

**Finance and Economics Discussion Series  
Divisions of Research & Statistics and Monetary Affairs  
Federal Reserve Board, Washington, D.C.**

**Accurate Evaluation of Expected Shortfall for Linear Portfolios  
with Elliptically Distributed Risk Factors**

**Dobrislav Dobrev, Travis D. Nesmith, and Dong Hwan Oh**

**2016-065**

Please cite this paper as:

Dobrev, Dobrislav, Travis D. Nesmith, and Dong Hwan Oh (2016). "Accurate Evaluation of Expected Shortfall for Linear Portfolios with Elliptically Distributed Risk Factors," Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2016-065. Washington: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, <https://doi.org/10.17016/FEDS.2016.065r1>.

NOTE: Staff working papers in the Finance and Economics Discussion Series (FEDS) are preliminary materials circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comment. The analysis and conclusions set forth are those of the authors and do not indicate concurrence by other members of the research staff or the Board of Governors. References in publications to the Finance and Economics Discussion Series (other than acknowledgement) should be cleared with the author(s) to protect the tentative character of these papers.

# Accurate Evaluation of Expected Shortfall for Linear Portfolios with Elliptically Distributed Risk Factors

Dobrislav Dobrev <sup>1,†,‡,\*</sup>, Travis D. Nesmith <sup>2,†</sup> and Dong Hwan Oh <sup>3,†,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Federal Reserve Board of Governors; [dobrislav.p.dobrev@frb.gov](mailto:dobrislav.p.dobrev@frb.gov)

<sup>2</sup> Federal Reserve Board of Governors; [travis.d.nesmith@frb.gov](mailto:travis.d.nesmith@frb.gov)

<sup>3</sup> Federal Reserve Board of Governors; [donghwan.oh@frb.gov](mailto:donghwan.oh@frb.gov)

\* Correspondence: [dobrislav.p.dobrev@frb.gov](mailto:dobrislav.p.dobrev@frb.gov) & [donghwan.oh@frb.gov](mailto:donghwan.oh@frb.gov); Tel.: +1-202-[452-2953 & 973-7334]

† Current address: 20th St. and Constitution Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20551

The authors thank Federal Reserve Board Research Library Lead Librarian Helen Keil-Losch for comprehensive bibliographic assistance as well as Justin Skillman for related research assistance.

‡ These authors contributed equally to this work.

**Abstract:** We provide an accurate closed-form expression for the expected shortfall of linear portfolios with elliptically distributed risk factors. Our results aim to correct inaccuracies that originate in [1] and are present also in at least thirty other papers referencing it, including the recent survey [2] on estimation methods for expected shortfall. In particular, we show that the correction we provide in the popular multivariate Student  $t$  setting eliminates understatement of expected shortfall by a factor varying from at least 4 to more than 100 across different tail quantiles and degrees of freedom. As such, the resulting economic impact in financial risk management applications could be significant. We further correct such errors encountered also in closely related results in [3,4] for mixtures of elliptical distributions. More generally, our findings point to the extra scrutiny required when deploying new methods for expected shortfall estimation in practice.

**Keywords:** Expected shortfall; elliptical distributions; multivariate Student  $t$  distribution; accurate closed-form expression

**MSC:** 91G10

**JEL:** C46,G11

---

## 1. Introduction

Important advantages of expected shortfall (ES) over value at risk (VaR) as a coherent risk measure [see 5] have drawn the attention of financial risk managers, regulators and academics alike. For instance, a key element of a recent proposal by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision [6] is moving the quantitative risk metrics system in regard to trading book capital requirement policies from 99% VaR to 97.5% ES. The surge in interest in ES estimation methods also has been reflected in the recent and extensive survey by Nadarajah *et al.* [2], which emphasizes many new developments and covers over 140 references on the subject. In this context, using elliptically distributed risk factors emerges as an appealing choice in multivariate settings, because elliptical distributions can model heavy-tailed, and thus riskier, financial return distributions flexibly while remaining analytically tractable.<sup>1</sup> These benefits, however,

---

<sup>1</sup> Imposing any particular parametric distributional assumptions can be avoided at the cost of sacrificing analytical tractability based on non-parametric approaches to ES estimation such as Scaillet [7] and [8], among many others. See Nadarajah *et al.* [2] for further details.

require restricting all risk factors to have equally heavy tails. One popular elliptical example is given by the multivariate Student  $t$  distribution, which allows for setting the tail index, and consequently the thickness of the tails, directly as a function of the number of degrees of freedom.

Further restricting attention to linear portfolios, the main purpose of this paper is to correct the inaccuracies in Kamdem [1] for the analytical expressions and numerical results for ES in both the elliptical and the multivariate Student  $t$  cases. In particular, the ES expressions derived in [1] for both the general case of any elliptical distribution and the special case of a multivariate Student  $t$  distribution are too large by a factor of two. Furthermore, we find that the power in the ES formula for multivariate Student  $t$  should be  $-(\frac{\nu-1}{2})$ , rather than  $-(\frac{\nu+1}{2})$  as derived in [1]. This later error more than offsets the missing scaling factor of  $1/2$ , implying that fixing both errors will increase estimates of ES for portfolios of risk factors that are distributed according to a multivariate Student  $t$  distribution. Both the linear and nonlinear errors are propagated in the survey paper Nadarajah *et al.* [2] and are confounded by additional numerical errors in [1] in the tabulated values for ES in the multivariate Student  $t$  case. More specifically, we find that the inaccurate analytical expression derived in [1] does not match the reported numerical values in [1] for ES in the multivariate Student  $t$  case and neither one of them matches the correct expression and values we derive.

Including the recent survey Nadarajah *et al.* [2], the inaccurate results in [1] have been referenced in at least 30 subsequent English publications without correction [2–4,9–36].<sup>2</sup> In particular, while Lu's Ph.D. thesis [36] contains a stand-alone derivation of the correct analytical expression for ES in the multivariate Student  $t$  case, it still reports the inaccurate ES expression in [1] for the general elliptical case; it also does not correct any of the numerical inaccuracies in [1] for the multivariate Student  $t$  case. Similarly, [18] provides a stand-alone derivation of the correct ES expression only for the multivariate Student  $t$  case, addressing neither the general elliptical case nor the need to correct numerical results in [1]. Moreover, in addition to being incomplete, neither of these implicit corrections of part of the results in [1] has drawn attention to the errors originating in [1] that have spilled over into all of the above other references. As such, the inaccuracies in [1] that we aim to correct have yet to be explicitly recognized and acknowledged more broadly. As evidenced also by their propagation to the recent survey [2] both in the general elliptical case and the special multivariate Student  $t$  case, it is likely for the inaccurate results to be further utilized and propagated if left unchecked.

In terms of magnitude of the resulting tail risk measurement errors, applying our correction in the popular multivariate Student  $t$  setting, particularly the derivation of the correct power  $-(\frac{\nu-1}{2})$  in addition to applying the necessary scaling factor of  $1/2$  from the general elliptical case, eliminates understatement of ES by a factor varying from at least 4 to more than 100 across different tail quantiles and degrees of freedom. For the 97.5% quantile specified by [6] and the range of 3–8 degrees of freedom commonly used in risk management applications, the corrections produce ES estimates that are around six times larger. Clearly, the resulting economic impact in financial risk management applications could be significant. As another contribution of our paper, we eliminate such economically significant inaccuracies that have propagated also in the closely related results in [3,4] for ES in the case of mixtures of elliptical distributions.

Another viable approach to obtaining the accurate ES expression for linear portfolios in elliptically distributed risk factors we derive would be to express the returns of such portfolios as corresponding univariate elliptically distributed random variables and making appropriate substitutions in the respective ES formula for the univariate case. We show the equivalence of this alternative approach by

---

<sup>2</sup> Ten more papers not written in English also cite [1]; our ability to read these papers is limited, but they do not seem to correct the inaccuracies in [1] either.

specializing the expressions we derive to the univariate Student t case. We further note that Landsman and Valdez [37, Theorems 1 and 2], preceding the results in [1], have formally advocated this approach for representing ES for linear combinations of jointly elliptical variables. However, neither [1], nor the recent survey [2] on estimation methods for expected shortfall or any of the other references mentioned above have made the connection we make to the results in [37] as an alternative way to correct the errors in [1].<sup>3</sup>

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 derives the correct ES expression in the general elliptical case. Section 3 deals with the additional correction that needs to be made in the multivariate Student t case. Section 4 validates the corrected ES expressions via a mapping to the univariate Student t case. Section 5 conducts an assessment of the resulting economic impact. Section 6 extends the correction to mixtures of elliptical distributions, and more particularly multivariate Student t mixtures. Section 7 concludes.

## 2. Accurate ES in the General Elliptical Case

Following the notations in [1], we consider a linear portfolio with a weight row vector  $\delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_n)$  in  $n$  elliptically distributed risky returns  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$  with mean  $\mu$ , scale matrix  $\Sigma = AA'$ , and probability density function (pdf) of  $X$  taking the form

$$f_X(x) = |\Sigma|^{-1/2} g\left((x - \mu) \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu)'\right)$$

for some non-negative density generator function  $g$ , where for any matrix  $|\cdot|$  represents the determinant.

The expected shortfall associated with the continuous portfolio returns  $\Delta\Pi \equiv \delta X' = \delta_1 X_1 + \dots + \delta_n X_n$  is then given by<sup>4</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} -ES_\alpha &= E(\Delta\Pi | \Delta\Pi \leq -\text{VaR}_\alpha) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} E(\Delta\Pi \cdot 1_{\{\Delta\Pi \leq -\text{VaR}_\alpha\}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{\{\delta x' \leq -\text{VaR}_\alpha\}} \delta x' f(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$  is defined by  $\Pr\{\Delta\Pi < -\text{VaR}_\alpha\} = \alpha$ . The notation follows the usual convention of recording portfolio losses as negative numbers, but stating VaR and ES as positive quantities of money. After the same change of variables as in [1, section 2], we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} -ES_\alpha &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{\{|\delta A|z_1 \leq -\delta\mu - \text{VaR}_\alpha\}} (|\delta A|z_1 + \delta\mu) g(\|z\|^2) dz \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{\{|\delta A|z_1 \leq -\delta\mu - \text{VaR}_\alpha\}} |\delta A|z_1 g(\|z\|^2) dz + \delta\mu, \end{aligned}$$

<sup>3</sup> We thank an anonymous referee for suggesting to reconcile our results with the ones that can be obtained following the alternative approach by Landsman and Valdez [37, Theorems 1 and 2], which precedes the inaccurate results in [1].

<sup>4</sup> See [38] for various definitions of ES for continuous or discontinuous portfolio returns.

where the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  is defined as the Euclidean norm.<sup>5</sup> By writing  $\|z\|^2 = z_1^2 + \|z'\|^2$  and introducing spherical coordinates  $z' = r\zeta, \zeta \in S_{n-2}$ , the integral on the right hand side above can be expressed as

$$-ES_\alpha = \delta\mu + \frac{|S_{n-2}|}{\alpha} \int_0^\infty r^{n-2} \left[ \int_{-\infty}^{-q_\alpha} |\delta A| z_1 g(z_1^2 + r^2) dz_1 \right] dr,$$

where  $|S_{n-2}| = \frac{2\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})}$  is the surface measure of the unit-sphere in  $R^{n-1}$  and  $q_\alpha = \frac{\delta\mu + \text{VaR}_\alpha}{|\delta A|}$ . We can then change the variable  $z_1$  to  $-z_1$  and the variable  $r$  to  $u$  as given by  $u = z_1^2 + r^2$ , which then implies that  $du = 2r dr$  so that  $dr = \frac{du}{2r} = \frac{du}{2\sqrt{u-z_1^2}}$  and  $r = \sqrt{u-z_1^2}$ . Substituting the change of variables leads to the following equivalent expression for  $-ES_\alpha$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} -ES_\alpha &= \delta\mu - \frac{|S_{n-2}|}{\alpha} \int_{q_\alpha}^\infty \int_0^\infty r^{n-2} |\delta A| z_1 g(z_1^2 + r^2) dr dz_1 \\ &= \delta\mu - \frac{|S_{n-2}| |\delta A|}{2\alpha} \int_{q_\alpha}^\infty \int_{z_1^2}^\infty z_1 (u - z_1^2)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} g(u) du dz_1. \end{aligned}$$

Changing the order of the two integrals further yields

$$\begin{aligned} -ES_\alpha &= \delta\mu - \frac{|S_{n-2}| |\delta A|}{2\alpha} \int_{q_\alpha^2}^\infty \int_{q_\alpha}^{\sqrt{u}} z_1 (u - z_1^2)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} g(u) dz_1 du \\ &= \delta\mu - \frac{|S_{n-2}| |\delta A|}{2\alpha} \int_{q_\alpha^2}^\infty g(u) \int_{q_\alpha}^{\sqrt{u}} z_1 (u - z_1^2)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} dz_1 du. \end{aligned}$$

Because the inner integral simplifies to  $\frac{1}{n-1} (u - q_\alpha^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ , and by definition  $|\delta A| = |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2}$ , we obtain the following final result,

$$\begin{aligned} ES_\alpha &= -\delta\mu + |\delta A| \frac{|S_{n-2}|}{2\alpha} \int_{q_\alpha^2}^\infty \frac{1}{n-1} (u - q_\alpha^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} g(u) du \\ &= -\delta\mu + |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2} \underbrace{\frac{2\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{2\alpha\Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)(n-1)}}_{=2\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)} \int_{q_\alpha^2}^\infty (u - q_\alpha^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} g(u) du \\ &= -\delta\mu + |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2} \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{2\alpha\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)} \int_{q_\alpha^2}^\infty (u - q_\alpha^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} g(u) du. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have proved the following theorem for ES in the general elliptical case:

---

<sup>5</sup> The first change of variables in [1],  $y = (x - \mu)A^{-1}$ , transforms the distribution into a spherical distribution with the same generating function [39, Corollary 2.1 and Definition 2.2 on page 17]. The spherical distribution is invariant to rotations like the second change of variables,  $y = zR$  where  $R$  is the rotation in [1].

$$\underbrace{\frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{\alpha\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})} \int_{q_\alpha^2}^{\infty} (u - q_\alpha^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} g(u) du}_{\text{Kamdem [1]}} \quad \underbrace{\frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{2\alpha\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})} \int_{q_\alpha^2}^{\infty} (u - q_\alpha^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} g(u) du}_{\text{Theorem 1}}$$

**Figure 1.** Comparison of the formula for  $ES_\alpha$  from [1, Theorem 4.1] with the accurate one from Theorem 1 for the zero-mean unit-variance case.

**Theorem 1.** *The expected shortfall  $ES_\alpha$  at quantile  $\alpha$  of a linear portfolio  $\delta X$  in elliptically distributed risk factors  $X$  with pdf defined by  $f_X(x) = |\Sigma|^{-1/2} g\left((x - \mu)\Sigma^{-1}(x - \mu)'\right)$  is given by*

$$ES_\alpha = -\delta\mu + |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2} \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{2\alpha\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})} \int_{q_\alpha^2}^{\infty} (u - q_\alpha^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} g(u) du, \quad (1)$$

where  $q_\alpha = \frac{\delta\mu + VaR_\alpha}{|\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2}}$ .<sup>6</sup>

Comparing the above result to the corresponding expressions in [1, equation (4.1) in Theorem 4.1] as well as in [2, equation (15) in section 3.20], we conclude that our second term on the right hand side of equation (1) is smaller by a factor of 2. In particular, this corrects a two-fold overstatement of ES in the zero-mean case of typical interest in many short-term financial risk management applications. To highlight the difference, the formulas are compared for the zero-mean unit-variance case in Figure 1, where the factor has been increased in size and colored red.

### 3. Accurate ES in the Multivariate Student t Case

The formula in equation (1) can be specialized to derive  $ES_\alpha$  for any specific distribution in the family of multivariate elliptical distributions, by replacing  $g(u)$  by the appropriate generating function. A special case commonly used in risk management applications is given by the multivariate Student t distribution, which has the following pdf,

$$f_X(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})\sqrt{|\Sigma|}(\nu\pi)^\nu} \left(1 + \frac{(x - \mu)\Sigma^{-1}(x - \mu)'}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{(\nu+n)}{2}},$$

<sup>6</sup> From Kamdem [1, Theorem 2.1]  $q_\alpha$  is the unique solution of a transcendental equation; the specific equation will depend on the type of elliptical distribution.

where  $\Gamma(a) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} t^{a-1} dt$  is the Gamma function.<sup>7</sup> Substituting  $g(u) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})\sqrt{(\nu\pi)^n}} \left(1 + \frac{u}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{(n+\nu)}{2}}$  in equation (1) above further specializes the obtained general expression for ES to the multivariate Student t case, so that

$$\begin{aligned} ES_\alpha &= -\delta\mu + |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2} \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{2\alpha\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})\sqrt{(\nu\pi)^n}} \int_{q_\alpha^2}^\infty (u - q_\alpha^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{u}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{(n+\nu)}{2}} du \\ &= -\delta\mu + |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2} \frac{1}{2\alpha\sqrt{(\nu)^n\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})} \int_{q_\alpha^2}^\infty (u - q_\alpha^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{u}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{(n+\nu)}{2}} du. \end{aligned}$$

By [1, Lemma 2.1], where  $B(a, b) = \frac{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}$  is the Euler Beta function, we have the following equality

$$\int_{q_\alpha^2}^\infty (u - q_\alpha^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{u}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{(n+\nu)}{2}} du = \nu^{\frac{n+\nu}{2}} (q_\alpha^2 + \nu)^{-\frac{(\nu-1)}{2}} B\left(\frac{\nu-1}{2}, \frac{n+1}{2}\right).$$

Substituting the equality into the prior equation yields in turn:

$$\begin{aligned} ES_\alpha &= -\delta\mu + |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2} \frac{1}{2\alpha\sqrt{(\nu)^n\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})} \nu^{\frac{n+\nu}{2}} (q_\alpha^2 + \nu)^{-\frac{(\nu-1)}{2}} B\left(\frac{\nu-1}{2}, \frac{n+1}{2}\right) \\ &= -\delta\mu + |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2} \frac{1}{2\alpha\sqrt{(\nu)^n\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})} \nu^{\frac{n+\nu}{2}} (q_\alpha^2 + \nu)^{-\frac{(\nu-1)}{2}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n+\nu}{2})} \\ &= -\delta\mu + |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2} \frac{\nu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2\alpha\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} (q_\alpha^2 + \nu)^{-\frac{(\nu-1)}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

With this, we obtain the following result for ES in the multivariate Student t case:

**Theorem 2.** *The expected shortfall  $ES_\alpha$  at quantile  $\alpha$  of a linear portfolio  $\delta X$  in risk factors  $X$  having multivariate Student t distribution with pdf  $f_X(x) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})\sqrt{|\Sigma|(\nu\pi)^n}} \left(1 + \frac{(x-\mu)\Sigma^{-1}(x-\mu)'}{\nu}\right)^{-\frac{(n+\nu)}{2}}$  is given by*

$$ES_\alpha = -\delta\mu + es_{\alpha,\nu} \cdot |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2}, \quad (3)$$

with

$$es_{\alpha,\nu} = \frac{\nu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2\alpha\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} (q_{\alpha,\nu}^2 + \nu)^{-\frac{(\nu-1)}{2}} \quad (4)$$

and

$$q_{\alpha,\nu} = \frac{\delta\mu + VaR_\alpha}{|\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2}}, \quad (5)$$

<sup>7</sup> Following [1], we are using what [40, pp. 1] calls “the most common and natural form” of the pdf of a multivariate Student t distribution.

$$\underbrace{\frac{\nu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{\alpha\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} (q_{\alpha,\nu}^2 + \nu)^{-\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)}}_{\text{Kamdern [1]}} \qquad \underbrace{\frac{\nu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2\alpha\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} (q_{\alpha,\nu}^2 + \nu)^{-\left(\frac{\nu-1}{2}\right)}}_{\text{Theorem 2}}$$

**Figure 2.** Comparison of the formula for  $ES_\alpha$  from [1, Theorem 4.2] with the accurate one from Theorem 2 for the zero-mean unit-variance case.

where  $q_{\alpha,\nu}$  is uniquely determined by solving a transcendental equation given by [1, Theorem 2.2] and [2, section 3.20].<sup>8</sup>

A close inspection of our expression for  $es_{\alpha,\nu}$  in equation (4) above in comparison to the corresponding equations in [1, Theorem 4.2] and [2, section 3.20] reveals a difference of 1 in the power of the last term  $(q_{\alpha,\nu}^2 + \nu)^{-\left(\frac{\nu-1}{2}\right)}$  in addition to the extra scaling factor by 2 inherited from the correction made above in the general elliptical case. In particular, the correct power of that term is  $-\left(\frac{\nu-1}{2}\right)$  rather than  $-\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)$ . This nonlinear error is larger than the missing scaling factor. Combined, these two corrections eliminate an understatement of ES by a factor of  $\frac{(q_{\alpha,\nu}^2 + \nu)}{2} > 1$  in the zero-mean multivariate Student t setting with  $\nu \geq 2$  degrees of freedom of particular interest in many applications. Again to highlight the difference, the formulas are compared for the zero-mean unit-variance case in Figure 2, where the different power term is colored red in addition to the scaling factor being increased in size and colored red.

Before conducting a numerical assessment of this combined effect of correcting the two separate inaccuracies in the ES expressions found in the general elliptical case and the multivariate Student t case overlooked in both [1] and [2], we first provide an alternative way to reconcile our results through the univariate Student t case.

#### 4. Comparison to the Univariate Student t Case

The ES expression in Theorem 2 holds for any linear portfolio. In particular, it should hold if only a single asset is held, for example if  $\delta = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$ . Consequently, the formula for expected shortfall for the multivariate Student t should reproduce the formula for a univariate Student t.

The results in [41, section 2.2.2] show that the expected shortfall for a zero-mean unit-variance univariate Student t random variable is given by<sup>9</sup>

$$ES_\alpha = \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\pi}\sqrt{\nu}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} \left(1 + \frac{q_\alpha^2}{\nu}\right)^{-\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{\nu + q_\alpha^2}{\nu - 1}\right)$$

<sup>8</sup> Accurate numerical values of  $q_{\alpha,\nu}$  for different  $\alpha$  and  $\nu$  of interest are reproduced in Table A1 in the appendix as tabulated also by [1, section 2.2].

<sup>9</sup> We can restrict attention to the zero-mean unit-variance case without loss of generality given the affine properties of ES for Student t or any other elliptical distribution as a function of its mean and standard deviation.

Collecting terms and using known identities allows us to equivalently express this as

$$\begin{aligned}
ES_\alpha &= \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} \left(\nu + q_\alpha^2\right)^{-\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \nu^{\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{\nu + q_\alpha^2}{\nu - 1}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\nu-1}{2} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} \left(\nu + q_\alpha^2\right)^{-\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \nu^{\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{\nu + q_\alpha^2}{\nu - 1}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\alpha\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{2\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} \left(\nu + q_\alpha^2\right)^{-\left(\frac{\nu-1}{2}\right)} \nu^{\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right)} \\
&= \frac{\nu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2\alpha\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} \left(q_\alpha^2 + \nu\right)^{-\left(\frac{\nu-1}{2}\right)} \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

This result matches exactly our equation (4) from Theorem 2 on page 6 with  $n = 1$  for the zero-mean unit-variance case. Landsman and Valdez [37, equations (23) and (27)] obtain a seemingly different closed-form ES expression for univariate Student t distribution. Although it is not the same as equation (6), substituting with known equalities and rearranging terms makes it identical to equation (6) in line with the accuracy of our expression specialized to the univariate case.

Conversely, combining this expression from the univariate case with the location-scale properties of the multivariate Student t distribution (as an elliptical distribution) with respect to  $\delta\mu$  and  $|\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2}$  can also be used to reconcile our expressions in Theorem 2 with the ones that can be obtained following the approach by Landsman and Valdez [37, Theorems 1 and 2], which precedes the inaccurate results in [1] we correct. The consistency of our results in the univariate case also readily applies to general elliptical distributions. By contrast, the formulas contained in both [1] and [2] for elliptical distributions and multivariate Student t distributions are not consistent with the respective univariate formulas.

## 5. Economic Impact of The Correction

In order to assess the resulting economic impact, we study numerically the combined effect of the above corrections of the inaccuracies in the ES expressions found in [1] and [2] as well as additional numerical errors we uncover in the respective tabulated values in [1]. Without loss of generality, the numerical results restrict attention to the zero-mean unit-variance multivariate Student t setting. We tabulate in Table 1 on the next page the accurate (panel A) and inaccurate (panel B) values of  $es_{\alpha,\nu}$  as well as their ratio (panel D) across different tail quantiles  $\alpha = 0.01, 0.025, 0.05$  and degrees of freedom  $\nu = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 100, 200, 250$ .

It stands out that the ratio  $(q_{\alpha,\nu}^2 + \nu)/2$  of the accurate versus inaccurate values reported in panel D of Table 1 on the following page is quite large and varies from at least just above 4 (for  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\nu = 3$  or 4) to more than 100 (for  $\nu \geq 200$ ). The later discrepancies occur as the results should be converging to the results for a Gaussian distribution; the results in panel A are converging to the Gaussian ones unlike the values in panel B.

Importantly, in the case of  $\alpha = 0.025$  the minimum ratio of the accurate to inaccurate values of ES is about 6. Given that moving the quantitative risk metrics system in regard to trading book capital requirement policies from 99% VaR to 97.5% ES (i.e. in our notation  $\alpha = 0.025$ ) is a key element of the recent proposal by [6], the numerical results imply that the correction would eliminate at least a six-fold and potentially much larger understatement of risk in the popular zero-mean multivariate Student t setting. Clearly, the resulting economic impact in financial risk management applications could be significant.

Noting again the magnitude and potential economic impact of our correction, one could look for possible reasons as to why such large inaccuracies in the otherwise quite popular multivariate Student t

**Table 1. Numerical Comparison of the Accurate versus Inaccurate Expression for Expected Shortfall in the Multivariate Student  $t$  Case.** The table reports the accurate analytical (panel A), inaccurate analytical (panel B), and inaccurate numerically tabulated (panel C) values of  $es_{\alpha,\nu}$  as well as the respective ratios of accurate versus inaccurate analytical (panel D) and accurate analytical versus inaccurate numerically tabulated (panel E) values across different tail quantiles  $\alpha = 0.01, 0.025, 0.05$  (different rows) and degrees of freedom  $\nu = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 100, 200, 250$  (different columns) of the multivariate Student  $t$  distribution governing the individual risky returns in a linear portfolio. The accurate analytical expression in panel A reflects the derivations in this paper (Theorems 1 and 2). The inaccurate expression in panel B is originally due to Kamdem [1, Theorem 4.2] and is reproduced in Nadarajah *et al.* [2, section 3.20], while the inaccurate values in panel C are the ones numerically tabulated in [1, section 4.1].

$\nu$	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	100	200	250
<b>Panel A:</b> The accurate analytical $es_{\alpha,\nu} = \frac{\nu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{2\alpha\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} (q_{\alpha,\nu}^2 + \nu)^{-\frac{\nu-1}{2}}$ derived in sections 2 and 3 above												
$es_{0.010,\nu}^t$	14.071	7.004	5.221	4.452	4.033	3.770	3.591	3.462	3.363	2.722	2.717	2.665
$es_{0.025,\nu}^t$	8.832	5.040	3.994	3.522	3.256	3.087	2.970	2.884	2.819	2.379	2.358	2.354
$es_{0.050,\nu}^t$	6.164	3.874	3.203	2.890	2.711	2.595	2.514	2.515	2.891	2.093	2.078	2.075
<b>Panel B:</b> The inaccurate analytical $es_{\alpha,\nu} = \frac{\nu^{\frac{\nu}{2}}}{\alpha\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} (q_{\alpha,\nu}^2 + \nu)^{-\frac{\nu+1}{2}}$ in [1, theorem 4.2] and [2, section 3.20]												
$es_{0.010,\nu}^t$	0.557	0.593	0.579	0.546	0.508	0.472	0.438	0.408	0.381	0.052	0.026	0.021
$es_{0.025,\nu}^t$	0.861	0.768	0.682	0.607	0.543	0.490	0.446	0.409	0.377	0.046	0.023	0.019
$es_{0.050,\nu}^t$	1.171	0.908	0.750	0.638	0.555	0.490	0.439	0.409	0.453	0.041	0.021	0.016
<b>Panel C:</b> The inaccurate numerically tabulated $es_{\alpha,\nu}$ in [1, section 4.1]												
$es_{0.010,\nu}^t$	5.572	5.931	5.788	5.456	5.080	4.716	4.382	4.082	3.814	0.516	0.264	0.209
$es_{0.025,\nu}^t$	8.611	7.678	6.822	6.068	5.433	4.903	4.460	4.086	3.768	0.458	0.231	0.185
$es_{0.050,\nu}^t$	11.712	9.075	7.497	6.380	5.546	4.901	4.388	3.971	3.626	0.407	0.205	0.164
<b>Panel D:</b> Ratio $(q_{\alpha,\nu}^2 + \nu)/2$ of the accurate analytical $es_{\alpha,\nu}$ (panel A) to the inaccurate analytical $es_{\alpha,\nu}$ (panel B)												
$es_{0.010,\nu}^t$	25.253	11.808	9.020	8.161	7.938	7.994	8.195	8.480	8.819	52.795	102.741	127.750
$es_{0.025,\nu}^t$	10.256	6.564	5.854	5.804	5.994	6.296	6.659	7.059	7.482	51.968	101.944	126.939
$es_{0.050,\nu}^t$	5.263	4.269	4.272	4.530	4.888	5.295	5.729	6.143	6.378	51.378	101.365	126.363
<b>Panel E:</b> Ratio of the accurate analytical $es_{\alpha,\nu}$ (panel A) to the inaccurate numerically tabulated $es_{\alpha,\nu}$ (panel C)												
$es_{0.010,\nu}^t$	2.525	1.181	0.902	0.816	0.794	0.799	0.819	0.848	0.882	5.279	10.275	12.774
$es_{0.025,\nu}^t$	1.026	0.656	0.585	0.580	0.599	0.630	0.666	0.706	0.748	5.197	10.195	12.696
$es_{0.050,\nu}^t$	0.526	0.427	0.427	0.453	0.489	0.529	0.573	0.633	0.797	5.138	10.134	12.635

setting could have gone unnoticed. One important observation to make in this regard is that, as recently noted by [42] among others, the literature on backtesting ES is fairly new, thereby leaving a potential loophole for any such errors in ES computations to go unnoticed for a while, because financial industry applications may not yet perform routine and powerful enough ES backtesting.

Another possibility to keep in mind is that instead of using the inaccurate expressions in [1] and [2] one could alternatively take directly the values of  $es_{\alpha,\nu}$  tabulated by [1, section 4.1] and reproduced in panel C of Table 1. These numerical values happen to be offset by yet another separate mistake by a factor of 10, thereby mechanically, but still inaccurately, shifting the discrepancy in the opposite more conservative direction across much of the range of tabulated different tail quantiles and degrees of freedom. To illustrate this, panel E reports the ratio of the accurate analytical values (panel A) to the inaccurate numerically tabulated values (panel C). In particular, the magnitude of ES underestimation when using the wrongly tabulated values in panel C still remains very large for  $\nu$  much larger than 10.

However, for most other values of  $\nu$  there is at least some partial cancellation effect with all other errors as a result of this third inaccuracy in [1]; the result for 97.5% ES specified by [6] and the range of 3–8 degrees of freedom commonly used in risk management applications would be to bring most discrepancies down to the order of 0.6, thereby shifting the direction of the numerical errors from underestimation to overestimation of ES.

Last but not least, as pointed out above, the accurate ES expressions we provide can also be obtained following the alternative approach by Landsman and Valdez [37, Theorems 1 and 2] preceding [1]. Thus, although the inaccurate results in [1] have spread across [2–4,9–36], it cannot be ruled out that at least in some cases the errors in [1] could have been avoided by following [37] instead.

All in all, partial offsetting of different errors, challenges with ES backtesting, as well as the potential use of viable alternative approaches such as [37] could have played a role for ES discrepancies of even such large magnitude and potential economic impact as the ones we report in panel D of Table 1 to elude detection for some time. Our findings provide a word of caution about the scrutiny required when deploying any new methods for ES estimation in practice, as may be happening as a result of the proposed new guidelines issued by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision [6].

## 6. Accurate ES for Mixtures of Elliptical Distributions and Multivariate Student t Mixtures

As another useful application we further eliminate similar economically significant inaccuracies that have propagated also in closely related results for ES in the case of mixtures of elliptical distributions studied by [3,4].<sup>10</sup> In particular, using a similar derivation to [1], both [3] and [4] provide inaccurate closed-form ES expressions for the general case of mixtures of elliptical distributions as well as the special case of multivariate Student t mixtures with identical variance-covariance matrix  $\Sigma_i = \Sigma$ . The expressions for ES in [3,4] have inherited the omission of the scaling factor  $1/2$  corrected above. Therefore, for the sake of completeness we provide accurate ES expressions first for the general case of multivariate elliptical distribution mixtures (Theorem 3) and then also for the special case of multivariate Student t mixtures (Theorem 4).

**Theorem 3.** *The expected shortfall  $ES_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{g_i\}_{i=1}^m}$  at quantile  $\alpha$  of a linear portfolio  $\delta X$  in risk factors  $X$  following a mixture of elliptical distributions with pdf  $f_X(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i |\Sigma_i|^{-1/2} g_i((x - \mu_i) \Sigma_i^{-1} (x - \mu_i)')$  where  $\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i = 1$  is given by*

$$ES_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{g_i\}_{i=1}^m} = - \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i (\delta \mu_i) + \frac{\pi^{\frac{n-1}{2}}}{2\alpha \Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)} \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i |\delta \Sigma_i \delta'|^{1/2} \times \int_{q_{\alpha,i}^2}^{\infty} (u - q_{\alpha,i}^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} g_i(u) du \quad (7)$$

where  $q_{\alpha,i} = (\delta \mu_i + VaR_{\alpha,i}) / |\delta \Sigma_i \delta'|^{1/2}$  and  $VaR_{\alpha,i}$  is defined by  $\Pr\{\delta Y < -VaR_{\alpha,i}\} = \alpha$  with  $Y$  following an elliptical distribution with pdf  $f_Y(y) = |\Sigma_i|^{-1/2} g_i((y - \mu_i) \Sigma_i^{-1} (y - \mu_i)')$ .

As above, we further specialize this result for the special case of multivariate Student t mixtures with  $\mu_i = \mu$  and  $\Sigma_i = \Sigma$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ .

---

<sup>10</sup> Distribution mixtures are known to provide a flexible and tractable way for modelling a richer set of heavy tailed distributions encountered in many risk management applications.

**Theorem 4.** The expected shortfall  $ES_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m}$  at quantile  $\alpha$  of a linear portfolio  $\delta X$  in risk factors  $X$  following a mixture of multivariate Student  $t$  distributions with pdf  $f_X(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \frac{\Gamma(\frac{v_i+n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{v_i}{2}) \sqrt{|\Sigma|(v_i\pi)^m}} \left(1 + \frac{(x-\mu)\Sigma^{-1}(x-\mu)'}{v_i}\right)^{-\frac{(n+v_i)}{2}}$  where  $\sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i = 1$  is given by

$$ES_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m} = -\delta\mu + es_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m}^t \cdot |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2} \quad (8)$$

with

$$es_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m}^t = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i \frac{v_i^{\frac{v_i}{2}}}{2\alpha\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{v_i-1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{v_i}{2})} \left(q_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m}^2 + v_i\right)^{-\left(\frac{v_i-1}{2}\right)} \quad (9)$$

and

$$q_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m} = \frac{\delta\mu + VaR_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m}}{|\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2}}, \quad (10)$$

where  $q_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m} = \left(\delta\mu + VaR_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m}\right) / |\delta\Sigma\delta'|^{1/2}$ ,  $VaR_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m}$  is defined by  $\Pr\left\{\delta X < -VaR_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m}\right\} = \alpha$  and  $q_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^m, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^m}$  is uniquely determined by solving a transcendental equation given by [3, Corollary 3.8].<sup>11</sup>

The difference between equation (7) and the corresponding equations in [3, Theorem 5.1] and [4, Theorem 4.1] is the scaling factor of two in the denominator. Likewise, the difference between equation (9) and the corresponding equation in [3, Theorem 5.4] and [4, Theorem 4.2] is only the scaling factor of two in the denominator. Importantly, there is no additional error in the power of the last term, unlike the one encountered in [1] and corrected in section 3 on page 5. Nonetheless, the numerically tabulated values for ES in [3,4] differ from the accurate ones by a significantly larger scaling factor than two.

To illustrate these additional numerical errors, we tabulate the correct and incorrect analytically obtained values of ES for a mixture of multivariate Student  $t$  distributions respectively in panel A and panel B of Table 2; the ratio of the accurate values in panel A to the inaccurate ones in panel B is reported in panel D and is exactly 1/2 as expected. However, the numerically tabulated values in both [3] and [4], which are reproduced in panel C of Table 2, are completely different from those in either panel B or panel A of Table 2. It is unclear how [3,4] have generated these values, because they cannot be obtained from the formula in [3, Theorem 5.4] and [4, Theorem 4.2] and do not match the accurate formula we provide in Theorem 4 either.<sup>12</sup> Panel E of Table 2 reports the ratios of the accurate values in panel A to the inaccurate numerically tabulated ones in panel C. With most ratios in panel E significantly larger than one, the correction we provide can eliminate very large and economically significant underestimation of ES also for the considered mixtures of distributions in Theorems 3 and 4 above.

<sup>11</sup> Accurate numerical values of  $q_{\alpha, \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^2, \{v_i\}_{i=1}^2}$  for different  $\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2 (= 1 - \beta_1), v_1$ , and  $v_2$  of interest are reproduced in Table A2 in the appendix as tabulated also in [3, tables 2 and 3] and [4, tables 1 and 2].

<sup>12</sup> In addition, the values in Table 4 of [3] are exactly the same as the incorrect ones in [1] reflecting the inaccurate tabulation of ES in the case of a multivariate Student  $t$  distribution.

**Table 2. Numerical Comparison of the Accurate versus Inaccurate Expression for Expected Shortfall in the Case of a Multivariate Student t Mixture.** The table reports the accurate analytical (panel A), inaccurate analytical (panel B), and inaccurate numerically tabulated (panel C) values of  $es_{\alpha,\beta,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$  as well as the respective ratios of accurate versus inaccurate analytical (panel D) and accurate analytical versus inaccurate numerically tabulated (panel E) values across different tail quantiles  $\alpha = 0.01$  and  $0.001$  (left and right panel), different mixture weights  $\beta = 0.25, 0.30, 0.35, 0.40, 0.45, 0.50$  (different rows), and different pairs of degrees of freedom  $(\nu_1, \nu_2) = (2, 3), (3, 4), (4, 6), (7, 15)$  (different columns) for a mixture of multivariate Student t distributions governing the individual risky returns in a linear portfolio. The accurate expression in panel A reflects the derivations in this paper (Theorems 3 and 4). The inaccurate expression in panel B is originally due to Kamdem [3, Theorem 5.4] and Kamdem [4, Theorem 4.2], while the inaccurate values in panel C are the ones numerically tabulated in Kamdem [3, tables 5 and 6] and Kamdem [4, tables 3 and 4].

	$\alpha = 0.01$				$\alpha = 0.001$				
	$(\nu_1, \nu_2)$	(2,3)	(3,4)	(4,6)	(7,15)	(2,3)	(3,4)	(4,6)	(7,15)
<b>Panel A: The accurate analytical <math>es_{\alpha,\beta,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t</math> derived in section 6</b>									
$es_{\alpha,0.25,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	8.994	5.709	4.366	3.290	24.981	11.474	7.510	4.790	
$es_{\alpha,0.30,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	9.372	5.803	4.430	3.327	26.634	11.795	7.699	4.882	
$es_{\alpha,0.35,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	9.745	5.896	4.492	3.362	28.220	12.105	7.879	4.969	
$es_{\alpha,0.40,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	10.111	5.988	4.554	3.398	29.743	12.406	8.052	5.051	
$es_{\alpha,0.45,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	10.471	6.078	4.614	3.432	31.210	12.697	8.218	5.128	
$es_{\alpha,0.50,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	10.825	6.168	4.674	3.466	32.625	12.979	8.377	5.201	
<b>Panel B: The inaccurate analytical <math>es_{\alpha,\beta,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t</math> derived in [3,4]</b>									
$es_{\alpha,0.25,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	17.987	11.418	8.732	6.580	49.961	22.949	15.020	9.580	
$es_{\alpha,0.30,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	18.745	11.606	8.859	6.653	53.269	23.590	15.398	9.764	
$es_{\alpha,0.35,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	19.489	11.792	8.984	6.725	56.440	24.211	15.759	9.937	
$es_{\alpha,0.40,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	20.222	11.976	9.108	6.795	59.486	24.811	16.104	10.101	
$es_{\alpha,0.45,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	20.942	12.157	9.229	6.864	62.420	25.393	16.435	10.256	
$es_{\alpha,0.50,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	21.650	12.336	9.348	6.932	65.251	25.957	16.753	10.402	
<b>Panel C: The inaccurate tabulated <math>es_{\alpha,\beta,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t</math> in [3, tables 5-6] and [4, tables 3-4]</b>									
$es_{\alpha,0.25,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	6.366	1.294	0.243	0.003	20.896	3.033	0.577	0.007	
$es_{\alpha,0.30,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	7.019	1.410	0.279	0.003	23.164	3.323	0.666	0.007	
$es_{\alpha,0.35,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	7.647	1.523	0.314	0.004	25.271	3.588	0.716	0.008	
$es_{\alpha,0.40,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	8.251	1.631	0.348	0.004	27.239	3.837	0.776	0.009	
$es_{\alpha,0.45,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	8.834	1.737	0.380	0.005	29.089	4.071	0.831	0.009	
$es_{\alpha,0.50,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	9.396	1.839	0.410	0.005	30.835	4.290	0.881	0.010	
<b>Panel D: Ratio 1/2 of the accurate values of <math>es_{\alpha,\beta,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t</math> in Panel A to those in Panel B</b>									
$es_{\alpha,0.25,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	
$es_{\alpha,0.30,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	
$es_{\alpha,0.35,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	
$es_{\alpha,0.40,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	
$es_{\alpha,0.45,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	
$es_{\alpha,0.50,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.500	
<b>Panel E: Ratio of the accurate values of <math>es_{\alpha,\beta,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t</math> in Panel A to those in Panel C</b>									
$es_{\alpha,0.25,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	1.413	4.412	17.967	1096.633	1.195	3.783	13.016	684.271	
$es_{\alpha,0.30,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	1.335	4.116	15.877	1108.833	1.150	3.550	11.560	697.414	
$es_{\alpha,0.35,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	1.274	3.871	14.306	840.575	1.117	3.374	11.005	621.088	
$es_{\alpha,0.40,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	1.225	3.671	13.085	849.375	1.092	3.233	10.376	561.167	
$es_{\alpha,0.45,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	1.185	3.499	12.143	686.400	1.073	3.119	9.889	569.756	
$es_{\alpha,0.50,\nu_1,\nu_2}^t$	1.152	3.354	11.400	693.180	1.058	3.025	9.508	520.110	

## 7. Conclusion

Elliptically distributed risk factors are popular in financial risk management applications, because they can model heavy tails while still offering a great deal of flexibility and analytical tractability. Our accurate closed-form expressions for the expected shortfall of linear portfolios with elliptically-distributed risk factors correct major inaccuracies in the results by Kamdem [1] for both the general elliptical case and the special multivariate Student t case. The inaccurate results in [1] have been referenced by at least thirty other papers [2–4,9–36], including the recent comprehensive survey of ES estimation methods by Nadarajah *et al.* [2]. We note that our accurate results can be reconciled also following the alternative approach by Landsman and Valdez [37, Theorems 1 and 2] preceding the inaccurate derivations by [1] and all of these other studies referring to [1]. In terms of its magnitude, our correction in the zero-mean multivariate Student t setting eliminates potential understatement of ES by a factor varying from at least 4 to more than 100 across different tail quantiles and degrees of freedom. As such, the economic impact from using our accurate ES expressions in financial risk management applications with elliptically-distributed risk factors can be significant. We also eliminate economically significant inaccuracies that have further propagated in the closely related results in [3,4] for ES of mixtures of elliptical distributions.

Another important application for the accurate closed-form results for ES with elliptically distributed, or mixtures of elliptically distributed, risk factors is gauging the statistical precision of non-parametric ES estimation methods relying on Monte Carlo simulations in the spirit of the analysis in [43]. In particular, the ability to study the performance of alternative non-parametric ES estimators in controlled experiments for multivariate heavy-tailed settings with accurately known analytical results can help provide some useful guidance in the context of the proposal by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision [6] to move the quantitative risk metrics system in regard to trading book capital requirement policies from 99% VaR to 97.5% ES. More generally, our findings point to the extra scrutiny required when deploying new methods for ES estimation in practice, especially also in light of the widely acknowledged separate challenges with backtesting expected shortfall.

**Author Contributions:** The research problem was identified by D.D.; the analytical solution and all numerical results were obtained independently by both D.D. and D.O.; the paper was written jointly by D.D. and D.O., and it was edited by T.D.N.

**Conflicts of Interest:** All authors currently work at the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors or any other person associated with the Federal Reserve System.

### Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

ES: Expected shortfall

VaR: Value-at-risk

### Appendix. Supplemental Tables

**Table A1. Accurate Numerical Values of  $q_{\alpha,\nu}$  for Different  $\alpha$  and  $\nu$  in the Case of Multivariate Student t.** The table reproduces numerical values of  $q_{\alpha,\nu}$  for different  $\alpha$  and  $\nu$  of interest as tabulated by [1, section 2.2] for the purposes of computing ES.

$\nu$	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	100	200	250
$q_{0.010,\nu}$	6.965	4.541	3.747	3.365	3.143	2.998	2.896	2.821	2.764	2.364	2.341	2.345
$q_{0.025,\nu}$	4.303	3.182	2.776	2.571	2.447	2.365	2.306	2.262	2.228	1.984	1.972	1.969
$q_{0.050,\nu}$	2.920	2.353	2.132	2.015	1.943	1.895	1.860	1.812	1.660	1.660	1.653	1.651

**Table A2. Accurate Numerical Values of  $q_{\alpha,\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^2,\{v_i\}_{i=1}^2}$  for Different  $\alpha,\beta_1,\beta_2 (= 1 - \beta_1),v_1,$  and  $v_2$  in the Case of Multivariate Student t Mixture.** The table reproduces numerical values of  $q_{\alpha,\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^2,\{v_i\}_{i=1}^2}$  for different  $\alpha,\beta_1,\beta_2 (= 1 - \beta_1),v_1,$  and  $v_2$  of interest as tabulated by [3, tables 2 and 3] and [4, tables 1 and 2] for the purposes of computing ES.

$(v_1, v_2)$	$\alpha = 0.01$				$\alpha = 0.001$			
	(2, 3)	(3, 4)	(4, 6)	(7, 15)	(2, 3)	(3, 4)	(4, 6)	(7, 15)
$q_{\alpha,0.25,v_1,v_2}$	5.103	3.940	3.291	2.700	13.558	8.014	5.775	4.051
$q_{\alpha,0.30,v_1,v_2}$	5.221	3.980	3.321	2.720	14.221	8.177	5.883	4.111
$q_{\alpha,0.35,v_1,v_2}$	5.341	4.019	3.351	2.740	14.874	8.338	5.990	4.169
$q_{\alpha,0.40,v_1,v_2}$	5.463	4.059	3.381	2.760	15.517	8.497	6.094	4.226
$q_{\alpha,0.45,v_1,v_2}$	5.585	4.099	3.412	2.780	16.148	8.654	6.196	4.282
$q_{\alpha,0.50,v_1,v_2}$	5.709	4.139	3.442	2.800	16.767	8.808	6.296	4.335

### Bibliography

1. Kamdem, J.S. Value-at-risk and expected shortfall for linear portfolios with elliptically distributed risk factors. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance* **2005**, *8*, 537–551.
2. Nadarajah, S.; Zhang, B.; Chan, S. Estimation methods for expected shortfall. *Quantitative Finance* **2014**, *14*, 271–291.
3. Kamdem, J.S.  $\Delta$ -VaR and  $\Delta$ -TVaR for portfolios with mixture of elliptic distributions risk factors and DCC. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **2009**, *44*, 325–336.
4. Kamdem, J.S. VaR and ES for linear portfolios with mixture of elliptic distributions risk factors. *Computing and Visualization in Science* **2007**, *10*, 197–210.
5. Artzner, P.; Delbaen, F.; Eber, J.M.; Heath, D. Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance* **1999**, *9*, 203–228.
6. Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. Consultative Document, Fundamental Review of the Trading Book: A revised Market Risk framework. *BIS, Basel, Switzerland* **2013**.
7. Scaillet, O. Nonparametric Estimation and Sensitivity Analysis of Expected Shortfall. *Mathematical Finance* **2004**, *14*, 115–129.
8. Scaillet, O. Nonparametric estimation of conditional expected shortfall. *Insurance and risk management journal* **2005**, *74*, 639–660.

9. Bormetti, G.; Cisana, E.; Montagna, G.; Nicosini, O. A non-Gaussian approach to risk measures. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **2007**, *376*, 532–542.
10. Birbil, S.; Frenk, J.; Kaynar, B.; Noyan, N. Risk measures and their applications in asset management. Technical report, Econometric Institute, Erasmus University Rotterdam, 2008.
11. Kamdem, J.S.; Genz, A. Approximation of multiple integrals over hyperboloids with application to a quadratic portfolio with options. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **2008**, *52*, 3389–3407.
12. Elliott, R.J.; Miao, H. VaR and expected shortfall: a non-normal regime switching framework. *Quantitative Finance* **2009**, *9*, 747–755.
13. Genz, A.; Bretz, F. *Computation of multivariate normal and t probabilities*; Springer, 2009.
14. Kamdem, J.S. VaR and ES for linear portfolios with mixture of generalized Laplace distributions risk factors. *Annals of Finance* **2009**, *8*, 123–150.
15. Bormetti, G.; Cazzola, V.; Livan, G.; Montagna, G.; Nicosini, O. A generalized Fourier transform approach to risk measures. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2010**, 2010.
16. Kamdem, J.S. Sharp estimates for the CDF of quadratic forms of MPE random vectors. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **2010**, *101*, 1755–1771.
17. Yueh, M.L.; Wong, M.C. Analytical VaR and expected shortfall for quadratic portfolios. *The Journal of Derivatives* **2010**, *17*, 33–44.
18. Jiang, C.F.; Yang, Y.K. Tail conditional variance of portfolio and applications in financial engineering. *Systems Engineering Procedia* **2011**, *2*, 213–221.
19. Kamdem, J.S. Businesses risks aggregation with copula. *Journal of Quantitative Economics* **2011**, *9*, 58–72.
20. Paindaveine, D.; Šiman, M. On directional multiple-output quantile regression. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **2011**, *102*, 193–212.
21. Chen, Z.; Song, Z. Dynamic portfolio optimization under multi-factor model in stochastic markets. *OR Spectrum* **2012**, *34*, 885–919.
22. Broda, S.A. The expected shortfall of quadratic portfolios with heavy-tailed risk factors. *Mathematical Finance* **2012**, *22*, 710–728.
23. Pimenova, I. Semi-parametric estimation of elliptical distribution in case of high dimensionality. Master's thesis, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 2012.
24. Liu, Y.J.; Zhang, W.G. Fuzzy portfolio optimization model under real constraints. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **2013**, *53*, 704 – 711.
25. Makdissi, P.; Sylla, D.; Yazbeck, M. Decomposing health achievement and socioeconomic health inequalities in presence of multiple categorical information. *Economic Modelling* **2013**, *35*, 964 – 968.
26. Date, P.; Bustreo, R. Measuring the risk of a non-linear portfolio with fat-tailed risk factors through a probability conserving transformation. *IMA Journal of Management Mathematics* **2014**.
27. Moussa, A.M.; Kamdem, J.S.; Shapiro, A.; Terraza, M. CAPM with fuzzy returns and hypothesis testing. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **2014**, *55*, 40 – 57.
28. Moussa, A.M.; Kamdem, J.S.; Terraza, M. Fuzzy value-at-risk and expected shortfall for portfolios with heavy-tailed returns. *Economic Modelling* **2014**, *39*, 247–256.
29. Sun, C.; Zhang, Y.; Peng, S.; Zhang, W. The inequalities of public utility products in China: From the perspective of the Atkinson index. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* **2015**, *51*, 751 – 760.
30. Jiang, C.F.; Peng, H.Y.; Yang, Y.K. Tail variance of portfolio under generalized Laplace distribution. *Applied Mathematics and Computation* **2016**, *282*, 187–203.
31. Cisana, E. Non-Gaussian stochastic models and their applications in econophysics. PhD thesis, University of Pavia, 2007.
32. Diallo, A.; Mbairadjim Moussa, A. Addressing agent specific extreme price risk in the presence of heterogeneous data sources: A food safety perspective. Technical report, LAMETA, Université de Montpellier I, 2014.
33. Abad, P.; Benito, S. Variance reduction technique for calculating value at risk in fixed income portfolios. *Statistics and Operations Research Transactions* **2010**, *34*, 21–44.

34. Spangler, M.; Werner, R. Potential future market risk: Coping with long term model risk. Technical report, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1587937>, 2010.
35. Kamdem, J.S. Downside risk And Kappa index of non-Gaussian portfolio with LPM. Technical report, Available at HAL: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00733043>, 2011.
36. Lu, N. Statistical issues in coherent risk management. PhD thesis, North Carolina State University, 2004.
37. Landsman, Z.; Valdez, E. Tail conditional expectations for elliptical distributions. *North American Actuarial Journal* **2003**, *7*, 55–71.
38. Acerbi, C.; Tasche, D. On the coherence of expected shortfall. *Journal of Banking and Finance* **2002**, *26*, 1487–1503.
39. Gupta, A.K.; Varga, T.; Bodnar, T. *Elliptically Contoured Models in Statistics and Portfolio Theory*, 2nd ed.; Springer, 2013.
40. Kotz, S.; Nadarajah, S. *Multivariate T-Distributions and Their Applications*, 1st ed.; Cambridge University Press, 2004.
41. Broda, S.A.; Paoletta, M.S., Expected shortfall for distributions in finance. In *Statistical Tools for Finance and Insurance*; Čížek, P.; Härdle, K.W.; Weron, R., Eds.; Springer: Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011; pp. 57–99.
42. Acerbi, C.; Szekely, B. Backtesting expected shortfall. *Risk* **2014**.
43. Yamai, Y.; Yoshida, T. Comparative analyses of expected shortfall and value-at-risk: their estimation error, decomposition, and optimization. *Monetary and Economic Studies* **2002**, *20*, 87–121.