

Risk–Averse Classification

Constantine Alexander Vitt¹, Darinka Dentcheva², and Hui Xiong¹

¹Rutgers University, Newark and New Brunswick, NJ

²Stevens Insitute of Technology, Hoboken, NJ

September 20, 2022

Abstract

We develop a new approach to solving classification problems, in which the labeled training data is viewed as random samples from populations with unknown distributions and we base our analysis on the theory of coherent measures of risk and risk sharing. The proposed approach aims at designing a risk-averse classifier. We stipulate that misclassification in different classes is associated with different risk. Therefore, we employ non-linear (in probability) risk functionals specific to each class.

We analyze the structure of the new classifier design problem and establish its theoretical relation to the risk-neutral design problem. In particular, we show that the risk-sharing classification problem is equivalent to an implicitly defined optimization problem with unequal, implicitly defined but unknown weights for each data point. We implement our methodology in a binary classification scenario on several different data sets and carry out numerical comparison with classifiers which are obtained using the Huber loss function and other popular loss functions. In these applications, we use linear support vector machines in order to demonstrate the viability of our method.

1 Introduction

Classification is one of the fundamental tasks of the data mining and machine learning community. The need for accurate and effectively solution of classification problems proliferates throughout the business world, engineering, and sciences. In this paper, we propose a new approach to classification problems with the aim to develop a methodology for reliable risk-averse classifiers design which has the flexibility to allow customers choice of risk measurement for the misclassification errors in various classes. The proposed approach has its foundation on the theory of coherent measures of risk and risk sharing. Although, this theory is well advanced in the field of mathematical finance and actuarial analysis, the classification problem does not fit the problem setting analyzed in those fields and the theoretical results on risk sharing are inapplicable here. The classification problem raises new issues, poses new challenges, and requires a dedicated analysis.

We consider labeled data consisting of k subsets S_1, \dots, S_k of n -dimensional vectors. The cardinality of S_i is $|S_i| = m_i$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. The classification problem consists of identifying a mapping ϕ , whose image can be partitioned into k subsets corresponding to each class of data, so that $\phi(\cdot)$ can be used as an indicator function of each class. We adopt the following definition.

Definition 1 *A classifier is a function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\varphi(x) \in K_i$ for all $x \in S_i$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, where $K_i \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $K_i \cap K_j = \emptyset$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, k$ and $i \neq j$.*

In our discussion, we assume that the classifier belongs to a certain functional family depending on a finite number of parameters, which we denote by $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^s$. The task is to choose a suitable values for the parameter π , that is, we deal with a vector valued classifier $\varphi(x; \pi) = (\phi_1(x; \pi), \dots, \phi_k(x; \pi))^\top$

and regions $K_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. An example of this point of view is given by the support vector machine, in which $k = 2$, $\varphi(x; \pi) = v^\top x - \gamma$, $\pi = (v, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, and $K_1 = (0, +\infty)$, $K_2 = (-\infty, 0)$. When kernels are used, then the mapping $\varphi(x; \pi)$ becomes a composition of a projection mapping to the reduced feature space and a classifier mapping in the feature space.

2 Loss Functions

A key element, which distinguishes various classification approaches is the choice of a loss function, which combines several goals. On the one hand, it serves as a model fitting loss function in the statistical sense while minimizing misclassification. On the other hand, it also controls model flexibility and numerical stability when the classification problem is solved. Typically, the loss function is chosen as one of the known risk functionals in statistical model fitting. The quality of every model is determined by analysis of the residuals, e.g. the error. Let us introduce the following notation. For a random observation $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we calculate $\varphi(z; \pi)$ and note that misclassification occurs when $\varphi(z; \pi) \notin K_i$, while $z \in S_i$ for any $i = 1, \dots, k$. Our proposed approach suggests to minimize the magnitude of the error in a risk averse manner. For this purpose, we propose new family of loss functions. The misclassification error can be defined as the distance of a particular record to the classification set, to which it should belong. Here the distance from a point r to a set K_i is defined by using a suitable norm in \mathbb{R}^n :

$$\text{dist}(r, K_i) = \min\{\|r - a\| : a \in K_i\}.$$

Note that here we assume implicitly that the sets K_i are convex and closed. The records in every data class S_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$ constitute a sample of an unknown distribution of a random vector X^i defined on a probability spaces (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) . The random variables defined as follows

$$Z^i(\pi) = \text{dist}(\varphi(X_i; \pi), K_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \quad (1)$$

represent the misclassification of records in class i when parameter π is used. They are univariate variables defined on the same probability space and are represented by the sampled observations

$$Z_j^i(\pi) = \text{dist}(\varphi(x_j; \pi), K_i) \quad \text{with } x_j \in S_i \quad j = 1, \dots, m_i.$$

The expected misclassification for each class is estimated as follows:

$$\hat{Z}^i = \sum_{x_j \in S_i} \frac{1}{m_i} \text{dist}(\varphi(x_j; \pi), K_i)$$

It is well-known that the expected value is sensitive to outliers and that is why the design of robust




Figure 1: Classification error calculation

estimators, robust classifiers in particular, has attracted attention of statisticians as well as of data scientists. Additionally, the distributions of the populations providing the currently available records may not be well represented by the current sample (e.g. it might have heavy tails, not be unimodal, etc.) Furthermore, misclassification may lead to different cost with different probability depending on the error. An example for such a case is the damage caused by a hurricane. If we fail to predict correctly that a hurricane will take place in certain region, the cost of the damage depends on the features used for classification and is highly non-linear with respect to those features (see [7]).

3 Coherent Measure of Risk

Measures of risk are widely used in finance and insurance. Additionally, the signal to noise measures, used in engineering and statistics (Fano factor [12] or the index of dispersion [6]) are of similar spirit.

An axiomatic theory of measures of risk is presented in [3, 13, 19, 30] In a more general setting risk measures are analyzed in [33]. For $p \in [1, \infty]$ and a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , we use the notation $\mathcal{L}_p(\Omega)$, for the space of random variables with finite p -th moments. We use $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ to denote the extended real line $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \cup \{-\infty\}$.

A *coherent measure of risk* is a functional $\varrho : \mathcal{L}_p(\Omega) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfying the following axioms:

Convexity: $\varrho(\gamma X + (1 - \gamma)Y) \leq \gamma\varrho(X) + (1 - \gamma)\varrho(Y)$
for all X, Y and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$.

Monotonicity: If $Y \geq X$ P -a.s., then $\varrho(Y) \geq \varrho(X)$.

Translation Equivariance: If $a \in \mathbb{R}$ then $\varrho(X + a) = \varrho(X) + a$ for all X .

Positive Homogeneity: If $t > 0$ then $\varrho(tX) = t\varrho(X)$ for any X .

For an overview of the theory of coherent measures of risk, we refer to [35] and the references therein.

Recall that a risk measure $\varrho(\cdot)$ is law-invariance if $\varrho(\cdot)$ has the same value for random variables with the same distributions. It is clear that in our context, only law invariant measures of risk are relevant.

The following result is know as a dual representation of coherent measures of risk. The space $\mathcal{L}_p(\Omega)$ and the space $\mathcal{L}_q(\Omega)$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ are viewed as paired locally convex topological vector spaces with respect to the bilinear form

$$\langle \zeta, Z \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \zeta(\omega)Z(\omega)dP(\omega), \quad \zeta \in \mathcal{L}_q(\Omega), \quad Z \in \mathcal{L}_p(\Omega). \quad (2)$$

For any $\zeta \in \mathcal{L}_q(\Omega)$, we can view $\langle \zeta, Z \rangle$ as the expectation $\mathbb{E}_Q[Z]$ taken with respect to the probability measure $dQ = \zeta dP$, defined by the density ζ , i.e., Q is absolutely continuous with respect to P and its Radon-Nikodym derivative is $dQ/dP = \zeta$.

Theorem 2 ([35]) *If ρ is a coherent risk measure, then a convex weakly* closed subset \mathcal{A} of probability density functions $\zeta \in \mathcal{L}_q(\Omega)$ exists, such that for any random variable $Z \in \mathcal{L}_p(\Omega)$, it holds*

$$\rho(Z) = \sup_{\zeta \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \zeta, Z \rangle = \sup_{dQ/dP \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_Q[Z]. \quad (3)$$

For every coherent measure of risk, the set \mathcal{A} is the convex subdifferential of the functional $\rho(\cdot)$ calculated at 0, i.e., $\mathcal{A} = \partial\rho(0)$. We note that this result reveals how measures of risk provide robustness with respect to the changes of the distribution; it constitutes a new approach to robust statistical inference.

We refer to [17, 11, 15, 16] and the references therein for methods of robust classification design. Various approaches in the literature address the design of a robust classifier specifically for the support vector machine. The design of a binary classifier can be accomplished by solving the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{v, \gamma, Z^1, Z^2} \quad & \frac{1}{m_1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} Z_i^1 + \frac{1}{m_2} \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} Z_j^2 + \delta \|v\|_2^2 \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & \langle v, x_i \rangle - \gamma + Z_i^1 \geq 1 \quad i = 1, \dots, m_1, \\ & \langle v, y_j \rangle - \gamma - Z_j^2 \leq -1 \quad j = 1, \dots, m_2, \\ & Z^1 \geq 0, Z^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here the loss function is the estimated expected total classification error:

$$L_E(z; v, \gamma) = \frac{1}{m_1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} Z_i^1 + \frac{1}{m_2} \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} Z_j^2$$

and the design problem (4) uses additional regularization term consisting of the squared norm of the normal vector to the separating hyperplane. We point out that many coherent measures of risk do not require regularization as they are strictly convex functions.

Most notable approach to robust classification is provided by the theory and methods of robust statistics. In this approach, the model is fit using the Huber risk function, which is defined for $z \in S_i, i = 1, 2$ as follows:

$$L_H(z; v, \gamma) = \begin{cases} [\max(0, 1 + (-1)^i(\gamma - \langle v, z \rangle))]^2 & \text{if} \\ \quad (-1)^i(\gamma - \langle v, z \rangle) \geq -1 \\ (-1)^i(\langle v, z \rangle - \gamma) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Another approach is presented in [22, 11], where the tools of robust optimization are employed. The idea there is that the uncertainty sets are defined assuming that future records will come from a distribution with the same mean and covariance. In [27] the authors look at the median hinge loss determined for each class and minimize the sum of the two median losses.

For a random variable $X \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Omega)$ with distribution function $F_X(\eta) = P\{X \leq \eta\}$, we consider the left-continuous inverse of the cumulative distribution function defined as follows:

$$F_X^{(-1)}(\alpha) = \inf \{\eta : F_X(\eta) \geq \alpha\} \quad \text{for } 0 < \alpha < 1.$$

It is clear that $F_X^{(-1)}(\alpha)$ is the left α -quantile of X . The *Value at Risk* of X at level α is defined as $\text{VaR}_\alpha(X) = -F_X^{(-1)}(\alpha)$. The Lorenz functions are widely used in economics for comparison of positive random variables (see [2, 14] and the references therein).

In the theory of measures of risk a special role is played by the functional called the Average Value at Risk and denoted $\text{AVaR}(\cdot)$ (see [1, 32]). The *Average Value at Risk* of X at level α is defined as

$$\text{AVaR}_\alpha(X) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^\alpha \text{VaR}_t(X) dt. \quad (6)$$

It is related to the absolute Lorenz function, introduced in [25] and widely used in economics, as the cumulative quantile function:

$$F_X^{(-2)}(\alpha) = \int_0^\alpha F_X^{(-1)}(t) dt \quad \text{for } 0 < \alpha \leq 1, \quad (7)$$

with $F_X^{(-2)}(0) = 0$. We have $\text{AVaR}_\alpha(X) = -\frac{1}{\alpha} F_X^{(-2)}(\alpha)$. Due to Kusioka theorem ([21],[35, Thm. 6.24]), every law invariant, finite-valued coherent measure of risk on $\mathcal{L}^p(\Omega)$ for non-atomic probability space can be represented as a mixture of Average Value-at-Risk at all probability levels. This result can be extended for finite probability spaces with equally likely observations. Kusuoka representations allow to extend statistical estimators of Lorenz curves to spectral law-invariant measures of risk as shown in [8]. Central limit theorems for general composite risk functionals is established in [10]. Other popular coherent measures of risk (when small outcomes are preferred) include the upper mean-semi-deviations of order p , defined as

$$\sigma_p^+[Z] := \mathbb{E}[Z] + \kappa \left(\mathbb{E} \left[(Z - \mathbb{E}[Z])_+^p \right] \right)^{1/p}, \quad (8)$$

where $p \in [1, \infty)$ is a fixed parameter. It is well defined for all random variables Z with finite p -th order moments and is coherent for $\kappa \in [0, 1]$. In the special case of $p = 1$, the upper semi-deviation

is equal to $1/2$ of the standard deviation. non-atomic space Ω . Other classes of coherent measures of risk were proposed and analyzed in [5, 9, 20, 29, 35] and the references therein.

In [31], the use of coherent measures of risk for generalized regression and model fit was proposed. This point of view was also utilized in SVM in the report [15]. Minimizing the Conditional Value-at-Risk for the total misclassification error was used also in [?] while in [?], a constraint on the value at risk is used leading to a chance-constrained problem. Chance constraints are widely investigated in stochastic programming; we refer to [?, 35] for an overview. While those works recognize the need of expressing different attitude to errors in fitting statistical models, the authors propose using one overall measure of risk as an objective in the regression problem, respectively in the SVM problem. The classification design based on a single measure of risk does not allow for differentiation between the classes. Our point of view is that *different attitude should be allowed to classification errors for the different classes*.

The notion of risk sharing and analysis of this topic is a subject of intensive investigations in the community of economics, quantitative finance and risk management. This is due to the fact that the sum of the risk of each component in a system does not equal the risk of the entire system. Risk allocation assumes that there is a quantitative assessment undertaken by a higher authority within a firm, which divides the firm's costs between the constituents. The main focus in the extant literature on risk-sharing is on the choice of decomposition of a random variable X into k terms $X = X^1 + \dots + X^k$, so that when each component is measured by a specific risk measure, the associated total risk is in some sense optimal. Assigning coherent measures of risk ϱ_i to each term X^i , the adopted point of view is that the outcome $(\varrho_1(X^1), \dots, \varrho_k(X^k))$ should be Pareto-optimal among the feasible allocations. The main results in risk-sharing theory show that the decomposition of X into terms is accomplish by looking at infimal convolution of the measures of risk. Furthermore, the random variables X^i satisfy a co-monotonicity property (see, e.g., [23, 26]). While we adopt the same view on optimality, we note that our problem setting is quite different and we cannot expect co-monotonicity properties. The presence of constraints in the optimization problem, the functional dependence of the misclassification error on the classifier's parameters, and the complex nature of design problem require dedicated analysis.

4 Risk Sharing in Classification

A *risk-sharing classification problem* (RSCP) is given by the set of labeled data, the parametric classifier family $\varphi(\cdot; \pi)$ with the associated collection of sets K_i , and the set of law-invariant risk-measures ϱ_i , $i = 1 \dots, k$. The presumption is that we have different attitude to misclassification in the various classes and the total risk is shared among the classes according to risk-averse preferences. Let \mathcal{Y} denote the set of all random vectors $(Z^1(\pi), \dots, Z^k(\pi))$ with realizations $z_j^i = \text{dist}(\varphi(x_j; \pi), K_i)$, $x_j \in S_i$ for some parameter π , i.e., this is the set of all attainable classification errors considered as random vectors in the sampling space given by the data set.

Definition 3 A vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^k$ represents an attainable risk-allocation for the classification problem, if a parameter $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ exists such that

$$w = (\varrho_1(Z^1(\pi)), \dots, \varrho_k(Z^k(\pi))) \in \mathbb{R}^k \quad \text{for } (Z^1(\pi), \dots, Z^k(\pi)) \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

We denote the set of all attainable risk allocations by \mathcal{X} . Assume that a partial order on \mathbb{R}^k is induced by a pointed convex cone $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, i.e., $v \preceq_{\mathcal{K}} w$ if and only if $w - v \in \mathcal{K}$. A point $v \in A \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is \mathcal{K} -minimal point of the set A if no point $w \in A$ exists such that $v - w \in \mathcal{K}$. If $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{R}_+^k$, then the notion of \mathcal{K} -minimal points of a set corresponds to the well-known notion of Pareto-efficiency or Pareto-optimality in \mathbb{R}^k .

Definition 4 A classifier $\varphi(\cdot; \pi)$ is \mathcal{K} -optimal for the risk-sharing classification problem, if its risk-allocation is a \mathcal{K} -minimal element of \mathcal{X} .

We shall see that the Pareto-minimal risk allocations are produced by random vectors, which are minimal points in the set \mathcal{Y} with respect to the following stochastic order.

Definition 5 A random variable Z is stochastically larger than a random variable Z' with respect to the usual stochastic order (denoted $Z \succeq_{(1)} Z'$), if

$$\mathbb{P}(Z > \eta) \geq \mathbb{P}(Z' > \eta) \quad \forall \eta \in \mathbb{R},$$

or, equivalently, $F_Z(\eta) \leq F_{Z'}(\eta)$. The relation is strict (denoted $Z \succ_{(1)} Z'$), if additionally, $\exists \eta \in \mathbb{R}$ for which the corresponding inequality is strict.

A random vector $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_k)$ is stochastically larger than $\mathbf{Z}' = (Z'_1, \dots, Z'_k)$ (denoted $\mathbf{Z} \succeq \mathbf{Z}'$) if $Z_i \succeq_{(1)} Z'_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. The relation is strict if for some component $Z_i \succ_{(1)} Z'_i$.

The random vectors of \mathcal{Y} , which are non-dominated with respect to this order will be called *minimal points* of \mathcal{Y} .

For more information on stochastic orders see, e.g., [34].

The following result is known for non-atomic probability spaces. We verify it for a sample space in order to deal with the empirical distributions.

Theorem 6 Suppose the probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) is finite with equal probabilities of all simple events. Then every law-invariant risk functional ρ is consistent with the usual stochastic order if and only if it satisfies the monotonicity axiom. If ρ is strictly monotonic with respect to the a.s. relation, then ρ is consistent with the strict dominance relation, i.e. $\rho(Z_1) < \rho(Z_2)$ whenever $Z_2 \succ_{(1)} Z_1$.

Proof 1 Assuming that $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m\}$, let the random variable $U(\omega_i) = \frac{i}{m}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. If $Z_2 \succeq_{(1)} Z_1$, then defining $\hat{Z}_1 := F_{Z_1}^{-1}(U)$ and $\hat{Z}_2 := F_{Z_2}^{-1}(U)$, we obtain $\hat{Z}_2(\omega) \geq \hat{Z}_1(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Due to the monotonicity axiom, $\rho(\hat{Z}_2) \geq \rho(\hat{Z}_1)$. The random variables \hat{Z}_i and Z_i , $i = 1, 2$, have the same distribution by construction. This entails that $\rho(Z_2) \geq \rho(Z_1)$ because the risk measure is law invariant. Consequently, the risk measure ρ is consistent with the usual stochastic order. The other direction is straightforward.

This observation justifies our restriction to risk-measures, which are consistent with the usual stochastic order, also known as the first order stochastic dominance relation. Furthermore, when dealing with non-negative random variables as in the context of classification, then strictly monotonic risk measures associate no risk only when no misclassification occurs as shown by the following statement.

Corollary 7 If ρ is a law invariant strictly monotonic coherent measure of risk, then

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(Z) &> 0 \text{ for all random variables } Z \geq 0 \text{ a.s., } Z \not\equiv 0 \\ \rho(Z) &< 0 \text{ for all random variables } Z \leq 0 \text{ a.s., } Z \not\equiv 0. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Proof 2 Denote the random variable, which is identically equal zero by $\mathbf{0}$. Notice that $\rho(\mathbf{0}) = \rho(2 \cdot \mathbf{0}) = 2\rho(\mathbf{0})$, which implies that $\rho(\mathbf{0}) = 0$. If $Z \geq 0$ a.s. and $Z \not\equiv 0$, then $\rho(Z) > \rho(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ by the strict monotonicity of ρ . The second statement follows analogously.

Theorem 8 Assume that the risk measures ρ_i are finite-valued. If the function $\varphi(x, \cdot)$ is continuous for every argument $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the sets K_i are non-empty and convex, then the attainable risk allocations $\rho_i(Z^i(\cdot))$ are continuous functions. If additionally, each component of the vector function $\varphi(x, \cdot)$ is a convex function, then $\rho_i(Z^i(\cdot))$ are convex functions.

Proof 3 As the risk measures $\rho_i(\cdot)$ are finite, they are continuous on \mathcal{L}_p . The distance functions $z \mapsto \text{dist}(z, K_i)$ are continuous convex functions (see, e.g., [4]) and $\text{dist}(z, K_i) < \infty$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, the composition of the distance function with the continuous function $\varphi(x, \cdot)$ is continuous, meaning that the random variable $Z^i(\pi) = \text{dist}(\varphi(X; \pi), K_i)$ has realizations, which are continuous functions of π . Therefore, $Z^i(\cdot)$ is continuous with respect to the norm in the space \mathcal{L}_p . We conclude that its composition with the risk measure: $\rho_i(Z^i(\cdot))$, is continuous.

Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $\pi_\lambda = \lambda\pi + (1 - \lambda)\pi'$. convexity of $\varphi(x, \cdot)$ implies $\varphi(x; \pi_\lambda) \leq \lambda\varphi(x; \pi) + (1 - \lambda)\varphi(x; \pi')$. Due to the fact that \mathbb{R}^d is a Banach lattice, we have

$$\|\varphi(x; \pi_\lambda) - z\| \leq \|\lambda\varphi(x; \pi) + (1 - \lambda)\varphi(x; \pi')\| \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^m,$$

which entails

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(\varphi(x; \pi_\lambda), K_i) &\leq \text{dist}(\lambda\varphi(x; \pi) + (1 - \lambda)\varphi(x; \pi'), K_i) \\ &\leq \lambda \text{dist}(\varphi(x; \pi), K_i) + (1 - \lambda) \text{dist}(\varphi(x; \pi'), K_i). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows by the convexity of the distance function. Using the monotonicity and convexity axioms, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i(\text{dist}(\varphi(X; \pi_\lambda), K_i)) &\leq \lambda\rho_i(\text{dist}(\varphi(X; \pi), K_i)) \\ &\quad + (1 - \lambda)\rho_i(\text{dist}(\varphi(X; \pi'), K_i)). \end{aligned}$$

This result implies the existence of Pareto-optimal classifier when the set of feasible parameters is bounded or when one of the functions involved is coercive. Furthermore, the convexity property allows us to identify the Pareto-optimal risk-allocations by using scalarization techniques.

Corollary 9 (a) Assume that the function $\varphi(x, \cdot)$ is convex for every argument $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the sets $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^s$, and K_i $i = 1, \dots, k$ are non-empty, closed, and convex. Then a parameter π defines a Pareto-optimal classifier $\varphi(\cdot, \pi)$ for the given RSCP if and only if a scalarization vector $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^k$ exists with $\sum_{i=1}^k w_i = 1$, such that π is a solution of the problem

$$\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i \rho_i(\text{dist}(\varphi(X_i; \pi), K_i)). \quad (10)$$

(b) For every Pareto-optimal classifier $\varphi(\cdot; \pi)$, the corresponding random vector $(Z^1(\pi), \dots, Z^k(\pi))$ is a minimal point of \mathcal{Y} with respect to the order of Definition 5 provided the risk measures ρ_i are strictly monotonic for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Proof 4 Statement (a) follows from the well-known scalarization theorem in vector optimization problems ([28] and 8. The set \mathcal{Y} is the image of \mathcal{D} via the vector function $\pi \rightarrow (\text{dist}(\varphi(X_1; \pi), K_1), \dots, \text{dist}(\varphi(X_k; \pi), K_k))$, which has convex components as shown in the proof of Theorem 8. Suppose the point $Z(\pi) = (Z^1(\pi), \dots, Z^k(\pi))$ is not minimal. Then a parameter π' exists, such that the corresponding vector $Z(\pi')$ is strictly stochastically dominated by Z , which implies $Z^i(\pi) \succeq_{(1)} Z^i(\pi')$ with a strict relation for some component. We obtain $\rho_i(Z^i(\pi)) \geq \rho_i(Z^i(\pi'))$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. with a strict inequality for some i due to the consistency of the coherent measures of risk with the strong stochastic order relation, which is a contradiction to the Pareto-optimality.

We consider the sample space $\Omega = \prod_{i=1}^k \Omega_i$ where $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, P_i)$ is a finite space with m_i simple events $\omega_j \in \Omega_i$, $P_i(\omega_j) = \frac{1}{m_i}$, and \mathcal{F}_i consisting of all subsets of Ω_i .

Theorem 10 Assume that the risk measures ρ_i are finite-valued for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, for bounded random variables. Suppose each component of the vector function $\varphi(x, \cdot)$ is convex for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the sets \mathcal{D} and K_i are non-empty and convex, If the parameter $\hat{\pi}$ defines a Pareto-optimal classifier $\varphi(\cdot, \hat{\pi})$ for the RSCP, then a probability measure μ on Ω exists so that $\hat{\pi}$ is an optimal solution for the problem

$$\min_{\pi \in \mathcal{D}} \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \mu_j^i \text{dist}(\varphi(x_j^i; \pi), K_i). \quad (11)$$

Proof 5 As the parameter $\hat{\pi}$ defines a Pareto-optimal classifier $\varphi(\cdot, \hat{\pi})$ for the RSCP and all conditions of Corollary 9 are satisfied, then $\hat{\pi}$ is an optimal solution of problem (10) for some scalarization w . Let \mathcal{A}_i denotes the set of probability measures corresponding to the risk measure ρ_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$ in representation (3). As the risk measures ρ_i take finite values on Ω_i , the supremum in the dual representation (3) is achieved at some elements $\zeta^i \in \mathcal{A}_i$. As ζ_i are probability densities, we have $\zeta_j^i \geq 0$, $\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \frac{\zeta_j^i}{m_i} = 1$ and

$$\rho_i(\text{dist}(\varphi(X^i; \pi), K_i)) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \frac{\zeta_j^i}{m_i} \text{dist}(\varphi(x_j^i; \pi), K_i).$$

Setting

$$\mu_j^i = w_i \frac{\zeta_j^i}{m_i}, \quad j = 1, \dots, m_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k$$

we observe that the vector $\mu \in R^{m_1 + \dots + m_k}$ constitutes a probability mass function. Thus problem (10) can be reformulated as (11).

This result shows that the RSCP can be viewed as a classification problem in which the expectation error is minimized, however, the expectation is not calculated with respect to the empirical distribution but with respect to another measure μ , which is implicitly determined by the chosen measures of risk.

5 Risk Sharing in SVM

We analyze the SVM problem in more detail. We consider only law-invariant strictly monotonic coherent measures of risk ϱ_1, ϱ_2 for the two classes S_1 and S_2 .

The *risk-sharing SVM problem (RSSVM)* consists in identifying a parameter $\pi = (v, \gamma) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ corresponding to a Pareto-minimal point of the attainable risk-allocation \mathcal{X} for the affine classifier $\varphi(z; \pi) = \langle v, z \rangle - \gamma$. Due to Corollary 9 we can determine a risk-averse classifier by solving the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{v, \gamma, Z^1, Z^2} \quad & \lambda \varrho_1(Z^1) + (1 - \lambda) \varrho_2(Z^2) + \delta \|v\|^2 \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & \langle v, x_j^1 \rangle - \gamma + z_j^1 \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m_1, \\ & \langle v, x_j^2 \rangle - \gamma - z_j^2 \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m_2, \\ & Z^1 \geq 0, Z^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Here $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ is a parameter and the vectors Z^i have components z_j^i , $i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, \dots, m_i$, representing the classification error for each class. We note that the objective function is coercive and, thus, we do not need to bound the norm of the vector v . This automatically bounds also γ because for any fixed v , the component γ can be considered restricted in a compact set $[\gamma_m(v), \gamma_M(v)]$, where

$$\gamma_m = \max_{1 \leq j \leq m_2} v^\top x_j^2 \quad \gamma_M = \min_{1 \leq j \leq m_1} v^\top x_j^1.$$

Thus, in this case we can set $\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{R}^n$. A particular instance of problem (12) minimizes the expected total error, which is the risk-neutral version of it. In that case, the classifier is determined by solving the following linear optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{v, \gamma, Z^1, Z^2} \quad & \frac{1}{m_1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} z_i^1 + \frac{1}{m_2} \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} z_j^2 + \delta \|v\|^2 \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & \langle v, x_i^1 \rangle - \gamma + z_i^1 \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m_1, \\ & \langle v, x_j^2 \rangle - \gamma - z_j^2 \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m_2, \\ & Z^1 \geq 0, Z^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We observe that each Pareto-optimal classifier parameter (v, γ) can be obtained by solving the following problem :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min_{v, \gamma, Z^1, Z^2} \varrho_1(Z^1) + \varrho_2(Z^2) + \delta \|v\|^2 \\
& \text{s. t. } \langle v, x_i^1 \rangle - \gamma + \frac{1}{\lambda} z_i^1 \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m_1, \\
& \quad \langle v, x_j^2 \rangle - \gamma - \frac{1}{1-\lambda} z_j^2 \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m_2, \\
& \quad Z^1 \geq 0, Z^2 \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The equivalence follows from the positive homogeneity of the risk measures: $w_i \rho_i(Z^i) = \rho_i(w_i Z^i)$. Defining new random variables $\tilde{Z}^i = w_i Z^i$, we can rescale the variables in the corresponding inequality constraint. This observation is a counterpart of the result in [18] for the risk-sharing of random losses among constituents.

Table 1: Main results in terms of F₁-score

	exp_val	joint_cvar	asym_risk	one_cvar	risk_cvar	two_risk	two_cvar
WDBC							
lambda			0.47	0.65	0.62	0.58	0.47
alpha_1							0.75
alpha_2		0.75		0.95	0.75		0.75
Class1	16	13	15	9	12	12	9
Class2	10	11	10	11	11	13	13
Recall	0.95283	0.94811	0.95283	0.94811	0.94811	0.93868	0.93868
Precision	0.92661	0.93925	0.93088	0.95714	0.94366	0.94313	0.95673
FScore	0.93953	0.94366	0.94172	0.95261	0.94588	0.94090	0.94762
pima-indians-diabetes							
lambda			0.48	0.47	0.47	0.45	0.40
alpha_1							0.91
alpha_2		0.92		0.75	0.90		0.75
Class1	106	98	160	139	139	173	62
Class2	81	88	46	56	56	44	114
Recall	0.69776	0.67164	0.82836	0.79104	0.79104	0.83582	0.57463
Precision	0.63823	0.64748	0.58115	0.60399	0.60399	0.56423	0.71296
FScore	0.66667	0.65934	0.68308	0.68498	0.68498	0.67368	0.63636
seismic-bumps							
lambda			0.61	0.6	0.65	0.53	0.45
alpha_1							0.75
alpha_2		0.88		0.91	0.81		0.75
Class1	471	345	267	224	226	270	57
Class2	64	75	83	89	89	82	148
Recall	0.62353	0.55882	0.51176	0.47647	0.47647	0.51765	0.12941
Precision	0.18371	0.21591	0.24576	0.26557	0.26384	0.24581	0.27848
FScore	0.28380	0.31148	0.33206	0.34105	0.33962	0.33333	0.17671

6 Numerical Experiments

In the previous sections, we have shown the solid theoretical foundation supporting our approach. In this section, we display the performance of the proposed framework, as well as its flexibility.

To this end, we use several publicly available data sets and compare the performance of our approach to some existing formulations, in terms of F_1 -score. Further, we showcase the flexibility of the framework by exploring the Pareto-efficient frontier of various classifiers derived from our framework.

In our numerical experiments, we have used the Average Value-at-Risk and the mean semi-deviation of order 1. It was shown in [10] that those risk measure can be represented as composite risk functions, which can be estimated by a plug-in estimator and a central limit theorem is established. More precisely, if $\rho^{(N)}$ is a plug-in estimator for the risk measure $\rho(X)$ based on sample of size N , then the random variable $\sqrt{N}(\rho^{(N)} - \rho(X))$ converges in distribution to the normal distribution with zero expectation. The variance is determined by the Hadamard-derivative of the risk measure. Central limit theorem for the optimal value of an optimization problem, when the objective function is given by a composite risk functional is also established in [10] under certain differentiability assumptions. The latter result can be extended to our setting, however this extension goes beyond the scope of this paper.

6.1 Performance

We compare our approach to other known approaches on several datasets. More specifically, we use three data sets obtained from the UCI Machine Learning Repository [24]. These data sets exhibit different degrees of class imbalance, that is the proportion of records in one class versus that of the other class. A summary of basic characteristics of the data sets is shown in the following table.

Data Set	Features	Observations		Class
		Class1	Class2 (%)	Balance
pima-indians-diabetes	7	500	267 (34.8)	0.534
seismic-bumps	18	2414	170 (6.6)	0.070
wdbc	30	357	211 (37.1)	0.591

Table 2: Data summary

We consider scenarios for choices of measures of risk. In the first scenario, we treat one of the classes (Class1) in a risk neutral manner, while applying the mean-semi-deviation measure to the classification error of the second class. We call this loss function “asym_risk” (see Table 3). In the same table, we provide the risk measure combinations for other loss functions which we have used in our numerical experiments. The loss functions called “risk_cvar” and “two_cvar” use a convex combination of the expected error and the Average Value-at-Risk of the classification error. These convex combinations use an additional model parameter $\beta \in (0,1)$. We note that such a convex combination is a coherent measure of risk. Additionally, we note that $AVaR_\alpha$ can be calculated by a linear optimization problem.

$$AVaR_\alpha(Z) = \min_{\eta} \left\{ \eta + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}[Z - \eta]_+ \right\} \quad (15)$$

Loss Function Name	Class1 - $\varrho_1(Z^1)$	Class2 - $\varrho_2(Z^2)$
asym_risk	$\mathbb{E}[Z^1]$	$\mathbb{E}[Z^2] + c\sigma^+[Z^2]$
one_cvar	$\mathbb{E}[Z^1] + c\sigma^+[Z^1]$	$AVaR_\alpha(Z^2)$
risk_cvar	$\mathbb{E}[Z^1] + c\sigma^+[Z^1]$	$\beta_2\mathbb{E}[Z^2] + (1 - \beta_2)AVaR_\alpha(Z^2)$
two_risk	$\mathbb{E}[Z^1] + c\sigma^+[Z^1]$	$\mathbb{E}[Z^2] + c\sigma^+[Z^2]$
two_cvar	$\beta_1\mathbb{E}[Z^1] + (1 - \beta_1)AVaR_{\alpha_1}(Z^1)$	$\beta_2\mathbb{E}[Z^2] + (1 - \beta_2)AVaR_{\alpha_2}(Z^2)$

Table 3: Risk measure combinations used as loss functions in the experiments

We compare our results against three different benchmarks with the following loss functions.

$$\frac{1}{m_1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} z_i^1 + \frac{1}{m_2} \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} z_j^2 \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{1}{m_1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} \min(z_i^1, (z_i^1)^2) + \frac{1}{m_2} \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} \min(z_j^2, (z_j^2)^2) \quad (17)$$

$$\beta(\mu_1 + \mu_2) + (1 - \beta) \left(\eta + \frac{1}{\alpha(m_1 + m_2)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_1} s_i^1 + \sum_{j=1}^{m_2} s_j^2 \right) \right) \quad (18)$$

We note that all scenarios of the RSSVM Problem (12) listed in Table 3 can be formulated as linear optimization problems, which leads to quick and efficient solutions. However, if we use higher order semi-deviations or higher order inverse risk measures, the problem becomes non-linear.

In two the loss functions provide us with risk-neutral formulations, in which the objective of problem (12) is replaced by the total expected error (16) or by the Huber function (17). The third benchmark uses a single risk measure (18) on the total error as proposed in [15]. Interestingly, both risk-neutral formulations produce identical results on all data sets. Subsequently we only report one of them under the name “exp_val”. In the presented figures and tables below, we refer to the loss function consisting of a single Average Value-at-Risk measure, as “joint_cvar”.

We perform k -fold cross-validation and all reported results are out of sample.

In Table 1, we report the recall, precision, and F_1 -score for all loss functions on the various data sets. Additionally, we report the number of misclassified observations, as well as the chosen parameters where applicable. We have traversed the Pareto frontier by varying λ from 0.4 to 0.7. We have observed that the solution is rather sensitive to the scalarization used in the loss function. Subsequently, we have optimized the choice of scalarization in terms of F_1 -score. We have chosen the probability level for the Average Value-at-Risk in a similar way. We observe that the loss function “one_cvar” consistently provides the best performance. A close second, is the loss function “risk_cvar,” which has a similar structure. Interestingly, using the same risk measure on both classes does not perform as well.

Figure 4 shows how the empirical distribution of the results from applying the classifier to out-of-sample records. Negative values indicate correctly classified observations, while positive values indicate misclassification. Each of our loss functions is compared to the benchmarks, and lastly against each other on the “seismic-bumps” dataset.

Finally, we have calculated the value of various risk functionals on the test data on order to provide additional evaluation of the obtained classifiers. These results are shown in Tables 4-6. We have calculated the expected error, mean-semi-deviation, and Average Value-at-Risk at levels 0.75, 0.85, and 0.95.

WDBC		Expectation	MSD	AVaR (0.75)	AVaR (0.85)	AVaR (0.95)
exp_val	Class1	0.00055	0.00108	0.00074	0.00065	0.00058
	Class2	0.00105	0.00205	0.00140	0.00123	0.00110
joint_cvar	Class1	0.00055	0.00108	0.00074	0.00065	0.00058
	Class2	0.00109	0.00213	0.00146	0.00128	0.00115
asym_risk	Class1	0.00071	0.00139	0.00095	0.00084	0.00075
	Class2	0.00097	0.00190	0.00130	0.00114	0.00102
one_cvar	Class1	0.00060	0.00119	0.00080	0.00071	0.00063
	Class2	0.00166	0.00323	0.00221	0.00195	0.00175
risk_cvar	Class1	0.00055	0.00108	0.00073	0.00065	0.00058
	Class2	0.00155	0.00301	0.00206	0.00182	0.00163
two_risk	Class1	0.00052	0.00102	0.00069	0.00061	0.00055
	Class2	0.00136	0.00265	0.00182	0.00161	0.00144
two_cvar	Class1	0.00531	0.01048	0.00707	0.00624	0.00558
	Class2	0.01248	0.02419	0.01663	0.01468	0.01313

Table 4: Risk Evaluation of the Risk-Averse Classifiers on Test Data WDBC




Figure 2: Comparing all loss functions to benchmarks and then to each other : seismic-bumps




Figure 3: Comparing all loss functions to benchmarks and then to each other : seismic-bumps




Figure 4: Comparing all loss functions to benchmarks and then to each other : seismic-bumps




Figure 5: The distributions from the Pareto-efficient frontier in three different formulations with the same set of λ values on the seismic-bumps dataset

6.2 Flexibility

Our approach provides additional flexibility which is generally not available for classification methods like SVM. We allow the user to implement a predetermined attitude toward risk of misclassification, and to explore the Pareto-efficient frontier of classifiers. We note that the efficient frontier can be used to choose a risk-averse classifier according to additional criterion as the F_1 -score, Recall, Preci-




Figure 6: The distributions from the Pareto-efficient frontier in three different formulations with the same set of λ values on the seismic-bumps dataset

pima-indians-diabetes						
		Expectation	MSD	AVaR (0.75)	AVaR (0.85)	AVaR (0.95)
exp_val	Class1	0.19607	0.35396	0.26142	0.23067	0.20639
	Class2	0.21735	0.37707	0.28980	0.25570	0.22879
joint_cvar	Class1	0.17234	0.31334	0.22979	0.20275	0.18141
	Class2	0.23951	0.40872	0.31934	0.28177	0.25211
asym_risk	Class1	0.29833	0.51161	0.39778	0.35098	0.31404
	Class2	0.11259	0.20645	0.15012	0.13246	0.11852
one_cvar	Class1	0.25975	0.45789	0.34634	0.30559	0.27342
	Class2	0.16135	0.29169	0.21514	0.18983	0.16984
risk_cvar	Class1	0.25975	0.45789	0.34634	0.30559	0.27342
	Class2	0.16135	0.29169	0.21514	0.18983	0.16984
two_risk	Class1	0.31232	0.53003	0.41642	0.36743	0.32875
	Class2	0.10050	0.18559	0.13400	0.11823	0.10579
two_cvar	Class1	0.13380	0.25204	0.17840	0.15741	0.14084
	Class2	0.50844	0.82336	0.67792	0.59816	0.53520

Table 5: Risk Evaluation of the Risk-Averse Classifiers on Test Data pima-indians-diabetis

		Expectation	MSD	AVaR (0.75)	AVaR (0.85)	AVaR (0.95)
exp_val	Class1	0.05238	0.09534	0.06984	0.06163	0.05514
	Class2	0.08570	0.14228	0.11427	0.10082	0.09021
joint_cvar	Class1	0.03763	0.07032	0.05018	0.04427	0.03961
	Class2	0.11755	0.18844	0.15673	0.13829	0.12374
asym_risk	Class1	0.02280	0.04321	0.03040	0.02683	0.02400
	Class2	0.11949	0.18784	0.15932	0.14058	0.12578
one_cvar	Class1	0.02059	0.03934	0.02745	0.02422	0.02167
	Class2	0.13808	0.21200	0.18410	0.16244	0.14535
risk_cvar	Class1	0.02008	0.03837	0.02677	0.02362	0.02114
	Class2	0.13807	0.21157	0.18410	0.16244	0.14534
two_risk	Class1	0.01934	0.03665	0.02578	0.02275	0.02035
	Class2	0.10596	0.16611	0.14128	0.12466	0.11154
two_cvar	Class1	0.00167	0.00330	0.00223	0.00197	0.00176
	Class2	0.22061	0.30246	0.28861	0.25925	0.23222

Table 6: Risk Evaluation of the Risk-Averse Classifiers on Test Data seismic-bumps

sion, or other similar performance metrics. In Figures 6, we show the resulting error densities from such a traversal. We can observe how varying the weight between the two risk measures allows us to obtain a family of risk-averse Pareto-optimal classifiers. The Pareto frontier looks substantially different when different combinations of risk measures are used. Further research would reveal the effect of higher order risk measures and their ability to create a classifier with highly discriminant

powers.

7 Concluding Remarks

This paper proposes a novel approach to classification problems by leveraging mathematical models of risk. We have formulated several optimization problems for optimizing a classifier over a parametric family of functions. The problem's objective is a weighted sum of risk-measures, associated with the classification error of the classes: each class may be treated with an individual risk preference. We have shown the existence of an optimal risk-sharing classifier under mild assumptions. Additionally, we demonstrate that the optimal risk-sharing classifier also solves an implicit risk-neutral classification problem, in which the empirical probabilities of the data points are replaced by a probability distribution from the subdifferential of the risk-measures. We have provided a more specific problem formulation for the case of binary classification and have conducted experiments on three data sets. Further, we have compared our approach to three benchmarks, which use the minimization of the total expected error, the Huber function, and the Average Value-at-Risk as presented in [15]. Our observations are the following. On the data sets for which traditional formulations perform well, the novel approach performs on par or slightly better depending on the particular choice of risk measures and parameters. The proposed approach has an advantage on all data sets as measured by the F_1 -score. Exploring the Pareto-efficient frontier provides additional flexibility and is a tool for customizing the classifier. As we see from the numerical results, we achieve larger recall or precision by adjusting the scalarization factor λ . Overall, this is an extremely flexible approach which allows fine-tuning leading allowing the user to achieve the best possible result in the chosen metric.

References

- [1] Carlo Acerbi and Dirk Tasche. On the coherence of expected shortfall. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 26(7):1487–1503, 2002.
- [2] Barry C Arnold. The lorenz order in the space of distribution functions. In *Majorization and the Lorenz Order: A Brief Introduction*, pages 29–44. Springer, 1987.
- [3] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, and David Heath. Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical finance*, 9(3):203–228, 1999.
- [4] Gerald Beer. *Topologies on closed and closed convex sets*, volume 268. Springer Science & Business Media, 1993.
- [5] Patrick Cheridito and Tianhui Li. Risk measures on orlicz hearts. *Mathematical Finance*, 19(2):189–214, 2009.
- [6] D. R. Cox and Peter A. W. Lewis. *The statistical analysis of series of events [by] D.R. Cox and P.A.W. Lewis*. Methuen London, 1966.
- [7] Justin R Davis and Stan Uryasev. Analysis of tropical storm damage using buffered probability of exceedance. *Natural Hazards*, 83(1):465–483, 2016.
- [8] Darinka Dentcheva and Spiridon Penev. Shape-restricted inference for lorenz curves using duality theory. *Statistics & probability letters*, 80(5):403–412, 2010.
- [9] Darinka Dentcheva, Spiridon Penev, and Andrzej Ruszczyński. Kusuoka representation of higher order dual risk measures. *Annals of Operations Research*, 181(1):325–335, 2010.
- [10] Darinka Dentcheva, Spiridon Penev, and Andrzej Ruszczyński. Statistical estimation of composite risk functionals and risk optimization problems. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, pages 1–24, 2016.

- [11] Laurent El Ghaoui, Gert René Georges Lanckriet, Georges Natsoulis, et al. *Robust classification with interval data*. Computer Science Division, University of California, 2003.
- [12] Ugo Fano. Ionization yield of radiations. ii. the fluctuations of the number of ions. *Physical Review*, 72(1):26, 1947.
- [13] Hans Föllmer and Alexander Schied. *Stochastic finance: an introduction in discrete time*. Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- [14] Joseph L Gastwirth. The estimation of the lorenz curve and gini index. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, pages 306–316, 1972.
- [15] Jun-ya Gotoh and Stan Uryasev. Support vector machines based on convex risk functionals and general norms. Technical report, Technical Report 2013-6, Risk Management and Financial Engineering Lab, University of Florida, 2013.
- [16] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman. *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction, Second Edition*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer New York, 2009.
- [17] Peter J Huber. *Robust statistics*. Springer, 2011.
- [18] Elyes Jouini, Walter Schachermayer, and Nizar Touzi. Optimal risk sharing for law invariant monetary utility functions. *Mathematical Finance*, 18(2):269–292, 2008.
- [19] Masaaki Kijima and Masamitsu Ohnishi. Mean-risk analysis of risk aversion and wealth effects on optimal portfolios with multiple investment opportunities. *Annals of Operations Research*, 45(1):147–163, 1993.
- [20] Pavlo A Krokmal. Higher moment coherent risk measures. 2007.
- [21] Shigeo Kusuoka. On law invariant coherent risk measures. In *Advances in mathematical economics*, pages 83–95. Springer, 2001.
- [22] Gert RG Lanckriet, Laurent El Ghaoui, Chiranjib Bhattacharyya, and Michael I Jordan. A robust minimax approach to classification. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:555–582, 2003.
- [23] Michael Landsberger and Isaac Meilijson. Co-monotone allocations, bickel-lehmann dispersion and the arrow-pratt measure of risk aversion. *Annals of Operations Research*, 52(2):97–106, 1994.
- [24] M. Lichman. UCI machine learning repository, 2013.
- [25] Max O Lorenz. Methods of measuring the concentration of wealth. *Publications of the American statistical association*, 9(70):209–219, 1905.
- [26] Michael Ludkovski and Ludger Rüschendorf. On comonotonicity of pareto optimal risk sharing. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 78(10):1181–1188, 2008.
- [27] Yifei Ma, Li Li, Xiaolin Huang, and Shuning Wang. Robust support vector machine using least median loss penalty. In *the 16th IFAC World Congress*, pages 11208–11213, 2011.
- [28] Kaisa Miettinen. *Nonlinear multiobjective optimization*, volume 12. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- [29] Włodzimierz Ogryczak and Andrzej Ruszczyński. Dual stochastic dominance and related mean-risk models. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 13(1):60–78, 2002.

- [30] R Tyrrell Rockafellar, Stan Uryasev, and Michael Zabarankin. Generalized deviations in risk analysis. *Finance and Stochastics*, 10(1):51–74, 2006.
- [31] R Tyrrell Rockafellar, Stan Uryasev, and Michael Zabarankin. Risk tuning with generalized linear regression. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 33(3):712–729, 2008.
- [32] R Tyrrell Rockafellar and Stanislav Uryasev. Conditional value-at-risk for general loss distributions. *Journal of banking & finance*, 26(7):1443–1471, 2002.
- [33] Andrzej Ruszczyński and Alexander Shapiro. Optimization of convex risk functions. *Mathematics of operations research*, 31(3):433–452, 2006.
- [34] M Shaked and J Shantikumar. *Stochastic orderings*, 2007.
- [35] Alexander Shapiro, Darinka Dentcheva, and Andrzej Ruszczyński. *Lectures on stochastic programming: modeling and theory*, volume 16. SIAM, 2014.