



Estimation of second order parameters using probability-weighted moments

Julien Worms, Rym Worms

► To cite this version:

Julien Worms, Rym Worms. Estimation of second order parameters using probability-weighted moments. 2009. hal-00365305v1

HAL Id: hal-00365305

<https://hal.science/hal-00365305v1>

Preprint submitted on 3 Mar 2009 (v1), last revised 9 Mar 2009 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ESTIMATION OF SECOND ORDER PARAMETERS USING PROBABILITY WEIGHTED MOMENTS

JULIEN WORMS¹ AND RYM WORMS²

Abstract. The P.O.T. method (Peaks Over Threshold) consists in using the generalized Pareto distribution (GPD) as an approximation for the distribution of excesses over a high threshold. In this work, we use a refinement of this approximation in order to estimate second order parameters of the model using the method of probability-weighted moments (PWM): in particular, this leads to the introduction of a new estimator for the second order parameter ρ , which will be compared to other recent estimators through some simulations. Asymptotic normality results are proved ; they are especially valid in the case $\rho = 0$.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 62G32; Secondary 60G70.

Submitted : February 27th, 2009.

1. INTRODUCTION

In statistical extreme value theory, one is often interested by the estimation of the far tail of a distribution. The quality of this estimation especially depends on knowledge about the so-called tail index $\gamma = \gamma(F)$ of the underlying model F , which is the shape parameter of the Generalized Pareto Distribution (GPD) with distribution function (d.f.)

$$G_{\gamma,\sigma}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 - \left(1 + \frac{\gamma x}{\sigma}\right)^{-\frac{1}{\gamma}}, & \text{for } \gamma \neq 0 \\ 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{x}{\sigma}\right), & \text{for } \gamma = 0. \end{cases}$$

The GPD appears as the limiting d.f. of excesses over a high threshold u defined for $x \geq 0$ by

$$F_u(x) := \mathbb{P}(X - u \leq x \mid X > u), \text{ where } X \text{ has d.f. } F.$$

It was established in Pickands' and Balkema and de Haan's results (see [17] and [1]) that F is in the domain of attraction of an extreme value distribution with shape parameter γ if and only if

$$\lim_{u \rightarrow s_+(F)} \sup_{0 < x < s_+(F) - u} \left| F_u(x) - G_{\gamma,\sigma(u)}(x) \right| = 0$$

Keywords and phrases: Extreme values. Domain of attraction. Excesses. Generalized Pareto Distribution. Probability-Weighted Moments. Second order parameter. Third order conditions.

¹ Université de Versailles Saint-Quentin, Laboratoire de Mathématiques de Versailles (CNRS UMR 8100), UFR de Sciences, Bât. Fermat, 45 av. des Etats-Unis, 78035 Versailles Cedex, e-mail : worms@math.uvsq.fr

² Université Paris 12 Val de Marne, Laboratoire d'Analyse et de Mathématiques Appliquées (CNRS UMR 8050), 61 av. du G^l de Gaulle, 94010 Créteil cedex, e-mail : rym.worms@univ-paris12.fr

for some positive scaling function $\sigma(u)$ depending on u , where $s_+(F) = \sup\{x : F(x) < 1\}$. Since the far tail of the unknown underlying distribution F is closely tied to the d.f. of excesses over a high threshold, accurate modelisation of the distribution of excesses is an important topic.

In what follows, we suppose that F is twice differentiable and that its inverse F^{-1} exists. Let V and A be the two functions defined by

$$V(t) = \overline{F}^{-1}(e^{-t}) \quad \text{and} \quad A(t) = \frac{V''(\ln t)}{V'(\ln t)} - \gamma.$$

We suppose the following first and second order conditions hold (RV_ρ below stands for the set of regularly varying functions with coefficient of variation ρ) :

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} A(t) = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

$$A \text{ is of constant sign at } \infty \text{ and there exists } \rho \leq 0 \text{ such that } |A| \in RV_\rho, \tag{1.2}$$

Under these assumptions, it is proved in [18] that if (u_n) is a sequence of thresholds such that $u_n \rightarrow s_+(F)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then we have the following development

$$\overline{F}_{u_n}(\sigma_n y) - \overline{G}_\gamma(y) = a_n D_{\gamma, \rho}(y) + o(a_n), \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty, \tag{1.3}$$

for all y , where $\overline{G}_\gamma(y) := 1 - G_{\gamma, 1}(y)$,

$$\sigma_n := \sigma(u_n) = V'(V^{-1}(u_n)), \quad a_n := A(e^{V^{-1}(u_n)}),$$

$$D_{\gamma, \rho}(y) := \begin{cases} C_{0, \rho}(y), & \text{if } \gamma = 0, \\ C_{\gamma, \rho}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \ln(1 + \gamma y)\right) & \text{if } \gamma \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$C_{\gamma, \rho}(y) := e^{-(1+\gamma)y} I_{\gamma, \rho}(y) \quad \text{and} \quad I_{\gamma, \rho}(y) := \int_0^y e^{\gamma u} \int_0^u e^{\rho s} ds du.$$

The idea of the present work is that, according to the result (1.3), $\overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma(u)}(x) + a_n D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma(u))$ is a better approximation of $\overline{F}_u(x)$ than $\overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma(u)}(x)$ alone : this is the starting point of our method for the estimation of the second order parameters a_n and ρ .

The estimation of ρ is of great importance (for instance for the determination of the optimal sample fraction needed in the estimation of the tail index or of high quantiles) and has been studied by several authors during the last 15 years. Many of the existing estimators of ρ are based on functionals of the moment statistics $M_n^{(j)}(k_n) = k_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} (\ln X_{n-i+1:n} - \ln X_{n-k_n:n})^j$, where $X_{i:n}$ denotes the i th ascending order statistic associated to a sample (X_1, \dots, X_n) of d.f. F , and k_n is the number of excesses retained for the estimation (where $k_n \rightarrow \infty$ but slower than n). We can cite those introduced in [14], [7], [16], [12], [10], [8] and [3].

The estimation of a_n can also be very useful. For instance, if we consider the estimation of the tail index γ by the PWM estimator, it was proved in [5] that the main component of the bias of this estimator is of order a_n . An estimation of the latter parameter could thus be used to reduce this bias. Moreover, it was proved in [21] that, in the case $\rho = 0$, the GPD $G_{\gamma+a_n, \sigma_n}$ is a better approximation of the distribution of the excesses F_u than G_{γ, σ_n} ; this is called the penultimate approximation, and the estimation of a_n is important in this framework.

In this work, we use the probability-weighted moments (PWM) techniques introduced by Hosking and Wallis in [15] to estimate the second order parameters ρ and a_n , as well as the scale parameter σ_n . The proposed estimators are based on an ‘‘external’’ estimation of γ : a similar procedure was undertaken in [8], as well as in [13] but in the reverse way (*i.e.* the estimator of γ was based on an external estimator of ρ).

Under conditions (1.1) and (1.2), it is known (see [18]) that

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\frac{V(t+x)-V(t)}{V'(t)} - \int_0^x e^{\gamma s} ds}{A(e^t)} = I_{\gamma, \rho}(x). \quad (1.4)$$

In order to achieve asymptotic normality results, we will need the following third order condition which specifies the rate of convergence in (1.4) :

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{B(e^t)} \left(\frac{\frac{V(t+x)-V(t)}{V'(t)} - \int_0^x e^{\gamma s} ds}{A(e^t)} - I_{\gamma, \rho}(x) \right) = R_{\gamma, \rho, \beta}(e^x), \quad (1.5)$$

where

$$R_{\gamma, \rho, \beta}(e^x) := \int_0^x e^{\gamma s} \int_0^s e^{\rho z} \int_0^z e^{\beta y} dy dz ds$$

and the function B tends to 0 and is of constant sign at ∞ and $|B| \in RV_\beta$, for some $\beta \neq 0$. This condition has been introduced in [8] and studied in more details in [9].

Remark 1. We can choose, in our regular case, $B(t) := \frac{tA'(t)}{A(t)} - \rho$ (F should then be three times differentiable).

In Section 2, we introduce the new model based on (1.3) and the associated probability-weighted moments and establish the asymptotic normality of their estimators. In Section 3, we present our estimators for ρ , a_n and σ_n and establish their asymptotic normality, first when γ is supposed to be known and then for the unknown γ case. It is worth mentioning that our results are valid in the whole scope $\rho \neq 0$, including the case $\rho = 0$. Section 4 contains some simulations illustrating the behaviour of our new estimator of ρ , by comparison to two other recent estimators.

2. ESTIMATORS FOR THE PROBABILITY-WEIGHTED MOMENTS

2.1. Definition of the Probability-Weighted Moments

In [15], Hosking and Wallis introduced the PWM method in order to define estimators of γ and σ_n based on a sample with d.f. supposed to be an exact GPD. These estimators were obtained through a substitution method based on the following quantities, the probability-weighted moments

$$\nu_j = \mathbb{E}(X \overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma_n}^j(X))$$

where $j \in \{0, 1\}$ and X has d.f. G_{γ, σ_n} . The results were generalized in [5] to the case where the sample was only supposed to be in the domain of attraction of a GPD.

In this work, more parameters are considered, and we note $\theta_n = (\gamma, \sigma_n, a_n, \rho)$. According to the asymptotic result (1.3), we define our extended model by the distribution function

$$B_{\theta_n}(x) = G_{\gamma, \sigma_n}(x) - a_n D_{\gamma, \rho} \left(\frac{x}{\sigma_n} \right), \text{ for all } x,$$

and consider the corresponding first three PWM as follows, where X has d.f. B_{θ_n}

$$\tilde{\nu}_j = \mathbb{E}(X \overline{B}_{\theta_n}^j(X)), \text{ for } j \in \{0, 1, 2\}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\tilde{\nu}_j = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{(1 - B_{\theta_n}(x))^{j+1}}{j+1} dx.$$

Note that for all the PWM and their estimators, the subscript n is omitted in order to simplify the notations. The following lemmas provide expressions of these PWM as functions of the parameters.

Lemma 1. For $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, $\rho \leq 0$ and $-1 < \gamma < 1$,

$$\nu_j = \frac{\sigma_n}{(j+1)(j+1-\gamma)}.$$

Lemma 2.

$$\tilde{v}_0 = \nu_0 + a_n \int_0^{+\infty} D_{\gamma, \rho} \left(\frac{x}{\sigma_n} \right) dx := v_0,$$

and, for $j \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\tilde{v}_j = \nu_j + a_n \int_0^{+\infty} \bar{G}_{\gamma, \sigma_n}^j(x) D_{\gamma, \rho} \left(\frac{x}{\sigma_n} \right) dx + o(a_n) := v_j + o(a_n),$$

Lemma 3. For $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, $\rho \leq 0$ and $-1 < \gamma < 1$, we have $\tilde{v}_j = v_j + o(a_n)$ where

$$v_j := \frac{\sigma_n}{(j+1)(j+1-\gamma)} + \frac{a_n \sigma_n}{u_j} \quad \text{and} \quad u_j := (j+1)(j+1-\gamma)(j+1-\gamma-\rho).$$

In the sequel, we will use the quantities v_0, v_1, v_2 (rather than $\tilde{v}_0, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2$) in order to estimate ρ, a_n, σ_n , by a classical substitution method, relying on Lemma 3 above which gives the relations between the two triplets of parameters. The proof of lemmas 2 and 3 are given in Appendices 5.1 and 5.2 respectively. That of Lemma 1 can be found in [5] for $j = 0, 1$: the case $j = 2$ is similar.

2.2. Asymptotic behaviour of the estimators of the Probability-Weighted Moments

Let (X_1, \dots, X_n) be n i.i.d. random variables with distribution function F , and $X_{1:n}, \dots, X_{n:n}$ denote the corresponding order statistics. For a given threshold u_n , we introduce $Y_{1,N_n}, \dots, Y_{N_n,N_n}$ the N_n excesses over u_n , in ascending order, *i.e.*

$$Y_{j,N_n} = X_{n-N_n+j:n} - u_n \quad \text{where} \quad N_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{X_i > u_n}.$$

According to (1.3), the distribution B_{θ_n} is then likely to be a good approximation for the distribution F_{u_n} of $Y_{1,N_n}, \dots, Y_{N_n,N_n}$. This method is of the Peak-Over-Threshold (POT) type.

Remark 2. Note that N_n is binomial distributed with mean $n(1 - F(u_n))$ which will be chosen as going to infinity : consequently, $N_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $N_n/(n(1 - F(u_n))) \rightarrow 1$ in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 1. For $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, define the estimator of v_j by

$$\hat{v}_j := \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{(1 - \mathbb{A}_{n,u_n}(x))^{j+1}}{j+1} dx,$$

where,

$$\mathbb{A}_{n,u_n}(x) = \frac{1}{N_n} \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} \mathbb{I}_{\{Y_i \leq x\}}.$$

It follows that, conditionnally on $N_n = k_n$,

$$\hat{v}_j := \frac{1}{j+1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_n} \left(\left(1 - \frac{i-1}{k_n} \right)^{j+1} - \left(1 - \frac{i}{k_n} \right)^{j+1} \right) Y_{i,k_n}.$$

Let $b_n = B(e^{V^{-1}(u_n)})$.

Theorem 1. *Under assumptions (1.1), (1.2) and (1.5), with $-1 < \gamma < 1/2$, and if*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n(1-F(u_n))} a_n b_n = \lambda_1, \quad \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n(1-F(u_n))} a_n^2 = \lambda_2, \quad \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n(1-F(u_n))} a_n = \infty, \quad (2.3)$$

we have, for almost all sequences $k_n \rightarrow +\infty$, conditionally on $N_n = k_n$,

$$\sqrt{k_n} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\hat{v}_0}{\sigma_n} - \frac{v_0}{\sigma_n} \\ \frac{\hat{v}_1}{\sigma_n} - \frac{v_1}{\sigma_n} \\ \frac{\hat{v}_2}{\sigma_n} - \frac{v_2}{\sigma_n} \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\lambda_1 C, \Gamma),$$

where

$$\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} ((1-2\gamma)(1-\gamma)^2)^{-1} & ((1-\gamma)(1-\gamma)(2-2\gamma))^{-1} & ((3-\gamma)(1-\gamma)(4-2\gamma))^{-1} \\ ((2-\gamma)(1-\gamma)(2-2\gamma))^{-1} & ((3-2\gamma)(2-\gamma)^2)^{-1} & ((2-\gamma)(3-\gamma)(4-2\gamma))^{-1} \\ ((3-\gamma)(1-\gamma)(3-2\gamma))^{-1} & ((2-\gamma)(3-\gamma)(4-2\gamma))^{-1} & ((5-2\gamma)(3-\gamma)^2)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} c_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}^0 \\ c_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}^1 \\ c_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{where } c_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}^j = ((j+1)(j+1-\gamma-\rho)(j+1-\gamma-\rho-\beta))^{-1}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1

Note that

$$\mathbb{A}_{n,u_n} \stackrel{d}{=} F_{u_n} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_n}} \alpha_{k_n} \circ F_{u_n},$$

where α_{k_n} is the uniform empirical process based on k_n i.i.d. random variables uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. We have, for $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\hat{v}_j}{\sigma_n} - \frac{v_j}{\sigma_n} &= \frac{\hat{v}_j}{\sigma_n} - \frac{\nu_j}{\sigma_n} - \frac{a_n}{u_j} \\ &= T_{j,k_n}^1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_n}} T_{j,k_n}^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_n}} T_{j,k_n}^3 - \frac{a_n}{u_j}, \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{j,k_n}^1 &= \frac{1}{j+1} \int_0^{+\infty} [(\overline{F}_{u_n}(\sigma_n y))^{j+1} - (\overline{G}_\gamma(y))^{j+1}] dy \\ T_{j,k_n}^2 &= \int_0^{+\infty} [\alpha_{k_n} \circ F_{u_n}(\sigma_n y)] (F_{u_n}(\sigma_n y))^j dy \\ T_{j,k_n}^3 &= \begin{cases} \int_0^{+\infty} \int_0^1 (1-t) \frac{1}{\sqrt{k_n}} [\alpha_{k_n} \circ F_{u_n}]^2(\sigma_n y) \cdot j \left[\overline{F}_{u_n}(\sigma_n y) - \frac{t}{\sqrt{k_n}} \alpha_{k_n} \circ F_{u_n}(\sigma_n y) \right]^{j-1} dt dy & \text{if } j \in \{1, 2\} \\ 0 & \text{if } j = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This is indeed straightforward for $j = 0$, whereas for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ we use a Taylor expansion, as in the proof of Theorem 1 in [4] (page 850), with power functions instead of their general weight functions, which have to be null at zero ¹.

The following lemma concerns the terms T_{j,k_n}^1 and will be proved in Appendix 5.3.

Lemma 4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$T_{j,k_n}^1 - \frac{a_n}{u_j} = c_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}^j a_n b_n + o(a_n b_n).$$

T_{0,k_n}^2 has been studied in [5]. The other terms T_{j,k_n}^2 and T_{j,k_n}^3 , for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, have been treated in [4] (see pages 851-853), in a more general framework. The results are stated in the following lemma and the proofs remains valid under our slightly different assumptions (where the role of the condition $\sqrt{k_n} a_n \rightarrow \lambda$ is replaced here by $\sqrt{k_n} a_n^2 \rightarrow \lambda$).

Lemma 5. *Under the assumptions² of Theorem 1, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$T_{j,k_n}^3 \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad T_{j,k_n}^2 \xrightarrow{d} \int_0^1 t^{-\gamma-1} t^j \mathbb{B}(t) dt,$$

where \mathbb{B} is a Brownian Bridge on $[0, 1]$. Moreover, the vector of coordinates $\int_0^1 t^{-\gamma-1} t^j \mathbb{B}(t) dt$ with $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ has a multivariate normal distribution with mean 0 and covariance matrix Γ defined by (2.4).

We deduce from these lemmas that

$$\sqrt{k_n} \left(\frac{\hat{v}_j}{\sigma_n} - \frac{v_j}{\sigma_n} \right) \xrightarrow{d} c_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}^j \sqrt{k_n} a_n b_n + Z_n^j + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1),$$

where, using [19] (p. 18), the vector of coordinates Z_n^j (for $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$) converges in distribution to $N(0, \Gamma)$. The statement of Theorem 1 follows by the assumption $\sqrt{k_n} a_n b_n \rightarrow \lambda_1$.

Remark 3. The third order condition is not used to prove Lemma 5. This implies that the consistence of the vector of coordinates \hat{v}_j/σ_n could be obtained under weaker assumptions.

3. ASYMPTOTIC NORMALITY OF THE PWM ESTIMATORS OF THE PARAMETERS

3.1. Asymptotic normality for known γ

From now on we will use the following notations :

$$V_n = (v_0, v_1, v_2)^t, \quad \hat{V}_n = (\hat{v}_0, \hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^t$$

The expressions of the probability weighted-moments as functions of the parameters ρ, a_n, σ_n are stated in Lemma 3. Elementary calculus leads to the following equations (recall that $u_j = (j+1)(j+1-\gamma)(j+1-\gamma-\rho)$ for $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$) :

$$\rho = \phi_{1,\gamma}(V_n), \quad a_n = \phi_{2,\gamma}(V_n), \quad \sigma_n = \phi_{3,\gamma}(V_n)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{1,\gamma} : (x, y, z) &\mapsto \frac{(1-\gamma)^2 x - 4(2-\gamma)^2 y + 3(3-\gamma)^2 z}{(1-\gamma)x - 4(2-\gamma)y + 3(3-\gamma)z} \\ \phi_{2,\gamma} : (x, y, z) &\mapsto \frac{2((1-\gamma)x - 2(2-\gamma)y)((1-\gamma)x - 3(3-\gamma)z)(2(2-\gamma)y - 3(3-\gamma)z)}{((1-\gamma)x - 4(2-\gamma)y + 3(3-\gamma)z)(6(3-\gamma)z[(1-\gamma)x - 2(2-\gamma)y] - 2(2-\gamma)y[(1-\gamma)x - 3(3-\gamma)z])} \\ \phi_{3,\gamma} : (x, y, z) &\mapsto \frac{6(3-\gamma)z[(1-\gamma)x - 2(2-\gamma)y] - 2(2-\gamma)y[(1-\gamma)x - 3(3-\gamma)z]}{(1-\gamma)x - 4(2-\gamma)y + 3(3-\gamma)z} \end{aligned}$$

¹this fact excludes the case $j=0$, where the weight function is identically equal to 1, from their study.

²The restriction $\gamma < \frac{1}{2}$ comes from the study of T_{0,k_n}^2

First assuming that the first order parameter γ is known (the case γ unknown will be handled in the next section), we can then define our estimators of the parameters ρ , a_n , and σ_n as :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\rho}_\gamma \\ \hat{a}_{n,\gamma} \\ \hat{\sigma}_{n,\gamma} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{1,\gamma}(\hat{V}_n) \\ \phi_{2,\gamma}(\hat{V}_n) \\ \phi_{3,\gamma}(\hat{V}_n) \end{pmatrix} \text{ hence } \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\rho}_\gamma \\ \hat{a}_{n,\gamma} \\ \hat{\sigma}_{n,\gamma}/\sigma_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{1,\gamma}(\hat{V}_n/\sigma_n) \\ \phi_{2,\gamma}(\hat{V}_n/\sigma_n) \\ \phi_{3,\gamma}(\hat{V}_n/\sigma_n) \end{pmatrix}$$

Proving the asymptotic normality of these estimators by the delta-method (see [20] for instance) would be straightforward if the functions $\phi_{j,\gamma}$ were well-defined at the limit

$$v := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V_n}{\sigma_n} = ((1-\gamma)^{-1}, (2(2-\gamma))^{-1}, (3(3-\gamma))^{-1})^t.$$

However this is not the case here, and the proof needs more care than it seems at first glance.

Proposition 1. *Suppose that $-1 < \gamma < 1/2$ is known, and assumptions (1.1), (1.2), (1.5), (2.1)-(2.3) hold. Then for almost all sequences $k_n \rightarrow +\infty$, we have, conditionally on $N_n = k_n$:*

$$\sqrt{k_n} a_n (\hat{\rho}_\gamma - \rho) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\lambda_1 \nabla_1^t H_\gamma C, \nabla_1^t H_\gamma \Gamma H_\gamma \nabla_1) \quad (3.1)$$

$$\sqrt{k_n} a_n \left(\frac{\hat{a}_{n,\gamma}}{a_n} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\lambda_1 \nabla_2^t H_\gamma C, \nabla_2^t H_\gamma \Gamma H_\gamma \nabla_2) \quad (3.2)$$

$$\sqrt{k_n} \left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_{n,\gamma}}{\sigma_n} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\lambda_1 \nabla_3^t H_\gamma C, \nabla_3^t H_\gamma \Gamma H_\gamma \nabla_3) \quad (3.3)$$

where $\nabla_1, \nabla_2, \nabla_3$ and H_γ are defined in the proof of this proposition, and λ_1 in (2.1).

Proof of Proposition 1

Let H_γ denote the matrix

$$H_\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 1-\gamma & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2(2-\gamma) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3(3-\gamma) \end{pmatrix}$$

and let us define the following functions

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{1,\gamma} : (x, y, z) &\mapsto \frac{(1-\gamma)x - 2(2-\gamma)y + (3-\gamma)z}{x - 2y + z} \\ \psi_2 : (x, y, z) &\mapsto \frac{2(x-y)(x-z)(y-z)}{(x-2y+z)(2z(x-y) - y(x-z))} \\ \psi_3 : (x, y, z) &\mapsto \frac{2z(x-y) - y(x-z)}{x - 2y + z} \end{aligned}$$

If U denotes the subset of \mathbb{R}^3 on which ψ_2 is defined, we have $\phi_{1,\gamma}(u) = \psi_{1,\gamma}(H_\gamma u)$, $\phi_{2,\gamma}(u) = \psi_2(H_\gamma u)$ and $\phi_{3,\gamma}(u) = \psi_3(H_\gamma u)$, for every $u = (x, y, z)^t \in U$.

The proof of the proposition relies on the introduction of the following modified probability-weighted moments

$$\hat{V}'_n = \frac{\hat{V}_n/\sigma_n - v}{a_n} \quad \text{and} \quad V' = \frac{V_n/\sigma_n - v}{a_n} = \left(\frac{1}{u_0}, \frac{1}{u_1}, \frac{1}{u_2} \right)^t$$

(where the u_j are defined in the statement of Lemma 3). If we note $e = (1, 1, 1)^t$, then for every $u \in U$ we have

$$\psi_{1,\gamma}(u + e) = \psi_{1,\gamma}(u), \quad \psi_2(u + e) = \tilde{\psi}_2(u)(1 + d_2(u)/d_1(u))^{-1}, \quad \psi_3(u + e) = \psi_3(u) + 1, \quad (3.4)$$

where $d_1(x, y, z) = x - 2y + z$, $d_2(x, y, z) = 2z(x - y) - y(x - z)$ and

$$\tilde{\psi}_2 : (x, y, z) \mapsto \frac{2(x - y)(x - z)(y - z)}{(x - 2y + z)^2}.$$

Defining

$$V'' := H_\gamma V' = ((1 - \gamma - \rho)^{-1}, (2 - \gamma - \rho)^{-1}, (3 - \gamma - \rho)^{-1})^t \quad (3.5)$$

and noticing that $H_\gamma v = e, d_2(V'') = 0$ and $d_1(V'') \neq 0$, it is now easy to prove the following identities using (3.4) :

$$\sqrt{k_n} a_n (\hat{\rho}_\gamma - \rho) = \sqrt{k_n} a_n (\phi_{1,\gamma}(\hat{V}_n/\sigma_n) - \phi_{1,\gamma}(V_n/\sigma_n)) = \sqrt{k_n} a_n (\psi_{1,\gamma}(H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n) - \psi_{1,\gamma}(V'')) \quad (3.6)$$

$$\sqrt{k_n} a_n (\hat{a}_{n,\gamma}/a_n - 1) = \sqrt{k_n} a_n (\phi_{2,\gamma}(\hat{V}_n/\sigma_n) - \phi_{2,\gamma}(V_n/\sigma_n)) = \sqrt{k_n} a_n (\tilde{\psi}_2(H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n) - \tilde{\psi}_2(V'')) + R_n \quad (3.7)$$

$$\sqrt{k_n} a_n (\hat{\sigma}_{n,\gamma}/\sigma_n - 1) = \sqrt{k_n} a_n (\phi_{3,\gamma}(\hat{V}_n/\sigma_n) - \phi_{3,\gamma}(V_n/\sigma_n)) = \sqrt{k_n} a_n (\psi_3(H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n) - \psi_3(V'')) \quad (3.8)$$

where

$$R_n = \sqrt{k_n} a_n \tilde{\psi}_2(H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n) \left((1 + a_n d_2(H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n)/d_1(H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n))^{-1} - 1 \right). \quad (3.9)$$

The point is that the functions $\psi_{1,\gamma}$, ψ_2 and ψ_3 and their derivatives are well-defined at V'' defined by (3.5) (it was not the case for the functions $\phi_{j,\gamma}$ at the limit $v = \lim V_n/\sigma_n$). The delta-method can thus be called upon to obtain relations (3.1) and (3.3) by combining equations (3.6) and (3.8), Theorem 1 and the following equality

$$\sqrt{k_n} a_n (H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n - V'') = H_\gamma (\sqrt{k_n} (\hat{V}_n/\sigma_n - V_n/\sigma_n))$$

where

$$\nabla_1 = \nabla \psi_{1,\gamma}(V'') = \begin{pmatrix} p(1 - \gamma - \rho)/2 \\ -p(2 - \gamma - \rho) \\ p(3 - \gamma - \rho)/2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_3 = \nabla \psi_3(V'') = \begin{pmatrix} (1 - \gamma - \rho)^2/2 \\ -(2 - \gamma - \rho)^2 \\ (3 - \gamma - \rho)^2/2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

$p = (1 - \gamma - \rho)(2 - \gamma - \rho)(3 - \gamma - \rho)$.

We can deal with the case of $\hat{a}_{n,\gamma}$ similarly : with ∇_2 defined by

$$\nabla_2 = \nabla \tilde{\psi}_2(V'') = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(1 - \gamma - \rho)(-5 + 7\gamma + 7\rho - 2(\gamma + \rho)^2) \\ 2(2 - \gamma - \rho)(4 - 4\gamma - 4\rho + (\gamma + \rho)^2) \\ \frac{1}{2}(3 - \gamma - \rho)(-9 + 9\gamma + 9\rho - 2(\gamma + \rho)^2) \end{pmatrix}$$

relation (3.2) will follow from (3.7) by the delta-method, provided R_n (defined in (3.9)) converges to 0 in probability. This is the case, since $H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n \rightarrow V''$ in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and consequently

$$R_n = -\sqrt{k_n} a_n^2 \tilde{\psi}_2(H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n) \frac{d_2(H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n)}{d_1(H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n)} \left(1 + a_n d_2(H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n)/d_1(H_\gamma \hat{V}'_n) \right)^{-1}$$

vanishes to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (in probability) because $\tilde{\psi}_2(V'') = 1$, $d_1(V'') = 2/p$, $d_2(V'') = 0$, and using assumption (2.2) (which ensures that $\sqrt{k_n} a_n^2$ has a real limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$).

3.2. Asymptotic normality for unknown γ

We can now define our final estimators of the parameters ρ , a_n , and σ_n , by plugging-in an external estimator of γ . We set

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\rho} \\ \hat{a}_n \\ \hat{\sigma}_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{1,\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{V}_n) \\ \phi_{2,\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{V}_n) \\ \phi_{3,\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{V}_n) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\hat{\gamma} = \hat{\gamma}_n$ defines a sequence of estimators of γ based on the \tilde{N}_n upper excesses associated to a threshold \tilde{u}_n such that $\tilde{u}_n \rightarrow s_+(F)$. Let $\tilde{a}_n = A(e^{V^{-1}(\tilde{u}_n)})$ and $\tilde{\lambda}, c, d$ denote some real constants.

Theorem 2. *Let the assumptions of Proposition 1 hold and suppose that for some real constant $\tilde{\lambda}$,*

$$\sqrt{n(1 - F(\tilde{u}_n))} \tilde{a}_n \rightarrow \tilde{\lambda} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.10)$$

If conditionally on $\tilde{N}_n = \tilde{k}_n$

$$\tilde{k}_n^{1/2}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\lambda}c, d) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.11)$$

then for almost all sequences $k_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\tilde{k}_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $\tilde{k}_n = o(k_n)$, we have, conditionally on $N_n = k_n$ and $\tilde{N}_n = \tilde{k}_n$,

$$\tilde{k}_n^{1/2} a_n(\hat{\rho} - \rho) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\lambda}cc_1, dc_1^2) \quad (3.12)$$

$$\tilde{k}_n^{1/2} a_n \left(\frac{\hat{a}_n}{a_n} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\lambda}cc_2, dc_2^2) \quad (3.13)$$

$$\tilde{k}_n^{1/2} \left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_n}{\sigma_n} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\tilde{\lambda}cc_3, dc_3^2) \quad (3.14)$$

for some constants c_1, c_2, c_3 depending on γ and ρ (which expressions are given in the proof of the theorem).

Remark 4. The condition $\tilde{k}_n = o(k_n)$ means that we take less excesses for the estimation of the first-order parameter γ than for the estimation of the second-order parameter ρ .

Remark 5. It is worth mentioning that the asymptotic normality results for our estimator of ρ are valid in the whole scope $\rho \leq 0$ (whereas many other works in the litterature, concerning the estimation of ρ , exclude the case $\rho = 0$).

Remark 6. In our simulations, we use the PWM estimator defined by Hosking & Wallis in [15] (and studied in [5]).

Proof of Theorem 2

We keep using the notations previously introduced in the proof of Proposition 1 and add the following one :

$$\hat{V}_{n,\gamma}'' = H_\gamma \frac{\hat{V}_n/\sigma_n - v_\gamma}{a_n} = H_\gamma \hat{V}_{n,\gamma}' \quad \text{where } v_\gamma = ((1 - \gamma)^{-1}, (2(2 - \gamma))^{-1}, (3(3 - \gamma))^{-1}).$$

We first study the deviation

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}_\gamma &= \psi_{1,\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{V}_{n,\hat{\gamma}}'') - \psi_{1,\gamma}(\hat{V}_{n,\gamma}'') \\ &= \psi_{1,\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{V}_{n,\hat{\gamma}}'') - \psi_{1,\gamma}(\hat{V}_{n,\hat{\gamma}}'') + \psi_{1,\gamma}(\hat{V}_{n,\hat{\gamma}}'') - \psi_{1,\gamma}(\hat{V}_{n,\gamma}'') \\ &= \gamma - \hat{\gamma} + \psi_{1,\gamma}(\hat{V}_{n,\hat{\gamma}}'') - \psi_{1,\gamma}(\hat{V}_{n,\gamma}'') \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where we used the fact that $\psi_{1,\gamma}(x, y, z) = -\gamma + (x - 4y + 3z)/(x - 2y + z)$. We thus have to concentrate on the second term. If we note J the 3×3 diagonal matrix with diagonal coefficients 1, 2 and 3, after some calculations we obtain the following essential development

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_{n,\hat{\gamma}}'' - \hat{V}_{n,\gamma}'' &= (H_{\hat{\gamma}} - H_\gamma) \hat{V}_{n,\gamma}' + H_{\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{V}_{n,\hat{\gamma}}' - \hat{V}_{n,\gamma}') \\ &= (\gamma - \hat{\gamma})J \hat{V}_{n,\gamma}' + H_{\hat{\gamma}}(v_\gamma - v_{\hat{\gamma}})/a_n \\ &= (\gamma - \hat{\gamma})J \hat{V}_{n,\gamma}' + \frac{\gamma - \hat{\gamma}}{a_n} J v_\gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Note that, according to assumptions (3.11), (3.10) and the second order condition (1.2) (which ensures that $\frac{\hat{a}_n}{a_n} \rightarrow 0$), we have

$$\frac{\gamma - \hat{\gamma}}{a_n} = \frac{\tilde{a}_n \tilde{k}_n^{1/2} (\gamma - \hat{\gamma})}{a_n \tilde{k}_n^{1/2} \tilde{a}_n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ in probability.} \quad (3.17)$$

Since $\hat{V}'_{n,\gamma} \rightarrow V'$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{V}''_{n,\gamma} = H_\gamma \hat{V}'_{n,\gamma}$ converges in probability to V'' (defined in (3.5)), and consequently relations (3.16) and (3.17) imply that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{V}''_{n,\hat{\gamma}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{V}''_{n,\gamma} = V'' \quad \text{in probability.} \quad (3.18)$$

Therefore, in view of (3.15) and (3.18), there exists some sequence W_n converging to V'' such that

$$\hat{\rho} - \rho = (\gamma - \hat{\gamma}) + a_n^{-1}(\gamma - \hat{\gamma}) < \nabla \psi_{1,\gamma}(W_n), J v_\gamma + a_n J \hat{V}'_{n,\gamma} > + (\hat{\rho}_\gamma - \rho).$$

The central term of the right-hand side of the relation above makes it impossible to have $\sqrt{k_n} a_n$ as the speed for the asymptotic normality of $\hat{\rho} - \rho$ (because $\sqrt{k_n} a_n (\gamma - \hat{\gamma}) \rightarrow 0$ in probability but $\sqrt{k_n} (\gamma - \hat{\gamma})$ does not) : we have instead

$$\tilde{k}_n^{1/2} a_n (\hat{\rho} - \rho) = \tilde{k}_n^{1/2} a_n (\gamma - \hat{\gamma}) + \tilde{k}_n^{1/2} (\gamma - \hat{\gamma}) < \nabla \psi_{1,\gamma}(W_n), J v_\gamma + a_n J \hat{V}'_{n,\gamma} > + (\tilde{k}_n/k_n)^{1/2} \sqrt{k_n} a_n (\hat{\rho}_\gamma - \rho).$$

which, according to assumptions (3.10), (3.11) and Proposition 1, converges in distribution to the gaussian distribution with mean $\tilde{\lambda} c c_1$ and variance $d c_1^2$ where

$$c_1 = \nabla_1^t J v_\gamma = \frac{p}{2} ((1 - \gamma - \rho)(1 - \gamma)^{-1} - 2(2 - \gamma - \rho)(2 - \gamma)^{-1} + (3 - \gamma - \rho)(3 - \gamma)^{-1})$$

The proof of the asymptotic normality for the other two parameters relies on the same tools as above. As before, there exists some sequence (W_n) converging to V'' in probability such that

$$\frac{\hat{\sigma}_n}{\sigma_n} - \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{n,\gamma}}{\sigma_n} = a_n (\psi_3(\hat{V}''_{n,\hat{\gamma}}) - \psi_3(\hat{V}''_{n,\gamma})) = (\gamma - \hat{\gamma}) < \nabla \psi_3(W_n), J v_\gamma + a_n J \hat{V}'_{n,\gamma} >.$$

The limiting distribution of $\tilde{k}_n^{1/2} (\hat{\sigma}_n/\sigma_n - 1)$ is therefore $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{\lambda} c c_3, d c_3^2)$ where $c_3 = \nabla_3^t J v_\gamma$.

The case of \hat{a}_n needs a few more details. Setting $h(u) = \tilde{\psi}_2(u)(1 + d_2(u)/d_1(u))^{-1}(d_2(u)/d_1(u))$ and $e = (1, 1, 1)^t$, using (3.4) we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{a}_n - \hat{a}_{n,\gamma} &= \phi_{2,\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{V}_n/\sigma_n - v_{\hat{\gamma}} + v_{\hat{\gamma}}) - \phi_{2,\gamma}(\hat{V}_n/\sigma_n - v_\gamma + v_\gamma) \\ &= \psi_2(a_n \hat{V}''_{n,\hat{\gamma}} + e) - \psi_2(a_n \hat{V}''_{n,\gamma} + e) \\ &= \tilde{\psi}_2(a_n \hat{V}''_{n,\hat{\gamma}}) - \tilde{\psi}_2(a_n \hat{V}''_{n,\gamma}) + h(a_n \hat{V}''_{n,\hat{\gamma}}) - h(a_n \hat{V}''_{n,\gamma}) \\ &= a_n (\tilde{\psi}_2(\hat{V}''_{n,\hat{\gamma}}) - \tilde{\psi}_2(\hat{V}''_{n,\gamma})) + a_n^2 o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \end{aligned}$$

where we used (3.18) and the following facts : $d_2(V'') = 0$, $\tilde{\psi}_2(V'') = 1$, $\tilde{\psi}_2(\alpha u) = \alpha \tilde{\psi}_2(u)$ and $(d_2/d_1)(\alpha u) = \alpha(d_2/d_1)(u)$ for any $\alpha \neq 0$ and $u \in U$. We thus have, for some sequence (W_n) converging to V'' in probability,

$$\tilde{k}_n^{1/2} a_n (\hat{a}_n/a_n - 1) = \tilde{k}_n^{1/2} (\gamma - \hat{\gamma}) < \nabla \tilde{\psi}_2(W_n), J v_\gamma + a_n J \hat{V}'_{n,\gamma} > + o_{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{k}_n^{1/2} a_n^2) + (\tilde{k}_n/k_n)^{1/2} \sqrt{k_n} a_n (\hat{a}_{n,\gamma}/a_n - 1)$$

which converges in distribution to $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{\lambda} c c_2, d c_2^2)$ where $c_2 = \nabla_2^t J v_\gamma$.

4. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we shall present some of the graphics obtained, concerning bias and mean square errors of our estimator of ρ , compared with two others, for three different classes of underlying distributions.

For the three estimators considered, the P.O.T. method we use consists in choosing a threshold $u_n = \overline{F}^{-1}(p_n)$ for the estimation of ρ , as well as a second threshold $\tilde{u}_n = \overline{F}^{-1}(\tilde{p}_n)$ for the preliminary estimation of γ (only when necessary, since one of the estimators studied below does not rely on such an initial estimation of γ) : the corresponding number of excesses k_n and \tilde{k}_n are then random, and p_n and \tilde{p}_n are the sample fractions retained for the estimation of ρ and γ respectively. In our simulations, we take, for $\hat{\gamma} = \hat{\gamma}(\tilde{k}_n)$, the Hosking and Wallis' estimator defined in [15] and studied in [5] and [4].

We compare our estimator, denoted in this section by $\hat{\rho}_{PWM}$, with two others: the one presented in Fraga Alves, de Haan, Gomes [10], which will be noted $\hat{\rho}_{FGH}$ and the one presented in Fraga Alves, de Haan, Lin [8], which will be noted $\hat{\rho}_{FHL}$. They are defined as

$$\hat{\rho}_{FGH} = - \left| \frac{3(T_n^{(\tau)}(k_n) - 1)}{T_n^{(\tau)}(k_n) - 3} \right|$$

(see [10] for the definition of $T_n^{(\tau)}(k_n)$), with the tuning parameter τ equal to 0 whenever one expects ρ to be in the range $[-1, 0)$ and equal to 1 otherwise (as suggested for instance in [2]), and

$$\hat{\rho}_{FHL} = 3 - 8\hat{\gamma}_-(\tilde{k}_n) + \frac{6 - 12\hat{\gamma}_-(\tilde{k}_n)}{T_n(k_n) - 3}$$

(see [8] for the definition of $T_n(k_n)$ and $\hat{\gamma}_-(\tilde{k}_n)$, the latter being an estimator of $\gamma_- = \min(0, \gamma)$). Recall that k_n is the number of excesses used for the estimation of ρ and the calculation of $\hat{T}_n(k_n)$, and \tilde{k}_n the one used for the estimation of γ_- . The estimator $\hat{\rho}_{FGH}$ does not depend on an initial estimation of the parameter γ , though.

The models presented in our simulations are the following :

- The *Burr*(λ, τ) distribution (for which $\gamma = 1/\lambda\tau$ and $\rho = -1/\lambda$) defined by

$$\overline{F}(x) = (1 + x^\tau)^{-\lambda}, \quad x > 0.$$

- The *Arcsin* model (for which $\gamma = \rho = -2$) defined by

$$F(x) = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \sqrt{x}, \quad x \in (0, 1).$$

- The model, for which $\gamma > 0$ and $\rho = 0$ (see [11]), defined by

$$U(t) = \overline{F}^{-1}(1/t) = t^\gamma(1 + \ln t), \quad t > 0. \quad (4.1)$$

We consider 1000 samples of size n (where $n = 5000$ for the Arcsin model and 1000 otherwise) and present the bias and the mean square error of the three estimators of ρ considered above, as function of the fraction p_n of the excesses used for the estimation of ρ . The sample fraction \tilde{p}_n used for the calculation of $\hat{\rho}_{PWM}$ was chosen as 0.1 for the Burr model (as in [5]), 0.05 for the third model, and in the sense of the minimization of the simulated MSE for the Arcsin model. For the preliminary estimation of γ_- in the calculation of $\hat{\rho}_{FHL}$, the sample fraction \tilde{p}_n was set to the same values as for our estimator $\hat{\rho}_{PWM}$, except for the Arcsin model where the criterion of minimization of the asymptotic MSE was chosen (as suggested in [8], see figure 4 and details therein). Note however that the simulations undertaken showed that $\hat{\rho}_{FHL}$ was much less sensitive to the choice of \tilde{k}_n than $\hat{\rho}_{PWM}$.





(a) Bias for Burr(2, $\frac{1}{2}$) model, $n = 1000$, $\tilde{p}_n = 0.1$ (b) RMSE for Burr(2, $\frac{1}{2}$) model, $n = 1000$, $\tilde{p}_n = 0.1$ (c) Bias for Burr(8, $\frac{1}{8}$) model, $n = 1000$, $\tilde{p}_n = 0.1$ (d) RMSE for Burr(8, $\frac{1}{8}$) model, $n = 1000$, $\tilde{p}_n = 0.1$

FIGURE 1. Bias and RMSE of three estimators of ρ for some models (Burr(2, 1/2) and Burr(8, 1/8), for which respectively $\gamma = 1$, $\rho = -1/2$, and $\gamma = 1$, $\rho = -1/8$) as a function of the sample fraction p_n . The dashed line is for $\hat{\rho}_{FHL}$, the thin solid line for $\hat{\rho}_{FGH}$, and the thick solid line for $\hat{\rho}_{PWM}$.

Our simulations (see Figures 1 and 2) confirm that in order to estimate the correct value of ρ , one should generally use even more than half of the order statistics of the sample. This is coherent with our theoretical result which says that the number of order statistics to use for the estimation of ρ must be of larger order than the order needed for the estimation of the tail index γ .

The flat pattern of the RMSE of $\hat{\rho}_{PWM}$ for a reasonably wide region of sample fractions makes the exact determination of the optimal choice of the sample fraction p_n to use less relevant, from a practical point of view.

The figures presented here show that our estimator can be competitive especially when $|\rho|$ is small. The same conclusions have been drawn for sample sizes $n = 500$ and $n = 5000$ for the distributions presented here. Note that none of the 4 particular distributions presented here satisfy the restriction $-1 < \gamma < 1/2$ imposed in our theorems.





(a) Bias for the Arcsin model, $n = 5000$ (b) RMSE for Arcsin model, $n = 5000$ (c) Bias for model (4.1), $\gamma = 1$, $n = 1000$, $\tilde{p}_n = 0.05$ (d) RMSE for model (4.1), $\gamma = 1$, $n = 1000$, $\tilde{p}_n = 0.05$

FIGURE 2. Bias and RMSE of three estimators of ρ for some models (Arcsin model, for which $\gamma = \rho = -2$, and model (4.1) with $\gamma = 1$, for which $\rho = 0$) as a function of the sample fraction p_n . The dashed line is for $\hat{\rho}_{FHL}$, the thin solid line for $\hat{\rho}_{FGH}$, and the thick solid line for $\hat{\rho}_{PWM}$.

5. APPENDIX

5.1. Proof of lemma 2

Since $B_{\theta_n}(x) = G_{\gamma, \sigma_n}(x) - a_n D_{\gamma, \rho}(\frac{x}{\sigma_n})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{v}_0 &= \int_0^{+\infty} \overline{B}_{\theta_n}(x) dx \\ &= \int_0^{+\infty} (\overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma_n}(x) + a_n D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma_n)) dx \\ &= \nu_0 + a_n \int_0^{+\infty} D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma_n) dx. \end{aligned}$$

and, for $j \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{v}_j &= \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{\overline{B}_{\theta_n}^{j+1}(x)}{j+1} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{j+1} \int_0^{+\infty} (\overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma_n}(x) + a_n D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma_n))^{j+1} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{j+1} \int_0^{+\infty} \overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma_n}^{j+1}(x) dx + a_n \int_0^{s_+(B_{\theta_n})} \overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma_n}^j(x) D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma_n) dx + o(a_n) \\
&= \nu_j + a_n \int_0^{+\infty} \overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma_n}^j(x) D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma_n) dx + o(a_n).
\end{aligned}$$

5.2. Proof of lemma 3

In the case $\gamma \neq 0$, $\rho < 0$ and $\gamma + \rho \neq 0$,

$$D_{\gamma, \rho}(x) = \frac{(1 + \gamma x)^{-1/\gamma}}{\gamma \rho (\gamma + \rho)} \left(\gamma (1 + \gamma x)^{\rho/\gamma} + \rho (1 + \gamma x)^{-1} - \gamma - \rho \right).$$

At the end of this subsection, we will give expressions of $D_{\gamma, \rho}$ in the other cases.

We give the sketch of the proof in case $\gamma > 0$, $\rho < 0$ and $\gamma + \rho \neq 0$. All the other cases are similar. We will see below how the restriction $\gamma < 1$ appears (similarly, in case $\gamma < 0$, appears the restriction $\gamma > -1$). In the sequel, we will note σ instead of $\sigma(u_n)$.

(i) *Calculation of v_0* : We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{+\infty} D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma) dx &= \frac{1}{\rho(\gamma + \rho)} \int_0^{+\infty} (1 + \gamma x/\sigma)^{(\rho-1)/\gamma} dx + \frac{1}{\gamma(\gamma + \rho)} \int_0^{+\infty} (1 + \gamma x/\sigma)^{-1/\gamma-1} dx \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\gamma \rho} \int_0^{+\infty} (1 + \gamma x/\sigma)^{-1/\gamma} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\rho(\gamma + \rho)} I_1 + \frac{1}{\gamma(\gamma + \rho)} I_2 - \frac{1}{\gamma \rho} I_3,
\end{aligned}$$

where, for $\gamma < 1$,

$$I_1 = \frac{\sigma}{1 - \gamma - \rho}, \quad I_2 = \sigma, \quad I_3 = \frac{\sigma}{1 - \gamma}.$$

Therefore $\int_0^{+\infty} D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma) dx = \frac{\sigma}{(1-\gamma)(1-\gamma-\rho)}$ and the result for v_0 follows.

(ii) *Calculation of v_1* : We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{+\infty} \overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma}(x) D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma) dx &= \frac{1}{\rho(\gamma + \rho)} \int_0^{+\infty} (1 + \gamma x/\sigma)^{(\rho-2)/\gamma} dx + \frac{1}{\gamma(\gamma + \rho)} \int_0^{+\infty} (1 + \gamma x/\sigma)^{-2/\gamma-1} dx \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\gamma \rho} \int_0^{+\infty} (1 + \gamma x/\sigma)^{-2/\gamma} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\rho(\gamma + \rho)} I_1 + \frac{1}{\gamma(\gamma + \rho)} I_2 - \frac{1}{\gamma \rho} I_3,
\end{aligned}$$

where,

$$I_1 = \frac{\sigma}{2 - \gamma - \rho}, \quad I_2 = \sigma/2, \quad I_3 = \frac{\sigma}{2 - \gamma}.$$

Therefore $\int_0^{+\infty} \overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma}(x) D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma) dx = \frac{\sigma}{2(2-\gamma)(2-\gamma-\rho)}$ and the expression of v_1 follows.

(iii) *Calculation of v_2* : We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{+\infty} \overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma}^2(x) D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma) dx &= \frac{1}{\rho(\gamma + \rho)} \int_0^{+\infty} (1 + \gamma x/\sigma)^{(\rho-3)/\gamma} dx + \frac{1}{\gamma(\gamma + \rho)} \int_0^{+\infty} (1 + \gamma x/\sigma)^{-3/\gamma-1} dx \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\gamma \rho} \int_0^{+\infty} (1 + \gamma x/\sigma)^{-3/\gamma} dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\rho(\gamma + \rho)} I_1 + \frac{1}{\gamma(\gamma + \rho)} I_2 - \frac{1}{\gamma \rho} I_3,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$I_1 = \frac{\sigma}{3 - \gamma - \rho}, \quad I_2 = \sigma/3, \quad I_3 = \frac{\sigma}{3 - \gamma}.$$

Therefore $\int_0^{+\infty} \overline{G}_{\gamma, \sigma}^2(x) D_{\gamma, \rho}(x/\sigma) dx = \frac{\sigma}{3(3-\gamma)(3-\gamma-\rho)}$ which yields the result for v_2 .

Here are the expressions of $D_{\gamma, \rho}$ in the different other cases :

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\gamma, \rho}(x) &= \frac{(1+\gamma x)^{-1/\gamma}}{\gamma \rho} \left((1 + \gamma x)^{-1} (1 + \ln(1 + \gamma x)) - 1 \right) && \text{if } \gamma \neq 0, \rho < 0, \gamma + \rho = 0 \\ &= \frac{(1+\gamma x)^{-1/\gamma}}{\gamma^2} \left(\ln(1 + \gamma x) - 1 + (1 + \gamma x)^{-1} \right) && \text{if } \gamma \neq 0, \rho = 0 \\ &= \frac{e^{-x}}{\rho} \left(\frac{1}{\rho} (e^{\rho x} - 1) - x \right) && \text{if } \gamma = 0, \rho < 0 \\ &= \frac{x^2}{2} e^{-x} && \text{if } \gamma = 0, \rho = 0 \end{aligned}$$

5.3. Proof of lemma 4

$$\begin{aligned} T_{j, k_n}^1 &= \frac{1}{j+1} \int_0^{+\infty} [(\overline{F}_{u_n}(\sigma_n y))^{j+1} - (\overline{G}_\gamma(y))^{j+1}] dy \\ &= \frac{1}{j+1} \int_0^{+\infty} ((\overline{F}_{u_n}(\sigma_n y))^{j+1}) - \frac{1}{j+1} \int_0^{+\infty} ((\overline{G}_\gamma(y))^{j+1}) dy \\ &=: I_1 - I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Defining g_n and g by

$$g_n(x) = V^{-1}(u_n + \sigma_n x) - V^{-1}(u_n) \quad \text{and} \quad g(x) = \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln(1 + \gamma x),$$

we have,

$$\overline{F}_{u_n}(\sigma_n y) = e^{-g_n(y)} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{G}_\gamma(y) = e^{-g(y)}$$

Setting $W(x) = \frac{x^{j+1}}{j+1}$, integration by parts yields

$$I_1 = \int_0^{+\infty} W(e^{-g_n(y)}) dy = \int_0^{+\infty} y W'(e^{-g_n(y)}) g_n'(y) e^{-g_n(y)} dy = \int_0^{+\infty} g_n^{-1}(s) e^{-(j+1)s} ds.$$

(where we used the fact that $y W(\overline{F}_{u_n}(\sigma_n y)) \rightarrow 0$ as $y \rightarrow +\infty$) and

$$I_2 = \int_0^{+\infty} W(e^{-g(y)}) dy = \int_0^{+\infty} y W'(e^{-g(y)}) g'(y) e^{-g(y)} dy = \int_0^{+\infty} g^{-1}(s) e^{-(j+1)s} ds.$$

It follows that, for $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$,

$$T_{j, k_n}^1 = \int_0^{+\infty} (g_n^{-1}(s) - g^{-1}(s)) e^{-(j+1)s} ds = \int_0^{+\infty} p_{u_n}(s) e^{-(j+1)s} ds,$$

where $p_{u_n}(s) = \frac{V(s+V^{-1}(u_n)) - u_n}{V'(V^{-1}(u_n))} - \int_0^s e^{\gamma u} du$. Moreover, it is easy to see that

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-(j+1)s} I_{\gamma, \rho}(s) ds = \frac{1}{u_j},$$

and therefore

$$\frac{T_{j, k_n}^1 - \frac{a_n}{u_j}}{a_n b_n} = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-(j+1)s} \left[\frac{\frac{p_{u_n}(s)}{a_n} - I_{\gamma, \rho}(s)}{b_n} \right] ds.$$

We deduce from the third order condition (1.5) that

$$\Gamma_n(s) := \frac{\frac{p_{u_n}(s)}{a_n} - I_{\gamma,\rho}(s)}{b_n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} R_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}(e^s).$$

In order to conclude the proof, it remains to use the dominated convergence theorem to show that $\frac{1}{a_n b_n} (T_{j,k_n}^1 - \frac{a_n}{u_j})$ converges to $\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-(j+1)s} R_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}(e^s) ds$. Under the third order condition (1.5), we can use the following bound which is proved in [9] (see equation (2.9) in Theorem 2.1 of [9]):

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists n_0, \forall n \geq n_0, \forall s \geq V^{-1}(u_{n_0}) - V^{-1}(u_n), |\Gamma_n(s) - R_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}(e^s)| \leq \epsilon e^{\epsilon s} e^{(\gamma+\rho+\beta)s}.$$

Therefore,

$$\left| \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-(j+1)s} (\Gamma_n(s) - R_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}(e^s)) ds \right| \leq \epsilon \int_0^{+\infty} e^{(j+1-\gamma-\rho-\beta-\epsilon)s} ds,$$

with the right hand side of the inequality being bounded, since ϵ can be set sufficiently small to insure that $j+1-\gamma-\rho-\beta-\epsilon > 0$. Finally, elementary calculus leads to

$$\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-(j+1)s} R_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}(e^s) ds = \frac{1}{(j+1)(j+1-\gamma-\rho)(j+1-\gamma-\rho-\beta)} = c_{\gamma,\rho,\beta}^j$$

which concludes the proof of Lemma 4.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Balkema and L. de Haan, Residual life time at a great age. *Ann. Probab.* **2** (1974) 792-801.
- [2] F. Caeiro, M.I. Gomes and D. Pestana, A note on the asymptotic variance at optimal levels of a bias-corrected Hill estimator, *Stat. Probab. Letters* 79 (2009) 295-303.
- [3] G. Ciuperca and C. Mercadier, Semi-parametric estimation for heavy-tailed distributions. *Submitted (2008)*, available on HAL archive, <http://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00292587/en/>.
- [4] J. Diebolt, A. Guillo and I. Rached, Approximation of the distribution of excesses through a generalized probability-weighted moments method. *J. Statist. Planning and Inference* 137 (2007) 841-857.
- [5] J. Diebolt, A. Guillo and R. Worms, Asymptotic behaviour of the probability-weighted moments and penultimate approximation. *ESAIM: P&S* 7 (2003) 217-236.
- [6] J. Diebolt, A. Guillo and I. Rached, Approximation of the distribution of excesses through a generalized probability-weighted moments method. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* 137 (2007) 841-857.
- [7] H. Drees and E. Kaufmann, Selecting the optimal sample fraction in univariate extreme value estimation. *Stoch. Proc. and Appl.* 75 (1) (1998) 149-172.
- [8] M.I. Fraga Alves, L. de Haan and T. Lin, Estimation of the parameter controlling the speed of convergence in extreme value theory. *Math. Methods of Statistics* 12 (2) (2003) 155-176.
- [9] M.I. Fraga Alves, L. de Haan and T. Lin, Third order extended regular variation. *Publ. de l'Institut Mathématique* tome 80 (94) (2006) 109-120.
- [10] M.I. Fraga Alves, M.I. Gomes and L. de Haan, A new class of semi-parametric estimators of the second order parameter. *Portugaliae Mathematica* 60 (2) (2003) 193-213.
- [11] M.I. Fraga Alves, M.I. Gomes, L. de Haan and C. Neves, A note on second order conditions in extreme value theory: linking general and heavy tail conditions. *REVSTAT Statistical Journal* 5 (3) (2007) 285-304.
- [12] M.I. Gomes, L. de Haan and L. Peng, Semi-parametric estimation of the second order parameter in statistics of extremes. *Extremes* 5 (4) (2002) 387-414.
- [13] M.I. Gomes and J. Martins, "Asymptotically unbiased" estimators of the tail index based on external estimation of the second order parameter. *Extremes* 5 (1) (2002) 5-31.
- [14] P. Hall and A.H. Welsh, Adaptive estimates of parameters of regular variation. *Ann. Stat.* 13 (1985) 331-341.
- [15] J. Hosking and J. Wallis, Parameter and quantile estimation for the generalized Pareto distribution. *Technometrics* 29 (3) (1987) 339-349.
- [16] L. Peng, Asymptotically unbiased estimator for the extreme value index. *Statist. Prob. Letters* 38 (2) (1998) 107-115.
- [17] J. Pickands III, Statistical inference using extreme order statistics. *Ann. Statist.* 3 (1975) 119-131.

- [18] J.P. Raoult and R. Worms, Rate of convergence for the generalized Pareto approximation of the excesses. *Adv. Applied Prob.* 35 (4) (2003) 1007-1027.
- [19] R.J. Serfling, *Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics*. Wiley & Son (1980).
- [20] A.W. van der Vaart, *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics (2000).
- [21] R. Worms, Penultimate approximation for the distribution of the excesses. *ESAIM: P&S* 6 (2002) 21-31.