA may understandably challenge conventional valuation norms. While not without its limitations, and subject to reasonable debate concerning its assumptions and computational structure, the framework presented here aims to demonstrate its coherence and relevance as a forward-looking tool for valuation.

The PPP and its derivative metrics are relatively new, and there is a pressing need for continued research—both conceptual and empirical—to refine their theoretical foundations, test their predictive validity, and assess their applicability across a wide range of industries, market cycles, and geographies.

Moreover, like all financial models, the reliability of PPP-based valuation is constrained by the quality of its inputs—most notably projected earnings growth rates, discount rates, and risk measures such as beta. Even the most rigorous framework can yield misleading results if built on flawed or overly optimistic assumptions. This underscores the critical importance of **sensitivity analysis**, which must accompany any serious valuation exercise using PPP or its derivatives to assess the robustness of conclusions under varying input scenarios.

Ultimately, no model can capture every relevant variable or anticipate all market dynamics. The objective is not to predict the future with certainty, but to reflect economic reality as faithfully as possible—while offering a logically consistent, transparent, and decision-relevant approach to valuation. In this respect, SIRRIPA represents both a **theoretical advance** and a **practical tool**—one that encourages more disciplined thinking about return, risk, and time in modern equity markets.

REFERENCES

I- Articles Introducing or Applying the PPP and SIRRIPA Framework

[1] Sam, R. (1984). *Le P.E.R., un instrument mal adapté à la gestion mondiale des portefeuilles. Comment remédier à ses lacunes.* Analyse Financière.
https://www.stockinternalrateofreturn.com/Analyse-Financie%CC%80re_1.pdf

[2] Sam, R. (2023). *Stock Evaluation: Discovering the Potential Payback Period (PPP) as a Dynamic P/E Ratio.* Website.
https://www.stockinternalrateofreturn.com/index.html

[3] Sam, R. (2025). *SIRRIPA: The Stock-Tailored Yield to Maturity (YTM) and the Emergence of a Cross-Asset Valuation Metric.*
https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202504.1934.v1

[4] Sam, R. (2025). *Why SIRRIPA is Set to Replace the P/E Ratio in Modern Equity Valuation.*
https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202504.1213/v1

[5] Sam, R. (2025). *Mathematics of Stock Valuation: Why the Potential Payback Period (PPP) Outperforms the P/E and PEG Ratios.*
10.5281/zenodo.15668147

[6] Sam, R. (2025). *Breaking the Valuation Deadlock: Replacing the P/E Ratio with the Potential Payback Period (PPP) for Loss-Making Companies – A Case Study on Intel (2025).*
http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5247858

[7] Sam, R. (2025). *Proving that the P/E Ratio is Just a Limiting Case of the Potential Payback Period (PPP) When Earnings Growth and Interest Rate are Ignored.*
https://ssrn.com/abstract=5254723

[8] Sam, R. (2025). *Beyond Valuation: The Four PPP-Derived Return Metrics and Their Role in Modern Equity Analysis.*
0.5281/zenodo.16155541

[9] Sam, R. (2025). *Mathematics of Stock Valuation: How the Potential Payback Period (PPP) Subsumes the P/E and PEG Ratios.*
http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5314340

[10] Sam, R. (2025). *A Quantitative Revelation in Equity Valuation: The P/E Ratio as a Degenerate Case of the Potential Payback Period (PPP).*
DOI: https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202505.2166.v1

[11] Sam, R. (2025). *How to Adjust the P/E Ratio for Earnings Growth in Equity Valuation: PEG or PPP?*
DOI: https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202505.0212.v1

II- Articles Addressing Specific Valuation Models (Including Gordon-Shapiro) or Case Studies

[12] Sam, R. (2025). *Reassessing the Discounted Cash Flow Model (DCFM): How the Potential Payback Period (PPP) Improves Applicability and Accuracy with a Time-Based Approach.*
http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5279126

[13] Sam, R. (2025). *Is the S&P 500 Overvalued? All Metrics Say Yes, Except SIRRIPA.*
http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5320663

[14] Sam, R. (2025). *Resolving the Valuation Mystery of Palantir Technologies: How PPP and SIRRIPA Rationalize a Market Darling with a P/E Over 500.*
http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5338179

[15] Sam, R. (2025). *NVIDIA Leads in Forward Returns: A PPP-Based Stock Valuation Analysis of Four Leading Technology Firms.*
http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5337514

[16] Sam, R. (2025). *The Insolent, Persistent Bull Market on Wall Street: A Rebuttal to Traditional Metrics—P/E Ratio, PEG Ratio, and Earnings Yield—and a Validation of SIRRIPA.*
http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5347721

[17] Sam, R. (2025). *Revisiting the Gordon-Shapiro Model: How the Potential Payback Period (PPP) Refines and Operationalizes a Foundational Framework in Stock Valuation.*
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5257245

[18] Sam, R. (2025). *Making the P/E Ratio a Truly Dynamic Valuation Metric: Gordon-Shapiro vs. Potential Payback Period (PPP).*
https://zenodo.org/records/15832809

III- Foundational and Independent Books on Valuation Theory

[19] Damodaran, A. (2012). *Investment Valuation: Tools and Techniques for Determining the Value of Any Asset* (3rd ed.). Wiley.

[20] Penman, S. H. (2013). *Financial Statement Analysis and Security Valuation* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

[21] Koller, T., Goedhart, M., & Wessels, D. (2020). *Valuation: Measuring and Managing the Value of Companies* (7th ed.). Wiley.

[22] Graham, B., & Dodd, D. L. (2009). *Security Analysis: Sixth Edition, Foreword by Warren Buffett.* McGraw-Hill Education.

[23] Greenwald, B., Kahn, J., Sonkin, P. D., & van Biema, M. (2004). *Value Investing: From Graham to Buffett and Beyond.* Wiley.