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1 Introduction

Consider a continuous random vector $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_d)$ with a joint cumulative distribution function $H$ and marginals $F_1, \ldots, F_d$. By Sklar’s theorem, $H$ has the following copula representation

$$H(x_1, \ldots, x_d) = C(F_1(x_1), \ldots, F_d(x_d)),$$

where $C$ is a unique cumulative distribution function, whose marginals are uniform on $[0, 1]^d$. Copulas represent the dependence structure between elements of $\mathbf{X}$ and this allows one to model and estimate distributions of random vectors by estimating the marginals and the copula separately. In economics, finance and insurance, this ability is very important because it facilitates accurate pricing of risk (see, e.g., Zimmer [2012]). In such problems $d$ is often quite high – tens or hundreds – and this has spurred a lot of interest to high dimensional copula modeling and testing in the recent years (see, e.g., Patton [2012]).

In such high dimensions, classical multivariate parametric copulas such as the elliptical or Archimedean copulas are often insufficiently flexible in modeling different correlations or tail dependencies. On the other hand, they are very flexible and powerful in bivariate modeling. This advantage was used by Joe [1996] and later by Bedford and Cooke [2001, 2002] to construct multivariate densities using hierarchically bivariate copulas as building blocks. This process – known as a pair-copula construction (PCC, Aas et al. [2009]) – results in a very flexible class of regular vine (R-vine) copula models, which can have a relative large dimension, yet remain computationally tractable (see, e.g., Czado [2010], Kurowicka and Cooke [2006] for introductions to vine copulas).

A copula model for $\mathbf{X}$ arises when $C$ is unknown but belongs to a parametric family $C_0 = \{C_\theta : \theta \in \mathcal{O}\}$, where $\mathcal{O}$ is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^p$ for some integer $p \geq 1$, and $\theta$ denotes the copula parameter vector. There is a wide literature on estimation of $\theta$ under the assumption $\mathcal{H}_0 : C \in C_0 = \{C_\theta : \theta \in \mathcal{O}\}$ given independent copies $\mathbf{X}_1 = (X_{11}, \ldots, X_{1d}), \ldots, \mathbf{X}_n = (X_{n1}, \ldots, X_{nd})$ of $\mathbf{X}$; see, e.g., Genest et al. [1995], Joe [2005]. The complementary issue of testing

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : C \in C_0 = \{C_\theta : \theta \in \mathcal{O}\} \text{ vs. } \mathcal{H}_1 : C \notin C_0 = \{C_\theta : \theta \in \mathcal{O}\}$$

is more recent – surveys of available tests can be found in Berg [2009] and Genest et al. [2009].

Currently, the main problem in testing is to develop operational “blanket” tests, powerful in high dimensions. This means we need tests which remain computationally feasible and powerful against a wide class of high-dimensional alternatives, rather
than against specific low-dimensional families, and which do not require ad hoc choices, such as a bandwidth, a kernel, or a data categorization (see, e.g., Klugman and Parsa, 1999; Genest and Rivest, 1993; Junker and May, 2005; Fermanian, 2005; Scaillet, 2007). Genest et al. (2009) discuss five testing procedures that qualify as “blanket” tests. We will use some of them in our simulations.

Recently, Huang and Prokhorov (2014) proposed a “blanket” test based on the information matrix equality for copulas and Schepsmeier (2013, 2015) extended that test to vine copulas. The point of this test is to compare the expected Hessian with the expected outer-product-of-the-gradient (OPG) form of the covariance matrix – under \( H_0 \), their sum should be zero. This is the so called Bartlett identity. So in multi-parameter cases, the statistic is based on a random vector whose dimension – being equal to the number of distinct elements in the Hessian – grows as the square of the number of parameters. Even though the statistic has a standard asymptotic distribution, simulations suggest that using analytical critical values leads to severe oversize distortions, especially when dimension is high.

The tests we propose in this paper are motivated by recent developments in information matrix equality testing (see, e.g., Golden et al., 2013). Specifically, we use alternative, eigenspectrum-based statements of the information matrix equality. This means we use functions of the eigenvalues of the two matrices, instead of the distinct elements of the matrices. This leads to a noticeable reduction in dimension of the random vector underlying the test statistic, which permits significant size and power improvements. The improvements are more pronounced for high dimensional dependence structures. Regular vine copulas are effective in this setting because of a further dimension reduction they permit. We argue that R-vines offer additional computational benefits for our tests. Compared to available alternatives, our tests applied to vine copula constructions remain operational and powerful in fairly high dimensions and seem to be the only tests allowing for copula specification testing in high dimensions.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce seven new goodness-of-fit tests for copulas and discuss their asymptotic properties. Section 3 describes the computational benefits that result from applying our tests to vine copulas. In Section 4 we use the new tests in a Monte Carlo study where we first study the new copula tests in terms of their size and power performance and then examine the effect of dimensionality, sample size and dependence strength on size and power of these tests, as compared with three popular “blanket” tests that perform well in simulations. Section 5 concludes.
2 Generalized Information Matrix Test for Copulas

In the setting of general specification testing, Golden et al. (2013) introduced an extension to the original information equality test of White (1982), which they call Generalized Information Matrix Test (GIMT). Unlike the original test which is based on the negative expected Hessian and OPG, GIMT is based on functions of the eigenspectrum of the two matrices. In this section we develop a series of copula goodness-of-fit tests which draw on GIMT and we study their properties.

2.1 Basic Asymptotic Result

Let \( X_i = (X_{i1}, \ldots, X_{id}), i = 1, \ldots, n \), denote realizations of a random vector \( X = (X_1, \ldots, X_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \). All tests we consider are based on a pseudo-sample \( U_i = (U_{i1}, \ldots, U_{id}), U_n = (U_{n1}, \ldots, U_{nd}) \), where \( U_i = (U_{i1}, \ldots, U_{id}) = (R_{i1}/n+1, \ldots, R_{id}/n+1) \), and \( R_{ij} \) is the rank of \( X_{ij} \) amongst \( X_{1j}, \ldots, X_{nj} \). This transformation of each \( X_{ij} \) to its normalized rank can be viewed as the empirical marginal distribution of \( X_j, j = 1, \ldots, d \). The denominator \( n + 1 \) is used instead of \( n \) to avoid numerical problems at the boundaries of \([0, 1]^d\). Given an independent sample \( \{X_1, \ldots, X_n\} \), the pseudo-sample \( \{U_1, \ldots, U_n\} \) – no longer independent due to the rank transformation – can be viewed as a sample from the underlying copula \( C \).

Assume that the copula density \( c_\theta \) exists. Let \( \mathbb{H}(\theta) \) denote the expected Hessian matrix of \( \ln c_\theta \) and let \( \mathbb{C}(\theta) \) denote the expected outer product of the corresponding score function (OPG), i.e.,

\[
\mathbb{H}(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \nabla^2_\theta \ln c_\theta(U) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{C}(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \nabla_\theta \ln c_\theta(U) \nabla'_\theta \ln c_\theta(U),
\]

where “\( \nabla_\theta \)” denotes derivatives with respect to \( \theta \) and expectations are with respect to the true distribution \( H \). Let \( \theta_0 \) denote the true value of \( \theta \) and assume \( \mathbb{H}(\theta_0) \) and \( \mathbb{C}(\theta_0) \) are in the interior of a compact set \( S^{p \times p} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \). For \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), let

\[
\mathbb{H}_i(\theta) = \nabla^2_\theta \ln c_\theta(U_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{C}_i(\theta) = \nabla_\theta \ln c_\theta(U_i) \nabla'_\theta \ln c_\theta(U_i).
\]

For any \( \theta \in \mathcal{O} \), define the sample analogues of \( \mathbb{H}(\theta) \) and \( \mathbb{C}(\theta) \):

\[
\bar{\mathbb{H}}(\theta) := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{H}_i(\theta) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mathbb{C}}(\theta) := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{C}_i(\theta).
\]

Then, given an estimate \( \hat{\theta}_n \) of \( \theta_0 \), we can denote estimates of \( \mathbb{H}(\theta_0) \) and \( \mathbb{C}(\theta_0) \) by

\[
\bar{\mathbb{H}}_n := \bar{\mathbb{H}}(\hat{\theta}_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mathbb{C}}_n := \bar{\mathbb{C}}(\hat{\theta}_n).
\]
Definition 1 (Hypothesis Function) Let \( s : S^{p \times p} \times S^{p \times p} \to \mathbb{R}^r \) be a continuous differentiable function in both of its matrix arguments. \( s \) is called a hypothesis function if for every \( A, B \in S^{p \times p} \) it follows:

\[
\text{If } A = -B, \text{ then } s(A, B) = 0_r,
\]

where \( 0_r \) is the zero vector of dimension \( r \).

Definition 2 (GIMT) A test statistic \( \hat{s}_n := s(\bar{H}_n, \bar{C}_n) \) is a GIMT for copula \( C_\theta \) if it tests the null hypothesis:

\[
H_0 : s(\bar{H}(\theta_0), \bar{C}(\theta_0)) = 0_r.
\]

We can now look at the properties of the GIMT for copulas.

Lemma 1 (Asymptotic Normality of \( \sqrt{n}\hat{s}_n \)) Let \( s : S^{p \times p} \times S^{p \times p} \to \mathbb{R}^r \) be a GIMT hypothesis function with \( \nabla_{\theta} s(\bar{H}(\theta), \bar{C}(\theta)) \) evaluated at \( \theta_0 \) having full row rank \( r \). Then, under \( H_0 \) and suitable regularity conditions,

\[
\sqrt{n}\hat{s}_n \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma_s(\theta_0)),
\]

where the asymptotic covariance matrix is given by

\[
\Sigma_s(\theta_0) := (\nabla s_{\theta_0}) V_{\theta_0} (\nabla s_{\theta_0})', \tag{1}
\]

where \( \nabla s_{\theta_0} \) and \( V_{\theta_0} \) are given in Eqs. (6)-(7) of Appendix A.

Proof: see Appendix A for all proofs.

The regularity conditions used in Lemma 1 are standard assumptions of continuity and differentiability of the likelihood and rank conditions on information (see, e.g., White (1982), Assumptions A1-A10). In the copula context, they translate into equivalent assumptions on the copula density (see, e.g., Genest et al. (1995)).

The main difference between Lemma 1 and the specification tests of White (1982) and Golden et al. (2013) is in the form of \( V_{\theta_0} \). The complication arises from the rank transformation which requires a non-trivial adjustment to the variance of \( \hat{s}_n \), accounting for the estimation error (see Huang and Prokhorov 2014).
Theorem 1 (Asymptotic Theory) Let \( \hat{\Sigma}_{n,s} \) denote a consistent estimate of the asymptotic covariance matrix \( \Sigma_s(\theta_0) \). Then, under \( H_0 \) and suitable regularity conditions, the GIMT statistic for copulas

\[ W_n := n \hat{s}_n' \hat{\Sigma}_{n,s}^{-1} \hat{s}_n \]  

is asymptotically \( \chi^2_r \) distributed.

These results suggest that we can use any function of \( H(\theta_0) \) and \( C(\theta_0) \) with a known probability limit for testing copula validity. One of the main insights of Golden et al. (2013) is that different hypothesis functions permit misspecification testing in different directions. For example, a test comparing the determinants of \( H \) and \( C \) will detect small variations in eigenvalues of the two matrices, while a test comparing traces will focus on differences in the major principal components of the two matrices.

In multivariate settings, the dimension of \( \theta \) often grows faster than the dimension of \( U \). For example, a \( d \)-variate \( t \)-copula has \( O(d^2) \) parameters. The eigenspectrum-based hypothesis functions allow to reduce the dimension of the test statistic (and thus the degrees of freedom of the test) from \( p(p+1)/2 \), where \( p \) is the number of copula parameters, to the number of values of the hypothesis function, \( r \).

A consistent estimator \( \hat{\Sigma}_{n,s} \) would require estimation of \( \nabla s_{\theta_0} \) and \( V_{\theta_0} \). Some aspects of consistent estimation of \( V_{\theta_0} \) are discussed by Huang and Prokhorov (2014) so in the propositions that follow we focus on the additional complexity introduced by the various hypothesis functions through \( \nabla s_{\theta_0} \).

Table [1] lists the hypothesis functions we consider. The original White and IR (Information Ratio) Tests are special cases. We introduce the Trace White Test to focus on the sum of the eigenvalues of \( H + C \) and the Determinant White Test to focus on the product of the eigenvalues of \( H + C \). The focused testing allows for directional power which we discuss later.

Two more tests are log-versions of the last two. The (Log) Determinant IR Test focuses on the determinant of the information matrix ratio, and the Log Trace Test looks at whether the sum of the eigenvalues is the same for the negative Hessian and the OPG form. We use logarithms here as variance stabilizing transformations. In contrast to the White (or IR) version, the Log Trace Test does not use the eigenvalues of the sum (or the ratio) of \( H \) and \( C \), rather it looks at the eigenvalues of each matrix separately.

The Log GAIC (Generalized Akaike Information Criterion) Test picks on the idea of the IR Test that the negative Hessian multiplied by the inverse of the OPG (or vice versa) equals the identity matrix. The new feature is that we focus on the
Table 1: Summary of eigenspectrum tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>short</th>
<th>$s(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{C})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Test</td>
<td>$\mathcal{T}_n$</td>
<td>$vech(\mathbb{H}) + vech(\mathbb{C}) = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinant White Test</td>
<td>$\mathcal{T}_n^{(D)}$</td>
<td>$det(\mathbb{H} + \mathbb{C}) = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trace White Test</td>
<td>$\mathcal{T}_n^{(T)}$</td>
<td>$tr(\mathbb{H} + \mathbb{C}) = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR Test</td>
<td>$\mathcal{Z}_n$</td>
<td>$tr(-\mathbb{H}^{-1}\mathbb{C}) - p = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinant IR Test</td>
<td>$\mathcal{Z}_n^{(D)}$</td>
<td>$det(-\mathbb{H}^{-1}\mathbb{C}) - 1 = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Trace IMT</td>
<td>$\mathcal{T}r_n$</td>
<td>$log(tr(-\mathbb{H}^{-1})) - log(tr(\mathbb{C})) = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log GAIC IMT</td>
<td>$\mathcal{G}_n$</td>
<td>$log[\frac{1}{p}(1_p)'(\Lambda(-\mathbb{H}^{-1}) \odot \Lambda(\mathbb{C}))] = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Eigenspectrum IMT</td>
<td>$\mathcal{P}_n$</td>
<td>$log(\Lambda(-\mathbb{H}^{-1})) - log(\Lambda(\mathbb{C}^{-1})) = 0_p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue Test</td>
<td>$\mathcal{Q}_n$</td>
<td>$\Lambda(-\mathbb{H}^{-1}\mathbb{C}) = 1_p$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average product of the Hessian-based eigenvalues and OPG-based eigenvalues. The last two tests are explicitly based on the full eigenspectrum. The Eigenspectrum Test compares the eigenvalues of $\mathbb{H}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ separately, the Eigenvalue Test uses the eigenvalues of the information matrix ratio.

All these hypothesis functions are identical under the null, yet the behavior of these tests varies widely. We first look at the asymptotic approximations of the behavior.

### 2.2 White Test for Copulas

In the case of the original [White (1982)] test, the asymptotic covariance matrix in Lemma 1 simplifies. [Huang and Prokhorov (2014, Proposition 1)] provide the asymptotic variance matrix for this case. It can be obtained by rearranging the building blocks used in construction of the test statistic (elements of $d(\theta)$ in Appendix A), and by setting $\nabla s_{\theta_0} = (I_{p(p+1)/2} I_{p(p+1)/2})$, where $I_k$ is a $k \times k$ identity matrix.

One of the most important criticisms of this test is its slow convergence to the asymptotic distribution. One cause of this problem is its high degrees of freedom. For example, in the setting of a vine copula estimation, [Schepsmeier (2013)] shows that for a five-dimensional vine ($df = p(p + 1)/2 = 55$), the number of observations needed to show acceptable size and power behavior using asymptotic critical values is at least 10,000; for an eight-dimensional vine ($df = 406$) that number is greater than 20,000. The alternatives we propose are determinant- and trace-based.

**Proposition 1 (Determinant White Test)** Let $\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}$ be as defined in Theorem 1.
with an estimator of $\nabla s_{\theta_0}$ given by

$$\hat{\nabla} s_{\theta_0} = \det(\bar{H}_n + \bar{C}_n) \text{vech}\left[(\bar{H}_n + \bar{C}_n)^{-1}\right]' \left[ I_{(p+1)/2} : I_{(p+1)/2} \right].$$

Then, under $H_0$, the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic

$$T_n^{(D)} := n \frac{\det(\bar{H}_n + \bar{C}_n)^2}{\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}}$$

is $\chi_1^2$.

**Proposition 2 (Trace White Test)** Let $\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}$ be as defined in Theorem 1 with $\nabla s_{\theta_0}$ defined as follows

$$\hat{\nabla} s_{\theta_0} = (\text{vech}(I_p)' , \text{vech}(I_p)').$$

Then, under $H_0$, the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic

$$T_n^{(T)} := n \frac{tr(\bar{H}_n + \bar{C}_n)^2}{\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}}$$

is $\chi_1^2$.

The two tests are chi-square with one degree of freedom, rather than $p(p + 1)/2$, and have important differences allowing for what can be called directional testing. Because larger eigenvalues have larger effect on determinant than on trace, the *Trace White Test* will be less sensitive to changes in eigenvalues, especially small ones, and thus less powerful than the *Determinant White Test*.

**2.3 Information Ratio Test for Copulas**

As extensions of the original White test, [Zhou et al. (2012)] and [Presnell and Boos (2004)] consider using a ratio of the Hessian and OPG. Under correct specification, the matrix $H(\theta)^{-1}C(\theta)$ is equal to a $p$-dimensional identity matrix. We propose two versions of this test for copulas.

**Proposition 3 (IR Test)** Let $\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}$ be as defined in Theorem 1 with an estimator of $\nabla s_{\theta_0}$ given by

$$\hat{\nabla} s_{\theta_0} = \left[ \text{vech}\left(\bar{H}_n^{-1}\bar{C}_n\bar{H}_n^{-1}\right)' , \text{vech}\left(-\bar{H}_n^{-1}\right)' \right].$$
Then, under $H_0$, the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic

$$Z_n := n \frac{\left[ tr(-\bar{H}_n^{-1}\bar{C}_n) - p \right]^2}{\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}}$$

is $\chi^2_1$.

**Proposition 4 (Log-Determinant IR Test)** Let $\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}$ be as defined in Theorem 1 with an estimator of $\nabla s_{\theta_0}$ given by

$$\hat{\nabla} s_{\theta_0} = \text{det}(\bar{H}_n^{-1}\bar{C}_n) \left( \text{vech} \left( -\bar{C}_n\bar{H}_n^{-1}\bar{C}_n \right)' \right) vech \left( I_p \right)'$$

Then, under $H_0$, the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic

$$Z_n^{(D)} := n \frac{\left( \log(\text{det}(\bar{H}_n^{-1}\bar{C}_n)) \right)^2}{\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}}$$

is $\chi^2_1$.

### 2.4 Log Trace Test for Copulas

Similar to the Log-Determinant IR Test we can construct a test using the log of traces of $-\bar{H}$ and $\bar{C}$, which should be identical under the null.

**Proposition 5 (Log Trace Test)** Let $\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}$ be as defined in Theorem 1 with an estimator of $\nabla s_{\theta_0}$ given by

$$\hat{\nabla} s_{\theta_0} = \left( -\frac{1}{tr(-\bar{H}_n^{-1})} \text{vech}(\bar{H}_n^{-2})', \ -\frac{1}{tr(-\bar{C}_n^{-1})} \text{vech}(I_p)' \right)$$

Then, under $H_0$, the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic

$$Tr_n := n \frac{\left[ \log(tr(-\bar{H}_n^{-1})) - \log(tr(\bar{C}_n)) \right]^2}{\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}}$$

is $\chi^2_1$.

As mentioned earlier, trace-based tests pick up changes in larger eigenvalues easier than in smaller – a property desirable for some alternatives.
2.5 Log GAIC Test for Copulas

It is well known (see, e.g., Takeuchi, 1976) that under model misspecification the Generalized Akaike Information Criterion defined as follows

\[ GAIC := -2 \log \prod_{i=1}^{n} f(U_i; \hat{\theta}_n) + 2 \text{tr}(-\bar{H}^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_n)\bar{C}(\hat{\theta}_n)) \]

is an unbiased estimator of the expected value of \(-2 \log \prod_{i=1}^{n} f(U_i; \hat{\theta}_n)\). Under correct model specification \(2 \text{tr}(-\bar{H}^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_n)\bar{C}(\hat{\theta}_n)) \to 2p\), since \(-\bar{H}^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_n)\bar{C}(\hat{\theta}_n) \to I_p\) a.s., and so GAIC becomes AIC. This motivates the use of the IR Test but also of the following form of the GIMT.

Let \(\Lambda(A) = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_p)'\) denote the vector of sorted eigenvalues of \(A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}\). Further, let \(\Lambda^{-1}(A) := 1/\Lambda(A)\) denote component-wise \(\{1/\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{p}\) and \(\Lambda(A^{-1}) = \Lambda^{-1}(A)\). Then, under the null, \(\text{tr}(-\bar{H}^{-1}\bar{C}) = (1_p)'(\Lambda(-\bar{H}^{-1}) \odot \Lambda(\bar{C}))\), where \(\odot\) denotes the Hadamard product, i.e. component-wise multiplication; however, generally, eigenvalues of the product matrix are not equal to the product of eigenvalues of the components.

Proposition 6 (GAIC Test) Let \(\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}\) be as defined in Theorem 1, with an estimator of \(\nabla_{s\theta_0}\) given by

\[
\hat{\nabla}_{s\theta_0} = \frac{1}{\text{tr}(\bar{H}^{-1}_n\bar{C}_n)} \left[ \text{vech} \left( \bar{H}^{-1}_n\bar{C}_n\bar{H}^{-1}_n \right)', \text{vech} \left( -\bar{H}^{-1}_n \right)' \right].
\]

Then, under \(H_0\), the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic

\[
G_n := n \left\{ \log \left[ \frac{1}{p}(1_p)' \left( \Lambda(-\bar{H}^{-1}_n) \odot \Lambda(\bar{C}_n) \right) \right] \right\}^2 \frac{\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}}{\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}}
\]

is \(\chi^2_1\).

In contrast to the IR Test the eigenvalues of the Hessian and the OPG are calculated separately. Thus, similar to the Log Determinant IR Test, the Log GAIC Test is more sensitive to changes in the entire eigenspectrum than the IR Test (see Golden et al., 2013 for a more detailed discussion).
2.6 Eigenvalue Test for Copulas

The form of the Log Eigenspectrum IMT was initially proposed by Golden et al. [2013]. It is a $p$-degrees-of-freedom test so the reduction in the degrees-of-freedom from $p(p+1)/2$ is more noticeable for larger $p$, which would typically mean a higher dimensional copula.

In order to derive its asymptotic distribution we need additional notation. For a real symmetric matrix $A$, let $y_j(A)$ denote the normalized eigenvector corresponding to eigenvalue $\lambda_j(A)$, $j = 1, \ldots, p$. Let $D$ denote the duplication matrix, i.e. such a matrix that $D \text{vech}(A) = \text{vec}(A)$ (see, e.g. Magnus and Neudecker [1999]).

**Proposition 7 (Log Eigenspectrum Test)** Let $\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}$ be as defined in Theorem 1, with an estimator of $\nabla_{s \theta_0}$ given by

$$
\hat{\nabla}_{s \theta_0} = \begin{bmatrix}
-\frac{1}{\lambda_1(\overline{H}_n)^2} [y_1(\overline{H}_n)' \otimes y_1(\overline{C}_n)'] D & \frac{1}{\lambda_1(\overline{C}_n)} [y_1(\overline{C}_n)' \otimes y_1(\overline{C}_n)'] D \\
\vdots & \vdots \\
-\frac{1}{\lambda_p(\overline{H}_n)^2} [y_p(\overline{H}_n)' \otimes y_p(\overline{H}_n)'] D & \frac{1}{\lambda_p(\overline{C}_n)} [y_p(\overline{C}_n)' \otimes y_p(\overline{C}_n)'] D 
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

Then, under $H_0$, the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic

$$
P_n := n \left[ \log(\Lambda(-\overline{H}_n^{-1})) - \log(\Lambda(\overline{C}_n^{-1})) \right] \hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}^{-1} \left[ \log(\Lambda(-\overline{H}_n^{-1})) - \log(\Lambda(\overline{C}_n^{-1})) \right]
$$

is $\chi^2_p$.

A similar approach is based on the eigenspectrum of the information matrix ratio $\Lambda(-\overline{H}_n^{-1}(\theta_0)\overline{C}(\theta_0))$. We will call this test the Eigenvalue Test.

**Proposition 8 (Eigenvalue Test)** Let $\hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}$ be as defined in Theorem 1 with an estimator of $\nabla_{s \theta_0}$ given by

$$
\hat{\nabla}_{s \theta_0} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{\lambda_1(\overline{H}_n)} [y_1(\overline{C}_n)' \otimes y_1(\overline{C}_n)'] D & -\frac{\lambda_1(\overline{C}_n)}{\lambda_1(\overline{H}_n)^2} [y_1(\overline{H}_n)' \otimes y_1(\overline{H}_n)'] D \\
\vdots & \vdots \\
\frac{1}{\lambda_p(\overline{H}_n)} [y_p(\overline{C}_n)' \otimes y_p(\overline{C}_n)'] D & -\frac{\lambda_p(\overline{C}_n)}{\lambda_p(\overline{H}_n)^2} [y_p(\overline{H}_n)' \otimes y_p(\overline{H}_n)'] D 
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

Then, under $H_0$, the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic

$$
Q_n := n \left[ \Lambda(-\overline{H}_n^{-1}\overline{C}_n) - 1_p \right] \hat{\Sigma}_{s,n}^{-1} \left[ \Lambda(-\overline{H}_n^{-1}\overline{C}_n) - 1_p \right]
$$

is $\chi^2_p$. 
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3 GIMTs for Vine Copulas

A regular vine (R-vine) copula is a nested set of bivariate copulas representing unconditional and conditional dependence between elements of the initial random vector (see, e.g., [Joe 1996; Bedford and Cooke 2001, 2002]. Any \( d \)-variate copula can be expressed as a product of such (conditional) bivariate copulas and there are many ways of writing this product. Graphically, R-vine copulas can be illustrated by a set of connected trees \( \mathcal{V} = \{T_1, \ldots, T_{d-1}\} \), where each edge represents a bivariate conditional copula. The nodes illustrate the arguments of the associated copula. The edges of tree \( T_i \) form the nodes of tree \( T_{i+1} \), \( i \in \{1, \ldots, d-2\} \). The proximity condition of [Bedford and Cooke 2001] then defines which possible edges are allowed between the nodes to form an R-vine. If we denote the set of bivariate copulas used in trees \( \mathcal{V} \) by \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}) \) and the corresponding set of parameters by \( \theta(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V})) \), then we can specify an R-vine copula by \( (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}), \theta(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}))) \).

Let \( U_1, \ldots, U_d \) denote a pseudo-sample as introduced in Section 2.1. The edges \( j(e), k(e)\) of \( D(e) \) in \( E_i \), for \( 1 \leq i \leq d-1 \) correspond the set of bivariate copula densities \( \mathcal{B} = \{ c_{j(e),k(e)}|D(e)|e \in E_i, 1 \leq i \leq d-1 \} \). The indices \( j(e) \) and \( k(e) \) form the conditioned set while \( D(e) \) is called conditioning set. Then a regular vine copula density is given by the product

\[
c_{1,\ldots,d}(u) = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \prod_{e \in E_i} c_{j(e),k(e)}|D(e)|C_j(e)|D(e)(u_{j(e)}|u_D(e)), C_k(e)|D(e)(u_{k(e)}|u_D(e))). \tag{3}
\]

The copula arguments \( C_j(e)|D(e)(u_{j(e)}|u_D(e)) \) and \( C_k(e)|D(e)(u_{k(e)}|u_D(e)) \) can be derived integral-free by the formula derived from the first derivative of the corresponding cdf with respect to the second copula argument [Joe 1996]:

\[
C_j(e)|D(e)(u_{j(e)}|u_D(e)) = \frac{\partial C_j(e)|D(e)(u_{j(e)}|u_D(e)), C(u_{j(e)}|u_D(e),j(e)))}{\partial C(u_{j(e)}|u_D(e),j(e))}.
\]

An example of a 5-dimensional R-vine is given in Figure 1.

The canonical vine (C-vine) and the drawable vine (D-vine) are two special R-vines. The C-vine has in each tree a root node which is connected to all other nodes in this tree. In the D-vine each node is connected to two other nodes at most.

The copula parameter vector \( \theta(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V})) \) can be estimated either in a tree-by-tree approach called sequential estimation, or in a full maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) procedure [Aas et al. 2009]. The sequential procedure uses the hierarchical structure of R-vines and is quick – its results are often used as starting values for the MLE approach. Both are consistent estimators.
Figure 1: Tree structure of a 5-dimensional R-vine copula.

Vine copulas have gained popularity because of the benefits they offer when dimension $d$ is high. First, they permit a decomposition of a $d$-variate copula with $O(d^2)$ or more parameters into $d(d-1)/2$ bivariate (one-parameter) copulas, which reduces computational burden. Second, they offer a natural way to impose conditional independence by dropping selected higher-order edges in $\mathcal{V}$. Finally, the integral free expressions for the conditional copulas offer an additional computational benefit.

Such a reduction of parameters using the conditional independence copula can be achieved in two ways. First, single conditional copulas can be assumed independent, especially if some pre-testing procedure confirms this (see, e.g., Genest and Favre, 2007). Further, by setting all pair-copula families above a certain tree order to the independence copula, the number of parameters can be reduced significantly. This involves no testing and is often done heuristically; Brechmann et al. (2012) call this approach truncation.

In our settings, vine copulas offer an additional advantage over conventional copulas. As an example, consider testing goodness-of-fit of a $d$-variate Eyraud-Farlie-Gumbel-Morgenstern (EFGM) copula. This copula has $2^d - d - 1$ parameters so the number of degrees-of-freedom for the White Test is of order $O(2^{2d})$, while for the eigenspectrum-based tests that number is as low as one. Regardless of the GIMT, the calculation of the test statistic involves evaluating, analytically or numerically, the score function and the Hessian. The score $\nabla_{\theta} \ln c_{\theta}$ is a vector-valued function with $2^d - d - 1$ elements, each a function of all $2^d - d - 1$ elements of $\theta$. The Hessian is a large matrix-valued function, in which each component is a function of the entire vector $\theta$. Now what changes if we replace that copula with a $d$-variate vine?

Consider the case of $d = 3$. Suppose we use the following R-vine representation

$$c_{123}(u_1, u_2, u_3; \theta) = c_{12}(u_1, u_2; \theta_1)c_{23}(u_2, u_3; \theta_2)c_{13;2}(C_{1|2}(u_1|u_2; \theta_1), C_{3|2}(u_3|u_2; \theta_2); \theta_3),$$
where each bivariate copula is EFGM and \( \theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3) \). Then, it is easy to see that \( \nabla_\theta \ln c_\theta \) has the form
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\nabla_{\theta_1} \ln c_{12} + \nabla_{\theta_1} \ln c_{13;2} \\
\nabla_{\theta_2} \ln c_{23} + \nabla_{\theta_2} \ln c_{13;2} \\
\nabla_{\theta_3} \ln c_{13;2}
\end{pmatrix},
\]
where each element is a score function for the corresponding element of \( \theta \) – a simpler function with fewer argument (see, e.g., Stöber and Schepsmeier, 2013). The term \( \nabla_{\theta_1} \ln c_{13;2} \) is the only term that has all three parameters but if a sequential procedure is used, estimates of \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) come from previous steps and are treated as known so only \( \theta_3 \) is effectively unknown in \( c_{13;2} \). Regardless of the estimation method, only derivatives of bivariate copulas are needed, which are much simpler than in higher dimensions. Closed form expressions for the first two derivatives of several bivariate copulas are given in Schepsmeier and Stöber (2014, 2012). The Hessian \( H \) will simplify accordingly – some cross derivatives will be zero (Stöber and Schepsmeier, 2013). The same is true for the third-order derivatives used to obtain \( \hat{\Sigma}_{s,n} \).

These are sizable simplifications when dealing with high dimensional copulas. The problem is that multivariate dependence requires sufficiently rich parametrization which affects tests’ properties. It also imposes heavy computational burdens as most available “blanket” tests use parametric bootstrap, which is harder to implement in high dimensions. Our simulations suggest that goodness-of-fit tests including GIMTs deteriorate quickly for copulas with dimension \( d > 2 \) unless the copulas are vines.

## 4 Power study

In this section we analyze the size and power properties of the new copula goodness-of-fit tests. We start by comparing performance of the various versions of GIMT for vine copulas. This is the case where we believe our tests are particularly useful in high dimensions. Then, for classical (non-vine) copula specifications, we compare the best performing tests with “blanket” non-GIMT alternatives favored in an extensive simulation study by Genest et al. (2009).

### 4.1 Comparison Between GIMTs for Vine Copulas

#### 4.1.1 Simulation Setup

We follow the simulation procedure of Schepsmeier (2013) and consider testing the null that the vine copula model is \( M_0 = RV(\mathcal{V}_0, \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{V}_0), \theta_0(\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{V}_0))) \) against the alternative \( M_1 = RV(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{V}_1), \theta_1(\mathcal{B}_1(\mathcal{V}_1))), M_1 \neq M_0 \). In each Monte Carlo simulation
we generate \( n \) observations on \( \mathbf{u}_{M_0} = (\mathbf{u}_{M_0}^1, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_{M_0}^d) \) from model \( M_0 \), estimate the vine copula parameters \( \theta_0(B_0(V_0)) \) and \( \theta_1(B_1(V_1)) \) and calculate the test statistic under the null, \( t^*_n(M_0) \), and under the alternative, \( t^*_n(M_1) \), for all the tests considered in Section 2. The number of simulations is \( B = 5000 \).

Then we obtain approximate p-values \( \hat{p}_n \) for each test statistic as \( \hat{p}_n := \hat{p}(t_j) := 1/B \sum_{r=1}^{B} 1\{t_r \geq t_j\}, j = 1, \ldots, B \) and the actual size \( \hat{F}_{M_0}(\alpha) \) and (size-adjusted) power \( \hat{F}_{M_1}(\alpha) \) using the formula

\[
\hat{F}(\alpha) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{r=1}^{B} 1\{\hat{p}_r \leq \alpha\}, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1)
\]

We use an R-vine copula with \( d = 5 \) and \( d = 8 \) as \( M_0 \). As \( M_1 \) we use (a) a multivariate Gaussian copula, which can also be represented as a vine, (b) a C-vine copula and (c) a D-vine copula. The details on the copulas under the null and alternatives, as well as on the method used for choosing the specific bivariate components, are provided in Appendix B. All calculations in this section were performed with R [R Development Core Team, 2013] and the R-package VineCopula of Schepsmeier et al. (2013). ^1

### 4.1.2 Simulation Results

We start by assessing the asymptotic approximation of the tests. Figures 2-3 show empirical distributions of the test statistics for two sample sizes, \( n = 500 \) and 1000. Several observations seem important here. First, overall we observe convergence to the asymptotic distribution even for the fairly high dimensional copulas we consider but asymptotics serve as a very poor approximator in all, except for a few, cases. Second, the sequential approach performs better than the MLE approach – an observation for which we do not have an explanation. Third, the sampling distributions of the Trace White and Determinant IR Tests – one-degree-of-freedom tests – are much closer to their asymptotic limits, regardless of the dimension, than tests with other functional forms and tests with greater degrees of freedom. Fourth, the Determinant White, Log Trace, and Eigenvalue Tests deteriorate quickly as dimension increases. The Trace White and Determinant IR Tests dominate other tests in terms of asymptotic approximation.

Now we look at size-power behavior. Since some of the proposed tests face substantial numerical problems with the asymptotic variance estimation and many exhibit large deviations from the \( \chi^2_1 \) distribution in small samples, especially when

---

^1The R code used in this section, as well as the Matlab codes used in the next section are available from the authors upon request.
Figure 2: Empirical densities of GIMT for R-vine copulas: $d = 5, n = 500$
Figure 3: Empirical densities for GIMT for R-vine copulas: $d = 8, n = 1000$
dimension is high, we only investigate the bootstrap version of the tests. Figures 4-5 illustrate the estimated power of all 9 proposed tests. We consider three dimensions, \( d = 5, 8 \) and 16; and two versions, sequential (dotted lines) and MLE (solid lines). The two sample sizes we consider are \( n = 500 \) and 1000 for \( d = 5 \) and 8; and \( n = 1000 \) and 5000 for \( d = 16 \). Percentage of rejections of \( H_0 \) is on the y-axis, while the truth (R-vine) and the alternatives are on the x-axis. Obviously, the power is equal to the actual size for the true model. A horizontal black dashed line indicates the 5% nominal size.

All proposed tests maintain their given size independently of the number of sample points, dimension or estimation method. For \( d = 5 \) we can observe increasing power as sample size increases for all tests except the Determinant White Test. If \( d = 8 \) the behaviour of the tests, especially the MLE versions, is more erratic. The Determinant White Test seems to be the only test that continues to perform poorly in terms of power when sample size increases. Other tests show improvement in power for either the mle or sequential version or both. Interestingly, the Trace White, Eigenvalue and IR Tests at times show very strong power in one of the two versions (mle or sequential) and no power in the other. Overall, all tests except the Determinant White show power against each alternative, showing that they are consistent.

For \( d = 16 \) we report only sequential estimates as they were most time efficient. The Log Eigenspectrum, Eigenvalue, IR and Determinant IR tests show consistently good behavior in terms of power against the two alternatives. The power of the Determinant IR and Log Eigenspectrum Tests remains high independent of the dimension or the sample size.

4.2 Comparison with Non-GIMT Tests

4.2.1 Simulation Setup

In this section we compare selected GIMTs for copulas with the original White test \( T_n \) and three “blanket” copula goodness-of-fit tests analyzed by Genest et al. (2009). The GIMTs we select are the Log GAIC Test \( G_n \) and the Eigenvalue Test \( Q_n \) – they showed favorable size and power properties in the simulations of previous sections. The selected non-GIMTs are based on the empirical copula process and the Rosenblatt and Kendall transformation – they showed a favorable size and power behavior in an extensive Monte Carlo study by Genest et al. (2009). We provide details on the three tests in Appendix D and we summarize them in Table 2. For vine copulas such comparisons are provided by Schepsmeier (2015) so in this section we focus on classical multivariate (non-vine) copulas.

Again, since the limiting approximation is poor and depends on an unknown
Figure 4: Size and power comparison for bootstrap versions of proposed tests in 5 and 8 dimensions with different sample sizes.
Figure 5: Size and power comparison for bootstrap versions of proposed tests in 16 dimensions and different sample sizes (only sequential estimates are reported).
Table 2: Summary of non-GIMTs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empirical copula process</th>
<th>$S_n$</th>
<th>$n \int_{[0,1]} [(C_n(u) - C_{\theta_n}(u))^2 dC_n(u)]$</th>
<th>$= \sum_{j=1}^{n} {C_n(U_j) - C_{\theta_n}(U_j)}^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosenblatt’s transform</td>
<td>$S_n^R$</td>
<td>${V_j = R_{C_{\theta_n}}(U_j)}_{j=1}^{n}$</td>
<td>$\sum_{j=1}^{n} {C_n(V_j) - C_{\theta_n}(V_j)}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall’s transform</td>
<td>$S_n^K$</td>
<td>$C_\theta(U) \sim K_\theta$</td>
<td>$n \int_{[0,1]} [(K_n(v) - K_{\theta_n}(v))^2 dK_{\theta_n}(v)]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

parameter $\theta$, we resort to parametric bootstrap to obtain valid $p$-values. Furthermore, $\theta_0$ and $F_1, \ldots, F_d$ are unknown as before. Therefore we use the pseudo-sample $\{U_{ij}\}_{i=1}^{n} \sim F_1, \ldots, F_d$ to approximate $F_1(X_{1j}), \ldots, F_d(X_{nj})$, where $U_{ij} = \frac{R_{ij}}{n+1}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, $j = 1, \ldots, d$, and $R_{ij}$ is the rank of $X_{ij}$ amongst $X_{1j}, \ldots, X_{nj}$. We can use any consistent estimator of $\theta_0$, e.g., the estimator based on Kendall’s $\tau$, or the canonical maximum likelihood estimator (CMLE), which maximizes the pseudo-likelihood $\ell(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln c_\theta(U_i)$, where $U_i = (U_{i1}, \ldots, U_{id})$. In this section, we use the estimator based on Kendall’s $\tau$ in all bivariate and multivariate cases except for tests involving the Outer Power Clayton copula, for which the estimator based on Kendall’s $\tau$ is not feasible. For details see Appendix C.

4.2.2 Simulation Results

We report selected size and power results in tables similar to those reported by Genest et al. (2009) and Huang and Prokhorov (2014). The point of the tables is to examine the effect of the sample size, degree of dependence and dimension on size and power of the seven tests. The nominal level is fixed at 5% as before.

We first report bivariate results for selected values of Kendall’s $\tau$ and four one-parameter copula families, where we obtain an estimate of the parameter by inverting the sample version of Kendall’s $\tau$. The results are based on 1,000 random samples of size $n = 150$ and 500. Tables 3 and 4 report the size and power results for $n = 150$ and Kendall’s $\tau$ equal 0.5 and 0.75, respectively. Table 5 reports the results for $n = 500$ and Kendall’s $\tau = 0.5$. In each row we report the percentage of rejections of $H_0$ associated with $S_n$, $S_n^R$, $S_n^K$, $T_n$ and $Q_n$. As an example, Table 3 shows that when testing the null of the Gaussian copula using $Q_n$ and $n = 150$, we reject the null about 42% of the time when the true copula was Gumbel with Kendall’s $\tau = 0.5$. For all tests, except $T_n$, we bootstrap critical values. We use analytical values for $T_n$ to show that the conventional version of IMT is badly oversized (more comparisons including bootstrap $T_n$ can be found in Huang and Prokhorov (2014)).
Table 3: Percentage of rejections of $H_0$ by various tests for sample size $n = 150$ arising from different copula models with $d = 2$ and Kendall’s $\tau = 0.50$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copula under $H_0$</th>
<th>True copula</th>
<th>$S_n$</th>
<th>$S_n^R$</th>
<th>$S_n^K$</th>
<th>$T_n$</th>
<th>$Q_n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that all the tests maintain the nominal size and generally have power against the alternatives. We note that in the bivariate case we use only one indicator in constructing $T_n$ and so $Q_n$ provides no dimension reduction. The analytical p-values used for $T_n$ lead to noticeable oversize distortions, while $Q_n$ retains size close to nominal and is often conservative compared with $S_n$, $S_n^R$, and $S_n^K$. The tables also show that a higher dependence or a larger sample size give higher power, which is true for all the tests we consider. The increase in power resulting from the sample size increase is an indication of $Q_n$ being consistent.

Table 6 presents selected results for $d = 4$. Here we focus on $S_n$, $T_n$ and $Q_n$ but report two versions of $T_n$, one based on bootstrapped critical values ($T_n^b$) and the other based on the analytical asymptotic critical values ($T_n^a$) – this high dimensional comparison was not considered by Huang and Prokhorov (2014). We do not include
Table 4: Percentage of rejections of $\mathcal{H}_0$ by various tests for sample size $n = 150$ arising from different copula models with $d = 2$ and Kendall’s $\tau = 0.75$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copula under $\mathcal{H}_0$</th>
<th>True copula</th>
<th>Test based on $S_n$</th>
<th>$S_n^R$</th>
<th>$S_n^K$</th>
<th>$T_n$</th>
<th>$Q_n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$S_n^R$ and $S_n^K$ because their behavior appears similar to that of $S_n$. Under the null, we have three one-parameter Archimedean copulas, the Gaussian copula with six distinct parameters in the correlation matrix and the Outer Power Clayton copula with two parameters. The alternatives are six four-dimensional copula families. We did not include the Student-t copula under the null (but include it under the alternative) due to the heavy computational burden associated with generating from this copula. All the other true copulas are also considered under the null.

Several observations are unique to the multivariate simulations because they involve more than one parameter and more than two marginals. To simulate from the Outer Power Clayton copula, which has two parameters, we set $(\beta, \theta) = (4/3, 1)$, which corresponds to Kendall’s $\tau$ equal 0.5. For the Gaussian copula, after estimating the pairwise Kendall $\tau$’s, we invert them to obtain the corresponding elements of the correlation matrix. For the Archimedean copulas, we follow Berg (2009) and
Table 5: Percentage of rejections of $\mathcal{H}_0$ by various tests for sample size $n = 500$ arising from different copula models with $d = 2$ and Kendall’s $\tau = 0.50$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copula under $\mathcal{H}_0$</th>
<th>True copula</th>
<th>Test based on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S_n$</td>
<td>$S_n^R$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

obtain the dependence parameter by inverting the average of six pairwise Kendall $\tau$’s. For the Outer Power Clayton copula, we can only estimate the parameters by CMLE. Details on simulating from and estimation of the Outer Power Clayton copula can be found in Hofert et al. (2012). For a given value of $\tau$ and each combination of copulas under the null and under the alternative, the results we report are based on 1,000 random samples of size $n = 150$. Each of these samples is then used to test goodness-of-fit. Table 6 reports size and power for (average) Kendall’s $\tau$ equal 0.5.

The key observation from Table 6 is that $Q_n$ dominates both versions of $T_n$ in terms of power. We attribute this to the dimension reduction permitted by $Q_n$. The table also shows that our test maintains the nominal size of 5% in the multivariate cases. Overall, the behavior of $Q_n$ is as good if not better than that of $S_n$. A remarkable case of the better performance of $Q_n$ is the tests involving the Student-t alternative, where $S_n$ does worse, regardless of the copula under the null.
Table 6: Percentage of rejections of $\mathcal{H}_0$ for $n = 150$ and $d = 4$ with Kendall’s $\tau = 0.50$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copula under $\mathcal{H}_0$</th>
<th>True copula</th>
<th>Test based on $S_d$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{T}_n^a$</th>
<th>$\mathcal{T}_n^b$</th>
<th>$Q_n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Percentage of rejections of $H_0$ for $n = 150$ and $d = 5$ with Kendall’s $\tau = 0.50$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copula under $H_0$</th>
<th>True copula</th>
<th>Test based on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S_d$</td>
<td>$Q_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Percentage of rejections of $\mathcal{H}_0$ for $n = 150$ and $d = 8$ with Kendall’s $\tau = 0.50$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copula under $\mathcal{H}_0$</th>
<th>True copula</th>
<th>Test based on</th>
<th>$S_n$</th>
<th>$Q_n$</th>
<th>$T_n$</th>
<th>$G_n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.0}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{4.8}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.0}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.0}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>$\mathbf{4.9}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{4.9}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.0}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{4.9}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>$\mathbf{4.9}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{4.9}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.0}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.0}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.2}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.0}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.1}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.1}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>Gaussian</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>Gumbel</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Power Clayton</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.0}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.1}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.3}$</td>
<td>$\mathbf{5.0}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An interesting observation is how the power of $Q_n$ changes between Table 3 and Table 6. Consider, for example, the test of the null of the Frank copula. Regardless of the alternative, $Q_n$ performs poorly in the bivariate case. However, with the increased dimension the behavior of $Q_n$ improves substantially. This is especially pronounced in comparison with $T_n$, whose power remains particularly low against the Archimedean alternatives. At the same time, for the Student-t and Gaussian alternatives, the performance of $Q_n$ stands out even compared with $S_n$.

Table 7 and Table 8 present selected results for $d = 5$ and $d = 8$, respectively. Here we focus on $S_d$, $Q_n$, $T_n$, and $G_n$. We use $T_n$ (bootstrap) as a benchmark. The Log GAIC Test $G_n$ is another GIMT that performed well in Section 4.1 — we use it to further illustrate the dimension reduction permitted by GIMTs. In Tables 7 and 8, under the null we have three one-parameter Archimedean copulas, the Outer Power Clayton copula with two parameters, and the Gaussian copula with $\frac{d(d-1)}{2}$ distinct parameters in the correlation matrix. The alternatives are Frank, Clayton, Gumbel, Outer Power Clayton, Gaussian, and $t$ copulas. Samples are in every scenario are simulated from a copula with Kendall’s $\tau$ equal to 0.5. The parameter estimation here is done by CMLE, rather than by conversion of Kendall’s $\tau$ used for $d = 4$ in Table 7. The explicit expressions of the score functions of the selected Archimedean copulas can be found in Hofert et al. (2012).

The results in Tables 7-8 show that, as expected, $Q_n$, $G_n$, and $T_n$ all maintain the nominal size and show power. More interestingly, the power of the three GIMT tests increases as the dimension increases. In particular, $Q_n$ and $G_n$ behave similarly under all null hypotheses and both show significant increases in power in almost all scenarios as the dimension grows. We also see that $Q_n$ and $G_n$ dominate $T_n$ in all scenarios. Note that for the Frank, Clayton, and Gumbel copulas, both Hessian and OPG matrices degenerate to scalars; therefore there is no dimension reduction in $Q_n$ and $G_n$ compared to $T_n$. Yet, we observe that $Q_n$ and $G_n$ are more powerful than $T_n$, which may be due to the fact that the eigenvalues of $-H^{-1}C$ are more sensitive to changes in $H$ and $C$ than the eigenvalues of $H + C$. When testing multi-parameter copulas, e.g., multivariate Gaussian, due to the additional dimension reduction, $Q_n$ and $G_n$ perform much better than $T_n$.

5 Conclusion

We consider a battery of tests resulting from eigenspectrum-based versions of the information matrix equality applied to copulas. The benefit of this generalization is due to a reduction in degrees of freedom of the tests and to the focused hypothesis function used to construct them. For example, in testing the validity of
high-dimension, multi-parameter copulas we manage to reduce the information ma-
trix based test statistic to an asymptotically $\chi^2$ with one degree of freedom, and we
can focus on the effect of larger or smaller eigenvalues by using specific functions of
the eigenspectrum such as $\text{det}$ or $\text{trace}$. However, only a few of the proposed tests
can be well approximated by their asymptotic distributions in realistic sample sizes
so we have also looked at the bootstrap version of the tests.

The main argument of the paper is that the bootstrap versions of GIMTs domi-
nate other available tests of copula validity when copulas are high-dimensional and
multi-parameter. We use this argument to motivate the use of GIMTs on vine cop-
ulas, where additional simplifications result from the functional form of the Hessian
and the score.
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A Proofs

Proof of Lemma 1: The proof is based on combining the results of [Golden et al. (2013) and Huang and Prokhorov (2014)]. It also relates to the work of [Presnell and Boos (2004)] on information ratio test.

We start with $d = 2$ for simplicity and later give the formulas for any $d$. Let

$$d_i(\theta) := \begin{pmatrix} vech(\mathbb{H}_i(\theta)) \\ vech(\mathbb{C}_i(\theta)) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p(p+1)}$$

denote the lower triangle vectorizations of $-\mathbb{H}_i(\theta)$ and $\mathbb{C}_i(\theta)$ and let $\nabla D_\theta := \mathbb{E} \nabla_\theta d_i(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{p(p+1) \times p}$ denote the expected Jacobian matrix of the random vector $d_i(\theta)$. We can estimate $\mathbb{E} d_i(\theta_0)$ by $\bar{d}(\hat{\theta}_n)$, where $\bar{d}(\theta) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i(\theta)$.

Let $\hat{F}_{ji} = \hat{F}_j(x_{ji})$, $j = 1, 2$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, be the empirical cdf’s. Note that $d_i(\theta)$ implicitly depends on the nonparametric estimates of the marginals, $\hat{F}_1(x_1)$ and $\hat{F}_2(x_2)$. Then,

$$d_i(\theta) = \left\{ vech[\nabla^2_\theta \ln c(\hat{F}_{1i}, \hat{F}_{2i}; \theta)]', vech[\nabla_\theta \ln c(\hat{F}_{1i}, \hat{F}_{2i}; \theta) \nabla'_\theta \ln c(\hat{F}_{1i}, \hat{F}_{2i}; \theta)]' \right\}' .$$

Provided that the derivatives and expectation exist, let

$$\nabla D_\theta = \mathbb{E} \nabla_\theta d_i(\theta)$$

and

$$\nabla \bar{D}_\theta = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_\theta d_i(\theta).$$

First, expand $\sqrt{n} \bar{d}_\theta$ with respect to $\theta$:

$$\sqrt{n} \bar{d}(\theta) = \sqrt{n} d(\theta_0) + \nabla D_{\theta_0} \sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) + o_p(1).$$

Chen and Fan (2006) show that

$$\sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \rightarrow N(0, B^{-1}GB^{-1}),$$

where

$$B = -\mathbb{H}(\theta_0),$$
$$G = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(\sqrt{n} A_n^*),$$
$$A_n^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\nabla_\theta \ln c(F_{1i}, F_{2i}; \theta_0) + W_1(F_{1i}) + W_2(F_{2i})).$$
Here terms $W_1(F_{i_1})$ and $W_2(F_{2i})$ are the adjustments needed to account for the empirical distributions used in place of the true distributions. These terms are calculated as follows:

$$
W_1(F_{i_1}) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 [I\{F_{i_1} \leq u\} - u] \nabla^2_{\theta,u} \ln c(u, v; \theta_0) c(u, v; \theta_0) du dv,
$$

$$
W_2(F_{2i}) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 [I\{F_{2i} \leq v\} - v] \nabla_{\theta,v} \ln c(u, v; \theta_0) c(u, v; \theta_0) du dv.
$$

So, rewriting the consistency result from Chen and Fan (2006) we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) = B^{-1} \sqrt{n}A_n + o_p(1).$$

Second, expand $\sqrt{n}d(\theta_0)$ with respect to $F_1$ and $F_1$:

$$\sqrt{n}d(\theta_0) \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i(\theta_0) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla F_1 d_i(\theta_0) \sqrt{n}(\hat{F}_{1i} - F_{1i}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla F_2 d_i(\theta_0) \sqrt{n}(\hat{F}_{2i} - F_{2i}).$$

Under suitable regularity conditions (see, e.g., Genest et al., 1995; Chen and Fan, 2006),

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla F_1 d_i(\theta_0) \sqrt{n}(\hat{F}_{1i} - F_{1i})$$

$$\simeq \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \nabla_u \left\{ vech[\nabla^2_{\theta} \ln c(u, v; \theta_0)]', vech[\nabla_{\theta} \ln c(u, v; \theta_0) \nabla'_{\theta} \ln c(u, v; \theta_0)]' \right\}'\left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^1 \int_0^1 [I\{F_{1i} \leq u\} - u] \nabla_u \left\{ vech[\nabla^2_{\theta} \ln c(u, v; \theta_0)]', vech[\nabla_{\theta} \ln c(u, v; \theta_0) \nabla'_{\theta} \ln c(u, v; \theta_0)]' \right\}' c(u, v; \theta_0) du dv \right].$$

Denote

$$M_1(F_{1i}) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 [I\{F_{1i} \leq u\} - u] \nabla_u \left\{ vech[\nabla^2_{\theta} \ln c(u, v; \theta_0)]', vech[\nabla_{\theta} \ln c(u, v; \theta_0) \nabla'_{\theta} \ln c(u, v; \theta_0)]' \right\}' c(u, v; \theta_0) du dv,$$

then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla F_1 d_i(\theta_0) \sqrt{n}(\hat{F}_{1i} - F_{1i}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n M_1(F_{1i}).$$
Similarly, denote
\[ M_2(F_{2i}) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 [I\{F_{2i} \leq v\} - v] \nabla_v \{ vech[\nabla^2_\theta \ln c(u, v; \theta_0)]' \ n_v \ln c(u, v; \theta_0) \} \}' c(u, v; \theta_0) du dv, \]
then
\[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{F_{2i}} d_i(\theta_0) \sqrt{n} (\hat{F}_{2i} - F_{2i}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=1}^n M_2(F_{2i}). \]

Therefore, equation (5) can be rewritten as
\[ \sqrt{n} \tilde{d}(\theta_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i(\theta_0) + \sqrt{n} B_n^* + o_p(1), \]
where
\[ B_n^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [M_1(F_{1i}) + M_2(F_{2i})]. \]

Finally, combining the expansions gives
\[ \sqrt{n} \tilde{d}(\hat{\theta}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n d_i(\theta_0) + \sqrt{n} B_n^* + \nabla D_{\theta_0} B^{-1} \sqrt{n} A_n^* + o_p(1). \]

So \( \tilde{d}(\hat{\theta}) \) converges in distribution to a multivariate normal with variance matrix \( V_{\theta_0} \):
\[ \sqrt{n} \tilde{d}(\hat{\theta}) \rightarrow N(0, V_{\theta_0}), \]
where
\[ V_{\theta_0} = \mathbb{E} \left\{ d_i(\theta_0) + M_1(F_{1i}) + M_2(F_{2i}) + \nabla D_{\theta_0} B^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} \ln c(F_{1i}, F_{2i}; \theta_0) + W_1(F_{1i}) + W_2(F_{2i}) \right\} \times \left\{ d_i(\theta_0) + M_1(F_{1i}) + M_2(F_{2i}) + \nabla D_{\theta_0} B^{-1} \nabla_{\theta} \ln c(F_{1i}, F_{2i}; \theta_0) + W_1(F_{1i}) + W_2(F_{2i}) \right\}'. \]

Extension to \( d \geq 2 \) is straightforward. Now
\[ d_i(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} vech(\nabla^2_\theta \ln c(F_{1i}, F_{2i}, \ldots, F_{di}; \theta)) \\ vech(\nabla_\theta \ln c(F_{1i}, F_{2i}, \ldots, F_{di}; \theta) \nabla^\prime_\theta \ln c(F_{1i}, F_{2i}, \ldots, F_{di}; \theta)) \end{pmatrix}, \]
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and the asymptotic variance matrix becomes

\[ V_{\theta_0} = E \left\{ d_i(\theta_0) - \nabla D_{\theta_0} \mathbb{H}^{-1} \left[ \nabla_\theta \ln c(F_{1i}, F_{2i}, \ldots, F_{di}; \theta_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{d} W_j(F_{ji}) + \sum_{j=1}^{d} M_j(F_{ji}) \right] \right\} \]

\[ \times \left\{ d_i(\theta_0) - \nabla D_{\theta_0} \mathbb{H}^{-1} \left[ \nabla_\theta \ln c(F_{1i}, F_{2i}, \ldots, F_{di}; \theta_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{d} W_j(F_{ji}) + \sum_{j=1}^{d} M_j(F_{ji}) \right] \right\}', \]

(6)

where, for \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, d \),

\[ W_j(F_{ji}) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 [I\{F_{ji} \leq u_n\} - u_j] \nabla_{\theta, u_j}^2 \ln c(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_d; \theta_0) c(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_d; \theta_0) du_1 du_2 \cdots du_d, \]

and

\[ M_j(F_{ji}) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 [I\{F_{ji} \leq u_j\} - u_j] \nabla_{u_j} \text{vech}[\nabla_\theta^2 \ln c(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_d; \theta_0) + \nabla_\theta \ln c(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_d; \theta_0)] \nabla_\theta' \ln c(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_d; \theta_0) c(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_d; \theta_0) du_1 du_2 \cdots du_d. \]

Now, since \( \hat{s}_n \) is a function of \( \hat{\mathbf{d}}(\bar{\theta}) \), its asymptotic distribution can be easily obtained using the delta method. Define

\[ \nabla s_{\theta_0} := \left( \frac{\partial s}{\partial \text{vech}(\mathbb{H})'} \bigg|_{\theta_0}, \frac{\partial s}{\partial \text{vech}(\mathbb{C})'} \bigg|_{\theta_0} \right) \]

(7)

Then,

\[ \sqrt{n} \hat{s}_n \overset{d}{\rightarrow} N(0, \Sigma_s(\theta_0)), \]

where

\[ \Sigma_s(\theta_0) := (\nabla s_{\theta_0}) V_{\theta_0} (\nabla s_{\theta_0})'. \]

**Proof of Theorem 1:** Follows trivially from Lemma 1 and consistency of \( \hat{\Sigma}_{n,s} \) for \( \Sigma \).

**Lemma A1:** For any real-valued square matrices \( A \) and \( B \), let the elements of \( B \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r} \) be functions of \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \). Let the matrix \( \frac{dB}{dA} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r^2} \) be called matrix derivative of \( B \) by \( A \) if

\[ \frac{dB}{dA} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \text{vec}(A)} \text{vec}(B)', \]
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where vec denotes the vectorization operator. Let $D$ denote the transition matrix, i.e. such a matrix that for, any $A$, $vech(A) = Dvec(A)$ and $D^+ vech(A) = vec(A)$, where $D^+$ is the Moore-Penrose inverse of $D$. Then, the following results hold (see, e.g., Kollo and von Rosen (2006):

$$\frac{dA}{dA} = I_p^2$$
$$\frac{dC'A}{dA} = I_p \otimes C$$, where $C$ is a matrix of proper size with constant elements

$$\frac{d(C'B)}{dA} = \frac{dB}{dA}(I \otimes C)$$
$$\frac{dB'C}{dA} = \frac{dB}{dA}(C \otimes I)$$
$$\frac{dA^{-1}}{dA} = -A^{-1} \otimes (A')^{-1}$$
$$\frac{d\text{tr}(B)}{dA} = \frac{dB}{dA} vech(I_r)$$
$$\frac{d\text{tr}(C'A)}{dA} = vec(C)$$, where $C$ is a matrix of proper size with constant elements

$$\frac{d \det(A)}{dA} = \det(A) vec(A^{-1})'$$
$$\frac{dA(B(C')}{dC} = \frac{dB}{dC} \frac{dA}{dB}$$

**Lemma A2:** Let $\lambda$ denote an eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix $A$ and let $y$ denote the corresponding normalized eigenvector, i.e. the solution of the equation system $Ay = \lambda y$, such that $y'y = 1$. Let $D$ denote the duplication matrix. Then, the following result holds (see Magnus (1985):

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial vech(A)} = [y' \otimes y']D$$

**Proof of Proposition 1:** First use Lemma A1 on determinant differentiation, as well as properties of vec and vech operators, to obtain

$$\nabla s_{\theta_0} = det(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0) + \mathbb{C}(\theta_0)) vech((\mathbb{H}(\theta_0) + \mathbb{C}(\theta_0))^{-1} [I_{p+1}/2, I_{p(p+1)}/2]$$

Now use $\hat{\theta}_n$, which is consistent for $\theta_0$, and the sample equivalents $\mathbb{H}$ and $\mathbb{C}$, which are consistent for $\mathbb{H}$ and $\mathbb{C}$, to obtain the consistent estimator $\hat{\nabla} s_{\theta_0}$ given in the proposition.
The asymptotic distribution of $T_n^{(D)}$ then follows from Theorem 1.

**Proof of Proposition 2:** First use Lemma A1 on trace differentiation to obtain the form of $\nabla s_{\theta_0}$, then the result follows trivially from Theorem 1.

**Proof of Proposition 3:** First use Lemma A1 on trace and inverse differentiation as well as the fact that $[C' \otimes A] vec(B) = vec(ABC)$, to obtain

$$\nabla s_{\theta_0} = \left( vech \left( \mathbb{H}(\theta_0)^{-1} C(\theta_0) \mathbb{H}(\theta_0)^{-1} \right)' , \; vech \left( -\mathbb{H}(\theta_0)^{-1} \right)' \right)$$

then replace the population values with consistent estimates as before, and apply Theorem 1 to obtain the result.

**Proof of Proposition 4:** Similar to previous propositions, using Lemma A1 on determinant differentiation to obtain

$$\nabla s_{\theta_0} = \text{det}(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0)^{-1} C(\theta_0)) \left( vech \left( -C(\theta_0)^{-1} \mathbb{H}(\theta_0)^{-1} C(\theta_0) \right)' , \; vech \left( C(\theta_0)^{-1} \right)' \right).$$

**Proof of Proposition 5:** Similar to previous propositions, using Lemma A1 on trace differentiation to obtain

$$\nabla s_{\theta_0} = \left( -\frac{1}{\text{tr}(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0)^{-1})} vech \left( \mathbb{H}(\theta_0)^{-2} \right)' , \; -\frac{1}{\text{tr}(C(\theta_0))} vech \left( I_p \right)' \right).$$

**Proof of Proposition 6:** Under the null, this is a log version of the IR test, so

$$\nabla s_{\theta_0} = \frac{1}{\text{tr}(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0)^{-1} C(\theta_0))} \left( vech \left( \mathbb{H}(\theta_0)^{-1} C(\theta_0) \mathbb{H}(\theta_0)^{-1} \right)' , \; vech \left( -\mathbb{H}(\theta_0)^{-1} \right)' \right).$$

The rest of the proof is the same as in previous propositions.

**Proof of Proposition 7:** Similar to above, using Lemma A2 to obtain

$$\nabla s_{\theta_0} = \left[ \begin{array}{c} -\frac{1}{\lambda_1(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))} [y_1(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))' \otimes y_1(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))' ] D \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_1(C(\theta_0))} [y_1(C(\theta_0))' \otimes y_1(C(\theta_0))' ] D \\ \\ ... \\ \\ -\frac{1}{\lambda_p(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))} [y_p(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))' \otimes y_p(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))' ] D \cdot \frac{1}{\lambda_p(C(\theta_0))} [y_p(C(\theta_0))' \otimes y_p(C(\theta_0))' ] D \end{array} \right].$$

**Proof of Proposition 8:** Similar to above, using Lemma A2 to obtain

$$\nabla s_{\theta_0} = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{\lambda_1(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))} [y_1(C(\theta_0))' \otimes y_1(C(\theta_0))' ] D \cdot -\frac{\lambda_1(C(\theta_0))}{\lambda_1(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))^2} [y_1(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))' \otimes y_1(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))' ] D \\ \\ ... \\ \\ \frac{1}{\lambda_p(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))} [y_p(C(\theta_0))' \otimes y_p(C(\theta_0))' ] D \cdot -\frac{\lambda_p(C(\theta_0))}{\lambda_p(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))^2} [y_p(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))' \otimes y_p(\mathbb{H}(\theta_0))' ] D \end{array} \right].$$
In Section 4.1.2 we used the following vine copula for our simulation study. Table 9 for \( d = 5 \) and Table 10 for \( d = 8 \) give details about the vine copula decomposition (structure) \( \mathcal{V} \), their selected pair-copula families \( \mathcal{B} \) and Kendall’s \( \tau \) for the vine copula under the null hypothesis. For the C-vine and D-vine, \( \mathcal{V} \) as well as \( \mathcal{B} \) are selected by the algorithms provided in the VineCopula package (Schepsmeier et al., 2013). \( \hat{\tau} \) denotes the estimated Kendall’s \( \tau \) in the pre-run step of the simulation procedure of Schepsmeier (2013). Note that the vine copula density is written in a short hand notation omitting the pair-copula arguments. The notation of the pair-copula families follows Brechmann and Schepsmeier (2013).

For the C- and D-vine the calculation of the vine copula density (3) simplifies. For the five-dimensional example used in the simulation study, (3) can be expressed as

\[
\begin{align*}
c_{12345} &= c_{1,2} \cdot c_{2,3} \cdot c_{2,4} \cdot c_{2,5} \cdot c_{1,3,2} \cdot c_{1,4,2} \cdot c_{1,5,2} \cdot c_{3,4,1,2} \cdot c_{4,5,1,2} \cdot c_{3,5,1,2,4} \\
c_{12345} &= c_{1,2} \cdot c_{1,5} \cdot c_{4,5} \cdot c_{3,4} \cdot c_{2,5,1} \cdot c_{1,4,5} \cdot c_{3,5,4} \cdot c_{2,4,1,5} \cdot c_{1,3,4,5} \cdot c_{2,3,1,4,5}
\end{align*}
\]

Similar representations used for \( d = 8 \) and 16 as well as a similar table for \( d = 16 \) are available from the authors upon request.

## C Outer Power Clayton Copula

The Outer Power Clayton copula is defined as follows:

\[
C(u) = \psi'(u_1) + \cdots + \psi'(u_d)),
\]

where \( \psi(t) = \tilde{\psi}(t^{1/\beta}) \) for some \( \beta \in [1, \infty) \) and \( \psi(t) \) is the Clayton copula generator \( \tilde{\psi}(t) = (1 + t)^{-1/\theta} \) for some \( \theta \in (0, \infty) \). The inversion of Kendall’s \( \tau \) is not feasible here because \( \tau = \tau(\theta, \beta) = 1 - \frac{2}{\beta(\theta+2)} \) and so \( (\beta, \theta) \) are not identifiable individually. Our simulations using the CMLE instead of the inversion of Kendall’s \( \tau \) for other copulas (not reported here) suggest that the CMLE leads to a substantial power improvement of some GIMT, e.g., of \( Q_n \). We do not have an explanation for this phenomenon and so only report the least favorable results. The power reported in Section 4.2.2 for tests that do not involve the Outer Power Clayton copula is therefore conservative.
Table 9: Chosen vine copula structures, copula families and Kendall’s $\tau$ values for the R-vine copula model and the C- and D-vine alternatives in the five-dimensional case (N:=Normal, C:=Clayton, G:=Gumbel, F:=Frank, J:=Joe; 90, 180, 270:= degrees of rotation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R-vine</th>
<th></th>
<th>C-vine</th>
<th></th>
<th>D-vine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$c_{1,2}$</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>$c_{1,2}$</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c_{1,3}$</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>$c_{2,3}$</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c_{1,4}$</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>$c_{2,4}$</td>
<td>G180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c_{4,5}$</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>$c_{2,5}$</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$c_{2,4,1}$</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>$c_{1,3,2}$</td>
<td>G90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c_{3,4,1}$</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>$c_{1,4,2}$</td>
<td>G180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c_{1,5,4}$</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>$c_{1,5,2}$</td>
<td>G180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$c_{2,3,1,4}$</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>$c_{3,4,1,2}$</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$c_{3,5,1,4}$</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>$c_{3,5,1,2}$</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$c_{2,5,1,3,4}$</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>$c_{4,5,1,2,3}$</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D Non-GIMTs for Copulas

Here we provide details on the non-GIMTs used in Section 4.2. We start with a few definitions.

Given a multivariate distribution, the Rosenblatt transformation (Rosenblatt, 1952) yields a set of independent uniforms on $[0,1]$ from possibly dependent realizations obtained using that multivariate distribution. The Rosenblatt transform can be specialized to copulas as follows:

**Definition 3** Rosenblatt’s probability integral transformation (PIT) of a copula $C$ is the mapping $R : (0,1)^d \rightarrow (0,1)^d$ which to every $u = (u_1,\ldots,u_d) \in (0,1)^d$ assigns a vector $R(u) = (e_1,\ldots,e_d)$ with $e_1 = u_1$ and, for $i \in \{2,\ldots,d\}$,

$$e_i = \frac{\partial^{i-1}C(u_1,\ldots,u_i,1,\ldots,1)}{\partial u_1 \cdots \partial u_{i-1}} / \frac{\partial^{i-1}C(u_1,\ldots,u_{i-1},1,\ldots,1)}{\partial u_1 \cdots \partial u_{i-1}}.$$  \hfill (8)

As noted by Genest et al. (2009), the initial random vector $U$ has distribution $C$, denoted $U \sim C$, if and only if the distribution of the Rosenblatt transform $R(U)$ is the $d$-variate independence copula defined as $C_\perp(e_1,\ldots,e_d) = \prod_{j=1}^d e_j$. Thus $\mathcal{H}_0 : U \sim C \in \mathcal{C}_0$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{H}_0^* : R_\theta(U) \sim C_\perp$. 
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Table 10: Chosen vine copula structures, copula families and Kendall’s $\tau$ values for R-vine copula model and the C- and D-vine alternatives in the eight-dimensional case (I:=indep., N:=Normal, C:=Clayton, G:=Gumbel, F:=Frank, J:=Joe; 90, 180, 270:= degrees of rotation).
The PIT algorithm for R-vine copulas is given in the Appendix of Schepsmeier (2015). It makes use of the hierarchical structure of the R-vine, which simplifies the calculation of (8).

**Definition 4** Kendall’s transformation is the mapping $X \mapsto V = C(U_1, \ldots, U_d)$, where $U_i = F_i(X_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$ and $C$ denotes the joint distribution of $U = (U_1, \ldots, U_d)$.

Let $K$ denote the (univariate) distribution function of Kendall’s transform $V$ and let $K_n$ denote the empirical analogue of $K$ defined by

$$K_n(v) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} 1(V_j \leq v), \; v \in [0, 1],$$

(9)

where $1(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. Then, under standard regularity conditions, $K_n$ is a consistent estimator of $K$. Also, under $\mathcal{H}_0$, the vector $U = (U_1, \ldots, U_d)$ is distributed as $C_\theta$ for some $\theta \in \mathcal{O}$, and hence Kendall’s transformation $C_\theta(U)$ has distribution $K_\theta$.

Note that $K$ is not available for all parametric copula families in closed form, especially not for vine copulas. Thus Genest et al. (2009) use a bootstrap procedure to approximate $K$ in such cases.

We now describe the non-GIMTs used in the simulation study.

**D.1 Empirical copula process test**

This test is based on the empirical copula defined as follows:

$$C_n(u) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1(U_{i1} \leq u_1, \ldots, U_{id} \leq u_d).$$

(10)

It is a well-known result that, under regularity conditions, $C_n$ is a consistent estimator of the true underlying copula $C$, whether or not $\mathcal{H}_0$ is true. Note that $C_n(u)$ is different from $K_n(v)$, which is a univariate empirical distribution function.

A natural goodness-of-fit test would be based on a “distance” between $C_n$ and an estimated copula $C_\theta_n$ obtained under $\mathcal{H}_0$. In this paper, $\hat{\theta}_n = \Gamma_n(U_1, \ldots, U_n)$ stands for an estimator of $\theta$ obtained using the pseudo-observations.
Thus the test relies on the empirical copula process (ECP) $\sqrt{n}(C_n - C_{\theta_n})$. In particular, it has the following rank-based Cramér-von Mises form:

$$S_n = \int_{[0,1]^d} (C_n - C_{\theta_n})^2 dC_n(u) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \{C_n(U_j) - C_{\theta_n}(U_j)\}^2,$$

where large values of $S_n$ would lead to a rejection of $\mathcal{H}_0$. Genest et al. (2009) demonstrate that the test is consistent, that is, that if $C \notin \mathcal{C}_0$ then $\mathcal{H}_0$ is rejected with probability one as $n \to \infty$.

In the vine copula case we have to perform a double bootstrap procedure to obtain p-values since $C_{\theta_n}$ is not available in closed form.

### D.2 Rosenblatt’s transformation test

As an alternative to $S_n$, Genest and Rémillard (2008) proposed using $\{V_j = \mathcal{R}_{C_{\theta_n}}(U_j)\}_{j=1}^{n}$ instead of $U_j$, where $\mathcal{R}_{C_{\theta}}$ represents Rosenblatt’s transformation with respect to the copula $C_{\theta_n} \in \mathcal{C}_0$ and $\hat{\theta}_n$ is a consistent estimator of the true value $\theta_0$, under $\mathcal{H}_0 : C \in \mathcal{C}_0 = \{C_{\theta} : \theta \in \Omega\}$.

The idea is then to compare $C_n(V_j)$ with the independence copula $C_{\perp}(V_j)$ and the corresponding Cramér-von Mises type statistic can be written as follows:

$$S_n^R = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \{C_n(V_j) - C_{\perp}(V_j)\}^2.$$  \hfill (12)

In the vine copula context Schepsmeier (2015) called this GOF test ECP2 test addressing its close relation to the ECP.

### D.3 Kendall’s transformation test

Since under $\mathcal{H}_0$, the Kendall’s transformation $C_{\theta}(U)$ has distribution $K_\theta$, the distance between $K_n$ and a parametric estimator $K_{\hat{\theta}_n}$ of $K$ is another natural testing criterion. We are testing the null $\mathcal{H}_0^{**} : K \in \mathcal{K}_0 = \{K_{\theta} : \theta \in \Omega\}$ using the empirical process $\mathcal{K} = \sqrt{n}(K_n - K_{\hat{\theta}_n})$. The specific statistic considered by Genest et al. (2006) is the following rank-based analogue of the Cramér-von Mises statistic

$$S_n^K = \int_0^1 \mathcal{K}_n(v)^2 dK_{\hat{\theta}_n}(v)$$
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