

Models for temporal clustering of extreme events with applications to mid-latitude winter cyclones

Christina Mathieu^{*1}, Katharina Hees^{1,2,3}, and Roland Fried¹

¹TU Dortmund University, Department of Statistics, 44221 Dortmund,
Germany

²University of Siegen, Mathematics Department, 57068 Siegen, Germany

³Paul-Ehrlich-Institut, Section of Biometrics, 63225 Langen, Germany

July 12, 2024

Abstract

The occurrence of extreme events like heavy precipitation or storms at a certain location often shows a clustering behaviour and is thus not described well by a Poisson process. We construct a general model for the inter-exceedance times in between such events which combines different candidate models for such behaviour. This allows us to distinguish data generating mechanisms leading to clusters of dependent events with exponential inter-exceedance times in between clusters from independent events with heavy-tailed inter-exceedance times, and even allows us to combine these two mechanisms for better descriptions of such occurrences. We propose a modification of the Cramér-von Mises distance for model fitting. An application to mid-latitude winter cyclones illustrates the usefulness of our work.

*Corresponding author: mathieu@statistik.tu-dortmund.de

Keywords: dependent observations, heavy-tailed waiting times, extreme value theory, peaks-over-threshold, minimum distance estimation, Cramér-von Mises distance

1 Introduction

In extreme value analysis there is large interest in the recurrence times of extreme events. Classically, in the simplest case of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) observations the *return levels* or *return periods* are calculated. The return period of a given event magnitude is the average time span between subsequent events that exceed this value, and the return level of a given time span is the event magnitude that occurs on average once in that time.

Our work is within the peaks-over-threshold approach (see e.g. Coles, 2001) as we model the return times of extreme events with magnitudes which exceed a given threshold. Such extreme events are thus called *exceedances* and the time between two consecutive exceedances is called *inter-exceedance time* (IET). Classically, if the event magnitudes are i.i.d. and events are measured in constant time intervals (i.e., equidistant observation times) or in i.i.d. random time intervals following a distribution with existing first moment, asymptotically the exceedances form a Poisson process with i.i.d. exponentially distributed IETs (e.g., Shanthikumar and Sumita, 1983; Gut and Hüsler, 1999).

In many applications the inter-exceedance times show a clustering behaviour with more very short and more very long IETs than expected for a Poisson process. There are different relaxations of this classical assumption which can model temporal clustering.

If the event magnitudes are only stationary and a mixing condition that limits long-range dependence is fulfilled, the exceedances form a compound Poisson process asymptotically (Hsing et al., 1988) where the IETs follow a mixture distribution of the Dirac measure at zero and an exponential distribution (Ferro and Segers, 2003). Exceedances occur in clusters then which are asymptotically independent with exponentially distributed recurrence times between subsequent clusters. If, on the contrary, the event magnitudes are independent but the waiting times between subsequent events are heavy-tailed with

infinite mean, then the exceedances form a fractional Poisson process asymptotically (Laskin, 2003; Meerschaert et al., 2011) with Mittag-Leffler distributed IETs (Hees et al., 2021). Both models for IETs (dependent event magnitudes or heavy-tailed waiting times between subsequent events) describe a temporal clustering behaviour of the extreme events, with short time intervals containing several exceedances followed by long time intervals without any exceedance, but the underlying mechanisms differ widely.

Here we will study the behaviour of the IETs when the two conditions stationary event magnitudes and heavy-tailed waiting times between subsequent events are met jointly. Such scenarios result in fractional compound Poisson processes with IETs following a mixture distribution with a Mittag-Leffler instead of an exponential component. By considering both mechanisms simultaneously, we do not need to decide in advance which of them causes the clustering behaviour. We develop new theory for scenarios where the events are separated by heavy-tailed waiting times W .

There are some challenges in finding a suitable estimation method for the parameters of the resulting mixture distribution since it is neither continuous nor has finite moments in case of $\alpha < 1$, and it fits the data only asymptotically. We suggest the minimum distance approach based on a modification of the Cramér-von Mises (CM) distance for this task.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 first introduces the two probabilistic models that lead to temporal clustering behaviour in detail and then combines them to a general model. Section 3 discusses the difficulties finding a suitable estimation model and suggests a minimum distance estimation of the parameters of this general model. Section 4 evaluates the estimators in a simulation study and in Section 5 we discuss a data example about mid-latitude cyclones. Finally we close with some conclusions in Section 6.

2 Probabilistic model

Let $(X_n, T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a marked point process with T_n being the occurrence time and X_n the event magnitude of the n -th event. The waiting times between two consecutive events are defined as $W_n = T_n - T_{n-1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that the waiting times $(W_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and magnitudes $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are independent of each other, and that $X_0 > u$ and $T_0 \equiv 0$ for a given threshold u . Furthermore we require that the event magnitudes are identically distributed random variables (r.v.) with the same distribution \mathbb{P}^X as a r.v. X that belongs to the max-domain of attraction of some non-degenerate distribution $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}$. This means that $a_n > 0$ and $d_n \in \mathbb{R}$ exist such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\tilde{M}_n - d_n}{a_n} \leq x \right) = \tilde{G}(x), \quad (1)$$

where $\tilde{M}_n := \max\{\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n\}$ with i.i.d. copies $\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n$ of X , and \tilde{G} is the cumulative distribution function (c.d.f.) of $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}$. Then, $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}$ belongs to the family of generalized extreme value distributions (GEV), see e.g. Theorem 1.4.2 in Leadbetter et al. (1983). This is a standard condition in extreme value theory to ensure that the limiting distribution of extreme events is not degenerate in the case of stochastically independent event magnitudes.

We further consider that the marks $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ form a (strictly) stationary sequence which fulfills the following mixing condition that limits the long-range dependency:

Condition 1. Let $M(J) := \max\{X_j \mid j \in J\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{j,l}(u_n) := \{\{M(I) \leq u_n\} \mid I \subset \{j, \dots, l\}\}$. For all $A_1 \in \mathcal{I}_{1,l}(u_n)$, $A_2 \in \mathcal{I}_{l+s,n}(u_n)$ and $1 \leq l \leq n - s$,

$$|P(A_1 \cap A_2) - P(A_1)P(A_2)| \leq \alpha(n, s)$$

and $\alpha(n, s_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for some positive integer sequence s_n such that $s_n = o(n)$. This mixing condition is called $D(u_n)$ condition.

Condition 1 states that two disjoint events that are separated by a time lag s_n are

approximately stochastically independent as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If it is fulfilled with $u_n = a_n \cdot x + d_n$ for all x with $\tilde{G}(x) > 0$, where \tilde{G} , a_n and d_n are the same as in equation (1), and if $\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{M_n - d_n}{a_n} \leq x\right)$ converges for increasing n , then it holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{M_n - d_n}{a_n} \leq x\right) = G(x) = \tilde{G}^\theta(x), \quad (2)$$

for a constant $\theta \in [0, 1]$ called *extremal index* of $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $M_n := \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$. In case of $\theta > 0$, G is also the c.d.f. of a GEV distribution. The case $\theta = 0$ exists but is pathological. For more information see Beirlant et al. (2004, chapter 10.2.3). In the following we always assume $\theta > 0$. One can show that for each $\nu \in (0, \infty)$ there is a sequence u_n such that

$$n \cdot \mathbb{P}(X > u_n) \rightarrow \nu \quad \text{and} \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbb{P}(M_n \leq u_n) \rightarrow \exp(-\theta\nu) \quad (4)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, see e.g. Leadbetter et al. (1983).

Here we call an event extreme if its magnitude exceeds a given threshold u (Peak-over-threshold approach). Therefore they are also called *exceedances*. Then (3) and (4) mean that the expected number of extremes within the first n events converges to ν and the probability that no event exceeds the threshold converges to $\exp(-\theta\nu)$.

Our interest is in the return time of such an extreme event:

$$T(u) := T_{\tau(u)} = \sum_{i=1}^{\tau(u)} W_i \quad (\text{given } X_0 > u)$$

with stopping time $\tau(u) := \min\{k \geq 1 \mid X_k > u\}$. This means that $X_{\tau(u)}$ is the first magnitude that exceeds the threshold u and $\mathbb{P}(\tau(u) > n) = \mathbb{P}(M_n \leq u)$ applies.

Ferro and Segers (2003) derived that

$$\mathbb{P}(p(u_n)\tau(u_n) > t) \xrightarrow{d} \theta \exp(-\theta t) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

where $p(u_n) := \mathbb{P}(X > u_n)$. They used a slightly stronger mixing condition than Condition 1, but as stated in Beirlant et al. (2004), their result also holds under $D(u_n)$.

In case that the marks $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ occur in equidistant time intervals, i.e., $T_n = T_{n-1} + 1$ and $W_n \equiv 1 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T(u) = \tau(u)$ and thus

$$p(u)T(u) = p(u)\tau(u) \xrightarrow{d} T_\theta \text{ as } u \uparrow x_R. \quad (5)$$

Hereby, x_R is the right endpoint of the distribution of X , and T_θ is a r.v. distributed according to the mixture distribution

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta := (1 - \theta) \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \theta \cdot \text{Exp}(\theta),$$

with ε_0 being the Dirac measure in 0 and $\text{Exp}(\theta)$ the exponential distribution with rate θ . It means that instead of a pure exponential distribution, as is the case for $\theta = 1$, the return times asymptotically follow a mixture distribution with the Dirac measure in zero and the exponential distribution as components. Thus, the extremal index θ is related to the times between two exceedances and is responsible for the clustering behaviour. In the limit the IET is either zero, representing the times within a cluster, or exponentially distributed, representing the time between subsequent clusters. Therefore it forms a compound Poisson Process (see e.g. Beirlant et al., 2004, chapter 10).

The asymptotics in equation (5) can be extended to i.i.d. waiting times $(W_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with finite expected value:

Theorem 2. *Assume that the event magnitudes $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ fulfill assumption (2) for some $\theta > 0$ and let the waiting times $(W_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be i.i.d. with $\mathbb{E}(W_n) = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$p(u)T(u) \xrightarrow{d} T_\theta \text{ as } u \uparrow x_R, \quad (6)$$

where $p(u) := \mathbb{P}(X > u)$, x_R is the right endpoint of the distribution of X , and T_θ is a

r.v. distributed according to the mixture distribution

$$\mathbb{P}_\theta := (1 - \theta) \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \theta \cdot \text{Exp}(\theta),$$

with ε_0 being the Dirac measure in 0 and $\text{Exp}(\theta)$ the exponential distribution with rate θ .

Proof. The proof of this is analogous to that of Theorem 1 in Gut and Hüsler (1999), who consider the case of $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ being stochastically independent. Using (5) we have

$$p(u)T(u) = p(u)\tau(u) \frac{1}{\tau(u)} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau(u)} W_i \xrightarrow{d} T_\theta \cdot \mathbb{E}(W_1) \text{ as } u \uparrow x_R, \quad (7)$$

since we can deduce from Theorem 2 of Richter (1965) together with Kolmogorov's SLLN that $\frac{1}{\tau(u)} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau(u)} W_i \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(W_1)$ in probability if $\tau(u) \rightarrow \infty$ in probability as $u \uparrow x_R$. This condition is fulfilled since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau(u) > m) &= \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq u, \dots, X_m \leq u) = 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^m \{X_i > u\}\right) \\ &\geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{P}(X_i > u) = 1 - m \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_1 > u) \rightarrow 1 - 0 \text{ for all } m \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Another mechanism that leads to temporal clustering behaviour are heavy-tailed distributed waiting times, with heavy-tailed meaning that the tail function is regularly varying with index $-\alpha$, $\alpha > 0$. Note that a function $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is said to be *regularly varying with index α* if it satisfies the following condition:

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(\lambda x)}{f(x)} = \lambda^\alpha \text{ for all } \lambda > 0.$$

Also, for every regularly varying function f with index α , there is a regularly varying function L with index 0 such that $f(x) = x^\alpha \cdot L(x)$.

This implies that $\mathbb{P}(W_1 > x) = x^{-\alpha} L(x)$ and thus $\mathbb{E}(W_1^\gamma) < \infty$ if $\gamma < \alpha$ and $\mathbb{E}(W_1^\gamma) = \infty$ if $\gamma > \alpha$. A prominent example of a heavy-tailed distribution is the Pareto distribution,

which as opposed to the exponential distribution has polynomial tails.

For $\alpha > 1$ the mean of W_1 is finite and thus (7) remains true. For $0 < \alpha < 1$ it follows that the waiting time distribution does not have a finite mean and is in the strict domain of attraction of a positively skewed sum-stable distribution with stability parameter α and Laplace transform

$$\mathcal{L}_{D_\alpha}(s) := \mathbb{E}(\exp(-sD_\alpha)) = \exp(-s^\alpha). \quad (8)$$

More precisely, there is a regularly varying function b with index $1/\alpha$ such that

$$\frac{W_1 + \cdots + W_n}{b(n)} \xrightarrow{d} D_\alpha, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (9)$$

see Meerschaert and Sikorskii, 2012, Theorem 4.5 and Propositions 4.15 & 4.16.

In case of an i.i.d. sequence of magnitudes $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, Hees et al. (2021) showed that

$$\frac{T(u)}{b(1/p(u))} \xrightarrow{d} T_\alpha \text{ as } u \uparrow x_R,$$

where T_α is a Mittag-Leffler distributed r.v. corresponding to a fractional Poisson Process.

A positive r.v. T_β is Mittag-Leffler distributed with parameter $\beta \in (0, 1]$ if it has the Laplace transform

$$\mathcal{L}_{T_\beta}(s) = \frac{1}{1 + s^\beta}.$$

We write $\text{ML}(\beta, \sigma)$ for the distribution of σT_β , where $\sigma > 0$ is a scale parameter. For $\beta < 1$, the Mittag-Leffler distribution is heavy-tailed with index $\alpha = \beta$ and thus has infinite mean. The exponential distribution is a limiting case, as $\text{ML}(1, \sigma) = \text{Exp}(1/\sigma)$ with mean σ . For more information on the Mittag-Leffler distribution, see e.g. Haubold et al. (2011), and for algorithms, see e.g. the R package `MittagLefflerR` (Gill and Straka, 2017).

Now we bring the two clustering mechanisms together by considering stationary magnitudes $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with extremal index $\theta > 0$ and heavy-tailed waiting times $(W_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ simultaneously. The following novel theorem states that the limiting distribution of $T(u)$ changes from a mixture distribution with an exponential component or Mittag-Leffler distribution, respectively, to a mixture with a Mittag-Leffler component. The resulting renewal process changes from a compound Poisson process or fractional Poisson process, respectively, to a fractional compound Poisson process. See e.g. Laskin (2003) for more information on this model class.

Theorem 3. *Assume that the event magnitudes $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ fulfill (2) for some $\theta > 0$ and let the waiting times $(W_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be regularly varying with index $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then,*

$$\frac{T(u)}{b(1/p(u))} \xrightarrow{d} T_{\beta, \theta} \text{ as } u \uparrow x_R,$$

where x_R is the right endpoint of the distribution of X and $T_{\beta, \theta}$ is a random variable distributed according to the mixture distribution

$$\mathbb{P}_{\beta, \theta} := (1 - \theta) \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \theta \cdot ML(\beta, \theta^{-1/\beta}),$$

with tail parameter $\beta = \alpha$ and ε_0 being the Dirac measure in 0.

Proof. Consider any sequence of thresholds u_n such that $n \cdot p(u_n) = n \cdot \mathbb{P}(X > u_n) \rightarrow \nu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with $0 < \nu < \infty$. Obviously, we have $u_n \rightarrow x_R$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. It follows from Theorem 2 that

$$\frac{\tau(u_n)}{n} = \frac{p(u_n)\tau(u_n)}{n \cdot p(u_n)} \xrightarrow{d} E$$

where $E \stackrel{d}{=} T_\theta/\nu \sim (1 - \theta) \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \theta \cdot \text{Exp}(\nu\theta)$ with $\text{Exp}(\nu\theta)$ being the exponential distribution with rate $\nu\theta$. Using (8) and Gnedenko's transfer theorem (see Gnedenko, 1983) it follows

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\tau(u_n)} \frac{W_i}{b(n)} \xrightarrow{d} Z, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where the distribution of Z has the Laplace transform

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_Z(s) &= \int_0^\infty (\mathcal{L}_{D_\alpha}(s))^y d\mathbb{P}^E(y) \\ &= (1-\theta) \int_0^\infty (\mathcal{L}_{D_\alpha}(s))^y d\varepsilon_0(y) + \theta \int_0^\infty (\mathcal{L}_{D_\alpha}(s))^y d\mu_{\nu\theta}(y) \\ &= (1-\theta) + \theta \frac{1}{1 - \log(\mathcal{L}_{D_\alpha}(s))/(\nu\theta)} = (1-\theta) + \theta \frac{1}{1 + (s(\nu\theta)^{-1/\alpha})^\alpha}\end{aligned}$$

which is the Laplace transform of the mixture distribution

$$(1-\theta) \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \theta \cdot \text{ML}(\alpha, (\nu\theta)^{-1/\alpha}).$$

where the Laplace transform \mathcal{L}_{D_α} of D_α is the same as in (8) and $\mu_{\nu\theta}$ denotes the exponential distribution with rate $\nu\theta$.

Since b is a regularly varying function, we have

$$\frac{b(n)}{b(1/p(u_n))} = \frac{b(n)}{b(n/(n \cdot p(u_n)))} \sim (n \cdot p(u_n))^{1/\alpha} \rightarrow \nu^{1/\alpha} \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $f(x) \sim g(x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ for real valued functions f and g means $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = 1$. We finally get

$$\frac{1}{b(1/p(u_n))} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau(u_n)} W_i = \frac{b(n)}{b(1/p(u_n))} \frac{1}{b(n)} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau(u_n)} W_i \xrightarrow{d} \nu^{1/\alpha} Z$$

with $\nu^{1/\alpha} Z \sim \mathbb{P}_{\alpha,\theta} = (1-\theta) \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \theta \cdot \text{ML}(\alpha, \theta^{-1/\alpha})$. Since $u_n \uparrow x_R$ has been arbitrary, the assertion of the Theorem follows with $u := u_n$ and $p(u) := p(u_n)$. \square

Remark 4. *In case of an i.i.d. sequence of event magnitudes $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ the extremal index is $\theta = 1$. Then the return time $T(u)$ is asymptotically Mittag-Leffler distributed corresponding to a fractional Poisson process, see Hees et al. (2021).*

Waiting times with finite means are covered by the other limiting case $\beta = 1$. Then we get the exponential distribution as component of the mixture distribution as shown in Theorem 2. Note that this does not mean that eq. (9) holds with $\alpha = 1$.

From now on we do not distinguish between the index α and the tail parameter β . The only exception is the case $\beta = 1$, which corresponds to scenarios of waiting times with finite means and does not refer to heavy-tailed waiting times with index $\alpha = 1$.

3 Statistical Inference

In this section we treat the estimation of the parameters of the mixture distribution derived in Theorem 3 using the observed IETs stemming from a sequence of random vectors $(X_i, T_i)_{i=1}^n$ and a threshold u . Restarting the sequence $(X_i, T_i)_{i=1}^n$ at $\tau(u)$, we inductively get the two sequences $(X_j(u))_{j=0}^k$ and $(T_j(u))_{j=1}^k$, where $X_j(u)$ is the j -th exceedance of the threshold u , and $T_j(u)$ is the IET between $X_{j-1}(u)$ and $X_j(u)$. Given that we know the previous exceedance, $T_j(u)$ is distributed as $T(u)$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$. Theorem 3 implies that for a high threshold u , we may approximate the distribution of $T(u)$ with the mixture distribution $(1 - \theta) \varepsilon_0 + \theta \text{ML}(\beta, \theta^{-1/\beta} \sigma_{p(u)})$, where $\sigma_{p(u)}/b(1/p(u))$ is expected to stabilize at a constant as u increases. Thus, in total there are three parameters to be estimated: the tail parameter β , the extremal index θ and the scale parameter $\sigma_{p(u)} \approx b(1/p(u)) = p(u)^{-1/\beta} L(1/p(u))$ with a slowly varying function L .

The choice of the threshold u means a trade-off between bias and variance: On the one hand, the smaller the threshold, the more exceedances and IETs we have for the estimation (small variance). On the other hand, the distribution of the IETs may deviate strongly from the mixture distribution (high bias) if the threshold is chosen too low. Hees et al. (2021) explains how to use stability plots for this decision in the situation of fitting a Mittag-Leffler distribution, which corresponds to our special case $\theta = 1$. The drawback there is that it is based on a subjective decision and cannot be automated easily. Our focus is not on the choice of the threshold but on the estimation of the parameters from a given sequence of IETs. Therefore we do not discuss this issue further here.

In the special case of waiting times with finite mean μ , i.e., $\beta = 1$ and $\sigma_{p(u)} = p(u)^{-1} \cdot \mu$, there are many estimation methods for the extremal index θ . Well known are the blocks and runs estimators (see e.g. Weissman and Novak, 1998), the interval estimator of

Ferro and Segers (2003), which is based on the relative ratio of the first two moments of the mixture distribution, and the maximum likelihood estimator introduced by Süveges (2007). $\sigma_{p(u)}$ can be estimated separately by the mean of the IETs $T_1(u), \dots, T_k(u)$ then, since

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k T_i(u) = \frac{n^*}{k} \frac{1}{n^*} \sum_{i=1}^{n^*} W_i, \quad (10)$$

where X_{n^*} is the last event that exceeds the threshold. Then $\frac{k}{n^*}$ is the estimation for $p(u)$ and $\frac{1}{n^*} \sum_{i=1}^{n^*} W_i$ estimates the mean μ .

In the other special case of stochastically independent event magnitudes, i.e. $\theta = 1$, the Mittag-Leffler distribution can be fitted for example by using the log-moments estimator proposed by Cahoy et al. (2010), the fractional moments estimator by Kozubowski (2001) or a maximum likelihood estimator (Gill and Straka, 2017) for both parameters β and $\sigma_{p(u)}$ jointly. Hees et al. (2021) discuss statistical inference for this case.

Searching for a suitable estimation method for estimating β , θ and $\sigma_{p(u)}$ simultaneously, we face some difficulties:

- The mixture distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}} = (1 - \theta) \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \theta \cdot \text{ML}(\beta, \theta^{-1/\beta} \sigma_{p(u)})$ is neither continuous nor discrete. It is continuous except for a discontinuity point at zero which is the left endpoint of the distribution.
- For $\beta < 1$, $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}$ is heavy tailed without finite moments.
- The observed IETs are all larger than zero, while $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(\{0\}) = 1 - \theta$.

These issues make the use of standard estimation methods like maximum likelihood or method of moments difficult or even impossible.

In this work we propose and investigate *minimum distance estimation* based on modifications of the *Cramér-von-Mises-distance* for the parameters $\beta \in (0, 1]$, $\theta \in (0, 1]$ and $\sigma_{p(u)} > 0$ of the mixture distribution.

The minimum distance approach has been introduced by Wolfowitz (1957) and explored in many further works, see e.g. Drossos and Philippou (1980) or Parr (1981). The main

idea is to measure the “similarity” of the sample data with a parametric model, minimizing a distance measure between the probability density function or the cumulative distribution function of the parametric model and a non-parametric density estimate or the empirical distribution function of the sample data. Here, we use distances based on distribution functions.

Definition 5. Let Z_1, \dots, Z_n be random variables with c.d.f. F_ϑ , $\vartheta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, $p \geq 1$, F_n the empirical c.d.f. corresponding to Z_1, \dots, Z_n , and $\Delta(\cdot, \cdot) > 0$ a function quantifying the distance between two c.d.f.’s. If there is a $\hat{\vartheta} \in \Theta$ such that

$$\Delta(F_n, F_{\hat{\vartheta}}) = \inf_{\vartheta \in \Theta} \Delta(F_n, F_\vartheta),$$

then $\hat{\vartheta}$ is called a minimum distance estimate of ϑ .

$\Delta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is called *criterion function*. We use a modification of the popular Cramér-von-Mises (CM) distance as criterion function. Widely used are also the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and the Anderson-Darling distances.

The Cramér-von-Mises distance between two c.d.f.’s G and H is defined as

$$\Delta^{[\text{CM}]}(G, H) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (G(x) - H(x))^2 dH(x) = \mathbb{E}_H((G(X) - H(X))^2), \quad X \sim H.$$

The CM distance is not symmetrical, i.e., $\Delta^{[\text{CM}]}(G, H) \neq \Delta^{[\text{CM}]}(H, G)$, and thus not a metric. If H is absolutely continuous with density function h , we have

$$\Delta^{[\text{CM}]}(G, H) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (G(x) - H(x))^2 \cdot h(x) dx. \quad (11)$$

and if additionally $G = F_n$ is an empirical c.d.f. of observations $x_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq x_{(n)}$, then

$$\Delta^{[\text{CM}]}(F_n, H) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{i - \frac{1}{2}}{n} - H(x_{(i)}) \right)^2 + \frac{1}{12n^2}. \quad (12)$$

Let $F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_p(u)}$ be the c.d.f. of the mixture distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_p(u)} = (1 - \theta) \cdot \varepsilon_0 + \theta \cdot$

$\text{ML}(\beta, \theta^{-1/\beta} \sigma_{p(u)})$ and $F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}^*$ the c.d.f. of the Mittag-Leffler distribution $\text{ML}(\beta, \theta^{-1/\beta} \sigma_{p(u)})$.

Since $\mathbb{P}_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}$ has a positive probability mass at zero, we cannot use (11) and (12). Because of

$$F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(x) = (1 - \theta) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[0, \infty)}(x) + \theta \cdot F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}^*(x),$$

the Cramér-von-Mises distance between $F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}$ and the empirical c.d.f. F_k of the k observed IETs t_1, \dots, t_k is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{[\text{CM}]}(F_k, F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}) &= \int_0^\infty (F_k(x) - F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(x))^2 dF_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(x) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(\{0\}) \cdot (F_k(0) - F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(0))^2 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}((0, \infty)) \cdot \int_0^\infty (F_k(x) - F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(x))^2 dF_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}^*(x) \\ &= (1 - \theta)^3 + \theta \cdot \int_0^\infty (F_k(x) - F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(x))^2 dF_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}^*(x). \end{aligned}$$

The smaller the value of θ is, the less influence have the data on the distance $\Delta^{[\text{CM}]}$. Irrespective of the underlying true parameter values it holds that $\Delta^{[\text{CM}]}(F_k, F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}) > (1 - \theta)^3$ and $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \Delta^{[\text{CM}]}(F_k, F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}) = 1$. Since $\Delta^{[\text{CM}]}(F_k, F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}) \in [0, 1]$, this can lead to a huge bias when we search for the infimum of $\Delta^{[\text{CM}]}(F_k, F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}})$. Therefore, we consider the following modification:

$$\Delta^{[\text{CMmod}]}(\tilde{F}_k, F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}) = \frac{1}{\theta^2} \int_0^\infty (\max\{\tilde{F}_k(x), 1 - \theta\} - F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(x))^2 dF_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}^*(x)$$

where \tilde{F}_k is the empirical c.d.f. of $t_1 + 1, t_2 + 1, \dots, t_k + 1$, the by one shifted observed IETs. Some explanations are given in Remark 6 below.

Remark 6.

1. CMmod is obtained by only considering the continuous part of the integrator of CM.

2. We truncate the empirical c.d.f., because $F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(x) > 1 - \theta$ for all $x > 0$.
3. Since $(\max\{\tilde{F}_k(x), 1 - \theta\} - F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(x))^2 \in [0, \theta^2]$, we additionally standardise it with θ^2 .
4. We use $t_i + 1$ instead of t_i for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, because prior simulations have shown that this improves parameter estimation and the asymptotics from Theorem 3 still hold since $b(1/p(u)) \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\frac{T(u) + 1}{b(1/p(u))} \xrightarrow{d} T_{\beta, \theta}.$$

For computations we prefer rewriting the distances in terms of sums as it is done for continuous distributions in equation (12). After some cumbersome but straightforward calculations we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{[\text{CM}]}(F_k, F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}) &= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{i - \frac{1}{2}}{k} - F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(t_{(i)}) \right)^2 + \frac{1}{12k^2} + \frac{2}{3} (1 - \theta)^3 \\ \Delta^{[\text{CMmod}]}(\tilde{F}_k, F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}) &= \frac{1}{\theta^3} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=l+1}^k \left(\frac{i - \frac{1}{2}}{k} - F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(t_{(i)} + 1) \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{k - l}{12k^3\theta^3} - \frac{(k(1 - \theta))^3 - l^3}{3k^3\theta^3} \\ &\quad + \frac{(k(1 - \theta))^2 - l^2}{k^2\theta^3} F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(t_{(l)} + 1) - \frac{k(1 - \theta) - l}{k\theta^3} F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}(t_{(l)} + 1)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $t_{(1)} < \dots < t_{(k)}$ are the ordered IETs and $l := \lceil k(1 - \theta) \rceil$, with $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ being the ceiling function and k the number of IETs.

The CMmod distance converges to $1/3$ as $\theta \rightarrow 0$, since for $\theta < 1/k$, $l = \lceil k(1 - \theta) \rceil = k$ and therefore

$$\Delta^{[\text{CMmod}]}(\tilde{F}_k, F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}) \stackrel{\theta < 1/k}{=} \frac{1}{3}.$$

Therefore, we suggest to restrict the parameter spaces of both, β and θ , to a compact interval $[a, 1]$ for some lower bound $a > 1/k$, so that the minimum distance estimate

$(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\sigma}_{p(u)})$ of $(\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)})$ shall fulfill

$$\Delta^{[\text{CMmod}]}(\tilde{F}_k, F_{\hat{\beta}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\sigma}_{p(u)}}) = \inf_{\substack{\beta, \theta \in [a, 1] \\ \sigma_{p(u)} \in (0, \infty)}} \Delta^{[\text{CMmod}]}(\tilde{F}_k, F_{\beta, \theta, \sigma_{p(u)}}).$$

The lower boundary a can be chosen depending on the situation and prior knowledge. We believe that $a = 0.1$ might usually be an appropriate choice, since we expect that the true parameter value is usually larger than this. Otherwise about 90% of the inter-exceedance times would be close to zero.

We also explored further modifications of the CM distance. However, they turned out to be less suitable and are thus not considered here.

4 Simulation Study

In this section we analyse the performance of the minimum distance method proposed above. All statistical computations are done with R (R Core Team, 2021).

Scenarios

We generate 1000 event sequences for each of several scenarios. We consider event sequences of from max-autoregressive processes defined as

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &:= Y_1 \\ X_{i+1} &:= \max\{(1 - \theta) \cdot X_i, \theta \cdot Y_{i+1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $Y_i, i = 1, \dots, n$, are independent unit Fréchet random variables and $\theta \in \{0.5, 0.6, \dots, 1\}$ is the extremal index. In case of $\beta = 1$, we consider the following distributions for the stochastically independent waiting times $W_i, i = 1, \dots, n$:

- (a) Exponential distribution with mean equal to one.
- (b) Dirac measure at point one (i.e., deterministic waiting times equal to one).

- (c) Pareto distribution with stability parameter $\alpha = 1.5$ and mean equal to one but infinite variance.
- (d) Pareto distribution with stability parameter $\alpha = 2.5$ and mean equal to one and finite variance.

For $\beta < 1$ the waiting times are in the domain of a positively skewed sum-stable distribution with stability parameter $\beta \in \{0.5, \dots, 0.9\}$. We consider these three distributions:

- (i) stable distribution
- (ii) Mittag-Leffler distribution and
- (iii) Pareto distribution with shift one.




Figure 1: Density of the continuous waiting time distributions with tail parameter $\beta = 0.8$ (left) or tail parameter $\beta = 1$ (right). In case of the Dirac measure it is the probability mass function.

Case (i): We choose $W_i \stackrel{d}{=} D_\beta$, where D_β is as in (8). Due to the stability property, we have $(W_1 + \dots + W_n)/b(n) \stackrel{d}{=} D_\beta$ with $b(n) = n^{1/\beta}$. Using the parametrisation of Samorodnitsky and Taqqu (1994), D_β has the stable distribution $S_\beta(\cos(\pi\beta/2)^{1/\beta}, 1, 0)$, which is implemented in the R package `stabledist` by Wuertz et al. (2016).

Case (ii): We choose $W_i \sim \text{ML}(\beta, 1)$. Using the Laplace function, a few lines of calculation show that $(W_1 + \dots + W_n)/b(n) \xrightarrow{d} D_\beta$ with $b(n) = n^{1/\beta}$. The Mittag-Leffler distribution is implemented in the R package `MittagLeffler` by Gill and Straka (2017).

Case (iii): We choose W_i such that $\mathbb{P}(W_i - 1 > t) = Ct^{-\beta}$ with $C = 1/\Gamma(1 - \beta)$ and $t \geq \Gamma(1 - \beta)^{-1/\beta}$, i.e. $\tilde{W}_i = W_i - 1$ is Pareto distributed with shape parameter β and scale parameter $C^{1/\beta}$. Again, $(W_1 + \dots + W_n)/b(n) \xrightarrow{d} D_\beta$, as well as $(\tilde{W}_1 + \dots + \tilde{W}_n)/b(n) \xrightarrow{d} D_\beta$ with $b(n) = n^{1/\beta}$. This can be shown using Theorem 3.37 and Prop. 3.10 in Meerschaert and Sikorskii (2012). The unshifted Pareto distribution of r.v. \tilde{W}_i is e.g. implemented in the R package `ReIns` by Reynkens and Verbelen (2020).

Thus, for all cases, the slowly varying component $L(n)$ of $b(n) = n^{1/\beta}L(n)$ is constant equal to one. Therefore we consider $\rho = \sigma_u \cdot p(u)^{1/\beta} \approx 1$ instead of $\sigma_u \approx b(1/p(u)) = p(u)^{-1/\beta}$ as scaling parameter. For case (i) and (iii) the waiting time W_1 converges to one in distribution as $\beta \rightarrow 1$, which means it converges towards the Dirac measure at point one. Note that the reason for the shift $W_1 = \tilde{W}_1 + 1$ in case (iii) is because of $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 1} W_1 \equiv 1$ instead of $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow 1} \tilde{W}_1 \equiv 0$. For case (ii) W_1 converges to the exponential distribution with mean one.

For illustration, Figure 1 shows the densities of the waiting time distributions presented above.

We focus on sequences $(X_i, W_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$ of length $n = 10000$. In our context it would mean that if we had on average hourly observations, we would need data from about 14 months to reach $n = 10000$ observations; if we had daily observations, we would need data from about 27.4 years, and if we had on average weekly observations, we would need data from about 185 years. To view results for other sample sizes, see Figure A.1 in the appendix.

We determine the threshold such that the 2% largest magnitudes are considered as exceedances, meaning that the threshold corresponds to the 98% sample quantile. For $n = 10000$ observations this leads to $k = 200$ exceedances. In general, selecting an appropriate threshold is a difficult task. It cannot be set too high because we require a

sufficient number of inter-exceedance times to compute the empirical distribution function. Conversely, the approximation may not be accurate if the threshold is set too low. Previous studies not reported here suggest that 2% is a reasonable choice in our scenarios (see Figure A.2 in the appendix).

For minimisation we use the standard optimisation algorithm *L-BFGS-B* based on quasi-Newton with several starting points (Byrd et al., 1995). We restrict the search space to $[a, 1] \times [a, 1] \times (0, \infty)$ with $a = 0.1$ as discussed before. We report the root of the mean-square error (RMSE) and the bias of the point estimators.

Results

When reporting the simulation results, we focus on the differences between the waiting time distributions. In the special cases $\beta = 1$ and $\theta = 1$ we compare our estimators with established estimators for these scenarios.

Overall, the results of the simulation study are rather satisfactory and differ only slightly with respect to the different waiting time distributions in general. In some cases, the Pareto distribution leads to a slightly larger bias. In almost all cases, the bias and RMSE decrease with higher parameter values for β and θ . The results are shown in Figure 2.

As discussed in Sections 2 and 3, for $\beta = 1$ we are in the special case of a mixture distribution with the exponential distribution as continuous part, $T(u) \approx (1 - \theta)\varepsilon_0 + \text{Exp}(p(u)^{1/\beta}\rho^{-1})$ with ε_0 being the Dirac measure. The IETs are not heavy-tailed then and θ is called *extremal index*, see e.g. Beirlant et al. (2004). Among the many estimators of the extremal index we choose the popular interval estimator $\hat{\theta}_I$ of Ferro and Segers (2003) for comparison, since it uses the IETs and does not need any hyperparameters for calculation. We need to adapt it slightly since we may have IETs $T_1(u), \dots, T_k(u)$





Figure 2: RMSE and Bias of the CMmod estimator for the tail parameter β (top), for the extremal index θ (middle) and the scale parameter ρ (bottom).

(a) Special case $\beta = 1$



(b) Special case $\theta = 1$




Figure 3: Comparison of CMmod with (a) the interval estimator in the special case $\beta = 1$ among all waiting time distributions except the Pareto distribution with $\alpha = 1.5$ (top), and with (b) the maximum likelihood and log-moment estimator in the special case $\theta = 1$ among all waiting time distributions.

smaller than one:

$$\hat{\theta}_I = \min \left\{ \frac{2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \max\{T_i(u) - 1, 0\} \right)^2}{k \sum_{i=1}^k (\max\{T_i(u) - 1, 0\})(\max\{T_i(u) - 2, 0\})}, 1 \right\}, \quad \text{if any } T_i(u) > 2$$

$$\hat{\theta}_I = \min \left\{ \frac{2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^k T_i(u) \right)^2}{k \sum_{i=1}^k T_i(u)^2}, 1 \right\}, \quad \text{if all } T_i(u) \leq 2.$$

The parameter ρ can be estimated separately using (10). Figure 3 (a) shows the results of the interval estimator and the CMmod estimator where the boxplots are calculated among all waiting times, excluding the Pareto distribution with $\alpha = 1.5$ (details below). The minimum distance method shows a slightly larger bias for the extremal index θ , but its variability is typically smaller resulting in a smaller RMSE. The scale parameter ρ is estimated more accurately by the interval estimator. However, the interval estimator struggles when the waiting times are Pareto distributed with stability parameter $\alpha = 1.5$, and the estimation accuracy does not improve for larger sample sizes. This is plausible, since the variance does not exist and the interval estimator uses the ratio of the first two distribution moments. Therefore, this distribution is not included in the results of Figure 3 (a). However, see Figure A.3 for the comparison regarding the Pareto distribution with stability parameter $\alpha = 1.5$.

For $\theta = 1$ we are in the special case of asymptotically Mittag-Leffler distributed IETs, i.e., $T(u) \approx ML(\beta, p(u)^{-1/\beta} \rho)$. Thus we can compare our estimation method for β and ρ with the established maximum likelihood estimator and the log-moment estimator (Cahoy et al., 2010) for the tail and scale parameter of the Mittag-Leffler distribution, which are based on the log-transformed data. Both are implemented in the R package `MittagLefflerR`. The comparison for the tail and the scale parameter is shown in Figure 3 (b). Maximum likelihood usually shows the best performance. This confirms findings by Hees et al. (2021) that the maximum likelihood estimator often outperforms the log-moment estimator. The CMmod estimator performs similarly to the log-moment estimator, although it needs to estimate the parameter θ additionally. For larger sample

sizes, the results of the CMmod estimator are even better than those of the log-moment estimator and similar to the results of the maximum likelihood estimator (see Figure A.4).

Overall CMmod shows quite satisfactory performance even in both special cases, although it needs to estimate one parameter more than the competitors which are designed for these scenarios. A drawback is the high computing time of the minimum distance method. Numerical optimisation is needed to find the triplet $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\sigma}_u)$ for which the distance is minimal. Because of possible multiple local minima we used several initialisations $(\{0.25, 0.55, 0.85\}^2 \times \{\hat{\sigma}_{\text{LogMom}}\})$, where $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{LogMom}}$ is the log-moment estimator of the Mittag-Leffler distribution. The computing time seems to be linear in the number of exceedances k (see Figure 4). For comparison, Figure 4 shows the computing time needed for the maximum likelihood method in the special case $\theta = 1$, for which the computing time is also much higher than that of the log-moment and the interval estimator.




Figure 4: Computing time of CMmod and the maximum likelihood estimator for an increasing number of exceedances $k = 100, 200, 400, 800$. Note that both the x-axis and y-axis are log-transformed.

5 Data Example

Now we apply the proposed method to the occurrences of extreme mid-latitude cyclones on the northern hemisphere. Mid-latitude cyclones strongly affect the weather conditions, e.g. temperature, wind, precipitation and cloud cover and are therefore of great

interest (Dacre and Pinto, 2020). In meteorology, the position of cyclones in the northern hemisphere are typically identified by the maxima of the relative vorticity or the minima of mean sea-level pressure in a given area at a certain time (e.g. Neu et al., 2013). Mailier et al. (2006) analysed the temporal clustering of mid-latitude cyclones by calculating the variance-to-mean ratio as it measures the degree of deviation from a Poisson point-process (PP). Their results indicate serial clustering at the west coast of Europe, where the exit region of storm tracks on the North Atlantic is located. This pattern has been reproduced in other studies (Dacre and Pinto, 2020).

Blender et al. (2015) suggest the application of fractional Poisson processes (FPP) to model the clustering behaviour, with IETs following a Mittag-Leffler instead of an exponential distribution. However, since software such as the Mittag-Leffler R-package (Gill and Straka, 2017) was not available at that time, they instead used the simpler Weibull distribution and identified the shape parameter k of the Weibull distribution for $k \leq 1$ with the tail parameter β of the Mittag-Leffler distribution. Compound Poisson processes (CPP) as another explanation of the serial clustering were not considered there.

Given these findings, we apply the fractional compound fractional Poisson process (FCPP) introduced in Section 2 to the occurrences of mid-latitude cyclones in Europe and compare it with its special cases PP, FPP and CPP. This allows us to determine whether the IETs can be better described by the exponential, or by the Mittag-Leffler distribution, or by a mixture distribution with an exponential component, or by a combination of both. We use the same data source and method for identifying extreme cyclones as Blender et al. (2015). There are some differences, as data for a longer time period starting in 1940 with a higher horizontal resolution are available now.

Data and Method

We use relative vorticity at 850 hPa pressure level of the ERA5 reanalysis data (Hersbach et al., 2023) provided by the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecast

(ECMWF) from Winter 1940/41 to 2022/23 including 6h time steps with a horizontal resolution of 1° on the North Atlantic Area ($30^\circ\text{N} - 60^\circ\text{N}$, $20^\circ\text{E} - 20^\circ\text{W}$). We analyze only winter data from December, January and February (DJF) due to the different climate and weather dynamics in the other seasons of the year. This is a standard approach in meteorological studies (e.g. Blender et al., 2015 or Neu et al., 2013) and also justifies the assumption of (approximately) stationary event magnitudes. A disadvantage is that we can only consider IETs within the same winter, which cannot get larger than 60 days. The extreme cyclones are determined by the peak-over-threshold method as all cyclones exceeding the 99% quantile calculated separately at each grid point.

Results

Our results for the FCPP model (see Figure 5, middle column) fit well to the general pattern that serial clustering occurs at the exit region of storm tracks to the west of Europe. Moreover, the mountains in southern Europe seem to have a large influence on the return time distribution, as we find the strongest clustering behaviour regarding both parameters β and θ there. Comparing the results for the FCPP and the FPP model (see Figure 5, right column), we see that the tail parameter β is generally estimated larger in the FCPP. Except for the storm track exit region over the north Atlantic and European mountain areas the tail parameter β is estimated mostly close to one, while the FPP model suggests lower values of β . The reason for the difference between the results for the FCPP and FPP model is that the FCPP is more flexible and explains the serial clustering via both effects, the mixture component and heavy tails, so that a larger value of β is compensated in the FCPP model by a extremal index θ less than 1 in these regions.

When comparing the results of the FCPP model to the CPP model (see Figure 5, left column), we observe fewer differences concerning the extremal index θ . This is due to the tail parameter β being estimated to be close to one at most locations, which puts us in the special case of the CPP. In regions where β is estimated to be clearly less than




Figure 5: Estimations of tail parameter β and extremal index θ in case of the CPP (left), the FCPP (middle) and FPP (right). The tail parameter is equal to 1 in the CPP, while this applies to θ in the FPP.

one, the estimate of θ is higher than in the CPP model.

In general, our findings provide evidence to support the hypothesis of Blender et al. (2015) that the deviation of the dispersion from zero in the exit region of the storm tracks can be described, at least in part, by the Mittag-Leffler distribution. Beyond that, our results indicate that using a mixture model provides even better fits. The tail parameter might be estimated too small otherwise, pretending a too heavy distributional tail.

We now have a closer look at the different model fits by examining three locations in more detail. All three locations show clustering behaviour regarding at least one of the two parameters fitted in the FCPP model. Table 1 shows the parameter estimations with location *A* being grid point 3°E 46°N (in the interior of France), location *B* grid point 5°E 53°N (west coast of U.K.) and location *C* grid point 5°W 52°N (west coast of the Netherlands). They are marked in Figure 5 as black points in the middle column. While the parameter estimates for the CPP and FPP are quite similar for the three locations,

Table 1: Parameter estimations of all three locations A , B and C .

A	β	θ	ρ	B	β	θ	ρ	C	β	θ	ρ
FCPP	1.00	0.78	0.52	FCPP	0.92	0.84	0.27	FCPP	0.85	1.00	0.17
FPP	0.84	-	0.16	FPP	0.83	-	0.13	FPP	0.89	-	0.23
CPP	-	0.89	0.47	CPP	-	0.75	0.44	CPP	-	0.80	0.48

they differ for the FCPP. At location B , both parameters are estimated to be clearly less than one, i.e., the clustering indicates the existence of both a mixture component and of heavy tails. As opposed to this, at location A only the extremal index θ and at location C only the tail parameter β is estimated to be less than one, suggesting that one of both clustering mechanisms suffices to capture the clustering behavior.




Figure 6: Histogram of the IETs of location A , B and C with bar width of one day, and densities fitted using the different models.

Figure 6 shows the histograms of the three locations with a bar width of one day. The fitted densities of the three models CPP, FCPP and FPP, are included for comparison. We can see the differences between the locations concerning the parameter estimation of β and θ . At locations B and C β is estimated to be less than one. The right tail of the distribution is apparently heavier there than at location A , where β is estimated to be equal to one. At locations A and B , θ is estimated to be less than one. This is due to the high number of very small IETs that do not exceed one day. Accordingly, the FCPP confirms that the FPP provides a good fit to the histogram at Location C , since the extremal index θ is estimated to be one, while at Location A the CPP provides a good fit, since β is estimated to be one in the FCPP. At location B , on the other hand, according to the FCPP, both special cases can apparently be improved by the combined

model.

6 Conclusion

Extremes above a certain threshold often occur in temporal clusters, i.e., several extreme values occur in a short period of time, followed by a longer period of time without such extremes. The interexceedance times (IETs) are then poorly described by an exponential distribution derived by a Poisson process. There are several asymptotical modelling approaches to capture the deviation from exponential return times. One of them is the CPP which corresponds to a mixture distribution of the Dirac measure at zero and an exponential distribution (Ferro and Segers, 2003). Another model is the FPP where the IETs are asymptotically Mittag-Leffler distributed (Hees et al., 2021) with tails heavier than those of the exponential distribution. In the present work we have combined these two approaches. Relaxing the conditions for the classical Poisson process results into both directions, we consider events that are stationary and separated by heavy-tailed waiting times. Asymptotically the IETs then follow a fractional compound Poisson process, which corresponds to a mixture distribution of the Dirac measure at zero and a Mittag-Leffler distribution. This model has three parameters, namely the tail parameter β , the extremal index θ and the scaling parameter σ_u . The CPP and the FPP correspond to the special cases $\beta = 1$ and $\theta = 1$, respectively.

For estimating these three parameters we propose CMmod, a minimum distance approach based on a modification of the Cramér-von Mises distance. Our simulation study illustrates the suitability of the CMmod estimation, although the bias and RMSE are slightly higher in case of a low extremal index θ and Mittag-Leffler and exponentially distributed waiting times compared to the other scenarios we considered. In the special cases $\beta = 1$ and $\theta = 1$ it performs competitively and sometimes even better than common estimation methods designed for these scenarios. In our simulations and real data analysis a parameter which was not needed for describing the data was often estimated to be equal or very close to 1. Thus, there seems to be little disadvantage when fitting

the more general FCPP model, except for the longer computing time. We thus do not need to decide in advance which of the mathematical causes of clustering provides the better description of the data.

In our application to mid-latitude winter cyclones in western Europe we have seen that different models provide the best fit to the data depending on the exact location (off-shore in the Atlantic, west shore of Europe, interior of the continent, in the mountains, etc.). This indicates the potential usefulness of the general modelling approach proposed here but further studies are needed to validate these practical results.

Acknowledgements

This research has been funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) within the subproject SCAHA (project number 01LP1902K) of the research network on climate change and extreme events (climXtreme). The authors gratefully acknowledge the computing time provided on the Linux HPC cluster at TU Dortmund University (LiDO3), partially funded in the course of the Large-Scale Equipment Initiative by the German Research Foundation (DFG) as project 271512359. The authors would like to thank Prof. Richard Blender and Dr. Alexia Karwat for helpful discussions and insights on meteorological topics, especially mid-latitude winter cyclones.

Data availability statement

The R-Code used for the simulation study will be provided as supplement. The ERA5 reanalysis data are openly available in the Climate Data Store of the ECMWF at <https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp/#!/search?type=dataset>.

References

Beirlant, J., Goegebeur, Y., Segers, J., & Teugels, J. (2004). *Statistics of extremes - theory and applications*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Blender, R., Raible, C. C., & Lunkeit, F. (2015). Non-exponential return time distributions for vorticity extremes explained by fractional poisson processes. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, *141*, 249–257. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2354>
- Byrd, R. H., Lu, P., Nocedal, J., & Zhu, C. (1995). A limited memory algorithm for bound constrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, *16*(5), 1190–1208. <https://doi.org/10.1137/0916069>
- Cahoy, D., Uchaikin, V., & Woyczynski, W. (2010). Parameter estimation for fractional poisson processes. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, *140*, 3106–3120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspi.2010.04.016>
- Coles, S. (2001). *An introduction to statistical modeling of extreme values* (1st ed.). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-3675-0>
- Dacre, H. F., & Pinto, J. G. (2020). Serial clustering of extratropical cyclones: A review of where, when and why it occurs. *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science*, *3*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-020-00152-9>
- Drossos, C. A., & Philippou, A. N. (1980). A note on minimum distance estimates. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, *32*, 121–123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02480318>
- Ferro, C., & Segers, J. (2003). Inference for clusters of extreme values. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, *65*, 545–556. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9868.00401>
- Gill, G., & Straka, P. (2017). *MittagLeffler: Using the Mittag-Leffler distributions in R*.
- Gnedenko, B. V. (1983). On limit theorems for a random number of random variables. In J. V. Prokhorov & K. Itô (Eds.), *Probability theory and mathematical statistics* (pp. 167–176). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0072914>
- Gut, A., & Hüsler, J. (1999). Extreme shock models. *Extremes*, *2*, 295–307. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009959004020>

- Haubold, H. J., Mathai, A. M., & Saxena, R. K. (2011). Mittag-Leffler functions and their applications. *Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 2011, 1–51. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/298628>
- Hees, K., Nayak, S., & Straka, P. (2021). Statistical inference for inter-arrival times of extreme events in bursty time series. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 155, 107096. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2020.107096>
- Hersbach, H., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Biavati, G., Horányi, A., Muñoz Sabater, J., Nicolas, J., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Rozum, I., Schepers, D., Simmons, A., Soci, C., Dee, D., & Thépaut, J.-N. (2023). Era5 hourly data on pressure levels from 1940 to present [Accessed 21 July 2023]. *Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S) Climate Data Store (CDS)*. <https://doi.org/10.24381/cds.bd0915c6>
- Hsing, T., Hüsler, J., & Leadbetter, M. (1988). On the exceedance point process for stationary sequence. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 78, 97–112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00718038>
- Kozubowski, T. J. (2001). Fractional moment estimation of linnik and Mittag-Leffler parameters. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 34(9), 1023–1035. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-7177\(01\)00115-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0895-7177(01)00115-7)
- Laskin, N. (2003). Fractional Poisson process. *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, 8, 201–213. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1007-5704\(03\)00037-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1007-5704(03)00037-6)
- Leadbetter, M. R., Lindgren, G., & Rootzén, H. (1983). *Extremes and related properties of random sequences and processes*. Springer.
- Mailier, P. J., Stephenson, D. B., Ferro, C. A. T., & Hodges, K. I. (2006). Serial clustering of extratropical cyclones. *Monthly weather review*, 134, 2224–2240. <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR3160.1>

- Meerschaert, M. M., Nane, E., & Vellaisamy, P. (2011). The fractional Poisson process and the inverse stable subordinator. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, *16*, 1600–1620. <https://doi.org/10.1214/EJP.v16-920>
- Meerschaert, M. M., & Sikorskii, A. (2012). *Stochastic models for fractional calculus*. De Gruyter.
- Neu, U., Akperov, M. G., N., Bellenbaum, Benestad, R. S., Blender, R., R., C., Cozza, A., Dacre, H. F., Feng, Y., Fraedrich, K., Grieger, J., Gulev, S., Hanley, J., Hewson, T., Inatsu, M., Keay, K., Kew, S. F., Kindem, I., Leckebusch, G. C., ... Wernli, H. (2013). IMILAST a community effort to intercompare extratropical cyclone detection and tracking algorithms. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, *94*, 529–547. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00154.1>
- Parr, W. C. (1981). Minimum distance estimation: a bibliography. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, *10*, 1205–1224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610928108828104>
- R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria.
- Reynkens, T., & Verbelen, R. (2020). *Reins: Functions from "Reinsurance: Actuarial and statistical aspects"* [R package version 1.0.10].
- Richter, W. (1965). Limit theorems for sequences of random variables with sequences of random indices. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, *10*(1), 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1110007>
- Samorodnitsky, G., & Taqqu, M. S. (1994). *Stable non-gaussian random processes: Stochastic models with infinite variance*. Taylor & Francis.
- Shanthikumar, J. G., & Sumita, U. (1983). General shock models associated with correlated renewal sequences. *Journal of Applied Probability*, *20*, 600–614. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3213896>

- Süveges, M. (2007). Likelihood estimation of the extremal index. *Extremes*, 10, 41–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10687-007-0034-2>
- Weissman, I., & Novak, S. Y. (1998). On blocks and runs estimators of the extremal index. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 66, 281–288. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3758\(97\)00095-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-3758(97)00095-5)
- Wolfowitz, J. (1957). The minimum distance method. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 28, 75–88.
- Wuertz, D., Maechler, M., & core team members., R. (2016). *Stabledist: Stable distribution functions* [R package version 0.7-1].

A Appendix to Section 4: Simulation Study




Figure A.1: RMSE and Bias of the CMmod estimator for the tail parameter β (left), for the extremal index θ (middle) and the scale parameter ρ (right) among all waiting time distributions for different sample sizes with 2% exceedances.




Figure A.2: RMSE and Bias of the CMmod estimator for the tail parameter β (left), for the extremal index θ (middle) and the scale parameter ρ (right) among all waiting time distributions for different proportions of exceedances with sample size $n = 10000$.




Figure A.3: Comparison of the CMmod estimator with the interval estimator for sample sizes $n = 10000$ and $n = 40000$ in the special case $\beta = 1$ and Pareto distributed with stability parameter $\alpha = 1.5$.




Figure A.4: Comparison of the CMmod estimator with the maximum likelihood and log-moment estimator for sample sizes $n = 10000$ and $n = 40000$ in the special case $\theta = 1$ among all waiting time distributions.