

On Extremal Index of Max-Stable Random Fields

Enkelejd Hashorva

*Department of Actuarial Science, University of Lausanne
Chamberonne 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
e-mail: enkelejd.hashorva@unil.ch*

Abstract: For a given stationary max-stable random field $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the corresponding generalised Pickands constant coincides with the classical extremal index $\theta_X \in [0, 1]$. In this contribution we discuss necessary and sufficient conditions for θ_X to be 0, positive or equal to 1 and also show that θ_X is equal to the so-called block extremal index. Further, we consider some general functional indices of X and prove that for a large class of functionals they coincide with θ_X .

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 60G15; secondary 60G70.

Keywords and phrases: Max-stable random fields, Brown-Resnick random fields, Pickands constants, classical extremal index, block extremal index, functional index

1. Introduction

The connection between Pickands constant and extremal index of stationary max-stable Brown-Resnick random fields (rf's) has been initially pointed out in [16]. Calculation of Pickands constants for a general stationary max-stable rf $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ has been later dealt with in [25]. Previous investigations concerned with the calculation of extremal index in the context of max-stable processes are [47, 21, 8, 9]. Recent research in [2, 51, 45, 26] has shown, contrary to the prevailing intuitions, that there are certain subtleties (if $d > 1$) when dealing with stationary multivariate regularly varying rf's (see e.g., [48] for the definition) and the calculation of their extremal indices. Influenced by the findings of [7], several formulas for extremal indices of stationary regularly varying time series have appeared in the literature, see e.g., [35] and the references therein. Various (less well-known) formulas have been discovered also for Pickands constants in contributions unrelated to time series modelling. For instance in sequential analysis and statistical applications [42, 43] and extremes of random fields [52, 29] just to mention a few. For large classes of Gaussian rf's extremal indices have been discussed in [24, 11, 44], see also [49, 4] for non-Gaussian cases and related results.

Without loss of generality, we shall focus on the class of max-stable rf's with Fréchet marginals. Since these are limiting rf's, see e.g., [18], our formulas

for their extremal indices are valid (with obvious modifications) also for the candidate extremal index of more general stationary regularly varying rf's (see [35] for recent findings). Studying max-stable rf's, instead of these more general rf's is also justified by Lemma 2.3 stated in Section 2 and Remark 2.4 *iii*).

In view of the well-known de Haan characterisation given in [13], the rf X with non-degenerated marginal distributions corresponds to some non-negative spectral rf $Z(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ having the following representation (in distribution)

$$X(t) = \max_{i \geq 1} \Gamma_i^{-1/\alpha} Z_i(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Gamma_i = \sum_{k=1}^i Q_k$ with $Q_k, k \geq 1$ unit exponential random variables (rv's) independent of Z_i 's which are independent copies of Z .

Clearly, Z is not unique since also $\tilde{Z}(t) = RZ(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a spectral rf for X , provided that R is a non-negative rv independent of Z such that $\mathbb{E}\{R^\alpha\} = 1$. Note that if for some $h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have $Z(h) = 1$ almost surely, then in view of Balkema's lemma (stated in [14][Lem 4.1]) any spectral rf \tilde{Z} of X has the same law as Z .

We shall assume without loss of generality that for some $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t) > 0\right\} = 1, \quad \mathbb{E}\{Z^\alpha(t)\} = 1, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (1.2)$$

Lemma 7.1 in Appendix shows how to construct a spectral rf Z such that the first assumption in (1.2) holds. Note that $\mathbb{E}\{Z^\alpha(t)\} = 1$ implies that $X(t)$ has α -Fréchet distribution function $e^{-x^{-\alpha}}, x > 0$. This is no restriction since we are interested in stationary max-stable rf's. As in [25] define the Pickands constant (when the limit exists) with respect to the spectral rf Z by

$$\mathcal{H} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \mathbb{E}\left\{\max_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} Z^\alpha(t)\right\} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E}\{Z^\alpha(t)\} \leq 1. \quad (1.3)$$

Since the finite dimensional distributions (fidi's) of X can be calculated explicitly (see (6.1) below), if \mathcal{H} exists, then

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} X(t) \leq n^d x\right\} = e^{-\frac{1}{n^d} \mathbb{E}\{\max_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} Z^\alpha(t)/x^\alpha\}} \rightarrow e^{-\mathcal{H}/x^\alpha} \quad (1.4)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is valid for all $x > 0$.

As argued in [16] and [25, 10] the sub-additivity of maximum functional implies that \mathcal{H} is well-defined and finite, provided that X is stationary. Consequently, in view of (1.4) the extremal index (or using the terminology of [51], the classical extremal index) of the stationary max-stable rf X (denoted below by θ_X) always exists, does not depend on the particular spectral rf Z but on the law of the rf X and is given by

$$\theta_X = \mathcal{H} \in [0, 1]. \quad (1.5)$$

In the special case

$$X(t) = V_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (1.6)$$

where V_t 's are independent α -Fréchet rv's we have $\theta_X = 1$. We shall show that this is the only max-stable rf with unit Fréchet marginals satisfying $\theta_X = 1$. Using this fact and Lemma 2.3 we can construct a spectral rf Z for X , see Remark 3.7 *iii*).

Hereafter we shall assume for simplicity that the max-stable rf X has unit Fréchet marginal distributions, i.e., below we shall consider the case

$$\alpha = 1.$$

If the spectral rf Z is not easy to determine or $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is stationary but not max-stable, commonly the block extremal index (denoted below by $\widetilde{\theta}_X$) is utilised in various applications related to extreme value analysis. Assuming for simplicity that X has unit Fréchet marginals, it is defined by (see [23, 51])

$$\widetilde{\theta}_X := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}\{\max_{0 \leq i \leq r_n, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} X(i) > n\tau\}}{\prod_{j=1}^d r_{nj} \mathbb{P}\{X(0) > n\tau\}} \quad (1.7)$$

for any $\tau > 0$ and any sequence $r_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d, n \geq 1$ with non-decreasing integer-valued components $r_{nj}, j \leq d$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_{nj} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n/r_{nj}^d = \infty$ for any $j \leq d$. In our setting we do not need to put the last restriction. In (1.7) $i \leq r_n$ is interpreted component-wise, i.e., $i_j \leq r_{nj}$ for all $j \leq d$ components of i and r_n , respectively.

Next, we define functional indices $\theta_{X,F}$ of X by

$$\theta_{X,F} = \mathbb{E}\{Z(0)F(Z)\} \in [0, 1],$$

where $F : E \mapsto [0, 1]$ is a measurable functional with respect to the product σ -field \mathcal{E} on $E := [0, \infty)^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$.

As mentioned above different choices of Z for X are possible. In order to make the definition of $\theta_{X,F}$ independent of the choice of Z and thus only dependent on the law of X , we shall also require that F is 0-homogeneous, i.e., $F(cf) = F(f)$ for any $c > 0, f \in E$. Indeed, under this assumption we have that

$$\theta_{X,F} = \mathbb{E}\{Z(0)F(Z/Z(0))\} = \mathbb{E}\{F(\Theta_0)\},$$

where the rf Θ_h is defined by (hereafter $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ denotes the indicator function)

$$\mathbb{P}\{\Theta_h \in A\} = \mathbb{E}\{Z(h)\mathbb{I}(Z/Z(h) \in A)\}, \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (1.8)$$

It is known that for any $h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the law of Θ_h does not depend on the particular choice of the spectral rf Z and can be directly determined by X . In the case that for a spectral rf Z of X we have that $Z(h) > 0$ almost surely, this fact follows from Balkema's lemma. The proof for the general case follows from [25][Lem A.1], or from [50][Thm 1.1] and [31][Thm 2]. Consequently, the functional index

$\theta_{X,F}$ depends only on the law of X . Note that for the definition of $\theta_{X,F}$ no stationarity of X is assumed.

It is well-known that a max-stable rf X with Fréchet marginals is a multivariate regularly varying rf. For general multivariate regularly varying rf's which are not max-stable, there is no spectral process Z as in our case of max-stable X and therefore the rf's $\Theta_h, h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ are defined via a conditional limit, see e.g., [18, 40] and (2.1) below. The key advantage in the framework of max-stable rf's is that Θ_h is directly obtained by tilting a given spectral rf Z .

At this point two natural questions for a given stationary max-stable rf X arise:

Question 1: What is the relation between θ_X and $\widetilde{\theta}_X$?

Question 2: For what F is the functional index $\theta_{X,F}$ equal to θ_X ?

In this contribution we show that we simply have $\theta_X = \widetilde{\theta}_X$ and then describe a large class of functionals F such that $\theta_X = \theta_{F,X}$. Further, we consider in some detail the cases $\theta_X = 0$ and $\theta_X = 1$.

Brief organisation of the rest of the paper: In the next section we discuss some basic properties of the rf's $\Theta_h, h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and then show how to construct a stationary max-stable rf X from a given rf Θ^* which in turn is necessary equal in law with Θ_0 . In Section 3 we claim that $\theta_X = \widetilde{\theta}_X$ for any stationary max-stable rf's X . Additionally, we give equivalent conditions that guarantee $\theta_X > 0$ or $\theta_X = 0$ and then present several formulas for θ_X . Section 4 is concerned with the anti-clustering condition whereas Section 5 displays some examples. All the proofs are relegated to Section 6 which is followed by an Appendix.

2. Preliminaries

Unless otherwise specified we shall consider below a max-stable rf $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ as in the Introduction with spectral rf Z such that $\mathbb{E}\{Z(t)\} = 1, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Hence $X(t)$ has unit Fréchet distribution $e^{-1/x}, x > 0$. We shall discuss first the case that X is non-stationary.

2.1. General max-stable X

The importance of the rf's $\Theta_h, h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ defined in (1.8) relates to the following conditional convergence results. Namely, in view of [25][Lem 2.1, A.1 & Rem 6.4] or by [18][Lem 3.5] we have that the convergence in distribution

$$X(t)/X(h) \Big| (X(h) > u) \xrightarrow{d} \Theta_h(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad (2.1)$$

$$u^{-1}X(t) \Big| (X(h) > u) \xrightarrow{d} Y_h(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}^d \quad (2.2)$$

hold as $u \rightarrow \infty$ in the product topology of $E = [0, \infty)^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$, where Θ_h is defined in (1.8) and

$$Y_h(t) = R\Theta_h(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

with R an α -Pareto rv with survival function $x^{-\alpha}, x \geq 1$ independent of any other random element (recall that we consider $\alpha = 1$ for simplicity).

If for a given max-stable rf X if a spectral rf Z is known, it is often simpler to determine the law of Θ_h directly via (1.8) than deriving it from (2.1). In particular, if $\mathbb{P}\{Z(h) = 1\} = 1$, then the following equality in law

$$\Theta_h \stackrel{d}{=} Z \tag{2.3}$$

is valid. Below we determine the fidi's of Y_h in terms of Z and Θ_h .

Lemma 2.1. *For any $h, t_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d, x_i \in (0, \infty), i \leq n$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{Y_h(t_1) \leq x_1, \dots, Y_h(t_n) \leq x_n\} &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\max\left(1, \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{\Theta_h(t_i)}{x_i}\right) - \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{\Theta_h(t_i)}{x_i}\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\max\left(Z(h), \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Z(t_i)}{x_i}\right) - \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Z(t_i)}{x_i}\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Remark 2.2. *For the case of the stationary Brown-Resnick model (2.4) is stated in [51][Prop 6.1] for $h = 0$.*

2.2. Stationary max-stable X

In view of [25][Thm 6.9] the max-stable rf $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with unit Fréchet marginals is stationary, if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}\{Z(h)F(Z)\} = \mathbb{E}\{Z(0)F(B^h Z)\}, \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{Z}^d \tag{2.5}$$

is valid for any measurable function $F : E \mapsto [0, \infty]$ which is 0-homogeneous. Here B is the shift-operator so that $B^h Z(\cdot) = Z(\cdot - h), h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Note that for the stationary Brown-Resnick model the claim in (2.5) is first formulated in [16][Lem 5.2].

For notational simplicity we shall omit the subscript 0 and write simply Θ and Y instead of Θ_0 and Y_0 , respectively; in our notation the origin of $\mathbb{R}^k, k \in \mathbb{N}$ is denoted by 0.

In view of [25][Thm 4.3] condition (2.5) is equivalent with the following equality in law

$$\Theta_h \stackrel{d}{=} B^h \Theta$$

valid for any $h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Yet another equivalent formulation of condition (2.5) stated for the rf Θ is

$$\mathbb{E}\{\Theta(h)F(\Theta)\} = \mathbb{E}\{F(B^h \Theta)\mathbb{I}(B^h \Theta(0) \neq 0)\}, \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{Z}^d \tag{2.6}$$

valid again for all measurable functionals F as above, see e.g., [2, 18].

We note in passing that with the same arguments as in [18] it can be shown that (2.6) is equivalent to the so-called time-change formula derived in [2] for multivariate regularly varying rf's.

Next, since for stationary X we have that (2.2) holds, then in view of [2, 18] X is a multivariate regularly varying rf and Y is the so-called tail rf of X , whereas Θ is the so-called spectral tail rf. Therefore for a stationary max-stable rf X the rf Θ defined in (1.8) is simply the spectral tail rf of X .

Adopting the terminology of [28] for stationary max-stable rf's X , we shall refer to their spectral rf's Z as Brown-Resnick stationary (abbreviated as BRs) rf's.

From Z we can easily define the spectral tail rf Θ . Moreover, as mentioned in (2.3) we simply have $\Theta \stackrel{d}{=} Z$ if $Z(0) = 1$ almost surely. The key properties of BRs rf's Z and spectral tail rf's Θ are the TSF (2.5) and the identity (2.6), respectively. This is revealed by our next result, which shows how to construct a BRs rf Z from a given rf Θ^* that satisfies (2.6) and $\Theta^*(0) = 1$ almost surely, extending thus [27][Thm 4.2] to rf's.

Let in the following

$$\mathcal{I}_{fm}(p \cdot Y) = \min(i \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \max_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |p_j Y(j)| = |p_i Y(i)|),$$

where p_j 's are non-negative numbers such that $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_j^\alpha = 1$ (recall $\alpha = 1$ in our case).

Hereafter N is a rv independent of any other random element such that $\mathbb{P}\{N = j\} = p_j > 0, j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Further, both min and max are defined with respect to a translation-invariant order on \mathbb{Z}^d , see [2] for the definition.

Lemma 2.3. *If $Y(t) = R\Theta^*(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with R a unit Pareto rv independent of Θ^* which satisfies (2.6) and $\Theta^*(0) = 1$ almost surely, then Z_N given by*

$$Z_N(t) = \frac{B^N Y(t)}{\max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_i B^N Y(i)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(p \cdot B^N Y) = N), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}^d \quad (2.7)$$

is a spectral rf of some stationary max-stable rf $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with unit Fréchet marginals. Moreover, the spectral tail rf Θ of X has the same law as Θ^ .*

Remark 2.4. *i) In case $\alpha \neq 1$ the above construction is still valid by substituting the denominator with $(\max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_i^\alpha B^N Y(i))^{1/\alpha}$. In fact, (2.7) is a minor modification of the construction given in [18][Prop 2.12]. The other known constructions in [27, 35, 18] can be easily extended for the case $d > 1$, we omit the details.*

ii) A \mathbb{R}^q -valued rf $\Theta(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is called a spectral tail rf if it satisfies (2.6) where $\Theta(h), \Theta(-h)$ are substituted by $\|\Theta(h)\|, \|\Theta(-h)\|$ with $\|\cdot\|$ a norm on \mathbb{R}^q and F is redefined accordingly and further $\mathbb{P}\{\|\Theta(0)\| = 1\} = 1$, see e.g., [3, 35, 2]. For such a rf, a BRs rf Z_N can be determined as in (2.7) by changing $\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_t B^N Y(t)$ to $\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_t B^N \|\Theta(t)\|$ and instead of $\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_t B^N Y(t)$ and $p \cdot B^N Y$ putting $\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_t B^N \|\Theta(t)\|, p \cdot B^N \|\Theta(t)\|$, respectively (with $Y(t) = R\Theta(t)$ and R a unit Pareto rv independent of Θ).

3. Classical, block & functional indices

As mentioned in the Introduction the classical extremal index θ_X of a stationary max-stable rf X always exists. We show first that it is equal to the block extremal index $\widetilde{\theta}_X$ defined in (1.7) and then answer the question when $\theta_X = 0$. This is already known for $d = 1$, see [10]. Our main findings in Theorem 3.6 gives several formulas for θ_X . The next result is a minor generalisation of the case $d = 1$ stated in [20].

Lemma 3.1. *If $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a stationary max-stable rf, then $\theta_X = \widetilde{\theta}_X$.*

Below we slightly modify the definition of anchoring maps introduced in [2]. Write next $\bar{\mathbb{Z}}^d$ for $\mathbb{Z}^d \cup \{\infty\}$ and recall that $E = [0, \infty)^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is equipped with the product σ -field \mathcal{E} .

Definition 3.2. *We call a measurable map $\mathcal{I} : E \mapsto \bar{\mathbb{Z}}^d$ anchoring if for $O = \{f \in E : \mathcal{I}(f) \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ the following conditions are satisfied for all $f \in O, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$:*

- i) $\mathcal{I}(f) = i$ implies $f(i) \geq \min(f(0), 1)$;*
- ii) $\mathcal{I}(f) = \mathcal{I}(B^i f) - i$.*

As in [2] we define two important anchoring maps which are specified with respect to a translation-invariant order on \mathbb{Z}^d . In particular the minimum and maximum below are with respect to such an order. An instance of a translation-invariant order is the lexicographical one. Hereafter $\mathcal{S}(f) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f^\alpha(t)$ for any $f \in E$. Note that apart from Section 5.2 we have considered for simplicity only the case $\alpha = 1$.

Example 1. Let the non-empty set $O \in \mathcal{E}$ be given by

$$O = \left\{ f \in E : \mathcal{S}(f) < \infty, \max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f(i) > 0 \right\}$$

and define the first maximum functional

$$\mathcal{I}_{fm}(f) = \min\left(j \in \mathbb{Z}^d : f(j) = \max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f(i)\right), \quad f \in O,$$

where $\mathcal{I}_{fm}(f) = \infty$ if $f \notin O$. Clearly, $\mathcal{I}_{fm}(f)$ is finite for $f \in O$ and condition *i*) holds by the definition, whereas condition *ii*) follows by the invariance (in the sense of [51]) of the translation-invariant order.

The first and last maximum functionals are important since they are both anchoring and 0-homogeneous. Moreover, for a stationary max-stable rf $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with spectral rf Θ and Fréchet marginals $\Phi(x) = e^{-1/x^\alpha}, x > 0$ we have that the law of X is specified by \mathcal{I}_{fm} and Θ as follows

$$-\ln \mathbb{P}\{X(i) \leq x_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{1}{x_i^\alpha} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta/(B^{-i}x)) = 0\} \quad (3.1)$$

for any $x = (x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ with finitely many positive components and the rest equal to ∞ ; here $\Theta/(B^{-i}x) = (\Theta(j)/x_{j+i})_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$. The proof of (3.1) is displayed in Appendix, see also [25][Eq. (6.10)]. Note in passing that (3.1) shows that the law

of X is uniquely determined by Θ .

Example 2. Define the first exceedance functional by

$$\mathcal{I}_{f_e}(f) = \min\left(j \in \mathbb{Z}^d : f(j) > 1\right), \quad f \in O$$

and set $\mathcal{I}_{f_e}(f) = \infty$ if $f \notin O$, where

$$O = \left\{f \in E : \mathcal{S}(f) < \infty, \max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f(t) > 1\right\} \in \mathcal{E}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{I}_{f_e}(f)$ for $f \in O$ is finite and *i*) holds. Moreover since $\mathcal{I}_{f_e}(f), f \in O$ is determined by a finite number of points in a neighbourhood of 0, then \mathcal{I}_{f_e} is measurable. Again condition *ii*) is implied by the translation-invariance of the chosen order on \mathbb{Z}^d .

We call a measurable map $F : E \mapsto [0, \infty]$ shift-invariant if $F(B^h f) = F(f), h \in \mathbb{Z}^d, f \in E$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\Theta(t), t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a real-valued rf satisfying (2.6) with $\Theta(0) = 1$ almost surely. If R is a unit Pareto rv independent of Θ , then for any two anchoring maps $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'$ and any shift-invariant map F we have (set $Y(t) = R\Theta(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$)*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, \mathcal{I}'(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d, F(Y) < \infty\} = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}'(Y) = 0, \mathcal{I}(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d, F(Y) < \infty\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Moreover, $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, F(Y) < \infty\} = 0$ is equivalent with $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d, F(Y) < \infty\} = 0$.

Remark 3.4. *If $\mathcal{I}(Y), \mathcal{I}'(Y)$ are almost surely in \mathbb{Z}^d , then (3.2) boils down to $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}'(Y) = 0\} = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0\}$, which is already shown in [2][Lem 3.5]. In general, $\mathcal{I}(Y)$ might not be finite almost surely.*

Hereafter we consider anchoring maps $\mathcal{I} : E \mapsto \bar{\mathbb{Z}}^d$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\} = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\}, \quad (3.3)$$

which is in particular valid for both first (last) maximum and first (last) exceedance functionals.

Lemma 3.5. *If $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a stationary max-stable rf with some spectral rf Z and spectral tail rf Θ , then $\theta_X = 0$ if and only if $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(\Theta) = \infty\} = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(Z) = \infty\} = 1$. If further the anchoring map \mathcal{I} satisfies (3.3), then $\theta_X = 0$ is equivalent with*

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\} = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Since the first and last maximum functionals are 0-homogeneous and finite on the set $O = \{f \in E : \mathcal{S}(f) < \infty, \max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f(i) > 0\}$ we have that $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(Z) = \infty\} = 1$ is equivalent with

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{f_m}(Z) \notin \mathbb{Z}^d\} = 1$$

and the same also holds for the last maximum functional.

In view of Lemma 3.5, Lemma 7.2 and [19] $\theta_X = 0$ is equivalent with $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(Z) = \infty\} = 1$. Further we have the following equivalent statements (below $\|\cdot\|$ is a norm on \mathbb{R}^d):

A1: $Z(t) \rightarrow 0$ almost surely as $\|t\| \rightarrow \infty$;

A2: $\Theta(t) \rightarrow 0$ almost surely as $\|t\| \rightarrow \infty$;

A3: $\mathcal{S}(Z) < \infty$ almost surely;

A4: $\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty$ almost surely.

The equivalence of **A1** and **A3** is shown in [19], whereas the equivalence of **A1** and **A2** is a direct consequence of Lemma 7.2 and similarly for the equivalence of **A3** and **A4**. The equivalence **A2** and **A4** follows from [27] and [51]. Note further that $Y(t) = R\Theta(t) \rightarrow 0$ almost surely as $\|t\| \rightarrow \infty$ is equivalent with **A2** and $\mathcal{S}(Y) = R\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty$ almost surely is equivalent with **A4**.

We state next the main result of this section; define in the following $\mathcal{B}(Y) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{I}(Y(t) > 1)$ and interpret $0 : 0$ and $\infty : \infty$ as 0.

Theorem 3.6. *Let \mathcal{I}, X be as in Lemma 3.5. If \mathcal{I} satisfies (3.3) and $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\} > 0$, then*

$$\theta_X = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\} \quad (3.5)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fe}(Y) = 0\} \quad (3.6)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta) = 0\} \quad (3.7)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(\Theta) = 0, \mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\} \quad (3.8)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t)}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t)}\right\} \quad (3.9)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\left\{Z(0) \frac{\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t)}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t)}\right\} \quad (3.10)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{\mathcal{B}(Y)}\right\}, \quad (3.11)$$

where (3.8) holds if further \mathcal{I} is 0-homogeneous. Moreover $\{\mathcal{B}(Y) < \infty\} = \{\mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\}$ almost surely and in particular $\theta_X = 1$ if and only if $\Theta(i) = 0$ almost surely for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d, i \neq 0$.

Remark 3.7. *i) $\Theta(t) = \Theta_1(t_1)\Theta_2(t_2), t_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^k, t_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^m, t = (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with Θ_1, Θ_2 independent rf's satisfying (2.6) and $\mathbb{P}\{\Theta_i(0) = 1\} = 1, i = 1, 2$, then (3.9) implies that $\theta_X = \theta_{X_1}\theta_{X_2}$ where $X, X_i, i = 1, 2$ are stationary max-stable rf's with spectral rf Θ and $\Theta_i, i = 1, 2$, respectively.*

ii) For $d = 1$ and $\theta_X = 1$ the claim that $\Theta(i) = 0, i \neq 0$ in Theorem 3.6 follows also from [30][Prop 2.2 (ii)].

iii) Since Θ uniquely defines X , then Theorem 3.6 implies that the only stationary max-stable rf X such that $\theta_X = 1$ is that given by (1.6). In view of (2.1) $\Theta(i) = 0, i \neq 0$ and hence by (2.7)

$$Z_N(t) = \frac{1}{p_t} \mathbb{I}(N = t), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$$

is a spectral rf for X specified in (1.6), where N is a discrete rv with positive probability mass function $p_t > 0, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

iv) Taking $F(f) = \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}(f) = 0, \mathcal{S}(f) < \infty)$, then (3.8) implies $\theta_X = \theta_{X,F}$ under the further assumption that \mathcal{I} is a 0-homogeneous functional satisfying (3.3).

v) It follows from the proof of Theorem 3.6 that (3.11) holds without the assumption that $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\} > 0$. Hence $\theta_X = 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{B}(Y) = \infty$ almost surely. Further, from Theorem 3.6 we have that **A1**, **A2**, **A3** and **A4** are equivalent with **A5**: $\mathcal{B}(Y) < \infty$ almost surely.

iv) Formula (3.9) appears initially as extremal index in [38, 39] and in [17] as Pickands constant.

4. The anti-clustering condition

Since stationary max-stable rf's with Fréchet marginals are multivariate regularly varying (see for more details [2]) the classical extremal index of those rf's can be calculated using the findings of [2] and [51]. In the framework of stationary multivariate regularly varying rf's the anti-clustering condition of [7] plays a crucial role for the calculation of extremal index. Considering the stationary max-stable rf $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with unit Fréchet marginals, in view of [2] the aforementioned condition reads as follows:

Condition C: Suppose that there exists a positive sequence of non-decreasing integers $r_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n^d/n = 0$ such that for any $s > 0$

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{m < \|t\| < r_n, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} X(t) > ns | X(0) > ns \right\} = 0.$$

The equivalence of Condition C and $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\} = 1$ for the case $d = 1$ is known, see [18]. The case $d \geq 1$ of Brown-Resnick model is dealt with in [51][Prop 6.2]. Next we show that this equivalence holds for a general stationary max-stable rf X with spectral tail rf Θ and spectral rf Z .

Lemma 4.1. *The anti-clustering Condition C for X is equivalent with **Ai**, $i = 1, \dots, 5$.*

If $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\} = 1$ or equivalently Condition C holds, then by [2] Lemma 3.1, Lemma 4.1 and [2][Prop 5.2] for any anchoring map \mathcal{I}

$$\theta_X = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0\} = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(Y) = 0\} = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta) = 0\} \in (0, 1], \quad (4.1)$$

provided that $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} = 1$. In the special case $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{fe}$ (as shown already in [2])

$$\theta_X = \mathbb{P}\{\max_{0 \prec t} Y(t) \leq 1\}. \quad (4.2)$$

Here \prec denotes a translation-invariant order on \mathbb{Z}^d .

Remark 4.2. *The expression in (4.2) is a well-known formula in the Gaussian setup and has appeared in numerous papers inspired by [1]. This special formula for the Gaussian setup is also referred to as Albin's constant, see [17]. In the context of stationary regularly varying time series the same formula has appeared in [3].*

Next, consider the case that Condition C does not hold, i.e., $p = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\} \in (0, 1)$ and define the rf's $\Theta_1 = \Theta | (\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty)$ and $\Theta_2 = \Theta | (\mathcal{S}(\Theta) = \infty)$. In view of [19][Thm 9, Prop 10], for two independent stationary max-stable rf's $\eta_i(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d, i = 1, 2$ with unit Fréchet marginals and corresponding spectral tail rf's equal in law to $\Theta_i, i = 1, 2$ we have that X has the same law as

$$\max(p\eta_1(t), (1-p)\eta_2(t)), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (4.3)$$

Since η_1 satisfies Condition C, then by [51][Prop 5.2], Lemma 3.1, (4.1) and Theorem 3.6

$$\theta_X = p\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta_1) = 0\} = p\theta_{\eta_1} \in (0, 1]. \quad (4.4)$$

Alternatively, since by the stationarity of X we have that θ_X exists and moreover $\theta_{\eta_2} = 0$, then Lemma 7.5 implies that $\theta_X = p\theta_{\eta_1}$. Consequently, we conclude that Condition C, Lemma 7.5, representation (4.3) together with the findings of [2] establish the validity of the first four expressions in Theorem 3.6.

We remark that from the above arguments, by (4.2) and Lemma 2.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_X &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\max_{0 \leq t} \Theta(t) - \max_{0 < t} \Theta(t); \mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\max_{0 \leq t} Z(t) - \max_{0 < t} Z(t); \mathcal{S}(Z) < \infty\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first formula above is already obtained for the Brown-Resnick model (see Section 5) in [51][Corr 6.3] and for the case $d = 1$ in [20][Thm 2.1].

5. Examples

We present below some examples starting first with the Brown-Resnick model. The second example and Lemma 2.3 show in particular how to construct stationary max-stable rf's starting from any α -summable deterministic sequence. We then discuss how to construct from some given rf a stationary max-stable rf X such that θ_X equals a given constant.

5.1. Brown-Resnick model

Consider $Z(t) = e^{W(t) - \sigma^2(t)/2}, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $W(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ a centered Gaussian rf with variance function σ^2 which is not identical to 0 and $\sigma(0) = 0$. Let $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ denote a max-stable rf with spectral rf Z . The case W is a standard

Brownian motion and $d = 1$ is investigated in [6] and therefore this construction is referred to as the Brown-Resnick model.

For any fixed $h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the Gaussian rf (set $\gamma(s, t) = \text{Var}(W(t) - W(s))$, $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$)

$$S_h(t) = W(t) - W(h) - \gamma(h, t)/2, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$$

is such that $S_h(h) = 0$ almost surely and has variance function $\sigma_h^2(t) = \gamma(h, t)$. With the same arguments as in [25], it follows that $Z_h(t) = e^{S_h(t)}$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is also a spectral rf for X for any $h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Since $S_h(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a Gaussian rf with variance $\text{Var}(W(t) - W(h)) = \gamma(t, h)$, then the law of X depends only on $\gamma(h, t)$ and not on σ^2 . If we assume that W has stationary increments, then (2.5) implies that X is a stationary max-stable rf. The fact that $Z_h(h) = 1$ for any $h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ almost surely implies that $\Theta := \Theta_0$ defined in (1.8) is simply given by $\Theta(t) = Z(t)$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and hence (recall $Y = R\Theta$)

$$Y(t) = e^{\widetilde{W}(t)+Q}, \quad \widetilde{W}(t) = W(t) - \sigma^2(t)/2, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

where $Q = \ln R$ is a unit exponential rv independent of W .

For an $N(0, 1)$ rv V with distribution Φ being independent of Q and all $c > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (set $\widetilde{\Phi} = 1 - \Phi$, $V_c = cV - c^2/2$)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{V_c + Q > x\} &= \mathbb{P}\{V_c + Q > x, V_c > x\} + \mathbb{P}\{V_c + Q > x, V_c \leq x\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\{V_c > x\} + e^{-x} \mathbb{E}\{e^{V_c} \mathbb{I}(V_c \leq x)\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\{V_c > x\} + e^{-x} \mathbb{P}\{cV \leq x - c^2/2\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where we used that the exponentially tilted rv U defined by $\mathbb{P}\{U \leq x\} = \mathbb{E}\{e^{V_c} \mathbb{I}(V_c \leq x)\}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ has $N(c^2/2, c^2)$ distribution, see e.g., [25][Lem 7.1]. Consequently, for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $c := \sigma(t) > 0$ and all $y > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}\{Y(t) \leq y\} = \Phi(c^{-1} \ln y + c/2) - e^{-1/y} \Phi(c^{-1} \ln y - c/2), \quad (5.2)$$

which agrees with the claim of [51][Prop 6.1] where the stationary case is considered.

Next, under the assumption that W has stationary increments, in view of (3.9) and (3.11)

$$\theta_X = \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{I}(\widetilde{W}(t) + Q > 0)}\right\} = \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{\widetilde{W}(t)}}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} e^{\widetilde{W}(t)}}\right\}, \quad (5.3)$$

which yields the following lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_X &= \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{I}(\widetilde{W}(t) + Q > 0)}\right\} \geq \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}\{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{I}(\widetilde{W}(t) + Q > 0)\}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}\{\widetilde{W}(t) + Q > 0\}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \widetilde{\Phi}(\sigma^2(t)/2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where we used Fubini theorem for the first equality and (5.1) implies (5.4). The lower bound above is strictly positive under some growth conditions on σ , see [12] for similar calculations in the continuous case. Derivation of a tight positive lower bound is of general interest since in most of the cases direct evaluation of θ_X is not feasible.

It is of some interest to compare two different extremal indices of stationary max-stable Brown-Resnick rf's for different variance functions. With similar arguments as in [10][Thm 3.1] we can prove the following result:

Lemma 5.1. *Let $X_1(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $X_2(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be two stationary max-stable Brown-Resnick rf's corresponding to two centered Gaussian processes W_1, W_2 with stationary increments, continuous trajectories and variance functions σ_1^2 and σ_2^2 which vanish at the origin. If $\sigma_1(t) \geq \sigma_2(t)$ holds for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then $\theta_{X_1} \geq \theta_{X_2}$.*

Remark 5.2. *i) Under the conditions of Lemma 5.1*

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{I}(\widetilde{W}_1(t) + Q > 0)} \right\} \geq \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{I}(\widetilde{W}_2(t) + Q > 0)} \right\}.$$

ii) The calculation of θ_X and different expressions for it have appeared in the literature in various contexts: the most prominent one concerns extremes of Gaussian rf's where in fact θ_X has been originally calculated, see e.g., [34, 15, 29]. The first expression in (5.3) for the continuous setup, $d = 1$ and the fractional Brownian motion case is obtained in [5][Thm 10.5.1]. Applications to sequential analysis and statistics have given rise to various forms of formula (5.3), see e.g., [41, 32]. As already shown in [17] (5.3) is useful for simulations of θ_X .

5.2. Θ generated by summable sequences

Let $c_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be non-negative constants satisfying $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} c_i^\alpha = C \in (0, \infty)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ and define

$$\Theta(i) = \frac{c_{i+S}}{c_S}, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$$

for a given rv S with values in \mathbb{Z}^d satisfying

$$\mathbb{P}\{S = i\} = c_i^\alpha / C, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

Clearly, $\Theta(0) = 1$ almost surely and moreover Θ satisfies (2.6) stated for the case $\alpha > 0$ as below, namely for any $h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{\Theta^\alpha(h)F(\Theta)\} &= \mathbb{E}\{c_{h+S}^\alpha / c_S^\alpha \mathbb{I}(c_S \neq 0)F(c_{+S})\} \\ &= \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} c_{h+i}^\alpha \mathbb{I}(c_i \neq 0)F(c_{+i}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\{F(B^h\Theta)\mathbb{I}(\Theta(-h) \neq 0)\}$$

is valid for any 0-homogeneous measurable functional $F : E \mapsto [0, \infty]$.

Clearly, $\mathcal{S}(\Theta) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta^\alpha(t)$ is finite almost surely, hence

$$\theta_X = \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} c_{t+S}^\alpha}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} c_{t+S}^\alpha}\right\} = \frac{1}{C} \max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} c_t^\alpha \in (0, 1]. \quad (5.5)$$

We note that θ_X given in (5.5) is the extremal index of a large class of stationary rf's, see e.g., [4, 45].

5.3. Constructions of X with given extremal index

From the previous example we conclude that for any $a \in (0, 1]$ we can construct a stationary max-stable rf X such that $\theta_X = a$. We present below examples of rf X satisfying $\theta_X = 0$ and then we construct stationary max-stable rf's $X^{(p)}$ indexed by $p \in (0, 1)$ and calculate their extremal indices.

Consider next independent, non-negative rf's $\Theta_k(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}, k \leq d$ that satisfy (2.6) such that $\mathbb{P}\{\Theta_k(0) = 1\} = 1, k \leq d$. It follows that the rf $\Theta(t) = \prod_{1 \leq k \leq d} \Theta_k(t_k), t = (t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ also satisfies (2.6). In view of Lemma 2.3 we can construct stationary max-stable rf's $X, X_k, k \leq d$ corresponding to $\Theta, \Theta_k, k \leq d$. As already mentioned in Remark 3.7 *ii*) we have $\theta_X = \prod_{k \leq d} \theta_{X_k}$ and therefore $\theta_X = 0$ if some θ_{X_k} equals zero. If we define $\Theta_k(j) = 1$ for all even integers j and $\Theta_k(j) = 0$ for all odd integers j , then Θ_k satisfies (2.6). Since $\mathcal{S}(\Theta_k) = \infty$ almost surely, then $\theta_{X_k} = 0$ follows and hence also $\theta_X = 0$.

In view of our examples, we can construct two independent stationary max-stable rf's $\eta_1(t), \eta_2(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ with unit Fréchet marginals and spectral tail rf's Z_1 and Z_2 , respectively satisfying $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(Z_1) < \infty\} = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(Z_2) = \infty\} = 1$. The rf $X^{(p)}(t) = \max(p\eta_1(t), (1-p)\eta_2(t)), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ for any given $p \in (0, 1)$ is stationary and further max-stable with unit Fréchet marginals. As already shown in the previous section, we have $\theta_{X^{(p)}} = p\theta_{\eta_1}$.

6. Proofs

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.1: For a given non-negative spectral rf Z of a max-stable rf X with unit Fréchet marginals by the de Haan representation of X for any $t_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d, x_i \in (0, \infty), i \leq n$

$$-\ln \mathbb{P}\{X(t_1) \leq x_1, \dots, X(t_n) \leq x_n\} = \mathbb{E}\left\{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{Z(t_i)}{x_i}\right\}. \quad (6.1)$$

Consequently, with $t_0 = h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $x_0 = 1$ we obtain as $u \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\{u^{-1}X(t_i) \leq x_i, i = 1, \dots, n | X(t_0) > u\} \\ & \sim u \mathbb{P}\{u^{-1}X(t_i) \leq x_i, i = 1, \dots, n, u^{-1}X(t_0) > x_0\} \\ & = u [\mathbb{P}\{u^{-1}X(t_i) \leq x_i, i = 1, \dots, n\} - \mathbb{P}\{u^{-1}X(t_i) \leq x_i, i = 0, \dots, n\}] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \left\{ \max_{i=0, \dots, n} \frac{Z(t_i)}{x_i} - \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \frac{Z(t_i)}{x_i} \right\}, \quad u \rightarrow \infty \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{I}(Z(t_0) > 0) \left[\max_{i=0, \dots, n} \frac{Z(t_i)}{x_i} - \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \frac{Z(t_i)}{x_i} \right] \right\} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left\{ Z(t_0) \mathbb{I}(Z(t_0) > 0) \left[\max_{i=0, \dots, n} \frac{Z(t_i)}{Z(t_0)x_i} - \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \frac{Z(t_i)}{Z(t_0)x_i} \right] \right\} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \max_{i=0, \dots, n} \frac{\Theta_h(t_i)}{x_i} - \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \frac{\Theta_h(t_i)}{x_i} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by the definition of Θ_h in (1.8). Hence in view of (2.2) and the fact that $\Theta_h(h) = 1$ almost surely, the proof is complete. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.3: Since by the assumptions $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_j = 1$ and Θ^* is non-negative we have for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_i \Theta^*(i - j) \right\} = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_i \mathbb{E} \{ \Theta^*(i - j) \} = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_i \mathbb{P} \{ \Theta^*(j - i) > 0 \} \leq 1,$$

which together with the non-negativity of Θ^* implies for some norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^d

$$\lim_{\|t\| \rightarrow \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_t \Theta^*(t - j) = \lim_{\|t\| \rightarrow \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_t Y(t - j) = 0 \quad (6.2)$$

almost surely. Consequently, since further

$$\mathbb{P} \{ p_N > 0 \} = \mathbb{P} \{ Y(0) > 1 \} = 1,$$

then $\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_t B^N Y(t) \in (0, \infty)$ almost surely and thus Z_N in (2.7) is well-defined. Next, for any $a, h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and any 0-homogeneous measurable functional $F : E \mapsto [0, \infty]$, by the independence of N and Y applying Fubini theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \{ Z_N(h) F(B^a Z_N) \} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{B^N Y(h)}{\max_{s \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_s B^N Y(s)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(p \cdot B^N Y) = N) F(B^{a+N} Y) \right\} \\
& = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E} \left\{ p_j \frac{B^j \Theta^*(h)}{\max_{s \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_s \Theta^*(s - j)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(p \cdot B^j \Theta^*) = j) F(B^{a+j} \Theta^*) \right\} \\
& = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E} \{ B^j \Theta^*(h) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(p \cdot B^j \Theta^*) = j) F(B^{a+j} \Theta^*) \} \\
& = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E} \{ \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(p \cdot B^h \Theta^*) = j, \Theta^*(j - h) > 0) F(B^{a+h} \Theta^*) \} \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left\{ F(B^{a+h} \Theta^*) \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(p \cdot B^h \Theta^*) = j, \Theta^*(j - h) > 0) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}\{F(B^{a+h}\Theta^*)\} \\
&= \mathbb{E}\{Z_N(a)F(B^h Z_N)\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows since $\mathcal{I}_{fm}(p \cdot B^j \Theta^*) = j$ implies

$$\max_{s \in \mathbb{Z}^d} p_s \Theta^*(s - j) = p_j B^j \Theta^*(j) = p_j \Theta^*(0) = p_j > 0$$

almost surely, the fourth equality follows from (2.6) and the assumption that $\mathbb{P}\{\Theta^*(0) = 1\} = 1$, the sixth one is consequence of the following (which follows from (6.2))

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(p \cdot B^h \Theta^*) = j) = \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(p \cdot B^h \Theta^*) \in \mathbb{Z}^d) = 1$$

almost surely and the fact that $\mathcal{I}_{fm}(p \cdot B^h \Theta^*) = j$ implies for any $h \in \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$p_j \Theta^*(j - h) \geq p_h \Theta^*(0) \geq p_h > 0$$

almost surely and consequently $\Theta^*(j - h) > 0$ almost surely. Finally, the last claimed equality is established by repeating the calculations for $\mathbb{E}\{Z_N(a)F(B^h Z_N)\}$. Hence the proof follows by (2.5) and the definition of the spectral tail rf Θ via the spectral rf Z . \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1: Let $r_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $n \geq 1$ be non-negative integers with components r_{nj} , $j \leq d$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n/r_{nj} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_{nj} = \infty$. The stationarity of X yields further

$$C(A) = \mathbb{E}\left\{\max_{i \in A} Z(i)\right\} = C(A')$$

for any finite set of indices $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and any $A' \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ which is a shift/translation of A . Moreover, by the sub-additivity of the maximum

$$C(A \cup B) \leq C(A) + C(B).$$

Hence the growth of $C(A)$ is as that of the counting measure of A , see [16] for this argument and [33]. Consequently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}\{\max_{0 \leq i \leq r_n, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(i)\}}{\prod_{j=1}^d r_{nj}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-d} \mathbb{E}\left\{\max_{i \in [0, n]^d, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(i)\right\} = \mathcal{H}.$$

The assumption on r_n and (6.1) imply that

$$\widetilde{\theta}_X \sim \frac{\mathbb{P}\{\max_{0 \leq i \leq r_n, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} X(i) > n\}}{\prod_{j=1}^d r_{nj} \mathbb{P}\{X(0) > n\}} \sim \frac{\mathbb{E}\{\max_{0 \leq i \leq r_n, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(i)\}}{\prod_{j=1}^d r_{nj}}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence $\mathcal{H} = \theta_X$ establishes the proof. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.3: We give first a key characterisation of tail rf's proved initially in [35] and also stated for rf's in [2]. Namely, for any measurable map $F : E \mapsto [0, \infty]$

$$\mathbb{E}\{F(Y)\mathbb{I}(Y(i) > 1/t)\} = t\mathbb{E}\{F(B^i Y)\mathbb{I}(Y(-i) > t)\} \quad (6.3)$$

holds for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d, t > 0$. If $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}'$ are two anchoring maps, since $Y(0) = R > 1$ almost surely and $\mathcal{I}(Y) = i$ implies $Y(i) > 1$ almost surely, by (6.3)

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \mathcal{I}'(Y) = 0, F(Y) < \infty\} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = i, \mathcal{I}'(Y) = 0, F(Y) < \infty\} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = i, Y(i) > 1, \mathcal{I}'(Y) = 0, F(Y) < \infty\} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(B^i Y) = i, Y(-i) > 1, \mathcal{I}'(B^i Y) = 0, F(Y) < \infty\} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, F(Y) < \infty, Y(-i) > 1, \mathcal{I}'(Y) = -i\} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, F(Y) < \infty, \mathcal{I}'(Y) = -i\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}'(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, F(Y) < \infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

With similar arguments we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d, F(Y) < \infty\} = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, F(Y) < \infty, Y(-i) > 1\}.$$

Consequently, $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, F(Y) < \infty\} = 0$ is equivalent with

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d, F(Y) < \infty\} = 0$$

establishing the proof. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.5: As shown in [19] condition $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(Z) = \infty\} = 1$ is equivalent with X being generated by a non-singular conservative flow. The latter is equivalent with $\theta_X = 0$, see [21] (which follows by [38] if $d = 1$ and by [37] for $d > 1$). In view of Lemma 3.3 and (3.3) $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\} = 0$ is equivalent with $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\} = 0$. Applying Lemma 7.2 in Appendix the latter is equivalent with $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(Z) < \infty\} = 0$. This establishes the proof since the latter is equivalent with $\theta_X = 0$. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.6: We have that $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(Z) < \infty\} = 0$ is equivalent with X is generated by a non-singular conservative flow, which in view of [38, 37, 36] is equivalent with $\theta_X = 0$. Applying Lemma 7.3 in Appendix to BRs spectral rf

Z we have that $ZF(Z)$ is also a BRs spectral rf for any measurable functional $F : E \mapsto [0, \infty]$, which is 0-homogeneous and shift-invariant. Since both $\mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}(f) = \infty), \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}(f) < \infty), f \in E$ are measurable 0-homogeneous and shift-invariant functionals and by the above

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \max_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}(Z) = \infty) \right\} = 0$$

we have using further (1.5)

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_X = \mathcal{H} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \max_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t) \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \max_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}(Z) < \infty) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

Next, assuming that $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(Z) < \infty\} > 0$ by Lemma 7.2 $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\} > 0$ and the converse also holds. Setting $Z_*(t) = Z(t) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}(Z) < \infty)$ by Lemma 7.3 it is BRs and further $\mathcal{S}(Z_*) < \infty$ almost surely. In view of Lemma 7.1 we can assume that $\mathcal{S}(Z_*) > 0$ almost surely. Applying (2.5) and using the equivalence of **A1** and **A3** we obtain further

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_X &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{h \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E} \left\{ Z_*(h) \frac{\max_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} Z_*(t)}{\sum_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} Z_*(t)} \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{h \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E} \left\{ Z_*(0) \frac{\max_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} B^h Z_*(t)}{\sum_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} B^h Z_*(t)} \right\} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{h \in [\varepsilon n, (1-\varepsilon)n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E} \left\{ Z_*(0) \frac{\max_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} B^h Z_*(t)}{\sum_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} B^h Z_*(t)} \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ Z_*(0) \frac{\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z_*(t)}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z_*(t)} \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t)}{\mathcal{S}(\Theta)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since by definition the events $\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta) \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ and $\{\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\}$ are almost surely the same, the 0-homogeneity of $\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\cdot)$ implies (recall $\Theta(0) = 1$ almost surely)

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_X &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t)}{\mathcal{S}(\Theta)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta) \in \mathbb{Z}^d) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t)}{\mathcal{S}(\Theta)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta) = j) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \Theta(j) \frac{\Theta(0)}{\mathcal{S}(\Theta)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta) = j) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\Theta(-j)}{\mathcal{S}(\Theta)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(B^j \Theta) = j) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{\Theta(-j)}{\mathcal{S}(\Theta)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta) = 0) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta) = 0\} \\
&= \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta) = 0, \mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\},
\end{aligned}$$

where we applied (2.6) in the last third line combined with condition *ii*) in the definition of anchoring maps and also used that $\mathcal{S}(f)$, $f \in E$ is a shift-invariant functional. Clearly, the last two formulas hold also for the last maximum functional. Since (3.3) implies

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) \notin \mathbb{Z}^d, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\} = 0, \quad (6.5)$$

then using Lemma 3.3 to obtain the second equality below we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(\Theta) = 0, \mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\} &= \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(Y) = 0, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty, \mathcal{I}(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(Y) = 0, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty, \mathcal{I}(Y) \notin \mathbb{Z}^d\} \\
&= \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fm}(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty, \mathcal{I}(Y) = 0\} \\
&= \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\}
\end{aligned}$$

and hence $\theta_X = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{fe}(Y) = 0\}$ follows and the same is true also for the last exceedance functional. In view of the equivalence **A2** and **A4** we have

$$\{\mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\} \subset \{\mathcal{B}(Y) < \infty\}, \quad (6.6)$$

with $\mathcal{B}(Y) := \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{I}(Y(t) > 1)$. Hence since $Y(0) = R\Theta(0) = R > 1$ almost surely implies $\mathcal{B}(Y) \geq 1$ almost surely

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{B}(Y)}{\mathcal{B}(Y)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty) \right\} \\
&= \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mathcal{B}(Y)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}(Y) = 0, Y(t) > 1, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mathcal{B}(Y)} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}(Y) = -t, Y(-t) > 1, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mathcal{B}(Y)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mathcal{B}(Y)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mathcal{B}(Y)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty) \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (6.3) to derive the last fourth line and the last second equality follows from (6.5). With the same arguments as in the proof of [46][Lem 2.5] considering the discrete setup as in [18] for any $n > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\max_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t)\right\} = \sum_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{\sum_{s \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{I}(Y(s-t) > 1)}\right\}.$$

Since $Y(0) > 1$ almost surely and thus the denominator in the expectation above is greater equal 1 and converges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely to $\mathcal{B}(Y)$, it follows by the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\theta_X = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-d} \mathbb{E}\left\{\max_{t \in [0, n]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t)\right\} = \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{\mathcal{B}(Y)}\right\} \leq 1,$$

hence (3.11) holds. From the last two expressions of θ_X we conclude that $\mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{1}{\mathcal{B}(Y)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}(Y) = \infty)\right\} = 0$. Consequently, almost surely $\{\mathcal{B}(Y) < \infty\} \subset \{\mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\}$, which together with (6.6) implies that almost surely

$$\{\mathcal{B}(Y) < \infty\} = \{\mathcal{S}(Y) < \infty\}.$$

Next, if $\mathbb{P}\{\Theta(i) = 0\} = 1$ for all $i \neq 0, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then

$$\theta_X = \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t)}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t)} \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty)\right\} = 1.$$

Conversely, if $\theta_X = 1$, then necessarily $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{S}(\Theta) < \infty\} = 1$ and thus

$$\theta_X = 1 = \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t)}{\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t)}\right\}$$

implying that $\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t)$ almost surely. Taking $\mathcal{I}(f) = \mathcal{I}_{f_m}(f)$ we have that $\theta_X = \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}(\Theta) = 0\} = 1$ implies that $\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t) = \Theta(0) = 1$ almost surely and therefore

$$\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t) = 1 + \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d, t \neq 0} \Theta(t) = 1$$

almost surely. Consequently, (recall $\Theta(i)$'s are non-negative) $\mathbb{P}\{\Theta(i) = 0\} = 1$ for all $i \neq 0, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ establishing the proof. \square

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.1: For any $s > 0$ and any non-decreasing sequence of integers $r_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ tending to infinity such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n^d/n = 0$ we have for any positive integer m (recall $\mathbb{E}\{Z(t)\} = 1$ for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$)

$$n^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left\{\max_{m < \|t\| < r_n, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t)\right\} \leq n^{-1} \sum_{m < \|t\| < r_n, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E}\{Z(t)\} \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

hence by (6.1) and the dominated convergence theorem

$$1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{m < \|t\| < r_n, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} X(t) > ns \mid X(0) > ns\right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= s \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{m < \|t\| < r_n, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} X(t) \leq ns, X(0) > ns \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \max_{m < \|t\| < \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d, t=0} Z(t) - \max_{m < \|t\| < \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t) \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbb{I}(Z(0) > 0) \left[\max_{m < \|t\| < \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d, t=0} Z(t) - \max_{m < \|t\| < \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t) \right] \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ Z(0) \mathbb{I}(Z(0) > 0) \left[\max_{m < \|t\| < \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d, t=0} \frac{Z(t)}{Z(0)} - \max_{m < \|t\| < \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{Z(t)}{Z(0)} \right] \right\} \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(1 - \max_{m < \|t\| < \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t) \right)_+ \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

for any positive integer m (recall $\Theta(0) = 1$ almost surely). If **A1** holds, then by the dominated convergence theorem

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \max_{m < \|t\| < \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d, t=0} Z(t) - \max_{m < \|t\| < \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t) \right\} = \mathbb{E}\{Z(0)\} = 1,$$

hence Condition C is satisfied.

Conversely, if Condition C is satisfied for some sequence $r_n, n \geq 1$ of non-negative increasing integers, then by the above calculations

$$\begin{aligned}
&1 - \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \max_{m < \|t\| < r_n, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} X(t) > ns \mid X(0) > ns \right\} \\
&= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left(1 - \max_{m < \|t\| < \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t) \right)_+ \right\} = 1
\end{aligned}$$

and thus almost surely as $m \rightarrow \infty$

$$\max_{m < \|t\| < \infty, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \Theta(t) \rightarrow 0.$$

Consequently, by Lemma 7.4 in Appendix condition **A2** holds, hence the proof follows from Remark 3.7. \square

7. Appendix

For notational simplicity we consider the case $\alpha = 1$ in the following. The results for $\alpha > 0$ can be formulated with obvious modifications.

Lemma 7.1. *If $X(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a max-stable rf with de Haan representation (1.1) and some spectral rf Z satisfying $\mathbb{E}\{Z(t)\} \in (0, \infty)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then we can find a spectral rf Z_* for X such that $\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z_*(t) > 0$ almost surely.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 7.1: Let $w_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be positive constants such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_i Z(i) \right\} \in (0, \infty).$$

w_i 's exist since $\mathbb{E}\{Z(i)\} \in (0, \infty)$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. By the choice of w_i 's we have that

$$M = \max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_i Z(i)$$

is a non-negative rv and $a = \mathbb{E}\{M\} \in (0, \infty)$. Let $Z_*(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a rf defined by

$$\mathbb{P}\{Z_* \in A\} = \mathbb{E}\{M \mathbb{I}(aZ/M \in A)/a\}$$

for any measurable set $A \subset E$. Since by the above definition

$$\mathbb{P}\{\max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_i Z_*(i) = 0\} = \mathbb{E}\{M \mathbb{I}(\max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_i Z(i)/M = 0)/a\} = 0$$

it follows that $\mathbb{P}\{\max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z_*(i) = 0\} = 0$. Moreover, for any $x_i \in (0, \infty), t_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d, i \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned} & -\ln \mathbb{P}\{X(t_1) \leq x_1, \dots, X(t_n) \leq x_n\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Z(t_i)/x_i\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{I}(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Z(t_i) > 0) \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Z(t_i)/x_i\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{M/a \mathbb{I}(M > 0) \mathbb{I}(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Z(t_i) > 0) \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} aZ(t_i)/(Mx_i)\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{I}(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Z_*(t_i) > 0) \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Z_*(t_i)/x_i\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Z_*(t_i)/x_i\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality is a simple consequence of $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Z(t_i) > 0$ implies $M > 0$. Hence Z_* is a spectral rf for X . The calculations above show that we can define alternatively $Z_*(t) = \mathbb{P}\{\max_{s \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(s) > 0\} Z(t)$ conditioned on $\max_{s \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(s) > 0$, which was suggested by the reviewer. \square

Proof of (3.1): As in the proof of Lemma 7.1, we can assume without loss of generality that Z is such that $\max_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (Z(t)/x_t) > 0$ almost surely for any $x = (x_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ a positive sequence. Suppose for simplicity that $\alpha = 1$ and let next x be a sequence with finite number of positive elements and the rest equal to ∞ (we interpret a/∞ as 0). Since further Z/x consists of zeros and finitely many positive numbers, then $\mathcal{I}_{fm}(Z/x) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ almost surely. Consequently, by (6.1), Fubini theorem and the fact that $\mathcal{I}_{fm}(Z/x) = j$ implies $\max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} (Z(t_i)/x_i) = Z(j)/x_j$ almost surely

$$\begin{aligned} -\ln \mathbb{P}\{X(i) \leq x_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} &= \mathbb{E}\{\max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t_i)/x_i \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(Z/x) \in \mathbb{Z}^d)\} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E}\{\max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(t_i)/x_i \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(Z/x) = j)\} \\ &= \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{1}{x_j} \mathbb{E}\{Z(j) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{fm}(Z/x) = j)\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& / \\
& = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{1}{x_j} \mathbb{E}\{Z(0) \mathcal{I}_{f_m}(B^j Z/x) = j\} \\
& = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{1}{x_j} \mathbb{E}\{Z(0) \mathbb{I}(\mathcal{I}_{f_m}((B^j Z/x)/Z(0)) = j)\} \\
& = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{1}{x_j} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{f_m}(B^j(\Theta/(B^{-j}x))) = j\} \\
& = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \frac{1}{x_j} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{I}_{f_m}(\Theta/(B^{-j}x)) = 0\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the fourth first equality follows from (2.5) and the last equality follows since \mathcal{I}_{f_m} is an anchoring map. \square

Lemma 7.2. *Let $Z(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a BRs rf satisfying (1.2). If $F : E \mapsto [0, \infty]$ is a shift-invariant and 0-homogeneous measurable map, then $\mathbb{E}\{F(Z)\} = 0$ is equivalent with $\mathbb{E}\{F(\Theta)\} = 0$. If further F is bounded by 1, then $\mathbb{E}\{F(Z)\} = 1$ is equivalent with $\mathbb{E}\{F(\Theta)\} = 1$.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 7.2: By the shift-invariance of F and (2.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & = \mathbb{E}\{F(\Theta)\} = \mathbb{E}\{Z(0)F(Z/Z(0))\} = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E}\{Z(0)F(B^{-i}Z)\} \\
& = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E}\{Z(i)F(Z)\} \geq \mathbb{E}\left\{\left(\max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(i)\right)F(Z)\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

hence since Z is chosen such that $\max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d} Z(i) > 0$ almost surely, then $\mathbb{E}\{F(Z)\} = 0$ follows. If $\mathbb{E}\{F(Z)\} = 0$, then $F(Z) = 0$ almost surely and thus

$$0 = \mathbb{E}\{Z(0)F(Z)\} = \mathbb{E}\{F(\Theta)\} = 0$$

follows. Next, $\mathbb{E}\{F(\Theta)\} = 1$ is the same as $\mathbb{E}\{1 - F(\Theta)\} = 0$, which is equivalent with $\mathbb{E}\{1 - F(Z)\} = 0$ as shown above, establishing the proof. \square

Lemma 7.3. *If $F : E \mapsto [0, \infty]$ is a 0-homogeneous measurable functional and $Z(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a BRs rf, then $Z_* = ZF(Z)$ is also a BRs rf, provided that $\mathbb{E}\{Z_*(t_0)\} \in (0, \infty)$ for some $t_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 7.3: Using (2.5) we have that $\mathbb{E}\{Z_*(t)\} = \mathbb{E}\{Z_*(t_0)\} \in (0, \infty)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and in particular $\mathbb{P}\{F(Z) = 0\} < 1$ and $\mathbb{P}\{F(Z) = \infty\} = 0$. Since F is 0-homogeneous, we have that Z_* satisfies (2.5), which is an equivalent condition for a spectral rf to be a BRs rf, see [25]. \square

Lemma 7.4. *If $V(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a non-negative rf, then $\mathbb{P}\{\lim_{\|t\| \rightarrow \infty} V(t) = 0\} = 1$ is equivalent with there exists a non-decreasing sequence of integers $r_n, n \geq 1$ that converge to infinite as $n \rightarrow \infty$ such that*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{m \leq \|t\| \leq r_n} V(t) > \delta\right\} = 0 \quad (7.1)$$

is valid for any $\delta > 0$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 7.4: It is well-known that (see e.g., [22][A1.3])

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\lim_{\|t\|\rightarrow\infty} V(t) = 0\right\} = 1$$

if and only if for all large m and any δ, ε positive

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\max_{\|t\|\geq m} V(t) > \delta\right\} < \varepsilon,$$

which clearly implies (7.1). Assuming that the latter condition holds, then for given δ, ε positive there exists N such that for all m, n larger than N we have $\mathbb{P}\{\max_{m\leq\|t\|\leq r_n} V(t) > \delta\} < \varepsilon$. Since $\lim_{n\rightarrow\infty} r_n = \infty$, then $\mathbb{P}\{\max_{m\leq\|t\|} V(t) > \delta\} \leq \varepsilon$, hence the claim follows. \square

Lemma 7.5. *Let $\eta_i(t), i = 1, 2, t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be two independent stationary rf's with unit Fréchet marginal distributions. If the extremal indices of both η_1 and η_2 exist, then the rf $X(t) = \max(p\eta_1(t), (1-p)\eta_2(t)), t \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ has for any $p \in (0, 1)$ extremal index $\theta_X = p\theta_{\eta_1} + (1-p)\theta_{\eta_2} \in [0, 1]$.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 7.5: By the independence of η_1 and η_2 we have that X is stationary with unit Fréchet marginal distributions. In order to show the claim it suffices to prove that $\max_{t \in [0, n]^d} X(t)/n^d$ converges in distribution as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to $(p\theta_{\eta_1} + (1-p)\theta_{\eta_2})\xi$, where ξ is a unit Fréchet rv. As $n \rightarrow \infty$, by the assumptions $\max_{t \in [0, n]^d} \eta_i(t)/n^d$ converge for $i = 1, 2$ in distribution to $p_i\theta_{\eta_i}\xi_i$ with ξ_1, ξ_2 two independent unit Fréchet rv's and $p_1 = 1 - p_2 = p$. Since $\max(p_1\theta_{\eta_1}\xi_1, p_2\theta_{\eta_2}\xi_2)$ has the same df as $(p_1\theta_{\eta_1} + p_2\theta_{\eta_2})\xi$, the claim follows by the independence of η_i 's and Slutsky's lemma. \square

Acknowledgments

Partial support by SNSF Grants 200021-175752/1 and 200021-196888 is kindly acknowledged. I am in debt to the reviewer and the Editor for several suggestions, comments and corrections which improved the manuscript significantly.

References

- [1] J. M. P. Albin. On extremal theory for stationary processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 18(1):92–128, 1990.
- [2] B. Basrak and H. Planinić. Compound Poisson approximation for random fields with application to sequence alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.00723*, 2018.
- [3] B. Basrak and J. Segers. Regularly varying multivariate time series. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 119(4):1055–1080, 2009.
- [4] B. Basrak and A. Tafro. Extremes of moving averages and moving maxima on a regular lattice. *Probab. Math. Statist.*, 34(1):61–79, 2014.
- [5] S. M. Berman. *Sojourns and Extremes of Stochastic Processes*. The Wadsworth & Brooks/Cole Statistics/Probability Series. Wadsworth & Brooks/Cole Advanced Books & Software, Pacific Grove, CA, 1992.

- [6] B. M. Brown and S. I. Resnick. Extreme values of independent stochastic processes. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 14:732–739, 1977.
- [7] R. A. Davis and T. Hsing. Point process and partial sum convergence for weakly dependent random variables with infinite variance. *Ann. Probab.*, 23(2):879–917, 1995.
- [8] R. A. Davis, T. Mikosch, and Y. Zhao. Measures of serial extremal dependence and their estimation. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 123(7):2575–2602, 2013.
- [9] K. Dębicki and E. Hashorva. On extremal index of max-stable processes. *Probability and Mathematical Statistics*, 27(2):299–317, 2017.
- [10] K. Dębicki and E. Hashorva. Approximation of Supremum of Max-Stable Stationary Processes & Pickands Constants. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 33(1):444–464, 2020.
- [11] K. Dębicki, E. Hashorva, and N. Soja-Kukieła. Extremes of homogeneous Gaussian random fields. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 52(1):55–67, 2015.
- [12] K. Dębicki, Z. Michna, and X. Peng. Approximation of sojourn times of Gaussian processes. *Methodol. Comput. Appl. Probab.*, 21(4):1183–1213, 2019.
- [13] L. de Haan. A spectral representation for max-stable processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 12(4):1194–1204, 1984.
- [14] L. de Haan and J. Pickands, III. Stationary min-stable stochastic processes. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 72(4):477–492, 1986.
- [15] K. Dębicki. Ruin probability for Gaussian integrated processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 98(1):151–174, 2002.
- [16] A. B. Dieker and T. Mikosch. Exact simulation of Brown-Resnick random fields at a finite number of locations. *Extremes*, 18:301–314, 2015.
- [17] A. B. Dieker and B. Yakir. On asymptotic constants in the theory of extremes for Gaussian processes. *Bernoulli*, 20(3):1600–1619, 2014.
- [18] C. Dombry, E. Hashorva, and P. Soulier. Tail measure and spectral tail process of regularly varying time series. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 28(6):3884–3921, 2018.
- [19] C. Dombry and Z. Kabluchko. Ergodic decompositions of stationary max-stable processes in terms of their spectral functions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 127(6):1763–1784, 2017.
- [20] K. Dębicki and E. Hashorva. On extremal index of max-stable stationary processes. *Probab. Math. Statist.*, 37(2):299–317, 2017.
- [21] A. Ehlert and M. Schlather. Capturing the multivariate extremal index: bounds and interconnections. *Extremes*, 11(4):353–377, 2008.
- [22] P. Embrechts, C. Klüppelberg, and T. Mikosch. *Modelling extremal events*, volume 33 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. For insurance and finance.
- [23] H. Ferreira and L. Pereira. How to compute the extremal index of stationary random fields. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 78(11):1301–1304, 2008.
- [24] J. P. French and R. A. Davis. The asymptotic distribution of the maxima of a Gaussian random field on a lattice. *Extremes*, 16(1):1–26, 2013.
- [25] E. Hashorva. Representations of max-stable processes via exponential tilt-

- ing. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 128(9):2952–2978, 2018.
- [26] A. Jakubowski and N. Soja-Kukieła. Managing local dependencies in asymptotic theory for maxima of stationary random fields. *Extremes*, 22(2):293—315, 2019.
- [27] A. Janßen. Spectral tail processes and max-stable approximations of multivariate regularly varying time series. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 129(6):1993–2009, 2019.
- [28] Z. Kabluchko, M. Schlather, and L. de Haan. Stationary max-stable fields associated to negative definite functions. *Ann. Probab.*, 37:2042–2065, 2009.
- [29] S. G. Kobelkov and V. I. Piterbarg. On maximum of Gaussian random field having unique maximum point of its variance. *Extremes*, 22(3):413–432, 2019.
- [30] D. Krizmanić. Functional weak convergence of partial maxima processes. *Extremes*, 19(1):7–23, 2016.
- [31] I. Molchanov, M. Schmutz, and K. Stucki. Invariance properties of random vectors and stochastic processes based on the zonoid concept. *Bernoulli*, 20(3):1210–1233, 2014.
- [32] Y. Nardi, D. O. Siegmund, and B. Yakir. The distribution of maxima of approximately Gaussian random fields. *Ann. Statist.*, 36(3):1375–1403, 2008.
- [33] X.-X. Nguyen. Ergodic theorems for subadditive spatial processes. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 48(2):159–176, 1979.
- [34] J. Pickands, III. Asymptotic properties of the maximum in a stationary Gaussian process. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 145:75–86, 1969.
- [35] H. Planinić and P. Soulier. The tail process revisited. *Extremes*, 21(4):551–579, 2018.
- [36] P. Roy. Nonsingular group actions and stationary $S\alpha S$ random fields. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 138(6):2195–2202, 2010.
- [37] P. Roy and G. Samorodnitsky. Stationary symmetric α -stable discrete parameter random fields. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 21(1):212–233, 2008.
- [38] G. Samorodnitsky. Extreme value theory, ergodic theory and the boundary between short memory and long memory for stationary stable processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(2):1438–1468, 2004.
- [39] G. Samorodnitsky. Maxima of continuous-time stationary stable processes. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 36(3):805–823, 2004.
- [40] J. Segers, Y. Zhao, and T. Meinguet. Polar decomposition of regularly varying time series in star-shaped metric spaces. *Extremes*, 20(3):539–566, 2017.
- [41] D. Siegmund and B. Yakir. Tail probabilities for the null distribution of scanning statistics. *Bernoulli*, 6(2):191–213, 2000.
- [42] D. Siegmund, B. Yakir, and N. R. Zhang. Tail approximations for maxima of random fields by likelihood ratio transformations. *Sequential Anal.*, 29(3):245–262, 2010.
- [43] D. Siegmund, B. Yakir, and N. R. Zhang. Detecting simultaneous variant intervals in aligned sequences. *Ann. Appl. Stat.*, 5(2A):645–668, 2011.
- [44] N. Soja-Kukieła. Extremes of multidimensional stationary Gaussian ran-

- dom fields. *Probab. Math. Statist.*, 38(1):191–207, 2018.
- [45] N. Soja-Kukieła. On maxima of stationary fields. *Adv. Appl. Probability, in press*, 2019.
- [46] P. Soulier. The tail process and tail measure of continuous time regularly varying stochastic processes. *arXiv:2004.00325*, 2020.
- [47] S. A. Stoev. Max-stable processes: Representations, ergodic properties and statistical applications. *Dependence in Probability and Statistics, Lecture Notes in Statistics 200*, Doukhan, P., Lang, G., Surgailis, D., Teyssiere, G. (Eds.), 200:21–42, 2010.
- [48] C. Tillier and O. Wintenberger. Regular variation of a random length sequence of random variables and application to risk assessment. *Extremes*, 21(1):27–56, 2018.
- [49] K. F. Turkman. A note on the extremal index for space-time processes. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 43(1):114–126, 2006.
- [50] Y. Wang and S. A. Stoev. On the association of sum- and max-stable processes. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 80(5-6):480–488, 2010.
- [51] L. Wu and G. Samorodnitsky. Regularly varying random fields. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130(7):4470–4492, 2020.
- [52] B. Yakir. *Extremes in random fields*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester; Higher Education Press, Beijing, 2013. A theory and its applications.