

Tail risk forecasting with semi-parametric regression models by incorporating overnight information

Cathy W.S. Chen*¹, Takaaki Koike², and Wei-Hsuan Shau¹

¹Department of Statistics, Feng Chia University, Taiwan

²Graduate School of Economics, Hitotsubashi University, Japan

Abstract

This research incorporates realized volatility and overnight information into risk models, wherein the overnight return often contributes significantly to the total return volatility. Extending a semi-parametric regression model based on asymmetric Laplace distribution, we propose a family of RES-CAViaR-oc models by adding overnight return and realized measures as a nowcasting technique for simultaneously forecasting Value-at-Risk (VaR) and expected shortfall (ES). We utilize Bayesian methods to estimate unknown parameters and forecast VaR and ES jointly for the proposed model family. We also conduct extensive backtests based on joint elicibility of the pair of VaR and ES during the out-of-sample period. Our empirical study on four international stock indices confirms that overnight return and realized volatility are vital in tail risk forecasting.

Keywords: Nowcasting, Markov chain Monte Carlo method, Value-at-Risk, Expected shortfall, CAViaR model, Realized measures, Overnight return.

JEL Classification: C11 · C22 · C51 · C53 · C58

*Corresponding author: Cathy W.S. Chen, E-mail: chenws@mail.fcu.edu.tw

1 Introduction

Value-at-Risk (VaR) is one of the most common measurements to quantify the risk of potential losses for a firm or an investment. It presents how much money one can lose from a portfolio or stock market during a specified period. While VaR only provides the maximum loss at a certain confidence level, it says nothing about what could happen beyond that point. In contrast, expected shortfall (ES, [Artzner et al. 1999](#)) measures the average loss in the worst-case scenarios beyond the VaR cutoff point. This feature makes ES a more comprehensive risk measure, as it better captures tail risk, which refers to the risk of extreme events. The ES of the return r_t given \mathcal{F}_{t-1} at the level α is:

$$ES_t = E(r_t | r_t < Q_t, \mathcal{F}_{t-1}), \quad (1)$$

where r_t is a daily return at time t , \mathcal{F}_t is some information set available at time t , and Q_t is the conditional VaR of r_t given \mathcal{F}_{t-1} at probability level α . ES is a coherent risk measure, whereas VaR is not due to the lack of subadditivity. Furthermore, ES is preferred by regulators. For example, the Basel III framework recommends using both VaR and ES for market risk measurement. In practice, both measures are often used together to get a more comprehensive understanding of risk and to develop a more robust risk management strategy. This study focuses on forecasting VaR and ES jointly during the out-of-sample period, because doing so offers a better, more efficient, and more consistent understanding of risk, assisting with decision-making processes and helping to meet regulatory demands.

With the popularity of high-frequency data, observations on intra-day returns are now more widely available. Many studies explore intra-day return during trading hours given the availability of high-frequency data, whereby volatility can be predicted more precisely via, for example, realized variance ([Andersen and Bollerslev 1998](#); [Andersen et al. 2003](#)), realized range ([Martens and van Dijk 2007](#); [Christensen and Podolskij 2007](#)), and realized kernel ([Barndorff-Nielsen et al. 2008](#)). Some contemporary works incorporate the realized volatility component into parametric models to forecast VaR and ES ([Chen and Watanabe 2019](#); [Chen et al. 2021, 2022](#)). [Lazar and Xue \(2020\)](#) and [Chen et al. \(2023\)](#) integrate realized volatility into the generalized autoregressive score (GAS) and the RES-CAViaR model within a semi-parametric framework. [Gerlach and Wang \(2020\)](#) and [Wang et al. \(2023\)](#) present semi-parametric models that include realized volatility measures.

Information flow in modern financial markets is continuous, but major stock exchanges are typically only open during regular trading hours ([Ahoemi & Lanne 2013](#)). One day's opening price usually differs from the previous day's closing price, with the corresponding overnight return often accounting for

a significant portion of the total daily return. This study integrates overnight information by defining the difference between today's opening price and yesterday's closing price. Consequently, we forecast VaR and ES immediately after today's market opening. In this context, the cut-off line is the market opening time, with any information beyond this time remaining unknown. This concept relates to nowcasting through overnight information.

CAViaR (Conditional Autoregressive Value at Risk) first appears in [Engle and Manganelli \(2004\)](#) and is a significant development in the realm of financial econometrics as it models and predicts VaR directly. The CAViaR model is designed to forecast VaR and does not provide an estimate for ES, which is considered a more comprehensive risk measure. [Taylor \(2019\)](#) proposes a joint model that estimates conditional VaR and ES simultaneously and shows its superior performance to various existing models. We refer to this joint model as ES-CAViaR in this paper.

Motivated by the superior performance of the ES-CAViaR model in [Taylor \(2019\)](#), we propose to combine it with realized volatility and the concept of nowcasting through overnight information. We name this newly developed model as RES-VAViaR-oc. The contribution of this proposed model is to forecast VaR and ES by adding trading information, including close-to-close return, realized volatility, and overnight news simultaneously. Overnight information is critical in stock markets, mainly due to the uncertainty it introduces. Key announcements or events often happen during non-trading hours. This could include earnings reports, geopolitical events, or policy changes. These developments can lead to a significant difference in the perceived value of a stock as well as to a gap up or down at the next market opening. Since these announcements are unpredictable, they add an element of uncertainty that we must consider when forecasting the tail risks.

From a risk management perspective, the overnight return often contributes to a significant portion of total return volatility. This additional volatility introduces further uncertainty, making it essential for us to measure and manage its exposure to overnight risks. Moreover, in a globally interconnected world nowadays, developments in foreign markets can impact domestic markets; e.g., the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic or the conflict between Ukraine and Russia. Overnight news or economic data from other countries affect investors' sentiment and expectations, causing a price adjustment when the market opens. As different countries operate in different time zones, the unpredictability of these foreign market influences adds uncertainty.

The proposed model herein is more flexible, because it includes ES-CAViaR of [Taylor \(2019\)](#) and RES-CAViaR of [Chen et al. \(2023\)](#) as special cases. With the relevance of the asymmetric Laplace (AL)

distribution and the quantile regression, we estimate all unknown parameters and forecast tail risks jointly via the Bayesian methods. This approach has various advantages. First, it is a more efficient and flexible way to estimate all parameters for complex models. Second, the parameter restrictions are established on the prior distribution. Third, it estimates the unknown parameters and tail risk simultaneously.

To compare the forecasting abilities among competing models, we use the violation rate (VRate) and three standard backtests. These backtests include the unconditional coverage (UC) test described by [Kupiec \(1995\)](#), the conditional coverage (CC) test by [Christoffersen \(1998\)](#), and the Dynamic Quantile (DQ) test of [Engle and Manganelli \(2004\)](#). We use these tests to evaluate VaR performance. The VRate measures the average number of instances when the return falls below the VaR forecast, and experts widely use it to assess the accuracy of the target models. The closer VRate is to the given level α , the better is the model's performance in forecasting VaR. In addition to these traditional backtesting techniques, we use the quantile score ([Giacomini and Komunjer 2005](#)) for the comparative backtest of VaR.

Regarding the ES evaluation, we first conduct the measurement of [Embrechts, Kaufmann, and Patie \(2005\)](#), which has the benefit of directly connecting ES to VaR and to the tail of the loss distribution. In addition, we apply the regression-based backtest proposed by [Bayer and Dimitriadis \(2022\)](#) for solely backtesting ES. For the pair assessment of VaR and ES, we consider the AL log score ([Taylor 2019](#)), which integrates the AL distribution and the class of scoring functions derived by [Fissler and Ziegel \(2016\)](#). Note that the latter two methods depend on the choice of the scoring function, for which the ranking of competing forecasts may change under a different scoring function ([Patton 2020](#)). Due to this concern, we provide the Murphy diagram of [Ehm et al. \(2016\)](#) and [Ziegel et al. \(2020\)](#), which is a powerful tool in assessing the quality of probabilistic forecasts of VaR or ES via visual inspection. The key advantages of using Murphy Diagrams for VaR or ES include (1) robustness: provides a robust forecasting evaluation against the choice of the scoring function; (2) comprehensive comparison: allows for performance assessment for a relevant class of scoring functions; (3) visual interpretation: facilitates clear graphical representation of model performance; and (4) versatility: applicable to various types of risk models. We also conduct a formal hypothesis test for forecast dominance ([Ziegel et al. 2020](#)), which is a strong concept showing that one forecast is superior to another under a relevant class of scoring functions.

The [Basel Committee on Banking Supervision \(2016\)](#) recommends a shift in risk metrics from VaR to ES and a reduction in the confidence level from 99% to 97.5%. This change heightens the focus on tail

risk, thereby enabling banks to better understand their risk exposure through the examination of a more extensive set of worst-case scenarios and ensuring they have adequate capital to absorb potential losses. In alignment with these suggestions, we evaluate tail forecasts, VaR and ES, at the 1% and 2.5% levels for four international stock markets: NASDAQ in the U.S., DAX in Germany, HSI in Hong Kong, and Nikkei 225 in Japan. We consider five competing risk models, three related to our proposed models with overnight information, as well as ES-CAViaR of [Taylor \(2019\)](#) and RES-CAViaR with realized volatility of [Chen et al. \(2023\)](#).

The above-mentioned backtests and Murphy diagrams confirm that CAViaR-type models with overnight return and realized volatility are more efficient in forecasting tail risk than models without incorporating overnight information. In particular, our Murphy diagrams and related hypothesis tests indicate a strong relation of forecast dominance ([Ziegel et al. 2020](#)) between models with and without incorporating overnight information, which demonstrates the improvement of tail risk forecasting by nowcasting independently of the choice of the scoring function. Finally, by comparing standardized score differences, we observe that the improvement of incorporating overnight information is typically more significant in RES-CAViaR compared with ES-CAViaR, and in the two Asian markets in Japan and Hong Kong compared with those in U.S. and Germany.

The rest of the paper runs as follows. Section 2 presents the RES-CAViaR-type models. Section 3 explains the Bayesian Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method for estimating unknown parameters, and describes our forecast evaluation methods. Section 4 shows the empirical analysis, which adopts four market indices to ensure the performance of our proposed models. Section 5 concludes the study.

2 Realized volatility CAViaR-type models

An asset's opening price is usually not identical to its previous day's closing price, because essential information related to the listed companies might be released after the financial market closes. The difference is that after-hours trading changes investor valuations or expectations for assets. Aside from news about companies, the development of after-hours trading has significantly influenced the difference between the previous closing price and the opening price. After-hours trading can also reflect volatility of a stock price.

When incorporating the idea of nowcasting, we take information on the difference between the opening price and the previous day's closing price into our risk model. We calculate today's tail risk once the

market opens. For a given stock of interest, O_t and C_t respectively denote its opening price and closing price at time t . The overnight return at time t is $OC_t = 100 \times \log(O_t/C_{t-1})$. In the framework of nowcasting, the information set \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^+ is generated by the union of all closing prices up to time $t-1$ and those of opening prices until time t . For a given α level, the conditional VaR and ES of r_t given \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^+ are Q_t and ES_t , respectively. Based on market reaction, we propose to use different coefficients in response to positive and negative OC_t . We now describe the first proposed model as follows.

ES-CAViaR-oc:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_t &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 Q_{t-1} + \beta_3 I(OC_t > 0) |OC_t| + \beta_4 I(OC_t \leq 0) |OC_t|, & (2) \\
ES_t &= Q_t - w_t, \\
w_t &= \begin{cases} \gamma_1 + \gamma_2(Q_{t-1} - r_{t-1}) + \gamma_3 w_{t-1}, & \text{if } r_{t-1} \leq Q_{t-1}, \\ w_{t-1}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

The stationarity condition in Eq. (2) is $-1 < \beta_2 < 1$ to ensure the stability of the time series. If the market perceives overnight information as negative, investors might become more risk-averse the following day. Additionally, if overnight information suggests that assets were previously overvalued, their prices might drop, leading to a higher VaR the next day. For these reasons, we expect β_4 to be a negative coefficient.

Realized volatility is an important factor to forecast tail risk as confirmed by many papers in the literature. Therefore, we further include the realized volatility series RV_t into Eq. (2).

RES-CAViaR-oc:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_t &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 Q_{t-1} + \beta_3 RV_{t-1} + \beta_4 I(OC_t > 0) |OC_t| + \beta_5 I(OC_t \leq 0) |OC_t|, & (3) \\
ES_t &= Q_t - w_t, \\
w_t &= \begin{cases} \gamma_1 + \gamma_2(Q_{t-1} - r_{t-1}) + \gamma_3 w_{t-1}, & \text{if } r_{t-1} \leq Q_{t-1}, \\ w_{t-1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $-1 < \beta_2 < 1$, and we expect $\beta_5 < 0$.

When a stock price falls in the opening market compared to the previous closing price, it creates market volatility to which traders and investors are sensitive. Hence, we only consider a negative effect of OC_t in the model.

RES-CAViaR-oc⁻:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_t &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 Q_{t-1} + \beta_3 RV_{t-1} + \beta_4 I(OC_t \leq 0) |OC_t|, \\
ES_t &= Q_t - w_t, \\
w_t &= \begin{cases} \gamma_1 + \gamma_2(Q_{t-1} - r_{t-1}) + \gamma_3 w_{t-1}, & \text{if } r_{t-1} \leq Q_{t-1}, \\ w_{t-1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Here, $-1 < \beta_2 < 1$, and we expect $\beta_4 < 0$. Note that the setting $\beta_3 = 0$ in (3) reduces to (2), and the setting $\beta_4 = 0$ in (3) gives (4). Therefore, ES-CAViaR-oc in Eq. (2) and RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ in Eq. (4) are special cases of RES-CAViaR-oc in Eq. (3). For this reason, we describe our analysis for the most general RES-CAViaR-oc model (3) in the next section. We use the parsimonious models (2) and (4) to study the effects of the dropped explanatory variables in Section 4.

3 Estimation and forecast evaluations

3.1 Bayesian MCMC approach

This section describes the Bayesian approach and MCMC sampling procedures employed in estimating unknown parameters of the proposed model and for conducting the tail risk forecasting. For brevity, we present the procedures only for the RES-CAViaR-oc model.

Let $\phi = (\beta', \gamma')$ in the RES-CAViaR-oc model, where $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5)'$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3)'$. Fundamentally, the MCMC method requires a posterior distribution of ϕ , which is the product of a prior distribution $P(\phi)$ and a likelihood function $\mathcal{L}(\phi | \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{OC}, \mathbf{RV})$, where $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_n)'$, $\mathbf{OC} = (OC_1, \dots, OC_n)'$, and $\mathbf{RV} = (RV_1, \dots, RV_n)'$. We adopt the AL distribution as the log-likelihood function:

$$\log \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{OC}, \mathbf{RV} | \beta, \gamma) = \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\log \frac{\alpha - 1}{ES_t} + \frac{(r_t - Q_t)(\alpha - I(r_t \leq Q_t))}{\alpha ES_t} \right). \tag{5}$$

As in Taylor (2019), we assume throughout the paper that $\mathbb{E}[r_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^+] = 0$ for every t .

With flat priors on β and γ , the prior specifications go as follows.

$$P(\beta) \propto I(A_1), \quad P(\gamma) \propto I(A_2), \tag{6}$$

where $A_1 = \{|\beta_2| < 1, \beta_3, \beta_5 < 0\}$, and $A_2 = \{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \geq 0, 0 \leq \gamma_3 < 1\}$. We impose $|\beta_2| < 1$ and $0 \leq \gamma_3 < 1$ to guarantee the stability of the time series. In addition, the downside effects of realized

volatility and negative overnight return to the tail risk are incorporated into the conditions $\beta_3, \beta_5 < 0$. Finally, the constraints $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \geq 0$ assure that $ES_t \leq Q_t \leq 0$ for every t .

The conditional posterior distribution is expressed by the likelihood function and prior distribution as follows:

$$P(\phi_j | \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{OC}, \mathbf{RV}, \phi_{-j}) \propto \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{OC}, \mathbf{RV} | \phi) P(\phi_j | \phi_{-j}), \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ is the likelihood function for the proposed model in the description, and ϕ_{-j} represents the vector ϕ without component j .

In order to estimate the nonstandard posterior distribution for the proposed model, we employ an adaptive MCMC algorithm of [Chen and So \(2006\)](#), which integrates the random walk Metropolis algorithm ([Metropolis et al. 1953](#)) and independent kernel Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm ([Hastings 1970](#)). The parameter groups of β and γ are updated based on an adaptive MCMC method separately. The simulation study in [Gerlach et al. \(2011\)](#) employs Bayesian methods for the general quantile regression problem using the asymmetric-Laplace distribution. Their approach is designed for parameter estimation of the CAViaR model family via an adaptive MCMC sampling scheme. The study demonstrates favorable estimation performance regarding precision and efficiency compared to numerical optimization of the standard quantile criterion function. Although the model proposed in [Gerlach et al. \(2011\)](#) does not factor in realized volatility and overnight information, we believe the results still attest to the effectiveness of the adaptive MCMC methods for parameter estimation.

To forecast VaR and ES in the out-of-sample period for the RES-CAViaR-oc model, we choose a one-step-ahead approach with rolling window and compute them by all unknown parameters estimated in the MCMC procedure. Let N be the number of total iterations of the MCMC run and M be the burn-in period. The procedure based on the MCMC algorithm goes as follows.

Step 1: Initialize $\phi^{[0]} = (\beta^{[0]}, \gamma^{[0]})$.

Step 2: For the j th iteration, draw from the conditional posteriors:

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\beta^{[j]} | \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{OC}, \mathbf{RV}, \gamma^{[j-1]}\right) \\ &P\left(\gamma^{[j]} | \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{OC}, \mathbf{RV}, \beta^{[j]}\right) \end{aligned}$$

by the random walk Metropolis if $j < M$ and independent kernel MH if $j \geq M$.

Step 3: Collect $(\beta^{[j]}, \gamma^{[j]}, Q_{n+1}^{[j]}, \text{ and } ES_{n+1}^{[j]})$ based on:

$$Q_{n+1}^{[j]} = \beta_1^{[j]} + \beta_2^{[j]} Q_n^{[j]} + \beta_3^{[j]} RV_n + \beta_4^{[j]} I(OC_n > 0) |OC_n| + \beta_5^{[j]} I(OC_n \leq 0) |OC_n|,$$

$$ES_{n+1}^{[j]} = Q_{n+1}^{[j]} - w_{n+1}^{[j]},$$

$$w_{n+1}^{[j]} = \begin{cases} \gamma_1^{[j]} + \gamma_2^{[j]} (Q_n^{[j]} - r_n) + \gamma_3^{[j]} w_n^{[j]}, & r_n \leq Q_n^{[j]}, \\ w_n^{[j]}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Step 4: When $j = N$, we calculate:

$$Q_{n+1} = \frac{1}{N-M} \sum_{j=M+1}^N Q_{n+1}^{[j]} \quad \text{and} \quad ES_{n+1} = \frac{1}{N-M} \sum_{j=M+1}^N ES_{n+1}^{[j]},$$

where $Q_{n+1}^{[j]}$ and $ES_{n+1}^{[j]}$ are obtained from Step 3.

3.2 Evaluation of VaR and ES forecasting

It is critical that financial regulators evaluate the accuracy of the proposed models in forecasting VaR and ES since both tail risks are unobservable. We employ various tests to evaluate the forecast performance of the proposed models, which include traditional backtests and recent comparative backtests based on loss (scoring) functions.

First, we identify the model's forecasting accuracy equal to the nominal level α by computing the violation rate (VRate) for quantile forecasting:

$$\text{VRate} = \frac{\sum_{t=n+1}^{n+m} I(r_t < Q_t)}{m}, \quad (8)$$

where n is the in-sample period, m is the out-of-sample period, and Q_t stands for VaR in the models. The closer VRate is to α , the better the performance of the model is to forecast VaR. For a conservative evaluation of risk, we prefer VRate to be overestimated than underestimated.

Second, we employ three traditional VaR backtest procedures to properly evaluate the accuracy of the VaR forecast: UC test, CC test, and DQ test. Both CC and DQ are joint tests where the null hypothesis consists of the independence property of the VaR violation, equivalently correct conditional violation rate for a given model, and combined with a correct UC rate.

Third, we assess whether the ES forecast is specified correctly based on various measurements. [Embrechts, Kaufmann, and Patie \(2005\)](#) consider the measure $V(\alpha) = (|V_1(\alpha)| + |V_2(\alpha)|)/2$, where

$V_1(\alpha)$ is the sample mean of $\delta_t(\alpha) = r_t - ES_t(\alpha)$ over the time points in $\{n+1, \dots, n+m\}$ when (estimated) VaR violation occurs, and $V_2(\alpha)$ is the sample mean of $\delta_t(\alpha)$ over the time points when $\delta_t(\alpha) < q(\alpha)$ with $q(\alpha)$ being the empirical α -quantile of $\delta_t(\alpha)$. We prefer the smallest value of V for ES in the comparisons. We also examine the regression-based ES backtest proposed by [Bayer and Dimitriadis \(2022\)](#) for ES backtesting. We carry out three versions of the ES regression (ESR) backtests: **Strict ESR**, **Auxiliary ESR**, and **Strict Intercept**, using the R package *esback* ([Bayer and Dimitriadis 2019](#)).

Under the framework of a comparative backtest ([Nolde and Ziegel 2017](#)), a possibly vector-valued risk measure forecast ϱ_t is said to (empirically) dominate another $\tilde{\varrho}_t$ with respect to a scoring function S if:

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=n+1}^{n+m} S(\tilde{\varrho}_t, r_t) \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=n+1}^{n+m} S(\varrho_t, r_t).$$

We take function S to be strictly consistent in the sense that the risk measure of interest is the unique minimizer of the expectation of S with respect to the return. If such a function exists, then the risk measure is called elicitable. It is known that VaR is elicitable, and that the pair of risk measures $(\text{VaR}_\alpha, \text{ES}_\alpha)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, is (jointly) elicitable ([Fissler and Ziegel 2016](#)). Therefore, we evaluate the forecasting accuracy of the series Q_t and the pair of series (Q_t, ES_t) under certain choices of strictly consistent scoring functions. Among others, we use the quantile score ([Giacomini and Komunjer 2005](#)) for the comparative backtest of VaR:

$$S(Q_t, r_t) = (\alpha - \mathbf{I}(r_t \leq Q_t))(r_t - Q_t). \quad (9)$$

For the pair of VaR and ES, we consider the AL log score ([Taylor 2019](#)), which integrates the AL distribution and the class of scoring functions derived by [Fissler and Ziegel \(2016\)](#). Under the assumption that $\mathbb{E}[r_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^+] = 0$, the AL log score is:

$$S(Q_t, ES_t, r_t) = -\log \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{ES_t} \right) - \frac{(r_t - Q_t)(\alpha - \mathbf{I}(r_t \leq Q_t))}{\alpha ES_t}. \quad (10)$$

The AL log score is the negative logarithm of the AL distribution, and this interpretation connects the comparative backtest based on this score with the (quasi) maximum likelihood and Bayesian quantile regression frameworks.

A potential criticism of the above backtesting framework is that the scoring functions (9) and (10) are just a few of innumerable strictly consistent scoring functions of Q_t and (Q_t, ES_t) , respectively. To address this issue, we also provide Murphy diagrams, which enable us to check whether one forecast

dominates another under a relevant class of scoring functions. [Ehm et al. \(2016\)](#) propose the Murphy diagram for VaR, which plots the empirical elementary scores:

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=n+1}^{n+m} (\mathbf{I}(r_t \leq Q_t) - \alpha)(\mathbf{I}(\eta \leq Q_t) - \mathbf{I}(\eta \leq r_t)),$$

against $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$. For ES, [Ziegel et al. \(2020\)](#) propose to plot:

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=n+1}^{n+m} \left\{ \mathbf{I}(\eta \leq ES_t) \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbf{I}(r_t \leq Q_t)(Q_t - r_t) - (Q_t - \eta) \right) + \mathbf{I}(\eta \leq r_t)(r_t - \eta) \right\},$$

against $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ to evaluate the forecasting accuracy of ES.

We refer the reader to [Ehm et al. \(2016\)](#) and [Ziegel et al. \(2020\)](#) for more details, such as the range of the x -axis of the diagram. These Murphy diagrams provide graphical ways to check forecast dominance, where a forecast Q_t , or ES_t , dominates others, independently of the choice of scoring functions, if its curve of empirical elementary scores against η is lower than those of others on the entire line. The forecast dominance undergoes formal examination using the test proposed by [Ziegel et al. \(2020\)](#), which is based on the stationary bootstrap ([Politis and Romano 1994](#)).

4 Empirical study

This study utilizes data of daily (opening and closing) prices, as well as realized volatility data. We collect four market indices: Nasdaq Composite (U.S.), DAX (Germany), Hang Seng Index (HSI, Hong Kong), and Nikkei 225 (Japan). From Oxford-Man Institute of Quantitative Finance by [Heber et al. \(2009\)](#), we download the daily returns $r_t = (\ln(C_t) - \ln(C_{t-1})) \times 100$, where C_t is defined as closing price on day t , close-to-open returns $OC_t = (\ln(O_t) - \ln(C_{t-1})) \times 100$, where O_t is defined as opening price on day t , and the square root of median realized volatility is $\sqrt{\text{med}RV_t}$.

We divide the dataset into two parts: one is the in-sample period from January 3, 2011 to December 31, 2017, and the other is the out-of-sample period from January 2, 2018 to June 28, 2022. The out-of-sample period covers the COVID-19 pandemic period and the circuit breakers in the U.S. stock market in March 2020. Table 1 exhibits the summary statistics for the series of r_t , OC_t , and RV_t . The series of r_t and OC_t exhibit left skewness, while RV_t shows right skewness in all of the markets. The OC_t series is much more skewed than the r_t series in the out-of-sample period for all markets. Figures 1 and 2 are the time plots of r_t , OC_t , and RV_t for each market.

Table 1: Summary statistics of r_t , OC_t , and RV_t for the four stock markets in the specified periods.

Market	Period	Mean	Std	Skewness	Excess kurtosis	Min	Max
U.S.	In-sample						
	r_t	0.0543	1.0219	-0.4916	4.0615	-7.1685	5.1919
	OC_t	0.0321	0.6213	-1.5929	19.3854	-7.8300	3.4956
	RV_t	0.4417	0.2704	2.6949	12.1243	0.0000	2.7297
	Out-of-sample						
	r_t	0.0430	1.5964	-0.8308	7.8033	-13.1409	8.9264
	OC_t	0.0429	0.9676	-1.4884	11.4856	-7.4754	5.5183
	RV_t	0.6504	0.4814	2.5585	10.0379	0.0529	4.0618
Germany	In-sample						
	r_t	0.0352	1.2463	-0.3188	2.8239	-6.9250	5.4459
	OC_t	0.0375	0.6961	-2.0460	30.3964	-10.3707	3.4814
	RV_t	0.6002	0.3483	2.2364	8.5089	0.1118	3.4666
	Out-of-sample						
	r_t	0.0021	1.3476	-0.6325	10.2397	-11.8631	9.7634
	OC_t	0.0218	0.9035	-0.9364	11.9028	-7.7812	5.7059
	RV_t	0.5679	0.3766	4.1954	27.6662	0.0000	4.3226
Hong Kong	In-sample						
	r_t	0.0152	1.1409	-0.2975	2.7641	-5.9799	5.4535
	OC_t	0.0553	0.8072	-0.4703	7.0448	-6.4188	5.5614
	RV_t	0.3654	0.1662	2.7188	12.9573	0.1176	1.7931
	Out-of-sample						
	r_t	-0.0295	1.3688	-0.0630	3.1543	-5.7351	8.7072
	OC_t	0.0448	0.9502	-0.7125	6.4850	-7.0391	6.3041
	RV_t	0.4643	0.2088	2.1383	7.8327	0.1592	2.0100
Japan	In-sample						
	r_t	0.0466	1.3680	-0.5936	6.1547	-11.1534	7.4262
	OC_t	0.0592	0.8115	-0.1524	-0.1471	-2.0717	2.1097
	RV_t	0.4151	0.2451	2.7385	12.9574	0.0740	2.7455
	Out-of-sample						
	r_t	0.0160	1.2765	-0.1262	3.6175	-6.2736	7.7314
	OC_t	0.0245	0.7656	-0.2236	0.0276	-2.6409	1.9427
	RV_t	0.3798	0.2542	4.6227	38.1402	0.0941	3.5747




Figure 1: Time plots of the U.S. and Germany stock markets

We consider five competing risk models. Three of them are proposed in this study: (1) ES-CAViaR-oc with overnight information in Eq. (2); (2) RES-CAViaR-oc with overnight information and realized volatility in Eq. (3); and (3) RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ with negative overnight information and realized volatility in Eq. (4). The other two we consider for comparison are: (4) ES-CAViaR of Taylor (2019) and (5) RES-CAViaR with realized volatility of Chen et al. (2023). The latter two appear as follows.

ES-CAViaR:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q_t &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 I(r_{t-1} > 0) |r_{t-1}| + \beta_3 I(r_{t-1} \leq 0) |r_{t-1}| + \beta_4 Q_{t-1}, & (11) \\
 ES_t &= Q_t - w_t, \\
 w_t &= \begin{cases} \gamma_1 + \gamma_2(Q_{t-1} - r_{t-1}) + \gamma_3 w_{t-1}, & \text{if } r_{t-1} \leq Q_{t-1}. \\ w_{t-1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$




Figure 2: Time plots of the Hong Kong and Japan stock markets

RES-CAViaR:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q_t &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 Q_{t-1} + \beta_3 RV_{t-1}, \\
 ES_t &= Q_t - w_t, \\
 w_t &= \begin{cases} \gamma_1 + \gamma_2(Q_{t-1} - r_{t-1}) + \gamma_3 w_{t-1}, & \text{if } r_{t-1} \leq Q_{t-1}, \\ w_{t-1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Here, $|\beta_4| < 1$ in (11) and $|\beta_2| < 1$ in (12) are the stationarity conditions, respectively. For all the CAViaR models, the initial values (Q_0, ES_0) are set to be negative. In our experiment, the results are robust when we vary the initial values.

The adaptive MCMC method consists of two steps. We carry out 20,000 MCMC iterations, discard the first 8,000 iterations as the burn-in period, and include only every fourth iteration in the sample period for inference. [Gelman et al. \(1996\)](#) demonstrate that the acceptance rate should be between 25% to 50% in the MCMC procedure. To ensure rapid convergence and an optimal mix of adaptive MCMC, the trace plot and autocorrelation function (ACF) plot reflect the convergence conditions. Convergence diagnostic

Table 2: Posterior means, medians, standard deviations, and 95% credible intervals of the unknown parameters of the RES-CAViaR-oc model.

	U.S.					Germany				
	Mean	Median	Std	2.5%	97.5%	Mean	Median	Std	2.5%	97.5%
β_1	-0.7478	-0.7492	0.0335	-0.8113	-0.6799	-0.7199	-0.7161	0.0582	-0.8349	-0.6101
β_2	0.2496	0.2496	0.0267	0.1981	0.3011	0.3636	0.3631	0.0262	0.3118	0.4147
β_3	-1.6094	-1.6045	0.1007	-1.8128	-1.4347	-1.2814	-1.2792	0.0907	-1.4914	-1.1087
β_4	0.0760	0.0779	0.0707	-0.0698	0.2174	0.4841	0.4866	0.0845	0.3350	0.6455
β_5	-1.1728	-1.1766	0.0638	-1.2867	-1.0407	-1.0442	-1.0446	0.0263	-1.0982	-0.9910
γ_1	0.2652	0.2658	0.0611	0.1420	0.3851	0.2807	0.2857	0.0723	0.1309	0.4154
γ_2	0.2561	0.2528	0.1061	0.0576	0.4669	0.7706	0.7845	0.1384	0.4547	0.9860
γ_3	0.1208	0.1009	0.0933	0.0044	0.3511	0.1384	0.1215	0.0993	0.0063	0.3648
	Hong Kong					Japan				
β_1	-0.7128	-0.7117	0.0587	-0.8367	-0.6082	0.0356	0.0390	0.0264	-0.0200	0.0831
β_2	0.2901	0.2931	0.0334	0.2117	0.3467	0.6361	0.6364	0.0111	0.6132	0.6572
β_3	-1.5477	-1.5436	0.1223	-1.8302	-1.3341	-1.5112	-1.5192	0.1277	-1.7167	-1.2271
β_4	0.3820	0.3835	0.0443	0.2912	0.4624	0.1516	0.1511	0.0233	0.1110	0.2002
β_5	-1.0172	-1.0170	0.0541	-1.1266	-0.9139	-1.5864	-1.5857	0.0393	-1.6636	-1.5133
γ_1	0.2564	0.2558	0.0836	0.0958	0.4143	0.9718	0.9713	0.0853	0.8105	1.1345
γ_2	0.3547	0.3487	0.1760	0.0476	0.7084	0.3043	0.3004	0.0546	0.2014	0.4169
γ_3	0.3396	0.3408	0.1228	0.0957	0.5781	0.0296	0.0210	0.0288	0.0008	0.1092

plots are in Supplementary Materials. We discover that the ACF plots decay quickly and that the trace plots are a good mix, denoting that the MCMC iterations reach convergence from these plots.

For the initial value, we select $\beta = -0.1I_k$ and $\gamma = 0.1I_3$, where k represents the number of parameters for β in the proposed model. Tables 2 and 3 present the Bayesian estimates for the two oc-type models across the four stock markets. These estimates include posterior means, medians, standard deviations, and 95% credible intervals for the unknown parameters. For the RES-CAViaR-oc model, we note that the estimates β_4 for the U.S. market and β_1 for the Japan market are insignificant, as their 95% credible intervals include zero. Similarly, for the RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ model, β_1 for the Japan market is not significant. Since all the other estimated coefficients are significant, we conclude that both realized volatility and positive overnight return explain the variation in tail risk.

Table 3: Posterior means, medians, standard deviations, and 95% credible intervals of the unknown parameters of the RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ model.

	U.S.					Germany				
	Mean	Median	Std	2.5%	97.5%	Mean	Median	Std	2.5%	97.5%
β_1	-0.6282	-0.6298	0.0582	-0.7364	-0.5038	-0.7643	-0.7669	0.0443	-0.8427	-0.6740
β_2	0.2616	0.2638	0.0316	0.1965	0.3209	0.1669	0.1642	0.0324	0.1081	0.2370
β_3	-1.8802	-1.8839	0.1033	-2.0887	-1.6766	-1.9311	-1.9346	0.1240	-2.1701	-1.6422
β_4	-1.2534	-1.2574	0.0743	-1.3953	-1.1151	-1.1340	-1.1336	0.0613	-1.2489	-1.0324
γ_1	0.2978	0.2974	0.0623	0.1725	0.4248	0.2499	0.2515	0.0593	0.1297	0.3613
γ_2	0.1703	0.1640	0.0944	0.0135	0.3751	0.7842	0.7954	0.1268	0.5125	0.9849
γ_3	0.1211	0.1053	0.0877	0.0041	0.3254	0.0765	0.0633	0.0590	0.0030	0.2159
	Hong Kong					Japan				
	Mean	Median	Std	2.5%	97.5%	Mean	Median	Std	2.5%	97.5%
β_1	-0.5649	-0.5678	0.0401	-0.6325	-0.4819	0.0023	0.0045	0.0346	-0.0754	0.0741
β_2	0.3055	0.3038	0.0248	0.2620	0.3571	0.7346	0.7354	0.0163	0.6990	0.7661
β_3	-1.3807	-1.3800	0.0895	-1.5656	-1.2155	-1.0280	-1.0258	0.1253	-1.2884	-0.7893
β_4	-1.2980	-1.2973	0.0387	-1.3835	-1.2223	-0.9925	-0.9954	0.0623	-1.1095	-0.8728
γ_1	0.2369	0.2299	0.1038	0.0529	0.4489	0.9872	0.9883	0.0804	0.8327	1.1430
γ_2	0.5217	0.5302	0.1680	0.1760	0.8435	0.1726	0.1716	0.0502	0.0732	0.2693
γ_3	0.2908	0.2944	0.1357	0.0362	0.5493	0.0448	0.0342	0.0395	0.0013	0.1449

Due to space limits, we only provide two violation plots for U.S. and Hong Kong in Figures 3 and 4, respectively, which illustrate the VaR violation plots at the 1% level based on the ES-CAViaR-oc, RES-CAViaR, RES-CAViaR-oc, and RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ models. We examine the performance of forecasting by observing the violation during the circuit breakers in the U.S. stock market in March 2020. In this study, all four markets are successfully able to capture the extreme negative return for forecasting in the RES-CAViaR-oc and RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ models.




Figure 3: The VaR violation plots of the U.S. market based on the RES-CAViaR, ES-CAViaR-oc, RES-CAViaR-oc, and RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ models. Gray line represents r_t , blue line is 1% VaR forecasts, and red points are the violation dates.




Figure 4: The VaR violation plots of the Hong Kong market based on the RES-CAViaR, ES-CAViaR-oc, RES-CAViaR-oc, and RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ models. Gray line represents r_t , blue line is 1% VaR forecasts, and red points are the violation dates.

Table 4 displays the 1% level forecasting performance for each model. The fourth column shows the VRate at $\alpha = 0.01$, with values closer to 1% indicating superior models. For instance, between 0.9% and 1.1% VRate, 0.9% is preferable as it forecasts more conservatively. The boldface values in this column highlight the models that are closest to the desired 1% rate. The fifth column lists the rejection counts for the UC, CC, and DQ tests in out-of-sample forecasts. If the p-value is below 5%, we count the number of rejections. Notably, both RES-CAViaR-oc and RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ pass the backtests across all markets. The final column employs the ES evaluation method (Embrechts, Kaufmann, and Patie 2005), where smaller values are favored.

In the U.S. and Germany markets, RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ stands out as the best-performing model. In the Hong Kong market, three models have the same violation rate which is the closest to 1%. However, RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ is favored when considering the ES evaluation method. For Japan, the simple ES-CAViaR model has the violation rate closest to 1% and the smallest ES value, making it the most favored model for this market. Finally, the last column represents the number of rejections from three ES regression (ESR) backtesting methods (Bayer and Dimitriadis 2019, 2022): **Strict ESR**, **Auxiliary ESR**, and **Strict Intercept**. All tests are two-sided, and decisions are based on the 10% significance level. The results suggest that RES-CAViaR and ES-CAViaR do not forecast the 1% ES effectively for the Germany market, aligning with the findings from the ES evaluation method.

Table 5 presents the forecasting performance of each model at the 2.5% level. According to the VRate column, at the 0.025 level the RES-CAViaR model is most appropriate for the U.S. market, while RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ is the most suitable choice for the Germany market. For Japan, RES-CAViaR-oc is selected based on its superior forecasting accuracy. Using the ES evaluation method, the U.S. and Germany markets prefer the RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ model, while the Hong Kong market opts for the ES-CAViaR-oc model. The ESR backtests reveal that the RES-CAViaR model for Hong Kong and the models incorporating overnight returns in Japan do not provide precise ES forecasts. These findings align with the results of the ES evaluation method presented in the sixth column. On the whole, the ES-CAViaR model is effective for Japan, whereas the RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ model seems to be a fitting choice for the other markets.

Table 4: Evaluation of 1% VaR and ES performance during the out-of-sample periods in the four stock markets.

Market	Model	Violation number	Violation rate %	Count of rejection VaR backtests ^a	ES evaluation ^b	Count of rejection ESR backtests ^c
U.S.	RES-CAViaR	14	1.25	0	0.1989	0
	ES-CAViaR	22	1.96	3	0.3585	0
	ES-CAViaR-oc	20	1.78	3	0.2069	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	13	1.16	0	0.0175	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc	13	1.16	0	0.0709	0
Germany	RES-CAViaR	26	2.30	3	0.7876	1
	ES-CAViaR	20	1.77	3	0.6831	1
	ES-CAViaR-oc	8	0.71	0	0.1639	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	13	1.15	0	0.0853	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc	14	1.24	0	0.1374	0
Hong Kong	RES-CAViaR	16	1.47	2	0.3547	0
	ES-CAViaR	16	1.47	0	0.2954	0
	ES-CAViaR-oc	20	1.83	3	0.1291	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	17	1.56	0	0.0825	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc	16	1.47	0	0.0913	0
Japan	RES-CAViaR	15	1.39	0	0.0700	0
	ES-CAViaR	11	1.02	0	0.0137	0
	ES-CAViaR-oc	10	0.93	0	0.4621	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	11	1.02	0	0.3034	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc	12	1.11	0	0.2094	0

^aNumber of rejections of UC, CC, and DQ tests are based on the 5% significance level.

^bThe ES evaluation method by Embrechts, Kaufmann, and Patie (2005).

The boldface highlights the most favored model.

^cThe three ES regression (ESR) backtesting methods—**Strict ESR**, **Auxiliary ESR**, and **Strict Intercept**, cited in (Bayer and Dimitriadis 2019, 2022)—determine the number of rejections at the 10% significance level. All tests are two-sided.

Table 5: Evaluation of 2.5% VaR and ES performance during the out-of-sample periods in the four stock markets.

Market	Model	Violation number	Violation rate %	Count of rejection VaR backtests ^a	ES evaluation ^b	Count of rejection ESR backtests ^c
U.S.	RES-CAViaR	29	2.58%	0	0.2000	0
	ES-CAViaR	43	3.83%	2	0.2234	0
	ES-CAViaR-oc	42	3.74%	3	0.1117	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	36	3.21%	0	0.0505	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc	33	2.94%	0	0.0827	0
Germany	RES-CAViaR	43	3.81%	3	0.4345	0
	ES-CAViaR	37	3.28%	0	0.2255	0
	ES-CAViaR-oc	36	3.19%	0	0.3141	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	30	2.66%	0	0.0394	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc	33	2.92%	0	0.2110	0
Hong Kong	RES-CAViaR	37	3.39%	2	0.2782	2
	ES-CAViaR	41	3.75%	2	0.1722	0
	ES-CAViaR-oc	45	4.12%	3	0.1350	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	30	2.75%	0	0.3566	0
	RES-CAViaR-oc	37	3.39%	1	0.2727	0
Japan	RES-CAViaR	31	2.88%	0	0.0523	0
	ES-CAViaR	23	2.13%	0	0.0453	0
	ES-CAViaR-oc	26	2.41%	0	0.3581	1
	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	30	2.78%	0	0.3629	2
	RES-CAViaR-oc	27	2.50%	0	0.1981	2

^aNumber of rejections of UC, CC, and DQ tests are based on the 5% significance level.

^bThe ES evaluation method by Embrechts, Kaufmann, and Patie (2005).

The boldface highlights the most favored model.

^cThe three ES regression (ESR) backtesting methods—**Strict ESR**, **Auxiliary ESR**, and **Strict Intercept**, cited in (Bayer and Dimitriadis 2019, 2022)—determine the number of rejections at the 10% significance level. All tests are two-sided.

Table 6: Quantile score for VaR at the 1% and 2.5% levels.

Level	Market	RES-CAViaR	ES-CAViaR	ES-CAViaR-oc	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	RES-CAViaR-oc
1%	U.S.	49.1663	54.8570	48.4814	38.6955	38.8420
	Germany	57.5574	54.4840	38.8935	37.7599	37.7904
	Hong Kong	48.3234	47.9249	33.8620	32.6990	31.1612
	Japan	42.7430	43.3155	33.8938	34.3394	32.8257
	Avg loss ^a	49.4475	50.1453	38.7827	35.8734	35.1548
2.5%	U.S.	105.6847	111.0860	98.2114	85.0127	84.5575
	Germany	109.5971	104.0882	86.3762	95.8727	77.3612
	Hong Kong	101.0733	103.9773	70.3721	72.1480	72.3486
	Japan	90.5812	92.4619	69.4997	63.0793	63.5964
	Avg loss ^a	101.7341	102.9034	81.1148	79.0282	74.4659

^aAvg loss is the average loss of the four stock markets in every model.

*Boldface number represents the best model in each market.

Table 6 illustrates the quantile score for VaR at two different levels: 1% and 2.5%, for five models, in which the most accurate model should minimize the scoring functions. For each of the two VaR levels, the lowest quantile score (boldface number) in each market indicates the best-performing model for that market, as a lower score indicates a better fit to the data. At the 1% VaR level, the RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ model performs best in the U.S. and Germany markets, while the RES-CAViaR-oc model outperforms in the Hong Kong and Japan markets. At the 2.5% VaR level, the RES-CAViaR-oc model provides the best performance in the U.S. and Germany markets, whereas the RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ model is superior in the Hong Kong and Japan markets.

The AL log score, as per Taylor (2019), is a measure used to evaluate the goodness of fit of these models. Lower AL log scores indicate a better fit of the model to the data. Table 7 presents the scoring function by the AL distribution at the 1% and 2.5% levels, evaluating VaR and ES jointly. At the 1% level, as the scoring function is smallest, RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ is outstanding in the U.S. and Germany markets; otherwise, RES-CAViaR-oc is the best in the Hong Kong and Japan markets. The last row demonstrates RES-CAViaR-oc is most appropriate by average loss. As for the 2.5% level, RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ has the best performance in the U.S., Hong Kong, and Japan markets, and RES-CAViaR-oc has the best performance in the Germany market. Finally, the RES-CAViaR-oc is more outstanding for both functions than the others.

Table 7: AL log score for VaR and ES at the 1% and 2.5% levels.

Level	Market	RES-CAViaR	ES-CAViaR	ES-CAViaR-oc	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	RES-CAViaR-oc
1%	U.S.	2685.305	2984.366	2822.656	2423.667	2457.262
	Germany	2942.582	2877.914	2524.169	2487.010	2500.123
	Hong Kong	2740.954	2735.130	2378.305	2305.682	2248.653
	Japan	2532.623	2565.484	2325.988	2360.695	2240.589
	Avg loss ^a	2725.366	2790.724	2512.780	2394.264	2361.657
2.5%	U.S.	2511.184	2690.685	2492.153	2301.253	2318.049
	Germany	2613.412	2568.101	2885.410	2855.559	2320.561
	Hong Kong	2529.315	2565.263	2190.503	2166.356	2168.694
	Japan	2374.241	2399.931	2112.757	1998.683	2009.564
	Avg loss ^a	2507.038	2555.995	2420.206	2330.463	2204.217

^aAvg loss is the average loss of the four stock markets in each model.

*Boldface number represents the best model in each market.

Figures 5–8 display the Murphy diagrams for the 1% VaR and ES. From these figures, it is evident that the proposed RES-CAViaR-oc type models outperform other models, regardless of the scoring functions applied. We choose to include the Murphy diagrams for the 2.5% VaR and ES in the Supplementary Materials, as they exhibit the same patterns as those mentioned above. We also formally test the forecast dominance of the proposed RES-CAViaR-oc model over other models through the test proposed by Ziegel et al. (2020). Specifically, for each competing forecast of VaR or ES in comparison with RES-CAViaR-oc, we establish a null hypothesis: RES-CAViaR-oc outperforms the other model across the set of elementary scoring functions. If this test is rejected, then the proposed RES-CAViaR-oc model provides less accurate forecasts than its competitor, when accuracy is gauged using an elementary scoring function. Notably, for each competing forecast in comparison to RES-CAViaR-oc and for each market, the p-value is so close to 1 that we opt not to report the findings. As a result, the hypothesis remains unchallenged even at a significance level of 10%.

These results formally corroborate the insights gained from the Murphy diagrams, suggesting that the proposed model outperforms others, irrespective of the scoring functions chosen. Given the extent of this dominance, as described in Ehm et al. (2016) and Nolde and Ziegel (2017), we believe these findings strongly support the choice of the AL log score and highlight the benefits of nowcasting based on overnight information.




Figure 5: Murphy diagrams for (1) VaR and (2) ES at the 1% level for the U.S. market.




Figure 6: Murphy diagrams for (1) VaR and (2) ES at the 1% level for the Germany market.




Figure 7: Murphy diagrams for (1) VaR and (2) ES at the 1% level for the Hong Kong market.




Figure 8: Murphy diagrams for (1) VaR and (2) ES at the 1% level for the Japan market.

Tables 8 and 9 present summaries of model comparisons, which are ranked by five criteria at the 1% and 2.5% levels, respectively. The top-performing model is assigned a rank of 1, and the ranking continues in ascending order. In case of a tie, the models share the same rank, and the next rank is skipped. The last row in each market’s table represents the sum of the previous four rank rows, which are ordered according to VRate, the ES method, quantile score, AL log score, and ESR backtest.

At the 1% level, Table 8 showcases the performance of five different models based on five criteria across four stock markets. Across the board, RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ appears to be the most consistently high-performing model, particularly in the U.S. and Germany markets. The RES-CAViaR-oc model exhibits solid performance across multiple markets, particularly in the U.S., Germany, and Japan markets (Table 9). In reference to the last row in Tables 8 and 9, the RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ and RES-CAViaR-oc models are the most appropriate, as indicated by the smallest rank sum at the 1% and 2.5% levels, respectively. In conclusion, the ES-CAViaR model, which incorporates realized volatility and overnight return, along with RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ and RES-CAViaR-oc, demonstrates strong performance in the model comparison process.

We observe that nowcasting enhances forecasting accuracy. Our next inquiry is to determine if and how this improvement varies across different models and markets. To investigate this, we examine the sample mean, denoted by μ , of the score difference $\delta_t = S_{t,2} - S_{t,1}$ over the out-of-sample period $t = n + 1, \dots, n + m$, where $S_{t,1}$ presents the score of a forecast from the ES-CAViaR-oc (or RES-CAViaR-oc) model at time t and $S_{t,2}$ is that of the ES-CAViaR (or RES-CAViaR) model, which does not incorporate overnight information. We choose the quantile score for VaR and AL log score for ES. To compare this average difference across countries, we compute the t -statistics $\sqrt{m}\mu/\sigma$ where σ is an autocorrelation-consistent estimator of the standard deviation as computed in Ziegel et al. (2020). The results appear in Tables 10 and 11. The larger the reported standardized score difference is, the more nowcasting enhances forecasting accuracy. We note that both models, especially RES-CAViaR, benefit from incorporating overnight information. Furthermore, the two Asian markets, Japan and Hong Kong, show more significant nowcasting improvement than do the U.S. and Germany. This implication suggests that Asian markets might be more influenced by other markets that are trading live while they are closed.

Table 8: Ranking of the five models based on five criteria at the 1% level. The highest-performing model receives the lowest rank.

Market	Rule	RES-CAViaR	ES-CAViaR	ES-CAViaR-oc	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	RES-CAViaR-oc
U.S.	VRate	3	5	4	1	1
	ES method	3	5	4	1	2
	Quantile score	4	5	3	1	2
	AL log score	3	5	4	1	2
	ESR backtest	1	1	1	1	1
	Sum ^a	14	21	16	5	8
Germany	VRate	5	4	3	1	2
	ES method	5	4	3	1	2
	Quantile score	5	4	3	1	2
	AL log score	5	4	3	1	2
	ESR backtest	4	4	1	1	1
	Sum	24	20	13	5	9
Hong Kong	VRate	4	1	5	3	1
	ES method	5	4	3	1	2
	Quantile score	5	4	3	2	1
	AL log score	5	4	3	2	1
	ESR backtest	1	1	1	1	1
	Sum	20	14	15	9	6
Japan	VRate	5	1	3	1	4
	ES method	2	1	5	4	3
	Quantile score	4	5	2	3	1
	AL log score	4	5	2	3	1
	ESR backtest	1	1	1	1	1
	Sum	16	13	13	12	10
Total ^b		74	68	57	31	33

^aSum is the summation of five criteria.

^bTotal is the total ranking of the four stock markets in each model.

* Boldface number represents the best model in each market.

Table 9: Ranking of the five models based on five criteria at the 2.5% level. The highest-performing model receives the lowest rank.

Market	Rule	RES-CAViaR	ES-CAViaR	ES-CAViaR-oc	RES-CAViaR-oc ⁻	RES-CAViaR-oc
U.S.	VRate	1	4	5	3	2
	ES method	4	5	3	1	2
	Quantile score	4	5	3	2	1
	AL log score	4	5	3	1	2
	ESR backtest	1	1	1	1	1
	Sum ^a	14	20	15	8	8
Germany	VRate	5	4	3	1	2
	ES method	5	3	4	1	2
	Quantile score	5	4	2	3	1
	AL log score	3	2	5	4	1
	ESR backtest	1	1	1	1	1
	Sum	19	14	15	10	7
Hong Kong	VRate	3	4	5	1	2
	ES method	4	2	1	5	3
	Quantile score	4	5	1	2	3
	AL log score	4	5	3	1	2
	ESR backtest	5	1	1	1	1
	Sum	20	17	11	10	11
Japan	VRate	5	4	2	3	1
	ES method	2	1	4	5	3
	Quantile score	4	5	3	1	2
	AL log score	4	5	3	1	2
	ESR backtest	1	1	3	4	4
	Sum	16	16	15	14	12
Total ^b		69	67	56	42	38

^aSum is the summation of five criteria.

^bTotal is the total ranking of four stock markets in each model.

* Boldface number represents the best model in each market.

Table 10: Improvement of nowcasting of 1% VaR and ES performance measured by the standardized score difference.

Market	VaR		ES	
	ES-CaViaR	RES-CaViaR	ES-CaViaR	RES-CaViaR
U.S.	1.34	3.87	0.75	3.19
Germany	2.85	2.55	2.50	2.30
Hong Kong	2.83	5.14	2.30	4.59
Japan	3.78	4.13	2.85	4.06

Table 11: Improvement of nowcasting of 2.5% VaR and ES performance measured by the standardized score difference.

Market	VaR		ES	
	ES-CaViaR	RES-CaViaR	ES-CaViaR	RES-CaViaR
U.S.	2.04	4.49	1.67	3.91
Germany	2.06	3.16	-0.82	2.71
Hong Kong	3.93	5.03	0.89	3.20
Japan	6.37	5.66	5.80	5.60

5 Conclusion

This study offers a combination of the semi-parametric model with realized volatility and the concept of nowcasting through overnight information for forecasting VaR and ES simultaneously. We extend a semi-parametric regression model based on asymmetric Laplace distribution and offer a family of RES-CAViaR-oc models by adding overnight return and realized measures as a nowcasting method. We further employ the adaptive MCMC method in Bayesian inference for parameter estimation and tail forecasting due to the advantage of estimating complex models. We also see optimal convergence for every parameter. In addition, we conduct comprehensive backtests to ensure forecasting capability of the proposed models in the out-of-sample period.

The empirical study finds that both the RES-CAViaR-oc and RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ models are more fa-

vorable than the original ES-CAViaR, ES-CAViaR-oc and RES-CAViaR models in terms of the quantile and AL log scores. This suggests that realized volatility and overnight information are two important factors that are useful for predicting tail risk. Murphy diagrams also confirm that CAViaR-type models with realized volatility and overnight returns are more efficient in forecasting tail risk than other models. The results help financial institutions raise capital allocation efficiency, allowing them more profit maximization opportunities.

Acknowledgement

We extend our gratitude to the editor, the associate editor, and the anonymous referees for their invaluable time and insightful comments on our paper. Cathy W.S. Chen's research is funded by the National Science and Technology Council, Taiwan (NSTC109-2118-M-035-005-MY3 and NSTC112-2118-M-035-001-MY3). Takaaki Koike is supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP21K13275).

References

- Ahoniemi, K. & Lanne, M. (2013). Overnight stock returns and realized volatility. *International Journal of Forecasting*, **29**, 592–604.
- Andersen, T.G. & Bollerslev, T. (1998). Answering the skeptics: Yes, standard volatility models do provide accurate forecasts. *International Economic Review*, **39**, 885–905.
- Andersen, T.G., Bollerslev, T., Diebold, F.X., & Labys, P. (2003). Modeling and forecasting realized volatility. *Econometrica*, **71**, 579–625.
- Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J.M., & Heath, D. (1999). Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance*, **9**, 203–228.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O.E., Hansen, P.R., Lunde, A., & Shephard, N. (2008). Designing realised kernels to measure the ex-post variation of equity prices in the presence of noise. *Econometrica*, **76**, 1481–1536.
- Basel Committee on Banking Supervision Minimum capital requirements for market risk BIS, Basel, Switzerland (2016) <http://www.bis.org/bcbs/publ/d352.pdf>

- Bayer, S., & Dimitriadis, T. (2019). *esback: Expected Shortfall Backtesting*. R package version 0.3.0. Available at <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=esback>.
- Bayer, S., & Dimitriadis, T. (2022). Regression-based expected shortfall backtesting. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, **20**, 437–471.
- Chen, C.W.S., Hsu, H.Y., & Watanabe T. (2023). Tail risk forecasting of realized volatility CAViaR models. *Finance Research Letters*, **51**, 103326.
- Chen, C.W.S., Lin, E.M.H., & Huang, T.F.J. (2022). Bayesian quantile forecasting via the realized hysteretic GARCH model. *Journal of Forecasting*, **41**, 1317–1337.
- Chen, C.W.S. & So, M.K. (2006). On a threshold heteroscedastic model. *International Journal of Forecasting*, **22**, 73–89.
- Chen, C.W.S. & Watanabe, T. (2019). Bayesian modeling and forecasting of Value-at-Risk via threshold realized volatility. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, **35**, 747–765.
- Chen, C.W.S., Watanabe, T., & Lin, E.M.H. (2023). Bayesian estimation of realized GARCH-type models with application to financial tail risk management. *Econometrics and Statistics*, **28**, 30–46.
- Christoffersen, P.F. (1998). Evaluating interval forecasts. *International Economic Review*, **39**, 841–862.
- Christensen, K. & Podolskij, M. (2007). Realized range-based estimation of integrated variance. *Journal of Econometrics*, **141**, 323–349.
- Ehm, W., Gneiting, T., Jordan, A., & Krüger, F. (2016). Of quantiles and expectiles: Consistent scoring functions, choquet representations and forecast rankings. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, **78**, 505–562.
- Embrechts, P., Kaufmann, R., & Patie, P. (2005). Strategic long-term financial risks : Single risk factors. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, **32**, 61–90.
- Engle, R.F. & Manganelli, S. (2004). CAViaR: conditional autoregressive value at risk by regression quantiles. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **22**, 367–381.
- Fissler, T. & Ziegel, J.F. (2016). Higher order elicibility and Osband’s principle. *The Annals of Statistics*, **44**, 1680–1707.

- Gerlach, R., Chen, C.W.S., & Chan, N.Y. (2011). Bayesian time-varying quantile forecasting for value-at-risk in financial markets. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **29**, 481–492.
- Gerlach, R., Wang, C. (2020). Semi-parametric dynamic asymmetric Laplace models for tail risk forecasting, incorporating realized measures. *International Journal of Forecasting*, **36**, 489–506.
- Gelman, A., Roberts, G.O., & Gilks, W.R. (1996). Efficient metropolis jumping rules. *Bayesian Statistics*, **5**, 599–608.
- Giacomini, R. and Komunjer, I. (2005). Evaluation and combination of conditional quantile forecasts. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **23**, 416–431.
- Hastings, W.K. (1970). Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications. *Biometrika*, **57**, 97–109.
- Heber, G., Lunde, A., Shephard, N., & Sheppard, K. (2009). Oxford-Man Institute’s realized library, Oxford-Man Institute, University of Oxford. Library Version: 0.3.
- Kupiec, P.H. (1995). Techniques for verifying the accuracy of risk measurement models. *Journal of Derivatives*, **3**, 73–84.
- Lazar, E. & Xue, X. (2020). Forecasting risk measures using intraday data in a generalized autoregressive score framework. *International Journal of Forecasting*, **36**, 1057–1072.
- Martens, M. & van Dijk, D. (2007). Measuring volatility with the realized range. *Journal of Econometrics*, **138**, 181–207.
- Metropolis, N., Rosenbluth, A.W., Rosenbluth, M.N., Teller, A.H., & Teller, E. (1953). Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, **21**, 1087–1092.
- Nolde, N. and Ziegel, J.F. (2017). Elicitability and backtesting: Perspectives for banking regulation. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, **11**, 1833–1874.
- Patton, A. J. (2020). Comparing possibly misspecified forecasts. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, **38**, 796–809.
- Politis, D. N. and Romano, J. P. (1994). The stationary bootstrap. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **89**(428), 1303–1313.

- Taylor, J.W. (2019). Forecasting value at risk and expected shortfall using a semiparametric approach based on the asymmetric Laplace distribution. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **37**, 121–133.
- Wang, C., Gerlach, R., Chen Q. (2023). A semi-parametric conditional autoregressive joint value-at-risk and expected shortfall modeling framework incorporating realized measures. *Quantitative Finance*, **23**, 309–333.
- Ziegel, J.F., Krüger, F., Jordan, A., & Fasciati, F. (2020). Robust Forecast Evaluation of Expected Shortfall. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, **18**, 95–120.

Supplement to “Tail risk forecasting with semi-parametric regression models by incorporating overnight information”

To monitor the convergence and stability of MCMC iterates for the stock markets of the U.S., Germany, Hong Kong, and Japan, Figures S9 to S12 present ACF plots and trace plots for each parameter based on the RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ model, while Figures S13 to S16 focus on the RES-CAViaR-oc model. We carry out $M = 20,000$ MCMC iterations, discard the first $N = 8,000$ as the burn-in period, and include only every fourth iteration in the sample period for inference.

Figures S17 through S20 display Murphy diagrams for (1) VaR and (2) ES at the 2.5% level for the stock markets of the U.S., Germany, Hong Kong, and Japan.




Figure S9: ACF and trace plots after the burn-in period for the U.S. market from RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ model.




Figure S10: ACF and trace plots after the burn-in period for the Germany market from RES-CAViaR-oc model.




Figure S11: ACF and trace plots after the burn-in period for the Hong Kong market from RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ model.




Figure S12: ACF and trace plots after the burn-in period for the Japan market from RES-CAViaR-oc⁻ model.




Figure S13: ACF and trace plots after the burn-in period for the U.S. market from RES-CAViaR-oc model.




Figure S14: ACF and trace plots after the burn-in period for the Germany market from RES-CAViaR-oc model.




Figure S15: ACF and trace plots after the burn-in period for the Hong Kong market from RES-CAViaR-oc model.




Figure S16: ACF and trace plots after the burn-in period for the Japan market from RES-CAViaR-oc model.




Figure S17: Murphy diagrams for (1) VaR and (2) ES at the 2.5% level for the U.S. market.




Figure S18: Murphy diagrams for (1) VaR and (2) ES at the 2.5% level for the Germany market.




Figure S19: Murphy diagrams for (1) VaR and (2) ES at the 2.5% level for the Hong Kong market.




Figure S20: Murphy diagrams for (1) VaR and (2) ES at the 2.5% level for the Japan market.