# Flexible space-time models for extreme data

Lorenzo Dell'Oro

Dipartimento di Scienze Statistiche, Università di Padova, Padova, Italy lorenzo.delloro@phd.unipd.it

Carlo Gaetan

Dipartimento di Scienze Ambientali, Informatica e Statistica, Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia, Venezia, Italy gaetan@unive.it

December 2, 2024

#### Abstract

Extreme Value Analysis is an essential methodology in the study of rare and extreme events, which hold significant interest in various fields, particularly in the context of environmental sciences. Models that employ the exceedances of values above suitably selected high thresholds possess the advantage of capturing the "sub-asymptotic" dependence of data. This paper presents an extension of spatial random scale mixture models to the spatio-temporal domain. A comprehensive framework for characterizing the dependence structure of extreme events across both dimensions is provided. Indeed, the model is capable of distinguishing between asymptotic dependence and independence, both in space and time, through the use of parametric inference. The high complexity of the likelihood function for the proposed model necessitates a simulation approach based on neural networks for parameter estimation, which leverages summaries of the sub-asymptotic dependence present in the data. The effectiveness of the model in assessing the limiting dependence structure of spatio-temporal processes is demonstrated through both simulation studies and an application to rainfall datasets.

## 1 Introduction

The analysis of spatial extreme data has received a significant boost because many natural extreme hazards, such as heat waves, heavy rain and snowfall, high tides, and windstorms, have a spatial extent. Much of the effort has been directed toward the proposal of spatial models that are based directly on the theory of extreme values, such as max-stable processes

(de Haan, 1984; Smith, 1990; Schlather, 2002). In addition to the solid theoretical arguments, the widespread use of these models is also due to the possibility of estimating their parameters in a relatively simple way, at least for a not large number of sites (Padoan et al., 2010; Castruccio et al., 2016).

Other spatial statistical models (Davison et al., 2012; Huser and Wadsworth, 2020) have roots in hierarchical models (Casson and Coles, 1999; Cooley et al., 2007; Gaetan and Grigoletto, 2007; Sang and Gelfand, 2009) and copula models (Bortot et al., 2000; Sang and Gelfand, 2010).

In a forthcoming paper (Huser et al., 2024) the authors argue that although the maxstable processes as models are supported by a well-established asymptotic theory, in environmental studies exhibit some restrictions. Since max-stable processes are defined in terms of block maxima at each location, they are not intended to describe the stochastic variability of the extremes of the original individual events. Moreover, max-stable processes attempt to characterize the extremal dependence of the normalized maxima as the block size grows to infinity. In such a situation, two cases arise: dependence in the limit, i.e., asymptotic dependence, or exact independence, i.e., for any block size. However, what is often observed in reality is a third situation, in which the dependence vanishes in the limit (asymptotic independence), but is still present for finite block size (sub-asymptotic dependence). For this reason, several attempts are made to build sub-asymptotic models for spatial extremes based on the exceedances of high thresholds, combining tail flexibility with computational tractability, see for example Wadsworth and Tawn (2012); Bacro et al. (2016); Huser et al. (2017); Huser and Wadsworth (2019); Wadsworth and Tawn (2022).

If the interest is to model the extremes of the original events, a further complication arises when dealing with spatio-temporal data. Many spatial models are fitted by ignoring the temporal dependence of the extremes and then adjusting the uncertainty of the parameter estimates (Fawcett and Walshaw, 2006). Modeling the spatio-temporal extremal dependence adds an extra layer of difficulties (Steinkohl et al., 2013; Huser and Davison, 2014; Morris et al., 2017; Tawn et al., 2018; Bacro et al., 2020). In fact, different forms of asymptotic dependence could arise in the spatial and temporal domains. The limiting class could itself change with the temporal and/or spatial lag. In the aforementioned references, the models maintain the same limiting dependence in both space and time.

Recently, Simpson and Wadsworth (2021), Simpson et al. (2023) provide examples of formulations for threshold exceedances that allow for different forms of extremal dependence in the two domains. These papers use a conditional approach based on an asymptotic approximation of the distribution of the space-time process conditional on a single location and time. The construction is highly flexible; however, it is unclear whether a unique space-time process exists, given that the specification is conditional.

Similarly, Bortot and Gaetan (2024) employ a time series approach, wherein extreme spatial dependence is integrated into a time series model (Davis and Mikosch, 2008). One of the advantages of the proposed model is that it allows for straightforward simulation, thereby facilitating the extrapolation of extremal functionals of interest. Nevertheless, this approach is limited in that the specific type of extremal dependence in the two domains must be predetermined, and the space-time interactions lack sufficient flexibility.

In this paper, we present novel space-time models that build upon the class of models initially proposed by Huser and Wadsworth (2019) in the spatial framework. This extension allows for greater flexibility than the models previously considered in Bortot and Gaetan (2024), because the ones presented here encompass both extremal dependence classes according to the value of one parameter, which can be identified using the data.

The proposed models are employed as copula models and they are subsequently applied to a real data set. However, likelihood-based inference for the parameters of the models becomes infeasible even for moderate sample sizes.

As the simulation of data from the proposed models is a relatively straightforward and rapid process, the parameter estimation is founded on a simulation-based methodology which employs neural networks to learn the implicit mapping between the simulated data and the parameter values (Lenzi et al., 2023; Sainsbury-Dale et al., 2024).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we introduce our model. Section 3 presents and discusses parameter estimation using neural networks. The estimation procedure is evaluated in Section 4 through a small simulation study and an analysis of precipitation data from a dataset of rainfall amounts recorded at weather stations in the North Brabant province of the Netherlands. The paper concludes in Section 5.

## 2 Models for space-time extreme values

We will consider  $Y(s,t) \ s \in S$  as a spatio-temporal process on the geographic space  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and observed at times  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ , with  $\mathcal{T} = \{1, 2, ...\}$ . To model the spatio-temporal extremal dependence of Y(s,t), we follow a copula-based approach: first, we define a process, X(s,t), with a suitable extremal dependence structure, and then we marginally transform it into Y(s,t). Moreover, since the goal is to model only extreme values, we set a high threshold and consider the values that exceed this threshold, while censoring the other observations. In this section, we focus on the specification of X(s,t), leaving the details of marginal transformation to the data application (section 4).

### 2.1 Asymptotic dependence and independence classes

Let  $X_1 := X(s_1, t_1)$  and  $X_2 := X(s_2, t_2)$  be a generic pair of random variables of a spacetime process X(s, t) with marginal distribution functions  $F_{X_1}$  and  $F_{X_2}$ , respectively. The strength of dependence in the upper tail of  $(X_1, X_2)$  is commonly quantified in terms of the tail dependence coefficient,  $\chi \in [0, 1]$ , defined as the limit of

$$\chi(u) = \lim_{u \to 1^{-}} \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(F_{X_1}(X_1) > u, F_{X_2}(X_2) > u\right)}{1 - u}$$

when this limit exists (Joe, 1997), i.e.

$$\chi = \lim_{u \to 1^{-}} \chi(u) = \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > x, X_2 > x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > x\right)}.$$
(1)

The last equivalence holds if we assume the marginal distribution of X(s,t) to be stationary over S and T, with the upper endpoint at infinity.

When  $\chi > 0$ , the components of  $(X_1, X_2)$  are said to be asymptotically dependent (AD) in the upper tail, and when  $\chi = 0$ , they are said to be asymptotically independent (AI).

In the latter case it is useful to consider the rate at which the subasymptotic measure  $\chi(u)$  tends to zero as  $u \to 1^-$ . Following Ledford and Tawn (1996) we may assume that

$$\chi(u) \sim \ell\left((1-u)^{-1}\right)(1-u)^{1/\eta-1},$$
(2)

where  $\ell(\cdot)$  is a slowly varying function at infinity, that is,  $\ell(tx)/\ell(x) \to 1$  as  $\to \infty$  for all t > 0. The coefficient  $0 < \eta \leq 1$  is called the residual tail dependence coefficient. When  $\eta = 1$  and  $\lim_{u\to 1^-} \ell((1-u)^{-1}) \neq 0$  we obtain AD, but otherwise there is AI. The case  $\eta < 1$  may be further classified into (a) positive association with  $0.5 < \eta < 1$ ; (b) near-independence with  $\eta = 0.5$ ; and (c) negative association with  $0 < \eta < 0.5$ . Here, for notation simplicity, we have omitted any reference to the pair  $(X_1, X_2)$  when defining  $\chi(u), \chi, \eta$  and  $\ell$ . Finally, we say that the process X(s, t) is asymptotically independent (AI) or asymptotically dependent (AD) if  $\eta$  is either strictly less than 1 or equal to 1, respectively, for all pairs  $(X_1, X_2)$ .

### 2.2 Model definition

Huser and Wadsworth (2019) consider the following spatial model:

$$X(s) = R^{\delta} \times W(s)^{1-\delta}, \quad \delta \in [0, 1],$$

where R is a standard Pareto random variable, i.e.  $\mathbb{P}(R \leq r) = 1 - r^{-1}, r \geq 1$ , and W(s) is an AI spatial process, independent of R, whose marginal distribution is also standard Pareto. The authors show that if  $\delta > 1/2$  then X(s) is AD, while if  $\delta \leq 1/2, X(s)$  is AI.

We extend their framework to the space-time setting as:

$$X(s,t) = R(t)^{\delta} \times W(s,t)^{1-\delta}, \quad \delta \in [0,1],$$
(3)

where the processes R(t) and W(s, t) are mutually independent with standard Pareto marginal distribution. The marginal distribution of X(s, t) is given by

$$G(x) = \begin{cases} 1 - \left[ \frac{\delta}{(2\delta - 1)} \cdot x^{-1/\delta} - \frac{(1 - \delta)}{(2\delta - 1)} \cdot x^{-1/(1 - \delta)} \right] & \text{for } \delta \neq 0.5, \\ 1 - x^{-2} \left[ 2\log(x) + 1 \right] & \text{for } \delta = 0.5. \end{cases}$$
(4)

An alternative representation of model (3) can be obtained by taking the logarithm

$$\widetilde{X}(s,t) = \delta \widetilde{R}(t) + (1-\delta)\widetilde{W}(s,t),$$
(5)

where  $\widetilde{X}(s,t) := \log\{X(s,t)\} =$ ,  $\widetilde{R}(t) := \log\{R(t)\}$  and  $\widetilde{W}(s,t) := \log\{W(s,t)\}$ , In such case the marginal distributions of  $\widetilde{R}(t)$  and  $\widetilde{W}(s,t)$  are standard exponential distributions and the marginal distribution of  $\widetilde{X}(s,t)$  is known as hypo-exponential or general Erlang distribution (Johnson et al., 1994, p. 552). The formulation (5) preserves the extremal dependence structure of (3), but results in more steady realizations, making it preferable for simulation and parameter estimation.

### 2.3 Dependence properties

The dependence properties of model (3) are presented only for pair  $X_1 = X(s_1, t_1)$  and  $X_2 = X(s_2, t_2)$ , with  $s_1 \neq s_2$  and  $t_1 \neq t_2$ . The determination of the extremal dependence class for pairs that share the same space location  $(s_1 = s_2)$  or the same time  $(t_1 = t_2)$  is either straightforward or included in the proofs presented in Huser and Wadsworth (2019).

We assume that the pairs  $(R_1, R_2) := (R(t_1), R(t_2))$  and  $(W_1, W_2) := (W(s_1, t_1), W(s_2, t_2))$ of R(t) and W(s, t), respectively, satisfy the condition (2). The coefficients of the residual tail dependence for the aforementioned pairs are denoted by  $\eta_X$ ,  $\eta_R$  and  $\eta_W$ . We can show (see Appendix A) that

if  $\delta < 1/2$ , -  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AI if  $(W_1, W_2)$  are AI, with  $\eta_W < 1$ ; -  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AD if  $(W_1, W_2)$  are AD; if  $\delta > 1/2$ , -  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AI if  $(R_1, R_2)$  are AI, with  $\eta_R < 1$ ; -  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AD if  $(R_1, R_2)$  are AD; if  $\delta = 1/2$ , -  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AI, with  $\eta_X < 1$ if  $(W_1, W_2), (R_1, R_2)$  are AI, with  $\eta_W < 1, \eta_R < 1$ ; -  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AI, with  $\eta_X = 1$ if  $(W_1, W_2)$  are AI, with  $\eta_W < 1$ , and  $(R_1, R_2)$  are AD; -  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AI, with  $\eta_X = 1$ if  $(W_1, W_2)$  are AD and  $(R_1, R_2)$  are AI, with  $\eta_R < 1$ ; -  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AD if  $(W_1, W_2)$  are AD and  $(R_1, R_2)$  are AD.

### 2.4 Possible models

In principle, R(t) and W(s, t) in (3) can be both Asymptotically Independent (AI) or Asymptotically Dependent (AD) stochastic processes. This results in four distinct combinations, or potential models, which are outlined in Table 1. For a comprehensive and definitive account, we direct the reader to the Appendix A.

With the exception of combination 4, all other combinations are distinguished by two distinct extremal dependence configurations in space and time. The selection between these configurations is dependent on the value of the parameter  $\delta$ . This allows for the comparison and testing of a pair of scenarios specific to each model.

It is noteworthy that four distinct combinations could be constructed by replacing R(t) with a spatial process, R(s), as illustrated by the following equation:

$$X(s,t) = R(s)^{\delta} \times W(s,t)^{1-\delta}, \quad \delta \in [0,1],$$

This is excluded from the discussion here for purposes of simplicity.

In general, the presented framework is valid for any specification of the extremal dependence structure for the processes R(t) and W(s,t) such that they are either AI or AD.

Model	R(t)	W(s,t)	$\delta > 0.5$	$\delta = 0.5$	$\delta < 0.5$	
	AI	AD	AD in space	AD in space	AD in space	
1			AI in time	AI in time	AD in time	
			AI in space-time	AI in space-time	AD in space-time	
2	AD	AI	AD in space	AI in space	AI in space	
			AD in time AI in time		AI in time	
			AD in space-time	AI in space-time	AI in space-time	
3	AI	AI	AD in space	AI in space	AI in space	
			AI in time	AI in time	AI in time	
			AI in space-time	AI in space-time	AI in space-time	
4	AD	AD	AD in space	AD in space	AD in space	
			AD in time	AD in time	AD in time	
			AD in space-time	AD in space-time	AD in space-time	

Table 1: The four possible model combinations for R(t) and W(s,t) and the corresponding extremal dependence for pairs  $[X(s_1,t_1), X(s_2,t_2)]$  in space (i.e., for  $s_1 \neq s_2$ ,  $t_1 = t_2$ ), in time (i.e., for  $s_1 = s_2$ ,  $t_1 \neq t_2$ ) and in space-time (i.e., for  $s_1 \neq s_2$ ,  $t_1 \neq t_2$ ), for different values of the parameter  $\delta$ .

We end this section by presenting two specific examples for the processes R(t) and W(s, t), motivated by the real data application (Section 4).

We transform marginally the processes  $R^*(t)$  and  $W^*(s, t)$ , defined either as Gaussian processes, that are AI processes (Resnick, 2013, Corollary 5.8), or as Student's t processes, that are AD processes (Chan and Li, 2008). A Student's t process with  $\nu$  degrees of freedom is defined as a Gaussian process divided by the square root of a common Gamma random variable, with shape parameter  $\nu/2$  and rate parameter  $\nu/2$ . The choice is motivated by the fact that the dependence structure of these models can be specified with relative ease via a covariance function with a minimal number of parameters, and that realizations can be simulated from them. The transformations

$$R(t) = 1/[1 - F_{R^*}(R^*(t))],$$
  

$$W(s,t) = 1/[1 - F_{W^*}(W^*(s,t))],$$
(6)

where  $F_{R^*}$  and  $F_{W^*}$  are the marginal distribution functions of  $R^*(t)$  and  $W^*(s,t)$ , lead R(t) and W(s,t) to follow marginally a standard Pareto distribution, while maintaining the extremal dependence class of the untransformed processes.

## 3 Estimation method

The defined models are characterized by a parameter,  $\theta$ , which could be divided into two sets,  $(\theta_D, \theta_M)$ . We denote as  $\theta_D := (\delta, \phi, \psi) \in \Theta_D$  the set of dependence parameters of the copula model X(s,t) in (3), where  $\phi$  are the parameters of R(t) and  $\psi$  are those of W(s,t), and as  $\theta_M \in \Theta_M$  the set of marginal parameters of the process Y(s,t), which is in the observed data scale.

The complex structure of the space-time mixture underlying the copula model X(s,t)makes the computation of the likelihood for  $\theta_D$  unfeasible, even in moderate dimensions. On the other hand, it is relatively simple and fast to simulate numerous spatio-temporal datasets from the model. Therefore, parameter estimation relies on a simulation-based approach, inspired by the Neural Bayes Estimators (Sainsbury-Dale et al., 2024). The idea is to choose, or randomly generate, a dense configuration of values covering the entire parameter space, or a reasonable subset of it. For each parameter value, a space-time dataset is then simulated. The implicit mapping that connects data and parameters is estimated by a neural network. The same network can then be used to predict parameter values from datasets that are similar, in terms of parameter space, to those used for its training. The variability of this these point estimates is typically evaluated through a bootstrap procedure.

A major difference, compared to the Neural Bayes Estimators, is that we use appropriately chosen summary statistics as input of the neural networks, instead of letting the network extract them from the datasets. A similar approach has been implemented by Gerber and Nychka (2021) in the geostatistical context. Although the optimality of the choice of statistics is not guaranteed, this leads to less memory usage and faster network training, allowing the space-time dimensionality to be considerably increased. In particular, we employ the empirical pairwise coefficient  $\hat{\chi}(u)$ , which has been previously used as input of a neural network by Ahmed et al. (2022). In practice, the data are divided into N independent blocks of space- and time-dependent observations, so the coefficient is computed, for a specific lag in space and time, as an average over the blocks. For instance, in the data application (Section 4) each block corresponds to one year. We define the empirical coefficient, for the block-specific observations  $y_{1,i}$ ,  $y_{2,i}$  of the generic pair  $Y_1 = Y(s_1, t_1)$ ,  $Y_2 = Y(s_2, t_2)$ , as

$$\widehat{\chi}(u) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}(y_{1,i} > \widehat{F}_1^{-1}(u), y_{2,i} > \widehat{F}_2^{-1}(u))}{N(1-u)},\tag{7}$$

where  $\widehat{F}_1^{-1}(u)$  and  $\widehat{F}_2^{-1}(u)$  are the estimated quantiles of order u for the locations  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ . Moreover, we compute the mean of  $\widehat{\chi}(u)$  for all the pairs  $(s_1, s_2)$  and  $(t_1, t_2)$  lying at 8 different ranges of spatial distances and 8 temporal lags, resulting in a 8 × 8 grid of values in [0, 1]. This is done for  $u \in \{0.9, 0.95, 0.99\}$ , leading to three different grids. Note that (7) is the empirical version of (1) for a finite threshold, even though the first is defined for the process Y(s, t), in the scale of the observed data, while the second refers to the copula process X(s, t). Indeed, the marginal transformation linking the two processes does not affect the values of this coefficient.

In the network training, a 2-dimensional convolution is applied to the  $\hat{\chi}(u)$  grids, treating each of the three grids as a channel, as if they were the three RGB colours intensity of an image (LeCun et al., 2015). The result is then passed through few dense layers, resulting in an output vector corresponding to the values of the parameters. The loss function to be minimized by the network is the mean absolute error. The neural network is built and

#### Algorithm 1 Neural estimation method for $\theta_D$

#### Simulation

- 1. Generate many parameter values  $\theta_D^*$  uniformly on the parameter space
- 2. Simulate a dataset  $y^*$  from the model for each parameter value  $\theta^*$
- 3. Summarize each dataset  $y^*$  through some statistics  $s^*$

#### Point estimation

- 4. Learn the map  $g(\cdot)$  that connects  $\theta_D^*$  to the statistics  $s^*$  using neural networks
- 5. Use the map to predict a value of  $\theta_D$  from the statistics computed on the observed dataset,  $s^o$ . The predicted value  $\hat{\theta}_D = g(s^o)$  is the neural estimate

### Interval estimation

- 6. Simulate B datasets  $y^b$  from the model with  $\hat{\theta}_D$  and compute  $s^b$ , for  $b = 1, \ldots, B$
- 7. Evaluate  $\hat{\theta}_D^b = g(s^b)$ , for  $b = 1, \dots, B$ , and use them to compute confidence intervals

trained using the R package keras3 (Kalinowski et al., 2024).

In the data application (Section 4), 30 000 vectors are randomly generated on a reasonable subset of the parameter space  $\Theta_D$ ; for each of these parameter values, a dataset with the same spatial locations and time periods of the observed one is simulated. Each dataset is then summarized by the two groups of statistics described above.

The variability of the point estimates is evaluated through a parametric bootstrap approach: once a parameter value is estimated by the neural network, B = 400 datasets are simulated from it, and the same network is applied to each dataset, allowing to compute bootstrap confidence intervals.

The estimation method described above is summarized in Algorithm 1. Note that, once the network is trained (point 1. to 4.), it can be applied to other dataset, similar to the original one in terms of structure and parameter space, to get parameter estimates very quickly (Sainsbury-Dale et al., 2024). Moreover, the employed statistics focus on the joint tail (above 0.9 quantiles) of the data distribution, without giving the network any information on its bulk; in this way, we are operating an implicit censoring on the data, without the need to adapt the network to a censoring scheme, as in Richards et al. (2024).

Inference on the marginal parameter  $\theta_M$  of the distribution of Y(s,t) can be performed by maximizing the independence likelihood (Varin et al., 2011). To quantify the variability of the estimates, we adopt again a parametric bootstrap procedure: we simulate B = 400datasets from Y(s,t) with  $\hat{\theta}_D$  estimated by the neural network and the maximum likelihood estimate  $\hat{\theta}_M$ , and we evaluate  $\hat{\theta}_M^b$ , for  $b = 1, \ldots, B$ , on each dataset, using their distribution to compute confidence intervals.

## 4 Numerical examples

### 4.1 Rainfall data

The models described in section 2 are applied to a dataset of daily rainfall collected between 1999 and 2018 in the North Brabant province of the Netherlands. The dataset, already studied by Bortot and Gaetan (2024), was downloaded from the European Climate Assessment (ECA) and Dataset website (https://www.ecad.eu) and contains data collected over 30 stations, after discarding those with missing data. Moreover, we focus here on spring months (March, April, May) to avoid seasonality. This leads to 20 blocks (each corresponding to one year) of 92 observations for each station. The data are assumed to be time-dependent within each year and independent between years. Figure 1 shows the location of the 30 stations within the Netherlands. The relatively small size and the geographic homogeneity of the region support the hypothesis of strong spatial dependence of climate events (such as rainfall) within it, although this dependence is not necessarily persistent as the magnitude of the events becomes more extreme.

#### North Brabant stations



Figure 1: Location of the 30 stations in the North Brabant province of the Netherlands.

### 4.2 Space-time model for rainfall data

Bortot and Gaetan (2024) study the same data, although focusing on different months, and compare models with various space-time extremal dependence, concluding that the process underlying the rainfall data in the North Brabant province is AI in time and AD in space. This setting, which seems to be confirmed by exploratory analysis on our data, is possible only under model 1 and model 3 (see Table 1), so we focus on these two configurations. Note that the value of  $\delta$  has a different interpretation in the two models: model 1 is always AD in space and could be AI or AD in time and space-time, depending on  $\delta$ ; model 3 is always AI in time and space-time and could be AI or AD in space, depending on  $\delta$ .

Both in model 1 and in model 3, R(t) is asymptotically independent, so we define it as a transformation of an autoregressive Gaussian process, as in (6), with standard normal marginal distribution and AR(1) correlation structure governed by the parameter  $\phi$ . On the other hand, W(s,t) is AI in model 3 and AD in model 1. In both cases, we follow again (6) and take it as a transformed Gaussian process or as a transformed Student's t process with  $\nu = 1$  degree of freedom, respectively. In order to minimize the number of parameters, we assume the Gaussian process to have a separable space-time correlation function:  $\rho(h, u) = [1+(h/\psi_1)^2]^{-1} \times \exp\{-(\ell/\psi_2)^2\}$ , for spatial lag h and temporal lag  $\ell$ . The Student's t process is obtained by multiplying a Gaussian process with the same correlation structure by a common random variable. Therefore, for both models  $\theta_D := (\delta, \phi, \psi_1, \psi_2)$ , where again it should be noted that the interpretation of the values of  $\delta$  is specific to each model.

Model (3) is used only as a copula for the dependence structure of the data. To model extreme values, and following the Peaks Over Thresholds (POT) approach, the highest values of the process X(s,t) are transformed into Y(s,t), which marginally follows a Generalized Pareto Distribution (GPD), while the observations below the thresholds are censored. Let G be the marginal distribution of X(s,t),  $\forall s, t$ , as defined in (3). Then

$$Y(s,t) - \mu(s) = F(G^{-1}(X(s,t))), \quad \text{for} \quad Y(s,t) > \mu(s),$$
(8)

where  $F = \text{GPD}(\sigma, \xi)$ , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Y(s,t) - \mu(s) > y \mid Y(s,t) > \mu(s)\right) = \begin{cases} (1 + (\xi y)/\sigma)_+^{-1/\xi} & \text{for } \xi \neq 0, \\ \exp\left\{-y/\sigma\right\} & \text{for } \xi = 0, \end{cases}$$
(9)

and  $\mu(s)$  is a location-specific threshold, namely the 0.90 quantile for each station, estimated via quantile regression. In principle, the marginal parameters  $\theta_M := (\sigma, \xi)$  could also depend on space or time, but we assume them to be constant over all the North Brabant province, following Bortot and Gaetan (2024).

### 4.3 A small simulation study

The performance of the estimation method described in Section 3 is assessed on simulated data. The dependence structure of models 1 and 3 is defined in accordance with the specifications outlined in Section 4.2. Due to its relevance for the determination of extremal dependence, we focus here on the estimation of  $\delta$ , keeping the other parameters fixed at the values estimated by model 1 and model 3 on the real data. For each value of  $\delta$  in the interval [0.1, 0.9], 200 datasets are generated from the two models, with the same spatial locations



Figure 2: True (red points) and estimated (boxplots) values of  $\delta$  on 200 independently simulated datasets, for model 1 (left) and model 3 (right).

and time periods as the observed dataset maintained. The results are shown in Figure 2. The estimation method seems to work well enough to discriminate correctly between values smaller or greater than 0.5, confirming that inference on  $\delta$  is a viable means of determining the extremal dependence of the data, within the possibilities of each model (see Table 1).

### 4.4 Results for real data application

The training of the neural network involved, for both model 1 and model 3, 30 000 simulated datasets with the same spatial location and time periods of the observed one. For each dataset, a parameter value is uniformly generated on the following sets: [0, 1] for  $\delta$ , [0, 1] for  $\phi$ , [4, 16] for  $\psi_1$ , [0, 2.5] for  $\psi_2$ .

The estimated values for first parameter are  $\hat{\delta} = 0.582$ , with bootstrap confidence interval  $\operatorname{CI}_{0.90}(\delta) = (0.531, 0.627)$ , for model 1, and  $\hat{\delta} = 0.634$ , with bootstrap confidence interval  $\operatorname{CI}_{0.90}(\delta) = (0.604, 0.652)$ , for model 3. Therefore, both models support the conclusion that rainfall data in the North Brabant province are asymptotically dependent in space and asymptotically independent in time (see Table 1), which is consistent with the findings of Bortot and Gaetan (2024).

Figure 3 shows the empirical pairwise coefficient  $\hat{\chi}_{1,2}(u)$ , as defined in (7), for pairs  $(Y_1, Y_2)$  at different distances in space and time and for  $u \in \{0.9, 0.95, 0.99\}$ . The dots represent the empirical coefficients observed in the dataset, while the lines are smoothed estimates from the two models, evaluated by simulation. Both the models are able to capture the decay of joint tail probabilities, characterized by the persistence of positive values in space, symptom of asymptotic dependence (first column), and by values rapidly going to zero for pairs at time lag 1 or 2, that are asymptotically independent (second and third columns).



Figure 3: Values of  $\chi(u)$  for different spatial distances and temporal lags, derived from the estimated model 1 (red lines), from the model 3 (green lines) and the nonparametric ones for each pair of stations (dots).

It is not straightforward to determine which model best fits the data from Figure 3. To formally do so, we perform a likelihood-free model selection based on cross validation. Since the dataset includes 20 years of daily observation, and we assume independence and stationarity among years, we split it into a 15-years block and a 5-years block, randomly sampled. The grids of empirical  $\hat{\chi}$  described in Section 3 are computed separately on the two blocks. The ones computed on the 15-years block are used to get parameter estimates for each model from the neural network, and 500 5-years datasets are simulated to get a Monte Carlo estimate of the grids, to be compared with those computed on the 5-years left-out block, through the root mean-squared error (RMSE). This procedure is repeated iteratively 50 times. The resulting RMSE is equal to 0.066 for model 1 and to 0.064 for model 3, indicating a slight preference for the latter.

Another diagnostic measure that we adopt, similarly to Bacro et al. (2020), is

$$\chi_{s_i;h}^*(u) := \mathbb{P}\left(Y(s_j, t) > \widehat{F}_j^{-1}(u), \forall s_j \in \partial s_i \mid Y(s_i, t-h) > \widehat{F}_i^{-1}(u)\right)$$

where  $\partial s_i$  is the set of the four nearest neighbors of site  $s_i$ ,  $i = 1, \ldots, 30$  and  $\widehat{F}_i^{-1}(u)$  and  $\widehat{F}_j^{-1}(u)$  are the estimated quantiles of order u for the locations  $s_i$  and  $s_j$ . This allows to evaluate the performance of the models with respect to higher-dimensional extremal dependence in space and time, while the parameter estimation relies on pairwise information only, see (7). The empirical estimates of  $\chi^*_{s_i;h}(u)$ ,  $\widehat{p}_i(h, u)$ , for  $h \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  and  $u \in \{0.9, 0.95\}$ , are compared with parametric bootstrap estimates  $\widetilde{p}_i^{(j)}(h, u)$ , for  $j = 1, \ldots, 1000$ , through the site-specific RMSE

RMSE<sub>i</sub>(h, u) = 
$$\left\{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{1000} (\widehat{p}_i^{(j)}(h, u) - \widehat{p}_i(h, u))^2}{1000}\right\}^{1/2}$$

and the total mean  $\text{RMSE}(h, u) = \sum_{i=1}^{30} \text{RMSE}_i(h, u)/30$ , which is reported in Table 2. Model 3 seems to perform better than model 1 on the multivariate spatial dependence for neighbors at the same time periods (h = 0) and higher quantile (u = 0.95), while the performance of the two models is similar in the other settings.

Model	h	= 0	h = 1		h=2	
	u = 0.9	u = 0.95	u = 0.9	u = 0.95	u = 0.9	u = 0.95
1	0.115	0.145	0.026	0.028	0.027	0.029
3	0.108	0.113	0.029	0.031	0.028	0.030

Table 2: RMSE(h, u) between empirical estimates of  $\chi^*_{s_i;h}(u)$  and estimates from model 1 and model 3 (see Table 1).

Figure 4 shows the distribution of thresholds exceedances observed in the rainfall dataset. The thresholds  $\mu(s)$  are the quantiles of order 0.90 at each station, estimated via quantile regression. The dashed blue line is the theoretical GPD density with the parameter values set as the maximum likelihood estimate. In particular, the scale parameter is estimated as  $\hat{\sigma} = 46.33$ , with bootstrap confidence interval  $\text{CI}_{0.90}(\sigma) = (41.13, 53.07)$ , while the shape parameter is estimated as  $\hat{\xi} = 0.115$ , with  $\text{CI}_{0.90}(\xi) = (-0.008, 0.214)$ .

Finally, Figure 5 shows a simulation of four consecutive days of rainfall from model 1 with the following plausible values of the parameters:  $\delta = 0.6$ ,  $\phi = 0.3$ ,  $\psi_1 = 10$ ,  $\psi_2 = 0.3$ . The simulated data below the 0.90 marginal quantile are censored and the value of the thresholds, which are spatially varying, are colored in blue and green. The areas colored in red and yellow are those with rainfall amounts exceeding the thresholds. Black points denote

### Exceedances distribution



Figure 4: Observed right tail (threshold exceedances) of the marginal distribution. The blue line is the theoretical GPD density with parameters equal to the maximum likelihood estimates  $\hat{\sigma} = 46.33$  and  $\hat{\xi} = 0.115$ .

the stations observed in the data application. Since  $\delta > 0.5$ , the model is AD in space and AI in time: this results in a storm with extreme amounts of rainfall over the majority of the spatial domain at t = 1, but rapidly fading away in the following time periods.

## 5 Conclusions

It is widely acknowledged in the literature that sub-asymptotic models should be employed to capture the dependence between values exceeding a convenient high threshold (Huser et al., 2024). However, the use of this type of models has mainly focused on spatial dependence, while spatio-temporal dependence is less studied. Indeed, the presence of a distinct type of extremal dependence in the spatial and temporal dimensions renders specification challenging. In comparison to previous attempts that have sought to achieve the same objective (Bortot and Gaetan, 2024), this work proposes a solution that has the advantage of being able to capture the different types of dependence through a parameter whose value can be estimated from the data. The estimation of this parameter, as well as the other model parameters, is achieved through the utilization of the computational power offered by





t = 3



Figure 5: A simulation of four consecutive days of rainfall from model 1 (see Table 1) with  $\delta > 0.5$ : AD in space and AI in time. Data exceeding the 0.90 marginal quantile are highlighted in red, while the rest of the data is censored and the estimated 0.90 quantiles are displayed. Black points denote the stations observed in the data application.

modern numerical libraries for learning neural networks.

The proposed spatio-temporal model exhibits an extremal spatio-temporal dependence that is stationary within the specified period. In consideration of its potential application to the study of climate change, a logical subsequent step is to consider a non-stationary model, similarly to the approach outlined in Maume-Deschamps et al. (2024). Moreover, in order to apply the model to larger spatial domains, the introduction of spatial non-stationarity would be an useful extension.

The flexibility of the models presented in this work makes them suitable for analyzing many type of data whose extremal dependence in space and time is of interest, and notably environmental data. Nevertheless, given the novelty of the employed parameter estimation method, a greater focus is needed on competitive model selection, which would require the development of new diagnostic tools, and will be the subject of future research.

## Acknowledgments

The authors thank Thomas Opitz for helpful discussions and suggestions about the random scale construction and Raphaël Huser for hints about the estimation method.

## References

- Ahmed, M., Maume-Deschamps, V., and Ribereau, P. (2022). Recognizing a spatial extreme dependence structure: A deep learning approach. *Environmetrics*, 33:e2714.
- Bacro, J.-N., Gaetan, C., Opitz, T., and Toulemonde, G. (2020). Hierarchical space-time modeling of exceedances with an application to rainfall data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115:555–569.
- Bacro, J. N., Gaetan, C., and Toulemonde, G. (2016). A flexible dependence model for spatial extremes. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 172:36–52.
- Bortot, P., Coles, S., and Tawn, J. (2000). The multivariate Gaussian tail model: an application to oceanographic data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 49:31–049.
- Bortot, P. and Gaetan, C. (2024). A model for space-time threshold exceedances with an application to extreme rainfall. *Statistical Modelling*, 24:169–193.
- Breiman, L. (1965). On some limit theorems similar to the arc-sin law. Theory of Probability & Its Applications, 10:323–331.
- Casson, E. and Coles, S. G. (1999). Spatial regression models for extremes. *Extremes*, 1:449–468.
- Castruccio, S., Huser, R., and Genton, M. (2016). High-order composite likelihood inference for max-stable distributions and processes. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 25:1212–1229.
- Chan, Y. and Li, H. (2008). Tail dependence for multivariate t-copulas and its monotonicity. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 42:763–770.
- Cooley, D., Nychka, D., and Naveau, P. (2007). Bayesian spatial modeling of extreme precipitation return levels. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102:824–840.
- Davis, R. A. and Mikosch, T. (2008). Extreme value theory for space-time processes with heavy-tailed distributions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 118:560–584.

- Davison, A. C., Padoan, S. A., Ribatet, M., et al. (2012). Statistical modeling of spatial extremes. *Statistical Science*, 27:161–186.
- de Haan, L. (1984). A spectral representation for max-stable processes. The Annals of Probability, 12:1194–1204.
- Engelke, S., Opitz, T., and Wadsworth, J. L. (2019). Extremal dependence of random scale constructions. *Extremes*, 22:623–666.
- Fawcett, L. and Walshaw, D. (2006). Improved estimation for temporally clustered extremes. *Environmetrics*, 18:173–188.
- Gaetan, C. and Grigoletto, M. (2007). A hierarchical model for the analysis of spatial rainfall extremes. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*, 12:434–449.
- Gerber, F. and Nychka, D. (2021). Fast covariance parameter estimation of spatial Gaussian process models using neural networks. *Stat*, 10:e382.
- Huser, R. and Davison, A. C. (2014). Space-time modelling of extreme events. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology), 76:439–461.
- Huser, R., Opitz, T., and Thibaud, E. (2017). Bridging asymptotic independence and dependence in spatial extremes using Gaussian scale mixtures. *Spatial Statistics*, 21:166–186.
- Huser, R., Opitz, T., and Wadsworth, J. L. (2024). Modeling of spatial extremes in environmental data science: Time to move away from max-stable processes.
- Huser, R. and Wadsworth, J. L. (2019). Modeling spatial processes with unknown extremal dependence class. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114:434–444.
- Huser, R. and Wadsworth, J. L. (2020). Advances in statistical modeling of spatial extremes. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics, page e1537.
- Joe, H. (1997). *Multivariate Models and Multivariate Dependence Concepts*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Johnson, N. L., Kotz, S., and Balakrishnan, N. (1994). Continuous Univariate Distributions, Volume 1. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Kalinowski, T., Allaire, J., and Chollet, F. (2024). keras3: R Interface to 'Keras'. R package version 1.2.0, https://github.com/rstudio/keras3.
- Kasahara, Y. (2018). A note on the product of independent random variables with regularly varying tails. *Tsukuba Journal of Mathematics*, 42:295–308.
- Kifer, Y. and Varadhan, S. (2017). Tails of polynomials of random variables and stable limits for nonconventional sums. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 166:575–608.

- LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., and Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. Nature, 521:436–444.
- Ledford, A. W. and Tawn, J. A. (1996). Statistics for near independence in multivariate extreme values. *Biometrika*, 83:169–187.
- Lenzi, A., Bessac, J., Rudi, J., and Stein, M. L. (2023). Neural networks for parameter estimation in intractable models. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 185:107762.
- Maume-Deschamps, V., Ribereau, P., and Zeidan, M. (2024). A spatio-temporal model for temporal evolution of spatial extremal dependence. *Spatial Statistics*, 64.
- Morris, S. A., Reich, B. J., Thibaud, E., and Cooley, D. (2017). A space-time skew-t model for threshold exceedances. *Biometrics*, 73:749–758.
- Padoan, S. A., Ribatet, M., and Sisson, S. A. (2010). Likelihood-based inference for maxstable processes. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 105:263–277.
- Resnick, S. I. (2013). *Extreme Values, Regular Variation and Point Processes*. Springer, New York.
- Richards, J., Sainsbury-Dale, M., Zammit-Mangion, A., and Huser, R. (2024). Neural bayes estimators for censored inference with peaks-over-threshold models.
- Sainsbury-Dale, M., Zammit-Mangion, A., and Huser, R. (2024). Likelihood-free parameter estimation with neural bayes estimators. *The American Statistician*, 78:1–14.
- Sang, H. and Gelfand, A. (2009). Hierarchical modeling for extreme values observed over space and time. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*, 16:407–426.
- Sang, H. and Gelfand, A. E. (2010). Continuous spatial process models for spatial extreme values. Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics, 15:49–65.
- Schlather, M. (2002). Models for stationary max-stable random fields. *Extremes*, 5:33–44.
- Simpson, E. S., Opitz, T., and Wadsworth, J. L. (2023). High-dimensional modeling of spatial and spatio-temporal conditional extremes using INLA and Gaussian Markov random fields. *Extremes*, 26:669–713.
- Simpson, E. S. and Wadsworth, J. L. (2021). Conditional modelling of spatio-temporal extremes for Red Sea surface temperatures. *Spatial Statistics*, 41:100482.
- Smith, R. L. (1990). Max-stable processes and spatial extremes. Preprint. University of Surrey.
- Steinkohl, C., Davis, R., and Klüppelberg, C. (2013). Extreme value analysis of multivariate high-frequency wind speed data. *Journal of Statistical Theory and Practice*, 7:73–94.

- Tawn, J., Shooter, R., Towe, R., and Lamb, R. (2018). Modelling spatial extreme events with environmental applications. *Spatial Statistics*, 28:39–58.
- Varin, C., Reid, N., and Firth, D. (2011). An overview of composite likelihood methods. *Statistica Sinica*, 21:5–42.
- Wadsworth, J. and Tawn, J. (2022). Higher-dimensional spatial extremes via single-site conditioning. *Spatial Statistics*, 51:100677.
- Wadsworth, J. and Tawn, J. A. (2012). Dependence modelling for spatial extremes. Biometrika, 99:253–272.

## A Proof on dependence properties

This appendix contains the proofs on the dependence properties of model (3) stated in Section 2.3. Let  $(X_1, X_2)$ , with  $X_1 := X(s_1, t_1)$  and  $X_2 := X(s_2, t_2)$ ,  $s_1 \neq s_2$  and  $t_1 \neq t_2$ , be a generic pair from model (3). For notational simplicity, let  $R_i := R(t_i)$  and  $W_i := W(s_i, t_i)$ , for i = 1, 2 and define  $R_{\wedge} := \min\{R_1, R_2\}$  and  $W_{\wedge} := \min\{W_1, W_2\}$ . To study the extremal dependence of  $(X_1, X_2)$ , we have to compute their coefficient  $\chi_X$ , equivalent to the one defined in (1), and in particular its numerator, for a fixed  $u, \mathbb{P}(X_1 > F_{X_1}^{-1}(u), X_2 > F_{X_2}^{-1}(u))$ .

### **A.1** Case 1: $\delta < 1/2$

By Breiman's lemma (Breiman, 1965, see also Engelke et al., 2019, Lemma 8), as  $x \to \infty$ ,

$$\bar{F}_{X_1}(x) \sim \mathbb{E}\left(R_1^{\delta/(1-\delta)}\right) \bar{F}_{W_1^{1-\delta}}(x) = \frac{1-\delta}{1-2\delta} x^{-1/(1-\delta)},$$

and, as  $u \to 1$  (see Engelke et al., 2019, eq. 22),

$$F_{X_1}^{-1}(u) \sim \mathbb{E}\left(R_1^{\delta/(1-\delta)}\right)^{1-\delta} F_{W_1^{1-\delta}}^{-1}(u) = \left(\frac{1-\delta}{1-2\delta}\right)^{1-\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right)^{1-\delta}$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{1} > F_{X_{1}}^{-1}(u), X_{2} > F_{X_{2}}^{-1}(u)\right) \sim \mathbb{P}\left(X_{1} > \left(\frac{1-\delta}{1-2\delta}\right)^{1-\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right)^{1-\delta}, X_{2} > \left(\frac{1-\delta}{1-2\delta}\right)^{1-\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right)^{1-\delta}\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\left(R_{1}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{1} > \frac{1-\delta}{(1-2\delta)(1-u)}, R_{2}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{2} > \frac{1-\delta}{(1-2\delta)(1-u)}\right)$$

$$< \mathbb{P}\left(R_{1}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{1} > \frac{1}{1-u}, R_{2}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{2} > \frac{1}{1-u}\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\left(\min\left\{R_{1}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{1}, R_{2}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{2}\right\} > \frac{1}{1-u}\right)$$

$$< \mathbb{P}\left(R_{1}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{\Lambda} > \frac{1}{1-u}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(R_{2}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{\Lambda} > \frac{1}{1-u}\right).$$

Note that  $\bar{F}_{W_{\wedge}}(x) \sim x^{-1/\eta_{W}}$ , while  $\bar{F}_{R_{t}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}}(x) \sim x^{-(1-\delta)/\delta}$ . By Breiman's Lemma, as  $u \to 1$ ,  $\mathbb{P}\left(X_{1} > F_{X_{1}}^{-1}(u), X_{2} > F_{X_{2}}^{-1}(u)\right) \sim (1-u)^{\min\{(1-\delta)/\delta, 1/\eta_{W}\}}.$ 

If  $(W_1, W_2)$  are AI with  $\eta_W < 1$ , min  $\{(1 - \delta)/\delta, 1/\eta_W\} > 1$  and

$$\chi_X = \lim_{u \to 1} \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > F_{X_1}^{-1}(u), X_2 > F_{X_2}^{-1}(u)\right)}{1 - u} \le \lim_{u \to 1} \frac{(1 - u)^{\min\left\{\frac{1 - \delta}{\delta}, \frac{1}{\eta_W}\right\}}}{1 - u} = 0$$

i.e.  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AI, with  $\eta_X \le \max \{\delta/(1-\delta), \eta_W\} < 1$ .

On the other hand,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{1} > F_{X_{1}}^{-1}(u), X_{2} > F_{X_{2}}^{-1}(u)\right) \sim \mathbb{P}\left(X_{1} > \left(\frac{1-\delta}{1-2\delta}\right)^{1-\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right)^{1-\delta}, X_{2} > \left(\frac{1-\delta}{1-2\delta}\right)^{1-\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right)^{1-\delta}\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\left(R_{1}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{1} > \frac{1-\delta}{(1-2\delta)(1-u)}, R_{2}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{2} > \frac{1-\delta}{(1-2\delta)(1-u)}\right)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\left(\min\left\{R_{1}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{1}, R_{2}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{2}\right\} > \frac{1-\delta}{(1-2\delta)(1-u)}\right)$$

$$\geq \mathbb{P}\left(R_{\wedge}^{\delta/(1-\delta)}W_{\wedge} > \frac{1-\delta}{(1-2\delta)(1-u)}\right)$$

$$\sim c(\delta) (1-u)^{\min\{(1-\delta)/(\delta\cdot\eta_{R}), 1/\eta_{W}\}}.$$

If  $(W_1, W_2)$  are AD, then  $\eta_W = 1$ , so min  $\{(1 - \delta)/(\delta \cdot \eta_R), 1/\eta_W\} = 1$  and

$$\chi_X = \lim_{u \to 1} \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > F_{X_1}^{-1}(u), X_2 > F_{X_2}^{-1}(u)\right)}{1 - u} \ge \lim_{u \to 1} \frac{c(\delta)(1 - u)}{1 - u} > 0,$$

i.e.  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AD.

# **A.2** Case 2: $\delta > 1/2$

By Breiman's lemma,

$$\bar{F}_{X_1}(x) \sim \mathbb{E}\left(W_1^{(1-\delta)/\delta}\right) \bar{F}_{R_1^{\delta}}(x) = \frac{\delta}{2\delta - 1} x^{-1/\delta},$$
$$F_{X_1}^{-1}(u) \sim \mathbb{E}\left(W_1^{(1-\delta)/\delta}\right)^{\delta} F_{R_1^{\delta}}^{-1}(u) = \left(\frac{\delta}{2\delta - 1}\right)^{\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1 - u}\right)^{\delta}$$

Therefore, similarly to case 1,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > F_{X_1}^{-1}(u), X_2 > F_{X_2}^{-1}(u)\right) \sim \mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > \left(\frac{\delta}{2\delta - 1}\right)^{\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1 - u}\right)^{\delta}, X_2 > \left(\frac{\delta}{2\delta - 1}\right)^{\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1 - u}\right)^{\delta}\right)$$
$$< \mathbb{P}\left(R_1 W_1^{(1 - \delta)/\delta} > \frac{1}{1 - u}, R_2 W_2^{(1 - \delta)/\delta} > \frac{1}{1 - u}\right)$$
$$< \mathbb{P}\left(R_{\wedge} W_1^{(1 - \delta)/\delta} > \frac{1}{1 - u}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(R_{\wedge} W_2^{(1 - \delta)/\delta} > \frac{1}{1 - u}\right).$$

Note that  $\bar{F}_{R_{\wedge}}(x) \sim x^{-1/\eta_R}$ , while  $\bar{F}_{W^{(1-\delta)/\delta}}(x) \sim x^{-\delta/(1-\delta)}$ . By Breiman's Lemma, as  $u \to 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > F_{X_1}^{-1}(u), X_2 > F_{X_2}^{-1}(u)\right) \sim (1-u)^{\min\{(\delta/(1-\delta), 1/\eta_R\}}$$

If  $(R_1, R_2)$  are AI with  $\eta_R < 1$ , min  $\{(\delta/(1-\delta), 1/\eta_R\} > 1$  and

$$\chi_X = \lim_{u \to 1} \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > F_{X_1}^{-1}(u), X_2 > F_{X_2}^{-1}(u)\right)}{1 - u} \le \lim_{u \to 1} \frac{(1 - u)^{\min\{(\delta/(1 - \delta), 1/\eta_R\}}}{1 - u} = 0$$

i.e.  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AI, with  $\eta_X \le \max\{(1-\delta)/\delta, \eta_R\} < 1$ .

On the other hand, similarly to case 1,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > F_{X_1}^{-1}(u), X_2 > F_{X_2}^{-1}(u)\right) \sim \mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > \left(\frac{\delta}{2\delta - 1}\right)^{\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1 - u}\right)^{\delta}, X_2 > \left(\frac{\delta}{2\delta - 1}\right)^{\delta} \left(\frac{1}{1 - u}\right)^{\delta}\right)$$
$$\geq \mathbb{P}\left(R_{\wedge} W_{\wedge}^{(1 - \delta)/\delta} > \frac{\delta}{(2\delta - 1)(1 - u)}\right)$$
$$\sim c(\delta) \left(1 - u\right)^{\min\{1/\eta_R, \ \delta/[(1 - \delta) \cdot \eta_W]\}}.$$

If  $(R_1, R_2)$  are AD, then  $\eta_R = 1$ , so min  $\{1/\eta_R, \delta/[(1-\delta) \cdot \eta_W]\} = 1$  and

$$\chi_X = \lim_{u \to 1} \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > F_{X_1}^{-1}(u), X_2 > F_{X_2}^{-1}(u)\right)}{1 - u} \ge \lim_{u \to 1} \frac{c(\delta)(1 - u)}{1 - u} > 0,$$

i.e.  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AD.

### **A.3** Case 3: $\delta = 1/2$

Since  $X_1 = R_1^{1/2} W_1^{1/2}$  and  $X_2 = R_2^{1/2} W_2^{1/2}$  have the same marginal distribution, we can compute  $\chi_X$  in (1) as

$$\chi_X = \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > x, X_2 > x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > x\right)}$$

Note that, as reported in (4), the denominator is equal to

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x) = x^{-2} [2\log(x) + 1].$$

• If  $(W_1, W_2)$  are AI with  $\eta_W < 1$  and  $(R_1, R_2)$  are AD, the numerator is such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x, X_2 > x) = \mathbb{P}\left(R_1^{1/2}W_1^{1/2} > x, R_2^{1/2}W_2^{1/2} > x\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\min\{R_1W_1, R_2W_2\} > x^2\right)$$
  
$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left(R_1W_{\wedge} > x^2 \cap R_1 > R_2\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(R_2W_{\wedge} > x^2 \cap R_1 \le R_2\right)$$
  
$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left(R_1W_{\wedge} > x^2\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(R_2W_{\wedge} > x^2\right)$$
  
$$\sim 2\mathbb{E}[W_{\wedge}] F_R(x^2) = 2\mathbb{E}[W_{\wedge}] x^{-2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\chi_X = \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x, X_2 > x)}{\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x)} \le \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{2\mathbb{E}[W_{\wedge}] \ x^{-2}}{x^{-2} [2\log(x) + 1]} = 0,$$

i.e.  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AI, although  $\eta_X = 1$ .

• If  $(R_1, R_2)$  are AI with  $\eta_R < 1$  and  $(W_1, W_2)$  are AD, the numerator is such that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x, X_2 > x) = \mathbb{P}\left(R_1^{1/2}W_1^{1/2} > x, R_2^{1/2}W_2^{1/2} > x\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\min\{R_1W_1, R_2W_2\} > x^2\right)$$
  
$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left(W_1R_{\wedge} > x^2\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(W_2R_{\wedge} > x^2\right)$$
  
$$\sim 2\mathbb{E}[R_{\wedge}]F_W(x^2) = 2\mathbb{E}[R_{\wedge}]x^{-2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\chi_X = \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x, X_2 > x)}{\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x)} \le \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{2\mathbb{E}[R_{\wedge}] x^{-2}}{x^{-2} [2\log(x) + 1]} = 0,$$

i.e.  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AI, although  $\eta_X = 1$ .

• If  $(W_1, W_2)$  are AI with  $\eta_W < 1$  and  $(R_1, R_2)$  are AI with  $\eta_R < 1$ , the numerator is

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 > x, X_2 > x) \sim c \ x^{-2\min\{1/\eta_W, \ 1/\eta_R\}},$$

so  $\chi_X = 0$  and  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AI with  $\eta_X = \max\{\eta_W, \eta_R\} < 1$ .

• If both  $(W_1, W_2)$  and  $(R_1, R_2)$  are AD, the numerator is such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > x, X_2 > x\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\min\left\{R_1^{1/2}W_1^{1/2}, R_2^{1/2}W_2^{1/2}\right\} > x\right) \ge \mathbb{P}\left(R_{\wedge}^{1/2}W_{\wedge}^{1/2} > x\right).$$

We use the result (1.5) from Kasahara (2018), proved by Kifer and Varadhan (2017): if  $Z_1, Z_2$  are independent random variables such that

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_j > z) \sim c_j z^{-\alpha_j} (\log z)^{k_j}, \quad j = 1, 2,$$

and  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ , then

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_1 Z_2 > z) \sim \alpha_1 B(k_1 + 1, k_2 + 1) c_1 c_2 z^{-\alpha_1} (\log z)^{k_1 + k_2 + 1}.$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(R^{1/2}_{\wedge} > x\right) \sim L_R(x^2) \, x^{-2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}\left(W^{1/2}_{\wedge} > x\right) \sim L_W(x^2) \, x^{-2}, \text{ with}$$
$$L_R(x^2) \to \chi_R > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad L_W(x^2) \to \chi_W > 0, \text{ as } x \to \infty,$$

i.e. there exist a positive constant  $\varepsilon < \min\{\chi_R, \chi_W\}$  and  $x_\varepsilon$  such that,  $\forall x > x_\varepsilon$ ,

$$L_R(x^2) \ge \chi_R - \varepsilon$$
 and  $L_W(x^2) \ge \chi_W - \varepsilon$ 

Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left(R_{\wedge} W_{\wedge} > x\right) \ge c \, x^{-2} \log x,$$

with  $c = (\chi_R - \varepsilon)(\chi_W - \varepsilon)$ , and

$$\chi_X = \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > x, X_2 > x\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(X_1 > x\right)} \ge c > 0,$$

i.e.  $(X_1, X_2)$  are AD.