

---

# Approximation of high quantiles from intermediate quantiles

Cees de Valk

June 20, 2014

**Abstract** Motivated by applications requiring quantile estimates for very small probabilities of exceedance  $p_n \ll 1/n$ , this article addresses estimation of high quantiles for  $p_n$  satisfying  $p_n \in [n^{-\tau_2}, n^{-\tau_1}]$  for some  $\tau_1 > 1$  and  $\tau_2 > \tau_1$ . For this purpose, the tail regularity assumption  $\log U \circ \exp \in ERV$  (with  $U$  the left-continuous inverse of  $1/(1 - F)$ , and  $ERV$  the extended regularly varying functions) is explored as an alternative to the classical regularity assumption  $U \in ERV$  (corresponding to the Generalised Pareto tail limit). Motivation for the alternative regularity assumption is provided, and it is shown to be equivalent to a log-GW limit for the survival function, generalising the GW (Generalised Weibull) limit, a generalisation of the Weibull tail limit. The domain of attraction is characterised, and convergence results are presented for log-GW and GW quantile approximations and for simple quantile estimators based on these approximations. Simulations are presented, and advantages and limitations of log-GW estimation of high quantiles are discussed.

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2010):** 60G70, 62G32, 26A12, 26A48

## 1 Introduction

An important application of extreme value theory is the estimation of tail quantiles. Theoretical analysis usually addresses tail quantile estimation from  $n$  independent random variables  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  with common distribution function  $F$ , and considers the asymptotic properties of estimators as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Of particular interest are *high quantiles*, exceeded with probabilities  $p_n = O(1/n)$ ; see *e.g.* [22, 11, 9] and for dependent random variables, [13]. Every quantile beyond the sample range is therefore a high quantile.

Let  $X_{1,n} \leq X_{2,n} \leq \dots \leq X_{n,n}$  be the order statistics derived from  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ , and let  $U$  denote the left-continuous inverse of  $1/(1 - F)$  on  $(1, \infty)$ . The *intermediate quantile*  $U(n/k_n)$ , with the sequence  $(k_n)$  satisfying

$$k_n \in \{1, \dots, n\} \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n/n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n = \infty, \quad (1.1)$$

---

CentER, Tilburg University, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands. Email: ceesfdevalk@gmail.com

is estimated consistently by the intermediate order statistic  $X_{n-k_n+1,n}$ ; see *e.g.* [14]. In contrast, the expected number of data points exceeding a high quantile is eventually bounded. A high quantile estimator can therefore not be expected to converge without some form of regularity of the tail, allowing it to be derived from intermediate order statistics.

The classical regularity assumption on the upper tail of the distribution function  $F$  (*e.g.* [8]) can be expressed as a condition on  $U$ ; it requires that a positive function  $w$  and a nonconstant function  $\varphi$  exist such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{U(t\lambda) - U(t)}{w(t)} = \varphi(\lambda) \quad \forall \lambda \in C_\varphi, \quad (1.2)$$

with  $C_\varphi$  the continuity points of  $\varphi$  in  $\mathbb{R}^+$ . As the limiting function  $\varphi$  is continuous (*e.g.* [8], Theorem 1.1.3),  $U$  satisfying (1.2) is extended regularly varying (see *e.g.* Appendix B2 of [8], or Chapter 3 of [4]). Therefore,  $w$  can be chosen to be regularly varying and (since  $U$  is nondecreasing) such that

$$\varphi = h_\gamma \quad (1.3)$$

for some real  $\gamma$  with for all positive  $\lambda$ ,

$$h_\gamma(\lambda) := \int_1^\lambda t^{\gamma-1} dt, \quad (1.4)$$

which is  $\gamma^{-1}(\lambda^\gamma - 1)$  if  $\gamma \neq 0$  and  $\log \lambda$  if  $\gamma = 0$ ; (1.2) with (1.3) is equivalent to a Generalised Pareto (GP) tail limit for the survival function (*e.g.* [8], Theorem 1.1.2). In (1.2), the limit has been written with unspecified right-hand side in order to stress the nonparametric nature of the classical regularity assumption, which makes it particularly attractive from the point of view of applications.

When referring to (1.2), we will write  $U \in ERV$ , with  $ERV$  the extended regularly varying functions<sup>1</sup>. We will write  $U \in ERV_S$  to specify that in addition, (1.3) holds with  $\gamma \in S \subset \mathbb{R}$ , and  $U \in ERV_{\{\gamma\}}(w)$  for (1.2) and (1.3) with a particular  $\gamma$  and  $w$ . We will apply the same notational conventions when a limit of the form (1.2) applies to a nondecreasing function other than  $U$ . For a regularly varying function  $g$  (*e.g.* [4]), we will write  $g \in RV$ , or  $g \in RV_S$  to specify that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g(t\lambda)/g(t) = \lambda^\alpha$  for all  $\lambda > 0$  for some  $\alpha \in S \subset \mathbb{R}$ .

It has been known for long that existence of the limit (1.2) alone is not sufficient for approximation of a high quantile  $U(1/p_n)$  with  $p_n = O(1/n)$  from an intermediate quantile  $U(n/k_n)$  with  $(k_n)$  as in (1.1), since  $\lambda_n := k_n/(np_n) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, additional assumptions on the rate of convergence in (1.2) are introduced for this purpose, such as (strong) second-order extended regular variation [10, 8], the Hall class [16], or conditions (1.5) and (1.6) of [9].

In this article, a different approach is explored: instead of strengthening (1.2), we will look for an alternative regularity assumption specifically to approximate certain high quantiles from intermediate quantiles, and by extension, to estimate such high quantiles. The quantiles we will focus on are very high quantiles corresponding to probabilities of exceedance  $(p_n)$  satisfying

$$p_n \in [n^{-\tau_2}, n^{-\tau_1}] \quad \text{for some } \tau_1 > 1, \tau_2 > \tau_1, \quad (1.5)$$

<sup>1</sup> Ignoring that as an assumption, (1.2) is formally weaker than  $U \in ERV$ ; but since  $U$  is nondecreasing, we know that  $C_\varphi = \mathbb{R}^+$ , so the difference is immaterial.

without excluding that the approximation may also be suitable for less rapidly vanishing  $(p_n)$ . This choice is motivated by applications requiring quantile estimates for probabilities of exceedance  $p_n$  satisfying  $p_n n \ll 1$ , such as flood hazard assessment [7], design criteria on wind, waves and currents for offshore structures [17] (paragraph A.5.7), seismic hazard assessment [1] and analysis of bank operational risk [5]. In such applications, one would want an estimator for  $U(1/p_n)$  which converges in a meaningful sense even when  $p_n n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . However, the latter condition is difficult to handle in its full generality. Therefore, we will narrow the focus to  $(p_n)$  satisfying (1.5). Moreover, we will try to find an estimator which for  $p_n = n^{-\tau}$  converges (in some yet-to-be-defined sense) uniformly in  $\tau \in [1, T]$  for every  $T > 1$ . In practical terms, this means that if the assumptions for convergence are satisfied, then an estimate of a quantile exceeded with a probability of, say, 0.01 can be extended to an estimate of the quantile exceeded with a probability of 0.0001 without seriously stretching the assumptions<sup>2</sup>, as these probabilities differ only a factor of two in terms of  $\tau$ . Such flexibility is important in applications, because  $p_n$  is generally based on social and economic considerations, without regard for the feasibility of estimating  $U(1/p_n)$ .

For convenience, we will assume throughout that  $U(\infty) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} U(t) > 1$ ; in applications, this can be ensured by adding a positive number to  $U$ .

## 2 An alternative regularity condition

The alternative regularity assumption on the upper tail of  $F$  proposed for estimation of a very high quantile  $U(1/p_n)$  with  $(p_n)$  satisfying (1.5) is

$$\log q \in ERV \tag{2.1}$$

with

$$q := U \circ \exp. \tag{2.2}$$

(2.1) is of the same nonparametric form as the classical regularity assumption (1.2), but with  $U$  replaced by  $\log U \circ \exp$ . Therefore, it implies that for some real  $\rho$  and positive function  $g$ ,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log q(y\lambda) - \log q(y)}{g(y)} = h_\rho(\lambda) \quad \forall \lambda > 0. \tag{2.3}$$

To see the relevance of (2.1) for approximation of a very high quantile  $q(-\log p_n) = U(1/p_n)$  with  $(p_n)$  satisfying (1.5) from an intermediate quantile  $q(\log(n/k_n)) = U(n/k_n)$ , assume that in addition to (1.1),  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log k_n / \log n < 1$ . This ensures that  $-\log p_n = O(\log(n/k_n))$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and since convergence in (2.3) is locally uniform in  $\lambda > 0$  (e.g. [4], Theorem 3.1.16), it implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\log U(1/p_n) - \log U(n/k_n)}{g(\log(n/k_n))} - h_\rho \left( \frac{\log(1/p_n)}{\log(n/k_n)} \right) \right| = 0.$$

To illustrate that condition (2.1) is a natural assumption, Proposition 1 below shows how it may arise in the context of a GP tail limit (1.2) with (1.3) and the GP tail approximation

$$\tilde{U}_{t,\gamma,w}(z) := U(t) + h_\gamma(z/t)w(t) \tag{2.4}$$

with  $w$  and  $\gamma$  as in (1.2) and (1.3).

---

<sup>2</sup> Of course, this does not obviate the need to investigate whether these assumptions apply.

**Proposition 1** Let  $U \in ERV$ , so (1.2) holds with  $\varphi = h_\gamma$  for some real  $\gamma$  and positive function  $w$ . (a) If  $\gamma > 0$ , then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log U(t^\tau) - \log U(t)}{\gamma \log t} = \tau - 1 \quad \forall \tau > 0 \quad (2.5)$$

and therefore,  $\log q \in ERV_{\{1\}}$ .

(b) If  $\gamma \leq 0$  and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{U}_{t,\gamma,w}(t^\tau) - U(t^\tau)}{U(t)} = 0 \quad \forall \tau \geq 1, \quad (2.6)$$

then either  $q \in ERV_{\{1\}}$  and  $\log q \in ERV_{\{0\}}$ , or  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} U(t^\tau)/U(t) = 1$  for all  $\tau > 0$ .

*Proof* The proof is found in Subsection 8.1.

Before considering the wider implications of Proposition 1, it will be illustrative to look at the case that  $\gamma \leq 0$  under (b) first. If  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} U(t^\tau)/U(t) = 1$  for all  $\tau > 0$ , then (2.6) can be satisfied by simply taking  $U(t)$  for  $\tilde{U}_{t,\gamma,w}(t^\tau)$  for every  $\tau \geq 1$ , or in other words, convergence of the GP approximation as in (2.6) is trivial. If  $\gamma < 0$ , then  $U(\infty) \in (1, \infty)$ , so this condition is satisfied; we will return to this case later in Section 3. On the other hand, if tail weight is sufficient that  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} U(t^\xi)/U(t) > 1$  for some  $\xi > 1$ , then by Proposition 1(b),  $q \in ERV_{\{1\}}$  is a necessary condition for convergence of a GP-based quantile approximation as in (2.6)<sup>3</sup>.

However,  $q \in ERV_{\{1\}}$  itself is a restrictive condition. For example, for the normal distribution,  $q \in ERV_{\{1/2\}}$  and (2.6) does not hold. In analogy to (1.2), a natural generalisation of  $q \in ERV_{\{1\}}$  would be  $q \in ERV$ , which implies that for some real  $\rho$  and some positive function  $g$ ,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q(y\lambda) - q(y)}{g(y)} = h_\rho(\lambda) \quad \forall \lambda > 0. \quad (2.7)$$

This limit is equivalent to a limit for decreasing powers of the survival function with suitably normalised arguments:

**Theorem 1** The limit (2.7) for some positive function  $g$  and real  $\rho$  is equivalent to the limit

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} |1 - F(xg(y) + q(y))|^{1/y} = e^{-h_\rho^{-1}(x)} \quad \forall x \in h_\rho(\mathbb{R}^+). \quad (2.8)$$

Moreover, if  $\rho > 0$ , then also,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} |1 - F(xq(y))|^{1/y} = e^{-x^{1/\rho}} \quad \forall x > 0. \quad (2.9)$$

*Proof* For  $q = U \circ \exp$ , equivalence of (2.7) and (2.8) is implied by [8] (Lemma 1.1.1), since (2.8) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log |1 - F(xg(y) + q(y))|}{y} = h_\rho^{-1}(x) \quad \forall x \in h_\rho(\mathbb{R}^+). \quad (2.10)$$

If  $\rho > 0$ , then  $q \in RV_{\{\rho\}}$  and we may take  $\rho q$  for  $g$ , yielding (2.9).  $\square$

<sup>3</sup> irrespective of which additional assumptions are invoked in order to guarantee (2.6).

The equivalent pair of limits (2.7) and (2.8) can be seen as the analogue for  $q$  of (1.2) with  $\varphi = h_\gamma$  and the equivalent GP limit for the survival function (e.g. [8], Theorem 1.1.2):

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t |1 - F(xw(t) + U(t))| = 1/h_\gamma^{-1}(x) \quad \forall x \in h_\gamma(\mathbb{R}^+). \quad (2.11)$$

The limit (2.9) in the  $\rho > 0$  case is the survival function of a Weibull distribution [21]. Therefore, we will refer to the distribution function corresponding to the limiting survival function in (2.8) as the Generalised Weibull (GW) distribution and by equivalence, extend usage of the term GW limit also to (2.7).

Over the last two decades, several articles about Weibull tail limits and quantile estimation have appeared, e.g. [3, 15] and references in the latter. [15] makes a connection between the Pareto and Weibull tail limits by considering them as members of a family of tail limits corresponding to a one-parameter family of transformations, containing the exponential as in (2.2) as well as the identity. Here, we avoid the use of such a transformation as an adjustable degree of freedom; the exponent appears in (2.2) specifically for the purpose of approximating high quantiles with probabilities of exceedance ( $p_n$ ) satisfying (1.5). Among the distribution functions with a GW tail limit are the Weibull, gamma, and normal distributions, and also light-tailed distribution functions with finite  $q(\infty)$ .

Going back to Proposition 1, then (2.1) must hold if  $U \in ERV_{\{\gamma\}}$  for some real  $\gamma$  and either  $\gamma > 0$ , or the GP approximation of  $U(t^\tau)$  converges nontrivially for all  $\tau \geq 1$  as in (2.6). Since (2.1) is much less restrictive than the specific conditions  $\log q \in ERV_{\{1\}}$  from (a) and  $\log q \in ERV_{\{0\}}$  from (b), it seems sensible to adopt it as regularity assumption for the present purpose instead of  $U \in ERV$ . In its explicit form (2.3) with  $\rho$  a real number and  $g$  a positive function, (2.1) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} |1 - F(q(y) \exp(xg(y)))|^{1/y} = e^{-h_\rho^{-1}(x)} \quad \forall x \in h_\rho(\mathbb{R}^+), \quad (2.12)$$

which follows from a slight modification of Theorem 1. We will refer to the equivalent limits (2.12) and (2.3) as the log-GW tail limit.

The following theorem helps to characterise the attraction domains of the log-GW and GW limits. It just states the bare results; an interpretation follows. As a reminder, we are always assuming that  $U(\infty) > 1$ .

**Theorem 2** For  $q := U \circ \exp$ ,

- (a) if  $U \in ERV$  and  $q \in ERV$ , then  $U \in ERV_{\{0\}}$ ;
- (b) if  $q \in ERV$ , then  $\log q \in ERV_{(-\infty, 0]}$ ;
- (c)  $q \in ERV_{(-\infty, 0)}$  if and only if  $\log q \in ERV_{(-\infty, 0)}$ ;
- (d) if  $U \in ERV$  and  $\log q \in ERV$ , then
  - either  $U \in ERV_{\{0\}}$  and  $\log q \in ERV_{(-\infty, 1]}$ ,
  - or  $U \in ERV_{(0, \infty)}$  and  $\log q \in ERV \in \mathcal{E}_{\{1\}}$ .

*Proof* See Subsection 8.2.

Theorem 2(b) implies that if  $F$  satisfies a GW tail limit, then it must also satisfy a log-GW tail limit. Therefore, not only the condition  $q \in ERV_{\{1\}}$  from Proposition 1(b), but also its generalisation  $q \in ERV$  implies (2.1).

Theorem 2(a) supplements Proposition 1(b) for the  $\gamma = 0$  case: the existence of a GW limit excludes distribution functions with heavy and light GP tail limits. Theorem

2(d) identifies which specific log-GW limits may coexist with a GP limit. It is possible that  $U \in ERV_{\{0\}}$  and  $\log q \in ERV_{\{1\}}$ ; an example is  $q(y) = \exp(y/\log(y+1) - 1)$ . By assertion (d), a GP limit with  $\gamma < 0$  excludes a log-GW limit. This case will be addressed later in Section 3. Theorem 2(c) equates the light-tailed distribution functions with finite endpoints satisfying GW and log-GW tail limits.

The domain of attraction of log-GW limits covers a wide range of tail behaviour. In addition to the attraction domain of GW limits (by Theorem 2(b)) and the entire attraction domain of classical Pareto limits with  $\gamma > 0$  (by Proposition 1(a)), it includes distribution functions satisfying  $\log q \in ERV_{(0,1)}$ , with tails heavier than a Weibull tail but lighter than a Pareto tail. An example is the lognormal distribution, which satisfies  $\log q \in ERV_{\{1/2\}}$ . Also, the domain includes heavy-tailed distribution functions without classical limits which satisfy  $\log q \in ERV_{(1,\infty)}$ . For the latter, the mean of the excess  $(X - \alpha) \vee 0$  over any finite threshold  $\alpha$  is infinite.

The log-GW limit for the survival function (2.12) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} -y^{-1} \log |1 - F(q(y) \exp(xg(y)))| = h_\rho^{-1}(x) \quad \forall x \in h_\rho(\mathbb{R}^+), \quad (2.13)$$

It is important to realise that convergence of a log-ratio of probabilities as in (2.13) is a much weaker notion than convergence of a ratio of probabilities as in the GP limit (2.11). This difference reflects precisely the difference in extrapolation range between (2.3) and (1.2) with (1.3): when extrapolating over a longer range, larger errors should be expected. The same comment applies to the GW limit; see (2.10).

Having established the log-GW limit as a widely applicable regularity assumption for approximation of high quantiles with probabilities  $(p_n)$  satisfying (1.5), the following sections will address quantile approximation and estimation under this assumption. Results based on log-GW limits will be presented along with their analogues based on GW limits, because the latter look simpler and also, because the attraction domain of GW limits may be a useful subclass of the attraction domain of log-GW limits to consider when estimating high quantiles of distribution functions with moderate tail weights.

### 3 Penultimate approximations

Consider the following penultimate log-GW quantile approximation based on (2.3):

$$\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(z) := q(y) \exp(\tilde{g}(y)h_{\tilde{\rho}(y)}(z/y)) \quad \forall y, z > 0, \quad (3.1)$$

with  $\tilde{\rho}$  a real function and  $\tilde{g}$  a positive function. In the context of (3.1), we will assume that  $\tilde{\rho}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  satisfy for some  $\xi > 1$ ,

$$\tilde{\rho}(y) - a_\xi^l(y) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{g}(y) \sim (\log q(y\xi) - \log q(y))/h_{\tilde{\rho}(y)}(\xi) \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty \quad (3.2)$$

with for every  $\iota \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ ,

$$a_\iota^l(y) \log \iota := \log \left| \log q(y\iota^2) - \log q(y\iota) \right| - \log |\log q(y\iota) - \log q(y)|. \quad (3.3)$$

We will also consider the penultimate GW quantile approximation based on (2.7):

$$\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(z) := q(y) + \tilde{g}(y)h_{\tilde{\rho}(y)}(z/y) \quad \forall y, z > 0 \quad (3.4)$$

and in the context of (3.4), assume that  $\tilde{\rho}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  are such that for some  $\xi > 1$ ,

$$\tilde{\rho}(y) - a_\xi(y) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{g}(y) \sim (q(y\xi) - q(y))/h_{\tilde{\rho}(y)}(\xi) \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty \quad (3.5)$$

with for every  $\iota \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ ,

$$a_\iota(y) \log \iota := \log \left| q(y\iota^2) - q(y\iota) \right| - \log |q(y\iota) - q(y)|. \quad (3.6)$$

The following convergence results are straightforward consequences of the limits.

**Proposition 2** (a) *If  $q \in ERV_{\{\rho\}}$  for some real  $\rho$  and the real function  $\tilde{\rho}$  and positive function  $\tilde{g}$  satisfy (3.5), then  $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\rho}(y) = \rho$  and*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\lambda \in [A^{-1}, A]} \left| \frac{\tilde{q}_{y, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}(y\lambda) - q(y\lambda)}{q(y)} \right| = 0 \quad \forall A > 1. \quad (3.7)$$

(b) *If  $\log q \in ERV_{\{\rho\}}$  for some real  $\rho$  and the real function  $\tilde{\rho}$  and positive function  $\tilde{g}$  satisfy (3.2), then  $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\rho}(y) = \rho$  and*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\lambda \in [A^{-1}, A]} \left| \frac{\log \tilde{q}_{y, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}^l(y\lambda) - \log q(y\lambda)}{\log q(y)} \right| = 0 \quad \forall A > 1, \quad (3.8)$$

and if in addition,  $q \in ERV$ , then also

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\lambda \in [A^{-1}, A]} \left| \frac{\tilde{q}_{y, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}^l(y\lambda) - q(y\lambda)}{q(y)} \right| = 0 \quad \forall A > 1. \quad (3.9)$$

*Proof* A proof of this standard result can be found in Subsection 8.3.

If  $U(\infty) < \infty$ , then approximations of  $q(y\lambda)$  as above converge for  $\lambda \geq 1$  under weaker assumptions than those for Proposition 2. Of particular interest is the case of  $U$  satisfying (1.2) with  $\varphi = h_\gamma$  and  $\gamma < 0$ , which by Theorem 2(d) is incompatible with a log-GW limit. Nevertheless, GW and log-GW approximations converge trivially in this case:

**Proposition 3** *Let  $U \in ERV_{(-\infty, 0)}$ .*

(a) *If the real function  $\tilde{\rho}$  and positive function  $\tilde{g}$  satisfy (3.5), then*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \geq y} |\tilde{q}_{y, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}(z) - q(z)| = 0. \quad (3.10)$$

(b) *If the real function  $\tilde{\rho}$  and positive function  $\tilde{g}$  satisfy (3.2), then*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \geq y} |\tilde{q}_{y, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}^l(z) - q(z)| = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

*Proof* For (a), because  $U \in ERV_{(-\infty, 0)}$ ,  $q(\infty) < \infty$  and by the Potter bounds (e.g. [4], Theorem 1.5.6),  $\tilde{\rho}(y) \sim a_\xi(y) \rightarrow -\infty$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ , and therefore,  $h_{\tilde{\rho}(y)}(\xi) \sim -1/\tilde{\rho}(y)$  and  $-\tilde{g}(y)/\tilde{\rho}(y) \sim q(y\xi) - q(y) \rightarrow 0$ . Moreover, if  $\tilde{\rho}(y) < 0$ , then for all  $z \geq y$ ,  $|\tilde{q}_{y, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}(z) - q(z)| = |\tilde{g}(y)h_{\tilde{\rho}(y)}(z/y) + q(y) - q(z)| \leq |\tilde{g}(y)/\tilde{\rho}(y)| + |q(\infty) - q(y)|$ , so combining, (3.10) follows. The proof of (b) is similar.  $\square$

The rate of convergence of the quantile approximations (3.4) and (3.1) is a less trivial issue than convergence as in (3.10) and (3.11), but this topic is outside the present scope.

#### 4 Probability-based quantile approximation errors

When  $q(\infty) = \infty$ , then eq. (3.8), valid for all  $q$  satisfying  $\log q \in ERV$ , expresses a weaker notion of convergence than eq. (3.7) or (3.9), which apply in the special case that  $q \in ERV$ . However, if we could express quantile approximation errors in terms of the mismatch between the probabilities of exceedance of the quantile and its approximation, then the same notion of convergence would apply irrespective of whether  $q \in ERV$ .

In fact, there may be better reasons for considering probability-based quantile approximation and estimation errors. For example, in the context of applications in structural reliability analysis and safety engineering (*e.g.* flood protection, tall buildings, bridges, offshore structures, etc.), the required overall safety level constrains a design; usually, it takes the form of a maximum tolerated failure rate, fixed in legislation or in rules issued by regulators or classification societies. Within such a context, errors in estimates of load quantiles are often viewed in terms of equivalent errors in frequency of exceedance.

For  $\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}$  defined by (3.4), a natural expression of the mismatch between  $1 - F(\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(z))$  and  $1 - F(q(z))$  is  $\nu_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(z)$ , defined for all positive  $y$  and  $z$  by

$$\nu_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(z) := \frac{q^{-1}(\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(z))}{q^{-1}(q(z))} - 1 = \frac{\log(1 - F(\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(z)))}{\log(1 - F(q(z)))} - 1. \quad (4.1)$$

If  $q(\infty) < \infty$ , then  $\nu_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(z) = \infty$  if  $\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(z) > q(\infty)$ . Because  $F$  may be constant over some nonempty interval, it is possible that  $\nu_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(z) = 0$  while  $\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(z) \neq q(z)$ . If  $F$  is continuous, then  $q^{-1}(q(z)) = -\log(1 - F(q(z))) = z$  in (4.1). The same type of approximation error associated with the log-GW quantile approximation  $\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(z)$  is

$$\nu_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(z) := \frac{q^{-1}(\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(z))}{q^{-1}(q(z))} - 1 = \frac{\log(1 - F(\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(z)))}{\log(1 - F(q(z)))} - 1. \quad (4.2)$$

We have the following convergence result.

**Theorem 3** (a) *If  $q \in ERV$  and real functions  $\tilde{\rho}$  and  $\tilde{g}$ ,  $\tilde{g}$  positive, satisfy (3.5), then*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\lambda \in [A^{-1}, A]} |\nu_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(y\lambda)| = 0 \quad \forall A > 1. \quad (4.3)$$

(b) *If  $\log q \in ERV$  and real functions  $\tilde{\rho}$  and  $\tilde{g}$ ,  $\tilde{g}$  positive, satisfy (3.2), then*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\lambda \in [A^{-1}, A]} |\nu_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(y\lambda)| = 0 \quad \forall A > 1. \quad (4.4)$$

*Proof* See Subsection 8.4.

*Remark 1* Convergence of  $\nu_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(y\lambda)$  to zero, equivalent to convergence of the log-ratio of probabilities on the right-hand side of (4.2) for  $z = y\lambda$  to 1, is a weak notion of convergence, similar to convergence to the log-GW limit in (2.13). Alternatively, one might want to consider a stronger notion of convergence:  $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} N_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(y\lambda) = 0$  for all  $\lambda \geq 1$ , with  $N_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(z) := (1 - F(q(z)))/(1 - F(\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(z))) - 1$ . However, among the distribution functions satisfying a log-GW limit, the latter condition is rather exceptional, as it is equivalent to  $y\lambda \nu_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(y\lambda) \sim -\log(1 - F(q(y\lambda))) \nu_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^l(y\lambda) \rightarrow 0$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $\lambda \geq 1$ . A similar comment applies to  $\nu_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}$  within the context of the GW limit.

*Remark 2* If  $\log q \in ERV_{\{0\}}$ , then by Theorem 3(b), (4.4) holds with  $\tilde{\rho} = 0$  for every positive function  $\tilde{g}$  satisfying (3.2). Because  $\tilde{q}_{y,0,\tilde{g}}^l = \tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{g},\tilde{g}q}$  (see [6] for an analogous observation with  $U$  instead of  $q$ ),  $\nu_{y,0,\tilde{g}}^l = \nu_{y,\tilde{g},\tilde{g}q}$ , so  $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\lambda \in [A^{-1}, A]} |\nu_{y,\tilde{g},\tilde{g}q}(y\lambda)| = 0$  for every  $A > 1$ . This indicates that (3.7) and (4.3) for the GW approximation hold under a weaker condition than  $q \in ERV$  and therefore, that the condition  $\log q \in ERV$  for (3.8) and (4.4) can be relaxed as well; see [12] for further details.

## 5 Simple high quantile estimators

To demonstrate the potential of the alternative regularity condition for estimation of high quantiles, this section introduces quantile estimators closely related to the log-GW and GW approximations (3.1) and (3.4) and presents consistency results.

Consider a sequence of independent random variables  $(X_n)$  with  $X_i \sim F$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $X_{k,n}$  denote the  $k$ -th lowest order statistic out of  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ . A simple GW-based estimator for a quantile  $q(z)$  with probability of exceedance  $\exp(-z)$  is  $\hat{q}_{n,\iota}(z)$ , which for every  $\iota > 1$ ,  $z > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is given by

$$\hat{q}_{n,\iota}(z) := \hat{g}_{n,\iota} h_{\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}}(z/y_n) + X_{n-k_0(n)+1,n}, \quad (5.1)$$

with

$$\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota} := \frac{\log \left( \frac{X_{n-k_2(n)+1,n} - X_{n-k_1(n)+1,n}}{X_{n-k_1(n)+1,n} - X_{n-k_0(n)+1,n}} \right)}{\log \iota}, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\hat{g}_{n,\iota} := \frac{X_{n-k_1(n)+1,n} - X_{n-k_0(n)+1,n}}{h_{\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}}(\iota)}, \quad (5.3)$$

$$y_n := \log \left( \frac{n}{k_0(n)} \right), \quad (5.4)$$

for some nondecreasing<sup>4</sup>  $k_2 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that  $k_2(n) \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and with for  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ ,

$$k_j(n) := \left\lfloor (k_2(n)/n)^{\iota^{j-2}} n \right\rfloor. \quad (5.5)$$

This estimator can be regarded as a straightforward application of the approximation (3.4) to the sampling distribution of  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  instead of to  $F$ , taking

$$g_\iota(y) := (q(y\iota) - q(y))/h_{a_\iota(y)}(\iota) \quad (5.6)$$

for  $\tilde{g}(y)$  and  $a_\iota(y)$  for  $\tilde{\rho}(y)$ . Assume that  $k_2(n)/n \rightarrow 0$  and  $k_2(n) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then by (5.5), as  $\iota > 1$ , also  $k_j(n)/n \rightarrow 0$  and  $k_j(n) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for  $j = 1$  and  $j = 0$ . Moreover, if  $k_2$  is chosen to satisfy

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log k_2(n)}{\log n} = c < 1, \quad (5.7)$$

then by (5.5),  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\log k_0(n))/\log n = 1 + \iota^{-2}(c-1)$ , so  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n/\log n = (1-c)\iota^{-2}$ . Therefore, for every  $T \geq 1$ , eventually

$$[T^{-1} \log n, T \log n] \subset [\lambda^{-1} y_n, \lambda y_n] \quad \forall \lambda > T \iota^2 / (1-c), \quad (5.8)$$

<sup>4</sup> For notational convenience, we write some sequences as functions on  $\mathbb{N}$ .

and as a result,  $-\log p_n$  with  $(p_n)$  as in (1.5) is eventually in the interval  $[\lambda^{-1}y_n, \lambda y_n]$  for some  $\lambda > 1$ .

If (5.5) were modified to  $k_j(n) := \lfloor k_2(n)\iota^{2-j} \rfloor$ , then with  $\iota = 2$ , (5.2) would become Pickands' estimator [19] for the extreme value index  $\gamma$ . Estimators based on only three order statistics such as (5.1)-(5.3) are known to be relatively inaccurate; see *e.g.* [8] for Pickands' estimator. Such an estimator was chosen as an example here because of its simplicity and proximity to the approximation (3.4) with  $\tilde{\rho} = a_\iota$  and  $\tilde{g} = g_\iota$ .

Analogous to  $\nu$  in (4.1), the probability-based quantile estimation error  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}(z)$  is defined for every  $\iota > 1$ ,  $z > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  by

$$\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}(z) := \frac{q^{-1}(\hat{q}_{n,\iota}(z))}{q^{-1}(q(z))} - 1 = \frac{\log(1 - F(\hat{q}_{n,\iota}(z)))}{\log(1 - F(q(z)))} - 1. \quad (5.9)$$

**Theorem 4** *Let  $q \in ERV_{\{\rho\}}$  for some real  $\rho$ , and  $k_2 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  satisfy (5.7) and  $k_2(n)/\log n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $\hat{q}_{n,\iota}$ ,  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}$  and  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}$  defined by (5.1)-(5.5) and (5.9) satisfy for every  $\iota > 1$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\rho}_{n,\iota} = \rho \quad a.s. \quad (5.10)$$

and for every  $T > 1$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\tau \in [T^{-1}, T]} |\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}(\tau \log n)| = 0 \quad a.s.; \quad (5.11)$$

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\tau \in [T^{-1}, T]} \left| \frac{\hat{q}_{n,\iota}(\tau \log n) - q(\tau \log n)}{q(y_n)} \right| = 0 \quad a.s. \quad (5.12)$$

*Proof* The proof is found in Subsection 8.5.

Theorem 4 establishes a.s. convergence of very high quantile estimates for probabilities of exceedance of  $n^{-\tau}$  uniformly for all  $\tau$  in an arbitrary compact subset of  $(0, \infty)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

With  $k_0, k_1, k_2$  and  $y_n$  as in (5.5) and (5.4), the analogous log-GW-based quantile estimator  $\hat{q}_{n,\iota}^l(z)$  is defined for every  $\iota > 1$ ,  $z > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $X_{n-k_0(n)+1,n} > 0$  by

$$\hat{q}_{n,\iota}^l(z) := X_{n-k_0(n)+1,n} \exp\left(\hat{g}_{n,\iota}^l h_{\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}^l}^l(z/y_n)\right) \quad (5.13)$$

with

$$\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}^l := \frac{\log \log \left( \frac{X_{n-k_2(n)+1,n}}{X_{n-k_1(n)+1,n}} \right) - \log \log \left( \frac{X_{n-k_1(n)+1,n}}{X_{n-k_0(n)+1,n}} \right)}{\log \iota}, \quad (5.14)$$

$$\hat{g}_{n,\iota}^l := \frac{\log X_{n-k_1(n)+1,n} - \log X_{n-k_0(n)+1,n}}{h_{\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}^l}^l(\iota)}. \quad (5.15)$$

The associated probability-based quantile estimation error is

$$\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}^l(z) := \frac{q^{-1}(\hat{q}_{n,\iota}^l(z))}{q^{-1}(q(z))} - 1 = \frac{\log(1 - F(\hat{q}_{n,\iota}^l(z)))}{\log(1 - F(q(z)))} - 1. \quad (5.16)$$

**Corollary 1** *Let  $\log q \in \text{ERV}_{\{\rho\}}$  for some real  $\rho$ , and  $k_2 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  satisfy (5.7) and  $k_2(n)/\log n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then (a)  $\hat{q}_{n,\iota}^l$ ,  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}^l$  and  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}^l$  defined above satisfy for every  $\iota > 1$ ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}^l = \rho \quad a.s., \quad (5.17)$$

and for every  $T > 1$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\tau \in [T^{-1}, T]} \left| \hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}^l(\tau \log n) \right| = 0 \quad a.s. \quad (5.18)$$

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\tau \in [T^{-1}, T]} \left| \frac{\log \hat{q}_{n,\iota}^l(\tau \log n) - \log q(\tau \log n)}{\log q(y_n)} \right| = 0 \quad a.s. \quad (5.19)$$

and (b) if in addition,  $q \in \text{ERV}$ , also

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\tau \in [T^{-1}, T]} \left| \frac{\hat{q}_{n,\iota}^l(\tau \log n) - q(\tau \log n)}{q(y_n)} \right| = 0 \quad a.s. \quad (5.20)$$

*Proof* Since  $q(\infty) > 1$ , almost surely some  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  exists such that for all  $n \geq n_0$ ,  $X_{n-k_0(n)+1,n} > 0$  and  $\hat{q}_{n,\iota}^l(z)$  is defined. Then the proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 4, so almost surely, Theorem 3(b) and Proposition 2(b) apply after substituting  $\hat{a}_i^l$  for  $\tilde{\rho}$  and  $\hat{g}_i^l$  for  $\tilde{g}$ , with  $\hat{a}_i^l(y) := \hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}^l$  and  $\hat{g}_i^l(y) := \hat{g}_{n,\iota}^l$  for all  $y \in [y_n, y_{n+1})$  and all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Using (5.8) completes the proof.

Because of its wider applicability (see Theorem 2(b)), this Corollary is a more important result than Theorem 4.

Under a modest additional assumption, asymptotic normality of the estimators can be proven. We will say that  $f \in \mathcal{L}$  if  $f$  is nondecreasing, absolutely continuous with derivative  $f'$ , and satisfies the one-sided smoothness condition (cf. [4], eq. 1.7.10")

$$\lim_{A \downarrow 1} \liminf_{y \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\lambda \in [1, A]} \frac{f'(y\lambda)}{f'(y)} \vee \lim_{A \downarrow 1} \liminf_{y \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\lambda \in [1, A]} \frac{f'(y)}{f'(y\lambda)} \geq 1. \quad (5.21)$$

Let  $g_\iota$  be defined by (5.6) and

$$\kappa_\rho(\lambda, \iota) := \partial(h_\rho(\lambda)/h_\rho(\iota))/\partial\rho \quad (5.22)$$

for all real  $\rho, \iota \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$  and  $\lambda > 0$ . For the GW-based estimator, we have:

**Theorem 5** *Under the assumptions for Theorem 4, if  $q \in \mathcal{L}$ , then for all  $\iota > 1$ ,*

$$Z_{n,\iota} := \left( \hat{\rho}_{n,\iota} - a_\iota(y_n) \right) y_n \sqrt{k_2(n) h_\rho(\iota)} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, (\iota^{\rho-2} / \log \iota)^2) \quad (5.23)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and for all  $T > 1$ ,

$$\sup_{z \in [T^{-1} \log n, T \log n]} \left| \left( \hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}(z) - \nu_{y_n, a_\iota, g_\iota}(z) \right) y_n \sqrt{k_2(n)} - \frac{\kappa_\rho\left(\frac{z}{y_n}, \iota\right)}{\left(\frac{z}{y_n}\right)^\rho} Z_{n,\iota} \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad (5.24)$$

$$\sup_{z \in [T^{-1} \log n, T \log n]} \left| \frac{\hat{q}_{n,\iota}(z) - \tilde{q}_{y_n, a_\iota, g_\iota}(z)}{q'(y_n)} \sqrt{k_2(n)} - \kappa_\rho\left(\frac{z}{y_n}, \iota\right) Z_{n,\iota} \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (5.25)$$

*Proof* See Subsection 8.6.

Eq. (5.24) and (5.7) imply that  $y_n \sqrt{k_2(n)} (\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}(\lambda y_n) - \nu_{y_n, a_\iota, g_\iota}(\lambda y_n))$  is asymptotically normal with zero mean and variance equal to  $((\iota^{\rho-2}/\log \iota) \lambda^{-\rho} \kappa_\rho(\lambda, \iota))^2$  for every  $\lambda > 0$ . A similar comment applies to (5.25).

With  $g_\iota^l(y) := (\log q(y\iota) - \log q(y))/h_{a_\iota^l(y)}(\iota)$ , the analogous result for the log-GW-based estimator is:

**Corollary 2** *Under the assumptions for Corollary 1, if  $\log q \in \mathcal{L}$ , then for all  $\iota > 1$ ,*

$$Z_{n,\iota}^l := \left( \hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}^l - a_\iota^l(y_n) \right) y_n \sqrt{k_2(n)} h_\rho(\iota) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, (\iota^{\rho-2}/\log \iota)^2) \quad (5.26)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and for all  $T > 1$ ,

$$\sup_{z \in [T^{-1} \log n, T \log n]} \left| \left( \hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}^l(z) - \nu_{y_n, a_\iota^l, g_\iota^l}^l(z) \right) y_n \sqrt{k_2(n)} - \frac{\kappa_\rho \left( \frac{z}{y_n}, \iota \right)}{\left( \frac{z}{y_n} \right)^\rho} Z_{n,\iota}^l \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad (5.27)$$

$$\sup_{z \in [T^{-1} \log n, T \log n]} \left| \frac{\log \hat{q}_{n,\iota}^l(z) - \log \hat{q}_{y_n, a_\iota^l, g_\iota^l}^l(z)}{q'(y_n)/q(y_n)} \sqrt{k_2(n)} - \kappa_\rho \left( \frac{z}{y_n}, \iota \right) Z_{n,\iota}^l \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (5.28)$$

*Remark 3* Deriving limiting distributions for the random error of log-GW and GW-based estimators as above requires no assumptions beyond the basic regularity assumption and some smoothness. They can be used for deriving asymptotic confidence intervals: for the GW estimator, for example (but similar comments apply to the log-GW estimator), eq. (5.23) remains valid with  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}$  substituted for  $\rho$ , due to (5.10). Deriving such results for the estimation error  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota} - \rho$  instead of  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota} - a_\iota(y_n)$  is not possible without additional assumptions on the rate of convergence of  $a_\iota(y)$  to  $\rho$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$  and/or on the size of the sample fraction used (see *e.g.* [15, 2] in the context of Weibull tail limits). For example, (5.23) implies that the standard deviation of  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}$  will eventually vanish more rapidly than the bias  $a_\iota(y_n) - \rho$ , unless  $|a_\iota(y_n) - \rho| = O(1/(y_n \sqrt{k_2(n)}))$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , which is too restrictive to be assumed *a priori* in applications. However, the relatively rapid convergence of  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota} - a_\iota(y_n)$  can be used to estimate how  $a_\iota(y)$  varies as a function of  $y$ . In practice, threshold stability plots are used for this purpose; replacing  $k_2(n)$  in (5.1)-(5.3) by  $k_2^{(\eta)}(n) := \lceil n(k_2(n)/n)^\eta \rceil$  for any  $\eta \in (0, 1]$  while replacing  $k_1(n)$ ,  $k_0(n)$  and  $y_n$  by  $k_1^{(\eta)}(n)$ ,  $k_0^{(\eta)}(n)$  and  $y_n^{(\eta)} \sim y_n \eta$  derived from  $k_2^{(\eta)}(n)$  as in (5.5) and (5.4), all assumptions for Theorems 4 and 5 and Corollaries 1 and 2 remain satisfied. The resulting estimates  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}^{(\eta)}$  and confidence intervals for  $a_\iota(y_n^{(\eta)})$  for  $\eta \in (0, 1]$  may be interpreted by a statistician to draw conclusions about convergence of  $a_\iota(y_n)$  and the associated uncertainty in high quantiles, possibly using a second-order regularity assumption. Evidently, this would be more useful for estimators which are more precise than the ones considered here as examples.

## 6 Simulations

As an illustration, the log-GW-based quantile estimator  $\hat{q}_{n,\iota}^l$  defined in (5.13)-(5.15) with (5.4)-(5.5) was applied to simulated samples of *iid* random variables to estimate very high quantiles with a probability of exceedance of  $n^{-2}$ . For comparison, a

Pickands-type GP-based quantile estimator was applied to the same data; it is given by (5.1)-(5.4) with (5.5) replaced by  $k_j(n) := \lfloor k_2(n)\iota^{2-j} \rfloor$ , and  $h_{\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}}(z/y_n)$  in (5.1) replaced by  $h_{\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}}(e^{z-y_n})$ . To avoid confusion,  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}$  for this GP-based estimator will be referred to as  $\hat{\gamma}_{n,\iota}^p$ , and the corresponding quantile estimator as  $\hat{q}_{n,\iota}^p$ .

For each distribution function considered and each  $n$  in  $\{2^5, 2^6, \dots, 2^{16}\}$ , 1000 random samples were generated. The estimators were applied with  $\iota = 2$  and  $k_0(n) = \lfloor n^{13/16} \rfloor$ . Quantile estimates were constrained from below by the sample maxima.

Both the normal and lognormal distribution function satisfy  $U \in ERV_{\{0\}}$ , *i.e.*, (1.2) and (1.3) with  $\gamma = 0$ . For the normal distribution,  $q(y) \sim \sqrt{2y}$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ , so  $q \in ERV_{\{1/2\}}$  and by Theorem 2(b,c),  $\log q \in ERV_{\{0\}}$ ;  $\log q \in ERV_{\{1/2\}}$  for the lognormal distribution. For both,  $\log q \in \mathcal{L}$ . Therefore, Corollaries 1 and 2 apply.

Figure 6.1 shows the results for the lognormal distribution with the GP-based estimator in the top row, and with the log-GW-based estimator in the bottom row. The leftmost column (a) shows medians and empirical 90%-intervals (between the 5% and 95% percentiles) of the quantile estimates. The quantiles  $U(n^2)$  to be estimated are indicated by a dashed curve. Approximate thresholds  $U(n/k_0(n))$  are indicated by open squares. The middle column (b) shows the parameter estimates  $\hat{\gamma}_{n,\iota}^p$  (top) and  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}^l$  (bottom), with the dashed lines indicating the tail indices  $\gamma$  and  $\rho$  for the distribution function considered. The rightmost column (c) displays the probability-based errors  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}^p := q^{-1}\hat{q}_{n,\iota}^p/q^{-1}q - 1$  (top) and  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}^l$  defined by (5.16) (bottom). For the log-GW-based estimator, also deterministic approximations and asymptotic 90% intervals based on (5.26)-(5.28) are displayed; these will be discussed later.

The top row of Figure 6.1 shows the GP-based estimates of  $\log U(n^2)$  diverging upward from the exact values with increasing  $n$ , and no convergence of  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}^p$ . The parameter estimates  $\hat{\gamma}_{n,\iota}^p$  appear to converge slowly. In the bottom row, the log-GW-based estimator is seen to perform well, with bias rapidly vanishing.


Figure 6.2 for the normal distribution displays a similar pattern as Figure 6.1, but with some differences. The GP-based estimator now underestimates the very high quantiles, with bias increasing in magnitude with increasing  $n$ , even though the parameter estimator  $\hat{\gamma}_{n,\iota}^p$  appears to converge;  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}^p$  does not converge. This is the only case in which the sample maximum as lower bound to the quantile estimate became effective. The log-GW-based quantile estimator is performing much better, although convergence is not as rapid as with lognormal data. Based on these results alone, it is not clear whether the bias in  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}^l$  converges to zero; deterministic computations (not shown) for  $n$  up to  $2^{60}$  show that it vanishes slowly. For  $\hat{q}_{n,\iota}^l - q$ , a small nonzero bias remains, but the relative error vanishes.

Since the favourable results of the log-GW-based estimator on lognormal data translate directly to equivalent results with the GW-based estimator on normal data, the GW-based quantile estimator would do better on the normal data than the log-GW-based quantile estimator in Figure 6.2. This indicates that in some cases, convergence may be speeded up by replacing the latter by the GW-based estimator; see [12].


Figure 6.3 shows results obtained for a distribution function with a Pareto tail limit:  $U(t) = t(1 + 2(\log t)^2) - 1$ . It satisfies  $U \in ERV_{\{1\}}$  and therefore, by Proposition 1(a),  $\log q \in ERV_{\{1\}}$ . The GP-based median error in the estimates of  $\log q$  diverges, and the median of  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}^p$  does not converge or converges very slowly at best, differing considerably from 0 for the highest  $n$ . Errors of the log-GW quantile estimator all appear to converge, although a small residual appears to vanish slowly (confirmed by

deterministic computations for high  $n$ ), possibly related to the slow convergence of the parameter estimates  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\ell}^l$  in this case.


**Fig. 6.1** High quantile estimates for probabilities of exceedance of  $n^{-2}$  on simulated independent standard lognormal samples based on GP (top) and log-GW (bottom) based estimators as functions of  $n$  (see text). Diamonds/vertical bars: median of estimates (black) with 90% interval. Left (a): quantile estimates, with target quantiles  $U(n^2)$  (dashed) and approximate thresholds  $U(n/k_0(n))$  (squares). Centre (b): parameter estimates  $\hat{\gamma}_{n,\ell}^p$  (top) and  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\ell}^l$  (bottom), dashed lines indicating the indices  $\gamma$  and  $\rho$ . Right (c): errors  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\ell}^p$  (top) and  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\ell}^l$  (bottom). For log-GW only: quantile approximations (-) and asymptotic 90% interval bounds (-.).



**Fig. 6.3** As Figure 6.1, but for the Pareto-like distribution ( $U(t) = t(1 + 2(\log t)^2) - 1$ ) instead of the lognormal.




**Fig. 6.2** As Figure 6.1, but for the standard normal distribution instead of the lognormal.



Finally, Figure 6.4 shows results for the Burr(1,1/4,4) distribution with  $U(t) = (t^{1/4} - 1)^4$ , which also satisfies  $U \in ERV_{\{1\}}$ . Unlike the previous examples,  $U$  has a negative second-order index (see [8]) in this case, so eventually, convergence toward the GP limit is more rapid than in these other examples. The log-GW-based estimator does

**Fig. 6.4** As Figure 6.1, but for the Burr( $1, \frac{1}{4}, 4$ ) distribution (see main text) instead of the lognormal.



not perform very well for the sample sizes up to  $2^{16}$  considered; however, for higher  $n$  (not shown), the relative error in  $\log q$  begins to reduce in size, so the estimates appear to satisfy (5.19). The bias of the GP-based estimator is of opposite sign and much larger. It can be shown that eventually, the relative bias in quantile estimates vanishes for both estimators, but begins to decrease in size only after  $n$  exceeds  $10^{10}$ .

The empirical 90% intervals of estimates are generally rather wide, as can be expected from simple estimators using only three order statistics. For the log-GW-based estimator, the asymptotic 90%-interval based on (5.17) provides a good approximation to the empirical 90%-interval for  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\ell}^l$  in all cases considered. However, for  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\ell}^l$  and especially for  $\hat{q}_{n,\ell}^l$ , the asymptotic 90% intervals are in some cases too wide, in particular with small sample sizes. In all cases, the empirical 90% intervals for  $\hat{\nu}_{n,\ell}^l$  and  $\hat{q}_{n,\ell}^l$  appear to tend toward the asymptotic intervals, which was confirmed by simulations with  $n$  up to  $2^{22}$  (not shown).

The same simulations were also carried out (not shown) with Pickands' estimator replaced by the moment estimator from [11, 9]. Variance was reduced in comparison to Pickands' estimator, but bias was not noticeably reduced.

## 7 Discussion

The regularity assumption  $\log q \in ERV$ , resulting in the log-GW tail limit, makes it possible to approximate and estimate quantiles  $U(n^\tau)$  locally uniformly in  $\tau > 0$  (see Proposition 2, Theorem 3 and Corollary 1). This is important for applications which require estimates of  $U(1/p_n)$  for  $p_n \ll 1/n$ . It is a relatively weak assumption, of the same nature as the classical regularity assumption  $U \in ERV$  corresponding to the GP limit. Moreover, it generalises the restrictive condition  $\log q \in ERV_{\{0,1\}}$  which must

hold if  $U \in ERV_{\{\gamma\}}$  for some real  $\gamma$  and either  $\gamma > 0$ , or the GP approximation of  $U(t^\tau)$  converges nontrivially for all  $\tau \geq 1$  as in (2.6) (see Proposition 1). The log-GW tail limit does not apply to the domain of attraction of the GP limit with  $\gamma < 0$ , but for these light-tailed distribution functions, log-GW quantile approximations converge trivially as shown in Proposition 3. We may conclude that in contrast to the GP limit, the log-GW tail limit is both widely applicable and sufficient for constructing convergent approximations and estimators of high quantiles including those for probabilities (1.5).

There are limitations as well. The error  $b_\lambda(x) := (\log q(x\lambda) - \log q(x))/g(x) - h_\rho(\lambda)$  in approximating a log-GW limit and the same error in approximating the GP limit of a different distribution function (*i.e.*,  $(U(x\lambda) - U(x))/g(x) - h_\rho(\lambda) = b_\lambda(x)$ ) converge from a statistical perspective at entirely different rates, since with  $(k_n)$  as in (1.1),  $b_\lambda(\log(n/k_n))$  as a function of  $n$  vanishes much more slowly than  $b_\lambda(n/k_n)$  when  $n$  increases. Therefore, one might suspect that slow convergence of bias in log-GW quantile estimators with increasing  $n$  could be common in applications. For the same reason, the estimation error  $\rho_{n,\ell}^l - \rho$  of the log-GW index  $\rho$  is eventually dominated by bias, unless  $a_\ell^l(y)$  converges rapidly to  $\rho$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$  (see the discussion of the analogous GW case at the end of Section 5). On the bright side, the variation of a slowly vanishing bias can be estimated, so a statistician may use such estimates (*e.g.* threshold sensitivity plots; see the end of Section 5) to draw conclusions about the uncertainty in parameter and quantile estimates associated with bias. Also, slow convergence is a lesser problem than no convergence, which is more likely the case with a GP-based quantile estimator, in view of the restrictive conditions for convergence of the GP-based quantile approximation in Proposition 1. At any rate, the issue of bias requires serious attention when estimating quantiles  $U(1/p_n)$  for  $p_n \ll 1/n$ .

Another limitation is that the notions of convergence which apply without strengthening the assumption  $\log q \in ERV$  are weak; see (3.8) and (5.19), and for probability-based errors, (4.4) and (5.18). The latter consider the log-ratio of survival functions of a quantile and its approximation or estimator, which is natural in view of the probability range considered. Stronger notions of convergence, *e.g.* of a ratio of survival functions, would require additional assumptions on the distribution function  $F$  which seem hard to justify *a priori* in applications.

The simulations in Section 6 suggest that log-GW-based estimation of high quantiles may have merits, but it would be premature to draw further conclusions from a few examples. In order to find out what extreme value analysis based on the log-GW tail limit can offer to applications requiring quantile estimates for very low probabilities  $p_n \ll 1/n$ , more effort will be needed to develop and test good log-GW-based estimators and in particular, methods for analysing bias. In certain cases, it might be justified to assume that  $F$  is in some subset of the domain of attraction of the log-GW tail limit such as the domain of attraction of the GW limit, based on diagnostics like threshold sensitivity plots and accumulated experience in a specific field of application.

## 8 Proofs and lemmas

### 8.1 Proof of Proposition 1

*Proof* If  $U \in ERV_{\{\gamma\}}$  for  $\gamma > 0$ , then  $U \in RV_{\{\gamma\}}$  so by the Potter bounds (*e.g.* [4], Theorem 1.5.6), there is for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \gamma \wedge 1)$  a  $y_\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $y(\lambda - 1)(\gamma - \varepsilon) - \varepsilon \leq \log q(y\lambda) - \log q(y) \leq y(\lambda - 1)(\gamma + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon$  for all  $y \geq y_\varepsilon$  and all  $\lambda \geq 1$ .

This implies  $\log q \in ERV_{\{1\}}$ , proving (a). For (b), note that if  $U(\infty) \in (1, \infty)$ , then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} U(t^\tau)/U(t) = 1$  for all  $\tau \geq 1$ , so  $q$  can not be in  $ERV_{\{1\}}$ . Therefore, consider the case that  $U(\infty) = \infty$ , implying  $\gamma = 0$ . Applying (2.6) with  $\iota\lambda$  for  $\tau$  and with  $\lambda$  for  $\tau$  with  $\iota > 1$  and  $\lambda > 1$  and subtracting, produces

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{w(t) \log t}{U(t)} \right) \left( \frac{U(t^{\tau\iota\lambda}) - U(t^\lambda)}{w(t^\lambda) \log t^\lambda} \left( \frac{w(t^\lambda)}{w(t)} \right) - (\iota - 1) \right) = 0. \quad (8.1)$$

Also from (2.6),  $U(t^{\iota\lambda}) - U(t^\lambda) = (\iota - 1)w(t^\lambda) \log t^\lambda + o(U(t^\lambda))$ , so inserting this into (8.1) and simplifying, we obtain for all  $\lambda \geq 1$ ,

$$\frac{w(t^\lambda)}{w(t)} = 1 + o\left(\frac{U(t)}{w(t) \log t} \vee 1\right) \quad (8.2)$$

and by substituting  $x^{1/\lambda}$  for  $t$  in (8.2) and multiplying by  $w(x^{1/\lambda})/w(x)$ , (8.2) is seen to hold for all  $\lambda > 0$ . Therefore, (2.6) holds also for all  $\tau > 0$ , *i.e.*,

$$U(t^\tau) - U(t) = (\tau - 1)w(t) \log t + o(U(t)) \quad \forall \tau > 0. \quad (8.3)$$

From [4] (Theorem 3.6.6) and (1.2) with  $\varphi = \log$ ,  $U(t) = \int_{x=T}^t (1+u(x))w(x)x^{-1}dx + c + o(w(t))$  for all  $t \geq T$  and some constants  $T \in (1, \infty)$  and  $c$ , with  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} u(x) = 0$  and  $T$  large enough that  $w$  is locally bounded and  $1 + u$  is positive on  $[T, \infty)$ . With  $H$  the unit step function, therefore,

$$\frac{U(t)}{w(t) \log t} = \int_{\lambda=0}^1 (1 + u(t^\lambda)) \frac{w(t^\lambda)}{w(t)} H(t^\lambda - T) d\lambda + \frac{c}{w(t) \log t} + o(1/\log t) \quad (8.4)$$

Suppose that for some sequence  $(t_n \in [T, \infty))$  increasing to  $\infty$  and some  $M > 0$ ,  $U(t_i)/(w(t_i) \log t_i) \leq M$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $U(\infty) = \infty$ ,  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} w(t_i) \log t_i = \infty$ , so choosing  $t_1$  large enough, the integral in (8.4) is bounded by  $2M$  for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . By (8.2), the nonnegative integrand in (8.4) at  $t = t_i$  converges for every  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$  to 1 as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, by a theorem due to Fatou in [18] (Section 30.1, Theorem 3), the integral converges to 1 as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , so  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} U(t_i)/(w(t_i) \log t_i) = 1$  and by (8.3),  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} U(t_i^\tau)/U(t_i) = \tau$  for every  $\tau > 0$ . On the other hand, if  $U(z_i)/(w(z_i) \log z_i)$  tends to  $\infty$  for some sequence  $(z_n \in [T, \infty))$  increasing to  $\infty$ , then by (8.3),  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} U(z_i^\tau)/U(z_i) = 1$  for every  $\tau > 0$ . Suppose that  $(t_n)$  and  $(z_n)$  as above both exist. Replacing them by subsequences such that  $t_i < z_i < t_{i+1}$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , necessarily  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \log z_i / \log t_i = \infty$  and  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \log t_{i+1} / \log z_i = \infty$ . Therefore, there must be a sequence  $(x_n \in [T, \infty))$  increasing to  $\infty$  such that for some  $\tau > 1$ ,  $U(x_i^\tau)/U(x_i)$  has neither  $\tau$  nor 1 as a limit point as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . However, since  $(x_n)$  contains a subsequence for which  $U(x_i)/(w(x_i) \log x_i)$  is either bounded or tends to  $\infty$ ,  $U(x_i^\tau)/U(x_i)$  must have a limit point in  $\{1, \tau\}$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore,  $(t_n)$  and  $(z_n)$  cannot coexist, so either  $q \in RV_{\{1\}} = ERV_{\{1\}}$ , or  $q \in RV_{\{0\}}$ , proving (b).  $\square$

## 8.2 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof* Suppose that  $U \in ERV_{\{\gamma\}}$  with  $\gamma > 0$ , then as in Subsection 8.1, there is for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, \gamma \wedge 1)$  a  $y_\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $y(\lambda - 1)(\gamma - \varepsilon) - \varepsilon \leq \log(q(y\lambda)/q(y)) \leq$

$y(\lambda - 1)(\gamma + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon$  for all  $y \geq y_\varepsilon$  and all  $\lambda \geq 1$ , and therefore, fixing  $\iota > 1$  and  $\xi > \iota$ , there is some  $\varepsilon \in (0, \gamma(\xi - \iota)/(\xi + \iota - 2) \wedge 1)$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and  $z_\varepsilon \geq y_\varepsilon$  such that

$$\frac{q(y\xi) - q(y)}{q(y\iota) - q(y)} \geq \frac{e^{y(\xi-1)(\gamma-\varepsilon)}(1-\varepsilon) - 1}{e^{y(\iota-1)(\gamma+\varepsilon)}(1+\varepsilon) - 1} \geq \exp(\delta y) \quad \forall y \geq z_\varepsilon. \quad (8.5)$$

However, since  $q \in ERV$ , the left-hand side of (8.5) must tend to  $h_\rho(\xi)/h_\rho(\iota) < \infty$  for some real  $\rho$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ , so  $\gamma$  cannot exceed 0. Assuming that  $\gamma < 0$ , a similar argument leads to a similar contradiction, completing the proof of (a).

For (b), if  $q \in ERV_{\{\rho\}}$  with  $\rho > 0$ , then  $q \in R_{\{\rho\}}$  so  $\log q \in ERV_{\{0\}}$ . If  $q \in ERV_{\{\rho\}}$  with  $\rho \leq 0$ , then  $g(y)/q(y) \rightarrow 0$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$  in (2.7), so for every  $\lambda > 0$ , with  $f := g/q$ ,

$$\frac{\log q(y\lambda) - \log q(y)}{f(y)} = \frac{\log(1 + g^\lambda(y)(h_\rho(\lambda) + o(1)))}{f(y)} = h_\rho(\lambda) + o(1), \quad (8.6)$$

so  $\log q \in ERV_{\{\rho\}}$  (cf. the proof of (B.3.43) in [8]). Taking  $\rho < 0$ , this also proves the ‘‘only if’’ part of (c), and since in this case  $f(y) \rightarrow 0$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$  on the left-hand side of (8.6),  $q(y\lambda)/q(y) - 1 \sim \log q(y\lambda) - \log q(y)$  for all  $\lambda > 0$ , proving the ‘‘if’’ part.

For (d), if  $U \in ERV$  then by (b),  $\log U \in ERV$  so since  $\log q \in ERV$ , (a) implies  $\log U \in ERV_{\{0\}}$ . Since  $U \in ERV$  and  $\log q \in ERV$ , Proposition 1(a) implies that either  $U \in ERV_{(0,\infty)}$  and  $\log q \in ERV_{\{1\}}$ , or  $U \in ERV_{(-\infty,0]}$ . In the latter case, since  $\log U \in ERV_{\{0\}}$ , (c) implies that  $U \in ERV_{\{0\}} \subset RV_{\{0\}}$ . Therefore, by the Potter bounds,  $\log q(y) = o(y)$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ , so again by the Potter bounds,  $\log q$  cannot be in  $RV_{(1,\infty)} = ERV_{(1,\infty)}$ .  $\square$

### 8.3 Proof of Proposition 2

*Proof* For (a), as  $q \in ERV_{\{\rho\}}(g)$  for some positive function  $g$ ,  $q(\text{Id}\xi) - q \in RV_{\{\rho\}}$  with  $\xi > 1$  as in (3.5). Therefore,  $a_\xi(y) \rightarrow \rho$ ,  $\tilde{\rho}(y) \rightarrow \rho$  and  $\tilde{g}(y) \sim (q(y\xi) - q(y))/h_\rho(\xi) \sim g(y)$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ , so  $\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(y\lambda) = q(y) + g(y)h_\rho(\lambda) + o(g(y))$  and by (2.7) with locally uniform convergence in  $\lambda > 0$  (see [4], Theorem 3.1.16),

$$\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}(y\lambda) - q(y\lambda) = o(g(y)) \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty, \quad (8.7)$$

with the  $o(g(y))$  terms vanishing locally uniformly in  $\lambda > 0$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $\rho \leq 0$ , then  $g(y)/q(y) \rightarrow 0$  and if  $\rho > 0$ , then  $g(y)/q(y) \rightarrow \rho$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ , so (8.7) implies (3.7). For (b), assuming that  $\log q \in ERV_{\{\rho\}}(g)$ , a similar argument shows that

$$\log \tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^\lambda(y\lambda) - \log q(y\lambda) = o(g(y)) \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty \quad (8.8)$$

locally uniformly in  $\lambda > 0$ , and therefore, (3.8). Suppose that in addition,  $q \in ERV_{\{\rho'\}}$  for some real  $\rho'$ . If  $\rho' > 0$ , then  $q \in RV_{\{\rho'\}}$ , so by (2.3),  $g(y) \rightarrow \rho'$ , and if  $\rho' \leq 0$ , then  $\log q \in ERV_{\{\rho'\}}(g)$  with  $g(y) \rightarrow 0$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ , as in the proof of Theorem 2(b). Therefore, by (8.8),  $\tilde{q}_{y,\tilde{\rho},\tilde{g}}^\lambda(y\lambda)/q(y\lambda) - 1 \rightarrow 0$  locally uniformly in  $\lambda > 0$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ , and since  $q \in ERV$  is of bounded increase (see [4], Section 2.1), (3.9) follows.  $\square$

## 8.4 Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof* For (a), fix  $\Lambda > 1$  and suppose that for some increasing sequence  $(y_n \rightarrow \infty)$ , sequence  $(\lambda_n \in [\Lambda^{-1}, \Lambda])$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\nu_{y_i, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}(y_i \lambda_i) \geq 2\varepsilon > 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Assume, without loss of generality, that  $\lambda_i \rightarrow \lambda_\infty \in [\Lambda^{-1}, \Lambda]$ . Then by (4.1),  $q^{-1}(\tilde{q}_{y_i, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}(y_i \lambda_i)) \geq (1 + 2\varepsilon)q^{-1}(q(y_i \lambda_i))$ , and by (2.10) (equivalent to (2.8)), eventually,

$$-y_i^{-1} \log(1 - F(\tilde{q}_{y_i, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}(y_i \lambda_i))) - (1 + \varepsilon)\lambda_\infty \geq 0. \quad (8.9)$$

By Proposition 2(a),  $\tilde{\rho}(y) \rightarrow \rho$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ , and with (3.5), we obtain  $\tilde{q}_{y_i, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}(y_i \lambda_i) = q(y) + g(y)h_\rho(\lambda_\infty) + o(g(y))$ , so by (2.10),  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} -y_i^{-1} \log(1 - F(\tilde{q}_{y_i, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}(y_i \lambda_i))) = \lambda_\infty$ . Since this contradicts (8.9),  $\varepsilon$  cannot be positive. Therefore, for all  $\Lambda > 1$ ,  $\limsup_{y \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\lambda \in [\Lambda^{-1}, \Lambda]} \nu_{y, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}(y\lambda) \leq 0$ . In a similar manner, it can be proven that  $\liminf_{y \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\lambda \in [\Lambda^{-1}, \Lambda]} \nu_{y, \tilde{\rho}, \tilde{g}}(y\lambda) \geq 0$  for all  $\Lambda > 1$ , and therefore (a) follows. The proof of (b) is analogous.  $\square$

## 8.5 Proof of Theorem 4

Define  $\hat{\iota}_m(n)$  for all  $n \geq 1$  and  $m \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  by

$$\hat{\iota}_m(n) := y_n^{-1} q^{-1}(X_{n-k_m(n)+1, n}) = -y_n^{-1} \log(1 - F(X_{n-k_m(n)+1, n})). \quad (8.10)$$

*Proof* The conditions for Lemma 1 apply, so (8.20) and (8.21) hold. Consider a sequence  $(r_n)$  satisfying that  $r_n \in (1, \iota)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $r_n \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then by (5.2), (8.10) and (8.21), almost surely there is some  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\hat{\iota}_2(n)/\hat{\iota}_1(n) \geq r_n$  and  $\hat{\iota}_1(n)/\hat{\iota}_0(n) \geq r_n$  for all  $n \geq n_0$  and using (8.20),

$$\hat{\rho}_{n, \iota}^- := \frac{\log \frac{q(y_n \hat{\iota}_2(n)) - q(y_n \hat{\iota}_1(n) r_n)}{q(y_n \hat{\iota}_1(n) r_n) - q(y_n \hat{\iota}_0(n))}}{\log \iota} \leq \hat{\rho}_{n, \iota} \quad (8.11)$$

$$\leq \frac{\log \frac{q(y_n \hat{\iota}_2(n) r_n) - q(y_n \hat{\iota}_1(n))}{q(y_n \hat{\iota}_1(n)) - q(y_n \hat{\iota}_0(n) r_n)}}{\log \iota} =: \hat{\rho}_{n, \iota}^+ \quad \forall n \geq n_0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

$$\hat{g}_{n, \iota}^- := \frac{q(y_n \hat{\iota}_1(n)) - q(y_n \hat{\iota}_0(n) r_n)}{h_{\hat{\rho}_{n, \iota}^-}(\iota)} \leq \hat{g}_{n, \iota} \quad (8.12)$$

$$\leq \frac{q(y_n \hat{\iota}_1(n) r_n) - q(y_n \hat{\iota}_0(n))}{h_{\hat{\rho}_{n, \iota}^+}(\iota)} =: \hat{g}_{n, \iota}^+ \quad \forall n \geq n_0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By (2.7) (with convergence locally uniform in  $\lambda > 0$ ; see [4], Theorem 3.1.16)) and (8.21), almost surely  $\hat{\rho}_{n, \iota}^- \rightarrow \rho$  and  $\hat{\rho}_{n, \iota}^+ \rightarrow \rho$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and by (8.11), we obtain (5.10). Similarly, almost surely  $\hat{g}_{n, \iota}^- \sim g(y_n)$  and  $\hat{g}_{n, \iota}^+ \sim g(y_n)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , so by (8.12),

$$\hat{g}_{n, \iota} \sim g(y_n) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (8.13)$$

By (5.10) and (8.13), the piecewise constant functions  $\bar{a}_\iota$  and  $\bar{g}_\iota$  defined by  $\bar{a}_\iota(y) := \hat{\rho}_{n, \iota}$  and  $\bar{g}_\iota(y) := \hat{g}_{n, \iota}$  for all  $y \in [y_n, y_{n+1})$  and all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfy almost surely that  $\bar{a}_\iota(y) \rightarrow \rho$  and  $\bar{g}_\iota(y) \sim g(y)$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, almost surely, Theorem 3(a) and Proposition 2(a) apply after substituting  $\bar{a}_\iota$  for  $\tilde{\rho}$  and  $\bar{g}_\iota$  for  $\tilde{g}$ , which by (5.8) implies (5.11) and (5.12).  $\square$

## 8.6 Proof of Theorem 5

*Proof* If  $q \in ERV_{\{\rho\}}$  for some real  $\rho$  and  $q \in \mathcal{L}$  (see (5.21)), then  $q' \in RV_{\{\rho-1\}}$  (see [4], Theorem 1.7.5 for  $\rho \neq 0$ , and [4], Theorem 3.6.10 for  $\rho = 0$ ). Therefore,  $q$  is a homeomorphism on some neighbourhood of  $\infty$ , so without loss of generality, we can take  $q$  and  $q^{-1}$  continuous, and  $X_{n-k_m(n)+1,n} = q(y_n \hat{\iota}_m(n))$  for all  $n$  and  $m \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ . Moreover,  $q' \in RV_{\{\rho-1\}}$  implies that  $q(y\lambda) - q(y) = q'(y)yh_\rho(\lambda)(1 + o(1))$  with  $o(1)$  vanishing locally uniformly for  $\lambda > 0$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ <sup>5</sup>. Therefore, with  $\hat{\iota}$  as in (8.10) and

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\iota}^m := \frac{X_{n-k_m(n)+1,n} - q(y_n \iota^m)}{q'(y_n \iota^m) y_n \iota^m},$$

using (8.21) from Lemma 1, almost surely

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\iota}^m = \frac{q(y_n \hat{\iota}_m(n)) - q(y_n \iota^m)}{q'(y_n \iota^m) y_n \iota^m} \sim h_\rho(\iota^{-m} \hat{\iota}_m(n)) \sim \iota^{-m} \hat{\iota}_m(n) - 1 \quad (8.14)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for  $m \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ , and similarly, by Theorems 3 and 4, since  $q' \in RV_{\{\rho-1\}}$ ,

$$\frac{q(y_n \lambda(1 + \hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}(y_n \lambda))) - q(y_n \lambda(1 + \nu_{y_n, a_\iota, g_\iota}(y_n \lambda)))}{q'(y_n) y_n} \sim (\hat{\nu}_{n,\iota}(y_n \lambda) - \nu_{y_n, a_\iota, g_\iota}(y_n \lambda)) \lambda^\rho \quad (8.15)$$

locally uniformly for  $\lambda > 0$ . From (3.6) and (5.2), using (8.14), (8.21),  $q \in ERV_{\{\rho\}}$  and  $q' \in RV_{\{\rho-1\}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota} - a_\iota(y_n)) \log \iota &= \log \left( 1 + \frac{\mathcal{R}_{n,\iota}^2 \frac{q'(y_n \iota^2)}{q'(y_n \iota)} - \mathcal{R}_{n,\iota}^1}{\frac{q(y_n \iota^2) - q(y_n \iota)}{y_n \iota q'(y_n \iota)}} \right) - \log \left( 1 + \frac{\mathcal{R}_{n,\iota}^1 \frac{q'(y_n \iota)}{q'(y_n)} - \mathcal{R}_{n,\iota}^0}{\frac{q(y_n \iota) - q(y_n)}{y_n q'(y_n)}} \right) \\ &= (h_\rho(\iota))^{-1} \left( \iota^\rho (\iota^{-2} \hat{\iota}_2(n) - 1)(1 + o(1)) - (\iota^{-1} \hat{\iota}_1(n) - 1)(1 + o(1)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \iota^\rho (\iota^{-1} \hat{\iota}_1(n) - 1)(1 + o(1)) + (\hat{\iota}_0(n) - 1)(1 + o(1)) \right) \quad a.s. \quad (8.16) \end{aligned}$$

Because  $1 - F(X)$  has the uniform distribution on  $(0, 1)$ , by Smirnov's lemma [20],

$$y_n (\hat{\iota}_m(n) - \iota^m) \sqrt{k_m(n)} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \quad \forall m \in \{0, 1, 2\} \quad (8.17)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, as  $k_2(n) = o(k_1(n))$  and  $k_1(n) = o(k_0(n))$ , (8.16) implies (5.23). From (5.1) and (3.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\hat{q}_{n,\iota}(y_n \lambda) - \tilde{q}_{y_n, a_\iota, g_\iota}(y_n \lambda)}{y_n q'(y_n)} &= \mathcal{R}_{n,\iota}^0 + \frac{h_{a_\iota(y_n)}(\lambda)}{h_{a_\iota(y_n)}(\iota)} \left( \mathcal{R}_{n,\iota}^1 \frac{q'(y_n \iota)}{q'(y_n)} - \mathcal{R}_{n,\iota}^0 \right) \\ &+ \left( \frac{h_{\hat{\rho}_\iota(n)}(\lambda)}{h_{\hat{\rho}_\iota(n)}(\iota)} - \frac{h_{a_\iota(y_n)}(\lambda)}{h_{a_\iota(y_n)}(\iota)} \right) \left( \frac{q(y_n \iota) - q(y_n)}{y_n q'(y_n)} + \mathcal{R}_{n,\iota}^1 \frac{q'(y_n \iota)}{q'(y_n)} - \mathcal{R}_{n,\iota}^0 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (8.18)$$

By Proposition 2(a)  $a_\iota(y_n) \rightarrow \rho$  and by Theorem 4, almost surely  $\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota} \rightarrow \rho$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , so by uniform Taylor expansion,

$$\frac{h_{\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}}(\lambda)}{h_{\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota}}(\iota)} = \frac{h_{a_\iota(y_n)}(\lambda)}{h_{a_\iota(y_n)}(\iota)} + (\kappa_\rho(\lambda, \iota) + o(1)) (\hat{\rho}_{n,\iota} - a_\iota(y_n)) \quad a.s. \quad (8.19)$$

<sup>5</sup> and therefore,  $U \in ERV_{\{0\}}$ , supplementing Theorem 2(a).

(see (5.22)), with the  $o(1)$  term vanishing locally uniformly in  $\lambda > 0$ . Therefore, from (8.18), using (8.19), (8.14), (8.17),  $q \in ERV_{\{\rho\}}$  and  $q' \in RV_{\{\rho-1\}}$ , for all  $\Lambda > 1$ ,

$$\sup_{\lambda \in [\Lambda^{-1}, \Lambda]} \left| \frac{\hat{q}_{n,\iota}(y_n \lambda) - \tilde{q}_{y_n, a_\iota, g_\iota}(y_n \lambda)}{y_n q'(y_n)} - \kappa_\rho(\lambda, \iota)(\hat{\rho}_\iota(n) - a_\iota(y_n))h_\rho(\iota) \right| y_n \sqrt{k_2(n)} \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

so by (5.23) and (5.8), (5.25) is obtained, and using (8.15) and continuity of  $q$ , we subsequently obtain (5.24).  $\square$

### 8.7 Properties of $\hat{\iota}$

**Lemma 1**  $\hat{\iota}$  defined by (8.10) with (5.5) satisfies

$$X_{n-k_m(n)+1,n} = q(y_n \hat{\iota}_m(n)) \quad \forall m \in \{0, 1, 2\}, n \in \mathbb{N} \quad a.s. \quad (8.20)$$

and if  $q \in ERV$ ,  $k_2 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  satisfies (5.7) and  $k_2(n)/\log n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\iota}_m(n) = \iota^m \quad \forall m \in \{0, 1, 2\} \quad a.s. \quad (8.21)$$

*Proof* Almost surely,  $X_{n-k+1,n} = q(-\log \mathcal{U}_{k,n})$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , with  $\mathcal{U}_{k,n}$  the  $k^{\text{th}}$  order statistic of a sample of  $n$  independent random variables uniformly distributed on  $(0, 1)$ . Therefore, by (8.10),

$$\hat{\iota}_m(n) y_n = q^{-1}(q(-\log \mathcal{U}_{k_m(n),n})) \quad \forall m \in \{0, 1, 2\}, n \in \mathbb{N} \quad a.s. \quad (8.22)$$

and (8.20) follows. For each  $m \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ ,  $k_m(n)/n \rightarrow 0$  and  $k_m(n)/\log n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , so by [14] (Theorem 3),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (n/k_m(n)) \mathcal{U}_{k_m(n),n} = 1 \quad \forall m \in \{0, 1, 2\} \quad a.s.$$

and because (5.7) implies that  $\log(n/k_m(n)) - \iota^m y_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $m \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \log \mathcal{U}_{k_m(n),n} + \iota^m y_n = 0 \quad \forall m \in \{0, 1, 2\} \quad a.s. \quad (8.23)$$

and (8.21) follows from (8.22), (8.23) and (2.10), which is equivalent to (2.8).  $\square$

**Acknowledgements** The author would like to thank an anonymous Associate Editor and two Referees of EXTREMES, John Einmahl, Laurens de Haan and Juan-Juan Cai for their helpful criticism and suggestions.

### References

1. Adams, J. and G. Atkinson, "Development of seismic hazard maps for the proposed 2005 edition of the National Building Code of Canada". *Can. J. Civ. Eng.* **30**: 255–271, (2003).
2. Asimit, A.V., D. Li, L. Peng, "Pitfalls in using Weibull tailed distributions". *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **140**(7), 2018-2024, (2010).
3. Broniatowski, M., "On the estimation of the Weibull tail coefficient", *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **35**, 349–366, (1993).
4. Bingham, N.H., C.M. Goldie, J.L. Teugels, *Regular variation*. Cambridge Univ. Press, (1987).

5. Cope, E.W., Mignolia, G., Antonini, G. & Ugocioni, R., "Challenges and pitfalls in measuring operational risk from loss data". *The Journal of Operational Risk*, **4**(4), 3-27, (2009).
6. Degen, M. and P. Embrechts, Scaling of high-quantile estimators. *J. Appl. Probab.* **48**(4), 968-983, (2011).
7. De Haan, L., "Fighting the arch-enemy with mathematics". *Stat. Neerl.*, **44**, 45-68 (1990).
8. De Haan, L. and A. Ferreira, *Extreme value theory - An introduction*. Springer, (2006).
9. De Haan, L. and H. Rootzén, "On the estimation of high quantiles". *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **35**(1), 1-13, (1993).
10. De Haan, L. and U. Stadtmüller, "Generalized regular variation of second order". *J. Austral. Math. Soc. (Ser. A)* **61**, 381-395, (1996).
11. Dekkers, A.L.M., J.H.J. Einmahl and L. De Haan, "A Moment Estimator for the Index of an Extreme-value Distribution". *The Annals of Statistics* **17**(4), 1833-1855, (1989).
12. De Valk, C.F., "Tail approximation without tail limits, with an application to high quantile estimation" (*manuscript in preparation*), (2014).
13. Drees, H., "Extreme quantile estimation for dependent data, with applications to finance". *Bernoulli* **9**(1), 617-657, (2003).
14. Einmahl, J.H.J., and D. Mason, "Strong limit theorems for weighted quantile processes". *The Annals of Probability* **16**(4), 1623-1643, (1988).
15. Gardes, L., S. Girard & A. Guillo, "Weibull tail-distributions revisited: a new look at some tail estimators", *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **141**, 429-444, (2011).
16. Hall, P., "On some simple estimates of an exponent of regular variation". *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, **44**(1), 37-42 (1982).
17. ISO, "Petroleum and natural gas industries - Specific requirements for offshore structures Part 1: Metocean design and operating considerations". *ISO/FDIS 19901-1:2005(E)*, (2005).
18. Kolmogorov, A.N. and S.V. Fomin, *Introductory real analysis*. Dover, (1975).
19. Pickands III, J., "Statistical inference using extreme order statistics". *Annals of Statistics* **3**, 119-131, (1975).
20. Smirnov, N.V., "Limit distributions for the terms of a variational series". In Russian: *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov.* **25** (1949). Translation: *Transl. Amer. Math. Soc.* **11**, 82-143, (1952).
21. Weibull, W., "A statistical distribution function of wide applicability", *ASME Journal Of Applied Mechanics* **18**, 293-297, (1951).
22. Weissman, I., "Estimation of parameters and large quantiles based on the k largest observations". *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **73**, 812-815, (1978).