

Additional results

This note provides simulation results for GARCH processes and estimators of the tail index using harmonic numbers discussed in Section 3. Tables 5 and 6 present the numerical results on the performance of OLS estimators in regressions (1.3) with $\gamma = 0$ and $\gamma = 1/2$ for GARCH(1, 1) processes $Z_t = \sigma_t \epsilon_t$, where $\sigma_t^2 = \beta + \lambda Z_{t-1}^2 + \delta \sigma_{t-1}^2$, and ϵ_t are i.i.d. standard normal errors. The choice of the parameter values for β, λ and δ follows that in the simulation results presented by Kokoszka and Wolf (2004) who focused on subsampling approaches to estimating the mean of heavy-tailed observations. The corresponding values of the tail index ζ_0 of GARCH processes considered are provided in the same paper. The GARCH processes were simulated using the UCSD GARCH toolbox for Matlab by Kevin Sheppard. The IGARCH processes were simulated using the code by Mico Loretan.

Tables 7 and 8 provide simulation results for the Pareto exponent estimators in regression (3.12) for AR(1) and MA(1) processes driven by heavy-tailed innovations exhibiting deviations from power laws in form (4.16) and Student t distributions.

The numerical results reported in Tables 5 and 6 indicate that the modified OLS approach to the tail index estimation using regression (1.3) with $\gamma = 1/2$ also performs well in the case of GARCH(1, 1) processes, including IGARCH(1, 1) time series that have the GARCH coefficient (the coefficient at the lagged conditional variance) not too close to 1. For such processes, it also dominates, similar to the simulations discussed in this section, the traditional procedure based on regressions (1.3) with $\gamma = 0$. The OLS tail index estimation approach may be combined with GARCH filters (see, among others, Subsection 3.3 in Prigent 2003) to make inference on Pareto exponents under dependence and heavy-tailedness beyond those implied by conditional heteroskedasticity.

The comparison of Tables 7 and 8 with Tables 3 and 4 in the paper shows that the performance of and the numerical results for the tail index estimator using harmonic numbers

and regression (3.12) are very similar to those for the OLS estimator in regression (1.3) with the optimal shift $\gamma = 1/2$. All in all, the shifted OLS regression may be preferable, because it is arguably a more transparent and easier to use.

References

Kokoszka, P. and Wolf, M. (2004), ‘Subsampling the mean of heavy-tailed dependent observations’, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **25**, 217–234.

Prigent, J.-L. (2003), *Weak convergence of financial markets*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Table 5. Behavior of the usual OLS estimator \hat{b}_n in the regression

log (Rank) = $a - b \log$ (Size) for GARCH(1, 1) innovations				
n	50	100	200	500
Mean \hat{b}_n (OLS s.e) (SD \hat{b}_n)				
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 1.3,$ $\delta = 0.05, \zeta_0 \approx 1.19$	1.375* (0.035) (0.417)	1.294* (0.019) (0.328)	1.234* (0.011) (0.252)	1.139 (0.006) (0.159)
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 1.1,$ $\delta = 0.1, \zeta_0 \approx 1.43$	1.587* (0.040) (0.465)	1.511* (0.022) (0.366)	1.411 (0.013) (0.276)	1.297* (0.007) (0.164)
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 0.9,$ $\delta = 0.15, \zeta_0 \approx 1.83$	1.926* (0.047) (0.534)	1.839* (0.026) (0.411)	1.761 (0.015) (0.305)	1.534 (0.010) (0.162)
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 0.9,$ $\delta = 0.1, \zeta_0 = 2$	2.057 (0.050) (0.530)	1.979 (0.028) (0.407)	1.881* (0.016) (0.296)	1.628* (0.011) (0.151)
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 0.5,$ $\delta = 0.5, \zeta_0 = 2$	2.315* (0.059) (0.665)	2.136* (0.033) (0.528)	1.983 (0.019) (0.391)	1.630* (0.013) (0.202)
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 0.1,$ $\delta = 0.9, \zeta_0 = 2$	3.799* (0.104) (0.880)	3.235* (0.060) (0.701)	2.677* (0.038) (0.546)	1.855* (0.022) (0.303)

Notes: The entries are the estimates of the tail index and their standard errors using regression (1.3) with $\gamma = 0$ for GARCH(1, 1) processes $Z_t = \sigma_t \epsilon_t$, where $\sigma_t^2 = \beta + \lambda Z_{t-1}^2 + \delta \sigma_{t-1}^2$, and ϵ_t are i.i.d. standard normal errors. “Mean \hat{b}_n ” is the sample mean of the estimates \hat{b}_n obtained in simulations, and “SD \hat{b}_n ” is their sample standard deviation. “OLS s.e.” is the OLS standard error in regression (1.3) with $\gamma = 0$. The value ζ_0 is the true tail index of Z_t . The asteric indicates rejection of the true null hypothesis $H_0 : \zeta = \zeta_0$ in favor of the alternative hypothesis $H_a : \zeta \neq \zeta_0$ at the 5% significance level using the reported OLS standard errors. The total number of observations $N = 2000$. Based on 10000 replications.

Table 6. Behavior of the usual OLS estimator \hat{b}_n in the regression

log(Rank - 1/2) = a - b log(Size) for GARCH(1, 1) innovations				
n	50	100	200	500
	Mean $\hat{b}_n^{\gamma=1/2}$			
	$(\sqrt{2/n} \times \text{Mean } \hat{b}_n^{\gamma=1/2})$ (SD $\hat{b}_n^{\gamma=1/2}$)			
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 1.3,$ $\delta = 0.05, \zeta_0 \approx 1.19$	1.495 (0.299) (0.453)	1.366 (0.193) (0.346)	1.277 (0.128) (0.260)	1.159 (0.073) (0.162)
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 1.1,$ $\delta = 0.1, \zeta_0 \approx 1.43$	1.727 (0.345) (0.505)	1.596 (0.226) (0.386)	1.492 (0.149) (0.285)	1.321 (0.084) (0.166)
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 0.9,$ $\delta = 0.15, \zeta_0 \approx 1.83$	2.097 (0.419) (0.580)	1.943 (0.275) (0.432)	1.823 (0.182) (0.314)	1.562 (0.099) (0.164)
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 0.9,$ $\delta = 0.1, \zeta_0 = 2$	2.243 (0.449) (0.585)	2.091 (0.296) (0.424)	1.951 (0.195) (0.308)	1.658* (0.105) (0.150)
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 0.5,$ $\delta = 0.5, \zeta_0 = 2$	2.512 (0.502) (0.721)	2.271 (0.321) (0.555)	2.051 (0.205) (0.398)	1.658* (0.105) (0.203)
$\beta = 1, \lambda = 0.1,$ $\delta = 0.9, \zeta_0 = 2$	4.116* (0.823) (0.948)	3.405* (0.482) (0.740)	2.745* (0.274) (0.566)	1.884 (0.119) (0.307)

Notes: The entries are the estimates of the tail index and their standard errors using regression (1.3) with $\gamma = 1/2$ for GARCH(1, 1) processes $Z_t = \sigma_t \epsilon_t$, where $\sigma_t^2 = \beta + \lambda Z_{t-1}^2 + \delta \sigma_{t-1}^2$, and ϵ_t are i.i.d. standard normal errors. “Mean $\hat{b}_n^{\gamma=1/2}$ ” is the sample mean of the estimates \hat{b}_n^γ with $\gamma = 1/2$ obtained in simulations, and “SD $\hat{b}_n^{\gamma=1/2}$ ” is their sample standard deviation. The values $\sqrt{2/n} \times \text{Mean } \hat{b}_n^{\gamma=1/2}$ are the standard errors of \hat{b}_n^γ with $\gamma = 1/2$ provided by Theorem 2. The value ζ_0 is the true tail index of Z_t . The asteric indicates rejection of the true null hypothesis $H_0 : \zeta = \zeta_0$ in favor of the alternative hypothesis $H_a : \zeta \neq \zeta_0$ at the 5% significance level using the reported standard errors. The total number of observations $N = 2000$. Based on 10000 replications.

Table 7. Behavior of the OLS estimator \hat{b}'_n in the regression $\log(H(t-1)) = a' - b' \log(\text{Size}_t)$ for innovations deviating from power laws

		n	50	100	200	500
AR(1)			Mean \hat{b}'_n			
c	ρ		$(\sqrt{2/n} \times \text{Mean } \hat{b}'_n)$ (SD \hat{b}'_n)			
0	0		1.002 (0.200) (0.195)	0.998 (0.141) (0.140)	0.995 (0.100) (0.100)	0.996 (0.063) (0.062)
0	0.5		1.167 (0.233) (0.318)	1.122 (0.159) (0.253)	1.105 (0.110) (0.201)	1.123 (0.071) (0.147)
0	0.8		1.462 (0.292) (0.555)	1.337 (0.189) (0.435)	1.266* (0.127) (0.346)	1.252* (0.079) (0.269)
0.5	0		0.997 (0.199) (0.194)	0.966 (0.141) (0.139)	0.995 (0.100) (0.099)	0.995 (0.063) (0.064)
0.5	0.5		1.161 (0.232) (0.324)	1.120 (0.158) (0.249)	1.105 (0.110) (0.200)	1.122 (0.071) (0.149)
0.5	0.8		1.471 (0.294) (0.557)	1.336 (0.189) (0.444)	1.268* (0.127) (0.345)	1.257* (0.080) (0.268)
0.8	0		1.004 (0.201) (0.198)	0.995 (0.141) (0.138)	0.996 (0.100) (0.099)	0.995 (0.063) (0.063)
0.8	0.5		1.162 (0.232) (0.324)	1.121 (0.159) (0.252)	1.106 (0.111) (0.199)	1.121 (0.071) (0.147)
0.8	0.8		1.475 (0.295) (0.556)	1.340 (0.189) (0.436)	1.266* (0.127) (0.351)	1.253* (0.079) (0.268)
MA(1)			Mean \hat{b}'_n			
c	θ		$(\sqrt{2/n} \times \text{Mean } \hat{b}'_n)$ (SD \hat{b}'_n)			
0	0.5		1.066 (0.213) (0.279)	1.047 (0.148) (0.201)	1.039 (0.104) (0.145)	1.052 (0.067) (0.095)
0	0.8		1.067 (0.213) (0.294)	1.043 (0.147) (0.206)	1.041 (0.104) (0.149)	1.052 (0.067) (0.097)
0.5	0		0.999 (0.200) (0.194)	0.996 (0.141) (0.140)	0.995 (0.100) (0.100)	0.995 (0.063) (0.063)
0.5	0.5		1.068 (0.214) (0.277)	1.042 (0.147) (0.200)	1.039 (0.104) (0.143)	1.049 (0.066) (0.096)
0.5	0.8		1.075 (0.215) (0.296)	1.049 (0.148) (0.211)	1.043 (0.104) (0.150)	1.051 (0.066) (0.098)
0.8	0		1.001 (0.200) (0.196)	0.996 (0.141) (0.138)	0.995 (0.100) (0.099)	0.995 (0.063) (0.063)
0.8	0.5		1.068 (0.214) (0.279)	1.045 (0.148) (0.197)	1.042 (0.104) (0.144)	1.049 (0.066) (0.095)
0.8	0.8		1.071 (0.214) (0.291)	1.046 (0.148) (0.209)	1.040 (0.104) (0.148)	1.051 (0.066) (0.098)

Notes: The entries are estimates of the tail index and their standard errors using regression (3.12) for the AR(1) and MA(1) processes $Z_t = \rho Z_{t-1} + u_t$, $t \geq 1$, $Z_0 = 0$, and $Z_t = u_t + \theta u_{t-1}$, where i.i.d. u_t follow the distribution $P(Z > s) = s^{-\zeta} (1 + c(s^{-\alpha\zeta} - 1))$, $s \geq 1$, with $\zeta = \alpha = 1$ and $c \in [0, 1)$. For a general case $\zeta > 0$, one multiplies all the numbers in the table by ζ . “Mean \hat{b}'_n ” is the sample mean of the estimates \hat{b}'_n obtained in simulations, and “SD \hat{b}'_n ” is their sample standard deviation. The values $\sqrt{2/n} \times \text{Mean } \hat{b}'_n$ are the standard errors of \hat{b}'_n provided by expansion (3.14). The asteric indicates rejection of the true null hypothesis $H_0 : \zeta = 1$ in favor of the alternative hypothesis $H_a : \zeta \neq 1$ at the 5% significance level using the reported standard errors. The total number of observations $N = 2000$. Based on 10000 replications.

Table 8. Behavior of the OLS estimator \hat{b}_n in the regression $\log(H(t-1)) = a' - b' \log(\text{Size}_t)$ for Student t innovations

n		50	100	200	500
AR(1)		Mean \hat{b}'_n			
m	ρ	$(\sqrt{2/n} \times \text{Mean } \hat{b}'_n)$ (SD \hat{b}'_n)			
2	0	1.959 (0.392) (0.370)	1.911 (0.270) (0.252)	1.827 (0.183) (0.165)	1.550* (0.098) (0.074)
2	0.5	2.153 (0.431) (0.488)	2.082 (0.295) (0.362)	1.995 (0.200) (0.253)	1.675* (0.106) (0.115)
2	0.8	2.634 (0.527) (0.843)	2.437 (0.345) (0.636)	2.253 (0.225) (0.443)	1.822 (0.115) (0.202)
3	0	2.763 (0.553) (0.501)	2.631 (0.372) (0.323)	2.417* (0.242) (0.194)	1.869* (0.118) (0.080)
3	0.5	3.077 (0.615) (0.629)	2.922 (0.413) (0.433)	2.683 (0.268) (0.270)	2.022* (0.128) (0.109)
3	0.8	3.921 (0.784) (1.103)	3.569 (0.505) (0.757)	3.141 (0.314) (0.463)	2.214* (0.140) (0.188)
4	0	3.409 (0.682) (0.588)	3.160 (0.447) (0.365)	2.820* (0.282) (0.204)	2.048* (0.130) (0.083)
4	0.5	3.813 (0.763) (0.706)	3.530 (0.499) (0.463)	3.116* (0.312) (0.266)	2.196* (0.139) (0.111)
4	0.8	4.897 (0.979) (1.168)	4.317 (0.610) (0.748)	3.617 (0.362) (0.428)	2.369* (0.150) (0.189)
MA(1)		Mean \hat{b}'_n			
m	θ	$(\sqrt{2/n} \times \text{Mean } \hat{b}'_n)$ (SD \hat{b}'_n)			
2	0.5	2.097 (0.419) (0.480)	2.025 (0.286) (0.336)	1.935 (0.193) (0.224)	1.631* (0.103) (0.099)
2	0.8	2.141 (0.428) (0.565)	2.064 (0.292) (0.379)	1.962 (0.196) (0.249)	1.645* (0.104) (0.107)
3	0.5	3.002 (0.600) (0.620)	2.850 (0.403) (0.441)	2.605 (0.261) (0.253)	1.976* (0.125) (0.098)
3	0.8	3.156 (0.631) (0.752)	2.956 (0.418) (0.491)	2.677 (0.268) (0.290)	2.006* (0.127) (0.107)
4	0.5	3.715 (0.743) (0.691)	3.431 (0.485) (0.442)	3.038* (0.304) (0.255)	2.156* (0.136) (0.100)
4	0.8	3.943 (0.789) (0.847)	3.590 (0.508) (0.527)	3.128* (0.313) (0.296)	2.191* (0.139) (0.108)

Notes: The entries are estimates of the tail index and their standard errors using regression (3.12) for the AR(1) and MA(1) processes $Z_t = \rho Z_{t-1} + u_t$, $t \geq 1$, $Z_0 = 0$, and $Z_t = u_t + \theta u_{t-1}$, where i.i.d. u_t have the Student t distribution with m degrees of freedom. “Mean \hat{b}'_n ” is the sample mean of the estimates \hat{b}'_n obtained in simulations, and “SD \hat{b}'_n ” is their sample standard deviation. The values $\sqrt{2/n} \times \text{Mean } \hat{b}'_n$ are the standard errors of \hat{b}'_n provided by expansion (3.14). The asteric indicates rejection of the true null hypothesis $H_0 : \zeta = m$ in favor of the alternative hypothesis $H_a : \zeta \neq m$ at the 5% significance level using the reported standard errors. The total number of observations $N = 2000$. Based on 10000 replications.