

Conditional sampling for spectrally discrete max-stable random fields*

Yizao Wang and Stilian A. Stoev[†]

February 4, 2022

Abstract

Max-stable random fields play a central role in modeling extreme value phenomena. We obtain an explicit formula for the conditional probability in general max-linear models, which include a large class of max-stable random fields. As a consequence, we develop an algorithm for efficient and exact sampling from the conditional distributions. Our method provides a computational solution to the prediction problem for spectrally discrete max-stable random fields. This work offers new tools and a new perspective to many statistical inference problems for spatial extremes, arising, for example, in meteorology, geology, and environmental applications.

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Max-stable stochastic processes and random fields are fundamental statistical models for the dependence of extremes. This is because they arise in the limit of rescaled maxima. Indeed, consider the component-wise maxima

$$M_t^{(n)} = \max_{j=1,\dots,n} \xi_t^{(j)}, \quad t \in T$$

of independent realizations $\{\xi_t^{(j)}\}_{t \in T, j=1,\dots,n}$ of a random field $\xi = \{\xi_t\}_{t \in T}$. If the random field $\{M_t^{(n)}\}_{t \in T}$ converges in law, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, under

*This work was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-0806094 at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

[†]Address: Department of Statistics, The University of Michigan, 439 W. Hall, 1085 S. University, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1107. U.S.A. E-mails: {yizwang, sstoev}@umich.edu.

judicious normalization, then its limit $X = \{X_t\}_{t \in T}$ is necessarily *max-stable* (see e.g. Resnick [19] and de Haan and Ferreira [11]).

Therefore, the max-stable processes (random fields, resp.) are as important to extreme value theory as are the Gaussian processes to the classical statistical theory based on the central limit theorem. The multivariate max-stable laws and processes have been studied extensively in the past 30 years. See e.g. Balkema and Resnick [1], de Haan [9, 10], de Haan and Pickands [13], Giné et al. [15], Smith [24], Resnick and Roy [21], Davis and Resnick [6, 7], Stoev and Taqqu [26], Kabluchko et al. [16], Wang and Stoev [28], among many others.

The modeling and parameter estimation of the univariate marginal distributions of the extremes have been studied extensively (see e.g. Davison and Smith [8], de Haan and Ferreira [11], Resnick [20] and the references therein). Many of the recent developments in this domain focus on the characterization, modeling and estimation of the dependence for multivariate extremes. In this context, building adequate max-stable processes and random fields plays a key role. See e.g. de Haan and Pereira [12], Buishand et al. [2], Schlather [22], Schlather and Tawn [23], Cooley et al. [4], and Naveau et al. [17].

Our present work is motivated by an important and long-standing challenge, namely, the prediction for max-stable random processes and fields. Suppose that one already has a suitable max-stable model for the dependence structure of a random field $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$. The field is observed at several locations $t_1, \dots, t_n \in T$ and one wants to *predict* the values of the field X_{s_1}, \dots, X_{s_m} at some other locations. The optimal predictors involve the *conditional distribution* of $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$, given the data. Even if the finite-dimensional distributions of the field $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$ are available in analytic form, it is typically impossible to obtain a closed-form solution for the conditional distribution. Naïve Monte Carlo approximations are not practical either, since they involve conditioning on events of infinitesimal probability, which leads to mounting errors and computational costs.

Prior studies of Davis and Resnick [6, 7] and Cooley et al. [4], among others, have shown that the prediction problem in the max-stable context is challenging, and it does not have an elegant analytical solution. On the other hand, the growing popularity and the use of max-stable processes in various applications, make this an important problem. This motivated us to seek a *computational* solution.

In this work, we develop theory and methodology for sampling from the conditional distributions of spectrally discrete max-stable models. More precisely, we provide an algorithm that can generate efficiently *exact* inde-

pendent samples from the *regular conditional probability* of $(X_{s_1}, \dots, X_{s_m})$, given the values $(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n})$. For the sake of simplicity, we write $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n) \equiv (X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_n})$. The algorithm applies to the general *max-linear model*:

$$X_i = \max_{j=1, \dots, p} a_{i,j} Z_j \equiv \bigvee_{j=1}^p a_{i,j} Z_j, i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (1)$$

where the $a_{i,j}$'s are known non-negative constants and the Z_j 's are independent continuous non-negative random variables. Any multivariate max-stable distribution can be approximated arbitrarily well via a max-linear model with sufficiently large p .

The main idea is to first generate samples from the *regular conditional probability* distribution of $\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$, where $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_j)_{j=1, \dots, p}$. Then, the conditional distributions of

$$X_{s_k} = \bigvee_{j=1}^p b_{k,j} Z_j, 1 \leq k \leq m,$$

given $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ can be readily obtained, for any given $b_{k,j}$'s. In this paper, we assume that the model is completely known, i.e., the parameters $\{a_{i,j}\}$ and $\{b_{k,j}\}$ are given. The statistical inference for these parameters is beyond the scope of this paper.

Observe that if $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$, then (1) implies natural equality and inequality constraints on the Z_j 's. More precisely, (1) gives rise to a set of so-called *hitting scenarios*. In each hitting scenario, a subset of the Z_j 's equal, in other words *hit*, their upper bounds and the rest of the Z_j 's can take arbitrary values in certain open intervals. We will show that the regular conditional probability of $\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ is a weighted mixture of the various distributions of the vector \mathbf{Z} , under all possible hitting scenarios corresponding to $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$.

The resulting formula, however, involves determining *all* hitting scenarios, which becomes computationally prohibitive for large and even moderate values of p . This issue is closely related to the NP-hard *set-covering problem* in computer science (see e.g. [3]).

Fortunately, further detailed analysis of the probabilistic structure of the max-linear models allows us to obtain a different formula of the regular conditional probability (Theorem 2). It yields an exact and computationally efficient algorithm, which in practice can handle complex max-linear models with p in the order of thousands, on a conventional desktop computer. The algorithm is implemented in the R ([18]) package `maxLinear` [27], with the

core part written in C/C++. We also used the R package `fields` ([14]) to generate some of the figures in this paper.

We illustrate the performance of our algorithm over two classes of processes: the max-autoregressive moving average (MARMA) time series (Davis and Resnick [6]), and the Smith model (Smith [24]) for spatial extremes. The MARMA processes are spectrally discrete max-stable processes, and our algorithm applies directly. In Section 3.1, we demonstrate the prediction of MARMA processes by conditional sampling and compare our result to the projection predictors proposed in [6]. To apply our algorithm to the Smith model, on the other hand, we first need to discretize the (spectrally continuous) model. Section 3.2 is devoted to conditional sampling for the discretized Smith model. Thanks to the computational efficiency of our algorithm, we can choose a mesh fine enough to obtain a satisfactory discretization. Figure 1 shows four realizations from such a discretized Smith model, conditioning only on 7 observations (with assumed value 5). The algorithm applies in the same way to more complex models.

1.2 Multivariate Max-Stable Distributions: a Brief Review

Consider a general max-stable process $X = \{X_t\}_{t \in T}$, indexed by a set T (e.g. $T = [0, 1], \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^d$ or \mathbb{Z}^d). We shall assume that the finite-dimensional distributions of X are known and the ultimate goal is to study the conditional distributions of X . For convenience and without loss of generality, we focus on max-stable processes X with α -Fréchet marginals ($\alpha > 0$), such that all max-linear combinations

$$\xi = \max_{j=1, \dots, n} a_j X_{t_j} \equiv \bigvee_{i=1}^n a_j X_{t_j}, \quad a_j > 0, \quad t_j \in T,$$

have the α -Fréchet distribution:

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi \leq x) = \exp\{-\sigma_\xi^\alpha x^{-\alpha}\}, \quad x \in (0, \infty),$$

with scale coefficient $\sigma_\xi > 0$. Any max-stable process can be related to such an α -Fréchet process by simple transformation of the marginals (see e.g. [19]).

Essentially all max-stable processes $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$ admit the following *extremal integral representation*:

$$\{X_t\}_{t \in T} \stackrel{d}{=} \left\{ \int_S^e f_t(s) M_\alpha(ds) \right\}_{t \in T}, \quad (2)$$




Figure 1: Four samples from the conditional distribution of the discrete Smith model (see Section 3.2), given the *observed* values (all equal to 5) at the locations marked by crosses.

where the f_t 's are non-negative, measurable deterministic functions defined on a suitable measure space (S, μ) and such that $\int_S f_t^\alpha(s) \mu(ds) < \infty$. Here M_α is an α -Fréchet random sup-measure with control measure μ . The extremal integral $\int_S f dM_\alpha$ can be defined for all $f \in L^\alpha(S, \mu)$, $f \geq 0$, as the limit in probability of extremal integrals of simple functions. For more details, see [26] and the seminal work [10] for an alternative treatment.

The functions $\{f_t\}_{t \in T}$ are called the *spectral functions* of the process $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$. They determine the finite-dimensional distributions of $\{X_t\}_{t \in T}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{t_1} \leq x_1, \dots, X_{t_n} \leq x_n) = \exp \left\{ - \int_S \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n f_{t_i}(s)/x_i \right)^\alpha \mu(ds) \right\},$$

for all $t_i \in T$, $x_i \in \mathbb{R}_+ := (0, \infty)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. A popular equivalent representation of multivariate max-stable laws is as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{t_1} \leq x_1, \dots, X_{t_n} \leq x_n) = \exp \left\{ - \int_{\mathbb{S}_+^{n-1}} \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n w_i/x_i \right)^\alpha \Gamma(d\mathbf{w}) \right\}.$$

Here $\mathbb{S}_+^{n-1} = \{\mathbf{w} = (w_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 \leq w_j \leq \max_{i=1, \dots, n} w_i = 1\}$ is the positive unit sphere in the sup-norm, and Γ is a unique finite measure on \mathbb{S}_+^{n-1} called the *spectral measure* of the distribution (see e.g. [19, 11]).

Any multivariate max-stable vector $(X_{t_j})_{j=1}^n$ can be approximated arbitrarily well in probability, by discretizing the extremal integral:

$$X_{t_i} = \int_S^e f_{t_i}(s) M_\alpha(ds) \approx \bigvee_{j=1}^p a_{i,j} Z_j,$$

where Z_j , $j = 1, \dots, p$ are independent standard α -Fréchet variables and $a_{i,j} \geq 0$. This is equivalent to considering multivariate max-stable vectors with discrete spectral measures concentrated on at most p points on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}_+^{n-1} . The error of approximation, moreover, can be controlled explicitly through convenient probability metrics (see e.g. [26]).

In this paper, we shall focus on the class of max-stable processes:

$$X_t := \bigvee_{j=1}^p \phi_j(t) Z_j, \quad t \in T,$$

where the $\phi_j(t)$'s are non-negative deterministic functions. These processes are called *spectrally discrete*, since their spectral measures Γ are discrete. By taking sufficiently large p 's and with judicious $\phi_j(t)$'s, one can build flexible models that can replicate the behavior of an arbitrary max-stable process. From this point of view, a satisfactory computational solution must be able to deal with max-linear models with large p 's.

The treatment of the exact conditional distributions of general spectrally continuous max-stable processes requires different tools and still remains an open problem, to the best of our knowledge. As we shall see, the solution in the discrete case, although complete, is already quite involved.

Acknowledgments. The authors were partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0806094 at the University of Michigan.

2 Conditional Probability in Max-Linear Models

2.1 Intuition and Basic Theory

Consider the max-linear model in (1). We shall denote this model by:

$$\mathbf{X} = A \odot \mathbf{Z}, \quad (3)$$

where $A = (a_{i,j})_{n \times p}$ is a matrix with non-negative entries, $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_p)$ are column vectors. We assume that the Z_j 's, $j = 1, \dots, p$, are independent non-negative random variables having probability densities.

In this section, we provide an explicit formula for the *regular conditional probability* of \mathbf{Z} with respect to \mathbf{X} (see Theorem 1 below and the Appendix for a precise definition). We start with some intuition and notation. Throughout this paper, we assume that the matrix A has at least one nonzero entry in each of its rows and columns. This will be referred to as *Assumption A*.

Observe that if $\mathbf{x} = A \odot \mathbf{z}$ with $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^p$, then

$$0 \leq z_j \leq \hat{z}_j \equiv \hat{z}_j(A, \mathbf{x}) := \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i / a_{i,j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p. \quad (4)$$

That is, the max-linear model (3) imposes certain inequality and equality constraints on the Z_j 's, given a set of *observed* X_i 's. Namely, some of the upper bounds $\hat{z}_j(A, \mathbf{x})$ in (4) must be attained, or *hit*, i.e., $z_j = \hat{z}_j(A, \mathbf{x})$ in such a way that

$$x_i = a_{i,j(i)} z_{j(i)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

with judicious $j(i) \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. The next example helps to understand the inequality and equality constraints.

Example 1. Suppose that $n = p = 3$ and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\mathbf{x} = A \odot \mathbf{z}$ for some $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^3$. In this case, it necessarily follows that $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq x_3$. Moreover, (4) yields $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{x}$.

- (i) If $\mathbf{x} = (1, 2, 3)$, then it trivially follows that $\mathbf{z} = \hat{\mathbf{z}} = (1, 2, 3)$, which is an equality constraint on \mathbf{z} .

- (ii) If $\mathbf{x} = (1, 1, 3)$, then it follows that $z_1 = \hat{z}_1 = 1, z_2 \leq \hat{z}_2 = 1$ and $z_3 = \hat{z}_3 = 3$. Here, the “equality constraints” must hold for $z_1 = \hat{z}_1$ and $z_3 = \hat{z}_3$, while z_2 only needs to satisfy the “inequality constraint” $0 \leq z_2 \leq \hat{z}_2$.

Write

$$C(A, \mathbf{x}) := \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^p : \mathbf{x} = A \odot \mathbf{z}\},$$

and note that the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$ concentrates on the set $C(A, \mathbf{x})$. The observation in Example 1 can be generalized and formulated as follows.

- Every $\mathbf{z} \in C(A, \mathbf{x})$ corresponds to a set of *active* (equality) constraints $J \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$, which we refer to as a *hitting scenario* of (A, \mathbf{x}) , such that

$$z_j = \hat{z}_j(A, \mathbf{x}), \quad j \in J \text{ and } z_j < \hat{z}_j(A, \mathbf{x}), \quad j \in J^c := \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus J. \quad (5)$$

Observe that if $j \notin J$, then there are no further constraints and z_j can take any value in $[0, \hat{z}_j)$, regardless of the values of the other components of the vector $\mathbf{z} \in C(A, \mathbf{x})$.

- Every value \mathbf{x} may give rise to many different hitting scenarios $J \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$. Let $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})$ denote the collection of all such J 's. We refer to $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})$ as to the *hitting distribution* of \mathbf{x} w.r.t. A :

$$\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x}) \equiv \left\{ J \subset \{1, \dots, p\} : \text{exist } \mathbf{z} \in C(A, \mathbf{x}), \text{ such that (5) holds} \right\}.$$

To illustrate the notions of hitting scenario and hitting distribution, consider again Example 1. Therein, we have $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x}) = \{\{1, 2, 3\}\}$ in case (i), and $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x}) = \{\{1, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}$ in case (ii).

The hitting distribution $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})$ is a finite set and thus can always be identified. However, the identification procedure is the key difficulty in providing an efficient algorithm for conditional sampling in practice. This issue is addressed in Section 2.2. In the rest of this section, suppose that $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})$ is given. Then, we can partition $C(A, \mathbf{x})$ as follows

$$C(A, \mathbf{x}) = \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})} C_J(A, \mathbf{x}),$$

where

$$C_J(A, \mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^p : z_j = \hat{z}_j, \quad j \in J \text{ and } z_j < \hat{z}_j, \quad j \notin J\}.$$

The sets $C_J(A, \mathbf{x})$, $J \in \mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})$ are disjoint since they correspond to different *hitting scenarios* in $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})$. Let

$$r(\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})) = \min_{J \in \mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})} |J|, \quad (6)$$

where $|J|$ is the number of elements in J . We call $r(\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x}))$ the *rank* of the hitting distribution $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})$. It equals the minimal number of equality constraints among the hitting scenarios in $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})$. It will turn out that the hitting scenarios $J \subset \mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})$ with $|J| > r(\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x}))$ occur with (conditional) probability zero and can be ignored. We therefore focus on the set of all *relevant* hitting scenarios:

$$\mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x}) = \{J \in \mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x}) : |J| = r(\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x}))\}.$$

Theorem 1. *Consider the max-linear model in (3), where Z_j 's are independent random variables with densities f_{Z_j} and distribution functions F_{Z_j} , $j = 1, \dots, p$. Let $A = (a_{i,j})_{n \times p}$ have non-negative entries satisfying Assumption A and let $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{R}_+^p}$ be the class of all rectangles $\{(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f}], \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}_+^p\}$ in \mathbb{R}_+^p .*

For all $J \in \mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})$, $E \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{R}_+^p}$, and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, define

$$\nu_J(\mathbf{x}, E) := \prod_{j \in J} \delta_{\hat{z}_j}(\pi_j(E)) \prod_{j \in J^c} \mathbb{P}\{Z_j \in \pi_j(E) \mid Z_j < \hat{z}_j\}, \quad (7)$$

where $\pi_j(z_1, \dots, z_p) = z_j$ and δ_a is a unit point-mass at a .

Then, the regular conditional probability $\nu(\mathbf{x}, E)$ of \mathbf{Z} w.r.t. \mathbf{X} equals:

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}, E) = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})} p_J(A, \mathbf{x}) \nu_J(\mathbf{x}, E), \quad E \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{R}_+^p}, \quad (8)$$

for $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}$ -almost all $\mathbf{x} \in A \odot (\mathbb{R}_+^p)$, where for all $J \in \mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})$,

$$p_J(A, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{w_J}{\sum_{K \in \mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})} w_K} \quad \text{with} \quad w_J = \prod_{j \in J} \hat{z}_j f_{Z_j}(\hat{z}_j) \prod_{j \in J^c} F_{Z_j}(\hat{z}_j). \quad (9)$$

In the special case when the Z_j 's are α -Fréchet with scale coefficient 1, we have $w_J = \prod_{j \in J} (\hat{z}_j)^{-\alpha}$.

Remark 1. *We state (8) only for rectangle sets E because the projections $\pi_j(B)$ of an arbitrary Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{R}_+^p$ are not always Borel (see e.g. [25]). Nevertheless, the extension of measure theorem ensures that Formula (8) specifies completely the regular conditional probability.*

We do not provide a proof of Theorem 1 directly. Instead, we will first provide an equivalent formula for $\nu(\mathbf{x}, E)$ in Theorem 2 in Section 2.2, and then prove that $\nu(\mathbf{x}, E)$ is the desired regular conditional probability. All the proofs are deferred to Section 4. The next example gives the intuition behind Formula (8).

Example 2. *Continue with Example 1.*

- (i) If $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} = (1, 2, 3)$, then $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{x}$, $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x}) = \{\{1, 2, 3\}\}$. Therefore, $r(\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})) = 3$ and Formula (8) yields

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}, E) = \nu_J(\mathbf{x}, E) = \delta_{\hat{z}_1}(\pi_1(E))\delta_{\hat{z}_2}(\pi_2(E))\delta_{\hat{z}_3}(\pi_3(E)) \equiv \delta_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(E),$$

a degenerate distribution with single unit point mass at $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$.

- (ii) If $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} = (1, 1, 3)$, then, $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{x}$, $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x}) = \{\{1, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}$, and $r(\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})) = 2$. Therefore, $\mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x}) = \{\{1, 3\}\}$ and Formula (8) yields:

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}, E) = \nu_{\{1, 3\}}(\mathbf{x}, E) = \delta_{\hat{z}_1}(\pi_1(E))\mathbb{P}(Z_2 \in \pi_2(E) \mid Z_2 < \hat{z}_2)\delta_{\hat{z}_3}(\pi_3(E)).$$

In this case, the conditional distribution concentrates on the one-dimensional set $\{1\} \times (0, 1) \times \{3\}$.

- (iii) Finally, if $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} = (1, 1, 1)$, then $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x}) = \{\{1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}$. Then, $\mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x}) = \{\{1\}\}$ and

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}, E) = \nu_{\{1\}}(\mathbf{x}, E) = \delta_{\hat{z}_1}(\pi_1(E)) \prod_{j=2}^3 \mathbb{P}(Z_j \in \pi_j(E) \mid Z_j < \hat{z}_j).$$

The conditional distribution concentrates on the set $\{1\} \times (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$.

We conclude this section by showing that the conditional distributions (8) arise as suitable limits. This result can be viewed as a heuristic justification of Theorem 1. Let $\epsilon > 0$, consider

$$C_J^\epsilon(A, \mathbf{x}) := \left\{ \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^p : z_j \in [\hat{z}_j(1-\epsilon), \hat{z}_j(1+\epsilon)], j \in J, z_k < \hat{z}_k(1-\epsilon), k \in J^c \right\}, \quad (10)$$

and set

$$C^\epsilon(A, \mathbf{x}) := \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})} C_J^\epsilon(A, \mathbf{x}). \quad (11)$$

Note that the sets $A \odot (C^\epsilon(A, \mathbf{x}))$ shrink to the point \mathbf{x} , as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$.

Proposition 1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, for all $\mathbf{x} \in A \odot (\mathbb{R}_+^p)$, we have, as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in E \mid \mathbf{Z} \in C^\epsilon(A, \mathbf{x})) \longrightarrow \nu(\mathbf{x}, E), \quad E \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{R}_+^p}. \quad (12)$$

Proof. Recall the definition of C_J^ϵ in (10). Observe that for all $\epsilon > 0$, the sets $\{C_J^\epsilon(A, \mathbf{x})\}_{J \in \mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})}$ are mutually disjoint. Thus, writing $C^\epsilon \equiv C^\epsilon(A, \mathbf{x})$ and $C_J^\epsilon \equiv C_J^\epsilon(A, \mathbf{x})$, by (11) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in E \mid \mathbf{Z} \in C^\epsilon) &= \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in E \mid \mathbf{Z} \in C_J^\epsilon) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in C_J^\epsilon \mid \mathbf{Z} \in C^\epsilon) \\ &= \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in E \mid \mathbf{Z} \in C_J^\epsilon) \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in C_J^\epsilon)}{\sum_{K \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in C_K^\epsilon)}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the terms with $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in C_J^\epsilon) = 0$ are ignored. One can see that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in E \mid \mathbf{Z} \in C_J^\epsilon)$ converge to $\nu_J(E, \mathbf{x})$ in (7), as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. The independence of the Z_j 's also implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in C_J^\epsilon) &= \prod_{j \in J} \mathbb{P}(Z_j \in [\hat{z}_j(1 - \epsilon), \hat{z}_j(1 + \epsilon)]) \prod_{k \in J^c} \mathbb{P}(Z_k \leq \hat{z}_k(1 - \epsilon)) \\ &= \prod_{j \in J} \left(f_{Z_j}(\hat{z}_j) \hat{z}_j \cdot 2\epsilon + o(\epsilon) \right) \prod_{k \in J^c} \left(F_{Z_k}(\hat{z}_k) + o(\epsilon) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Observe that for $J \in \mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})$, the latter expression equals $2w_J \epsilon^{|J|} (1 + o(1))$, $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ and the terms with $|J| > r$ will become negligible since they are of smaller order. Therefore, Relation (14) yields (8), and the proof is thus complete. \square

The proof of Proposition 1 provides an insight to the expressions of the weights w_J 's in (9) and the components ν_J 's in (7). In particular, it explains why only hitting scenarios of rank r are involved in the expression of the conditional probability. The formal proof of Theorem 1, however, requires a different argument.

2.2 Conditional Sampling: Computational Efficiency

We discuss here important computational issues related to sampling from the regular conditional probability in (8). It turns out that identifying all hitting scenarios amounts to solving the *set covering problem*, which is NP-hard (see e.g. [3]). The probabilistic structure of the max-linear models, however, will

lead us to an alternative efficient solution, valid with probability one. In particular, we will provide a new formula for the regular conditional probability, showing that \mathbf{Z} can be decomposed into conditionally independent vectors, given $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$. As a consequence, with probability one we are not in the ‘bad’ situation that the corresponding set covering problem requires exponential time to solve. Indeed, this will lead us to an efficient and linearly-scalable algorithm for conditional sampling, which works well for max-linear models with large dimensions $n \times p$ arising in applications.

To fix ideas, observe that Theorem 1 implies the following simple algorithm.

ALGORITHM I:

1. Compute \hat{z}_j for $j = 1, \dots, p$.
2. Identify $\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x})$, compute $r = r(\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{x}))$ and focus on the set of *relevant hitting scenarios* $\mathcal{J}_r = \mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})$.
3. Compute $\{w_J\}_{J \in \mathcal{J}_r}$ and $\{p_J\}_{J \in \mathcal{J}_r}$.
4. Sample $\mathbf{Z} \sim \nu(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ according to (8).

Step 1 is immediate. Provided that Step 2 is done, Step 3 is trivial and, Step 4 can be carried out by first picking a *hitting scenario* $J \in \mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})$ (with probability $p_J(A, \mathbf{x})$), setting $Z_j = \hat{z}_j$, for $j \in J$ and then resampling independently the remaining Z_j ’s from the truncated distributions: $Z_j \mid \{Z_j < \hat{z}_j\}$, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus J$.

The most computationally intensive aspect of this algorithm is to identify the set of all relevant hitting scenarios $\mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})$ in Step 2. This is closely related to the NP-hard *set covering problem* in theoretical computer science (see e.g. [3]), which is formulated next. Let $H = (h_{i,j})_{n \times p}$ be a matrix of 0’s and 1’s, and let $c = (c_j)_{j=1}^p \in \mathbb{Z}_+^p$ be a p -dimensional *cost* vector. For simplicity, introduce the notation:

$$\langle m \rangle \equiv \{1, 2, \dots, m\}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For the matrix H , we say that the column $j \in \langle p \rangle$ *covers* the row $i \in \langle n \rangle$, if $h_{i,j} = 1$. The goal of the set-covering problem is to find a minimum-cost subset $J \subset \langle p \rangle$, such that every row is covered by at least one column $j \in J$. This is equivalent to solving

$$\min_{\substack{\delta_j \in \{0,1\} \\ j \in \langle p \rangle}} \sum_{j \in \langle p \rangle} c_j \delta_j, \quad \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{j \in \langle p \rangle} h_{i,j} \delta_j \geq 1, i \in \langle n \rangle. \quad (15)$$

We can relate the problem of identifying $\mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})$ to the set covering problem by defining

$$h_{i,j} = \mathbf{1}_{\{a_{i,j}\hat{z}_j = x_i\}}, \quad (16)$$

where $A = (a_{i,j})_{n \times p}$ and $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{i=1}^n$ are as in (3), and $c_j = 1, j \in \langle p \rangle$. It is easy to see that, every $J \in \mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})$ corresponds to a solution of (15), and vice versa. Namely, for $\{\delta_j\}_{j \in \langle p \rangle}$ minimizing (15), we have $J = \{j \in \langle p \rangle : \delta_j = 1\} \in \mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})$.

The set $\mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})$ corresponds to the set of *all* solutions of (15), which depends only on the matrix H . Therefore, in the sequel we write $\mathcal{J}_r(H)$ for $\mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})$, and

$$H = (h_{i,j})_{n \times p} \equiv \mathbb{H}(A, \mathbf{x}), \quad (17)$$

with $h_{i,j}$ as in (16) will be referred to as the *hitting matrix*.

Example 3. Recall Example 2. The following hitting matrices correspond to the three cases of \mathbf{x} discussed therein:

$$H^{(i)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad H^{(ii)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad H^{(iii)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Observe that solving for $\mathcal{J}_r(H)$ is even more challenging than solving the set covering problem (15), where only one minimum-cost subset J is needed, and often an approximation of the optimal solution is acceptable. Here, we need to identify exhaustively all J 's such that (15) holds. Fortunately, this problem can be substantially simplified, thanks to the probabilistic structure of the max-linear model.

We first study the distribution of H . In view of (17), we have that $H = \mathbb{H}(A, \mathbf{X})$, with $\mathbf{X} = A \odot \mathbf{Z}$, is a random matrix. It will turn out that, with probability one, H has a *nice* structure, leading to an efficient conditional sampling algorithm.

For any hitting matrix H , we will decompose the set $\langle p \rangle \equiv \{1, \dots, p\}$ into a certain disjoint union $\langle p \rangle = \bigcup_{s=1}^r \bar{\mathcal{J}}^{(s)}$. The vectors $(Z_j)_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{J}}^{(s)}}$, $s = 1, \dots, r$ will turn out to be conditionally independent (in s), given $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$. Therefore, $\nu(\mathbf{x}, E)$ will be expressed as a product of (conditional) probabilities.

We start by decomposing the set $\langle n \rangle \equiv \{1, \dots, n\}$. First, for all $i_1, i_2 \in \langle n \rangle, j \in \langle p \rangle$, we write $i_1 \stackrel{j}{\sim} i_2$, if $h_{i_1,j} = h_{i_2,j} = 1$. Then, we define an equivalence relation on $\langle n \rangle$:

$$i_1 \sim i_2, \quad \text{if} \quad i_1 = \tilde{i}_0 \stackrel{j_1}{\sim} \tilde{i}_1 \stackrel{j_2}{\sim} \dots \stackrel{j_m}{\sim} \tilde{i}_m = i_2, \quad (18)$$

with some $m \leq n$, $i_1 = \tilde{i}_0, \tilde{i}_1, \dots, \tilde{i}_m = i_2 \in \langle n \rangle, j_1, \dots, j_m \in \langle p \rangle$. That is, ‘ \sim ’ is the transitive closure of ‘ $\tilde{\sim}$ ’. Consequently, we obtain a partition of $\langle n \rangle$, denoted by

$$\langle n \rangle = \bigcup_{s=1}^r I_s, \quad (19)$$

where $I_s, s = 1, \dots, r$ are the equivalence classes w.r.t. (18). Based on (19), we define further

$$J^{(s)} = \left\{ j \in \langle p \rangle : h_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for all } i \in I_s \right\}, \quad (20)$$

$$\overline{J}^{(s)} = \left\{ j \in \langle p \rangle : h_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for some } i \in I_s \right\}. \quad (21)$$

The sets $\{J^{(s)}, \overline{J}^{(s)}\}_{s \in \langle r \rangle}$ will determine the factorization form of $\nu(\mathbf{x}, E)$.

Theorem 2. *Let \mathbf{Z} be as in Theorem 1. Let also H be the hitting matrix corresponding to (A, \mathbf{X}) with $\mathbf{X} = A \odot \mathbf{Z}$, and $\{J^{(s)}, \overline{J}^{(s)}\}_{s \in \langle r \rangle}$ be the sets defined in (20) and (21). Then, with probability one, we have*

$$(i) \quad r = r(\mathcal{J}(A, \mathbf{X})),$$

(ii) for all $J \subset \langle p \rangle$, $J \in \mathcal{J}_r(A, A \odot \mathbf{Z})$ if and only if J can be written as

$$J = \{j_1, \dots, j_r\} \quad \text{with} \quad j_s \in J^{(s)}, s \in \langle r \rangle, \quad (22)$$

(iii) for $\nu(\mathbf{x}, E)$ defined in (8),

$$\nu(\mathbf{X}, E) = \prod_{s=1}^r \nu^{(s)}(\mathbf{X}, E) \quad \text{with} \quad \nu^{(s)}(\mathbf{X}, E) = \frac{\sum_{j \in J^{(s)}} w_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{X}) \nu_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{X}, E)}{\sum_{j \in J^{(s)}} w_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{X})}, \quad (23)$$

where for all $j \in J^{(s)}$,

$$w_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}) := \widehat{z}_j f_{Z_j}(\widehat{z}_j) \prod_{k \in \overline{J}^{(s)} \setminus \{j\}} F_{Z_k}(\widehat{z}_k), \quad (24)$$

$$\nu_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}, E) := \delta_{\pi_j(E)}(\widehat{z}_j) \prod_{k \in \overline{J}^{(s)} \setminus \{j\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_k \in \pi_k(E) | Z_k < \widehat{z}_k), \quad (25)$$

with $\widehat{z}_j = \widehat{z}_j(\mathbf{x})$ as in (4).

The proof of Theorem 2 is given in Section 4.

Remark 2. Note that this result does not claim that $\nu(\mathbf{x}, E)$ in (23) is the regular conditional probability. It merely provides an equivalent expression for (8), which is valid with probability one. We still need to show that (8), or equivalently (23), is indeed the regular conditional probability.

From (24) and (25), one can see that $\nu^{(s)}$ is the conditional distribution of $(Z_j)_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{J}}^{(s)}}$. Therefore, Relation (23) implies that $\{(Z_j)_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{J}}^{(s)}}\}_{s \in \langle r \rangle}$, as vectors indexed by s , are *conditionally independent*, given $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$. This leads to the following improved conditional sampling algorithm:

Algorithm II:

1. Compute \hat{z}_j for $j = 1, \dots, p$ and the hitting matrix $H = \mathbb{H}(A, \mathbf{x})$.
2. Identify $\{J^{(s)}, \bar{\mathcal{J}}^{(s)}\}_{s \in \langle r \rangle}$ by (20) and (21).
3. Compute $\{w_j^{(s)}\}_{j \in J^{(s)}}$ for all $s \in \langle r \rangle$ by (24).
4. Sample $(Z_j)_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{J}}^{(s)}} \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} \sim \nu^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ independently for $s = 1, \dots, r$.
5. Combine the sampled $(Z_j)_{j \in \bar{\mathcal{J}}^{(s)}}, s = 1, \dots, r$ to obtain a sample \mathbf{Z} .

This algorithm identifies all hitting scenarios in an efficient way. To illustrate its efficiency compared to Algorithm I, consider that $r = 10$ and $|J^{(s)}| = 10$ for all $s \in \langle 10 \rangle$. Then, applying Formula (8) in Algorithm I requires storing in memory the weights of all 10^{10} hitting scenarios. In contrast, the implementation of (23) requires saving only 10×10 weights. This improvement is critical in practice since it allows us to handle large, realistic models.

Table 1 demonstrates the running times of Algorithm II as a function of the dimensions $n \times p$ of the matrix A . It is based on a discretized 2-d Smith model (Section 3.2) and measured on an Intel(R) Core(TM)2 Duo CPU E4400 2.00GHz with 2GB RAM. It is remarkable that the times scale linearly in both n and p .

3 Examples

3.1 MARMA processes

In this section, we apply our result to the max-autoregressive moving average (MARMA) processes studied by Davis and Resnick [6]. A stationary process $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a MARMA(m, q) process if it satisfies the MARMA recursion:

$$X_t = \phi_1 X_{t-1} \vee \dots \vee \phi_m X_{t-m} \vee Z_t \vee \theta_1 Z_{t-1} \vee \dots \vee \theta_q Z_{t-q}, \quad (26)$$

Table 1: Means and standard deviations (in parentheses) of the running times (in seconds) for the decomposition of the hitting matrix H , based on 100 independent observations $\mathbf{X} = A \odot \mathbf{Z}$, where A is an $(n \times p)$ matrix corresponding to a discretized Smith model.

$p \setminus n$	1	5	10	50
2500	0.03 (0.02)	0.13 (0.03)	0.24 (0.04)	1.25 (0.09)
10000	0.11 (0.04)	0.50 (0.05)	1.00 (0.08)	4.98 (0.33)

for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $\phi_i \geq 0, \theta_j \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, q$ are the parameters, and $\{Z_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are i.i.d. 1-Fréchet random variables. Proposition 2.2 in [6] shows that, (26) has a unique solution in form of

$$X_t = \bigvee_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j Z_{t-j} < \infty, \text{ almost surely,} \quad (27)$$

with $\psi_j \geq 0, j \geq 0, \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j < \infty$, if and only if $\phi^* = \bigvee_{i=1}^m \phi_i < 1$. In this case,

$$\psi_j = \bigvee_{k=0}^{j \wedge q} \alpha_{j-k} \theta_k,$$

where $\{\alpha_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are determined recursively by $\alpha_j = 0$ for all $j < 0$, $\alpha_0 = 1$ and

$$\alpha_j = \phi_1 \alpha_{j-1} \vee \phi_2 \alpha_{j-2} \vee \dots \vee \phi_m \alpha_{j-m}, \forall j \geq 1. \quad (28)$$

In the sequel, we will focus on the MARMA process (26) with unique stationary solution (27). In this case, the MARMA process is a spectrally discrete max-stable process. Without loss of generality, we also assume $\{Z_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ to be standard 1-Fréchet.

We consider the prediction of the MARMA process in the following framework: suppose at each time $t \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we observe the value X_t of the process, and the goal is to predict $\{X_s\}_{n < s \leq n+N}$. We do so by generating i.i.d. samples from the conditional distribution $\{X_s\}_{n < s \leq n+N} \mid \{X_t\}_{t=1, \dots, n}$. To apply our result, it suffices to provide a max-linear representation of this model. We will truncate (27) to obtain

$$\tilde{X}_t = \bigvee_{j=0}^p \psi_j Z_{t-j}, \forall t = 1, \dots, n+N. \quad (29)$$

The truncated process can approximate the original one arbitrarily well, if we take p large enough. Indeed, by using the independence and max-stability of the Z_t 's, one can show that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_t = X_t) = \mathbb{P}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^p \psi_j Z_{t-j} \geq \bigvee_{j=p+1}^{\infty} \psi_j Z_{t-j}\right) = 1 - \frac{\sum_{j=p+1}^{\infty} \psi_j}{\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j} \longrightarrow 1, \quad (30)$$

as $p \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, by induction on α_j in (28), one can show that $\alpha_j \leq (\phi^*)^{\lceil j/m \rceil}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus the convergence (30) above is geometrically fast.

Now, we reformulate the prediction problem with the model (29) as follows:

$$\text{observe } \mathbf{X}_{[1,n]} = A \odot \mathbf{Z}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{predict } \mathbf{Y}_{[1,N]} = B \odot \mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{X}_{[1,n]},$$

with the notation $\mathbf{X}_{[1,n]} = (\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n)$, $\mathbf{Y}_{[1,N]} = (\tilde{X}_{n+1}, \dots, \tilde{X}_{n+N})$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_{1-p}, Z_{2-p}, \dots, Z_{n+N})$. Here, $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times (p+n+N)}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N \times (p+n+N)}$ are determined by (29). In particular,

$$\begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_p & \psi_{p-1} & \cdots & \psi_0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \psi_p & \psi_{p-1} & \cdots & \psi_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \psi_p & \psi_{p-1} & \cdots & \psi_0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \psi_p & \psi_{p-1} & \cdots & \psi_0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

In practice, given the observations $\mathbf{X}_{[1,n]}$, we use our algorithm to sample from the conditional distribution $\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{X}_{[1,n]}$. Therefore, we can sample

$$\mathbf{Y}_{[1,N]} \mid \mathbf{X}_{[1,n]} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbf{B} \odot \mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{X}_{[1,n]}. \quad (32)$$

Our approach is different from the prediction considered in [6], which we will briefly review. Davis and Resnick took the classic time series point of view and investigated how to approximate X_s by a max-linear combination of $\{X_t\}_{t=1, \dots, n}$, w.r.t. a certain metric d . Namely, for all $Y \in \mathcal{H}$ with

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{ \bigvee_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha_j Z_j : \alpha_j \geq 0, \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha_j < \infty \right\},$$

they considered a projection of Y onto the space \mathcal{F}_n , max-linearly spanned by $\{X_t\}_{t=1, \dots, n}$: $\mathcal{F}_n = \{\bigvee_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j X_{n-j} : b_j \geq 0, \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j < \infty\}$. That is, consider the projection $\mathcal{P}_n Y$ defined by

$$\mathcal{P}_n Y = \operatorname{argmin}_{\tilde{Y} \in \mathcal{F}_n} d(\tilde{Y}, Y) \quad (33)$$

with the metric d induced by $d(\bigvee_j \alpha_j Z_j, \bigvee_j \beta_j Z_j) = \sum_j |\alpha_j - \beta_j|$. For specific MARMA processes, [6] provided predictors based on the projection (33). We will refer to these predictors as the *projection predictors*.

In general, the conditional samplings reflect the conditional distribution (32), and they provide more information than the projection predictors. Sampling multiple times from (32), we can calculate e.g., conditional medians, conditional means, quantiles, etc., which are optimal predictors with respect to various loss functions.

Example 4 (MAR(m) processes). *Consider the MAR(m) \equiv MARMA($m, 0$) process with*

$$X_t = \phi_1 X_{t-1} \vee \cdots \vee \phi_m X_{t-m} \vee Z_t. \quad (34)$$

The projection predictor for this model can be obtained recursively by

$$\hat{X}_{t+k} = \phi_1 \hat{X}_{t+k-1} \vee \cdots \vee \phi_m \hat{X}_{t+k-m}, \quad (35)$$

with $\hat{X}_t = X_t, t = 1, \dots, n$ (see [6], p. 799).

Figure 2 illustrates an application of our conditional sampling algorithm in this case. Consider an MAR(3) process $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^{150}$ with $\phi_1 = 0.7, \phi_2 = 0.5$ and $\phi_3 = 0.3$. In effect, we use the truncated model $\{\tilde{X}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ in (29) with $p = 500$, but we still write X_t for the sake of simplicity. Treating the first 100 values as observed, we plot the projection predictor, conditional upper 95%-quantiles and the conditional medians of $\{X_s\}_{s=101}^{150}$ based on 500 independent samples from the conditional distribution.

Observe that the value of the projection predictor in Figure 2 is always below the conditional median. This “underestimation” phenomenon was typical in all the simulations we performed. It can be explained by the fact that, the projection predictor in (35) does not account for the jumps of the process caused by new arrivals $\{Z_t\}_{t>100}$. Indeed, a large new arrival Z_t will cause the process to jump immediately to Z_t at time t , but this will never occur for the projection predictor \hat{X}_t .

Next, we apply our algorithm to examine the bias of the projection predictor. To do this, for each generated MARMA process, we calculated the cumulative probability that the projection predictor corresponds to, for each location $s = 101, \dots, 150$. Namely, using 500 independent samples $\{X_s^{(k)}\}_{s=101}^{150}, k = 1, \dots, 500$ from the conditional distribution, we calculated

$$\mathbb{P}(X_s \leq \hat{X}_s \mid \{X_t\}_{t=1}^{100}) \approx \frac{1}{500} \sum_{k=1}^{500} \mathbf{1}\{X_s^{(k)} \leq \hat{X}_s\}, \forall s > 100, \quad (36)$$




Figure 2: Prediction of a MARMA(3,0) process with $\phi_1 = 0.7, \phi_2 = 0.5$ and $\phi_3 = 0.3$, based on the observation of the first 100 values of the process.

where \hat{X}_s is the projection predictor in (35). This procedure was repeated 1000 times for independent realizations of $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^{100}$ and the means of the (estimated) probability in (36) are reported in Table 2. Note that as the time lag increases, the conditional quantiles of the projection predictors decrease. In this way, our conditional sampling algorithm helps quantify numerically the observed underestimation phenomenon in Figure 2.

Finally, we compare the generated conditional samples to the true process values at times $s = 101, \dots, 150$. Our goal is to demonstrate the validity of our conditional sampling algorithm. The idea is that, at each location $s = 101, \dots, 150$, the true process should lie below the predicted 95% upper

Table 2: Cumulative probabilities that the projection predictors correspond to at time $100 + t$, based on 1000 simulations.

t	1	2	3	4	5	10	20	30	40
mean	70.6%	50.3%	35.6%	25.3%	17.8%	2.9%	0.1%	0%	0%

confidence bound of $X_s \mid \{X_t\}_{t=1}^{100}$, with probability at least 95%. (Note that due to the presence of atoms in the conditional distributions, the coverage probability may in principle be higher than 95%.) Motivated by this, we repeat the procedure in the previous paragraph and record the proportion of the times that X_s is below the predicted confidence quantile, for each s . We refer to these values as the *coverage rates*. As discussed, the coverage rates should be close to 95%. This is supported by our simulation result, shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Coverage rates (CR) and the widths of the upper 95% confidence intervals at time $100 + t$, based on 1000 simulations.

t	1	2	3	4	5	10	20	30	40
CR	0.956	0.952	0.954	0.957	0.966	0.947	0.943	0.951	0.955
width	13.06	26.6	37.8	45.6	51.2	62.8	66.0	66.2	65.4

Table 3 also shows the widths of the upper 95%-confidence intervals. Note that these widths are not equal to the upper confidence bounds, given by the conditional 95%-quantiles, since the left end-point of the conditional distributions are greater than zero. When the time lag is small, the left end-point is large and the widths are small, due to the strong influence of the past of the process $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^{100}$. On the other hand, because of the weak temporal dependence of the MAR(3) processes, this influence decreases fast as the lags increase. Consequently, the conditional distribution converges to the unconditional one, and the conditional quantile to the unconditional one. Note that the (unconditional) 95%-quantile of X_s for the MARMA process (27) can be calculated via the formula $0.95 = \mathbb{P}(\sigma Z \leq u) = \exp(-\sigma u^{-1})$, with $\sigma = \sum_{j=0}^p \psi_j$. For the MAR(3) process we chose, we have $\sigma = 3.4$ and the 95%-quantile of X_s equals 66.29. This is consistent with the widths in Table 3 for large lags.

Remark 3. *As pointed out by an anonymous referee, in this case one can*

directly generate samples from $\{X_s\}_{s=n+1}^N \mid \{X_t\}_{t=1}^n$, by generating independent Fréchet random variables and iterating (34). We selected this example only for illustrative purpose and to be able to compare with the projection predictors in [6]. One can modify slightly the prediction problem, such that our algorithm still applies by adjusting accordingly (31), while both the projection predictor and the direct method by using (34) do not apply. For example, consider the prediction problem with respect to the conditional distribution $\mathbb{P}(\{X_s\}_{s=2n+1}^{2n+N} \in \cdot \mid \{X_t : t = 1, 3, \dots, 2n-1\})$ (prediction with only partial history observed) or $\mathbb{P}(\{X_s\}_{s=2}^{n-1} \in \cdot \mid X_1, X_n)$ (prediction of the middle path with the beginning and the end-point (in the future) given). In other words, our algorithm has no restriction on the locations of observations. This feature is of great importance in spatial prediction problems.

3.2 The Discrete Smith Model

Consider the following *moving maxima* random field model in \mathbb{R}^2 :

$$X_{\mathbf{t}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}^e \phi(\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{u}) M_{\alpha}(d\mathbf{u}), \quad \mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (37)$$

where M_{α} is an α -Fréchet random sup-measure on \mathbb{R}^2 with the Lebesgue control measure. Smith [24] proposed to use for ϕ the bivariate Gaussian density:

$$\phi(t_1, t_2) := \frac{\beta_1 \beta_2}{2\pi \sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2(1 - \rho^2)} [\beta_1^2 t_1^2 - 2\rho \beta_1 \beta_2 t_1 t_2 + \beta_2^2 t_2^2] \right\}, \quad (38)$$

with correlation $\rho \in (-1, 1)$ and variances $\sigma_i^2 = 1/\beta_i^2$, $i = 1, 2$. Consistent and asymptotically normal estimators for the parameters ρ , β_1 and β_2 were obtained by de Haan and Pereira [12]. Here, we will assume that these parameters are known and will illustrate the conditional sampling methodology over a discretized version of the random field (37). Namely, we truncate the extremal integral in (37) to the square region $[-M, M]^2$ and consider a uniform mesh of size $h := M/q$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$. We then set

$$X_{\mathbf{t}} := \bigvee_{-q \leq j_1, j_2 \leq q-1} h^{2/\alpha} \phi(\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{u}_{j_1 j_2}) Z_{j_1 j_2}, \quad (39)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_{j_1 j_2} = ((j_1 + 1/2)h, (j_2 + 1/2)h)$ and $h^{2/\alpha} Z_{j_1 j_2} \stackrel{d}{=} M_{\alpha}((j_1 h, (j_1 + 1)h] \times (j_2 h, (j_2 + 1)h])$. This discretized model (39) can be made arbitrarily close to the spectrally continuous one in (37) by taking a fine mesh h and sufficiently large M (see e.g. [26]).

Suppose that the random field X in (39) is observed at n locations $X_{\mathbf{t}_i} = x_i$, $\mathbf{t}_i \in [-M, M]^2$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. In view of (39), we have the max-linear model $\mathbf{X} = A \odot \mathbf{Z}$, with $\mathbf{X} = (X_{\mathbf{t}_i})_{i=1}^n$ and $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_j)_{j=1}^p$, $p = q^2$. By sampling from the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{Z} \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$, we can predict the random field $X_{\mathbf{s}}$ at arbitrary locations $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

To illustrate our algorithm, we used the model (39) with parameter values $\rho = 0, \beta_1 = \beta_2 = 1, M = 4, p = q^2 = 2500$, and $n = 7$ observed locations. We generated $N = 500$ independent samples from the conditional distribution of the random field $\{X_{\mathbf{s}}\}$, where \mathbf{s} takes values on an uniform 100×100 grid, in the region $[-2, 2] \times [-2, 2]$. We have already seen four of these realizations in Figure 1. Figure 3 illustrates the median and 0.95-th quantile of the conditional distribution. The former provides the optimal predictor for the values of the random field given the observed data, with respect to the absolute deviation loss. The marginal quantiles, on the other hand, provide important confidence regions for the random field, given the data.

Certainly, conditional sampling may be used to address more complex *functional* prediction problems. In particular, given a two-dimensional threshold surface, one can readily obtain the *correct* probability that the random field exceeds or stays below this surface, conditionally on the observed values. This is much more than what marginal conditional distributions can provide.




Figure 3: Conditional medians (*left*) and 0.95-th conditional marginal quantiles (*right*). Each cross indicates an *observed* location of the random field, with the observed value at right.

4 Proofs of Theorems 1 and 2

In this section, we prove Theorems 1 and 2. We will first prove Theorem 2, which simplifies the regular conditional probability formula (8) in Theorem 1. Then, we show the simplified new formula is the desired regular conditional probability, which completes the proof of Theorem 1. The key step to prove Theorem 2 is the following lemma. Write $H_{\cdot j} = \{i \in \langle r \rangle : h_{i,j} = 1\}$.

Lemma 1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2, with probability one,*

- (i) $J^{(s)}$ is nonempty for all $s \in \langle r \rangle$, and
- (ii) for all $j \in J^{(s)}$, $H_{\cdot j} \cap I_s \neq \emptyset$ implies $H_{\cdot j} \subset I_s$.

Proof. Note that to show part (ii) of Lemma 1, it suffices to observe that since I_s is an equivalence class w.r.t. Relation (18), $H_{\cdot j} \setminus I_s$ and $H_{\cdot j} \cap I_s$ cannot be both nonempty. Thus, it remains to show part (i). We proceed by excluding several \mathbb{P} -measure zero sets, on which the desired results may not hold.

First, observe that for all $i \in \langle n \rangle$, the maximum value of $\{a_{i,j}Z_j\}_{j \in \langle r \rangle}$ is achieved for unique $j \in \langle p \rangle$ with probability one, since the Z_j 's are independent and have continuous distributions. Thus, the set

$$\mathcal{N}_1 := \bigcup_{i \in \langle n \rangle, j_1, j_2 \in \langle p \rangle, j_1 \neq j_2} \left\{ a_{i,j_1}Z_{j_1} = a_{i,j_2}Z_{j_2} = \max_{j \in \langle p \rangle} a_{i,j}Z_j \right\}$$

has \mathbb{P} -measure zero. From now on, we focus on the event \mathcal{N}_1^c and set $j(i) = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \in \langle p \rangle} a_{i,j}Z_j$ for all $i \in \langle n \rangle$.

Next, we show that with probability one, $i_1 \stackrel{j}{\sim} i_2$ implies $j(i_1) = j(i_2)$. That is, the set

$$\mathcal{N}_2 := \bigcup_{j \in \langle p \rangle, i_1, i_2 \in \langle n \rangle, i_1 \neq i_2} \mathcal{N}_{j,i_1,i_2} \text{ with } \mathcal{N}_{j,i_1,i_2} := \left\{ j(i_1) \neq j(i_2), i_1 \stackrel{j}{\sim} i_2 \right\}$$

has \mathbb{P} -measure 0. It suffices to show $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_{j,i_1,i_2}) = 0$ for all $i_1 \neq i_2$. If not, since $\langle p \rangle$ and $\langle n \rangle$ are finite sets, there exists $\mathcal{N}_0 \subset \mathcal{N}_{j,i_1,i_2}$, such that $j(i_1) = j_1 \neq j(i_2) = j_2$ on \mathcal{N}_0 , and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_0) > 0$. At the same time, however, observe that $i_1 \stackrel{j}{\sim} i_2$ implies $h_{i_1,j} = h_{i_2,j} = 1$, which yields

$$a_{i_k,j}\hat{z}_j = x_{i_k} = a_{i_k,j(i_k)}Z_{j(i_k)} = a_{i_k,j_k}Z_{j_k}, k = 1, 2.$$

It then follows that on \mathcal{N}_0 , $Z_{j_1}/Z_{j_2} = a_{i_1,j}a_{i_2,j_2}/(a_{i_2,j}a_{i_1,j_1})$, which is a constant. This constant is strictly positive and finite. Indeed, this is because

on \mathcal{N}_1^c , $a_{i,j(i)} > 0$ by Assumption A and $h_{i,j} = 1$ implies $a_{i,j} > 0$. Since Z_{j_1} and Z_{j_2} are independent continuous random variables, it then follows that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_0) = 0$.

Finally, we focus on the event $(\mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2)^c$. Then, for any $i_1, i_2 \in I_s$, we have $i_1 \sim i_2$ and let $\tilde{i}_0, \dots, \tilde{i}_n$ be as in (18). It then follows that $j(i_1) = j(\tilde{i}_0) = j(\tilde{i}_1) = \dots = j(\tilde{i}_n) = j(i_2)$. Note that for all $i \in \langle n \rangle$, $h_{i,j(i)} = 1$ by the definition of $j(i)$. Hence, $j(i_1) = j(i_2) \in J^{(s)}$. We have thus completed the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Since $\{I_s\}_{s \in \langle r \rangle}$ are disjoint with $\bigcup_{s \in \langle r \rangle} I_s = \langle n \rangle$, in the language of the set-covering problem, to cover $\langle n \rangle$, we need to cover each I_s . By part (ii) of Lemma 1, any two different I_{s_1} and I_{s_2} cannot be covered by a single set H_j . Thus we need at least r sets to cover $\langle n \rangle$. On the other hand, with probability one we can select one j_s from each $J^{(s)}$ (by part (i) of Lemma 1), which yields a valid cover. That is, with probability one, $r = r(\mathcal{J}(H))$ and any valid minimum-cost cover of $\langle n \rangle$ must be as in (22), and vice versa. We have thus proved parts (i) and (ii).

To show (iii), by straight-forward calculation, we have, with probability one,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})} w_J &= \sum_{j_1 \in J^{(1)}} \cdots \sum_{j_r \in J^{(r)}} w_{j_1, \dots, j_r} \\
&= \sum_{j_1 \in J^{(1)}} \cdots \sum_{j_{r-1} \in J^{(r-1)}} \left[\prod_{s=1}^{r-1} \hat{z}_{j_s} f_{Z_{j_s}}(\hat{z}_{j_s}) \prod_{\substack{j \notin \overline{J}^{(r)} \\ j \neq j_1, \dots, j_{r-1}}} F_{Z_j}(\hat{z}_j) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \left\{ \sum_{j \in J^{(r)}} \left(\hat{z}_j f_{Z_j}(\hat{z}_j) \prod_{k \in \overline{J}^{(r)} \setminus \{j\}} F_{Z_k}(\hat{z}_k) \right) \right\} \right] \\
&= \prod_{s=1}^r \sum_{j \in J^{(s)}} \left(\hat{z}_j f_{Z_j}(\hat{z}_j) \prod_{k \in \overline{J}^{(s)} \setminus \{j\}} F_{Z_k}(\hat{z}_k) \right) = \prod_{s=1}^r \sum_{j \in J^{(s)}} w_j^{(s)} \quad (40)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}_r(A, \mathbf{x})} w_J \nu_J(\mathbf{x}, E) = \prod_{s=1}^r \left(\sum_{j \in J^{(s)}} w_j^{(s)} \nu_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}, E) \right). \quad (41)$$

By plugging (40) and (41) into (8), we obtain the desired result and complete the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. To prove that ν in (8) yields the regular conditional probability of \mathbf{Z} given \mathbf{X} , it is enough to show that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \in D, \mathbf{Z} \in E) = \int_D \nu(\mathbf{x}, E) \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(d\mathbf{x}), \quad (42)$$

for all rectangles $D \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{R}_+^n}$ and $E \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{R}_+^p}$. In view of Theorem 2, it is enough to work with $\nu(\mathbf{x}, E)$ given by (23).

We shall prove (42) by breaking the integration into a suitable sum of integrals over regions corresponding to all hitting matrices H for the max-linear model $\mathbf{X} = A \odot \mathbf{Z}$. We say such a hitting matrix H is *nice*, if $J^{(s)}$ defined in (20) is nonempty for all $s \in \langle r \rangle$. In view of Lemma 1, it suffices to focus on the set $\mathcal{H}(A)$ of *nice* hitting matrices H . Notice that the set $\mathcal{H}(A)$ is finite since the elements of the hitting matrices are 0's and 1's.

For all rectangles $D \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{R}_+^n}$, let

$$D_H = \left\{ \mathbf{x} = A \odot \mathbf{z} : \mathbb{H}(A, \mathbf{x}) = H, \mathbf{x} \in D \right\}$$

be the set of all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ that give rise to the hitting matrix H . By Lemma 1 (i), for the random vector $\mathbf{X} = A \odot \mathbf{Z}$, with probability one, we have

$$\mathbf{X} = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}(A)} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{1}_{D_H}(\mathbf{X})$$

and hence

$$\int_D \nu(\mathbf{x}, E) \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(d\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}(A)} \int_{D_H} \nu(\mathbf{x}, E) \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(d\mathbf{x}). \quad (43)$$

Now fix an arbitrary and *non-random* nice hitting matrix $H \in \mathcal{H}(A)$. Let $\{I_s\}_{s \in \langle r \rangle}$ denote the partition of $\langle n \rangle$ determined by (18) and let $J^{(s)}$, $\bar{J}^{(s)}$, $s = 1, \dots, r$ be as in (20). Recall that $J^{(s)} \subset \bar{J}^{(s)}$ and the sets $\bar{J}^{(s)}$, $s = 1, \dots, r$ are disjoint.

Focus on the set $D_H \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Without loss of generality, and for notational convenience, suppose that $s \in I_s$, for all $s = 1, \dots, r$. That is,

$$I_1 = \{1, i_{1,2}, \dots, i_{1,k_1}\}, I_2 = \{2, i_{2,2}, \dots, i_{2,k_2}\}, \dots, I_r = \{r, i_{r,2}, \dots, i_{r,k_r}\}.$$

Define the projection mapping $\mathcal{P}_H : D_H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^r$ onto the first r coordinates:

$$\mathcal{P}_H(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1, \dots, x_r) \equiv \mathbf{x}_r.$$

Note that \mathcal{P}_H , restricted to D_H is one-to-one. Indeed, for all $i \in I_s$, we have $x_i = a_{i,j} \hat{z}_j$ and $x_s = a_{s,j} \hat{z}_j$, for all $j \in J^{(s)}$ (recall (20)). This implies $x_i = (a_{i,j}/a_{s,j})x_s$, for all $i \in I_s$ and all $s = 1, \dots, r$. Hence, $\mathcal{P}_H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \mathcal{P}_H(\mathbf{x})$ implies $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}$.

Consequently, can write $\mathbf{x} = \mathcal{P}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_r)$, $\mathbf{x}_r \in \mathcal{P}(D_H)$, and

$$\int_{D_H} \nu(\mathbf{x}, E) \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(d\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{P}_H(D_H)} \nu(\mathbf{x}, E) \mathbb{Q}_H^{\mathbf{X}_r}(dx_1 \dots dx_r),$$

where $\mathbb{Q}_H^{\mathbf{X}_r} := \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}} \circ \mathcal{P}_H^{-1}$ is the induced measure on the set $\mathcal{P}_H(D_H)$.

Lemma 2. *The measure $\mathbb{Q}_H^{\mathbf{X}_r}$ has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure on the set $\mathcal{P}_H(D_H)$. The density is given by*

$$\mathbb{Q}_H^{\mathbf{X}_r}(d\mathbf{x}_r) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{P}_H(D_H)}(\mathbf{x}_r) \prod_{s=1}^r \sum_{j \in J^{(s)}} w_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{dx_1}{x_1} \dots \frac{dx_r}{x_r}. \quad (44)$$

The proof of this result is given below. In view of (44) and (23), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{P}_H(D_H)} \nu(\mathbf{x}, E) \mathbb{Q}_H^{\mathbf{X}_r}(d\mathbf{x}_r) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{P}_H(D_H)} \underbrace{\prod_{s=1}^r \left(\frac{\sum_{j \in J^{(s)}} w_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}) \nu_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}, E)}{\sum_{k \in J^{(s)}} w_k^{(s)}(\mathbf{x})} \right)}_{=\nu(\mathbf{x}, E)} \times \underbrace{\prod_{s=1}^r \sum_{j \in J^{(s)}} w_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}) \frac{dx_1}{x_1} \dots \frac{dx_r}{x_r}}_{=\mathbb{Q}_H^{\mathbf{X}_r}(d\mathbf{x}_r)} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{P}_H(D_H)} \prod_{s=1}^r \sum_{j \in J^{(s)}} w_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}) \nu_j^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}, E) \frac{dx_1}{x_1} \dots \frac{dx_r}{x_r}, \end{aligned}$$

which equals

$$\sum_{j_1 \in J^{(1)}, \dots, j_r \in J^{(r)}} \underbrace{\int_{\mathcal{P}_H(D_H)} \prod_{s=1}^r w_{j_s}^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}) \nu_{j_s}^{(s)}(\mathbf{x}, E) \frac{dx_1}{x_1} \dots \frac{dx_r}{x_r}}_{=: I(j_1, \dots, j_r)}. \quad (45)$$

Fix $j_1 \in J^{(1)}, \dots, j_r \in J^{(r)}$ and focus on the integral $I(j_1, \dots, j_r)$. Define

$$\Omega_H^r(D_H) := \left\{ (z_{j_1}, \dots, z_{j_r}) : z_{j_s} = x_s / a_{s,j_s}, s = 1, \dots, r, \mathbf{x}_r = (x_s)_{s=1}^r \in \mathcal{P}_H(D_H) \right\}.$$

We have, by (24), (25), and replacing x_s with $a_{s,j_s}z_{j_s}$, $s = 1, \dots, r$ (simple change of variables),

$$\begin{aligned}
& I(j_1, \dots, j_r) \\
&= \int_{\Omega_H^r(D_H)} \prod_{s=1}^r \left(z_{j_s} f_{Z_{j_s}}(z_{j_s}) \prod_{k \in \bar{J}^{(s)} \setminus \{j_s\}} F_{Z_k}(\widehat{z}_k) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \delta_{\pi_{j_s}(E)}(z_{j_s}) \prod_{k \in \bar{J}^{(s)} \setminus \{j_s\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_k \in \pi_k(E) \mid Z_k < \widehat{z}_k) \right) \frac{dz_{j_1}}{z_{j_1}} \dots \frac{dz_{j_r}}{z_{j_r}} \\
&= \int_{\Omega_H^r(D_H)} \prod_{s=1}^r f_{Z_{j_s}}(z_{j_s}) \delta_{\pi_{j_s}(E)}(z_{j_s}) \\
&\quad \times \prod_{k \in \langle p \rangle \setminus \{j_1, \dots, j_r\}} \mathbb{P}(Z_k \in \pi_k(E), Z_k < \widehat{z}_k) dz_{j_1} \dots dz_{j_r}. \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_{H;j_1, \dots, j_r}(D_H) &= \left\{ \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^p : \mathbf{x} = A \odot \mathbf{z} \in D_H, \right. \\
&\quad \left. z_{j_s} = x_s / a_{s,j_s}, s = 1, \dots, r, z_k < \widehat{z}_k(\mathbf{x}), k \in \langle p \rangle \setminus \{j_1, \dots, j_r\} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the independence of the Z_k 's, (46) becomes

$$I(j_1, \dots, j_r) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in \Omega_{H;j_1, \dots, j_r}(D_H) \cap E). \tag{47}$$

By plugging (47) into (45), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{D_H} \nu(\mathbf{x}, E) \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(d\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathcal{P}_H(D_H)} \nu(\mathbf{x}, E) \mathbb{Q}_H^{\mathbf{X}_r}(d\mathbf{x}_r) \\
&= \sum_{j_1 \in J^{(1)}, \dots, j_r \in J^{(r)}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in \Omega_{H;j_1, \dots, j_r}(D_H) \cap E) = \mathbb{P}(A \odot \mathbf{Z} \in D_H, \mathbf{Z} \in E), \tag{48}
\end{aligned}$$

because the summation over (j_1, \dots, j_r) accounts for all relevant hitting scenarios corresponding to the matrix H . Plugging (48) into (43), we have

$$\int_D \nu(\mathbf{x}, E) \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(d\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}(A)} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \equiv A \odot \mathbf{Z} \in D_H, \mathbf{Z} \in E) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \in D, \mathbf{Z} \in E).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. Consider the random vector $\mathbf{X}_r = (X_1, \dots, X_r)$. Observe that by the definition of the set $\mathcal{P}_H(D_H)$, on the event $\{\mathbf{X}_r \in \mathcal{P}_H(D_H)\}$, we have

$$\mathbf{X}_r = \sum_{j_1 \in J^{(1)}, \dots, j_r \in J^{(r)}} \begin{pmatrix} a_{1,j_1} Z_{j_1} \\ \vdots \\ a_{r,j_r} Z_{j_r} \end{pmatrix} \prod_{s=1}^r \underbrace{\mathbf{1}\left\{ \bigvee_{k \in \overline{J}^{(s)} \setminus \{j_s\}} a_{s,k} Z_k < a_{s,j_s} Z_{j_s} \right\}}_{=: \mathbf{1}\{C_{s,j_s}\}}. \quad (49)$$

Note that since $J(s) \subset \overline{J}^{(s)}$, $s = 1, \dots, r$, the events $\bigcap_{s=1}^r C_{s,j_s}$ are disjoint for all r -tuples $(j_1, \dots, j_r) \in J^{(1)} \times \dots \times J^{(r)}$.

Recall that our goal is to establish (44). By the fact that the sum in (49) involves only one non-zero term for some (j_1, \dots, j_r) , with probability one, we have that for all measurable set $\Delta \subset \mathcal{P}_H(D_H)$, writing $\xi_{j_s} = a_{s,j_s} Z_{j_s}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_H^{\mathbf{X}_r}(\Delta) &\equiv \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_r \in \Delta) \\ &= \sum_{j_1 \in J^{(1)}, \dots, j_r \in J^{(r)}} \mathbb{P}\left(\{(\xi_{j_1}, \dots, \xi_{j_r}) \in \Delta\} \cap \left(\bigcap_{s=1}^r C_{s,j_s}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Now, consider the last probability, for fixed (j_1, \dots, j_r) . The random variables ξ_{j_s} , $s = 1, \dots, r$ are independent and they have densities $f_{Z_{j_s}}(x_s/a_{s,j_s})/a_{s,j_s}$, $x_s \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We also have that the events C_{s,j_s} , $s = 1, \dots, r$ are mutually independent, since their definitions involve Z_k 's indexed by disjoint sets $\overline{J}^{(s)}$, $s = 1, \dots, r$. By conditioning on the ξ_{j_s} 's, we obtain that the probability in the right-hand side of (50) equals

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Delta} \left(\prod_{s=1}^r \frac{1}{a_{s,j_s}} f(x_s/a_{s,j_s}) \right) \times \prod_{s=1}^r \mathbb{P}\left(\bigvee_{k \in \overline{J}^{(s)} \setminus \{j_s\}} a_{s,k} Z_k < x_s \right) dx_1 \cdots dx_r \\ &= \int_{\Delta} \prod_{s=1}^r \left(\frac{1}{a_{s,j_s}} f(x_s/a_{s,j_s}) \prod_{k \in \overline{J}^{(s)} \setminus \{j_s\}} F_{Z_k}(x_s/a_{s,k}) \right) dx_1 \cdots dx_r. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (49) and (24), replacing $\sum_{j_1 \in J^{(1)}, \dots, j_r \in J^{(r)}} \prod_{s=1}^r \dots$ by $\prod_{s=1}^r (\sum_{j \in J^{(s)}} \dots)$, we obtain that the measure $\mathbb{Q}_H^{\mathbf{X}_r}$ has a density on $\mathcal{P}(D_H)$, given by (44). \square

A Regular conditional probability

We recall here the notion of regular conditional probability. Let $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_p)$, $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$, and let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}_+^p}$ denote the Borel σ -algebra on \mathbb{R}_+^p . The *regular conditional probability* ν of \mathbf{Z} given $\sigma(\mathbf{X})$, is a function from $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}_+^p} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ to $[0, 1]$, such that

- (i) $\nu(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ is a probability measure, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$,
- (ii) The function $\nu(\cdot, E)$ is measurable, for all Borel sets $E \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^p}$.
- (iii) $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in E, \mathbf{X} \in D) = \int_D \nu(\mathbf{x}, E) \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(d\mathbf{x})$, for all $E \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^p}$ and $D \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$, where $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\cdot) := \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \in \cdot)$.

See e.g. Proposition A 1.5.III in [5] for more details.

In Section 2, we provided an expression for the regular conditional probability in the max-linear model (3):

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}, E) := \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in E \mid \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}), \quad E \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}_+^p}, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n. \quad (51)$$

The definition of ν implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} g(\mathbf{z}) \nu(\mathbf{X}, d\mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{E}(g(\mathbf{Z}) \mid \sigma(\mathbf{X})), \quad \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}\text{-almost surely,}$$

for all Borel functions $g : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathbb{E}|g(\mathbf{Z})| < \infty$. By the strong law of large numbers, the latter conditional expectations are readily approximated by $N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N g(\mathbf{Z}^{(i)})$, where $\mathbf{Z}^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ are independent samples from the regular conditional probability $\nu(\mathbf{X}, d\mathbf{z})$. Thus, ν is the *right* distribution to sample from when performing prediction, given prior observed data.

References

- [1] A. A. Balkema and S. I. Resnick. Max-infinite divisibility. *J. Appl. Probability*, 14(2):309–319, 1977.
- [2] T. Buishand, L. de Haan, and C. Zhou. On spatial extremes: With application to a rainfall problem. *Ann. Appl. Stat.*, 2(2):624–642, 2008.
- [3] A. Caprara, P. Toth, and M. Fischetti. Algorithms for the set covering problem. *Ann. Oper. Res.*, 98:353–371 (2001), 2000. Optimization theory and its application (Perth, 1998).

- [4] D. Cooley, D. Nychka, and P. Naveau. Bayesian spatial modeling of extreme precipitation return levels. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 102(479):824–840, 2007.
- [5] D. J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones. *An introduction to the theory of point processes. Vol. II.* Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer, New York, second edition, 2008. General theory and structure.
- [6] R. A. Davis and S. I. Resnick. Basic properties and prediction of max-ARMA processes. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 21(4):781–803, 1989.
- [7] R. A. Davis and S. I. Resnick. Prediction of stationary max-stable processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 3(2):497–525, 1993.
- [8] A. C. Davison and R. L. Smith. Models for exceedances over high thresholds. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 52(3):393–442, 1990. With discussion and a reply by the authors.
- [9] L. de Haan. A characterization of multidimensional extreme-value distributions. *Sankhyā Ser. A*, 40(1):85–88, 1978.
- [10] L. de Haan. A spectral representation for max-stable processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 12(4):1194–1204, 1984.
- [11] L. de Haan and A. Ferreira. *Extreme value theory.* Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York, 2006. An introduction.
- [12] L. de Haan and T. T. Pereira. Spatial extremes: Models for the stationary case. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34:146–168, 2006.
- [13] L. de Haan and J. Pickands, III. Stationary min-stable stochastic processes. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, 72(4):477–492, 1986.
- [14] R. Furrer, D. Nychka, and S. Sain. *fields: Tools for spatial data*, 2009. R package version 6.01.
- [15] E. Giné, M. G. Hahn, and P. Vatan. Max-infinitely divisible and max-stable sample continuous processes. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 87(2):139–165, 1990.
- [16] Z. Kabluchko, M. Schlather, and L. de Haan. Stationary max-stable fields associated to negative definite functions. *Ann. Probab.*, 37(5):2042–2065, 2009.

- [17] P. Naveau, A. Guillou, D. Cooley, and J. Diebolt. Modelling pairwise dependence of maxima in space. *Biometrika*, 96(1):1–17, 2009.
- [18] R Development Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2009. ISBN 3-900051-07-0.
- [19] S. I. Resnick. *Extreme values, regular variation, and point processes*, volume 4 of *Applied Probability. A Series of the Applied Probability Trust*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.
- [20] S. I. Resnick. *Heavy-tail phenomena*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York, 2007. Probabilistic and statistical modeling.
- [21] S. I. Resnick and R. Roy. Random usc functions, max-stable processes and continuous choice. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 1(2):267–292, 1991.
- [22] M. Schlather. Models for stationary max-stable random fields. *Extremes*, 5:33–44, 2002.
- [23] M. Schlather and J. A. Tawn. A dependence measure for multivariate and spatial extreme values: Properties and inference. *Biometrika*, 90:139–156, 2003.
- [24] R. L. Smith. Max-stable processes and spatial extremes. unpublished manuscript, 1990.
- [25] S. M. Srivastava. *A course on Borel sets*, volume 180 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [26] S. A. Stoev and M. S. Taqqu. Extremal stochastic integrals: a parallel between max-stable and alpha-stable processes. *Extremes*, 8(3):237–266, 2006.
- [27] Y. Wang. *maxLinear: Conditional sampling for max-linear models*, 2010. R package version 1.0.
- [28] Y. Wang and S. A. Stoev. On the structure and representations of max-stable processes. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 42(3):855–877, 2010.