JDMFID
Journal of Dependence Modelling in Finance, Insurance and Demography
JDMFID-2026-005
2026

Reproducibility and Model Validation in Dependence-Based Risk Research: A Practical Framework

JDMFID Editorial Office
Independent Scholarly Publisher, Greece
Editorial contact: info@dependencemodelling.org

Short Communication - Pre-publication Manuscript | Volume 1, Issue 1, 2026

Abstract
Dependence-based risk models are often computationally intensive and sensitive to preprocessing, marginal specifications, optimization choices, simulation settings and forecast design. Reproducibility is therefore not an accessory to validation but a condition for meaningful evaluation. This note proposes a practical framework for reproducible dependence research in finance, insurance and demography. The framework covers data provenance, deterministic preprocessing, separation of estimation and evaluation samples, versioned code, random-seed control, parameter disclosure, benchmark specification, robustness analysis and preservation of computational outputs. It also distinguishes reproducibility from replication and argues that journals can improve the reliability of computational research by requiring concise, proportionate transparency statements rather than imposing a single software or repository standard.

Keywords: reproducibility; model validation; open science; risk modelling; forecasting; computational research

1. Why reproducibility matters for dependence models
Modern dependence studies may combine several layers: data cleaning, marginal models, probability integral transforms, copula selection, numerical optimization, simulation, rolling forecasts and downstream risk calculations. Two researchers using the same conceptual method can obtain different results because of seemingly minor implementation choices. Reproducibility is therefore a practical part of model validation, particularly when a paper's contribution depends on computation rather than a closed-form theorem.

Peng (2011) described reproducibility as a minimum standard for computational science when full independent replication is not feasible. Later work emphasized the need to disclose code, computational environments and workflow information where possible (Stodden et al., 2016). Open-science standards likewise encourage transparent reporting without assuming that all data can always be made public (Nosek et al., 2015).

2. A minimum reproducibility record
A dependence-modelling paper should preserve a minimum reproducibility record. First, data provenance should identify the source, access date, sample restrictions and any transformations. Second, preprocessing should be deterministic where feasible and documented sufficiently to reconstruct the analysis sample. Third, software versions and key package versions should be recorded. Fourth, random seeds should be fixed and disclosed for simulations, bootstraps or stochastic optimization. Fifth, model

settings - including copula families, window lengths, optimization bounds, convergence tolerances and forecast horizons - should be stated explicitly.

The record does not need to be cumbersome. A machine-readable configuration file, a concise README and a small number of well-named scripts can be more useful than hundreds of undocumented files. The objective is to allow another researcher, or the original author months later, to understand exactly how the reported tables and figures were generated.

3. Validation should be separated from model construction

Reproducibility and validation reinforce each other when the workflow separates model development from evaluation. In-sample diagnostics are useful for detecting misspecification, but they cannot by themselves establish forecast value. A transparent workflow should identify training, validation and test periods, or explain the rolling-origin design used for time series. Benchmark models should be specified before results are interpreted.

Forecast evaluation should also match the prediction target. Density forecasts can be assessed with proper scoring rules (Gneiting & Raftery, 2007). Point or risk forecasts can be compared using target-specific losses and formal predictive-accuracy tests where their assumptions are reasonable (Diebold & Mariano, 1995). Dependence models should additionally be checked for numerical stability, sensitivity to starting values and failed fits, because silently dropping difficult windows can bias reported performance.

4. Robustness without specification mining

Robustness analysis is valuable when it tests a small set of scientifically motivated alternatives: different marginal distributions, dependence families, window lengths, sample endpoints or stress definitions. It becomes less informative when hundreds of specifications are searched and only favourable results are reported. A reproducible paper should make the model universe visible enough for readers to distinguish robustness from specification mining.

Pre-specified benchmark sets, complete result tables and machine-readable outputs can help. When a large model search is itself part of the method, the selection rule should be algorithmic and applied inside the out-of-sample loop rather than using future information. This is especially important for automated copula selection, machine-learning risk models and mortality model-selection systems.

5. Journal-level practice and conclusion

Journals can support reproducibility with proportionate requirements. A short data-availability statement, code-availability statement, conflict-of-interest declaration, funding statement and AI-use disclosure create a useful baseline. When data are proprietary or restricted, authors can still share synthetic examples, code templates and metadata describing the inaccessible inputs. The FAIR principles provide a useful aspiration for making digital research objects findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable when legal and ethical constraints permit (Wilkinson et al., 2016).

Reproducibility does not guarantee correctness, and a reproducible error remains an error. Its value is that it makes the analytical chain inspectable. In dependence-based risk research, where results may be sensitive to marginal assumptions, numerical optimization and simulation, that inspectability is a core component of scientific credibility.

Declarations

Data availability: No new empirical data were generated or analysed for this conceptual and methodological note.

Funding: No external funding was received for this pre-publication editorial manuscript.

Competing interests: The institutional author is the JDMFID Editorial Office. This status is disclosed explicitly because the manuscript is part of the journal's inaugural pre-publication materials.

Peer-review status: This is a pre-publication manuscript and has not yet completed the journal's full external peer-review process. It must not be described as peer-reviewed until that process has been completed.

AI-assisted drafting disclosure: Generative AI was used to assist drafting and editorial structuring. The JDMFID Editorial Office is responsible for checking the sources, revising the text and approving any version that is posted or formally published.

References

Diebold, F. X., & Mariano, R. S. (1995). Comparing predictive accuracy. Journal of Business & Economic Statistics, 13(3), 253-263.

Gneiting, T., & Raftery, A. E. (2007). Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 102(477), 359-378. https://doi.org/10.1198/016214506000001437

Nosek, B. A., Alter, G., Banks, G. C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S. D., Breckler, S. J., et al. (2015). Promoting an open research culture. Science, 348(6242), 1422-1425. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aab2374

Peng, R. D. (2011). Reproducible research in computational science. Science, 334(6060), 1226-1227. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1213847

Stodden, V., McNutt, M., Bailey, D. H., Deelman, E., Gil, Y., Hanson, B., Heroux, M. A., Ioannidis, J. P. A., & Taufer, M. (2016). Enhancing reproducibility for computational methods. Science, 354(6317), 1240-1241. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah6168

Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., et al. (2016). The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. Scientific Data, 3, 160018. https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18

Joe, H. (2014). Dependence modeling with copulas. Chapman & Hall/CRC.

McNeil, A. J., Frey, R., & Embrechts, P. (2015). Quantitative risk management: Concepts, techniques and tools (Rev. ed.). Princeton University Press.

Internal article identifier: JDMFID-2026-005 | https://dependencemodelling.org/