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Abstract

Neural networks are suggested for learning a map from $d$-dimensional samples with any underlying dependence structure to multivariate uniformity in $d'$ dimensions. This map, termed DecoupleNet, is used for dependence model assessment and selection. If the data-generating dependence model was known, and if it was among the few analytically tractable ones, one such transformation for $d' = d$ is Rosenblatt's transform. DecoupleNets only require an available sample and are applicable to $d' < d$, in particular $d' = 2$. This allows for simpler model assessment and selection without loss of information, both numerically and, because $d' = 2$, graphically. Through simulation studies based on data from various copulas, the feasibility and validity of this novel approach is demonstrated. Applications to real world data illustrate its usefulness for model assessment and selection.
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1 Introduction

If $U \sim C$ for any $d$-dimensional copula $C$, the central idea of this work is to introduce a DecoupleNet, a neural network to be specified later, which maps $U$ to $U' \sim U(0,1)^{d'}$ for $d' \leq d$. The flexibility of DecoupleNets allows us to learn transformations not only from any (non-tractable) parametric copula $C$, but also from any underlying empirical copula of a given dataset. DecoupleNets thus yield numerical and graphical tools for answering the question

“How can we assess and select copulas that best fit given data?”

In Section 2 we introduce DecoupleNets and our approach for dependence model assessment and selection. As a high-level and easy to grasp graphical example for $d = d' = 2$ in this introduction, we trained a DecoupleNet, denoted by $D_{2,2}^{C_4,0.4}$, on a sample of size 50,000 from a bivariate $t$ copula with $\nu = 4$ degrees of freedom and Kendall's tau being $\tau = 0.4$; in short, $C = C_{\nu,\tau}^t = C_{4,0.4}^t$. The top left plot of Figure 1 shows a (new) sample of size $n_{\text{gen}} = 5000$ from this copula. Passing this sample through $D_{2,2}^{C_4,0.4}$ leads to the bottom left plot whose uniformity confirms training quality. In the top
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Figure 1 Samples of size $n_{\text{gen}} = 5000$ from a bivariate $C_{4,0.4}^t$ copula (top left) and a bivariate $C_{0.4}^C$ copula (top right), with corresponding $D_{2,2}^{C_{4,0.4}^t}$-transformed samples (bottom row).
right plot, we see a sample of size 5000 from some candidate model – here, a Clayton copula with the same Kendall’s tau \( \tau = 0.4 \) – whose adequacy for the training data we want to assess. Applying \( D_{2,2}^{C_{4,0.4}} \) to this sample leads to the plot on the bottom right. We clearly see the departure from uniformity suggesting that this Clayton copula is not an adequate model for our data. Doing this for several candidate models allows us to assess them and select the most suitable one. As we will see later, the same holds true if \( d > d' = 2 \), which makes this graphical assessment and selection approach feasible in higher dimensions. Measuring the quality of (non-)uniformity can also be done numerically. Section 3 investigates the details of the graphical and numerical approach in terms of simulated data. Another advantage of DecoupleNets is that they can capture the dependence of any real world data, which we will see in Section 4. Section 5 concludes with a summary and outlook.

2 DecoupleNets for model assessment and selection

2.1 Transformation

Let \( C \) be any \( d \)-dimensional copula. A DecoupleNet \( D_{d,d'}^{C} \) is a neural network that maps \( U \sim C \) to \( U' \sim U(0,1)^d \), so \( D_{d,d'}^{C}(U) = U' \) with the goal of model assessment and selection. We specify this map to be \( D_{d,d'}^{C} = T^C \circ \Phi^{-1} \), where \( \Phi^{-1}(u) = (\Phi^{-1}(u_1), \ldots, \Phi^{-1}(u_d)) \) is a componentwise transformation with the standard normal quantile function \( \Phi^{-1} \) and \( T^C \) is a trained neural network. The initial map \( \Phi^{-1} \) to standard normal margins acts as a pre-processing step that helps facilitate the training of the neural network \( T^C \).

Remark 2.1 (Rosenblatt’s transformation)

Another transformation from \( U \sim C \) to \( U' \sim U(0,1)^d \), but limited to \( d' = d \), is the transformation of Rosenblatt [1952]. It is the (only known) general such transformation from \( U \sim C \) (the “general” referring to the fact that it applies to any \( d \)-dimensional copula \( C \)) to \( U' \sim U(0,1)^d \); for specific \( C \), there may be other transformations, for example the one of Wu et al. [2007] for Archimedean copulas. Having to rely on such transformations has several main drawbacks in comparison to DecoupleNets. For most copulas, \( \Phi^{-1} \) is not available analytically, nor tractable numerically. Notable exceptions where \( \Phi^{-1} \) is available are normal, \( t \) and Clayton copulas. However, these copulas are typically not flexible enough to fit real world data well, the second drawback. This especially applies to higher dimensions where, additionally, the fact that \( d' = d \) makes computing \( \Phi^{-1} \) numerically and computationally intractable, the third drawback. Despite these drawbacks, Rosenblatt’s transformation is applied in copula modeling, see, for example, Genest et al. [2009]. As we will see, DecoupleNets have none of these drawbacks.

Note that the copula \( C \) underlying \( D_{d,d'}^{C} \) is typically not known analytically and only specified through a given sample.
2.2 Optimization

To train a DecoupleNet, we make use of a generative neural network modeling technique introduced by Li et al. (2015) and Dziugaite et al. (2015). We work with a family T of feedforward neural networks with a pre-specified architecture, where a network $T^C \in T$ is characterized by weights $W$. Given a sample $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}}$ from $C$ and a sample $\{U'_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}}$ from $U(0, 1)^d$, we minimize

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\{T^C(\Phi^{-1}(U_i))\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}}, \{U'_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}}\right)$$

over all $T^C \in T$ by a version of stochastic gradient descent, where $K(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a kernel function. Minimizing (2) ensures that the distribution of the DecoupleNet output $\{D^C_{d,d'}(U_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}}$ is as close as possible to $U(0, 1)^d$. This is due to the fact that the loss function $\mathcal{L}$ being minimized is equal to

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n_{\text{trn}}} \sum_{i'=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}} \varphi(T^C(\Phi^{-1}(U_{i'}))) - \frac{1}{n_{\text{trn}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}} \varphi(U'_i) \right\|^2,$$  

where $\varphi$ is the implied feature map of $K$, such that $K(u, v) = \varphi(u)^T \varphi(v)$. By selecting $K$ to be a Gaussian kernel $K(u, v) = \exp(-\|u - v\|^2/\sigma)$, where $\sigma > 0$ denotes the bandwidth parameter, the two terms in (3) will contain all empirical moments of $\{D^C_{d,d'}(U_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}}$ and $\{U'_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}}$, respectively, thus ensuring that the DecoupleNet output matches the $U(0, 1)^d$ distribution. As in Hofert, Prasad, et al. (2021b), we follow the suggestion of Li et al. (2015) and work with a mixture of Gaussian kernels with different bandwidth parameters in order to avoid selecting a single optimal bandwidth parameter.

2.3 Training

Directly performing the optimization in (2), also known as batch optimization, would involve all $\binom{n_{\text{trn}}}{2}$ pairs of observations which is memory-prohibitive even for moderately large $n_{\text{trn}}$. Instead, we adopt a mini-batch optimization procedure, where the training dataset is partitioned into batches of size $n_{\text{bat}}$ and the batches are used sequentially to update the weights $W$ with the Adam optimizer of Kingma and Ba (2014) (a “memory-sticking gradient” procedure, that is a weighted combination of the current gradient and past gradients from earlier iterations). After a pass through the entire training data, that is, after roughly $(n_{\text{trn}}/n_{\text{bat}})$-many gradient steps, one epoch of the neural network training is completed. The trade-off in utilizing mini-batches, particularly with a smaller batch size $n_{\text{bat}}$, is that the objective function is computed only with partial information for each gradient step in the optimization. For relatively small datasets however batch optimization can still be used and conceptually we can view it as a special case of the mini-batch procedure where $n_{\text{bat}} = n_{\text{trn}}$.

The detailed training procedure is summarized in Algorithm 2.2.

Algorithm 2.2 (DecoupleNet training)

1) Fix the number $n_{\text{epo}}$ of epochs and the batch size $1 \leq n_{\text{bat}} \leq n_{\text{trn}}$, where $n_{\text{bat}}$ is assumed to divide $n_{\text{trn}}$. Initialize the epoch counter $k = 0$ and the neural network weights $W = W(0)$ following Glorot and Bengio (2010).

2) Initialize the vectors $m_1^{(0)} = 0$ and $m_2^{(0)} = 0$, where $m_1^{(0)}$ and $m_2^{(0)}$ have the same dimension as the flattened weight vector $W$. Following Kingma and Ba (2014), we fix the exponential decay rates $\beta_1 = 0.9$ and $\beta_2 = 0.999$, the step size $\alpha = 0.001$ and the smoothing constant $\varepsilon = 10^{-8}$.
3) For epoch $k = 1, \ldots, n_{\text{epo}}$, do:

3.1) Randomly partition the input training sample $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}}$ and the desired output sample $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}}$ into corresponding $n_{\text{trn}}/n_{\text{bat}}$ non-overlapping batches $\{U_i^{(b)}\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{bat}}}$ and $\{U_i^{(b)}\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{bat}}}$, $b = 1, \ldots, n_{\text{trn}}/n_{\text{bat}}$, of size $n_{\text{bat}}$ each.

3.2) For batch $b = 1, \ldots, n_{\text{trn}}/n_{\text{bat}}$, let $r = b + (k-1)n_{\text{trn}}/n_{\text{bat}}$ and do:

3.2.1) Compute the DecoupleNet output $D_{d,d'}^C(U_i^{(b)}) = T^C(\Phi^{-1}(U_i^{(b)}); W^{(r-1)})$, $i = 1, \ldots, n_{\text{bat}}$.

3.2.2) Compute the gradient $\nabla^{(r)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial W} \mathcal{L}(\{D_{d,d'}^C(U_i^{(b)})\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{bat}}}, \{U_i^{(b)}\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{bat}}})$ via automatic differentiation.

3.2.3) Update $m_1^{(r)} = \beta_1 m_1^{(r-1)} + (1 - \beta_1) \nabla^{(r)}$ and compute the bias corrected version $\tilde{m}_1^{(r)} = m_1^{(r)}/(1 - \beta_1)$. 

3.2.4) Update $m_2^{(r)} = \beta_2 m_2^{(r-1)} + (1 - \beta_2)(\nabla^{(r)})^2$, where all operations are componentwise, and compute the bias corrected version $\tilde{m}_2^{(r)} = m_2^{(r)}/(1 - \beta_2)$. 

3.2.5) Update the weights $W^{(r)} = W^{(r-1)} - \alpha \tilde{m}_1^{(r)}/(\sqrt{\tilde{m}_2^{(r)}} + \varepsilon)$, where all operations are componentwise.

4) Return the trained DecoupleNet weights $W = W^{(n_{\text{epo}}n_{\text{trn}}/n_{\text{bat}})}$.

### 2.4 Understanding DecoupleNets and how to use them for dependence model assessment

We now briefly revisit the example of Section 1 to illustrate the nature of a trained DecoupleNet transform and why it is useful.

By construction, given an input sample $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{gen}}}$ from a known copula $C$ (or, as introduced later, pseudo-observations of an unknown copula $C$), the trained DecoupleNet $D_{d,d'}^C$ generates an output sample $\{D_{d,d'}^C(U_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{gen}}}$ that is approximately $U(0,1)^d$. On the other hand, for an input sample $\{\tilde{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{gen}}}$ from some candidate copula $\tilde{C}$, $\tilde{C} \neq C$, the DecoupleNet output $\{D_{d,d'}^C(\tilde{U}_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{gen}}}$ should exhibit departures from $U(0,1)^d$.

To demonstrate this idea, Figure 2 shows the same data as Figure 1 but now colored different regions of the input samples $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{gen}}}$ and, correspondingly, the corresponding output samples $\{D_{d,d'}^{C_{i_{1.0.4}}}(U_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{gen}}}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $d = 1, \ldots, 7$. Comparing the plot on the bottom left with the one on the top left, we see from the colored regions that samples $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{gen}}}$ in the joint right tail of $C_{i_{1.0.4}}$ are here mapped to samples $\{D_{d,d'}^{C_{i_{1.0.4}}}(U_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{gen}}}$ that concentrate near the bottom (small second component), and similarly for the joint left tail. Comparing the plot on the bottom right with the one on the bottom left, we see that the region at the bottom with samples from the joint right tail is underrepresented, so there must have been too few input samples in the upper right region – indeed what we see in the plot at the top right; one can also verify this numerically, the probability to fall in $[0, 1/7]^2$ is about 0.0673 under $C_{i_{1.0.4}}$ and 0.0874 under $C_{i_{0.4}}$. Similarly, the region at the top with samples from the joint left tail is overrepresented, so there must have been too many input samples in the lower left region – indeed what we see in the plot at the top right; again one can verify this numerically, the probability to fall in $[6/7, 1]^2$ is about 0.0673 under $C_{i_{1.0.4}}$ and 0.0400 under $C_{i_{0.4}}$. In short, the colors indicate to which
Figure 2 Colored samples of size $n_{\text{gen}} = 5000$ from a bivariate $C_{4,0.4}^t$ copula (top left) and a bivariate $C_{0.4}^C$ copula (top right), with corresponding $D_{2,2}^{C_{4,0.4}}$-transformed samples (bottom row).
regions input samples are transformed and thus allow us to assess and select copulas that well capture specific regions of interest.

Figure 3 shows $D_{3,2}^{C_{t}^{4,0.4}}$-transformed colored samples from a $C_{4,0.4}^{t}$ and a $C_{0.4}^{C}$ copula. This is an example where the DecoupleNet maps from $d$ to $d'$ with $3 = d > d' = 2$, and we still see from the overrepresented dark color (joint left tail) and underrepresented bright color (joint right tail) which regions $C_{0.4}^{C}$ fails to capture.

These examples already demonstrates how DecoupleNets can be utilized for graphical model assessment of copulas. For additional bivariate and higher-dimensional examples of graphical assessments in a simulated and in a real world setting, see Sections 3.1 and 4, respectively.

We can also numerically assess how close a DecoupleNet output $\{D_{d,d'}^{C}(U_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{gen}}$ is to $U(0,1)^{d'}$ using the Cramér-von-Mises (CvM) type score

$$S_{n_{gen},d'} = \int_{[0,1]^{d'}} n_{gen} \left( C_{n_{gen}}(u) - \prod_{j=1}^{d'} u_j \right)^2 dC_{n_{gen}}(u),$$

where $C_{n_{gen}}$ is the empirical copula of the pseudo-observations of $\{D_{d,d'}^{C}(U_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{gen}}$, so the empirical copula of $\{R_{i}/(n_{gen} + 1)\}_{i=1}^{n_{gen}}$ with $R_i = (R_{i,1}, \ldots, R_{i,d'})$, where $R_{i,j}$ denotes the rank of the $j$th among all components of $D_{d,d'}^{C}(U_i)$.

2.5 Model selection

Passing samples from different candidate models through a DecoupleNet allows us to construct a dependence model selection procedure, which we now introduce.

![Figure 3](image_url)
We denote an element of Algorithm 2.3 (Model assessment and selection with DecoupleNets) where \( \hat{C}_{n_{trn}} \) denote the empirical copula of \( \{\hat{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{trn}} \).

Suppose we are interested in selecting the best copula from a collection \( C \) of candidate models. We denote an element of \( C \) as \( C_\theta \) for a parameter vector \( \theta \), note however that \( C_\theta \) could very well be a copula without parameter vector to estimate, for example, if specified by an expert. For each parametric candidate model \( C_\theta \in C \), we proceed by first fitting \( \theta \) to the pseudo-observations \( \{\hat{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{trn}} \).

Next, we learn a DecoupleNet \( D_{d,d'}^{C_{n_{trn}}} \) from the pseudo-observations \( \{\hat{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{trn}} \) to \( U(0,1)^d \). By passing samples from each fitted candidate copula \( C_\theta \) through \( D_{d,d'}^{C_{n_{trn}}} \), we can use the resulting DecoupleNet-transformed samples to rank the fit of the candidate copulas to the pseudo-observations, that is, the closer the DecoupleNet-transformed sample is to \( U(0,1)^d \), the better. Formulated as an algorithm, our proposed model selection procedure is summarized in Algorithm 2.3.

**Algorithm 2.3 (Model assessment and selection with DecoupleNets)**

1) Given data \( \{X_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{trn}} \), construct the pseudo-observations \( \{\hat{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{trn}} \). Their empirical copula is denoted by \( \hat{C}_{n_{trn}} \).

2) For each parametric candidate copula \( C_\theta \in C \), fit the parameter \( \theta \) of \( C_\theta \) to the pseudo-observations \( \{\hat{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{trn}} \) to obtain \( C_\theta \). This leaves us with a finite number of candidate copulas, fitted or fixed; the latter refers to copulas with fixed parameters where no estimation is necessary. We denote a generic candidate copula by \( \tilde{C} \).

3) Train the DecoupleNet \( D_{d,d'}^{C_{n_{trn}}} \) based on the pseudo-observations \( \{\tilde{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{gen}} \) and the desired output \( \{\hat{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{gen}} \) from \( U(0,1)^d \); see Algorithm 2.2.

4) For each candidate copula \( \tilde{C} \) do:
   4.1) Generate a sample \( \{\tilde{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{gen}} \) from \( \tilde{C} \).
   4.2) Pass \( \{\tilde{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{n_{gen}} \) through the DecoupleNet \( D_{d,d'}^{C_{n_{trn}}} \) to obtain \( \{D_{d,d'}^{C_{n_{trn}}} (\tilde{U}_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{gen}} \).
   4.3) Optional, if \( d' = 2 \): For a graphical assessment, create a scatter plot of the DecoupleNet-transformed sample \( \{D_{d,d'}^{C_{n_{trn}}} (\tilde{U}_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{gen}} \). Determine the color of sample points \( \tilde{U}_i \) according to regions of interest, then color the sample \( \{D_{d,d'}^{C_{n_{trn}}} (\tilde{U}_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{gen}} \) accordingly and create a colored scatter plot.
   4.4) Compute the Cramér-von-Mises score \( S_{n_{gen},d'} \) of (4) for the DecoupleNet-transformed sample \( \{D_{d,d'}^{C_{n_{trn}}} (\tilde{U}_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{gen}} \).

5) For the graphical approach (optional), compare the two types of scatter plots created in Step 4.3 for all candidate copulas \( \tilde{C} \) and assess and select the candidate copula that shows least non-uniformity overall or in the region of interest. For the numerical approach, compare the Cramér-von-Mises scores for all candidate copulas \( \tilde{C} \) and assess and select the candidate copula that yields the lowest Cramér-von-Mises score.

In what follows we consider \( d' = 2 \) which allows us to investigate both the graphical and the numerical approach to dependence model assessment and selection. We also investigated the numerical
approach for \( d' > 2 \) (results not presented) and found no advantage over \( d' = 2 \). Moreover, the case \( d' = 2 \) has the advantage of a reduced run time when training a DecoupleNet.

3 Model assessment and selection based on simulated data

In this section we investigate our model assessment and selection procedure based on simulated data. Section 3.1 considers the graphical approach, and Section 3.2 the numerical one.

3.1 Graphical approach

We first focus on the graphical assessment and selection approach. Figure 4 shows DecoupleNet-transformed samples from different copulas (columns) and from different dimensions (rows). Let us start by focusing on the first row. Here a DecoupleNet was trained on a sample of size \( n_{\text{trn}} = 50000 \) from a bivariate \( C_{t,4,0.4} \) copula. The resulting DecoupleNet is \( D_{2,2}^{C_{t,4,0.4}} \). Then samples of size \( n_{\text{gen}} = 5000 \) from \( C_{t,4,0.4} \) (so the same copula as the DecoupleNet was trained on, referred to as the \textit{true} copula),

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Figure 4} & \quad D_{2,2}^{C_{t,4,0.4}} - \text{transformed samples of size } n_{\text{gen}} = 50000 \text{ from bivariate } C_{t,4,0.4}, \quad C_{t,4,0.2}, \quad C_{t,4,0.6}, \quad C_{0.4} \text{ and } C_{0,4} \text{ copulas (top row, from left to right), } D_{5,2}^{C_{t,4,0.4}} - \text{transformed samples of the same size and from the same type of copulas but five-dimensional (middle row), and } D_{10,2}^{C_{t,4,0.4}} - \text{transformed samples of the same size and from the same type of copulas but ten-dimensional (bottom row).}
\end{align*}
\]
from \( C_{4,0.2}^t \), \( C_{4,0.6}^t \) (so also \( t \) copulas with the same degrees of freedom but different Kendall’s tau), from \( C_{4,0.4}^t \) (the Archimedean Frank copula with Kendall’s tau 0.4) and from \( C_{0.4}^C \) copulas are generated and each is passed through the DecoupleNet \( D_{2,2}^{C_{4,0.4}} \) and then plotted in the first row of Figure 4 (from left to right). For the true copula, so the sample from \( C_{4,0.4}^t \), the \( D_{2,2}^{C_{4,0.4}} \)-transformed samples look uniform as they should. And for all candidate copulas, we clearly see non-uniformity in the \( D_{2,2}^{C_{4,0.4}} \)-transformed samples. The samples in the second and third row of Figure 4 are constructed similarly, the same candidate copulas are used but now in \( d = 5 \) (middle row) and \( d = 10 \) (bottom row) dimensions; the corresponding DecoupleNets trained are denoted by \( D_{5,2}^{C_{4,0.4}} \) (middle row) and \( D_{10,2}^{C_{4,0.4}} \) (bottom row). We come to the same conclusion as in the first row – namely, that we correctly observe uniformity in the first column and non-uniformity in all others. From all plots showing departures from uniformity in Figure 4, we can even see that, across the dimensions \( d \in \{2, 5, 10\} \), the type of non-uniformity remains roughly the same within each column – up to rotation by a multiple of 90 degrees, an insignificant artifact stemming from the stochastic nature of our training procedure. This observation shows that we do not lose much information when mapping from \( d > 2 \) to \( d' = 2 \) for the purpose of model assessment and selection.

Next, Figure 5 shows the middle row of Figure 4 but with colored samples. As also in the rest of the paper, we used the same color scheme here as we have already seen in Figure 2 so darker colors correspond to the joint left tail and brighter colors to the joint right tail of the input sample or copula. This allows us to assess the different five-dimensional candidate copulas, and ultimately to select one of them, according to their ability to properly capture, say, the joint right tail. For example, the \( D_{5,2}^{C_{4,0.4}} \)-transformed samples from \( C_{4,0.2}^t \) (second plot) and \( C_{0.4}^C \) (last plot) show too few red points in the top region and thus underestimates the joint right tail; this can also be verified numerically, the probability to fall in \( [6/7, 1]^5 \) is about 0.0673 under \( C_{4,0.4}^t \) but 0.0457 under \( C_{4,0.2}^t \) and 0.0400 under \( C_{0.4}^C \). Similarly, the \( D_{5,2}^{C_{4,0.4}} \)-transformed sample from \( C_{4,0.6}^t \) (third plot) shows too many points in the top region and thus overestimates the joint right tail; the probability to fall in \( [6/7, 1]^5 \) is about 0.0912 under \( C_{4,0.6}^t \). Selecting a model based on only the joint right tail region (an important region for risk management applications, for example), we pick \( C_{0.4}^F \) (fourth plot); again this is confirmed numerically, the probability to fall in \( [6/7, 1]^5 \) under \( C_{0.4}^F \) is 0.0548, so closest to the probability 0.0673 of the true model.

In our next example we consider deviations from the true \( t \) copula in some entries of the underlying correlation matrix \( P \). To this end we use trivariate \( t \) copulas with \( \nu = 4 \) degrees of freedom and

---

**Figure 5** \( D_{5,2}^{C_{4,0.4}} \)-transformed colored samples of size \( n_{\text{gen}} = 5000 \) from five-dimensional \( C_{4,0.4}^t \), \( C_{4,0.2}^t \), \( C_{4,0.6}^t \), \( C_{0.4}^F \) and \( C_{0.4}^C \) copulas (from left to right). The plots correspond to the middle row of Figure 4 but with colors.
correlation matrices $P$ of hierarchical nature. The top row of Figure 6 shows scatter plot matrices of the trivariate samples of size $n_{gen} = 5000$ from these models, denoted by $C^t_{4,(0.2,0.7)}$, $C^t_{4,(0.4,0.7)}$ and $C^t_{4,0.45}$ (from left to right). The notation for the former two models is $C^t_{4,(\tau_0,\tau_1)}$, where $\tau_0$ is the Kendall’s tau corresponding to the entries $\rho_{13}, \rho_{23}$ or the correlation matrix $P$ of the $t$ copula, whereas $\tau_1$ corresponds to the entry $\rho_{12}$ of $P$; note that for $t$ copulas, one has $\rho = \sin(\pi \tau/2)$. The bottom row of Figure 6 shows scatter plots of the $D_{3,2}^{C^t_{4,(0.2,0.7)}}$-transformed samples of $C^t_{4,(0.2,0.7)}$ (the true copula here), $C^t_{4,(0.4,0.7)}$ (deviating in $\tau_1$, so in $\rho_{13}, \rho_{23}$) and $C^t_{4,0.45}$ (deviating in all entries of $P$ but capturing the average Kendall’s tau $(0.2 + 0.7)/2$). As before, also here we correctly see uniformity in the first, and non-uniformity in the other two plots.

3.2 Numerical approach

We now focus on the numerical assessment and selection approach. To this end we include replications. The following algorithm provides a summary of what we do in this section for various dependence models to be specified later.

Algorithm 3.1 (Numerical model assessment and selection based on simulated data)
1) Fix a \( d \)-dimensional copula \( C \) and a number \( B \in \mathbb{N} \) of replications.
2) For \( b = 1, \ldots, B \) do:

2.1) Generate a sample of size \( n_{\text{trn}} \) from \( C \) and compute its pseudo-observations \( \{ \hat{U}_i^{(b)} \}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}} \); we use pseudo-observations here to mimic a realistic scenario as would be the case for real world data.
2.2) Train the DecoupleNet \( D_{d,2}^{C} \) on the pseudo-observations \( \{ \hat{U}_i^{(b)} \}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}} \).
2.3) For the true copula \( C \) and each candidate copula \( \tilde{C} \), do:

2.3.1) If the copula is parametric, estimate its parameters based on the pseudo-observations \( \{ \hat{U}_i^{(b)} \}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{trn}}} \); note that this case is considered in Figure 9.
2.3.2) Generate a sample of size \( n_{\text{gen}} \) from the (fitted) copula.
2.3.3) Pass the generated sample through the trained DecoupleNet \( D_{d,2}^{C} \) and obtain the decoupled output sample.

2.3.4) Evaluate the decoupled output sample by computing the CvM score (4).

We apply Algorithm 3.1 in three settings. In all three we consider \( d \in \{3, 5, 10\} \), \( B = 25 \), \( n_{\text{trn}} = 50 \,000 \) and \( n_{\text{gen}} = 10 \,000 \). In the first and third setting, the copulas were chosen among the few with analytically available Rosenblatt transform to allow for a comparison.

In the first setting, we consider \( C_{0.4}^{0.4} \) as true copula \( C \) in Algorithm 3.1 and \( C_{0.4}^{0.4}, C_{4.0.4}, C_{5.2}^{0.4} \) and \( C_{0.6}^{0.6} \) as candidate copulas. The left-hand side of Figure 7 shows box plots of the CvM scores according to Algorithm 3.1 for \( d = 3 \) (top), \( d = 5 \) (middle) and \( d = 10 \) (bottom). The right-hand side includes similar plots but obtained from applying the Rosenblatt transform \( R_{d}^{C_{0.4}} \) instead of a DecoupleNet \( D_{d,2}^{C_{0.4}} \). In particular, recall that the Rosenblatt transform maps to \( d > d' = 2 \) dimensions so the values of the CvM scores are not directly comparable. Nevertheless, apart from \( C_{4.0.4}^{1} \) (for \( d \in \{3, 5\} \)) and \( C_{0.2}^{0.4} \) (for \( d = 10 \)), the rankings of the candidate models are the same. A comparison with the box plot of the true copula \( C_{0.4}^{0.4} \) also correctly reveals that based on both \( D_{d,2}^{C_{0.4}} \) and \( R_{d}^{C_{0.4}} \), none of the candidate copulas is adequate.

In the second setting, we consider nested Clayton copulas as true copula \( C \) in Algorithm 3.1. To this end let \( C_{k}, k = 0, 1, 2 \), be a Clayton copula with parameter chosen such that Kendall’s tau equals \( \tau_0 \). For \( d = 3 \) we choose a (2, 1)-nested Clayton copula \( C_{0}(C_{1}(u_1, u_2), u_3) \) with \( (\tau_0, \tau_1) = (0.2, 0.4) \), denoted by \( C_{0.2.0.4}^{C_{1}} \). Besides this copula as true copula, we consider the trivariate candidate models \( C_{0.2.0.5}^{C_{1}(0.2,0.5)}, C_{0.3.0.4}^{C_{1}(0.3,0.4)}, C_{0.2.0}^{C_{1}(0.2,0)} \) and \( C_{0.2.0}^{C_{1}(0.2,0)} \). The left-hand side of Figure 8 shows the box plots of the CvM scores according to Algorithm 3.1. For \( d = 5 \) we choose a (2, 3)-nested Clayton copula \( C_{0}(C_{1}(u_1, u_2), C_{2}(u_3, u_4, u_5)) \) with \( (\tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2) = (0.2, 0.4, 0.6) \), denoted by \( C_{0.2.0.4.0.6}^{C_{2}} \). Besides this copula as true copula, we consider the five-dimensional candidate models \( C_{0.2.0.5}^{C_{1}(0.2,0.5,0.75)}, C_{0.3.0.4}^{C_{1}(0.3,0.4,0.6)}, C_{0.3.0.4}^{C_{1}(0.3,0.4,0.6)} \) and \( C_{0.2.0.4.0.6}^{C_{1}(0.2,0.4,0.6)} \). The resulting box plots of the CvM scores according to Algorithm 3.1 are shown in the center of Figure 8. And for \( d = 10 \) we choose a (5, 5)-nested Clayton copula \( C_{0}(C_{1}(u_1, \ldots, u_5), C_{2}(u_6, \ldots, u_{10})) \) with \( (\tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2) = (0.2, 0.4, 0.6) \), also denoted by \( C_{0.2.0.4.0.6}^{C_{2}} \), and ten-dimensional candidate models \( C_{0.2.0.5}^{C_{1}(0.2,0.5,0.75)}, C_{0.3.0.4}^{C_{1}(0.3,0.4,0.6)}, C_{0.3.0.4}^{C_{1}(0.3,0.4,0.6)} \) and \( C_{0.2.0.4.0.6}^{C_{1}(0.2,0.4,0.6)} \). The resulting box plots of the CvM scores are shown on the right-hand side of Figure 8. Among the candidate models, the first two are also of hierarchical nature, just with different parameters, whereas the other candidate models are exchangeable with parameters chosen to match the average pairwise dependence. That is, for \( d = 3 \), \( d = 5 \) and \( d = 10 \) copulas, we set \( \tau = \frac{1}{(2)} (2\tau_0 + \tau_1) \), \( \tau = \frac{1}{(2)} (6\tau_0 + \tau_1 + 3\tau_2) \) and \( \tau = \frac{1}{(2)} (25\tau_0 + 10\tau_1 + 10\tau_2) \), respectively.
3 Model assessment and selection based on simulated data

Figure 7 Box plots of CvM scores $S_{n_{\text{gen}}}$ based on $B = 25$ $D_{d,2}^{C_{0.4}}$-transformed (left column) and $R_{d}^{C_{0.4}}$-transformed (right column) samples of size $n_{\text{gen}} = 10000$ from trivariate ($d = 3$; top), five-dimensional ($d = 5$; middle) and ten-dimensional ($d = 10$; bottom) copulas $C_{0.4}^C$, $C_{0.4}^F$, $C_{4,0.4}^C$, $C_{0.2}^C$ and $C_{0.6}^C$. See Algorithm 3.1 for details.
We clearly see from Figure 8 that none of the exchangeable or nested candidate models are adequate. Both observations align with intuition. Moreover, from the rankings of the two nested models, we see that the deviation in $\tau_0$ is more important than deviations in both $\tau_1$ or $\tau_2$. This is due to the fact that there exist more pairwise marginal copula with Kendall’s tau $\tau_0$ than those with Kendall’s tau $\tau_1$ and Kendall’s tau $\tau_2$ combined.

In the third and final setting, we consider an unstructured $t$ copula with $\nu = 4$ degrees of freedom and random correlation matrix as true copula, in $d = 3$, $d = 5$ and $d = 10$ dimensions. As benchmark we include a fitted (unstructured) $t$ copula $\hat{C}^{t}_{\text{un}}$. As candidate copulas we include a fitted vine copula $\hat{C}^V$ (fitted with R package VineCopula with tree structure selected using Dissmann’s algorithm in Dissmann et al. (2013) and AIC to select the pair-copula families), a fitted (unstructured) normal copula $\hat{C}^N_{\text{un}}$, a fitted exchangeable normal copula $\hat{C}^N_{\text{ex}}$ and a fitted Frank copula $\hat{C}^F$. The left-hand side of Figure 9 shows the box plots of the CvM scores according to Algorithm 3.1 for $d = 3$ (top), $d = 5$ (middle) and $d = 10$ (bottom). The right-hand side includes similar plots but obtained from applying the Rosenblatt transform $R^{C_{d,1}}_{\text{un}}$ instead of a DecoupleNet $D^{C^d}_{d,2,\text{un}}$. We observe here that the rankings produced from these different transforms are fairly comparable as well. We do, however, notice a large variance for the $D^{C^d}_{d,2,\text{un}}$-transformed samples. This does not come as a surprise due to the retraining of the DecoupleNet $B$ times, a price one has to pay for the gain in flexibility.

4 Model assessment and selection based on real world data

In this section we apply our DecoupleNet approach to two real world datasets. The first contains pseudo-observations of the water-level heights of two rivers; the second consists of two sets of foreign exchange rates.
Figure 9 Box plots of CvM scores $S_{\text{gen}, 2}$ based on $B = 25 \, D_{d, 2}^{\hat{C}_t^{\text{un}}}$-transformed (left column) and $R_{d}^{\hat{C}_t^{\text{un}}}$-transformed (right column) samples of size $n_{\text{gen}} = 10\,000$ from trivariate ($d = 3$; top), five-dimensional ($d = 5$; middle) and ten-dimensional ($d = 10$; bottom) fitted copulas $\hat{C}_t^{\text{un}}$, $\hat{C}_t^{\text{N}}$, $\hat{C}_t^{\text{ex}}$ and $\hat{C}_t^{\text{F}}$. See Algorithm 3.1 for details.
4.1 Danube data

We consider the dataset danube from the R package lcopula, referred to as the “Danube data” in what follows. It consists of 659 pseudo-observations of prewhitened monthly average water-level heights of the Danube river at Nagyramos (Hungary) and those of the Inn river at Schärding (Austria); for more information about the Danube data, including the type of prewhitening applied, see the help page of danube in lcopula. With the Inn being a tributary to the Donau, the two water-level heights are naturally dependent, and Hofert, Kojadinovic, et al. (2018, Section 5.2.5) showed that there is no strong evidence against the hypothesis that this dependence is Gumbel.

For demonstrating our graphical assessment and selection procedure, we train a DecoupleNet $D_{d,2}^{C_n}$ on the Danube data. We then pass $n_{\text{gen}} = 659$ samples from various copulas through $D_{d,2}^{C_n}$. As benchmark, we include $\hat{C}_n$; sampling from $\hat{C}_n$ is done in the usual way, by drawing pseudo-observations at random with replacement. As candidate models, we include a Gumbel copula, a normal copula, a $t$ copula, a Clayton copula and the independence copula. All parameters of the candidate models were estimated from the Danube data. The top row of Figure 10 shows scatter plots of the $D_{d,2}^{C_n}$-transformed samples for the Danube data, and the bottom row shows the samples colored with the same color scheme as before, so, for example, samples with bright colors are decoupled samples from the joint right tail of the input sample. The graphical assessment and selection procedure is a bit more challenging to apply in this case due to the small sample size $n = 659$ of the dataset. We cannot select a clear winner among the fitted Gumbel, $t$ or normal copulas. Nevertheless, we see (more) non-uniformity for the fitted Clayton and the independence copula. Similarly for the corresponding colored plots in the bottom row of Figure 10.

More promising for such small sample sizes is the numerical approach. We consider the same models as in the graphical approach. For each such model, we generate $n_{\text{rep}} = 25$ samples of size $n_{\text{gen}} = 10,000$ and pass them through the DecoupleNet $D_{d,2}^{C_n}$. We then compute the corresponding CvM scores $S_{n_{\text{gen}},2}$; see (4). The resulting box plots are shown in Figure 11. In contrast to the graphical approach, the numerical assessment based on box plots reveals the fitted Gumbel copula as an adequate dependence
model and best among all candidate copulas. For as small sample sizes as for the Danube data, the numerical approach may therefore be preferred.

4.2 Exchange rate data

Here we consider two datasets of foreign exchange rates (FX) with the goal to investigate the dependence for each of these datasets, an important task from the realm of risk management. The data can be found in the R package qrmdata. The first dataset consists of daily exchange rates of Canadian dollar (CAD), Pound sterling (GBP), Euro (EUR), Swiss Franc (CHF) and Japanese yen (JPY) with respect to the US dollar (USD). And the second consists of daily exchange rates of CAD, USD, EUR, CHF, JPY and the Chinese Yuan (CNY) with respect to the GBP. The considered trading days are from 2000-01-01 to 2015-12-31, resulting in 5844 five-dimensional ($d = 5$) and six-dimensional ($d = 6$) observations for the USD and the GBP FX datasets, respectively. The data can be found in the R package qrmdata. For each of the two datasets, negative log-returns were formed and deGARCHed; see Hofert, Prasad, et al. (2021a) for more details. This leaves us with $n = 5843$ observations per dataset.

For demonstrating our graphical assessment and selection procedure, we consider the pseudo-observations with corresponding $d$-dimensional empirical copula $\hat{C}_n$ for both datasets. For each dataset, we trained a DecoupleNet $D_{d,2}^*\hat{C}_n$ on these pseudo-observations. We then pass $n_{\text{gen}} = 5000$ samples from various copulas through $D_{d,2}^*\hat{C}_n$. As benchmark, we include $\hat{C}_n$. And as candidate models, we include a vine copula, a $t$ copula with unstructured correlation matrix, an exchangeable normal copula with homogeneous correlation matrix, a Clayton copula and the independence copula. All parameters of the candidate models were estimated from the respective pseudo-observations. The first row of Figure 12...
shows scatter plots of the $D_{d,2}^C$-transformed samples for the USD FX data ($d = 5$), and the second row shows the samples colored with the same color scheme as before. Rows three and four of Figure 12 show similar plots as rows one and two, respectively, but now for the GBP FX data ($d = 6$). The first column shows uniformity of the DecoupleNet-transformed samples of the empirical copula $\hat{C}_n$, so training of the two DecoupleNets worked well. The samples corresponding to all candidate models show non-uniformity, though, so none of them seems to fit the respective dataset well. From the (barely visible) green samples in row two and four, we can identify that none of the candidate models fits well in the body of the underlying $d$-dimensional distribution. Judging from the fits in the joint right tail (bright colors), both the fitted vine and the fitted $t$ copula seem adequate for capturing the dependence in this region.
For demonstrating our numerical assessment and selection procedure, we consider the same models as in the graphical approach. For each of the datasets and models considered, we generate \( n_{\text{rep}} = 25 \) samples of size \( n_{\text{gen}} = 10000 \) and pass them through the respective DecoupleNet \( \hat{D}_{d,2}^{\hat{C}_d} \) (for the USD FX data) or \( \hat{D}_{d,2}^{\hat{C}_d} \) (for the GBP FX data). We then compute the corresponding CvM scores \( S_{n_{\text{gen}},2} \); see (4). The resulting box plots are shown in Figure 13. Our conclusion from the numerical approach is the same as from the graphical approach. We see from the box plots that none of the candidate models are particularly good for the respective data set, with vine and \( t \) copulas performing best on both the USD and the GBP FX data.

5 Conclusion

We introduced DecoupleNets for dependence model assessment and selection. A DecoupleNet is a neural network based transformation of a random vector from a copula to a random vector from a standard uniform distribution. A DecoupleNet can be trained on samples from a known copula or, more importantly, on pseudo-observations from a given multivariate dataset for which no copula is known. A candidate copula for the given dataset can then be assessed by computing a DecoupleNet-transformed sample from the candidate model and assessing its (non-)uniformity. Model selection can be done by comparing the (non-)uniformity of DecoupleNet-transformed samples from the candidate models and selecting the one producing the least non-uniform output, for example measured numerically with a Cramér-von-Mises type score. For both tasks, the flexibility of neural networks is a main advantage and allows DecoupleNets to be trained on and applied to any copula sample. Another advantage is that DecoupleNets can map to the (bivariate) unit square, which is computationally advantageous and,
especially, allows for a graphical approach to dependence model assessment and model selection. In particular, coloring input samples and corresponding DecoupleNet-transformed output samples even allows one to assess and select dependence models based on particular regions of interest.
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