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Abstract

We consider multivariate stationary processes \((X_t)\), satisfying a stochastic recurrence equation of the form

\[ X_t = m M_t X_{t-1} + Q_t, \]

where \((M_t)\) and \((Q_t)\) are iid random variables and random vectors, respectively, and \(m = \text{diag}(m_1,\ldots,m_d)\) is a deterministic diagonal matrix. We obtain a full characterization of the multivariate regular variation properties of \((X_t)\), proving that coordinates \(X_{t,i}\) and \(X_{t,j}\) are asymptotically independent if and only if \(m_i \neq m_j\); even though all coordinates rely on the same random input \((M_t)\). We describe extremal properties of \((X_t)\) in the framework of vector scaling regular variation. Our results are applied to multivariate autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity (ARCH) processes.
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1 Introduction

1.1 The model

We consider the diagonal specification of the BEKK-ARCH(1) model as in Pedersen and Wintenberger (2018)

\[ X_t = H_t^{1/2} Z_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{1.1} \]

\[ H_t = C + \text{Diag}(m_1, \ldots, m_d)X_{t-1}X_{t-1}^\top \text{Diag}(m_1, \ldots, m_d). \tag{1.2} \]

Here we restrict our setting to the case where \((Z_t)\) is an iid sequence of Gaussian random vectors \(\mathcal{N}_d(0, I)\). The model depends on few parameters, the ones in the symmetric semi-definite positive matrix \(C\) and the diagonal coefficients \(m_i > 0\) for \(1 \leq i \leq d\). The Diagonal BEKK-ARCH(1) model is very interesting as it allows different tail indices on the margins of the stationary solution. This freedom is not offered by other BEKK-ARCH models which marginals have common tail indices, see Pedersen and Wintenberger (2018). This feature is important for modelling: Heavy tailed data, such as in finance, may exhibit different tail indices indicating different responses during financial crisis.

More precisely, under the top-Lyapunov condition

\[ m_i^2 < 2e^\gamma, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d, \tag{1.3} \]

where \(\gamma \approx 0.5772\) is the Euler constant, it exists a stationary solution \((X_t)\) of the system (1.1)-(1.2); see e.g. Nelson (1990). This solution has nice properties: it is a uniform ergodic Markov chain on \(\mathbb{R}^d\). Moreover, its marginals are regularly varying with possibly different tail indices; following Goldie (1991) we have that

\[ \mathbb{P}(X_{0,i} > x) \sim \mathbb{P}(X_{0,i} \geq -x) \sim \frac{c_i}{2} x^{-\alpha_i}, \quad x \to \infty, \tag{1.4} \]

where \(c_i > 0\) and \(\alpha_i > 0\) is the unique solution of the equation \(\mathbb{E}[|m_i M|^{\alpha}] = 1\), for \(M \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)\). Here and below, \(f(x) \sim g(x)\) means that \(\lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = 1\). As \(\alpha_i\) is a decreasing function of \(m_i\), the tail indices are distinct when the diagonal terms are distinct. Moreover the serial extremal dependence of the marginal sequences \((X_{t,i})\) for any \(1 \leq i \leq d\) is well known since the pioneer work of De Haan et al (1989).

1.2 Outline and scope of this paper

The main goal of this paper is to understand the joint extremal behaviour, i.e., multivariate regular variation of \(X_t\) and the interplay between marginals
that have distinct tail indices. As an example, consider the case of a couple \((X_{0,i}, X_{0,j})\) of marginals such that \(m_i \neq m_j\) and then \(\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j\). Our first main result in Section 3 states that \(X_{0,i}\) and \(X_{0,j}\) are asymptotically independent in the sense that

\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(X_{0,i} > x^{1/\alpha_i} \mid X_{0,j} > x^{1/\alpha_j}) = \lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(X_{0,j} > x^{1/\alpha_j} \mid X_{0,i} > x^{1/\alpha_i}) = 0.
\]

This result remains true also when \(Q_i = Q_j\). Thus, even though \(X_{0,i}\) and \(X_{0,j}\) are perfectly dependent in the sense that all their randomness comes from the same random variables, extremes never occur simultaneously in these marginals. This result also allows us to derive that \(((X_{0,i}, X_{0,j}))\) is non-standard regularly varying in the sense of Resnick (2007).

Section 4 concerns the case where the diagonal terms \(m_i\) are identically equal to \(m\) and hence the tail indices of the marginals \(X_{0,i}\) are the same. Applying Theorem 1.6 of Buraczewski et al. (2009) on the SRE equation (1.1)-(1.2) with multiplicative similarity matrix \(mM_0I_d\), we derived multivariate regular variation of the process \((X_t)\) in Pedersen and Wintenberger (2018). These results are refined here.

To study the general diagonal BEKK-ARCH(1) model where some diagonal elements are identical and others are distinct, we use and extend the framework of Vector Scaling Regular Variation (VSRV), introduced in Pedersen and Wintenberger (2018). It is defined in full generality in Section 2. It describes the joint extremal behaviour via a spectral tail process \((\Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}\), satisfying

\[
\Theta_t = \text{Diag}(m_1, \ldots, m_d)M_t\Theta_{t-1}, \quad t \geq 1
\]

from some initial value \(\Theta_0\). In Section 5, we derive the characterization of \(\Theta_0\), proving asymptotic independence between blocks with different tail indices, and asymptotic dependence within blocks.

In Section 6 we extend our results by studying second order properties, i.e., we show - under more restrictive assumptions - that there exist two rates \(\Delta > \delta > 0\), depending on the coefficients \(m_i\) and \(m_j\), so that

\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} x^{1+\delta} \mathbb{P}(X_{0,i} > x^{1/\alpha_i}, X_{0,j} > x^{1/\alpha_j}) = 0 \quad (1.6)
\]

\[
\liminf_{x \to \infty} x^{1+\Delta} \mathbb{P}(X_{0,i} > x^{1/\alpha_i}, X_{0,j} > x^{1/\alpha_j}) > 0. \quad (1.7)
\]

We conclude the introduction by relating the BEKK-ARCH(1) model to a stochastic recurrence equation, followed by a formulation of our main assumptions.
There and in the rest of the paper we will denote by \( \text{law} = \) the equality in distribution (between random variables on both sides), \( \| \cdot \| \) will denote any vector norm on \( \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( \| \cdot \|_2 \) and \( \| \cdot \|_{\infty} \) represent the euclidean and infinity norm, respectively.

### 1.3 A stochastic recurrence equation and our main assumptions

A crucial remark in obtaining the result is that, from the Gaussian assumption, the system (1.1)-(1.2) can be written as a Stochastic Recurrence Equation (SRE)

\[
X_t = \text{Diag}(m_1, \ldots, m_d) M_t X_{t-1} + Q_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z},
\]

where \((M_t)\) is an iid sequence of \( \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \) random variables and \((Q_t)\) is an iid sequence of \( \mathcal{N}_d(0, C) \) random vectors, independent of \((M_t)\).

Most of our results will be applicable to a wider class of SREs, e.g., most results do not require independence between \((M_t)\) and \((Q_t)\). Stationary solutions to SRE have attracted a lot of research in the past few years, see Buraczewski et al. (2016b) for an exhaustive list of references. However, in the present setting of diagonal matrices, only marginal tail behavior has been investigated so far, see Pedersen and Wintenberger (2018); Matsui and Pedersen (2019).

We will work under the following set of assumptions. Denoting by \((M, Q)\) a generic copy of \((M_t, Q_t)\), we assume that for all \(1 \leq i \leq d\),

\[
\mathbb{E} \log (m_i | M|) < 0. \tag{A1}
\]

This guarantees that the Markov chain \((X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\) has a unique stationary distribution. It is given by the law of the random variable

\[
X = \begin{pmatrix} X_1 \\ \vdots \\ X_d \end{pmatrix} := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \begin{pmatrix} m_1^{k-1} & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & m_d^{k-1} \end{pmatrix} M_1 \cdots M_{k-1} Q_k. \tag{1.9}
\]

We further assume that there exist positive constants \(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\) such that for \(1 \leq i \leq d\)

\[
\mathbb{E}(m_i | M|)^{\alpha_i} = 1. \tag{A2}
\]

Given these \(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\), we assume for \(1 \leq i \leq d\)

\[
\mathbb{E}(|M|^{\alpha_i + \epsilon}) < \infty, \quad \mathbb{E}(|Q|^{\alpha_i + \epsilon}) < \infty \quad \text{for some } \epsilon > 0. \tag{A3}
\]
Of course, it suffices to check this condition for the maximal \( \alpha_i \). We also need the technical assumption that

\[
\text{the law of } \log |M| \text{ is non-arithmetic.} \tag{A4}
\]

Finally, to avoid degeneracy, we require for \( 1 \leq i \leq d \)

\[
P(m_i M x + Q_i = x) < 1 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R} \tag{A5}
\]

For all pairs \( 1 \leq i, j \leq d \) such that \( \alpha_i > \alpha_j \), we will require that

\[
\lim_{u \to \infty} \log(u) P\left( \frac{|Q_j|}{|Q_i|} > u^\epsilon \right) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \epsilon > 0. \tag{A6}
\]

For the particular case of the BEKK-ARCH(1) model, \((M_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\) are iid \( \mathcal{N}(0,1) \) and \((Q_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\) are i.i.d \( \mathcal{N}(0,C) \) and independent of \((M_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\). This set of random variables satisfies the assumptions above as soon as (1.3) holds, which is necessary for (A1) to hold; see Pedersen and Wintenberger (2018) for details.

Subject to these assumptions, we will show the following.

**Theorem 1.1.** Suppose (A1) – (A6), and that \( m_i \neq m_j \) for \( i \neq j \). Then all components of \( X \) are asymptotically independent, i.e., (1.3) holds.

This theorem is a particular case of the more general Theorem 5.1 proved in Section 5.

**1.4 Notation**

For vectors, we use bold notation \( \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \). Operations between vectors or scalar and vector are interpreted coordinate wise, e.g., \( x^{-1/\alpha} = (x^{-1/\alpha_1}, \ldots, x^{-1/\alpha_d}) \) and \( a \mathbf{b} = (a_i b_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} \). A notation that will be used frequently is vector scaling of a sequence of \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-valued random variables, e.g.

\[
x^{-1/\alpha}(X_0, \ldots, X_t) = \left( x^{-1/\alpha} X_0, \ldots, x^{-1/\alpha} X_t \right) = \left( (x^{-1/\alpha_i} X_{0,i})_{1 \leq i \leq d}, \ldots, (x^{-1/\alpha_i} X_{t,i})_{1 \leq i \leq d} \right). \tag{1.10}
\]

For some potentially distinct \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d \) we define the following notion of a radial distance:

\[
\| \mathbf{x} \|_\alpha = \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |x_i|^\alpha_i = \| x^{\alpha} \|, \quad \mathbf{x} = (x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d} \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.11}
\]
Note that $\|x\|_\alpha$ is neither homogeneous nor does it satisfy the triangle inequality for general values of $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d$. Thus, it is not a (pseudo-)norm, but will provide a meaningful scaling function. Note that $x \mapsto \|x\|_\alpha$ is a continuous function and is $\frac{1}{\alpha}$-homogeneous in the following sense:

$$\|\lambda^{1/\alpha} X_0\|_\alpha = \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |\lambda^{1/\alpha} X_{0,i}| = \lambda \|X_0\|_\alpha$$

For the reader’s convenience, we note some expressions and identities that will appear frequently:

$$\|X_0\|^{-1/\alpha} X_t = \left(\|X_0\|^{-1/\alpha} X_{0,i}\right)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$$

Note that the components of this vector have modulus less or equal to one. Using (1.12) with $\lambda = x^{-1}$, we obtain the following identity

$$\left(\|x^{-1/\alpha} X_0\|^{-1/\alpha}\right)x^{-1/\alpha} X_t = \left(x^{-1}\|X_0\|\right)^{-1/\alpha} x^{-1/\alpha} X_t$$

$$= x^{1/\alpha} \|X_0\|^{-1/\alpha} x^{-1/\alpha} X_t = \|X_0\|^{-1/\alpha} X_t$$

(1.14)

2 Vector Scaling Regular Variation (VSRV)

Markov chains

2.1 Vector Scaling Regular Variation

2.1.1 Regular variation and the tail process

Let $(X_t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a stationary time series. Its regular variation properties are defined in different ways. The most common way is to define the tail process as in Basrak and Segers (2009) in the following way. The time series $(X_t)$ is regularly varying if there exists non null weak limits

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(x^{-1}(X_0, \ldots, X_t) \in \cdot \bigm\|X_0\| > x) = \mathbb{P}( (Y_0, \ldots, Y_t) \in \cdot), \quad t \geq 0.$$ 

By stationarity and thanks to Kolmogorov consistency theorem one can extend the trajectories $(Y_0, \ldots, Y_t)$ into a process $(Y_t)$ called the tail process.

The tail process has many nice properties inherited from the stationary property of the times series $(X_t)$ and the homogeneity induced by the conditional probabilities; for instance, $\|Y_0\| \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is necessarily Pareto distributed and $\Theta_t = \|Y_0\|^{-1} Y_t$ constitutes a process that is independent of $\|Y_0\|$. Thus, one can rephrase the notion of regular variation for the time
series \((X_t)\) in the following way: \(\|X_0\|\) is regularly varying and there exists a spectral tail process \((\Theta_t)\) satisfying
\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} P\left(\|X_0\|^{-1}(X_0, \ldots, X_t) \in \cdot \big| \|X_0\| > x\right) = P\left((\Theta_0, \ldots, \Theta_t) \in \cdot\right) \quad t \geq 0.
\]

2.1.2 Non-standard Regular Variation

Write \(X_0 = (X_{0,1}, \ldots, X_{0,d})^\top\). If there exists \(1 \leq i \leq d\) such that
\[
P(|X_{0,i}| > x) = o\left(P(\|X_0\| > x)\right) \quad x \to \infty,
\]
then the marginals of \(X_0\) are not tail equivalent. In this case, the notion introduced above is not suitable, since then the corresponding coordinate of the spectral tail process is degenerated, \(i.e., Y_{0,i} = 0\). Hence, information about extremes in this coordinate is lost.

To circumvent this issue, the notion of non-standard regular variation was introduced (see [Resnick (2007)]). It is based on a standardization of the coordinates as follows. If all marginals are (one-dimensional) regularly varying in the sense that
\[
P(|X_{0,i}| > x) \sim c_i x^{-\alpha_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq d,
\]
for positive constants \(c_i\), and possibly different tail indices \(\alpha_i, 1 \leq i \leq d\); and
\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} x \cdot P\left(x^{-1/\alpha}X_0 \in \cdot\right)
\]
exists in the vague sense, then the standardized vector
\[
c^{-1}X_0^\alpha = (c_i^{-1}X_{0,i}^\alpha)_{1 \leq i \leq d}.
\]
is regularly varying in the classical sense. Note that the standardization is made so that all coordinates are tail equivalent
\[
P\left(c_i^{-1}X_{0,i}^\alpha > x\right) \sim P\left(c_j^{-1}X_{0,j}^\alpha > x\right), \quad x \to \infty, i \neq j.
\]

2.1.3 Vector Scaling Regular Variation

When dealing with time series such as diagonal BEKK-ARCH(1) model, temporal dependencies between extremes are of particular interest. As it turns out, neither of the notions discussed above is fully adequate for the investigation of these. Indeed, the SRE representation \((1.8)\) of the diagonal BEKK-ARCH(1) model appeals for an analysis of the serial extremal dependence directly on \((X_t)\) rather than on the standardized version \((c^{-1}X_t^\alpha)\). For
SRE Markov chains such as (1.8), it has been shown by Janssen and Seger (2014) that the spectral tail process satisfies
\[ \Theta_t = \text{Diag}(a_1, \ldots, a_d)\Theta_{t-1}, \quad t \geq 1. \]

This multiplicative property has nice consequences and allows to translate the properties of multiplicative random walks to the extremes of multivariate time series. However, the degeneracy of the coordinates discussed above propagates through time. On the other hand, the standardized version does not satisfy an SRE and the simple multiplicative structure is lost when standardizing by taking different powers as in (2.1). Its serial extremal dependence is less explicit; see Perfekt (1997) for details.

In order to treat the temporal dependence of the stationary solution \((X_t)\), we will use the notion of Vector Scaling Regular Variation (VSRV) introduced in Pedersen and Wintenberger (2018). We slightly extend the original notion of Pedersen and Wintenberger (2018), suppressing the requirement that the marginal tails are equivalent to power functions. This wider definition of VSRV writes in a simpler form as follows:

**Definition 2.1 (VSRV).** A process \((X_t)\) is VSRV of order \(\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d)\) if there exists a tail process \((Y_t)\) satisfying
\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} \Pr\left( x^{-1/\alpha}(X_0, \ldots, X_t) \in \cdot \bigg| \|X_0\|_\alpha > x \right) = \Pr\left( (Y_0, \ldots, Y_t) \in \cdot \right), \tag{2.2}
\]
for any \(t \geq 0\).

Note that the notation introduced in (1.10) and (1.11) is used here. We say that a random vector \(X\) is VSRV if \((X, 0, 0, \ldots)\) is a VSRV process. An equivalent definition comes from the following relation between the tail process and the spectral tail process.

**Proposition 2.2.** Consider a VSRV process \((X_t)_{t \geq 0}\). Then \(\|Y_0\|_\alpha\) is Pareto distributed and the spectral tail process defined by the relation
\[ \Theta_t = \|Y_0\|_\alpha^{-1/\alpha}Y_t, \quad t \geq 0, \]
is independent of the random variable \(\|Y_0\|_\alpha\).

**Proof.** For any \(y > 1\), it follows from (1.12) and the continuous mapping theorem that
\[
\Pr(\|Y_0\|_\alpha > y) = \lim_{x \to \infty} \Pr\left( \|x^{-1/\alpha}X_0\|_\alpha > y \bigg| \|X_0\|_\alpha > x \right)
= \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{\Pr(\|X_0\|_\alpha > xy)}{\Pr(\|X_0\|_\alpha > x)}
\]
thus \( \|X_0\|_\alpha \) is regularly varying with some index \( \beta > 0 \) and \( \|Y_0\|_\alpha \) is Pareto distributed.

Using in addition the identity (1.14) twice, we obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{P}\left( \|Y_0\|_\alpha > y, (\Theta_0, \ldots, \Theta_t) \in \cdot \right)
&= \lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \|X_0\|_\alpha > x y, \left(\|x^{-1/\alpha} X_0\|_\alpha^{-1/\alpha} x^{-1/\alpha}(X_0, \ldots, X_t) \in \cdot \right) \mathbb{P}(\|X_0\|_\alpha > x) \right) \\
&= \lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \|X_0\|_\alpha^{-1/\alpha}(X_0, \ldots, X_t) \in \cdot, \|X_0\|_\alpha > x y) \mathbb{P}(\|X_0\|_\alpha > x) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\|Y_0\|_\alpha > y) \cdot \lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \left(\|x^{-1/\alpha} X_0\|_\alpha^{-1/\alpha} x^{-1/\alpha}(X_0, \ldots, X_t) \in \cdot \right) \|X_0\|_\alpha > x y) \mathbb{P}(\|X_0\|_\alpha > x) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\|Y_0\|_\alpha > y) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left( (\Theta_0, \ldots, \Theta_t) \in \cdot \right)
\end{align*}
\]

for any \( y > 1 \) which proves the independence of \((\Theta_t)\) and \(\|Y_0\|_\alpha\). \(\Box\)

The previous result motivates the following equivalent definition of VSRV.

**Theorem 2.3 (VSRV).** A process \((X_t)\) is VSRV of order \(\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d)\) if \(\|X_0\|_\alpha\) is regularly varying and there exists a spectral tail process \((\Theta_t)\) satisfying

\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\|X_0\|_\alpha^{-1/\alpha}(X_0, \ldots, X_t) \in \cdot \right) \|X_0\|_\alpha > x) = \mathbb{P}\left( (\Theta_0, \ldots, \Theta_t) \in \cdot \right),
\]

for any \( t \geq 0 \).

**Proof.** Let \( Y \) be a random variable which is independent of \((\Theta_0, \ldots, \Theta_t)\), with law given by

\[
\mathbb{P}(Y > y) := \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\|X_0\|_\alpha > x y)}{\mathbb{P}(\|X_0\|_\alpha > x)}, \quad y > 1.
\]

Then, by assumption, \( Y \) is Pareto distributed with some index \( \beta > 0 \). We define the process

\[
(Y_0, \ldots, Y_t) := Y \cdot (\Theta_0, \ldots, \Theta_t)
\]

and it remains to show that this process satisfies (2.2). We will prove (2.2) for continuous sets \( A = T^{-1}(B \times (y, \infty)) \) for any

\[
B \subset \left\{ (x_0, \ldots, x_t) \left| x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|x_0\|_\alpha = 1 \right. \right\}, \quad y > 1,
\]
and where $T$ is the radial decomposition

$$T : (x_0, \ldots, x_t) \mapsto \left( \|x_0\|_{\alpha}^{-1/\alpha} (x_0, \ldots, x_t), \|x_0\|_{\alpha} \right).$$

This is sufficient thanks to Dynkin’s theorem as such sets $A \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{t+1}$ constitute a $\pi$-system.

Now by definition of $(Y_t)$, using the independence of $Y$ and $(\Theta_t)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_0, \ldots, Y_t) \in A) = \mathbb{P}(Y > y)\mathbb{P}(\Theta_0, \ldots, \Theta_t) \in B)$$

$$= \lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\|x_0\|_{\alpha} > xy) \mathbb{P}(\|x_0\|_{-1/\alpha}^{-1/\alpha}(X_0, \ldots, X_t) \in B) \|X_0\|_{-1/\alpha} > xy)$$

$$= \lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\|x_0\|_{\alpha} > xy, \|x_0\|_{-1/\alpha}^{-1/\alpha}(X_0, \ldots, X_t) \in B) \|X_0\|_{\alpha} > xy)$$

$$= \lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\|x_0\|_{\alpha} > xy, \|x_0\|_{-1/\alpha}^{-1/\alpha}(X_0, \ldots, X_t) \in B) \|X_0\|_{\alpha} > x)$$

Here we have used the identity (1.14) in the penultimate line; in the second line we have used that we can replace $\lim_{x \to \infty}$ by $\lim_{x/y \to \infty}$ for any fixed $y > 0$.

A few remarks are in order. Note that a VSRV time series with indices $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d$ is also VSRV with indices $\beta \alpha_1, \ldots, \beta \alpha_d$ for any $\beta > 0$. Note also that a times series is VSRV with indices $\alpha_1 = \ldots = \alpha_d$ if and only if it is standard regularly varying. For general indices, the marginals $X_{0,i}$ have distributions $F_i$ with different tail indices. More precisely, their tails satisfy the following property.

**Proposition 2.4.** Let $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a VSRV process of order $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d)$. Then $X_0$ is non-standard regularly varying with

$$\mathbb{P}(\pm X_{0,i} > x) \sim \mathbb{P}(\pm Y_{0,i} > 1) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\|X_0\|_{\alpha} > x_{\alpha i}), \quad x \to \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

Moreover, if $\mathbb{P}(Y_{0,i} > 1) > 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, then the regularly varying standardized process $((1/(1 - F_t(X_{0,i}))_{1 \leq i \leq d})$ has a tail process for the sup-norm distributed as

$$\mathbb{P}\left( ((cY_{0,+})^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, cY_{t+})^{\alpha} \right) \in \mathbb{P}(\|cY_0\|_{\alpha} > 1),$$

where $c = (c_1, \ldots, c_d)$,

$$c_t = \left( \min_{1 \leq j \leq d} \mathbb{P}(Y_{0,j} > 1) / \mathbb{P}(Y_{0,i} > 1) \right)^{1/(\beta \alpha_i)}.$$
with $\beta > 0$ the index of regular variation of $\|X_0\|_\alpha$ and $Y_{t+} = ((Y_{t,i})_{1 \leq i \leq d})_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ for all $t \geq 0$.

We remark that the distribution of tail process of the standardized sequence $((1/(1 - F_i(X_{t,i})))_{1 \leq i \leq d})$ is completely determined by the tail process $(Y_t)$. However the expression involving conditioning is intricate whereas we will derive explicit expressions of $(Y_t)$ for many Markov chains in Section 2.2. We emphasize that this simplicity is the main motivation for introducing the notion of VSRV.

**Proof.** Fix $1 \leq i \leq d$. Denoting $y = x^{\alpha_i}$ we have, using (1.12)

$$
\frac{\mathbb{P}(\pm X_{0,i} > y^{1/\alpha_i})}{\mathbb{P}(\|X_0\|_\alpha > y)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\pm y^{-1/\alpha_i}X_{0,i} > 1, \|X_0\|_\alpha > y)}{\mathbb{P}(\|X_0\|_\alpha > y)} = \mathbb{P}\left(\pm y^{-1/\alpha_i}X_{0,i} > 1 \mid \|X_0\|_\alpha > y\right) \to \mathbb{P}(Y_{0,i} > 1), \text{ as } y \to \infty,
$$

by the definition of the weak convergence as $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; \pm x_i > 1\}$ is a continuity set by homogeneity of the limiting measure. The first assertion is proved.

Regarding the second assertion, we will use the following identity. Write $d_i := \mathbb{P}(Y_{0,i} > 1)$, then (2.4) reads

$$
\mathbb{P}(X_{0,i} > x^{1/\alpha_i}) \sim d_i \mathbb{P}(\|X_0\|_\alpha > x), \quad x \to \infty,
$$

and it follows, using that $\|X_0\|_\alpha$ is regularly varying with index $\beta$,

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(d_i^{-1/\beta}(X_{0,i})^{\alpha_i} > x\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(X_{0,i} > (d_i^{1/\beta} x)^{1/\alpha_i}\right) \sim d_i \mathbb{P}(\|X_0\|_\alpha > d_i^{1/\beta} x) \sim \mathbb{P}(\|X_0\|_\alpha > x), \quad x \to \infty.
$$

Denoting $F_\alpha(x)$ the cdf of $\|X_0\|_\alpha$, the above identity yields

$$
1 - F_i\left((d_i^{1/\beta} x)^{1/\alpha_i}\right) \sim 1 - F_\alpha(x) \iff 1 - F_i(y) \sim 1 - F_\alpha(d_i^{-1/\beta} y^{\alpha_i}). \quad (2.5)
$$

The standardized vector

$$
\left(\frac{1}{1 - F_\alpha(d_i^{-1/\beta}(X_{t,i})^{\alpha_i})}\right)_{1 \leq i \leq d}
$$

has marginal tails equivalent to standard Pareto distribution, e.g. (Resnick, 2007, Theorem 6.5). By (2.5), this vector is tail equivalent to the standard
Pareto marginally distributed vector \((1/(1 - F_i(X_{t,i})))_{1 \leq i \leq d}\). Thus, the spectral component of the latter defined as the limit of

\[
P\left(x^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{1 - F_i(X_{t,i})}\right)_{1 \leq i \leq d} \right) \rightarrow \left\| \left(\frac{1}{1 - F_i(X_{t,i})}\right)_{1 \leq i \leq d} \right\|_{\infty} > x
\]
is equivalent to (abbreviating \(\bar{F}_\alpha = 1 - F_\alpha\))

\[
P\left(1 \over x \bar{F}_\alpha(d_i^{-1/\beta}(X_{t,i})_{+}^{\alpha})_{1 \leq i \leq d} \in \cdot \left\| (\bar{F}_\alpha(d_i^{-1/\beta}(X_{t,i})_{+}^{\alpha})_{1 \leq i \leq d} \right\|_{\infty} > x \right)
\]

\[
\sim P\left(y^{-1}d^{-1/\beta}(X_t)_{+}^{\alpha} \in \cdot \left\| d^{-1/\beta}(X_0)_{+}^{\alpha} \right\|_{\infty} > y \right)
\]

with \(d = (d_1, \ldots, d_d)\) and \(y = F_\alpha^+(1 - 1/x) \rightarrow \infty\) when \(x \rightarrow \infty\). Here \(F_\alpha^+\) denotes the generalized inverse of the distribution function (quantile function).

We have that \(\left\| d^{-1/\beta}(X_0)_{+}^{\alpha} \right\|_{\infty} \leq (\max_i d_i^{-1/\beta}) \left\| X_0 \right\|_{\alpha}\) thus the conditioning implies that \(\left\| X_0 \right\|_{\alpha} > z := (\max_i d_i^{-1/\beta})^{-1}y\). Thus, one can condition with \(\left\| X_0 \right\|_{\alpha} > z\) and obtain

\[
P\left(y^{-1}d^{-1/\beta}(X_t)_{+}^{\alpha} \in \cdot \left\| d^{-1/\beta}(X_0)_{+}^{\alpha} \right\|_{\infty} > y \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{P\left(y^{-1}\left\| d^{-1/\beta}(X_0)_{+}^{\alpha} \right\|_{\infty} > 1 \left\| X_0 \right\|_{\alpha} > z \right)}{P\left(y^{-1}\left\| d^{-1/\beta}(X_0)_{+}^{\alpha} \right\|_{\infty} > 1 \left\| X_0 \right\|_{\alpha} > z \right)}
\]

(2.6)

We replace \(y^{-1}\) by \(z^{-1}(\max_i d_i^{-1/\beta})^{-1} = z^{-1}(\min_i d_i)^{1/\beta}\) and recall that

\[
c_i = \left(d_i^{-1/\beta}(\min_i d_i)^{1/\beta}\right)^{1/\alpha_i},
\]

hence (using (1.12) as well)

\[
y^{-1}\left\| d^{-1/\beta}(X_0)_{+}^{\alpha} \right\|_{\infty} = z^{-1}\left\| c^{\alpha}(X_0)_{+}^{\alpha} \right\|_{\infty} = z^{-1}\left\| cX_0 \right\|_{\alpha} = \left\| z^{-1/\alpha}cX_0 \right\|_{\alpha}.
\]

Using the definition of VSRV (2.2), we conclude that

\[
P\left(\left\| z^{-1/\alpha}cX_t \right\|_{\alpha} > 1 \left\| X_0 \right\|_{\alpha} > z \right)
\]

\[
\rightarrow \frac{P\left(cY_t \right)_{+}^{\alpha} \in \cdot , \left\| cY_0 \right\|_{\alpha} > 1 \right)}{P\left(\left\| cY_0 \right\|_{\alpha} > 1 \right)}
\]

as \(y \rightarrow \infty\),

which proves the assertion.

\(\square\)
2.2 VSRV Markov chains

We adapt the work of Janssen and Segers (2014) to our framework. We consider a Markov chain \((X_t)_{t\geq 0}\) with values in \(\mathbb{R}^d\) satisfying the recursive equation
\[
X_t = \Phi(X_{t-1}, Z_t), \quad t \geq 0,
\]
where \(\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{E} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d\) is measurable and \((Z_t)\) is an iid sequence taking values in a Polish space \(\mathcal{E}\). We work under the following assumption, which is the vector scaling adaptation of (Janssen and Segers, 2014, Condition 2.2).

As above, we fix in advance the positive indices \(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\). We denote by
\[
S_{d-1}^\alpha = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; \|x\|_\alpha = 1\}
\]
the space associated to the VS spectral component.

**VS Condition for Markov chains:** There exists a measurable function \(\phi : S_{d-1}^\alpha \times \mathcal{E} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d\) such that, for all \(e \in \mathcal{E}\),
\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} x^{-1/\alpha} \Phi(x^{1/\alpha} s(x), e) \to \phi(s, e),
\]
whenever \(s(x) \to s\) in \(S_{d-1}^\alpha\). Moreover, if \(P(\phi(s, Z_0) = 0) > 0\) for some \(s \in S_{d-1}^\alpha\) then \(Z_0 \in \mathcal{W}\) a.s. for a subset \(\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{E}\) such that, for all \(e \in \mathcal{W}\),
\[
\sup_{\|y\|_\alpha \leq x} \|\Phi(y, e)\|_\alpha = O(x) \quad x \to \infty.
\]

We extend \(\phi\) over \(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{E}\) thanks to the relation
\[
\phi(v, e) = \begin{cases} \|v\|^{1/\alpha} \phi\left(\|v\|^{-1/\alpha} v, e\right) & \text{if } v \neq 0, \\
0 & \text{if } v = 0. \end{cases}
\]

We have the following result which extends Theorem 2.1 of Janssen and Segers (2014).

**Theorem 2.5.** If the Markov chain \((X_t)\) satisfies the recursion (2.7) with \(\Phi\) together with the VS condition and \(X_0\) is VSRV with the same positive indices \(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\) then \((X_t)_{t\geq 0}\) is a VSRV process and its spectral tail process satisfies the relation
\[
\Theta_t = \phi(\Theta_{t-1}, Z_t), \quad t \geq 0.
\]

started from \(\Theta_0\), the spectral component of \(X_0\).
Proof. It suffices to prove that (2.3) holds with a spectral tail process (Θ) satisfying (2.3). As in the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [Janssen and Segers (2014)], we proceed by induction over \( t \). For \( t = 0 \), there is nothing to prove since we have assumed that \( X_0 \) is VS RV with indices \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d \).

So we may assume the weak convergence
\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| x^{-1/\alpha} X_0 \right\|_\alpha > x \right) = \mathbb{P} \left( \left( Y_0, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_{t-1}, Z_t \right) \in \cdot \right) \tag{2.9}
\]

Under Condition VS on \( \Phi \) we have the relation
\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} x^{-1/\alpha} \mathbb{P} \left( x^{-1/\alpha} y(x)^{-1/\alpha} \Phi \left( x^{1/\alpha} y(x)^{1/\alpha} \right), e \right) \to \phi(v, e) \tag{2.10}
\]

for \( \mathbb{P}(Z_0 \in \cdot) \)-a.e. \( e \in \mathcal{E} \), where \( v(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( y(x) \in [0, \infty) \) are arbitrary sequences with \( \lim_{x \to \infty} v(x) = v \) and \( \lim_{x \to \infty} y(x) > 0 \), respectively. This can be shown as in Lemma 2.1 of [Janssen and Segers (2014)]; if \( v = 0 \), then the second part of Condition VS becomes relevant.

The result follows from the relation (recall (1.14))
\[
\left\| X_0 \right\|^{-1/\alpha}_\alpha X_t = \left\| X_0 \right\|^{-1/\alpha}_\alpha \Phi(X_{t-1}, Z_t)
\]
\[
= x^{-1/\alpha} \left\| x^{-1/\alpha} X_0 \right\|^{-1/\alpha}_\alpha \Phi \left( x^{1/\alpha} \left\| x^{-1/\alpha} X_0 \right\|^{1/\alpha}_\alpha \left\| X_0 \right\|^{-1/\alpha}_\alpha X_{t-1}, Z_t \right)
\]

Upon interpreting \( y(x) = \left\| x^{-1/\alpha} X_0 \right\|^{-1/\alpha}_\alpha \) and \( v(x) = \left\| X_0 \right\|^{-1/\alpha}_\alpha X_{t-1} \) and using an extension of the continuous mapping theorem [van der Vaart (1998), Theorem 18.11] for convergent sequences of continuous functions (here given by (2.10)), we conclude (see Janssen and Segers (2014, Theorem 2.1) for details) that
\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \left\| x^{-1/\alpha} X_0 \right\|^{1/\alpha}_\alpha \left\| X_0 \right\|^{1/\alpha}_\alpha (X_0, \ldots, X_{t-1}, X_t, Z_t) \right) \in \cdot \mid \left\| X_0 \right\|^{1/\alpha}_\alpha > x
\]
\[
\mathbb{P} \left( \left( Y_0, \theta_0, \ldots, \theta_{t-1}, \phi(\theta_{t-1}, Z_t), Z_t \right) \in \cdot \right)
\]

which proves the assertion.

We are specially interested in Stochastic Recurrence Equations (SRE) corresponding to the Markov chains
\[
X_t = \Phi(X_{t-1}, (M, Q)_t) = M_t X_{t-1} + Q_t, \quad t \geq 0.
\]

In this setting \((M_t)\) are iid random \( d \times d \) matrices and \((Q_t)\) iid random vectors in \( \mathbb{R}^d \). We have
Proposition 2.6. The SRE Markov chain \((X_t)_{t \geq 0}\) satisfies Condition VS for positive indices \(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\) if and only if \(M_{ij} = 0\) a.s. for any \((i, j)\) so that \(\alpha_i > \alpha_j\). Then
\[
\phi(s, (M, Q)) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^{d} M_{ij} 1_{\alpha_i = \alpha_j} s_j \right)_{1 \leq i \leq d}.
\]

Proof. As \(x \to \infty\) and \(s(x) \to s\), we have
\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} x^{-1/\alpha} \Phi\left( (x^{1/\alpha}) s(x), (M, Q) \right) = \lim_{x \to \infty} x^{-1/\alpha} \left( M (x^{1/\alpha} s(x)) + Q \right)
\]
\[
= \lim_{x \to \infty} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{d} M_{ij} s(x)_j x^{1/\alpha_i - 1/\alpha_j} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq d}.
\]
Each coordinate converges to \(\sum_{j=1}^{d} M_{ij} 1_{\alpha_i = \alpha_j} s_j\) for any \(s \in \mathcal{S}_d^{d-1}\) if and only if \(M_{ij} = 0\) a.s. for any \((i, j)\) so that \(\alpha_i > \alpha_j\).

In case of distinct \(\alpha_i\)’s, it means that the dynamic tail process depends only on the diagonal elements of \(M\). In general, specifying \(M_t\) to be diagonal, we ensure that if \(X_0\) is VSRV then the SRE process is VSRV with
\[
\Theta_t = M_t \Theta_{t-1}, \quad t \geq 1
\]
whatever are the positive indices \(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d\).

3 The diagonal BEKK-ARCH(1) model with distinct coefficients

In this section we will show that the marginals of the diagonal BEKK-ARCH(1) model with distinct coefficients are asymptotically independent. A standard argument reduces the discussion to the bivariate case.

More precisely, we consider the bivariate random recursive process \(X_t = M_t X_{t-1} + Q_t\), defined by \(X_0 = 0\) and
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
X_{t,1} \\
X_{t,2}
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
m_1 & 0 \\
0 & m_2
\end{pmatrix} M_t \begin{pmatrix}
X_{t-1,1} \\
X_{t-1,2}
\end{pmatrix} + Q_t,
\]
where \((M_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\) are iid real-valued random variables, \((Q_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}\) are iid random vectors independent of \((M_t)\) while
\[
0 < m_1 < m_2
\]
are positive constants. We assume assumptions (A1) – (A6) to hold for $i = 1, 2$, which gives that $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$.

With no loss of generality, we assume throughout the section that $\mathbb{P}(M_1 < 0) > 0$, the case of positive multiplicative factors $M_i$ following from simpler arguments.

We are going to study partial sums converging to the random variables $X_1, X_2$ given by (1.9), namely

$$X_{n,i} := \sum_{k=1}^{n} m_{k}^{i-1} M_1 \cdots M_{k-1} Q_{k,i}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$ 

Note the distinction between the Markov chain $(X_{t,i})$ (the forward process) and the almost surely convergent series $(X_{n,i})$ defined above (the backward process); see Letac (1986). Within this section, we will always consider the backward process $(X_{n,i})$.

Under our assumptions, by the Kesten-Goldie-Theorem of Goldie (1991); Kesten (1973) applied to multiplicative factors with $\mathbb{P}(m_i M < 0) > 0, i = 1, 2$, we have

$$\lim_{u \to \infty} u^{\alpha_1} \mathbb{P}(\pm X_1 > u) = C_1, \quad \lim_{u \to \infty} u^{\alpha_2} \mathbb{P}(\pm X_2 > u) = C_2 \quad (3.2)$$

for positive constants $C_1, C_2$. Note that $C_1$ and $C_2$ are the same for the left and right tails.

### 3.1 Proof of the asymptotic independence

The asymptotic independence of $(X_1, X_2)$ is proved assuming $m_2 > m_1$, which implies $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$. The following quantity

$$\mu_i = \mathbb{E}[\log(m_i |M_1|)(m_i |M_1|)^{\alpha_i}], \quad i = 1, 2,$$

will play an important role in the proof.

**Theorem 3.1.** Assume (A1) – (A6) for $i = 1, 2$. Then we have

$$\lim_{u \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_2| > u^{1/\alpha_2} \mid |X_1| > u^{1/\alpha_1}\right) = 0,$$

i.e., $|X_1|$ and $|X_2|$ are asymptotically independent.
Remark 3.2. In particular, $\pm X_1$ and $\pm X_2$ are asymptotically independent. Indeed, from (3.2) we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\pm X_i > u^{1/\alpha_i}\right) \sim \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_i| > u^{1/\alpha_i}\right), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

so that immediately we obtain as well

$$\lim_{u \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\pm X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2} \mid \pm X_1 > u^{1/\alpha_1}\right) = 0.$$  

Proof. Thanks to the Kesten-Goldie theorem (see Eq. (3.2)) it is enough to prove

$$\lim_{u \to \infty} u \mathbb{P}\left(|X_2| > u^{1/\alpha_2}, |X_1| > u^{1/\alpha_1}\right) = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

**Step 1.** We reduce to the study of a dominating sequence with nonnegative coefficients:

$$|X_{n,i}| \leq X^*_{n,i} := \sum_{k=1}^{n} m_i^{k-1} |M_1 \cdots M_{k-1}| |Q_{k,i}|, \quad i = 1, 2.$$  

We notice that $X^*_{i} := \lim_{n \to \infty} X^*_{n,i}$ satisfies the fixed point equation, in distribution,

$$X^*_{i} \text{ law } = m_i |M| X^*_{i} + |Q_i|, \quad i = 1, 2.$$  

In particular, thanks to (A1)–(A4), the Kesten-Goldie theorem, now used in the case of positive coefficients, applies and yields

$$\lim_{u \to \infty} u \mathbb{P}\left(X^*_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2}\right) = C^*_2 > 0 \quad \lim_{u \to \infty} u \mathbb{P}\left(X^*_1 > u^{1/\alpha_1}\right) = C^*_1 > 0. \quad (3.4)$$  

Note that the tail indices $\alpha_1$, $\alpha_2$ remain unchanged thanks to their definition in (A2). Since $|X_i| \leq X^*_i$, $i = 1, 2$, the result will follow from the relation

$$\lim_{u \to \infty} u \mathbb{P}\left(X^*_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2}, X^*_1 > u^{1/\alpha_1}\right) = 0.$$  

**Step 2.** We gain additional control by introducing the first exit time for $(X^*_{n,1})$,

$$T_u := \inf \left\{n \in \mathbb{N} : X^*_{n,1} > u^{1/\alpha_1}\right\}.$$  

As $X^*_1 = \sup_{n \geq 0} X^*_n$, we have $\{X^*_i > u^{1/\alpha_1}\} = \{T_u < \infty\}$. By (3.4) we have

$$\lim_{u \to \infty} u \cdot \mathbb{P}(T_u < \infty) > 0. \quad (3.5)$$
Thus, the desired result will follow from the relation
\[
\lim_{u \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( X_2^* > u^{1/\alpha_2} \mid T_u < \infty \right) = 0. \quad (3.6)
\]

Introducing the following notation for partial sums,
\[
X_{j,m,i}^* := \sum_{k=j+1}^{m_2} m^k_{i+1} |M_{j+1} \cdots M_{k-1}| |Q_{k,i}|, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (3.7)
\]
we have on the set \( \{ T_u^* < \infty \} \),
\[
X_2^* = X_{T_u,2}^* + m_2 T_u |M_1 \cdots M_{T_u}| X_{T_u,\infty,2}^*. \quad (3.8)
\]

The simple inclusion
\[
\{ X_2^* > s \} \subset \{ X_{T_u,2}^* > s/2 \} \cup \{ m_2 T_u |M_1 \cdots M_{T_u}| X_{T_u,\infty,2}^* > s/2 \} =: I \cup II
\]
allows us to consider the contributions in \((3.8)\) separately. The following lemma, to be proved subsequently, provides stronger control and is the crucial ingredient for evaluating the contributions of \( I \) and \( II \).

**Lemma 3.3.** For any \( \epsilon > 0 \), define the set \( C_u(\epsilon) \) as the intersection
\[
\left\{ T_u \leq L_u \right\} \cap \left\{ X_{T_u,1}^* \leq u^{1+\epsilon/\alpha_1} \right\} \cap \left\{ \max_{1 \leq k \leq L_u} \frac{|Q_{k,2}|}{|Q_{k,1}|} \leq u^{\epsilon/\alpha_1} \right\} \cap \left\{ m_2 |M_{T_u}| \leq u^\epsilon \right\}
\]
where \( L_u := \log(u)/(\mu_1\alpha_1) + Cf(u) \), \( f(u) := \sqrt{\log(u) \cdot \log(\log(u))} \) and \( C \) is a (suitably large) constant that can be chosen independent of \( \epsilon \).

Then it holds that
\[
\lim_{u \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( \left\{ X_2^* > u^{1/\alpha_2} \right\} \cap C_u(\epsilon) \mid T_u < \infty \right) = \lim_{u \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left( X_2^* > u^{1/\alpha_2} \mid T_u < \infty \right)
\]
if either of the limits exists.

**Step 3.** Considering \( I \), we have, using \( m_2 > m_1 \) and the controls provided by \( C_u(\epsilon) \), that
\[
X_{T_u,2}^* \leq \left( \frac{m_2}{m_1} \right)^{T_u} \max_{1 \leq k \leq T_u} \frac{|Q_{k,2}|}{|Q_{k,1}|} X_{T_u,1}^* \leq \left( \frac{m_2}{m_1} \right)^{L_u} u^{(1+2\epsilon)/\alpha_1} = \exp \left\{ \left( \log(m_2) - \log(m_1) \right) L_u \right\} u^{(1+2\epsilon)/\alpha_1} \leq u^{1/(1+\log(m_2)/m_1+3\epsilon)}.
\]
Here we have used that 
\[ \exp(\sqrt{\log u}) \log u = \exp(\log u/\sqrt{\log u}) \log u = u^{1/\sqrt{\log u}} \log u \leq u^{\epsilon/\alpha_1} \]
for any fixed \( \epsilon > 0 \), as soon as \( u \) is large enough. Abbreviate 
\[ \eta := \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \left( 1 + \frac{\log(m_2) - \log(m_1)}{\mu_1} + 4\epsilon \right). \]

We will subsequently prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4.** The relation 
\[ \alpha_2 \left( 1 + \frac{\log(m_2) - \log(m_1)}{\mu_1} \right) < \alpha_1, \]  
(3.10)
is always satisfied (for \( m_2 > m_1 \)).

Then (3.10) ensures that \( \eta < 1/\alpha_2 \) (choose \( \epsilon \) sufficiently small) so that by (3.9),
\[ \{ X_{T_u,2}^* > \frac{u^{1/\alpha_2}}{2} \} \cap C_u(\epsilon) \subset \{ u^\eta \geq X_{T_u,2}^* > \frac{u^{1/\alpha_2}}{2} \} = \emptyset \]
for \( u \) sufficiently large. It follows that the first term \( I \) in (3.8) does not contribute.

**Step 4.** Turning to \( II \), we note that the multiplicative factor is almost the last summand in \( X_{T_u,2}^* \), so we use the previous result to estimate on \( C_u(\epsilon) \)
\[ m_2^{T_u} |M_1 \cdots M_{T_u}| \leq \left( \frac{m_2}{m_1} \right)^{T_u-1} \max_{1 \leq k \leq T_u-1} \frac{|Q_{k,2}|}{|Q_{k,1}|} X_{T_u,1}^* m_2 |M_{T_u}| \leq u^\eta, \]
for \( u \) sufficiently large. Hence
\[ \mathbb{P} \left( \left\{ m_2^{T_u} |M_1 \cdots M_{T_u}| X_{T_u,\infty,2}^* > \frac{1}{2} u^{1/\alpha_2} \right\} \cap C_u(\epsilon) \left| T_u < \infty \right. \right) \]
\[ \leq \mathbb{P} \left( X_{T_u,\infty,2}^* > \frac{1}{2} u^{1/\alpha_2-\eta} \left| T_u < \infty \right. \right) = \mathbb{P} \left( X_2^* > \frac{1}{2} u^{1/\alpha_2-\eta} \right). \]
since \( X_{T_u,\infty,2}^* \) is independent of \( \{ T_u < \infty \} \). But as long as \( 1/\alpha_2 > \eta \), which is ensured by (3.10), the probability \( II \) tends to zero.

We conclude that
\[ \lim_{u \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( X_2^* > u^{1/\alpha_2} \left| T_u < \infty \right. \right) = 0 \]
as soon as (3.10) holds and the desired result follows. \( \Box \)
3.2 Proof of Lemma 3.3

Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and write $C_u = C_u(\epsilon)$.

**Step 1.** It is enough to show that $\lim_{u \to \infty} \P(C_u^c | T_u < \infty) = 0$. Indeed, we can sandwich the conditional probabilities as follows

$$\P \left( X_2^* > u^{1/\alpha_2} \mid T_u < \infty \right) \geq \P \left( \{ X_2^* > u^{1/\alpha_2} \} \cap C_u \mid T_u < \infty \right)$$

$$= \P \left( X_2^* > u^{1/\alpha_2} \mid T_u < \infty \right) - \P \left( \{ X_2^* > u^{1/\alpha_2} \} \cap C_u^c \mid T_u < \infty \right)$$

$$\geq \P \left( X_2^* > u^{1/\alpha_2} \mid T_u < \infty \right) - \P \left( C_u^c \mid T_u < \infty \right).$$

Then the desired result follows by letting $u \to \infty$. We will consider each of the four contributions to $C_u^c$ separately:

$$C_u^c = \left\{ T_u > L_u \right\} \cup \left\{ X_{T_u,1}^* > u^{(1+\epsilon)/\alpha_1} \right\}$$

$$\cup \left\{ \max_{1 \leq k \leq L_u} \left| \frac{Q_{k,2}}{Q_{k,1}} \right| > u^{\epsilon/\alpha_1} \right\} \cup \left\{ m_2 |M_{T_u}| > u^\epsilon \right\}$$

$$= A \cup B \cup D \cup E.$$

By (3.5), the required assertion $\lim_{u \to \infty} \P(B \mid T_u < \infty) = 0$ will as well follow from

$$\lim_{u \to \infty} u \cdot \P(B \cap \{ T_u < \infty \}) \leq \lim_{u \to \infty} u \cdot \P(B) = 0.$$

**Step 2.** The negligibility of $A$ is a direct consequence of (Buraczewski et al., 2016a, Lemma 4.3)) which provides that for a sufficiently large constant $C$,

$$\lim_{u \to \infty} \P \left( \left| T_u - \frac{\log u}{\mu_1 \alpha_1} \right| \geq C f(u), \mid T_u < \infty \right) = 0, \quad (3.11)$$

where $f(u) = \sqrt{\log(u) \cdot \log(\log(u))}$.

Turning to $B$, we have by (3.4) that $\lim_{u \to \infty} u \P(X_1^* > u^{(1+\epsilon)/\alpha_1}) = 0$ implying that $\lim_{u \to \infty} u \P(X_{T_u,1}^* > u^{(1+\epsilon)/\alpha_1}) = 0$, since $X_1^* = \sup_n X_n^*$.

$D$ will be considered below; the negligibility of $E$ is ensured by the independece of $M_{T_u}$ and $T_u$,

$$\lim_{u \to \infty} \P \left( m_2 |M_{T_u}| > u^\epsilon \mid T_u < \infty \right) = \lim_{u \to \infty} \P(m_2 |M| > u^\epsilon) = 0 \quad (3.12)$$

**Step 3.** Now we turn to $D$. A union bound yields

$$\P \left( \max_{1 \leq k \leq L_u} \left| \frac{Q_{k,2}}{Q_{k,1}} \right| > u^{\epsilon/\alpha_1}, \mid T_u < \infty \right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{L_u} \P \left( u^{\epsilon/\alpha_1} |Q_{k,1}| < |Q_{k,2}|, \mid T_u < \infty \right).$$
We decompose for any $k \geq 0$

$$\Pr(u^{\varepsilon/\alpha} | Q_{k,1} < |Q_{k,2}|, T_u < \infty) \leq \Pr(u^{\varepsilon/\alpha} | Q_{k,1} < |Q_{k,2}|, X_1^* > u^{1/\alpha_1})$$

$$\leq \Pr(u^{\varepsilon/\alpha} | Q_{k,1} < |Q_{k,2}|, \sum_{j \neq k} m_j^{j-1}|M_1 \cdots M_{j-1}| |Q_{j,1}| + m_1^{k-1}|M_1 \cdots M_{k-1}| |Q_{k,1}| > u^{1/\alpha_1}).$$

We bound this probability by the sum of two terms

$$\Pr(u^{\varepsilon/\alpha} | Q_{k,1} < |Q_{k,2}|, \sum_{j \neq k} m_j^{j-1}|M_1 \cdots M_{j-1}| |Q_{j,1}| > \frac{1}{2} u^{1/\alpha_1})$$

$$+ \Pr(u^{\varepsilon/\alpha} | Q_{k,1} < |Q_{k,2}| m_1^{k-1}|M_1 \cdots M_{k-1}| |Q_{k,1}| > \frac{1}{2} u^{1/\alpha_1}) \quad (3.13)$$

and have to show that both contributions, when summed over $k = 0, \ldots, L_u$, are of order $o(u^{-1})$.

By independence, the first term in (3.13) is equal to

$$\Pr(u^{\varepsilon/\alpha} | Q_1 < |Q_2|) \cdot \Pr\left(\sum_{j \neq k} m_j^{j-1}|M_1 \cdots M_{j-1}| |Q_{j,1}| > \frac{1}{2} u^{1/\alpha_1}\right)$$

$$\leq \Pr(u^{\varepsilon/\alpha} | Q_1 < |Q_2|) \cdot \Pr\left(X_1^* > \frac{1}{2} u^{1/\alpha_1}/2\right) = o((\log(u)u)^{-1})$$

thanks to the regular variation properties of $X_1^*$ and the assumption on $|Q_2|/|Q_1|$, see (3.4) and (A6), respectively. Since $L_u = O(\log(u))$, we may sum over $k = 0, \ldots, L_u$ and obtain a contribution of order $o(u^{-1})$, as required.

We estimate the second term in (3.13) thanks to Markov’s inequality of order $\alpha_1/(1+\varepsilon) < \kappa < \alpha_1$:

$$\Pr(u^{\varepsilon/\alpha} | Q_{k,1} < |Q_{k,2}|, m_1^{k-1}|M_1 \cdots M_{k-1}| |Q_{k,1}| > \frac{1}{2} u^{1/\alpha_1})$$

$$\leq \Pr(m_1^{k-1}|M_1 \cdots M_{k-1}| |Q_{k,2}| > \frac{1}{2} u^{(1+\varepsilon)/\alpha_1})$$

$$\leq \frac{2^\kappa (m_1^\kappa \mathbb{E}[|M|^\kappa])^k \mathbb{E}[\|Q\|^\kappa]}{u^{\kappa((1+\varepsilon)/\alpha_1)}}.$$

As $\alpha_1/(1+\varepsilon \alpha_1) < \kappa < \alpha_1$ we have that $m_1^\kappa \mathbb{E}[|M|^\kappa] < 1$ and conclude

$$\sum_{k=0}^\infty \Pr(u^{\varepsilon/\alpha} | q_k < |q_k^2 a_1^{k-1}|m_1 \cdots m_{k-1}| |q_k^1| > u^{1/\alpha_1}/2)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{(a_1^\kappa \mathbb{E}[|m_1|^\kappa])^k}{u^{\kappa((1+\varepsilon)/\alpha_1)}} = o(u^{-1}).$$
3.3 Proof of Lemma 3.4

We rewrite the condition (3.10) as follows:

\[
\alpha_2 \left( 1 + \frac{\log(m_2) - \log(m_1)}{\mu_1} \right) < \alpha_1 \tag{3.14}
\]

\[
\iff \alpha_2 \frac{\log(m_2) - \log(m_1)}{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2} < \mu_1
\]

\[
\iff -\frac{\alpha_2 \log(m_2) - \alpha_1 \log(m_1)}{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1} + \log(m_1) < \mu_1 \tag{3.15}
\]

The outline of the proof is as follows: The values \(m_i\) and \(\alpha_i\) are one-to-one by the condition \(E(|m_i M|^{\alpha_i}) = 1\). This will allow us to define the function \(\alpha \mapsto m(\alpha)\) and thereupon the function

\[
g(\alpha) := \alpha \cdot \log(m(\alpha)).
\]

If \(g\) is differentiable, then we can replace the difference quotient by \(-g'(\xi)\) for some \(\xi \in (\alpha_2, \alpha_1)\) due to the intermediate value theorem. We will further identify \(\mu_1 - \log(m_1)\) as \(-g'(\alpha_1)\), i.e. (3.15) becomes

\[
-g'(\xi) < -g'(\alpha_1) \iff g'(\alpha_1) < g'(\xi) \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha_1 > \xi \tag{3.16}
\]

Hence, the assertion follows if we can prove that \(g'' < 0\), i.e., \(g\) is strictly concave.

We start by showing that \(g\) is well-defined and differentiable, by using the implicit function theorem. Define \(F(m, \alpha) := E(|m M|^\alpha)\). For all \(m < \sqrt{2e^7}\) there is a unique positive value \(\alpha(m)\) satisfying \(F(m, \alpha(m)) = 1\). \(F\) has nonvanishing continuous partial derivatives

\[
\frac{\partial F}{\partial m} = \frac{\alpha}{m} F(m, \alpha), \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial \alpha} = E[|m M|^\alpha \log(m|M|)] =: \mu(m, \alpha).
\]

Note that \(\mu(m, \alpha(m))\) can be interpreted as the drift of the random walk \(S_1 := \log(m|M|)\) under the shifted probability measure \(P^\alpha(S_1 \in dx) := e^{\alpha x} P(S_1 \in dx)\). For fixed \(m\), the function \(\alpha \mapsto F(m, \alpha)\) is convex with \(F(m, 0) = F(m, \alpha(m)) = 1\), hence \(\mu\) is always positive; as are \(\alpha\) and \(m\). Thus the implicit function theorem gives that \(\alpha\) is continuously differentiable in \(m\) with

\[
\frac{d\alpha}{dm} = -\left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial \alpha}\right)^{-1} \frac{\partial F}{\partial m} = -\frac{\alpha}{m \cdot \mu(m, \alpha)}.
\]

As \(\alpha\) is positive, we can define \(m(\alpha)\) as the inverse to the function \(\alpha(m)\), and obtain that

\[
\frac{dm}{d\alpha} = -\frac{m \cdot \mu(m, \alpha)}{\alpha}.
\]
In particular, \( m(\alpha) \) and thus \( g(\alpha) \) are differentiable, and we obtain

\[
\frac{dg}{d\alpha} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial \alpha} + \frac{\partial g}{\partial m} \frac{dm}{d\alpha} = \log(m) + \frac{\alpha}{m} \left( - \frac{m\mu}{\alpha} \right) = \log(m(\alpha)) - \mu(m(\alpha), \alpha).
\]

It remains to show that \( g''(\alpha) \) is negative. Therefore, we need

\[
\frac{d\mu}{d\alpha} = \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \alpha} + \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial m} \frac{dm}{d\alpha} = E \left[ (mM)^{\alpha} \log(|mM|)^2 \right] + \left( \frac{\alpha}{m} \mu + \frac{1}{m} \right) \cdot \left( - \frac{m\mu}{\alpha} \right)
\]

We recognize \( \sigma^2 := E \left[ (mM)^{\alpha} \log(|mM|)^2 \right] - \mu^2 \) as the variance of \( S_1 \) under \( \mathbb{P}^{\alpha} \), which is always positive. Hence

\[
\frac{d^2 g}{d\alpha^2} = \frac{d}{d\alpha} \left( \log(m) - \mu \right) = \frac{dm}{d\alpha} - \frac{d\mu}{d\alpha} = - \frac{\mu}{\alpha} - \left( \sigma^2 - \frac{\mu}{\alpha} \right) = - \sigma^2 < 0.
\]

Thus we have proven (3.16) and the assertion of the lemma follows.

4 The diagonal BEKK-ARCH(1) model with diagonal coefficients that are equal

In this section we focus on the case where \( m_i = m > 0 \) for any \( 1 \leq i \leq d \) so that

\[
X_t = mM_t X_{t-1} + Q_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]

We can interprete the multiplicative factor \( mM_t \) as multiplication with the random similarity matrix \( mM_t \text{Diag}(1, \ldots, 1) \), which allows us to use the results of Buraczewski et al. (2009). There it is shown that the stationary distribution of the above process, which admits marginal tails equivalent to power functions with the same tail index \( \alpha > 0 \), given by \( E[|mM|^{\alpha}] = 1 \), is also multivariate regularly varying.

We will assume (A1)–(A5) to hold for all \( 1 \leq i \leq d \).

As before, all assumptions are satisfied for the BEKK-ARCH(1) model as soon as all coefficients \( m_i = m \) are equal and \( m^2 < 2e^\gamma \).

We have the following result:

**Theorem 4.1.** Assume (A1)–(A5) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq d \). Let \( X_0 \) have the stationary distribution. Then \( X_0 \) is VSRV and \((X_t)_{t \geq 0}\) is a VSRV process of order \( \alpha = (\alpha, \ldots, \alpha) \), and its spectral tail process satisfies the relation

\[
\Theta_t = mM_t \Theta_{t-1}, \quad t \geq 1.
\]
Proof. It is shown in (Buraczewski et al., 2009, Theorem 1.6), (Buraczewski et al., 2016b, Theorem 4.4.21) that there is a non-null Radon measure \( \mu \) on \([-\infty, \infty]^d \setminus \{0\} \) such that
\[
x^\alpha \mathbb{P}(x^{-1} X_0 \in \cdot) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} \mu, \quad x \to \infty.
\]
That is, \( X_0 \) is multivariate regularly varying. By the equivalent definitions of multivariate regular variation, provided by (Resnick, 2007, Theorem 6.1), this asserts the convergence
\[
x^\alpha \mathbb{P}\left((x^{-1} \|X_0\|, \frac{X_0}{\|X_0\|}) \in \cdot\right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} c \nu_\alpha \otimes \mathbb{P}(\Theta \in \cdot)
\]
where \( c > 0 \), \( \| \cdot \| \) is an arbitrary norm on \( \mathbb{R}^d \), \( \nu((t, \infty]) = t^{-\alpha} \) for all \( t > 0 \) and the r.v. \( \Theta \) takes its values in the corresponding unit sphere of \( \mathbb{R}^d \). Note that, since \( \alpha_i = \alpha \), \( 1 \leq i \leq d \) here, \( \| \cdot \|_\alpha = \| \cdot \|_\infty \). Hence, \( X_0 \) is VSRV of order \( \alpha = (\alpha, \ldots, \alpha) \).

The remaining assertions follow from a direct application of Proposition 2.6.

In order to determine whether the components of \( X_0 \) are asymptotically independent or dependent, we are interested in information about the support of \( \mathbb{P}(\Theta_0 \in \cdot) \). The following observations are immediate. We write \( \text{supp}(Q) \) for the support of the law of \( Q \) and \( \text{span}(E) \) for the linear space spanned by set \( E \subset \mathbb{R}^d \). Let \( S_{\infty}^{d-1} \) denote the unit sphere in \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with respect to \( \| \cdot \|_\infty = \| \cdot \|_\alpha \).

**Corollary 4.2.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1,
\[
\text{supp}(\Theta_0) \subset \text{span}(\text{supp}(Q)) \cap S_{\infty}^{d-1}.
\]

If there is a group \( G \) of matrices, such that \( gQ \overset{\text{law}}{=} Q \) for all \( g \in G \), i.e., the law of \( Q \) is invariant under the action of \( G \), then \( \text{supp}(\Theta_0) \) is invariant under the action of \( G \).

In particular, if the law of \( Q \) is rotationally invariant, then \( \text{supp}(\Theta_0) = S_{\infty}^{d-1} \).

**Proof.** The first assertion follows immediately from the series representation of \( X_0 \):
\[
X_0 = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} m^{k-1} M_1 \cdots M_{k-1} Q_k,
\]
where the right hand side is a sum of vectors in \( \text{span}(\text{supp}(Q)) \).

If \( gQ \overset{\text{law}}{=} Q \), then
\[
gX \overset{\text{law}}{=} g(mMX + Q) = m MgX + gQ \overset{\text{law}}{=} mM(gX) + Q,
\]
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i.e., the law of $X$ satisfies the same equation as the law of $gX$. But the solution to $X \overset{\text{law}}{=} mM + Q$ is unique in law, hence $gX \overset{\text{law}}{=} X$. Thus, the law of $X$ is invariant under the action of $G$, which implies the same invariance for its tail spectral measure $P(\Theta_0 \in \cdot)$.

We conclude by providing sufficient conditions in order to have equality in (4.2). Consider the following assumptions.

\begin{align}
M & \text{ is independent of } Q \quad \text{(A7)} \\
\text{supp}(M) & \text{ is dense in } \mathbb{R} \quad \text{(A8)}
\end{align}

Lemma 4.3. Assume that (A1)–(A5) and (A7), (A8) hold. Then

$$\text{supp}(\Theta_0) = \text{span}(\text{supp}(Q)) \cap S^{d-1}_\infty.$$

For the diagonal BEKK-ARCH(1) model, all assumptions of Lemma 4.3 are satisfied. Whenever the support of $Q$ is not contained in a lower-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$, it holds that $\text{supp}(\Theta_0) = S^{d-1}_\infty$. This entails that the components of $X_0$ are asymptotically dependent.

If $\text{span}(\text{supp}(Q))$ is a $k$-dimensional subspace, $k < d$, then the whole problem is in fact $k$-dimensional, for the stationary solution $X_0$ arises as a linear combination of (independent) copies of $Q$. Within this $k$-dimensional subspace, all components are again asymptotically dependent.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. The proof rests on [Buraczewski et al., 2009, Remark 1.9], which gives that the support of the spectral measure $\sigma_\infty$ with respect to the Euclidean norm is given by the directions (subsets of the unit sphere $S^{d-1}$) in which the support of $X_0$ is unbounded. More precisely, consider the measures

$$\sigma_t(A) := P\left(\|X_0\|_2 > t, \frac{X_0}{\|X_0\|_2} \in A\right)$$

Then $\text{supp}(\sigma_\infty) = \bigcap_{t>0} \text{supp}(\sigma_t)$. The surprising part of this result is that all directions, in which the support of $X_0$ is unbounded, do matter. One does not need a lower bound on the decay of mass at infinity. But if we know that the support of the spectral measure w.r.t. the Euclidean norm is the intersection of a particular subspace with the unit sphere, we immediately deduce the same for the spectral measure w.r.t. $\| \cdot \|_\infty$, i.e., for $P(\Theta_0 \in \cdot)$.

Thus, to proceed, we have to study the support of $X_0$. For simplicity, we work with $m = 1$, which is equivalent to replacing $M$ by $mM$. This allows us to write, for the remainder of the proof, $(m, q)$ for a realization of the random variables $(M, Q)$. We identify a pair $(m, q)$ with the affine mapping.
\[ h(x) = mx + q, \]
we say that \( h \in \text{supp}((M, Q)) \) if \( (m, q) \in \text{supp}((M, Q)) \).
We consider the semigroup generated by mappings in \( \text{supp}((M, Q)) \),
\[ G := \{ h_1 \cdots h_n : h_i \in \text{supp}((M, Q)), 1 \leq i \leq n, n \geq 1 \}. \]
Then, by (Buraczewski et al., 2009, Proposition 2.4), (Buraczewski et al., 2016b, Proposition 4.3.1),
\[ \text{supp}(X_0) = \text{closure of } \left\{ (I - mI)^{-1}q : (m, q) \in G, |m| < 1 \right\}. \]
If \( M \) and \( Q \) are independent, then \( \text{supp}((M, Q)) = \text{supp}(M) \times \text{supp}(Q) \) and a general element in \( G \) is of the form
\[ h(x) = m_1 \cdots m_n x + \left( q_1 + \sum_{k=2}^{n} m_1 \cdots m_{k-1} q_k \right) \]
with \( m_i \in \text{supp}(M), q_i \in \text{supp}(Q) \). Thus, a generic point in \( \text{supp}(X_0) \) is of the form
\[ (1 - m_1 \cdots m_n)^{-1} \left( q_1 + \sum_{k=2}^{n} m_1 \cdots m_{k-1} q_k \right), \quad (4.3) \]
with \( m_i \in \text{supp}(M), q_i \in \text{supp}(Q), |m_1 \cdots m_n| < 1. \)
The prefactor is scalar while the bracket term represents a linear combination of elements in \( \text{supp}(Q) \). This yields the first assertion.
If in addition \( \text{supp}(M) \) is dense in \( \mathbb{R} \), then the bracket term can approximate any linear combination of elements in \( \text{supp}(Q) \), i.e., the bracket term is dense in \( \text{span}(\text{supp}(Q)) \). Then, given \( t > 0 \), \( m_n \) can be chosen arbitrarily small, such that \( |m_1 \cdots m_n| < 1 \) and moreover, the norm of (4.3) exceeds \( t \). It follows that \( \text{supp}(\sigma_t) = \text{span}(\text{supp}(Q)) \cap S^{d-1} \) for all \( t \), which yields the assertion since \( \text{supp}(\sigma_\infty) = \bigcap_{t>0} \text{supp}(\sigma_t) \).

As soon as \( Q \) is not confined to a linear subspace of \( \mathbb{R}^d \), we have that \( X_0 \) is multivariate regularly varying and its components are asymptotically dependent. In fact, the spectral measure charges the whole unit sphere.

## 5 The diagonal BEKK-ARCH(1) model - the general case

In this section we study the vector scaling regular variation properties of the diagonal BEKK-ARCH(1) model in full generality. We suppose that
coordinates are chosen in such a way that

\[ m_1 = m_2 = \cdots = m_{d_1} \quad \text{with} \quad I_1 \]

\[ m_{d_1+1} = m_{d_1+2} = \cdots = m_{d_1+d_2} \quad \text{with} \quad I_2 \]

with \( d_1 + \cdots + d_r = d \). This means, we partition \( \{1, \ldots, d\} = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \cdots \cup I_r \) such that \( m_i = m_j \) if and only if \( i, j \in I_\ell \) for some \( 1 \leq \ell \leq r \) and \( m_i < m_j \) if \( i \in I_k, j \in I_\ell \) with \( k < \ell \). It follows that the tail indices are equal within a block, but distinct between different blocks. More precisely, \( \alpha_i > \alpha_j \) iff \( i \in I_k, j \in I_\ell \) with \( k < \ell \).

We further denote for \( 1 \leq j \leq r \)

\[ S^{\mid I_\ell \mid - 1} = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\ell}; \max_{i \in I_\ell} |x_i| = 1 \text{ and } x_i = 0 \text{ for } i \notin I_\ell \} \]

the \( \| \cdot \|_\infty \)-unit sphere of the \( d_\ell \)-dimensional subspace corresponding with coordinates indexed by \( I_\ell \). Note that if \( I_\ell = \{i\} \) is a singleton, then \( S^{\mid I_\ell \mid - 1} = \{e_i, -e_i\} \).

**Theorem 5.1.** If the stationarity assumption \([1.3]\) is satisfied, the diagonal BEKK-ARCH(1) solution \((X_t)\) is a VSRV process satisfying

\[ \text{Supp}(\Theta_0) = \bigcup_{1 \leq \ell \leq r} S^{\mid I_\ell \mid - 1} \quad (5.1) \]

and

\[ \Theta_t = M_t \text{Diag}(m_1, \ldots, m_d) \Theta_{t-1}, \quad t \geq 1. \]

**Proof.** The second assertion is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.6, so we focus on proving \((5.1)\).

We start by showing that \( \text{Supp}(\Theta_0) \subset \bigcup_{1 \leq \ell \leq r} S^{\mid I_\ell \mid - 1} \), which is equivalent to asymptotic independence between the blocks of different tail indices.

**Step 1.** Fix two disjoint blocks of indices, \( I \) and \( J \), say. Write \( m_I \) and \( \alpha_I \) for the common values of \( m_i, i \in I \) and \( \alpha_i, i \in I \), respectively; and define \( m_J \) and \( \alpha_J \) in the same way. Then it suffices to show that

\[ \lim_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{i \in I} X_{0,i} > x^{1/\alpha_I} \mid \max_{j \in J} X_{0,j} > x^{1/\alpha_J} \right) = 0. \quad (5.2) \]

We note that from the regular variation properties of Section 4 we have that \( \mathbb{P}(\max_{j \in J} X_{0,j} > x^{1/\alpha_J}) \sim cx^{-1} \) for some constant \( c > 0 \) (see Eq. 4.11). Thus, it is enough to prove that

\[ \lim_{x \to \infty} x \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{i \in I} X_{0,i} > x^{1/\alpha_I}, \max_{j \in J} X_{0,j} > x^{1/\alpha_J} \right) = 0. \]
This follows from (3.3) when applied to the dominating processes \( X^{*}_{t,I}, X^{*}_{t,J} \), given by the stochastic recurrence equations

\[
X^{*}_{t,I} = m_{I} |M_{t}| X^{*}_{t-1,I} + Q^{*}_{t,I}; \quad X^{*}_{t,J} = m_{J} |M_{t}| X^{*}_{t-1,J} + Q^{*}_{t,J}, \quad t \geq 1,
\]

where \( Q^{*}_{t,I} = \max_{i \in I} |Q_{t,i}| \) as well as \( Q^{*}_{t,J} = \max_{j \in J} |Q_{t,j}| \). All the conditions (A1)–(A5) are satisfied for \( (X^{*}_{t,I}) \) and \( (X^{*}_{t,J}) \). It remains to check the condition (A6).

**Step 2.** Let \( \sigma_{i}^{2} = \text{Var}(Q_{i}) \) and \( \rho_{ij} \) be the correlation coefficient of \( Q_{i} \) and \( Q_{j} \); \( \mathbb{E}Q_{i} = \mathbb{E}Q_{j} = 0 \). Then the ratio \( Q_{i}/Q_{j} \) has a Cauchy distribution with location parameter \( a = \rho_{ij} \sigma_{i} / \sigma_{j} \) and scale parameter \( b = \sigma_{i} \sigma_{j} \sqrt{1 - \rho_{ij}^{2}} \); see e.g. (Curtiss, 1941, Eq. (3.3)). The Cauchy distributions are 1-stable, hence

\[
P\left(\frac{|Q_{i}|}{|Q_{j}|} > u\right) = O(u)
\]

and (A6) follows if \( I, J \) are singletons. To compare \( Q^{*}_{I} = \max_{i \in I} |Q_{i}| \) with \( Q^{*}_{J} = \max_{j \in J} |Q_{j}| \) we use the simple bound (fix any \( j \in J \))

\[
\left\{ \frac{Q_{I}}{Q_{J}} > u \right\} \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} \left\{ \frac{|Q_{i}|}{|Q_{k}|} > u \right\}
\]

to conclude that the probability of this event still decays as \( O(u) \). Thus (A6) also holds in this case.

The asymptotic independence can be rephrased as

\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} x \mathbb{P}(X_{0} \notin \bigcup_{1 \leq \ell \leq r} S^{I_{l}|I| - 1}) = 0.
\]

It shows that the spectral component of the VSRV \( X_{0} \) has no mass outside \( \bigcup_{1 \leq \ell \leq r} S^{I_{l}|I| - 1} \).

**Step 3.** It remains to show that \( \text{supp}(\Theta_{0}) \) is equal to \( \bigcup_{1 \leq \ell \leq r} S^{I_{l}|I| - 1} \). Therefore, we can focus on a particular block \( I \) and show that the spectral measure of the restriction \( (X_{0,i})_{i \in I} \) has full support \( S^{I_{l}|I| - 1} \).

If \( I \) is a singleton, then this means nothing but that left and right tails are regularly varying with the same index; which already follows from the Goldie-Kesten theorem, see (3.2). If \( |I| > 1 \) then we are in the setting of Section 4. The result follows from the second assertion of Lemma 4.3, since \( M \) and \( (Q_{i})_{i \in I} \) are independent Gaussians, and \( \text{span}(\text{supp}((Q_{i})_{i \in I})) = \mathbb{R}^{|I|} \) since \( C \), the variance of \( Q \), has full rank.

The multivariate regular variation properties of the BEKK-ARCH(1) process is quite simple as the support is preserved by the multiplicative form
of the tail process: The tail process is a mixture of multiplicative random walks with distinct supports. Each support corresponds to the span of the diagonal coefficients of the multiplicative matrix that are equal. From a risk analysis point of view, it means that the extremal risks are dependent and of similar intensity only in the directions of equal diagonal coefficients. Our multivariate analysis appeals for an extreme financial risk analysis based on the estimation of the diagonal coefficients of the BEKK-ARCH(1) process accompanied with a test of their equality.

The asymptotic independence between directions with distinct diagonal coefficients may be seen as artificially due to the diagonal restriction imposed on the multiplicative matrices. However we suspect it is the case in any situation of VSRV Markov chains as in Proposition 2.6. More precisely, we conjecture in the upper triangular matrices case:

Remark 5.2. [Damek et al. (2019)] study bivariate stochastic recurrence equations with upper triangular matrices, including the following model:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
X_{t,1} \\
X_{t,2}
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
m_1 & m_{12} \\
0 & m_2
\end{pmatrix}
M_t \begin{pmatrix}
X_{t-1,1} \\
X_{t-1,2}
\end{pmatrix} + Q_t,
\]

here \((M_t)\) and \((Q_t)\) are iid, taking values in \([0, \infty)\) and \([0, \infty)^2\), respectively. Defining \(\alpha_i\) as before by the condition \(E(m_i M_i)^{\alpha_i} = 1\) and assuming (A1)–(A5), they study the marginal tail behavior.

Let \(X_0\) have the stationary distribution. Since \((X_{t,2})\) satisfies a one-dimensional SRE, it holds \(P(X_{0,2} > x) \sim c_2 x^{-\alpha_2}\) by the Kesten-Goldie theorem. Since all random variables are nonnegative, it is clear that \(X_{t,1} \geq m_1 M_t X_{t-1,1} + Q_{t,1}\); in particular, the tails of \(X_{0,1}\) have to be at least as heavy as \(t^{-\alpha_1}\) which would be the case if we had \(m_{12} = 0\). In fact, it is proved in [Damek et al. (2019)] that

\[
P(X_{0,1} > x) \sim \begin{cases}
c_1 x^{-\alpha_1} & \text{if } \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 \quad (\text{CASE 1}) \\
\tilde{c}_1 x^{-\alpha_2} & \text{if } \alpha_1 > \alpha_2 \quad (\text{CASE 2})
\end{cases}
\]

with positive constants \(c_1, \tilde{c}_1\). In Case 2, \(X_{0,1}\) and \(X_{0,1}\) are obviously dependent (also asymptotically), while we conjecture that our methods will carry over to prove asymptotic independence in Case 1. We expect similar results to hold in the higher-dimensional setup studied in [Matsui and Swiatkowski (2018)].

6 Second order results

In this section, we work in the setup of Section 3, i.e., in the two-dimensional setting with distinct coefficients \(m_1 < m_2\). We discuss two second-order
results, proving that there are $0 < \delta < \Delta$ such that
\[
\lim_{u \to \infty} u^{1+\delta} \mathbb{P}(X_1 > u^{1/\alpha_1}, X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2}) = 0, \quad (6.1)
\]
\[
\liminf_{u \to \infty} u^{1+\Delta} \mathbb{P}(X_1 > u^{1/\alpha_1}, X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2}) > 0. \quad (6.2)
\]

We decided not to treat the most general case here, but rather consider these two results as illustration of the possible second-order behavior. The reason is that both proofs use as a crucial ingredient deep results on the exceedance times of the a.s. convergent series $X_{n,1}$ and $X_{n,2}$. Such estimates are not available in full generality, see Buraczewski et al. (2018, 2016a) for a discussion and counterexamples. This is why we refrained from striving for optimal assumptions here.

6.1 Asymptotic independence

Our first result considers “second-order-independence”, i.e., (6.1). We start with a simple, but useful observation.

**Lemma 6.1.** Consider a sequence of events $A_u, B_u, D_u$ such that there is $\delta \geq 0$ with
\[
\lim_{u \to \infty} u \cdot \mathbb{P}(D_u) \in (0, \infty), \quad \lim_{u \to \infty} u^{1+\delta} \cdot \mathbb{P}(B_u^c) = 0. \quad (6.3)
\]

Then $u^\delta \cdot \mathbb{P}(A_u \mid D_u)$ converges if and only if $u^\delta \cdot \mathbb{P}(A_u \cap B_u \mid D_u)$ converges (as $u \to \infty$) and if either of the limits exists, it holds
\[
\lim_{u \to \infty} u^\delta \cdot \mathbb{P}(A_u \mid D_u) = \lim_{u \to \infty} u^\delta \cdot \mathbb{P}(A_u \cap B_u \mid D_u).
\]

**Proof.** Using the elementary definition of conditional probabilities (the denominators are positive by Assumption (6.3) as soon as $u$ is large enough),
\[
\left| u^\delta \mathbb{P}(A_u \mid D_u) - u^\delta \mathbb{P}(A_u \cap B_u \mid D_u) \right| = \left| \frac{u^{1+\delta} \mathbb{P}(A_u \cap B_u \cap D_u)}{u \mathbb{P}(D_u)} - \frac{u^{1+\delta} \mathbb{P}(A_u \cap B_u \cap D_u)}{u \mathbb{P}(D_u)} \right| \leq \frac{u^{1+\delta} \mathbb{P}(B_u^c)}{u \mathbb{P}(D_u)},
\]
and the last expression tends to 0 by Assumption (6.3). \qed

The proof of the subsequent result proceeds by exploiting further the estimates used in the proof of Theorem 3.1. As a main ingredient, we need upper large deviation bounds for the exceedence time $T_u$, which are only available under additional regularity assumptions on $Q$ and $M$. 
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Theorem 6.2. In addition to Assume \((A1), (A2), (A4), (A5)\), assume that \(Q = (1, 1)^t\) and that the law of \(M\) has compact support and is absolutely continuous with a bounded density. Then there exists \(\delta > 0\) such that

\[
\lim_{u \to \infty} u^\delta \cdot P \left( X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2} \mid X_1 > u^{1/\alpha_1} \right) = 0.
\]

Proof. We will proceed along the same lines as in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Therefore, we will abbreviate some arguments and focus on the new ingredients. Without loss of generality, we may assume that \(M, Q_1, Q_2\) are nonnegative by studying dominating sequences (see Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 3.1). Let

\[ T_u = \inf \{ n \in \mathbb{N} : X_{n,1} > u^{1/\alpha_1} \} \]

**Step 1.** We introduce sets \(B_u\) satisfying

\[
\lim_{u \to \infty} u^\delta \cdot P \left( X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2} \mid X_1 > u^{1/\alpha_1} \right) = \lim_{u \to \infty} u^\delta \cdot P \left( \{ X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2} \} \cap B_u \mid T_u < \infty \right), \tag{6.4}
\]

(given that one out of the two limits exists), chosen in such a way that they provide further control over \(T_u\) and \(X_{T_u,1}\).

In order to define \(B_u\), consider the function \(\Lambda_1(s) := \log \mathbb{E}[(m_1 M)^s]\), with Fenchel-Legendre transform \(\Lambda_1^*(x) := \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} (sx - \Lambda_1(s))\). For any \(0 < \mu < \mu_1\) there is \(\alpha\) such that \(\mu = \Lambda_1'(\alpha)\). For such corresponding \(\alpha\) and \(\mu\), it holds by a standard calculation in large deviation theory that

\[
I(\mu) := \frac{\Lambda_1^*(\mu)}{\mu} = \alpha - \frac{\Lambda_1'(\alpha)}{\Lambda_1'(\alpha)} > \alpha_1.
\]

Choose \(0 < \mu* < \mu_1\) and \(\epsilon > 0\) such that the following restrictions are satisfied:

\[
\alpha_2 \left( 1 + \frac{\log(m_2) - \log(m_1)}{\mu*} + \epsilon \right) < \alpha_1, \tag{6.5}
\]

\[
\lim_{u \to \infty} u^{I(\mu*)/\alpha_1} P(X_1 > u^{\frac{1}{\alpha_1}(1+\epsilon)}) = 0. \tag{6.6}
\]

This is possible by Lemma 3.4 and the fact that \(\mu*\) and \(I(\mu*)\) deviate continuously from \(\mu\) and \(\alpha_1\), respectively. Our additional conditions ensure that the assumptions of \(\text{[Buraczewski et al., 2016a, Theorem 2.4]}\) are satisfied, which yields

\[
\lim_{u \to \infty} u^{I(\mu*)/\alpha_1} P(T_u > \frac{\log u}{\alpha_1 \mu*}) = 0. \tag{6.7}
\]
Note that $\Lambda_1$ is a convex function with $\Lambda'_1(0) < 0$, hence $\mu_* = \Lambda'_1(\alpha_*) > 0$ implies that there is $\beta < \min\{1, \alpha_*\}$ with $\Lambda(\beta) < \Lambda(\alpha_*)$. Thus, Condition (2.26) of Buraczewski et al. (2016a, Theorem 2.4) is satisfied.

Set
\[
\delta := \frac{I(\mu_*)}{\alpha_1} - 1 > 0, \quad B_u := \left\{ T_u < \frac{\log u}{\alpha_1 \mu_*} \right\} \cap \left\{ X_{T_u,1} \leq u^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha_1}(1+\epsilon)} \right\}.
\]

By Eqs. (6.6), (6.7) and the fact that $X_{T_u,1} \leq X_{1}$, we have
\[
\lim_{u \to \infty} u^{1+\delta} \mathbb{P}(B_u^c) = 0.
\]

Thus (6.4) follows by an application of Lemma 6.1.

**Step 2.** Decomposing as in (3.8), we estimate
\[
\limsup_{u \to \infty} u^\delta \cdot \mathbb{P}\left( \left\{ X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2} \right\} \cap B_u \bigg| T_u < \infty \right) 
\leq \limsup_{u \to \infty} u^\delta \cdot \mathbb{P}\left( \left\{ X_{T_u,2} > \frac{1}{2} u^{1/\alpha_2} \right\} \cap B_u \bigg| T_u < \infty \right) 
+ \limsup_{u \to \infty} u^\delta \cdot \mathbb{P}\left( \left\{ m_2^T u M_1 \cdots M_{T_u} X_{T_u,\infty,2} > \frac{1}{2} u^{1/\alpha_2} \right\} \cap B_u \bigg| T_u < \infty \right). 
\] (6.8)

On the set $B_u$,
\[
X_{T_u,2} \leq \left( \frac{m_2}{m_1} \right)^{T_u} X_{T_u,1} \leq \left( \frac{m_2}{m_1} \right)^{\frac{\log u}{\alpha_1 \mu_*}} u^{\frac{\beta}{\alpha_1}(1+\epsilon)} = u^\eta 
\] (6.10)

with
\[
\eta = \frac{1}{\alpha_1} \left( 1 + \frac{\log(a_2) - \log(a_1)}{\mu_*} + \epsilon \right) < \frac{1}{\alpha_2},
\]
see Eq. (6.5). Hence the term in (6.8) vanishes.

Turning to (6.9), we have on $B_u$
\[
m_2^{T_u} M_1 \cdots M_{T_u} X_{T_u,\infty,2} \leq X_{T_u,2} \cdot (m_2 M_{T_u}) \cdot V_{T_u,\infty}^2 \leq u^\eta \cdot V_{T_u,\infty}^2
\]
(recall that $M$ and thus $M_{T_u}$ have bounded support). Using the independence of $X_{T_u,\infty,2}$ and $T_u$, we find that the term in (6.9) is bounded by
\[
\limsup_{u \to \infty} u^\delta \cdot \mathbb{P}\left( X_{T_u,\infty,2} > u^{1/\alpha_2 - \eta} \bigg| T_u < \infty \right) = \limsup_{u \to \infty} u^\delta \mathbb{P}\left( X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2 - \eta} \right).
\]
Since $1/\alpha_2 > \eta$, we can choose $0 < \delta^* \leq \delta$ such that
\[ \delta^* < 1 - \alpha_2\eta \quad \text{or, equivalently,} \quad \frac{\alpha_2}{\delta^*} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_2} - \eta \right) > 1. \]

But then
\[ u^{\delta^*} \mathbb{P}(X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2 - \eta}) = 0. \]

We conclude [note that the previous estimates also hold with $\delta$ replaced by $\delta^*$, since $\delta^* \leq \delta$] that
\[ \lim_{u \to \infty} u^{\delta^*} \cdot \mathbb{P}(X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2} \mid X_1 > u^{1/\alpha_1}) = 0. \]

\[ \Box \]

**Remark 6.3.** Considering the estimates (6.10) and (3.9), it would be possible to weaken the assumptions on $Q$, in particular, allowing for random $Q$. However, we would have to require that $Q_2/Q_1$ has very light tails in order to deduce that
\[ \lim_{u \to \infty} u^{\delta^*} \cdot \mathbb{P} \left( \max_{1 \leq k \leq T_u} \frac{|Q_{2,k}|}{Q_{1,k}} > u^{\epsilon/\alpha_1} \right) = 0. \]

The regularity assumptions on $M$ are a requirement of the quoted result (Buraczewski et al., 2016a, Theorem 2.4) and cannot be weakened without reproving that (very technical) result.

### 6.2 Asymptotic Dependence

Finally, we consider the possibility of “second-order-dependence”, *i.e.*, we study (6.2). Since we will use bounds from below, we cannot work with dominating sequences here, so we have to assume that $M$ is positive. The requirement that $Q$ is constant could be weakened by assuming some lower bounds on the ratio of $Q_1/Q_2$.

**Theorem 6.4.** Assume $\{A_1\}, \{A_2\}, \{A_4\}, \{A_5\}$, that $Q = (1, 1)$ and that $M$ is positive and satisfies
\[ \mathbb{E}M^s < \infty \quad \text{for all} \quad s > 0. \quad (6.11) \]

Then there is $\Delta > 0$ such that
\[ \liminf_{u \to \infty} u^{1+\Delta} \cdot \mathbb{P} \left( X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2}, X_1 > u^{1/\alpha_1} \right) > 0. \quad (6.12) \]
Proof. In contrast to the previous proofs, we now study the exceedence time of $X_{n,2}$,

\[ N_u := \inf\{ n : X_{n,2} > u^{1/\alpha_2} \} \]

in order to bound $X_{N_u,1}$ from below by comparing it to $X_{N_u,2}$ on the set \( \{ N_u < \infty \} \).

**Step 1.** Once again, we want to control $N_u$ and introduce the events

\[ B_u := \left\{ N_u \leq \frac{\log u}{\mu^* \alpha_2} \right\}, \]

where $\mu^*$ is a parameter to be chosen below in Step 2, where we are going to show the existence of $\Delta > 0$ with

\[ \liminf_{u \to \infty} u^{1+\Delta} \cdot P\left( \left\{ X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2}, X_1 > u^{1/\alpha_1} \right\} \right) = \liminf_{u \to \infty} u^{1+\Delta} \cdot P(B_u) > 0. \tag{6.13} \]

Using $X_1 \geq X_{N_u,1}$, it holds that

\[ \liminf_{u \to \infty} u^{1+\Delta} \cdot P\left( X_2 > u^{1/\alpha_2}, X_1 > u^{1/\alpha_1} \right) \geq \liminf_{u \to \infty} u^{1+\Delta} \cdot P\left( B_u \cap \left\{ X_{N_u,1} > u^{1/\alpha_1} \right\} \right) \]

The result will follow from (6.13) if we can show that $B_u$ implies $X_{N_u} > u^{1/\alpha_1}$. Namely, on $B_u$ we have the following estimate

\[ X_{N_u,1} \geq \left( \frac{m_1}{m_2} \right)^{N_u} X_{N_u,2} \]

\[ > \exp \left( \left( \log(m_1) - \log(m_2) \right) \frac{\log u}{\mu^* \alpha_2} \right) \cdot u^{1/\alpha_2} = u^\mathbb{N} \]

with

\[ \mathbb{N} = \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \left( 1 + \frac{\log(m_1) - \log(m_2)}{\mu^*} \right) \]

The proof concludes by

**Step 2.** We can choose $\mu^* > 0, \Delta > 0$, satisfying (6.13), such that $\mathbb{N} \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_1}$.

The condition $\mathbb{N} \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_1}$ is equivalent to

\[ \mu^* \geq \frac{\alpha_2 \log(a_2) - \alpha_1 \log(a_1)}{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2} + \log(a_2). \tag{6.14} \]

We choose $\mu^*$ such that we have equality in (6.14). It follows from the calculations in the proof of Lemma 3.4 that (for some $\xi \in (\alpha_2, \alpha_1)$)

\[ \mu^* = \frac{\alpha_2 \log(a_2) - \alpha_1 \log(a_1)}{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2} + \log(a_2) = -g'(\xi) + \log(a_2) \]

\[ > -g'(a_2) + \log(a_2) = \mu_2. \]
Defining $\Lambda_2(s) = \log \mathbb{E}(m_2 M)^s$, this function is finite for all $s > 0$ due to (6.11) and moreover, it is strictly convex; $\Lambda'_2(\alpha_2) = \mu_2$. Hence there is $\alpha^* > \alpha_2$ with $\Lambda'_2(\alpha^*) = \mu^*$. In this case, (Buraczewski et al. [2016a, Theorem 2.1, (2.14)] yields that

$$\liminf_{u \to \infty} u^{- \frac{J(\alpha^*)}{\alpha_2}} \cdot \mathbb{P}\left( N_u \leq \frac{\log u}{\mu^* \alpha_2} \right) > 0 \quad (6.15)$$

where

$$J(\alpha^*) = \alpha^* - \frac{\Lambda_2(\alpha^*)}{\Lambda'_2(\alpha^*)}$$

and $J(\alpha^*) > \alpha_2$ as soon as $\Lambda'(\alpha^*) > 0$, which is satisfied here. Thus, (6.13) holds with $\Delta := J(\alpha^*)/\alpha_2 - 1$, and the assertion follows.

References


35


