

Submitted to *Bernoulli*
 arXiv: [arXiv:2003.01016](https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.01016)

Asymptotics for sliding blocks estimators of rare events

HOLGER DREES¹, SEBASTIAN NEBLUNG¹

¹*University of Hamburg, Department of Mathematics, SPST, Bundesstr. 55, 20146 Hamburg, Germany, E-mail: drees@math.uni-hamburg.de; *sebastian.neblung@uni-hamburg.de*

Abstract Drees & Rootzén (2010) have established limit theorems for a general class of empirical processes of statistics that are useful for the extreme value analysis of time series, but do not apply to statistics of sliding blocks, including so-called runs estimators. We generalize these results to empirical processes which cover both the class considered by Drees & Rootzén (2010) and processes of sliding blocks statistics. Using this approach, one can analyze different types of statistics in a unified framework. We show that statistics based on sliding blocks are asymptotically normal with an asymptotic variance which, under rather mild conditions, is smaller than or equal to the asymptotic variance of the corresponding estimator based on disjoint blocks. Finally, the general theory is applied to three well-known estimators of the extremal index. It turns out that they all have the same limit distribution, a fact which has so far been overlooked in the literature.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 62G32; secondary 62M10, 62G05, 60F17.

Keywords: asymptotic efficiency, empirical processes, extremal index, extreme value analysis, sliding vs disjoint blocks, time series, uniform central limit theorems.

1. Introduction

The analysis of the serial dependence between large observations is crucial for a thorough understanding of the extreme value behavior of stationary time series. In the peaks over threshold (POT) approach, estimators of the dependence structure can usually be defined blockwise. To be more specific, assume that, starting from a stationary \mathbb{R}^d -valued time series $(X_t)_{1 \leq t \leq n}$, random variables (rv's) $X_{n,i}$ are defined, that in some sense capture its extreme value behavior. The most common example is $X_{n,i} := (X_i/u_n)\mathbf{1}_{(u_n, \infty)}(\|X_i\|)$ for some threshold u_n and some norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^d , but for certain applications $X_{n,i}$ may also depend on observations in the neighborhood of extreme observations. We consider statistics $g(Y_{n,j})$ of blocks

$$Y_{n,j} := (X_{n,j}, \dots, X_{n,j+s_n-1}) \tag{1.1}$$

of (possibly increasing) length s_n , starting with the j th rv. Estimators and test statistics of interest can then be defined in terms of averages of such blocks statistics. For example, the well-known blocks estimator of the extremal index (roughly speaking, the reciprocal of the mean size of a cluster of extreme values) is of this type; see Section 3 for details.

Other examples are the empirical extremogram analyzed by [Davis & Mikosch \(2009\)](#), forward and backward estimators of the distribution of the spectral tail process of a regularly varying time series examined by [Drees et al. \(2015\)](#) and [Davis et al. \(2018\)](#), and the estimator of the cluster size distribution proposed by [Hsing \(1991\)](#).

Here one may average either statistics $g(Y_{n, is_n+1})$, $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor n/s_n \rfloor - 1$, of disjoint blocks or statistics $g(Y_{n,i})$, $1 \leq i \leq n - s_n + 1$, of overlapping sliding blocks. It has been suggested in the literature that the latter approach may often be more efficient; see, e.g., [Beirlant et al. \(2004\)](#), p. 390, for such a statement about blocks estimators of the extremal index. However, the asymptotic performance of both approaches has been compared only for a couple of estimators, while general results showing the superiority of the sliding blocks estimators are not yet known in the POT setting. [Robert et al. \(2009\)](#) proved that for a different type of estimators of the extremal index the version using sliding blocks has a strictly smaller asymptotic variance than the one based on disjoint blocks, while the bias is asymptotically the same. In a block maxima setting, [Zou et al. \(2019\)](#) proved that under quite general conditions an estimator of the extreme value copula of multivariate stationary time series is more efficient if it is based on sliding rather than disjoint blocks. The same observation has been made by [Bücher & Segers \(2018\)](#) for the maximum likelihood estimator of the parameters of a Fréchet distribution based on maxima of sliding or disjoint blocks, respectively, of a stationary time series with marginal distribution in the maximum domain of attraction of this Fréchet distribution. [Drees & Rootzén \(2010\)](#) provided a general framework to analyze the asymptotic behavior of statistics which are based on averages of functionals of disjoint blocks from an absolutely regular time series. Sufficient conditions for convergence of the empirical process of so-called cluster functionals established there proved to be a powerful tool for establishing asymptotic normality of a wide range of estimators; see, e.g., [Drees \(2015\)](#), [Davis et al. \(2018\)](#), and [Drees & Knezevic \(2020\)](#). Unfortunately, the setting considered by [Drees & Rootzén \(2010\)](#) is too restrictive to accommodate empirical processes based on sliding blocks.

The first aim of the present paper is thus to establish results on the convergence of empirical processes of the type

$$\bar{Z}_n(g) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n} b_n(g)} \sum_{j=1}^{n-s_n+1} (g(Y_{n,j}) - Eg(Y_{n,j})), \quad g \in \mathcal{G}.$$

Here $Y_{n,j}$ is defined by [\(1.1\)](#) for some row-wise stationary triangular array $(X_{n,i})_{1 \leq i \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$, \mathcal{G} is a set of functionals defined on vectors of arbitrary length that vanish if applied to a null vector and $\sqrt{p_n} b_n(g)$ is a normalizing sequence which will be introduced in [Section 2](#). We are mainly interested in the case when $X_{n,i}$ are suitably standardized extremes. In particular, we will assume $P\{\exists g \in \mathcal{G} : g(Y_{n,1}) \neq 0\} \rightarrow 0$. It is worth mentioning, though, that our general results can be applied to other statistics of rare events (cf. [Drees & Rootzén \(2010\)](#), Ex. 3.5).

The second aim is to compare the performance of estimators derived from $\bar{Z}_n(g)$ with their analogs based on disjoint blocks. To this end, we will prove convergence of certain empirical processes in an abstract unifying framework which encompasses both the afore-

mentioned setting to deal with sliding blocks processes \bar{Z}_n and the setting discussed by [Drees & Rootzén \(2010\)](#). This way one may derive the asymptotic normality of functionals of sliding resp. disjoint blocks under similar conditions, and the expressions obtained for their asymptotic variances become comparable. It will be shown that indeed, under weak conditions, the asymptotic variance of an estimator using sliding blocks statistics is never greater than the asymptotic variance of its counterpart based on disjoint blocks. Sometimes block based extreme value statistics are motivated by the interpretation that all large values in such a block form a cluster of extremes. In another interpretation, all large values which are not separated in time by a certain number of smaller values form a cluster. This leads to so-called runs estimators, the best-known example of which is the estimator of the extremal index, proposed by [Hsing \(1993\)](#). Such runs estimators can be considered as a special type of sliding blocks estimators and can thus be analyzed with the techniques developed in this paper under comparable conditions as estimators based on disjoint blocks. It turns out that both types of estimators of the extremal index have the same asymptotic variance. While the asymptotic normality of both estimators has already been proved by [Weissman & Novak \(1998\)](#), the equality of their asymptotic variances has been overlooked, because the variances were expressed differently. In addition, we establish the asymptotic normality of the direct sliding blocks analog to the disjoint blocks estimator. Under mild conditions, this estimator has the same asymptotic variance, too. This application demonstrates that, by analyzing different estimators of the same parameter in a unifying framework, one may gain new insights.

The paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we first establish sufficient conditions for the convergence of empirical processes of sliding blocks statistics. [Table 1](#) provides an overview of several sequences of real and integer numbers arising in this context. In [Subsection 2.1](#), the asymptotic variances of estimators using sliding and disjoint blocks, respectively, are compared. In [Section 3](#), the general theory is applied to three estimators of the extremal index. Process convergence in the general abstract setting is presented in [Appendix A](#), while all proofs are collected in [Appendix B](#). Refinements to some of the results of this paper and detailed sufficient conditions for the asymptotic normality of statistics considered in [Subsection 2.1](#) are presented in a Supplement.

Throughout the paper, $(E, \|\cdot\|)$ denotes a complete normed vector space and $E_{\cup} := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E^n$ the set of vectors of arbitrary length with E -valued components. \mathbb{N} denotes the natural numbers excluding 0. For any doubly indexed sequence $Q_{n,i}$, $1 \leq i \leq m_n$, of random variables that are identically distributed, Q_n denotes a generic random variable with the same distribution as $Q_{n,1}$. Outer probabilities are denoted by P^* , outer expectations by E^* . Weak convergence is indicated by \xrightarrow{w} , while \xrightarrow{P} denotes convergence in probability and $\xrightarrow{P^*}$ convergence in outer probability. The positive part of any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is denoted by $x^+ := \max(x, 0)$.

2. Empirical processes of sliding blocks statistics

Throughout this section we assume that $(X_{n,i})_{1 \leq i \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a triangular array of row-wise stationary E -valued random variables. First we establish conditions under which an empirical process of sliding blocks statistics of the type

$$\bar{Z}_n(g) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n} b_n(g)} \sum_{j=1}^{n-s_n+1} (g(Y_{n,j}) - Eg(Y_{n,j})), \quad g \in \mathcal{G}, \quad (2.1)$$

converges to a Gaussian process in the space $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{G})$ of bounded functions on \mathcal{G} , endowed with the supremum norm. The normalizing sequence $\sqrt{p_n} b_n(g) \rightarrow \infty$ is discussed below. To this end, we will apply the general abstract results presented in Appendix A to

$$V_{n,i}(g) := \frac{1}{b_n(g)} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,(i-1)r_n+j}) \quad (2.2)$$

where r_n denotes a sequence that grows faster than s_n but slower than n . Furthermore, r_n is chosen such that it is unlikely to have any extreme value in a sequence of r_n consecutive observations. More precisely, we assume

$$p_n := P\{\exists g \in \mathcal{G} : V_n(g) \neq 0\} \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.3)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where V_n has the same distribution as any $V_{n,i}$. The set $\{\exists g \in \mathcal{G} : V_n(g) \neq 0\}$ is measurable under the following condition:

(D0) The processes V_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are separable.

Condition (D0) helps to avoid measurability problems; in particular, it is fulfilled if \mathcal{G} is finite. Note that \bar{Z}_n can be approximated by

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n(g) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n} b_n(g)} \sum_{j=1}^{m_n r_n} (g(Y_{n,j}) - Eg(Y_{n,j})) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{m_n} (V_{n,i}(g) - EV_{n,i}(g)), \quad g \in \mathcal{G}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

with $m_n := \lfloor (n - s_n + 1)/r_n \rfloor$. We will see below that under suitable conditions the last $n - s_n + 1 - m_n r_n < r_n$ summands in definition (2.1) of \bar{Z}_n are asymptotically negligible. We will prove process convergence using the well-known ‘‘big blocks, small blocks’’ technique where each $Y_{n,j}$ takes over the role of a single observation and r_n is the length of the big blocks. In addition, we need to choose the length l_n of the smaller blocks which must not be smaller than s_n , so that $Y_{n,j}$ and $Y_{n,j+l_n}$ do not overlap. Moreover, we assume that the dependence between observations separated in time by $l_n - s_n$ vanishes asymptotically. The strength of dependence will be measured by the mixing coefficients

$$\beta_{n,k}^X := \sup_{1 \leq l \leq n-k-1} E \left[\sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{n,l+k+1}^n} |P(B|\mathcal{B}_{n,1}^l) - P(B)| \right] \quad (2.5)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{n,i}^j$ denotes the σ -field generated by $(X_{n,l})_{i \leq l \leq j}$. To summarize, we require the following conditions on the observational scheme, the different sequences and the function class:

- (A1) $(X_{n,i})_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is stationary for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (A2) The sequences $l_n, r_n, s_n \in \mathbb{N}$, p_n defined in (2.3), and $b_n(g) > 0$, $g \in \mathcal{G}$, satisfy $s_n \leq l_n = o(r_n)$, $r_n = o(n)$, $p_n \rightarrow 0$ and $r_n = o(\sqrt{p_n} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} b_n(g))$.
- (MX) $m_n \beta_{n, l_n - s_n}^X \rightarrow 0$ for $m_n := \lfloor (n - s_n + 1)/r_n \rfloor$.

An overview of the sequences and their interpretations can be found in Table 1. Finally, to ensure the convergence of the finite dimensional marginal distributions (fidis) of \bar{Z}_n , we assume

- (C) There exists a function $c : \mathcal{G}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\frac{m_n}{p_n} \text{Cov}(V_n(g), V_n(h)) \rightarrow c(g, h), \quad \forall g, h \in \mathcal{G}.$$

Our first result deals with the convergence of the fidis if \mathcal{G} is uniformly bounded.

Theorem 2.1. Suppose $g_{\max} = \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} |g|$ is bounded and measurable and the conditions (A1), (A2), (D0) and (MX) are met. Moreover, assume

$$E \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{g(Y_{n,j}) \neq 0\}} \right)^2 \right] = O \left(\frac{p_n b_n^2(g)}{m_n} \right), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}. \quad (2.6)$$

Then

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} |Z_n(g) - \bar{Z}_n(g)| \xrightarrow{P^*} 0. \quad (2.7)$$

If, in addition, (C) is fulfilled, then the fidis of each of the empirical processes $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ and $(\bar{Z}_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ converge weakly to the fidis of a Gaussian process $(Z(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ with covariance function c .

The following criterion is often useful to verify condition (2.6):

- (S) For all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{r_n} P \{g(Y_{n,1}) \neq 0, g(Y_{n,k}) \neq 0\} = O \left(\frac{p_n b_n^2(g)}{n} \right).$$

Lemma 2.2. If condition (S) is satisfied, then (2.6) holds.

For instance, in Section 3 we consider the bounded functions

$$g_1(x_1, \dots, x_s) := \mathbb{1}_{\{\max_{1 \leq i \leq s} x_i > 1\}}, \quad g_2(x_1, \dots, x_s) := \mathbb{1}_{\{x_1 > 1\}}$$

to analyze the sliding blocks estimator of the extremal index. Here appropriate normalizing sequences are $b_n(g_1) = \sqrt{m_n} s_n$ and $b_n(g_2) = \sqrt{m_n}$. Note that already in this rather simple example, the normalizing sequences converge at a different rate for different functions. Indeed, it is somewhat archetypical that the event $g(Y_{n,1}) \neq 0$ either depends on all observations of the block $Y_{n,1}$ (as for $g = g_1$), or it only depends on a single fixed observation $X_{n,i}$ (as for $g = g_2$); usually the normalizing factor $b_n(g)$ is larger by the factor s_n in the former case.

To ensure asymptotic equicontinuity or tightness of the processes $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ and $(\bar{Z}_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$, and thus process convergence if the conditions of Theorem 2.1 are fulfilled, we need the following additional conditions.

- (D1) There exists a semi-metric ρ on \mathcal{G} such that \mathcal{G} is totally bounded (i.e. for all $\epsilon > 0$, it can be covered by finitely many balls with radius ϵ w.r.t. ρ) and

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{g, h \in \mathcal{G}, \rho(g, h) < \delta} \frac{m_n}{p_n} E[(V_n(g) - V_n(h))^2] = 0.$$

- (D2)

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\delta \sqrt{\log N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}, L_2^n)} d\epsilon = 0,$$

where $N_{[\cdot]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}, L_2^n)$ denotes the ϵ -bracketing number of \mathcal{G} w.r.t. L_2^n , i.e. the smallest number N_ϵ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a partition $(\mathcal{G}_{n,k}^\epsilon)_{1 \leq k \leq N_\epsilon}$ of \mathcal{G} satisfying

$$\frac{m_n}{p_n} E^* \left[\sup_{g, h \in \mathcal{G}_{n,k}^\epsilon} (V_n(g) - V_n(h))^2 \right] \leq \epsilon^2, \quad \forall 1 \leq k \leq N_\epsilon.$$

- (D3) Denote by $N(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}, d_n)$ the ϵ -covering number of \mathcal{G} w.r.t. the random semi-metric

$$d_n(g, h) = \left(\frac{1}{p_n} \sum_{i=1}^{m_n} (V_{n,i}^*(g) - V_{n,i}^*(h))^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

with $V_{n,i}^*$, $1 \leq i \leq m_n$, independent copies of $V_{n,1}$, i.e. $N(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}, d_n)$ is the smallest number of balls with respect to d_n with radius ϵ which is needed to cover \mathcal{G} . We assume

$$\lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P^* \left\{ \int_0^\delta \sqrt{\log(N(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}, d_n))} d\epsilon > \tau \right\} = 0, \quad \forall \tau > 0.$$

Roughly speaking, condition (D1) ensures the continuity of the process w.r.t. ρ while (D2) and (D3) ensure that the parameter set \mathcal{G} is not too complex. In particular, condition (D3) is satisfied if \mathcal{G} is a VC-class (cf. Drees & Rootzén (2010), Remark 2.11).

Theorem 2.3. Suppose the conditions of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied. If, in addition, one of the following sets of conditions

	<i>interpretation</i>	\rightarrow	<i>main constraints</i>	<i>typ. behavior</i>	<i>first use</i>
n	number of observations	∞			p.1
s_n	length of sliding blocks			$s_n \rightarrow \infty$	(1.1)
r_n	length of big block	∞	in Sect. 2: $r_n = o(n)$ $r_n = o(\sqrt{p_n} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} b_n(g))$ in Sect. 3: $r_n v_n \rightarrow 0$, $r_n = o(\sqrt{m_n v_n})$		(2.2)
l_n	length of small block	∞	$s_n \leq l_n = o(r_n)$		(A2)
m_n	number of big blocks	∞	$m_n \asymp n/r_n$		(2.4)
u_n	threshold for X to be large	∞			p.1
v_n	$P\{X_{n,1} \neq 0\}$	0	$n v_n \rightarrow \infty$		p.8
p_n	$P\{\exists 1 \leq i \leq r_n : X_{n,i} \neq 0\}$	0	$r_n = o(\sqrt{p_n} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} b_n(g))$	$p_n \asymp r_n v_n$	(2.3)
$b_n(g)$	normalizing constant	∞	$\sqrt{p_n} b_n(g) \rightarrow \infty$	$b_n(g) \asymp \sqrt{m_n}$ or $b_n(g) \asymp \sqrt{m_n s_n}$	(2.1)
a_n	normalization in Section 2.1			$a_n \asymp 1$	p.8

Table 1. Overview of sequences occurring in Sections 2 and 2.1.

- (i) (D1) and (D2), or
- (ii) (D1) and (D3)

is fulfilled, then each of the empirical processes $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ and $(\bar{Z}_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ converge weakly to a Gaussian process with covariance function c .

So far, we have only discussed the case of bounded functions g . This assumption can be dropped if the moment condition (2.6) is strengthened.

Theorem 2.4. (i) Suppose all conditions of Theorem 2.1 except for the boundedness of g_{\max} and (2.6) are met. In addition, we assume $m_n l_n P\{V_n(|g|) \neq 0\} = o(r_n b_n^2(g) p_n)$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and

$$E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} |g(Y_{n,i})| \right)^{2+\delta} \right] = O \left(\frac{p_n b_n^2(g)}{m_n} \right), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}, \quad (2.8)$$

for some $\delta > 0$. Then the fidis of $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ and of $(\bar{Z}_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ converge to the fidis of the Gaussian process $(Z(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ defined in Theorem 2.1.

- (ii) If, in addition, $b_n(g) = b_n$ is the same for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, (2.8) holds for $g = g_{\max}$ and the conditions (i) or (ii) of Theorem 2.3 are fulfilled, then the processes $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ and $(\bar{Z}_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ converge weakly to $(Z(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ uniformly.

Note that usually $P\{V_n(|g|) \neq 0\} = O(p_n)$; in particular this holds true if g has fixed sign. Then the condition $m_n l_n P\{V_n(|g|) \neq 0\} = o(r_n b_n^2(g) p_n)$ is fulfilled for the typical behavior of the sequences outlined in Table 1. As mentioned above, usually it suffices to consider just two different normalizing sequences, say $b_{n,1}$ and $b_{n,2}$. In this case, one may apply Theorem 2.4 separately to $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}_i}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ with $\mathcal{G}_i := \{g \in \mathcal{G} | b_n(g) = b_{n,i}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ to conclude that both processes are asymptotically tight. This in turn implies the asymptotic tightness of $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ and thus, in view of part (i), its convergence to $(Z(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$. Hence, in fact the extra condition on b_n in part (ii) does not further restrict the setting in the vast majority of applications.

2.1. Sliding vs. disjoint blocks statistics

The previous section was devoted to general limit theorems for sliding blocks statistics. In this section, we want to compare the asymptotic variance of a sliding blocks statistic for a single functional g with that of the corresponding disjoint blocks statistic. Here we use a different parametrization of the normalizing constants, partly because the probability p_n used in the normalization above refers to the whole process and seems inappropriate in the present context, partly to facilitate the comparison of the asymptotic variances. More precisely, we consider the sliding blocks statistic and its disjoint blocks analog

$$T_n^s(g) := \frac{1}{nv_n s_n a_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} g(Y_{n,i})$$

$$T_n^d(g) := \frac{1}{nv_n a_n} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/s_n \rfloor} g(Y_{n,(i-1)s_n+1}),$$

with $v_n := P(X_{n,1} \neq 0) \rightarrow 0$. We assume that a_n is chosen such that $E(T_n^s(g))$ converges in \mathbb{R} , i.e. that there exists some $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$E[T_n^s(g)] = \frac{1}{s_n v_n a_n} E[g(Y_n)] \frac{n-s_n+1}{n} \rightarrow \xi. \quad (2.9)$$

Then also $E(T_n^d(g))$ tends to ξ . Moreover, the difference between both expectations is asymptotically negligible if

$$\left| E[T_n^d(g) - T_n^s(g)] \right| = \frac{1}{s_n v_n a_n} |E[g(Y_n)]| \cdot \left| \frac{s_n}{n} \lfloor \frac{n}{s_n} \rfloor - \frac{n-s_n+1}{n} \right| = O(s_n/n)$$

is of smaller order than $(nv_n)^{-1/2}$ (cf. (2.11), (2.12)), which in particular holds under the basic condition $s_n v_n \rightarrow 0$. In that case, $T_n^s(g)$ will be a more efficient estimator than $T_n^d(g)$ if its asymptotic variance is smaller.

Applying Theorem 2.1 with $b_n(g) = \sqrt{nv_n/p_n a_n s_n}$, under suitable conditions including the convergence

$$c^{(s)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n^2 a_n^2} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,i}) \right) \in (0, \infty), \quad (2.10)$$

one can prove the asymptotic normality of the sliding blocks statistics

$$\sqrt{nv_n} (T_n^s(g) - E[T_n^s(g)]) \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{N}(0, c^{(s)}). \quad (2.11)$$

To establish an analogous result for the statistic based on disjoint blocks, one applies Theorem A.1 to $V_{n,i}(g) = \sqrt{p_n/(nv_n a_n^2)} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n/s_n} g(Y_{n,(j-1)s_n+(i-1)r_n+1})$, $1 \leq i \leq m_n$. Recall that the sequence r_n is only needed in the proofs which use the “big blocks, small blocks” technique, i.e. it has no operational meaning, but it must be chosen such

that the conditions of Theorem 2.1 resp. Theorem A.1 are met. For example, suppose that for a given sequence $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence such that the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied. Let $r_n^* := \lfloor r_n/s_n \rfloor s_n \sim r_n$, so that $l_n = o(r_n^*)$, $r_n^* = o(n)$ and $m_n^* := \lfloor (n - s_n + 1)/r_n^* \rfloor \sim m_n$. Moreover, the proof of Theorem 2.1 (cf. (B.4)) shows that for

$$V_{n,1}^*(g) := \frac{1}{b_n(g)} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n^*} g(Y_{n,j}), \quad \text{and} \quad p_n^* := P\{\exists g \in \mathcal{G} : V_{n,1}^*(g) \neq 0\},$$

one has

$$E[(V_{n,1}^*(g) - V_{n,1}(g))^2] = E\left[\left(\frac{1}{b_n(g)} \sum_{j=r_n^*+1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,j})\right)^2\right] = o\left(\frac{p_n}{m_n}\right),$$

$$|p_n^* - p_n| \leq s_n v_n.$$

Hence, if $p_n \asymp r_n v_n$ (which holds true for all known examples), $p_n^* \sim p_n$ and the conditions of Theorem 2.1 are still fulfilled if one replaces r_n with r_n^* . One may argue similarly in the setting of Theorem 2.4.

We may thus assume w.l.o.g. that r_n is a multiple of s_n , where the multiplicity depends on n . Note that r_n/s_n must tend to ∞ if Theorem 2.1 shall be applied. We then obtain

$$\sqrt{nv_n} (T_n^d(g) - E[T_n^d(g)]) \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{N}(0, c^{(d)}), \quad (2.12)$$

with

$$c^{(d)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n a_n^2} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n/s_n} g(Y_{n, is_n+1}) \right). \quad (2.13)$$

See the Supplement for details about the conditions under which (2.11) and (2.12) hold. Alternatively, one could prove the asymptotic normality of $T_n^d(g)$ using Theorem 2.3 of Drees & Rootzén (2010) with r_n replaced by s_n , but the above representation of the asymptotic variance $c^{(d)}$ simplifies the comparison with $c^{(s)}$. The following theorem shows that the asymptotic variance of the sliding blocks statistic is never greater than that of the disjoint blocks statistic.

Theorem 2.5. If conditions (A1), (2.10) and (2.13) hold, and $r_n/s_n \in \mathbb{N}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $c^{(s)} \leq c^{(d)}$.

Indeed, one can even prove a multivariate version of this theorem: under suitable conditions the asymptotic covariance matrix of a vector of sliding blocks statistics $(T_n^s(g_i))_{1 \leq i \leq I}$ is smaller w.r.t. the Loewner order than the corresponding matrix of the disjoint blocks statistics (see Supplement).

Usually, the probability v_n that a single observation $X_{n,1}$ does not vanish is unknown, whereas the normalizing constant a_n may depend on g , but not on the unknown distribution of $X_{n,1}$. In what follows, we thus analyze versions of our statistics where v_n is

replaced with a simple empirical estimator. This results in the estimators

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{T}_n^s(g) &:= \frac{nv_n T_n^s(g)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}}} = \frac{\frac{1}{s_n a_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} g(Y_{n,i})}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}}}, \\ \tilde{T}_n^d(g) &:= \frac{nv_n T_n^d(g)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}}} = \frac{\frac{1}{a_n} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/s_n \rfloor} g(Y_{n,(i-1)s_n+1})}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}}}\end{aligned}$$

of ξ . In order to prove convergence of these estimators, one needs the joint convergence of the numerator and denominator. This can again be concluded from Theorem 2.1 or Theorem A.1, respectively, now applied with $\mathcal{G} = \{g, h\}$ and $h(x_1, \dots, x_s) = \mathbb{1}_{\{x_1 \neq 0\}}$. Similarly as before, one obtains

$$\sqrt{nv_n} \left(\frac{T_n^\sharp(g) - E[T_n^\sharp(g)]}{\frac{1}{nv_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} - v_n)} \right) \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{N}_2 \left(0, \begin{pmatrix} c^{(\sharp)} & c^{(\sharp, v)} \\ c^{(\sharp, v)} & c^{(v)} \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

where \sharp stands either for d or s and

$$\begin{aligned}c^{(s, v)} &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n a_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,i}), \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} \right), \\ c^{(d, v)} &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n a_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n/s_n} g(Y_{n,(j-1)s_n+1}), \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} \right), \\ c^{(v)} &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n} E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} \right)^2 \right].\end{aligned}$$

Note that the same result holds if $\sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1}$ is replaced with $\sum_{i=1}^n$ (cf. (2.7)).

By some standard continuous mapping argument (see Supplement), one may conclude

$$\sqrt{nv_n} (\tilde{T}_n^\sharp - \xi) \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{N}(0, \tilde{c}^{(\sharp)})$$

with $\tilde{c}^{(\sharp)} := c^{(\sharp)} + \xi^2 c^{(v)} - 2\xi c^{(\sharp, v)}$, provided the bias of the estimator is negligible, that is $E[g(Y_n)]/s_n v_n a_n - \xi = o((nv_n)^{-1/2})$.

It turns out that under rather mild conditions again the asymptotic variance of the estimator using sliding blocks is not greater than that of the disjoint blocks estimator, if the function g has constant sign.

Theorem 2.6. Suppose the conditions of Theorem 2.5 are satisfied, (2.9) holds, the function g is bounded and does not change its sign, $s_n = o(r_n a_n)$ and $s_n v_n \rightarrow 0$. If, in addition, there exists a sequence $k_n = o(r_n a_n)$ of natural numbers such that the β -mixing coefficients defined in (2.5) satisfy $\sum_{i=k_n}^{r_n} \beta_{n,i}^X = o(r_n v_n a_n)$, then $\tilde{c}^{(s)} \leq \tilde{c}^{(d)}$.

In fact, it can be shown that $\tilde{c}^{(d)} - \tilde{c}^{(s)} = c^{(d)} - c^{(s)}$. In the most common case that the mixing coefficients decrease exponentially fast and $\log n = o(r_n a_n)$, the sequence $k_n = \lfloor c \log n \rfloor$ with sufficiently large constant $c > 0$ fulfills the conditions of Theorem 2.6.

3. Estimating the extremal index

In this section we apply the general theory presented in Section 2 and Appendix A to analyze the asymptotic behavior of three estimators for the extremal index of a real-valued stationary time series $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$. If for all thresholds $u_n(\tau)$ such that $nP\{X_0 > u_n(\tau)\} \rightarrow \tau$ for some $\tau > 0$ one has

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P\left\{ \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} X_i \leq u_n(\tau) \right\} = e^{-\theta\tau},$$

then θ is said to be the *extremal index* of the time series (Leadbetter (1983)). The extremal index always lies in $[0, 1]$. In what follows, we exclude the degenerate case $\theta = 0$ and assume $\theta > 0$.

The estimation of this extremal index has been much discussed in the literature, see e.g. Smith & Weissman (1994), Ferro & Segers (2003), Süveges (2007), Robert et al. (2009), Berghaus et al. (2018), among others. We examine two of the most popular estimators, the blocks and the runs estimator, and a variant of the former. Throughout this section, we use the notation $M_{i,j} := \max(X_i, \dots, X_j)$.

If the extremal index exists then, under weak additional conditions,

$$\frac{P\{M_{1,k_n} > u_n\}}{k_n P\{X_1 > u_n\}} \rightarrow \theta \quad (3.1)$$

for sequences $k_n \rightarrow \infty$ and u_n such that $k_n P\{X_1 > u_n\} \rightarrow \theta$. In particular, this holds if $\beta_{n,l_n}^X / (k_n v_n) \rightarrow 0$ for some $l_n = o(k_n)$ (cf. Leadbetter (1983), Theorem 3.4). If one replaces the unknown probabilities by empirical ones, using disjoint blocks to estimate the numerator for $k_n = s_n$, one arrives at the following estimator proposed by Hsing (1991):

$$\hat{\theta}_n^d := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/s_n \rfloor} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{(i-1)s_n+1, i s_n} > u_n\}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n\}}}.$$

He proved asymptotic normality of this blocks estimator under some tailor-made conditions. As suggested in Section 10.3.4 of Beirlant et al. (2004), alternatively one may use sliding blocks, which leads to

$$\hat{\theta}_n^s := \frac{\frac{1}{s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n\}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n\}}}.$$

The so-called runs estimator of θ is based on the following characterization of the extremal index:

$$P(M_{2,k_n} \leq u_n | X_1 > u_n) \rightarrow \theta, \quad (3.2)$$

which was first proven by O'Brien (1987) under suitable conditions. Again, by replacing the unknown probabilities for $k_n = s_n$ by empirical counterparts, one arrives at

$$\hat{\theta}_n^r := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n, M_{i+1, i+s_n-1} \leq u_n\}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n\}}}.$$

This runs estimator was suggested by [Hsing \(1993\)](#). Its asymptotic normality was first established in [Weissman & Novak \(1998\)](#) who also proved the asymptotic normality of $\hat{\theta}_n^d$ under somewhat simpler conditions than [Hsing \(1991\)](#). For a very specific model, [Weissman & Novak \(1998\)](#) showed that the asymptotic variances of both estimators are the same, but they did not realize that this is indeed true under quite general structural assumptions, as we will show below.

To establish asymptotic normality of these estimators, we need the following conditions:

($\theta 1$) For $v_n := P\{X_1 > u_n\} \rightarrow 0$, one has $nv_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $s_n \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, there exists a sequence $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $s_n = o(r_n)$, $r_n v_n \rightarrow 0$, $r_n = o(\sqrt{nv_n})$ and $(n/r_n)\beta_{n,s_n-1}^X \rightarrow 0$.

($\theta 2$) $c := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n} E \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > u_n\}} \right)^2 \right]$ exists in $[0, \infty)$.

(θP) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $e_n(k)$ such that

$$e_n(k) \geq P(X_k > u_n | X_0 > u_n)$$

$$\text{and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{r_n} e_n(k) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_n(k) < \infty.$$

By Pratt's lemma ([Pratt \(1960\)](#)), condition (θP) enables us to exchange sums and limits in the calculation of variance and covariance. Moreover, under ($\theta 1$) and (θP), both [\(3.1\)](#) and [\(3.2\)](#) hold for all $k_n \leq r_n$ such that $k_n \rightarrow \infty$. This follows from Theorem 1 and Corollary 2 of [Segers \(2003\)](#) in combination with the aforementioned result on convergence [\(3.1\)](#).

The limit c is the asymptotic variance of the estimator for $v_n = P\{X_i > u_n\}$. If (θP) holds and the positive part $(X_t^+)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of the time series is regular varying, then c can be represented in terms of its tail process $(W_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ (see Supplement), i.e. ($\theta 2$) holds with

$$\begin{aligned} c &= 1 + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{r_n-1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{r_n}\right) (P(X_k > u_n | X_0 > u_n) + P(X_0 > u_n | X_{-k} > u_n)) \\ &= 1 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P\{W_k > 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, one may use the representation $c = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} P\{W_k > 1\}$.

In addition, we have to assume that convergence [\(3.1\)](#) for $k_n = s_n$ and convergence [\(3.2\)](#), respectively, is sufficiently fast to ensure that the bias of the block based estimators or runs estimators, respectively, is asymptotically negligible:

$$(\mathbf{B}_b) \quad \frac{P\{M_{1,s_n} > u_n\}}{s_n v_n} - \theta = o((nv_n)^{-1/2}).$$

$$(\mathbf{B}_r) \quad P(M_{2,s_n} \leq u_n | X_1 > u_n) - \theta = o((nv_n)^{-1/2}).$$

The following result shows that under our conditions all three estimator have the same limit distribution.

Theorem 3.1. If the conditions $(\theta 1)$, $(\theta 2)$ and (θP) are satisfied, then

$$\sqrt{nv_n}(\hat{\theta}_n^\sharp - \theta) \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{N}(0, \theta(\theta c - 1)),$$

provided (B_b) holds when \sharp stands for ‘d’ or ‘s’, and (B_r) holds when \sharp stands for ‘r’.

In practice, usually the threshold u_n is replaced with some data driven choice \hat{u}_n , like an intermediate order statistic of the observed time series. By the techniques developed in [Drees & Knezevic \(2020\)](#), one may prove that these versions of the estimators of the extremal index asymptotically behave the same, provided $\hat{u}_n/u_n \xrightarrow{P} 1$ and the time series $(X_t^+)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is regular varying. To this end, the results about the convergence of the fidis are not sufficient any more, but the full process convergence is needed. The precise results and their proofs are given in the Supplement.

Appendix A: Functional limit theorems in an abstract setting

In this section we prove abstract limit theorems for empirical processes which imply both the limit theorems [2.1](#), [2.3](#) and [2.4](#) for statistics of sliding blocks and the limit theorems established by [Drees & Rootzén \(2010\)](#). As in [Section 2](#) we consider a triangular array $(X_{n,i})_{1 \leq i \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of row-wise stationary E -valued random variables. Fix sequences $r_n = o(n)$ and $s_n = o(r_n)$ of natural numbers. In what follows, $V_{n,i}(g)$ are real-valued random variables that are measurable w.r.t. $(X_{n,(i-1)r_n+1}, \dots, X_{n,ir_n+s_n-1})$, for all $1 \leq i \leq m_n$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}$, which are assumed to form a stationary sequence of processes. We are interested in the weak convergence of

$$Z_n(g) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{m_n} (V_{n,i}(g) - E[V_{n,i}(g)]), \quad g \in \mathcal{G},$$

where $m_n := \lfloor (n - s_n + 1)/r_n \rfloor$ and $p_n := P\{\exists g \in \mathcal{G} : V_n(g) \neq 0\} \rightarrow 0$ is assumed.

The choice $V_{n,i}(g) = m_n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} g(X_{n,(i-1)r_n+j})$ leads to the generalized tail array sums examined in [Section 3](#) of [Drees & Rootzén \(2010\)](#). Sums of more general statistics of disjoint blocks can be analyzed using $V_{n,i}(g) = \sum_{j=0}^{r_n/s_n-1} g(Y_{n,(i-1)r_n+j s_n+1})/d_n(g)$ for suitable normalizing sequences $d_n(g)$ (assuming that r_n is a multiple of s_n), while the choice [\(2.2\)](#) yields sums of statistics of sliding blocks.

In an abstract version of the “big blocks, small blocks” approach, we approximate $V_{n,i}$ by stationary sequences of random processes $\tilde{V}_{n,i}$ that are asymptotically independent.

For example, $V_{n,i}(g) = m_n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} g(X_{n,(i-1)r_n+j})$ can be approximated by $\tilde{V}_{n,i}(g) = m_n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n-l_n} g(X_{n,(i-1)r_n+j})$ for a suitable sequence $l_n = o(r_n)$.

We now list the conditions used to establish convergence of the finite dimensional marginal distributions (fidis) of Z_n .

- (A) $(X_{n,i})_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is stationary for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and the sequences $s_n, r_n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy $s_n = o(r_n)$ and $r_n = o(n)$.
- (V) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 \leq i \leq m_n = \lfloor (n - s_n + 1)/r_n \rfloor$, $V_{n,i}$ and $\tilde{V}_{n,i}$ are real valued processes indexed by \mathcal{G} that are measurable w.r.t. $(X_{n,(i-1)r_n+1}, \dots, X_{n,ir_n+s_n-1})$, and $(V_{n,i}, \tilde{V}_{n,i})_{1 \leq i \leq m_n}$ is stationary.
- (M \tilde{V}) $m_n \beta_{n,0}^{\tilde{V}} \rightarrow 0$
- (MX $_k$) $m_n \beta_{n,(k-1)r_n-s_n}^{\tilde{X}} \rightarrow 0$
- (Δ) $\Delta_n := V_n - \tilde{V}_n$ satisfies
- (i) $E \left[(\Delta_n(g) - E[\Delta_n(g)])^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|\Delta_n(g) - E[\Delta_n(g)]| \leq \sqrt{p_n}\}} \right] = o(p_n/m_n), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G},$
- (ii) $P \{ |\Delta_n(g) - E[\Delta_n(g)]| > \sqrt{p_n} \} = o(1/m_n), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}.$
- (L) $E \left[(V_n(g) - E[V_n(g)])^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_n(g) - E[V_n(g)]| > \epsilon \sqrt{p_n}\}} \right] = o(p_n/m_n), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}, \epsilon > 0.$

In addition, Conditions (C) and (D0) stated in Section 2 are needed. Condition (Δ) ensures that the approximation of $V_{n,i}$ by $\tilde{V}_{n,i}$ is sufficiently accurate. It is always fulfilled if

$$E \left[(\Delta_n(g))^2 \right] = o(p_n/m_n), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The mixing conditions (MX $_k$) and (M \tilde{V}) enable us to replace the summands by independent copies, while (C) and the Lindeberg condition (L) imply convergence of the sum of independent copies of $V_n(g)$.

Theorem A.1. Suppose the conditions (A), (V), (M \tilde{V}), (MX $_k$) for some $k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2$, (Δ), (L), (D0) and (C) are satisfied. Then the fidis of the empirical process $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ converge weakly to the fidis of a Gaussian process with covariance function c .

To conclude convergence of the processes $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$, we have to show that they are asymptotically tight or asymptotically equicontinuous. To this end, we need (D1)–(D3) from Section 2 and the following conditions:

- (B) $E[|V_n(g)|^2] < \infty$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, and $V_n(\mathcal{G}) := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} |V_n(g)| < \infty$.
- (L1) $E^* \left[V_n(\mathcal{G}) \mathbf{1}_{\{V_n(\mathcal{G}) > \epsilon \sqrt{p_n}\}} \right] = o(\sqrt{p_n}/m_n), \quad \forall \epsilon > 0.$

Condition (L1) follows from the following condition of Lindeberg type, that also implies (L) (see Supplement):

$$(\text{L2}) \quad E^* \left[(V_n(\mathcal{G}))^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{V_n(\mathcal{G}) > \epsilon \sqrt{p_n}\}} \right] = o(p_n/m_n), \quad \forall \epsilon > 0.$$

Theorem A.2. (i) If the conditions (A), (V), (MX $_k$) for some $k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2$, (B), (L1), (D0), (D1) and (D2) are satisfied, then the processes $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ are asymptotically tight.

(ii) If the conditions (A), (V), (MX $_k$) for some $k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2$, (B), (L2), (D0), (D1) and (D3) are satisfied, then the processes $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ are asymptotically equicontinuous.

Hence, the processes converge to a Gaussian process with covariance function c if, in addition, the assumptions of Theorem A.1 are fulfilled.

Appendix B: Proofs

B.1. Proofs of Appendix A

We first show that for the proof of convergence of the fidis it suffices to consider independent copies of $V_{n,i}$.

Lemma B.1. Suppose the conditions (A), (Δ), ($M\tilde{V}$) and (MX_k) for some $k \in \mathbb{N}, k \geq 2$, are satisfied. Let

$$Z_n^*(g) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{m_n} (V_{n,i}^*(g) - E[V_{n,i}^*(g)]), \quad g \in \mathcal{G},$$

where $V_{n,i}^*$ are independent copies of $V_{n,i}$, $1 \leq i \leq m_n$. Then the fidis of $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ converge weakly if and only if the fidis of $(Z_n^*(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ converge, and if so, the limits coincide.

Proof of Lemma B.1. Let $\Delta_{n,i} := V_{n,i} - \tilde{V}_{n,i}$ and $\Delta_{n,i}^*$ be independent copies of $\Delta_{n,i}$, $1 \leq i \leq m_n$. For the k for which (MX_k) is satisfied and for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, condition (Δ) and Theorem 1 of Section IX.1 of [Petrov \(1975\)](#) yield

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_{n,k,i}} (\Delta_{n,jk-i}^*(g) - E[\Delta_{n,jk-i}^*(g)]) = o_P(1), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $m_{n,k,i} := \lfloor (m_n + i)/k \rfloor \leq m_n$.

Recall that $\Delta_{n,jk-i}$ is measurable w.r.t. $(X_{n,(jk-i-1)r_n+1}, \dots, X_{n,(jk-i)r_n+s_n-1})$. For different j , these blocks are separated by at least $(k-1)r_n - s_n$ observations. Hence, by (MX_k) and Lemma 2 of [Eberlein \(1984\)](#), the total variation distance between the joint distribution of $\Delta_{n,jk-i}$, $1 \leq j \leq m_{n,k,i}$, and that of $\Delta_{n,jk-i}^*$, $1 \leq j \leq m_{n,k,i}$, converges to 0:

$$\|P^{(\Delta_{n,jk-i}^*)_{1 \leq j \leq m_{n,k,i}}} - P^{(\Delta_{n,jk-i})_{1 \leq j \leq m_{n,k,i}}}\|_{TV} \leq m_{n,k,i} \beta_{n,(k-1)r_n-s_n}^X \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Hence (B.1) holds with $\Delta_{n,jk-i}$ instead of $\Delta_{n,jk-i}^*$. Summing over all $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ leads to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} (\Delta_{n,j}(g) - E\Delta_{n,j}(g)) = o_P(1), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Thus the fidis of \tilde{Z}_n defined by

$$\tilde{Z}_n(g) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{m_n} (\tilde{V}_{n,i}(g) - E\tilde{V}_{n,i}(g)) = Z_n(g) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_n} (\Delta_{n,j}(g) - E\Delta_{n,j}(g)), \quad g \in \mathcal{G},$$

converge if and only if the fidis of Z_n converge, and the limits coincide if they exist.

Now, by assumption $(M\tilde{V})$ and again the inequality by [Eberlein \(1984\)](#),

$$\|P^{(\tilde{V}_{n,j}^*)_{1 \leq j \leq m_n}} - P^{(\tilde{V}_{n,j})_{1 \leq j \leq m_n}}\|_{TV} \leq m_n \beta_{n,0}^{\tilde{V}} \rightarrow 0.$$

where $\tilde{V}_{n,i}^*$ are iid copies of $\tilde{V}_{n,i}$. Hence, the fidis of \tilde{V}_n converge if and only if the fidis of

$$\tilde{Z}_n^*(g) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{m_n} (\tilde{V}_{n,i}^*(g) - E\tilde{V}_{n,i}^*(g)), \quad g \in \mathcal{G},$$

converge. Finally using the analog to [\(B.3\)](#) with $\Delta_{n,j}^*$ instead of $\Delta_{n,j}$, we arrive at the assertion. \square

Proof of Theorem A.1. In view of the assumptions (L) and (C), the multivariate central limit theorem by Lindeberg-Feller yield convergence of the fidis of $(Z_n^*(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$. The assertion thus follows from [Lemma B.1](#). \square

Proof of Theorem A.2. It suffices to prove that, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$, the processes

$$Z_n^{(i)}(g) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_{n,k,i}} (V_{n,kj-i}(g) - EV_{n,kj-i}(g)), \quad g \in \mathcal{G},$$

(with $m_{n,k,i} := \lfloor (m_n + i)/k \rfloor$) are asymptotically tight or asymptotically equicontinuous, respectively, since these properties carry over to their sum Z_n .

By the same arguments as in the proof of [Lemma B.1](#) (cf. [\(B.2\)](#)), we may conclude

$$\|P^{(V_{n,jk-i}^*)_{1 \leq j \leq m_{n,k,i}}} - P^{(V_{n,jk-i})_{1 \leq j \leq m_{n,k,i}}}\|_{TV} \leq m_{n,k,i} \beta_{n,(k-1)r_n-s_n}^X \rightarrow 0,$$

where $V_{n,jk-i}^*$, $1 \leq j \leq m_{n,k,i}$ are independent copies of $V_{n,1}$.

Therefore, it suffices to prove asymptotic tightness or asymptotic equicontinuity, respectively, of

$$Z_n^{(i)*}(g) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_{n,k,i}} (V_{n,kj-i}^*(g) - E[V_{n,kj-i}^*(g)]), \quad g \in \mathcal{G}.$$

This, however, follows under the given conditions (B), (L1), (D1) and (D2) from [Theorem 2.11.9](#), and under the given conditions (B), (L2), (D0), (D1) and (D3) from [Theorem 2.11.1](#) of [Van der Vaart & Wellner \(1996\)](#). Note that the measurability condition of the latter theorem is automatically fulfilled if the processes are separable. \square

B.2. Proofs of Section 2

Proof of Theorem 2.1. First check that, by assumption (A2),

$$E^* \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} (Z_n(g) - \bar{Z}_n(g))^2 \right] = E^* \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n} b_n(g)} \sum_{j=r_n m_n + 1}^{n-s_n} (g(Y_{n,j}) - E(g(Y_{n,j}))) \right)^2 \right]$$

$$\leq \frac{\|g_{\max}\|_{\infty}^2 r_n^2}{p_n \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} b_n(g)^2} \rightarrow 0,$$

which implies (2.7).

To prove convergence of the fidis, we apply Theorem A.1 to $V_{n,i}$ defined by (2.2) and $\tilde{V}_{n,i}(g) = (b_n(g))^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n-l_n} g(Y_{n,(i-1)r_n+j})$, for which condition (V) is obvious. The conditions (M \tilde{V}) and (MX $_2$) follow readily from (MX) and $\ell_n = o(r_n)$.

For the above choices, we obtain

$$\Delta_{n,1}(g) = V_{n,1}(g) - \tilde{V}_{n,1}(g) = \frac{1}{b_n(g)} \sum_{j=r_n-l_n+1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,j}) \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{b_n(g)} \sum_{j=1}^{l_n} g(Y_{n,j}).$$

Using the arguments of the proof of Cor. 3.6 of Drees & Rootzén (2010) with $X_{n,i}$ replaced by $g(Y_{n,i})$ (cf. also the proof of Theorem 2.4), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} E [(\Delta_n(g))^2] &\leq \frac{1}{b_n(g)^2} \|g_{\max}\|_{\infty}^2 E \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{l_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{g(Y_{n,j}) \neq 0\}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= O \left(\frac{l_n}{r_n b_n(g)^2} E \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{g(Y_{n,j}) \neq 0\}} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= o \left(\frac{p_n}{m_n} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{B.4}$$

Hence, Condition (A.1) is fulfilled, which in turn implies Condition (Δ).

Since g_{\max} is bounded and $\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} b_n(g) > 0$, we have

$$V_n(\mathcal{G}) = \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{b_n(g)} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,(i-1)r_n+j}) \leq r_n \|g_{\max}\|_{\infty} \frac{1}{\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} b_n(g)} < \infty. \tag{B.5}$$

Because of $r_n = o(\sqrt{p_n} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} b_n(g))$, for all $\epsilon > 0$, eventually $V_n(\mathcal{G}) \leq \sqrt{p_n} \epsilon$, so that Condition (L2) (and thus (L), too) is trivial. Now the assertion follows from Theorem A.1. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.2. The stationarity assumption (A1) and condition (S) imply

$$\begin{aligned} E \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{g(Y_{n,j}) \neq 0\}} \right)^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} E [\mathbb{1}_{\{g(Y_{n,i}) \neq 0\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{g(Y_{n,j}) \neq 0\}}] \\ &\leq 2r_n \sum_{k=1}^{r_n} \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{r_n} \right) P \{g(Y_{n,1}) \neq 0, g(Y_{n,k}) \neq 0\} \\ &= O \left(\frac{p_n b_n(g)^2}{m_n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Because of (2.7), the convergence of Z_n and the convergence of \bar{Z}_n are equivalent. To prove the former, we apply Theorem A.2 to the processes $V_{n,i}$ and $\bar{V}_{n,i}$ defined in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Since the conditions (V), (MX₂) and (L2) have already been verified there and the (Di)-conditions, $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, are explicitly assumed to hold in Theorem 2.3, it remains to show that (B) holds. This, however, is obvious from (B.5). \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4. We again apply Theorem A.1 to establish fidi-convergence of $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$. Only the conditions (Δ) and (L) must be verified, because the remaining conditions follow as in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

By the Hölder inequality, the generalized Markov inequality and (2.8), for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \left[(V_n(g))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|V_n(g)| > \sqrt{p_n} \epsilon\}} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{b_n^2(g)} E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,i}) \right)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,i}) \right| > \sqrt{p_n} b_n(g) \epsilon \right\}} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{b_n^2(g)} \left(E \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,i}) \right|^{2+\delta} \right] \right)^{2/(2+\delta)} \left(E \left[\mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,i}) \right| > \sqrt{p_n} b_n(g) \epsilon \right\}} \right] \right)^{\delta/(2+\delta)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{b_n^2(g)} \left(E \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,i}) \right|^{2+\delta} \right] \right)^{2/(2+\delta)} \left(\frac{E \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,i}) \right|^{2+\delta} \right]}{(\sqrt{p_n} b_n(g) \epsilon)^{2+\delta}} \right)^{\delta/(2+\delta)} \\
&= O \left(\frac{1}{b_n^2(g)} \cdot \frac{p_n b_n^2(g)}{m_n} \cdot \frac{1}{(\sqrt{p_n} b_n(g))^\delta} \right) = o \left(\frac{p_n}{m_n} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

because $\sqrt{p_n} b_n(g) \rightarrow \infty$ by assumption (A2). It is easily seen (cf. Section 7 in the Supplement) that this bound implies condition (L).

Furthermore,

$$E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} |g(Y_{n,i})| \right)^2 \right] \geq \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor r_n/l_n \rfloor} E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{l_n} |g(Y_{n,(j-1)l_n+i})| \right)^2 \right] = \lfloor r_n/l_n \rfloor E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{l_n} |g(Y_{n,i})| \right)^2 \right]$$

and thus, by (2.8),

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\Delta_n(g)^2) &\leq \frac{1}{b_n^2(g)} E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{l_n} |g(Y_{n,i})| \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{b_n^2(g) \lfloor r_n/l_n \rfloor} E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} |g(Y_{n,i})| \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{b_n^2(g) \lfloor r_n/l_n \rfloor} E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} |g(Y_{n,i})| \right)^{2+\delta} + \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} |g(Y_{n,i})| \neq 0 \right\}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$= O\left(\frac{l_n}{r_n b_n^2(g)} \left(\frac{p_n b_n^2(g)}{m_n} + P\{V_n(|g|) \neq 0\}\right)\right) = o\left(\frac{p_n}{m_n}\right)$$

where in the last step we have used the assumption $m_n l_n P\{V_n(|g|) \neq 0\} = o(r_n b_n^2(g) p_n)$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Hence, condition (A.1) holds, which in turn implies (Δ) . Now, the convergence of the fidis of $(Z_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ follows from Theorem A.1.

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} E\left((\bar{Z}_n(g) - Z_n(g))^2\right) &= \text{Var}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n} b_n(g)} \sum_{j=r_n m_n+1}^{n-s_n} g(Y_{n,j})\right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p_n b_n^2(g)} E\left[\left(\sum_{j=r_n m_n+1}^{n-s_n} |g(Y_{n,j})|\right)^2\right] \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{m_n} + \frac{P\{V_n(|g|) \neq 0\}}{p_n b_n^2(g)}\right) \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

because $p_n b_n^2(g) \rightarrow \infty$ by assumption (A2), so that the fidi-convergence of $(\bar{Z}_n(g))_{g \in \mathcal{G}}$ follows, too.

Under the conditions of part (ii), the above calculations with g_{\max} instead of g yield (2.7) as well as

$$E^*\left[(V_n(\mathcal{G}))^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{V_n(\mathcal{G}) > \sqrt{p_n} \epsilon\}}\right] = \frac{1}{b_n^2} E\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_{\max}(Y_{n,i})\right)^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_{\max}(Y_{n,i}) > \sqrt{p_n} b_n \epsilon\}}\right] = o\left(\frac{p_n}{m_n}\right),$$

i.e. (L2). Since Condition (B) is obvious, the assertion follows from Theorem A.2. \square

B.3. Proofs of Subsection 2.1

Proof of Theorem 2.5. We compare the pre-asymptotic variances which converge to $c^{(d)}$ and $c^{(s)}$, respectively. Check that, by stationarity,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{r_n v_n a_n^2} \text{Var}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n/s_n} g(Y_{n, i s_n+1})\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{r_n v_n a_n^2} E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{r_n/s_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n/s_n} g(Y_{n, j s_n+1}) g(Y_{n, i s_n+1})\right] - \frac{1}{r_n v_n a_n^2} \left(\frac{r_n}{s_n} E[g(Y_{n,0})]\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{r_n v_n a_n^2} \sum_{k=-r_n/s_n+1}^{r_n/s_n-1} \left(\frac{r_n}{s_n} - |k|\right) E[g(Y_{n, k s_n}) g(Y_{n,0})] - \frac{r_n E[g(Y_{n,0})]^2}{s_n^2 v_n a_n^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{s_n v_n a_n^2} \sum_{l=-r_n+1}^{r_n-1} \mathbf{1}_{\{l \bmod s_n=0\}} \left(1 - \frac{|l|}{r_n}\right) E[g(Y_{n,l}) g(Y_{n,0})] - \frac{r_n E[g(Y_{n,0})]^2}{s_n^2 v_n a_n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n^2 a_n^2} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,i}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{v_n s_n^2 a_n^2} \sum_{k=-r_n+1}^{r_n-1} \left(1 - \frac{|k|}{r_n} \right) E[g(Y_{n,0})g(Y_{n,k})] - \frac{r_n E[g(Y_{n,0})]^2}{v_n s_n^2 a_n^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (2.10) and (2.13), it suffices to show that the difference between these pre-asymptotic variances

$$\frac{1}{s_n v_n a_n^2} \left(\sum_{k=-r_n+1}^{r_n-1} \left(1 - \frac{|k|}{r_n} \right) \gamma_n(k) E[g(Y_{n,0})g(Y_{n,k})] \right)$$

is non-negative. Here

$$\gamma_n(k) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{s_n}, & \text{if } k \bmod s_n = 0, \\ -\frac{1}{s_n}, & \text{if } k \bmod s_n \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. To this end, we take up an idea by Zou et al. (2019), proof of Lemma A.10. Let U_n be uniformly distributed on $\{0, \dots, s_n-1\}$ and independent of $(X_{n,i})_{1 \leq i \leq n}$. Define

$$\phi_{n,k} = \begin{cases} \frac{s_n-1}{\sqrt{s_n}}, & \text{if } k \bmod s_n = U_n, \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{s_n}}, & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $(h \bmod s_n) = 0$ then

$$E[\phi_{n,k} \phi_{n,k+h}] = \frac{1}{s_n} \cdot \frac{(s_n-1)^2}{s_n} + \frac{s_n-1}{s_n} \cdot \frac{1}{s_n} = 1 - \frac{1}{s_n},$$

whereas for $(h \bmod s_n) \neq 0$

$$E[\phi_{n,k} \phi_{n,k+h}] = \frac{2}{s_n} \cdot \frac{s_n-1}{\sqrt{s_n}} \cdot \frac{-1}{\sqrt{s_n}} + \frac{s_n-2}{s_n} \cdot \frac{1}{s_n} = -\frac{1}{s_n}.$$

Thus, $E[\phi_{n,k} \phi_{n,k+h}] = \gamma_n(h)$ and

$$E[\phi_{n,j} \phi_{n,i} g(Y_{n,i}) g(Y_{n,j})] = E[\phi_{n,j} \phi_{n,i}] E[g(Y_{n,i}) g(Y_{n,j})] = \gamma_n(|i-j|) E[g(Y_{n,0}) g(Y_{n,|i-j|})]$$

for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r_n\}$, since U_n and (X_1, \dots, X_n) are independent. Similarly as above, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{1}{r_n} E \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \phi_{n,j} g(Y_{n,j}) \right)^2 \right] = \frac{1}{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \gamma_n(|i-j|) E[g(Y_{n,0}) g(Y_{n,|i-j|})] \\ &= \sum_{k=-r_n+1}^{r_n-1} \left(1 - \frac{|k|}{r_n} \right) \gamma_n(|k|) E[g(Y_{n,0}) g(Y_{n,k})], \end{aligned}$$

which proves the assertion. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.6. W.l.o.g. we assume $g \geq 0$ which implies $\xi \geq 0$. Since $\tilde{c}^{(d)} - \tilde{c}^{(s)} = c^{(d)} - c^{(s)} - 2\xi(c^{(d,v)} - c^{(s,v)})$, in view of Theorem 2.5 it suffices to show that $c^{(d,v)} \leq c^{(s,v)}$. Using the row-wise stationarity of the triangular scheme, the asymptotic covariance $c^{(s,v)}$ can be calculated as the limit of

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n a_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,j}), \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n a_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} E \left[g(Y_{n,j}) \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} \right] - \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n a_n} \cdot r_n E g(Y_{n,1}) \cdot r_n v_n \\ &= \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n a_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} E \left[g(Y_{n,1}) \sum_{i=2-j}^{r_n-j+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} \right] + \frac{r_n E g(Y_{n,1})}{s_n a_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Likewise, $c^{(d,v)}$ is the limit of

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r_n v_n a_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_n/s_n} g(Y_{n,(k-1)s_n+1}), \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{r_n v_n a_n} \sum_{k=1}^{r_n/s_n} E \left[g(Y_{n,1}) \sum_{i=1-(k-1)s_n}^{r_n-(k-1)s_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} \right] + \frac{r_n E g(Y_{n,1})}{s_n a_n} \\ &= \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n a_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} E \left[g(Y_{n,1}) \sum_{i=1-\lfloor \frac{j-1}{s_n} \rfloor s_n}^{r_n-\lfloor \frac{j-1}{s_n} \rfloor s_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} \right] + \frac{r_n E g(Y_{n,1})}{s_n a_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

It remains to show that the limit superior of the following difference between both right hand sides of (B.7) and (B.6) is not positive. To this end, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n a_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} E \left[g(Y_{n,1}) \left(\sum_{i=1-\lfloor \frac{j-1}{s_n} \rfloor s_n}^{r_n-\lfloor \frac{j-1}{s_n} \rfloor s_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} - \sum_{i=2-j}^{r_n-j+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} \right) \right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n a_n} \sum_{j=2}^{r_n} \sum_{i=r_n-j+2}^{r_n-\lfloor \frac{j-1}{s_n} \rfloor s_n} E(g(Y_{n,1}) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}}) \\ & = \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n a_n} \sum_{i=2}^{r_n} \sum_{j=r_n-i+2}^{(\lfloor \frac{r_n-i}{s_n} \rfloor + 1) s_n} E(g(Y_{n,1}) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{r_n v_n a_n} \sum_{i=2}^{r_n} E(g(Y_{n,1}) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Note that $Eg(Y_{n,1}) = O(s_n a_n v_n)$ by (2.9). Using

$$E(g(Y_{n,1}) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}}) \leq Eg(Y_{n,1}) P\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\} + 2\|g\|_{\infty} \beta_{n,i-s_n-1}^X$$

$$= O(s_n a_n v_n^2) + 2\|g\|_\infty \beta_{n,i-s_n-1}^X$$

for $i > s_n + k_n$ (see Doukhan (1994), Section 1.2, Lemma 3 and Section 1.1, Prop. 1) and $E(g(Y_{n,1})\mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}}) \leq \|g\|_\infty v_n$ for $i \leq s_n + k_n$, we conclude that (B.8) is bounded by

$$\frac{s_n + k_n}{r_n a_n} \|g\|_\infty + O(s_n v_n) + \frac{2\|g\|_\infty}{r_n v_n a_n} \sum_{l=k_n}^{r_n} \beta_{n,l}^X$$

which tends to 0 under the given conditions. (In fact, similarly one can establish a lower bound on the difference between the pre-asymptotic covariances which shows that the difference tends to 0.) \square

B.4. Proofs of Section 3

If $(\theta 1)$ and (θP) hold for some sequence r_n , then the former is obviously fulfilled by $r_n^* := \lfloor r_n/s_n \rfloor s_n$, too, and (θP) remains true because of

$$\sum_{k=r_n^*+1}^{r_n} P(X_k > u_n | X_0 > u_n) \leq \frac{s_n}{v_n} (v_n^2 + \beta_{n,r_n^*}^X) \leq r_n v_n + \frac{n}{r_n} \beta_{n,s_n} \frac{r_n^2}{n v_n} \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover, the arguments given in Subsection 2.1 show that the limit c in $(\theta 2)$ does not change if we replace r_n with r_n^* . Thus, w.l.o.g. we may assume that r_n/s_n is a natural number (tending to ∞) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

For all three estimators, we first prove joint convergence of a bivariate vector with components related to the numerator and the denominator, respectively, using the general theory developed in Section 2 and Appendix A.

We start with analyzing the disjoint blocks estimator using Theorem A.1. For $i \in \{1, \dots, m_n\}$ with $m_n = \lfloor (n - s_n + 1)/r_n \rfloor$, let

$$\begin{aligned} V_{n,i}^d &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n/s_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{(i-1)r_n+(j-1)s_n+1, (i-1)r_n+j s_n} > u_n\}}, \\ \tilde{V}_{n,i}^d &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n/s_n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{(i-1)r_n+(j-1)s_n+1, (i-1)r_n+j s_n} > u_n\}}, \\ V_{n,i}^c &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{(i-1)r_n+j} > u_n\}}, \\ \tilde{V}_{n,i}^c &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_n}} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n-s_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{(i-1)r_n+j} > u_n\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $p_n = P\{M_{1,r_n} > u_n\}$. Recall that, under the conditions $(\theta 1)$ and (θP) , (3.1) holds for all $k_n \rightarrow \infty$, $k_n \leq r_n$, which in turn yields

$$p_n = r_n v_n (\theta + o(1)), \quad P\{M_{1,s_n} > u_n\} = s_n v_n (\theta + o(1)), \quad (\text{B.9})$$

with $v_n = P\{X_1 > u_n\}$.

Proposition B.2. If the conditions $(\theta 1)$, $(\theta 2)$ and (θP) are satisfied, then

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z_n^d \\ Z_n^c \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{m_n} (V_{n,i}^d - E[V_{n,i}^d]) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{m_n} (V_{n,i}^c - E[V_{n,i}^c]) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{w} \begin{pmatrix} Z^d \\ Z^c \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}_2 \left(0, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1/\theta \\ 1/\theta & c/\theta \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Proof. The conditions (A), (V), $(M\tilde{V})$ and (MX_2) follow readily from $(\theta 1)$. It thus suffices to verify the conditions (Δ) , (L) (which can be checked separately for $V_{n,i}^d$ and $V_{n,i}^c$) and (C), in order to conclude the assertion from Theorem A.1. Check that

$$\Delta_n^d := V_{n,1}^d - \tilde{V}_{n,1}^d = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_n}} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{r_n-s_n+1, r_n} > u_n\}} \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_n}} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{1, s_n} > u_n\}}.$$

Now (3.1) and $s_n = o(r_n)$ imply (A.1), and thus (Δ) , for $V_{n,i}^d$:

$$\frac{m_n}{p_n} E[(\Delta_n^d)^2] \leq \frac{P\{M_{1, s_n} > u_n\}}{P\{M_{1, r_n} > u_n\}} = \frac{P\{M_{1, s_n} > u_n\}}{s_n P\{X_1 > u_n\}} \cdot \frac{r_n P\{X_1 > u_n\}}{P\{M_{1, r_n} > u_n\}} \cdot \frac{s_n}{r_n} \rightarrow 0.$$

Condition (L) for $V_{n,i}^d$ follows immediately from $V_{n,i}^d \leq m_n^{-1/2} r_n / s_n = O(r_n / (s_n \sqrt{m_n v_n}))$ $\sqrt{r_n v_n} = o(\sqrt{p_n})$, because of (B.9) and $(\theta 1)$.

Since $V_{n,1}^c$ is a sliding blocks statistic with $X_{n,i} := X_i / u_n$, bounded function $h(x_1, \dots, x_s) = 1_{(1, \infty)}(x_1)$ and $b_n = \sqrt{m_n}$, the proof of Theorem 2.1 shows that (Δ) and (L) hold if $r_n = o(\sqrt{p_n} b_n) = o(\sqrt{r_n v_n m_n}) = o(\sqrt{n v_n})$ and condition (2.6) is satisfied; both are immediate consequences of our assumptions $(\theta 1)$ and $(\theta 2)$.

It remains to show convergence (C) of the covariance matrix. To this end, first note that by stationarity one has uniformly for all $1 \leq \ell \leq r_n - s_n$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=\ell+s_n+1}^{r_n} P\{M_{\ell+1, \ell+s_n} > u_n, X_j > u_n\} &\leq \sum_{j=s_n+1}^{r_n} P\{M_{1, s_n} > u_n, X_j > u_n\} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} \sum_{j=s_n+1}^{r_n} P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n\} \\ &= s_n v_n \sum_{k=1}^{r_n} \min\left(1, \frac{k}{s_n}, \frac{r_n - k}{s_n}\right) P(X_k > u_n | X_0 > u_n) \\ &= o(s_n v_n). \end{aligned} \tag{B.10}$$

In the last step we have used Pratt's lemma (Pratt 1960) according to which, under condition (θP) , the limit of the last sum can be calculated as the infinite sum of the limit of each summand, which all equal 0, because $k/s_n \rightarrow 0$. Likewise,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} P\{M_{\ell+1, \ell+s_n} > u_n, X_j > u_n\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} \sum_{j=s_n-r_n+1}^0 P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n\} = o(s_n v_n) \tag{B.11}$$

uniformly for $1 \leq \ell \leq r_n - s_n$.
By stationarity and (B.9),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m_n}{p_n} \text{Var}(V_n^d) &= \frac{r_n}{s_n p_n} P\{M_{1,s_n} > u_n\} (1 - P\{M_{1,s_n} > u_n\}) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{p_n} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq r_n/s_n} \text{Cov}(\mathbb{1}_{\{M_{(i-1)s_n+1, is_n} > u_n\}}, \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{(j-1)s_n+1, js_n} > u_n\}}) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) + \frac{2}{p_n} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq r_n/s_n} P\{M_{(i-1)s_n+1, is_n} > u_n, M_{(j-1)s_n+1, js_n} > u_n\} \\ &\quad + O\left(\frac{1}{p_n} \left(\frac{r_n}{s_n}\right)^2 (s_n v_n)^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

In view of (B.10), the second term can be bounded by

$$\frac{2}{p_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n/s_n-1} \sum_{k=is_n+1}^{r_n} P\{M_{(i-1)s_n+1, is_n} > u_n, X_k > u_n\} = o\left(\frac{r_n v_n}{p_n}\right) = o(1).$$

Since $(r_n/s_n)^2 (s_n v_n)^2 / p_n = O(r_n v_n) \rightarrow 0$ by (B.9) and $(\theta 1)$, we conclude

$$\frac{m_n}{p_n} \text{Var}(V_n^d) \rightarrow 1.$$

Next check that, by (B.9) and $(\theta 2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m_n}{p_n} \text{Var}(V_{n,1}^c) &= \frac{1}{p_n} \text{Var}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > u_n\}}\right) \\ &= \frac{r_n v_n}{p_n} \cdot \frac{1}{r_n v_n} E\left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > u_n\}}\right)^2\right] - \frac{1}{p_n} (r_n v_n)^2 \\ &= (1/\theta + o(1))(c + o(1)) + O(r_n v_n) \\ &\rightarrow c/\theta. \end{aligned} \tag{B.12}$$

Finally, again by (B.9), (B.10) and (B.11),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m_n}{p_n} \text{Cov}(V_{n,1}^d, V_{n,1}^c) &= \frac{1}{p_n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n/s_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} P\{M_{(i-1)s_n+1, is_n} > u_n, X_j > u_n\} - \frac{r_n}{s_n} P\{M_{1,s_n} > u_n\} r_n v_n \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{p_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n/s_n} \left(s_n v_n + \sum_{j=1}^{(i-1)s_n} P\{M_{(i-1)s_n+1, is_n} > u_n, X_j > u_n\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{j=i_{s_n}+1}^{r_n} P\{M_{(i-1)s_n+1, i_{s_n}} > u_n, X_j > u_n\} \Big) + O(r_n v_n) \\
& = \frac{1}{p_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n/s_n} (s_n v_n + o(s_n v_n)) + O(r_n v_n) \\
& \rightarrow 1/\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we turn to the sliding blocks estimator. Numerator and denominator can be written in terms of the process \bar{Z}_n in (2.1) based on $X_{n,i} := X_i/u_n$ and the following bounded functions:

$$g(x_1, \dots, x_s) := \mathbb{1}_{\{\max_{1 \leq i \leq s} x_i > 1\}}, \quad h(x_1, \dots, x_s) := \mathbb{1}_{\{x_1 > 1\}}.$$

As normalizing sequences we choose $b_n(g) = \sqrt{nv_n/p_n^s} s_n$ and $b_n(h) = \sqrt{nv_n/p_n^s}$ with $p_n^s := P\{M_{1, r_n+s_n-1} > u_n\} = r_n v_n \theta(1 + o(1))$, by (3.1).

Proposition B.3. If the conditions $(\theta 1)$, $(\theta 2)$ and (θP) are satisfied, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{pmatrix} \bar{Z}_n(g) \\ \bar{Z}_n(h) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{nv_n} s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n\}} - p_n) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{nv_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n\}} - v_n) \end{pmatrix} \\
&\xrightarrow{w} \begin{pmatrix} Z(g) \\ Z(h) \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}_2 \left(0, \begin{pmatrix} \theta & 1 \\ 1 & c \end{pmatrix} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We are going to apply Theorem 2.1. Condition (A1) is obvious, and (A2) with $l_n = 2s_n - 1$ and (MX) easily follow from $(\theta 1)$. Condition (2.6) for the functional h is immediate from $(\theta 2)$ (see proof of Proposition B.2). To check it for g , we employ Lemma 2.2. First note that $p_n^s b_n(g)^2/n = s_n^2 v_n$. Moreover, by stationarity of the time series,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{s_n^2 v_n} \sum_{k=1}^{r_n} P\{M_{1, s_n} > u_n, M_{k, k+s_n-1} > u_n\} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{s_n^2 v_n} \sum_{k=1}^{r_n} \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} \sum_{j=k}^{k+s_n-1} P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n\} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{s_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{s_n} P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n\} + \sum_{j=s_n+1}^{r_n+s_n-1} P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n\} \right) \\
& \leq 1 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{s_n-1} P(X_k > u_n | X_0 > u_n) + \sum_{k=1}^{r_n+s_n-2} P(X_k > u_n | X_0 > u_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, condition (S) follows from (θP) and

$$\sum_{k=r_n+1}^{r_n+s_n-2} P(X_k > u_n | X_0 > u_n) \leq \frac{s_n}{v_n} (v_n^2 + \beta_{n,r_n}^X) = o\left(s_n v_n + \frac{n}{r_n} \beta_{n,r_n}^X\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Then, condition (2.6) for g follows from Lemma 2.2. It remains to prove convergence (C) of the standardized covariance matrix. For the variance pertaining to g and the covariance, this is done in Lemma B.5 (iii) and (iv). The convergence

$$\frac{m_n}{p_n^s} \text{Var}(V_n(h)) = \frac{1 + o(1)}{r_n v_n} \text{Var}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > u_n\}}\right) \rightarrow c$$

has been shown in (B.12). \square

Finally, we examine the statistics pertaining to the runs estimator, again using Theorem 2.1. Here we consider $X_{n,i}$, and the functions h defined above and

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_s) = \mathbb{1}_{\{x_1 > 1, \max_{2 \leq i \leq s} x_i \leq 1\}}.$$

The normalization is chosen as $b_n := \sqrt{nv_n/p_n}$ for both functions f and h .

Proposition B.4. If the conditions $(\theta 1)$, $(\theta 2)$ and (θP) are satisfied, then

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{Z}_n(f) \\ \bar{Z}_n(h) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{nv_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n, M_{i+1, i+s_n-1} \leq u_n\}} - P\{X_1 > u_n, M_{2, s_n} \leq u_n\}) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{nv_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n\}} - v_n) \end{pmatrix} \\ &\xrightarrow{w} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{Z}(f) \\ \bar{Z}(h) \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}_2\left(0, \begin{pmatrix} \theta & 1 \\ 1 & c \end{pmatrix}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition B.4. Conditions (A1), (A2), (MX) and (2.6) for the functional h have already been checked in the proof of Proposition B.3. Condition (2.6) for f follows readily, because $f(x) \neq 0$ implies $h(x) \neq 0$. While condition (C) for $\text{Var}(V_n(h))$ has been verified in the proof of Proposition B.3, it is established for $\text{Var}(V_n(f))$ and $\text{Cov}(V_n(f), V_n(h))$ in Lemma B.5 (i) and (ii). Thus the assertion follows from Theorem 2.1. \square

Now Theorem 3.1 easily follows from the above propositions by a continuous mapping argument.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Since the arguments are basically the same for all three estimators, we give the details only for the disjoint blocks estimator. In view of $E[V_n^c] = m_n^{-1/2} r_n v_n$, $E[V_n^d] = m_n^{-1/2} (r_n/s_n) P\{M_{1, s_n} > u_n\}$ and $p_n^{1/2} m_n^{-1/2} (r_n v_n)^{-1} = (\theta/(nv_n))^{1/2} (1 + o(1)) = o(1)$ (by (B.9) and $(\theta 1)$), direct calculations show that

$$\sqrt{nv_n}(\hat{\theta}_n^d - \theta) = \sqrt{nv_n} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m_n} V_{n,i}^d}{\sum_{i=1}^{m_n} V_{n,i}^c} - \theta \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sqrt{nv_n} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{p_n}(Z_n^d - \theta Z_n^c) + m_n(E[V_n^d] - \theta E[V_n^c])}{m_n E[V_n^c] + \sqrt{p_n} Z_n^c} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{nv_n p_n}{m_n (r_n v_n)^2}} \cdot \frac{Z_n^d - \theta Z_n^c + \sqrt{m_n/p_n} r_n v_n (P\{M_{1,s_n} > u_n\}/(s_n v_n) - \theta)}{1 + \sqrt{p_n/m_n} (r_n v_n)^{-1} Z_n^c} \\
&= \sqrt{\theta}(1 + o(1)) \frac{Z_n^d - \theta Z_n^c + O(\sqrt{nv_n})(P\{M_{1,s_n} > u_n\}/(s_n v_n) - \theta)}{1 + o_P(1)} \\
&\rightarrow \sqrt{\theta}(Z^d - \theta Z^c),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used Proposition B.2 and the bias condition (B_b). The limit random variable is centered and normally distributed with variance $\theta(1 - 2\theta(1/\theta) + \theta^2(c/\theta)) = \theta(\theta c - 1)$. \square

Lemma B.5. If the conditions ($\theta 1$), ($\theta 2$) and (θP) are met, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(i)} \quad & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n, M_{i+1, i+s_n-1} \leq u_n\}} \right) = \theta \\
\text{(ii)} \quad & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n\}}, \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > u_n, M_{j+1, j+s_n-1} \leq u_n\}} \right) = 1 \\
\text{(iii)} \quad & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n s_n v_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n\}}, \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > u_n\}} \right) = 1 \\
\text{(iv)} \quad & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n s_n^2 v_n} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n\}} \right) = \theta
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. To prove assertion (i), check that by stationarity

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n, M_{i+1, i+s_n-1} \leq u_n\}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} P\{X_i > u_n, M_{i+1, i+s_n-1} \leq u_n, X_j > u_n, M_{j+1, j+s_n-1} \leq u_n\} \\
&\quad - r_n v_n (P(M_{2, s_n} \leq u_n | X_1 > u_n))^2 \\
&= P(M_{2, s_n} \leq u_n | X_1 > u_n) + O(r_n v_n) \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n - s_n} \sum_{j=i+s_n}^{r_n} P\{X_i > u_n, M_{i+1, i+s_n-1} \leq u_n, X_j > u_n, M_{j+1, j+s_n-1} \leq u_n\},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we have used that the probability in the sum equals 0 if $1 \leq |i - j| < s_n$. The last term is bounded by

$$\frac{2}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n - s_n} \sum_{j=i+s_n}^{r_n} P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n\} \leq 2 \sum_{k=s_n-1}^{r_n} P(X_k > u_n | X_0 > u_n) \quad (\text{B.13})$$

and hence it tends to 0 by Pratt's lemma and (θP) . Now (3.2) and $r_n v_n \rightarrow 0$ yields the convergence of the normalized variance to θ .

Next we consider (ii). Similarly as above, stationarity implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n\}}, \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > u_n, M_{j+1, j+s_n-1} \leq u_n\}} \right) \\ &= P(M_{2, s_n} \leq u_n | X_1 > u_n) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{r_n} P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n, M_{j+1, j+s_n-1} \leq u_n\} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=s_n+1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{i-s_n} P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n, M_{j+1, j+s_n-1} \leq u_n\} + O(r_n v_n) \\ &=: I + II + III + O(r_n v_n), \end{aligned}$$

where $I \rightarrow \theta$ by (3.2). Term III can be bounded by $(r_n v_n)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n-s_n} \sum_{i=j+s_n}^{r_n} P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n\}$, which tends to 0 by (B.13). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} II = \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{r_n} & \left(P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n, M_{j+1, r_n+s_n-1} \leq u_n\} \right. \\ & \left. + P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n, M_{j+1, j+s_n-1} \leq u_n, M_{j+s_n, r_n+s_n-1} > u_n\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If first j is interpreted as the last instance of an exceedance in $\{i+1, \dots, r_n+s_n-1\}$ and then i as the last instance of an exceedance in $\{1, \dots, r_n-1\}$, then one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{r_n} P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n, M_{j+1, r_n+s_n-1} \leq u_n\} \\ &= \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-1} P\{X_i > u_n, M_{i+1, r_n+s_n-1} > u_n\} \\ &= \frac{(r_n-1)v_n}{r_n v_n} - \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-1} P\{X_i > u_n, M_{i+1, r_n+s_n-1} \leq u_n\} \\ &= 1 + o(1) - \frac{1}{r_n v_n} P\{M_{1, r_n-1} > u_n, M_{r_n, r_n+s_n-1} \leq u_n\} \\ &\rightarrow 1 - \theta, \end{aligned}$$

because of (B.9) and $P\{M_{r_n, r_n+s_n-1} > u_n\} \leq s_n v_n = o(r_n v_n)$. Furthermore,

$$\frac{1}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{r_n} P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n, M_{j+1, j+s_n-1} \leq u_n, M_{j+s_n, r_n+s_n-1} > u_n\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{r_n} (P\{X_i > u_n, X_j > u_n\} P\{M_{j+s_n, r_n+s_n-1} > u_n\} + \beta_{n, s_n-1}^X) \\
&\leq r_n v_n \sum_{k=1}^{r_n} P(X_k > u_n | X_0 > u_n) + \frac{r_n}{v_n} \beta_{n, s_n-1}^X \\
&\rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by $(\theta 1)$ and (θP) . To sum up, $II \rightarrow 1 - \theta$, which concludes the proof of (ii). In view of (B.10) and (B.11), the standardized covariance in (iii) equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{r_n s_n v_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n\}}, \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > u_n\}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{r_n s_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} P\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n, X_j > u_n\} - \frac{r_n}{s_n} P\{M_{1, s_n} > u_n\} \\
&= \frac{1}{r_n s_n v_n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=i}^{\min(i+s_n-1, r_n)} P\{X_j > u_n\} + o(r_n s_n v_n) \right) + O(r_n v_n) \\
&= \frac{1}{r_n s_n} \left((r_n - s_n + 1) s_n + \frac{s_n(s_n - 1)}{2} \right) + o(1) \\
&\rightarrow 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we turn to (iv). Stationarity implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n\}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} P\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n, M_{j, j+s_n-1} > u_n\} - (r_n P\{M_{1, s_n} > u_n\})^2 \\
&= 2 \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=i}^{r_n} P\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n, M_{j, j+s_n-1} > u_n\} - r_n P\{M_{1, s_n} > u_n\} + O((r_n s_n v_n)^2) \\
&= 2 \left[\sum_{i=1}^{r_n-3s_n} \sum_{j=i}^{i+s_n-1} P\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n, M_{j, j+s_n-1} > u_n\} \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=r_n-3s_n+1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=i}^{r_n} P\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n, M_{j, j+s_n-1} > u_n\} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-3s_n} \sum_{j=i+s_n}^{r_n-s_n} P\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n, M_{j, j+s_n-1} > u_n\} \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-3s_n} \sum_{j=r_n-s_n+1}^{r_n} P\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > u_n, M_{j, j+s_n-1} > u_n\} \right] + o(r_n s_n^2 v_n)
\end{aligned}$$

$$=: 2[I + II + III + IV] + o(r_n s_n^2 v_n).$$

Term *II* is of the order $s_n^2 s_n v_n = o(r_n s_n^2 v_n)$. Term *III* can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-3s_n} \sum_{j=i+s_n}^{r_n-s_n} \sum_{k=j}^{j+s_n-1} P\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > u_n, X_k > u_n\} \\ & \leq s_n \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-3s_n} \sum_{k=i+s_n}^{r_n} P\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > u_n, X_k > u_n\} \\ & = o(r_n s_n^2 v_n) \end{aligned}$$

by (B.10). Moreover, by $(\theta 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} IV & \leq \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-3s_n} \sum_{j=r_n-s_n+1}^{r_n} (P\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > u_n\} \cdot P\{M_{j,j+s_n-1} > u_n\} + \beta_{n,s_n-1}^X) \\ & = O(r_n s_n ((s_n v_n)^2 + \beta_{n,s_n-1}^X)) = o(r_n s_n^2 v_n) \end{aligned}$$

because $r_n s_n = r_n^2 s_n / r_n = o(n v_n s_n / r_n) = o(n / r_n)$.

It remains to be shown that

$$\frac{I}{r_n s_n^2 v_n} = \frac{1 + o(1)}{s_n^2 v_n} \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} P\{M_{1,s_n} > u_n, M_{k,k+s_n-1} > u_n\} \rightarrow \frac{\theta}{2}.$$

Distinguish according to the last exceedance in $\{1, \dots, s_n\}$ to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} P\{M_{1,s_n} > u_n, M_{k,k+s_n-1} > u_n\} \\ & = \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \sum_{j=1}^{s_n} P\{X_j > u_n, M_{j+1,s_n} \leq u_n, M_{k,k+s_n-1} > u_n\} \\ & = \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \sum_{j=k}^{s_n} P\{X_j > u_n, M_{j+1,s_n} \leq u_n\} + O\left(\sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} P\{X_j > u_n, M_{k,k+s_n-1} > u_n\}\right) \\ & = \sum_{j=1}^{s_n} j P\{X_j > u_n, M_{j+1,s_n} \leq u_n\} + o(s_n^2 v_n) \\ & = \sum_{j=1}^{s_n} j P\{X_1 > u_n, M_{2,s_n-j+1} \leq u_n\} + o(s_n^2 v_n), \end{aligned}$$

where in the penultimate step we have employed (B.11). The last sum can be bounded from below by

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s_n} j P\{X_1 > u_n, M_{2,s_n} \leq u_n\} = \frac{s_n(s_n+1)}{2} v_n P(M_{2,s_n} \leq u_n | X_1 > u_n) = \frac{s_n^2 v_n}{2} \theta(1+o(1))$$

because of (3.2). Similarly, for any sequence $t_n = o(s_n)$ tending to ∞ , (3.2) yields the asymptotic behavior of the following upper bound

$$\sum_{j=1}^{s_n-t_n} jP\{X_1 > u_n, M_{2,t_n} \leq u_n\} + t_n s_n v_n = \frac{s_n^2 v_n}{2} \theta(1 + o(1)).$$

Hence, the sum divided by $s_n^2 v_n$ must tend to $\theta/2$, which concludes the proof. \square

Acknowledgement: We thank two anonymous referees for their valuable comments and suggestions which lead to a substantial improvement of the presentation.

References

- Beirlant, J., Goegebeur, Y., Segers, J. & Teugels, J. L. (2004), *Statistics of Extremes: Theory and Applications*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Berghaus, B., Bücher, A. et al. (2018), ‘Weak convergence of a pseudo maximum likelihood estimator for the extremal index’, *The Annals of Statistics* **46**(5), 2307–2335.
- Bücher, A. & Segers, J. (2018), ‘Inference for heavy tailed stationary time series based on sliding blocks’, *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **12**(1), 1098–1125.
- Davis, R. A., Drees, H., Segers, J. & Warchoł, M. (2018), ‘Inference on the tail process with application to financial time series modeling’, *Journal of Econometrics* **205**(2), 508–525.
- Davis, R. & Mikosch, T. (2009), ‘The extremogram: a correlogram for extreme events’, *Bernoulli* **15**(4), 977–1009.
- Doukhan, P. (1994), *Mixing: Properties and Examples*, Vol. 85 of *Lecture Notes in Statistics*, Springer.
- Drees, H. (2015), ‘Bootstrapping empirical processes of cluster functionals with application to extremograms’, *arXiv preprint:1511.00420*.
- Drees, H. & Knezevic, M. (2020), ‘Peak-over-threshold estimators for spectral tail processes: random vs deterministic thresholds’, *Extremes* **23**(3), 465–491.
- Drees, H. & Rootzén, H. (2010), ‘Limit theorems for empirical processes of cluster functionals’, *The Annals of Statistics* **38**(4), 2145–2186.
- Drees, H., Segers, J. & Warchoł, M. (2015), ‘Statistics for tail processes of markov chains’, *Extremes* **18**(3), 369–402.
- Eberlein, E. (1984), ‘Weak convergence of partial sums of absolutely regular sequences’, *Statistics & Probability Letters* **2**(5), 291–293.
- Ferro, C. A. & Segers, J. (2003), ‘Inference for clusters of extreme values’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **65**(2), 545–556.
- Hsing, T. (1991), ‘Estimating the parameters of rare events’, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **37**(1), 117–139.
- Hsing, T. (1993), ‘Extremal index estimation for a weakly dependent stationary sequence’, *The Annals of Statistics* **21**(4), 2043–2071.

- Leadbetter, M. R. (1983), ‘Extremes and local dependence in stationary sequences’, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **65**(2), 291–306.
- O’Brien, G. L. (1987), ‘Extreme values for stationary and markov sequences’, *The Annals of Probability* **15**(1), 281–291.
- Petrov, V. V. (1975), *Sums of Independent Random Variables*, Springer Science, Berlin.
- Pratt, J. W. (1960), ‘On interchanging limits and integrals’, *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **31**(1), 74–77.
- Robert, C. Y., Segers, J. & Ferro, C. A. T. (2009), ‘A sliding blocks estimator for the extremal index’, *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **3**, 993–1020.
- Segers, J. (2003), ‘Functionals of clusters of extremes’, *Advances in Applied Probability* **35**(4), 1028–1045.
- Smith, R. L. & Weissman, I. (1994), ‘Estimating the extremal index’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **56**(3), 515–528.
- Süveges, M. (2007), ‘Likelihood estimation of the extremal index’, *Extremes* **10**(1-2), 41–55.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. & Wellner, J. A. (1996), *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*, Springer, New York.
- Weissman, I. & Novak, S. Y. (1998), ‘On blocks and runs estimators of the extremal index’, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **66**(2), 281–288.
- Zou, N., Volgushev, S. & Bücher, A. (2019), ‘Multiple block sizes and overlapping blocks for multivariate time series extremes’, *arXiv preprint:1907.09477*.

Submitted to Bernoulli

Supplement to the paper Asymptotics for sliding blocks estimators of rare events

HOLGER DREES¹, SEBASTIAN NEBLUNG¹

¹University of Hamburg, Department of Mathematics, SPST, Bundesstr. 55, 20146 Hamburg, Germany, E-mail: drees@math.uni-hamburg.de; * sebastian.neblung@uni-hamburg.de

Abstract We specify sufficient conditions for the asymptotic normality of the statistics considered in Subsection 2.1 of the main paper. Furthermore, a multivariate generalization to Theorem 2.5 is given and the asymptotic behavior of a sliding blocks estimator for the extremal index is analyzed which uses all observations above a *random* threshold. Finally we discuss the relationship between a Lindeberg type condition and an analog based on first moments.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 62G32; secondary 62M10, 62G05, 60F17.

Keywords: asymptotic efficiency, empirical processes, extremal index, extreme value analysis, sliding vs disjoint blocks, time series, uniform central limit theorems.

To avoid confusion, we continue the section numbering from the main article.

4. Conditions for asymptotic normality

In (2.10) and (2.11), the asymptotic normality of statistics based on sliding blocks and on disjoint blocks, respectively, has been claimed. Here we give precise conditions under which these convergences follow from the general results of Section 2 and Appendix A. For the sliding blocks statistic $T_n^s(g) := (nv_n s_n a_n)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} g(Y_{n,i})$ the asymptotic normality

$$\sqrt{nv_n}(T_n^s(g) - E[T_n^s(g)]) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, c^{(s)}). \quad (4.1)$$

can be established using Theorem 2.1. In the setting of Section 2, we have $m_n = \lfloor (n - s_n + 1)/r_n \rfloor$, $p_n = P\{\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,i}) \neq 0\}$, and we choose $b_n(g) = b_n = \sqrt{nv_n/p_n a_n s_n}$ with $v_n = P(X_{n,1} \neq 0)$.

Corollary 4.1. *Suppose the following conditions are fulfilled:*

- (i) $(X_{n,i})_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is stationary for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (ii) The sequences $l_n, r_n, s_n \in \mathbb{N}$, a_n and p_n satisfy $s_n \leq l_n = o(r_n)$, $r_n = o(n)$, $p_n \rightarrow 0$, $r_n = o(\sqrt{nv_n s_n a_n})$ and $(n/r_n)\beta_{n, l_n - s_n}^X \rightarrow 0$.
- (iii) g is measurable and bounded.

- (iv) $E \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{g(Y_{n,j}) \neq 0\}} \right)^2 \right] = O(r_n v_n a_n^2 s_n^2)$.
- (v) $c^{(s)}$ as defined in (2.9) exists in $[0, \infty)$.

Then convergence (4.1) holds.

One may drop the assumption that g is bounded if condition (iv) is adapted in the same way as in Theorem 2.4 (i).

Next we turn to the asymptotic normality of the statistic $T_n^d(g) = (nv_n a_n)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/s_n \rfloor} g(Y_{n,(i-1)s_n+1})$ based on disjoint blocks:

$$\sqrt{nv_n} (T_n^d(g) - E[T_n^d(g)]) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, c^{(d)}). \quad (4.2)$$

Recall that r_n/s_n is assumed to be a natural number. In the setting of Appendix A, we let $V_{n,i}(g) := \sqrt{p_n/(nv_n a_n^2)} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n/s_n} g(Y_{n,(j-1)s_n+(i-1)r_n+1})$, $1 \leq i \leq m_n$, with $p_n = P\{\sum_{j=1}^{r_n/s_n} g(Y_{n,(j-1)s_n+1}) \neq 0\}$. Moreover, we choose a sequence l_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of multiples of s_n and define the shortened sum $\tilde{V}_{n,i}(g) = \sqrt{p_n/(nv_n a_n^2)} \sum_{j=1}^{(r_n - l_n)/s_n} g(Y_{n,(j-1)s_n+(i-1)r_n+1})$.

Corollary 4.2. *Suppose that, in addition to (i) and (iii) of Corollary 4.1, the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (ii*) *For the sequences $l_n, r_n, s_n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $l_n = o(r_n)$ is a multiple of s_n , $r_n = o(n)$, $p_n \rightarrow 0$, $r_n = o(\sqrt{nv_n})$ and $(n/r_n)\beta_{n,l_n-s_n}^X \rightarrow 0$.*
- (iv*) $E \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{l_n/s_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{g(Y_{n,j}) \neq 0\}} \right)^2 \right] = o(r_n v_n a_n^2)$.
- (v*) $c^{(d)}$ as defined in (2.12) exists in $[0, \infty)$.
- (vi*) $E \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_n/s_n} (g(Y_{n,(j-1)s_n+1}) - E g(Y_n))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{|\sum_{j=1}^{r_n/s_n} (g(Y_{n,(j-1)s_n+1}) - E g(Y_n))| > \varepsilon \sqrt{nv_n a_n}\}} \right) = o\left(\frac{r_n p_n}{n}\right)$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Then convergence (4.2) follows from Theorem A.1.

Condition (iv*) could be weakened to condition (Δ) of Appendix A.

For the joint convergence

$$\sqrt{nv_n} \left(\frac{T_n^\sharp(g) - E[T_n^\sharp(g)]}{\frac{1}{nv_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} - v_n)} \right) \xrightarrow{w} \begin{pmatrix} T_1^\sharp \\ T_2^\sharp \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}_2 \left(0, \begin{pmatrix} c^{(\sharp)} & c^{(\sharp,v)} \\ c^{(\sharp,v)} & c^{(v)} \end{pmatrix} \right) \quad (4.3)$$

as stated before Theorem 2.6 the conditions of Corollary 4.1 and 4.2, respectively, are sufficient, provided $c^{(\sharp,v)}$ and $c^{(v)}$ exist, with $\sharp \in \{s, d\}$. The asymptotic normality of $\tilde{T}_n^s(g) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} g(Y_{n,i}) / (s_n a_n \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}})$ centered at ξ holds, if in addition the bias condition

$$E[g(Y_n)]/s_n v_n a_n - \xi = o((nv_n)^{-1/2})$$

is satisfied. This is seen by the following continuous mapping argument:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{nv_n} \left(\frac{T_n^s(g)}{(nv_n)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}}} - \xi \right) \\
&= \sqrt{nv_n} \frac{T_n^s(g) - E[T_n^s(g)] - \xi(nv_n)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} - v_n) + \frac{n-s_n+1}{n} (\frac{E[g(Y_{n,1})]}{s_n v_n a_n}) - \xi}{(nv_n)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} - v_n) + \frac{n-s_n+1}{nv_n} v_n} \\
&= \frac{\sqrt{nv_n} (T_n^s(g) - E[T_n^s(g)]) - \xi(nv_n)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \neq 0\}} - v_n) + o(1)}{1 + o_P(1)} \\
&\rightarrow T_1^s + \xi T_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from (4.3). The asymptotic normality of $\tilde{T}_n^d(g)$ follows along the same lines.

5. Loewner order of covariance matrices

The asymptotic variances of the sliding and disjoint blocks statistics for a single function g are compared in Theorem 2.5. In the following a multivariate version of this result will be established. The asymptotic covariance matrices are compared w.r.t. the Loewner order, i.e. $A \leq_L B$ if and only if $B - A$ is positive semi-definite.

Fix some finite set \mathcal{G} of functions g of the type considered in Subsection 2.1. If all functions in \mathcal{G} fulfill the conditions of Corollary 4.1 and 4.2, respectively, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\sqrt{nv_n} (T_n^s(g) - ET_n^s(g)))_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{|\mathcal{G}|}(0, C^{(s)}) \\
& (\sqrt{nv_n} (T_n^d(g) - ET_n^d(g)))_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{|\mathcal{G}|}(0, C^{(d)})
\end{aligned}$$

with $C^{(s)} = (c^{(s)}(g, h))_{g, h \in \mathcal{G}}$ and $C^{(d)} = (c^{(d)}(g, h))_{g, h \in \mathcal{G}}$, provided

$$\begin{aligned}
c^{(s)}(g, h) &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n^2 a_n^2} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,i}), \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} h(Y_{n,i}) \right), \\
c^{(d)}(g, h) &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n a_n^2} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n/s_n} g(Y_{n, i s_n + 1}), \sum_{i=1}^{r_n/s_n} h(Y_{n, i s_n + 1}) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

exist in $[0, \infty)$ for all $g, h \in \mathcal{G}$.

Corollary 5.1. *If condition (A1) holds, $r_n/s_n \in \mathbb{N}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $|\mathcal{G}| < \infty$, then $C^{(s)} \leq_L C^{(d)}$.*

Note that the assertion is equivalent to the statement that for all linear combinations h of functions in \mathcal{G} the asymptotic variance of $T_n^s(h)$ is not greater than the corresponding asymptotic variance of $T_n^d(h)$.

Proof of Corollary 5.1. The inequality $C^s \leq_L C^d$ is equivalent to

$$\sum_{g,h \in \mathcal{G}} w_g w_h c^{(s)}(g, h) \leq \sum_{g,h \in \mathcal{G}} w_g w_h c^{(d)}(g, h)$$

for all $(w_g)_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{G}|}$. Obviously, for $\tilde{f}_w := \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} w_g g$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{g,h \in \mathcal{G}} w_g w_h c^{(s)}(g, h) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n^2 a_n^2} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} w_g \sum_{k=1}^{r_n} g(Y_{n,k}), \sum_{h \in \mathcal{G}} w_h \sum_{k=1}^{r_n} h(Y_{n,k}) \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n^2 a_n^2} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_n} \tilde{f}_w(Y_{n,k}) \right) =: c_w^{(s)}. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$\sum_{g,h \in \mathcal{G}} w_g w_h c^{(d)}(g, h) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n s_n^2 a_n^2} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{r_n/s_n} \tilde{f}_w(Y_{n,ks_n+1}) \right) =: c_w^{(d)}.$$

Since all conditions of Theorem 2.5 are satisfied for the single function \tilde{f}_w , this result yields $c_w^{(s)} \leq c_w^{(d)}$, i.e. the assertion. \square

6. Extremal index estimators using random thresholds

In practice, when estimating extreme value parameters, instead of a deterministic threshold u_n , usually a threshold \hat{u}_n that depends on the observed time series is used. For instance, under suitable mixing conditions the k_n th largest order statistics $X_{n-k_n+1:n}$ of the observations satisfies $X_{n-k_n+1:n}/u_n \rightarrow 1$ in probability if $k_n = \lceil nv_n \rceil$ (cf. [Drees & Knezevic \(2020\)](#), Lemma 2.2). In the following, we consider modified extremal index estimators where we replace the thresholds u_n with random thresholds. The limit distribution of these estimators can be established with the theory from Section 2 and Appendix A using methods developed by [Drees & Knezevic \(2020\)](#). To this end, though, we must consider more complicated empirical processes than in Section 3 and we need full process convergence instead of convergence of the finite dimensional distributions of these processes. For the sake of brevity, we only consider the sliding blocks estimator, but the disjoint blocks estimator and the runs estimator can be analyzed in a similar fashion.

Recall that $M_{i,j} = \max(X_i, \dots, X_j)$ for $-\infty < i \leq j < \infty$.

The modified sliding blocks estimator with random threshold is defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_{n, \hat{u}_n}^s := \frac{\frac{1}{s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > \hat{u}_n\}}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > \hat{u}_n\}}}.$$

The random threshold \hat{u}_n is assumed consistent for u_n in the sense that

$$D_n := \frac{\hat{u}_n}{u_n} \xrightarrow{P} 1. \quad (6.1)$$

The basic idea of the asymptotic analysis of $\hat{\theta}_{n, \hat{u}_n}^s$ is to amend the empirical process $(\bar{Z}_n(g), \bar{Z}_n(h))$ used in the proof of Theorem 3.1 by an additional parameter $d \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$ (for some $\epsilon > 0$) that later on is replaced with D_n . We thus modify some of the conditions used in Section 3 as follows:

(θ PR) There exist $\epsilon > 0$ and, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $e_n(k)$ such that

$$e_n(k) \geq P(X_k > (1 - \epsilon)u_n \mid X_0 > (1 - \epsilon)u_n)$$

$$\text{and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{r_n} e_n(k) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_n(k) < \infty.$$

(B_b R) For all sequences $d_n \rightarrow 1$, $\frac{P\{M_{1, s_n} > d_n u_n\}}{s_n P\{X_0 > d_n u_n\}} - \theta = o((nv_n)^{-1/2})$.

In addition, we assume that the positive part $(X_t^+)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} := (X_t \mathbf{1}_{\{X_t \geq 0\}})_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of the time series is regular varying, that is all finite dimension distributions are multivariate regularly varying. According to Basrak & Segers (2009), Theorem 2.1, this assumption is equivalent to the existence of a tail process $(W_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ such that

$$P\left(\left(\frac{X_i}{u}\right)_{s \leq i \leq t} \in \cdot \mid X_0 > u\right) \xrightarrow{w} P((W_i)_{s \leq i \leq t} \in \cdot) \quad (6.2)$$

as $u \rightarrow \infty$ for all $-\infty < s \leq t < \infty$. Then W_0 is independent of the so-called (tail) spectral process $(\Theta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} := (W_t/W_0)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $P\{W_0 > t\} = t^{-\alpha}$ for all $t > 1$ and some $\alpha > 0$, the so-called index of regular variation. We thus assume

(R) $(X_t^+)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is regular varying with tail process $(W_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$, spectral process $(\Theta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and index α .

Observe that if (θ PR) and (R) are satisfied then the following generalization of (θ PR) holds, too: one has eventually for all $c, d \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_k > cu_n \mid X_1 > du_n) &\leq P(X_k > (1 - \epsilon)u_n \mid X_1 > (1 - \epsilon)u_n) \cdot \frac{P\{X_1 > (1 - \epsilon)u_n\}}{P\{X_1 > (1 + \epsilon)u_n\}} \\ &\leq 2 \left(\frac{1 - \epsilon}{1 + \epsilon}\right)^{-\alpha} e_n(k) =: \tilde{e}_n(k) \end{aligned}$$

with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{r_n} \tilde{e}_n(k) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{e}_n(k) < \infty$.

The following result shows that the sliding blocks estimator with random thresholds has the same limit distribution as the estimators with deterministic thresholds.

Theorem 6.1. *If the conditions ($\theta 1$), (θ PR), (B_b R), (R) and (6.1) are satisfied, then*

$$\sqrt{nv_n}(\hat{\theta}_{n, \hat{u}_n}^S - \theta) \xrightarrow{w} \mathcal{N}(0, \theta(\theta c - 1))$$

with c defined in condition ($\theta 2$).

Due to condition (θP) and (R) , c can be represented in terms of the tail process $(W_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} c &= 1 + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{r_n-1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{r_n}\right) (P(X_k > u_n | X_0 > u_n) + P(X_0 > u_n | X_{-k} > u_n)) \\ &= 1 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P\{W_k > 1\} \end{aligned}$$

(see also Section 3).

In the proof, we consider the class $\mathcal{G} = \{g_d, h_d : d \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]\}$ of bounded functions

$$\begin{aligned} g_d(x_1, \dots, x_s) &:= \mathbb{1}_{\{\max_{1 \leq i \leq s} x_i > d\}}, \\ h_d(x_1, \dots, x_s) &:= \mathbb{1}_{\{x_1 > d\}}. \end{aligned}$$

We choose $X_{n,i} := (X_i/u_n)\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > u_n\}}$ and the normalizing sequence $b_n(g_d) = \sqrt{nv_n/p_n^s} s_n$ and $b_n(h_d) = \sqrt{nv_n/p_n^s}$ with $p_n^s = P\{M_{1,r_n+s_n-1} > (1-\epsilon)u_n\} = (1-\epsilon)^{-\alpha} r_n v_n \theta (1+o(1))$ by (3.1) and regular variation. Define \bar{Z}_n as in (2.1), i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Z}_n(g_d) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{nv_n} s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > du_n\}} - P\{M_{1,s_n} > du_n\}) \\ \bar{Z}_n(h_d) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{nv_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > du_n\}} - P\{X_0 > du_n\}). \end{aligned}$$

In a first step we prove the asymptotic normality of $(\bar{Z}_n(f))_{f \in \mathcal{G}}$. There we use the notation $U_{s,t}^* := \sup_{s \leq i \leq t, i \in \mathbb{Z}} U_i$ for a process $(U_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $-\infty \leq s \leq t \leq \infty$.

Proposition 6.2. *If the conditions $(\theta 1)$, (θPR) and (R) are satisfied, then*

$$(\bar{Z}_n(f))_{f \in \mathcal{G}} \xrightarrow{w} (Z(f))_{f \in \mathcal{G}},$$

where Z is a centered Gaussian process with $\text{Var}(Z(g_1)) = \theta$, $\text{Var}(Z(h_1)) = c$ and $\text{Cov}(Z(g_1), Z(h_1)) = 1$.

Proof. Since the functions g_d and h_d are bounded, we can apply Theorem 2.3. The Conditions (A1), (A2) and (MX) easily follow from $(\theta 1)$ and (R) , and Condition (D0) is obvious. Condition (2.5) for $g_{1-\epsilon}$, and hence for all g_d , $d \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$, follows from (θPR) in the same way as in the proof of Proposition B.3. One may argue similarly to verify (2.5) for h_d , $d \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$.

The convergence of the covariance matrix is established in Lemma 6.3. In particular, for $d = 1$ one obtains the same covariances as in Proposition B.3, since $P\{W_0 > 1\} = 1$. It remains to check the conditions for convergence of the process, i.e. (D1) and (D3).

The functionals $(g_d)_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}$ are linearly ordered: $g_d \geq g_{d'}$ for $d \leq d'$. Hence, $(g_d)_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}$ forms a VC(2)-class and (D3) is satisfied for $(g_d)_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}$ (cf. Drees & Rootzén (2010), Remark 2.11). The same argument applies to $(h_d)_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}$. Therefore, Condition (D3) is satisfied.

Note that the remaining Condition (D1) may be verified for the functions $(g_d)_{d \in (1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon)}$ and $(h_d)_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}$ separately. In the remaining parts we only check it for $(g_d)_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}$, as the assertion for h_d follows along the same lines.

The family $(g_d)_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}$ is totally bounded with respect to the metric $\rho(g_d, g_{d'}) := |d^{-\alpha} - d'^{-\alpha}|$. Lemma 6.3 (iii) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r_n s_n^2 v_n} E \left[\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_d(Y_{n,i}) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_{d'}(Y_{n,i}) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{r_n s_n^2 v_n} Cov \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_d(Y_{n,i}), \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} g_{d'}(Y_{n,i}) \right) + O(r_n v_n) \\ &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \left(P\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > d'/d\} d^{-\alpha} + P\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > d/d'\} d'^{-\alpha} \right) \\ &=: D(d, d'). \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

Because

$$\begin{aligned} P\left\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > c\right\} &= P\left\{W_0 \leq \frac{1}{\Theta_{1,\infty}^*}, W_0 > \frac{c}{\Theta_{-\infty,\infty}^*}\right\} \\ &= \int \left(\left(\max\left(\frac{c}{t}, 1\right) \right)^{-\alpha} - \left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^{-\alpha} \right)^+ P^{(\Theta_{1,\infty}^*, \Theta_{-\infty,\infty}^*)}(ds, dt) \end{aligned}$$

for all $c > 0$, the limit in (6.3) is a continuous function of $(d, d') \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]^2$. Moreover, the left-hand side of (6.3) is monotone in d and d' . Hence, convergence (6.3) holds uniformly on $[1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]^2$.

Since $W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > 1$ almost surely, we may conclude, uniformly for $1-\epsilon \leq d \leq d' \leq 1+\epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r_n s_n^2 v_n} E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} (g_d(Y_{n,i}) - g_{d'}(Y_{n,i})) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\rightarrow D(d, d) + D(d', d') - 2D(d, d') \\ &= P\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1\} (d^{-\alpha} + d'^{-\alpha}) - P\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > d'/d\} d^{-\alpha} \\ &\quad - P\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > d/d'\} d'^{-\alpha} \\ &= P\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1\} d^{-\alpha} - P\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > d'/d\} d^{-\alpha} \\ &= P\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty,\infty}^* \leq d'/d\} d^{-\alpha} \\ &\leq P\{W_0 \leq d'/d\} d^{-\alpha} = (1 - (d'/d)^{-\alpha}) d^{-\alpha} = \rho(g_d, g_{d'}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{d, d' \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon], \rho(g_d, g_{d'}) < \delta} \frac{1}{r_n s_n^2 v_n} E \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} (g_d(Y_{n,i}) - g_{d'}(Y_{n,i})) \right)^2 \right] \leq \delta,$$

i.e. Condition (D1) is satisfied.

Now Theorem 2.3 yields the assertion. \square

It remains to show that the standardized covariances of \bar{Z}_n converge.

Lemma 6.3. *If the conditions $(\theta 1)$, (θPR) and (R) are met, then the following three limits exists for all $c, d \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$:*

(i)

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > cu_n\}}, \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > du_n\}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P \left\{ W_k > \frac{c}{d} \right\} d^{-\alpha} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P \left\{ W_k > \frac{d}{c} \right\} c^{-\alpha} + (\max(c, d))^{-\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

(ii)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n s_n v_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > cu_n\}}, \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > du_n\}} \right) = P \left\{ W_{-\infty, \infty}^* > \frac{c}{d} \right\} d^{-\alpha}$$

(iii)

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_n s_n^2 v_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > cu_n\}}, \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{j, j+s_n-1} > du_n\}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(P \left\{ W_{1, \infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty, \infty}^* > \frac{d}{c} \right\} c^{-\alpha} + P \left\{ W_{1, \infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty, \infty}^* > \frac{c}{d} \right\} d^{-\alpha} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The following technical lemma is used in the proof of Lemma 6.3.

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose the conditions (θPR) and (R) are satisfied. Then, for all sequences $t_n, \tilde{t}_n, t_n^* \rightarrow \infty$, $t_n, \tilde{t}_n, t_n^* \leq r_n$ and all $c, d, d^* \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$,*

$$P(M_{-t_n, \tilde{t}_n} > du_n, M_{1, t_n^*} \leq d^* u_n \mid X_0 > cu_n) \rightarrow P \left\{ W_{-\infty, \infty}^* > d/c, W_{1, \infty}^* \leq d^*/c \right\} \quad (6.4)$$

$$P(M_{-t_n, \tilde{t}_n} > du_n \mid X_0 > cu_n) \rightarrow P \left\{ W_{-\infty, \infty}^* > d/c \right\}. \quad (6.5)$$

Proof. First note that under (θPR) and (R) , the tail process will finally not exceed $(1 - \epsilon)/(1 + \epsilon)$, i.e., $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} P \left\{ \sup_{|t| > l} W_t > (1 - \epsilon)/(1 + \epsilon) \right\} = 0$. To see this, check that for all $1 \leq l \leq m$

$$\begin{aligned} P \left\{ W_{l, m}^* > \frac{1 - \epsilon}{1 + \epsilon} \right\} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(M_{l, m} > (1 - \epsilon)u_n \mid X_0 > (1 + \epsilon)u_n) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=l}^m P(X_j > (1 - \epsilon)u_n \mid X_0 > (1 + \epsilon)u_n) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \sum_{j=l}^{\infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e_n(j) \left(\frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \right)^{-\alpha}.$$

By monotone convergence, one may conclude $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} P\{W_{l,\infty}^* > (1-\epsilon)/(1+\epsilon)\} = 0$.

The proof of $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} P\{W_{-\infty,-l}^* > (1-\epsilon)/(1+\epsilon)\} = 0$ is similar.

Hence, for any fixed $\eta > 0$, there exists $m_\eta \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \geq m_\eta$

$$|P\{W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > d/c, W_{1,\infty}^* \leq d^*/c\} - P\{W_{-m,m}^* > d/c, W_{1,m}^* \leq d^*/c\}| < \eta/3.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| P(M_{-t_n, \tilde{t}_n} > du_n, M_{1, t_n^*} \leq d^* u_n \mid X_0 > cu_n) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - P(M_{-m, m} > du_n, M_{1, m} \leq d^* u_n \mid X_0 > (1-\epsilon)u_n) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{k=m+1}^{\max(\tilde{t}_n, t_n^*)} P(X_k > (1-\epsilon)u_n \mid X_0 > (1-\epsilon)u_n) \cdot \frac{P\{X_0 > (1-\epsilon)u_n\}}{P\{X_0 > cu_n\}} \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=m+1}^{t_n} P(X_0 > cu_n \mid X_{-k} > (1-\epsilon)u_n) \cdot \frac{P\{X_{-k} > (1-\epsilon)u_n\}}{P\{X_0 > cu_n\}} \\ & \leq 3 \left(\frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \right)^{-\alpha} \sum_{k=m+1}^{\max(t_n, \tilde{t}_n, t_n^*)} e_n(k) \\ & \leq \frac{\eta}{3} \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large m and n . Therefore, one has eventually

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| P(M_{-t_n, \tilde{t}_n} > du_n, M_{1, t_n^*} \leq d^* u_n \mid X_0 > cu_n) - P\{W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > d/c, W_{1,\infty}^* \leq d^*/c\} \right| \\ & < \left| P(M_{-m, m} > du_n, M_{1, m} \leq d^* u_n \mid X_0 > cu_n) - P\{W_{-m,m}^* > d/c, W_{1,m}^* \leq d^*/c\} \right| + \frac{2}{3}\eta \\ & < \eta \end{aligned}$$

by definition (6.2) of the tail process. Since $\eta > 0$ is arbitrary, this proves (6.4). The second assertion can be established by similar arguments. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.3. To prove assertion (i), first note that by regular variation $P\{X_0 > du_n\} = d^{-\alpha} v_n (1 + o(1))$ for all $d > 0$. Hence, by stationarity,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i > cu_n\}}, \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > du_n\}} \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{r_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} P\{X_i > cu_n, X_j > du_n\} + O(r_n v_n) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k=1}^{r_n-1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{r_n}\right) P(X_k > cu_n | X_0 > du_n) \frac{P\{X_0 > du_n\}}{v_n} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{r_n-1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{r_n}\right) P(X_k > du_n | X_0 > cu_n) \frac{P\{X_0 > cu_n\}}{v_n} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{v_n} P\{X_0 > \max(c, d)u_n\} + O(r_n v_n) \\
&\rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P\left\{W_k > \frac{c}{d}\right\} d^{-\alpha} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P\left\{W_k > \frac{d}{c}\right\} c^{-\alpha} + (\max(c, d))^{-\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last step we have used regular variation and Pratt's lemma, that can be applied due to Condition (θ PR) (see the discussion given below Condition (R)). Next note that the following generalizations to the equations (B.10) and (B.11) hold for all $c, d \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=\ell+s_n+1}^{r_n} P\{M_{\ell+1, \ell+s_n} > cu_n, X_j > du_n\} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=\ell+s_n+1}^{r_n} P\{M_{\ell+1, \ell+s_n} > (1 - \epsilon)u_n, X_j > (1 - \epsilon)u_n\} \\
&= o(s_n v_n)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} P\{M_{\ell+1, \ell+s_n} > cu_n, X_j > du_n\} = o(s_n v_n) \tag{6.6}$$

uniformly for $1 \leq \ell \leq r_n - s_n$. It follows for the left hand side in (ii)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{r_n s_n v_n} \text{Cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > cu_n\}}, \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_j > du_n\}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{r_n s_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} P\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > cu_n, X_j > du_n\} + O(r_n v_n) \\
&= \frac{1}{r_n s_n v_n} \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=i}^{\min(i+s_n-1, r_n)} P\{M_{i, i+s_n-1} > cu_n, X_j > du_n\} + o(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{s_n} \sum_{k=-s_n+1}^0 \left(1 - \frac{|k|}{r_n}\right) P(M_{k, k+s_n-1} > cu_n | X_0 > du_n) \frac{P\{X_0 > du_n\}}{v_n} + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any sequence $t_n \rightarrow \infty$, $t_n = o(s_n)$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s_n} \sum_{k=-s_n+t_n+1}^{-t_n} P(M_{k,k+s_n-1} > cu_n \mid X_0 > du_n) \\ & \leq \frac{s_n - 2t_n}{s_n} P(M_{-s_n,s_n} > cu_n \mid X_0 > du_n) \\ & \rightarrow P\left\{W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > \frac{c}{d}\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where (6.5) was applied in the last step. Likewise, for sufficiently large n ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s_n} \sum_{k=-s_n+t_n+1}^{-t_n} P(M_{k,k+s_n-1} > cu_n \mid X_0 > du_n) \\ & \geq \frac{s_n - 2t_n}{s_n} P(M_{-t_n,t_n} > cu_n \mid X_0 > du_n) \\ & \rightarrow P\left\{W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > \frac{c}{d}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s_n} \sum_{k=-s_n+1}^0 \left(1 - \frac{|k|}{r_n}\right) P(M_{k,k+s_n-1} > cu_n \mid X_0 > du_n) \frac{P\{X_0 > du_n\}}{v_n} + o(1) \\ & = \frac{1}{s_n} \sum_{k=-s_n+t_n+1}^{-t_n} P(M_{k,k+s_n-1} > cu_n \mid X_0 > du_n) \frac{P\{X_0 > du_n\}}{v_n} \\ & \quad + O\left(\frac{t_n}{s_n} + \frac{s_n}{r_n}\right) + o(1) \\ & \rightarrow P\left\{W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > \frac{c}{d}\right\} d^{-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we turn to (iii). The arguments are similar to the arguments used in the proof of assertion (ii) and in the proof of Lemma B.5 (iv). By stationarity,

$$\begin{aligned} & Cov\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > cu_n\}}, \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \mathbb{1}_{\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > du_n\}}\right) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} P\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > cu_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > du_n\} + O((r_n s_n v_n)^2) \\ & = \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=i}^{r_n} P\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > cu_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > du_n\} \\ & \quad + \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=i}^{r_n} P\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > du_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > cu_n\} + o(r_n s_n^2 v_n). \quad (6.7) \end{aligned}$$

For all $c, d \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$ one can decompose the first term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=i}^{r_n} P\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > cu_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > du_n\} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-3s_n} \sum_{j=i}^{i+s_n-1} P\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > cu_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > du_n\} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=r_n-3s_n+1}^{r_n} \sum_{j=i}^{r_n} P\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > cu_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > du_n\} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-3s_n} \sum_{j=i+s_n}^{r_n-s_n} P\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > cu_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > du_n\} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{r_n-3s_n} \sum_{j=r_n-s_n+1}^{r_n} P\{M_{i,i+s_n-1} > cu_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > du_n\} \\
&=: I + II + III + IV.
\end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Lemma B.5, one can show that the terms II, III, and IV are of smaller order than $r_n s_n^2 v_n$. We next show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{I}{r_n s_n^2 v_n} &= \frac{1 + o(1)}{s_n^2 v_n} \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} P\{M_{1,s_n} > cu_n, M_{k,k+s_n-1} > du_n\} \\
&\rightarrow \frac{1}{2} P\left\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > \frac{d}{c}\right\} c^{-\alpha}. \tag{6.8}
\end{aligned}$$

Distinguish according to the last exceedance in $\{1, \dots, s_n\}$ to conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} P\{M_{1,s_n} > cu_n, M_{k,k+s_n-1} > du_n\} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{s_n} P\{X_i > cu_n, M_{i+1,s_n} \leq cu_n, M_{k,k+s_n-1} > du_n\} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \sum_{i=k}^{s_n} P\{X_i > cu_n, M_{i+1,s_n} \leq cu_n, M_{k,k+s_n-1} > du_n\} \\
&\quad + O\left(\sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} P\{X_i > cu_n, M_{k,k+s_n-1} > du_n\}\right) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \sum_{i=k}^{s_n} P\{X_0 > cu_n, M_{1,s_n-i} \leq cu_n, M_{k-i,k-i+s_n-1} > du_n\} + o(s_n^2 v_n) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{s_n} \sum_{j=k-s_n}^0 P\{X_0 > cu_n, M_{1,s_n+j-k} \leq cu_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > du_n\} + o(s_n^2 v_n)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1-s_n}^0 \sum_{k=1}^{s_n+j} P\{X_0 > cu_n, M_{1,s_n+j-k} \leq cu_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > du_n\} + o(s_n^2 v_n).$$

where in the third step we have employed (6.6). For any sequence $t_n \rightarrow \infty$, $t_n = o(s_n)$, this last sum can eventually be bound from below by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=-s_n+t_n}^{-t_n} \sum_{k=1}^{s_n+j} P\{X_0 > cu_n, M_{1,s_n+j-k} \leq cu_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > du_n\} + O(t_n s_n v_n) \\ & \geq \sum_{j=-s_n+t_n}^{-t_n} (s_n + j - 1) P\{X_0 > cu_n, M_{1,s_n} \leq cu_n, M_{-t_n, t_n-1} > du_n\} + o(s_n^2 v_n) \\ & = \frac{s_n^2 v_n}{2} \frac{P\{X_0 > cu_n\}}{v_n} P\left\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > \frac{d}{c}\right\} (1 + o(1)) \end{aligned}$$

by (6.4). Similarly, the sum has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=t_n-s_n+1}^0 \sum_{k=1}^{s_n+j-t_n} P\{X_0 > cu_n, M_{1,s_n+j-k} \leq cu_n, M_{j,j+s_n-1} > du_n\} + O(t_n s_n v_n) \\ & \leq \sum_{j=-s_n}^0 (s_n + j - t_n) P\{X_0 > cu_n, M_{1,t_n} \leq cu_n, M_{-s_n, s_n} > du_n\} + o(s_n^2 v_n) \\ & = \frac{s_n^2 v_n}{2} c^{-\alpha} P\left\{W_{1,\infty}^* \leq 1, W_{-\infty,\infty}^* > \frac{d}{c}\right\} (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence convergence (6.8) follows, which gives the asymptotic behavior of the first term in (6.7). Interchanging the role of c and d yields the analogous result for the second term, which concludes the proof of (iii). \square

Finally, we prove the asymptotic normality of the sliding blocks estimator based on the exceedances over the random threshold $\hat{u}_n = D_n u_n$.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. By Proposition 6.2

$$(\bar{Z}_n(g_d), \bar{Z}_n(h_d))_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]} \xrightarrow{w} (Z(g_d), Z(h_d))_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}.$$

Using (6.1) and Slutsky's Lemma, we may conclude

$$((\bar{Z}_n(g_d), \bar{Z}_n(h_d))_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}, D_n) \xrightarrow{w} ((Z(g_d), Z(h_d))_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}, 1). \quad (6.9)$$

By Skorohod's representation theorem there exist versions of these processes which converge almost surely. According to (Van der Vaart & Wellner (1996), Addendum 1.5.8), under the conditions (D0), (D1) and (D3) established in the proof of Proposition 6.2, the limit process $(Z(g_d))_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}$ has almost surely continuous sample paths w.r.t. the

metric ρ_g . Analogously $(Z(h_d))_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]}$ has almost surely continuous sample paths. Therefore, in view of the almost sure version of (6.9),

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{Z}_n(g_{D_n}) - Z(g_1)| &\leq |\bar{Z}_n(g_{D_n}) - Z(g_{D_n})| + |Z(g_{D_n}) - Z(g_1)| \\ &\leq \sup_{d \in [1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon]} |\bar{Z}_n(g_d) - Z(g_d)| + |Z(g_{D_n}) - Z(g_1)| \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

almost surely, and likewise

$$|\bar{Z}_n(h_{D_n}) - Z(h_1)| \rightarrow 0 \quad (6.11)$$

almost surely.

Now, for $d \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$, define

$$\theta_{n,d}^s := \frac{\frac{1}{s_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} g_d(Y_{n,i})}{\sum_{i=1}^{n-s_n+1} h_d(Y_{n,i})},$$

so that $\hat{\theta}_{n,\hat{u}_n}^s = \theta_{n,D_n}^s$ if $D_n \in [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$, which holds with probability tending to 1. Let

$$\theta_n(d) := \frac{P(M_{1,s_n} > d u_n)}{s_n P(X_0 > d u_n)}.$$

Then, for any sequence $d_n \rightarrow 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{nv_n}(\theta_{n,d_n}^s - \theta_n(d_n)) \\ &= \sqrt{nv_n} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{\sqrt{nv_n}} \bar{Z}_n(g_{d_n}) + \frac{n-s_n+1}{nv_n s_n} P(M_{1,s_n} > d_n u_n)}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{nv_n}} \bar{Z}_n(h_{d_n}) + \frac{n-s_n+1}{nv_n} P(X_0 > d_n u_n)} - \theta_n(d_n) \right) \\ &= \frac{\bar{Z}_n(g_{d_n}) - \theta_n(d_n) \bar{Z}_n(h_{d_n})}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{nv_n}} \bar{Z}_n(h_{d_n}) + \frac{n-s_n+1}{nv_n} P(X_0 > d_n u_n)}. \end{aligned}$$

The denominator tends to 1 by (6.9) and regular variation. Since $\theta_n(D_n) \rightarrow \theta$ by the bias condition (B_bR), from $D_n \rightarrow 1$, (6.10) and (6.11) we may conclude

$$\sqrt{nv_n}(\theta_{n,D_n}^s - \theta_n(D_n)) \rightarrow Z(g_1) - \theta Z(h_1)$$

almost surely. Now the assertion is an immediate consequence of the bias condition (B_bR), as $Z(g_1) - \theta Z(h_1)$ is a centered normal random variable with the same variance $Var(Z(g_1)) + \theta^2 Var(Z(h_1)) - 2Cov(Z(g_1), Z(h_1)) = \theta(\theta c - 1)$ as obtained in Theorem 3.1. \square

7. Lindeberg condition (L2) implies conditions (L1) and (L)

In Appendix A, the Lindeberg condition (L2) for $V_n(\mathcal{G}) := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} |V_n(g)|$ was introduced:

$$(L2) \quad \frac{m_n}{p_n} E^* \left[(V_n(\mathcal{G}))^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{V_n(\mathcal{G}) > \sqrt{p_n} \epsilon\}} \right] \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall \epsilon > 0.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Chebyshev's inequality it follows

$$\begin{aligned} E^* \left[V_n(\mathcal{G}) \mathbf{1}_{\{V_n(\mathcal{G}) > \sqrt{p_n} \epsilon\}} \right] &\leq \sqrt{E^* \left[(V_n(\mathcal{G}))^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{V_n(\mathcal{G}) > \sqrt{p_n} \epsilon\}} \right] E^* \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{V_n(\mathcal{G}) > \sqrt{p_n} \epsilon\}} \right]} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{(E^* [(V_n(\mathcal{G}))^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{V_n(\mathcal{G}) > \sqrt{p_n} \epsilon\}}])^2}{\epsilon^2 p_n} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\stackrel{(L2)}{=} o \left(\left(\frac{p_n^2}{p_n m_n^2} \right)^{1/2} \right) = o \left(\frac{\sqrt{p_n}}{m_n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (L2) implies condition (L1).

Moreover, under (L2), by Jensen's inequality

$$(E[V_n(g)])^2 \leq E[(V_n(g))^2] \leq E \left[(V_n(g))^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_n(g)| > \sqrt{p_n} \epsilon\}} \right] + \epsilon^2 p_n = o \left(\frac{p_n}{m_n} \right) + \epsilon^2 p_n$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$, and thus $E|V_n(g)| = o(\sqrt{p_n})$. We may conclude for sufficiently large n

$$\begin{aligned} &E \left[(V_n(g) - EV_n(g))^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_n(g) - EV_n(g)| > \epsilon \sqrt{p_n}\}} \right] \\ &\leq 2E \left[((V_n(g))^2 + (EV_n(g))^2) \mathbf{1}_{\{|V_n(g)| > \epsilon \sqrt{p_n}/2\}} \right] \\ &\leq 2E^* \left[(V_n(\mathcal{G}))^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{V_n(\mathcal{G}) > \epsilon \sqrt{p_n}/2\}} \right] + o(p_n) P\{|V_n(g)| > \epsilon \sqrt{p_n}/2\} \\ &\leq 4E^* \left[(V_n(\mathcal{G}))^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{V_n(\mathcal{G}) > \epsilon \sqrt{p_n}/2\}} \right] \\ &= o \left(\frac{p_n}{m_n} \right), \end{aligned}$$

i.e. (L) holds.

References

- Basrak, B. & Segers, J. (2009), 'Regularly varying multivariate time series', *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications* **119**(4), 1055–1080.
- Drees, H. & Knezevic, M. (2020), 'Peak-over-threshold estimators for spectral tail processes: random vs deterministic thresholds', *Extremes* **23**(3), 465–491.
- Drees, H. & Rootzén, H. (2010), 'Limit theorems for empirical processes of cluster functionals', *The Annals of Statistics* **38**(4), 2145–2186.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. & Wellner, J. A. (1996), *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*, Springer, New York.