

New Bayesian method for estimation of Value at Risk and Conditional Value at Risk

Jacinto Martín, M. Isabel Parra, Eva L. Sanjuán, Mario M. Pizarro*

Department of Mathematics, University of Extremadura

Abstract

Value at Risk (VaR) and Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR) have become the most popular measures of market risk in Financial and Insurance fields. However, the estimation of both risk measures is challenging, because it requires the knowledge of the tail of the distribution. Therefore, tools from Extreme Value Theory are usually employed, considering that the tail data follow a Generalized Pareto distribution (GPD). Using the existing relations from the parameters of the baseline distribution and the limit GPD's parameters, we define highly informative priors that incorporate all the information available for the whole set of observations. We show how to perform Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm to estimate VaR and CVaR employing the highly informative priors, in the case of exponential, stable and Gamma distributions. Afterwards, we perform a thorough simulation study to compare the accuracy and precision provided by three different methods. Finally, data from a real example is analyzed to show the practical application of the methods.

Keywords:

Value at Risk, Conditional Value at Risk, generalized Pareto distribution, Bayesian inference, Informative priors, MH algorithm

1. Introduction

Extreme value theory (EVT) is a branch of Statistics which comprehends the statistical tools that allow us to model and forecast events that are more extreme than any previously observed, called extreme values. It is widely employed in Climatology, to study extreme temperatures [1], rainfall or floods [2]; but also in Finance and Insurance, mainly in Risk Management, for estimation of financial reserves in insurance [3, 4, 5, 6].

A distribution that plays an important role in EVT is the Generalized Pareto distribution. Due to its importance, several methods to estimate shape and scale parameters of the GPD have been proposed. Classical methods require conditions on the shape parameter for the asymptotic theory on which they are based, as it is shown in [7]. That is why Bayesian inference is advisable.

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: jmartin@unex.es (Jacinto Martín), mipa@unex.es (M. Isabel Parra), etlopez@unex.es (Eva L. Sanjuán), mariomp@unex.es (Mario M. Pizarro)

There have been some attempts to estimate the parameters of the GPD employing Bayesian techniques. The first one corresponds to [8], who employed Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods, [9] estimated shape parameter when it is positive and [10] applied Metropolis-Hastings algorithm and Jeffrey's prior distribution. More recently, [11] employed all the data available of the baseline distribution to perform estimations, based on existing relations between the parameters of the baseline distribution and the parameters of the limit GPD, applying the same strategy developed before in [12] for block maxima and Gumbel distribution.

In the field of Risk Theory, EVT is essential, because it allows us to study measures associated to those data that differ significantly from most observations, mainly to those belonging to the tail of the distribution. Most employed risk measures are Value at Risk (VaR) and Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR) [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]. Some researchers have developed estimation strategies for VaR and CVaR, such as [20] proposed a three-parameter Pareto distribution to estimate VaR of a GPD, [21] studied estimations for VaR and CVaR considering heavy tail distributions modelled by GPD; [22] proposed a weighted random bootstrap method to estimate VaR by intervals, considering GPD. More recently, [23] showed the existing relation between VaR and CVaR for GPD and proposed a generalization of CVaR for high order risks

In this work, we will focus on estimating VaR and CVaR for different baseline distributions, employing Bayesian strategies similar to those proposed in [11] to estimate the parameters of the GPD, by using highly informative priors, built with all the information available in the whole dataset.

In Section 2, we introduce the definitions of VaR and CVaR and show their analytical expressions or how to compute them, when it is possible, for GPD, Gamma distribution, and Stable distributions, in particular for Cauchy and Normal distributions. In Section 3, we detail two Bayesian methods based on Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm to estimate VaR and CVaR and propose a new method, considering highly informative priors, for exponential, stable and Gamma distributions. Afterwards, we perform a thorough simulation study to compare the accuracy provided by the three methods for the distributions considered, showing that the new method provides the best estimations for VaR and CVaR in Section 4. Finally, in Section 5, a real example is studied to provide a practical application of the methods.

2. Risk measures

As we commented in the Introduction, VaR and CVaR are usually the employed measures to describe the tail of a loss distribution in a financial context.

Consider a continuous random variable X which represents the loss of an investment over a certain time horizon.

Definition 1. Given a parameter $0 < p < 1$, the Value at Risk (VaR_p) of X is the p -quantile of the distribution X

$$VaR_p(X) = \inf\{c : P(X \leq c) \geq p\} \quad (1)$$

and the Conditional Value at Risk ($CVaR_p$) of X is

$$CVaR_p(X) = E[X | X \geq VaR_p(X)] \quad (2)$$

VaR_p is the maximum loss expected in the $p \cdot 100\%$ of the best cases, while $CVaR_p$ is the expected loss conditioned to the loss is bigger than VaR_p . This measure is more sensitive to the shape of the tail of the loss distribution.

[24] proposed an equivalent definition of CVaR_p

$$\begin{aligned}\text{CVaR}_p(X) &= \frac{1}{1-p} \int_p^1 \text{VaR}_q(X) dq \\ &= \frac{1}{1-p} \int_{\text{VaR}_p(X)}^{+\infty} xf(x) dx\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

where $f(x)$ is the density function of X .

These measures depend on the distribution function of the observations, therefore in this work we show how to compute them for GPD and Gamma distribution. Afterwards, we focus on stable distributions and show how to compute VaR and CVaR for Cauchy and Normal distribution.

2.1. Generalized Pareto distribution

Peaks-over-threshold (POT) method is based on the property that the distribution of data above a fixed threshold u can be approximated by a properly scaled Generalized Pareto distribution, when u tends to the endpoint of the distribution [25, 26]. Therefore, to estimate VaR_p , it is necessary that $p > u$.

Definition 2. A random variable X is distributed as a GPD with shape parameter ξ and scale parameter σ when its distribution function is

$$\text{GPD}(\xi, \sigma; x) = \begin{cases} 1 - \left(1 + \xi \frac{x}{\sigma}\right)^{-1/\xi} & \text{if } \xi \neq 0 \\ 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{x}{\sigma}\right) & \text{if } \xi = 0 \end{cases}\quad (4)$$

where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma > 0$, with support $x \geq 0$ if $\xi \geq 0$ and $0 \leq x \leq -\frac{\sigma}{\xi}$ if $\xi < 0$.

Notice that, when $\xi = 0$, $\text{GPD}(0, \sigma)$ is the Exponential distribution with parameter $\lambda = \frac{1}{\sigma}$.

Proposition 1. Let $X \sim \text{GPD}(\xi, \sigma)$ be a random variable. Given a parameter $0 < p < 1$,

$$\text{VaR}_p(X) = \frac{\sigma}{\xi} \left[(1-p)^{-\xi} - 1 \right]\quad (5)$$

$$\text{CVaR}_p(X) = \frac{\sigma}{\xi} \left[\frac{1}{1-\xi} (1-p)^{-\xi} - 1 \right]\quad (6)$$

For $\xi = 0$, $X \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ and

$$\text{VaR}_p(X) = -\frac{1}{\lambda} \ln(1-p)\quad (7)$$

$$\text{CVaR}_p(X) = \frac{1}{\lambda} [1 - \ln(1-p)]\quad (8)$$

2.2. Gamma distribution

Gamma distribution is often employed to model financial data, so it is widely applied in the field of Risk Theory. When $X \sim \Gamma(\alpha, \beta)$, it is impossible to find an analytic expression for VaR_p , because there is not such expression for the distribution function. However, by means of Equation (3), it is possible to deduce CVaR_p employing upper incomplete gamma function $\Gamma(a, x) = \int_x^\infty t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt$.

Proposition 2. *Let $X \sim \Gamma(\alpha, \beta)$ be a random variable. Given a parameter $0 < p < 1$, the Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR_p) of X is*

$$\text{CVaR}_p(X) = \frac{1}{(1-p)\Gamma(\alpha)\beta} \Gamma(\alpha+1, \beta \text{VaR}_p(X)) \quad (9)$$

2.3. Stable distributions

Stable distributions are used to model physical and economic systems due to their important properties. Defined by [27], they have been studied and applied in a financial context [5, 28]. Besides, [29] showed different estimates for VaR and CVaR for stable distributions. In previous work [11], we explained the relationship between stable distributions and GPD in order to compute estimations for the parameters of the GPD.

Proposition 3. *Let $Z \sim \text{Stable}(1, 0)$ and $X = aZ + b$, with parameters $a > 0$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. Given a parameter $0 < p < 1$,*

$$\text{VaR}_p(X) = a\text{VaR}_p(Z) + b \quad (10)$$

$$\text{CVaR}_p(X) = a\text{CVaR}_p(Z) + b \quad (11)$$

2.3.1. Normal distribution

Normal distribution is one of the most used distributions in economic models and it has a great interest in finance and insurance. Also, this distribution is one of the best known stable distributions.

Proposition 4. *Let $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma)$ be a random variable with mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and standard deviation $\sigma > 0$. Given a parameter $0 < p < 1$,*

$$\text{VaR}_p(X) = \mu + \sigma z_p \quad (12)$$

$$\text{CVaR}_p(X) = \mu + \frac{\sigma}{(1-p)\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}z_p^2\right\} \quad (13)$$

where z_p is the p -quantile of $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

2.3.2. Cauchy distribution

Cauchy distribution is a stable distribution with heavy tails, and it has the special characteristic that it does not present finite moments, so it is not possible to determine its mean. Then, it is impossible to define the risk measure CVaR. However, unlike Normal distribution, this time the risk measure VaR can be computed theoretically.

Proposition 5. *Let $X \sim C(\gamma, \delta)$ be a random variable. Given a parameter $0 < p < 1$, VaR_p is computed by*

$$\text{VaR}_p(X) = \gamma + \delta \tan\left[\pi\left(p - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right] \quad (14)$$

3. Bayesian estimation methods

In this Section, we will show how Bayesian methods can be applied to estimate VaR and CVaR for the GPD that models the tail of some distributions, which we call baseline distributions. We will focus on the cases when the baseline distribution is Exponential, Gamma or Stable (Cauchy or Normal).

Let X be a random variable with distribution function $F(x; \theta)$ (baseline distribution) and define u as a threshold value. The random variable $X_u = X - u \mid X > u$ represents the exceedances over u . We know [25, 26] that for a sufficiently high threshold u , the random variable X_u follows a scaled Generalized Pareto distribution, GPD(ξ, σ).

Regarding to the threshold choice, in financial context, the most usual way to select it is by fixing the probability below the threshold p_u , that is, by choosing the p_u -quantile of X .

Proposition 6. *Let u be the threshold defined as the p_u -quantile of X . For a p parameter that satisfies $p > p_u$, the VaR and CVaR of X can be computed from the VaR and CVaR of X_u , defined by Proposition 1. Therefore,*

$$\text{VaR}_p(X) = u + \text{VaR}_{p_t}(X_u) \quad (15)$$

$$\text{CVaR}_p(X) = u + \text{CVaR}_{p_t}(X_u) \quad (16)$$

$$\text{where } p_t = \frac{1-p}{1-p_u}.$$

Usual Bayesian method to estimate a parameter is based on the Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm. We will consider non-informative prior distributions to estimate the parameters of the GPD using the random variable X_u (details of the method can be consulted in [11]) and apply Proposition 6 to estimate VaR and CVaR. However, since this method only employs the observations above the threshold, which are usually scarce, it provides skewed estimates oftenly.

To seize all the dataset, the idea of using all the observations from the baseline distribution has already been employed in [11, 12]. We called this method Baseline MH method (BMH), and in this work we apply it to the estimation of VaR and CVaR, which can be computed straightforward. In this case, the problem can arise when we do not know the baseline distribution of the data, which is quite usual in real situations.

The new method we proposed tries to solve these difficulties. It is also based on MH, but employs an informative prior distribution for the parameters of the GPD, obtained from the relationship between the parameters ξ and σ of the GPD and the parameters of the baseline distribution. We called this method Informative Prior Baseline MH method (IPBMH) and it allows to compute VaR and CVaR for X_u and by Proposition 6, the estimates for risk measures of X can also be computed.

In this method, we give more weight to the tail values than to the values under the threshold. In a first step, BMH is used to estimate the parameters of the baseline distribution that will be used in the existing relationships. With them, highly informative prior distributions are constructed for the parameters of the GPD, using only the excesses of the threshold.

Next, this method is presented for each baseline distribution, since it is necessary to know the relationships between the baseline parameters and the GPD parameters.

Let $\mathbf{x}_u = (x_u^1, \dots, x_u^m)$ be a sample of size m of the random variable X_u .

3.1. Exponential distribution

When the baseline distribution is an Exponential distribution with parameter λ , the tail distribution X_u is the same as the underlying distribution. Therefore, we can establish the relationship $\lambda = \frac{1}{\sigma}$.

As a consequence, the following prior distribution can be considered to estimate σ

$$\sigma \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\sigma, \nu_\sigma)$$

with $\mu_\sigma = \frac{1}{\lambda}$, where λ will be estimated by BMH.

As the prior distribution is highly informative, the probability of acceptance of the MH algorithm is only affected by the likelihood functions, so the ratio can be computed as

$$r_\sigma = \left(\frac{\sigma^{(j)}}{\sigma^*}\right)^m \exp\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^{(j)}} - \frac{1}{\sigma^*}\right) \sum_{i=1}^m x_u^i\right\} \quad (17)$$

3.2. Stable distributions

Let $Z \sim \text{Stable}(1, 0)$ and $X = aZ + b$. For a threshold u , it is satisfied that $Z_u \sim \text{GPD}(\xi_Z, \sigma_Z)$, and consequently $X_u \sim \text{GPD}(\xi_Z, a\sigma_Z)$. Therefore, it is enough to find estimates for the parameters ξ_Z and σ_Z . In [11], a simulation study is shown for the estimates of standard stable distributions Normal and Cauchy, for a threshold u defined as the p_u -quantile.

Table 1: Estimates for GPD's parameters

distribution	ξ_Z	σ_Z
$\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$	$-0.7 + 0.61p_u$	$0.34 + 3.18(1 - p_u) - 12.4(1 - p_u)^2$
$C(0, 1)$	1	$\frac{1}{\pi}(1 - p_u)^{-1}$

Table 1 shows the estimates found. Then, to estimate the GPD parameters, ξ, σ , we can take the prior distributions

$$\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(\xi_Z, b_1), \sigma \sim \mathcal{N}(a \cdot \sigma_Z, b_2)$$

where a will be estimated by BMH. In particular, a is the scale parameter of stable distributions, so for the normal distribution it is equal to σ and for the Cauchy distribution it is δ . The coefficients b_1 and b_2 are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Coefficients of the prior distributions' hyperparameters

distribution	b_1	$b_2 = \exp\{c_1 p_u^2 + c_2 p_u + c_3\}$		
		c_1	c_2	c_3
$\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$	0.03	-46.24	83.55	-41.58
$C(0, 1)$	0.065	323.57	-588.51	266.13

The ratios of MH algorithm for each parameter are

$$r_{\xi} = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2b_1^2} \left((\xi^{(j)} - \xi_Z)^2 - (\xi^* - \xi_Z)^2 \right) - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\xi^*} \right) \sum_{i=1}^m \ln \left(1 + \xi^* \frac{x_u^i}{\sigma^{(j)}} \right) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\xi^{(j)}} \right) \sum_{i=1}^m \ln \left(1 + \xi^{(j)} \frac{x_u^i}{\sigma^{(j)}} \right) \right\} \quad (18)$$

$$r_{\sigma} = \left(\frac{\sigma^{(j)}}{\sigma^*} \right)^m \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2b_2^2} \left((\sigma^{(j)} - a \cdot \sigma_Z)^2 - (\sigma^* - a \cdot \sigma_Z)^2 \right) - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\xi^{(j)}} \right) \sum_{i=1}^m \ln \left(1 + \xi^{(j)} \frac{x_u^i}{\sigma^*} \right) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\xi^{(j)}} \right) \sum_{i=1}^m \ln \left(1 + \xi^{(j)} \frac{x_u^i}{\sigma^{(j)}} \right) \right\} \quad (19)$$

3.3. Gamma distribution

Let $X \sim \Gamma(\alpha, \beta)$ be a random variable. For a threshold u , the random variable of excesses X_u follows a GPD(ξ, σ). A simulation study has been carried out, similar to that of stable distributions, with the aim of obtaining empirical relationships between α, β parameters and the GPD parameters. Obtained relationships are

$$\xi = -0.032 + 0.014\alpha^{-1}, \quad \sigma = \frac{1}{2}\beta^{-1} (1 + \sqrt{\alpha}) \quad (20)$$

These empirical relationships allow the construction of highly informative prior distributions for ξ and σ . Therefore, the prior distributions are

$$\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\xi}, \nu_{\xi}), \quad \sigma \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{\sigma}, \nu_{\sigma})$$

where

$$\mu_{\xi} = -0.032 + 0.014\alpha^{-1}, \quad \mu_{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2}\beta^{-1} (1 + \sqrt{\alpha}) \quad (21)$$

In this case, the probability of acceptance is only affected by the likelihood functions, so the ratio can be computed as

$$r_{\xi, \sigma} = \left(\frac{\sigma^{(j)}}{\sigma^*} \right)^m \cdot \prod_{i=1}^m \left[\left(1 + \xi^* \frac{x_u^i}{\sigma^*} \right)^{-(1+1/\xi^*)} \cdot \left(1 + \xi^{(j)} \frac{x_u^i}{\sigma^{(j)}} \right)^{1+1/\xi^{(j)}} \right] \quad (22)$$

4. Results

In this Section, we show the results of a thorough simulation study in order to compare the quality of the estimates for VaR and CVaR computed with the three Bayesian methods explained in previous section.

We fixed the threshold as the quantile of 0.9 order. Therefore, $p_u = 0.9$, and we computed $\text{VaR}_{0.95}(X)$, $\text{CVaR}_{0.95}(X)$, being X the baseline distribution. We developed the cases studied in Section 3, Exponential, Stable (Cauchy and Normal) and Gamma distributions, for different sizes and parameters.

For each baseline distribution and fixed parameters, samples of sizes $n = 2^i, i = 5, \dots, 10$ were simulated. We obtained a Monte Carlo Markov chain (MCMC) of length 10000, taking 3000 training values and 50 thinning values. Finally, each sequence was repeated 100 times, and we computed the mean to estimate VaR or CVaR.

Next, we provide graphs with the estimates of both risk measures computed by the three methods: MH, BMH and IPBMH, in order to compare their accuracy.

4.1. Exponential distribution

Let $X \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$, we considered $\lambda = 2^j, j = -2, -1, 0, 1, 2$. Figure 1 shows the estimates for $\text{VaR}_{0.95}(X)$ (left) and $\text{CVaR}_{0.95}(X)$ (right), along with 2.5% and 97.5% confidence bounds, computed with MH (red lines), BMH (green lines) and IPBMH (blue lines) for $\lambda = 0.5$ (upper charts), $\lambda = 1$ (middle charts) and $\lambda = 2$ (lower charts). Besides, the real values of each risk measures are drawn as a black line.

As we can see, MH is the method that offers the worst estimates, especially when data are scarce, while IPBMH offers the most accurate and precise estimates for both risk measures for any size of the dataset n .

We also observed that high values of λ produced more deviations in estimations from MH and BMH methods when n is low. Again, estimates from IPBMH remain stable.




Figure 1: Estimates of $\text{VaR}_{0.95}(X)$ (left charts) and $\text{CVaR}_{0.95}(X)$ (right charts), for $X \sim \text{Exp}(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = 0.5$ (upper charts), $\lambda = 1$ (middle charts) and $\lambda = 2$ (lower charts), with 2.5% and 97.5% confidence bounds, by MH (red lines), BMH (green lines) and IPBMH (blue lines). Black lines represent the real value of each risk measure.

4.2. Stable distributions

Let $X \sim \text{Stable}(a, b)$. For stable distributions, the location parameter b does not have an influence on the estimates of the parameters of the GPD, therefore it does not affect the estimates of the risk measures. So, we fixed $b = 0$. In particular, $\mu = 0$ and $\gamma = 0$ for Normal and Cauchy distribution, respectively.

The scale parameter a does affect the estimates, therefore we took $a = 2^j$, $j = -2, -1, 0, 1, 2$ (σ for Normal, δ for Cauchy). The most representative cases $a = 0.5, 1, 2$ are shown in Figures 2-3. In particular, Figure 2 shows the estimates of VaR and CVaR for Normal distribution and Figure 3 shows the estimates for VaR. In both figures we can see how BMH and IPBMH provide very similar estimates for any size n , for any value of the parameter. The estimates are also quite accurate, but IPBMH shows less dispersion than BMH. In contrast, MH provides the worst estimates, especially when there is a lack of data.

In particular, for the Cauchy distribution, when the scale parameter δ is high and the size n is low, MH offers estimates of VaR with really high deviations from the real value.




Figure 2: Estimates of $\text{VaR}_{0.95}(X)$ (left charts) and $\text{CVaR}_{0.95}(X)$ (right charts), for $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ with $\sigma = 0.5$ (upper charts), $\sigma = 1$ (middle charts) and $\sigma = 2$ (lower charts), with 2.5% and 97.5% confidence bounds, by MH (red lines), BMH (green lines) and IPBMH (blue lines). Black lines represent the real value of each risk measure.

4.3. Gamma distribution

Let $X \sim \Gamma(\alpha, \beta)$. We considered $\alpha = 2^k$, $k = -2, 1, 1, 2$ and $\beta = 2^j$, $j = -2, -1, 0, 1, 2$. Figures 4-5 show the estimates of $\text{VaR}_{0.95}(X)$ and $\text{CVaR}_{0.95}(X)$ for different values of β (0.25, 1, 4), for




Figure 3: Estimates of $\text{VaR}_{0.95}(X)$ for $X \sim C(0, \delta)$ with $\delta = 0.5$ (left chart), $\delta = 1$ (center chart) and $\delta = 2$ (right chart) , with 2.5% and 97.5% confidence bounds, by MH (red lines), BMH (green lines) and IPBMH (blue lines). Black lines represent the real value of each risk measure.

$\alpha = 0.5$ (Fig. 4) and $\alpha = 2$ (Fig. 5).

As we can see, charts from Figure 4 are quite similar in shape to those for Figure 5. As in the previous cases, MH is the method that offers the worst estimates, especially when the number of data n is low and with low values of β . BMH and IPBMH provide very accurate estimates of both measures, being IPBMH the most precise method, regardless of the value of the parameters and the size of the sample.

5. Application

As we commented previously, risk measures are essential in Financial Risk studies. In Spain, the most important stock index is Iberia Index or IBEX35. This index is equivalent to S&P500 index. For this study, the data of IBEX35's daily closing for year 2022 were selected. Besides, in order to study the possible consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic about this stock index, data for year 2020 were taken. The IBEX35's behaviour is shown in Figure 6 (left charts).

However, in order to compute the risk measures for financial data, it is usually employed the daily logarithmic return of stock index. It can be defined by

$$R_t = \ln\left(\frac{P_t}{P_{t-1}}\right) \quad (23)$$

where P_t and P_{t-1} indicate the stock index on day t and $t - 1$, respectively.

Figure 6 (right charts) shows the percentage of noise of the one-year daily return for 2020 and 2022, respectively. In both cases, the majority of these values range between -5.0% and 5.0%, but it should be noted that in March of 2020, R_t took a value of -15% due to COVID-19 pandemic. For both years, the dataset comprehends a sample of 257 values. Figure 7 shows the behaviour of the data, and it can be observed that data seem to follow a normal distribution.

In Financial Risk, a quantity of interest is the maximum loss expected in the 95% of the worst cases, that is, $\text{VaR}_{0.05}$. As we have assumed a normal distribution for the dataset, quantile $\text{VaR}_{0.05}$ is equal to $-\text{VaR}_{0.95}$, therefore we employ the negative values of R_t for the computations.

To show the advantage of the new proposed method, IPBMH, a study was carried out to compare it with MH. The BMH method can only be used when the distribution of the data is known with certainty, an assumption that does not generally happen in real situations, therefore we can not employ BMH method.




Figure 4: Estimates of $\text{VaR}_{0.95}(X)$ (left charts) and $\text{CVaR}_{0.95}(X)$ (right charts), for $X \sim \Gamma(0.5, \beta)$ with $\beta = 0.25$ (upper charts), $\beta = 1$ (middle charts) and $\beta = 4$ (lower charts), with 2.5% and 97.5% confidence bounds, by MH (red lines), BMH (green lines) and IPBMH (blue lines). Black lines represent the real value of each risk measure.




Figure 5: Estimates of $\text{VaR}_{0.95}(X)$ (left charts) and $\text{CVaR}_{0.95}(X)$ (right charts), for $X \sim \Gamma(2, \beta)$ with $\beta = 0.25$ (upper charts), $\beta = 1$ (middle charts) and $\beta = 4$ (lower charts), with 2.5% and 97.5% confidence bounds, by MH (red lines), BMH (green lines) and IPBMH (blue lines). Black lines represent the real value of each risk measure.




Figure 6: IBEX35's daily closing (left charts) and daily logarithmic return (%) (right charts) for 2020 (upper charts) and 2022 (lower charts).




Figure 7: Data histogram of IBEX35's daily logarithmic return (%) of 2020 (left chart) and 2022 (right chart).

The values that exceed the threshold u located in the quantile of $p_u = 0.9$ order were considered as extreme values.

The historical simulation model proposes [30, 31] to determine the risk measures employing historical data. That is, let X_t be a value of time t , the risk measure value for a time t is computed using X_1, \dots, X_{t-1} values. This model needs a large size of data to obtain precise values, because there are few extreme values.

Figure 8 shows the estimates for VaR and CVaR provided by MH (red lines) and IPBMH (blue lines) employing the historical simulation model. IPBMH provides better estimates than MH, for any value of the size of the dataset.




Figure 8: Estimates of $VaR_{0.05}(R_t)$ (upper charts) and $CVaR_{0.05}(R_t)$ (lower charts) by MH (red lines) and IPBMH (blue lines). Green dashed lines represent the real value of each risk measure. Black curves represent the IBEX35 daily logarithmic return (%).

6. Conclusions

1. We showed analytical expressions to compute VaR and CVaR for most employed distributions in Risk Theory: GPD, Gamma and Stable distributions (Normal and Cauchy).
2. We detailed two Bayesian methods, based on MH algorithm, to estimate VaR and CVaR. Those methods (MH and BMH) were developed for the distributions considered in this work. BMH consists on considering all the dataset, not only the observations above the threshold, to perform estimations. Therefore, it is a good strategy when the baseline distribution is known.
3. We proposed a new method which considers highly informative priors (IPBMH). This method also employs the whole dataset of observations, but the tail values have a greater importance than those under the threshold. It also seizes the relation between the parameters of the baseline distribution and the limit GPD's parameters.

4. We performed a wide simulation study for the distributions considered, to compute the accuracy and precision of the estimates for VaR and CVaR given by the three methods. For any baseline distribution or chosen parameter, IPBMH provided the most accurate, less skewed and precise estimates, especially when the dataset was scarce. As the sample size increase, the three methods provide very similar results.
5. BMH and IPBMH present similar behaviour for stable distributions, regardless of parameters and sample size.
6. In real situations, the distribution of the data is generally unknown. In this case, we can not apply BMH. We considered an example with real data and showed how IPBMH is for more appropriate than MH to perform estimation, with a more stable behaviour and lower dispersion.

Declarations

- **Funding:** This research was part of R&D&I Project PID2021-122209OB-C32 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and European Regional Development Funds.
- **Authors' contributions:** These authors contributed equally to this work.

References

- [1] J. A. García, M. M. Pizarro, F. J. Acero, M. I. Parra, A bayesian hierarchical spatial copula model: An application to extreme temperatures in extremadura (spain), *Atmosphere* 12 (7) (2021). doi:10.3390/atmos12070897.
- [2] J. García, J. Martín, L. Naranjo, F. Acero, A bayesian hierarchical spatio-temporal model for extreme rainfall in extremadura (spain), *Hydrological sciences journal* 63 (6) (2018) 878–894. doi:10.1080/02626667.2018.1457219.
- [3] F. M. Longin, Value at risk and extreme values, *IFAC Proceedings Volumes* 31 (16) (1998) 45–49.
- [4] K. Chinhamu, C.-K. Huang, C.-S. Huang, D. Chikobvu, et al., Extreme risk, value-at-risk and expected shortfall in the gold market, *International Business & Economics Research Journal (IBER)* 14 (1) (2015) 107–122. doi:10.19030/iber.v14i1.9035.
- [5] P. Embrechts, C. Klüppelberg, T. Mikosch, *Modelling extremal events: for insurance and finance*, Vol. 33, Springer Science & Business Media, Berlin, Germany, 2013.
- [6] G. Magnou, An application of extreme value theory for measuring financial risk in the uruguayan pension fund, *Compendium: Cuadernos de Economía y Administración* 4 (7) (2017) 1–19.
- [7] P. de Zea Bermudez, S. Kotz, Parameter estimation of the generalized pareto distribution—part ii, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 140 (6) (2010) 1374–1388. doi:10.1016/j.jspi.2008.11.020.
- [8] P. de Zea Bermudez, M. Turkman, Bayesian approach to parameter estimation of the generalized pareto distribution, *Test* 12 (1) (2003) 259–277.
- [9] J. Diebolt, M.-A. El-Aroui, M. Garrido, S. Girard, Quasi-conjugate bayes estimates for gpd parameters and application to heavy tails modelling, *Extremes* 8 (1) (2005) 57–78.
- [10] M. E. Castellanos, S. Cabras, A default bayesian procedure for the generalized pareto distribution, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 137 (2) (2007) 473–483.
- [11] J. Martín, M. I. Parra, M. M. Pizarro, E. L. Sanjuán, Baseline methods for the parameter estimation of the generalized pareto distribution, *Entropy* 24 (2) (2022) 178. doi:10.3390/e24020178.
- [12] J. Martín, M. I. Parra, M. M. Pizarro, E. L. Sanjuán, Baseline methods for bayesian inference in gumbel distribution, *Entropy* 22 (11) (2020) 1267. doi:10.3390/e22111267.
- [13] M. Gilli, et al., An application of extreme value theory for measuring financial risk, *Computational Economics* 27 (2) (2006) 207–228.
- [14] T. G. Bali, A generalized extreme value approach to financial risk measurement, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 39 (7) (2007) 1613–1649.
- [15] G. Trzpiot, J. Majewska, Estimation of value at risk: Extreme value and robust approaches, *Operations Research and Decisions* 20 (1) (2010) 131–143.

- [16] M. H. Park, J. H. Kim, Estimating extreme tail risk measures with generalized pareto distribution, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 98 (2016) 91–104.
- [17] S. Van der Merwe, D. Steven, M. Pretorius, Bayesian extreme value analysis of stock exchange data, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.01807* (2018).
- [18] M. El Ghourabi, A. Nani, I. Gammoudi, A value-at-risk computation based on heavy-tailed distribution for dynamic conditional score models, *International Journal of Finance & Economics* 26 (2) (2021) 2790–2799. doi:10.1002/ijfe.1934.
- [19] W. Kuang, Oil value-at-risk forecasts: A filtered semiparametric approach, *Journal of Energy Markets* 15 (1) (2022).
- [20] M. Ç. Korkmaz, E. Altun, H. M. Yousof, A. Z. Afify, S. Nadarajah, The burr x pareto distribution: Properties, applications and var estimation, *Journal of Risk and Financial Management* 11 (1) (2018). doi:10.3390/jrfm11010001.
- [21] N. Nolde, C. Zhou, Extreme value analysis for financial risk management, *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* 8 (2021) 217–240.
- [22] Y. He, L. Peng, D. Zhang, Z. Zhao, Risk analysis via generalized pareto distributions, *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 40 (2) (2022) 852–867. doi:10.1080/07350015.2021.1874390.
- [23] S. Faroni, O. Le Courtois, K. Ostaszewski, Equivalent risk indicators: Var, tce, and beyond, *Risks* 10 (8) (2022) 142. doi:10.3390/risks10080142.
- [24] A. J. McNeil, R. Frey, P. Embrechts, *Quantitative Risk Management: Concepts, Techniques and Tools Revised edition*, no. 10496 in *Economics Books*, Princeton University Press, United Kingdom, 2015.
- [25] A. A. Balkema, L. De Haan, Residual life time at great age, *The Annals of probability* 2 (5) (1974) 792–804. doi:10.1214/aop/1176996548.
- [26] J. Pickands III, Statistical inference using extreme order statistics, *the Annals of Statistics* (1975) 119–131.
- [27] P. Lévy, *Calcul des probabilités*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1925.
- [28] J. P. Nolan, *Univariate stable distributions*, Springer, Boston, MA, USA, 2020.
- [29] Y. Yamai, T. Yoshiba, et al., Comparative analyses of expected shortfall and value-at-risk: their estimation error, decomposition, and optimization, *Monetary and economic studies* 20 (1) (2002) 87–121.
- [30] D. Likitrattharoen, N. Kronprasert, K. Wiwattanalamporn, C. Pinmanee, The accuracy of risk measurement models on bitcoin market during covid-19 pandemic, *Risks* 9 (12) (2021) 222.
- [31] D. Likitrattharoen, P. Chudasring, C. Pinmanee, K. Wiwattanalamporn, The efficiency of value-at-risk models during extreme market stress in cryptocurrencies, *Sustainability* 15 (5) (2023) 4395.