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The general framework

Given

- Risk (random) factors $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_d)$ $\sim F$, where
  
  $$F(x_1, \ldots, x_d) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x_1, \ldots, X_d \leq x_d)$$

- A financial position $\psi(\mathbf{X})$

- A risk measure/pricing function: $\rho$

Our goal is to

$$\text{calculate } \rho(\psi(\mathbf{X}))$$

Warning: $\rho(\psi(\mathbf{X}))$ depends on the joint distribution function $F_{\mathbf{X}}$ of $\mathbf{X}$ and, especially, on its behavior in the tails.
Current practice

Given some risk factors $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_d)$, we proceed as follow:

- First, estimate the marginal behavior $F_i$ of each $X_i$, i.e.
  \[ F_i(x) = \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq x). \]

- Find a copula $C$ (i.e. a d.f. with uniform marginals) such that
  \[ \mathbf{X} \sim F(x_1, \ldots, x_d) = C(F_1(x_1), \ldots, F_d(x_d)). \]

- Estimate $\rho(\psi(\mathbf{X}))$ either analytically or by means of a MC simulation from the probability d.f. $F$ of $\mathbf{X}$.

It is necessary to construct dependency models that reflect observed and expected dependencies without formalizing the structure of those dependencies with cause-effect models. The theory of copulas provides a comprehensive modelling tool that can reflect dependencies in a very flexible way.

International Actuarial Association, 2004
Bivariate sample clouds from the d.f. $F = C(F_1, F_2)$ where $F_1, F_2 \sim N(0, 1)$, while $C$ comes from different copula families.
Tail dependence coefficients

Let \( X \) and \( Y \) be continuous r.v.’s with d.f.’s \( F_X \) and \( F_Y \), respectively. The upper tail dependence coefficient \( \lambda_U \) of \((X, Y)\) is defined by

\[
\lambda_U = \lim_{t \to 1^-} \mathbb{P} \left( Y > F_Y^{-1}(t) \mid X > F_X^{-1}(t) \right);
\]

and the lower tail dependence coefficient \( \lambda_L \) of \((X, Y)\) is defined by

\[
\lambda_L = \lim_{t \to 0^+} \mathbb{P} \left( Y \leq F_Y^{-1}(t) \mid X \leq F_X^{-1}(t) \right);
\]

provided that the above limits exist.

(Sibuya, 1960; Joe, 1993)

TDC’s can be calculated from the copula \( C \) of \((X, Y)\); in fact,

\[
\lambda_L = \lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{C(t, t)}{t} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_U = \lim_{t \to 1^-} \frac{1 - 2t + C(t, t)}{1 - t}.
\]
Tail concentration function

An auxiliary function that may serve to visualize the tail dependence of a copula $C$ is the so–called tail concentration function, defined as the function $q_C: (0, 1) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ given by

$$q_C(t) = q_L(t) \cdot 1_{(0,0.5]}(t) + q_U(t) \cdot 1_{(0.5,1]}(t),$$

where

$$q_L(t) = \frac{C(t,t)}{t}, \quad q_U(t) = \frac{1 - 2t + C(t,t)}{1 - t}.$$  

(Venter, 2001; D., Fernández-Sánchez and Pappadà, 2015)

Notice that:

- if $C$ is the comonotonicity copula (positive monotone dependence), then $q_C = 1$;
- $q_C(0.5) = (1 + \beta_C)/2$, where $\beta_C = 4C(0.5,0.5) - 1$ is the Blomqvist’s measure of association related to $C$. 

Tail concentration for popular families of copulas

Tail concentration function for various families of copulas with zero LTDC and UTDC (left) and with possibly non-zero LTDC or UTDC (right).

Tail concentration function for various families of copulas with zero LTDC and UTDC (left) and with possibly non-zero LTDC or UTDC (right).
Tail concentration for patchwork copulas

Tail concentration functions for copulas obtained via patchwork methods.
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1. Patchwork Copulas and Tail Dependence

2. Graphical Tool for Copula Selection
The main idea

A patchwork copula derived from a fixed copula $C$ is any copula $\tilde{C}$ such that:

$$\tilde{C} = C \quad \text{on } [0, 1]^d \setminus \bigcup_i B_i,$$

where each $B_i \subseteq [0, 1]^d$ is a $d$–dimensional box in which the probability mass of $\tilde{C}$ is distributed according to another copula $C_i$.

![Diagram of patchwork copula](image)

Applications:
- Modification of tail dependence behaviour
- Approximation of copulas

Patchwork copulas include ordinal sums, multilinear copula extensions, Bernstein copulas, gluing copulas, upper comonotonicity, etc.
Patchwork copulas

Let $C$ and $C_B$ be $d$–dimensional copulas and let $B = [a, b]$ be a non-empty box contained in $I^d$ such that $\mathbb{P}_C(B) = \alpha > 0$. The function $C^* : I^d \rightarrow I$ given by

$$C^*(u) = \mathbb{P}_C([0, u] \cap B^c) + \alpha C_B \left( \tilde{F}_B^1(u_1), \ldots, \tilde{F}_B^d(u_d) \right)$$

is a copula, where, for every $x_i \in [a_i, b_i]$,

$$\tilde{F}_B^i(x_i) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{P}_C \left( [a_1, b_1] \times \cdots \times [a_{i-1}, b_{i-1}] \times [a_i, x_i] \times [a_{i+1}, b_{i+1}] \times \cdots \times [a_d, b_d] \right).$$

The copula $C^*$ is called patchwork of $(B, C_B)$ into $C$ and it is denoted by the symbol $C^* = \langle B, C_B \rangle^C$.

(D., Fernández–Sánchez and Sempi, 2013)
Patchwork copulas: simulation

Consider the patchwork \( C^* = \langle B, C_B \rangle^C \), where \( B = [a, 1] \).

An algorithm for generating a random sample from \( C^* \) goes as follows.

**Algorithm**

1. Generate \( u \) from the copula \( C \).
2. If \( u \in B \), then
   1. Generate \( v \) from the copula \( C_B \).
   2. For \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, d \) set \( w_i = (\tilde{F}_B^i)^{-1}(v_i) \).
3. Otherwise, set \( w = u \).
4. Return \( w \).

It can be used for “stress testing” the tail of the distribution.
Patchwork copulas: simulation

Random sample of 2500 realizations from the Frank copula with $\tau = 0.50$ (left) the copula $\langle B, C_B \rangle^C$ where $B = [0.50, 1]^2$, $C$ is the Frank copula with $\tau = 0.50$ and $C_B$ is the Gumbel copula with $\tau = 0.50$. 
Tail concentration function from random sample of 2500 realizations from the Frank copula with $\tau = 0.50$ (left) the copula $\langle B, C_B \rangle^C$ where $B = [0.50, 1]^2$, $C$ is the Frank copula with $\tau = 0.50$ and $C_B$ is the Gumbel copula with $\tau = 0.50$. 
Application: VaR and subadditivity

Consider two random losses $L_1$ and $L_2$ such that $L_1 = f(L_2)$ a.e. for some strictly increasing function $f$, i.e. they are comonotone and their copula is $M_2(u, v) = \min\{u, v\}$.

Then

$$\text{VaR}_\alpha(L_1 + L_2) = \text{VaR}_\alpha(L_1) + \text{VaR}_\alpha(L_2).$$

However, it is not true that $\text{VaR}_\alpha$ is subadditive, i.e. for all losses $L_1, L_2$

$$\text{VaR}_\alpha(L_1 + L_2) \leq \text{VaR}_\alpha(L_1) + \text{VaR}_\alpha(L_2).$$

In fact,

$$\sup\{\text{VaR}_\alpha(L_1 + L_2) : L_1, L_2 \text{ fixed} \} \geq \text{VaR}_\alpha(L_1) + \text{VaR}_\alpha(L_2).$$

Subadditivity reflects the idea that risk can be reduced by diversification.
Illustration: worst-case VaR copula for $d = 2$

Scatter plot from a comonotone copula (left) and from the copula giving the worst-case VaR (right). The copula for the right figure is based on works by Makarov (1981) and Rüschendorf (1982).
Illustration: worst-case VaR scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \tau )</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.50</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>−0.50</th>
<th>−1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{VaR}_\alpha(L_1^C, L_2^C) )</td>
<td>2.5631</td>
<td>2.5663</td>
<td>2.5749</td>
<td>3.0340</td>
<td>3.2897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numerical approximation of \( \text{VaR}_{0.90}(L_1^C, L_2^C) \) where \( L_1, L_2, \sim N(0, 1) \). \( C^* = \langle [0.90, 1]^2, C_B \rangle^{M_2} \) for a Clayton copula \( C_B \) with Kendall’s \( \tau \) equal to the indicated value. Results based on \( 10^6 \) simulation from the given copula. The value corresponding to \( \tau = -1 \) is the worst-case VaR scenario. The value corresponding to \( \tau = 1 \) is the comonotonic scenario.
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The goal

The aim is to ease the selection of the best copula that can be fitted to a random sample \((X_i, Y_i)_{i=1,...,n}\) starting from of a large number of possible parametric families. The “goodness criterion” depends on the tail dependence.

The procedure goes as follows:

- Consider a set of parametric copula models \(C_1, \ldots, C_k\) that may be appropriate for describing the unknown dependence structure in the given data, i.e. the so-called copula-test space.

- Find of a (tail-dependence driven) 2D visualization of the copula-test space associated to a given dataset, and use it as the first step of model building.

(Michiels and De Schepper, 2008, 2013)

(D., Fernández-Sánchez and Pappadà, 2015; Pappadà, D. and Torelli, 2017)
The Algorithm

Let \((X_i, Y_i)_{i=1,...,n}\) be a bivariate sample from an unknown copula.

1. Consider a set of \(k\) parametric copulas \(C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_k\) in the copula-test space that have been fitted to the available data.

2. Calculate a distance between the empirical copula \(C_n\) and \(C_i\) \((i = 1, \ldots, k)\) as

\[
\sigma(C_n, C_i) = \int_{a}^{b} (q_{C_n}(t) - q_{C_i}(t))^2 \, dt
\]

\(q_{C_n}\) is the empirical TCF given by

\[
q_{C_n}(t) = \frac{C_n(t, t)}{t} \cdot 1_{(0,0.5)}(t) + \frac{1 - 2t + C_n(t, t)}{1 - t} \cdot 1_{[0.5,1]}(t)
\]

\(q_{C_i}\) is the TCF associated with \(C_i\).
The Algorithm

3. Calculate a distance between the \(i\)–th and the \(j\)–th copula in the copula test space via

\[
\sigma(C_i, C_j) = \int_a^b (q_{C_i}(t) - q_{C_j}(t))^2 \, dt
\]

for \(1 \leq i \neq j \leq k\).

4. Construct the distance matrix \(\Delta = (\sigma_{ij})\), of order \((k+1)\), with elements

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma_{1j} &= \sigma(C_n, C_{j-1}), \quad j = 2, \ldots, k+1 \\
\sigma_{ij} &= \sigma(C_{i-1}, C_{j-1}), \quad i, j = 2, \ldots, k+1, \quad i < j \\
\sigma_{ii} &= 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, k+1
\end{align*}
\]
The Algorithm

5. Perform a non-metric scaling on $\Delta$ to find a low-dimensional map on which the inter-points distances $d_{ij}$’s are as close as possible to the original $\sigma_{ij}$’s
   - a monotonic transformation of the dissimilarities is calculated, which yields the disparities $\hat{d}_{ij}$, such that the $\hat{d}_{ij}$’s and the $\sigma_{ij}$’s have the same rank order
   - the optimum configuration is determined by minimising Kruskal’s stress

   \[
   s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i<j} (\hat{d}_{ij} - d_{ij})^2}{\sum_{i<j} d_{ij}^2}}
   \]

6. Visualize the resulting set of $k+1$ points $p_1, \ldots, p_{k+1}$, in the $q$–dimensional Euclidean space, $q \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$
Illustration: MSCI Index Data

We use *Morgan Stanley Capital International* (MSCI) Developed Markets Index, which measures the equity market performance of 23 developed markets (daily observations from 2002-06-04 to 2010-06-10).

Preliminary steps:

- We fit a convenient ARMA-GARCH model to each time series to remove possible (conditional) mean and variance effects.

- We extract the pseudo–observations from the fitted residuals of the univariate time series focusing, hence, on the copula among the innovations of the series.

- We select a convenient copula-test space given by:
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  C^1 &= \text{Clayton, Archimedean} & C^2 &= \text{Gumbel, Archimedean + EV} \\
  C^3 &= \text{Frank, Archimedean} & C^4 &= \text{Normal} \\
  C^5 &= \text{Joe, Archimedean} & C^6 &= \text{Plackett} \\
  C^7 &= \text{Galambos, EV} & C^8 &= \text{Student’s } t, \text{ 4 df} \\
  C^9 &= \text{Student’s } t, \text{ 8 df} & C^{10} &= \text{Survival Gumbel} \\
  C^{11} &= \text{Survival Clayton} & C^{12} &= \text{Survival Joe}
  \end{align*}
  \]
Empirical TCF (left) and two-dimensional representation of goodness-of-fit New Zealand–Hong Kong dependence structure, based on lower TCF (right). The estimated $\tau$-value equals 0.1639.
Illustration: MSCI Index Data

Pairs plots for a three dimensional dataset of MSCI Indices. Lower panels display the values of Kendall’ tau. Upper panels display the 2–dimensional TDC representation.
The Algorithm: finite-sample performances

Dissimilarities based on lower TCF between the empirical and the fitted copula–Clayton ($C_1$), Gumbel ($C_2$), Frank ($C_3$), Gaussian ($C_4$), Plackett ($C_5$), Galambos ($C_6$), Student-$t$, $\nu = 4$ ($C_7$), Surv. Gumbel ($C_8$)–when the “true” model is Clayton (in the first row) and Gumbel (in the second row), respectively. Sample size $n = 250$. 

© F. Durante (UniSalento)
A related algorithm: Tail dependence-based clustering

In a similar spirit, an interesting way to visualize the relationships between observed variables is to determine clusters of homogeneous variables as a preliminary step of high-dimensional models (e.g., factor models, hierarchical models, etc.)

The main feature of this approach has three main steps:

1. Determine a marginal distribution for each risk (in case of time series data).

2. Fix a copula-based measure of extreme dependence, which can be also estimated non-parametrically, for each pair of risks. For instance:

\[
\sigma_{ij} = \| q_{ij}^{\text{emp}} - q_{M_2} \|,
\]

where \( q_{M_2} \) is the TCF of the comonotone copula \( M_2 \) and \( \| \cdot \| \) any convenient norm.

3. Find a hierarchical structure with “bottom up” approach.

(D., Pappadà, Torelli, 2014; 2015)
Heat map matrix of dissimilarities (left) and dendrogram resulting from hierarchical clustering for the MSCI World Index Data according to complete linkage (right).
Concluding remarks

- We have presented the tail dependence coefficients and show some of their features via patchwork constructions.
- We have introduced a copula-based graphical tool to visualize the goodness-of-fit of a collection of parametric copula models at once.
- The given tool is based on a suitable measure of finite tail dependence in functional form, thus providing valuable indications for the choice of a copula model when the tail behaviour is of primary interest.
- A related method helps performing a cluster analysis of time series in order to detect groups of variables exhibiting higher association in the tails.
Questions? Comments?

Thanks for your attention!


