

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS TO “QUANTILED CONDITIONAL
VARIANCE, SKEWNESS, AND KURTOSIS BY CORNISH-FISHER
EXPANSION”

Appendix: Proofs.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By noting that

$$(A.1) \quad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}_t = \mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Z}' \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t}{n} \right),$$

the results follow from Assumptions 3.1–3.2 and the continuous mapping theorem. □

Proof of Theorem 3.2. By (A.1), Assumption 3.3, and Corollary 4.24 in [White \(2001\)](#),

$$(A.2) \quad (\mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{t,n} \mathbf{M}_n^{-1})^{-1/2} \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}_t) = (\mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \mathbf{V}_{t,n} \mathbf{M}_n^{-1})^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}_n^{-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{Z}' \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \\ \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \mathbf{I}) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Define a three-dimensional function $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}) = (g_1(\mathbf{x}), g_2(\mathbf{x}), g_3(\mathbf{x}))$ for $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$, where $g_1(\mathbf{x}) = x_2^2$, $g_2(\mathbf{x}) = 6x_3/x_2$, and $g_3(\mathbf{x}) = 24x_4/x_2 + 3$. By Taylor’s expansion and the fact that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}_t = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ from (A.2), we have

$$g_i(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t) = g_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t) + [\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} g_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)]' (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}_t) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$, where $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the gradient operator. Consequently, since $h_t = g_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)$, $s_t = g_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)$, $k_t = g_3(\boldsymbol{\theta}_t)$, $\widehat{h}_t = g_1(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t)$, $\widehat{s}_t = g_2(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t)$, and $\widehat{k}_t = g_3(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t)$, it follows that

$$(A.3) \quad \sqrt{n} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{h}_t - h_t \\ \widehat{s}_t - s_t \\ \widehat{k}_t - k_t \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{R}_t \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}_t) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right),$$

where

$$\mathbf{R}_t = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2\beta_{1t} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -6\beta_{2t}/\beta_{1t}^2 & 6/\beta_{2t} & 0 \\ 0 & -24\beta_{3t}/\beta_{1t}^2 & 0 & 24/\beta_{2t} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By (A.2)–(A.3), we know that \hat{h}_t , \hat{s}_t , and \hat{k}_t are \sqrt{n} -consistent, but they are not asymptotically normal since \mathbf{R}_t is a random rather than deterministic matrix. \square

Additional simulations on the selection of p^* . In Procedure 4.1, we use the CAViaR method to obtain the ECQs $\{\hat{Q}_t(\alpha_i)\}_{t=1}^T$, and then discard some of $\{\hat{Q}_t(\alpha_i)\}_{t=1}^T$ with p-values of DQ test less than $p^* = 0.1$. Below, we examine the performance of QCM method with respect to the choice of p^* .

Under the same simulation settings as before and the results of 100 replications, we plot the boxplots of $\Delta_{h,t}$, $\Delta_{s,t}$, and $\Delta_{k,t}$ for $t = 1, \dots, 10$ in Figs B1–B3 across four different choices of p^* (that is, $p^* = 0, 0.1, 0.3,$ and 0.5), where $\hat{Q}_t(\alpha_i)$ is mis-specified computed from the CAViaR method. From these three figures, we find that the performance of QCMs is robust to the choice of p^* , except that a larger p^* tends to deliver more outliers of $\Delta_{s,t}$ and $\Delta_{k,t}$. This exception is probably because a large value of p^* makes the value of n_0 become small and thus reduce the efficiency of the OLS estimator $\hat{\theta}_t$ and the QCMs.

Since the graphic difference of QCMs with respect to the choice of p^* in Figs B1–B3 is subtle, we further plot the mean values and standard deviations of $\Delta_{h,t}$, $\Delta_{s,t}$, and $\Delta_{k,t}$ for $t = 1, \dots, 10$ under four different values of p^* in Figs B4 and B5, respectively, based on the results of 100 replications. From Figs B4–B5, we find that although the estimation errors of QCMs generally have the smallest deviation when $p^* = 0$, they do not always have the smallest mean value under this choice of p^* . Therefore, to balance the mean and variance of QCM estimation errors, the choice of $p^* = 0.1$ seems desirable.

References.

White, H. (2001). *Asymptotic Theory for Econometricians, Revised edition*. San Diego: Academic Press.




Fig B1: The boxplots of $\Delta_{h,t}$, $\Delta_{s,t}$, and $\Delta_{k,t}$ for $t = 1, \dots, 10$ under four different choices of p^* , where the data are generated from the standard GARCH model in (5.1) with $\eta_t \sim N(0, 1)$, and $\hat{Q}_t(\alpha_i)$ are estimated via the CAViaR method.




Fig B2: The boxplots of $\Delta_{h,t}$, $\Delta_{s,t}$, and $\Delta_{k,t}$ for $t = 1, \dots, 10$ under four different choices of p^* , where the data are generated from the standard GARCH model in (5.1) with $\eta_t \sim ST_{\nu_t}$, and $\widehat{Q}_t(\alpha_i)$ are estimated via the CAViaR method.




Fig B3: The boxplots of $\Delta_{h,t}$, $\Delta_{s,t}$, and $\Delta_{k,t}$ for $t = 1, \dots, 10$ under four different choices of p^* , where the data are generated from the ARMA-MN-GARCH model in (5.4), and $\widehat{Q}_t(\alpha_i)$ are estimated via the CAViaR method.




Fig B4: The mean values of $\Delta_{h,t}$, $\Delta_{s,t}$, and $\Delta_{k,t}$ (denoted by $\bar{\Delta}_{h,t}$, $\bar{\Delta}_{s,t}$, and $\bar{\Delta}_{k,t}$, respectively) for $t = 1, \dots, 10$ under four different choices of p^* , where $\hat{Q}_t(\alpha_i)$ are estimated via the CAViaR method.




Fig B5: The standard deviations of $\Delta_{h,t}$, $\Delta_{s,t}$, and $\Delta_{k,t}$ (denoted by $SD(\Delta_{h,t})$, $SD(\Delta_{s,t})$, and $SD(\Delta_{k,t})$, respectively) for $t = 1, \dots, 10$ under four different choices of p^* , where $\hat{Q}_t(\alpha_i)$ are estimated via the CAViaR method.