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Abstract: This paper studies the estimation of extreme conditional quantiles for distributions with Weibull-type tails. We propose two families of estimators for the Weibull tail-coefficient, and construct an extrapolation estimator for the extreme conditional quantiles based on quantile regression and extreme value theory. The asymptotic results of the proposed estimators are established. The work fills a gap in the literature of extreme quantile regression where many important Weibull-type distributions are excluded by the assumed strong conditions. We demonstrate through simulation study that the proposed
extrapolation method provides more efficient and stable estimation of conditional quantiles of extreme orders than the conventional method.

The practical value of the proposed method is demonstrated through the analysis of extremely high birth weight.
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1. Introduction

Weibull-type distributions with a common extreme value index at zero form a rich family of light-tailed distributions including, for example, Gaussian, Gamma, Weibull and extended Weibull distributions. As noted in Beirlant and Teugels (1992), these distributions have been conventionally used in the area of non-life insurance. Recently, de Wet et al. (2016) also mentioned that these distributions may have a wide range of applications in other fields such as hydrology, meteorology, and environmental sciences.

There is an extensive literature on the analysis of univariate Weibull-type tails, such as Berred (1991), Broniatowski (1993), Girard (2004), (Gardes and Girard 2005, 2008), Diebolt et al. (2008), Goegebeur et al. (2010) and Goegebeur and Guillou (2011). In contrast, there are only few studies on investigating the extremal behavior of Weibull-type tails under the regression setting. Among limited literature, de Wet et al. (2016) con-
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sidered the estimation of the tail coefficient of a Weibull-type distribution and of the extreme conditional quantiles based on kernel statistics. Gardes and Girard (2016) focused only on the estimation of the tail-coefficient of a Weibull-type distribution based on a kernel estimator of extreme conditional quantiles. It is well known that nonparametric quantile regression is not stable on the boundary of the predictor support, and the estimation is challenging for multiple predictors due to the “curse of dimensionality”; see Daouia et al. (2013). This motivates us to investigate the extremal behavior of Weibull-type tails under the linear regression setting. To our knowledge, there is no existing literature on the extreme quantile estimation of Weibull-type tails under linear regression models.

There exists some work on tail index regression and extremal quantiles under the regression setup. Assuming Pareto-type distributions that correspond to positive extreme value indices, Wang and Tsai (2009) studied the tail index regression model by employing the logarithmic function to link the tail index to the linear predictor. Chernozhukov (2005) considered the extremal quantiles in the linear regression framework and derived the asymptotic properties under three types of tail distributions that correspond to the extreme value index $\xi < 0$, $\xi = 0$ and $\xi > 0$, respectively. However, for the condition R1 in this paper to hold, the case $\xi = 0$ is excluded.
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for the simple location-scale shift model; see Example 3.2 in Chernozhukov (2005). Therefore, results in Chernozhukov (2005) are not applicable to general models with Weibull-type distributions.

In this paper, we develop new theory and methods to study the extremal behavior of Weibull-type tails. We reconsider the important condition R1 in Chernozhukov (2005) to make it applicable for Weibull-type tails. Furthermore, we propose two families of estimators for the Weibull tail-coefficient based on linear regression of quantiles, and construct an estimator of the extreme conditional quantiles using the extrapolation method. The proposed estimators do not suffer from the “curse of dimensionality”, and can be readily applied to a wide range of studies with multiple predictors.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the linear quantile regression model and some regularity assumptions that are needed for establishing the asymptotic results of the new method. In Section 3 we propose two families of estimators for the Weibull tail-coefficient, and construct an efficient extrapolation estimator for the extreme conditional quantiles. The asymptotic results of the proposed estimators are also derived in this section. Miscellaneous issues, including the diagnosis of Weibull-type tails, the comparison of asymptotic efficiency of different estimators, the validation of model and technical assumptions,
are discussed in Section 4. In Section 5 we conduct a simulation study to evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed estimators and compare them with the conventional method. We illustrate the usefulness of the new method through the study of extremely high birth weights of live infants born in the United States in Section 6. All technical proofs are provided in the online supplement.

2. Model and assumptions

Let \( \{(X_i, Y_i), i = 1, \ldots, n\} \) be independent copies of the random vector \((X, Y)\), where \( X = (1, X_2, \ldots, X_d)' \) is a \( d \)-dimensional covariate and \( Y \) is a one-dimensional response variable. For convenience, let \( X_{-1} = (X_2, \ldots, X_d)' \) denote the covariate \( X \) without the first component, \( \mathcal{X} \) denote the support of \( X \), and \( F_Y(y|x) \) be the continuous conditional distribution function of \( Y \) given \( X = x \). Denote \( F_Y(y|x) = 1 - F_Y(y|x) \) and let \( q_Y(\tau|x) = \inf\{y : F_Y(y|x) \leq \tau\} \) be the \((1 - \tau)\)th conditional quantile of \( Y \) given \( X = x \), also referred to as the \( \tau \)th right-tailed conditional quantile.

In this paper, we consider the linear quantile regression model:

\[
q_Y(\tau|x) = x' \beta(\tau), \quad \text{for all } \tau \in (0, \tau_U] \text{ for some } 0 < \tau_U < 1, \ x \in \mathcal{X},
\]

(2.1)

where \( \beta(\tau) \) is a vector of quantile coefficients. For any given \( \tau \), \( \beta(\tau) \) can be
estimated by

\[ \hat{\beta}(\tau) = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho_{\tau}(Y_i - X_i'\beta), \]

(2.2)

where \( \rho_{\tau}(u) = u\{I(u > 0) - \tau\} \) is the asymmetric \( L_1 \) “check” function.

Let \( \tau_n \) be an intermediate quantile level in the sense that \( \tau_n \to 0 \) and \( n\tau_n \to \infty \). It was shown in Chernozhukov (2005) that at the intermediate quantile level, the asymptotic normal theory still holds for \( \hat{\beta}(\tau_n) \) and hence for the conventional conditional quantile estimator \( \hat{q}_n(\tau_n|x) = x'\hat{\beta}(\tau_n) \) of \( q_Y(\tau_n|x) \). Our main interest is on the estimation of conditional quantiles at the extreme quantile level \( \psi_n \to 0 \) which satisfies \( \psi_n \to 0 \) and \( \ln \psi_n/\ln\tau_n \to \kappa \in (1, \infty) \) as \( \tau_n \to 0 \). This allows \( \psi_n \) to go to zero at an arbitrarily fast rate; see more discussion in Section 4.3. Therefore, the corresponding quantile \( q_Y(\psi_n|x) \) is further in the right tail and more extreme than \( q_Y(\tau_n|x) \). In such a case, the conventional quantile estimator \( \hat{q}_n(\psi_n|x) := x'\hat{\beta}(\psi_n) \) for \( q_Y(\psi_n|x) \) is often unreliable due to the sparsity of data in the extreme tails. As a consequence, it remains a challenging task how to estimate the extreme quantiles precisely. What makes us delighted is that the extreme value theory provides a valuable mathematical tool for solving the problem.

In this paper, we propose to study the linear quantile regression model (2.1) with Weibull-type tails using the extreme value theory. To start with, let \( u \) be a random variable with the survival function \( \bar{F}_u(z) := P(u > z) \)
and the upper endpoint $s_u^* = \infty$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\bar{F}_u(\cdot)$ is continuous, differentiable and strictly decreasing. Recall that $\bar{F}_u$ has a Weibull-type tail if there exists $\theta > 0$ such that for all $\zeta > 0$,

$$\lim_{z \to \infty} \frac{\ln \bar{F}_u(\zeta z)}{\ln \bar{F}_u(z)} = \zeta^{1/\theta}. \quad (2.3)$$

The parameter $\theta$ is also referred to as the Weibull tail-coefficient that controls the tail behaviour such that a larger value of $\theta$ results in a slower decay of $\bar{F}_u$ to zero. Weibull-tailed distributions cover a wide class of light-tailed distributions in the Gumbel maximum domain, including Gaussian ($\theta = 1/2$), Exponential, Gamma, Logistic ($\theta = 1$) and Weibull distributions; see Section 4.3 for more specific discussion.

For convenience, we denote the cumulative hazard function by $H_u(z) := -\ln \bar{F}_u(z)$, and the quantile function $q_u(\tau) := \bar{F}_u^{-1}(\tau) = H_u^{-1}(\ln(1/\tau))$ for all $\tau \in (0, 1)$. By $(2.3)$, $H_u(\cdot)$ is a regularly varying function with index $1/\theta$: that is,

$$\lim_{z \to \infty} \frac{H_u(\zeta z)}{H_u(z)} = \zeta^{1/\theta}, \text{ for all } \zeta > 0, \quad (2.4)$$

and we denote it by $H_u(\cdot) \in \mathcal{RV}_\infty(1/\theta)$. Note that $(2.4)$ also holds locally uniformly on $\zeta > 0$. By Proposition 0.1 in Resnick (1987), we have $H_u^{-1}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{RV}_\infty(\theta)$. Hence, there exists a slowly varying function $l(\cdot)$ such that

$$H_u^{-1}(z) = z^\theta l(z) \text{ for } z > 0, \quad (2.5)$$
where \( l(\cdot) \) satisfies that \( \lim_{z \to \infty} l(\zeta z)/l(z) = 1 \) for all \( \zeta > 0 \). In addition, because \( H_u(z) \) is differentiable so that \( H_u^{-1}(z) \) is differentiable, we can obtain that \( \partial H_u^{-1}(z)/\partial z \in \mathcal{RV}_\infty(\theta - 1) \).

Throughout the paper, we use \( a(t) \sim b(t) \) to represent \( a(t)/b(t) \to 1 \) when \( t \) tends to a constant or to infinity. To establish the asymptotic results of the estimators to be proposed in Section 3, we specify in what follows some regularity assumptions.

(C1) There exists a bounded vector \( \beta_r \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and a survival function \( \bar{F}_u \) of the Weibull-type tail with tail-coefficient \( \theta \) such that (i) \( U = Y - X'\beta_r \) with \( s^*_U = \infty \); and (ii) \( H_U(z|x) \sim K(x)H_u(z) \) uniformly on \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) as \( z \uparrow s^*_U \), where \( s^*_U = \inf \{ y : \bar{F}_U(y|x) \leq 0 \} \) is the upper endpoint, and \( H_U(z|x) = -\ln F_U(z|x) \) with \( F_U(z|x) \) being the conditional survival function of \( U \) given \( X = x \). Furthermore, \( F_U(z|x) \) is assumed to be continuous and strictly decreasing with respect to \( z \), and \( K(\cdot) > 0 \) is a continuous bounded function on the support \( \mathcal{X} \).

(C2) For any \( k \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty) \), \( H_u^{-1}(-\ln(k\tau|x))/H_u^{-1}(-\ln \tau|x) - 1 \sim \theta \ln k/\ln \tau \) as \( \tau \to 0 \).

(C3) \( \mathcal{X} \) is a compact set in \( \mathbb{R}^d \), and \( E(XX') \) is a positive definite matrix.
(C4) Under (C1)-(C3), we assume that
\[
\frac{\partial H_U^{-1}(-\ln \tau | x)}{\partial \tau} \sim \frac{\partial H_u^{-1}(-\ln \tau / K(x))}{\partial \tau}
\]
uniformly on \(x \in \mathcal{X}\).

(C5) The slowly varying function \(l(\cdot)\) in [2.5] satisfies (i) there exist a constant \(\varrho \leq 0\) and a regularly varying function \(b(z) \in \mathcal{RV}_\infty(\varrho)\) by
\[(2.3.8)\] in de Haan and Ferreira (2006) and \(b(z) \to 0\) as \(z \to \infty\) such that locally uniformly on \(\lambda \geq 1\)
\[
\ln \left( \frac{l(\lambda z)}{l(z)} \right) = b(z)D_\varrho(\lambda)(1 + o(1)), \text{ as } z \to \infty,
\]
where \(D_\varrho(\lambda) = \int_1^\lambda t^{\varrho-1}dt\); (ii) \(l(z) = c \exp\{\int_1^z \varepsilon(t)/tdt\}\), where \(c > 0\) and \(\varepsilon : (0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}\) is a continuous function with \(\varepsilon(t) \to 0\) as \(t \to \infty\).

Remark 1. Condition (C1) implies that for any \(x \in \mathcal{X}\), the conditional cumulative hazard function \(H_U(\cdot | x)\) and the univariate cumulative hazard \(H_u(\cdot)\) are tail equivalent up to a constant. Under (C1), for large \(z\), we can write \(H_U(z | x) = K(x)H_u(z)(1 + \alpha(z|x))\), where \(\alpha(z|x) \to 0\) as \(z \to \infty\) uniformly on \(x \in \mathcal{X}\). Noting also that \(H_u^{-1}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{RV}_\infty(\theta)\), we thus have
\[
H_U^{-1}(-\ln \tau | x) = H_u^{-1}\left( \frac{-\ln \tau}{K(x)} \left(1 + \alpha\left(h^{-1}(-\ln \tau | x) | x\right)\right) \right)
\]
\[
\sim H_u^{-1}(-\ln \tau / K(x)), \quad (2.6)
\]
and $H_u^{-1}(-\ln \tau/K(x)) \sim H_u^{-1}(-\ln(k\tau)/K(x))$ as $\tau \to 0$ for any $k \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$. This leads to $H_U^{-1}(-\ln(k\tau)|x) \sim H_u^{-1}(-\ln(k\tau)/K(x))$ and $H_U^{-1}(-\ln(k\tau)|x) \sim H_U^{-1}(-\ln \tau|x)$. Condition (C2) further assumes that $H_U^{-1}(-\ln(k\tau)|x)/H_U^{-1}(-\ln \tau|x) - 1$ and $\theta \ln k/\ln \tau$ are asymptotically equivalent, that is, they converge to zero at the same convergence rate. The rationality of (C2) is discussed in Section 4.3.

Conditions (C1), (C3) and (C4) can be regarded as the adaptation of conditions R1-R3 in Chernozhukov (2005) to Weibull-type tails. Condition (C5)(i) is essentially the same as that in de Wet et al. (2016) and Girard (2004), which is the second order condition on $l(\cdot)$ with the second order parameter $\rho \leq 0$ that controls the convergence rate of $l(\lambda z)/l(z)$ toward 1. The closer $\rho$ is to zero, the slower is the convergence rate. Hence, condition (C5)(i) plays a crucial role in deriving the asymptotic results of our proposed estimators. Condition (C5)(ii) is essentially the same as condition (A.2) in Gardes and Girard (2016), which is also known as a special case of the Karamata representation; see Theorem B.1.6 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006) for the presentation theorem for regularly varying functions. The function $\varepsilon(\cdot)$ in (C5)(ii) determines the speed of convergence of the slowly varying function $l(\cdot)$. 
3. Proposed estimators

In this section, we propose an extrapolation estimator for extreme conditional quantiles, and develop two types of estimators for the Weibull tail-coefficient based on the regression quantiles.

For ease of notation, we denote \( q_U(\tau|\mathbf{x}) = \bar{F}_U^{-1}(\tau|\mathbf{x}) \) for all \( \tau \in (0,1) \).

By (2.6) and condition (C1), we have

\[
q_Y(\tau|\mathbf{x}) = q_U(\tau|\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{x}' \beta_r = q_u(\tau^{1/K(x)}) (1 + \alpha(\tau)) + \mathbf{x}' \beta_r
\]

for some \( \alpha(\tau) \to 0 \) as \( \tau \to 0 \). Therefore,

\[
\varpi(s,\tau^{1/K(x)}) = \frac{q_Y(s\tau|\mathbf{x})}{q_Y(\tau|\mathbf{x})} \frac{q_u(\tau^{1/K(x)})}{q_u((s\tau)^{1/K(x)})} - 1 \to 0,
\]

for all \( s > 0 \) as \( \tau \to 0 \).

3.1 Estimation of extreme conditional quantiles

Let \( \tau \in (0,1) \) be small enough. By (2.5) and similar arguments as used in the proof of Lemma 2 in Gardes and Girard (2016), for any given \( s \in (0,1] \) we have

\[
\ln q_Y(s\tau|\mathbf{x}) - \ln q_Y(\tau|\mathbf{x}) = \ln \left( \frac{q_u((s\tau)^{1/K(x)})}{q_u(\tau^{1/K(x)})} \right) + \ln \left[ 1 + \varpi(s,\tau^{1/K(x)}) \right]
\]

\[
= \ln \left( \frac{H_u^{-1}(-\ln(s\tau)/K(x))}{H_u^{-1}(-\ln(\tau)/K(x))} \right) + \ln \left[ 1 + \varpi(s,\tau^{1/K(x)}) \right]
\]

\[
= \theta \left[ \ln_{-2}(s\tau) - \ln_{-2}(\tau) \right] + T(s,\tau|\mathbf{x}), \quad (3.1)
\]
3.2 Estimation of Weibull tail-coefficient

where \( \ln_{-2}(z) := \ln[\ln(1/z)] \) and \( T(s, \tau|x) = \ln[l(-\ln(s\tau)/K(x))]/l(-\ln(\tau)/K(x))] + \ln[1 + \varpi(s, \tau^{1/K(x)})] \to 0 \) as \( \tau \to 0 \). Then, for any \( s \in (0, 1] \),

\[
\frac{q_Y(s\tau|x)}{q_Y(\tau|x)} - \left( \frac{\ln(s\tau)}{\ln \tau} \right)^{\theta} \to 0. \tag{3.2}
\]

Suppose that \( \hat{\theta}_n \) is some consistent estimator of \( \theta \) (to be discussed in Section 3.2). Inspired by (3.2), we can estimate \( q_Y(\psi_n|x) \) by the following extrapolation estimator:

\[
\hat{q}_{n,E}(\psi_n|x) = \hat{q}_n(\tau_n|x) \left( \ln \psi_n/\ln \tau_n \right)^{\hat{\theta}_n}, \tag{3.3}
\]

where \( \hat{q}_n(\tau_n|x) = x'\hat{\beta}(\tau_n) \), and \( \hat{\beta}(\tau_n) \) is defined in (2.2) at the intermediate quantile level \( \tau_n \).

3.2 Estimation of Weibull tail-coefficient

In this section, we propose several estimators for the Weibull tail-coefficient \( \theta \). For any given \( r \in (0, 1) \), let \( s_j = r^{j-1} \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, J \) and \( J \) is a positive integer. By (3.1) and the fact that \( \ln(1+u) \sim u \) as \( u \to 0 \), it follows by some calculations that

\[
\ln q_Y(s_{j+1}\tau|x) - \ln q_Y(s_j\tau|x) - \left\{ \frac{\ln(1/r)}{\ln(1/\tau)} \right\} \theta \to 0, \text{ as } \tau \to 0.
\]

Let \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) be a given covariate vector. Based on the conventional conditional quantile estimation at the intermediate quantile levels, namely,
3.2 Estimation of Weibull tail-coefficient

\[ \hat{q}_n(s_j \tau_n | x) = x' \hat{\beta}(s_j \tau_n) \] for \( j = 1, \ldots, J \), we can construct a weighted estimator of \( \theta \) as

\[
\hat{\theta}_{n,P}(x) = \frac{\ln(1/\tau_n)}{\ln(1/r)} \sum_{j=1}^{J-1} \omega_j \left[ \ln \hat{q}_n(s_j \tau_n | x) - \ln \hat{q}_n(s_j \tau_n | x) \right],
\]

where \( \{\omega_j\}_{j=1}^{J-1} \) is a sequence of nonnegative weights summing to one. The estimator \( \hat{\theta}_{n,P}(x) \) has a similar spirit as the refined Pickand estimator introduced in Daouia et al. (2013) for the conditional extreme value index.

Similar to Daouia et al. (2013), we consider two special cases of \( \hat{\theta}_{n,P}(x) \). The first case uses constant weights \( \omega_1 = \cdots = \omega_{J-1} = 1/(J-1) \), which yields

\[
\hat{\theta}_n^c_P(x) = \frac{\ln(1/\tau_n)}{(J-1) \ln(1/r)} \left[ \ln \hat{q}_n(r^{J-1} \tau_n | x) - \ln \hat{q}_n(\tau_n | x) \right].
\]

In the second case, we consider linear weights \( \omega_j = 2(J-j)/(J-1)J \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, J-1 \), which results in

\[
\hat{\theta}_n^l_P(x) = \frac{2\ln(1/\tau_n)}{J(J-1) \ln(1/r)} \sum_{j=1}^{J-1} \left[ \ln \hat{q}_n(s_j \tau_n | x) - \ln \hat{q}_n(\tau_n | x) \right].
\]

For comparison, we also introduce an estimator analogous to the one proposed in Gardes and Girard (2016):

\[
\hat{\theta}_{n,H}(x) = \frac{\ln(1/\tau_n)}{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left[ \ln \hat{q}_n(s_j \tau_n | x) - \ln \hat{q}_n(\tau_n | x) \right], \quad (3.4)
\]

where \( \{s_j : 0 < s_j < \cdots < s_1 \leq 1\} \) is a decreasing sequence. The estimator \( \hat{\theta}_{n,H}(x) \) is an adaptation of the Hill estimator (Hill, 1975) for univariate
heavy-tailed data; see also Daouia et al. (2011) and Wang et al. (2012) for the Hill-type estimators under the regression setup.

Remark 2. From a theoretical point of view, we can use \( \hat{\theta}_n(x) \) to estimate the coefficient \( \theta \) at any given \( x \in \mathcal{X} \). However, given the sample data \( \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \), our experience suggests that \( \hat{\theta}_n(\bar{x}) \) with \( \bar{x} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i/n \) is often more stable than \( \hat{\theta}_n(x) \) for \( x \) not in the centroid of the design space. The main reasons are that there are often more data around \( \bar{x} \), and the conventional conditional quantile estimator at \( \bar{x} \) is less susceptible to quantile crossing issues, seeing Koenker (2005, Chap. 2.5).

3.3 Asymptotic results

We establish the asymptotic results of the proposed estimators. Throughout, we assume that \( \tau_n \to 0 \) and \( n\tau_n \to \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). For any \( s > 0 \), define

\[
\tilde{q}_n(s|x) = \sqrt{n\tau_n} \ln (1/\tau_n) \left( \frac{\hat{q}_n(s\tau_n|x)}{q_Y(s\tau_n|x)} - 1 \right).
\]

Let \( \overset{d}{\to} \) and \( \overset{d}{=} \) denote “convergence in distribution” and “equality in distribution”, respectively.

We first present the asymptotic joint distribution of the random vector \( (\tilde{q}_n(s_1|x), \ldots, \tilde{q}_n(s_J|x)) \) for any given \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) and a positive sequence \( s_j \in (0, 1], j = 1, \ldots, J \).
3.3 Asymptotic results

**Theorem 1.** Assume that conditions (C1)-(C5) hold. For all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, if $\tau_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ such that $n \tau_n \to \infty$, then

$$(\tilde{q}_n(s_1|x), \ldots, \tilde{q}_n(s_J|x))' \xrightarrow{d} (q_\infty(s_1|x), \ldots, q_\infty(s_J|x))' \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma_{q(x)}),$$

where $(\Sigma_{q(x)})_{j,j'} = \theta^2((x'\Omega_1 x)H^{-2}(x)(\max(s_j, s_{j'}))^{-1}$ for $j, j' = 1, \ldots, J$,

$\Omega_1 = Q_H^{-1}Q_x Q_H^{-1}, \ Q_x = E(XX'), \ Q_H = E[(H(x))^{-1}XX']$ and $H(x) = [K(\mu_{x})/K(x)]^\theta$ with $\mu_{x} = E(X)$.

Theorems 2 and 3 present the asymptotic results of the two proposed Weibull tail-coefficient estimators: the Pickand-type estimator $\hat{\theta}_{n,P}(x)$ and the Hill-type estimator $\hat{\theta}_{n,H}(x)$ with $x \in \mathcal{X}$ being a given design vector.

**Theorem 2.** Suppose that conditions (C1)-(C5) hold. Let $s_j = r^{j-1}$, $j = 1, \ldots, J$, where $r \in (0, 1)$. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, if $\sqrt{n \tau_n} \max (1/\ln (1/\tau_n), |b(\ln (1/\tau_n))|) \to 0$ and $\sqrt{n \tau_n} \ln (1/\tau_n) \max_{j=1,\ldots,J} |\varpi(s_j, \tau_n 1/K(x))| \to 0$, then

$$\sqrt{n \tau_n} \left( \hat{\theta}_{n,P}(x) - \theta \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, (\ln r)^{-2}W'\Sigma_{q(x)}W),$$

where $W = (w_0 - w_1, \ldots, w_{j-1} - w_j, \ldots, w_{J-1} - w_J)'$ with $w_0 = w_J = 0$.

**Theorem 3.** Suppose that conditions (C1)-(C5) hold. Let $1 = s_1 > s_2 > \cdots > s_J > 0$ be a positive decreasing sequence. For any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, if $\sqrt{n \tau_n} \ln(1/\tau_n) \max_{j=1,\ldots,J} |\varpi(s_j, \tau_n 1/K(x))| \to 0$ and $\sqrt{n \tau_n} \max (1/\ln (1/\tau_n), $
3.3 Asymptotic results

\[ |b(\ln(1/\tau_n))| \rightarrow 0, \text{ then} \]

\[ \sqrt{n\tau_n} \left( \hat{\theta}_{n,H}(\mathbf{x}) - \theta \right) \overset{d}{\rightarrow} N(0, \Lambda_J H^{-2}(\mathbf{x})\theta^2 (\mathbf{x}'\Omega_1\mathbf{x})) , \]

where

\[ \Lambda_J = \left( \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left[ \frac{2(J-j)}{s_j} + \frac{1}{j} - 2 \right] \right)^{-2} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{J} \ln(1/s_j) \right)^{-2} . \tag{3.5} \]

For the Hill-type estimator, in practice we can choose \( s_j = 1/j \) as in Daouia et al. [2011]. Consequently, \( \Lambda_J = J(J-1)(2J-1)/(6\ln^2(J)) \). In this case, \( \Lambda_J \) is a convex function of \( J \), and is minimized at \( J = 9 \) with \( \Lambda_9 = 1.245 \). Throughout the paper, we use \( \hat{\theta}_{n,H}(\mathbf{x}) \) with the “optimal” tuning parameters \( s_j = 1/j \) and \( J = 9 \).

Finally, we establish the asymptotic normality of the proposed extrapolation estimator for the extreme conditional quantitle, \( \hat{q}_{n,E}(\psi_n|\mathbf{x}) \), based on an asymptotically normal tail-coefficient estimator \( \hat{\theta}_n \), which can be either the Pickand- or Hill-type.

**Theorem 4.** Suppose that conditions (C1)-(C5) hold, and \( \kappa_n := \ln\psi_n/\ln\tau_n \rightarrow \kappa \in (1, \infty) \) as \( n \rightarrow \infty \). Let \( \hat{\theta}_n \) be an estimator of \( \theta \) satisfying \( \sqrt{n\tau_n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta) \overset{d}{\rightarrow} N(0, \sigma^2_\theta) \) with \( \sigma^2_\theta > 0 \). Then for any \( \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} \), if \( \sqrt{n\tau_n} \max\{|b(\ln(1/\tau_n))|, |\varpi(\psi_n/\tau_n, \tau_n^{1/K(\mathbf{x})})|\} \rightarrow 0 \), we have

\[ \frac{\sqrt{n\tau_n}}{\ln\kappa_n} \left( \frac{\hat{q}_{n,E}(\psi_n|\mathbf{x})}{q_Y(\psi_n|\mathbf{x})} - 1 \right) \overset{d}{\rightarrow} N(0, \sigma^2_\theta). \]
4. Miscellaneous issues

4.1 Diagnosis of Weibull-type tails

The expression in (3.1) suggests that if the conditional distribution of $Y$ has a Weibull-type tail, then $\ln(q_Y(\tau|x))$ will be approximately linear in $\ln(-2(\tau))$ with slope $\theta$. Motivated by this, we consider a graphical tool to check the assumption of Weibull-type tail for the conditional distribution of $Y$. Specifically, given the sample data $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, we can obtain the conventional estimator $\hat{q}_n(\tau_j|\bar{x})$ at the sample mean $\bar{x}$ for a grid of small quantile levels $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_m$, and then draw a quantile plot by plotting $\ln(\hat{q}_n(\tau_j|\bar{x}))$ against $\ln(-2(\tau_j))$ with $j = 1, \ldots, m$. If the distribution is of a Weibull-type tail, the points should lie roughly on a straight line. The graphical diagnosis at one design point, $\bar{x}$, is reasonable, since the condition (C1) implies that, for any $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $z \mapsto H_U(z|x)$ and $z \mapsto H_U(z|x')$ are tail equivalent up to a constant. For the detailed operation steps, we postpone them to the case study in Section 6.

4.2 Comparison of asymptotic variances

Theorem 4 suggests that the estimation accuracy of the proposed extreme quantile estimator $\hat{q}_{n,E}(\psi_n|x)$ depends heavily on that of the Weibull tail-
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Figure 1: The plots of $\delta_P$, $\delta_{P}^{\text{op}}$ and $\delta_{H}^{\text{op}}$ against the Weibull tail-coefficient $\theta$.

Coefficient estimator. Define $\delta_P = W'\Sigma W/(\ln r)^2$ with $\Sigma_{j,j'} = \theta^2/(r^{j-1} \vee r^{j'-1})$ for $j, j' = 1, \ldots, J$ and $\delta_H = \Lambda J \theta^2$. By Theorems 3 and 4, we have $W'\Sigma_{q(x)} W/(\ln r)^2 = [(x'\Omega_1 x)/H^2(x)]\delta_P$ and $\Lambda J \theta^2(x'\Omega_1 x)/H^2(x) = [(x'\Omega_1 x)/H^2(x)]\delta_H$. Therefore, to compare the asymptotic variances of $\hat{\theta}_{n,P}(x)$ and $\hat{\theta}_{n,H}(x)$, it suffices to compare $\delta_P$ and $\delta_H$, where both of them are quadratic functions of $\theta$. For convenience, denote $\delta_{P}^{\text{c}}$ and $\delta_{P}^{l}$ as the special case of $\delta_P$ for constant and linear weights, and $\delta_{H}^{\text{op}}$ as the special case of $\delta_H$ with the “optimal” tuning parameters $s_j = 1/j$ and $J = 9$. For the Pickand-type estimators, we select the tuning parameters $J$ and $r$ by searching over $J = \{2,3,\ldots,10\}$ and $R = \{0.01,0.02,\ldots,0.99\}$.
tively, to identify the optimal pair that gives the smallest $\delta_P$. We note from Figure 1 that the three Weibull tail-coefficient estimators have similar efficiency for small $\theta \in (0, 0.5]$, but for larger $\theta$, $\hat{\theta}_{n,H}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{n,P}$ tend to be more efficient than $\hat{\theta}_{n,P}$.

4.3 Model validation

In this section, we show that conditions (C1) and (C2) are very general and they cover a wide range of the conventional regression models as special cases. We also present some important Weibull-type distributions that fulfill the conditions in (C5). For illustration, we first present two conventional regression models that satisfy condition (C1).

(M1) Consider the location shift model

$$Y = X'\beta + u,$$

where $u$ is independent of $X$, and the survival function $\bar{F}_u(\cdot)$ of $u$ has a Weibull-type tail. This model is a special case of (C1) where $X'\beta = X'\beta_r = X'\beta$, $U \equiv Y - X'\beta = u$, and $K(x) = 1$ given $X = x$. Moreover, $\bar{F}_U(z|x) = \bar{F}_u(z)$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $H_U(z|x) \sim K(x)H_u(z)$ uniformly on $x \in \mathcal{X}$ as $z \to \infty$. 
Consider the heteroscedastic model

\[ Y = X'\beta + (X'\xi) u, \]

where the scale function \( x'\xi > 0 \) for any \( X = x \in X \), \( u \) is independent of \( X \), and the survival function \( \tilde{F}_u(\cdot) \) of \( u \) has a Weibull-type tail. It is easy to see that

\[ \tilde{F}_Y^{-1}(\tau|X) = X'\beta + (X'\xi) \tilde{F}_u^{-1}(\tau). \]

Then, for \( X'\beta_r = X'\beta \) and \( U \equiv Y - X'\beta = (X'\xi) u \), we have

\[
H_U(z|x) = -\ln P ((x'\xi)u > z|x) \\
= H_u \left((x'\xi)^{-1} z\right) \\
\sim (x'\xi)^{-1/\theta} H_u (z),
\]

as \( z \to \infty \) by \([1,2]\). Thus condition (C1) is satisfied with \( K(x) = (x'\xi)^{-1/\theta} \) for any \( x \in X \).

Next, we present some important Weibull-type distributions as examples that satisfy condition (C5).

Let \( u \) follow the Gaussian distribution \( N(\mu, \sigma^2) \) with \( \sigma > 0 \).

We have \( H_u^{-1}(z) = z^{1/2}l(z) \), and an asymptotic expansion of \( l(\cdot) \) as

\[
l(z) = \sqrt{2\sigma} - \frac{\sigma}{2^{3/2}} \ln z + O(1/z).\]
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This leads to $\theta = 1/2$, $\rho = -1$, $c = \sqrt{2}\sigma \exp(-1/4)$, and $b(z) = \varepsilon(z) = \ln z/(4z)$.

(E2) Let $u$ follow the Gamma distribution $\Gamma(\beta, \alpha)$ with $\alpha, \beta > 0$.

We have the density function $f(z) = \beta^\alpha \Gamma^{-1}(\alpha) z^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta z)$, and $H_u^{-1}(z) = z l(z)$ with

$$l(z) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{\beta} & \text{if } \alpha = 1, \\
\frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{\alpha-1}{\beta} \ln z + O(1/z) & \text{if } \alpha \neq 1.
\end{cases}$$

This leads to $\theta = 1$, $\rho = -1$, $c = \exp(\alpha - 1)/\beta$, and $b(z) = \varepsilon(z) = (1 - \alpha) \ln z/z$.

(E3) Let $u$ follow the Weibull distribution $W(\alpha, \lambda)$ with $\alpha, \lambda > 0$.

We have the density function $f(z) = (\alpha/\lambda)(z/\lambda)^{\alpha-1} \exp(-(z/\lambda)^\alpha)$, $H_u^{-1}(z) = \lambda z^{1/\alpha}$ and $l(z) = \lambda$ for all $z > 0$. This leads to $\theta = 1/\alpha$, $\rho = -\infty$, $c = \lambda$, and $b(z) = \varepsilon(z) = 0$.

(E4) Let $u$ follow the extended Weibull distribution $EW(\alpha, \beta)$ with $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$.

The survival function of $u$ is given by $\bar{F}_u(z) = r(z) \exp(-z^\alpha)$, where $r(\cdot) \in \mathcal{RV}_\infty(\beta)$. Also, $H_u^{-1}(z) = z^{1/\alpha} l(z)$ with

$$l(z) = 1 + \frac{\beta}{\alpha^2} \frac{\ln z}{z} + O(1/z).$$
This leads to $\theta = 1/\alpha$, $\rho = -1$, $c = \exp(\beta/\alpha^2)$, and $b(z) = \varepsilon(z) = -\beta(\ln z)/(\alpha^2 z)$.

(E5) Let $u$ follow the modified Weibull distribution $MW(\alpha)$ with $\alpha > 0$.

Let $V \sim W(\alpha, 1)$ and $u = V \ln V$. Thus, $H_u^{-1}(z) = z^{1/\alpha}l(z)$ with $l(z) = \alpha \ln z$. This leads to $\theta = 1/\alpha$, $\rho = 0$, $c = \alpha$, and $b(z) = \varepsilon(z) = 1/\ln z$.

In what follows, we show that (C2) holds for both the location shift model (M1) and the heteroscedastic model (M2) with Weibull-tailed errors. By (2.5) and (C5), it yields after some calculations that

$$\frac{H_u^{-1}(-\ln(k\tau))}{H_u^{-1}(-\ln \tau)} - 1 \sim \frac{\theta \ln k}{\ln \tau} \quad \text{as} \quad \tau \to 0. \quad (3.1)$$

Noting that $H_u^{-1}(-\ln \tau|x) = H_u^{-1}(-\ln \tau)$ for any $\tau \in (0, 1)$ in (M1), it is clear that condition (C2) holds under (M1). Second, by $H_u^{-1}(-\ln \tau|x) = (x'\xi)H_u^{-1}(-\ln \tau)$ and $x'\xi > 0$ in (M2), it is easy to check that condition (C2) is also fulfilled under (M2) by using (3.1).

To verify the conditions required in Theorems 1-4, we need to determine the appropriate rates of $\tau_n$ and $\psi_n$. Specifically, we need that as $n \to \infty$, $\tau_n$ satisfies $\tau_n \to 0$, $n\tau_n \to \infty$, $\sqrt{n\tau_n \ln(1/\tau_n)} \max_{j=1,...,J} |\varpi(s_j, \tau_n^{1/K(x)})| \to 0$ and $\sqrt{n\tau_n} \max \{1/\ln(1/\tau_n), |b(\ln(1/\tau_n))|, \max_{j=1,...,J} |\varpi(s_j, \tau_n^{1/K(x)})| \} \to 0$ for all $x \in X$. The condition $n\tau_n \to \infty$ implies that $\tau_n$ should be of a larger order.
than $1/n$. In Propositions 1 and 2 of the online supplementary materials, we show that under both the location shift model (M1) and the heteroscedastic model (M2), $\tau_n = k_0 (\ln \ln n) / n$ for some constant $k_0 > 0$ is suitable for all five Weibull-type tail distributions in (E1)-(E5). Then a reasonable choice of $\psi_n$ is given as $\psi_n = k_1 / n^{1+\nu}$ or $k_1 \ln n / n^{\nu+1}$ for some $k_1 > 0$ and $\nu > 0$, leading to $\kappa_n = \ln \psi_n / \ln \tau_n \to 1 + \nu > 1$ as $n \to \infty$. This implies that any higher order conditional quantile $q_{Y}(\psi_n | x)$ than $q_{Y}(\tau_n | x)$ can be estimated effectively by our extrapolation method because the rate of $\psi_n = k_1 / n^{1+\nu}$ or $k_1 \ln n / n^{\nu+1} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ can be arbitrarily fast given a suitable $\nu$.

5. Simulation study

In this section, we conduct a simulation study to assess the finite sample performance of the proposed extreme quantile estimator. Consider the following data generating process:

$$Y_i = 1 + X_{i1} + X_{i2} + X_{i3} + \frac{(X_{i1} + X_{i2}) V_i}{2}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

where $\{X_{ij}\}_{i=1}^n$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables from the uniform distribution $U(0, 1)$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$, and $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are generated from the following five Weibull-type distributions respectively: $N(0, 9)$ with $\theta = 0.5$, $W(5, 1)$ with $\theta = 0.2$, $W(1, 1)$ with $\theta = 1$, $MW(2/3)$ with $\theta = 1.5$, and $MW(1/2)$ with $\theta = 2$. In each case, the true condition-
al quantile of $Y$ is $q_Y(\psi_n|x) = 1 + x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + (x_1 + x_2)\bar{F}^{-1}_Y(\psi_n)/2$ for $\psi_n \in (0, 1)$ and $x = (1, x_1, x_2, x_3)'$. We consider $n = 1000$ in the simulation study, and repeat the simulation 200 times for each case.

Our focus is on the estimation of extreme conditional quantiles $q_Y(\psi_n|x)$, where $\psi_n = 1/n^{1+\nu}$ with $\nu = 0.01$ (resulting in $\psi_n = 0.001$). For comparison, we consider the conventional quantile regression (QR) estimator $\hat{q}_n(\psi_n|x) = \mathbf{x}'\hat{\beta}(\psi_n)$, and three variations of the proposed extreme conditional quantile estimator: $\hat{q}^{P,c}_{n,E}(\psi_n|x)$, $\hat{q}^{P,l}_{n,E}(\psi_n|x)$ and $\hat{q}^{H}_{n,E}(\psi_n|x)$, which are based on three tail-coefficient estimators: $\hat{\theta}_{n,P}^c(\bar{x})$, $\hat{\theta}_{n,P}^l(\bar{x})$ and $\hat{\theta}_{n,H}(\bar{x})$. Here $\bar{x} = (1, \bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \bar{x}_3)'$ with $\bar{x}_j = R^{-1}\sum_{s=1}^R x_{sj}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$, and $\{x_{sj}\}_{s=1}^R$ ($R = 100$) are drawn randomly from $U(0, 1)$.

To examine the sensitivity of the proposed estimators against the choice of $\tau_n$, we let $\tau_n = k_0(\ln \ln n)/n$, and plot RMISE versus $k_0 \in [2, 30]$ in Figure 1 of the online supplement, where the RMISE is defined as the square root of the mean integrated squared error between a conditional quantile estimator and the truth $q_Y(\psi_n|x)$ integrated over $x$ and across 200 simulations. We have the following observations from Figure 1 of the online supplement.

For the Gaussian, Weibull(5,1) and Weibull(1,1) distributions with small or modest tail-coefficients, the estimator $\hat{q}^{P,1}_{n,E}$ is more sensitive to the choice of $k_0$ and it is generally more efficient than the conventional QR estimator.
for \( k_0 \in [2, 10] \), while the estimators \( \hat{q}_{n,E}^{P,c} \) and \( \hat{q}_{n,E}^{H} \) are generally more efficient than the QR estimator for \( k_0 \in [2, 20] \). On the other hand, for the MW(2/3) and MW(1/2) distributions with larger tail-coefficients, the estimator \( \hat{q}_{n,E}^{P,l} \) appears to be more efficient than \( \hat{q}_{n,E}^{P,c} \) and \( \hat{q}_{n,E}^{H} \), and all three are clearly more efficient than the QR estimator across \( k_0 \in [2, 30] \).

The tuning parameter \( k_0 \) plays a similar role as the threshold value in the extreme value literature; it balances between bias and variance, and has to be properly chosen. There exist some methods for choosing the threshold-type tuning parameter; see Caeiro and Gomes (2016) for a review on this topic. In practice, we choose \( k_0 \) by adapting the procedure in Neves et al. (2015) based on the path stability. Specifically, in our simulation study, we regard the path of the tail-coefficient estimation as a function of \( k_0 \), and chooses the \( k_0 \) value as the smallest one within \([2, 30]\) starting from which the estimation \( \hat{\theta} \) becomes most stable.

Table 1 summarizes the RMISE of the conventional QR estimator and three extrapolation estimators based on \( \tau_n = k_0 (\ln \ln n) / n \) with \( k_0 \) chosen by the path stability procedure. The Hill-type estimator and the Pickand-type estimator with constant weights perform similarly, and both are clearly more efficient than the QR estimator across all five distributions considered. The Pickand-type estimator with linear weights is the best performer for the
two MW distributions, which have larger tail-coefficients, but the method
is less efficient than the other two extrapolation estimators for distributions
with tail-coefficient \( \theta \leq 1 \). Those observations agree with the theoretical
comparison in Section 4.2.

6. Analysis of birth weights

To illustrate the usefulness of the proposed methods, we study the effect of
various behaviors of pregnant women on extremely high quantiles of birth
weights of live infants born in the United States. It is well known that
low birth weight is associated with many health problems. On the other
hand, high birth weight also has serious adverse impacts on both maternal
and child health. A baby born with an excessive birth weight may be at
increased birth risks including injuries, respiratory distress syndrome, low
blood sugar, jaundice, and long-term health risks such as type 2 diabetes,
childhood obesity and metabolic syndrome; see for instance Aye et al. (2010)
and Mohammadbeigi et al. (2013).

We use the June 1997 Detailed Natality Data published by the National
Center for Health Statistics, which contains the birth weights of 31912
infants born to black mothers. We let the response \( Y \) be the birth weight-
s in grams, and consider eight covariates, where \( X_1 \) is a binary variable
indicating whether the mother was married or not, $X_2$ indicates whether the infant is a boy, $X_3$ represents the mother’s age (with mean 26), $X_{4,1}$, $X_{4,2}$ and $X_{4,3}$ are three indicator variables indicating if the mother had no prenatal visit, visited the first time in the second trimester, and visited first in the third trimester, respectively, $X_5$ denotes the mother’s education level (0 for less than high school, 1 for high school, 2 for some college, and 3 for college graduate), $X_6$ indicates whether the mother smoked or not during pregnancy, $X_7$ represents the average daily number of cigarettes per day the mother smoked, and $X_8$ denotes the mother’s weight gain during pregnancy (with mean 29 pounds). The same data set was also analyzed in Abreveya (2001), Koenker and Hallock (2001) and Chernozhukov and Fernández-Val (2011), but the former two focused on the analysis on typical birth weights in the range between 2000 and 4500 grams, and the latter focused on extremely low birth weights in the range between 250 and 1500 grams. In contrast, we focus on the extremely high quantiles of birth weights over 4500 grams.

Let $X = (1, X_1, X_2, X_3, X_3^2, X_{4,1}, X_{4,2}, X_{4,3}, X_5, \ldots, X_8, X_8^2)^T$, where $X_3$, $X_3^2$ and $X_8$, $X_8^2$ are centered at zero. We consider the linear quantile regression model: $q_Y(\tau | X) = X'\beta(\tau)$, $\tau \in (0, 1)$.

To examine whether the conditional distribution of $Y$ has a Weibull-
type tail, we can follow the suggestion in Section 4.1 and plot \( \ln(\hat{q}_n(\tau|\bar{x})) \) against \( \ln_{-2}(\tau) \) for \( \tau \in \{0.01, 0.0095, \ldots, 0.001\} \) in Figure 2. The plot suggests that there is a strong linear relationship between \( \ln(\hat{q}_n(\tau|\bar{x})) \) and \( \ln_{-2}(\tau) \). Hence, our proposed method would be appropriate for analyzing this data. Similar to the simulation study, we choose \( J \) and \( r \) by following the grid search method discussed in Section 4.2 and let \( \tau_n = k_0(\ln \ln n)/n \). Figure 3 shows the path of the three tail-coefficient estimators against \( k_0 \in [2, 100] \). We exclude \( k_0 = 1 \) as this results in a small \( \tau_n \) so that the tail-coefficient is estimated to be zero. Based on the path stability procedure in Neves et al. (2015), the adaptive \( k_0 \) is chosen as 45, 63 and 40 for...
\[ \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{P}} (\bar{x}), \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{P}} (\bar{x}), \text{ and } \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{H}} (\bar{x}), \] respectively, and the corresponding estimates are \( \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{P}} (\bar{x}) = 0.225, \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{P}} (\bar{x}) = 0.166 \) and \( \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{H}} (\bar{x}) = 0.247. \) Figure 3 shows that the path of \( \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{P}} (\bar{x}) \) is relatively more stable than those of \( \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{P}} (\bar{x}) \) and \( \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{H}} (\bar{x}) \) when \( k_0 \in [40, 100]. \)

Next, we consider the estimation of extreme conditional quantiles. Figure 4 plots the estimated extremely high conditional quantiles of birth weights of baby girls and boys born to black mothers of the average profile from the conventional quantile regression (QR) and the proposed extrapolation estimators against the percentiles level \( 100(1-\psi_n) \), where \( \psi_n = k_1/n^{1.01} \) with \( k_1 \in \{0.1, 0.2, \ldots, 0.9, 1, 2, \ldots, 50\} \), and three extrapolation estimators based on \( \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{P}} (\bar{x}), \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{P}} (\bar{x}), \text{ and } \hat{\theta}_{n,\text{H}} (\bar{x}), \) denoted by EC, EL and EH, respectively.

We have the following observations from Figure 4. First, the estimates from the conventional QR method are not monotonically increasing with the quantile level, while such monotonicity is ensured by the extrapolation estimators. Second, for \( 100(1-\psi_n) \) ranging over \([99.8588, 99.9576]\), both the QR and the extrapolation estimators suggest that the quantiles of birth weights of boys are higher than those of girls. However, for extremely high percentiles \( 100(1-\psi_n) > 99.9831 \), the QR estimates suggest an opposite direction that girls have higher birth weights than boys. This result is
Figure 3: Three estimators of the Weibull tail-coefficient $\theta$ versus $k_0$ for the high birth weight.

surprising because it was often found that male infants are generally heavier than female infants. Based on QR, the 99.98th percentile of the birth weight of an infant girl born to an average mum is estimated to be 5269.218 grams and the 99.99th percentile is estimated to be 5674.657 grams. A further investigation shows that these high estimates from QR are mainly affected by one infant girl who has an extremely high birth weight of 6776 grams, and was born to a mother whose first prenatal visit was during the second trimester. In contrast, the proposed estimators are based on extrapolations from the $(1 - \psi_n)$th quantile and thus is less susceptible to the extreme
measurements of individual subjects.

Figure 4: Estimation of the extremely high conditional quantile of birth weights of baby girls and boys born to black mothers of the average profile from the conventional quantile regression (QR) and three extrapolation estimators.

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary materials include four sections. In Section S1, we provide seven lemmas that will be needed in deriving the asymptotic results of the proposed estimators. In Section S2, we provide two propositions that will be used in Section 4.3. Technical proofs of all four theorems are pre-
sented in Section S3. In Section S4, we present Figure 1, which plots the RMISE of different estimators versus $k_0$ for the simulation study.
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Table 1: The root mean integrated squared errors of different estimators of $q_Y(\psi_n|x)$ with $\psi_n = n^{-1.01}$ and $n = 1000$. Values in parentheses are the standard errors. The $\hat{q}_n$ is the conventional quantile regression estimator, and $\hat{q}_{n,E}^{P,c}$, $\hat{q}_{n,E}^{P,1}$ and $\hat{q}_{n,E}^{H}$ are the extrapolation estimators based on the Pickand-type tail-coefficient estimators with constant and linear weights, and the Hill-type tail-coefficient estimator, respectively. For the extrapolation estimators, $\tau_n = k_0(\ln \ln n)/n$, where $k_0$ is chosen by the path stability procedure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>$\hat{q}_{n,E}^{P,c}$</th>
<th>$\hat{q}_{n,E}^{P,1}$</th>
<th>$\hat{q}_{n,E}^{H}$</th>
<th>$\hat{q}_n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N (0, 9)</td>
<td>0.6143 (0.0194)</td>
<td>0.8067 (0.0189)</td>
<td>0.6260 (0.0184)</td>
<td>0.7753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W(5, 1)</td>
<td>0.0344 (0.0009)</td>
<td>0.0423 (0.0009)</td>
<td>0.0342 (0.0008)</td>
<td>0.0392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W(1, 1)</td>
<td>0.6892 (0.0168)</td>
<td>0.8264 (0.0178)</td>
<td>0.6921 (0.0172)</td>
<td>0.8712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW(2/3)</td>
<td>11.264 (0.5043)</td>
<td>8.394 (0.4223)</td>
<td>11.150 (0.4736)</td>
<td>17.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW(1/2)</td>
<td>54.730 (1.6219)</td>
<td>39.437 (1.4245)</td>
<td>52.879 (1.4677)</td>
<td>84.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>