

# Objective priors for the number of degrees of freedom of a multivariate $t$ distribution and the $t$ -copula

Cristiano Villa<sup>a\*</sup> and Francisco J. Rubio<sup>b\*\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> School of Mathematics, Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Kent, UK.

<sup>b</sup> London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, WC1E 7HT, UK.

\* E-mail: C.Villa-88@kent.ac.uk

\*\* E-mail: Francisco.Rubio@lshtm.ac.uk

## Abstract

We propose an objective Bayesian approach to estimate the number of degrees of freedom for the multivariate  $t$  distribution and for the  $t$ -copula, when the parameter is considered discrete. Inference on this parameter has been problematic, as the scarce literature for the multivariate  $t$  shows and, more important, the absence of any method for the  $t$ -copula. We employ an objective criterion based on loss functions which allows to overcome the issue of defining objective probabilities directly. The truncation derives from the property of both the multivariate  $t$  and the  $t$ -copula to convergence to normality for a sufficient large number of degrees of freedom. The performance of the priors is tested on simulated scenarios and on real data: daily logarithmic returns of IBM and of the Center for Research in Security Prices Database.

*Key Words: Information loss, Kullback–Leibler divergence, Log-returns, Multivariate  $t$  distribution, Objective prior,  $t$ -copula.*

## 1 Introduction

One way to model multivariate quantities is through a multivariate probability distribution and, due to its simplicity and appealing properties, the multivariate Normal distribution represents the most popular choice. However, due to the “lightness” of the tails, the Normal distribution does not properly represent the probability of occurrence of rare events. In other words, the multivariate Normal distribution is not the best choice to model data sets which contain outliers. An alternative is represented by the multivariate  $t$  distribution, whose expression is presented in Section 2; in fact, this distribution has a shape parameter (*i.e.* the number of degrees of freedom) that controls the tail behaviour allowing to capture heavier tails than those of the Normal distribution. The appropriateness of the  $t$  distribution (univariate or multivariate) to deal with outliers has been thoroughly discussed in the literature (West, 1984; Lange et al., 1989), and it has been applied in numerous contexts, such as medicine (Liu, 1994), finance and biology (Fernández and Steel, 1999), portfolio optimisation (Kotz and Nadarajah, 2004), financial engineering (Ruppert, 2011), among many others.

An alternative method for extending a distribution to the multivariate case, and model a set of variables, consists of using a copula distribution (Nelsen, 2007). The idea is to use a multivariate probability distribution (*i.e.* the *copula*), whose marginals are uniform densities on  $[0, 1]$ , to represent the dependence between the variables. The  $t$ -copula (Demarta and McNeil, 2005), which is formally presented in Section 2, represents a popular choice in applied statistics as, in comparison to the Normal copula for example, it allows for capturing a wider variety of tail dependencies between the corresponding marginal distributions (Nikoloulopoulos et al., 2009). The use of copulas has attracted great attention in financial applications (Genest et al., 2009), where the tail dependence is a common feature of many quantities, such as stock returns (Hartmann et al., 2004).

In the univariate scenario, several prior distributions have been proposed for the degrees of freedom parameter of the Student- $t$  distribution. In particular, Liu (1994) presents the expression for the Jeffreys prior (further studied in Fonseca et al., 2008) as well as other heuristic priors; Juárez and Steel (2010) proposed a proper prior with the same tail behaviour as that of the Jeffreys prior; Rubio and Steel (2015) introduce a noninformative prior based on a measure of kurtosis; while Simpson et al. (2016; in press) discuss a prior that penalises model complexity. Of particular interest for this work is the prior introduced in Villa and Walker (2014), as the prior for the number of degrees of freedom we propose is based on the result proposed by the authors. Villa and Walker (2014) discuss a discrete prior distribution which is truncated from above. The general idea is to assign a *worth* to each parameter value by objectively measuring the loss in information in removing the parameter value when it is the true one. More details about the method are discussed in Section 3.1.

In the multivariate case, little attention has been paid to the study of priors for the degrees of freedom. To the best of our knowledge, Liu (1994) represents the only reference addressing this problem. Liu (1994) presents the expression for the Jeffreys prior of the degrees of freedom, and briefly discusses some heuristic prior choices. Although  $t$ -copula models have been implemented in a Bayesian framework, the choice of the prior for the degrees of freedom has been mainly done from an informal perspective, such as the use of uniform priors on a bounded interval (Smith et al., 2012).

In this paper, we address the problem of estimating the number of degrees of freedom of the multivariate  $t$  distribution and of the  $t$ -copula. In particular, we approach the task by considering the Bayesian framework in the presence of minimal prior information. In Section 2, we describe the multivariate  $t$  distribution and the  $t$ -copula. In Section 3, we present the proposed priors and introduce weakly informative priors for the remaining parameters. In Section 4, we present a thorough simulation study where we illustrate the frequentist properties of the proposed priors. In Section 5, we present some financial applications of the proposed Bayesian models using real data. Finally, Section 6 contains some points for discussion and final remarks.

## 2 The multivariate $t$ distribution and the $t$ -copula

The  $d$ -variate  $t$  probability density function with  $\nu > 0$  degrees of freedom (see Liu, 1994 and Kotz and Nadarajah, 2004 for an extensive review of this model) is given by

$$f_d(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \nu) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+d}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right) \sqrt{(\pi\nu)^d |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|}} \left(1 + \frac{(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+d}{2}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the location (vector) parameter and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is the positive definite scale matrix. Similarly to the univariate case, the parameter  $\nu$  controls the heaviness of the tails of the density, with particular cases of  $\nu = 1$ , where the distribution coincides with a multivariate Cauchy density, and of  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ , where the distribution converges to a multivariate Normal density. As is discussed in Section 3.1, the convergence property of the multivariate  $t$  is exploited to truncate the prior on  $\nu$ . In fact, for a sufficiently large value of the number of degrees of freedom, the difference (in terms of practically any distance between probability measures) between a multivariate  $t$  and a multivariate Normal will be sufficiently small to consider all the  $t$  densities as virtually the same.

A copula, say  $C$ , is a distribution function in dimension  $d$  defined over the support  $[0, 1]^d$  with uniformly distributed marginals. As per Sklar's theorem, we can write a multivariate distribution function  $F$  with marginals  $F_1, \dots, F_d$  as

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_d) = C(F_1(x_1), \dots, F_d(x_d)),$$

for some copula  $C$ . This idea is often used to construct multivariate distributions by *joining* any set of univariate distribution functions by means of a copula  $C$  (Nelsen, 2007). In this paper, we focus on

the case where  $C$  is the  $t$ -copula and the marginal distributions,  $F_1, \dots, F_d$ , are given by univariate  $t$  densities (although our results apply to any marginal distributional assumptions). The  $t$ -copula is defined as (see Demarta and McNeil, 2005)

$$C_d^t(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{R}, \nu) = \int_{-\infty}^{t_\nu^{-1}(u_1)} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{t_\nu^{-1}(u_d)} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+d}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right) \sqrt{(\pi\nu)^d |\mathbf{R}|}} \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{x}}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+d}{2}} d\mathbf{x}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_d) \in [0, 1]^d$ ,  $\mathbf{R}$  is a correlation matrix, and  $t_\nu^{-1}$  denotes the quantile function associated to a Student- $t$  variate with  $\nu > 0$  degrees of freedom. The corresponding density function is given by (Demarta and McNeil, 2005)

$$c_d^t(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{R}, \nu) = \frac{f_d(t_\nu^{-1}(u_1), \dots, t_\nu^{-1}(u_d)|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{R}, \nu)}{\prod_{j=1}^d f_1(t_\nu^{-1}(u_j))}. \quad (3)$$

**Remark 1** Analogously to the multivariate  $t$  distribution, the  $t$ -copula converges to the Normal copula for increasing values of the number of degrees of freedom. That is,  $C_{\nu,d}^t \rightarrow C_d^N$  for  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ .

### 3 Prior distributions and inference

The inference on the parameters of the distributions, that is the multivariate  $t$  and the  $t$ -copula, is performed with a Bayesian approach. Thus, for the multivariate  $t$  we adopt the prior structure

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \nu) = \pi(\nu|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), \quad (4)$$

while for the  $t$ -copula, we have

$$\pi(\nu, \mathbf{R}) = \pi(\nu|\mathbf{R})\pi(\mathbf{R}). \quad (5)$$

As the aim of this paper is to outline an objective approach, we work under the assumptions that little or no information about any parameter is known. Hence, priors  $\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$  and  $\pi(\mathbf{R})$  are chosen to be minimally informative.

#### 3.1 Objective prior for $\nu$

In this section we present the proposed objective priors for the number of degrees of freedom for the multivariate  $t$  and the  $t$ -copula. As mentioned in Section 1, the literature related to the above problem is scarce. In particular, the here proposed objective prior for the  $t$ -copula case is, to the best of our knowledge, the sole available. For what it concerns the multivariate  $t$ , there are fundamentally three options (Liu, 1994). Anscombe (1967) proposed a prior of the form  $\pi(\nu) \propto (\nu + 1)^{-3/2}$ , for  $\nu \geq 1$ . Jeffreys prior, obtained by applying the Jeffreys rule (Jeffreys, 1957), has the following form

$$\pi(\nu) \propto \left\{ \psi\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{\nu+d}{2}\right) - \frac{2d(\nu+d+4)}{\nu(\nu+d)(\nu+d+2)} \right\}^{1/2},$$

where  $d$  is the dimension of the multivariate density,  $\psi(x) = d^2 / \{d^2 \log \Gamma(x)\}$  is the trigamma function, and  $\Gamma(\cdot)$  is the Gamma function. Finally, the third objective prior we consider is discussed in Relles and Rogers (1977), and it has the form  $\pi(\nu) \propto \nu^{-2}$ , for  $\nu \geq 1$ . For the simulation study presented in Section 4 we will compare the loss-based prior we propose in this paper with the above three options.

The principle to derive the objective prior for the number of degrees of freedom is the same for both the multivariate  $t$  and the  $t$ -copula. In particular, we will apply the criterion based on loss in information introduced in Villa and Walker (2015).

We make two important assumptions about the parameter space for the number of degrees of freedom  $\nu$ . First,  $\nu$  can only take positive integer values and, second, the parameter space is truncated at a value  $\nu_{\max}$ , which typically is 30. The first assumption originates from the fact that it is unlikely to have a sufficient number of observations which would allow to discern between (univariate or multivariate)  $t$  distributions with a difference in the number of degrees of freedom smaller than one (Jacquier et al., 2004). In support of the above assumption, we can see in Table 1 that the Kullback–Leibler divergence between distributions with discrete consecutive  $\nu$ , for dimensions  $d = 1, 2, 3$ , gets small already for  $\nu > 5$ . The second assumption is based on the property of the  $t$  density, for any dimension, to converge to a Normal density for  $\nu \rightarrow +\infty$ , of the same dimension. Although this is an approximation, and as such, devoid of an unequivocal value, it is common practice to consider the approximation as satisfactory for  $\nu \approx 30$ ; see, for example, Chu (1956). The property applies to the  $t$ -copula as well (Embrechts et al., 2001). As such, on the basis of the above two assumptions, we consider the parameter space for  $\nu$  discrete and truncated at  $\nu_{\max} = 30$ , where the model identified by  $\nu_{\max}$  will represent the multivariate Normal distribution or the Normal (*i.e.* Gaussian) copula. A thorough discussion on the motivations leading to a discrete and truncated parameter space for the number of degrees of freedom can be found in Villa and Walker (2014); although the discussion made by the authors refers to the univariate  $t$  density, the conclusions can be sensibly extended to the multivariate case.

The key idea is to assign a *worth* to each model identified by a value of  $\nu$ , by objectively measuring what is lost if that specific model is removed (*i.e.* not considered), and it is the true model. In Bayesian analysis, it is well known that, if a model is misspecified, the posterior will asymptotically accumulate on the model which happens to be the most similar to the true one, where the similarity is “measured” through the Kullback–Leibler divergence (Berk, 1966). In other words, the Kullback–Leibler divergence between the model identified by a  $\nu$  and the nearest one represents the loss in information one would incur in not considering that specific model (assumed to be the true one).

The prior distribution on the number of degrees of freedom is then constructed by linking the above loss to  $\pi(\nu)$  by means of the self-information loss function. This particular kind of loss function measures the loss in information intrinsic to a probability statement. That is, if  $P(A)$  is the probability that event  $A$  is true, then  $-\log P(A)$  is the self-information loss of  $P(A)$ . Therefore, if  $f(\cdot|\nu)$  represents a sampling distribution with parameter value  $\nu$ , we equate the two measures of the loss in information at  $\nu$ , obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} -\log \pi(\nu) &= -D_{KL}\left(f(\cdot|\nu)\|f(\cdot|\nu')\right), \\ \pi(\nu) &\propto \exp\left\{\min_{\nu' \neq \nu} D_{KL}\left(f(\cdot|\nu)\|f(\cdot|\nu')\right)\right\} - 1, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the “ $-1$ ” results from the process of bringing the two loss measures on the same scale (see Villa and Walker, 2015, equation (3), for a thorough discussion). In detail, let us set  $u_1(\nu) = \log \pi(\nu)$  and let the minimum divergence from  $\nu$  be represented by  $u_2(\nu)$ . We want  $u_1(\nu)$  and  $u_2(\nu)$  to be matching utility functions; though as it stands  $-\infty < u_1 \leq 0$  and  $0 \leq u_2 < \infty$ , and we want  $u_1 = -\infty$  when  $u_2 = 0$ . The scales are matched by taking exponential transformations; so  $\exp(u_1)$  and  $\exp(u_2) - 1$  are on the same scale. Hence, we have

$$e^{u_1(\nu)} = \pi(\nu) \propto e^{g\{u_2(\nu)\}}. \quad (7)$$

By setting  $g(u) = \log(e^u - 1)$  in (7), we derive (6). The next two sections will detail the derivation of the prior for, respectively, the multivariate  $t$  distribution and the  $t$ -copula.

### 3.1.1 Multivariate $t$

Let  $f_d(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \nu)$  be a multivariate  $t$ , of dimension  $d$ , with location vector  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ , scale matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  and  $\nu$  degrees of freedom. The aim is to define an objective prior for the parameter  $\nu$ . For simplicity in the

notation, we will write  $f_{d,\nu} = f_d(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \nu)$ , for  $\nu = 1, \dots, \nu_{\max} - 1$ , and  $f_{d,\nu_{\max}} = N_d(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ , with

$$N_d(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^d |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) \right\},$$

where in this case  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  is the vector of means and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  is the covariance matrix. The prior for  $\nu$  here discussed depends on the Kullback–Leibler divergence between two multivariate densities. In particular, for  $\nu = 1, \dots, \nu_{\max} - 1$ , the prior is based on the Kullback–Leibler divergence between two multivariate  $t$  densities which differ only on the number of degrees of freedom. The divergence between two  $d$ -variate  $t$  densities,  $f_{d,\nu}$  and  $f_{d,\nu'}$ , is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_{KL}(f_d(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \nu) || f_d(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \nu')) &= D_{KL}(f_d(\cdot|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}, \nu) || f_d(\cdot|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}, \nu')) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_d(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}, \nu) \log \frac{f_d(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}, \nu)}{f_d(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}, \nu')} d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} K(d, \nu) \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+d}{2}} \log \frac{K(d, \nu) \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+d}{2}}}{K(d, \nu') \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}}{\nu'}\right)^{-\frac{\nu'+d}{2}}} d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \log \frac{K(d, \nu)}{K(d, \nu')} - \frac{\nu+d}{2} \mathbb{E}_{d,\nu} \left[ \log \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}}{\nu}\right) \right] + \frac{\nu'+d}{2} \mathbb{E}_{d,\nu} \left[ \log \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}}{\nu'}\right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$K(d, \nu) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+d}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right) \sqrt{(\pi\nu)^d}},$$

and  $\mathbb{E}_{d,\nu}$  represents the expected value with respect to  $f_d(\cdot|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}, \nu)$ . Table 1 shows the KL divergences for  $\nu = 1, \dots, 30$ . These values are obtained using quadrature integration in Mathematica 9.0. As one would expect, the minimum divergence from  $f_{d,\nu}$  will either be  $f_{d,\nu-1}$  or  $f_{d,\nu+1}$ , as this generates the smallest perturbation in the density yielding a relatively similar distribution. For  $\nu = \nu_{\max}$ , the minimum Kullback–Leibler divergence is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_{KL}(N_d(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}) || f_d(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}, \nu_{\max-1})) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} N_d(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}) \log \left\{ \frac{N_d(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})}{f_d(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}, \nu_{\max-1})} \right\} d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \log \left\{ \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} K(\nu_{\max-1}, d)} \right\} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I} \\ &\quad + \frac{\nu_{\max-1} + d}{2} \mathbb{E}_d \left\{ \log \left(1 + \frac{\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x}}{\nu_{\max-1}}\right) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where we have used that  $D_{KL}(N_d(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) || f_d(\cdot|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \nu)) = D_{KL}(N_d(\cdot|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}) || f_d(\cdot|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}, \nu))$ . As anticipated, from Table 1 we see that the Kullback–Leibler divergence becomes very small already for moderate values of  $\nu$ . Furthermore, we note that the nearest density to  $f_{d,\nu}$  is always  $f_{d,\nu+1}$ . Thus, by applying the result in (6), we have the prior for  $\nu$ , given  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ , as

$$\pi(\nu|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \propto \exp \{D_{KL}(f_{d,\nu} || f_{d,\nu+1})\} - 1, \quad (9)$$

for  $\nu = 1, \dots, \nu_{\max}$ , and

$$\pi(\nu|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \propto \exp \{D_{KL}(N_d || f_{d,\nu_{\max-1}})\} - 1, \quad (10)$$

for  $\nu = \nu_{\max}$ . Figure 1 shows the induced priors.

$\nu$	$d = 1$		$d = 2$		$d = 3$	
	$D_{KL}(f_\nu \  f_{\nu-1})$	$D_{KL}(f_\nu \  f_{\nu+1})$	$D_{KL}(f_\nu \  f_{\nu-1})$	$D_{KL}(f_\nu \  f_{\nu+1})$	$D_{KL}(f_\nu \  f_{\nu-1})$	$D_{KL}(f_\nu \  f_{\nu+1})$
1	–	$1.131 \times 10^{-1}$	–	$1.416 \times 10^{-1}$	–	$1.552 \times 10^{-1}$
2	$6.210 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.917 \times 10^{-2}$	$7.944 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.733 \times 10^{-2}$	$8.851 \times 10^{-2}$	$3.208 \times 10^{-2}$
3	$1.364 \times 10^{-2}$	$5.897 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.956 \times 10^{-2}$	$9.139 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.313 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.129 \times 10^{-2}$
4	$4.700 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.412 \times 10^{-3}$	$7.283 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.961 \times 10^{-3}$	$9.021 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.087 \times 10^{-3}$
5	$2.047 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.170 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.353 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.005 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.307 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.654 \times 10^{-3}$
6	$1.033 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.364 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.764 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.127 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.332 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.529 \times 10^{-3}$
7	$5.768 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.761 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.018 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.838 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.378 \times 10^{-3}$	$9.459 \times 10^{-4}$
8	$3.473 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.366 \times 10^{-4}$	$6.289 \times 10^{-4}$	$4.394 \times 10^{-4}$	$8.680 \times 10^{-4}$	$6.179 \times 10^{-4}$
9	$2.215 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.563 \times 10^{-4}$	$4.097 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.955 \times 10^{-4}$	$5.749 \times 10^{-4}$	$4.213 \times 10^{-4}$
10	$1.479 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.075 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.785 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.061 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.962 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.975 \times 10^{-4}$
11	$1.025 \times 10^{-4}$	$7.632 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.959 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.483 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.821 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.162 \times 10^{-4}$
12	$7.326 \times 10^{-5}$	$5.570 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.419 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.094 \times 10^{-4}$	$2.064 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.610 \times 10^{-4}$
13	$5.375 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.161 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.052 \times 10^{-4}$	$8.252 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.546 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.224 \times 10^{-4}$
14	$4.033 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.172 \times 10^{-5}$	$7.973 \times 10^{-5}$	$6.342 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.180 \times 10^{-4}$	$9.475 \times 10^{-5}$
15	$3.084 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.460 \times 10^{-5}$	$6.151 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.956 \times 10^{-5}$	$9.173 \times 10^{-5}$	$7.451 \times 10^{-5}$
16	$2.399 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.937 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.821 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.929 \times 10^{-5}$	$7.237 \times 10^{-5}$	$5.941 \times 10^{-5}$
17	$1.894 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.546 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.833 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.155 \times 10^{-5}$	$5.786 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.796 \times 10^{-5}$
18	$1.515 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.250 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.085 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.563 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.682 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.915 \times 10^{-5}$
19	$1.227 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.021 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.511 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.104 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.830 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.227 \times 10^{-5}$
20	$1.004 \times 10^{-5}$	$8.420 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.065 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.743 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.163 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.685 \times 10^{-5}$
21	$8.291 \times 10^{-6}$	$7.007 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.714 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.457 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.636 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.252 \times 10^{-5}$
22	$6.909 \times 10^{-6}$	$5.879 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.434 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.227 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.214 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.903 \times 10^{-5}$
23	$5.803 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.969 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.209 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.041 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.873 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.619 \times 10^{-5}$
24	$4.910 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.229 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.027 \times 10^{-5}$	$8.886 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.595 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.386 \times 10^{-5}$
25	$4.182 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.622 \times 10^{-6}$	$8.775 \times 10^{-6}$	$7.633 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.367 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.194 \times 10^{-5}$
26	$3.584 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.120 \times 10^{-6}$	$7.544 \times 10^{-6}$	$6.593 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.179 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.034 \times 10^{-5}$
27	$3.089 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.702 \times 10^{-6}$	$6.521 \times 10^{-6}$	$5.725 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.022 \times 10^{-5}$	$8.999 \times 10^{-6}$
28	$2.677 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.352 \times 10^{-6}$	$5.666 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.995 \times 10^{-6}$	$8.899 \times 10^{-6}$	$7.869 \times 10^{-6}$
29	$2.332 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.056 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.947 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.378 \times 10^{-6}$	$7.786 \times 10^{-6}$	$6.911 \times 10^{-6}$
30	$2.040 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.806 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.338 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.853 \times 10^{-6}$	$6.843 \times 10^{-6}$	$6.095 \times 10^{-6}$

Table 1: Comparison of the Kullback–Leibler divergence for contiguous  $\nu$  values in dimension  $d = 1, 2, 3$ . For simplicity in the notation, we have written  $f_{d,\nu}$  as  $f_\nu$ .

### 3.1.2 $t$ -Copula

The Kullback–Leibler divergence between two  $d$ -variate  $t$ -copulas,  $c_d(\cdot|\nu, \mathbf{R})$  and  $c_d(\cdot|\nu', \mathbf{R})$ , is given by

$$D_{KL}(c_d(\cdot|\nu, \mathbf{R}) \| c_d(\cdot|\nu', \mathbf{R})) = \int_{[0,1]^d} c_d(\mathbf{u}|\nu, \mathbf{R}) \log \frac{c_d(\mathbf{u}|\nu, \mathbf{R})}{c_d(\mathbf{u}|\nu', \mathbf{R})} d\mathbf{u}. \quad (11)$$

This divergence depends on the degrees of freedom  $\nu$  and  $\nu'$  as well as on the correlation matrix  $\mathbf{R}$ .

Our aim is to construct a prior for  $(\nu, \mathbf{R})$  by using the decomposition  $\pi(\nu, \mathbf{R}) = \pi(\nu|\mathbf{R})\pi(\mathbf{R})$ . The prior  $\pi(\nu|\mathbf{R})$  will be obtained as in the Multivariate  $t$  case (*i.e.* applying the result in (6)), for each value of the correlation matrix  $\mathbf{R}$ , while for the prior  $\pi(\mathbf{R})$  we employ independent Beta(1/2, 1/2) priors for each of the entries of this matrix. For a more extensive discussion on the choice of priors for correlation parameters, we refer the reader to Smith (2013).

Each time we evaluate the log-posterior, we need to calculate the prior  $\pi(\nu|\mathbf{R})$ , which requires the calculation of the  $\nu_{\max}$  Kullback–Leibler divergences. In order to have a tractable approximation in the bivariate case, we propose discretising the range of values of  $\rho \in (-1, 1)$  into intervals of size 0.05:  $(-1, -0.975) \cup (-0.975, -0.925) \cup \dots \cup (0.925, 0.975) \cup (0.975, 1)$ . We have checked the variability of the Kullback–Leibler divergences within these intervals and found that this step-size produces an




Figure 1: Loss-based prior for the multivariate  $t$ ,  $\pi(\nu|\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ : (a)  $d = 1$ ; (b)  $d = 2$ ; (c)  $d = 3$ .

accurate approximation to the prior using either endpoints. Note that this discretisation only relates to the conditional prior  $\pi(\nu|\mathbf{R})$ , while there is no approximation on the marginal prior  $\pi(\mathbf{R})$ .

We approximate the Kullback-Liebler divergences using a Monte Carlo approximation to (11):

$$D_{KL}(c_d(\cdot|\nu, \mathbf{R})||c_d(\cdot|\nu', \mathbf{R})) \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \log \frac{c_d(\mathbf{u}_j|\nu, \mathbf{R})}{c_d(\mathbf{u}_j|\nu', \mathbf{R})},$$

where  $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_N$  are  $d$ -variate samples from  $c_d(\cdot|\nu, \mathbf{R})$ . Figure 2 shows the priors obtained for four choices of  $\rho$  in the bivariate case ( $d = 2$ ) using  $N = 10^7$  Monte Carlo simulations (the large number of simulations is chosen to improve accuracy). The figure indicates that the conditional value of  $\rho$  has negligible influence on the shape of the prior. Thus, in our examples we restrict to  $\rho = 0$ , which greatly simplifies sampling from the posterior distribution. A second approach for approximating the Kullback-Liebler divergences consist of using importance sampling. As the importance function we can employ the copula with the smallest degrees of freedom  $\min\{\nu, \nu'\}$ , which implies heavier tails as desired. We employ the latter method, with  $N = 5 \times 10^7$  Monte Carlo simulations, to approximate the prior probabilities for the 2-variate  $t$ -copula with  $\rho = 0$ . Table 2 shows the values of this prior for  $\nu = 1, \dots, 30$ .

### 3.2 Prior distributions for the parameters different from $\nu$

For the multivariate  $t$  distribution, as prior on the location vector and the scale matrix, as in (4), we use the independence-Jeffreys prior

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = \frac{1}{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^{3/2}}.$$




Figure 2:  $\pi(\nu|\rho)$ : (a)  $\rho = 0$ ; (b)  $\rho = 0.25$ ; (c)  $\rho = 0.5$ ; (d)  $\rho = 0.75$ .

Refer to Theorem 1 in Fernández and Steel (1999) to a proof of the property of the corresponding posterior for the parameters.

The  $t$ -copula illustrations are limited to the bivariate case, both in the simulation study and in the real data analysis. As such, the prior in (5) becomes

$$\pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \nu_1, \nu_2, \nu, \rho) = \pi(\mu_1)\pi(\mu_2)\pi(\sigma_1)\pi(\sigma_2)\pi(\nu_1)\pi(\nu_2)\pi(\nu, \rho).$$

The minimally informative priors for the location parameters of the marginal  $t$  densities are Normal distributions with zero mean and standard deviation 100. That is,  $\pi(\mu_j) \sim N(0, 100^2)$ , for  $j = 1, 2$ . To reflect vague prior information, we choose Cauchy densities for the scale parameters  $\pi(\sigma_j)$  (Rubio and Steel, 2015). The prior distributions for the number of degrees of freedom of the marginal densities,  $\pi(\nu_j)$ , are based on losses and correspond to the one derived in Villa and Walker (2014). The joint prior  $\pi(\nu, \rho)$  is decomposed as  $\pi(\nu|\rho)\pi(\rho)$ , where  $\pi(\nu|\rho)$  is the prior defined in Section 3.1.2, and  $\pi(\rho)$  is a Beta density on  $(1 + \rho)/2$  with parameters  $(1/2, 1/2)$ .

### 3.3 Posterior distribution

The joint posterior distributions for all parameters are

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \nu|\mathbf{x}) \propto L_d^t(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \nu|\mathbf{x})\pi(\nu|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}),$$

and

$$\pi(\nu, \mathbf{R}|\mathbf{x}) \propto L_d^c(\nu, \mathbf{R}|\mathbf{x})\pi(\nu|\mathbf{R})\pi(\mathbf{R}),$$

where  $L_d^t$  and  $L_d^c$  are the likelihood functions for, respectively, the multivariate  $t$  model and the  $t$ -copula model. In both cases, the posterior distributions are analytically intractable and have to be approximated by using Monte Carlo methods. In particular, a Metropolis–Hastings within Gibbs sampling.



$\nu$	1	2	3	4	5	6
Prob.	0.804	0.129	0.0368	0.014	0.007	0.004
$\nu$	7	8	9	10	11	12
Prob.	0.002	$1.28 \times 10^{-3}$	$8.05 \times 10^{-4}$	$5.33 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.58 \times 10^{-4}$	$3.05 \times 10^{-4}$
$\nu$	13	14	15	16	17	18
Prob.	$2.06 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.60 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.30 \times 10^{-4}$	$9.52 \times 10^{-5}$	$6.79 \times 10^{-5}$	$6.04 \times 10^{-5}$
$\nu$	19	20	21	22	23	24
Prob.	$4.55 \times 10^{-5}$	$3.44 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.19 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.39 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.06 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.31 \times 10^{-5}$
$\nu$	25	26	27	28	29	30
Prob.	$1.81 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.91 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.28 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.05 \times 10^{-5}$	$7.85 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.78 \times 10^{-6}$

Table 2: Loss-based prior  $\pi(\nu|\rho = 0)$  for the bivariate  $t$ -copula.

## 4 Simulation Study

In this section we present the results of the simulation studies performed for the multivariate  $t$  distribution and for the  $t$  copula. In particular, we analyse the frequentist performances of the respective yielded posterior distributions, focussing on the coverage on the 95% posterior credible interval and on the relative square-rooted mean squared error (MSE) from the posterior median.

### 4.1 Multivariate $t$

The loss-based prior for the number of degrees of freedom of a multivariate  $t$  density has been thoroughly studied by computing the frequentist performances of the yielded posterior. The simulation study includes a comparison of the proposed objective prior with the three options available in literature, introduced in Section 3.1. Namely, the Anscombe prior, the Jeffreys prior and the Relles & Rogers prior. Simulations from the posterior distribution associated to the proposed loss-based priors are obtained using a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm in which continuous parameters are sampled using a Random Walk Metropolis with Normal proposals, while the discrete parameter (the degrees of freedom) is sampled directly using the corresponding posterior probabilities in each iteration (formally, a block Metropolis within Gibbs sampler). For the alternative priors, simulations from the posterior distributions are obtained using the t-walk algorithm (Christen and Fox, 2010). In all the simulation scenarios,  $N = 500$  posterior samples are obtained using a burn-in period of 1000 iterations, and a thinning period of 10 iterations (6000 iterations in total).

The study consisted in replicating 250 times the derivation of the posterior distribution for  $\nu$ , under different initial choices, and computing the coverage of the 95% credible interval and the MSE from the median. This has been performed by considering the proposed prior and the three objective alternatives available in the literature. We have considered multivariate  $t$  densities of dimension  $d = 2$  and  $d = 3$ , with zero mean for each component and covariance matrix equal to the identity matrix, so to reflect unit scale for each component and linear independence. The generated samples are of size  $n = 50$ ,  $n = 100$  and  $n = 250$ , so to consider scenarios with little information from the data as well as with large information. The prior for  $(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$  is the independence-Jeffreys (see Section 3.2).

Figure 3 shows the results for  $d = 2$ , where we have the coverage (left column) and the MSE (right column) for the three sample sizes considered. The Anscombe prior appears to have the overall worst performance. In particular, the MSE, with the exception of the very low end of the parameter space, is always above the MSE obtained by employing any of the other priors. Also, for large values of  $\nu$ , the sample size appears to have little effect. As expected, the Jeffreys prior and the Relles & Roger prior have similar performance, in particular for relatively large values of the number of degrees of freedom. The proposed prior, in terms of MSE, appears to be the most influenced by the data, *i.e.* the sample size. In fact, the value in its higher region noticeably decreases as  $n$  increases. Furthermore, it has the best performance for relatively large values of  $\nu$ . If we consider the coverage, we note similar frequentist

performances of the four priors for relatively small values of  $\nu$ . Both Anscombe prior and the loss-based prior tend to 100% as  $\nu$  approaches 20, while the remaining two priors appear to “under-cover” the credible interval. This is more prominent for  $n = 50$  and for  $n = 100$ . The simulation results for the




Figure 3: Frequentist analysis of the multivariate  $t$  of dimension  $d = 2$ : (a)-(b) Coverage and MSE for  $n = 50$ ; (c)-(d) Coverage and MSE for  $n = 100$ ; (e)-(f) Coverage and MSE for  $n = 250$ . We have considered four prior distributions for  $\nu$ : Anscombe prior (black continuous), Jeffreys prior (red dashed), Relles & Rogers prior (green dotted) and the loss-based prior (blue dashed-dotted).

case  $d = 3$  are presented in Figure 4. We note that the Anscombe prior is affected by the increase in the dimensionality of the  $t$  distribution, in particular for small sample sizes. Although in a more confined way, both Jeffreys and Relles & Rogers prior are affected as well. The increase in  $d$  appears not to have any appreciable effect on the proposed loss-based prior. For what it concerns the coverage, the only noticeable difference from the case  $d = 2$  is in the tendency of the Anscombe prior to lie below the nominal value of 95%, for any sample size. An interesting aspect to highlight is the “bumpiness” of the




Figure 4: Frequentist analysis of the multivariate  $t$  of dimension  $d = 3$ : (a)-(b) Coverage and MSE for  $n = 50$ ; (c)-(d) Coverage and MSE for  $n = 100$ ; (e)-(f) Coverage and MSE for  $n = 250$ . We have considered four prior distributions for  $\nu$ : Anscombe prior (black continuous), Jeffreys prior (red dashed), Relles & Rogers prior (green dotted) and the loss-based prior (blue dashed-dotted).

MSE for the three priors we compare the loss-based to. This is particularly prominent for the Anscombe prior. The reason of the behaviour can be sought in the difficulty in sampling from models where heavy-tailed distributions are combined to heavy-tailed priors (Jarner and Roberts, 2007). Due to the truncated nature of the loss-based prior, which exhibits a relatively light tail, the effect is not noticeable, making it a good candidate to be used in the absence of sufficient prior information about the true number of degrees of freedom.

## 4.2 $t$ -copula

For the  $t$ -copula we have considered the following simulation scenarios. The sample sizes were  $n = 50$ ,  $n = 100$  and  $n = 250$ , while for the correlation coefficient we have chosen  $\rho = 0.25$ ,  $\rho = 0.50$  and  $\rho = 0.75$ . We have limited our study to the bivariate case, *i.e.*  $d = 2$ , as the extension to any dimension is straightforward (see also Section 6). For the marginals, without loss of generality, we have chosen equal location and scale parameters, that is  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0$ ,  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 1$ , and  $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 3$ . For the priors on the parameters other than  $\nu$ , as discussed in Section 3.2, we have chosen minimally informative priors. Samples from the posterior distributions are obtained using a MCMC algorithm where continuous parameters are sampled using a Random Walk Metropolis with Normal proposals, while the discrete parameters (the degrees of freedom of the copula and the degrees of freedom of the marginals) are sampled directly using the corresponding posterior probabilities in each iteration. In all the simulation scenarios,  $N = 500$  posterior samples are obtained using a burn-in period of 1000 iterations, and a thinning period of 10 iterations (6000 iterations in total).

We have then generated 250 *i.i.d.* samples for  $\nu = 1, \dots, 20$  for each scenario. The results obtained by applying the prior for  $\nu$  described in Section 3.1.2, are summarised in Figure 5. In particular, we note the following. The effect of  $\rho$  appears to be minimal, appreciable only in the MSE for  $n = 50$  and for a number of degrees of freedom between  $\nu = 3$  and  $\nu = 5$ . As one would expect, the larger the sample size the higher is the accuracy of the estimate; feature noticeable by inspecting the MSE curves. For what it concerns the coverage, the performance of the loss-based prior is in line with the one for the number of degrees of freedom of a  $t$  density, either in the univariate case (Villa and Walker, 2014) or in the multivariate case (see Section 4.1). In particular, we note a tendency to cover the 100% of samples for  $\nu$  approaching the maximum value, and this is more obvious for relatively small sample sizes. Similarities with the univariate and multivariate case can be seen in the MSE from the median as well. In fact, there is a peak in the relatively lower region of the parameter space, with a curve that rapidly decreases and  $\nu$  increases.




Figure 5: Frequentist analysis of the  $t$ -copula: (a)-(b) Coverage and MSE for  $n = 50$ ; (c)-(d) Coverage and MSE for  $n = 100$ ; (e)-(f) Coverage and MSE for  $n = 250$ . We have considered  $\rho = 0.25$  (continuous red line),  $\rho = 0.50$  (dashed green line) and  $\rho = 0.75$  (dotted blue line).

## 5 Applications

In this section, we present two financial applications in the context of modelling bivariate daily logarithm returns using the multivariate  $t$  distribution and the  $t$ -copula with Student- $t$  marginals. In the first application, we compare the inference obtained with the proposed loss-based prior for the multivariate  $t$  distribution with that of three alternative priors (see Section 3). Simulations from the posterior distribution associated to the proposed prior are obtained using an iterative MCMC algorithm (Metropolis within Gibbs) in which we employ a random walk Metropolis for the continuous parameters, using Normal proposal distributions, while the posterior of the degrees of freedom parameter (which are discrete and bounded) are directly sampled using their corresponding probabilities. The variance of the

Normal proposals are chosen in order to obtain around 30% acceptance rates. For the three alternative models, we employ the t-walk algorithm (Christen and Fox, 2010), which is implemented in the R package ‘Rtwalk’. In the second application, which illustrates the use of the proposed loss-based prior for the  $t$ -copula, simulations from the posterior distribution are again obtained using an iterative MCMC method composed by a random walk Metropolis for the continuous parameters and direct sampling for the discrete parameters. For each of these models, we obtained  $N = 5000$  samples from the posterior distribution after a burn-in period of 5000 iterations and a thinning period of 50 iterations (this is, 255000 iterations in total). This configuration produced stable traceplots of the MCMC posterior samples and the log-posterior. R codes used here are available under request.

## 5.1 Multivariate $t$ : Bivariate log-returns

We present an application of the bivariate  $t$  distribution in the context of modelling daily log-returns from the Center for Research in Security Prices (CRSP) Database. The data contains  $n = 2528$  observations corresponding to the daily log-returns of IBM (Permno 12490) and CRSP (the return for the CRSP value-weighted index, including dividends) of the period from the 3<sup>rd</sup> of January 1969 to the 31<sup>st</sup> of December 1998. The data are available from the ‘Ecdat’ R package (Croissant, 2015) and has been analysed using a bivariate  $t$  distribution, using likelihood estimation, in Ruppert (2011). We analyse these data using also a bivariate  $t$  distribution in a Bayesian framework. We adopt the prior structure:

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \nu) = \frac{1}{|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^{\frac{3}{2}}} \pi(\nu),$$

where  $\pi(\nu)$  represents the objective prior on the degrees of freedom of the bivariate  $t$  distribution proposed in Section 3.1.1. Table 3 shows the maximum likelihood estimators (MLE) of the parameters as well as the posterior median estimators associated to the 4 priors choices: the loss-based prior (LBP), the Anscombe prior (AP), the Jeffreys prior (JP) and the Relles & Rogers prior (RRP). This table also presents the 95% Bootstrap confidence intervals (based on 1000 Bootstrap samples) and the 95% credible intervals associated to each model. The maximum a posteriori (MAP) is reported for  $\nu$  in the LBP case. In this example we obtained similar estimators with all the different approaches due to the large sample size. The fit of the predictive distribution associated to the LBP is illustrated in Figure 6 for different contour plot levels.

Parameter	MLE	LBP	AP	JP	RRP
$\mu_1$	5.00	4.33	4.34	4.34	4.35
$\times 10^{-4}$	(-1.04, 10.6)	(-1.28, 10.0)	(-1.48, 10.1)	(-1.87, 10.3)	(-1.42, 10.3)
$\mu_2$	8.41	8.54	8.58	8.47	8.58
$\times 10^{-4}$	(6.10, 11.3)	(6.01, 11.1)	(5.69, 11.2)	(5.60, 11.4)	(5.70, 11.3)
$\sigma_1^2$	1.58	1.54	1.56	1.56	1.56
$\times 10^{-4}$	(1.44, 1.69)	(1.44, 1.66)	(1.43, 1.71)	(1.43, 1.71)	(1.43, 1.70)
$\sigma_2^2$	3.15	3.11	3.14	3.15	3.14
$\times 10^{-5}$	(2.85, 3.51)	(2.83, 3.42)	(2.79, 3.55)	(2.81, 3.55)	(2.79, 3.54)
$\sigma_{12}$	3.34	3.26	3.29	3.31	3.30
$\times 10^{-5}$	(2.90, 3.78)	(2.87, 3.70)	(2.82, 3.83)	(2.84, 3.82)	(2.82, 3.81)
$\nu$	4.19	4	4.12	4.15	4.12
	(3.75, 4.71)	{4}	(3.65, 4.69)	(3.66, 4.70)	(3.65, 4.72)

Table 3: IBM returns vs. CRSP returns data: MLE, 95% Bootstrap intervals, Bayesian estimators, and 95% credible intervals.




Figure 6: IBM returns vs. CRSP returns data: (a) Histogram of IBM data; (b) Histogram of CRSP data; and (c) Predictive contour plots associated to the LBP and levels = (0.55,1,2,4,8,16,32,64,128,256,512,1024,2048).

## 5.2 $t$ -copula: Bivariate log-returns

We model jointly the daily log-returns for the Swiss Market Index (SMI) and Swiss reinsurer (Swiss.Re). The data are available from the R package ‘ghyp’ (Lueth and Breymann, 2016) and contain  $n = 1769$  observations corresponding to the period January 2000 to January 2007. We model these data using a bivariate  $t$ -copula with Student- $t$  marginals. This model can capture heavy tails of the marginals as well as tail dependence (Demarta and McNeil, 2005). We adopt the following prior structure, as introduced in Section 3.2:

$$\pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \nu_1, \nu_2, \nu, \rho) = \pi(\mu_1)\pi(\mu_2)\pi(\sigma_1)\pi(\sigma_2)\pi(\nu_1)\pi(\nu_2)\pi(\nu, \rho),$$

where  $\pi(\mu_j)$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , are Normal densities with mean zero and scale parameter 100;  $\pi(\sigma_j)$  are Cauchy densities (which reflect vague prior information, see Rubio and Steel, 2015);  $\pi(\nu_j)$  are the objective (loss-based) priors proposed in Villa and Walker (2014); and the joint prior  $\pi(\nu, \rho)$  is decomposed as  $\pi(\nu|\rho)\pi(\rho)$ , where  $\pi(\nu|\rho)$  is the LBP proposed in 3.1.2 and  $\pi(\rho)$  is a Beta density (on  $(1 + \rho)/2$ ) with shape parameters  $(1/2, 1/2)$ . In order to simplify the implementation, we use  $\pi(\nu|\rho) = \pi(\nu|\rho = 0)$  as discussed in Section 3.1.2. Table 4 shows the MLE of the parameters as well as the posterior median estimators associated to this prior structure. The MAP is reported for  $\nu$ . This table also presents the 95% Bootstrap confidence intervals (based on 1000 Bootstrap samples) and the 95% credible intervals. Figure 7 illustrates the fit of the predictive contour plots.

In order to quantify the dependence between the marginals, we employ the coefficient of tail dependence and the Kendall’s  $\tau$  Rank Correlation, which are respectively given by (Demarta and McNeil,

2005):

$$\lambda = 2t_{\nu+1} \left( -\sqrt{\nu+1} \sqrt{1-\rho} / \sqrt{1+\rho} \right),$$

$$\tau = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\rho).$$

The estimators of  $\lambda$  and  $\tau$  (reported in Table 4) indicate tail dependence of the marginals.

Parameter	MLE	LBP
$\mu_1$	3.16	3.17
$\times 10^{-4}$	(-2.98, 9.12)	(-1.18, 7.53)
$\mu_2$	-2.18	-2.14
$\times 10^{-4}$	(-11.6, 6.40)	(-8.11, 4.32)
$\sigma_1$	7.94	8.13
$\times 10^{-3}$	(7.45, 8.47)	(7.80, 8.48)
$\sigma_2$	1.12	1.18
$\times 10^{-2}$	(1.05, 1.20)	(1.13, 1.23)
$\rho$	0.69	0.69
	(0.67, 0.71)	(0.66, 0.71)
$\nu_1$	3.45	4
	(2.97, 4.15)	{4}
$\nu_2$	2.52	3
	(2.22, 2.94)	{3}
$\nu$	3.93	4
	(3.54, 4.44)	{4, 5, 6}
$\lambda$	0.38	0.36
	(0.35, 0.42)	(0.30, 0.40)
$\tau$	0.48	0.49
	(0.47, 0.51)	(0.46, 0.51)

Table 4: Swiss Market Index vs. Swiss reinsurer data: MLE, 95% Bootstrap intervals, Bayesian estimators, and 95% credible intervals.

## 6 Discussion

The multivariate  $t$  distribution and the  $t$ -copula are models of great importance in financial applications, among other areas. The multivariate  $t$  distribution is typically used as a robust model to capture departures from normality in terms of heavy tails (outliers), while the  $t$ -copula is often employed to construct multivariate models that can capture a wider range of tail-dependence than that of the Normal copula (Embrechts et al., 2001).

We have proposed noninformative priors for the degrees of freedom in the multivariate  $t$  distribution and the  $t$ -copula. These priors are built upon an objective criterion based on loss functions previously proposed in Villa and Walker (2014), and further generalised in Villa and Walker (2015). Thus, our work extends the prior proposed in Villa and Walker (2014), for the univariate  $t$  distribution, to the multivariate case, while it represents the first objective prior for the degrees of freedom of the  $t$ -copula, to the best of our knowledge. Our simulation studies illustrate the good frequentist performance of the posterior distribution associated to the proposed objective priors. They also show that the posterior distribution associated to these priors is easier to sample from (due to the truncated and discrete nature of the prior), and lead to sensible inferences. For what it concerns the multivariate  $t$  distribution, we have compared the frequentist properties of the proposed prior to three alternative options presented






Figure 7: Swiss Market Index vs. Swiss reinsurer data: (a) Histogram of Swiss Market Index data; (b) Histogram of Swiss reinsurer data data; and (c) Predictive contour plots associated to the LBP and levels  $= (2,4,8,16,32,64,128,256,512,1024,2048)$ .

in literature. Overall, the loss-based prior appears to give better results, in particular for the larger dimension considered. Furthermore, its performance is more stable, in particular for relatively large values of  $\nu$ .

Although we have focused on low-dimensional scenarios in our applications and simulations, the extension of the proposed prior distributions to higher dimensions is immediate. Since the proposed priors are based on the Kullback–Leibler divergence, we acknowledge the well-known practical difficulty of calculating this divergence in higher dimensions. However, in the context of copula modelling, it has been largely advocated the use of the pair-copula decomposition, rather than a direct use of a multivariate copula, as a means to model complex patterns of tail dependence (Aas, 2004). The pair-copula decomposition is used to construct multivariate distributions based on bivariate copulas associated to pairs of variables. Since we have fully addressed the construction of priors for the bivariate  $t$ -copula, our results may serve as a framework for modelling data in higher dimensions via the pair-copula construction.

In the real data example presented in Section 5.2, we have employed symmetric Student- $t$  marginals since they were appropriate in our context. However, given that the proposed prior does not depend on the choice of the marginals, it is possible to employ more flexible marginal distributions, such as the two-piece Student- $t$  (see Rubio and Steel, 2015 for an extensive discussion of the family of two-piece distributions), in order to capture skewness and heavy tails. Leisen et al. (2017; in press) proposed an objective prior for the degrees of freedom parameter in the univariate two-piece Student- $t$  distribution, which is constructed using the loss-based principle discussed in Section 3. They show that this prior does not depend on the skewness parameter, and that it coincides with that proposed in Villa and Walker (2014) for the univariate Student- $t$  distribution (see Section 3). For the skewness parameter, Leisen et al. (2017; in press) employ the noninformative prior proposed in Rubio and Steel

(2014). Thus, the Bayesian model applied in Section 5.2 can be easily extended to capture skewness on the marginals by using these ideas.

## References

- K. Aas. Modelling the dependence structure of financial assets: A survey of four copulas. *Technical Report SAMBA/22/04*, 2004.
- F. J. Anscombe. Topics in the investigation of linear relations fitted by the method of least squares. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 29:1–52, 1967.
- R. H. Berk. Limiting behaviour of posterior distributions when the model is incorrect. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 37:51–58, 1966.
- J. A. Christen and C. Fox. A general purpose sampling algorithm for continuous distributions (the t-walk). *Bayesian Analysis*, 5(2):263–281, 2010.
- J. T. Chu. Errors in normal approximations to the  $y$ ,  $\tau$ , and similar types of distribution. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 27:780–789, 1956.
- Y. Croissant. *Ecdat: Data Sets for Econometrics*, 2015. URL <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Ecdat>. R package version 0.2-9.
- S. Demarta and A. J. McNeil. The t copula and related copulas. *International Statistical Review/Revue Internationale de Statistique*, pages 111–129, 2005.
- P. Embrechts, A. McNeil, and D. Straumann. *Correlation and dependency in risk management: properties and pitfalls*. In *Risk Management: Value at Risk and Beyond*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- C. Fernández and M. F. J. Steel. Multivariate Student-t regression models: Pitfalls and inference. *Biometrika*, 86(1):153–167, 1999.
- T. C. O. Fonseca, M. A. R. Ferreira, and H. S. Migon. Objective Bayesian analysis for the Student-t regression model. *Biometrika*, 95(2):325–333, 2008.
- C. Genest, M. Gendron, and M. Bourdeau-Brien. The advent of copulas in finance. *The European Journal of Finance*, 15(7-8):609–618, 2009.
- P. Hartmann, S. T. M. Straetmans, and C. G. De Vries. Asset market linkages in crisis periods. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86:313–326, 2004.
- E. Jacquier, N. G. Polson, and P. E. Rossi. Bayesian analysis of stochastic volatility models with fat-tails and correlated errors. *Journal of Econometrics*, 122:185–212, 2004.
- S. F. Jarner and G. O. Roberts. Convergence of heavy-tailed MCMC algorithms. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 34:781–815, 2007.
- S. H. Jeffreys. *Scientific Inference*. Syndics of the Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2nd edition, 1957.
- M. A. Juárez and M. F. J. Steel. Non-Gaussian dynamic Bayesian modelling for panel data. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 25(7):1128–1154, 2010.
- S. Kotz and S. Nadarajah. *Multivariate t-distributions and their applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- K. L. Lange, R. J. A. Little, and J. M. G. Taylor. Robust statistical modelling using the  $t$  distribution. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84:881–896, 1989.

- F. Leisen, J. M. Marin, and C. Villa. Objective Bayesian modelling of insurance risks with the skewed Student-t distribution. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 2017; in press.
- C. Liu. *Statistical analysis using the multivariate t distribution*. PhD thesis, Harvard University, 1994.
- D. Lueth and W. Breymann. *ghyp: A Package on Generalized Hyperbolic Distribution and Its Special Cases*, 2016. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ghyp>. R package version 1.5.7.
- R. B. Nelsen. *An introduction to copulas*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- A. K. Nikoloulopoulos, H. Joe, and H. Li. Extreme value properties of multivariate t copulas. *Extremes*, 12(2):129–148, 2009.
- D. A. Relles and W. H. Rogers. Statistics are fairly robust estimators of location. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 72:107–111, 1977.
- F. J. Rubio and M. F. J. Steel. Inference in two-piece location-scale models with Jeffreys priors. *Bayesian Analysis*, 9(1):1–22, 2014.
- F. J. Rubio and M. F. J. Steel. Bayesian modelling of skewness and kurtosis with two-piece scale and shape distributions. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 9(2):1884–1912, 2015.
- D. Ruppert. *Statistics and data analysis for financial engineering*. Springer, 2011.
- D. P. Simpson, T. G. Martins, A. Riebler, G. A. Fuglstad, H. Rue, and S. H. Sørbye. Penalising model component complexity: A principled, practical approach to constructing priors. *Statistical Science*, 2016; in press.
- M. S. Smith. Bayesian approaches to copula modelling. In P. Damien, P. Dellaportas, N. Polson, and D. Stephens, editors, *Bayesian Theory and Applications*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2013.
- M. S. Smith, Q. Gan, and R. J. Kohn. Modelling dependence using skew t copulas: Bayesian inference and applications. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 27(3):500–522, 2012.
- C. Villa and S. G. Walker. Objective prior for the number of degrees of freedom of a t distribution. *Bayesian Analysis*, 9(1):197–220, 2014.
- C. Villa and S. G. Walker. An objective approach to prior mass functions for discrete parameter spaces. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(511):1072–1082, 2015.
- M. West. Outlier models and prior distributions in Bayesian linear regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 46:431–439, 1984.