

# Supplemental Material

Vitor A. Monteiro<sup>1</sup>, Savvinos Aristeidou<sup>1</sup>, and Gerard J. O'Reilly<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Centre for Training and Research on Reduction of Seismic Risk (ROSE Centre), Scuola Universitaria Superiore IUSS di Pavia, Pavia 27100, Italy*

In this study, spatial and cross-intensity measure (IM) correlations can be modelled using a pairwise-principal component analysis (PCA) framework. For any given pair of two IMs, the model provides a valid correlation structure across sites. However, when extending this pairwise formulation to simulate multiple IMs simultaneously, a fundamental consistency issue arises: the resulting global covariance matrix is not guaranteed to be positive semidefinite (PSD).

Let  $N$  denote the number of IMs and  $M$  the number of sites. The within-event residual vector can be written as:

$$\delta_W = \begin{bmatrix} [\delta_{W,1}] \\ [\delta_{W,2}] \\ \vdots \\ [\delta_{W,N}] \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{NM} \quad (1)$$

where each  $\delta_{W,i} \in \mathbb{R}^M$  represents the spatial residual field of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  IM. The correlation structure between all IMs and sites is assembled in block form as:

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} R_{1,1} & R_{1,2} & \cdots & R_{1,N} \\ R_{2,1} & R_{2,2} & \cdots & R_{2,N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{N,1} & R_{N,2} & \cdots & R_{N,N} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

where each block  $R_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}$  represents the cross-correlation between IMs  $i$  and  $j$  across all sites. For each pair  $i$  and  $j$ , the entries are given as:

$$R_{i,j}(m,n) = \rho_{i,j}(m,n) \quad (3)$$

where  $\rho_{i,j}(m,n)$  is the cross-spatial correlation between IMs  $i$  and  $j$ , and  $m$  and  $n$  denote site locations. Although each pairwise correlation block  $R_{i,j}$  is valid by construction, the full matrix  $R$  assembled from independently derived pairwise models is not guaranteed to satisfy the global consistency condition required by correlation matrices, namely positive semi-definiteness:

$$R \succeq 0 \quad (4)$$

This issue arises because pairwise consistency does not imply multivariate consistency. Correlation models calibrated independently for different IM pairs may not be mutually compatible when combined into a single multivariate structure. As a result, the assembled matrix may exhibit negative eigenvalues, making it indefinite. From a simulation perspective, this leads to numerical instability and a breakdown of standard decomposition techniques (e.g., Cholesky factorisation). To address this limitation, the assembled correlation matrix  $R$  is corrected using a matrix nearness approach following Higham

[2002]. The nearest valid correlation matrix  $\tilde{R}$  is obtained by solving:

$$\min_X \|R - X\|_F \quad \text{subject to } X \succeq 0, \text{diag}(X) = \mathbf{1}, \quad (5)$$

where  $X$  denotes the corrected correlation matrix, i.e.,  $X \equiv \tilde{R}$ , and  $\|\cdot\|_F$  denotes the Frobenius norm, which measures the overall difference between matrices as the square root of the sum of squared element-wise differences. This formulation, therefore, seeks the closest matrix to  $R$  that is both positive semi-definite and has unit diagonal. The solution is obtained using the alternating projections algorithm with Dykstra's correction proposed by Higham [2002]. This iterative procedure alternates between the projection onto the set of positive semi-definite matrices and the projection onto the set of matrices with unit diagonal until convergence to the nearest feasible matrix is achieved.

Once the corrected correlation matrix  $\tilde{R}$  is obtained, it is substituted in place of  $R$  and transformed to covariance form using the within-event standard deviations:

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j}(m, n) = \phi_i(m) \phi_j(n) \tilde{R}_{i,j}(m, n), \quad (6)$$

or, equivalently, in matrix form:

$$\tilde{\Sigma} = D^{1/2} \tilde{R} D^{1/2}, \quad (7)$$

where  $D = \text{diag}(\phi_i^2(m))$  is a diagonal matrix of size  $NM \times NM$ , with  $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{NM}$  denoting the vector of within-event standard deviations stacked over all IM-site combinations. The resulting matrix  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  is symmetric positive semi-definite and preserves, in a least-squares (Frobenius norm) sense, the original correlation structure implied by the pairwise model. A spectral factorisation of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  is then used for simulation. Specifically, the matrix is decomposed as:

$$\tilde{\Sigma} = Q \Lambda Q^T \quad (8)$$

where  $Q$  contains the eigenvectors and  $\Lambda$  is a diagonal matrix of non-negative eigenvalues. The factor matrix is then defined as:

$$F = Q \Lambda^{1/2}, \quad (9)$$

such that:

$$\tilde{\Sigma} = F F^T \quad (10)$$

allowing correlated residuals to be generated as:

$$\delta_W = FZ, \quad Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}). \quad (11)$$

The need for this correction highlights an inherent limitation of pairwise-based correlation models. While they accurately describe bivariate relationships, they do not inherently guarantee a globally consistent multivariate structure. The application of the Higham [2002] procedure offers a solution that ensures mathematical validity of the covariance matrix while minimally modifying the original model, thereby enabling stable and consistent multi-IM simulations.

## References

N. J. Higham. Computing the nearest correlation matrix—a problem from finance. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 22:329–343, 7 2002. ISSN 0272-4979. doi: 10.1093/im anum/22.3.329.