Tilburg University

Two-Sample Testing for Tail Copulas with an Application to Equity Indices

Can, S.U.; Einmahl, John; Laeven, Roger

Publication date:
2021

Document Version
Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Can, S. U., Einmahl, J., & Laeven, R. (2021). *Two-Sample Testing for Tail Copulas with an Application to Equity Indices*. (CentER Discussion Paper; Vol. 2021-017). CentER, Center for Economic Research.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

No. 2021-017

**TWO-SAMPLE TESTING FOR TAIL COPULAS WITH
AN APPLICATION TO EQUITY INDICES**

By

Sami Umut Can, John H. J. Einmahl,
Roger J. A. Laeven

1 July 2021

ISSN 0924-7815
ISSN 2213-9532

TWO-SAMPLE TESTING FOR TAIL COPULAS WITH AN APPLICATION TO EQUITY INDICES

SAMI UMUT CAN, JOHN H. J. EINMAHL, AND ROGER J. A. LAEVEN

ABSTRACT. A novel, general two-sample hypothesis testing procedure is established for testing the equality of tail copulas associated with bivariate data. More precisely, using an ingenious transformation of a natural two-sample tail copula process, a test process is constructed, which is shown to converge in distribution to a standard Wiener process. Hence, from this test process a myriad of asymptotically distribution-free two-sample tests can be obtained. The good finite-sample behavior of our procedure is demonstrated through Monte Carlo simulations. Using the new testing procedure, no evidence of a difference in the respective tail copulas is found for pairs of negative daily log-returns of equity indices during and after the global financial crisis.

Keywords and Phrases: Tail dependence; tail copula; two-sample testing; financial crisis; distribution-free testing; martingale transformation.

JEL Classification: C12, C14, C58, G01, G15.

1. INTRODUCTION

Measuring dependence between economic variables such as asset returns and, in particular, between their tail events is of crucial importance for risk management, asset pricing, and portfolio choice. The tail dependence structure is, for example, a main ingredient for the computation of high quantiles of aggregate loss distributions, and hence for risk capital requirements, and dictates the extent of idiosyncratic tail risk, and hence the diversification potential, within a collection of assets.

A key question in financial econometrics and international finance is whether the dependence structure between economic variables, in particular asset returns, is constant over time and across markets, regions and institutions, or whether it is subject to variation due to e.g., financial market integration, emerging market developments, or financial contagion. Several papers analyze this question using a wide variety of different methodologies; see e.g., King and Wadhwani (1990),

Longin and Solnik (1995), Forbes and Rigobon (2002), Bekaert et al. (2005, 2009), Christoffersen et al. (2012), Bücher et al. (2015), Bormann and Schienle (2020), and the references therein.

In this paper, we focus on the tail dependence structure between two risks, which is completely characterized by the bivariate tail copula. In this context, we develop a general procedure to test for the equality of the tail copulas associated with two bivariate samples. A challenging feature of this two-sample problem is that the—under the null hypothesis—common tail copula is not specified. This complexity arises naturally as it follows from de Haan and Resnick (1977) that the class of all possible tail copulas is so large that it cannot be represented as a finite-dimensional parametric family, rendering the testing problem non-parametric. A pivotal property of our procedure is that, through an ingenious transformation, it leads to asymptotically distribution-free test statistics, so that critical values can be tabulated for universal use and no computer-intensive methods have to be developed and validated.

Our testing approach can be summarized as follows. We first construct two semi-parametric estimators of the tail copulas, one for each sample, consider their suitably normalized difference, and prove that it converges weakly to a non-trivial limiting process under the null hypothesis of tail copula equality. Next, we describe a martingale transformation that transforms this limiting process into a standard bivariate Wiener process. Then, we establish that the empirical counterpart of this transformation, when applied to the empirical process given by the normalized difference of the two tail copula estimators, converges weakly to a standard bivariate Wiener process under the null hypothesis. Finally, two-sample tests for tail copulas can now be conducted by comparing the transformed empirical process to a standard Wiener process. Hence, our approach leads to an asymptotically distribution-free test process and thus, by taking functionals, to asymptotically distribution-free test statistics. In other words, our procedure leads to an entire test *process* from which we can generate a myriad of asymptotically distribution-free tests.

We illustrate the finite-sample performance of our approach through Monte Carlo simulations. These confirm that tests based on our test process have good size and

power performances, notwithstanding the difficult nature of the testing problem considered in this paper.

We apply our procedure to test for tail copula equality of equity index returns during and after the global financial crisis. In particular, we analyze the tail dependence structure among the two European equity market indices FTSE 100 (UK) and DAX 30 (Germany) and the two transatlantic equity indices FTSE 100 and S&P 500 (US), during 2008–2011 (sample 1, covering the most volatile days of the global financial crisis and the subsequent European debt crisis) and 2012–2015 (sample 2, covering a “post-crisis” period of equal length). We construct synchronized daily observations of negative log-returns on the basis of high-frequency data using Coordinated Universal Time (UTC). Computing three commonly used test statistics from our test process, we find that the null hypothesis of tail copula equality between the two samples is not rejected, despite a clearly visible change in the marginal distributions of the index returns between the two samples. This finding applies to both the European pair {FTSE 100, DAX 30} and the transatlantic pair {FTSE 100, S&P 500}. That is, although the margins appear to have markedly changed from the crisis period to the post-crisis period, no statistical evidence is found for a change in the (margin-free) dependence structure between extremes, for both pairs of equity market indices. This means that, whereas for all the considered indices highly negative returns occur more frequently and more severely during the crisis period, the number of *margin-free joint extremes* is not statistically different between the two samples.

We briefly describe three papers that are related to the testing problem considered in this paper. In Christoffersen et al. (2012), an extensive analysis is conducted of the evolution over time of the regular and tail dependence structures among both developed and emerging financial markets, and the associated diversification potential. Econometrically, a novel dynamic asymmetric copula model of a parametric nature is used to capture asymmetric tail dependence. When assessing tail dependence, attention is restricted to the less informative tail dependence *coefficients*, rather than to tail copula *functions* as in the present paper, and their development over a long period of 20 years. In Bücher et al. (2015), new non-parametric tests for detecting structural breaks in tail dependence are constructed. Since such a

change-point problem requires the study of an involved *sequential* tail copula process, predominantly equality of margins before and after the break is assumed. The methods are applied to energy and financial markets data. An important difference between that paper and the present one is that here convenient distribution-free weak limits of test statistics are obtained, as described above, whereas in Bücher et al. (2015) computer-intensive multiplier bootstrap procedures are needed. Bormann and Schienle (2020) provides a detailed account of tail dependence asymmetries and inequalities in 90 years of US equity data, using a refined non-parametric testing procedure that compares two tail copulas locally piecewise on disjoint intervals employing multiple testing principles. As the corresponding complex limiting distributions do not admit closed-form expressions, finite-sample approximations are simulated using multiplier bootstrap procedures, as in Bücher et al. (2015).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we formalize our testing problem and in Section 3 we introduce our initial testing basis, which compares two semi-parametric tail copula estimators constructed separately from the two samples, and analyze its asymptotic behavior. In Section 4 we describe the martingale transformation and in Section 5 we prove that the empirical counterpart of this transformation applied to our initial testing basis converges weakly to a standard Wiener process. In Section 6 our Monte Carlo simulation analysis is presented. Section 7 describes the results of our empirical analysis of equity indices. Conclusions are given in Section 8. The proofs are deferred to Section 9.

2. TESTING PROBLEM

Consider i.i.d. random vectors $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ generated from some bivariate distribution function (df) F and i.i.d. random vectors $(X'_1, Y'_1), \dots, (X'_n, Y'_n)$ independently generated from some bivariate df F' . Let F have marginal dfs F_1, F_2 and let F' have marginal dfs F'_1, F'_2 , so that $X_i \sim F_1, Y_i \sim F_2$ and $X'_i \sim F'_1, Y'_i \sim F'_2$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

We assume that the dfs F and F' lie in the respective domains of attraction of bivariate extreme value distributions G and G' . This means that there exist normalizing sequences $a_j(n), a'_j(n) > 0$ and $b_j(n), b'_j(n) \in \mathbb{R}$, for $j = 1, 2$, such that

$$P\left(\frac{\bigvee_{i=1}^n X_i - b_1(n)}{a_1(n)} \leq x, \frac{\bigvee_{i=1}^n Y_i - b_2(n)}{a_2(n)} \leq y\right) \rightarrow G(x, y),$$

$$P\left(\frac{\bigvee_{i=1}^n X'_i - b'_1(n)}{a'_1(n)} \leq x, \frac{\bigvee_{i=1}^n Y'_i - b'_2(n)}{a'_2(n)} \leq y\right) \rightarrow G'(x, y),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for all continuity points $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ of G and G' , respectively. The normalizing sequences are chosen in such a way that the margins G_1, G_2 of G , and the margins G'_1, G'_2 of G' , are in the form of a standard generalized extreme value (GEV) distribution:

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} G_j(x) &= \exp\{-(1 + \gamma_j x)^{-1/\gamma_j}\}, \quad 1 + \gamma_j x > 0, \\ G'_j(x) &= \exp\{-(1 + \gamma'_j x)^{-1/\gamma'_j}\}, \quad 1 + \gamma'_j x > 0, \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, 2$. The constants $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ are the marginal extreme value (EV) indices associated with F and F' , respectively. Here, and in the rest of the paper, expressions of the form $(1 + \gamma \cdot)^{1/\gamma}$ should be interpreted as $\exp(\cdot)$ when $\gamma = 0$.

The distribution G , hence the asymptotic joint tail behavior of F , is characterized by the marginal EV indices γ_1, γ_2 and the bivariate tail copula R associated with F , which can be defined as

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} R(x, y) &:= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} tP(F_1(X_1) > 1 - x/t, F_2(Y_1) > 1 - y/t), \\ &\quad (x, y) \in [0, \infty]^2 \setminus \{(\infty, \infty)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The EV indices γ_1, γ_2 specify the margins of G through (1), and the function R specifies the dependence structure between the margins. While R is not a copula itself, it does characterize the copula of G , and hence the tail dependence structure of F . Similarly, the distribution G' is characterized by γ'_1, γ'_2 and the tail copula R' associated with F' , defined analogously to (2). We refer to, e.g., the monographs Kotz and Nadarajah (2000), Beirlant et al. (2004) and de Haan and Ferreira (2006) for further details about multivariate extreme value theory.

Observe that

$$R(1, 1) = \lim_{u \uparrow 1} \frac{P(F_1(X_1) > u, F_2(Y_1) > u)}{1 - u}.$$

For random variables with continuous margins, $R(1, 1)$ is often referred to as the *upper tail dependence coefficient* and denoted by λ_U ; see e.g., Joe (2001), p. 33. It measures the probability of a “large rank” of X_1 conditionally upon a “large rank”

of Y_1 . Indeed,

$$\lambda_U = \lim_{u \uparrow 1} P(F_1(X_1) > u \mid F_2(Y_1) > u) = R(1, 1).$$

We also note here that the function R generates a σ -finite measure R on the Borel subsets of $[0, \infty]^2 \setminus \{(\infty, \infty)\}$ via the identity

$$R([0, x] \times [0, y]) := R(x, y), \quad (x, y) \in [0, \infty]^2 \setminus \{(\infty, \infty)\}.$$

In this paper, we develop a general procedure to construct two-sample tests for the equality of the tail copulas R and R' . In other words, we assume that we have two random samples independently generated from F and F' , and provide a procedure that can be used to test the null hypothesis $R = R'$ against the alternative $R \neq R'$, where R and R' remain unspecified. Note that, while the bivariate extreme value setting is of a semi-parametric nature, both the null and alternative hypotheses we consider in this paper are non-parametric.

3. COMPARING TWO TAIL COPULA ESTIMATORS

Suppose we have a random sample $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ from F and an independent random sample $(X'_1, Y'_1), \dots, (X'_{n'}, Y'_{n'})$ from F' . Throughout Sections 3–5 we will assume that the null hypothesis holds, i.e., R and R' are the same tail copula, which we will refer to as R . In the present section, we define two semi-parametric estimators for the tail copula R , computed separately from the two available samples, and we describe the asymptotic behavior of the difference between these two estimators as the sample sizes tend to infinity.

From (2) one can verify that

$$(3) \quad R(x, y) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} tP(\tilde{X}_1(t) \leq x, \tilde{Y}_1(t) \leq y), \quad (x, y) \in [0, \infty)^2,$$

with

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_i(t) &= \left[\left(1 + \gamma_1 \frac{X_i - b_1(t)}{a_1(t)} \right) \vee 0 \right]^{-1/\gamma_1}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ \tilde{Y}_i(t) &= \left[\left(1 + \gamma_2 \frac{Y_i - b_2(t)}{a_2(t)} \right) \vee 0 \right]^{-1/\gamma_2}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

We also define $\tilde{X}'_i(t), \tilde{Y}'_i(t)$ analogously to (4), for $1 \leq i \leq n'$. We will use the representation (3), and its analogue with $\tilde{X}'_1, \tilde{Y}'_1$, as a basis for estimating R from the two available samples. To that end, we let $k = k(n)$ and $k' = k'(n')$ denote

intermediate sequences satisfying $k \uparrow \infty$, $k/n \downarrow 0$ as $n \uparrow \infty$ and $k' \uparrow \infty$, $k'/n' \downarrow 0$ as $n' \uparrow \infty$. We also introduce the function

$$(5) \quad R_n(x, y) = \frac{n}{k} P(\tilde{X}_1(n/k) \leq x, \tilde{Y}_1(n/k) \leq y), \quad (x, y) \in [0, \infty)^2,$$

and the analogously defined $R'_{n'}(x, y)$. From (3) it follows that $R_n \rightarrow R$ and $R'_{n'} \rightarrow R$ pointwise in $[0, \infty)^2$ as $n, n' \rightarrow \infty$.

We estimate R_n and hence R by replacing the unknown quantities $a_j(n/k)$, $b_j(n/k)$ and γ_j in (5) by appropriate estimators $\hat{a}_j(n/k)$, $\hat{b}_j(n/k)$ and $\hat{\gamma}_j$, for $j = 1, 2$, and the probability P by the corresponding empirical measure. We define, therefore,

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{X}_i(n/k) &= \left[\left(1 + \hat{\gamma}_1 \frac{X_i - \hat{b}_1(n/k)}{\hat{a}_1(n/k)} \right) \vee 0 \right]^{-1/\hat{\gamma}_1}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ \hat{Y}_i(n/k) &= \left[\left(1 + \hat{\gamma}_2 \frac{Y_i - \hat{b}_2(n/k)}{\hat{a}_2(n/k)} \right) \vee 0 \right]^{-1/\hat{\gamma}_2}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \end{aligned}$$

as an empirical analogue to (4), and we introduce the semi-parametric estimator

$$(7) \quad \hat{R}_n(x, y) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{X}_i(n/k) \leq x, \hat{Y}_i(n/k) \leq y\}}, \quad (x, y) \in [0, \infty)^2,$$

for the tail copula R . The random variables $\hat{X}'_i(n'/k')$, $\hat{Y}'_i(n'/k')$ and the estimator $\hat{R}'_{n'}(x, y)$ are defined analogously to (6) and (7), respectively.

For later reference, we also introduce the process

$$(8) \quad T_n(x, y) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{X}_i(n/k) \leq x, \tilde{Y}_i(n/k) \leq y\}}, \quad (x, y) \in [0, \infty)^2,$$

and the analogously defined $T'_{n'}$. It is known, by Einmahl et al. (1997, Lemma 3.1), that the weak convergence

$$(\sqrt{k}(T_n - R_n), \sqrt{k'}(T'_{n'} - R'_{n'})) \Rightarrow (V_R, V'_R)$$

holds in the product space $D([\delta, T]^2) \times D([\delta, T]^2)$ as $n, n' \rightarrow \infty$, for any $0 < \delta < T < \infty$. Here, $D([\delta, T]^2)$ denotes the Skorokhod space of functions with domain $[\delta, T]^2$, and V_R, V'_R are independent R -Wiener processes on $[0, \infty)^2$, i.e., independent zero-mean Gaussian processes with covariance structure

$$E[V_R(s, t)V_R(x, y)] = E[V'_R(s, t)V'_R(x, y)] = R(s \wedge x, t \wedge y).$$

Henceforth, we will omit the arguments (n/k) and (n'/k') where appropriate, for ease of notation.

Now, the estimators $\widehat{R}_n$ and $\widehat{R}'_{n'}$ estimate the same tail copula R from two different samples, while they would estimate different tail copulas under the alternative hypothesis. So the normalized difference between $\widehat{R}_n$ and $\widehat{R}'_{n'}$ is a natural starting point for a two-sample test. Thus we define $\kappa := kk'/(k+k')$ and

$$\eta_{n,n'}(x, y) := \sqrt{\kappa}[\widehat{R}_n(x, y) - \widehat{R}'_{n'}(x, y)], \quad (x, y) \in [0, \infty)^2.$$

Our first result will establish the asymptotic behavior of $\eta_{n,n'}$ as $n, n' \rightarrow \infty$. We first state the necessary assumptions and definitions.

A1. For some 6-variate random vector $(A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$, we have the joint weak convergence

$$(9) \quad \sqrt{k} \left(T_n - R_n, \frac{\widehat{a}_1}{a_1} - 1, \frac{\widehat{a}_2}{a_2} - 1, \frac{\widehat{b}_1 - b_1}{a_1}, \frac{\widehat{b}_2 - b_2}{a_2}, \widehat{\gamma}_1 - \gamma_1, \widehat{\gamma}_2 - \gamma_2 \right) \\ \Rightarrow (V_R, A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, in $D([\delta, T]^2) \times \mathbb{R}^6$, for any $0 < \delta < T < \infty$. Similarly, for some 6-variate random vector $(A'_1, A'_2, B'_1, B'_2, \Gamma'_1, \Gamma'_2)$, we have the joint weak convergence

$$(10) \quad \sqrt{k'} \left(T'_{n'} - R'_{n'}, \frac{\widehat{a}'_1}{a'_1} - 1, \frac{\widehat{a}'_2}{a'_2} - 1, \frac{\widehat{b}'_1 - b'_1}{a'_1}, \frac{\widehat{b}'_2 - b'_2}{a'_2}, \widehat{\gamma}'_1 - \gamma'_1, \widehat{\gamma}'_2 - \gamma'_2 \right) \\ \Rightarrow (V'_R, A'_1, A'_2, B'_1, B'_2, \Gamma'_1, \Gamma'_2)$$

as $n' \rightarrow \infty$, in $D([\delta, T]^2) \times \mathbb{R}^6$.

A2. The partial derivatives $R^{(1)}(x, y) := \partial R / \partial x$ and $R^{(2)}(x, y) := \partial R / \partial y$ exist and are continuous on $(0, \infty)^2$.

A3. The sequences k and k' are chosen such that $k'/(k+k') \rightarrow c$ for some $c \in (0, 1)$, and

$$\sqrt{k} \sup_{(x,y) \in [\delta/2, T+1]^2} |R_n(x, y) - R(x, y)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \\ \sqrt{k'} \sup_{(x,y) \in [\delta/2, T+1]^2} |R'_{n'}(x, y) - R(x, y)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n' \rightarrow \infty.$$

Finally, for $x > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the following functions:

$$(11) \quad f(x, \gamma) = \begin{cases} \frac{x(x^\gamma - 1)}{\gamma} & \gamma \neq 0 \\ x \log x & \gamma = 0 \end{cases}, \\ g(x, \gamma) = -x^{\gamma+1},$$

$$h(x, \gamma) = \begin{cases} \frac{x(1-x^\gamma)}{\gamma^2} + \frac{x \log x}{\gamma} & \gamma \neq 0 \\ -(x \log^2 x)/2 & \gamma = 0 \end{cases}.$$

We are now prepared to state the convergence result for $\eta_{n,n'}$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $0 < \delta < T < \infty$. If Assumptions A1–A3 hold, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{n,n'}(x, y) &\Rightarrow \sqrt{c} V_R(x, y) - \sqrt{1-c} V_R'(x, y) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{c} R^{(1)}(x, y) [f(x, \gamma_1) A_1 + g(x, \gamma_1) B_1 + h(x, \gamma_1) \Gamma_1] \\ (12) \quad &\quad + \sqrt{c} R^{(2)}(x, y) [f(y, \gamma_2) A_2 + g(y, \gamma_2) B_2 + h(y, \gamma_2) \Gamma_2] \\ &\quad - \sqrt{1-c} R^{(1)}(x, y) [f(x, \gamma'_1) A'_1 + g(x, \gamma'_1) B'_1 + h(x, \gamma'_1) \Gamma'_1] \\ &\quad - \sqrt{1-c} R^{(2)}(x, y) [f(y, \gamma'_2) A'_2 + g(y, \gamma'_2) B'_2 + h(y, \gamma'_2) \Gamma'_2] \\ &=: \eta(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

in $D([\delta, T]^2)$ as $n, n' \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 3.2. While the normalized difference between $\widehat{R}_n$ and $\widehat{R}'_{n'}$ provides a natural initial basis for two-sample testing, Theorem 3.1 reveals that it is not easily amenable for this purpose: the distribution of η depends upon the true underlying tail copula R , which is not specified by the null hypothesis, as well as on the true, but unknown, values of the parameters $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma'_1$ and γ'_2 . To obtain a suitable testing basis, we will in the next section describe a martingale transformation that will turn η into a standard process with a distribution that depends neither on R nor on the marginal extreme value indices.

Remark 3.3. The following relationships between the functions f, g, h defined in (11) can be verified, for any $x > 0$ and $\gamma, \gamma' \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma f(x, \gamma) + g(x, \gamma) &= \gamma' f(x, \gamma') + g(x, \gamma'), \\ \gamma h(x, \gamma) + f(x, \gamma) &= \gamma' h(x, \gamma') + f(x, \gamma'). \end{aligned}$$

Using these identities, the limiting process η appearing in (12) can also be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(x, y) &= \sqrt{c} V_R(x, y) - \sqrt{1-c} V_R'(x, y) \\ &\quad + R^{(1)}(x, y) \left[f(x, \gamma_1) \left(\sqrt{c} A_1 + \sqrt{1-c} A'_1 + (\gamma_1 - \gamma'_1) \sqrt{1-c} B'_1 \right) \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + g(x, \gamma_1) \left(\sqrt{c} B_1 + \sqrt{1-c} B'_1 \right) \\
& + h(x, \gamma_1) \left(\sqrt{c} \Gamma_1 + \gamma_1 \sqrt{1-c} A'_1 - \gamma_1 \gamma'_1 \sqrt{1-c} B'_1 \right) \\
& - h(x, \gamma'_1) \left(\sqrt{1-c} \Gamma'_1 - \gamma'_1 \sqrt{1-c} A'_1 + (\gamma'_1)^2 \sqrt{1-c} B'_1 \right) \Big] \\
& + R^{(2)}(x, y) \Big[f(y, \gamma_2) \left(\sqrt{c} A_2 + \sqrt{1-c} A'_2 + (\gamma_2 - \gamma'_2) \sqrt{1-c} B'_2 \right) \\
& + g(y, \gamma_2) \left(\sqrt{c} B_2 + \sqrt{1-c} B'_2 \right) \\
& + h(y, \gamma_2) \left(\sqrt{c} \Gamma_2 + \gamma_1 \sqrt{1-c} A'_2 - \gamma_2 \gamma'_2 \sqrt{1-c} B'_2 \right) \\
& - h(y, \gamma'_2) \left(\sqrt{1-c} \Gamma'_2 - \gamma'_2 \sqrt{1-c} A'_2 + (\gamma'_2)^2 \sqrt{1-c} B'_2 \right) \Big].
\end{aligned}$$

This equivalent, but—importantly—more parsimonious, form of the limiting process η , rather than that in (12), will serve as the basis for the martingale transformation described in the next section, which would otherwise be ill-defined.

Remark 3.4. Although the bivariate case is the most interesting and the most relevant one, the setup and results of this paper can be generalized to the d -variate case, for $d > 2$. We will not pursue this, however, because for $d > 2$ a d -variate tail copula R on the domain $[0, \infty)^d$ yields, in contrast to when $d = 2$, only limited information on the tail dependence structure of F .

4. MARTINGALE TRANSFORMATION

In this section, we describe a martingale transformation that enables us to transform the limiting process η into a standard bivariate Wiener process. The transformation is obtained by a suitable application of the martingale innovation transform approach originally developed in Khmaladze (1981, 1988, 1993), and used e.g., in Koenker and Xiao (2002, 2006) for quantile regression, in Khmaladze and Koul (2004) and Delgado et al. (2005) for goodness-of-fit testing of parametric regression and time series models, and used and extended in Can et al. (2015) for parametric tail copula goodness-of-fit testing. The classical Doob-Meyer decomposition of a Brownian bridge, which turns a Brownian bridge into a standard Brownian motion by subtracting its compensator, occurs as a simple special case of this approach. Heuristically, the present martingale transformation may therefore be understood as the suitable counterpart for η of the Doob-Meyer decomposition for a Brownian bridge.

Consider the representation we derived in Remark 3.3 for the limiting process η of Theorem 3.1. It is easy to see, by direct computation of the covariance, that the process $\sqrt{c} V_R(x, y) - \sqrt{1-c} V'_R(x, y)$ is an R -Wiener process, which we will call $\tilde{V}_R$. Thus η is of the form

$$(13) \quad \eta(x, y) = \tilde{V}_R(x, y) + \sum_{i=1}^8 Q_i(x, y) Z_i, \quad (x, y) \in (0, \infty)^2,$$

where the Z_i are random variables and the Q_i are deterministic functions on $(0, \infty)^2$, defined by

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} Q_1(x, y) &= R^{(1)}(x, y) f(x, \gamma_1), & Q_2(x, y) &= R^{(2)}(x, y) f(y, \gamma_2), \\ Q_3(x, y) &= R^{(1)}(x, y) g(x, \gamma_1), & Q_4(x, y) &= R^{(2)}(x, y) g(y, \gamma_2), \\ Q_5(x, y) &= R^{(1)}(x, y) h(x, \gamma_1), & Q_6(x, y) &= R^{(2)}(x, y) h(y, \gamma_2), \\ Q_7(x, y) &= R^{(1)}(x, y) h(x, \gamma'_1), & Q_8(x, y) &= R^{(2)}(x, y) h(y, \gamma'_2). \end{aligned}$$

We note that (13) is of the general bivariate form (23) in Can et al. (2015). Hence, η can be transformed into a standard Wiener process by suitably exploiting Theorem 3.1 of that paper. We will formally state this result in Theorem 4.1 below, but we first introduce some assumptions and notation.

A4. The tail copula R has a positive density $r = \partial^2 R / \partial x \partial y$ on $(0, \infty)^2$. The derivatives $r^{(1)} := \partial r / \partial x$ and $r^{(2)} := \partial r / \partial y$ exist and are continuous on $(0, \infty)^2$.

Observe that this condition allows R to have mass on the “axes at infinity” $\{(x, \infty) : x \geq 0\} \cup \{(\infty, y) : y \geq 0\}$, but it excludes (strict) tail independence, i.e., $r(x, y) = 0$ for all $(x, y) \in (0, \infty)^2$.

Now, with the functions Q_i as defined in (14), let us denote $q_i = dQ_i/dR$ for $i = 1, \dots, 8$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} q_1(x, y) &= f^{(1)}(x, \gamma_1) + f(x, \gamma_1) \frac{r^{(1)}(x, y)}{r(x, y)}, & q_2(x, y) &= f^{(1)}(y, \gamma_2) + f(y, \gamma_2) \frac{r^{(2)}(x, y)}{r(x, y)}, \\ q_3(x, y) &= g^{(1)}(x, \gamma_1) + g(x, \gamma_1) \frac{r^{(1)}(x, y)}{r(x, y)}, & q_4(x, y) &= g^{(1)}(y, \gamma_2) + g(y, \gamma_2) \frac{r^{(2)}(x, y)}{r(x, y)}, \\ q_5(x, y) &= h^{(1)}(x, \gamma_1) + h(x, \gamma_1) \frac{r^{(1)}(x, y)}{r(x, y)}, & q_6(x, y) &= h^{(1)}(y, \gamma_2) + h(y, \gamma_2) \frac{r^{(2)}(x, y)}{r(x, y)}, \\ q_7(x, y) &= h^{(1)}(x, \gamma'_1) + h(x, \gamma'_1) \frac{r^{(1)}(x, y)}{r(x, y)}, & q_8(x, y) &= h^{(1)}(y, \gamma'_2) + h(y, \gamma'_2) \frac{r^{(2)}(x, y)}{r(x, y)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $f^{(1)}(x, \gamma) := \partial f(x, \gamma) / \partial x$ and similarly for g and h . Let $\mathbf{q}(x, y)$ denote the column vector consisting of $q_1(x, y), \dots, q_8(x, y)$. We will also write $\mathbf{q}(x, y, \tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2)$,

$\tilde{\gamma}'_1, \tilde{\gamma}'_2, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2$) for the vector $\mathbf{q}(x, y)$ with the true parameters $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma'_1, \gamma'_2$ replaced by arbitrary $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2, \tilde{\gamma}'_1, \tilde{\gamma}'_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, the true density r replaced by an arbitrary mapping $\tilde{r} : (0, \infty)^2 \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, and the true partial derivatives $r^{(1)}, r^{(2)}$ replaced by arbitrary mappings $\tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2$ from $(0, \infty)^2$ to $\mathbb{R}$.

We also introduce matrices

$$(15) \quad \mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}(t) = \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T \mathbf{q}(s, t) \mathbf{q}(s, t)^{\top} r(s, t) \, ds \, dt, \quad t \in [\delta, T),$$

and we denote

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}(t, \tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2, \tilde{\gamma}'_1, \tilde{\gamma}'_2, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2) \\ &= \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T \mathbf{q}(s, t, \tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2, \tilde{\gamma}'_1, \tilde{\gamma}'_2, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2) \mathbf{q}(s, t, \tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2, \tilde{\gamma}'_1, \tilde{\gamma}'_2, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2)^{\top} \tilde{r}(s, t) \, ds \, dt, \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [\delta, T)$.

The functions $q_1, \dots, q_8$ bear resemblance to score functions, corresponding to $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma'_1$, and γ'_2 , respectively, using terminology from likelihood analysis. Note the asymmetry between the score functions associated to the two samples, which occurs due to Remark 3.3. Furthermore, $\mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}(t)$ can be viewed as a partial Fisher information matrix built from these scores.

Our next assumption is:

A5. The matrices $\mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}(t, \tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2, \tilde{\gamma}'_1, \tilde{\gamma}'_2, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2)$ are well-defined and invertible for all $t \in [\delta, T)$ and all $\tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2, \tilde{\gamma}'_1, \tilde{\gamma}'_2, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2$ in some neighborhood of $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, r, r^{(1)}, r^{(2)}$ w.r.t. the relevant metrics (Euclidean metric for $\tilde{\gamma}_j, \tilde{\gamma}'_j$, the metric generated by the norm $\sup_{[\delta, T]^2} |\cdot|$ for $\tilde{r}, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2$).

We are now equipped to state our martingale transformation result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let η be the limiting process derived in Remark 3.3 and let $0 < \delta < T < \infty$. If Assumptions A4–A5, confined to the true $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, r, r^{(1)}, r^{(2)}$ hold, then the process*

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} & W(x, y) \\ &= \int_{\delta}^{\delta+x} \int_{\delta}^{\delta+y} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r(s, t)}} \, d\eta(s, t) \\ &\quad - \int_{\delta}^{\delta+x} \int_{\delta}^{\delta+y} \mathbf{q}(s, t)^{\top} \left(\mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T \mathbf{q}(s', t') \, d\eta(s', t') \right) \sqrt{r(s, t)} \, ds \, dt \end{aligned}$$

is a standard Wiener process on $[0, \tau]^2$, for any $0 < \tau < T - \delta$.

Remark 4.2. Recall (13). The martingale transformation induces a nullification of $\eta(x, y) - \tilde{V}_R(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^8 Q_i(x, y) Z_i$ and normalizes the resulting R -Wiener process to render a standard Wiener process on $[0, \tau]^2$. The double integrals with respect to the process η can be understood pathwise as Riemann-Stieltjes integrals; we refer to e.g., Towghi (2002), Theorem 1.2(a), for an appropriate existence result.

Remark 4.3. We note that in the cases $\gamma_1 = \gamma'_1$ and $\gamma_2 = \gamma'_2$, we will have $q_5 \equiv q_7$ and $q_6 \equiv q_8$, respectively, and the matrix $\mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}(t)$ will be singular. If this information is available, the redundant q -functions can simply be omitted when constructing $\mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}(t)$, and Theorem 4.1 continues to apply *mutatis mutandis*. Otherwise, this case may be included by using the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of $\mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}(t)$ in (16) and adapting the proof of Theorem 4.1 accordingly. Besides, as we will show by simulations in Section 6, our testing approach, which uses the regular inverse of the matrix $\mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}(t, \tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2, \tilde{\gamma}'_1, \tilde{\gamma}'_2, \tilde{r}, \tilde{r}_1, \tilde{r}_2)$ defined above, can in practice still be applied without size distortions when $\gamma_1 = \gamma'_1$ or $\gamma_2 = \gamma'_2$.

5. TWO-SAMPLE TESTING

Applying the transformation in (16) to $\eta_{n, n'}$, with unknown quantities replaced by estimators, we obtain the following empirical process on $[0, T - \delta]^2$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & W_{n, n'}(x, y) \\
 &= \int_{\delta}^{\delta+x} \int_{\delta}^{\delta+y} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\hat{r}(s, t)}} d\eta_{n, n'}(s, t) \\
 (17) \quad & - \int_{\delta}^{\delta+x} \int_{\delta}^{\delta+y} \hat{\mathbf{q}}(s, t)^{\top} \left(\hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T \hat{\mathbf{q}}(s', t') d\eta_{n, n'}(s', t') \right) \sqrt{\hat{r}(s, t)} ds dt,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{q}}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\delta, T}(\cdot)$ are short-hand notations for $\mathbf{q}(\cdot, \hat{\gamma}_1, \hat{\gamma}_2, \hat{\gamma}'_1, \hat{\gamma}'_2, \hat{r}, \hat{r}^{(1)}, \hat{r}^{(2)})$ and $\mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}(\cdot, \hat{\gamma}_1, \hat{\gamma}_2, \hat{\gamma}'_1, \hat{\gamma}'_2, \hat{r}, \hat{r}^{(1)}, \hat{r}^{(2)})$, respectively.

To estimate the tail copula density r , we propose the non-parametric estimator

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{r}(x, y) &= \frac{k^{2/3}}{k^{2/3} + (k')^{2/3}} \frac{\hat{R}_n([x - h, x + h] \times [y - h, y + h])}{(2h)^2} \\
 &\quad + \frac{(k')^{2/3}}{k^{2/3} + (k')^{2/3}} \frac{\hat{R}'_{n'}([x - h', x + h'] \times [y - h', y + h'])}{(2h')^2} \\
 &=: \lambda s_h(x, y) + (1 - \lambda) s'_{h'}(x, y),
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$h = c_n(x, y)k^{-1/6}, \quad h' = c'_{n'}(x, y)(k')^{-1/6},$$

with, for some $\bar{c} > 0$, $c_n(x, y) \rightarrow \bar{c}$, $c'_{n'}(x, y) \rightarrow \bar{c}$, uniformly on $[\delta, T]^2$.

For the partial derivative $r^{(1)}$, we propose the non-parametric estimator

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{r}^{(1)}(x, y) &= \frac{k^{1/2}}{k^{1/2} + (k')^{1/2}} \frac{s_h(x + h, y) - s_h(x - h, y)}{2h} \\ &\quad + \frac{(k')^{1/2}}{k^{1/2} + (k')^{1/2}} \frac{s'_{h'}(x + h', y) - s'_{h'}(x - h', y)}{2h'}, \end{aligned}$$

where now

$$h = \tilde{c}_n(x, y)k^{-1/8}, \quad h' = \tilde{c}'_{n'}(x, y)(k')^{-1/8},$$

with, for some $\tilde{c} > 0$, $\tilde{c}_n(x, y) \rightarrow \tilde{c}$, $\tilde{c}'_{n'}(x, y) \rightarrow \tilde{c}$, uniformly on $[\delta, T]^2$. The partial derivative $r^{(2)}$ is estimated similarly. We will demonstrate, as part of our main theoretical result that follows, that these estimators are consistent.

In view of Theorems 3.1 and 4.1, one might anticipate the empirical process $W_{n, n'}$ to converge weakly to a standard Wiener process as $n, n' \rightarrow \infty$. This turns out to be true, and we will formally establish this result in Theorem 5.1 below. First we state one more assumption.

For notational convenience, let us denote

$$\rho_j(x, y) = \frac{r^{(j)}(x, y)}{r(x, y)}, \quad \hat{\rho}_j(x, y) = \frac{\hat{r}^{(j)}(x, y)}{\hat{r}(x, y)}, \quad \Delta \rho_j(x, y) = \rho_j(x, y) - \hat{\rho}_j(x, y),$$

for $j = 1, 2$, and

$$\sigma(x, y) = r(x, y)^{-1/2}, \quad \hat{\sigma}(x, y) = \hat{r}(x, y)^{-1/2}, \quad \Delta \sigma(x, y) = \sigma(x, y) - \hat{\sigma}(x, y).$$

Given a function $\varphi : [\delta, T]^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we will also let $V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(\varphi)$ denote the *Hardy-Krause variation* of this function over the rectangle $[\delta, T]^2$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(\varphi) &= V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{(2)}(\varphi) + V_{[\delta, T]}^{(1)}(\varphi(\cdot, \delta)) + V_{[\delta, T]}^{(1)}(\varphi(\cdot, T)) \\ &\quad + V_{[\delta, T]}^{(1)}(\varphi(\delta, \cdot)) + V_{[\delta, T]}^{(1)}(\varphi(T, \cdot)), \end{aligned}$$

where $V_{[\delta, T]}^{(1)}$ denotes the univariate total variation over the interval $[\delta, T]$ and $V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{(2)}$ denotes the bivariate Vitali total variation over $[\delta, T]^2$. We refer to Owen (2005) for an overview of various concepts of multivariate variation.

With this notation, we introduce our last assumption:

A6. For $j = 1, 2$, we have $V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(\rho_j) < \infty$ and $V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(\Delta\rho_j) = o_P(1)$. Also, $V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(\sigma) < \infty$ and $V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(\Delta\sigma) = o_P(1)$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $0 < \delta < T < \infty$. Under Assumptions A1–A6, the process $W_{n, n'}$ in (17) converges weakly to a standard bivariate Wiener process in $D([0, \tau]^2)$ as $n, n' \rightarrow \infty$, for any $0 < \tau < T - \delta$.*

Theorem 5.1, our main theoretical result, states that under the null hypothesis $R = R'$, the test process $W_{n, n'}$ converges weakly to a distribution-free limiting process, and hence $W_{n, n'}$ can be used as a generator of a multitude of asymptotically distribution-free test statistics for testing $R = R'$. We will not investigate how to construct optimal tests against certain specific alternative hypotheses. Instead, we will study in Section 6 three common examples of non-parametric omnibus tests based on $W_{n, n'}$, not only under the null but also under the alternative hypothesis.

6. SIMULATIONS

In this section, we study the finite-sample behavior of the test process $W_{n, n'}$ in (17), both under the null hypothesis $R = R'$ and the alternative hypothesis $R \neq R'$, via Monte Carlo simulations. All the computations of the present section, as well as those of the subsequent Section 7, are implemented in the software R, and the code is available from the authors upon request.

To improve the finite-sample approximation of Theorem 5.1, we actually consider the process $\widetilde{W}_{n, n'}$, an asymptotically equivalent version of $W_{n, n'}$, obtained by replacing k and k' by $k - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{k}$ and $k' - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{k'}$, respectively, in the definition of the normalizing factor $\sqrt{\kappa}$. For each model considered below, we generate 1000 pairs of bivariate samples of size $n = n' = 1500$. We take $k = k' = 250$, $\delta = 0.25$ and $T = 2$ everywhere. The estimators $\widehat{a}_j, \widehat{a}'_j$ and $\widehat{\gamma}_j, \widehat{\gamma}'_j$, $j = 1, 2$, are taken to be the moment estimators (see, e.g., de Haan and Ferreira (2006), Sections 4.2 and 3.5), and we set, as usual, $\widehat{b}_1 = X_{n-k:n}$, $\widehat{b}_2 = Y_{n-k:n}$ (and analogously for $\widehat{b}'_1, \widehat{b}'_2$), with $X_{i:n}, Y_{i:n}$ denoting the marginal order statistics.

Once a pair of bivariate samples is generated, we construct the process $\widetilde{W}_{n, n'} =: W_n$ on a 100×100 finite grid of equidistant points spanning $[0, 1]^2$. To compare this observed path with a standard Wiener process, we compute three test statistics,

namely

$$\begin{aligned}
 \kappa_n &= \max_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{G}} |W_n(x,y)|, & (\text{Kolmogorov-Smirnov type}) \\
 \omega_n^2 &= \|\mathcal{G}\|^2 \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{G}} W_n(x,y)^2, & (\text{Cramér-von Mises type}) \\
 A_n^2 &= \|\mathcal{G}\|^2 \sum_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{W_n(x,y)^2}{xy}, & (\text{Anderson-Darling type})
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{18}$$

where $\|\mathcal{G}\|$ is the mesh length, i.e., $1/100$.

The same statistics are also computed from 10,000 paths of the true standard Wiener process generated on the same grid $\mathcal{G}$, to create benchmark distribution tables. Recall that these tables have to be made only once as a consequence of obtaining a distribution-free limit. We denote the statistics, computed from the true Wiener process, by κ , ω^2 and A^2 . For each model, we present PP-plots for a visual comparison of the empirical distributions of κ_n vs. κ , ω_n^2 vs. ω^2 and A_n^2 vs. A^2 . We also present rejection frequencies at 5% and 1% significance levels.

6.1. Simulations under the null hypothesis. We consider the following three models:

- Model I. F has Gumbel(2) copula and Pareto(3) margins, F' has Gumbel(2) copula and Pareto(4) margins.
- Model II. Both F and F' have Gumbel(2) copula and Pareto(3) margins.
- Model III. F has Clayton(1) survival copula and Pareto(3) margins, F' has Clayton(1) survival copula and Pareto(4) margins.

Note that we specify each bivariate distribution F (and F') in terms of a copula C and marginal dfs F_1, F_2 , which characterize F via $F(x, y) = C(F_1(x), F_2(y))$. Also, Pareto(α) with $\alpha > 0$ refers to the df $1 - 1/x^\alpha$, $x > 1$; Gumbel(θ) with $\theta \geq 1$ refers to the copula

$$\exp\{-[(-\log u)^\theta + (-\log v)^\theta]^{1/\theta}\}, \quad (u, v) \in [0, 1]^2;$$

and for $\theta > 0$ the *survival* copula corresponding to the Clayton(θ) copula is given by

$$((1-u)^{-\theta} + (1-v)^{-\theta} - 1)^{-1/\theta} + u + v - 1, \quad (u, v) \in [0, 1]^2.$$

Since the tail copula of a bivariate df is entirely determined by the copula, the null hypothesis $R = R'$ holds for each of the three models described above.

FIGURE 6.1. PP-plots for the three test statistics constructed from 1000 simulated sample pairs per model

The PP-plots in Fig. 6.1 indicate that the process W_n indeed behaves like a standard Wiener process, providing an empirical confirmation of Theorem 5.1. Moreover, in Table 6.1 we present the rejection counts at 5% and 1% significance levels. For each particular model and test statistic, the rejection count is simply the observed number of times (out of 1000) the test statistic exceeds the 95th or the 99th

percentile of the corresponding distribution obtained from the true Wiener process. In all cases, the observed counts are consistent with Binomial(1000, 0.05) and Binomial(1000, 0.01) distributions, respectively, substantiating a good size performance. Note that the results for Model II show that our approach works well when F and F' have identical marginal distributions; see Remark 4.3.

	Model I	Model II	Model III		Model I	Model II	Model III
κ_n	47	54	43	κ_n	10	10	10
ω_n^2	47	56	48	ω_n^2	11	9	9
A_n^2	58	51	57	A_n^2	13	10	10

Table 6.1: Number of rejections in 1000 repetitions, at 5% (left) and 1% (right) significance levels

6.2. Simulations under the alternative hypothesis. Before describing the simulation models under the alternative, we first note that the estimation of $R(x, y)$ is statistically difficult in the sense that generally the corresponding estimator has considerable bias and variance. For simplicity, consider $R(1, 1)$, the upper tail dependence coefficient. For the sample sizes used in this simulation section, it is hard to distinguish between the values $R(1, 1) = 0.5$ and $R'(1, 1) = 0.6$, say, so a test cannot achieve a high power in such a case. In order to substantiate this, we reuse the simulation results from the df F with the Clayton(1) survival copula and Pareto(3) margins in Model III above. In this case $R(1, 1) = 0.5$. The histogram in Figure 6.2 depicts the distribution of the 1000 estimates $\hat{R}_n(1, 1)$. The (empirical) bias of these estimates is as high as 0.046 and the sample standard deviation is 0.026. We see from the figure that the central 95% of the estimates range from 0.492 to 0.596; the true value is barely included in this interval and the range is rather wide. Note that when performing a two-sample test, the bias and variance of the second sample also have to be taken into account.

In this subsection, we consider the four models listed below. The *linear factor model* of Model IVa refers to the bivariate random vector

$$(19) \quad (\lambda Z_1 + (1 - \lambda)Z_2, \mu Z_1 + (1 - \mu)Z_2),$$

FIGURE 6.2. Histogram of $\hat{R}_n(1,1)$ values computed from 1000 bivariate samples with Clayton(1) survival copula and Pareto(3) margins

with Z_1, Z_2 independent and $\lambda, \mu \in (0, 1)$ deterministic parameters.

- Model Ia. F has Gumbel(2) copula and Pareto(3) margins, F' has Gumbel(6) copula and Pareto(4) margins.
- Model IIa. F has Gumbel(4) copula and Pareto(3) margins, F' has Gumbel(1) (i.e., independence) copula and Pareto(4) margins.
- Model IIIa. F has Clayton(1) survival copula and Pareto(3) margins, F' has Clayton(5) survival copula and Pareto(4) margins.
- Model IVa. F is the df of the linear factor model (19), with $Z_1, Z_2 \sim \text{Pareto}(1)$, $\lambda = 0.9, \mu = 0.8$, and F' is the df of the same model (19) with $Z_1, Z_2 \sim \text{Pareto}(2)$, $\lambda = 0.9, \mu = 0.2$.

As in Subsection 6.1 above, we construct PP-plots for each model and each of the three test statistics; see Fig. 6.3. The PP-plots show dramatic deviations from the behavior under a standard Wiener process. We also present rejection counts at 5% significance level in Table 6.2. As suggested by the PP-plots, the three omnibus tests have considerable power with, for the present alternatives, Cramèr-von Mises outperforming Kolmogorov-Smirnov, and Anderson-Darling performing the best.

FIGURE 6.3. PP-plots for the three test statistics constructed from 1000 simulated sample pairs per model

	Model Ia	Model IIa	Model IIIa	Model IVa
κ_n	687	361	607	587
ω_n^2	832	576	787	672
A_n^2	943	832	916	958

Table 6.2: Number of rejections in 1000 repetitions at 5% significance level

7. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Emboldened by the Monte Carlo simulation results of the previous section, demonstrating good size and power performances, we now take our approach to real equity index data of three financial markets.

An important concern when analyzing multiple financial markets operating in different time zones is the synchronicity of the data, which requires a careful treatment. We use intra-daily data to construct three synchronized time series of daily equity index returns: for FTSE 100 (UK), DAX 30 (Germany), and S&P 500 (US). Data are obtained from the Tick History Database of Thomson Reuters. Our full sample spans the period May 2008 to August 2015. Using Coordinated Universal Time (UTC), care has been taken to account for the change to daylight savings time (DST), which does not occur on the same day around the world.

We focus on the pair {FTSE 100, DAX 30} for a detailed exposition. We construct two bivariate samples from the daily negative log-returns of these two indices: the first sample is generated from the 900 trading days preceding January 1, 2012 (spanning the period from May 23, 2008 to December 31, 2011), and the second sample is generated from the 900 trading days following January 1, 2012 (spanning the period from January 1, 2012 to August 13, 2015). To be more precise, the daily negative log-returns for a given index are the numbers $\log(p_t/p_{t+1})$, with p_t denoting the index price recorded at 14:30 UTC (13:30 UTC during European DST) on trading day t . Note that the first sample covers some of the most volatile trading days of the global financial crisis and the subsequent European debt crisis, while the second sample can be considered a relatively calm “post-crisis” period. We aim to test whether or not the tail dependence structure in the two samples, as characterized by the tail copula, shows statistical evidence of a change.

Figure 7.1 displays plots of the daily negative log-returns for the two indices during the two time periods, and Table 7.1 provides some sample statistics for these time series. It is visibly clear that the marginal structure changes for both indices from period 1 to period 2, but a possible change in the tail dependence structure is much more difficult to detect by visual inspection. The change in the marginal structure can also be observed in Figure 7.2, which plots the estimated extreme value index γ for each marginal data set over a set of k values ranging from 100 to 200. It is clear that the (right) tail of the daily negative log-returns is heavier in the first period (with EV index estimates firmly positive) than in the second period (with EV index estimates mostly hovering below 0).

FIGURE 7.1. Daily negative log-returns of FTSE 100 (top) and DAX 30 (bottom) in the two periods. Tick marks on the horizontal axes indicate the first trading day of each year.

	Period 1				Period 2			
	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max
FTSE 100	0.000	0.016	-0.078	0.121	0.000	0.008	-0.030	0.028
DAX 30	0.000	0.019	-0.102	0.140	0.001	0.011	-0.037	0.043

Table 7.1: Sample statistics of the daily negative log-returns of FTSE 100 and DAX 30 in the two periods

The next step in our analysis is to transform the observed negative log-returns (X_i, Y_i) in period 1 and (X'_i, Y'_i) in period 2 into $(\hat{X}_i, \hat{Y}_i)$ and $(\hat{X}'_i, \hat{Y}'_i)$ as described in (6), which leads to estimates $\hat{R}_n$ and $\hat{R}'_n$ of the tail copulas R and R' in the two periods. Figure 7.3 displays scatter plots of the transformed negative log-returns in the two periods, for $k = 150$. Since the transformation (6) maps joint extremes (X_i, Y_i) to points near the origin, the tail copula estimate $\hat{R}_n(x, y)$ is proportional to the number of points $(\hat{X}_i, \hat{Y}_i)$ inside the rectangle $[0, x] \times [0, y]$ (and analogously for $\hat{R}'_n$). In particular, the upper tail dependence coefficients $R(1, 1)$ of period 1 and $R'(1, 1)$ of period 2 can be estimated by dividing the number of points $(\hat{X}_i, \hat{Y}_i)$ or $(\hat{X}'_i, \hat{Y}'_i)$ in $[0, 1]^2$ by k . This leads to estimates $\hat{R}_n(1, 1) = 115/150 = 0.77$ and $\hat{R}'_n(1, 1) = 104/150 = 0.69$. The difference is small, and, also in light of the

FIGURE 7.2. Estimated marginal extreme value indices of the daily negative log-returns of FTSE 100 and DAX 30 in the two periods

FIGURE 7.3. Transformed daily negative log-returns $(\hat{X}_i, \hat{Y}_i)$ of period 1 and $(\hat{X}'_i, \hat{Y}'_i)$ of period 2, with $k = 150$. The number of points in the square $[0, 1]^2$, divided by k , gives the estimates $\hat{R}_n(1, 1) = 115/150 = 0.77$ and $\hat{R}'_n(1, 1) = 104/150 = 0.69$.

estimator's substantial bias and variance illustrated in Figure 6.2 for simulated data, it is not at all clear if it indicates a difference in the true tail copulas R and R' . Also note that $R(1, 1)$ does not tell the whole story about tail dependence, which can only be properly described by the entire tail copula R .

It remains to construct the test process W_n and compute the test statistics in (18), as in Section 6. We do this again for $k = 100, \dots, 200$. Plots of the resulting test statistics can be seen in Figure 7.4, together with the 95th and the

FIGURE 7.4. The three test statistics in (18) computed from the daily negative log-returns of FTSE 100 and DAX 30 in periods 1 and 2. The dotted lines indicate the 95th and 99th percentiles of the corresponding null distributions.

99th percentiles of their distributions under the null hypothesis. Each test statistic stays well below the 95th percentile of the corresponding null distribution for the entire range of k values, leading to non-rejection of the null hypothesis. Thus, the conclusion based on these three test statistics is that the tail dependence structure between the daily negative log-returns of FTSE 100 and DAX 30 does *not* change from period 1 to period 2, despite the visible evidence of change in the marginal (tail) behaviors of both equity indices.

A possible objection against this application could be that, per period, the data may be serially dependent. First note that pairwise dependence in the tails can only be “positive”; for example, for the countermonotonic copula, the case of perfect negative dependence, the corresponding tail copula is just the 0-function, the same as for the independence copula. Loosely speaking, in case of (positive) serial dependence at high levels, the data contain less information about the underlying df than in the i.i.d. case. Hence, estimation errors, that is, variances, become larger and so do therefore the critical values of the tests. As a result, our tests can, in fact, be considered as conservative: if the null hypothesis is not rejected using i.i.d. assumptions, it will not be rejected in the case of serial dependence. So, our conclusion of no change in tail copulas remains.

Having considered the tail dependence between a pair of European equity indices, we now turn our attention to the tail dependence between the transatlantic pair {FTSE 100, S&P 500}. We compute, like above, the daily negative log-returns

FIGURE 7.5. Daily negative log-returns of FTSE 100 (top) and S&P 500 (bottom) in the two periods. Tick marks on the horizontal axes indicate the first trading day of each year.

	Period 1				Period 2			
	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max
FTSE 100	0.000	0.016	-0.078	0.121	0.000	0.008	-0.030	0.028
S&P 500	0.000	0.018	-0.111	0.127	0.001	0.007	-0.032	0.027

Table 7.2: Sample statistics of the daily negative log-returns of FTSE 100 and S&P 500 in the two periods

of these two indices during the same periods 1 and 2 defined earlier, using daily synchronous index price data recorded at 14:30 UTC (13:30 UTC during European DST). Figure 7.5 displays plots of the daily negative log-returns for the two indices during the two time periods, and Table 7.2 provides sample statistics. As before, we see clear evidence of a change in the marginal behavior of the negative log-returns in period 1 vs. in period 2.

To test if there is a change in the tail dependence structure, we again construct our test process W_n from the two bivariate samples generated from the two periods, and compute the three test statistics in (18) for $k = 100, \dots, 200$; see Figure 7.6. We find that each test statistic mostly stays below the 95th percentile of the corresponding null distribution, with a few exceptions at particular k values. Keeping

FIGURE 7.6. The three test statistics in (18) computed from the daily negative log-returns of FTSE 100 and S&P 500 in periods 1 and 2. The dotted lines indicate the 95th and 99th percentiles of the corresponding null distributions.

in mind that (i) looking at several k values simultaneously amounts to a multiple testing problem, and moreover (ii) our data sets likely feature some serial dependence, both of which have an *upward* effect on critical values for the test statistics, we conclude that our testing approach again supports the null hypothesis of no change in the tail dependence structure of the negative log-returns in period 1 vs. in period 2.

8. CONCLUSIONS

We have developed a novel, general procedure to test for the equality of the tail copulas associated with two samples of bivariate data. A natural but complex feature of this problem is that the tail copulas, of which equality is tested for, are not specified. Deploying an ingenious martingale transformation of the suitably normalized difference between two semi-parametric estimators of the tail copulas, we have constructed a two-sample hypothesis testing process and established its weak convergence to a standard Wiener process under the null hypothesis. Applying our hypothesis testing procedure to samples of negative log-returns of equity indices, during and after the global financial crisis, we find no evidence to reject the null hypothesis of tail copula equality. That is, although large negative returns occur more frequently and severely during crisis vs. post-crisis for the pairs of equity indices we have analyzed, our testing procedure reveals that there is no statistical evidence of a change in their tail dependence structure. These findings suggest

that, for the highly developed equity markets we consider, whereas inference about marginal (tail) behavior should account for changes over time or across “regimes”, the tail dependence structure appears to be more stable and can thus be inferred from longer time periods.

9. PROOFS

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By Skorohod’s representation theorem, there is a probability space where probabilistically equivalent versions of all the random elements in Assumption A1 are defined, those in (9) independent of those in (10), and the convergences (9) and (10) hold in probability. All statements in this proof should be understood as statements about random elements in this probability space.

Given $(x, y) \in [0, \infty)^2$, let us define points $(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$ and $(\hat{x}', \hat{y}')$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x} &= \left[\left(1 + \gamma_1 \left(\frac{x^{-\hat{\gamma}_1} - 1}{\hat{\gamma}_1} \cdot \frac{\hat{a}_1}{a_1} + \frac{\hat{b}_1 - b_1}{a_1} \right) \right) \vee 0 \right]^{-1/\gamma_1}, \\ \hat{y} &= \left[\left(1 + \gamma_2 \left(\frac{y^{-\hat{\gamma}_2} - 1}{\hat{\gamma}_2} \cdot \frac{\hat{a}_2}{a_2} + \frac{\hat{b}_2 - b_2}{a_2} \right) \right) \vee 0 \right]^{-1/\gamma_2}, \\ \hat{x}' &= \left[\left(1 + \gamma'_1 \left(\frac{x^{-\hat{\gamma}'_1} - 1}{\hat{\gamma}'_1} \cdot \frac{\hat{a}'_1}{a'_1} + \frac{\hat{b}'_1 - b'_1}{a'_1} \right) \right) \vee 0 \right]^{-1/\gamma'_1}, \\ \hat{y}' &= \left[\left(1 + \gamma'_2 \left(\frac{y^{-\hat{\gamma}'_2} - 1}{\hat{\gamma}'_2} \cdot \frac{\hat{a}'_2}{a'_2} + \frac{\hat{b}'_2 - b'_2}{a'_2} \right) \right) \vee 0 \right]^{-1/\gamma'_2}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 1.1 in the Appendix of Can et al. (2015) that

$$\begin{aligned}(20) \quad & \sup_{x \in [\delta, T]} \left| \sqrt{k}(\hat{x} - x) - [f(x, \gamma_1)A_1 + g(x, \gamma_1)B_1 + h(x, \gamma_1)\Gamma_1] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \\ & \sup_{y \in [\delta, T]} \left| \sqrt{k}(\hat{y} - y) - [f(y, \gamma_2)A_2 + g(y, \gamma_2)B_2 + h(y, \gamma_2)\Gamma_2] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \\ & \sup_{x \in [\delta, T]} \left| \sqrt{k'}(\hat{x}' - x) - [f(x, \gamma'_1)A'_1 + g(x, \gamma'_1)B'_1 + h(x, \gamma'_1)\Gamma'_1] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \\ & \sup_{y \in [\delta, T]} \left| \sqrt{k'}(\hat{y}' - y) - [f(y, \gamma'_2)A'_2 + g(y, \gamma'_2)B'_2 + h(y, \gamma'_2)\Gamma'_2] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.\end{aligned}$$

Now, let $\hat{R}_n$ and T_n be as defined in (7) and (8), respectively, and let $\hat{R}'_{n'}$ and $T'_{n'}$ be their analogues constructed from the second sample. Note that the probability of the event

$$(21) \quad \{\hat{R}_n(x, y) = T_n(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \text{ and } \hat{R}'_{n'}(x, y) = T'_{n'}(\hat{x}', \hat{y}') \text{ for all } (x, y) \in [\delta, T]^2\}$$

tends to 1 as $n, n' \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, instead of $\eta_{n,n'}$, it will suffice to show convergence for $\eta_{n,n'}^*(x, y) := \sqrt{\kappa}[T_n(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) - T_{n'}'(\hat{x}', \hat{y}')]$, which we decompose as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_{n,n'}^*(x, y) &= \sqrt{\kappa}[T_n(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) - R_n(\hat{x}, \hat{y})] + \sqrt{\kappa}[R_n(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) - R(\hat{x}, \hat{y})] \\
&\quad + \sqrt{\kappa}[R(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) - R(x, y)] - \sqrt{\kappa}[T_{n'}'(\hat{x}', \hat{y}') - R_{n'}'(\hat{x}', \hat{y}')] \\
&\quad - \sqrt{\kappa}[R_{n'}'(\hat{x}', \hat{y}') - R(\hat{x}', \hat{y}')] - \sqrt{\kappa}[R(\hat{x}', \hat{y}') - R(x, y)] \\
&=: \eta_{1n}^*(x, y) + \eta_{2n}^*(x, y) + \eta_{3n}^*(x, y) - \eta_{4n'}^*(x, y) - \eta_{5n'}^*(x, y) - \eta_{6n'}^*(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

The in-probability convergence (9), (20) and the continuity of V_R yield

$$(22) \quad \sup_{(x,y) \in [\delta, T]^2} |\eta_{1n}^*(x, y) - \sqrt{c}V_R(x, y)| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

From Assumption A3 and (20) it also follows that

$$(23) \quad \sup_{(x,y) \in [\delta, T]^2} |\eta_{2n}^*(x, y)| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Moreover, from the Mean Value Theorem we know that

$$\eta_{3n}^*(x, y) = \sqrt{\kappa}[R^{(1)}(\check{x}, \check{y})(\hat{x} - x) + R^{(2)}(\check{x}, \check{y})(\hat{y} - y)],$$

for some $(\check{x}, \check{y})$ lying on the line segment connecting (x, y) and $(\hat{x}, \hat{y})$. The convergence (20) in combination with Assumption A2 now yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
(24) \quad \sup_{(x,y) \in [\delta, T]^2} &\left| \eta_{3n}^*(x, y) - \sqrt{c}R^{(1)}(x, y)[f(x, \gamma_1)A_1 + g(x, \gamma_1)B_1 + h(x, \gamma_1)\Gamma_1] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sqrt{c}R^{(2)}(x, y)[f(y, \gamma_2)A_2 + g(y, \gamma_2)B_2 + h(y, \gamma_2)\Gamma_2] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The analogues of (22), (23), (24) for $\eta_{4n'}^*$, $\eta_{5n'}^*$, $\eta_{6n'}^*$ are proved along similar lines. Combining these six results completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. This result essentially follows from the general martingale transformation result in Theorem 3.1 of Can et al. (2015). Instead of arbitrary Borel sets $B \subset [\delta, T]^2$ considered therein, we consider rectangles $[\delta, \delta+x] \times [\delta, \delta+y]$ for $0 \leq x, y \leq T-\delta$. Furthermore, we use the scanning family $A_u = [\delta, T] \times [\delta, (1-u)\delta+uT]$,

$0 \leq u \leq 1$. Then, from (13) above under Assumptions A4–A5 confined to the true $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, r, r^{(1)}, r^{(2)}$, we obtain that

$$W_R(x, y) = \int_{\delta}^{\delta+x} \int_{\delta}^{\delta+y} d\eta(s, t) - \int_{\delta}^{\delta+x} \int_{\delta}^{\delta+y} \mathbf{q}(s, t)^{\top} \left(\mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T \mathbf{q}(s', t') d\eta(s', t') \right) r(s, t) ds dt$$

is a bivariate Wiener process on $[0, \tau]^2$ for any $\tau \in (\delta, T - \delta)$, with “time” measure $R([\delta, \delta + \cdot] \times [\delta, \delta + \cdot])$. That is, W_R is a zero-mean Gaussian process with covariance structure

$$E[W_R(x, y)W_R(x', y')] = R([\delta, \delta + x \wedge x'] \times [\delta, \delta + y \wedge y']),$$

for $(x, y), (x', y') \in [0, \tau]^2$. It then follows from the standard theory of multivariate Gaussian processes (see, e.g., the lemma preceding Theorem 3 in Khmaladze (1988)) that the normalized process

$$\begin{aligned} W(x, y) &= \int_{\delta}^{\delta+x} \int_{\delta}^{\delta+y} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r(s, t)}} dW_R(s, t) \\ &= \int_{\delta}^{\delta+x} \int_{\delta}^{\delta+y} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r(s, t)}} d\eta(s, t) \\ &\quad - \int_{\delta}^{\delta+x} \int_{\delta}^{\delta+y} \mathbf{q}(s, t)^{\top} \left(\mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T \mathbf{q}(s', t') d\eta(s', t') \right) \sqrt{r(s, t)} ds dt \end{aligned}$$

is a standard bivariate Wiener process on $[0, \tau]^2$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. First we establish the consistency of the estimator $\hat{r}$, that is:

$$(25) \quad \sup_{(x, y) \in [\delta, T]^2} |\hat{r}(x, y) - r(x, y)| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \text{as } n, n' \rightarrow \infty.$$

Clearly, it is sufficient to show that

$$\sup_{(x, y) \in [\delta, T]^2} |s_h(x, y) - r(x, y)| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

We write

$$\begin{aligned} &s_h(x, y) - r(x, y) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2h)^2} \left[\hat{R}_n([x - h, x + h] \times [y - h, y + h]) - R([x - h, x + h] \times [y - h, y + h]) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(2h)^2} R([x - h, x + h] \times [y - h, y + h]) - r(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

From (22), (23) and (24), the first term is $O_P(k^{-1/2}(k^{1/6})^2) = o_P(1)$ uniformly on $[\delta, T]^2$. The second term is equal to

$$(2h)^{-2} \int_{y-h}^{y+h} \int_{x-h}^{x+h} (r(u, v) - r(x, y)) \, du \, dv,$$

which by the (uniform) continuity of r tends to 0, uniformly on $[\delta, T]^2$.

Next, we establish the consistency of $\hat{r}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{r}^{(2)}$, that is,

$$(26) \quad \sup_{(x,y) \in [\delta, T]^2} |\hat{r}^{(j)}(x, y) - r^{(j)}(x, y)| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \text{as } n, n' \rightarrow \infty,$$

for $j = 1, 2$. For this it is sufficient to show that

$$\sup_{(x,y) \in [\delta, T]^2} \left| \frac{s_h(x+h, y) - s_h(x-h, y)}{2h} - r^{(1)}(x, y) \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{s_h(x+h, y) - s_h(x-h, y)}{2h} - r^{(1)}(x, y) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2h)^3} \left\{ \left[\hat{R}_n([x, x+2h] \times [y-h, y+h]) - \hat{R}_n([x-2h, x] \times [y-h, y+h]) \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \left[R([x, x+2h] \times [y-h, y+h]) - R([x-2h, x] \times [y-h, y+h]) \right] \right\} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{(2h)^3} \left[R([x, x+2h] \times [y-h, y+h]) - R([x-2h, x] \times [y-h, y+h]) \right] \\ & \quad - r^{(1)}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

From (22)–(24) again, the first term is now $O_P(k^{-1/2}(k^{1/8})^3) = o_P(1)$ uniformly on $[\delta, T]^2$. The second term is equal to

$$(2h)^{-2} \int_{y-h}^{y+h} \int_x^{x+2h} \left(\frac{r(u, v) - r(u-2h, v)}{2h} - r^{(1)}(x, y) \right) \, du \, dv,$$

which tends to 0, uniformly on $[\delta, T]^2$, by the Mean Value Theorem and the (uniform) continuity of $r^{(1)}$.

Now, by Theorem 3.1 and Skorohod's representation theorem, there is a probability space where probabilistically equivalent versions of $\eta_{n,n'}$ and η are defined, and these satisfy $\|\eta_{n,n'} - \eta\|_{[\delta, T]^2} \rightarrow 0$ a.s., with $\|\cdot\|_S := \sup_S |\cdot|$ for $S \subset [0, \infty)^2$. We will show that in this probability space,

$$(27) \quad \|W_{n,n'} - W\|_{[0, \tau]^2} \xrightarrow{P} 0,$$

with W as defined in (16). In view of Theorem 4.1, this will suffice for the proof.

Throughout the proof, we will let $A_\delta(x, y)$ denote the rectangle $[\delta, \delta+x] \times [\delta, \delta+y]$ for $(x, y) \in [0, \tau]^2$. Note that (27) will follow from

$$(28) \quad \left\| \int_{A_\delta(x, y)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\widehat{r}(s, t)}} d\eta_{n, n'}(s, t) - \int_{A_\delta(x, y)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r(s, t)}} d\eta(s, t) \right\|_{[0, \tau]^2} \xrightarrow{P} 0$$

and

$$(29) \quad \left\| \int_{A_\delta(x, y)} \widehat{\mathbf{q}}(s, t)^\top \left(\widehat{\mathbf{I}}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) \int_\delta^T \int_t^T \widehat{\mathbf{q}}(s', t') d\eta_{n, n'}(s', t') \right) \sqrt{\widehat{r}(s, t)} ds dt \right. \\ \left. - \int_{A_\delta(x, y)} \mathbf{q}(s, t)^\top \left(\mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) \int_\delta^T \int_t^T \mathbf{q}(s', t') d\eta(s', t') \right) \sqrt{r(s, t)} ds dt \right\|_{[0, \tau]^2} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

We will prove (28) first. Let $\Delta_{n, n'} := \eta_{n, n'} - \eta$. Then (28) will follow from

$$(30) \quad \left\| \int_{A_\delta(x, y)} \Delta\sigma(s, t) d\eta(s, t) \right\|_{[0, \tau]^2} \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \left\| \int_{A_\delta(x, y)} \widehat{\sigma}(s, t) d\Delta_{n, n'}(s, t) \right\|_{[0, \tau]^2} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Applying bivariate integration by parts (see e.g., Henstock (1973), Theorem 3) to the first integral term in (30), we obtain the following bound:

$$(31) \quad \left| \int_{A_\delta(x, y)} \Delta\sigma(s, t) d\eta(s, t) \right| \\ \leq \sum_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{V}_\delta(x, y)} |\Delta\sigma(u, v) \eta(u, v)| + \|\eta\|_{A_\delta(x, y)} V_{A_\delta(x, y)}^{\text{HK}}(\Delta\sigma) \\ \leq \|\eta\|_{[\delta, T]^2} (4\|\Delta\sigma\|_{[\delta, T]^2} + V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(\Delta\sigma)),$$

where $\mathcal{V}_\delta(x, y)$ denotes the set of the four vertices of the rectangle $A_\delta(x, y)$. Now, Assumption A2 ensures that η is continuous (hence bounded) on $[\delta, T]^2$, (25) ensures that $|\Delta\sigma|$ is $o_P(1)$ uniformly over $[\delta, T]^2$, and A6 ensures that $V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(\Delta\sigma)$ is $o_P(1)$ as well. It follows that the far right-hand side of (31) vanishes in probability, and the first convergence in (30) is proved. The second convergence in (30) follows from a similar integration by parts argument:

$$\left| \int_{A_\delta(x, y)} \widehat{\sigma}(s, t) d\Delta_{n, n'}(s, t) \right| \leq \|\Delta_{n, n'}\|_{[\delta, T]^2} (4\|\widehat{\sigma}\|_{[\delta, T]^2} + V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(\widehat{\sigma})),$$

where the right-hand side is $o_P(1)$ since $\|\Delta_{n, n'}\|_{[\delta, T]^2}$ is $o_P(1)$ and $\|\widehat{\sigma}\|_{[\delta, T]^2}$ as well as $V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(\widehat{\sigma})$ are $O_P(1)$ terms.

We have thus established (28), and it remains to prove (29). For ease of notation, we let

$$\begin{aligned} H(s, t) &= \mathbf{q}(s, t)^\top \mathbf{I}_{\delta, t}^{-1}(t) \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T \mathbf{q}(s', t') d\eta(s', t'), \\ H_{n, n'}(s, t) &= \mathbf{q}(s, t)^\top \mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T \mathbf{q}(s', t') d\eta_{n, n'}(s', t'), \\ \widehat{H}(s, t) &= \widehat{\mathbf{q}}(s, t)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{I}}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T \widehat{\mathbf{q}}(s', t') d\eta(s', t'), \\ \widehat{H}_{n, n'}(s, t) &= \widehat{\mathbf{q}}(s, t)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{I}}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T \widehat{\mathbf{q}}(s', t') d\eta_{n, n'}(s', t'). \end{aligned}$$

Then (29) can be written succinctly as

$$\left\| \int_{A_{\delta}(x, y)} \left(\widehat{H}_{n, n'}(s, t) \sqrt{\widehat{r}(s, t)} - H(s, t) \sqrt{r(s, t)} \right) ds dt \right\|_{[0, \tau]^2} \xrightarrow{P} 0,$$

which can be proved by showing

$$(32) \quad \|H(\sqrt{\widehat{r}} - \sqrt{r})\|_{A_{\delta}(\tau, \tau)} \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \|(\widehat{H}_{n, n'} - H)\sqrt{\widehat{r}}\|_{A_{\delta}(\tau, \tau)} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

The first convergence in (32) follows easily from the continuity (hence boundedness) of H over $A_{\delta}(\tau, \tau)$ and (25). As for the second convergence in (32), since $\|\sqrt{\widehat{r}}\|_{A_{\delta}(\tau, \tau)} = O_P(1)$, we need to show that $\|\widehat{H}_{n, n'} - H\|_{A_{\delta}(\tau, \tau)} \xrightarrow{P} 0$. We will do this by proving

$$(33) \quad \|H_{n, n'} - H\|_{A_{\delta}(\tau, \tau)} \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \|\widehat{H}_{n, n'} - H_{n, n'}\|_{A_{\delta}(\tau, \tau)} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Consider the first convergence in (33). We have

$$\|H_{n, n'} - H\|_{A_{\delta}(\tau, \tau)} = \left\| \mathbf{q}(s, t)^\top \mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T \mathbf{q}(s', t') d\Delta_{n, n'}(s', t') \right\|_{A_{\delta}(\tau, \tau)},$$

with $\Delta_{n, n'} = \eta_{n, n'} - \eta$, as before. The term $|\mathbf{q}(s, t)^\top \mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t)|$ is component-wise bounded on $A_{\delta}(\tau, \tau)$ by continuity, so we need to show that

$$(34) \quad \sup_{t \in [\delta, \delta + \tau]} \left| \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T q_i(s', t') d\Delta_{n, n'}(s', t') \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, 8.$$

Applying integration by parts as before, we obtain

$$\left| \int_{\delta}^T \int_t^T q_i(s', t') d\Delta_{n, n'}(s', t') \right| \leq \|\Delta_{n, n'}\|_{[\delta, T]^2} (4\|q_i\|_{[\delta, T]^2} + V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(q_i)),$$

where the right-hand side is $o_P(1)$ since $\|\Delta_{n,n'}\|_{[\delta,T]^2} = o_P(1)$, $\|q_i\|_{[\delta,T]^2} < \infty$ by continuity, and $V_{[\delta,T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(q_i) < \infty$ by virtue of Assumption A6 together with Proposition 1 of Blümlinger and Tichy (1989). Hence (34) is established and it remains to prove the second convergence in (33).

By virtue of the first convergence in (33), and an analogous result for $\hat{H}_{n,n'}$ and $\hat{H}$, it will suffice to prove $\|\hat{H} - H\|_{A_\delta(\tau,\tau)} \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Note that

$$(35) \quad \begin{aligned} & |\hat{H}(s, t) - H(s, t)| \\ & \leq |\hat{\mathbf{q}}(s, t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) - \mathbf{q}(s, t)^\top \mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t)| \cdot \left| \int_\delta^T \int_t^T \mathbf{q}(s', t') d\eta(s', t') \right| \\ & \quad + |\hat{\mathbf{q}}(s, t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t)| \cdot \left| \int_\delta^T \int_t^T (\hat{\mathbf{q}}(s, t') - \mathbf{q}(s', t')) d\eta(s', t') \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where absolute values should be interpreted component-wise, as usual. Consider the first term on the right-hand side of (35). Our assumptions about the various estimators and (25)–(26) ensure that the difference $|\hat{\mathbf{q}}(s, t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t) - \mathbf{q}(s, t)^\top \mathbf{I}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t)|$ is $o_P(1)$ uniformly over $(s, t) \in A_\delta(\tau, \tau)$. Moreover, an integration by parts argument as before yields that

$$\left| \int_\delta^T \int_t^T q_i(s', t') d\eta(s', t') \right| \leq \|\eta\|_{[\delta, T]^2} (4\|q_i\|_{[\delta, T]^2} + V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(q_i)),$$

for $i = 1, \dots, 8$, where the right-hand side is $O_P(1)$. So the first summand on the right-hand side of (35) is $o_P(1)$ uniformly over $(s, t) \in A_\delta(\tau, \tau)$. The second summand there can be handled similarly: the term $|\hat{\mathbf{q}}(s, t)^\top \hat{\mathbf{I}}_{\delta, T}^{-1}(t)|$ is $O_P(1)$, and integration by parts yields

$$\left| \int_\delta^T \int_t^T \Delta q_i(s', t') d\eta(s', t') \right| \leq \|\eta\|_{[\delta, T]^2} (4\|\Delta q_i\|_{[\delta, T]^2} + V_{[\delta, T]^2}^{\text{HK}}(\Delta q_i))$$

for $i = 1, \dots, 8$, where the right-hand side is $o_P(1)$.

Both convergences in (32) are thereby established, which in turn proves (29). $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Estate V. Khmaladze for stimulating discussions about this paper. John Einmahl holds the Arie Kapteyn Chair 2019–2022 and gratefully acknowledges the corresponding research support. Roger Laeven is supported in part by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research under an NWO-Vici grant 2020–2025.

REFERENCES

- Beirlant, J., Goegebeur, Y., Teugels, J., and Segers, J. (2004). *Statistics of Extremes: Theory and Applications*. Wiley.
- Bekaert, G., Harvey, C. R., and Ng, A. (2005). Market integration and contagion. *J. Bus.*, 78(1):39–69.
- Bekaert, G., Hodrick, R. J., and Zhang, X. (2009). International stock return comovements. *J. Finance*, 64(6):2591–2626.
- Blümlinger, M. and Tichy, R. F. (1989). Topological algebras of functions of bounded variation I. *Manuscripta Math.*, 65:245–255.
- Bormann, C. and Schienle, M. (2020). Detecting structural differences in tail dependence of financial time series. *J. Bus. Econ. Stat.*, 38(2):380–392.
- Bücher, A., Jäschke, S., and Wied, D. (2015). Nonparametric tests for constant tail dependence with an application to energy and finance. *J. Econom.*, 187(1):154–168.
- Can, S. U., Einmahl, J. H. J., Khmaladze, E. V., and Laeven, R. J. A. (2015). Asymptotically distribution-free goodness-of-fit testing for tail copulas. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(2):878–902.
- Christoffersen, P., Errunza, V. R., Jacobs, K., and Langlois, H. (2012). Is the potential for international diversification disappearing? A dynamic copula approach. *Rev. Financ. Stud.*, 25(12):3711–3751.
- de Haan, L. and Ferreira, A. (2006). *Extreme Value Theory: An Introduction*. Springer.
- de Haan, L. and Resnick, S. I. (1977). Limit theory for multivariate sample extremes. *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete*, 40(4):317–337.
- Delgado, M. A., Hidalgo, J., and Velasco, C. (2005). Distribution free goodness-of-fit tests for linear processes. *Ann. Statist.*, 33(6):2568–2609.
- Einmahl, J., de Haan, L., and Sinha, A. (1997). Estimating the spectral measure of an extreme value distribution. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 70(2):143–171.
- Forbes, K. J. and Rigobon, R. (2002). No contagion, only interdependence: Measuring stock market comovements. *J. Finance*, 57(5):2223–2261.
- Henstock, R. (1973). Integration by parts. *Aeq. Math.*, 9:1–18.

- Joe, H. (2001). *Multivariate Models and Dependence Concepts*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, second edition.
- Khmaladze, E. V. (1981). Martingale approach in the theory of goodness-of-fit tests. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 26(2):240–257.
- Khmaladze, E. V. (1988). An innovation approach to goodness-of-fit tests in R^m . *Ann. Statist.*, 16(4):1503–1516.
- Khmaladze, E. V. (1993). Goodness of fit problem and scanning innovation martingales. *Ann. Statist.*, 21(2):798–829.
- Khmaladze, E. V. and Koul, H. L. (2004). Martingale transforms goodness-of-fit tests in regression models. *Ann. Statist.*, 32(3):995–1034.
- King, M. A. and Wadhwani, S. (1990). Transmission of volatility between stock markets. *Rev. Financ. Stud.*, 3(1):5–33.
- Koenker, R. and Xiao, Z. (2002). Inference on the quantile regression process. *Econometrica*, 70(4):1583–1612.
- Koenker, R. and Xiao, Z. (2006). Quantile autoregression. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 101(475):980–990.
- Kotz, S. and Nadarajah, S. (2000). *Extreme Value Distributions: Theory and Applications*. Imperial College Press.
- Longin, F. and Solnik, B. (1995). Is the correlation in international equity returns constant: 1960-1990? *J. Int. Money Finance*, 14(1):3–26.
- Owen, A. B. (2005). Multidimensional variation for quasi-Monte Carlo. In Fan, J. and Li, G., editors, *Contemporary Multivariate Analysis and Design of Experiments*, pages 49–74. World Scientific Publishing.
- Towghi, N. (2002). Multidimensional extension of L.C. Young’s inequality. *J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.*, 3(2):Article 22.

DEPARTMENT OF QUANTITATIVE ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, ROETERSSTRAAT
11, 1018 WB AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS

Email address: `s.u.can@uva.nl`

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMETRICS & OR AND CENTER, TILBURG UNIVERSITY, P.O. Box 90153,
5000 LE TILBURG, THE NETHERLANDS

Email address: `j.h.j.einmahl@uvt.nl`

DEPARTMENT OF QUANTITATIVE ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, ROETERSSTRAAT
11, 1018 WB AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS

Email address: `r.j.a.laeven@uva.nl`