

# High dimensional inference for extreme value indices

Liujun Chen\*, Chen Zhou†

July 31, 2024

## Abstract

When applying multivariate extreme values statistics to analyze tail risk in compound events defined by a multivariate random vector, one often assumes that all dimensions share the same extreme value index. While such an assumption can be tested using a Wald-type test, the performance of such a test deteriorates as the dimensionality increases.

This paper introduces a novel test for testing extreme value indices in a high dimensional setting. We show the asymptotic behavior of the test statistic and conduct simulation studies to evaluate its finite sample performance. The proposed test significantly outperforms existing methods in high dimensional settings. We apply this test to examine two datasets previously assumed to have identical extreme value indices across all dimensions.

*Keywords: extreme value statistics, max-test, tail dependence, heavy tails*

## 1 Introduction

To analyze tail risks of compound events, i.e. an extreme event related to multiple dependent random variables, multivariate extreme value statistics provides a set of tools for modeling the tail region of a multivariate random vector. When the data are heavy tailed, the tail of each marginal distribution can be approximated by a

---

\*International Institute of Finance, School of Management, University of Science and Technology of China, ljchen22@ustc.edu.cn

†Econometric Institute, Erasmus University Rotterdam, zhou@ese.eur.nl

Pareto distribution. The behavior of the tail is governed by the shape parameter of the Pareto distribution, which is commonly referred to as the extreme value index.

To simplify the multivariate model, in various domain science, it is commonly assumed that all marginal distributions share the same extreme value index. This assumption is foundational to several theoretical models, for example, the multivariate regular variation model proposed and applied in Resnick (2008), Cai et al. (2011) and Mainik et al. (2015). In addition, this assumption is also adopted by spatial extremes models applied to meteorological extremes, see, e.g. Buishand et al. (2008), Fuentes et al. (2013), and Hector and Reich (2023). Such a maintained assumption, the equal extreme value indices hypothesis, needs to be tested before applying the aforementioned models.

The classical method for testing the equal extreme value indices hypothesis is via Wald-type tests, by combining the estimates of the extreme value indices for all dimensions. These tests enjoy favorable properties when the dimensionality of the data is low, see, e.g., Kinsvater et al. (2016) and Daouia et al. (2024). However, Wald-type tests exhibit unsatisfactory performance in high dimensional scenarios, see, for example, our simulation study in Section 3.

Testing the equal extreme value indices hypothesis under a high dimensional setting is therefore an important validation step before applying existing models with this maintained assumption to high dimensional data. For instance, Kiriliouk and Zhou (2022) estimated the probability of a multivariate “failure set” for the maximal wind speeds across all stations in the Netherlands; Mainik et al. (2015) constructed an investment portfolio based on multivariate regular variation model using daily returns of the S&P 500 stocks. All these applied studies assume equal extreme value indices across a large number of dimensions without a rigorous test.

In the field of high dimensional statistics, it is known that traditional statistical methods, originally designed in a low dimensional context, often prove inadequate when applied to high dimensional data. For instance, the existing literature on the multivariate mean tests provide new testing methods in high dimensional settings; see, e.g., Cai et al. (2014). We refer interested readers to Huang et al. (2022) for a recent review of the mean test problem in high dimensional settings.

The “dimensionality curse” is more of a concern in extreme value statistics than in classical statistical problems such as the mean test. Denote the dimensionality of the data as  $p$  and the sample size of the data as  $n$ . High dimensional statistics consider situations where  $p = p(n) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , sometimes allowing for  $\log(p) = O(n^c)$  for some  $0 < c < 1$ , see e.g. Fan and Lv (2008) and Wang et al. (2012). In extreme value statistics, the effective sample size, i.e. the number of observations used for estimation, is often much lower than  $n$ . For instance, in the peak-over-threshold

approach, often the top  $k$  observations are used; in the block-maxima approach, when considering disjoint blocks,  $k$  block maximas are used. Theoretically, it is often required that  $k := k(n)$  satisfies  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $k/n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . When considering the “dimensionality curse”, it is about comparing  $p$  with the effective sample size  $k$ . Such a situation urges to have suitable statistical inference methods in high dimensional extremes.

In this paper, we propose a novel testing procedure for comparing extreme value indices in a high dimensional setting. There are very few existing extreme value studies that allow for high dimensional settings. To the best of our knowledge, the only two exceptions are Engelke and Volgushev (2022) and Wan and Zhou (2023). The former investigates the concentration bounds for estimating the tail dependence coefficients while the latter studies the graphical LASSO procedure when applying to extreme value dependence. Both results allow for  $p \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Our testing problems are formulated as follows. Consider identically and independently distributed (i.i.d.) observations  $\mathbf{X}_1 = (X_1^{(1)}, \dots, X_1^{(p)})$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_n^{(1)}, \dots, X_n^{(p)})$  drawn from a multivariate distribution function  $F$  with marginal distributions  $F_1, \dots, F_p$ . For all  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , assume that the distribution  $F_j$  is heavy-tailed, i.e., there exist extreme value indices  $\gamma_j > 0$  such that,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - F_j(tx)}{1 - F_j(t)} = x^{-1/\gamma_j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p.$$

The first goal of this paper is to test the null hypothesis

$$H_0 : \gamma_j = \gamma_j^0 \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, p,$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^0 = (\gamma_1^0, \dots, \gamma_p^0)^\top$  is a pre-specified positive vector. Additionally, we can extend our test procedure to test whether the extreme value indices are identical across  $p$  random variables, that is,

$$H_0^* : \gamma_1 = \dots = \gamma_p.$$

Our novel testing procedure is inspired by Cai et al. (2014), with two major differences. Firstly, our analysis addresses a characteristic of the tail of marginal distributions, which differs largely from moderate level characteristics such as the mean. Secondly, our test procedure is based on estimating all marginal extreme value indices using the Hill estimator in Hill (1975). Unlike the sample mean, this estimator involves averaging the logarithms of order statistics, which are neither independent nor identically distributed. This complexity calls for novel proofs in establishing the asymptotic theory of the test statistic in a high dimensional setting.

To the best of our knowledge, there are no existing methods tailored to address the testing problem associated with hypotheses  $H_0$  or  $H_0^*$  within a high dimensional setting, i.e.,  $p \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The present paper reports on a first attempt with providing a few technical tools that can be used in future research.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the test statistics and establishes their theoretical properties under both the null and local alternatives. A simulation study is carried out in Section 3. A real data application is given in Section 4. All the technical proofs are gathered in the Supplementary Material.

Throughout the paper,  $a(t) \asymp b(t)$  means that both  $|a(t)/b(t)|$  and  $|b(t)/a(t)|$  are  $O(1)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . For a matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega} = (\omega_{i,j})_{p \times p}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{\Omega}\|_1 = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j=1}^p |\omega_{ij}|$ ,  $\|\mathbf{\Omega}\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq p} |\omega_{ij}|$ .

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Test statistic for $H_0$

We first focus on testing the null hypothesis  $H_0$ . For  $\gamma_j > 0$ , an efficient estimator for the extreme value index  $\gamma_j$  is the Hill estimator (Hill, 1975). For each dimension  $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ , let  $k_j$  be an intermediate sequence  $k_j = k_j(n)$  such that  $k_j \rightarrow \infty$  and  $k_j/n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The Hill estimator is then defined as

$$\widehat{\gamma}_j(k_j) := \frac{1}{k_j} \sum_{i=1}^{k_j} \log \frac{X_{n-i+1,n}^{(j)}}{X_{n-k_j,n}^{(j)}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $X_{1,n}^{(j)} \leq \dots \leq X_{n,n}^{(j)}$  are the order statistics of  $\{X_1^{(j)}, \dots, X_n^{(j)}\}$ . We introduce the test statistic

$$\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} k_j \left( \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_j(k_j)}{\gamma_j^0} - 1 \right)^2.$$

To explore the asymptotic properties of  $\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$ , we make the following assumptions.

(C1) There exists  $\rho < 0$  and an eventually positive or negative function  $A$  such that as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $A(tx)/A(t) \rightarrow t^\rho$  for all  $x > 0$  and

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sup_{x > 1} \left| \frac{U_j(tx)}{U_j(t)} x^{-\gamma_j} - 1 \right| = O\{A(t)\},$$

where  $U_j(x) = F_j^{\leftarrow}(1 - 1/x)$  with  $\leftarrow$  denoting the left-continuous inverse function.

Condition (C1) is a typical second order condition in extreme value analysis to control the biases of Hill estimators  $\hat{\gamma}_j$ , see e.g. Chapter 2 of de Haan and Ferreira (2006). In the high dimensional setting, we require that the second-order conditions hold uniformly for  $1 \leq j \leq p$ . The condition (C1) is equivalent to

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sup_{x > 1} \left| \frac{1 - F_j(tx)}{1 - F_j(t)} x^{1/\gamma_j} - 1 \right| = O \left\{ A \left( \frac{1}{1 - F(t)} \right) \right\}, \quad (2)$$

see e.g. Theorem 2.3.9 of de Haan and Ferreira (2006).

Next, we impose a generic condition on tail dependence structure of  $\mathbf{X}$ .

(C2) Define  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(p)})^\top$ , where

$$Y^{(j)} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{k_j}} \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_j} \log \frac{X^{(j)}}{U_j(n/k_j)} - 1 \right) \mathcal{I} \{ X^{(j)} > U_j(n/k_j) \}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p.$$

Let  $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})_{p \times p}$  denote the covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{Y}$ . Assume that, for sufficient large  $n$ ,  $\max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} |\sigma_{ij}| \leq c < 1$  and  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j=1}^p \sigma_{ij}^2 \leq C$ , for some  $0 < c < 1, C > 0$ .

Condition (C2) imposes restrictions on the covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{Y}$ . This is comparable with restrictions on the covariance matrix in high dimensional mean tests. For instance, for the high dimensional mean tests, similar constraints are assumed on the covariance matrix of the original random vector  $\mathbf{X}$ , see e.g. Cai et al. (2014) and Feng et al. (2022). While condition (C2) serves as a general requirement, it can be verified for various data generating processes used in our simulation study.

In addition, we provide a set of sufficient conditions of Condition (C2), which have straightforward interpretations. In particular, they are related to the so-called pairwise tail dependence matrix of  $\mathbf{X}$ ; see, e.g. Cooley and Thibaud (2019) and Kiriliouk and Zhou (2022).

Assume the existence of a function  $A_1(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , and tail dependence functions  $R_{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i < j \leq p$  such that, for some  $T_0 > 0, \nu > 0$ ,

$$\max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \sup_{x, y \in (0, T_0]^2} (xy)^{-\nu} |R_{t,i,j}(x, y) - R_{ij}(x, y)| = O \{ A_1(t) \}, \quad (3)$$

where

$$R_{t,i,j}(x, y) = t \Pr \{ 1 - F_i(X^{(i)}) \leq x/t, 1 - F_j(X^{(j)}) \leq y/t \}.$$

Note that for one given pair  $(i, j)$ , the assumption in (3) is a standard second order condition often assumed in bivariate extreme value statistics, see e.g. Drees and Huang (1998) and Beirlant et al. (2006). The quantity  $R_{ij}(1, 1)$  is called the tail dependence coefficient, which measures the tail dependence between dimensions  $i$  and  $j$ . Furthermore, we impose the following conditions on the pairwise tail dependence matrix  $(R_{ij}(1, 1))_{1 \leq i, j \leq p}$  and  $A_1(t)$ .

(C2.1) For some constant  $0 < c_0 < 1, C_0 > 0$ ,  $\max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} R_{i,j}(1, 1) \leq c_0$  and  $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{j=1}^n (R_{ij}(1, 1))^2 < C_0$ , for sufficiently large  $n$ .

(C2.2) Choose  $k_j, j = 1, \dots, p$  such that  $k_j = c_j k$ , where  $c_j > 0$  are positive constants and  $0 < \min_{1 \leq j \leq p} c_j \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} c_j < \infty$ , and  $k$  is an intermediate sequence such that as  $n \rightarrow \infty, k \rightarrow \infty, k/n \rightarrow 0$ .

(C2.3) As  $n \rightarrow \infty, p \{A^4(n/k) + A_1^2(n/k)\} = O(1)$ .

Condition (C2.1) requires that the pairwise tail dependence matrix  $(R_{ij}(1, 1))_{p \times p}$  is sparse. Condition (C2.2) is a slightly stronger version of the condition (C3) below. Condition (C2.3) imposes a technical constraint on the maximum dimensionality allowed in our theory. Nevertheless, the constraint is very mild; see Remark 1 below. The following lemma shows the sufficient conditions for the validity of condition (C2).

**Lemma 1.** *Condition (C2) holds provided that conditions (C1), (C2.1), (C2.2), and (C2.3) hold.*

Besides the conditions (C1) and (C2), we make assumptions on the choices of the intermediate sequences  $k_1, \dots, k_p$  and the dimension  $p$ .

(C3) Choose  $k_j, j = 1, \dots, p$ , such that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$c_L \leq \frac{\min_{1 \leq j \leq p} k_j}{k} \leq \frac{\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} k_j}{k} \leq c_U,$$

where  $0 < c_L < c_U$  are positive constant, where  $k$  is an intermediate sequence such that as  $n \rightarrow \infty, k \rightarrow \infty$  and  $k/n \rightarrow 0$ .

(C4) As  $n \rightarrow \infty, p \rightarrow \infty$  and

$$\log p = o(1) \min \left\{ k^{1/5}, \left( \sqrt{k} A(n/k) \right)^{-2} \right\}.$$

Condition (C3) requires choosing  $k_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , at a similar order. Condition (C4) imposes an upper bound on the dimension  $p$ . Specifically, the first requirement,  $\log p = o(k^{1/5})$ , is similar to the conditions used in high dimensional mean tests (Cai et al., 2014), wherein the condition  $\log p = o(n^{1/4})$  is imposed. The discrepancy arises from two aspects. First, we utilize only the  $k_j = O(k)$  extreme observations for dimension  $j = 1, \dots, p$ . Second, we are dealing with heavy-tailed random vectors rather than sub-Gaussian random vectors. The second requirement, which states  $\sqrt{k}A(n/k)\sqrt{\log p} = o(1)$ , aims to control the biases in the Hill estimators  $\hat{\gamma}_j(k_j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , uniformly. Note that in a univariate context, the assumption  $\sqrt{k}A(n/k) = o(1)$  is often invoked to assume away the asymptotic bias of estimators of the extreme value index.

*Remark 1.* One example for  $k_1, \dots, k_p$  satisfying conditions (C3), (C4) and (C2.3) can be given as follows. Choose  $k_1 = k_2 = \dots = k$  and  $k \asymp n^\eta$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $\eta < (-\rho)/(-\rho + 1/2)$ . Then conditions (C3) and (C4) hold provided that  $\log p = o(n^\alpha)$ , with  $0 < \alpha < \min\{\eta/5, -2\rho(1 - \eta) - \eta\}$ .

Let  $\rho^* < 0$  be a constant such that  $A_1(t) = O(1)t^{\rho^*}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Then condition (C2.3) holds with  $p = o(n^\beta)$ , where  $0 < \beta < 2(1 - \eta) \min(-2\rho, -\rho^*)$ .

We establish the asymptotic theory of the test statistic  $\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  under  $H_0$  in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *Assume that conditions (C1)-(C4) hold. Under the null hypothesis  $H_0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\Pr(\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p) - 2 \log p + \log(\log p) \leq x) \rightarrow \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp(-x/2)\right\}.$$

Theorem 1 demonstrates that the test statistic  $\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$ , upon appropriate normalization, converges to a Gumbel distribution, also recognized as the Type-I extreme value distribution. The limiting distribution in our theory is the same as that of the high dimensional mean test statistic in Cai et al. (2014). Intuitively, this follows from the fact that the test statistic  $\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  is a maximum of  $p$  estimation errors which are asymptotically normally distributed. Hence, obtaining the Gumbel distribution as a limit is in line with the classical extreme value theorem (Fisher and Tippett, 1928; Gnedenko, 1943), despite that the  $p$  estimation errors are neither exactly normally distributed, nor independent.

On the basis of Theorem 1, we can construct the the test procedure as follows. Define

$$q_\alpha = -\log(\pi) - 2 \log\left\{\log \frac{1}{1 - \alpha}\right\},$$

which is the  $(1 - \alpha)$  quantile of the limit Gumbel distribution. We reject  $H_0$  if and only if  $\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p) \geq 2 \log p - \log(\log p) + q_\alpha$ .

The proof of Theorem 1 proceeds in two stages. Firstly, we establish the asymptotic theory of the ‘pseudo’ test statistic

$$\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(k_1, \dots, k_p) := \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left\{ \sqrt{k_j} \left( \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_j(k_j)}{\gamma_j} - 1 \right) \right\}^2,$$

where  $\tilde{\gamma}_j(k_j)$  is the ‘pseudo’ Hill estimator, defined as

$$\tilde{\gamma}_j(k_j) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \log X_i^{(j)} - \log U_j(n/k_j) \right\} \mathcal{I} \left\{ X_i^{(j)} \geq U_j(n/k_j) \right\}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{I} \left\{ X_i^{(j)} \geq U_j(n/k_j) \right\}}.$$

Note that, both the numerator and denominator of  $\tilde{\gamma}_j(k_j)$  are sums of i.i.d. random variables. Secondly, we demonstrate that the difference between  $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  and  $\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  is negligible. The Bahadur-Kiefer process (Kiefer, 1967) is utilized as a pivotal tool for this claim.

## 2.2 Power under local alternative

In this subsection, we analyze the power of the test statistic  $\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$ . Denote

$$\boldsymbol{\delta} = \left( \frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_1^0} - 1, \dots, \frac{\gamma_p}{\gamma_p^0} - 1 \right)^\top.$$

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  denote the set of indices corresponding to non-zero elements in  $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ , defined as  $\mathcal{S} = \{j : \boldsymbol{\delta}_j \neq 0\}$ . Let  $m$  represent the cardinality of  $\mathcal{S}$ , given by  $m = \sum_{j=1}^p \mathcal{I}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_j \neq 0)$ . We analyze the power of the test statistic  $\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  under the local alternative hypothesis:

$$H_1 : m = p^r, \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \sqrt{k_j} |\boldsymbol{\delta}_j| \geq \sqrt{2\beta \log p},$$

where  $0 < r < 1$  and  $\beta \geq (1 - \sqrt{r})^2 + \varepsilon$  for some constants  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We demonstrate that the asymptotic power of the test is 1 under the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$  in the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** *Assume the same conditions as in Theorem 1. Under the local alternative hypothesis  $H_1$ , we have that,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p) \geq 2 \log p - \log \log p + q_\alpha) = 1.$$

## 2.3 Test of equal extreme value indices hypothesis

In this subsection, we adapt the test procedure in Section 2.1 to test the equal extreme value indices hypothesis

$$H_0^* : \gamma_1 = \cdots = \gamma_p.$$

Under the null hypothesis, we estimate the common extreme value index by

$$\bar{\gamma}(k_1, \dots, k_p) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{\gamma}_j(k_j),$$

where  $\hat{\gamma}_j(k_j)$  is the Hill estimator in (1). We then adaptively consider the test statistic

$$\mathbf{T}^*(k_1, \dots, k_p) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} k_j \left( \frac{\hat{\gamma}_j(k_j)}{\bar{\gamma}(k_1, \dots, k_p)} - 1 \right)^2.$$

The asymptotic theory of the test statistic  $T^*(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  under  $H_0^*$  is established in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.** *Assume the same conditions as in Theorem 1. Then under  $H_0^*$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\Pr(\mathbf{T}^*(k_1, \dots, k_p) - 2 \log p + \log(\log p) \leq x) \rightarrow \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp(-x/2) \right\}.$$

The asymptotic behavior of  $T^*(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  is identical to that of  $T(k_1, \dots, k_p)$ , since  $\bar{\gamma}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  converges to  $\gamma_0$  at a rate faster than  $(k \log p)^{1/2}$  as shown in the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** *Assume the same conditions as in Theorem 1. Then under  $H_0^*$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\bar{\gamma}(k_1, \dots, k_p) - \gamma_0 = o_P \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{k \log p}} \right).$$

## 2.4 Why weighted test statistics do not work

In the high dimensional mean test problem, Cai et al. (2014) suggested to explore the advantages of the dependence structures between the variables. Suppose for the

moment that the precision matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega} = (\omega_{ij})_{p \times p} =: \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}$  is known, where  $\mathbf{\Sigma}$  is defined in condition (C2). Define  $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_p)^\top$ , where

$$\zeta_j = \sqrt{k_j} \left( \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_j(k_j)}{\gamma_j^0} - 1 \right).$$

Similar to Cai et al. (2014), one may take a linear transformation of  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$  by the matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  to obtain  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbf{\Omega}\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ . The test statistic for the null hypothesis  $H_0$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{\Omega}}(k_1, \dots, k_p) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \frac{\eta_j^2}{w_{jj}},$$

where

$$(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_p)^\top = \mathbf{\Omega}\boldsymbol{\zeta}.$$

To explore the asymptotic behavior of  $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{\Omega}}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$ , we make the following assumption.

(D1) Denote  $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(\omega_{11}, \dots, \omega_{pp})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Psi} = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}\mathbf{\Omega}\mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$ . We assume that, for sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $\max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} |\Psi_{i,j}| \leq r$ ,  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{|\omega_{ji}|}{\sqrt{\omega_{jj}}} \leq C$  and  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{i=1}^p (\Psi_{i,j})^2 \leq C$ , for some  $0 < r < 1$  and  $C > 0$ .

Condition (D1) is analogous to condition (C2), but focusing on the matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  instead. We demonstrate that the test statistic  $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{\Omega}}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  exhibits the same asymptotic behavior as  $\mathbf{T}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$ .

**Theorem 4.** *Assume that conditions (C1), (C3), (C4) and (D1) hold. Under  $H_0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\Pr(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{\Omega}}(k_1, \dots, k_p) - 2 \log p + \log(\log p) \leq x) \rightarrow \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp(-x/2) \right\}.$$

One limitation of the test procedure based on  $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{\Omega}}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  is that it requires the matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega} = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}$  to be sparse. However, the assumption of sparsity in  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  lacks meaningful justification in the context of extreme value dependence. This differs from the interpretation of the sparsity of the precision matrix of  $\mathbf{X}$  in the mean test problem. Furthermore, this requirement is not met by commonly used models in multivariate extremes, see, for example, models (C) and (D) in our simulation study.

Lastly, to make the testing statistic  $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{\Omega}}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  practical, one needs to estimate the unknown matrix  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  in a uniformly consistent manner, which is a difficult task. The subsequent theorem demonstrates that if  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  can be estimated at an appropriate rate, then the asymptotic theory remains valid for  $\mathbf{T}_{\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$ .

**Theorem 5.** *Assume the same conditions as in Theorem 4. Moreover, assume that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_1 = o_P\left(\frac{1}{\log p}\right). \quad (4)$$

*Under  $H_0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\Pr(\mathbf{T}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}}(k_1, \dots, k_p) - 2 \log p + \log(\log p) \leq x) \rightarrow \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp(-x/2)\right\}.$$

Estimation of  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$  is challenging in a high dimensional setting. We provide an estimator  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^*$  of  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$  in the Supplementary Material. We demonstrate that the required speed of convergence in (4) holds for our proposed estimator under very stringent conditions. For instance, condition ?? in the Supplementary Material requires that

$$\frac{k^2}{n \log^3 p \log^4(p+k)} \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5)$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This condition requires a high level of  $k$ , which might contradict with condition (C4). Our simulation study shows that the test procedure based on  $\mathbf{T}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^*}(k_1, \dots, k_p)$  performs unsatisfactorily in finite samples. Further efforts are needed to develop an efficient estimator for  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ , which is beyond the scope of this paper.

### 3 Simulation

In this section, we present a simulation study to illustrate the finite sample performance of our testing procedure for the null hypothesis  $H_0 : \boldsymbol{\gamma} = \boldsymbol{\gamma}^0$ . Without loss of generality, we shall always take  $\gamma_j^0 = 1$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ . We choose the true extreme value indices of the data generating processes under the null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis as follows. Under the null hypothesis,  $\gamma_j = \gamma_j^0$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ . Under the alternative hypothesis,  $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p)^\top$  has  $m$  entries that differ from 1. The indices of such entries  $\mathcal{S}$  are uniformly drawn from the set  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ . In this study, we take  $m = \lfloor p^{1/4} \rfloor$  where  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  denotes the largest integer that is smaller than or equal to  $x$ . For each  $j \in \mathcal{S}$ , the deviation  $\delta_j$  is set to be either  $2\sqrt{\log p/k_j}$  or  $-2\sqrt{\log p/k_j}$  with equal probability. For  $j \in \mathcal{S}^c$ , we set  $\gamma_j = 1$ .

The samples are generated from the following models. Obviously, all these models satisfy conditions (C1) and (C2).

- (A) Let  $M^{(i)} = (M^{(i,1)}, M^{(i,2)})^\top$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \lceil p/2 \rceil$  be i.i.d. random vectors following a bivariate Cauchy distribution with scale matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.7 \\ 0.7 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ . Here,  $\lceil x \rceil$  denotes the smallest integer that is larger than or equal to  $x$ . For  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , define

$$\tilde{X}^{(j)} = \begin{cases} M^{(\lceil j/2 \rceil, 1)}, & \text{if } j \text{ is odd,} \\ M^{(\lceil j/2 \rceil, 2)}, & \text{if } j \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

Then we transform the marginal distribution of  $\tilde{X}^{(j)}$  to a Student-t distribution with degree of freedom  $1/\gamma_j$ , by

$$X^{(j)} = \text{St}_{1/\gamma_j}^{-1} \left\{ \text{St}_1 \left( \tilde{X}^{(j)} \right) \right\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p,$$

where  $\text{St}_v(\cdot)$  denotes the cumulative distribution function of a Student-t distribution with degree of freedom  $v$ .

- (B) Define  $\tilde{X}^{(j)}$  as in Model (A), and

$$X^{(j)} = \left\{ 1 - \text{St}_1 \left( \tilde{X}^{(j)} \right) \right\}^{-\gamma_j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p.$$

- (C) Let  $Z^{(i)}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p+1$ , be i.i.d. random variables following Fréchet distributions with shape parameter 1, where the distribution function is given by  $\text{Fr}_1(x) = \exp(-x^{-1})$ . Define  $\tilde{X}^{(j)} = (Z^{(j)}/2) \vee (Z^{(j+1)}/2)$ , and

$$X^{(j)} = \left( \tilde{X}^{(j)} \right)^{\gamma_j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p.$$

- (D) Define  $\tilde{X}^{(j)}$  as in Model (C) and

$$X^{(j)} = \left\{ 1 - \text{Fr}_1 \left( \tilde{X}^{(j)} \right) \right\}^{-1/\gamma_j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p.$$

We compare the performance of the test procedures  $\mathbf{T}$ ,  $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$ ,  $\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\Omega}^*}$  and the Wald-type test. The test statistic  $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$  relies on the known matrix  $\Omega = \Sigma^{-1}$ . Due to the complexity of computing  $\Sigma$  in our model, we approximate  $\Sigma$  by the pairwise tail dependence matrix  $\{R_{ij}(1, 1)\}_{i,j=1,\dots,p}$ . Note that  $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$  is used here only for comparative purposes.

The Wald-type test statistic  $\mathbf{T}_W$  for  $H_0$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{T}_W =: \mathbf{T}_W(k_1, \dots, k_p) = \boldsymbol{\zeta}^\top \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\zeta},$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$  is a  $p$ -dimensional vector with component  $\zeta_j = \sqrt{k_j} (\hat{\gamma}_j(k_j)/\gamma_j^0 - 1)$ , and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$  is a  $p \times p$  matrix with  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{ij}$  being the the sample estimation of the tail dependence coefficient  $R_{ij}(1, 1)$ , i.e.,

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{ij} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{s=1}^n \mathcal{I} \left( X_s^{(i)} > X_{n-k,n}^{(i)}, X_s^{(j)} > X_{n-k,n}^{(j)} \right),$$

see e.g. Drees and Huang (1998). We then reject the null hypothesis when  $\mathbf{T}_W > \chi_{p,1-\alpha}^2$ . The asymptotic theory of  $\mathbf{T}_W$  is only established for a fixed  $p$ . Although there are no theoretical guarantees for  $\mathbf{T}_W$  in high dimensional settings, we implement the Wald-type test as a benchmark for comparison.

Under each model, the random samples  $\mathbf{X}$  are generated with sample size  $n = 1000$  and dimension  $p = 50, 80$  and  $100$ . For  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , the number of tail observations  $k_j$  is set uniformly to  $k_j = k$ . Two different values of  $k$  are considered:  $k = 50$  and  $k = 80$ . The empirical size and the power of the tests are calculated from 1000 replications.

	$k = 50$			$k = 80$		
	$p = 50$	$p = 80$	$p = 100$	$p = 50$	$p = 80$	$p = 100$
$\mathbf{T}$	0.07	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.10
(A) $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.08
$\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\Omega}^*}$	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
$\mathbf{T}_W$	0.13	0.22	0.29	0.16	0.27	0.33
$\mathbf{T}$	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.07
(B) $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.06	0.06
$\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\Omega}^*}$	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
$\mathbf{T}_W$	0.12	0.21	0.28	0.14	0.23	0.35
$\mathbf{T}$	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.12
(C) $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$	0.81	0.94	0.97	0.76	0.91	0.96
$\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\Omega}^*}$	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
$\mathbf{T}_W$	0.16	0.21	0.29	0.18	0.28	0.37
$\mathbf{T}$	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.06
(D) $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$	0.78	0.93	0.96	0.76	0.92	0.95
$\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\Omega}^*}$	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
$\mathbf{T}_W$	0.12	0.20	0.28	0.14	0.21	0.32

Table 1: Type I error based on 1000 replications with  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

The type I error of the tests, i.e., the rejection rates under the null hypothesis, are displayed in Tables 1. We observe that, the type I error of the Wald-type test  $\mathbf{T}_W$

exceeds the significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$  substantially, indicating that the Wald-type test performs unsatisfactorily in high dimensional settings. By contrast, the type I errors of the proposed test  $\mathbf{T}$  closely approximate the significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ , consistently outperforming the Wald-type test  $\mathbf{T}_W$  across all cases. For the test  $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$ , the type I error adheres to the significance level for models (A) and (B); however, they substantially exceed the significance level for models (C) and (D). This discrepancy can be attributed to the absence of sparsity in the matrix  $\Omega$  in models (C) and (D), thereby violating the conditions specified in Theorem 4. The test statistic  $\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\Omega}^*}$  fails in all four models. The primary reason is that the estimator  $\hat{\Omega}^*$  performs poorly in our simulation setting, as evidenced by comparing the performance between  $\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\Omega}^*}$  and  $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$ .

The power of the tests, i.e., the rejection rates under the alternative hypothesis, is presented in Table 2. We omit the data generating processes if the corresponding type I error are substantially different from 0.05. For models (A) and (B), the test  $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$  demonstrates superior power compared to  $\mathbf{T}$ , underscoring the utility of exploring tail dependence structure within the random vector for enhancing test effectiveness.

	$k = 50$			$k = 100$		
	$p = 50$	$p = 80$	$p = 100$	$p = 50$	$p = 80$	$p = 100$
$\mathbf{T}$	0.90	0.93	0.97	0.83	0.91	0.95
(A) $\mathbf{T}_\Omega$	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	1.00
(B) $\mathbf{T}$	0.97	0.99	1.00	0.95	0.97	1.00
$\mathbf{T}_\Omega$	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
(C) $\mathbf{T}$	0.97	0.92	1.00	0.95	0.94	1.00
(D) $\mathbf{T}$	0.91	1.00	1.00	0.95	0.98	0.98

Table 2: Power of the tests based on 1000 replications with  $\alpha = 0.05$

Finally, we adjust our simulation setting to accommodate conditions (5) and (C4), and then investigate the performance of  $\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\Omega}^*}$  in these scenarios. Condition (5) requires a high level of  $k$  for the estimation accuracy of  $\hat{\Omega}^*$ . However, a high level of  $k$  may introduce significant biases of the Hill estimators. To mitigate this, we focus on model (B) where the marginal distributions are Pareto, thus eliminating asymptotic biases in the Hill estimators. We generate data from model (B) with  $n = 1000$  and  $p = 50, 80$  and 100. We choose a high level of  $k$ , that is  $k = 800$ . The type I error and the power of the tests are presented in Table 3. In this setting, we observe that  $\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\Omega}}$  perform satisfactorily, outperforming  $\mathbf{T}$  in terms of the power. The Wald-type test fails. A potential reason is the poor performance of estimation of pairwise tail dependence  $\underline{\Sigma}$  for high levels of  $k$ .

		$p = 50$	$p = 80$	$p = 100$
	$\mathbf{T}$	0.04	0.05	0.04
(Type I error)	$\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\Omega}}$	0.04	0.05	0.07
	$\mathbf{T}_W$	1.00	1.00	1.00
(Power)	$\mathbf{T}$	0.92	0.99	0.99
	$\mathbf{T}_{\hat{\Omega}}$	1.00	1.00	1.00

Table 3: Type-I error and power of the tests for model (B) based on 1000 replications with  $k = 800$  and  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

## 4 Application

We apply our developed method to two datasets to test whether the extreme value indices are constant over the  $p$  dimensions. These datasets have been analyzed by Kiriliouk and Zhou (2022) under the assumption of identical extreme value indices.

We also compare our method  $\mathbf{T}^*$  with the Wald-type test (Kinsvater et al., 2016),

$$\mathbf{T}_W^* =: \mathbf{T}_W^*(k_1, \dots, k_p) = (\boldsymbol{\zeta}^*)^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\zeta}^*,$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^*$  is a  $p$ -dimensional vector with component  $\zeta_j^* = \sqrt{k_j}(\hat{\gamma}_j(k_j)/\bar{\gamma}(k_1, \dots, k_p) - 1)$ , and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$  is defined as in the simulation study. We then reject the null hypothesis when  $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_W > \chi_{p-1, 1-\alpha}^2$ . We also consider a constant choice of  $k_j$  over the  $p$ -dimensions throughout the application, that is  $k_1 = \dots = k_p = k$ .

The first dataset consists of the daily maximal speeds of wind gust in the Netherlands for  $p = 35$  different stations during the winter months (October through March) from 2015 to 2019, with  $n = 911$  observations<sup>1</sup>. We test the constancy of the extreme value indices over the  $p$  stations. The obtained  $p$ -values against various levels of  $k$  are shown in left panel of Figure 1. Employing the Wald-type test, we would reject the null hypothesis at the 5% significance level. Conversely, the maximum type test  $\mathbf{T}^*$  suggests not rejecting the null hypothesis when using  $k < 55$  (with one exception at  $k = 44$ ). We plot the Hill estimates, along with a 95% confidence interval for  $k = 30$ , in the right panel of Figure 1. We observe no apparent differences across these Hill estimates.

We also analyze a dataset containing daily loss returns from 30 different portfolios spanning 2010 to 2019, resulting in 1258 observations<sup>2</sup>. The obtained  $p$ -values

<sup>1</sup>This dataset is available from the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI), <https://climexp.knmi.nl/>.

<sup>2</sup>The dataset is downloaded from the Kenneth French Data Library.




Figure 1: Left: the  $p$ -values of the tests against different levels of  $k$  for the gust data. Right: estimates  $\hat{\gamma}_j$  with upper and lower 95% confidence limits for the gust data.

against various levels of  $k$  are shown in left panel of Figure 2. The maximum test produce  $p$ -values substantially higher than the 0.05 across nearly all levels of  $k$ . Consequently, the result suggests that the null hypothesis should not be rejected at the 5% significance level. The Wald-type test will reject the null hypothesis for some  $k$  values and not reject it for other values of  $k$ . We also display the Hill estimates with a 95% confidence interval for  $k = 35$  in the right panel of Figure 2, and observe no substantial differences across these Hill estimates.




Figure 2: Left: the  $p$ -values of the tests against different levels of  $k$  for the portfolio data. Right: estimates  $\hat{\gamma}_j$  with upper and lower 95% confidence limits for the portfolio data.

## References

- Beirlant, J., Goegebeur, Y., Segers, J., and Teugels, J. L. (2006). *Statistics of extremes: theory and applications*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Buishand, T., de Haan, L., and Zhou, C. (2008). On spatial extremes: With application to a rainfall problem. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 2(2):624–642.
- Cai, J., Einmahl, J., and de Haan, L. (2011). Estimation of extreme risk regions under multivariate regular variation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(3):1803–1826.
- Cai, T. T., Liu, W., and Xia, Y. (2014). Two-sample test of high dimensional means under dependence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(2):349–372.
- Cooley, D. and Thibaud, E. (2019). Decompositions of dependence for high-dimensional extremes. *Biometrika*, 106(3):587–604.
- Daouia, A., Padoan, S. A., Stupfler, G., et al. (2024). Optimal weighted pooling for inference about the tail index and extreme quantiles. *Bernoulli*, 20(2).
- de Haan, L. and Ferreira, A. (2006). *Extreme Value Theory: an Introduction*. Springer.
- Drees, H. and Huang, X. (1998). Best attainable rates of convergence for estimators of the stable tail dependence function. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 64(1):25–46.
- Engelke, S. and Volgushev, S. (2022). Structure learning for extremal tree models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(5):2055–2087.
- Fan, J. and Lv, J. (2008). Sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional feature space. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 70(5):849–911.
- Feng, L., Jiang, T., Li, X., and Liu, B. (2022). Asymptotic independence of the sum and maximum of dependent random variables with applications to high-dimensional tests. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01638*.
- Fisher, R. and Tippett, L. (1928). Limiting forms of the frequency distribution of the largest or smallest member of a sample. In *Mathematical proceedings of the Cambridge philosophical society*, pages 180–190. Cambridge University Press.

- Fuentes, M., Henry, J., and Reich, B. (2013). Nonparametric spatial models for extremes: Application to extreme temperature data. *Extremes*, 16:75–101.
- Gnedenko, B. (1943). Sur la distribution limite du terme maximum d’une serie aleatoire. *Annals of mathematics*, 44(3):423–453.
- Hector, E. C. and Reich, B. J. (2023). Distributed inference for spatial extremes modeling in high dimensions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–12.
- Hill, B. M. (1975). A simple general approach to inference about the tail of a distribution. *The Annals of Statistics*, 3(5):1163–1174.
- Huang, Y., Li, C., Li, R., and Yang, S. (2022). An overview of tests on high-dimensional means. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 188:104813.
- Kiefer, J. (1967). On Bahadur’s representation of sample quantiles. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 38(5):1323–1342.
- Kinsvater, P., Fried, R., and Lilienthal, J. (2016). Regional extreme value index estimation and a test of tail homogeneity. *Environmetrics*, 27(2):103–115.
- Kiriliouk, A. and Zhou, C. (2022). Estimating probabilities of multivariate failure sets based on pairwise tail dependence coefficients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.12618*.
- Mainik, G., Mitov, G., and Rüschendorf, L. (2015). Portfolio optimization for heavy-tailed assets: Extreme risk index vs. markowitz. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 32:115–134.
- Resnick, S. I. (2008). *Extreme values, regular variation, and point processes*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Wan, P. and Zhou, C. (2023). Graphical lasso for extremes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15004*.
- Wang, L., Wu, Y., and Li, R. (2012). Quantile regression for analyzing heterogeneity in ultra-high dimension. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107(497):214–222.