

Heavy tailed time series with extremal independence

Rafał Kulik*

Philippe Soulier†

Abstract

We consider heavy tailed time series whose finite-dimensional distributions are extremally independent in the sense that extremely large values cannot be observed consecutively. This calls for methods beyond the classical multivariate extreme value theory which is convenient only for extremally dependent multivariate distributions. We use the Conditional Extreme Value approach to study the effect of an extreme value at time zero on the future of the time series. In formal terms, we study the limiting conditional distribution of future observations given an extreme value at time zero. To this purpose, we introduce conditional scaling functions and conditional scaling exponents. We compute these quantities for a variety of models, including Markov chains, exponential autoregressive models, stochastic volatility models with heavy tailed innovations or volatilities.

Keywords: Multivariate regular variation, extremal independence, conditional scaling exponent, Markov chains, stochastic volatility models.

1 Introduction

Let $\{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a strictly stationary time series. We say that $\{X_t\}$ is regularly varying if all its finite dimensional distributions are regularly varying, i.e. for each $h \geq 0$, there exists a nonzero Radon measure ν_h on $[-\infty, \infty]^{h+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, called the exponent measure, which puts zero mass at infinity, and a scaling function c such that, as $s \rightarrow \infty$,

$$s\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{(X_0, \dots, X_h)}{c(s)} \in \cdot\right) \xrightarrow{v} \nu_h, \quad (1.1)$$

where \xrightarrow{v} means vague convergence, to be understood here on the space $[-\infty, \infty]^{h+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Recall that a sequence of measures ν_n defined on a complete separable metric space E (endowed with its Borel σ -field) is said to converge vaguely to a measure ν if $\nu_n(f) \rightarrow \nu(f)$ for all continuous functions with compact support, or equivalently $\nu_n(K) \rightarrow \nu(K)$ for all compact sets K with $\nu(\partial K) = 0$. See [Res87] for more details. This assumption implies that the function c is regularly varying with index $1/\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$, the measure ν_h is homogeneous of degree $-\alpha$ and the marginal distribution of X_0 is heavy tailed with positive tail index α . To avoid trivialities, we will only consider distributions that are not totally skewed to the left, that is we assume that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)/\mathbb{P}(|X_0| > x) > 0$. In that case, a possible choice for the scaling function in (1.1) is $c(s) = F_0^{\leftarrow}(1 - 1/s)$, where F_0 is the distribution function of X_0 , and we can rewrite (1.1) as

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(x^{-1}(X_0, \dots, X_h) \in \cdot)}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} \xrightarrow{v} \nu_h, \quad (1.2)$$

on $[-\infty, \infty]^{h+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

*University of Ottawa

†Université de Paris-Ouest

If $h \geq 1$, there exist two fundamentally different cases: either the exponent measure is concentrated on the axes or it is not. The former case is referred to as extremal independence and the latter as extremal dependence. In other words, extremal independence means that no two components can be extremely large at the same time, and extremal dependence means that two components can be simultaneously extremely large. The suitably renormalized componentwise maxima of an i.i.d. sequence of extremally independent random vectors converge to a max-stable distribution with independent marginals. See e.g. [Res02] or [Res07]. This definition is rather weak and it must be noted that if two components of the vector are extremally dependent then the whole vector is extremally dependent; e.g. the vector (X, X, Y) , if multivariate regularly varying (MRV), is extremally dependent even if X and Y are independent. For most time series models, the distribution of (X_0, \dots, X_h) is either extremally dependent or extremally independent for all h .

In a time series context, we may want to assess the influence of an extreme event at time zero on future observations. If the finite dimensional distributions of the time series model under consideration are extremally independent or more generally if the vector (X_0, X_m, \dots, X_h) is extremally independent for some $m \geq 1$, then, for any set A which is bounded away from zero in \mathbb{R}^{h-m+2} ,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > xu_0, (X_m, \dots, X_h) \in xA)}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} = 0. \quad (1.3)$$

Thus in case of extremal independence the exponent measure ν_h provides no information on (most) extreme events occurring after an extreme event at time 0. In concrete terms, if the series $\{X_t\}$ represent financial losses, extremal independence means that an extreme loss at time zero will be followed by another extreme loss of at least the same magnitude with an extremely small probability. This is good news, but it is still of great importance to know how likely a one million euro loss is to be followed by a smaller loss of, say, a hundred thousand euros, which might be disastrous after the previous loss. A moderate flood can still be devastating after a major one. Since the exponent measure provides no information, other tools must be used to quantify the influence of an extreme event at time zero on future events.

In order to obtain a non degenerate limit in (1.3) and a finer analysis of the sequence of extreme values, it is necessary to change the normalization in (1.2), and possibly the space on which we will assume that vague convergence holds. One idea is to find a sequence of normalizations $b_j(x)$, $j \geq 1$ such that for each $h \geq 1$, the conditional distribution of $(X_0/x, X_1/b_1(x), \dots, X_h(x)/b_h(x))$ given $X_0 > x$ has a non degenerate limit. Finding a limiting conditional distribution of a random vector given one extreme component is a very old problem. It was recently rigorously investigated for bivariate distributions using the concept of regular variation on cones by [HR07] and [DR11]. See the references in these paper for the earlier literature. If such a limiting distribution exists, the vector (X_0, \dots, X_h) is said to satisfy the ‘‘Conditional Extreme Value’’ (hereafter CEV) assumption. This expression was introduced in this context by [DR11]¹. It must be noted that if they exist, limiting conditional distributions given an extreme component need not be extreme value distributions and the variables X_1, \dots, X_h need not be in the domain of attraction of an extreme value distribution. Considering i.i.d. random variables, it is easily seen that any distribution can arise as a limiting distribution. Another important feature of the CEV approach is that it is applicable to extremally dependent regularly varying multivariate distributions as well; in that case, the limiting distribution is entirely determined by the exponent measure. This is important in view of statistical inference, since the same methodology can be applied to both types of distributions.

It is the goal of this paper to apply the CEV approach to the finite dimensional distributions of stationary (and some non stationary) time series, both extremally dependent and independent, though with a main focus on extremally independent time series.

¹Note that this expression is also used in the extreme value literature to refer to the standard extreme value theory in presence of a covariate.

In Section 2, we will state Assumption 1 which expresses the CEV condition in the correct vague convergence framework introduced by [HR07] and give several applications. One important problem with extremally independent random variables is the tail behavior of their product. The CEV condition alone does not guarantee that the product is regularly varying. In Section 2.1, we will strengthen it and obtain a result on the tail behavior of products. In Section 2.2, we will further strengthen it to obtain the convergence of conditional moments. This convergence can be applied to study risk measures such as the conditional tail expectation; this will be discussed in Section 2.3. In Section 2.4 we extend the tail process, introduced by [BS09] in the extremally dependent case, to the extremally independent case and we give a representation of the limiting conditional distributions in terms of this tail process. In Section 2.5 we will compare the CEV approach to Hidden Regular Variation.

In the following Sections 3, 4, and 5 we will study several models of regularly varying time series which satisfy Assumption 1. In Section 3, we give a general result for extremally independent Markov chains. In Section 4, we study a non-Markovian exponential linear process and in Section 5, we will finally consider stochastic volatility models with light tailed or heavy tailed volatilities. It should be pointed out that the models studied in Sections 4 and 5 allow for some form of long memory. This is of practical importance since it is one of the so-called stylized facts of financial time series (log-returns) that volatility may exhibit long memory.

Section 6 contains the proof of our main result on Markov chains and Section 7 discusses some directions of further research, the most important one being statistical inference.

2 Limiting conditional distributions and conditional scaling exponents

We now introduce the main Assumption of this paper. It is stated in terms of regular variation on space smaller than $[-\infty, \infty]^{h+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

Assumption 1. *There exist scaling functions b_j , $j \geq 1$ and Radon measures μ_h , $h \geq 1$, on $(0, \infty) \times [-\infty, +\infty]^h$, $h \geq 1$, such that*

$$\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} \mathbb{P} \left(\left(\frac{X_0}{x}, \frac{X_1}{b_1(x)}, \dots, \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)} \right) \in \cdot \right) \xrightarrow{v} \mu_h, \quad (2.1)$$

on $(0, \infty) \times [-\infty, +\infty]^h$ and for all $y_0 > 0$,

- a. the measure $\mu_h([y_0, \infty) \times \cdot)$ on \mathbb{R}^h is not concentrated on a line through infinity;
- b. the measure $\mu_h([y_0, \infty) \times \cdot)$ on \mathbb{R}^h is not concentrated on a hyperplane;
- c. the measure $\mu_h(\cdot \times \mathbb{R}^h)$ on $(0, \infty)$ is not concentrated at infinity.

Notice that vague convergence here must hold on a different space than in (1.1). This is of importance since the compact sets of $[-\infty, \infty]^{h+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $(0, \infty) \times [-\infty, +\infty]^h$ differ. For instance, if $h = 1$, $[0, \infty) \times [1, \infty)$ is compact in $[-\infty, \infty]^2 \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ but not in $(0, \infty) \times [-\infty, +\infty]$. More generally, a subset K of $[-\infty, \infty]^{h+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ is relatively compact if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mathbf{x} \in K$ implies that at least one component of \mathbf{x} is greater than ϵ ; a subset L of $(0, \infty) \times [-\infty, \infty]^h$ is relatively compact if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mathbf{x} \in L$ implies that the first component of \mathbf{x} is greater than ϵ .

For $h = 1$, Assumption 1 is Condition (5) in [HR07]. We extend it here to a multidimensional framework and to different scaling functions b_j , $j \geq 1$. This is a fundamental necessity in the time series context. As already mentioned in the introduction, Assumption 1 does not require stationarity of the time series $\{X_t\}$ and is compatible with both extremal dependence and independence.

We now make some comments on the conditions in Assumption 1.

- Assumption 1a implies that the scaling functions b_j are not too small.
- Assumption 1b implies that the scaling functions b_j are not too large. For instance, if X_0 and X_1 are independent, choosing $b_1(x) = x$ would yield a measure concentrated on $(0, \infty] \times \{0\}$.
- Assumption 1c implies that the marginal distribution of X_0 is heavy tailed with positive tail index. Hereafter, we let α denote the tail index.
- By construction, $\mu_h([1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^h) = 1$, i.e. the measure μ_h restricted to $[1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^h$ is a probability measure. Thus we can define the multivariate distribution functions Ψ_h on $[1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^h$ by

$$\Psi_h(\mathbf{y}) = \mu_h \left([1, y_0] \times \prod_{j=1}^h [-\infty, y_j] \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mathbf{y} = (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_h) \in [1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^h$. For all continuity points \mathbf{y} of Ψ_h , we obtain

$$\Psi_h(\mathbf{y}) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{X_0}{x} \leq y_0, \frac{X_1}{b_1(x)} \leq y_1, \dots, \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)} \leq y_h \mid X_0 > x \right). \quad (2.3)$$

The most important consequence of Assumption 1, is that the functions b_j , $j \geq 1$ are regularly varying and that the limiting measure μ_h has some homogeneity property. We state these properties as a lemma whose proof is a standard application of the Convergence to Type Theorem. See [HR07, Proposition 1].

Lemma 2.1. *If Assumption 1 holds, then there exists $\kappa_j \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_j(ty)}{b_j(t)} = y^{\kappa_j}$$

and for all $y_0 > 0$ and $(y_1, \dots, y_h) \in \mathbb{R}^h$,

$$\mu_h \left((ty_0, \infty] \times \prod_{i=1}^h [-\infty, t^{\kappa_i} y_i] \right) = t^{-\alpha} \mu_h \left((y_0, \infty] \times \prod_{i=1}^h [-\infty, y_i] \right). \quad (2.4)$$

To put emphasis on the regular variation of the functions b_j , we introduce the following definition.

Definition 1 (Conditional scaling exponent). *Under Assumption 1, for $h \geq 1$, we call the index κ_h of regular variation of the functions b_h the (lag h) **conditional scaling exponent**.*

The exponents κ_h , $h \geq 1$ reflect the influence of an extreme event at time zero on future lags. Even though we expect this influence to decrease with the lag in the case of extremal independence, these exponents are not necessarily monotone decreasing. See Sections 4 and 5.3.

Considering only the bivariate distribution of (X_0, X_h) , we have the following properties.

- If (X_0, X_h) is multivariate regularly varying in the sense of (1.1) and Assumption 1 holds, then $\kappa_h \leq 1$. If (X_0, X_h) is extremally dependent then $\kappa_h = 1$. If $b_h(x) = o(x)$, which holds in particular if $\kappa_h < 1$, then (X_0, X_h) is extremally independent. Negative values of κ_h are allowed. This means that extremely large values are typically followed by extremely small (absolute) values.
- Condition (1.1) and extremal independence do not imply that Assumption 1 holds, i.e. the existence of limiting conditional distributions. See Sections 2.5 and 2.6.
- In most of the examples investigated in the next sections, it will hold that $0 \leq \kappa_h < 1$ for all h . However, there are natural examples where the scaling exponent is larger than 1. See Section 3.1.

2.1 Tail of products

One application of Assumption 1 is to obtain the tail of products of regularly varying random variables. If a pair (X_0, X_h) is jointly regularly varying with tail index α and is extremally dependent, then it is well known that the tail of the product $X_0 X_h$ is $\alpha/2$; see e.g. [Res07, Proposition 7.6]. In the case of extremal independence, many different tail behaviors of the product are possible. Under Assumption 1 and an additional technical condition, we can obtain the tail index of $X_0 X_h$. The next result generalizes [MRR02, Theorem 3.1] who consider only the case $\kappa_h = 0$; see also [SM11]. As before, we denote $\mathbf{y} = (y_0, \dots, y_h)$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let Assumption 1 hold and assume moreover that*

$$\int_{[0, \infty]^{h+1}} \mathbb{1}_{\{y_0 y_h > 1\}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(d\mathbf{y}) < \infty, \quad (2.5)$$

and there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{X_0}{x} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_0 \leq \epsilon x\}} \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)} \right)^\delta \right]}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

Then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_0 X_h > x b_h(x) u)}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} = u^{-\alpha/(1+\kappa_h)} \int_{[0, \infty]^{h+1}} \mathbb{1}_{\{y_0 y_h > 1\}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(d\mathbf{y}). \quad (2.7)$$

Thus, the right tail index of the product $X_0 X_h$ is $\alpha/(1 + \kappa_h)$.

Proof. Fix some $\epsilon > 0$. Then, by vague convergence,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_0 \mathbb{1}_{\{X_0 > \epsilon x\}} X_h > x b_h(x) u)}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} = \int_{(\epsilon, \infty] \times [0, \infty]^h} \mathbb{1}_{\{y_0 y_h > u\}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(d\mathbf{y}).$$

and by Markov's inequality,

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(X_0 \mathbb{1}_{\{X_0 \leq \epsilon x\}} X_h > x b_h(x) u)}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{X_0}{x} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_0 \leq \epsilon x\}} \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)} \right)^\delta \right]}{u^\delta \mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)}.$$

Conditions (2.5) and (2.6) ensure that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_0 X_h > x b_h(x) u)}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} = \int_{[0, \infty]^{h+1}} \mathbb{1}_{\{y_0 y_h > u\}} \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(d\mathbf{y}).$$

This yields (2.7) by the homogeneity property (2.4) and the change of variable $y_0 = u^{1/(1+\kappa_h)} z_0$, $y_i = u^{\kappa_i/(1+\kappa_h)} z_i$, $1 \leq i \leq h$. \square

2.2 Convergence of moments

The following lemma states that under suitable moment assumptions, the convergence (2.3) can be extended to unbounded functionals.

Lemma 2.3. *Let Assumption 1 hold. Assume moreover that there exists $x_0 > 0$ and $q_0, \dots, q_h > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{x \geq x_0} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{X_0}{x} \right|^{q_0} \prod_{i=1}^h \left| \frac{X_i}{b_i(x)} \right|^{q_i} \mid X_0 > x \right] < \infty. \quad (2.8)$$

Let g be a continuous function defined on $[1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^h$ such that

$$|g(x_0, \dots, x_h)| \leq C \prod_{i=0}^h (|x_i| \vee 1)^{q'_i}, \quad (2.9)$$

for some $q'_i < q_i$, $0 \leq i \leq h$ and a positive constant C . Then

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[g \left(\frac{X_0}{x}, \frac{X_1}{b_1(x)}, \dots, \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)} \right) \mid X_0 > x \right] = \int_1^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^h} g(\mathbf{y}) \boldsymbol{\mu}_h(d\mathbf{y}). \quad (2.10)$$

Proof. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{h,x}$ be the measure defined on $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^h$ by

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{h,x}(\cdot) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} \mathbb{P} \left(\left(\frac{X_0}{x}, \frac{X_1}{b_1(x)}, \dots, \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)} \right) \in \cdot \right). \quad (2.11)$$

Then, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[g \left(\frac{X_0}{x}, \frac{X_1}{b_1(x)}, \dots, \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)} \right) \mid X_0 > x \right] = \int_1^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^h} g(\mathbf{y}) \boldsymbol{\mu}_{h,x}(d\mathbf{y}).$$

Note that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{h,x}$ is a probability measure on $[1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^h$ which converges weakly to $\boldsymbol{\mu}_h$. Let $\mathbf{Y}_{h,x}$ be a sequence of random variables with distribution $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{h,x}$. Then $\mathbf{Y}_{h,x}$ converges weakly to a random variable \mathbf{Y}_h with distribution $\boldsymbol{\mu}_h$. Therefore, the convergence (2.10) holds for all bounded and continuous function g . If g is unbounded and satisfies (2.9), then (2.8) ensures the uniform integrability of the sequence $g(\mathbf{Y}_{h,x})$ and thus $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Y}_{h,x})] = \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Y}_h)]$. \square

Remark 2.4. Condition (2.8) ensures the uniform integrability needed to obtain the convergence of the expectation in (2.10). In the case of extremal dependence, it is necessary that $q_0 + \dots + q_h \leq \alpha$ for (2.8) to hold. In the case of extremal independence, this is in general neither sufficient nor necessary. For each model, the range of the admissible exponents q_i must then be given.

2.3 Conditional Tail Expectation

Assumption 1 and Lemma 2.3 can be applied to study certain risk measures. In a time series context, we may be interested in the limiting behavior as $x \rightarrow \infty$ of the Conditional Tail Expectation (CTE), defined by

$$\text{CTE}_h(x) = \mathbb{E}[X_h \mid X_0 > x].$$

This quantity is related to the expected shortfall (ES), defined by

$$\text{ES}_h(u) = \mathbb{E}[X_h \mid X_0 > \text{VAR}_{X_0}(u)],$$

where $\text{VAR}_{X_0}(u)$ is the Value-at-Risk associated with the random variable X_0 , at the level u . Note that the expected shortfall (originally defined with $h = 0$) is a coherent risk measure in the sense of [ADEH99]. The previous quantities could be zero. In a risk measure context, one might rather be interested in $\text{CTE}_h^+(x) = \mathbb{E}[(X_h)_+ \mid X_0 > x]$ where $(X_h)_+$ represent the future losses in absolute values.

If for some $h > 0$ the vector (X_0, X_h) is extremally dependent and if $\alpha > 1$, then $\text{CTE}_h^+(x)$ will grow linearly with x , i.e. $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^{-1} \text{CTE}_h^+(x) > 0$. For a large class of regularly varying sequences (e.g. stationary solutions of stochastic recurrence equations), all the bivariate marginal distributions of the pairs (X_0, X_h) are extremally dependent. This means that a large value of X_0 yields the same order of magnitude of the CTE_h^+ for **all** lags h . This may not seem reasonable for

many real data sets, e.g. for high frequency financial data. In the case of extremal independence, under Assumption 1, if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{x \geq x_0} \frac{\mathbb{E}[|b_h^{-1}(x)X_h|^{1+\epsilon} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_0 > x\}}]}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} < \infty, \quad (2.12)$$

then $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^{-1} \text{CTE}_h^+(x) = 0$. Again, this does not mean that the CTE is uninformative, but that a smaller normalization is needed in order to obtain a non trivial limit. Lemma 2.3 implies that we can define

$$m_h = \int_1^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^h} (y_h)_+ \Psi_h(dy_0, \dots, dy_h), \quad (2.13)$$

and we have $\text{CTE}_h^+(x) \sim b_h(x)m_h$.

2.4 The tail process

In [BS09] the authors define the tail process as the distributional limit of the sequence $X_0/x, X_1/x, \dots, X_h/x, \dots$ conditionally on $X_0 > x$. In the case of extremal independence, this X_t/x converges weakly to 0 for all $t > 0$. Our approach suggests the following definition which includes the ordinary tail process.

Definition 2. Assume that Assumption 1 holds. The tail process $\{Y_t\}$ is the distributional limit of the sequence

$$\frac{X_0}{x}, \frac{X_1}{b_1(x)}, \dots, \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)}, \dots$$

conditionally on $X_0 > x$.

Note that the distribution of (Y_0, \dots, Y_h) is Ψ_h . We now give a representation of the tail process. Define the measure G_h on \mathbb{R}^h by

$$G_h(y_1, \dots, y_h) = \int_1^\infty \int_{-\infty}^{y_1} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{y_h} \mu_h(du_0, u_0^{\kappa_1} du_1, \dots, u_0^{\kappa_h} du_h).$$

Then, using the homogeneity property (2.4), we obtain

$$\int_{y_0}^\infty \int_{-\infty}^{y_1} \dots \int_{-\infty}^{y_h} \mu_h(du_0, u_0^{\kappa_1} du_1, \dots, u_0^{\kappa_h} du_h) = y_0^{-\alpha} G_h(y_1, \dots, y_h).$$

Let (J_1, \dots, J_h) be a random vector with distribution G_h . Assume that (Y_0, \dots, Y_h) and (J_1, \dots, J_h) are defined on the same probability space and such that Y_0 and (J_1, \dots, J_h) are independent. Note that (J_1, \dots, J_h) need not be independent. Then the previous identity yields that

$$(Y_0, \dots, Y_h) \stackrel{d}{=} (Y_0, Y_0^{\kappa_1} J_1, \dots, Y_0^{\kappa_h} J_h).$$

We can use the tail process to interpret the moment condition (2.5) in Proposition 2.2 which can now be expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}[J_h^{\alpha/(1+\kappa_h)}] < \infty. \quad (2.14)$$

The limit distribution of $X_0 X_h$ given $X_0 > x$ is thus the distribution of $Y_0^{1+\kappa_h} J_h$. The independence of J_h and Y_0 and Condition (2.6) imply that the tail of $Y_0^{1+\kappa_h} J_h$ is $\alpha/(1+\kappa_h)$ and that the tail index of $X_0 X_h$ is the same as that of $Y_0^{1+\kappa_h} J_h$.

2.5 Comparison with Hidden Regular Variation

A different way to quantify the joint extremal behavior of extremally independent distributions is Hidden Regular Variation (HRV), introduced in [Res02]. To simplify the notation, we will discuss hidden regular variation for non negative random variables only. Let \mathcal{C}_{h+1}^2 be the subset of $[0, \infty]^{h+1}$ comprised of vectors with at least two positive components (denoted \mathbb{E}^0 in [Res02]); that is, \mathcal{C}_{h+1}^2 is $[0, \infty]^2$ with the axes removed. For $h = 1$, $\mathcal{C}_2^2 = (0, \infty]^2$; for $h = 2$,

$$\mathcal{C}_3^2 = ((0, \infty]^2 \times [0, \infty]) \cup ((0, \infty] \times [0, \infty] \times (0, \infty]) \cup ([0, \infty] \times (0, \infty]^2) .$$

A vector (X_0, \dots, X_h) satisfying (1.1) is said to have Hidden Regular Variation if there exists a scaling function d such that $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} c(s)/d(s) = \infty$ and the sequence of measures $s\mathbb{P}(d^{-1}(s)(X_0, \dots, X_h) \in \cdot)$ converges vaguely to a non zero Radon measure on \mathcal{C}_{h+1}^2 . Under suitable non degeneracy conditions, the function d must then be regularly varying with some index $\beta \geq \alpha$. HRV implies extremal independence because of the condition $c(s)/d(s) \rightarrow \infty$ but HRV does not imply the existence of a limiting conditional distribution. See e.g. [HR07, Section 6] or [DR11, Example 4]. Conversely, it is conjectured but not proved in [DR11] that extremal independence and existence of a conditional limit law implies HRV.

Let us now highlight the differences between these two concepts. The fundamental theoretical difference between HRV and CEV lies in the space where vague convergence holds. This difference entails the following one: HRV only deals with joint exceedances of two components of the vector, and in dimension greater than two, the hidden exponent measure may be concentrated on hyperplanes; this is the case for instance of a vector with three i.i.d. regularly varying components. The CEV Assumption 1 prevents such a degeneracy. For example, if X, Y, Z are i.i.d. non negative regularly varying random variables with tail index α , then (X, Y, Z) has HRV with $\beta = 2\alpha$ but, for $u, v, w > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(X > xu, Y > xv, Z > xw)}{\mathbb{P}^2(X > x)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(X > xu, Y > v, Z > w)}{\mathbb{P}(X > x)} &= u^{-\alpha} \mathbb{P}(Y > v) \mathbb{P}(Z > w). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore HRV is uninformative for such exceedances but CEV yields a non degenerate limit.

The CEV assumption is also more flexible than HRV since it can also accommodate extremally dependent vectors (ruled out by HRV) with extremally independent subvectors. For example, we already seen that if X and Y are i.i.d. non negative regularly varying random variables with tail index α , then (X, X, Y) is extremally dependent; however, for $u, u', v > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(X > xu, X > xu', Y > xv)}{\mathbb{P}(X > x)} &= 0, \\ \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(X > xu, X > xu', Y > v)}{\mathbb{P}(X > x)} &= (u \vee u')^{-\alpha} \mathbb{P}(Y > v). \end{aligned}$$

The first limit is obtained by the standard multivariate regular variation property and is zero even though the vector is extremally dependent, and the second one shows that the CEV assumption is fulfilled.

In conclusion, we can say that the practical purposes of HRV and CEV are different: HRV gives an approximation of the probability of exceedances of pairs of components of an extremally independent vector over a “not too extreme” level, whereas CEV quantifies the influence of an extreme component (an extreme event at time zero in a time series context) on all other components (the future observations), be they extremally independent or dependent. There is no implication or exclusion between HRV and CEV and one approach cannot be deemed superior to the other. In higher dimensions, the CEV approach seems more flexible.

2.6 A counter example

We now give an example, where the conditional laws do not exist. Consider a stationary standard Gaussian process $\{\xi_t, t \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and define $X_t = e^{c\xi_t^2}$, with $c < 1/2$. Assume moreover that $|\text{cov}(\xi_0, \xi_n)| < 1$ for all $n \geq 1$. This is not a stringent assumption since a sufficient condition is that the process $\{\xi_t\}$ has a spectral density f such that $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(t) dt = 1$. In that case, extremal independence holds for the bivariate distributions, but a non trivial limiting conditional distribution $e^{c\xi_h^2}$ given $e^{c\xi_0^2} > x$ does not exist. See [HR07, section 2.4].

3 Extremally independent Markov chains

The extremal properties of Markov chains have received considerable attention recently; see [JS13], [RZ13] and the references therein. The aforementioned papers deal with extremal dependence. In this section, we will extend some results of [RZ13] to the present context which allows for extremal independence. Since the distribution of a Markov chain is entirely determined by its initial distribution and the transition kernel, denoted by Π , it is natural in this context to replace Assumption 1 by the following one, which is similar to [RZ13, Assumption 2.5]. For simplicity, we assume that the state space is $[0, \infty)$.

Assumption 2. *There exist a function b , regularly varying at infinity with index $\kappa \geq 0$ and a distribution function G on $[0, \infty)$, not concentrated on one point such that*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \Pi(x, b(x)A) = G(A) \quad (3.1)$$

for all Borel sets $A \subset [0, \infty)$ such that $G(\partial A) = 0$.

This means that the transition kernel is asymptotically homogeneous. It also means that conditionally on $X_0 = x$, the distribution of $X_1/b(x)$ converges weakly to the distribution G .

The main result of this section states that Assumption 2 implies Assumption 1. Define $b_0(x) = x$, $b_1(x) = b(x)$ and for $h \geq 1$, $b_h = b_{h-1} \circ b$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\{X_t\}$ be a Markov chain whose transition kernel satisfies Assumption 2 and with initial distribution having right tail index $\alpha > 0$. Assume moreover that $G(\{0\}) = 0$. Then Assumption 1 holds and the limiting conditional distribution of*

$$\left(\frac{X_0}{x}, \frac{X_1}{b_1(x)}, \dots, \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)}, \dots \right)$$

given $X_0 > x$ when $x \rightarrow \infty$ is the distribution of the exponential AR(1) process $\{Y_t, t \geq 0\}$ defined by $Y_t = Y_{t-1}^\kappa W_t$ where $\{W_t\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with distribution G , independent of the standard Pareto random variable Y_0 with tail index α .

The proof is in Section 6. For a Markov chain, the tail process is called the tail chain. With the normalization used here, we obtain a new type of tail chain which is an exponential AR(1) process. In the case of extremal dependence, the usual tail chain is an exponential random walk. This corresponds to the case $\kappa_j = 1$ for all j .

Since a Markov chain $\{X_t\}$ can always be expressed as $X_{t+1} = \Phi(X_t, \epsilon_{t+1})$, where $\{\epsilon_t, t \geq 1\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence (the innovations), independent of X_0 , Condition (3.1) is equivalent to the weak convergence of $b^{-1}(x)\Phi(x, \epsilon_0)$ to the distribution G in (3.1). This is the framework considered in [JS13] under the additional assumption that $b_j(x) = x$ for all j .

If $G(\{0\}) > 0$, then Theorem 3.1 may no longer be true. However, without this condition, it can be seen from the proof that the convergence still holds provided X_1, \dots, X_{h-1} are separated from

zero, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{X_0}{x} \leq y_0, \epsilon \leq \frac{X_1}{b_1(x)} \leq y_1, \dots, \epsilon \leq \frac{X_{h-1}}{b_{h-1}(x)} \leq y_{h-1}, \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)} \leq y_h \mid X_0 > x \right) \\ = \mathbb{P}(Y_0 \leq y_0, \epsilon \leq Y_1 \leq y_1, \dots, \epsilon \leq Y_{h-1} \leq y_{h-1}, Y_h \leq y_h), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

with $\{Y_j\}$ is the tail process as described in Theorem 3.1.

In the extremally dependent case (where $b_j(x) = x$ for all x), the convergence still holds under an additional regularity condition, see [RZ13, Proposition 5.1]. It would be possible to generalize this condition to the extremally independent context, but as in the extremally dependent case, this condition would not be necessary for the convergence to hold. Therefore we do not pursue in this direction. Note finally that if $G(\{0\}) > 0$ then the tail process is identically zero after a geometric time with mean $1/G(\{0\})$.

We now give examples of Markov chains satisfying condition (3.1).

3.1 Exponential AR(1)

Let the time series $\{V_t\}$ be defined by $V_t = e^{\xi_t}$ with

$$\xi_t = \phi \xi_{t-1} + \epsilon_t, \quad (3.3)$$

where $0 \leq \phi < 1$ and $\{\epsilon_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence such that $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_0] = 0$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(e^{\epsilon_0} > x) = x^{-\alpha} \ell(x), \quad (3.4)$$

for some $\alpha > 0$ and a slowly varying function ℓ . In other words, e^{ϵ_0} has a regularly varying right tail with index α . [MR13, Section 3] studied the regular variation and proved the extremal independence of this model. Let $\xi_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \phi^j \epsilon_{t-j}$ be the stationary solution of the AR(1) equation (3.3). Condition (3.4) implies that for $\phi \in [0, 1)$ and $j \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha \phi^j \epsilon_0}] < \infty.$$

Thus, applying Breiman's lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(V_t > x) &= \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_t} > x) = \mathbb{P}(e^{\epsilon_t} e^{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \phi^j \epsilon_{t-j}} > x) \\ &\sim \mathbb{P}(e^{\epsilon_0} > x) \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\alpha \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \phi^j \epsilon_{t-j}} \right] = \mathbb{P}(e^{\epsilon_0} > x) \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\alpha \phi^j \epsilon_{t-j}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

That is, V_t has a regularly varying right tail and is tail equivalent to e^{ϵ_0} . The Exponential AR(1) satisfies the equation

$$V_{t+1} = V_t^\phi e^{\epsilon_{t+1}}. \quad (3.5)$$

This corresponds to the functional representation $\Phi(x, \epsilon) = x^\phi \epsilon$. We have

$$\Pi(x, A) = \mathbb{P}(e^{\epsilon_0} \in x^{-\phi} A),$$

and thus, with G the distribution of e^{ϵ_0} , we have

$$\Pi(x, x^\phi A) = G(A).$$

Since $G(\{0\}) = 0$, Theorem 3.1 is applicable. The tail chain is a non stationary exponential AR(1) process $\{Y_t\}$ defined by $Y_t = Y_{t-1}^\phi e^{\epsilon_t}$ and Y_0 is a standard Pareto random variable.

For $(y_0, \dots, y_h) \in [1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^h$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(V_0 \leq xy_0, V_1 \leq x^\phi y_1, \dots, V_h \leq x^{\phi^h} y_h \mid V_0 > x) \\ = \int_1^{y_0} \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_{0,1}} \leq v^{-\phi} y_1, \dots, e^{\xi_{0,h}} \leq v^{-\phi^h} y_h) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv, \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where for $h \geq 1$, $\xi_{0,h} = \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \phi^j \epsilon_{h-j}$. The limiting conditional distribution of V_h given $V_0 > x$ is thus

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(V_h \leq x^{\phi^h} y \mid V_0 > x) = \int_1^\infty \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_{0,h}} \leq v^{-\phi^h} y) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv.$$

The conditional scaling exponent is $\kappa_h = \phi^h$. We also note that since $\kappa_h \in (0, 1)$, this distribution is tail equivalent to the distribution of e^{ϵ_0} , i.e. we have as $y \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(V_h > x^{\phi^h} y \mid V_0 > x) &= \int_1^\infty \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_{0,h}} > v^{-\kappa_h} y) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv \\ &\sim \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_{0,h}} > y) \int_1^\infty v^{\alpha \kappa_h} \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_{0,h}} > y)}{1 - \kappa_h} \sim \frac{\mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0} > y)}{(1 - \kappa_h) \mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha \kappa_h \xi_0}]}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha > 1$, we can apply Lemma 2.3 and we obtain

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{V_h}{x^{\kappa_h}} \mid V_0 > x \right] = \frac{\alpha \mathbb{E}[e^{\xi_{0,h}}]}{\alpha - \kappa_h} = \frac{\alpha \mathbb{E}[V_0]}{(\alpha - \kappa_h) \mathbb{E}[V_0^{\kappa_h}]}.$$

Tail of $V_0 V_h$. The recursion (3.3) yields $V_0 V_h = V_0^{1+\phi^h} e^{\sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \phi^j \epsilon_{h-j}}$ and the series in the exponential is independent of V_0 . Also, $\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha(1+\phi^h)^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \phi^j \epsilon_{h-j}}] < \infty$ and by Breiman's Lemma, we obtain directly that the tail index of $V_0 V_h$ is $\alpha/(1+\phi^h)$. We can also check that Condition (2.6) holds. Fix $\delta < \alpha$ such that $\delta(1+\phi^h) > \alpha$ and define $b_h(x) = x^{\phi^h}$. Then, for some constant $C > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{V_0}{x} \mathbb{1}_{\{V_0 \leq \epsilon x\}} \frac{V_h}{b_h(x)} \right)^\delta \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{V_0^{\delta(1+\phi^h)}}{x^{\delta(1+\phi^h)}} \mathbb{1}_{\{V_0 \leq \epsilon x\}} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\delta \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \phi^j \epsilon_{h-j}} \right] \leq C \epsilon^{\delta(1+\phi^h)} \mathbb{P}(e^{\epsilon_0} > \epsilon x).$$

This yields

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(e^{\epsilon_0} > x)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{V_0}{x} \mathbb{1}_{\{V_0 \leq \epsilon x\}} \frac{V_h}{b_h(x)} \right)^\delta \right] \leq C \epsilon^{\delta(1+\phi^h) - \alpha}.$$

By the choice of δ , this yields the negligibility condition (2.6).

Convergence of moments Using the same decomposition as above, we obtain that the moment condition (2.8) holds if, for $i = 0, \dots, h$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^i \phi^j q_{h-j} < \alpha.$$

This implies in particular that $q_j < \alpha$ for all $j = 0, \dots, h$.

Explosive case. Consider now the case $\phi > 1$. If the exponential AR(1) model is defined by the recurrence equation (3.5): $V_{t+1} = V_t^\phi e^{\epsilon_{t+1}}$ with $\{\epsilon_t, t \geq 1\}$ independent of V_0 , then the limit (3.6) still holds, but a stationary measure for this Markov chain does not exist.

On the other hand, the stationary (non-causal and non-Markovian) solution of Equation (3.3) is given by $\xi_t = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (-\phi)^{-j} \epsilon_{t+j}$. Then the sequence $\{e^{\xi_t}\}$ is stationary and regularly varying but the tail index is now $\alpha\phi$ and no conditional limiting distribution exist.

Finally, it is obvious that the time-reversed chain has an invariant measure and the limiting conditional distribution $\mathbb{P}(V_0 < x^{1/\phi} y_1 \mid V_1 > x)$ exists.

3.2 Switching exponential AR(1)

Let $\{U_t\}$ be an i.i.d. sequence with uniform marginal distribution on $[0, 1]$, and let $\{R_t\}$ be an i.i.d. sequence with marginal distribution F_R concentrated on $[0, \infty)$, independent of the sequence $\{U_t\}$. Let $\phi > 0$, $k : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a measurable function and define a Markov chain $\{X_t\}$ by X_0 and

$$X_{t+1} = R_{t+1}(X_t^\phi \mathbb{1}_{\{k(X_t) \leq U_{t+1}\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{k(X_t) > U_{t+1}\}}).$$

This is a multiplicative version of the Stochastic Unit Root process; see [GR06]. The transition kernel Π of the chain is defined by

$$\Pi(x, A) = F_R(x^{-\phi} A)(1 - k(x)) + F_R(A)k(x).$$

If $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} k(x) = \eta$, then Condition (3.1) holds with G defined by

$$G(A) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \Pi(x, x^\phi A) = F_R(A)(1 - \eta) + \eta\delta_0(A),$$

where δ_0 is the Dirac mass at 0. If $\eta = 0$, then we can apply Theorem 3.1. The conditional scaling exponent at lag 1 is $\kappa_1 = \phi$. If $\eta > 0$, then $G(\{0\}) > 0$ and Theorem 3.1 is not applicable. However, in the simple case $k(x) \equiv \eta$, it is readily checked that the conclusion of Theorem 3.1 nevertheless holds, i.e. if the distribution of X_0 has a right tail index $\alpha > 0$, then, conditionally on $X_0 > x$, $(x^{-1}X_0, x^{-\phi}X_1, \dots, x^{-\phi^h}X_h)$ converges to the tail process (Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_h) where $Y_j = Y_{j-1}^\phi W_j$, $j \geq 1$, Y_0 has a standard Pareto distribution with tail index α and W_1, \dots, W_h are i.i.d. with distribution G .

Let us now briefly discuss the existence of a stationary distribution for this Markov chain. We apply the Foster-Lyapunov criterion. See [MT09]. Define $V(x) = \log(x)$ and $c = \mathbb{E}[\log(R_0)]$. Then we have $\Pi V(x) = \phi\{1 - k(x)\}V(x) + c$. Assume that R_0 has an absolutely continuous distribution with a positive density around 0 so that the chain is irreducible. If $\phi \in (0, 1)$, then $\Pi V(x) \leq \phi V(x) + c$, and thus there exists a unique invariant distribution and the chain is geometrically ergodic.

4 Exponential linear process

The result for the Exponential AR(1) model can be extended to a (non-Markovian) exponential linear process e^{ξ_t} with possible long memory.

Lemma 4.1. *Define $\xi_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \phi_j \epsilon_{t-j}$, where $\{\epsilon_t\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_0] = 0$ and such that (3.4) holds, $\phi_0 = 1$, $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \phi_j^2 < \infty$ and $0 \leq \phi_j < 1$ for all $j \geq 1$.*

The sequence of measures defined on $(0, \infty) \times [0, \infty]^h$ by

$$\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0} > x)} \mathbb{P} \left(\left(\frac{e^{\xi_0}}{x}, \frac{e^{\xi_1}}{b_1(x)}, \dots, \frac{e^{\xi_h}}{b_h(x)} \right) \in \cdot \right)$$

converges vaguely to the measure μ_h defined by

$$\mu_h(\cdot) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha\xi_0^*}]} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left((ve^{\xi_0^*}, v^{\phi_1}e^{\xi_1^*}, \dots, v^{\phi_h}e^{\xi_h^*}) \in \cdot\right) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv.$$

where $\xi_j^* = \xi_j - \phi_j \epsilon_0$ and $b_j(x) = x^{\phi_j}$, $j \geq 1$.

Equivalently, we obtain the following limiting conditional distribution. For $y_0 \geq 1$ and $(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_h) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^h$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0} > xy_0, e^{\xi_1} \leq x^{\phi_1} y_1, \dots, e^{\xi_h} \leq x^{\phi_h} y_h \mid e^{\xi_0} > x) \\ = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha\xi_0^*}]} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(e^{\xi_0^*} > vy_0, e^{\xi_1^*} \leq v^{\phi_1} y_1, \dots, v^{\phi_h} e^{\xi_h^*} \leq y_h\right) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Thus, the lag h conditional scaling index is ϕ_h . If the coefficients ϕ_j are decreasing, i.e. $\phi_j > \phi_{j+1}$ for all $j \geq 0$, then the index of hidden regular variation of (e^{ξ_0}, e^{ξ_j}) is $\alpha(2 - \phi_j)$. Otherwise, it is the solution of an infinite dimensional optimization problem and may take any value. See [JD13] for more details.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. To avoid trivialities, we assume that $\phi_j \neq 0$ for at least one index $j \geq 1$. By definition, we have $\xi_k = \phi_k \epsilon_0 + \xi_k^*$ for all $k \geq 0$. Note that ϵ_0 is independent of ξ_k^* , $k \geq 0$. Denote the distribution of e^{ϵ_0} by F_ϵ and define the measure σ_x by $\sigma_x(dv) = F_\epsilon(xdv)/\bar{F}_\epsilon(x)$. The measure σ_x converges vaguely on $(0, \infty)$ to the measure with density $\alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv$; see [Res07, Theorem 3.6]. Then, for $(y_0, \dots, y_h) \in (0, \infty) \times [0, \infty]^h$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0} > xy_0, e^{\xi_1} \leq x^{\phi_1} y_1, \dots, e^{\xi_h} \leq x^{\phi_h} y_h) \\ = \mathbb{P}(e^{\epsilon_0 + \xi_0^*} > xy_0, e^{\phi_1 \epsilon_0} e^{\xi_1^*} \leq x^{\phi_1} y_1, \dots, e^{\phi_h \epsilon_0} e^{\xi_h^*} \leq x^{\phi_h} y_h) \\ = \int_{u=0}^\infty \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0^*} > (x/u)y_0, e^{\xi_1^*} \leq (x/u)^{\phi_1} y_1, \dots, e^{\xi_h^*} \leq (x/u)^{\phi_h} y_h) F_\epsilon(du) \\ = \bar{F}_\epsilon(x) \int_{v=0}^\infty \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0^*} > v^{-1} y_0, e^{\xi_1^*} \leq v^{-\phi_1} y_1, \dots, e^{\xi_h^*} \leq v^{-\phi_h} y_h) \sigma_x(dv). \end{aligned}$$

In order to prove the convergence of the integral, we must split it into two parts. Define the function \tilde{K}_h on $(0, \infty)^2 \times \mathbb{R}^h$ by

$$\tilde{K}_h(v, y_0, \dots, y_h) = \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0^*} > v^{-1} y_0, e^{\xi_1^*} \leq v^{-\phi_1} y_1, \dots, e^{\xi_h^*} \leq v^{-\phi_h} y_h).$$

The function \tilde{K}_h is uniformly bounded (by one), thus for $c > 0$, we have,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \int_c^\infty \tilde{K}_h(v, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_h) \sigma_x(dv) = \int_c^\infty \tilde{K}_h(v, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_h) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv.$$

Let $\phi^* = \sup_{j \geq 1} \phi_j$. By assumption, $0 < \phi^* < 1$. Thus $e^{\xi_0^*}$ has the tail index $\alpha/\phi^* > \alpha$. Moreover, since ϵ_0 is independent of ξ_0^* , by Markov's inequality, we have, for $\alpha < q < \alpha/\phi^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^c \tilde{K}_h(v, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_h) \sigma_x(dv) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(e^{\epsilon_0} e^{\xi_0^*} > xy_0, e^{\epsilon_0} \leq cx)}{\bar{F}_\epsilon(x)} \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[e^{q\xi_0^*}] \mathbb{E}[e^{q\epsilon_0} \mathbb{1}_{\{e^{\epsilon_0} \leq cx\}}]}{(xy_0)^q \bar{F}_\epsilon(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^c \tilde{K}_h(v, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_h) \sigma_x(dv) = O(c^{q-\alpha})$$

and thus since $q > \alpha$,

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^c \tilde{K}_h(v, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_h) \sigma_x(dv) = 0 .$$

We may now conclude that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty \tilde{K}_h(v, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_h) \sigma_x(dv) = \int_0^\infty \tilde{K}_h(v, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_h) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv .$$

Since $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0} > x) / \mathbb{P}(e^{\epsilon_0} > x) = \mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha \xi_0^*}]$, we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0} > xy_0, e^{\xi_1} \leq x^{\phi_1} y_1, \dots, e^{\xi_h} \leq x^{\phi_h} y_h \mid e^{\xi_0} > x) \\ = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha \xi_0^*}]} \int_0^\infty \tilde{K}_h(v, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_h) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv , \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly (4.1). \square

The AR(1) process is a particular case of a linear process with $\phi_j = \phi^j$ for all $j \geq 0$, so (4.1) and (3.6) must coincide in this case. To check this, recalling the notation of Section 3.1, note that for the exponential AR(1) we have $\xi_k^* = \xi_{0,k} + \phi^k \xi_0^*$ and ξ_0^* is independent of $\xi_{0,k}$ for each $k \geq 1$. Denoting by F_* the distribution of $e^{\xi_0^*}$ and considering for clarity only the case $h = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha \xi_0^*}]} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0^*} > v^{-1} y_0, e^{\xi_1^*} \leq v^{-\phi} y_1) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha \xi_0^*}]} \int_{v=0}^\infty \int_{s=v^{-1} y_0}^\infty \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_{0,1}} \leq (sv)^{-\phi} y_1) F_*(ds) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha \xi_0^*}]} \int_{s=0}^\infty \int_{v=s^{-1} y_0}^\infty \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_{0,1}} \leq (sv)^{-\phi} y_1) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv F_*(ds) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\alpha \xi_0^*}]} \int_{s=0}^\infty s^\alpha F_*(ds) \int_{y_0}^\infty \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_{0,1}} \leq u^{-\phi} y_1) \alpha u^{-\alpha-1} du \\ &= \int_{y_0}^\infty \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_{0,1}} \leq u^{-\phi} y_1) \alpha u^{-\alpha-1} du . \end{aligned}$$

That is, with $h = 1$, Equation (4.1) reduces to (3.6).

5 Stochastic volatility models

5.1 Stochastic volatility process with heavy tailed volatility

Assume now as in [MR13] that $X_t = V_t Z_t = e^{\xi_t} Z_t$, where $\{\xi_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the AR(1) process considered in Section 3.1 and $\{Z_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables such that $\mathbb{E}[|Z_0|^q] < \infty$ for some $q > \alpha$, independent of the sequence $\{\xi_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Breiman's lemma yields, for $x \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x) \sim \mathbb{E}[(Z_0)_+^\alpha] \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0} > x) , \quad (5.1)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(X_0 < -x) \sim \mathbb{E}[(Z_0)_-^\alpha] \mathbb{P}(e^{\xi_0} > x) . \quad (5.2)$$

Let F_0 be the distribution function of X_0 and ν_x is the measure defined by $\nu_x(du) = F_0(xdu)/\bar{F}_0(x)$. Then, conditioning on X_0 and the sequence $\{Z_t\}$, we have, for $y_0 \geq 1$ and $(y_1, \dots, y_h) \in \mathbb{R}^h$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(X_0 > xy_0, X_1 \leq x^{\phi^1} y_1, \dots, X_h \leq x^{\phi^h} y_h \mid X_0 > x) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_0 V_0 > xy_0, Z_1 e^{\xi_{0,1}} V_0^\phi \leq x^{\phi^1} y_1, \dots, Z_h e^{\xi_{0,h}} V_0^{\phi^h} \leq x^{\phi^h} y_h)}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(Z_0 > (x/u)y_0, Z_1 e^{\xi_{0,1}} \leq (x/u)^{\phi^1} y_1, \dots, Z_h e^{\xi_{0,h}} \leq (x/u)^{\phi^h} y_h) F_0(du) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(V_0 > x)}{\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(Z_0 > v^{-1} y_0, Z_1 e^{\xi_{0,1}} \leq v^{-\phi^1} y_1, \dots, Z_h e^{\xi_{0,h}} \leq v^{-\phi^h} y_h) \nu_x(dv). \end{aligned}$$

By arguments similar to those in the proof of (4.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(X_0 > xy_0, X_1 \leq x^{\phi^1} y_1, \dots, X_h \leq x^{\phi^h} y_h \mid X_0 > x) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[(Z_0)_+^\alpha]} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(Z_0 > v^{-1} y_0, Z_1 e^{\xi_{0,1}} \leq v^{-\phi^1} y_1, \dots, Z_h e^{\xi_{0,h}} \leq v^{-\phi^h} y_h) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv. \end{aligned}$$

The conditional scaling exponent is thus $\kappa_h = \phi^h$ and the limiting conditional distribution of $x^{-\kappa_h} X_h$ given $X_0 > x$ is

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(X_h \leq x^{\kappa_h} y \mid X_0 > x) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(Z_0 > v^{-1}, Z_h e^{\xi_{0,h}} \leq v^{-\kappa_h} y) \alpha v^{-\alpha-1} dv.$$

If $\alpha > 1$, we can apply Lemma 2.3 to obtain

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(X_h)_+}{x^{\kappa_h}} \mid X_0 > x \right] = \frac{\alpha \mathbb{E}[(Z_0)_+^{\alpha-\kappa_h}] \mathbb{E}[(Z_0)_+] \mathbb{E}[X_0]}{(\alpha - \kappa_h) \mathbb{E}[(Z_0)_+^\alpha] \mathbb{E}[X_0^\kappa]}.$$

Tail of $X_0 X_h$. Using similar computation as in Section 3.1 we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{X_0}{x} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_0 \leq \epsilon x\}} \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)} \right)^\delta \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{V_0^{\delta(1+\phi^h)} Z_0}{x^{\delta(1+\phi^h)}} \mathbb{1}_{\{V_0 Z_0 \leq \epsilon x\}} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\delta \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \phi^j \epsilon_h^{-j}} \right] \mathbb{E}[Z_h^\delta].$$

Moreover, if F_Z is the distribution function of Z_0 , then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(V_0 > x)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{V_0^{\delta(1+\phi^h)} Z_0}{x^{\delta(1+\phi^h)}} \mathbb{1}_{\{V_0 Z_0 \leq \epsilon x\}} \right] = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(V_0 > x)} \int \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{V_0^{\delta(1+\phi^h)} u}{x^{\delta(1+\phi^h)}} \mathbb{1}_{\{V_0 \leq \epsilon x/u\}} \right] F_Z(du) \\ & \leq \epsilon^{\delta(1+\phi^h)} \int u^{-\delta(1+\phi^h)} \frac{\mathbb{P}(V_0 > \epsilon x/u)}{\mathbb{P}(V_0 > x)} u F_Z(du) \leq C \epsilon^{\delta(1+\phi^h)-\alpha} \int u^{\alpha+1-\delta(1+\phi^h)} F_Z(du). \end{aligned}$$

If δ is chosen such that $\delta < \alpha$, $\alpha < \delta(1+\phi^h) < \alpha+1$, then the condition (2.6) holds.

5.2 Stochastic volatility process with heavy tailed innovation

Assume that $X_t = \sigma_t Z_t$, where $\{Z_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with regularly varying marginal distribution with tail index α , σ_t is non negative, $\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^q] < \infty$ for some $q > \alpha$ and $\{\sigma_t\}$ and $\{Z_t\}$ are independent. Then, by Breiman's lemma, X_t is regularly varying, and has extremal independence:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x) \sim \mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha] \bar{F}_Z(x),$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x, X_h > x) = o(\bar{F}_Z(x)),$$

where F_Z is the distribution function of Z_0 . For any integer $h > 0$, we have

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X_0}{x} > y_0, X_1 \leq y_1, \dots, X_h \leq y_h \mid X_0 > x\right) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha F_Z(y_1/\sigma_1) \cdots F_Z(y_h/\sigma_h)]}{y_0^\alpha \mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha]}. \quad (5.3)$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(X_h \leq y_h \mid X_0 > x) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha F_Z(y_h/\sigma_h)]}{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha]}.$$

The conditional scaling exponent κ_h is 0 at all lags $h \geq 1$. Note also that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(X_h > y_h \mid X_0 > x) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha \bar{F}_Z(y_h/\sigma_h)]}{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha]} \sim \bar{F}_Z(y_h) \frac{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha \sigma_h^\alpha]}{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha]} \sim \bar{F}_X(y_h) \frac{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha \sigma_h^\alpha]}{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_h^\alpha] \mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha]},$$

as $y_h \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, the limiting conditional distribution is tail equivalent to the unconditional distribution.

For more details on the extremal behavior of this model we refer to [DM01] and [KS13]. In particular, in the latter paper the conditional model and its extensions to different conditioning events is considered (cf. the discussion in Section 7), together with relevant statistical inference.

If $\alpha > 1$, then Lemma 2.3 applies and we obtain

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[(X_h)_+ \mid X_0 > x] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[(Z_0)_+] \mathbb{E}[\sigma_h \sigma_0^\alpha]}{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha]}.$$

5.3 Stochastic volatility process with heavy tailed innovation and leverage

We now consider a stochastic volatility process $X_t = \sigma_t Z_t$ and assume that the volatility σ_t has the form

$$\sigma_t = \sigma(\xi_t),$$

where σ is a positive function, $\xi_t = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j \eta_{t-j}$, $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j^2 < \infty$ and $\{(Z_t, \eta_t)\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence, but for each t , Z_t and η_t may be dependent. This implies that the volatility σ_t is independent of the innovation Z_t for each t , but σ_t may be dependent of $\{Z_j, j < t\}$. This allows for some leverage: today's value impacts future volatility. We still assume that the distribution of Z_0 is regularly varying with index α . For each t , Z_t and σ_t are independent, thus, if $\mathbb{E}[\sigma_t^q] < \infty$ for some $q > \alpha$, Breiman's lemma applies and we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(X_0 > x) \sim \mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha] \bar{F}_Z(x).$$

Consider now the probability of joint exceedances. Since σ_h and Z_0 may be dependent, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X_0 > x, X_h > x) &= \mathbb{P}(Z_0 \sigma_0 > x, Z_h \sigma_h > x) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\bar{F}_Z(x/\sigma_h) \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_0 \sigma_0 > x\}}] \\ &\sim \bar{F}_Z(x) \mathbb{E}[\sigma_h^\alpha \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_0 \sigma_0 > x\}}] = o(\bar{F}_Z(x)). \end{aligned}$$

(For the last part, a bounded convergence argument is used.) Thus there is still extremal independence, as in the previous model with no leverage, but the rate of decay of the joint exceedances probability is affected by the dependence between σ_h and Z_0 .

Under additional assumptions, we can obtain the limiting conditional distributions. Assume that $\eta_j = \log(|Z_j|) - \mathbb{E}[\log(|Z_j|)]$, $\sigma(x) = e^x$ and $0 < c_j < 1$ for all $j \geq 1$. Define $\tilde{\sigma}_j = \exp\{\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} c_i \eta_{j-i} - c_j \mathbb{E}[\log(|Z_0|)] + \sum_{i=j+1}^{\infty} c_i \eta_{j-i}\}$. Then, $X_j = \tilde{\sigma}_j |Z_0|^{c_j} Z_j$ and by the same type of arguments as previously, we obtain, for $(y_0, \dots, y_h) \in [1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^h$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(X_0 > xy_0, X_1 \leq x^{c_1} y_1, \dots, X_h \leq x^{c_h} y_h \mid X_0 > x) \\ = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\sigma_0 > y_0 u^{-1}, Z_1 \tilde{\sigma}_1 \leq y_1 u^{-c_1}, \dots, Z_h \tilde{\sigma}_h \leq y_h u^{-c_h}) \alpha u^{-\alpha-1} du. \end{aligned}$$

The conditional scaling exponent depends on h : $\kappa_h = c_h$. The marginal limiting distributions are also tail equivalent to the distribution of X_0 .

If $\alpha > 1$, Lemma 2.3 applies again and we obtain

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(X_h)_+}{x^{\kappa_h}} \mid X_0 > x \right] = \frac{\alpha \mathbb{E}[(Z_h)_+] \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\sigma}_h \sigma_0^{\alpha - \kappa_h}]}{(\alpha - \kappa_h) \mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha]} = \frac{\alpha \mathbb{E}[(Z_h)_+] \mathbb{E}[\sigma_h \sigma_0^{\alpha - \kappa_h}]}{(\alpha - \kappa_h) \mathbb{E}[|Z_0|^{\kappa_h}] \mathbb{E}[\sigma_0^\alpha]}.$$

6 Proof of Theorem 3.1

The following result is related to [Bil68, Theorem 5.5, page 34] and is sometimes referred to as *the second continuous mapping theorem*. See also [RZ13, Lemma 8.4].

Theorem 6.1. *Let (E, d) be a complete locally compact separable metric space. Let μ_n be a sequence of probability measures which converge weakly to a probability measure μ on E .*

- (i) *If φ_n is a uniformly bounded sequence of continuous functions which converge uniformly on compact sets of E to a function φ , then φ is continuous and bounded on E and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\varphi_n) = \mu(\varphi)$.*
- (ii) *Let F be a topological space. If g_n is a sequence of uniformly bounded, continuous functions on $F \times E$ which converge uniformly on compact sets of $F \times E$ to a function g , then g is continuous and bounded on $F \times E$ and the sequence of functions $\int_E g_n(u, v) \mu_n(dv)$ converge uniformly on compact sets of F to $\int_E g(u, v) \mu_n(dv)$.*

Proof. We start by proving (i). Let C be such that $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|\varphi_n\|_\infty \leq C$ and $\|\varphi\|_\infty \leq C$. Fix some $\epsilon > 0$ and let K be a compact set such that $\mu(\partial(K^c)) = 0$ and $\mu(K^c) \leq \epsilon/(2C)$. Let $K_\epsilon = \{x \in E \mid d(x, K) \leq \epsilon\}$ and let ψ be a continuous function such that $0 \leq \psi(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in E$, $\psi(x) = 1$ if $x \in K_\epsilon$ and $\psi(x) = 0$ if $x \notin K_\epsilon$.

$$\mu_n(\varphi_n) - \mu(\varphi) = \mu_n(\varphi_n) - \mu_n(\varphi) + \mu_n(\varphi) - \mu(\varphi).$$

By weak convergence, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\varphi) = \mu(\varphi)$, so we only need to consider $\mu_n(\varphi_n) - \mu_n(\varphi)$. Using the function ψ defined above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu_n(\varphi_n) - \mu_n(\varphi)| &\leq |\mu_n(\varphi_n \psi) - \mu_n(\varphi \psi)| + |\mu_n((1 - \psi)\varphi_n) - \mu_n(\varphi(1 - \psi))| \\ &\leq \mu_n(|\varphi_n \psi - \varphi \psi|) + 2C \mu_n(1 - \psi). \end{aligned}$$

Since φ_n converges to φ uniformly on compact sets and the function $1 - \psi$ is bounded and continuous, we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mu_n(\varphi_n) - \mu_n(\varphi)| \leq 2C \mu(1 - \psi) \leq 2C \mu(K^c) \leq \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, the proof of (i) is concluded.

We now prove (ii). Define $L_n(u) = \int_E g_n(u, v) \mu_n(dv)$, $\bar{L}_n(u) = \int_E g(u, v) \mu_n(dv)$ and $L(u) = \int_E g(u, v) \mu(dv)$. Since g is bounded and continuous, the first part of the theorem implies that \bar{L}_n converges uniformly to L on compact sets of F . We now prove that $L_n - \bar{L}_n$ converges to zero uniformly on compact sets of F . Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and let K_ϵ be as above. Since g_n and g are uniformly bounded, there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|L_n(u) - \bar{L}_n(u)| \leq \sup_{v \in K_\epsilon} |g_n(u, v) - g(u, v)| + 2C\epsilon.$$

For any compact set S of F , g_n converges uniformly on $S \times K_\epsilon$ to g , thus

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{u \in S} |L_n(u) - \bar{L}_n(u)| \leq 2C\epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, this proves that $L_n - \bar{L}_n$ converges to 0 uniformly on compact sets of F . \square

We finally need the following lemma. Let Π and G be as in Assumption 2 and define the kernels Π_x and G_1 by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_x f(u) &= \int_0^\infty f(v) \Pi(xu, b(x)dv), \\ G_1 f(u) &= \int_0^\infty f(u^\kappa v) G(dv) = \int_0^\infty f(v) G(u^{-\kappa} dv). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.2. *Let $f, f_x, x > 0$, be uniformly bounded, continuous functions on $[0, \infty)$. Assume that*

- (i) either f_x converges uniformly on compact sets of $[0, \infty)$ to f ;
- (ii) or f_x converges uniformly on compact sets of $(0, \infty)$ to f and $G(\{0\}) = 0$.

Then $\Pi_x f_x$ converges uniformly on compact sets of $(0, \infty)$ to $G_1 f$.

Proof. Fix some positive real numbers $0 < a_0 < a_1$. Since b is regularly varying at infinity with positive index, without loss of generality, we can assume that b is increasing and positive on (a_0, ∞) . Then, the ratio $b(xu)/b(x)$ is uniformly bounded on $[a_0, a_1]$, i.e.

$$0 < \sup_{x \geq 1} \sup_{a_0 \leq u \leq a_1} \frac{b(xu)}{b(x)} < \infty. \quad (6.1)$$

Fix some $\epsilon > 0$. Then, there exists A_ϵ such that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{a_0 \leq u \leq a_1} \Pi(xu, (b(x)A_\epsilon, \infty)) \leq \epsilon, \quad \sup_{a_0 \leq u \leq a_1} G((u^\kappa A_\epsilon, \infty)) \leq \epsilon. \quad (6.2)$$

Moreover, if $G(\{0\}) = 0$, then there also exists $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{a_0 \leq u \leq a_1} \Pi(xu, [0, b(x)\eta]) \leq \epsilon, \quad \sup_{a_0 \leq u \leq a_1} G([0, u^\kappa \eta]) \leq \epsilon. \quad (6.3)$$

Let now f_x and f be as in the statement of the lemma. Then, by the uniform boundedness assumption and by (6.2), there exists $C > 0$ such that, for $u \in [a_0, a_1]$,

$$|\Pi_x f_x(u) - \Pi_x f(u)| \leq \int_0^{A_\epsilon} |f_x(v) - f(v)| \Pi(xu, b(x)dv) + C\epsilon.$$

In case (i), it is assumed that f_x converges uniformly on the compact sets of $[0, \infty)$, thus the previous bound yields

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{a_0 \leq u \leq a_1} |\Pi_x f_x(u) - \Pi_x f(u)| \leq C\epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, this yields

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{a_0 \leq u \leq a_1} |\Pi_x f_x(u) - \Pi_x f(u)| = 0. \quad (6.4)$$

In case (ii), we must further decompose the integral into $\int_0^{A\epsilon} = \int_0^\eta + \int_\eta^{A\epsilon}$ and use the bound (6.3) to obtain (6.4).

We now prove that $\Pi_x f$ converges uniformly on compact sets of $(0, \infty)$ to $G_1 f$. Define the function f_t on $(0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$ by $f_t(u, v) = f(vb(t)/b(t/u))$. By the uniform convergence for regularly varying functions, f_t converges uniformly on compact sets of $(0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$ to $f(u^\kappa v)$. Define $F_t(u) = \int_0^\infty f_t(u, v) \Pi(t, b(t) dv)$. By item (ii) of Theorem 6.1, F_t converges to $G_1 f$ uniformly on compact sets of $(0, \infty)$. Note that by change of variables we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_x f(u) &= \int f(v) \Pi(xu, b(x) dv) = \int f\left(\frac{vb(xu)}{b(x)}\right) \Pi(xu, b(xu) dv) \\ &= \int f_{xu}(u, v) \Pi(xu, b(xu) dv) = F_{xu}(u), \end{aligned}$$

so $\Pi_x f$ converges uniformly on compact sets of $(0, \infty)$ to G_1 . □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We must prove that for all $h \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X_0}{x} \leq y_0, \frac{X_1}{b_1(x)} \leq y_1, \dots, \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)} \leq y_h \mid X_0 > x\right) \\ = \mathbb{P}(Y_0 \leq y_0, Y_1 \leq y_1, \dots, Y_h \leq y_h). \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

The proof is by induction on h . We start by proving (6.5) in the case $h = 1$. Recall that F_0 is the distribution of X_0 and define the measure ν_x by $\nu_x(du) = F_0(xdu)/\bar{F}_0(x)$. Let f be a bounded continuous function on $[0, \infty)$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f\left(\frac{X_1}{b(x)}\right) \mid X_0 > x\right] = \int_{u=1}^\infty \int_{v=0}^\infty f(v) \Pi(xu, b(x) dv) \nu_x(du) = \int_{u=1}^\infty \Pi_x f(u) \nu_x(du),$$

and thus we must prove that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \int_1^\infty \Pi_x f(u) \nu_x(du) = \int_1^\infty G_1 f(u) \alpha u^{-\alpha-1} du. \quad (6.6)$$

We know that the measure ν_x converges vaguely on $(0, \infty)$ to the Pareto measure $\alpha u^{-\alpha-1} du$. By Lemma 6.2 (applied with $f_x = f$, thus not requiring the assumption $G(\{0\}) = 0$), $\Pi_x f$ converges to $G_1 f$ uniformly on compact sets of $(0, \infty)$. Thus, applying Theorem 6.1(i) we obtain (6.6).

Consider now the higher dimensional distributions. Define the transition kernel $\Pi_{x,h}$ on $[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^h$ by

$$\Pi_{x,h}(u_0, d\mathbf{u}) = \prod_{i=1}^h \Pi(b_{i-1}(x)u_{i-1}, b_i(x)du_i),$$

with the convention $b_0(x) = x$. For f bounded and continuous on $[0, \infty)^h$, define

$$\Pi_{x,h} f(u_0) = \int_{\mathbf{u} \in [0, \infty)^h} f(\mathbf{u}) \Pi_{x,h}(u_0, d\mathbf{u}).$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\frac{X_1}{b_1(x)}, \dots, \frac{X_h}{b_h(x)} \right) \mid X_0 > x \right] = \int_{u_0=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{\Pi}_{x,h} f(u_0) \nu_x(du_0) .$$

Define also the kernel G_h on $(0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^h$ by

$$G_h f(u_0) = \int_0^{\infty} \cdots \int_0^{\infty} f(u_1, \dots, u_h) \prod_{i=1}^h G(u_{i-1}^{-\kappa_i} du_i) .$$

for any bounded continuous function f . What we must prove is that $\mathbf{\Pi}_{x,h} f$ converges uniformly on compact sets of $(0, \infty)$ to $G_h f$ for any bounded continuous function f on $[0, \infty)^h$. By Theorem 6.1(i), this will yield the required result. For $h = 1$ this is what we have just proved. Assume now that for $h \geq 1$, and any bounded continuous function f on $[0, \infty)^h$, $\mathbf{\Pi}_{x,h} f$ converges uniformly on compact sets of $(0, \infty)$ to $G_h f$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that the function f is of the form $f(u_1, \dots, u_{h+1}) = f_1(u_1) f_2(u_2, \dots, u_{h+1})$, where f_1 and f_2 are continuous and bounded on $[0, \infty)$ and $[0, \infty)^h$, respectively. Then, recalling that $b_h = b_{h-1} \circ b$,

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_{x,h+1} f(u_0) = \int_0^{\infty} f_1(u_1) \mathbf{\Pi}_{b(x),h} f_2(u_1) \Pi(xu_0, b(x) du_1) = \Pi_x(f_1 \mathbf{\Pi}_{x,h} f_2)(u_0) . \quad (6.7)$$

By the induction assumption, the sequence functions $f_1 \mathbf{\Pi}_{x,h} f_2$ converges uniformly on compact sets of $(0, \infty)$ to the continuous and bounded function $f_1 G_h f_2$. Thus, by Lemma 6.2, $\mathbf{\Pi}_{x,h+1} f$ converges to $G_1(f_1 G_h f_2) = G_{h+1} f_1 f_2 = G_{h+1} f$ uniformly on the compact sets of $(0, \infty)$. \square

7 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have put the concept of conditional extreme values in the context of univariate time series. We have introduced the conditional scaling exponent κ_h of a time series $\{X_t\}$ at lag h . If the time series is stationary and its finite dimensional marginal distributions are regularly varying, then $\kappa_h \in [0, 1]$ and a value $\kappa_h < 1$ implies the extremal independence of the bivariate distribution (X_0, X_h) . We have given conditions for Markov chains and other time series models commonly used in financial econometrics. This work is part of an ongoing project on extremally independent time series. We now briefly discuss several possible future lines of research.

Vector valued time series. Consider a d -dimensional vector valued times series $\{\mathbf{X}_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ such that for each $h \geq 0$, the $(h+1)d$ -dimensional vector $(\mathbf{X}_0, \dots, \mathbf{X}_h)$ is regularly varying with index $-\alpha$. For a relatively compact Borel set $C \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{h+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ (possibly with further regularity conditions), we may be interested in the limiting distribution of $(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_h)$ given that $\mathbf{X}_0 \in xC$, where $xC = \{x\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y} \in C\}$ and x is large. In the case of extremal dependence, the exponent measure of the vector $(\mathbf{X}_0, \dots, \mathbf{X}_h)$ provides the necessary information. In the case of extremal independence, it is useless, and we must investigate the existence of scaling functions b_1, \dots, b_h such that the conditional distribution of

$$\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_1}{b_1(x)}, \dots, \frac{\mathbf{X}_h}{b_h(x)} \right)$$

given $\mathbf{X}_0 \in xC$ converges to a proper probability distribution. The choice of the set C is determined by the problem considered. It could be the complement of the unit ball for some norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^d , if the event of interest is that $\|\mathbf{X}_0\|$ is large, or a half-space such as $C = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid a_1 y_1 + \dots + a_k y_d > 1\}$, if the event of interest is that a certain linear combination (a portfolio) is large.

Different conditioning events. We can also consider univariate time series and various conditioning events such as $\{y_0 > x, \dots, y_k > x\}$ ($k+1$ successive values are large), or $\{\max\{y_0, \dots, y_k\} > x\}$ (at least one large value among the first $k+1$), or any combination of such events. Again, in the case of extremal dependence the appropriate scaling is given by the multivariate regular variation property and the entire information is given by the exponent measure. In the case of extremal independence different scaling functions must be used for different lags and the limiting distributions are not given by the exponent measure.

Statistical procedures. The next step is obviously to provide valid statistical procedures to estimate the conditional scaling exponents, the scaling functions, the conditional limiting distributions and other quantities of interests such as the CTE. As usual in extreme value theory, these quantities cannot be estimated empirically since they are relevant only in a domain where few observations are available. Therefore extrapolation outside the range of available data is needed and semiparametric estimators must be defined. For instance, one can estimate m_h (defined in (2.13)) and κ_h and then to estimate $\text{CTE}_h^+(x)$ for x outside the range of the data by

$$\widehat{\text{CTE}}_h^{\text{SP}}(x) = x^{\hat{\kappa}_h} \hat{m}_h .$$

Non parametric estimators of the conditional limiting distributions and of the scaling functions, as well as semiparametric estimators of the conditional scaling exponents are the subject of our future research.

Acknowledgment

The authors are grateful to Holger Drees and Anja Janssen for the communication of the Reference [JD13] and for fruitful conversations during the 8th EVA conference in Shanghai which allowed to correct and improve a preliminary version of this paper. We are also grateful to an associate editor and an anonymous referee who helped reorganize and improve the paper.

References

- [ADEH99] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, and David Heath. Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance*, 9(3):203–228, 1999.
- [Bil68] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. New York, Wiley, 1968.
- [BS09] Bojan Basrak and Johan Segers. Regularly varying multivariate time series. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 119(4):1055–1080, 2009.
- [DM01] Richard A. Davis and Thomas Mikosch. Point process convergence of stochastic volatility processes with application to sample autocorrelation. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 38A:93–104, 2001. Probability, statistics and seismology.
- [DR11] Bikramjit Das and Sidney I. Resnick. Conditioning on an extreme component: model consistency with regular variation on cones. *Bernoulli*, 17(1):226–252, 2011.
- [GR06] Christian Gourieroux and Christian Y. Robert. Stochastic unit root models. *Econometric Theory*, 22(6):1052–1090, 2006.
- [HR07] Janet E. Heffernan and Sidney I. Resnick. Limit laws for random vectors with an extreme component. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 17(2):537–571, 2007.

- [JD13] Anja Janssen and Holger Drees. A stochastic volatility model with flexible extremal dependence structure. arXiv:1310.4621, 2013.
- [JS13] Anja Janssen and Johan Segers. Markov tail chains. arXiv:134:7637, 2013.
- [KS13] Rafał Kulik and Philippe Soulier. Estimation of limiting conditional distributions for the heavy tailed long memory stochastic volatility process. *Extremes*, 16(2):203 – 239, 2013.
- [MR13] Thomas Mikosch and Mohsen Rezapour. Stochastic volatility models with possible extremal clustering. *Bernoulli*, 19(5A):1688–1713, 2013.
- [MRR02] Krishanu Maulik, Sidney Resnick, and Holger Rootzén. Asymptotic independence and a network traffic model. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 39(4):671–699, 2002.
- [MT09] Sean Meyn and Richard L. Tweedie. *Markov chains and stochastic stability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2009.
- [Res87] Sidney I. Resnick. *Extreme values, regular variation and point processes*. Applied Probability, Vol. 4., New York, Springer-Verlag, 1987.
- [Res02] Sidney Resnick. Hidden regular variation, second order regular variation and asymptotic independence. *Extremes*, 5(4):303–336, 2002.
- [Res07] Sidney I. Resnick. *Heavy-Tail Phenomena*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York, 2007. Probabilistic and statistical modeling.
- [RZ13] Sidney I. Resnick and David Zeber. Asymptotics of Markov kernels and the tail chain. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 45(1):186–213, 2013.
- [SM11] R. Subhra Hazra and K. Maulik. Products in Conditional Extreme Value Model. arXiv:1104.1688, 2011.