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Abstract

Energy markets and the associated energy futures markets play a crucial role in global economies. It is of great theoretical and practical significance to gain a deeper understanding of extreme value statistics of the volatility of energy futures traded on the New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX). We investigate the statistical properties of the recurrence intervals of daily volatility time series of four NYMEX energy futures, which are defined as the waiting times \( \tau \) between consecutive volatilities exceeding a given threshold \( q \). We find that the recurrence intervals are distributed as a stretched exponential \( P_q(\tau) \sim e^{\omega \tau^q} \), where the exponent \( \omega \) decreases with increasing \( q \), and there is no scaling behavior in the distributions for different thresholds \( q \) after the recurrence intervals are scaled with the mean recurrence interval \( \bar{\tau} \). These findings are significant under the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the Cramér-von Mises test. We show that empirical estimations are in nice agreement with the numerical integration results for the occurrence probability \( W_q(\Delta t) \) of a next event above the threshold \( q \) within a (short) time interval after an elapsed time \( t \) from the last event above \( q \). We also investigate the memory effects of the recurrence intervals. It is found that the conditional distributions of large and small recurrence intervals differ from each other and the conditional mean of the recurrence intervals scales as a power law of the preceding interval \( \bar{\tau}^q/\bar{\tau} \sim (t_0/\bar{\tau})^\beta \), indicating that the recurrence intervals have short-term correlations. Detrended fluctuation analysis and detrending moving average analysis further uncover that the recurrence intervals possess long-term correlations. We confirm that the “clustering” of the volatility recurrence intervals is caused by the long-term correlations well known to be present in the volatility. Our findings shed new lights on the behavior of large volatility and have potential implications in risk management of energy futures.

Keywords: Econophysics; Recurrence interval; Extreme volatility; Distribution; Memory effect; Risk estimation

1. Introduction

The price behaviors of oil futures and related energy futures play a crucial role in modern economic and financial systems and our everyday life (Jones and Kaul, 1996; Sadorsky, 1999). Especially, people are more concerned with large price fluctuations than mild fluctuations for obvious reasons. Since extreme events are rare, it is a difficult task to infer their statistical properties and different mathematical tools have been developed to investigate the statistics of extreme values (Kotz and Nadarajah, 2000). In this work, we adopt the recurrence interval analysis to study the behaviors of large volatility of four energy futures listed on the New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX).

The idea of recurrence interval analysis is as follows. Consider a time series of normalized volatility \( \nu(t) \), as defined in Section 2. We are interested in the statistical properties of the inter-event times \( \tau \) (also called recurrence intervals) between successive “extreme” volatilities whose values are greater than a threshold \( q \). Rather than working directly on those extreme volatilities, we obtain the statistical properties of recurrence intervals above a series of small thresholds \( q \) and try to uncover possible dependence of the statistical properties on the threshold \( q \). If clear dependence is observed, we will be able to infer the statistical properties for extreme volatilities associated with large \( q \) values.

The recurrence interval analysis has been applied to investigate the extreme value statistics of time series in many fields, such as records of climate (Bunde et al., 2004, 2005), seismic activities (Saichev and Sornette, 2006), energy dissipation rates of three-dimensional turbulence (Liu et al., 2009), heartbeat intervals in medicine science (Bogachev et al., 2009), precipitation and river runoff (Bogachev and Bunde, 2012), Internet traffic (Bogachev and Bunde, 2009b), financial volatilities (Yamasaki et al., 2005), equity returns (Yamasaki et al., 2006), Bogachev et al. (2007), Ren and Zhou (2010a), Ren and Zhou (2010b), Ludescher et al. (2011), He and Chen (2011), Meng et al. (2012), and trading volumes (Podobnik et al., 2009, Ren and Zhou, 2010b, Li et al., 2011).

The majority of empirical studies have been carried out on financial volatility. In early years, it is argued that the distri-
bution of the recurrence intervals above a fixed threshold has a power-law tail:

\[ P_q(\tau) \sim \tau^{-(1+\gamma)}, \]  

Specifically, Kaizoji and Kaizoji (2004) found that the exponent \( \gamma \) decreases from 1.81 to 0.97 when the threshold increases from 0.1 to 0.9 for daily volatility for 800 stocks traded on the Tokyo Stock Exchange and decreases from 2.47 to 1.16 when the threshold increases from 0.05 to 0.3 for daily volatility of the Nikkei 225 index. Yamasaki et al. (2005) reported that \( \gamma \approx 1.0 \) for seven representative stocks and currencies which is independent of the threshold. Lee et al. (2006) observed that \( \gamma \approx 1.0 \) for 1-min volatility of the Korean stock-market index KOSPI, and Greco et al. (2008) obtained a power-law distribution for 1-min volatility of the Italian MIB30 index.

However, the overwhelming consensus is that the recurrence intervals of financial volatility are distributed as a stretched exponential:

\[ P_q(\tau) = c e^{-(\tau/\tau_0)^q}, \]  

which is supported by a handful of empirical evidence using daily or high-frequency data in developed or emerging stock markets. Wang et al. (2006, 2007), Jung et al. (2008), Qiu et al. (2008), Jeon et al. (2010), Wang and Wang (2012). To our knowledge, the only exception is that Zhang et al. (2010) used an alternative function \( P_q(\tau) \sim e^{-a(\ln \tau)^p} \) to fit the distribution. The adoption of stretched exponential for modelling recurrence interval distributions can be at least traced back to Bunde et al. (2003). It is also interesting to note that stretched exponential distributions are ubiquitous in natural and social sciences (Laherrère and Sornette, 1998).

It is important to note that the presence of scaling in the recurrence interval distributions is also a subtle issue. Although early works favor the presence of scaling behaviors, recent studies unveil mixed results showing that some stocks possess scaling behaviors while others exhibit multiscale behaviors in a same market (Wang et al., 2008; Ren and Zhou, 2008; Wang et al., 2009). If the volatility process is Poissonian, that is, there are no linear or nonlinear temporal correlations in the volatility time series, then the recurrence intervals are exponentially distributed and have no long-term memory for any threshold (Kotz and Nadarajah, 2000). This condition can be fulfilled if we shuffle the volatility time series to destroy any auto-correlations. There is numerical and analytical evidence verifying that the long-term memory of the original time series has a remarkable influence on the recurrence interval distribution [Bunde et al., 2003, 2005; Altmann and Kantz, 2003; Olla, 2007; Santhanam and Kantz, 2008; Bogachev et al., 2007, 2008]. Moreover, the exponent \( \gamma \) of the stretched exponential distribution of the recurrence intervals is explicitly related to the autocorrelation exponent of the original time series [Bunde et al., 2004; Altmann and Kantz, 2005; Bunde et al., 2005; Livina et al. 2005].

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 3 describes the data sets of NYMEX energy futures prices we shall investigate and the basic properties of the recurrence interval time series. Section 4 investigates the probability distributions of the recurrence intervals of the volatility. We find that there is no scaling in the distribution and the empirical distributions can be well fitted by stretched exponentials. Section 5 investigates the memory effects of the recurrence intervals. We show that there are both short-term and long-term correlations in the recurrence interval time series. We summarize our findings in Section 5.

2. Data description

We retrieve the daily prices of four NYMEX futures of crude oil (Light-Sweet, Cushing, Oklahoma), reformulated regular gasoline (New York Harbor), No. 2 heating oil (New York Harbor), and propane (Mont Belvieu, Texas). The prices of crude oil are in dollars per barrel, while all others in dollars per gallon. The raw data sets are downloaded from the web site of the U.S. Energy Information Administration. For each energy’s futures, we choose “contract 1” for analysis. The time periods of the records are 4 April 1983 - 2 October 2012 for crude oil, 3 October 2005 - 2 October 2012 for gasoline, 2 January 1980 - 2 October 2012 for heating oil, and 17 December 1993 - 18 September 2009 for propane, each containing 7401, 5512, 8214 and 3941 data points.

![Figure 1: (Color online.) The upper panel illustrates the normalized volatility \( \nu(t) \) of the daily crude oil futures prices and the lower panel shows the recurrence intervals \( \tau \) between successive normalized volatilities that are larger than a threshold \( q = 2 \).](image_url)

Denote \( Y(t) \) the futures price at time \( t \). The volatility is defined as the absolute value of the logarithmic return

\[ R(t) = |\ln Y(t) - \ln Y(t - 1)|, \]  

and the normalized volatility is determined as follows:

\[ \nu(t) = \frac{R(t)}{[(R(t)^2) - (R(t))^2]^{1/2}}. \]  

The upper panel of Fig. 1 illustrates the time series of the normalized volatility of the crude oil. There is clear evidence
of the volatility clustering phenomenon indicating long-term correlations well documented in Tabak and Caijauu (2007), Elder and Serletis (2008), and Cunado et al. (2010).

The recurrence intervals \( \tau \) are then determined as the waiting times between successive volatilities exceeding a given threshold \( q \). Assume that the volatility at day \( t \) is greater than \( q \): \( \nu(t) > q \). Then the recurrence interval is

\[
\tau(t) = \min\{t' - t : \nu(t') > q, t' > t\}.
\]

The lower panel of Fig. 1 shows the recurrence interval time probability distributions. We observe that the curves of \( \bar{\tau} \) times between successive volatilities exceeding a given threshold, as depicted in the lower panel of Fig. 2.

3. Empirical probability distributions

3.1. Tests of scaling in scaled probability distributions

For each threshold \( q \), we can obtain a sequence of recurrence intervals for each volatility time series. The empirical probability distribution of the sequence of recurrence intervals can be determined for each \( q \). Figure 2(a) illustrates the empirical probability distributions \( P_q(\tau) \) of the volatility recurrence intervals \( \tau \) associated with different thresholds \( q \) for the WTI crude oil futures. Similarly, the empirical PDFs for gasoline, heating oil and propane futures are shown in Fig. 2(b-d). With the increase of the threshold \( \bar{\tau} \) there are more large recurrence intervals and less small recurrence intervals. It is also found that all the curves in Fig. 2(a-d) for different thresholds and different equities have a similar shape.

We are interested in the presence of possible scaling behaviors in the PDFs. Following Yamasaki et al. (2005), we investigate the scaled recurrence intervals \( \bar{\tau} / \bar{\tau} \), whose probability distribution \( f_{\bar{\tau}}(\bar{\tau}/\bar{\tau}) \) is as follows

\[
f_{\bar{\tau}}(\bar{\tau}/\bar{\tau}) = P_q(\tau\bar{\tau}),
\]

where \( \bar{\tau} \) is the mean return interval that depends on the threshold \( q \). The scaled distributions are presented in Fig. 2(e-h). We do observe that the curves of \( f_{\bar{\tau}}(\bar{\tau}/\bar{\tau}) \) have a better collapsing than the original curves of \( P_q(\tau) \). However, it is not clear if there is a scaling behavior. If we shuffle the volatility time series, the resulting recurrence intervals are exponentially distributed for any threshold, as depicted in the lower panel of Fig. 2.

Theoretically, if \( f_{\bar{\tau}}(\bar{\tau}/\bar{\tau}) \) is independent of \( q \), the scaled PDFs are regarded to exhibit scaling behaviors. Expressing alternatively, \( f_{\bar{\tau}} \) has a scaling behavior if and only if for any pair of \( q_i \) and \( q_j \) the two corresponding sequences of recurrence intervals have the same distribution, that is, \( f_{\bar{\tau}} = f_{\bar{\tau}} \). In this work, we adopt the well established Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test to check if \( f_{\bar{\tau}} = f_{\bar{\tau}} \).

The standard KS test is designed to test the hypothesis that the distribution of the empirical data is equal to a particular distribution by comparing their cumulative distribution functions, which can also be applied to test if two samples have the same probability distribution. Denote \( F_q \), the cumulative probability function of \( f_q \). We calculate the KS statistic by comparing the two CDFs in the overlapping region:

\[
KS = \max(|F_{q_i} - F_{q_j}|), \quad q_i \neq q_j.
\]

When the KS statistic is less than a critical value \( CV \), the hypothesis is accepted. The critical value is

\[
CV = c_n \sqrt{(m + n)/mn},
\]

where \( m \) and \( n \) are the numbers of recurrence interval samples for \( q_i \) and \( q_j \) (Darling 1957, Stephens 1974), and the threshold is \( c_n = 1.36\) at the significance level of \( \alpha = 5\% \) (Smirnoff 1948, Young, 1977). The null hypothesis is that the two samples are drawn from the same distribution and it is rejected if \( KS > CV \) at the significance level of \( 5\% \).

We have performed KS tests for each pair of samples (\( \tau_{q_0}, \tau_{q_j} \)) for the four futures. The results are presented in Table 1. One can find that \( KS \) is much greater than \( CV \) in all cases. It means that there is no scaling in the distribution of recurrence intervals for different thresholds \( q \).

Table 1: Two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of possible scaling behaviors in the return interval distributions by comparing the statistic CV with the critical value at significance level of \( \alpha = 5\% \). The null hypothesis that the two samples have the same distribution is rejected if \( KS > CV \).

| \( q_i \) | \( q_j \) | Crude oil | Gasoline | Heating Oil | Propane |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.34 | 0.04 | 0.36 | 0.04 | 0.35 | 0.04 | 0.33 | 0.06 |
| 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.30 | 0.04 | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.30 | 0.04 | 0.30 | 0.07 |
| 1.0 | 1.6 | 0.27 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.07 |
| 1.0 | 1.8 | 0.42 | 0.05 | 0.40 | 0.06 | 0.41 | 0.05 | 0.41 | 0.08 |
| 1.0 | 2.0 | 0.39 | 0.06 | 0.47 | 0.06 | 0.47 | 0.05 | 0.49 | 0.08 |
| 1.2 | 1.4 | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.30 | 0.04 | 0.30 | 0.07 |
| 1.2 | 1.6 | 0.27 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.07 |
| 1.2 | 1.8 | 0.25 | 0.05 | 0.24 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.08 |
| 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.39 | 0.06 | 0.37 | 0.06 | 0.38 | 0.06 | 0.40 | 0.09 |
| 1.4 | 1.6 | 0.27 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.06 | 0.26 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.08 |
| 1.4 | 1.8 | 0.25 | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.08 |
| 1.4 | 2.0 | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.22 | 0.06 | 0.38 | 0.06 | 0.25 | 0.09 |
| 1.6 | 1.8 | 0.25 | 0.06 | 0.24 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.26 | 0.09 |
| 1.6 | 2.0 | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 0.22 | 0.06 | 0.25 | 0.09 |
| 1.8 | 2.0 | 0.23 | 0.07 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.06 | 0.25 | 0.10 |

3.2. Fitting the PDFs

We use the stretched exponential, expressed in Eq. (2) to fit the empirical recurrence interval distributions of financial volatility. Considering Eq. (6), we have

\[
f_{\bar{\tau}}(x) = f(x) = c\bar{\tau} e^{-(\alpha\bar{\tau} x)},
\]
The recurrence intervals are integers and stretched exponential in Eq. (2) to fit the recurrence intervals cases, one can fit only part of the distribution using chosen functions. Therefore there is only one free parameter normalized recurrence intervals and 

\[
\tau = \tau^* \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma.
\]

Similarly, we obtain

\[
\gamma \Gamma(1/\gamma) = a \Gamma(2/\gamma).
\]

Solving Eqs. (11) and (13), we have

\[
a = \frac{\Gamma(2/\gamma)}{\Gamma(1/\gamma)}
\]

and

\[
c = \gamma \Gamma(2/\gamma) / \Gamma(1/\gamma)^2.
\]

Therefore there is only one free parameter \( \gamma \) in the fitting of the normalized recurrence intervals \( x = \tau / \tau^* \).

However, the situation is more complicated. First of all, the recurrence intervals are integers and \( \tau \) is thus discrete. It means that the derivation above is not accurate and might be biased in capturing the “true” distribution. In addition, in most cases, one can fit only part of the distribution using chosen functions. Hence, we use the three-parameter stretched exponential in Eq. (2) to fit the recurrence intervals that are longer than some minimal value \( \tau_{\min} \). The idea of the method is the same as in Clauset et al. (2009) and Jiang et al. (2013a), which we describe below.

The approach is based on the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) and KS tests. We assume that the intervals larger than a truncated value \( \tau_{\min} \) are described by the three-parameter stretched exponential in Eq. (2). We also need to determine the lowest boundary \( \tau_{\min} \) as an additional parameter. A truncated sample is obtained by discarding the recurrence intervals less than \( \tau_{\min} \) in the original interval sample. Following Clauset et al. (2009), we search for the distribution parameters \( a, c \) and \( \gamma \) of the truncated sample using MLE and the associated KS statistic for different lowest boundaries. The optimal \( \tau_{\min} \) is determined as the one corresponding to the truncated sample with the smallest KS value.

The optimal value of \( \tau_{\min} \) and the corresponding estimates of \( a, c \) and \( \gamma \) for the samples of recurrence intervals above six thresholds of the four NYMEX energy futures contracts are presented in Table 2. We notice that only a few smallest recurrence intervals are excluded in the fitting and the stretched exponential fits most of the data points. For parameter \( a \), no clear dependence on \( q \) can be observed. Interestingly, we find that both \( c \) and \( \gamma \) exhibit a decreasing trend with increasing threshold \( q \), except that the case of heating oil with \( q = 1.4 \) is an outlier. The decreasing trend of \( \gamma \) is also observed for stock prices and stock indices when there is no scaling behavior in \( P_{\gamma}(\tau) \) and the values of \( \gamma \) of the energy futures are close to those of stock prices or stock indices (Ren et al. 2009a, 2009b).

3.3. Goodness-of-fit

For each sample, we use the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Cramér-von Mises (CVM) test to assess the goodness-of-Fit after the optimal \( \tau_{\min} \) and the corresponding distribution parameters are obtained. The null hypothesis \( H_0 \)
for our KS test and CvM test is that the left-truncated data ($\tau > \tau_{\text{min}}$) are drawn from the fitted stretched exponential distribution. The methods are described below, which are similar but not the same as in Ren and Zhou (2008).

In the one-sample situation, the KS statistic defined in Eq. (7) for the real sample of recurrence intervals is calculated as follows:

$$KS = \max\left\{|F_q - F_{SE}|\right\},$$  

where $F_{SE} = \int_{-\infty}^{\tau} e^{-\left(a(t)\right)^\gamma} \, dt$ is the cumulative distribution of $P_q(\tau)$ and the parameters $a$, $c$ and $\gamma$ are associated with the given $q$. Then the bootstrapping approach is adopted to determine the distribution of the KS statistic, $p(KS_{\text{sim}})$. We generate 10000 synthetic samples from the best fitted distribution and calculate the KS statistic for each synthetic sample in reference to the fitted distribution as follows:

$$KS_{\text{sim}} = \max\left\{|F_{\text{sim}} - F_{SE}|\right\}.  

The $p$-value is determined by the proportion that $KS_{\text{sim}} > KS$, which is the area enclosed by three curves $p(KS_{\text{sim}})$, $KS_{\text{sim}} = KS$, and $p(KS_{\text{sim}}) = 0$. Hence, a small $KS$ value corresponds to a large $p$-value and high goodness-of-fit.

Figure 3 illustrates the results of the goodness-of-fit tests using KS statistic for crude oil futures. The six distributions $p(KS_{\text{sim}})$ have similar shapes. With the increase of $q$, the distribution becomes broader and most probable value that corresponds to the maximum of the distribution increases. The estimated $p$-values are presented in Table 2 all greater than 5%.

The results for gasoline, heating oil and propane are also listed in Table 2. The minimal $p$-value is given by the recurrence intervals of heating oil with $q = 1.4$, which is identified as an outlier due to its abnormally large value of $\gamma$. We conclude that the stretched exponential can be used to model the recurrence interval distributions under the KS tests.

| Futures     | $q$ | $\tau_{\text{min}}$ | $c$ | $a$ | $\gamma$ | $p_{\text{KS}}$ | $p_{\text{CVM}}$ |
|-------------|-----|----------------------|-----|-----|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Crude oil   | 1.0 | 37.24                | 37.04| 0.35 | 0.14      | 0.23            |                 |
|             | 1.2 | 23.04                | 38.50| 0.33 | 0.11      | 0.08            |                 |
|             | 1.4 | 24.88                | 37.95| 0.32 | 0.11      | 0.26            |                 |
|             | 1.6 | 10.66                | 40.00| 0.30 | 0.21      | 0.18            |                 |
|             | 1.8 | 2.82                 | 14.35| 0.32 | 0.26      | 0.32            |                 |
|             | 2.0 | 3.16                 | 25.10| 0.28 | 0.23      | 0.59            |                 |
| Gasoline    | 1.0 | 98.64                | 33.75| 0.37 | 0.59      | 0.64            |                 |
|             | 1.2 | 50.15                | 33.35| 0.35 | 0.46      | 0.66            |                 |
|             | 1.4 | 35.15                | 38.40| 0.33 | 0.15      | 0.37            |                 |
|             | 1.6 | 19.24                | 32.95| 0.32 | 0.35      | 0.33            |                 |
|             | 1.8 | 4.88                 | 14.60| 0.33 | 0.63      | 0.50            |                 |
|             | 2.0 | 5.82                 | 31.85| 0.28 | 0.47      | 0.43            |                 |
| Heating oil | 1.0 | 30.26                | 33.25| 0.35 | 0.31      | 0.18            |                 |
|             | 1.2 | 38.10                | 40.00| 0.33 | 0.21      | 0.29            |                 |
|             | 1.4 | 1.77                 | 3.50 | 0.43 | 0.09      | 0.06            |                 |
|             | 1.6 | 10.66                | 40.00| 0.30 | 0.48      | 0.37            |                 |
|             | 1.8 | 8.04                 | 40.00| 0.28 | 0.09      | 0.46            |                 |
|             | 2.0 | 6.05                 | 40.00| 0.28 | 0.23      | 0.18            |                 |
| Propane     | 1.0 | 23.41                | 38.85| 0.33 | 0.83      | 0.65            |                 |
|             | 1.2 | 16.55                | 37.25| 0.32 | 0.68      | 0.61            |                 |
|             | 1.4 | 3.78                 | 14.00| 0.34 | 0.62      | 0.45            |                 |
|             | 1.6 | 2.96                 | 13.05| 0.33 | 0.59      | 0.42            |                 |
|             | 1.8 | 4.33                 | 39.25| 0.28 | 0.31      | 0.84            |                 |
|             | 2.0 | 3.49                 | 40.00| 0.27 | 0.14      | 0.23            |                 |
The $p$-value is determined by the proportion that $W^2_{q_{\text{sim}}} > W^2$, which is the area enclosed by three curves $p(W^2_{q_{\text{sim}}})$, $W^2_{q_{\text{sim}}} = W^2$, and $p(W^2_{q_{\text{sim}}}) = 0$. Hence, a small $W^2$ value corresponds to a large $p$-value and high goodness-of-fit.

Figure 4 illustrates the results of the goodness-of-fit tests using Cvm statistic for crude oil futures. The six distributions $p(W^2_{q_{\text{sim}}})$ have very similar shapes and the quantitative differences between them are much smaller than in Fig. 4. The estimated $p$-values are also presented in Table 3 as well as the results for gasoline, heating oil and propane. We find that all the $p$-values are greater than 5% and the minimal $p$-value is 6% for the outlier. Hence, the distributions of recurrence intervals above a fixed threshold $q$ can be well fitted by stretched exponentials.

$\text{Figure 4: (Color online.) Goodness-of-fit tests of the stretched exponential distributions using Cramér-von Mises statistic for different thresholds } q \text{ for crude oil futures. In each plot, the black solid line stands for the probability distribution } p(W^2_{q_{\text{sim}}}) \text{ and the red dashed line is the value of } W^2 \text{ for the real sample. The } p\text{-value is the area enclosed by } p(W^2_{q_{\text{sim}}}), W^2_{q_{\text{sim}}} = KS, \text{ and } p(W^2_{q_{\text{sim}}}) = 0.$

3.4. Risk assessment

Consider the situation that $t$ trading days have elapsed since the last large volatility greater than $q$. We are interested in the hazard probability that a new volatility greater than $q$ will occur within $\Delta t$ trading days. The hazard probability gives a quantitative estimation of risk. Mathematically, the hazard probability can be expressed as follows (Bogachev et al., 2007):

$$W_q(\Delta t) = \frac{\#(t < t_\tau \leq t + \Delta t)}{\#(t_\tau > t)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

where the denominator $\#(t_\tau > t)$ is the number of recurrence intervals greater than $t$ and the numerator $\#(t < t_\tau \leq t + \Delta t)$ is the number of intervals greater than $t$ and not greater than $t + \Delta t$ for a given $q$.

Figure 5 illustrates the dependence of the hazard probability $W_q(\Delta t)$ on $t$ when fixing $\Delta t = 1$ for crude oil futures. It is observed that the theoretical curves approximate the empirical curves very nicely. It is very important to notice that the discrepancy between theoretical and empirical curves decreases when $q$ increases. Another intriguing observation is that $W_q(\Delta t)$ decreases with increasing $t$, which is simply a consequence of the fact that recurrence intervals exhibit clustering behaviors as shown in Fig. 1(b) or long-term correlations that will be confirmed in Section 4. We also observe that, for small $t$ values, $W_{q_1}(\Delta t) > W_{q_2}(\Delta t)$, if $q_1 > q_2$. This is consistent with the intuition that the hazard probability decreases when the condition approaches to extreme and there are less recurrence intervals.

$\text{Figure 5: (Color online.) Comparison of } W_q(\Delta t = 1) \text{ estimated empirically using Eq. (21) and numerically using Eq. (20) for different } q \text{ values for crude oil futures. The black circles and red lines correspond respectively to empirical and numerical results.}$

We have also studied two other cases in which $\Delta t = 5$ and $\Delta t = 10$. The results are qualitatively the same as for $\Delta t = 1$. A new finding is that $W_q(\Delta t)$ increases with $\Delta t$ for given $t$ and $q$, which is actually trivial and can be derived from Eq. (20) directly. In general, $W_q(\Delta t)$ is a monotonously increasing function of $\Delta t$. All these findings apply to other three energy futures investigated in this work.
4. Memory effects

Previous works have reported that the recurrence intervals of stock and stock index volatility possess both short-term memory and long-term memory. It is interesting to investigate the memory effects of volatility recurrence intervals of energy futures. Note that the methods used in this work were proposed by Yamasaki et al. [2005].

4.1. Short-term memory

To investigate possible short-term correlations in the recurrence intervals, we compute and compare the conditional probability distributions $P_q(\tau|\tau_0)$, which is the distribution of recurrence interval $\tau$ conditioned on the value of its preceding recurrence interval $\tau_0$. If there is no short-term memory, $P_q(\tau|\tau_0)$ is independent of $\tau_0$. However, it is hard to determine $P_q(\tau|\tau_0)$ for a single value of $\tau_0$ since the size of the interval sample is not sufficiently large. We thus adopt an alternative approach, which employs the idea of coarse graining.

For a given $q$, the set $T$ of all recurrence intervals is partitioned into four non-overlapping subsets:

$$T = T_1 \cup T_2 \cup T_3 \cup T_4,$$

where $T_i \cap T_j = \Phi$ for $i \neq j$. In the partitioning procedure, all recurrence intervals in $T$ are sorted in an increasing order and then assigned in turn into $T_1$, $T_2$, $T_3$ and $T_4$ such that their sizes are approximately identical. We estimate the empirical conditional probability density functions $P_q(\tau|T_i) = P_q(\tau|\tau_0 \in T_i)$ of recurrence intervals that immediately follow a recurrence interval $\tau_0$ belonging to $T_i$. If recurrence intervals have no short-term memory, we should find that $P_q(\tau|T_i) = P_q(\tau|T_j)$ for any $i \neq j$.

We further investigate the mean of the conditional recurrence intervals $\bar{\tau}(\tau_0)/\bar{\tau}$ for each subset. For every $q$, the scatter plots of $\bar{\tau}(\tau_0)/\bar{\tau}$ against $\tau_0/\bar{\tau}$ for the four energy futures are shown in Fig. 7, where $\bar{\tau}$ is the mean of the whole sample of recurrence intervals for $q$. Hence, each plot in Fig. 7 contains $8 \times 6$ points, where “8” is the number of subsets for each $q$ and “6” is the number of $q$ values. We observe a nice power-law dependence

$$\bar{\tau}(\tau_0)/\bar{\tau} \sim (\tau_0/\bar{\tau})^\beta$$

with a positive power-law exponent $\beta$, which also holds for stock volatility. In contrast, when we shuffle the original volatility time series and repeat the above procedure, the conditional means are constant as shown in Fig. 7 i.e., $\bar{\tau}(\tau_0) = \bar{\tau}$ for each $q$. Therefore, Fig. 7 further confirms the presence of short-term correlations in the recurrence intervals.

4.2. Long-term memory

To investigate the possible long-term correlations in the recurrence intervals, we adopt the detrended fluctuation analysis (DFA) and the detrending moving average (DMA) analysis, which are regarded as “The Methods of Choice” in determining the Hurst index of time series [Shao et al. 2012]. Indeed, a lot of numerical experiments have unveiled that the performance of the DMA method is comparable to the DFA method with slightly differences under different situations [Xu et al. 2005, Bashan et al. 2008, Shao et al. 2012].
The DFA approach was invented by [Peng et al., 1994] to investigate the long-range dependence in DNA nucleotide sequences. The properties of DFA have been extensively studied by [Hu et al., 2001; Chen et al., 2002; 2005; Shang et al., 2009; Xu et al., 2009; Ma et al., 2010]. The DMA approach is based on the moving average technique [Carbone, 2009] and developed by [Vandewalle and Ausloos, 1998] and [Alessio et al., 2002]. The DMA method has been widely applied to the analysis of real-world time series [Carbone and Castelli, 2003; Carbone et al., 2004b; Varotsos et al., 2005; Serletis and Rosenberg, 2007; Arianos and Carbone, 2007; Matsushita et al., 2007; Serletis and Rosenberg, 2009] and synthetic signals [Carbone and Stanley, 2004; Xu et al., 2005; Serletis, 2008].

The DFA and DMA methods are briefly described below. In the first step, the cumulative summation series \( y_i \) is determined as follows

\[
y_i = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^{i} [r_j - \langle r \rangle], \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, N, \tag{25}
\]

where \( \langle r \rangle \) is the sample mean of the return series. Next, we determine the local trend \( \tilde{y}_i(s) \). The residual sequence \( e_i \) is obtained by removing local trend function \( \tilde{y}_i \) from \( y_i \):

\[
e_i(s) = y_i - \tilde{y}_i(s). \tag{26}
\]

We can then calculate the overall fluctuation function \( F(s) \) as follows

\[
F(s) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} [e_i(s)]^2. \tag{27}
\]

As the box size \( s \) varies in the range of \([20, N/4]\), one can determine the power law relationship between the overall fluctuation function \( F(s) \) and the box size \( s \),

\[
F(s) \sim s^H, \tag{28}
\]

where \( H \) signifies the DFA or DMA scaling exponent. It is necessary to emphasize that the scaling exponent \( H \) obtained from Eq. (28) should be called “DFA exponent” or “DMA exponent” rather than “Hurst index” in the rigorous sense [Jiang et al., 2013b].

The main difference between the DFA and DMA algorithms is the determination of the “local trend function” \( \tilde{y}_i \), which is dependent of box size \( s \). In the DFA algorithm, the local trend is determined by polynomial fits in boxes [Peng et al., 1994]. In the DMA approach, one calculates the moving average function \( \tilde{y}_i \) in a moving window [Arianos and Carbone, 2007],

\[
\tilde{y}_i(s) = \frac{1}{s} \sum_{k=-q}^{q} y_{i-k}, \tag{29}
\]

where \( k_B = [(s-1)\theta], k_F = [(s-1)(1-\theta)], s \) is the window size, \( \lfloor x \rfloor \) is the largest integer not greater than \( x \), \( \lfloor x \rfloor \) is the smallest integer not smaller than \( x \), and \( \theta \) is the position parameter with the value varying in the range \([0, 1]\). Hence, the moving average function considers \( [(s-1)(1-\theta)] \) data points in the past and \( [(s-1)\theta] \) points in the future. Three special cases are adopted in this paper. The first case \( \theta = 0 \) refers to the backward moving average result in the backward DMA analysis (BDMA), in which the moving average function \( \tilde{y}_i \) is calculated over all the past \( s-1 \) data points of the signal. The second case \( \theta = 0.5 \) corresponds to the centered moving average result in the centered DMA analysis (CDMA), where \( \tilde{y}_i \) contains half past and half future information in each window. The third case \( \theta = 1 \) is called the forward moving average result in the forward DMA analysis (FDMA), where \( \tilde{y}_i \) considers the trend of \( s-1 \) data points in the future.

Figure 8 shows the power-law dependence of the fluctuation function \( F(s) \) with respect to the box size \( s \). Note that only three thresholds \( q = 1.0, 1.2 \) and 1.4 are considered, since larger thresholds result in shorter recurrence interval time series. With
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Figure 8: Detrended fluctuation analysis (top panel) and detrending moving average analysis (bottom panel) of the recurrence intervals of energy futures price volatility: (a,e) Crude oil, (b,f) gasoline, (c,g) heating oil, and (d,h) propane. Only three thresholds \( q = 1.0, 1.2 \) and 1.4 are considered, since larger thresholds result in shorter recurrence interval time series. In the plots of the bottom panel, the detrending moving average analyses with \( \theta = 0 \) (backward DMA), \( \theta = 0.5 \) (centred DMA) and \( \theta = 1 \) (forward DMA) have been adopted.
Despite these discrepancies, there is no doubt that the recurrence intervals of crude oil, gasoline and heating oil futures possess long-term correlations, while the DMA methods do not. These long-term correlations are ambiguous: The DFA approach suggests the presence of long-term correlations. However, the results for propane are consistent with the DFA and DMA exponents close to 0.5. For propane, we find the increase of \( q \), the length of the recurrence interval time series decreases and the scaling range becomes narrower. A comparison of the four corresponding power-law curves of DFA, BDMA, CDMA and DMA for each recurrence interval time series unveils that some CDMA curves exhibit low-frequency trends around the power laws, and BDMA and CDMA curves have smaller fluctuations around the power laws than DFA curves. It is noteworthy to mention that crossover phenomena have been observed in the DFA fluctuation functions of recurrence time intervals for stocks (Wang et al. 2006, Ren et al. 2009a, b), but not for the energy futures studied in this work.

We fit the power-law curves in Fig. 8 using linear least-squares regressions between \( \ln F(s) \) and \( \ln s \). The estimated DFA and DMA exponents are presented in Table 3. For each recurrence interval time series, we find that the DFA and DMA exponents are close to 0.5. The estimated DFA and DMA exponents for each recurrence interval are presented in Table 3. For each futures contract and for each DFA/DMA estimator, we find that the conditional distributions of large and small recurrence intervals differ from each other and the conditional mean of the recurrence intervals scales as a power law of the preceding interval \( r(\tau_0)/\bar{r} \sim \tau_0 / \bar{r}^\beta \) with \( \beta > 0 \), indicating that the recurrence intervals have short-term correlations. Detrended fluctuation analysis and detrending moving average analysis further uncover that the recurrence intervals possess long-term correlations. We confirmed that the “clustering” of the volatility recurrence intervals is caused by the long-term correlations well known to be present in the volatility.

Despite these discrepancies, there is no doubt that the recurrence intervals of crude oil, gasoline and heating oil futures possess long-term correlations. However, the results for propane are ambiguous: The DFA approach suggests the presence of long-term correlations, while the DMA methods do not.

We have also performed DFA and DMA on the recurrence interval time series of the shuffled volatility series. We find that the estimated DFA and DMA exponents are close to 0.5. It means that the long-term correlations in the recurrence intervals originate from the long-term correlation in volatility. This finding is the same as for stock and index volatilities (Yamasaki et al. 2005).

### 5. Conclusion

In this work, we have studied the properties of the recurrence intervals above different thresholds of the daily volatility time series for four NYMEX energy futures (crude oil, gasoline, heating oil and propane), attempting to understand the behaviors of large volatilities. Specifically, the distributions and memory effects of recurrence intervals are investigated.

We found that there is no scaling behavior in the distributions for different thresholds \( q \) after the recurrence intervals are scaled with the mean recurrence interval \( \bar{r} \), which has been verified by the two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. We also found that the recurrence intervals are distributed as a stretched exponential \( P_q(\tau) \sim e^{\lambda(\tau)^\gamma} \) and the exponent \( \gamma \) decreases with increasing \( q \), which are significant under the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the Cramér-von Mises test. We showed that the empirical estimations are in nice agreement with the numerical integration results for the occurrence probability \( W_q(\Delta t|\tau) \) of a next large volatility above the threshold \( q \) within a short time interval after an elapsed time \( \tau \) from the last large volatility above \( q \).

We also investigated the memory effects of the recurrence intervals. We found that the conditional distributions of large and small recurrence intervals differ from each other and the conditional mean of the recurrence intervals scales as a power law of the preceding interval \( r(\tau_0)/\bar{r} \sim \tau_0 / \bar{r}^\beta \) with \( \beta > 0 \), indicating that the recurrence intervals have short-term correlations. Detrended fluctuation analysis and detrending moving average analysis further uncover that the recurrence intervals possess long-term correlations. We confirmed that the “clustering” of the volatility recurrence intervals is caused by the long-term correlations well known to be present in the volatility.

Our findings shed new lights on the behavior of large volatilities and have potential applications in risk estimation of energy futures. Theoretically, these findings have important implications in the pricing and risk management of futures’ derivatives such as options.
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**Table 3: Estimated DFA and DMA exponents of the recurrence intervals with \( q = 1.0, 1.2 \) and 1.4 for the four futures, which are the slopes of the power laws in Fig. 8 obtained with linear least-squares regressions. \( N_q \) is the size of the recurrence interval sample for \( q \).**

| \( q \) | Crude oil | Gasoline | Heating oil | Propane |
|------|---------|---------|-----------|--------|
|      | 1.0     | 1.2     | 1.4       | 1.0    | 1.2  | 1.4 |
| \( N_q \) | 2446 | 1893 | 1498 | 2073 | 1644 | 1333 | 2674 | 2115 | 1672 | 1111 | 884 | 705 |
| DFA  | 0.73   | 0.75   | 0.75     | 0.78   | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.72   | 0.72 | 0.70 | 0.71 | 0.69 | 0.72 |
| BDMA | 0.67   | 0.68   | 0.65     | 0.74   | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.68   | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.53 | 0.49 | 0.43 |
| CDMA | 0.79   | 0.80   | 0.80     | 0.80   | 0.81 | 0.86 | 0.61   | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 |
| FDMA | 0.71   | 0.68   | 0.64     | 0.76   | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.67   | 0.68 | 0.67 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 0.51 |
