

# A Short Course on Extreme Value Statistics in Applications

Arvid Naess Department of Mathematical Sciences

#### Resources

Presentations can be downloaded from:

https://folk.ntnu.no/arvidn/ENBIS 2022



#### Resources

Presentations can be downloaded from:

https://folk.ntnu.no/arvidn/ENBIS 2022

The ACER User guide and ACER program can be downloaded from:

https://folk.ntnu.no/arvidn/ACER



#### Resources

Presentations can be downloaded from:

https://folk.ntnu.no/arvidn/ENBIS 2022

The ACER User guide and ACER program can be downloaded from:

https://folk.ntnu.no/arvidn/ACER

My new book, which is not quite ready yet, but you are welcome to comment on it:

https://folk.ntnu.no/arvidn/BOOK\_EXTREMES



The approach to extreme value statistics very often adopted in engineering applications has been based on the assumption that exceedances above high thresholds can be assumed independent.



The approach to extreme value statistics very often adopted in engineering applications has been based on the assumption that exceedances above high thresholds can be assumed independent.

It is not always clear to what extent that is an acceptable approximation. A method for extreme value statistics that is capable of accounting for statistical dependence in the data series is therefore highly desirable.



The approach to extreme value statistics very often adopted in engineering applications has been based on the assumption that exceedances above high thresholds can be assumed independent.

It is not always clear to what extent that is an acceptable approximation. A method for extreme value statistics that is capable of accounting for statistical dependence in the data series is therefore highly desirable.

A number of approximate methods for dealing with dependence have been proposed over the years, but none of these methods were satisfactory.



NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology

In this course I shall describe a fairly new method that provides an exact representation, in a statistical sense, of the extreme value distribution residing in the data.



In this course I shall describe a fairly new method that provides an exact representation, in a statistical sense, of the extreme value distribution residing in the data.

The final step is then to find a suitable method for making predictions based on the empirical extreme value distribution.



Standard methods for estimating extreme values from limited sets of observed data are commonly based on assuming either that the distribution of epochal extreme values converges to a Gumbel (type-I) extreme value distribution, or by adopting a so-called generalized extreme value (GEV) distribution, which would include all three types of asymptotic extreme value distributions.



Standard methods for estimating extreme values from limited sets of observed data are commonly based on assuming either that the distribution of epochal extreme values converges to a Gumbel (type-I) extreme value distribution, or by adopting a so-called generalized extreme value (GEV) distribution, which would include all three types of asymptotic extreme value distributions.

Another commonly used approach is adopting a peaks-over-threshold (POT) method, assuming that the exceedances above high thresholds follow a generalized Pareto (GP) distribution.



A weakness of these approaches is that they depend on adopting asymptotic distributions.



A weakness of these approaches is that they depend on adoptingasymptotic distributions.

The main problem with this is that the assumption about asymptotic behaviour cannot be fully verified for the measured data used in the extreme value analysis, and in reality it has to be adopted basically by faith or convenience.



A consequence of adopting asymptotic distributions is that directfitting of such distributions to the data often points to the asymptotically wrong distribution.



A consequence of adopting asymptotic distributions is that directfitting of such distributions to the data often points to the asymptotically wrong distribution.

The result is an asymptotically inconsistent distribution, which may have a significant impact on the estimation of long return period extreme value levels.



The classical extreme value theory starts by looking at a sequence of independent and identically distributed (iid) random variables  $X_1, X_2, \ldots$  with common distribution function  $F_X(x)$ . The extreme value of a finite number  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  is then  $M_n = \max\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ .



The classical extreme value theory starts by looking at a sequence of independent and identically distributed (iid) random variables  $X_1, X_2, \ldots$  with common distribution function  $F_X(x)$ . The extreme value of a finite number  $X_1, \ldots, X_n$  is then  $M_n = \max\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ .

The distribution of  $M_n$  can be easily derived as

$$m{F}_{M_n}(x) = {\sf Prob}(M_n \leq x) = {\sf Prob}(X_1 \leq x, \dots, X_n \leq x) = ig(m{F}_X(x)ig)^n,$$

which is not useful in practice!



Instead of studying  $M_n$ , one introduces a renormalized version of  $M_n$ :

$$M_n^* = rac{M_n - b_n}{a_n}$$

for suitable sequences of constants  $a_n > 0$  and  $b_n$  that are chosen to stabilize the location and scale of  $M_n^*$  as  $n \to \infty$ .



Instead of studying  $M_n$ , one introduces a renormalized version of  $M_n$ :

$$M_n^* = \frac{M_n - b_n}{a_n}$$

for suitable sequences of constants  $a_n > 0$  and  $b_n$  that are chosen to stabilize the location and scale of  $M_n^*$  as  $n \to \infty$ .

It is then proven that there are, in fact, only three types of limiting distributions for this renormalized  $M_n^*$ . This is the famous Extremal Types Theorem.



If there exist sequences of constants  $a_n > 0$  and  $b_n$  such that

$$\mathsf{Prob}\Big(rac{M_n-b_n}{a_n}\leq x\Big)
ightarrow G(x)\,,\ n
ightarrow\infty,$$

where G(x) is a nondegenerate distribution function, then G(x) belongs to one of the following three families:



If there exist sequences of constants  $a_n > 0$  and  $b_n$  such that

$$\mathsf{Prob}\Big(rac{M_n-b_n}{a_n}\leq x\Big)
ightarrow G(x)\,,\ n
ightarrow\infty,$$

where G(x) is a nondegenerate distribution function, then G(x) belongs to one of the following three families:

I 
$$G(x) = \exp\left\{-\exp\left[-\left(\frac{x-b}{a}\right)\right]\right\}, -\infty < x < \infty;$$
 (1)



II 
$$G(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & , x \leq b, \\ \exp\left\{-\left(\frac{x-b}{a}\right)^{-c}\right\} & , x > b; \end{cases}$$



II 
$$G(x) = \begin{cases} 0 , x \leq b, \\ \exp\left\{-\left(\frac{x-b}{a}\right)^{-c}\right\}, x > b; \end{cases}$$

III 
$$G(x) = \begin{cases} \exp\left\{-\left(\frac{b-x}{a}\right)^{c}\right\} & , x < b, \\ 1 & , x \ge b; \end{cases}$$

for parameters a > 0, b and c > 0.



The ETT expressed by the Generalized Extreme Value (GEV) distribution:

$$G(x; \lambda, \delta, \kappa) = \exp\left\{-\left[1 + \kappa \left(\frac{x - \lambda}{\delta}\right)\right]_{+}^{-1/\kappa}\right\}$$

where  $\kappa \neq 0$  and  $[z]_+ = \max(0, z)$ .



The ETT expressed by the Generalized Extreme Value (GEV) distribution:

$$G(x; \lambda, \delta, \kappa) = \exp\left\{-\left[1 + \kappa\left(\frac{x - \lambda}{\delta}\right)\right]_{+}^{-1/\kappa}\right\}$$
  
where  $\kappa \neq 0$  and  $[z]_{+} = \max(0, z)$ .

When 
$$\kappa = 0$$
,  
 $G(x; \lambda, \delta, 0) = \exp\left\{-\exp\left(-\frac{x-\lambda}{\delta}\right)\right\}$ 
for  $-\infty < x < \infty$ 



The ETT expressed by the Generalized Extreme Value (GEV) distribution:

$$G(x; \lambda, \delta, \kappa) = \exp\left\{-\left[1 + \kappa\left(\frac{x - \lambda}{\delta}\right)\right]_{+}^{-1/\kappa}\right\}$$
  
where  $\kappa \neq 0$  and  $[z]_{+} = \max(0, z)$ .

When 
$$\kappa = 0$$
,  
 $G(x; \lambda, \delta, 0) = \exp\left\{-\exp\left(-\frac{x-\lambda}{\delta}\right)\right\}$ 
for  $-\infty < x < \infty$ .

 $\kappa$  < 0: Reverse Weibull,  $\kappa$  = 0: Gumbel,  $\kappa$  > 0: Fréchet.



The use of probability (or PP) plots and quantile (or QQ) plots may reveal very useful information about the extent of agreement between an assumed or estimated probability distribution and the empirical distribution of the data.



The use of probability (or PP) plots and quantile (or QQ) plots may reveal very useful information about the extent of agreement between an assumed or estimated probability distribution and the empirical distribution of the data.

Assume that the sample of block maxima has been ordered by increasing value:  $z_{(1)} \le z_{(2)} \le \ldots \le z_{(k)}$ .



The use of probability (or PP) plots and quantile (or QQ) plots may reveal very useful information about the extent of agreement between an assumed or estimated probability distribution and the empirical distribution of the data.

Assume that the sample of block maxima has been ordered by increasing value:  $z_{(1)} \le z_{(2)} \le \ldots \le z_{(k)}$ .

The empirical distribution function,  $\tilde{G}$  say, evaluated at  $z_{(i)}$  is given by,

$$\tilde{G}(z_{(i)})=i/(k+1).$$



The proposed GEV model is obtained by substituting the parameter estimates:

$$\hat{G}(z_{(i)}) = \exp\left\{-\left[1+\hat{\gamma}\left(\frac{z_{(i)}-\hat{\mu}}{\hat{\sigma}}\right)\right]^{-1/\hat{\gamma}}\right\}$$

provided  $\hat{\gamma} \neq 0$ . If  $\hat{\gamma} = 0$ , the plot is constructed using the Gumbel distribution.



The proposed GEV model is obtained by substituting the parameter estimates:

$$\hat{G}(z_{(i)}) = \exp\left\{-\left[1+\hat{\gamma}\left(\frac{z_{(i)}-\hat{\mu}}{\hat{\sigma}}\right)\right]^{-1/\hat{\gamma}}\right\}$$

provided  $\hat{\gamma} \neq 0$ . If  $\hat{\gamma} = 0$ , the plot is constructed using the Gumbel distribution.

If the GEV model is a good approximation, then the PP plot consisting of the points

$$\left(\hat{G}(z_{(i)}),\tilde{G}(z_{(i)})\right)$$
  $i=1,\ldots,k,$ 

should follow approximately the unit diagonal



NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology

For the case of extreme value distributions, a quantile or QQ plot is usually considered to be more informative than a PP plot because it shows more clearly the agreement at high values of the observed data, which is of primary concern when fitting extreme value models.



For the case of extreme value distributions, a quantile or QQ plot is usually considered to be more informative than a PP plot because it shows more clearly the agreement at high values of the observed data, which is of primary concern when fitting extreme value models.

For  $\hat{\gamma} \neq 0$ , the QQ plot is traced out by the point graph,  $(\hat{G}^{-1}(i/(k+1)), z_{(i)}), i = 1, ..., k,$ 

where

$$\hat{G}^{-1}(i/(k+1)) = \hat{\mu} - rac{\hat{\sigma}}{\hat{\gamma}} \left[1 - \left\{-\log\left(i/(k+1)
ight)
ight\}^{-\hat{\gamma}}
ight].$$

This graph should also approximately follow a straight line.

NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology

# **Confidence Intervals by Bootstrapping**

The bootstrapping method is based on resampling from a distribution determined by the available sample of data, either parametric or nonparametric.



## **Confidence Intervals by Bootstrapping**

The bootstrapping method is based on resampling from a distribution determined by the available sample of data, either parametric or nonparametric.

Assume that  $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, ..., z_n)$  is a sample or vector consisting of *n* independent observations of a random variable *Z*.



## **Confidence Intervals by Bootstrapping**

The bootstrapping method is based on resampling from a distribution determined by the available sample of data, either parametric or nonparametric.

Assume that  $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, z_2, ..., z_n)$  is a sample or vector consisting of *n* independent observations of a random variable *Z*.

Parametric: *Z* has a specified distribution function  $F_Z(z; \theta) = \operatorname{Prob}(Z \le z)$ , where  $\theta$  denotes a vector of unknown parameters, which determine the distribution. These parameters are then estimated from the observed data  $\mathbf{z}$ , giving  $\hat{\theta}$ , and  $F_Z(z; \hat{\theta})$  is adopted as the distribution of *Z*.



NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Nonparametric: A purely empirical distribution function is established for Z on the basis of the observed data by allocating a probability of 1/n to each of the observed data points.



#### 7

## **Confidence Intervals by Bootstrapping**

Nonparametric: A purely empirical distribution function is established for Z on the basis of the observed data by allocating a probability of 1/n to each of the observed data points.

The goal is to estimate some statistical quantity *V*, e.g. a high quantile like  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  ( $0 < \alpha << 1$ ), given by the unknown distribution.



#### 7

## **Confidence Intervals by Bootstrapping**

Nonparametric: A purely empirical distribution function is established for Z on the basis of the observed data by allocating a probability of 1/n to each of the observed data points.

The goal is to estimate some statistical quantity *V*, e.g. a high quantile like  $100(1 - \alpha)\%$  ( $0 < \alpha << 1$ ), given by the unknown distribution.

Let  $\hat{V}$  denote the estimate of *V* obtained from the fitted model distribution  $F_Z(z; \hat{\theta})$ , which is a GEV distribution.



Resampling: Let  $Z^*$  denote the random variable with distribution function  $F_Z(z; \hat{\theta})$ .  $\ell$  bootstrap samples  $\mathbf{z}_j^*$ ,  $j = 1, ..., \ell$ , with n independent observations of  $Z^*$  in each sample are now generated. Each sample  $\mathbf{z}_j^*$  is used to fit a new GEV model from which an estimate  $V_i^*$  of V is obtained.



Resampling: Let  $Z^*$  denote the random variable with distribution function  $F_Z(z; \hat{\theta})$ .  $\ell$  bootstrap samples  $\mathbf{z}_j^*, j = 1, ..., \ell$ , with n independent observations of  $Z^*$  in each sample are now generated. Each sample  $\mathbf{z}_j^*$  is used to fit a new GEV model from which an estimate  $V_i^*$  of V is obtained.

A simple estimator for confidence intervals on  $\hat{V}$  is derived by calculating the sample standard deviation  $s_V^*$ :

$$s_V^* = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ell-1}\sum_{j=1}^{\ell}(V_j^* - \bar{V}^*)^2},$$

where  $\bar{V}^* = (1/\ell) \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} V_j^*$ .



An approximate confidence interval at level 1 - q is then obtained as,

$$(\hat{V} - w_{q/2} s_V^*, \hat{V} + w_{q/2} s_V^*),$$
 (2)

where  $w_{q/2}$  denotes the 100(1 - q/2)% standard normal fractile.



An approximate confidence interval at level 1 - q is then obtained as,

$$(\hat{V} - w_{q/2} s_V^*, \hat{V} + w_{q/2} s_V^*),$$
 (2)

where  $w_{q/2}$  denotes the 100(1 - q/2)% standard normal fractile.

To avoid making the assumption that the bootstrap estimates are normally distributed, the true distribution may be approximated by generating a large number of bootstrap samples, usually several thousand are needed, especially for small values of q.



If  $\ell$  samples are generated, the  $V_j^*$  are rearranged in increasing order. A 100(1 - q)% confidence interval is then,

$$(V_{L}^{*}, V_{M}^{*}),$$

where  $L = [q\ell/2]$  and  $M = [(1 - q/2)\ell]$  ([a] means the integer part of a).



## **The Peaks-Over-Threshold Method**

If the distribution of maxima of some sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables  $X_1, X_2, ...$  converges asymptotically to a generalized extreme value distribution with parameters  $\lambda$ ,  $\delta$  and  $\kappa$ , as expressed in the GEV, then the exceedances given by Y = X - u of some high threshold u, conditional on X > u, are approximately distributed as the Generalized Pareto (GP) distribution:



#### **The Peaks-Over-Threshold Method**

If the distribution of maxima of some sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables  $X_1, X_2, ...$  converges asymptotically to a generalized extreme value distribution with parameters  $\lambda$ ,  $\delta$  and  $\kappa$ , as expressed in the GEV, then the exceedances given by Y = X - u of some high threshold u, conditional on X > u, are approximately distributed as the Generalized Pareto (GP) distribution:

$$H(y;\lambda,\delta,\kappa) = H(y) = 1 - \left(1 + \kappa rac{y}{ ilde{\delta}}
ight)^{-1/\kappa}$$

where  $\kappa \neq 0$ ,  $\{y : y > 0, (1 + \kappa y/\tilde{\delta}) > 0\}$ , and  $\tilde{\delta} = \delta + \kappa (u - \lambda)$  with  $\kappa$  equal to that of the corresponding GEV.



#### **The Peaks-Over-Threshold Method**

When  $\kappa = 0$ , the GP distribution becomes an exponential distribution:

$$H(y; \lambda, \delta, \mathbf{0}) = 1 - \exp\left(-rac{y}{ ilde{\delta}}
ight)$$

for y > 0.



22

#### The ACER Method



Let  $0 \le t_1 < ... < t_N \le T$  denote the points in time for the observed data values of X(t), and let  $X_k = X(t_k)$ , k = 1, ..., N.



Let  $0 \le t_1 < ... < t_N \le T$  denote the points in time for the observed data values of X(t), and let  $X_k = X(t_k)$ , k = 1, ..., N.

$$P(\eta) = \operatorname{Prob}\{X_1 \le \eta, \dots, X_N \le \eta\}$$
  
= 
$$\operatorname{Prob}\{X_N \le \eta | X_1 \le \eta, \dots, X_{N-1} \le \eta\} \operatorname{Prob}\{X_1 \le \eta, \dots, X_{N-1} \le \eta\}$$
  
= 
$$\prod_{j=2}^{N} \operatorname{Prob}\{X_j \le \eta | X_1 \le \eta, \dots, X_{j-1}\} \cdot P(X_1 \le \eta)$$



Let  $0 \le t_1 < ... < t_N \le T$  denote the points in time for the observed data values of X(t), and let  $X_k = X(t_k)$ , k = 1, ..., N.

$$P(\eta) = \operatorname{Prob}\{X_1 \le \eta, \dots, X_N \le \eta\}$$
  
= 
$$\operatorname{Prob}\{X_N \le \eta | X_1 \le \eta, \dots, X_{N-1} \le \eta\} \operatorname{Prob}\{X_1 \le \eta, \dots, X_{N-1} \le \eta\}$$
  
= 
$$\prod_{j=2}^{N} \operatorname{Prob}\{X_j \le \eta | X_1 \le \eta, \dots, X_{j-1}\} \cdot P(X_1 \le \eta)$$

For independent values with  $\alpha_{1j}(\eta) = \text{Prob}\{X_j > \eta\}$ ,

$$P(\eta) \approx \prod_{j=1}^{N} P(X_j \le \eta) = \prod_{j=1}^{N} (1 - \alpha_{1j}(\eta)) \approx P_1(\eta) = \exp\left(-\sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_{1j}(\eta)\right)$$

Conditioning on one previous value:

 $\mathsf{Prob}\{X_j \leq \eta | X_1 \leq \eta, ..., X_{j-1} \leq \eta\} \approx \mathsf{Prob}\{X_j \leq \eta | X_{j-1} \leq \eta\}.$ 

This leads to the approximation:

$$P(\eta) \approx P_2(\eta) = \exp\left(-\sum_{j=2}^N \alpha_{2j}(\eta) - \alpha_{11}(\eta)\right),$$

where  $\alpha_{2j}(\eta) = \operatorname{Prob}\{X_j > \eta \mid X_{j-1} \leq \eta\}.$ 



Two more approximations:

$$P(\eta) \approx P_3(\eta) = \exp\left(-\sum_{j=3}^N \alpha_{3j}(\eta) - \alpha_{22}(\eta) - \alpha_{11}(\eta)\right),$$
  
where  $\alpha_{3j}(\eta) = \operatorname{Prob}\{X_j > \eta \mid X_{j-1} \le \eta, X_{j-2} \le \eta\}.$   
$$P(\eta) \approx P_4(\eta) = \exp\left(-\sum_{j=4}^N \alpha_{4j}(\eta) - \alpha_{33}(\eta) - \alpha_{22}(\eta) - \alpha_{11}(\eta)\right)$$

where  $\alpha_{4j}(\eta) = \operatorname{Prob}\{X_j > \eta \mid X_{j-1} \leq \eta, X_{j-2} \leq \eta, X_{j-3} \leq \eta\}.$ 



Two more approximations:

$$P(\eta) \approx P_3(\eta) = \exp\big(-\sum_{j=3}^N \alpha_{3j}(\eta) - \alpha_{22}(\eta) - \alpha_{11}(\eta)\big),$$

where  $\alpha_{3j}(\eta) = \operatorname{Prob}\{X_j > \eta \mid X_{j-1} \leq \eta, X_{j-2} \leq \eta\}.$ 

$$P(\eta) \approx P_4(\eta) = \exp\big(-\sum_{j=4}^N \alpha_{4j}(\eta) - \alpha_{33}(\eta) - \alpha_{22}(\eta) - \alpha_{11}(\eta)\big),$$

where  $\alpha_{4j}(\eta) = \text{Prob}\{X_j > \eta \mid X_{j-1} \le \eta, X_{j-2} \le \eta, X_{j-3} \le \eta\}$ . For most practical applications N >> k, so that

$$P_{k}(\eta) \approx \exp\left(-\sum_{j=k}^{N} \alpha_{kj}(\eta)\right), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

We introduce the concept of average conditional exceedance rates (ACER) as follows,

$$\varepsilon_k(\eta) = \frac{1}{N-k+1} \sum_{j=k}^N \alpha_{kj}(\eta), \ k = 1, 2, \dots$$



We introduce the concept of average conditional exceedance rates (ACER) as follows,

$$\varepsilon_k(\eta) = \frac{1}{N-k+1} \sum_{j=k}^N \alpha_{kj}(\eta), \ k = 1, 2, \dots$$

The following random functions are defined,

 $A_{kj}(\eta) = \mathbf{1}\{X_j > \eta, X_{j-1} \le \eta, \dots, X_{j-k+1} \le \eta\}, j = k, \dots, N, k = 2, 3, \dots$ and

$$B_{kj}(\eta) = \mathbf{1}\{X_{j-1} \le \eta, \dots, X_{j-k+1} \le \eta\}, \ j = k, \dots, N, \ k = 2, \dots,$$

where  $\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{A}\}$  denotes the indicator function of some event  $\mathcal{A}$ .



NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Then

$$\alpha_{kj}(\eta) = \frac{\mathsf{E}[A_{kj}(\eta)]}{\mathsf{E}[B_{kj}(\eta)]}, \ j = k, \dots, N, \ k = 2, \dots$$

where  $E[\cdot]$  denotes the expectation operator.



Then

$$\alpha_{kj}(\eta) = \frac{\mathsf{E}[A_{kj}(\eta)]}{\mathsf{E}[B_{kj}(\eta)]}, \ j = k, \dots, N, \ k = 2, \dots$$

where E[·] denotes the expectation operator. Assuming an ergodic process, then obviously  $\varepsilon_k(\eta) = \alpha_{kk}(\eta) = \ldots = \alpha_{kN}(\eta)$ , and it may be assumed that,

$$arepsilon_k(\eta) = \lim_{N o \infty} rac{\sum_{j=k}^N a_{kj}(\eta)}{\sum_{j=k}^N b_{kj}(\eta)} \, .$$

where  $a_{kj}(\eta)$  and  $b_{kj}(\eta)$  are the realized values of  $A_{kj}(\eta)$  and  $B_{kj}(\eta)$ , respectively, for the observed time series.



#### 29

## **Empirical Estimation of ACER**

Clearly,  $\lim_{\eta\to\infty}\sum_{j=k}^{N} E[B_{kj}(\eta)] = N - k + 1 \approx N$ . Hence,  $\lim_{\eta\to\infty} \tilde{\varepsilon}_k(\eta)/\varepsilon_k(\eta) = 1$ , where the modified ACER function  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_k(\eta)$  is

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon}_{k}(\eta) = rac{\sum_{j=k}^{N} \mathsf{E}[A_{kj}(\eta)]}{N-k+1}$$



Clearly,  $\lim_{\eta\to\infty} \sum_{j=k}^{N} E[B_{kj}(\eta)] = N - k + 1 \approx N$ . Hence,  $\lim_{\eta\to\infty} \tilde{\varepsilon}_k(\eta)/\varepsilon_k(\eta) = 1$ , where the modified ACER function  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_k(\bar{\eta})$  is

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_k(\eta) = \frac{\sum_{j=k}^N \mathsf{E}[A_{kj}(\eta)]}{N-k+1}$$

This is very convenient for nonstationary time series.



It is of interest to note what events are actually counted for the calculation of  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_2(\eta)$ .



It is of interest to note what events are actually counted for the calculation of  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_2(\eta)$ .

 $\tilde{\varepsilon}_2(\eta) (N-1)$  can be interpreted as the expected number of exceedances above the level  $\eta$  satisfying the condition that an exceedance is counted only if it is immediately preceded by a non-exceedance.



It is of interest to note what events are actually counted for the calculation of  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_2(\eta)$ .

 $\tilde{\varepsilon}_2(\eta) (N-1)$  can be interpreted as the expected number of exceedances above the level  $\eta$  satisfying the condition that an exceedance is counted only if it is immediately preceded by a non-exceedance.

A reinterpretation of this is that  $\hat{\varepsilon}_2(\eta) (N-1)$  equals the average number of clumps of exceedances above  $\eta$ , where a clump of exceedances is defined as a maximum number of consecutive exceedances above  $\eta$ .



It is of interest to note what events are actually counted for the calculation of  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_2(\eta)$ .

 $\tilde{\varepsilon}_2(\eta) (N-1)$  can be interpreted as the expected number of exceedances above the level  $\eta$  satisfying the condition that an exceedance is counted only if it is immediately preceded by a non-exceedance.

A reinterpretation of this is that  $\hat{\varepsilon}_2(\eta) (N-1)$  equals the average number of clumps of exceedances above  $\eta$ , where a clump of exceedances is defined as a maximum number of consecutive exceedances above  $\eta$ .

In general,  $\hat{\varepsilon}_k(\eta) (N-1)$  then equals the average number of clumps of exceedances above  $\eta$  separated by at least k-1 non-exceedances.



31

## Parametric form of the ACER

The relevant asymptotic extreme value distribution is assumed to be of Gumbel type. Using the asymptotic form as a guide, it is assumed that

$$ilde{arepsilon}_k(\eta) pprox q_k(\eta) \, \exp\{-a_k(\eta-b_k)^{c_k}\}\,, \ \eta \geq \eta_1\,,$$

where the function  $q_k(\eta)$  is slowly varying compared with the exponential function  $\exp\{-a_k(\eta - b_k)^{c_k}\}$  and  $a_k, b_k$ , and  $c_k$  are suitable constants.



## Parametric form of the ACER

The relevant asymptotic extreme value distribution is assumed to be of Gumbel type. Using the asymptotic form as a guide, it is assumed that

$$ilde{arepsilon}_k(\eta) pprox q_k(\eta) \, \exp\{-a_k(\eta-b_k)^{c_k}\}\,, \ \eta \geq \eta_1\,,$$

where the function  $q_k(\eta)$  is slowly varying compared with the exponential function  $\exp\{-a_k(\eta - b_k)^{c_k}\}$  and  $a_k, b_k$ , and  $c_k$  are suitable constants.

Note that the values  $c_k = q_k = 1$  correspond to the asymptotic case.



Can  $q(\eta)$  be replaced by a constant q?



Can  $q(\eta)$  be replaced by a constant q? YES, in the tail.



Can  $q(\eta)$  be replaced by a constant q?

YES, in the tail.

The choice of parameters *a*, *b*, *c*, *q* can be made by optimizing the fit on the log level.



Can  $q(\eta)$  be replaced by a constant q?

YES, in the tail.

The choice of parameters *a*, *b*, *c*, *q* can be made by optimizing the fit on the log level.

We use Levenberg-Marquardt least squares optimization. The mean square error function to be minimized is written as

$$F(q, a, b, c) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_j \left( \log \hat{\varepsilon}_k(\eta_j) - \log q + a(\eta_j - b)^c \right)^2,$$

where  $w_j = (\log CI^+(\eta_j) - \log CI^-(\eta_j))^{-2}$ , and  $CI^{\pm}(\eta) = \hat{\varepsilon}_k(\eta) \pm 1.96 \, \hat{s}_k(\eta) / \sqrt{R}$  (95% conf. int.)

NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Let  $y_j = \log \hat{\varepsilon}_k(\eta_j)$ ,  $x_j = x_j(b, c) = (\eta_j - b)^c$ . Then  $F(q, a, b, c) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j (y_j - \log q + ax_j)^2,$ 


#### **Optimized Fit of Parameters**

Let 
$$y_j = \log \hat{\varepsilon}_k(\eta_j)$$
,  $x_j = x_j(b, c) = (\eta_j - b)^c$ . Then  

$$F(q, a, b, c) = \sum_{j=1}^N w_j (y_j - \log q + ax_j)^2$$

Hence, for fixed *b* and *c*, we have a weighted linear regression problem with solutions:

$$a^*(b,c) = -rac{\sum_{j=1}^N w_j(x_j-\overline{x})(y_j-\overline{y})}{\sum_{j=1}^N w_j(x_j-\overline{x})^2},$$

and

$$\log q^*(b,c) = \overline{y} + a^*(b,c)\overline{x}\,,$$

where  $\overline{x} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_j x_j / \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_j$ , with a similar definition of  $\overline{y}$ .



NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology

# **Optimized Fit of Parameters**

We may now use the Levenberg-Marquardt method on the function  $\tilde{F}(b,c) = F(q^*(b,c), a^*(b,c), b, c)$  to find the optimal values  $b^*$  and  $c^*$ , and then use the expressions for  $a^*(b,c)$  and  $\log q^*(b,c)$  to calculate the corresponding global optimal values  $a^*$  and  $q^*$ .



## **Optimized Fit of Parameters**

We may now use the Levenberg-Marquardt method on the function  $\tilde{F}(b,c) = F(q^*(b,c), a^*(b,c), b, c)$  to find the optimal values  $b^*$  and  $c^*$ , and then use the expressions for  $a^*(b,c)$  and  $\log q^*(b,c)$  to calculate the corresponding global optimal values  $a^*$  and  $q^*$ .

For estimation of a confidence interval for the predicted extreme value provided by the optimal curve, the empirical confidence band is reanchored to the optimal curve. The optimally fitted curves to the boundaries of the reanchored confidence band will determine an optimized confidence interval on the predicted extreme value.



NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology

To deal with nonstationary time series, it is recognized that  $E[B_{kj}(\eta)] \rightarrow 1$  when  $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ .



To deal with nonstationary time series, it is recognized that  $E[B_{kj}(\eta)] \rightarrow 1$  when  $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence.

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{P}(\eta) &\approx \exp\big(-\sum_{j=k}^{N} \alpha_{kj}(\eta)\big) = \exp\Big(-\sum_{j=k}^{N} \frac{\mathsf{E}[\mathcal{A}_{kj}(\eta)]}{\mathsf{E}[\mathcal{B}_{kj}(\eta)]}\Big) \\ &\simeq \\ &\underset{\eta \to \infty}{\simeq} \exp\big(-\sum_{j=k}^{N} \mathsf{E}[\mathcal{A}_{kj}(\eta)]\big) = \exp\big(-(N+k-1)\tilde{\varepsilon}_{k}(\eta)\big) \end{split}$$

where the modified ACER function  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_k(\eta)$  is given as

$$\widetilde{\varepsilon}_k(\eta) = rac{\sum_{j=k}^N \mathsf{E}[A_{kj}(\eta)]}{N-k+1}$$



Assume that the time series can be segmented into *K* blocks such that  $E[A_{ki}(\eta)]$  remains approximately constant within each block.



Assume that the time series can be segmented into *K* blocks such that  $E[A_{kj}(\eta)]$  remains approximately constant within each block.

Assume that  $\sum_{j \in C_i} E[A_{kj}(\eta)] \approx \sum_{j \in C_i} a_{kj}(\eta)$  for a sufficient range of  $\eta$ -values, where  $C_i$  denotes the set of indices for block no. *i*, i = 1, ..., K,



Assume that the time series can be segmented into *K* blocks such that  $E[A_{kj}(\eta)]$  remains approximately constant within each block.

Assume that  $\sum_{j \in C_i} E[A_{kj}(\eta)] \approx \sum_{j \in C_i} a_{kj}(\eta)$  for a sufficient range of  $\eta$ -values, where  $C_i$  denotes the set of indices for block no. *i*, i = 1, ..., K,

Then 
$$\sum_{j=k}^{N} \mathsf{E}[A_{kj}(\eta)] \approx \sum_{j=k}^{N} a_{kj}(\eta)$$
.



Assume that the time series can be segmented into *K* blocks such that  $E[A_{kj}(\eta)]$  remains approximately constant within each block.

Assume that  $\sum_{j \in C_i} E[A_{kj}(\eta)] \approx \sum_{j \in C_i} a_{kj}(\eta)$  for a sufficient range of  $\eta$ -values, where  $C_i$  denotes the set of indices for block no. *i*, i = 1, ..., K,

Then 
$$\sum_{j=k}^{N} \mathsf{E}[\mathsf{A}_{kj}(\eta)] \approx \sum_{j=k}^{N} \mathsf{a}_{kj}(\eta).$$

Thus, seasonal effects are automatically accounted for by the modified ACER method.



If the whole time series over a long term scenario is available, we have already shown that the long term statistics using ACER functions may be estimated directly from the time series.



If the whole time series over a long term scenario is available, we have already shown that the long term statistics using ACER functions may be estimated directly from the time series.

However, in many cases it would be more practical to analyze each short term condition separately and combine the obtained ACER  $\searrow$  functions after that.



If the whole time series over a long term scenario is available, we have already shown that the long term statistics using ACER functions may be estimated directly from the time series.

However, in many cases it would be more practical to analyze each short term condition separately and combine the obtained ACER  $\searrow$  functions after that.

This would, e.g. be the typical approach in a simulation based long term statistical analysis where the short term response time series would be simulated and the resulting time series subjected to an ACER analysis.



A long term formulation is obtained by considering that there are m, say, short term conditions. Assume that the number of data in condition no.j is  $N_j$ , j = 1, ..., m, and  $N = \sum_{j=1}^{m} N_j$ . Then we may write,

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_k(\eta) = \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\varepsilon}_k^{(j)}(\eta) \; \frac{N_j - k + 1}{N - k + 1} \,,$$

where the ACER function  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{k}^{(j)}(\eta)$  is estimated for condition no. *j*.



A long term formulation is obtained by considering that there are m, say, short term conditions. Assume that the number of data in condition no.j is  $N_j$ , j = 1, ..., m, and  $N = \sum_{j=1}^{m} N_j$ . Then we may write,

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_k(\eta) = \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\varepsilon}_k^{(j)}(\eta) \; \frac{N_j - k + 1}{N - k + 1} \,,$$

where the ACER function  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{k}^{(j)}(\eta)$  is estimated for condition no. *j*.

So, we obtain the long term extreme value distribution as,

$$P(\eta) \approx \exp\left(-(N-k+1)\hat{\varepsilon}_k(\eta)\right).$$



#### Scatter Diagram North Sea, 1973 – 2001

h <sub>s</sub> (m)									t <sub>p</sub> (s)					,				t <sub>p</sub> (s)													
	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	\17	18	19	20	> 20												
0.5	18	15	123	113	110	390	260	91	38	42	32	3	19	13	9	1	3	2	7												
1.0	16	49	675	433	589	1442	1802	959	273	344	125	33	64	29	13	<b>↓1</b>	7	1	6												
1.5	5	32	417	893	1107	1486	2757	1786	636	731	299	121	92	43	18	10	5	2	13												
2.0	1	0	102	741	1290	1496	2575	1968	780	868	492	200	116	51	31	8	4	4	8												
2.5	0	0	9	256	969	1303	2045	1892	803	941	484	181	157	58	23	19	5	1 .	8												
3.0	0	0	1	45	438	1029	1702	1898	705	957	560	218	196	92	40	11	4	2	5												
3.5	0	0	1	4	124	650	1169	1701	647	865	456	237	162	100	36	12	6	1	5 /												
4.0	0	0	2	0	33	270	780	1369	573	868	427	193	157	91	51	13	3	0	1 /												
4.5	0	0	0	0	3	90	459	1017	466	761	380	127	137	86	31	23	6	5	0												
5.0	0	0	0	0	0	15	228	647	408	737	354	119	96	50	32	18	2	4	1 \												
5.5	0	0	0	0	0	2	68	337	363	580	283	94	92	31	24	10	6	2	0 \												
6.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	166	221	418	307	63	76	24	13	9	4	0	0												
6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	50	140	260	257	59	49	20	12	4	2	2	2												
7.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	90	180	193	41	53	20	5	3	3	0	0												
7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	25	93	121	45	46	17	5	5	0	1	0												
8.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	50	84	26	47	11	6	0	1	0	0												
8.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	25	45	23	25	20	8	0	0	0	0												
9.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	30	22	20	19	0	0	0	0	0												
9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	21	14	7	1	1	0	1	0												
10.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	21	6	2	0	0	0	0												
10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	9	12	2	0	0	0	0												
11.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	3	1	0	1	0	0												
11.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0												
12.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0												
12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0												
13.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0												



Norwegian University of Science and Technology

With reference to a scatter diagram, an alternative equivalent formulation is obtained. Assume that the number of sea states in condition (i, j) is  $N_{ij}$ , i = 1, ..., m and j = 1, ..., n, and  $N = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} N_{ij}$ . Then,

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_k(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_k^{(ij)}(\eta) \, \frac{N_{ij}}{N} \, ,$$

where the ACER function  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{k}^{(ij)}(\eta)$  is estimated for condition (i, j).



With reference to a scatter diagram, an alternative equivalent formulation is obtained. Assume that the number of sea states in condition (i, j) is  $N_{ij}$ , i = 1, ..., m and j = 1, ..., n, and  $N = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n} N_{ij}$ . Then,

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_k(\eta) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_k^{(ij)}(\eta) \, \frac{N_{ij}}{N} \, ,$$

where the ACER function  $\hat{\varepsilon}_{k}^{(ij)}(\eta)$  is estimated for condition (i, j). So, again we obtain the long term extreme value distribution as,

$$P(\eta) \approx \exp\left(-(N-k+1)\hat{\varepsilon}_k(\eta)\right).$$



# Wind speed statistics

Locations of wind speed measurements



42

# Wind speeds at Torsvåg Lighthouse

Time series over 13 years of hourly maxima of gust wind.



time



## Wind speeds at Sula Lighthouse

Time series over 12 years of hourly maxima of gust wind.





44

### Wind speeds at Obrestad Lighthouse

Time series over 16 years of hourly maxima of gust wind.





# Torsvåg Lighthouse wind speed statistics

The ACER estimates for different degrees of conditioning.





46

#### Sula wind speed statistics

The ACER estimates for different degrees of conditioning.





47

# Obrestad Lighthouse wind speed statistics

The ACER estimates for different degrees of conditioning.





# Torsvåg Lighthouse wind speed statistics

13 years hourly maximum data.  $\hat{\varepsilon}_1(\eta)$  (\*); Optimized curve fit (—); Empirical 95% confidence band (- -); Optimized confidence band (· · ·); Predicted 100 year return level estimate = 47.46 m/s and 95% CI = (42.11, 50.71) m/s.



www.ntnu.no

#### Sula wind speed statistics

12 years hourly maximum data.  $\hat{\varepsilon}_1(\eta)$  (\*); Optimized curve fit (—); Empirical 95% confidence band (- -); Optimized confidence band (· · ·); Predicted 100 year return level estimate = 46.33 m/s and 95% CI = (43.41, 47.77) m/s.



NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology

# Obrestad Lighthouse wind speed statistics

16 years hourly maximum data.  $\hat{\varepsilon}_1(\eta)$  (\*); Optimized curve fit (—); Empirical 95% confidence band (- -); Optimized confidence band (· · ·); Predicted 100 year return level estimate = 48.38 m/s and 95% CI = (43.18, 50.74) m/s.



In engineering mechanics, a classical extreme response prediction problem is the case of a lightly damped mechanical oscillator subjected to random forces.



In engineering mechanics, a classical extreme response prediction problem is the case of a lightly damped mechanical oscillator subjected to random forces. A dynamic model can be expressed as

$$\ddot{X}(t) + 2\zeta \omega_{e} \dot{X}(t) + \omega_{e}^{2} X(t) = W(t),$$

where  $\zeta$  = relative damping,  $\omega_e$  = undamped eigenfrequency, and W(t) = a stationary Gaussian white noise (of suitable intensity).



In engineering mechanics, a classical extreme response prediction problem is the case of a lightly damped mechanical oscillator subjected to random forces. A dynamic model can be expressed as

$$\ddot{X}(t) + 2\zeta \omega_e \dot{X}(t) + \omega_e^2 X(t) = W(t),$$

where  $\zeta$  = relative damping,  $\omega_e$  = undamped eigenfrequency, and W(t) = a stationary Gaussian white noise (of suitable intensity). For small values of  $\zeta$ , the response time series will exhibit narrow band characteristics. This manifests itself by producing a strong beating of the response time series, which means that the size of the response peaks will change slowly in time,





Part of the narrow-band response time series of the linear oscillator with fully sampled and peak values indicated.





Comparison between ACER estimates for different degrees of conditioning for the narrow-band time series.





Comparison between ACER estimates for different degrees of conditioning based on the time series of the peak values.



# The Kvitebjorn Jacket Platform

#### The Kvitebjørn jacket platform



www.ntnu.no

# The Kvitebjorn Jacket Platform

The Kvitebjørn jacket platform with the superstructure removed.







# The Kvitebjorn Jacket Platform

 The equation of motion for the horizontal excursions of the jacket at main deck level is

 $\mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{X}} + \mathbf{C}\dot{\mathbf{X}} + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Q}.$ 


The equation of motion for the horizontal excursions of the jacket at main deck level is

$$\mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{X}} + \mathbf{C}\dot{\mathbf{X}} + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Q}.$$

-  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_N)^T$  where  $X_k = X_k(t), k = 1, \dots, N$ , denote displacement of the *k*-th node  $\mathbf{x}_k = (x_k, y_k, z_k)$  in the wave direction, which is the positive *x*-direction.



 The equation of motion for the horizontal excursions of the jacket at main deck level is

$$\mathbf{M}\ddot{\mathbf{X}} + \mathbf{C}\dot{\mathbf{X}} + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Q}.$$

- $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_N)^T$  where  $X_k = X_k(t), k = 1, \dots, N$ , denote displacement of the *k*-th node  $\mathbf{x}_k = (x_k, y_k, z_k)$  in the wave direction, which is the positive *x*-direction.
- $\mathbf{Q} = (Q(t, \mathbf{x}_1), \dots, Q(t, \mathbf{x}_N))^T$ , where  $Q(t, \mathbf{x}_k) = F_{in}(t, \mathbf{x}_k) + F_d(t, \mathbf{x}_k), k = 1, \dots, N$  and  $-d = z_1 \le z_k \le z_N = L - d$ , where d = 190 m is the water depth and L = 216 m is the jacket support height.



- The inertia force components are given as

$$F_{in}(t,\mathbf{x}_k) = k_m \dot{U}(t,\mathbf{x}_k)$$



- The inertia force components are given as

$$F_{in}(t,\mathbf{x}_k) = k_m \dot{U}(t,\mathbf{x}_k)$$

#### The drag force components

$$F_d(t, \mathbf{x}_k) = k_d \left( U(t, \mathbf{x}_k) + U_c \right) | U(t, \mathbf{x}_k) + U_c |$$



- The inertia force components are given as

$$F_{in}(t,\mathbf{x}_k) = k_m \dot{U}(t,\mathbf{x}_k)$$

#### The drag force components

$$F_d(t, \mathbf{x}_k) = k_d \left( U(t, \mathbf{x}_k) + U_c \right) |U(t, \mathbf{x}_k) + U_c|$$

$$k_m = C_m \rho \pi D^2/4, \ k_d = C_d \rho D/2$$



Gumbel plot of 20 simulated 3 hour extremes with fitted Gumbel distribution. Sea state with  $H_s = 12$  m,  $T_p = 12$  s.



Gumbel plot of 20 simulated 3 hour extremes with fitted Gumbel distribution. Sea state with  $H_s = 14.7$  m,  $T_p = 15$  s.



Empirical density of the predicted 90% fractile value based on sample of size 20 for the sea state with  $H_s = 12$  m,  $T_p = 12$  s. The \* indicates the limits of Cl<sub>0.95</sub>.



Empirical density of the predicted 90% fractile value based on sample of size 20 for the sea state with  $H_s = 14.7$  m,  $T_p = 16.5$  s. The \* indicates the limits of Cl<sub>0.95</sub>.



The ACER function  $\varepsilon_2$  (mean upcrossing rate) along with 95% confidence bands (--) for the sea state with  $H_s = 12$  m,  $T_p = 12$  s,  $\sigma = 0.047$  m. \* : Monte Carlo; - - - : linear fit.



The ACER function  $\varepsilon_2$  (mean upcrossing rate) with 95% confidence bands (--) for the sea state with  $H_s = 14.7$  m,  $T_p = 15$  s,  $\sigma = 0.066$  m. \* : Monte Carlo; - - - : linear fit.



# The Heidrun TLP

Heidrun TLP as seen from the side.

OVERALL TLP CONCEPT



#### Waves

Time series of wave elevation.



NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology

# **Tether tension**

Time series of tether tension T10, with a ringing event caused by a steep wave.



### **Power spectrum**

Power spectrum of tension in tether T10.





A. Naess, Applied Extreme Value Statistics

Log plot of ACER  $\varepsilon_k(\eta)$ , sea state 1 ( $H_s = 15.7 \text{ m}, T_p = 17.8 \text{ s}$ ).





Log plot of ACER  $\varepsilon_3(\eta)$  with extrapolation by optimally fitted curve, sea state 1. c = 0.43



72

Log plot of ACER  $\varepsilon_k(\eta)$ , sea state 2 ( $H_s = 15.0 \text{ m}, T_p = 16.7 \text{ s}$ ).





Log plot of ACER  $\varepsilon_3(\eta)$  with extrapolation by optimally fitted curve, sea state 2. c = 0.28



# Conclusions

 It has been shown that the ACER method can provide an estimate of the exact extreme value distribution provided by the data.



# Conclusions

- It has been shown that the ACER method can provide an estimate of the exact extreme value distribution provided by the data.
- From the examples studied, it is tentatively concluded that the proposed extrapolation procedure combined with the ACER method appears to be accurate and robust, while it is simple and practical to use.



# Conclusions

- It has been shown that the ACER method can provide an estimate of the exact extreme value distribution provided by the data.
- From the examples studied, it is tentatively concluded that the proposed extrapolation procedure combined with the ACER method appears to be accurate and robust, while it is simple and practical to use.
- Optimized fit and extrapolation can give accurate predictions of the ACER functions and thus extreme value statistics.

