

Hidden tail chains and recurrence equations for dependence parameters associated with extremes of higher-order Markov chains

Ioannis Papastathopoulos^{*}, Adrian Casey^{*} and Jonathan A. Tawn[†]

^{*}School of Mathematics and Maxwell Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH9 3FD, United Kingdom

[†]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Lancaster University, Lancaster, LA1 4YF, United Kingdom
i.papastathopoulos@ed.ac.uk acasey2@exseed.ed.ac.uk j.tawn@lancaster.ac.uk

Abstract

We derive some key extremal features for k th order Markov chains that can be used to understand how the process moves between an extreme state and the body of the process. The chains are studied given that there is an exceedance of a threshold, as the threshold tends to the upper endpoint of the distribution. Unlike previous studies with $k > 1$, we consider processes where standard limit theory describes each extreme event as a single observation without any information about the transition to and from the body of the distribution. Our work uses different asymptotic theory which results in non-degenerate limit laws for such processes. We study the extremal properties of the initial distribution and the transition probability kernel of the Markov chain under weak assumptions for broad classes of extremal dependence structures that cover both asymptotically dependent and asymptotically independent Markov chains. For chains with $k > 1$, the transition of the chain away from the exceedance involves novel functions of the k previous states, in comparison to just the single value, when $k = 1$. This leads to an increase in the complexity of determining the form of this class of functions, their properties and the method of their derivation in applications. We find that it is possible to derive an affine normalization, dependent on the threshold excess, such that non-degenerate limiting behaviour of the process is assured for all lags. These normalization functions have an attractive structure that has parallels to the Yule-Walker equations. Furthermore, the limiting process is always linear in the innovations. We illustrate the results with the study of k th order stationary Markov chains with exponential margins based on widely studied families of copula dependence structures.

Key-words: conditional extremes; conditional independence; Markov chains; tail chains; recurrence equations

MSC subject classifications: Primary: 60GXX, Secondary: 60G70

1 Introduction

The extreme value theory of sequences of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables has often been generalised to include the situation where the variables are no longer independent, as in the monograph of Leadbetter et al. (1983) where for stationary processes the focus is on long-range dependence conditions and local clustering of extremes as measured by the extremal index. Among the most useful stochastic processes are positive recurrent Markov chains, with a continuous state space, which provide the backbone of a broad range of statistical models and meet the required long-range dependence conditions (O'Brien 1987, Rootzén 1988). Such models have attracted considerable interest in the analysis of extremes of stochastic processes, by considering the behaviour of the process when it is extreme, that is, when it exceeds a high threshold. Rootzén (1988) showed that, under certain circumstances, the times of extreme events of stationary Markov chains that exceed a high threshold converge to a homogeneous Poisson process and that the limiting characteristics of the values within an extreme event, including the extremal index, can be derived as the threshold converges to the upper endpoint of the marginal distribution.

Although powerful, this approach only reveals the behaviour of the chain whilst it remains at the same level of marginal extremity as the threshold, and therefore it is only informative about clustering for a subset of processes, termed asymptotically dependent processes which are defined below. For any Markov process which does not exhibit any asymptotic dependence, known as asymptotically independent processes, e.g., for any Gaussian Markov process, this limit theory describes each extreme event as a single observation. Motivated by this observation, in this paper we seek to understand better the behaviour of a Markov chain within an extreme event under less restrictive conditions through using a more refined limit theory. Our analysis allows

us to characterise the event as it moves between an extreme state and the body of the distribution. In the case of first-order Markov chains, [Papastathopoulos et al. \(2017\)](#) treat both asymptotically dependent and asymptotically independent chains in a unified theory. The focus of this paper is similar, but this time on higher-order Markov chains, which leads to a substantial increase in the complexity relative to the situations considered by [Papastathopoulos et al. \(2017\)](#). To the best of our knowledge, important characteristics of the extremal behaviour of higher-order Markov chains have not been dealt with in-depth, yet these are crucial for understanding the evolution of extreme events of random processes and for providing well-founded parametric models that can be used for inference, prediction and assessment of risk, e.g., [Winter & Tawn \(2015, 2017\)](#).

To help illustrate the complexity in higher-order Markov chains, consider standard measures of extremal dependence ([Coles et al. 1999](#)). When analysing the extremal behaviour of a real-valued Markov process $\{X_t : t = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ with marginal distribution F_t and stationary copula ([Joe 2015](#)), one has to distinguish between two classes of extremal dependence. Let $D = \{1, \dots, k\}$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is the order of a Markov chain, and define $M = 2^D \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. The two classes can be characterized through the quantities

$$\chi_A = \lim_{u \rightarrow 1} \mathbb{P}(\{F_s(X_s) > u\}_{s \in A} \mid F_0(X_0) > u), \quad A \in M,$$

assuming that the limit exists for all $A \in M$. Bounds can be obtained for the coefficients, e.g., for any $A_1, A_2 \in M$, $0 \leq \chi_{A_1 \cup A_2} \leq \min(\chi_{A_1}, \chi_{A_2})$. When $\chi_D > 0$ ($\chi_j = 0$ for all $j \in D$) we say that the process is *fully asymptotically dependent* (*fully asymptotically independent*); for these processes, respectively, the bounds imply that for all $A \in M$, $\chi_A > 0$ if $|A| < k$ and $\chi_A = 0$ if $|A| > 2$. Previous work on k th order Markov chains considers only the case where the process is fully asymptotically dependent, deriving results via the tail chain ([Resnick & Zeber 2013](#), [Janßen & Segers 2014](#)). In this paper, we cover both cases, but also, we consider intermediate cases where $\chi_A > 0$ and $\chi_B = 0$, for at least one $A, B \in M \setminus D$ with $B \supseteq A$.

To derive greater detail about the behaviour within extreme events for Markov chains more information than simply χ_A for all $A \in M$ is required. In the case of stationary, fully asymptotically dependent Markov chains, where $k \geq 1$, with regular variation assumptions on the marginal distribution, the appropriate strategy is to study *tail chains* ([Janßen & Segers 2014](#)). A tail chain arises as a limiting process after witnessing an extreme state, under rescaling of the future Markov chain by the extreme observation, resulting in the tail chain being a multiplicative random walk. Even in these restrictive cases few results exist, e.g., [Perfekt \(1997\)](#), [Yun \(1998\)](#), [Janßen & Segers \(2014\)](#). However, tail chains fail to reveal the detailed structure of extreme events for Markov chains for which $\chi_D = 0$. For such process, we show that the *hidden tail chain* contains the necessary information, where the distinction between the hidden tail chain and the tail chain is explained below. [Papastathopoulos et al. \(2017\)](#) show that it is simplest to focus on Markov chains with marginal distributions with exponential-like tails, in the max-domain of attraction of the Gumbel distribution, using affine normalizations, as this reveals structure not apparent through the use of regularly varying marginals with affine normalisations. This is the approach we will also take.

We let $\sup\{x : F_0(x) < 1\} = \infty$. For $k > 1$, we assume that there exist $k - 1$ norming functions $a_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, for $t = 1, \dots, k - 1$, such that

$$\left\{ \frac{X_t - a_t(X_0)}{b_t(X_0)} : t = 1, \dots, k - 1 \right\} \mid \{X_0 > u\} \xrightarrow{w} \{Z_t : t = 1, \dots, k - 1\}$$

as $u \rightarrow \infty$, where \xrightarrow{w} denotes weak convergence of measures and (Z_1, \dots, Z_{k-1}) is a random vector that is non-degenerate in each component. Then our aim is to find conditions that guarantee the existence of an infinite sequence of additional functions $a_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ for $t = k, k + 1, \dots$, such that

$$\left\{ \frac{X_t - a_t(X_0)}{b_t(X_0)} : t = 1, 2, \dots \right\} \mid \{X_0 > u\} \xrightarrow{w} \{Z_t : t = 1, 2, \dots\}$$

where each Z_t is non-degenerate. The limit process $\{Z_t : t = 1, 2, \dots\}$ is termed the hidden tail chain. Note that this limit process generalises the tail chain studied by [Janßen & Segers \(2014\)](#), as in that treatment, the norming functions are restricted to be $a_t(x) = x$ and $b_t(x) = 1$ for all t , and any Z_t can be degenerate at $\{-\infty\}$. In cases where we find that $a_t(x)/x \rightarrow \alpha_t < 1$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ for all $t = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$, that is, the process has asymptotic pairwise independence for all lags up to $k - 1$, then the tail chain degenerates as $\{-\infty, -\infty, \dots\}$ but the hidden tail chain is $\{Z_1, Z_2, \dots\}$, which is finite and stochastic for all components. Furthermore, if we find that $a_t(x) \sim x$ and $b_t(x) \sim 1$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ are required for all $t = 1, 2, \dots, k - 1$ then the hidden tail chain is identical to the tail chain. So the hidden tail chain reveals important structure of the extreme events lost by the tail chain when the tail chain becomes degenerate but it equals the tail chain otherwise. Hence, hidden tail chains have wider use than tail chains. We focus almost exclusively on forward in time hidden tail chains, as above, but we also briefly discuss back-and-forth hidden tail chains, expanding on the equivalent feature for tail

chains that [Janßen & Segers \(2014\)](#) study.

Our primary target is to find how the first $k - 1$ norming functions $a_t(\cdot)$ and $b_t(\cdot)$, control those where $t \geq k$ and to identify the transition dynamics of the hidden tail chain. To find the behaviour of the $t \geq k$ norming functions requires a step-change in approach relative to the case when $k = 1$ studied by [Papastathopoulos et al. \(2017\)](#). In particular, the transitions involve novel functions, a and b , of the k previous values in comparison to just the single value when $k = 1$. Here we develop results for determining the form of this class of functions and present a method of their derivation in applications. It is important to also characterise how the dynamics of the hidden tail chain encode information about how the process changes along its index and state space. Under weak conditions, we make the surprising finding that we can always express Z_t in the form

$$Z_t = \psi_t^a(\mathbf{Z}_{t-k:t-1}) + \psi_t^b(\mathbf{Z}_{t-k:t-1})\varepsilon_t \quad \text{for all } t > k,$$

where $\mathbf{Z}_{t-k:t-1} = (Z_{t-k}, \dots, Z_{t-1})$, $\psi_t^a : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\psi_t^b : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ are continuous update functions and $\{\varepsilon_t : t = 1, 2, \dots\}$ is a sequence of non-degenerate i.i.d. innovations. This simple structure for the hidden tail chain is controlled through the update functions ψ_t^a and ψ_t^b which we show take particular classes of forms. Using the values of a_t, b_t and the properties of Z_t , as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we are able to investigate how the Markov chain returns to a non-extreme state following the occurrence of an extreme state. Additionally, some parallels between the extremal properties of the norming functions and the Yule–Walker equations, used in standard time-series analysis ([Yule 1927](#), [Walker 1931](#)), are identified.

The limit theory developed in this paper is the first that considers asymptotic independence when studying extreme values of any structured process other than a first-order Markov processes. The extension to k th order Markov processes opens the possibility to developing similar theory for much broader classes of graphical models. Studying multivariate extreme values on graphical structures has been a rich vein of research recently, with several influential papers such as [Engelke & Hitz \(2020\)](#), [Segers \(2020\)](#), [Asenova & Segers \(2022\)](#) and [Engelke & Ivanovs \(2021\)](#). However, all these papers focus on the case of all underlying distributions of cliques on the graph being asymptotically dependent. We believe that the results in this paper will help to unlock these approaches to enable the case when some, or all, cliques have asymptotic independence.

Organization of the paper. In [Section 2](#), we state our main theoretical results for higher-order tail chains with affine update functions under rather broad assumptions on the extremal behaviour of both fully asymptotically dependent and fully asymptotically independent Markov chains. As in previous accounts ([Perfekt \(1994\)](#), [Resnick & Zeber \(2013\)](#), [Janßen & Segers \(2014\)](#), [Kulik & Soulier \(2015\)](#) and [Papastathopoulos et al. \(2017\)](#)), our results only need the homogeneity (and not the stationarity) of the Markov chain and therefore, we state our results in terms of homogeneous Markov chains with initial distribution F_0 . In [Section 3](#) we study hidden tail chains of asymptotically independent and asymptotically dependent stationary Markov chains with standardized marginal distributions. Subsequently, in [Section 4](#) we characterise closed-form solutions for the norming functions for a class of asymptotically independent Markov chains, with the structure of these functions paralleling that of the autocovariance in Yule–Walker equations. In [Section 5](#), we provide examples of Markov chains constructed from widely studied joint distributions including a Markov chain which is neither fully asymptotically independent or dependent. All proofs are postponed to [Appendix A](#).

Some notation. We use the following notation. Vectors are typeset in bold and vector algebra is used throughout the paper. For a sequence of measurable functions $\{g_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ and real valued numbers $\{x_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, the notation $\mathbf{g}_{t-k:t-1}(x)$ and $\mathbf{x}_{t-k:t-1}$, for $t, k, t - k \in \mathbb{N}$, is used to denote $(g_{t-k}(x), \dots, g_{t-1}(x))$ and $(x_{t-k}, \dots, x_{t-1})$, respectively. By convention, univariable functions on vectors are applied componentwise, e.g., if $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, then $f(\mathbf{x}) = (f(x_1), \dots, f(x_k))$. The symbols $\mathbf{0}_p$ and $\mathbf{1}_p$, where $p \in \mathbb{N}$ are used to denote the vectors $(0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $(1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^p$. For a topological space E we denote its Borel- σ -algebra by $\mathcal{B}(E)$ and the set of bounded continuous functions on E by $C_b(E)$. If f_n, f are real-valued functions on E , we say that f_n converges uniformly on compact sets to f if for any compact $C \subset E$ the convergence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in C} |f_n(x) - f(x)| = 0$ holds true. Moreover, f_n is said to converge uniformly on compact sets to ∞ if $\inf_{x \in C} f_n(x) \rightarrow \infty$ for compact sets $C \subset E$. Weak convergence of measures on E is abbreviated by \xrightarrow{w} . For random elements X, X_1, X_2, \dots defined on the same probability space, we say $\{X_n\}$ converges in distribution to X , and we write $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, if the distributions P_n of the X_n converge weakly to the distribution P of X , that is, if $P_n \xrightarrow{w} P$. The closure of set A is denoted by \bar{A} . We use the notation $\|\mathbf{x}\|$ for the L_1 norm of a k -dimensional vector \mathbf{x} . For a Cartesian coordinate system \mathbb{R}^k with coordinates x_1, \dots, x_k , ∇ is defined by the partial derivative operators as $\nabla = \sum_{i=1}^k (\partial/\partial x_i) \mathbf{e}_i$ for an orthonormal basis $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_k\}$. For a differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = ((\nabla f)_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, (\nabla f)_k(\mathbf{x}))$ denotes the gradient vector of f at \mathbf{x} . The notation $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}$ is used for the scalar product of two vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, that is, $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = \sum_{i=1}^k x_i y_i$. A function $f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is termed ρ -homogeneous, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ if $f(t\mathbf{x}) = t^\rho f(\mathbf{x})$ for all $t > 0$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k$. The spectral radius $\rho(\mathbf{J})$ of a square

matrix $\mathbf{J} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ equals the maximum of the modulus of its eigenvalues. The standard $(k - 1)$ -dimensional unit-simplex $\{\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}_+^k : \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\| = 1\}$, $k \geq 1$, is denoted by \mathbf{S}_{k-1} .

2 Theory

2.1 Marginal standardization

To facilitate the generality of our theoretical developments, our assumptions about the margins of the process throughout Section 2 only concern the tail behaviour of the random variable at which we condition the Markov process to exceed a level. This assumption is in the style of theoretical approaches in conditional extreme value theory (Heffernan & Resnick 2007) and is made precise by Assumption A_0 .

Assumption A_0 . F_0 has upper end point ∞ and there exists a non-degenerate probability distribution H_0 on $[0, \infty)$ and a measurable norming function $\sigma(v) > 0$, such that

$$\frac{F_0(v + \sigma(v)x)}{\overline{F_0}(v)} \xrightarrow{w} H_0(x) \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow \infty.$$

From Pickands (1975), the limit distribution H_0 can be identified by a generalized Pareto distribution with a non-negative shape parameter. In later sections, we will take $H_0(x) = 1 - \exp(-x)$, $x \geq 0$, that is, the standard exponential distribution, such that F_0 lies in the maximum domain of attraction of a Gumbel distribution.

2.2 Chains with location and scale norming

The next assumption ensures that after an extreme event at time $t = 0$, a non-degenerate initial distribution, given $\{X_0 = v\}$, is obtained in the limit as $v \rightarrow \infty$ for the first $k - 1$ renormalized states of the Markov process.

Assumption A_1 . (behaviour of initial states in the presence of an extreme event) If $k > 1$, there exist

- (i) for $t = 1, \dots, k - 1$, measurable functions $a_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, satisfying $a_t(v) + b_t(v)x \rightarrow \infty$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$;
- (ii) a distribution G supported on \mathbb{R}^{k-1} that has non-degenerate margins such that

$$\Pr \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_{1:k-1} - \mathbf{a}_{1:k-1}(v)}{\mathbf{b}_{1:k-1}(v)} \leq \mathbf{z}_{1:k-1} \mid X_0 = v \right) \xrightarrow{w} G[-\infty, \mathbf{z}_{1:k-1}] \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow \infty.$$

Remark 1. When saying that a distribution is supported on a subset A of \mathbb{R}^k , we do not allow the distribution to place mass at the boundary ∂A of A .

Assumption A_1 implies that $a_t(v) \rightarrow \infty$ and $b_t(v) = o(a_t(v))$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$ and in Section 2.4 we cover the case where $a_t(v) = 0$ for all $v > 0$ and $b_t(v) \rightarrow \infty$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$.

After initializing the states X_0, \dots, X_{k-1} , a complete characterization of the advancing sequence of states for $t \geq k$ can be given from the one-step transition probability kernel of the homogeneous Markov process

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}, x_k) := \mathbb{P}(X_k \leq x_k \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}).$$

To motivate our next assumption about the behaviour of the transition probability kernel of the process, consider how a complete characterization may be given for higher-order Markov processes with $k > 1$ using induction on \mathbb{N} . Fix a $t \geq k > 1$ and assume there exist sequences of norming functions a_i and b_i , $i = 1, \dots, t - 1$, such that,

$$\frac{\mathbf{X}_{1:t-1} - \mathbf{a}_{1:t-1}(X_0)}{\mathbf{b}_{1:t-1}(X_0)} \mid \{X_0 > u\} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{Z}_{1:t-1} \quad \text{as } u \rightarrow \infty,$$

where each Z_i is a random variable with a non-degenerate distribution on \mathbb{R} . Therefore, what is required is to assert that, under the induction hypothesis, we can find a_t and b_t such that $\{\mathbf{X}_{1:t} - \mathbf{a}_{1:t}(X_0)\}/\mathbf{b}_{1:t}(X_0) \mid \{X_0 > u\} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{Z}_{1:t}$, as $u \rightarrow \infty$, where Z_t is a random variable with a non-degenerate distribution supported on \mathbb{R} and $\mathbf{a}_{1:t} = (\mathbf{a}_{1:t-1}, a_t)$ and $\mathbf{b}_{1:t} = (\mathbf{b}_{1:t-1}, b_t)$. To motivate our assumptions that guarantee this latter convergence, it suffices to consider marginal convergence, *viz.*, the case where the distribution of $\{X_t - a_t(X_0)\}/b_t(X_0) \mid \{X_0 >$

$u\}$ converges weakly under the induction hypothesis. For any $t \geq k$, standard calculations give that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\left(\frac{X_t - a_t(X_0)}{b_t(X_0)} \leq x_t \mid X_0 > u\right) = \\ & \frac{1}{\overline{F}_0(u)} \int_u^\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^{t-1}} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{0:t-1} \in d\mathbf{x}_{0:t-1}) \left[\int_{-\infty}^{x_t} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X_t - a_t(X_0)}{b_t(X_0)} \in dz_t \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:t-1} = \mathbf{x}_{0:t-1}\right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $d\mathbf{x}_{0:t-1}$ is shorthand for $dx_0 \times \dots \times dx_{t-1}$. Firstly, replace $a_t(X_0)$ by $a_t(x_0)$ in the innermost integral, by virtue of the conditioning on the exact value of X_0 being equal to x_0 . Then, use the Markov property so that the conditioning on all previous states is reduced to conditioning on the previous k states. Changing variables to $z_0 = \{x_0 - u\}/\sigma(u)$ and $z_i = \{x_i - a_i(x_0)\}/b_i(x_0)$ for $i = 1, \dots, t-1$, we thus have that for any $t \geq k$, expression (1) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \frac{F_0\{v_u(dz_0)\}}{\overline{F}_0(u)} \times \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{t-1}} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_{1:t-1} - \mathbf{a}_{1:t-1}(v_u(z_0))}{\mathbf{b}_{1:t-1}(v_u(z_0))} \in d\mathbf{z}_{1:t-1} \mid X_0 = v_u(z_0)\right) \times \right. \\ & \left. \times \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{x_t} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X_t - a_t(v_u(z_0))}{b_t(v_u(z_0))} \in dz_t \mid \frac{\mathbf{X}_{t-k:t-1} - \mathbf{a}_{t-k:t-1}(v_u(z_0))}{\mathbf{b}_{t-k:t-1}(v_u(z_0))} = \mathbf{z}_{t-k:t-1}\right) \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $a_0(x) = x$, $b_0(x) = 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v_u(z_0) = u + \sigma(u)z_0$. Hence, convergence of the innermost integral in the curly parentheses in equation (2), is necessary for marginal convergence. Let $\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{a}_{t-k:t-1}(v) + \mathbf{b}_{t-k:t-1}(v)\mathbf{z}$. Then, observe that for arbitrary mappings $a : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, the innermost integral can be written as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{x_t} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{X_t - a(\mathbf{X}_{t-k:t-1})}{b(\mathbf{X}_{t-k:t-1})} \in \frac{dz_t}{\psi_{t,u}^b(\mathbf{X}_{t-k:t-1})} - \psi_{t,u}^a(\mathbf{X}_{t-k:t-1}) \mid \mathbf{X}_{t-k:t-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{z}_{t-k:t-1})\right),$$

where $\psi_{t,u}^a$ and $\psi_{t,u}^b$ are given in expression (3) and depend on the mappings a, b and the normings $a_t, b_t, t \geq k$. Therefore, the connection between the convergence of the transition probability kernel and the sought marginal convergence can be established when the oscillation of the functions a and b in a neighbourhood of infinity is controlled, that is, when a and b are chosen such that the functions $\psi_{t,u}^a$ and $\psi_{t,u}^b$ converge locally uniformly to real-valued limits (ψ_t^a and ψ_t^b , respectively), as $u \rightarrow \infty$. These observations motivate our next assumption.

Assumption A_2 . (*behaviour of the next state of the process as the previous k states become extreme*) Let $k \geq 1$, $a_0(x) = x$ and $b_0(x) = 1$. If $k > 1$, suppose that for $\mathbf{X}_{1:k-1}$, the Assumption A_1 holds with norming functions $\mathbf{a}_{1:k-1}$ and $\mathbf{b}_{1:k-1}$. There exist,

(i) for $t = k, k+1, \dots$, measurable functions $a_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, continuous update functions $\psi_t^a : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\psi_t^b : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and measurable functions $a : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $b : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, such that, for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k$

$$\psi_{t,v}^a(\mathbf{z}_v) := \frac{a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v)) - a_t(v)}{b_t(v)} \rightarrow \psi_t^a(\mathbf{z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_{t,v}^b(\mathbf{z}_v) := \frac{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v))}{b_t(v)} \rightarrow \psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}), \quad (3)$$

whenever $\mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z}$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$, where $\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}) := \mathbf{a}_{t-k:t-1}(v) + \mathbf{b}_{t-k:t-1}(v)\mathbf{z}$;

(ii) a non-degenerate distribution K supported on \mathbb{R} , such that for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and for any $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \pi[\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v), a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v)) + b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v))] dx \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) K(dx), \quad t = k, k+1, \dots,$$

whenever $\mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z}$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$.

By the same token, we establish the weak convergence of the renormalized Markov chain to a hidden tail-chain. This is asserted by Theorem 1 below.

Theorem 1. Let $\{X_t : t = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be a homogeneous k th order Markov chain satisfying Assumptions A_0, A_1 and A_2 . Then as $v \rightarrow \infty$

$$\left(\frac{X_0 - u}{\sigma(v)}, \frac{X_1 - a_1(X_0)}{b_1(X_0)}, \dots, \frac{X_t - a_t(X_0)}{b_t(X_0)}\right) \mid \{X_0 > v\} \xrightarrow{d} (E_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_t), \quad t \geq k, \quad (4)$$

where

- (i) $E_0 \sim H_0$ and (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_t) are independent,
- (ii) $Z_0 = 0$ a.s., $(Z_1, \dots, Z_{k-1}) \sim G$ and

$$Z_s = \psi_s^a(\mathbf{Z}_{s-k:s-1}) + \psi_s^b(\mathbf{Z}_{s-k:s-1}) \varepsilon_s, \quad s = k, k+1, \dots \quad (5)$$

for a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $\varepsilon_s \sim K$.

Our theory provides a constructive approach to identify the sequence of additional norming functions a_t and b_t , for $t = k, k+1, \dots$. This is due to Proposition 1 below, a proof is given in Appendix A.3.

Proposition 1. *Let $a : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be measurable maps. Let $t \geq k$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k$. The following statements are equivalent*

- (i) *There exist measurable functions $a_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $b_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and continuous functions $\psi_t^a : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi_t^b : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, such that convergence (3) holds.*
- (ii) *There exist continuous functions $\lambda_t^a : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda_t^b : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, such that for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k$*

$$\frac{a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v)) - a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))}{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))} \rightarrow \lambda_t^a(\mathbf{z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v))}{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))} \rightarrow \lambda_t^b(\mathbf{z}),$$

whenever $\mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z}$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 2. *When $k = 1$, due to Proposition 1 we can choose, without loss of generality, $a_1(v) = a(v)$ and $b_1(v) = b(v)$ so that $\psi_1^a(0) = \{a(v) - a_1(v)\}/b_1(v) = 0$ and $\psi_1^b(0) = b(v)/b_1(v) = 1$. Consequently, expression (5) implies that $Z_1 = \varepsilon_1$ and thus, the special case of $k = 1$ in Theorem 1 corresponds to the results of Papastathopoulos et al. (2017).*

2.3 Near extremally independent chains

In this section, we consider Markov chains where no norming of the location and no norming of the scale are needed. This case resembles the formulation of Theorem 1, but has $a_t(v) = 0$ and $b_t(v) = 1$, for all $t \geq 1$. Thus, the next assumption ensures that after an extreme event at time $t = 0$, a non-degenerate distribution, given $\{X_0 = v\}$, is obtained in the limit as $v \rightarrow \infty$ for the first k states of the Markov process, without any renormalization.

Assumption A_1^* . *(behaviour of next k states in the presence of an extreme event) There exists a distribution G supported on \mathbb{R}^k that has non-degenerate margins such that*

$$\Pr\left(\mathbf{X}_{1:k} \leq \mathbf{z}_{1:k} \mid X_0 = v\right) \xrightarrow{w} G[-\infty, \mathbf{z}_{1:k}] \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow \infty.$$

Heffernan & Tawn (2004) showed that Assumption A_1^* holds for the Morgenstern copula for $k \geq 1$. A related assumption also appears Maulik et al. (2002) for the case $k = 1$ with (X_0, X_1) being nonnegative random variables. Here, we note that if $\mathbf{X}_{0:k}$ has the independence copula, then $G(\mathbf{z}_{1:k}) = \prod_{j=1}^k F_j(z_j)$ whereas cases with $G_j(z) \geq F_j(z)$ ($G_j(z) \leq F_j(z)$) for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, with G_j being the j th marginal distribution of G , correspond to positive (negative) near extremal independence at lag j in the hidden tail chain.

Assumptions A_0 and A_1^* are sufficient to establish the weak convergence of the conditioned Markov chain to a hidden tail-chain in Theorem 2 below. The proof of this theorem follows along the lines of the proof of Theorem 1 and is omitted for brevity.

Theorem 2. *Let $\{X_t : t = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be a homogeneous k th order Markov chain satisfying Assumptions A_0 and A_1^* . Then as $v \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\left(\frac{X_0 - u}{\sigma(v)}, X_1, \dots, X_t\right) \mid \{X_0 > v\} \xrightarrow{d} (E_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_t) \quad (6)$$

where

- (i) $E_0 \sim H_0$ and (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_t) are independent,
- (ii) $(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \sim G$ and

$$Z_s = \pi^{-1}(\mathbf{Z}_{s-k:s-1}, U_s), \quad s = k+1, k+2, \dots,$$

where $\{U_s\}$ is a sequence of independent uniform(0, 1) random variables and $\pi^{-1} : \mathbb{R}^k \times (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\pi^{-1}(\mathbf{z}, u) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \pi(\mathbf{z}, x) > u\}$.

We note that if $\mathbf{X}_{0:k}$ has the independence copula, then $\pi^{-1}(\mathbf{z}, u)$ is independent of \mathbf{z} .

2.4 Nonnegative chains with only scale norming

Consider nonnegative Markov chains where no norming of the location is needed. As in [Papastathopoulos et al. \(2017\)](#), we require extra care relative to Section 2.2 since the convergences in Assumption A_2 (i) will be satisfied for all $x \in (0, \infty)$, not all $x \in [0, \infty)$. Hence, we have to control the mass of the limiting renormalized initial distribution and the limiting renormalized transition probability kernel of the Markov process.

Assumption B_1 . (behaviour of the next state as the previous states becomes extreme) *There exist measurable functions $b_t : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ for $t = 1, \dots, k$, such that $b_t(v) \rightarrow \infty$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$ and a non-degenerate distribution function G on $[0, \infty)^k$, with no mass at any of the half-planes $C_j = \{(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}) \in [0, \infty)^{k-1} : z_j = 0\}$, that is, $G(\{C_j\}) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, k-1$, such that as $v \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\Pr\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_{1:k-1}}{\mathbf{b}_{1:k-1}(v)} \leq \mathbf{z}_{1:k-1} \mid X_0 = v\right) \xrightarrow{w} G[\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}_{1:k-1}] \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow \infty.$$

Assumption B_2 . (behaviour of the next state of the process as the initial states become extreme) *Let $k \geq 1$ and $b_0(x) = x$. If $k > 1$, suppose that for $\mathbf{X}_{1:k-1}$, the Assumption B_1 holds with norming functions $\mathbf{b}_{1:k-1}$. There exist*

- (i) *for $t = k, k+1, \dots$, measurable functions $b_t : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, continuous update functions $\psi_t^b : \mathbb{R}_+^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and a measurable function $b : \mathbb{R}_+^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, such that for all $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k > 0$ and $\mathbf{z} \in [\delta_1, \infty) \times \dots \times [\delta_k, \infty)$,*

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b(\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v))}{b_t(v)} \rightarrow \psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}) > 0, \quad (7)$$

whenever $\mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z}$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$ and $\sup\{\|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty : \mathbf{z} \in A_c\} \rightarrow 0$ as $c \downarrow 0$, where $\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}) := \mathbf{b}_{t-k:t-1}(v) \mathbf{z}$ and $A_c = \{\mathbf{z} \in (0, \infty)^k : \psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}) \leq c\}$ with the convention that $\sup(\emptyset) = 0$;

- (ii) *a non-degenerate distribution K supported on $[0, \infty)$ with no mass at $\{0\}$, that is, $K\{0\} = 0$, such that, for any $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+)$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} f(x) \pi[\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v), b(\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v))] dx \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} f(x) K(dx), \quad t = k, k+1, \dots$$

whenever $\mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z}$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 3. *Let $\{X_t : t = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be a homogeneous Markov chain satisfying Assumptions A_0, B_1 and B_2 . Then as $u \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\left(\frac{X_0 - u}{\sigma(u)}, \frac{X_1}{b_1(X_0)}, \dots, \frac{X_t}{b_t(X_0)}\right) \mid \{X_0 > u\} \xrightarrow{d} (E_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_t) \quad (8)$$

where

- (i) $E_0 \sim H_0$ and (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_t) are independent,
(ii) $Z_0 = 1$ a.s., $(Z_1, \dots, Z_k) \sim G$ and

$$Z_s = \psi_s^b(\mathbf{Z}_{s-k:s-1}) \varepsilon_s, \quad s = k, k+1, \dots \quad (9)$$

for a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $\varepsilon_s \sim K$.

Remark 3. *Theorem 3 appears simply to be the k -order extension of Theorem 3.1 in [Kulik & Soulier \(2015\)](#) but it differs as H_0 is in a broader class than the Pareto family considered by them. Here, an exponential tail for H_0 is also included.*

2.5 Back-and-forth hidden tail chains

In the discussion above, formally the entities we have referred to as tail chains and hidden tail chains are in fact forward tail and hidden tail chains (*cf.* [Janßen & Segers 2014](#)). These describe the behaviour of the Markov chain only forward in time from a large observation. There is also the parallel interest in a backward tail/hidden tail chain, to give how the chain evolves into an extreme event, and the joint behaviour of the two, known as back-and-forth tail processes.

Here we focus on an extension of the back-and-forth tail chains developed by [Janßen & Segers \(2014\)](#). The backward hidden tail chain characteristics are similar in structure to the forward hidden tail chain properties identified in Sections 2.2–2.4. To save repetition, here we outline the back-and-forth hidden tail chains for

the assumptions in Section 2.2 only. For this purpose, it suffices to consider a straightforward extension of Assumption A_2 which allows us to characterize the backward behaviour of the chain from an extreme event by requiring functional normalization for the backward chain $X_{-s} \mid \mathbf{X}_{-s+1:-s+k}$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, if the chain is time-reversible, then Assumption A_2 holds backwards with the same functional normalizations a and b and the same limit distribution K . In general, however, there is no mathematical connection between these forward and backward quantities and Assumption A_2^- below considers this more general case.

Assumption A_2^- . (behaviour of the backward state of the process) Let $k \geq 1$, $a_0(x) = x$ and $b_0(x) = 1$. If $k > 1$, suppose that for $\mathbf{X}_{1:k-1}$, the Assumption A_1 holds with norming functions $\mathbf{a}_{1:k-1}$ and $\mathbf{b}_{1:k-1}$. There exist,

(i) for $s = 1, 2, \dots$, measurable functions $a_{-s} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b_{-s} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, continuous update functions $\psi_{-s}^{a^-} : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\psi_{-s}^{b^-} : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and measurable functions $a^- : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $b^- : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, such that, for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k$

$$\frac{a^-(\mathbf{A}_{-s}(v, \mathbf{z}_v)) - a_{-s}(v)}{b_{-s}(v)} \rightarrow \psi_{-s}^{a^-}(\mathbf{z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{b^-(\mathbf{A}_{-s}(v, \mathbf{z}_v))}{b_{-s}(v)} \rightarrow \psi_{-s}^{b^-}(\mathbf{z}), \quad (10)$$

whenever $\mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z}$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$, where $\mathbf{A}_{-s}(v, \mathbf{z}) := \mathbf{a}_{-s+1:-s+k}(v) + \mathbf{b}_{-s+1:-s+k}(v) \mathbf{z}$;

(ii) a non-degenerate distribution K^- supported on \mathbb{R} , such that for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and for any $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) \pi[\mathbf{A}_{-s}(v, \mathbf{z}_v), a^-(\mathbf{A}_{-s}(v, \mathbf{z}_v)) + b^-(\mathbf{A}_{-s}(v, \mathbf{z}_v))] dx \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) K^-(dx), \quad s = 1, 2, \dots,$$

whenever $\mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z}$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$.

The back-and-forth hidden tail chain is presented in Theorem 4. For the sake of brevity, we do not include its proof as this is identical to the proof of Theorem 1.

Theorem 4. Let $\{X_t : t = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be a homogeneous k th order Markov chain satisfying Assumptions A_0, A_1, A_2 and A_2^- . Then as $v \rightarrow \infty$

$$\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_{-s:-1} - \mathbf{a}_{-s:-1}(X_0)}{\mathbf{b}_{-s:-1}(X_0)}, \frac{X_0 - u}{\sigma(v)}, \frac{\mathbf{X}_{1:t} - \mathbf{a}_{1:t}(X_0)}{\mathbf{b}_{1:t}(X_0)} \right) \mid \{X_0 > v\} \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbf{Z}_{-s:-1}, E_0, \mathbf{Z}_{1:t}), \quad t \geq k, \quad s \in \mathbb{N},$$

where

(i) $E_0 \sim H_0$ is independent of $(\mathbf{Z}_{-s:-1}, \mathbf{Z}_{1:t})$,

(ii) $Z_0 = 0$ a.s., $\mathbf{Z}_{1:k-1} \sim G$,

$$Z_t = \psi_t^a(\mathbf{Z}_{t-k:t-1}) + \psi_t^b(\mathbf{Z}_{t-k:t-1}) \varepsilon_t, \quad t = k, k+1, \dots$$

and

$$Z_s = \psi_s^{a^-}(\mathbf{Z}_{-s+1:-s+k}) + \psi_s^{b^-}(\mathbf{Z}_{-s+1:-s+k}) \varepsilon_{-s}, \quad s = 1, 2, \dots$$

for independent sequences of i.i.d. random variables $\{\varepsilon_{-s}\}_{s=1}^{\infty}$ and $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t=k}^{\infty}$, where $\varepsilon_{-s} \sim K^-$ and $\varepsilon_t \sim K$.

In general there is a relationship between the forward and backward hidden tail chains. When $k = 1$ these are independent, but when $k > 1$ and $t + s > k$, then Z_t is conditionally independent of Z_{-s} given $(\mathbf{Z}_{-s+1:-1}, \mathbf{Z}_{1:t-1})$. Hence, given any consecutive block of terms in the back-and-forth hidden tail chain of size k , then the values before and after this block are independent. We remark that the precise dependence conditions between the forward and backward hidden tail chains have been given for the case where only $a_j(x) = x$ and $b_j(x) = 1$ for all $j \neq 0$ by Janßen & Segers (2014). We focus on the forward hidden tail chain and do not address the inter-connections between the different $a_j(x)$ and $b_j(x)$ for positive and negative j .

3 Stochastic recurrence equations and dependence parameters

3.1 Introduction

The theory presented in Section 2 comprises a generalization of the theory presented in Papastathopoulos et al. (2017) who dealt only with first-order homogeneous Markov chains. Although working with homogeneous chains embeds the theory in a rather broad setting, it is impossible to explore the form of the results of Theorems 1–4 unless further structure is imposed. In practice, standardization to a common marginal form is typically performed on all marginal distributions of the process via the probability integral transform. This

approach is in the style of copula methods where the assumption of identical margins is sufficient to identify the extremal dependence structure of a random vector. Therefore, we will assume that all one-dimensional marginal distributions of the Markov process are standardized to unit-rate exponential random variables, as this is the marginal choice with the clearest mathematical formulation. To this end, we will assume that the Markov chain $\{X_t\}$ is stationary with unit-exponential marginal distributions, that is, $F_t(x) = \Pr(X_t \leq x) = (1 - \exp(-x))_+$, for $t = 0, 1, \dots$, which implies that the limit distribution H_0 in Assumption A_0 is also unit exponential. In Section 3.2 we consider the fully asymptotic dependence case when $\chi_D > 0$, so that $\chi_t > 0$ for all $t \geq 1$. In Section 3.3 we consider the case where the process is fully asymptotically independent, that is, $\chi_j = 0$ for all $j \in D$, which also implies $\chi_t = 0$ for all $t \geq 1$. Intermediate cases are discussed in Example 4 of Section 5.3.

Heffernan & Tawn (2004) found that for various copula models for a random vector $\mathbf{X}_{0:d}$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, with exponentially tailed random variables, the weak convergence of the conditional distribution of the renormalized states $\{\mathbf{X}_{1:d} - \mathbf{a}_{1:d}(X_0)\} / \mathbf{b}_{1:d}(X_0)$ given $X_0 > v$, to some distribution with non-degenerate margins, holds with the normalization functions taking the simple form $\mathbf{a}_{1:d}(v) = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{1:d} v$ and $\mathbf{b}_{1:d}(v) = v^\beta \mathbf{1}_d$, where $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{1:d}, \beta) \in [0, 1]^d \times [0, 1)$. The parameters α_t and β have a simple interpretation and control the strength of extremal association between variables X_0 and X_t , for $t = 1, \dots, d$. Informally, in the presence of an extreme event X_0 with $X_0 > v$ and v sufficiently large, we may then think of X_t as $X_t = \alpha_t X_0 + X_0^\beta Z_t$ where Z_t arises from a non-degenerate distribution. Thus, α_t and β are slope and scale parameters, respectively, with larger values of α_t indicating stronger linear dependence between X_0 and X_t and with larger values of β indicating a more diffuse distribution for $X_t | X_0 > v$. In particular, when $\alpha_t = 1$ and $\beta = 0$, then X_0 and X_t are asymptotically dependent so that $\chi_t > 0$. When $\alpha_t \in [0, 1)$ and $\beta \in [0, 1)$, then X_0 and X_t are asymptotically independent so that $\chi_t = 0$. An important special is when X_0 and X_t are extremally independent so that no norming is needed, thus $\alpha_t = 0$ and $\beta = 0$ as in Section 2.3.

3.2 Fully asymptotically dependent Markov chains

Corollary 1 (*Fully asymptotically dependent Markov chains*). *Let $\{X_t : t = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be a k -th order stationary Markov chain with unit-exponential margins. Suppose that Assumption A_1 holds with $a_t(x) = x$ and $b_t(x) = 1$, for $t = 1, \dots, k-1$. Suppose further that A_2 holds with the function a being non-zero and continuous, such that $\exp\{a(\log \mathbf{x})\}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$, is 1-homogeneous, that is,*

$$a(v\mathbf{1}_k + \mathbf{y}) - v = a(\mathbf{y}), \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and all } \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^k, \quad (11)$$

and $a(\mathbf{0}) \leq 0$. Then, the convergence (4) holds with $a_t(x) = x$ and $b_t(x) = 1$ for $t \geq k$, and

$$Z_t = a(\mathbf{Z}_{t-k:t-1}) + \varepsilon_t, \quad t = k, k+1, \dots,$$

for a sequence $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t=k}^\infty$ of i.i.d. random variables with a distribution supported on \mathbb{R} . Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}(Z_t) < 0$ for all $t \geq 1$.

Although $a_t(x) = x$ and $b_t(x) = 1$ for all $t \geq 1$, fully asymptotically dependent Markov chains return to the body of the distribution after witnessing an extreme event. This is due to the negative drift of the tail chain, that is, $\mathbb{E}(Z_t) < 0$ for all $t \geq 1$ which ensures that the Markov chain will return to the body regardless of the behaviour of the norming functions.

3.3 Fully asymptotically independent Markov chains

Corollary 2 (*Fully asymptotically independent Markov chains with location and scale norming*). *Let $\{X_t : t = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be a k -th order stationary Markov chain with unit exponential margins. Suppose Assumption A_1 holds with $a_t(v) = \alpha_t v$, $\alpha_t \in (0, 1)$ and $b_t(v) = v^\beta$, $\beta \in [0, 1)$, for $t = 1, \dots, k-1$. Suppose that Assumption A_2 holds with the function a being 1-homogeneous and the function b being β -homogeneous when $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and unity when $\beta = 0$. Then, convergence (4) holds with $a_t(v) = \alpha_t v$ and $b_t(v) = v^\beta$, where*

$$\alpha_t = a(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{t-k:t-1}), \quad t = k, k+1, \dots, \quad (12)$$

and

$$Z_t = \nabla a(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{t-k:t-1}) \cdot \mathbf{Z}_{t-k:t-1} + b(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{t-k:t-1}) \varepsilon_t \quad t = k, k+1, \dots, \quad (13)$$

for a sequence $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t=k}^\infty$ of i.i.d. random variables from a non-degenerate distribution K on \mathbb{R} . Additionally, if the function a is twice continuously differentiable, $a(\mathbf{1}_k) \neq 1$, and the spectral radius $\rho(\mathbf{J}_f(\mathbf{0}))$ of the Jacobian

matrix $\mathbf{J}_f : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ of the map $\mathbb{R}^k \ni \mathbf{x}_{1:k} \mapsto f(\mathbf{x}_{1:k}) = (\mathbf{x}_{2:k}, a(\mathbf{x}_{1:k}))$, is strictly less than unity, then

$$\alpha_t \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (14)$$

Despite its relatively weak assumptions Corollary 2 provides considerable insight into the behaviour of the hidden tail chain. It shows that the norming functions a_t , $t = k, k+1, \dots$, have a particularly neat structure, not least $a_t(X_0) = \alpha_t X_0$, where α_t is determined by the recurrence equation (12) of the k previous values $\alpha_{t-k:t-1}$ through the 1-homogeneous function a . Also $\alpha_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ leading eventually to no location norming in the limit, which is consistent with the independence case. For a flexible parametric class of the function a , in Section 4 we are able to explicitly solve the recurrence equation (12) and find the form of a geometric decay to zero in α_t as t increases.

When $\beta = 0$ the behaviour of the forward tail chain $t \rightarrow \infty$ is almost entirely given by Corollary 2. Here $X_t | \{X_0 = v\} = \alpha_t v + Z_t + o_p(1)$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$. For fixed t , X_t grows as $v \rightarrow \infty$. However, if we allow $t \rightarrow \infty$ sufficiently fast with $v \rightarrow \infty$ the location tends to zero and X_t converges to the process $\{Z_t\}$, which is a non-degenerate stationary autoregressive process. So, with such combined limiting operations, we have that $X_t | \{X_0 = v\}$ returns to the body of the distribution as $t \rightarrow \infty$, becoming independent of X_0 . Here, if $\alpha_t \sim A^t$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$ where A is a constant with $0 < A < 1$, i.e., geometric decay, then we would need $t/\log(v) \rightarrow \infty$, as $v \rightarrow \infty$ for this result to hold. When $0 < \beta < 1$ the limiting behaviour of the forward chain $X_t | \{X_0 = v\}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ is only partially implied by Corollary 2. This is because $Z_t \xrightarrow{p} 0$, since both the location and scale terms of ϵ_t in expression (13) tend to zero, but its scaling $(v)^\beta$ tends to infinity. Consequently, the limiting behaviour is determined by the relative speed of convergence of $\alpha_t v \rightarrow 0$ and $v^\beta Z_t \xrightarrow{p} 0$ if we link the growth rate of t to that of v .

In general we can view the recurrence relation in expression (12) as the parallel of the Yule–Walker equations and hence, term them the *extremal Yule–Walker equations*. The Yule–Walker equations provide a recurrence relation for the autocorrelation function in standard time series that is used to determine the dependence properties of a linear Markov process. For a k th order linear Markov process $Y_t = \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i Y_{t-k+i-1} + \eta_t$ with $\{\eta_t\}_{t=-\infty}^{\infty}$ a sequence of zero mean, common finite variance and uncorrelated random variables, where the set of regression parameters ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_k are real valued constants such that the characteristic polynomial $1 - \phi_k z - \phi_{k-1} z^2 - \dots - \phi_1 z^k \neq 0$ on $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 1\}$, the Yule–Walker equations relate the autocorrelation function of the process $\rho_t = \text{cor}(Y_{s-t}, Y_s)$ at lag t with the regression parameters ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_k and the k lagged autocorrelations according to $\rho_t = \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i \rho_{t-i}$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. The sequence $\{\alpha_t\}$ has a similar structure for extremes via recurrence (12).

In Corollary 2 we rule out the case $\beta < 0$, considered by Heffernan & Tawn (2004), corresponding to the case where location only normalization gives limits that are degenerate, with all limiting mass at $\{0\}$. For simplicity, the theory developed in this paper deals only with positive extremal association in Markov chains and hence, in Corollary 2, the case $\alpha_t < 0$ corresponding to the case where X_0 and X_t exhibit negative extremal association, is also ruled out. We note, however, that this latter case can be easily accommodated by suitable transformations of the marginal distributions, e.g., by standardizing margins to standard Laplace distributions, see for example Keef et al. (2013) and Papastathopoulos et al. (Theorem 3, 2017).

Corollary 3 (*Fully asymptotically independent Markov chains with only scale norming*). Let $\{X_t : t = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be a k -th order stationary Markov chain with unit-exponential margins. Suppose that Assumption B_1 holds with $b_t(x) = x^\beta$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, for $t = 1, \dots, k-1$. Suppose further that Assumption B_2 holds with the function b being continuous and β -homogeneous. Then convergence (8) holds with $b_t(x) = x^{\beta_t}$, $\beta_t \in (0, 1)$, $t \geq k$, where β_t satisfies the recurrence relation $\log \beta_t = \log \beta + \log(\max_{i=1, \dots, k} \beta_{t-i})$. This gives the solution

$$\log \beta_t = (\lfloor 1 + (t-1)/k \rfloor) \log \beta, \quad t \geq k,$$

where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the integer part of x . It follows that $\beta_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Also, for $t \geq k$ we have

$$Z_t = \begin{cases} b(Z_{t-k}, \mathbf{0}_{k-1}) \varepsilon_t & \text{when } \text{mod}_k(t) = 0 \\ b(Z_{t-k}, \dots, Z_{t-1}) \varepsilon_t & \text{when } \text{mod}_k(t) = 1 \\ b(Z_{t-k}, \dots, Z_{t-j}, \mathbf{0}_{j-1}) \varepsilon_t & \text{when } \text{mod}_k(t) = j \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}, \end{cases}$$

for a sequence $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t=k}^{\infty}$ of i.i.d. random variables with distribution supported on \mathbb{R}_+ and $Z_0 = 1$ a.s.

As with Corollary 2 we find a form of geometric decay in the dependence parameters β_t as t increases, leading eventually to extremal independence ($\alpha_t = 0$ and $\beta_t \rightarrow 0$) in the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$, so that X_t returns to the body of the distribution as it becomes independent of X_0 . However, in contrast to Corollary 2 where the location parameter α_t changed with t , here it is the power parameter β_t of the scale function. In particular, β_t

decays geometrically to 0 stepwise, with steps at every k lags. At time t the resulting hidden tail chain depends only on the last j values, with $j = \text{mod}_k(t)$.

4 A class of recurrence relations for dependence parameters in asymptotically independent Markov chains with closed form solutions

The results of Section 3 provide insight into the form of the norming and updating functions of Theorems 1 and 3, not least for asymptotically independent Markov chains where $(\alpha_t, \beta_t) \neq (1, 0)$ for all $t > 0$. A precise formulation of the location and scale parameters α_t and β_t for $t \geq k$, however, depends on the form of functionals $a(\cdot)$ and $b(\cdot)$ which is opaque even when these are assumed to be homogeneous functionals. Motivated by examples considered in Section 5.3, here we give an explicit characterization of the solution to the extremal Yule–Walker equations (12) in Corollary 2 for a parsimonious parametric subclass of 1-homogeneous functionals which imbeds many of the examples of Section 5.

Consider the 1-homogeneous function $a_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathbb{R}_+^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by

$$a_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}) = c \left\{ \gamma_1 (\gamma_1 x_1)^\delta + \cdots + \gamma_k (\gamma_k x_k)^\delta \right\}^{1/\delta}, \quad \delta \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \quad (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k) \in \mathbf{S}_{k-1}, \quad 0 < c < \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i^{1+\delta} \right)^{-1/\delta}. \quad (15)$$

The functional $a_{\mathcal{M}}$ is continuous in $\delta \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ with

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} a_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}) = c_0 x_1^{\gamma_1} x_2^{\gamma_2} \cdots x_k^{\gamma_k}, \quad c_0 = c \prod_{i=1}^k \gamma_i^{\gamma_i} < 1. \quad (16)$$

and $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \pm\infty} a_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}) = a_{\mathcal{M}, \pm\infty}(\gamma_1 x_1, \gamma_2 x_2, \dots, \gamma_k x_k)$ where $a_{\mathcal{M}, \infty}(\mathbf{x}) = c_\infty \max_{i=1, \dots, k} x_i$, $a_{\mathcal{M}, -\infty}(\mathbf{x}) = c_{-\infty} \min_{i=1}^k x_i$, $c_\infty = c \max_i \gamma_i$, $c_{-\infty} = c \min_{i: \gamma_i > 0} \gamma_i$, where $0 < c_{-\infty} < 1$ and $0 < c_\infty < 1$.

Proposition 2. *Consider the function $a_{\mathcal{M}}$ defined by expression (15). Suppose that the $s \in \mathbb{N}$ distinct (possibly complex) roots of the characteristic polynomial*

$$x^k - c^\delta \gamma_k^{1+\delta} x^{k-1} - \cdots - c^\delta \gamma_1^{1+\delta} = 0$$

are r_1, \dots, r_s with multiplicities m_1, \dots, m_s , $\sum_i m_i = k$. Then the solution of the recurrence relation (12) with $a(\mathbf{x}) = a_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$, subject to the initial condition $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}) \in (0, 1)^{k-1}$, is

$$\alpha_t = \left(\sum_{i=1}^s (C_{i0} + C_{i1} t + \cdots + C_{i, m_i-1} t^{m_i-1}) r_i^t \right)^{1/\delta} \quad \text{for } t = k, k+1, \dots \quad (17)$$

where the constants $C_{i0}, \dots, C_{i, m_i-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, s$, are uniquely determined by the initial condition via the system of equations

$$\alpha_t = \left(\sum_{i=1}^s (C_{i0} + C_{i1} t + \cdots + C_{i, m_i-1} t^{m_i-1}) r_i^t \right)^{1/\delta} \quad \text{for } t = 0, \dots, k-1,$$

with $\alpha_0 = 1$.

From Corollary 2, it follows that the sequence $\{\alpha_t\}$ in Proposition 2 satisfies $\alpha_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Let $I_r = \{I \in \{1, \dots, s\} : |r_I| = \max_{i=1, \dots, s} |r_i|\}$. Under the assumption that $|I_r| = 1$, then we have that α_t in expression (17) satisfies $\alpha_t \sim C_{I, m_I-1} t^{(m_I-1)/\delta} (r_I^{1/\delta})^t \rightarrow 0$, $I \in I_r$, $\delta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 4. *Although solution (17) holds for any $\delta \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, it is not evident what form the solution takes when $\delta = 0$ or when $\delta = \pm\infty$. These cases are considered separately below.*

Case $\delta \rightarrow 0$: *A logarithmic transformation in limit (16) results in the linear nonhomogeneous recurrence relation*

$$\log \alpha_t - \gamma_1 \log \alpha_{t-1} - \cdots - \gamma_k \log \alpha_{t-k} = \log c - I(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$$

where $I(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = -\sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i \log \gamma_i$. Suppose that the $s \in \mathbb{N}$ distinct (possibly complex) roots of the characteristic polynomial

$$x^k - \gamma_k x^{k-1} - \cdots - \gamma_1 = 0, \quad (18)$$

are r_1, \dots, r_s with multiplicities m_1, \dots, m_s , $\sum m_i = k$. Then the solution of recurrence (12) is

$$\alpha_t = \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^s (C_{i0} + C_{i1}t + \dots + C_{i,m_i-1}t^{m_i-1}) r_i^t + \frac{c - I(\gamma)}{\gamma_1 + 2\gamma_2 + \dots + k\gamma_k} t \right\} \quad \text{for } t = k, k+1, \dots$$

where the constants $C_{i0}, \dots, C_{i,m_i-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, s$, are uniquely determined by the system of equations

$$\alpha_t = \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^s (C_{i0} + C_{i1}t + \dots + C_{i,m_i-1}t^{m_i-1}) r_i^t + \frac{c - I(\gamma)}{\gamma_1 + 2\gamma_2 + \dots + k\gamma_k} t \right\} \quad \text{for } t = 0, \dots, k-1,$$

with $\alpha_0 = 1$ and $\alpha_t \in (0, 1)$ for $t = 1, \dots, k-1$.

Case $|\delta| \rightarrow \pm\infty$: Using forward substitution, we have that for $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ the solution of (12) is

$$\alpha_t = c^t \max_{i=1, \dots, k} (c_{t-i} \alpha_{i-1}), \quad c_{t-i} = \max_{n=1}^k \prod_{n=1}^k \gamma_{k+1-n}^{j_n} \quad t \geq k \quad (19)$$

where the maximum for c_{t-i} in expression (19) is taken over $0 \leq j_1 \leq \dots \leq j_k \leq t-i$ such that $\sum_{m=1}^{t-i} m j_m = t-i$. The case $\delta \rightarrow -\infty$ is obtained by replacing the maximum operator in expression (19) by the minimum operator.

Although Corollary 2 assumes a is differentiable, it is useful to understand the behaviour of the solution of the recurrence relation (12), for $a = a_{\mathcal{M}}$, with $a_{\mathcal{M}}$ given in equation (15), as $|\delta| \rightarrow \infty$. Recurrence relationship (19) shows that even when function a is non-differentiable, a simple recurrence is possible.

5 Results for kernels based on important copula classes

5.1 Strategy for finding norming functionals

In Section 5.3, we consider examples of k th order Markov chains that are covered by the proposed theory. In order to obtain the hidden tail chain for a given Markov process one needs to derive appropriate norming functions a_t, b_t , for time lags $t = 1, \dots, k-1$ and norming functionals a and b to ensure that after an extreme event at time $t = 0$, the joint distribution of the renormalized k states in the process, converges weakly to a non-degenerate limit. The methods for finding a_t, b_t for $t = 1, \dots, k-1$ for all our examples is given by Theorem 1 in Heffernan & Tawn (2004). To obtain the full sequence of norming functions a_t, b_t , for $t = 1, 2, \dots$, we need a new strategy that allows us to also derive the functionals a and b . We explain the strategy here for the case $a \neq 0$ and note that the case $a = 0$ and $b \neq 1$ is handled in similar manner.

Assuming the conditional distribution of $X_k \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}$ admits a Lebesgue density almost everywhere, a similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 1 in Heffernan & Tawn (2004) guarantees that the functionals a and b can be identified, up to type, by

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}) \right) = p \in (0, 1), \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k, \quad (20)$$

and

$$b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z})) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(X_k > a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}))}{[d\mathbb{P}\{X_k \leq y \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z})\} / dy]_{y=a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}))}}, \quad (21)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{a}_{t-k:t-1}(v) + \mathbf{b}_{t-k:t-1}(v) \mathbf{z}$ with $\mathbf{a}_{t-k:t-1}$ and $\mathbf{b}_{t-k:t-1}$ as in Assumption A₂. Expression (21) can be cumbersome to use in practice so we resort to asymptotic inversion in order to identify b . In particular, to find a representative form for b we make an informed choice based on the leading order terms in an asymptotic expansion of the conditional distribution in expression (20) to obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) + b(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) y \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}) \right) \xrightarrow{w} K[-\infty, y], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k \quad (22)$$

where K is a non-degenerate distribution on \mathbb{R} . This strategy is illustrated step by step in examples 1–3 of Section 5.3, where the identification of leading order terms is straightforward.

5.2 Preliminaries

To illustrate the results in Theorems 1 and 3, we study the extremal behaviour of k th order stationary Markov chains with unit exponential margins, with transition probability kernels for the copula of $k + 1$ consecutive values given in Section 5.3. The examples cover both extremal dependence types, not least they include two subclasses of asymptotically dependent max-stable distributions—namely those with logistic and Hüsler–Reiss dependence—and two classes of asymptotically independent distributions—namely the Gaussian copula and the inverted max-stable distribution with logistic dependence. We also consider an example of a transition probability kernel for a second-order Markov chain using max-stable distribution which exhibits a mixture of asymptotic independence and asymptotic dependence over different lags, and does not satisfy the assumptions of the theory developed in Section 2. The theory which motivates these as copulae does not matter here, we simply view them as a range of interesting and well known copula families for which we study their extremes in a Markov setting.

Let F denote the joint distribution function of a random vector $\mathbf{X} = (X_0, \dots, X_k)$, assumed to be absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure with unit exponential margins, that is, $F_i(x) = F_E(x) = (1 - \exp(-x))_+$, $i = 0, \dots, k$. Further, let $[k] = \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ and $\mathcal{P}([k]) = 2^{[k]} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. The construction of all Markov processes studied in this section, is summarised as follows. Writing $C : [0, 1]^{k+1} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for the copula of \mathbf{X} , that is, $C(\mathbf{u}) = F(F_E^{\leftarrow}(u_0), \dots, F_E^{\leftarrow}(u_k))$, where $\mathbf{u} = (u_0, \dots, u_k) \in [0, 1]^{k+1}$, we define the Markov kernel $\pi_E : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^k) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of the stationary process by

$$\pi_E(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}, x_k) = \left[\frac{\partial^k}{\partial u_0 \dots \partial u_{k-1}} C(\mathbf{u}_{0:k-1}, u_k) / \frac{\partial^k}{\partial u_0 \dots \partial u_{k-1}} C(\mathbf{u}_{0:k-1}, 1) \right] \Bigg|_{\mathbf{u}_{0:k} = \mathbf{v}_{0:k}},$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{0:k} = \{1 - \exp(-\mathbf{x}_{0:k})\}_+$. Assuming the copula function satisfies appropriate conditions that ensure stationarity (Joe 2015), then the initial distribution $F(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}, \infty)$ is k dimensional invariant distribution of a Markov process with unit exponential margins and kernel π_E .

In what follows, we set up the notation for the associated transition probability kernels that we study in Section 5.3 where we derive norming functions and hidden tail chains and impose conditions that ensure stationarity of the Markov chain in each example.

Gaussian copula: Our first example concerns stationary Gaussian autoregressive processes with positive dependence transformed componentwise to have exponential marginal distributions. Let $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1) \times (k+1)}$ be a $(k + 1)$ -dimensional Toeplitz correlation matrix, that is, $\Sigma = (\rho_{|i-j|})_{1 \leq i, j \leq k+1}$ with $\rho_0 = 1$, $\rho_i > 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$, assumed to be positive definite. The distribution function of the standard $(k + 1)$ -dimensional Gaussian with mean $\mathbf{0}_{k+1}$ and variance Σ , in exponential margins, is

$$F(\mathbf{x}_{0:k}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\Phi^{\leftarrow}\{1 - \exp(-\mathbf{x}_{0:k})\}} \frac{|\mathbf{Q}|^{1/2}}{(2\pi)^{k/2}} \exp(-\mathbf{s}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{s} / 2) \, d\mathbf{s} \quad \mathbf{s} = (s_0, \dots, s_k)^\top, \mathbf{x}_{0:k} \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1},$$

where $\Phi^{\leftarrow} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes the quantile function of the standard normal distribution function $\Phi(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{Q} = \Sigma^{-1} = (q_{i-1, j-1})_{1 \leq i, j \leq k+1}$ is a symmetric positive definite matrix. This joint distribution gives the transition probability kernel

$$\pi_E(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}, x_k) = \pi_G \{ \Phi^{\leftarrow}\{1 - \exp(-\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1})\}, \Phi^{\leftarrow}\{1 - \exp(-x_k)\} \}, (\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}$$

where the kernel π_G is the full conditional distribution function of the multivariate normal given by

$$\pi_G(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}, x_k) = \Phi \left[q_{kk}^{1/2} \left\{ x_k - \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \left(-\frac{q_{tk}}{q_{kk}} \right) x_t \right\} \right].$$

The condition $\rho_i > 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$ appears restrictive but is made to simplify the presentation. If we worked with standard Laplace marginals, instead of exponential marginals, as say in Keef et al. (2013), the presentation would be equally simple for any values $|\rho_i| > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, of the correlation matrix Σ .

Max-stable copula: A class of transition probability kernels for asymptotically dependent Markov processes is obtained from the class of multivariate extreme value distributions (Resnick 1987). The $k + 1$ dimensional distribution function of the multivariate extreme value distribution with exponential margins is given by

$$F(\mathbf{x}_{0:k}) = \exp(-V(\mathbf{y}_{0:k})), \quad \text{where } \mathbf{y}_{0:k} = T(\mathbf{x}_{0:k}) := -1/\log(1 - \exp(-\mathbf{x}_{0:k})), \quad \mathbf{x}_{0:k} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{k+1}, \quad (23)$$

with $V : \mathbb{R}_+^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ a -1 -homogeneous function, known as the exponent measure, given by

$$V(\mathbf{y}_{0:k}) = \int_{\mathbf{S}_k} \max_{i=0,\dots,k} \left(\frac{\omega_i}{y_i} \right) H(d\boldsymbol{\omega}), \quad (24)$$

where H is a Radon measure on \mathbf{S}_k that has total mass $k+1$ and satisfies the moment constraints $\int_{\mathbf{S}_k} \omega_i H(d\boldsymbol{\omega}) = 1$, for $i = 0, \dots, k$. Throughout this section, we assume that V has continuous mixed partial derivatives of all orders which ensures that a density for F exists (Coles & Tawn 1991). For any $J \subseteq [k]$, we write V_J to denote the higher-order partial derivative $\partial^{|J|} V(\mathbf{x}_{0:k}) / \prod_{j \in J} \partial x_j$ and Π_m for the set of partitions of $[m]$, with $m = 0, \dots, k$. Furthermore, for a vector $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{x}_{0:m}, \mathbf{x}_{m+1:k})$, we write $V(\mathbf{x}_{0:m}, \mathbf{x}_{m+1:k}) = V(\mathbf{z})$. For $m = 0, \dots, k-1$ we define $V(\mathbf{x}_{0:m}, \infty \cdot \mathbf{1}_{k-m}) := \lim_{\mathbf{x}_{m+1:k} \rightarrow \infty \cdot \mathbf{1}_{k-m}} V(\mathbf{x}_{0:m}, \mathbf{x}_{m+1:k})$, and for $J \subseteq [m]$, we define $V_J(\mathbf{x}_{0:m}, \infty \cdot \mathbf{1}_{k-m}) := \partial^{|J|} V(\mathbf{x}_{0:m}, \infty \cdot \mathbf{1}_{k-m}) / \prod_{j \in J} \partial x_j$. Stationarity is achieved by requiring that the distributions of $\{X_i : i \in A\}$ and $\{X_i : i \in B\}$ are identical for any set B that is a translate of the set A , that is, when there exists a unique $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $B = \{x + \omega : x \in A\}$. Hence, to ensure stationarity in the time series outlined in Examples 2–4, we assume for the $(k+1)$ -variate exponent measures associated to multivariate extreme value and inverted max-stable copula models that

$$\lim_{\mathbf{x}_{[k] \setminus A} \rightarrow \infty} V(\mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}_A = \mathbf{y}} = \lim_{\mathbf{x}_{[k] \setminus B} \rightarrow \infty} V(\mathbf{x}) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}_B = \mathbf{y}}, \quad \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|A|}. \quad (25)$$

whenever B is a translate set of A , with $A, B \subseteq [k]$. The transition probability kernel induced by the multivariate extreme value copula, in exponential margins, is

$$\pi_E(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}, x_k) = \frac{\left[\sum_{p \in \Pi_{k-1}} (-1)^{|p|} \prod_{J \in p} V_J(\mathbf{y}_{0:k}) \right]}{\left[\sum_{p \in \Pi_{k-1}} (-1)^{|p|} \prod_{J \in p} V_J(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty) \right]} \exp \{V(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty) - V(\mathbf{y}_{0:k})\} \quad (26)$$

where $(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}$ and with $\mathbf{y}_{0:k}$ as defined in expression (23).

Inverted max-stable: Lastly, the final class of transition kernels is based on the class of inverted max-stable distributions (Ledford & Tawn 1997, Papastathopoulos & Tawn 2016). The specification of this distribution is most elegantly expressed in terms of its $(k+1)$ -dimensional survivor function. In exponential margins, this is expressed as

$$\bar{F}(\mathbf{x}_{0:k}) = \exp(-V(1/\mathbf{x}_{0:k})), \quad (27)$$

where V denotes an exponent measure as defined by expression (24). To ensure stationarity, V is assumed to satisfy conditions (25). This distribution gives the transition probability kernel

$$\pi^{\text{inv}}(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}, x_k) = 1 - \pi_E[-\log\{1 - \exp(-\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1})\}, -\log\{1 - \exp(-1/x_k)\}], \quad (28)$$

where $(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}$ and π_E as given by equation (26).

5.3 Examples

We illustrate examples for a range of k th order Markov processes and show how they all fit with the theory developed. Central to all examples is the weak convergence of the renormalized initial distribution and the renormalized transition probability kernel. Under suitable regularity conditions, this permits the complete characterisation of the hidden tail chain. Our proofs for the weak convergence of each transition probability kernel are presented in Appendices A.7–A.11 where we implement step by step the strategy we outlined in Section 5.1. The behaviour of each (hidden) tail chain is illustrated in Figure 1 using simulation, for specific examples of the classes of processes we cover.

Example 4 is an example of a Markov process not covered by the theory developed thus far which exhibits irregular behaviour; this new behaviour permits the possibility of sudden switches from extreme to non-extreme states and vice versa. In this setting, a novel form of normalization of the transition probability kernel is required which, together with the associated hidden tail chain, carries information about the mechanism that governs the sudden transitions. Although the development of general theory for this type of process is beyond the scope of this paper, for our example we derive the hidden tail chain and illustrate its behaviour in Figure 2. We only mention in passing that for this example, the strategy that is implemented is similar to the strategy presented in Section 5.1.

Example 1 (*Stationary Gaussian autoregressive process—positive dependence*). Heffernan & Tawn (2004, Section 8.6) showed that Assumption A_1 holds with norming functions $a_i(v) = \rho_i^2 v$, $b_i(v) = v^{1/2}$, that is, $\alpha_i = \rho_i^2$

and $\beta_i = 1/2$, for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ and initial limiting distribution $G(\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1}) = \Phi_k(\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1}; \Sigma_0)$, $\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$, where $\Phi_k(\cdot; \Sigma_0)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of the k -dimensional multivariate normal distribution with mean vector zero and covariance matrix $\Sigma_0 = (2\rho_i \rho_j (\rho_{|j-i|} - \rho_i \rho_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq k-1}$. Appendix A.7 shows Assumption A_2 holds with norming functionals

$$a(\mathbf{u}) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i u_i^{1/2} \right)^2, \quad b(\mathbf{u}) = a(\mathbf{u})^{1/2}, \quad \mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_+^k, \quad (29)$$

where $\phi_i = -q_{k-i,k}/q_{kk}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ denote the first k partial autocorrelation coefficients of the stationary Gaussian process (on Gaussian margins), and the transition probability kernel of the renormalized Markov chain converges weakly to the distribution

$$K(x) = \Phi \left\{ (q_{kk}/2)^{1/2} x \right\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (30)$$

Corollary 2 asserts that a suitable location normalization after $t \geq k$ steps has $\alpha_t = a(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{t-k:t-1}) = \rho_t^2$ and $\beta_t = 1/2$, with $\rho_t = \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i \rho_{t-i}$, for $t \geq k$. This leads to the scaled autoregressive tail chain

$$Z_t = \rho_t \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\phi_i}{\rho_{t-i}} Z_{t-i} + \rho_t \varepsilon_t \quad t \geq k, \quad (31)$$

and $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t=k}^\infty$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with distribution K given by expression (30).

The hidden tail chain is a non-stationary k th order autoregressive Gaussian process with zero mean and autocovariance function $\text{cov}(Z_{t-s}, Z_t) = (2\rho_{t-s} \rho_t (\rho_s - \rho_{t-s} \rho_t))$ when $t \neq s$. The variance of the process satisfies $\text{var}(Z_t) = \mathcal{O}(\rho_t^2)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, hence showing that the process degenerates to 0 in the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This long-term degenerative behaviour is shown for a special case of this hidden tail chain in panel (a) of Figure 1.

Remark 5. The location functional a in expression (29) can be written in form (15) with $c = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{2/3} \right)^3$ and $\gamma_i = \phi_i^{2/3} / \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i^{2/3}$.

Example 2 (Inverted max-stable copula with logistic dependence). Consider a stationary k th order Markov chain with a $(k+1)$ -dimensional survivor function (27) and exponent measure of logistic type given by

$$V(\mathbf{y}_{0:k}) = \|\mathbf{y}_{0:k}\|^{-1/\alpha} \quad \mathbf{y}_{0:k} \in \mathbb{R}_+^d, \quad (32)$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Heffernan & Tawn (2004, Section 8.5) showed that Assumption B_1 holds with $b_i(v) = v^{1-\alpha}$, that is, $\beta_i = 1 - \alpha$ for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, and limiting initial distribution $G(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \{1 - \exp(-\alpha z_i^{1/\alpha})\}$, $\mathbf{z} \in (0, \infty)^{k-1}$. Appendix A.8 shows that Assumption B_2 holds with normalizing functionals

$$a(\mathbf{u}) = 0, \quad b(\mathbf{u}) = \|\mathbf{u}\|^{1/\alpha} \alpha^{(1-\alpha)}, \quad \mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_+^k, \quad (33)$$

and the transition probability kernel of the renormalized Markov chain converges weakly to the distribution

$$K(x) = 1 - \exp(-\alpha x^{1/\alpha}), \quad x \in (0, \infty),$$

as $u \rightarrow \infty$. Corollary 3 asserts that a suitable normalization after $t \geq k$ steps is $a_t(v) = 0$, $\log b_t(v) = ((1-\alpha)^{1+\lfloor (t-1)/k \rfloor}) \log v$, which leads to the scaled random walk hidden tail chain

$$Z_t = \begin{cases} \|(Z_{t-k}, \mathbf{0}_{k-1})\|^{1/\alpha} \alpha^{(1-\alpha)} \varepsilon_t & \text{when } \text{mod}_k(t) = 0 \\ \|\mathbf{Z}_{t-k:t-1}^{1/\alpha}\| \alpha^{(1-\alpha)} \varepsilon_t & \text{when } \text{mod}_k(t) = 1 \\ \|\mathbf{Z}_{t-k:t-j}^{1/\alpha}, \mathbf{0}_{j-1}\| \alpha^{(1-\alpha)} \varepsilon_t & \text{when } \text{mod}_k(t) = j \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}, \end{cases}$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t=k}^\infty$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with distribution K .

This hidden tail chain is a non-stationary process, specifically, after a logarithmic transformation, it is a non-stationary non-linear k th order autoregressive process. The first element of the process is $Z_0 = 1$ a.s., the next $k-1$ elements of the process $\mathbf{Z}_{1:k-1}$ are i.i.d. positive random variables with distribution function $K(x)$, $x > 0$. Subsequent elements Z_t , for $t \geq k$, have distributions that vary both in mean and variance. We see that for b given by expression (33) and any $\mathbf{x}_{1:k} \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$, then $b(\mathbf{x}_{1:k}) > b(\mathbf{x}_{2:k}, 0) > \dots > b(x_k, \mathbf{0}_{k-1})$. This leads to oscillating behaviour which is shown for a special case of this hidden tail chain in panel (b) of Figure 1. In particular, the mean and variance of the hidden tail chain both can be seen to decrease in a segment of k consecutive time points $(s, s+1, \dots, s+k-1)$ for any $s > k$ such that $\text{mod}_k(s) = 1$.

Example 3 (*Multivariate extreme value copula—all mass on interior of simplex*). [Heffernan & Tawn \(2004, Section 8.4\)](#) showed that if the spectral measure H in expression (24) places no mass on the boundary of \mathbf{S}_k , then Assumption A_1 holds for distribution (23) with norming functions $a_i(v) = v$, $b_i(v) = 1$, for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ and limiting distribution

$$G(\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1}) = -V_0[\exp\{(0, \mathbf{z}_{1:k-1})\}, \infty], \quad \mathbf{z}_{1:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1}. \quad (34)$$

Appendix A.9 shows that for any functional a satisfying condition (11), a slightly weaker form of Assumption A_2 holds (remembering here that $b \equiv 1$), in the sense that the limit distribution K , which is given here by

$$K(x; \mathbf{z}_{1:k-1}) = \frac{V_{0:k-1}[\exp(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}), \exp(a(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}) + x)]}{V_{0:k-1}[\exp(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}), \infty]}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (35)$$

depends on $\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$. Without additional assumptions, it is impossible to elicit additional information about a or the distribution K in expression (35). However, because both $V_{0:k-1}(\cdot, \infty)$ and $V_{0:k-1}(\cdot)$ are $-(k+1)$ -homogeneous functions, the map

$$\mathbb{R}_+^{k+1} \ni \mathbf{y}_{0:k} \mapsto V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, y_k) / V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \quad (36)$$

is 0-homogeneous and this latter property restricts the possible forms the transition kernel $V_{0:k-1} : \mathbb{R}_+^k \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ can take. One such simple form which is seen to hold for a wide variety of parametric models for the exponent measure is given by Property K_1 below.

Property K_1 . *There exists a continuous function $a_P : \mathbb{R}_+^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which is 1-homogeneous, and a non-degenerate distribution function K_P on \mathbb{R}_+ , such that,*

- (i) $K_P^{\leftarrow}(p^*) = 1$ for some $p^* \in (0, 1)$, where $K_P^{\leftarrow}(p) = \inf \{x \in \mathbb{R} : K_P(x) > p\}$;
- (ii) $V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, y_k) = V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty) K_P\{y_k / a_P(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1})\}$, for all $\mathbf{y}_{0:k} \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$.

Under Property K_1 , some additional information about the location functional a and the limit distribution K can be given. Proposition 3 gives a simple method for below.

Proposition 3. *Suppose that for a max-stable distribution with exponent measure V , Property K_1 holds. Let $a(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}) = \log[a_P\{\exp(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1})\}]$, $\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and assume there exists a right-inverse $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^k \ni (q, \mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}) \mapsto V_{0:k-1}^{\leftarrow}(q; \mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $V_{0:k-1}\{\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, V_{0:k-1}^{\leftarrow}(q; \mathbf{y}_{0:k-1})\} = q$ for all q and $\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}$ in the domain of $V_{0:k-1}^{\leftarrow}$. Then*

- (i) a satisfies property (11) and for all $\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^k$,

$$a(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}) = \log V_{0:k-1}^{\leftarrow}\{p^* V_{0:k-1}(e^{\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}}, \infty); e^{\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}}\}. \quad (37)$$

- (ii) Assumption A_2 holds with normalizing functionals a and $b \equiv 1$, and $K(x) = K_P(e^x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

- (iii) For all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$K(x) = \frac{V_{0:k-1}\{\exp(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}^*), \exp(x)\}}{V_{0:k-1}\{\exp(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}^*), \infty\}},$$

where $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}^*$ satisfies $a_P(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}^*) = 1$.

In what follows we treat two important special cases for the distribution (23). These special cases are the multivariate extreme value distribution with logistic dependence ([Beirlant et al. 2004](#)) and Hüsler–Reiss dependence ([Huser & Davison 2013](#)), which we cover below.

Logistic dependence: The exponent measure of the $(k+1)$ -dimensional max-stable distribution with logistic dependence is given in expression (32) where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ controls the strength of dependence, with stronger dependence as α decreases. The case $\alpha = 1$ is excluded as that corresponds to independence. The initial limiting distribution (34) is $G(\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1}) = \{1 + \|\exp(-\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1}/\alpha)\|\}^{\alpha-1}$, $\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$. Appendix A.10 shows that Assumption A_2 holds with normalizing functionals

$$a(\mathbf{u}) = -\alpha \log(\|\exp(-\mathbf{u}/\alpha)\|), \quad b(\mathbf{u}) = 1, \quad \mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_+^k,$$

and the transition probability kernel of the renormalized Markov chain converges weakly to the distribution

$$K(x) = \{1 + \exp(-x/\alpha)\}^{\alpha-k} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Corollary 1 asserts that a suitable normalization after $t \geq k$ steps is $a_t(v) = v$, $b_t(v) = 1$, which leads to the tail chain

$$Z_t = -\alpha \log \|\exp(-\mathbf{Z}_{t-k:t-1}/\alpha)\| + \varepsilon_t, \quad t = k, k+1, \dots, \quad (38)$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t=k}^\infty$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with distribution K . Note that the tail chain can also be expressed as

$$Z_t = Z_{t-k} - \alpha \log \|\exp\{-(0, Z_{t-k}\mathbf{1}_{k-1} - \mathbf{Z}_{t-k+1:t-1})/\alpha\}\| + \varepsilon_t, \quad t = k, k+1, \dots$$

Here the hidden tail chain is identical to the tail chain as $a_t(x) = x$ and $b_t(x) = 1$ for all $t = 1, 2, \dots$. When $k = 1$, the tail chain can be seen to reduce to the random walk results of Smith (1992) and Perfekt (1994), but when $k > 1$, the tail chain behaves like a random walk with an additional factor which depends in a non-linear way on the ‘‘profile’’ $Z_{t-k}\mathbf{1}_{k-1} - \mathbf{Z}_{t-k+1:t-1}$, of the $k - 1$ previous values.

Hüsler–Reiss dependence: The exponent measure of the $(k + 1)$ -dimensional max-stable distribution with Hüsler–Reiss dependence is

$$V(\mathbf{y}_{0:k}) = \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{1}{y_i} \Phi_k \left[\{\log(y_j/y_i) + \sigma^2 - \sigma_{ij}\}_{j \neq i}; \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)} \right], \quad \mathbf{y}_{0:k} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{k+1}$$

where $\Phi_k(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)})$ denotes the multivariate normal distribution function with mean zero and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(i)} = \mathbf{T}_i \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{T}_i^\top$, for $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = (\sigma_{ij})_{i,j=0}^k$ a positive definite Toeplitz covariance matrix with common diagonal elements $\sigma_{ii} = \sigma^2$. Here \mathbf{T}_i is a $k \times (k + 1)$ matrix with the $(i + 1)$ th column having -1 for each entry and the other columns being the k standard orthonormal basis vectors of \mathbb{R}^k , that is,

$$\mathbf{T}_i = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 0, \dots, k.$$

The matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ controls the strength of dependence, with larger values for σ_{ij} indicating stronger dependence between the associated elements of the random vector. The initial limiting distribution (34) is $G(\mathbf{x}) = \Phi_{k-1}[\mathbf{x} - \{-\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(0)})/2\}; \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(0)}]$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$. Appendix A.11 shows Assumption A_2 holds with normalizing functionals

$$a(\mathbf{u}) = -\tau \mathbf{K}_{01}^\top \mathbf{C} \mathbf{K}_{10} \cdot \mathbf{u}, \quad b(\mathbf{u}) = 1, \quad \mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$$

where the quantities $\tau, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{K}_{10}$ and \mathbf{K}_{01} are defined in Appendix A.11. The transition probability kernel of the renormalized Markov chain converges weakly to the distribution

$$K(x) = \Phi\{(x/\tau) + (\mathbf{K}_{01}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{k+1}^\top)/(\mathbf{1}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{q})\} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Corollary 1 asserts that a suitable normalization after $t \geq k$ steps is $a_t(v) = v$, $b_t(v) = 1$, which leads to the hidden tail chain (identical to the tail chain) of

$$Z_t = -\tau \mathbf{K}_{01}^\top \mathbf{C} \mathbf{K}_{10} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_{t-k:t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \quad t = k, k+1, \dots,$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t=k}^\infty$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with distribution K . Note that the tail chain can also be expressed as

$$Z_t = Z_{t-k} + \tau \mathbf{K}_{01}^\top \mathbf{C} \mathbf{K}_{10} \cdot (0, Z_{t-k}\mathbf{1}_{k-1} - \mathbf{Z}_{t-k+1:t-1}) + \varepsilon_t, \quad t = k, k+1, \dots,$$

which shows, similarly with the logistic copula, that the tail chain behaves like a random walk with an additional factor which depends linearly on the ‘‘profile’’ $Z_{t-k}\mathbf{1}_{k-1} - \mathbf{Z}_{t-k+1:t-1}$, of the $k - 1$ previous values, so differs from the previous example in this respect.

Panels (c) and (d) in Figure 1 show an almost linear behaviour for two special cases of the tail chains presented. Although the copulae used to derive both tail chains have the same extremal coefficient (see Schlather & Tawn 2003), ensuring that the core level of extremal dependence is common in both, the decay rate of the two processes is markedly different. This shows that the type of drift function and distribution for the innovation term ε_t might impact upon the characteristics of transitioning from an extreme state to the main body of the process.

Example 4 (Multivariate extreme value copula with asymmetric logistic structure (Tawn 1990)). This is a




Figure 1: Properties for each hidden tail chain for Examples 1–3. Presented for each chain are: pointwise 2.5% and 97% quantiles of the sampling distribution (shaded region), mean of the sampling distribution (dashed line) and one realization from the (hidden) tail chain (solid line). The copula of $\mathbf{X}_{0:k}$ used to derive the (hidden) tail chain comes from: (a) standard multivariate Gaussian copula with Toeplitz positive-definite covariance matrix Σ generated by the vector $(1, 0.70, 0.57, 0.47, 0.39, 0.33)$, (b): inverted logistic with $\alpha = \log(\mathbf{1}_{k+1}^\top \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{k+1}) / \log k = 0.27$, (c) logistic copula with $\alpha = 0.32$. The value of the function $\text{mod}_k(t)$ is also highlighted on the mean function of the time series with numbers ranging from 0 to 4 for all t . (d): Hüsler–Reiss copula with Toeplitz positive-definite covariance matrix generated by the vector $(1, 0.9, 0.7, 0.5, 0.3, 0.1)$. The parameters for all copulas are chosen such that the coefficient of residual tail dependence η (Ledford & Tawn 1997) and the extremal coefficient θ (Beirlant et al. 2004) are equal for the copulas in panels (a) and (b), and (c) and (d), respectively.

second-order Markov process for which Assumptions A_1 and A_2 fail to hold and it has more complicated structure than we have covered so far where weak convergence on \mathbb{R}^k was studied. In this example, the weak convergences in Assumptions A_1 and A_2 no longer hold on \mathbb{R}^{k-1} and \mathbb{R} (cf. Remark 1), but on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^{k-1}$ and $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$, respectively. The example is a special case of a stationary Markov chain with transition probability kernel (26) and exponent measure given by

$$\begin{aligned} V(x_0, x_1, x_2) &= \theta_0 x_0^{-1} + \theta_1 x_1^{-1} + \theta_2 x_2^{-1} + \\ &+ \theta_{01} \left\{ \left(x_0^{-1/\nu_{01}} + x_1^{-1/\nu_{01}} \right)^{\nu_{01}} + \left(x_1^{-1/\nu_{01}} + x_2^{-1/\nu_{01}} \right)^{\nu_{01}} \right\} + \\ &+ \theta_{01} \left(x_0^{-1/\nu_{02}} + x_2^{-1/\nu_{02}} \right)^{\nu_{02}} + \theta_{012} \left(x_0^{-1/\nu_{012}} + x_1^{-1/\nu_{012}} + x_2^{-1/\nu_{012}} \right)^{1/\nu_{012}}, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where $\nu_A \in (0, 1)$ for any $A \in 2^{\{0,1,2\}} \setminus \emptyset$, and

$$\theta_0 + \theta_{01} + \theta_{02} + \theta_{012} = 1, \quad \theta_1 + 2\theta_{01} + \theta_{012} = 1, \quad \theta_2 + \theta_{01} + \theta_{02} + \theta_{012} = 1$$

with $\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_{01}, \theta_{02}, \theta_{012} > 0$.

The initial distribution of the Markov process is $F_{01}(x_0, x_1) = F_{012}(x_0, x_1, \infty) = \exp\{-V(y_0, y_1, \infty)\}$, with (y_0, y_1) defined in expression (23). It can be seen that the transition probability kernel $\pi(x_0, x_1) = -y_0^2 V_0(y_0, y_1, \infty) \exp(y_0^{-1} - V(y_0, y_1, \infty))$ associated with the conditional distribution of $X_1 | X_0$, converges with two distinct normalizations, that is, $\pi(v, dx) \xrightarrow{w} K_0(dx)$ and $\pi(v, v+dx) \xrightarrow{w} K_1(dx)$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$, to the distributions $K_0 = (\theta_0 + \theta_{02}) F_E + (\theta_{01} + \theta_{012}) \delta_{+\infty}$, and $K_1 = (\theta_0 + \theta_{02}) \delta_{-\infty} + \theta_{01} G_{01} + \theta_{012} G_{012}$, respectively, where $F_E(x) = (1 - \exp(-x))_+$, $G_A(x) = (1 + \exp(-x/\nu_A))^{\nu_A-1}$ and δ_x is a point mass at $x \in [-\infty, \infty]$ (cf. Example 5 in Papastathopoulos et al. 2017). Distributions K_0 and K_1 have entire mass on $(0, \infty]$ and $[-\infty, \infty)$ respectively. In the first and second normalizations, mass of size $(1 - \theta_{01} - \theta_{012})$ escapes to $+\infty$ and mass of size $(\theta_0 + \theta_{02})$ escapes to $-\infty$, respectively. As explained by Papastathopoulos et al. (2017), the reason for this behaviour is that the separate normalizations are related to two different modes of the conditional distribution of $X_1 | X_0$. This phenomenon also manifests in the conditional distribution of $X_2 | \{X_0, X_1\}$, which is given by

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}_{0:1}, x_2) = \frac{(V_0 V_1 - V_{01})(\mathbf{y}_{0:2})}{(V_0 V_1 - V_{01})(\mathbf{y}_{0:1}, \infty)} \exp(V(\mathbf{y}_{0:1}, \infty) - V(\mathbf{y}_{0:2})),$$

where $g(f_1, f_2, f_3)(x) := g(f_1(x), f_2(x), f_3(x))$ for maps g and f_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$. Here the problem is more complex, with this transition probability kernel converging with $2(2^k - 1) = 6$ distinct normalizations. Letting

$$\begin{aligned} a_{11,1}(v_1, v_2) &= -\nu_{012} \log\{\exp(-v_1/\nu_{012}) + \exp(-v_2/\nu_{012})\} \\ a_{10,1}(v_1, v_2) &= v_1, a_{01,1}(v_1, v_2) = v_2 \\ a_{11,0}(v_1, v_2) &= a_{01,0}(v_1, v_2) = a_{10,0}(v_1, v_2) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

it can be shown that for $(x_0, x_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and as $v \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi((v+x_0, v+x_1), a_{11,1}(v+x_0, v+x_1) + dy) &\xrightarrow{w} K_{\{1,1\},\{1\}}(dy; x_0, x_1) \quad \text{on } [-\infty, \infty) \\ \pi((v+x_0, v+x_1), a_{11,0}(v+x_0, v+x_1) + dy) &\xrightarrow{w} K_{\{1,1\},\{0\}}(dy; x_0, x_1) \quad \text{on } (0, \infty] \\ \pi((v+x_0, x_1), a_{10,1}(v+x_0, x_1) + dy) &\xrightarrow{w} K_{\{1,0\},\{1\}}(dy; x_0, x_1) \quad \text{on } [-\infty, \infty), \\ \pi((v+x_0, x_1), a_{10,0}(v+x_0, x_1) + dy) &\xrightarrow{w} K_{\{1,0\},\{0\}}(dy; x_0, x_1) \quad \text{on } (0, \infty] \\ \pi((x_0, v+x_1), a_{01,1}(x_0, v+x_1) + dy) &\xrightarrow{w} K_{\{0,0\},\{1\}}(dy; x_0, x_1) \quad \text{on } [-\infty, \infty) \\ \pi((x_0, v+x_1), a_{01,0}(x_0, v+x_1) + dy) &\xrightarrow{w} K_{\{0,1\},\{0\}}(dy; x_0, x_1) \quad \text{on } (0, \infty] \end{aligned}$$

where the limiting measures are given by

$$K_{A,\{1\}} = m_A \delta_{-\infty} + (1 - m_A) G_{A,\{1\}} \quad \text{and} \quad K_{A,\{0\}} = m_A G_{A,\{0\}} + (1 - m_A) \delta_{\infty}, \quad A \in \{0, 1\}^2 \setminus \{0, 0\}$$

with

$$m_A(x_0, x_1) = \begin{cases} \left\{ 1 + (\kappa_{012}/\kappa_{01}) e^{\lambda(x_0+x_1)} W_{\nu_{01}-1}(e^{x_0}, e^{x_1}; \nu_{01}) / W_{\nu_{012}-1}(e^{x_0}, e^{x_1}; \nu_{012}) \right\}^{-1}, & A = \{1, 1\} \\ \theta_0 / (\theta_0 + \theta_{02}), & A = \{1, 0\} \\ \theta_1 / (\theta_1 + \theta_{01}), & A = \{0, 1\}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{\{1,1\},\{1\}}(y; x_0, x_1) &= W_2\{1, \exp(y); \nu_{012}\} \\
G_{\{1,1\},\{0\}}(y; x_0, x_1) &= F_E(y) \\
G_{\{1,0\},\{1\}}(y; x_0, x_1) &= W_1\{1, \exp(y); \nu_{02}\} \\
G_{\{1,0\},\{0\}}(y; x_0, x_1) &= [\theta_1 + \theta_{01}\{1 + W_1(1, T(y)/T(x_1); \nu_{01})\} + \theta_{012}W_1(1, T(y)/T(x_1); \nu_{012})]g_{10}(x, y) \\
G_{\{0,1\},\{1\}}(y; x_0, x_1) &= W_1\{1, \exp(y); \nu_{01}\} \\
G_{\{0,1\},\{0\}}(y; x_0, x_1) &= [\theta_0 + \theta_{01} + \theta_{02}W_1(1, T(y)/T(x_0); \nu_{02}) + \theta_{012}W_1(1, T(y)/T(x_0); \nu_{012})]g_{01}(x, y),
\end{aligned}$$

and the function T is defined in expression (23), $\kappa_A = \theta_A(\nu_A - 1)/\nu_A$, $W_p(x, y; \nu) = (x^{-1/\nu} + y^{-1/\nu})^{\nu-p}$, with $x, y > 0$, $p \in \mathbb{R}$, $\nu \in (0, 1)$, and

$$\log g_{10}(x, y) = V(\infty, T(x), \infty) - V(\infty, T(x), T(y)), \quad \text{and} \quad \log g_{01}(x, y) = V(T(x), \infty, \infty) - V(T(x), \infty, T(y)).$$

To help explain the necessity for requiring the normalizing functionals (40) to describe the evolution of an extreme episode after witnessing an extreme event in this 2nd order Markov process, it is useful to consider the behaviour of the spectral measure H , defined in equation (24), for the initial distribution F_{012} of this process. Here, the spectral measure H places mass of size $|A|\theta_A$ on each subspace $A \in \mathcal{P}([2])$ of \mathbf{S}_2 (Coles & Tawn 1991) which implies that different subsets of the variables (X_{t-2}, X_{t-1}, X_t) can take their largest values simultaneously, see for example Simpson et al. (2020). Hence, if the Markov process is in an extreme episode at time $t - 1$, $t \geq 3$, then it follows that there are four possibilities for the states (X_{t-2}, X_{t-1}) , that is, either the variables X_{t-2} and X_{t-1} are simultaneously extreme or just one of them is. Consequently, there are two possibilities for the state of the process at time t , that is, the variable X_t can be either extreme or not, and this is demonstrated by bimodality in the transition probability kernel under all four distinct possibilities for the states X_{t-2} and X_{t-1} . In total, this gives rise to 6 distinct possibilities which necessitate an ‘‘event specific’’ normalizing functional to guarantee the weak convergence of the transition probability kernel. This justifies the labelling of the functionals in expression (40) where the label (A, b) appearing in the subscript, with $A \in \{0, 1\}^2$ and $b \in \{0, 1\}$, indicates transitioning from one of four possible configurations (A) at times $t - 2$ and $t - 1$ into two possible configurations (b) at time t —with 1 indicating that the state is extreme and 0 otherwise. The case where the Markov process is in an extreme episode at time $t - 1$, for $t = 2$, is handled similarly noting now that X_0 is, by virtue of the conditioning, already extreme and hence there are two possibilities for X_0 and X_1 , that is, either X_1 is extreme or not. Although complex, these modes can be identified by any line determined by the loci of points $(\max(x_{t-2}, x_{t-1}), \zeta \max(x_{t-2}, x_{t-1}))$, where $x_{t-2}, x_{t-1} \in \mathbb{R}$, for some $\zeta \in (0, 1)$, in the distribution of $X_t \mid \max\{X_{t-2}, X_{t-1}\} > v$, see panels (b), (c) and (d) Figure 2, where v is taken equal to 9. This facilitates accounting for the identification of the normalizing functionals by introducing the stopping times, $T_0^X = 0$ a.s., and

$$T_j^X = \inf\{t \in (T_{j-1}^X, T^X] : X_t \leq \zeta \max(X_{t-2}, X_{t-1})\}, \quad j \geq 1,$$

where

$$T^X = \inf\{t \geq 2 : X_{t-1} \leq \zeta \max(X_{t-3}, X_{t-2}), X_t \leq \zeta \max(X_{t-2}, X_{t-1})\},$$

subject to the convention $X_{-s} = 0$ for $s \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, that is T_j^X , with $j \geq 1$, is the j th time that ζ multiplied by the maximum of the previous two states is not exceeded after time 0, and the termination time T^X is the first time after time 0 where two consecutive states did not exceed ζ times the maximum of their respective two previous states. Define

$$a_1(v) = \begin{cases} v & T_1^X > 1 \\ 0 & T_1^X = 1 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad b_t(v) = 1 \quad \text{for all } t \geq 1.$$




Figure 2: (a): time series plot showing a single realization from the 2nd order Markov chain with asymmetric logistic dependence (39) initialized from the distribution of $X_0 \mid X_0 > 9$. For this realization, there are three change-points T_1^X, T_2^X and T_3^X and are highlighted with a cross. (b): Scatterplot of states $\{(X_{t-1}, X_t) : X_{t-1} > 9\}$ drawn from 10^3 realisations of the Markov chain initialized from the distribution of $X_0 \mid X_0 > 9$. Points for which $X_{t-2} < 9$ and $X_{t-2} \geq 9$ are highlighted with grey crosses and black circles, respectively. (c): Scatterplot of consecutive states (X_{t-2}, X_t) . Points for which $X_{t-1} < 9$ and $X_{t-1} \geq 9$ are highlighted with grey crosses and black circles, respectively. (d): Scatterplot of states $\{(\max(X_{t-2}, X_{t-1}), X_t) : \max(X_{t-2}, X_{t-1}) > 9\}$ and line $X_t = c \max(X_{t-2}, X_{t-1})$ with $c = \frac{1}{2}$ superposed. (e): Histogram of termination time T^B obtained from 10^4 realizations from the hidden tail chain. The Monte Carlo estimate of the mean of the distribution is 8.42 and shown with a dashed vertical line. (f): pointwise 2.5% and 97% quantiles of the sampling distribution (shaded region), mean of the sampling distribution (dashed line) and one realization from the hidden tail chain (solid line), conditioned on $T^B = 8$. The value of the latent Bernoulli process B_t is highlighted with a cross when $B_t = 0$ and with a circle when $B_t = 1$. For all plots presented, $\theta_0 = \theta_1 = \theta_2 = \theta_{01} = \theta_{02} = 0.3$, $\theta_{012} = 0.1$, and $\nu_{01} = \nu_{02} = \nu_{012} = 0.5$.

Then for $t \in (T_{j-1}^X, T_j^X]$, letting

$$a_t(v_1, v_2) = \begin{cases} a_{11,1}(v_1, v_2) & \text{if } t \neq T_j^X, t-1 \neq T_{j-1}^X, t-2 \neq T_{j-1}^X \\ a_{11,0}(v_1, v_2) & \text{if } t = T_j^X, t-1 \neq T_{j-1}^X, t-2 \neq T_{j-1}^X \\ a_{10,1}(v_1, v_2) & \text{if } t \neq T_j^X, t-1 = T_{j-1}^X, t-2 \neq T_{j-1}^X \\ a_{10,0}(v_1, v_2) & \text{if } t = T_j^X, t-1 = T_{j-1}^X, t-2 \neq T_{j-1}^X \\ a_{01,1}(v_1, v_2) & \text{if } t \neq T_j^X, t-1 \neq T_{j-1}^X, t-2 = T_{j-1}^X \\ a_{01,0}(v_1, v_2) & \text{if } t = T_j^X, t-1 \neq T_{j-1}^X, t-2 = T_{j-1}^X \end{cases}$$

yields the hidden tail chain of this process. Specifically, let $\{B_t : t = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be a sequence of latent Bernoulli random variables. Define the hitting times $T_j^B = \inf\{T_{j-1}^B < t \leq T^B : B_t = 0\}$ with $T_0^B = 0$ a.s. and $T^B = \inf\{t \geq 2 : B_{t-1} = 0, B_t = 0\}$. Then the hidden tail chain process $\{Z_t\}$ together with the latent Bernoulli process $\{B_t\}$ form a second-order Markov process with initial distribution $(B_0, Z_0) = (1, 0)$ a.s., $B_1 \sim \text{Bern}(\theta_{01} + \theta_{02})$, and

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_1 \leq y \mid Z_0, \mathbf{B}_{0:1}) = \begin{cases} \theta_{01} G_{01}(y) + \theta_{012} G_{012}(y) & B_1 = 1 \\ F_E(y) & B_1 = 0. \end{cases}$$

The transition mechanism is given by

$$B_t \mid \mathbf{B}_{t-2:t-1}, \mathbf{Z}_{t-2:t-1}, \{t \leq T^B\} \sim \text{Bern}(m_{\{\mathbf{B}_{t-2:t-1}\}}(\mathbf{Z}_{t-2:t-1})),$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_t \leq z \mid \mathbf{B}_{t-2:t}, \mathbf{Z}_{t-2:t-1}, \{t \leq T^B\}) = G_{\{\mathbf{B}_{t-2:t-1}\}, \{B_t\}}(z - a_{\mathbf{B}_{t-2:t-1}, B_t}(\mathbf{Z}_{t-2:t-1})).$$

Panel (a) in Figure 2 illustrates a realization from a special case of this 2nd order Markov process. This realized path shows that after witnessing an extreme event at time $t = 0$ the process transitions to the body of the process at time $t = 1$ and then, has two extreme states at $t = 2$ and 3 and two non-extreme states at $t = 4$ and 5 . After two non-extreme values the process has permanently transitioned to its equilibrium, that is, for $t = 6, \dots$ in this realization. The sampling distribution of the average termination time T_B of the hidden tail chain is presented in panel (e) whereas the behaviour of hidden tail chain conditioned on it terminating after 8 steps, that is, $T_B = 8$, is shown in panel (f). This shows that whilst at an extreme state, the average value of Z_t is stable through time.

A Proofs

A.1 Preparatory results for Theorems 1 and 2

The proofs of Theorems 1 and 3 are based on Lemmas 1 and 2 below whose proofs are similar to Lemmas 4 and 5 in Papastathopoulos et al. (2017) and are omitted for brevity.

Lemma 1. Let $\{X_t : t = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be a homogeneous k -th order Markov chain satisfying Assumption A_2 . Then, for any $g \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$ and for each time step $t = k, k+1, \dots$, as $v \rightarrow \infty$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(y) \pi(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}), a_t(v) + b_t(v) dx) \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(\psi_t^a(\mathbf{z}) + \psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}) x) K(dx),$$

and the convergence holds uniformly on compact sets in the variable $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Lemma 2. Let $\{X_t : t = 0, 1, \dots\}$ be a homogeneous k -th order Markov chain satisfying Assumption B_2 . Then, for any $g \in C_b([0, \infty))$ and for each time step $t = k, k+1, \dots$, as $v \rightarrow \infty$

$$\int_{[0, \infty)} g(y) \pi(\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{x}), b_{t+1}(v) dy) \rightarrow \int_{[0, \infty)} g(\psi_t^b(\mathbf{x}) y) K(dy),$$

and the convergence holds uniformly on compact sets in the variable $\mathbf{x} \in [\delta_1, \infty) \times \dots \times [\delta_k, \infty)$ for any $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k) \in (0, \infty)^k$.

Lemma 3. [Slight variant of Kulik & Soulier (2015)] Let (E, d) be a complete locally compact separable metric space and μ_n be a sequence of probability measures which converges weakly to a probability measure μ on E as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

- (i) Let φ_n be a uniformly bounded sequence of measurable functions which converges uniformly on compact sets of E to a continuous function φ . Then φ is bounded on E and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\varphi_n) \rightarrow \mu(\varphi)$.
- (ii) Let F be a topological space. If $\varphi \in C_b(F \times E)$, then the sequence of functions $F \ni x \mapsto \int_E \varphi(x, y) \mu_n(dy) \in \mathbb{R}$ converges uniformly on compact sets of F to the (necessarily continuous) function $F \ni x \mapsto \int_E \varphi(x, y) \mu(dy) \in \mathbb{R}$.

A.2 Proofs of Theorems 1 and 2

Preliminaries. Let $a_0(v) \equiv v$ and $b_0(v) \equiv 1$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} v_u(z_0) &= u + \sigma(u)z_0, A_t(v, x) = a_t(v) + b_t(v)x, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{A}_{t-k:t-1}(v, \mathbf{z}_{t-k:t-1}) &= (A_{t-k}(v, x_{t-k}), \dots, A_{t-1}(v, x_{t-1})). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We note that in our notation, when $k = 1$, the initial distribution of the rescaled conditioned Markov chain is

$$\frac{F_0(v_u(dz_0))}{\bar{F}_0(u)} = \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{X_0 - u}{\sigma(u)} \in dz_0 \mid X_0 > u \right). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

whereas when $k > 1$, it equals to the product of the right hand side of equation (A.2) with

$$\pi_0(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{A}_{1:k-1}(v_u(z_0), d\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1})) := \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} \left\{ \frac{X_j - a_j(X_0)}{b_j(X_0)} \in dz_j \right\} \mid \frac{X_0 - u}{\sigma(u)} = z_0 \right).$$

For $j \in \{k, \dots, t\}$ with $t \geq k \geq 1$ the transition kernels of the rescaled Markov chain can be written as

$$\pi(\mathbf{A}_{j-k:j-1}(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{z}_{j-1,k}), A_j(v_u(z_0), dz_j)) = \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{X_j - a_j(X_0)}{b_j(X_0)} \in dz_j \mid \left\{ \frac{X_{j-i} - a_{j-i}(X_0)}{b_{j-i}(X_0)} = z_{j-i} \right\}_{i=1, \dots, k} \right).$$

Proof of Theorem 1. Consider, for $t \geq k \geq 1$, the measures

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_t^{(u)}(dz_0, \dots, dz_t) &= \prod_{j=k}^t \pi(\mathbf{A}_{j-k:j-1}(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{z}_{j-k:j-1}), A_j(v_u(z_0), dz_j)) \\ &\quad \times [\pi_0(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{A}_{1:k-1}(v_u(z_0), d\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1}))]^{1(k>1)} \frac{F_0(v_u(dz_0))}{\bar{F}_0(u)} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mu_t(dz_0, \dots, dz_t) = \prod_{j=k}^t K \left(\frac{dz_j - \psi_j^a(\mathbf{z}_{j-k:j-1})}{\psi_j^b(\mathbf{z}_{j-k:j-1})} \right) [G(dz_1 \times \dots \times dz_{k-1})]^{1(k>1)} H_0(dz_0),$$

on $[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^t$, where $1(k > 1)$ denotes the indicator function of $\{k > 1\}$. For $f \in C_b([0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^t)$, we may write

$$\mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\frac{X_0 - u}{\sigma(u)}, \frac{X_1 - a_1(X_0)}{b_1(X_0)}, \dots, \frac{X_t - a_t(X_0)}{b_t(X_0)} \right) \mid X_0 > u \right] = \int_{[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^t} f(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) \mu_t^{(u)}(dz_0, \dots, dz_t)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} [f(E_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_t)] = \int_{[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^t} f(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) \mu_t(dz_0, \dots, dz_t).$$

We need to show that $\mu_t^{(u)}$ converges weakly to μ_t . Let $g_0 \in C_b([0, \infty))$ and $g \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^k)$. The proof is by induction on t . For $t = k$ it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^k} g_0(z_0) g(z_1, \dots, z_k) \mu_k^{(u)}(dz_0, dz_1, \dots, dz_k) \\ &= \int_{[0, \infty)} g_0(z_0) \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} g(\mathbf{z}_{1:k}) \pi((v_u(z_0), \mathbf{A}_{1:k-1}(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{z}_{1:k-1})), A_k(v_u(z_0), dz_k)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \pi_0(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{A}_{1:k-1}(v_u(z_0), d\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1})) \right] \frac{F_0(v_u(dz_0))}{\bar{F}_0(u)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

converges to $\mathbb{E}(g_0(E_0)) \mathbb{E}(g(Z_1, \dots, Z_k))$.

By Assumptions A_1 and A_2 , the integrand in the term in square brackets in (A.3) converges pointwise to a limit and is dominated by $\sup\{g(\mathbf{z}) : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k\} \times \pi((v_u(z_0), \mathbf{A}_{1:k-1}(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{z}_{1:k-1})), A_k(v_u(z_0), dz_k))$. Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem yields that the term in square brackets of (A.3) is bounded and converges to $\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Z}_{1:k})]$ for $u \rightarrow \infty$ since $v_u(z_0) \rightarrow \infty$ as $u \rightarrow \infty$. The convergence holds uniformly in the variable $z_0 \in [0, \infty)$ since $\sigma(u) > 0$. Therefore Lemma 3 applies, which guarantees convergence of the entire term (A.3) to $\mathbb{E}(E_0) \mathbb{E}(g(\mathbf{Z}_{1:k}))$ due to Assumption A_0 .

Next, assume that the statement is true for some $t > k$. It suffices to show that for any $g_0 \in C_b([0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^t)$, $g \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^{t+1}} g_0(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) g(z_{t+1}) \mu_{t+1}^{(u)}(dz_0, dz_1, \dots, dz_{t+1}) \\ &= \int_{[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^t} g_0(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(z_{t+1}) \pi(\mathbf{A}_{t-k+1:t}(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t}), A_t(v_u(z_0), dz_{t+1})) \right] \\ & \quad \mu_t^{(u)}(dz_0, dz_1, \dots, dz_t) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

converges to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^{t+1}} g_0(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) g(z_{t+1}) \mu_{t+1}(dz_0, dz_1, \dots, dz_{t+1}) \\ &= \int_{[0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^t} g_0(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(z_{t+1}) K \left(\frac{dz_{t+1} - \psi_t^a(\mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t})}{\psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t})} \right) \right] \mu_t(dz_0, dz_1, \dots, dz_t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The term in square brackets of (A.4) is bounded, and by Lemma 1 and Assumptions A_1 and A_2 , it converges uniformly on compact sets in both variables $(z_0, \mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t}) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^k$ jointly, since $\sigma(u) > 0$. Hence the induction hypothesis and Lemma 3 imply the desired result. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Define

$$\mathbf{b}_{t-k:t-1}(v, \mathbf{x}_{t-k:t-1}) = (b_{t-k}(v) x_{t-k}, \dots, b_{t-1}(v) x_{t-1}).$$

Consider the measures

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_t^{(u)}(dz_0, \dots, dz_t) &= \prod_{j=k}^t \pi(\mathbf{b}_{j-k:j-1}(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{z}_{j-k:j-1}), b_j(v_u(z_0))) dz_j \\ & \quad [\pi_0(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{b}_{1:k-1}(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{z}_{1:k-1}))]^{1(k>1)} \frac{F_0(v_u(dz_0))}{\overline{F_0}(u)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

and

$$\mu_t(dz_0, \dots, dz_t) = \prod_{j=k}^t K \left(\frac{dz_j}{\psi_j^b(\mathbf{z}_{j-k:j-1})} \right) [G(dz_1, \dots, dz_{k-1})]^{1(k>1)} H_0(dz_0), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

on $[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^t$. We may write

$$\mathbb{E} \left[f \left(\frac{X_0 - u}{\sigma(u)}, \frac{X_1}{b_1(X_0)}, \dots, \frac{X_t}{b_t(X_0)} \right) \middle| X_0 > u \right] = \int_{[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^t} f(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) \mu_t^{(u)}(dz_0, \dots, dz_t)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[f(E_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_t)] = \int_{[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^t} f(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) \mu_t(dz_0, \dots, dz_t)$$

for $f \in C_b([0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^t)$. Note that $b_j(0)$, $j = 1, \dots, t$ need not be defined in (A.6), since $v_u(z_0) \geq u > 0$ for $z_0 \geq 0$ and sufficiently large u , whereas (A.7) is well-defined, since the measures G and K put no mass at any half-plane $C_j = \{(\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1}) \in [0, \infty)^{k-1} : z_j = 0\} \in [0, \infty)^{k-1}$ and at $0 \in [0, \infty)$ respectively. Formally, we may set $\psi_j^b(\mathbf{0}) = 1$, $j = 1, \dots, t$ in order to emphasize that we consider measures on $[0, \infty)^{t+1}$, instead of $[0, \infty) \times (0, \infty)^t$.

To prove the theorem, we need to show that $\mu_t^{(u)}(dz_0, \dots, dz_t)$ converges weakly to $\mu_t(dz_0, \dots, dz_t)$. The proof is by induction on t . We show two statements by induction on t :

(I) $\mu_t^{(u)}(dz_0, \dots, dz_t)$ converges weakly to $\mu_t(dz_0, \dots, dz_t)$ as $u \uparrow \infty$.

(II) For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta_t > 0$ such that $\mu_t([0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^{t-1} \times [0, \delta_t]) < \varepsilon$.

We start proving the case $t = k$.

(I) for $t = k$: It suffices to show that for any $g_0 \in C_b([0, \infty))$ and $g \in C_b([0, \infty)^{k-1})$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^{k-1} \times [0, \infty)} g_0(z_0) g(\mathbf{z}_{1:k}) \mu_1^{(u)}(dz_0, \dots, dz_k) \\ &= \int_{[0, \infty)} g_0(z_0) \left[\int_{[0, \infty)^{k-1}} \int_{[0, \infty)} g(z_1, \dots, z_k) \pi((v_u(z_0), \mathbf{b}_{0:k-1}(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})), b_k(v_u(z_0))) dz_k \right] \\ & \quad \pi_0(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{b}_{1:k-1}(v_u(z_0), d\mathbf{z}_{1:k-1})) \frac{F_0(v_u(dz_0))}{\overline{F_0(u)}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

converges to

$$\int_{[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^k} g_0(z_0) g(\mathbf{z}_{1:k}) \mu_1(dz_0, \dots, dz_k) = \mathbb{E}(g_0(E_0)) \mathbb{E}(g(Z_1, \dots, Z_k)).$$

By Assumptions A_0 and B_2 , the integrand in the term in square brackets converges pointwise to a limit and is dominated by

$$\sup\{g(\mathbf{z}) : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^k\} \times \pi((v_u(z_0), \mathbf{b}_{1:k-1}(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{z}_{1:k-1})), b_k(v_u(z_0))) dz_k).$$

Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem yields that the term in square brackets of (A.8) is bounded and converges to $\mathbb{E}(g(\mathbf{Z}_{1:k}))$ for $u \uparrow \infty$, since $v_u(z_0) \rightarrow \infty$ for $u \uparrow \infty$. The convergence is uniform in the variable z_0 , since $\sigma(u) > 0$. Therefore, Lemma 3 (i) applies, which guarantees convergence of the entire term (A.8) to $\mathbb{E}(g_0(E_0)) \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Z}_{1:k})]$ due to Assumption A_0 .

(II) for $t = k$: Since $K(\{0\}) = 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $K([0, \delta]) < \varepsilon$, which immediately entails $\mu_k([0, \infty)^k \times [0, \delta]) = H_0([0, \infty)) [G([0, \infty)^{k-1})]^{1(k>1)} K([0, \delta]) < \varepsilon$.

Now, let us assume that both statements ((I) and (II)) are proved for some $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

(I) for $t + 1$: It suffices to show that for any $g_0 \in C_b([0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^t)$, $g \in C_b([0, \infty))$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^{t+1}} g_0(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) g(z_{t+1}) \mu_{t+1}^{(u)}(dz_0, dz_1, \dots, dz_t, dz_{t+1}) \\ &= \int_{[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^t} g_0(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) \left[\int_{[0, \infty)} g(z_{t+1}) \pi(\mathbf{b}_{t-k+1:t}(v_u(z_0), \mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t}), b_{t+1}(v_u(z_0))) dz_{t+1} \right] \\ & \quad \mu_t^{(u)}(dz_0, dz_1, \dots, dz_t) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

converges to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^{t+1}} g_0(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) g(z_{t+1}) \mu_{t+1}(dz_0, dz_1, \dots, dz_t, dz_{t+1}) \\ &= \int_{[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^t} g_0(\mathbf{z}_{0:t}) \left[\int_{[0, \infty)} g(z_{t+1}) K(dz_{t+1} / \psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t})) \right] \mu_t(dz_0, dz_1, \dots, dz_t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

From Lemma 2 and Assumptions B_1 and B_2 we know that, for any $\delta > 0$, the (bounded) term in the square brackets of (A.9) converges uniformly on compact sets in the variable $\mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t} \in \prod_{i=1}^k [\delta_i, \infty)$ to the continuous function

$$\int_{[0, \infty)} g(\psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t}) z_{t+1}) K(dz_{t+1})$$

(the term in the square brackets of (A.10)). This convergence holds even uniformly on compact sets in both variables $(z_0, \mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t}) \in [0, \infty) \times \prod_{i=1}^k [\delta_i, \infty)$ jointly, since $\sigma(u) > 0$. Hence, the induction hypothesis (I) and Lemma 3 (i) imply that for any $\delta > 0$ the integral in (A.9) converges to the integral in (A.10) if the integrals with respect to μ_t and $\mu_t^{(u)}$ were restricted to $A_\delta := [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^{t-1} \times [\delta, \infty)$ (instead of integration over $[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^{t-1} \times [0, \infty)$).

Since g_0 and g are bounded, it suffices to control the mass of μ_t and $\mu_t^{(u)}$ on the complement $A_\delta^c = [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^{t-1} \times [0, \delta)$. For some prescribed $\varepsilon > 0$ it is possible to find some sufficiently small $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently large u , such that $\mu_t(A_\delta^c) < \varepsilon$ and $\mu_t^{(u)}(A_\delta^c) < 2\varepsilon$. Because of the induction hypothesis (II), we have indeed $\mu_t(A_{\delta_t}) < \varepsilon$ for some $\delta_t > 0$. Choose $\delta = \delta_t/2$ and note that the sets of the form A_δ are nested. Let C_δ be a continuity set of μ_t with $A_\delta^c \subset C_\delta \subset A_{2\delta}^c$. Then the value of μ_t on all three sets $A_\delta^c, C_\delta, A_{2\delta}^c$ is smaller than ε and because of the induction hypothesis (I), the value $\mu_t^{(u)}(C_\delta)$ converges to $\mu_t(C_\delta) < \varepsilon$. Hence, for sufficiently large u , we also have $\mu_t^{(u)}(A_\delta^c) < \mu_t^{(u)}(C_\delta) < \mu_t(C_\delta) + \varepsilon < 2\varepsilon$, as desired.

(II) for $t + 1$: We have for any $\delta > 0$ and any $c > 0$

$$\mu_{t+1}([0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^t \times [0, \delta]) = \int_{[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^t} K([0, \delta/\psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t})]) \mu_t(dz_0, \dots, dz_t).$$

Splitting the integral according to $\{\psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t}) > c\}$ or $\{\psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}_{t-k+1:t}) \leq c\}$ yields

$$\mu_{t+1}([0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^t \times [0, \delta]) \leq K([0, \delta/c]) + \mu_t([0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^{t-1} \times (\psi_t^b)^{-1}([0, c])).$$

By Assumption B_2 (i) and the induction hypothesis (II) we may choose $c > 0$ sufficiently small, such that the second summand $\mu_t([0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)^{t-1} \times (\psi_t^b)^{-1}([0, c]))$ is smaller than $\varepsilon/2$. Secondly, since $K(\{0\}) = 0$, it is possible to choose $\delta_{t+1} = \delta > 0$ accordingly small, such that the first summand $K([0, \frac{\delta}{c}])$ is smaller than $\varepsilon/2$, which shows (II) for $t + 1$. \square

A.3 Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. We start by proving that (i) implies (ii). Suppose there exist a_t, b_t, ψ_t^a and ψ_t^b such that (i) holds. Then, for $t = k, k + 1, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v)) - a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))}{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))} &= \frac{a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v)) - a_t(v)}{b_t(v)} \frac{b_t(v)}{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))} - \frac{a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0})) - a_t(v)}{b_t(v)} \frac{b_t(v)}{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))} \\ &\rightarrow \frac{\psi_t^a(\mathbf{z})}{\psi_t^b(\mathbf{0})} - \frac{\psi_t^a(\mathbf{0})}{\psi_t^b(\mathbf{0})} = \frac{\psi_t^a(\mathbf{z}) - \psi_t^a(\mathbf{0})}{\psi_t^b(\mathbf{0})}, \quad \text{whenever } \mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z} \text{ as } v \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v))}{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))} = \frac{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v))}{b_t(v)} \frac{b_t(v)}{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))} \rightarrow \frac{\psi_t^b(\mathbf{z})}{\psi_t^b(\mathbf{0})}, \quad \text{whenever } \mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z} \text{ as } v \rightarrow \infty.$$

Next we prove (ii) implies (i). Let $a_t(v) = a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0})) - cb(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))$ and $b_t(v) = db(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))$ for arbitrary constants $c \in \mathbb{R}, d \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, for $t = k, k + 1, \dots$,

$$\frac{a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v)) - a_t(v)}{b_t(v)} = \frac{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))}{b_t(v)} \left[\frac{a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v)) - a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))}{b(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{0}))} + c \right] \rightarrow \frac{\lambda_t^a(\mathbf{z})}{d} [\lambda_t^a(\mathbf{z}) + c],$$

whenever $\mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$. Define $\psi_t^a(\mathbf{z}) = (\lambda_t^a(\mathbf{z}) + c)/d$ and $\psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}) = \lambda_t^b(\mathbf{z})/d$. By assumption, $\lambda_t^a(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ and $\lambda_t^b(\mathbf{0}) = 1$. Hence, $\lambda_t^a(\mathbf{z}) = [\psi_t^a(\mathbf{z}) - \psi_t^a(\mathbf{0})]/\psi_t^b(\mathbf{0})$ and $\lambda_t^b(\mathbf{z}) = \psi_t^b(\mathbf{z})/\psi_t^b(\mathbf{0})$, which completes the proof. \square

A.4 Proof of Corollaries

Proof of Corollary 1. Since a is continuous, we have that $a(v\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{z}_v) - v = a(\mathbf{z}_v) \rightarrow a(\mathbf{z})$, whenever $\mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Hence, convergence (3) holds true with $\psi_t^a(\mathbf{z}) = a(\mathbf{z})$ and $\psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}) = 1$.

For any $s \in \mathbb{N}$, [Asenova & Segers \(2022\)](#) show that under the assumptions of Corollary 2, the random vector $\mathbf{X}_P = \exp(\mathbf{X}_{0:s})$ is multivariate regularly varying, that is, for any $A \subset \mathbf{S}_s$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}_P}{\|\mathbf{X}_P\|} \in A, \|\mathbf{X}_P\| > vr \mid \|\mathbf{X}_P\| > v \right) \rightarrow H(A) r^{-1}, \quad r \geq 1,$$

where H is a Radon measure on \mathbf{S}_s satisfying $H(\mathbf{S}_s) = s + 1$ and $\int_{\mathbf{S}_s} w_j dH(\mathbf{w}_{0:s}) = 1$ for $j = 0, \dots, s$. Theorem

1 and Proposition 4 of [Heffernan & Resnick \(2007\)](#) imply that $Z_t \sim G_t$ where

$$G_t(z) = \int_0^{q(z)} (1-w)H_t(dw), \quad \text{with } q(z) = e^z/(1+e^z), \quad z \in \mathbb{R},$$

where H_t denotes the lag t bivariate spectral measure associated with H , that is, for every $t \geq 1$, H_t is a Radon measure on \mathbf{S}_1 that satisfies $H_t(\mathbf{S}_1) = 2$ and $\int_{\mathbf{S}_1} wdH_t(w) = 1$. Thus, we have that the expected value of Z_t satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Z_t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} z dG_t(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^z du dG_t(z) = - \int_{-\infty}^0 G_t(z) dz + \int_0^{\infty} [1 - G_t(z)] dz = \\ &= - \int_0^{1/2} \int_0^u (1-w) dH_t(w) d \log\{u/(1-u)\} + \int_{1/2}^1 \int_u^1 (1-w) dH_t(w) d \log\{u/(1-u)\} = \\ &= - \int_0^{1/2} \int_w^{1/2} [d \log\{u/(1-u)\}] (1-w) dH_t(w) + \int_{1/2}^1 \int_{1/2}^w [d \log\{u/(1-u)\}] (1-w) dH_t(w) = \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{S}_1} \log\{w/(1-w)\} (1-w) dH_t(w) < \log \left[\int_{\mathbf{S}_1} w dH_t(w) \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The strict inequality follows from Jensen's inequality, the strict concavity of the log function, and due to Corollary 2 which requires G_t to be a non-degenerate distribution. The latter ensures $H_t \neq 2\delta_{1/2}$, where δ_x denotes the Dirac measure at $\{x\}$. □

Proof of Corollary 2. It suffices to show that for $a_t(x) = \alpha_t x$ and $b_t(x) = x^\beta$, with α_t given by expression (12), then convergence (3) holds true with $\psi_t^a(\mathbf{z}) = \nabla a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1}) \cdot \mathbf{z}$ and $\psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}) = b(\alpha_{t-k:t-1})$, and that $\alpha_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Since a is twice continuously differentiable, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v^{-\beta}[a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1}v + v^\beta \mathbf{z}_v) - a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1}v)] &= \nabla a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1}v) \cdot \mathbf{z}_v + v^{2\beta-1} \mathbf{z}_v^\top \nabla \nabla^\top a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1}v) \mathbf{z}_v + O(v^{3(\beta-1)}) \\ &= \nabla a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1}) \cdot \mathbf{z}_v + v^{\beta-1} \mathbf{z}_v^\top \nabla \nabla^\top a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1}) \mathbf{z}_v + o(v^{\beta-1}), \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows because a is 1-homogeneous, which gives that $\nabla a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1}v) = \nabla a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1})$ and $\nabla \nabla^\top a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1}v) = v^{-1} \nabla \nabla^\top a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1})$. Similarly, because b is continuous and β -homogeneous with $\beta \in [0, 1)$, this gives $v^{-\beta}b(\alpha_{t-k:t-1}v + v^\beta \mathbf{z}_v) = b(\alpha_{t-k:t-1} + v^{\beta-1} \mathbf{z}_v) \rightarrow b(\alpha_{t-k:t-1})$, as $v \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, convergence (3) holds true with $\psi_t^a(\mathbf{z}) = \nabla a(\alpha_{t-k:t-1}) \cdot \mathbf{z}$ and $\psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}) = b(\alpha_{t-k:t-1})$.

Lastly, we show that $\alpha_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose there exists a fixed point $\mathbf{x}_{1:k}^*$ of f , that is, $\mathbf{x}_{1:k}^*$ satisfies $f(\mathbf{x}_{1:k}^*) = (\mathbf{x}_{2:k}^*, a(\mathbf{x}_{1:k}^*)) = \mathbf{x}_{1:k}^*$. Equating terms element-wise gives that $\mathbf{x}_{1:k}^* = x\mathbf{1}$ and $a(x\mathbf{1}) = x$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$. By assumption, a is continuous and 1-homogeneous. This gives that $a(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ and hence, $\mathbf{0}$ is a fixed point, that is $f(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$. By assumption, we also have $a(\mathbf{1}) \neq 1$ and therefore, $\mathbf{0}$ is the unique fixed point of f . Thus, $\mathbf{x}_{1:k}^*$ exists, is unique, and satisfies $\mathbf{x}_{1:k}^* = \mathbf{0}$. The condition $\rho(\mathbf{J}_f(\mathbf{0})) < 1$ ensures $\mathbf{x}_{1:k}^*$ is a stable and attracting fixed point in the Lyapunov sense. Because f is a homogeneous map, a simple adaptation of Theorem 17.1 of [Hahn \(1967\)](#) to the case of autonomous discrete dynamical systems gives that $\mathbf{x}_{1:k}^*$ is globally asymptotically stable. The latter implies that $f^t(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \mathbf{x}^*$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, where f^t , $t \geq 2$, denotes the t th functional power of f defined by $f^t = f \circ f^{t-1}$. Therefore $f^t(1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}) = (\alpha_t, \dots, \alpha_{t+k-1}) \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, which gives $\alpha_t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. □

Proof of Corollary 3. Let $\log \beta_t = \log \beta + \log(\max_{i=1, \dots, k} \beta_{t-i})$ and consider convergence (7). For $t = k$, we have

$$v^{-\beta}b(vz_0, v^\beta z_1, \dots, v^\beta z_{k-1}) = b(z_0, v^{\beta-1}z_1, \dots, v^{\beta-1}z_{k-1}) \rightarrow b(z_0, \mathbf{0}_{k-1}), \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow \infty.$$

For $t = k + 1$ we have

$$v^{-\beta^2}b(v^\beta z_0, v^\beta z_1, \dots, v^\beta z_{k-1}) = b(z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}).$$

and for $t = k + j$ with $j \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v^{-\beta^2}b(v^\beta z_0, \dots, v^\beta z_{k-j}, v^{\beta^2} z_{k-j+1}, \dots, v^{\beta^2} z_{k-1}) &= b(z_0, \dots, z_{k-j}, v^{\beta(\beta-1)} z_{k-j+1}, \dots, v^{\beta(\beta-1)} z_{k-1}) \\ &\rightarrow b(z_0, \dots, z_{k-j}, \mathbf{0}_{j-1}), \quad \text{as } v \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Iterating forwards for $t = 2k, 2k + 1, \dots$, we see that convergence (7) holds with

$$\psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}) = \begin{cases} b(z_0, \mathbf{0}_{k-1}) & \text{when } \text{mod}_k(t) = 0 \\ b(z_0, \dots, z_{k-1}) & \text{when } \text{mod}_k(t) = 1 \\ b(z_0, \dots, z_{k-j}, \mathbf{0}_{j-1}) & \text{when } \text{mod}_k(t) = j \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}, \end{cases}$$

which completes the proof. \square

A.5 Proof of Proposition 2

Proof of Proposition 2. The recurrence relation $\alpha_t = c [\sum_{i=1}^k \gamma_i (\gamma_i \alpha_{t-k+i-1})^\delta]^{1/\delta}$ can be converted to the order- k homogeneous linear recurrence relation $y_t = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i y_{t-k+i-1}$, where $\{y_t\} = \{\alpha_t^\delta\}$ and $c_i = c^\delta \gamma_i^{1+\delta}$. Solving the linear recurrence relation and transforming the solution to the original sequence $\{\alpha_t\}$ leads to the claim. \square

A.6 Proof of Proposition 3

Proof of Proposition 3. (i) Because a_P is 1-homogeneous, a satisfies property (11). By definition of the right-inverse $V_{0:k-1}^\leftarrow$ and due to Property K_1 , we have that, for all $(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, q)$ in the domain of $V_{0:k-1}^\leftarrow$,

$$V_{0:k-1} \{ \mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, V_{0:k-1}^\leftarrow(q; \mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}) \} = V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty) K_P \{ V_{0:k-1}^\leftarrow(q; \mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}) / a_P(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}) \} = q.$$

Hence, $V_{0:k-1}^\leftarrow(q; \mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}) = a_P(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}) K_P^\leftarrow \{ q / V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty) \}$. Taking logarithms, setting $\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1} = e^{\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}}$, and letting $q = p^* V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty)$ where p^* satisfies $K_P^\leftarrow(p^*) = 1$ gives

$$a(\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}) = \log V_{0:k-1}^\leftarrow(p^* V_{0:k-1}(e^{\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}}, \infty); e^{\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1}}) - \log K_P^\leftarrow(p^*).$$

(ii) Since a satisfies property (11), then Appendix A.9 shows that Assumption A_2 holds with limit distribution $K(x; \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})$ given by expression (35). Using Property K_1 , we further have that under the normalizing functionals a and b , expression (35) simplifies to $K(x; \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}) = K_P(e^x)$ for all $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

(iii) The limit distribution $K(x; \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})$ in expression (35) does not depend on $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$. Because a_P is positive, 1-homogeneous, and continuous, 1 is in the image of a_P and thus, 0 is in the image of a . Hence, there exists $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}^* \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $a(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}^*) = 0$ and $K_P(e^x) = K(x; \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}^*)$ which proves the claim. \square

A.7 Convergence of multivariate normal full conditional distribution

Let $\mathbf{X}_N = (X_{N,0}, \dots, X_{N,k}) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{k+1}, \Sigma)$ where $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{(k+1) \times (k+1)}$ is a positive definite correlation matrix with $(i+1, j+1)$ element ρ_{ij} , $i, j = 0, \dots, k$. Let $\mathbf{Q} = \Sigma^{-1}$ and write q_{ij} for its $(i+1, j+1)$ element, $i, j = 0, \dots, k$. For $k \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, the conditional distribution of $X_{N,k}$ given $\mathbf{X}_{N,0:k-1} = \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ is normal with mean $-q_{kk}^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} q_{ik} z_i$ and variance q_{kk}^{-1} . Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_0, \dots, X_k)$ with $X_i = -\log\{1 - \Phi(X_{N,i})\}$, so that $X_i \sim \text{Exp}(1)$ for $i = 0, \dots, k$. Following the strategy outlined in Section 5.1, we have that for any $t \geq k \geq 1$,

$$\Pr(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})) = \Phi \left[\frac{1}{q_{kk}^{1/2}} \left\{ \Phi_{t,v}^{-1} - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(-\frac{q_{ik}}{q_{kk}} \right) \Phi_{t-k+i,v}^{-1} \right\} \right], \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where, for $i = t-1, \dots, t-k$, $\Phi_{i,v}^{-1} := \Phi^\leftarrow [1 - \exp\{-A_i(v, z_i)\}]$ and $\Phi_{t,v}^{-1} := \Phi^\leftarrow \{1 - \exp(-[a\{\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}])\}$.

Now, let $t = k$. Firstly, we seek to find a function a such that the conditional probability in equation (A.11) converges to a number $p \in (0, 1)$. Suppose that this function satisfies $a(\mathbf{a}_{t-k:t-1}(v)) \rightarrow \infty$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$. Using standard asymptotic series for the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{i,v}^{-1} &= \{2 A_i(v, z_i)\}^{1/2} - \frac{\log A_i(v, z_i) + \log 4\pi}{2\{2 A_i(v, z_i)\}^{1/2}} + o(A_i(v, z_i)^{-1/2}), \quad i = t-k, \dots, t-1, \\ \Phi_{t,v}^{-1} &= \{2 a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}))\}^{1/2} - \frac{\log a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})) + \log 4\pi}{2\{2 a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}))\}^{1/2}} + o(a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}))^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

as $v \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore,

$$\Phi_{t,v}^{-1} - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(-\frac{q_{ik}}{q_{kk}} \right) \Phi_{t-k+i,v}^{-1} = (2 [a\{\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}])^{1/2} - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(-\frac{q_{ik}}{q_{kk}} \right) \{2 A_{t-k+i,v}(z_i)\}^{1/2} + o(1), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

as $v \rightarrow \infty$. Substituting in (A.11), we observe that for the choice of a being $a(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}) = \{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (-q_{ik}/q_{kk}) |y_i|^{1/2}\}^2$, for $\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^k$, the conditions set out in Section 5.1 are met. In particular, due to expression (A.12) converging to zero and since Φ is continuous, we have the conditional probability (A.11) converging to $p = 1/2$, that is

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \Phi \left[q_{kk}^{1/2} \left\{ \Phi_{t,v}^{-1} - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(-\frac{q_{ik}}{q_{kk}} \right) \Phi_{t-k+i,v}^{-1} \right\} \right] = 1/2.$$

Using similar asymptotic series, we have that for $b(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}) = a(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1})^{1/2}$ and any $x_k \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) + b(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) x_k \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}) \right) = \Phi \left\{ (q_{kk}/2)^{1/2} x_k \right\}. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

The convergence in (A.13) holds uniformly on compact sets in the variable $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ by continuous convergence (see Section 0.1 in Resnick 1987). That is, expression (A.13) holds true after replacing $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ by $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}(v)$ satisfying $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}(v) \rightarrow \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$ and since the limit function is continuous in $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ (constant function), the argument follows. Additionally, we have that for any $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{t-k:t-1} \in (0, 1]^k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} v^{-1/2} [a(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{t-k:t-1} v + v^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}) - a(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{t-k:t-1} v)] &= \nabla a(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{t-k:t-1}) \cdot \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1} \\ \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} v^{-1/2} b(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{t-k:t-1} v + v^{1/2} \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}) &= b(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{t-k:t-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where both convergences hold uniformly on compact sets in the variable $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ since monotone increasing functions (in every argument) are converging point-wise to a continuous limit. Thus, Assumption A_2 holds true for the special case $t = k$ with

$$\alpha_t(v) = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(-\frac{q_{ik}}{q_{kk}} \right) \rho_{t-k+i}^{1/2} \right\}^2 v \quad \text{and} \quad b_t(v) = v^{1/2}.$$

Finally, observe that the entire argument after expression (A.11) remains unchanged upon changing $t = k$ to $t + 1 = k + 1$. The claim is proved through iteration.

A.8 Convergence of multivariate inverted logistic full conditional distribution

The transition probability kernel of this process is given by expression (28) with $V(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}^{-1/\alpha}\|^\alpha$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{k+1}$. For $t \geq k \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$, we have that $\Pr(X_k/b(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) < 1 \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}))$ is equal to

$$\mathcal{L}[v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}] \exp \left\{ \|\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{x}_{0:k-1})^{1/\alpha}\|^\alpha - \|(\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}), b\{\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\})^{1/\alpha}\|^\alpha \right\}, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where $\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}) = (B_{t-k}(v, z_0), \dots, B_{t-1}(v, z_{k-1}))$ and $\mathcal{L}(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}) = 1 + o(1)$ for all $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$.

Now let $t = k$ and set $z_0 = 1$. Firstly, we seek to find a function b such that the conditional probability in equation (A.14) converges to a number $p \in (0, 1)$. Suppose that this function satisfies $b(\mathbf{b}_{0:k-1}(v)) \rightarrow \infty$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$ with $b(\mathbf{b}_{0:k-1}(v)) = o(v)$. Under this assumption, we have that as $v \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \bar{\pi}^{\text{inv}}[\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}), b\{\mathbf{B}(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}] &= \\ &= \|\{\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}^{1/\alpha}\|^\alpha - \|\{\{\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}^{1/\alpha}, \{b(\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}))\}^{1/\alpha}\}\|^\alpha + o(1) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=t-k}^{t-1} B_i(v, z_i)^{1/\alpha} + [b\{\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}]^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha - \left(\sum_{i=t-k}^{t-1} B_i(v, z_i)^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha + o(1) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=t-k}^{t-1} B_i(v, z_i)^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha \left(1 + \frac{[b\{\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}]^{1/\alpha}}{\sum_{i=t-k}^{t-1} B_i(v, z_i)^{1/\alpha}} \right)^\alpha - \left(\sum_{i=t-k}^{t-1} B_i(v, z_i)^{1/\alpha} \right)^\alpha + o(1) \\ &= \alpha \left(\sum_{i=t-k}^{t-1} B_i(v, z_i)^{1/\alpha} \right)^{-(1-\alpha)} [b\{\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}]^{1/\alpha} + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

This expression converges to a positive constant provided $b(\mathbf{B}(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})) = \mathcal{O}[\{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} B_t(v, z_i)^{1/\alpha}\}^{\alpha(1-\alpha)}]$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, choosing b equal to $b(\mathbf{y}) = \|\mathbf{y}^{1/\alpha}\|^{\alpha(1-\alpha)}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$, gives the conditional probability (A.14)

converging to $p = 1 - \exp(-\alpha)$, that is

$$\pi^{\text{inv}}[\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}), b\{\mathbf{B}(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}] \rightarrow 1 - \exp(-\alpha), \quad \alpha \in (0, 1),$$

and generally, we also have that for any $x_k \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \pi^{\text{inv}}(\mathbf{B}(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}), b(\mathbf{B}(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})) z_k) = 1 - \exp(-\alpha x_k^{1/\alpha}). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Lastly, we note that the convergence in (A.15) holds uniformly on compact sets in the variable $\mathbf{x}_{0:k-1} \in [\delta_1, \infty) \times \cdots \times [\delta_k, \infty)$ by continuous convergence (see Section 0.1 in Resnick 1987). That is, expression (A.15) holds true after replacing $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ by $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}(v)$ satisfying $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}(v) \rightarrow \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1} \in [\delta_1, \infty) \times \cdots \times [\delta_k, \infty)$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$ and since the limit function is continuous in $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ (constant function), the argument follows.

Let β_t satisfy the recurrence relation $\log \beta_t = \log(1 - \alpha) + \log(\max_{i=1, \dots, k} \beta_{t-i})$ subject to $\beta_i = 1 - \alpha$ for $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$. For all $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_k > 0$ and $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1} \in [\delta_1, \infty) \times \cdots \times [\delta_k, \infty)$,

$$v^{-\beta_t} b(\mathbf{B}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_v)) \rightarrow \psi_t^b(\mathbf{z}), \quad \text{whenever } \mathbf{z}_v \rightarrow \mathbf{z} \text{ as } v \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\psi_t^b > 0$ is continuous and has the same form as in Corollary 3. Thus, Assumption B_2 holds for the special case $t = k$ with $b_t(v) = v^{\beta_t}$.

Finally, observe that the entire argument after expression (A.14) remains unchanged upon changing $t = k$ to $t + 1 = k + 1$. The claim is proved through iteration.

A.9 Convergence of max-stable full conditional distribution - no mass on boundary

Suppose that $a(v\mathbf{1}_k) \rightarrow \infty$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$. Let Π_{k-1} denote the set of partitions of $[k-1] = \{0, \dots, k-1\}$. Then, for $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and with some rearrangement, $\Pr(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}))$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 + \sum_{p \in \Pi_{k-1} \setminus [k-1]} (-1)^{|p|} \{\prod_{J \in p} V_J(\mathbf{y}_{0:k})\} / V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k})}{1 + \sum_{p \in \Pi_{k-1} \setminus [k-1]} (-1)^{|p|} \{\prod_{J \in p} V_J(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty)\} / V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty)} \times \frac{V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k})}{V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty)} \\ & \times \exp\{V(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty) - V(\mathbf{y}_{0:k})\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where $\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1} = -1/\log[1 - \exp\{-\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}]$ and $\mathbf{y}_k = -1/\log[1 - \exp\{-a(\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}))\}]$. Since V_J is a $-(|J|+1)$ -homogeneous function (Coles & Tawn 1991), it follows that

$$\frac{\prod_{J \in p} V_J(\mathbf{y}_{0:k})}{V_{[k-1]}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k})} = \mathcal{O}(\exp\{(1 - |p|)v\}), \quad \frac{\prod_{J \in p} V_J(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty)}{V_{[k-1]}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty)} = \mathcal{O}(\exp\{(1 - |p|)v\}), \quad (\text{A.17})$$

as $v \rightarrow \infty$. Because $|p| \geq 2$ for any $p \in \Pi_{k-1} \setminus [k-1]$, it follows that the first fraction in expression (A.16) converges to unity as $v \rightarrow \infty$ whereas the homogeneity property of the exponent measure V also guarantees that the last term in expression (A.16) converges to unity since $V(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty) = \mathcal{O}\{\exp(-v)\}$ and $V(\mathbf{y}_{0:k}) = \mathcal{O}\{\exp(-v)\}$. This leads to

$$\Pr(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})) = \frac{V_{[0:k-1]}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \mathbf{y}_k)}{V_{[0:k-1]}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty)} (1 + o(1)), \quad (\text{A.18})$$

as $v \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, for any functional a satisfying property (11), we have

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \frac{V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \mathbf{y}_k)}{V_{0:k-1}(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}, \infty)} = \frac{V_{0:k-1}[\exp(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}), \exp\{a(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}]}{V_{0:k-1}[\exp\{\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}, \infty\}]}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Similarly, we see that for $x_k \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\Pr(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) + x_k \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}))$ converges to K given by expression (35). The convergence in (A.19) holds uniformly on compact sets in the variable $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ by continuous convergence (see Section 0.1 in Resnick 1987). That is, expression (A.19) holds true after replacing $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ by $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}(v)$ satisfying $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}(v) \rightarrow \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ as $v \rightarrow \infty$ and since the limit function is continuous in $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$, the argument follows.

A.10 Convergence of logistic full conditional distribution

Under Assumption A_2 , expression (A.18) implies that for all $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^k$,

$$\Pr(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})) = \left[1 + \frac{\exp\{-a(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1})/\alpha\}}{\|\exp(-\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}/\alpha)\|} \right]^{\alpha-k} (1 + o(1))$$

as $v \rightarrow \infty$, where $\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1} = -1/\log[1 - \exp\{-\mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})\}]$. Making the choice of a to be $a(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}) = -\alpha \log \{\|\exp(-\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}/\alpha)\|\}$ we see that

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_v(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})) = 2^{\alpha-k} \in (0, 1),$$

and more generally, for any $x_k \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) + x_k \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})) = \{1 + \exp(-x_k/\alpha)\}^{\alpha-k}.$$

The limit distribution does not depend on $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ since a satisfies property (11).

A.11 Convergence of Hüsler–Reiss full conditional distribution

Wadsworth & Tawn (2014, equation (15)) and expression (A.18) imply that for all $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^k$,

$$\Pr(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_v(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})) = \Phi[\tau^{-1}\{a(\mathbf{A}_v(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})) - \mu(\mathbf{A}_v(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}))\}] (1 + o(1))$$

as $v \rightarrow \infty$, where Φ denotes the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution and $\mu(\mathbf{y}_{0:k-1}) = -\tau(\mathbf{K}_{01}^\top \mathbf{C} \mathbf{K}_{10} \cdot \mathbf{y}_{0:k-1} + \mathbf{K}_{01}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{k+1}^\top / \mathbf{1}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{q})$ where $\tau^{-1} = \mathbf{K}_{01}^\top \mathbf{C} \mathbf{K}_{01}$, $\mathbf{C} = (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} - \mathbf{q} \mathbf{q}^\top / \mathbf{1}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{q})$ is a $(k+1) \times (k+1)$ matrix of rank k , $\mathbf{q} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{k+1}$, and

$$\mathbf{K}_{10} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k \\ \mathbf{0}_{1,k} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{K}_{01} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{k,1} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Making the choice of a to be $a(\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}) = -\tau \mathbf{K}_{01}^\top \mathbf{C} \mathbf{K}_{10} \cdot \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ we see that for any $x_k \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(X_k < a(\mathbf{X}_{0:k-1}) + x_k \mid \mathbf{X}_{0:k-1} = \mathbf{A}_t(v, \mathbf{z}_{0:k-1})) = \Phi[\{x_k + \tau(\mathbf{K}_{01}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{k+1}^\top / \mathbf{1}_{k+1}^\top \mathbf{q})\} / \tau].$$

The limit distribution does not depend on $\mathbf{z}_{0:k-1}$ since a satisfies property (11). The latter follows from the properties $\mathbf{K}_{10} \cdot \mathbf{1}_k = \mathbf{1}_{k+1} - \mathbf{K}_{01}$ and $\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{k+1} = \mathbf{0}_{k+1,1}$ which give $-\tau \mathbf{K}_{01}^\top \mathbf{C} \mathbf{K}_{10} \cdot \mathbf{1}_k = 1$.

References

- Asenova, S. & Segers, J. (2022), ‘Extremes of Markov random fields on block graphs: max-stable limits and structured Hüsler–Reiss distributions’, *arXiv:2112.04847*.
- Beirlant, J., Goegebeur, Y., Segers, J. & Teugels, J. (2004), *Statistics of Extremes, Theory and Applications*, Wiley.
- Coles, S. G., Heffernan, J. E. & Tawn, J. A. (1999), ‘Dependence measures for extreme value analyses’, *Extremes* **2**, 339–365.
- Coles, S. G. & Tawn, J. A. (1991), ‘Modelling extreme multivariate events’, *J. Roy. Statist. Soc., B* **53**, 377–392.
- Engelke, S. & Hitz, A. S. (2020), ‘Graphical models for extremes (with discussion)’, *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*.
- Engelke, S. & Ivanovs, J. (2021), ‘Sparse structures for multivariate extremes’, *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* **8**, 241–270.
- Hahn, W. (1967), *Stability of Motion*, Vol. 138, Springer.
- Heffernan, J. E. & Resnick, S. I. (2007), ‘Limit laws for random vectors with an extreme component’, *Ann. Appl. Prob.* **17**, 537–571.
- Heffernan, J. E. & Tawn, J. A. (2004), ‘A conditional approach for multivariate extreme values (with discussion)’, *J. Roy. Statist. Soc., B* **66**(3), 1–34.

- Huser, R. & Davison, A. C. (2013), ‘Composite likelihood estimation for the Brown–Resnick process’, *Biometrika* **100**(2), 511–518.
- Janßen, A. & Segers, J. (2014), ‘Markov tail chains’, *J. Appl. Probab.* **51**(4), 1133–1153.
- Joe, H. (2015), *Dependence Modeling with Copulas*, Vol. 134 of *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Keef, C., Papastathopoulos, I. & Tawn, J. A. (2013), ‘Estimation of the conditional distribution of a multivariate variable given that one of its components is large: additional constraints for the Heffernan and Tawn model’, *J. Mult. Anal* **115**, 396–404.
- Kulik, R. & Soulier, P. (2015), ‘Heavy tailed time series with extremal independence.’, *Extremes* **18**, 1–27.
- Leadbetter, M. R., Lindgren, G. & Rootzén, H. (1983), *Extremes and Related Properties of Random Sequences and Series*, Springer–Verlag, New York.
- Ledford, A. W. & Tawn, J. A. (1997), ‘Modelling dependence within joint tail regions’, *J. Roy. Statist. Soc., B* **59**, 475–499.
- Maulik, K., Resnick, S. & Rootzén, H. (2002), ‘Asymptotic independence and a network traffic model’, *Journal of Applied Probability* **39**(4), 671–699.
- O’Brien, G. L. (1987), ‘Extreme values for stationary and Markov sequences’, *Ann. Probab.* **15**(1), 281–291.
- Papastathopoulos, I., Strokorb, K., Tawn, J. A. & Butler, A. (2017), ‘Extreme events of Markov chains’, *Advances in Applied Probability* **49**, 134–161.
- Papastathopoulos, I. & Tawn, J. A. (2016), ‘Conditioned limit laws for inverted max-stable processes’, *J. Mult. Anal.* **150**, 214–228.
- Perfekt, R. (1994), ‘Extremal behaviour of stationary Markov chains with applications’, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **4**(2), 529–548.
- Perfekt, R. (1997), ‘Extreme value theory for a class of Markov chains with values in \mathbb{R}^d ’, *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **29**(1), 138–164.
- Pickands, J. (1975), ‘Statistical inference using extreme order statistics’, *Ann. Statist.* **3**, 119–131.
- Resnick, S. I. (1987), *Extreme Values, Regular Variation and Point Processes*, Springer–Verlag, New York.
- Resnick, S. I. & Zeber, D. (2013), ‘Asymptotics of Markov kernels and the tail chain’, *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **45**(1), 186–213.
- Rootzén, H. (1988), ‘Maxima and exceedances of stationary Markov chains’, *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **20**, 371–390.
- Schlather, M. & Tawn, J. A. (2003), ‘A dependence measure for multivariate and spatial extreme values: properties and inference’, *Biometrika* **90**, 139–156.
- Segers, J. (2020), ‘One-versus multi-component regular variation and extremes of Markov trees’, *Advances in Applied Probability* **52**(3), 855–878.
- Simpson, E. S., Wadsworth, J. L. & Tawn, J. A. (2020), ‘Determining the dependence structure of multivariate extremes’, *Biometrika* **107**, 513–532.
- Smith, R. L. (1992), ‘The extremal index for a Markov chain’, *J. Appl. Probab.* **29**(1), 37–45.
- Tawn, J. A. (1990), ‘Modelling multivariate extreme value distributions’, *Biometrika* **77**, 245–53.
- Wadsworth, J. L. & Tawn, J. A. (2014), ‘Efficient inference for spatial extreme value processes associated to log-Gaussian random functions’, *Biometrika* **101**(1), 1–15.
- Walker, G. (1931), ‘On periodicity in series of related terms’, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **131**(818), 518–532.
- Winter, H. C. & Tawn, J. A. (2015), ‘Modelling heatwaves in central france: a case-study in extremal dependence’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* **65**(3), 345–365.

- Winter, H. C. & Tawn, J. A. (2017), ' k th-order Markov extremal models for assessing heatwave risks', *Extremes* **20**(2), 393–415.
- Yule, G. U. (1927), 'On a method of investigating periodicities in disturbed series, with special reference to Wolfer's sunspot numbers', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **226**(636-646), 267–298.
- Yun, S. (1998), 'The extremal index of a higher-order stationary Markov chain', *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **8**(2), 408–437.