

On the equivalence between Value-at-Risk and Expected Shortfall in non-concave optimization

An Chen,^{*} Mitja Stadje,[†] Fangyuan Zhang[‡]

September 11, 2022

Abstract

This paper studies a non-concave optimization problem under a Value-at-Risk (VaR) or an Expected Shortfall (ES) constraint. The non-concavity of the problem stems from the non-linear payoff structure of the optimizing investor. We obtain the closed-form optimal wealth with an ES constraint as well as with a VaR constraint respectively, and explicitly calculate the optimal trading strategy for constant relative risk aversion (CRRA) utility functions. In our non-concave optimization problem, we find that with a not too strict regulation for any VaR constraint with an arbitrary risk level, there exists an ES constraint leading to the same investment strategy, which shows on some level the ineffectiveness of the ES-based regulation. This differs from the conclusion drawn in Basak and Shapiro [2001] for the concave optimization problem, where VaR and ES lead to different solutions and ES provides a better loss protection.

Keywords Value-at-Risk · Expected Shortfall · Optimal investment strategy · Non-concave utility maximization

1 Introduction

One of the standard risk measures used as regulatory and risk management tool in the financial industry is Value-at-Risk (VaR). VaR describes the loss that is exceeded under a given probability within a given horizon, see Duffie and Pan [1997]. There has been lots of discussion in the literature about the suitability of VaR as a risk measure for regulatory purposes, see for instance Artzner et al. [1999], Rockafellar and Uryasev [2000], Cuoco and Liu [2006] and Danielsson et al. [2001]. Opponents criticize that VaR lacks the sub-additivity that an appropriate risk measure should have and furthermore only considers the probability but not the

^{*}Institute of Insurance Science, University of Ulm, Germany. an.chen@uni-ulm.de

[†]Institute of Insurance Science and Institute of Financial Mathematics, University of Ulm, Germany. mitja.stadje@uni-ulm.de

[‡]Institute of Insurance Science, University of Ulm, Germany. zhang.fangyuan@uni-ulm.de

magnitude of a loss. However, VaR is the cornerstone of the Basel III and Solvency II capital requirements and is widely used in practice. On the other hand, Expected Shortfall, which has various different versions such as Tail-Value-at-Risk (TVaR), Worst-Case-Value-at-Risk (WVaR) or Average-Value-at-Risk (AVaR), is seen as an alternative of VaR. Expected Shortfall is the expectation of the losses which are above a certain level. Some of its versions have also found their way into regulatory practice and are for instance used by the Swiss Solvency Test, see also the discussion in Acerbi and Tasche [2002b] and Embrechts et al. [2014]. Furthermore, in a consultative document on the third Basel accord, the committee explicitly raised the prospect of phasing out VaR and replacing it with Expected Shortfall, see Chen [2014].

The debate about whether VaR should be replaced by an ES-like risk measure is still ongoing. One stream of the discussion focuses on the axiomatic properties of VaR or ES as a risk measure. Acerbi et al. [2001] and Acerbi and Tasche [2002a] study the general definitions of AVaR and TVaR showing that these risk measures are essentially coherent and therefore support them as better risk measures over VaR. Another stream of the discussion focuses on the statistical properties of VaR, where it is well known that Expected Shortfall-like risk measures are notoriously sensitive to outliers and hence lack robustness, see Cont et al. [2010] and Kou et al. [2013]. Furthermore, VaR, contrary to its alternatives, is elicitable, see for instance Ziegel [2016]. For other related papers on statistical properties of VaR and ES we also recommend Bernard et al. [2014], Ghaoui et al. [2003], Du and Escanciano [2016], Lan et al. [2010] and Embrechts et al. [2013]. In a recent work, Embrechts et al. [2015] show that AVaR is more robust with respect to dependence uncertainty compared to VaR.

Except for being used for regulatory purposes, VaR and ES are also widely employed as (internal) risk management tools. For instance, VaR and ES can be applied as risk control constraints for portfolio selection. It is well documented that regulatory constraint and uncertainty affects organizations' strategies and decisions, see e.g. Basak and Shapiro [2001], who investigate the risk management problem of a concave utility maximizer with an additional VaR or ES constraint. They conclude that the VaR-based risk management will induce more severe losses than the ES-based risk management in the worst financial states and therefore advocate ES as an alternative and better risk measure. Shi and Werker [2012] use numerical methods to verify that the difference between the VaR and ES-strategy in the worst financial states will be reduced significantly if the risk constraint is re-evaluated multiple times before the investment horizon. Cuoco et al. [2008] compute VaR and ES dynamically in continuous time, assuming that the portfolio weights are unchanged for the time interval over which the regulatory capital is computed, and show that VaR and ES will induce the same optimal strategy in this case. He et al. [2015] study the dynamic portfolio choice problem under a newly defined weighted-VaR (WVaR) risk measure incorporating VaR and ES as special cases. Further, Wei [2018] considers the utility maximization problem under WVaR. Both latter papers conclude that WVaR induces

more risky trading behaviours compared to the unregulated case.

The previous conclusions apply to the standard concave optimization problem. This paper studies the effect of a VaR or an ES constraint in a non-concave environment, where the non-concavity stems from the non-linear payoff to the optimizing agent. The unconstrained utility maximization problems, where the utility function is still concave, but the optimized wealth/payoff to the investors are non-linear, have been rather extensively analysed in recent academic literature. For instance, Carpenter [2000] and Kouwenberg and Ziemba [2007] consider the optimization problem of a fund manager who is compensated with an option-type payoff. Nguyen and Stadje [2020], Dong et al. [2019] and Chen et al. [2019] consider a similar problem in an insurance context. For a summary of the existing unconstrained non-concave models, see Dai et al. [2019]. Our paper extends this stream of literature by incorporating a regulatory constraint, an ES or a VaR constraint. We adopt the limited expected loss proposed by Basak and Shapiro [2001] as our version of an ES constraint. Hence, our model can be seen as a counterpart model of Basak and Shapiro [2001] but in a non-concave environment. We shall mention that Nguyen and Stadje [2020] already solve the VaR-constrained non-concave optimization in which the regulatory threshold is set equal to the liability level. Our problem with a VaR-constraint includes the situation where the regulatory threshold is freely chosen.

We solve the non-concave optimization problem with an ES or a VaR constraint, using a static Lagrangian technique and the martingale approach. Unlike the unique type solution in a standard *concave* optimization problem, there exist several types of solutions to the constrained non-concave optimization problem. We find that the initial wealth and the strictness of the regulation are key factors influencing the structure of the solution. We compute the optimal terminal wealth, distinguishing between $L \leq D_T$ (a less strict regulator with a regulatory threshold lower than the debt level), and $L > D_T$ (a stricter regulator with a regulatory threshold higher than the debt level). Further, we calculate the initial wealth bound in each case distinguishing the binding solution and non-binding solution to see precisely how the solution structure changes with the initial wealth. Generally speaking, the solutions under an ES or a VaR constraint show a similar pattern as an unconstrained solution, an “all-or-nothing” strategy (c.f. Carpenter [2000]) demonstrating a gambling behavior. However, the risk constraint can effectively control the risky behavior of the benchmark (unconstrained) investor by shrinking the region of “nothing”, while it cannot prevent the gambling behavior completely.

Interestingly, we find that an ES- and a VaR-regulatory constraint induce the same terminal wealth and the same investment behavior in our non-concave optimization problem, as long as the regulation is not too strict, i.e., when the regulatory threshold L is smaller than the tangent point \widehat{D}_T (see Lemma 3.1). Since the tangent point of the debt level is larger than the debt level itself, i.e. $\widehat{D}_T > D_T$ (see Lemma 3.1), the condition $L < \widehat{D}_T$ contains not only the case $L < D_T$,

but also the region $D_T < L < \widehat{D}_T$. In this sense, this condition contains most of practical situations, where the regulatory bound is often set at or close to the debt level. Due to the fact that the unconstrained optimal terminal wealth (with no additional risk constraint) is either larger than the tangent point or equal to 0, the additional risk constraint only induces a passive strategy if the regulatory threshold is below the tangent point. By “a passive strategy”, we mean that the economic agent only invests the minimal amount needed to satisfy the risk constraint as cheaply as possible, because any additional wealth does not bring an additional gain to the agent in these financial states. This result indicates that an ES and a VaR constraint have the same effect constraining the risky behavior of a non-concave optimizer in most realistic settings, and these two risk constraints can be treated equivalently. They can reduce the probability of the worst loss but cannot control the gambling behavior fully. The equivalence between a VaR constraint and an ES constraint indicates that in non-concave optimization, an ES constraint has lost its advantage over a VaR constraint as in the standard concave optimization. In the less realistic case in which $L > \widehat{D}_T$, the equivalence result collapses, i.e., the ES-constrained solution is different from the VaR-constrained solution.

Our paper is related to, but differs from another stream of literature on non-concave utility maximization problem, where the non-concavity stems from the S -shaped utility function. An investor with S -shaped utility function differentiates losses and gains by a reference level and shows risk-seeking behavior in the loss-region while staying risk-averse in the gain-region. Berkelaar et al. [2004] solve the unconstrained optimal portfolio choice under an S -shaped utility. Dai et al. [2019] analyse the optimization problem with portfolio constraints and provide a new viscosity solution to the constrained non-concave (including the S -shaped utility function) optimization problem when the concavification technique is not applicable. Armstrong and Brigo [2019a] incorporate risk constraints like an ES or a VaR constraint in this type of non-concave utility maximization problem. Armstrong and Brigo [2019a] certainly draw an interesting result: they construct a mathematical setting with an S -shaped utility and show that even if the ES constraint is binding, it does not lead to a loss in the optimal utility level. Usually, a binding ES constraint does lead to a utility loss compared to the unconstrained solution for regular increasing and concave utility functions like power (c.f. Basak and Shapiro [2001]). Although it also follows from our analysis in some sense that the VaR and the ES regulation lead to the same utility levels, our setting, results and techniques are very different: a) while they analyse the VaR and TVaR regulation for an S -shaped utility for a trader who is allowed to encounter arbitrarily large losses (provided that the budget constraint holds), in our case the utility of the payoff structure is piece-wise concave and the non-concavity arises from distinguishing between debt and equity. We also do not allow the payoff for the equity holder to become negative, which is a key difference from Armstrong and Brigo [2019a]. b) We obtain a unique closed form solution for the optimal wealth and the strategy, while the maximal utility in the constrained and unconstrained case for an unbounded S -shaped utility function is infinity, and this maximum is

of course not attained. For this reason, it is actually common in S -shaped utility maximization to postulate a fixed exogenously given lower bound on the wealth process, see for instance Berkeelaar et al. [2004], Jin and Zhou [2008], Dai et al. [2019] and Nguyen and Stadje [2020]. c) In our non-concave maximization problem, VaR- and ES-based risk management lead to identical optimal solutions if the regulatory threshold is smaller than the tangent point corresponding to the debt level, which implies the equivalence between the risk constraints. However, the identical VaR and ES solutions in Armstrong and Brigo [2019a] are due to the ineffectiveness of the risk constraints in general. For a regulatory threshold greater than the tangency point corresponding to the debt level, the optimal solutions in our model are different. d) Although our paper also shows cases, where the ES-constrained solution is identical to the unconstrained solution, it is due to exactly the reverse reason than in Armstrong and Brigo [2019a]; namely, the ES constraint being not binding. For this specific result, our paper is consistent with Basak and Shapiro [2001]. The equivalence between the VaR- and ES-constrained solutions however distinguishes our result substantially from Basak and Shapiro [2001]. In Armstrong and Brigo [2019b], the authors further show that both VaR and TVaR (and coherent risk measures in general), are ineffective in controlling the behavior of a risk neutral investor with limited liability in incomplete markets provided the market admits a so called ρ -arbitrage opportunity.

The mathematical models and the optimal portfolio planning problems considered in our paper are rather general and can be considered as an individual's/a financial institution's optimal asset allocation problem under risk constraints. Our results are of high practical relevance and can bring some new insights to e.g. insurance regulation under Solvency II. In EU countries, the implementation of new insurance regulation framework "Solvency II" in 2016 has enhanced the role of a risk-based regulation that focuses on downside risk, requiring insurance companies to use measures such as VaR, TVaR or ES. The amount of risk capital needed usually follows from imposing an upper bound on one of these risk measures to the insurance company; alternatively, the regulator may directly impose restrictions on the insurance companies' investment decision and restrict the share of stocks and other risky investments in their portfolios. There are thus various regulatory measures that can be imposed on insurance companies. In this paper, we study how regulatory constraints, more specifically VaR and ES constraints, influence a financial institution's optimal asset allocation. Interestingly, we find that VaR and ES can lead to the same investment behavior of the insurance company in some circumstances, although VaR is designed only to control the probability of ruin, while ES is designed to control both the probability and the magnitude of loss. These results can be taken into consideration, when Solvency II develops new regulatory methods and tools in order to balance the interests of equity and policy holders.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: Section 2 describes the financial market and the basic model setup. Section 3 contains some background on the unconstrained non-concave

maximization problem which is used later as the benchmark case. Section 4 provides the optimal solution under a VaR or an ES constraint, respectively. Section 5 establishes the equivalence result when $L \leq \widehat{D}_T$, and shows that the two risk constraints are not equivalent when $L > \widehat{D}_T$. Section 6 computes the optimal trading strategies with a CRRA utility function and analyses the properties of the optimal strategies analytically and numerically. The last section concludes. All of the technical proofs are provided in the E-companion.

2 The Model

2.1 The financial market

Assume that we work in a *complete* financial market in continuous time without transaction costs that contains one traded risk free asset S_0 (the bank account) and m traded risky assets denoted by the stochastic processes $S = (S_1, \dots, S_m)'$.¹ We fix a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, P)$, $T < \infty$. Denote by Q the unique local martingale measure in the complete financial market and define by $\xi_T := \frac{S_0(0)dQ}{S_0(T)dP}$ the state price density process. Throughout the paper we assume that ξ_T is atom-less. Here ξ_T is the Arrow-Debreu value per probability unit of a security which pays out 1\$ at time T if scenario ω happens, and 0 else. As this value is high in a recession and low in prosperous time, $\xi_T(\omega)$ has the property of directly reflecting the overall state of the economy. Therefore, the functional relationship between the optimal wealth and ξ_T will be used as an interpretation of some of the results.

The financial institution endowed with x_0 chooses an investment strategy that we describe in terms of the fraction $\pi_i(t)$ of the total wealth invested in the i th risky asset at time t . The remaining wealth is invested in the risk free asset and the strategy is self-financing. We assume that $\pi(t) = (\pi_1(t), \dots, \pi_m(t))$ is adaptive with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$. The wealth process related to a strategy $\pi(t)$ starting with an initial wealth x_0 is then given by

$$X_t^\pi = X_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \int_0^t \pi_i(s) dS_i(s) = X_0 + \int_0^t \pi(s) dS(s), \quad X_0 = x_0 > 0. \quad (2.1)$$

In a complete financial market, choosing a self-financing trading strategy π is equivalent to choosing a terminal wealth X_T^π which can be financed by x_0 . The set of attainable terminal wealth is defined by

$$\mathcal{X} := \{X_T^\pi \text{ is } \mathcal{F}_T\text{-measurable, replicable, non-negative and } E[\xi_T X_T^\pi] \leq x_0\}.$$

From now on we omit the dependence of X_T on π .

¹Here S is an m -dimensional vector and $'$ denotes the transposed sign.

2.2 The model setup with a VaR or an ES constraint

In this section, we introduce the model setup with a VaR or an ES constraint. We consider a financial institution operating on $[0, T]$, $T < \infty$. At time 0, the company receives an initial contribution E_0 from the equity holders, and an amount D_0 from the debt holders. Consequently, the initial asset value of the company is given by $x_0 = E_0 + D_0$.

We assume that the benefits to the debt holders are paid out as a lump sum at time T . The defined benefits can be represented as the initial contributions of the debt holders accumulated with a (nominal) rate of return, i.e., $D_T = D_0 e^{\int_0^T g_s ds}$, with $D_T \geq D_0 e^{\int_0^T r_s ds}$ where r_s is the risk-free rate, if there is no maturity default, i.e., $X_T > D_T$. In case of maturity default, i.e., $X_T \leq D_T$, X_T is paid out at maturity. More compactly, the debt holders' terminal payoff can be presented as

$$\varphi_L(X_T) = \min(D_T, X_T).$$

Note that if $D_T \leq D_0 e^{\int_0^T r_s ds}$, the debt holders are better off by investing the money D_0 fully in the risk free asset.

The payoff to the equity holders can be determined residually by

$$\varphi_E(X_T) = X_T - \varphi_L(X_T) = \max(X_T - D_T, 0) =: (X_T - D_T)^+.$$

The financial institution on behalf of its equity holders invests the total proceedings x_0 in a diversified portfolio of the risky and the risk free assets as defined in Section 2.1. Further, we denote the equity holders' utility function by U and assume that the utility function is defined on the non-negative real line, strictly increasing, strictly concave, continuously differentiable and satisfies the usual Inada and asymptotic elasticity (AE) conditions,

$$U'(0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} U'(x) = \infty; \quad U'(\infty) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} U'(x) = 0; \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \sup \frac{xU'(x)}{U(x)} < 1.$$

In addition, we assume $U(0) = 0$.

Remark 1. If $U(0) \in (-\infty, \infty)$, we know that adding a constant to the utility function will not change the essence of the optimization problem. If $U(0) = -\infty$, one may see from the proof in the E-companion that the optimal terminal wealth is more than the debt level in any state. In this model, we allow the company to default and therefore exclude the case $U(0) = -\infty$.

Figure 1 is an illustrative example for the utility function of the equity holders, where the utility level equals zero when the wealth level is below the debt level.




Figure 1: The non-concave utility of the equity holders.

The optimal asset allocation problem of the financial institution acting on behalf of its equity holders under an ES- or a VaR-regulatory constraint can be described as follows in Problems 1 and 2.

Problem 1. The ES-constrained optimization problem is defined as

$$\max_{X_T \in \mathcal{X}} E[U((X_T - D_T)^+)],$$

subject to

$$E[\xi_T(L - X_T)\mathbb{1}_{X_T < L}] \leq \epsilon, \quad E[X_T\xi_T] \leq x_0,$$

where L is the given regulatory threshold and ϵ is chosen as a percentage of the initial wealth. In addition, $\mathbb{1}$ is the indicator function, i.e., $\mathbb{1}_A$ is 1 if A occurs and 0 otherwise. Note that throughout the paper the expectation is taken under the real world measure P .

Problem 2. The VaR-constrained optimization problem is defined as

$$\max_{X_T \in \mathcal{X}} E[U((X_T - D_T)^+)],$$

subject to

$$P(X_T < L) \leq \alpha, \quad E[X_T\xi_T] \leq x_0,$$

where $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

The VaR constraint is interpreted as a requirement that the terminal wealth is beyond the regulatory threshold L with a confidence level $1 - \alpha$, i.e., $P(X_T \geq L) \geq 1 - \alpha$. For example, Solvency II requires an insurance company to hold enough solvency capital such that it can meet its obligations to its policyholders with a confidence level of 99.5% (i.e., $\alpha = 0.005$) over a 12-month period.

In practice, the regulatory boundary is often at or close to the debt level D_T . However, if the asset's value falls below this level, this will not automatically entail liquidation of an insurance company, as a grace period is often allowed for recovery². In this sense, the effective regulatory threshold is lower, i.e., $L < D_T$. In subsequent cases, for completeness we will analyse both $L > D_T$ and $L \leq D_T$. Similarly, the ES constraint is interpreted as a limitation on the average of the severe losses given that the terminal wealth is already below the regulatory VaR-threshold, i.e., $E[\xi_T(L - X_T)\mathbb{1}_{X_T < L}] \leq \epsilon$.

3 Background on the non-concave optimization problem

In this section we will introduce some background regarding the general non-concave optimization problem. Then, we will provide the solution to the unconstrained case in our model as the benchmark solution.

3.1 Preliminaries

In solving the non-concave optimization problem, the technique commonly used is the concavification of the utility function, see Carpenter [2000] and Reichlin [2011]. However, this is not sufficient to solve the non-concave optimization problem with additional constraints, see Dai et al. [2019]. In our analysis, we will use a piecewise Lagrangian approach to solve the constrained non-concave optimization problem. Below we first recall the concept of a conjugate function and then give some of its properties in our setting.

Definition 3.1. For a fixed and positive d , consider a concave utility function $U(x - d)$ defined on (d, ∞) which satisfies the Inada and AE condition. For a given positive λ , we define the conjugate function $c(y) := \sup_{x > d} \{U(x - d) - x\lambda y\} = U(x(y) - d) - U'(x(y) - d)x(y) = U(I(\lambda y)) - \lambda y I(\lambda y) - \lambda y d$, where I is the inverse function of the first derivative of U and $y > 0$.

Lemma 3.1. i) $c(y)$ is decreasing in y .

ii) For each positive and fixed d , there exists a \hat{d} such that $U(\hat{d} - d)/\hat{d} = U'(\hat{d} - d)$. We call \hat{d} the tangent point. In addition, we have that $y(\hat{d}) := U'(\hat{d} - d)/\lambda$ and $c(y(\hat{d})) = 0$. In other words, $y(\hat{d})$ is the unique zero root of the conjugate function $c(y)$.

iii) For positive λ, λ_2, l and d , define a new conjugate function $c^*(y) := \sup_{x > d} \{U(x - d) - x\lambda y + \lambda y \frac{\lambda_2 l}{\lambda}\} = U(I(\lambda y)) - \lambda y I(\lambda y) - \lambda y d + \lambda y \frac{\lambda_2 l}{\lambda}$. Then $c^*(y)$ has a zero root if and only if $\frac{\lambda_2 l}{\lambda} - d =: s < 0$.

Note that $U(x - d) - x\lambda y$ represents a part of the static Lagrangian we employ to solve the optimization problem. The conjugate function describes the least upper hyperplane of this static Lagrangian. The second statement introduces the concept of the tangent point. We can see that

²See Broeders and Chen (2010) for a formal analysis of the impact of recovery periods.

the tangent point \hat{d} does not depend on λ and y . More interestingly, the conjugate function attains 0 at the tangent point. Due to the monotonicity of the conjugate function given in the first statement, we can determine whether the conjugate of the Lagrangian is positive or negative with a given y . In addition, we can construct the concave envelope with the tangent point, see Figure 2 below. Statement iii) defines a more complex conjugate function and introduces the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a zero root. We will see in the E-companion that this function is useful to solve the ES-constrained problem.

We provide the proof of Lemma 3.1 in the E-companion.




Figure 2: The non-concave utility function and the corresponding concave envelope.

3.2 The benchmark solution

The general unconstrained non-concave optimization problem has been solved. Hence, we provide the solution to the unconstrained problem in our model without proof. We consider the unconstrained solution as the benchmark solution in order to highlight the effect of the additional constraint.

Problem 3. The unconstrained optimization problem is

$$\max_{X_T \in \mathcal{X}} E[U((X_T - D_T)^+)], \quad \text{subject to} \quad E[X_T \xi_T] \leq x_0.$$

Throughout the remainder of the paper we assume that for any $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, we have that $E[U(I(\lambda \xi_T))] < \infty$ and $E[\xi_T I(\lambda \xi_T)] < \infty$. The benchmark solution is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. The optimal solution to Problem 3 is given by

$$X_T^B = (I(\lambda_B \xi_T) + D_T) \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\hat{D}_T}}, \quad (3.1)$$

where \widehat{D}_T is the tangent point with respect to D_T (see Lemma 3.1), $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T} = U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)/\lambda_B$, and λ_B is obtained by solving $E[X_T^B \xi_T] = x_0$.




Figure 3: The optimal terminal wealth in the benchmark case. This figure plots the optimal terminal wealth in the benchmark case. The basic parameters are chosen according to Table 1 in Section 5.

Figure 3 depicts the optimal terminal wealth as a function of the state price density in the benchmark case. Figure 3 shows the most distinctive property of the terminal wealth in the non-concave optimization problem, namely, the “all-or-nothing” shape. The reason for this shape is that the objective is to maximize the expected utility of an option-type payoff. Hence, the company is motivated to give up the region where the option is out of the money in order to save resources to invest more in the region where the option is in the money to gain more potential upward benefits.

4 Non-concave optimization under an ES or a VaR constraint

In this section we solve the non-concave optimization problem with an ES or a VaR constraint, respectively. We will see later that the correspondence between the debt level D_T and the regulatory threshold L has a significant influence on the constrained optimal solution. As mentioned previously, a higher L implies a stricter regulation. Usually the regulatory threshold L is set below and close at the debt level D_T in practice. In the following, for completeness, we consider both cases: $L \leq D_T$ and $L > D_T$.

4.1 The non-concave optimization under an ES constraint

We firstly consider the ES-constrained optimization problem in this section, namely,

$$\max_{X_T \in \mathcal{X}} E[U((X_T - D_T)^+)], \quad \text{s.t.} \quad E[\xi_T(L - X_T)\mathbb{1}_{X_T < L}] \leq \epsilon, \quad E[X_T \xi_T] \leq x_0.$$

Typically, the solution to the constrained problems highly depends on the initial wealth. If the initial wealth is low, the problem might be infeasible. If the initial wealth is sufficiently large, the risk constraint is not binding and the solution to the constrained problem coincides with the one to the unconstrained problem. On the other hand, there exists a region of the initial wealth, within which the risk constraint is binding. Note that in this specific ES-constrained problem, if $x_0 < x_0^{min} := Le^{-\int_0^T r_s ds} - \epsilon$, there is no feasible solution. With such a low initial wealth level, the expected shortfall is unavoidably larger than ϵ .

The solution to the ES-constrained optimization problem (**Problem 1**) is given in the following theorem. Various cases are distinguished according to the relation between the debt level D_T and the regulatory threshold L , and the available initial wealth for investments.

Theorem 4.1. a) If $\mathbf{L} \leq D_T$, the optimal solution to **Problem 1** is:

i) When $x_0^{min} \leq x_0 < x_0^1 := E[\xi_T(I(U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)\xi_T/\bar{\xi}_\epsilon) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon}]$

$$X^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon} \quad \text{if } \bar{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$X^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}}} + L\mathbb{1}_{\xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}} \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon} \quad \text{if } \bar{\xi}_\epsilon > \xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}}, \quad (4.2)$$

ii) when $x_0 \geq x_0^1$

$$X^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}}, \quad (4.3)$$

where $\xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}} = U'(\tilde{L} - (D_T - L))/\lambda_\epsilon$, \tilde{L} is the tangent point with respect to $D_T - L$, $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon$ is defined through $E[L\xi_T\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T \geq \bar{\xi}_\epsilon}] = \epsilon$, $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T} = U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)/\lambda_\epsilon$ and λ_ϵ is obtained by solving $E[\xi_T X_T^{ES}] = x_0$.

b) If $D_T < \mathbf{L} \leq \widehat{D}_T$, the optimal solution to **Problem 1** is:

i) When $x_0^{min} \leq x_0 < x_0^2 := E[\xi_T(I(U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)\xi_T/\bar{\xi}_\epsilon) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon}]$

$$X_T^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon} \quad \text{if } \bar{\xi}_\epsilon < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon, \quad (4.4)$$

$$X_T^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon} + L\mathbb{1}_{\underline{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon} \quad \text{if } \bar{\xi}_\epsilon \geq \underline{\xi}_\epsilon, \quad (4.5)$$

ii) when $x_0 \geq x_0^2$

$$X_T^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}}, \quad (4.6)$$

where $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon$ is defined through $E[L\xi_T\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T \geq \bar{\xi}_\epsilon}] = \epsilon$, $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T} = U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)/\lambda_\epsilon$ and λ_ϵ is obtained by solving $E[\xi_T X_T^{ES}] = \epsilon$.

c) If $\mathbf{L} > \widehat{D}_T$, the optimal solution to **Problem 1** is:

i) When $x_0^{min} \leq x_0 < x_0^3 := E[\xi_T(I(\bar{\lambda}\xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T \bar{\lambda} < U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)}]$

$$X_T^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon} + L\mathbb{1}_{\underline{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon} + (I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon)\xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\bar{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_T < \xi_\epsilon^{\widehat{D}_T}}, \quad (4.7)$$

ii) when $x_0 \geq x_0^3$

$$X_T^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T) \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}}, \quad (4.8)$$

where $\xi_\epsilon = \frac{U'(L-D_T)}{\lambda_\epsilon}$, $\bar{\xi} = \frac{U'(L-D_T)}{\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\xi}$, $\xi_\epsilon^{\widehat{D}_T} = \frac{U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)}{\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\xi}$, λ_ϵ and λ_2^ξ are obtained by solving the equations $E[\xi_T X^{ES}] = x_0$ and $E[\xi_T (L - X^{ES}) \mathbb{1}_{X^{ES} < L}] = \epsilon$. In addition, $\bar{\lambda}$ is obtained by $E[\xi_T (L - I(\bar{\lambda} \xi_T) - D_T) \mathbb{1}_{U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T) > \xi_T \bar{\lambda} \geq U'(L - D_T)} + \xi_T L \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T \bar{\lambda} \geq U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)}] = \epsilon$.

Remark 2. When the regulatory threshold is lower than the debt level, i.e., $L < D_T$, and the initial wealth level is relatively small, the three-region constrained solution applies. With an increasing initial wealth level, the three-region solution converges to the two-region solution. With a continuously increasing initial wealth level, the two-region solution converges to the benchmark (unconstrained) solution. The three-region solution is a more passive strategy compared to the two-region solution in the sense that the non-concave optimizer is forced to insure a large region by holding the regulatory threshold L while the payoff option in this region is out-of-money and hence all the terminal wealth will go to the debt holder. A wealthier non-concave optimizer who has more initial wealth is capable of investing in a larger region. In this case, he just shrinks the worst financial states where he allows the payoff option to be out-of-money to meet the risk constraint. Note that the case in which the regulatory threshold is equal to the debt level ($L = D_T$) represents a special case. Independent of the initial wealth level, only a two-region solution results. When $D_T < L < \widehat{D}_T$, the situation is similar. From Theorem 3.1, we know that the unconstrained terminal wealth is either larger than the tangent point \widehat{D}_T or is 0. When the regulatory threshold L is set smaller than the tangent point, the regulation forces the financial institution to redistribute the wealth in the “out-of-money” region. When $L > \widehat{D}_T$, the terminal wealth shows a similar structure as in Basak and Shapiro [2001] except for the worst financial states where the terminal wealth jumps to 0.

4.2 The non-concave optimization under a VaR constraint

With the martingale approach, the problem with a VaR constraint is

$$\max_{X_T \in \mathcal{X}} E[U((X_T - D_T)^+)], \quad \text{s.t.} \quad P(X_T < L) \leq \alpha, \quad E[X_T \xi_T] \leq x_0.$$

Note that if $x_0 < x_0^{\min} := E[L \xi_T \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha}]$ where $\bar{\xi}_\alpha$ is defined through $P(\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha) = \alpha$, there is no feasible solution. The VaR-constrained non-concave optimization can be solved similarly as the optimization problem with the ES constraint. But as can be seen in our E-companion, the proof to the VaR-constrained problem is less complex.

The solution to the VaR-constrained optimization problem (**Problem 2**) is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. a) If $L \leq D_T$, the optimal solution to **Problem 2** is:

i) When $x_0^{min} \leq x_0 < x_0^4 := E[\xi_T(I(U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)\xi_T/\bar{\xi}_\alpha) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha}]$

$$X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha} \quad \text{if } \xi^{\tilde{L}} \geq \bar{\xi}_\alpha, \quad (4.9)$$

$$X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\tilde{L}}} + L\mathbb{1}_{\xi^{\tilde{L}} \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha} \quad \text{if } \xi^{\tilde{L}} < \bar{\xi}_\alpha, \quad (4.10)$$

ii) when $x_0 \geq x_0^4$

$$X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}}, \quad (4.11)$$

where $\xi^{\tilde{L}} = U'(\tilde{L} - (D_T - L))/\lambda_\alpha$, \tilde{L} is the tangent point with respect to $D_T - L$, $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T} = U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)/\lambda_\alpha$ and λ_α is defined via the budget constraint $E[X_T^{VaR}\xi_T] = x_0$.

b) If $D_T < L \leq \widehat{D}_T$, the optimal solution to **Problem 2** is:

i) when $x_0^{min} \leq x_0 < x_0^5 := E[\xi_T(I(U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)\xi_T/\bar{\xi}_\alpha) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha}]$

$$X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\alpha} + L\mathbb{1}_{\underline{\xi}_\alpha \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha} \quad \text{if } \bar{\xi}_\alpha \geq \underline{\xi}_\alpha, \quad (4.12)$$

$$X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha} \quad \text{if } \bar{\xi}_\alpha < \underline{\xi}_\alpha, \quad (4.13)$$

where $\underline{\xi}_\alpha = U(L - D_T)/\lambda_\alpha$, $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T} = U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)/\lambda_\alpha$ and λ_α is obtained by solving $E[X_T^{VaR}\xi_T] = x_0$.

ii) When $x_0 \geq x_0^5$

$$X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}}. \quad (4.14)$$

c) If $L > \widehat{D}_T$, the optimal solution to **Problem 2** is:

i) when $x_0^{min} \leq x_0 < x_0^6 := E[\xi_T(I(U'(L - D_T)\xi_T/\bar{\xi}_\alpha) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha}]$

$$X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\alpha} + L\mathbb{1}_{\underline{\xi}_\alpha \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha} + (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\bar{\xi}_\alpha \leq \xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}} \quad \text{if } \bar{\xi}_\alpha < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}, \quad (4.15)$$

$$X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\alpha} + L\mathbb{1}_{\underline{\xi}_\alpha \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha} \quad \text{if } \bar{\xi}_\alpha \geq \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}. \quad (4.16)$$

ii) When $x_0^{min} \leq x_0 < x_0^6 := E[\xi_T(I(U'(L - D_T)\xi_T/\bar{\xi}_\alpha) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha}]$

$$X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}}. \quad (4.17)$$

Remark 3. Note that when $L \leq \widehat{D}_T$, the VaR-constrained solution has a similar structure as the ES-constrained solution. Later on we will show that it is possible to establish the equivalence between a VaR constraint and an ES constraint when $L \leq \widehat{D}_T$. While $L > \widehat{D}_T$, the VaR-constrained solution is similar to Basak and Shapiro [2001] except for the worst financial states, and is significantly different than the ES-constrained solution.

5 Equivalence between an ES- and a VaR-constraint

Apparently, when the initial wealth is sufficiently high, the resulting constrained solution is identical to the unconstrained solution since then the ES or VaR constraint is always satisfied. As a consequence, there is a natural equivalence between the ES- and VaR-constrained solution for the “trivial” case. In this section we focus on the case in which the ES and the VaR constraint are binding, we find that ES and VaR can still lead to identical solutions.

Corollary 5.1. Assume $L \leq \widehat{D}_T$ in the optimization Problems 1 and 2:

- i) For each given α , there exists one $\epsilon(\alpha)$ such that $X_T^{VaR} = X_T^{ES}$.
- ii) For each given α , there exists one $\epsilon(\alpha)$ such that $\pi^{VaR} = \pi^{ES}$, where π^{VaR} and π^{ES} denote the optimal trading strategy, respectively.

Proof. Let us divide $L \leq \widehat{D}_T$ into two intervals: $L \leq D_T$ and $D_T < L < \widehat{D}_T$. We first consider the case when $L \leq D_T$.

The two-region solution (4.1) in this case in Theorem 4.1 is: $X_T^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T) \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon}$. The two-region solution (4.9) in this case in Theorem 4.2 is: $X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha}$. Clearly, the two solutions are identical if $\bar{\xi}_\alpha = \bar{\xi}_\epsilon$ and $\lambda_\alpha = \lambda_\epsilon$, where $\bar{\xi}_\alpha$ is defined through $P(\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha) = \alpha$ and $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon$ is defined through $E[\xi_T L \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\epsilon}] = \epsilon$. Therefore, for each given α , we first calculate $\bar{\xi}_\alpha$ and then set $\epsilon(\alpha) := E[\xi_T L \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha}]$. With the same initial wealth x_0 , we must have $\lambda_\alpha = \lambda_\epsilon$. Therefore, for each α , there exists one unique $\epsilon(\alpha)$ such that $X_T^{VaR} = X_T^{ES}$.

The three-region (4.2) solution in Theorem 4.1 is: $X^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T) \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi_\epsilon^{\bar{L}}} + L \mathbb{1}_{\xi_\epsilon^{\bar{L}} \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon}$, and $X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\bar{L}}} + L \mathbb{1}_{\xi^{\bar{L}} \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha}$ is the three-region solution (4.10) in Theorem 4.2. In addition, $\bar{\xi}_\alpha$ and $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon$ are defined in the same way as in the case of the two-region solution. $\xi^{\bar{L}}$ is defined as $U'(\tilde{L} - (D_T - L))/\lambda_\alpha$ and $\xi_\epsilon^{\bar{L}}$ is defined through $U'(\tilde{L} - (D_T - L))/\lambda_\epsilon$. We first calculate $\bar{\xi}_\alpha$ and choose $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon$ such that $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon(\alpha) = \bar{\xi}_\alpha$. With the same initial wealth x_0 , we know that $\lambda_\alpha = \lambda_\epsilon$, which implies that $\xi^{\bar{L}} = \xi_\epsilon^{\bar{L}}$. Hence, for each given α , there exists one $\epsilon(\alpha)$ such that $X_T^{VaR} = X_T^{ES}$. (4.3) and (4.11) are obviously equivalent with the same initial wealth.

As the financial market is complete, every contingent claim can be perfectly replicated with a unique self-financing portfolio. Therefore, we obtain that for each given α , there is one $\epsilon(\alpha)$ such that $\pi^{VaR} = \pi^{ES}$.

With a similar argument, we can show that the equivalence results also holds for $D_T < L \leq \widehat{D}_T$. \square

In the following, we give an example to show how to specifically compute the equivalent significance levels between VaR and ES. For simplicity, we consider a Black Scholes market with only one risky asset with constant drift μ and volatility σ and one risk free asset with a constant risk free rate r and a consequential constant market price of risk $\theta = (\mu - r)/\sigma$. The dynamic of the unique state price density ξ_t is assumed to be $d\xi_t = -r\xi_t dt - \theta\xi_t dW_t$, $\xi_0 = 1$, where W_t is the one-dimensional standard Brownian motion. Therefore, we have that $\xi_T = \exp(-(r + 0.5\theta^2)T - \theta W_T)$ and that $\xi_T \sim LN(-(r + 0.5\theta^2)T, \theta^2 T)$ is lognormally distributed.

For a given α , $P(\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha) = \alpha$ is equivalent to

$$P(\xi_T \leq \bar{\xi}_\alpha) = P\left(\frac{\ln(\xi_T) + (r + 0.5\theta^2)T}{\sqrt{T}\theta} \leq \frac{\ln(\bar{\xi}_\alpha) + (r + 0.5\theta^2)T}{\sqrt{T}\theta}\right) = 1 - \alpha.$$

Hence, $\bar{\xi}_\alpha = \exp(\Phi_{1-\alpha}^{-1}\sqrt{T}\theta - (r + 0.5\theta^2)T)$, where $\Phi_{1-\alpha}^{-1}$ is the quantile of a standard normal distribution at $1 - \alpha$. Next, we calculate the corresponding $\epsilon(\alpha)$. We have that

$$\epsilon(\alpha) = E[\xi_T L \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha}] = L \exp(-rT) \left(1 - \Phi\left(\Phi_{1-\alpha}^{-1} - \theta\sqrt{T}\right)\right).$$

By Corollary 5.1, we know that with a given α and the corresponding $\epsilon(\alpha)$, Problem 1 and Problem 2 have the same solution.

We establish the equivalence according to the following procedure: (a) We first obtain $\bar{\xi}_\alpha$ through $P(\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha) = \alpha$.³ (b) Then we calculate the corresponding $\epsilon(\alpha)$ by $\epsilon(\alpha) = E[\xi_T L \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha}]$. In other words, if we choose $\epsilon(\alpha)$ as determined in (b), we obtain $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon = \bar{\xi}_\alpha$.

Table 1 contains the parameter we use for numerical illustration.

D_T	g_t	μ	r	σ	T	γ
100	0.04	0.08	0.03	0.2	1	0.5

Table 1: We consider the power utility function: $U(x) = \frac{x^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma}$.

Table 2 contains some significance levels for VaR- and ES-constraint leading to the same portfolio choice. In the most extreme case, the portfolio insurance ($\alpha = 0$) is equivalent to $\epsilon = 0$.

VaR (α)	ES (% of initial wealth: ϵ/x_0)
0.5%	0.87%
1%	1.70%
5%	6.82%

Table 2: The equivalence between VaR and ES.

This table shows the equivalent expected shortfall as a percentage of the initial wealth with respect to a VaR constraint in non-concave optimization assuming $L = 0.9D_T$. Other parameters are taken from Table 1.

The above example illustrates how to obtain the equivalent ES constraint with respect to a VaR constraint such that the optimal terminal wealth stays unchanged assuming $L \leq \hat{D}_T$. This procedure is similar when starting with a given ES constraint. As the benchmark wealth is either deep in the money $X_T^B > \hat{D}_T$ or far out of money $X_T^B = 0$, when the regulatory threshold is below the tangent point \hat{D}_T , the financial institution is forced to reallocate the wealth distribution in the far out-of-money region in order to satisfy the constraint. Further, the optimal wealth with or without additional risk constraint in a non-concave environment always jumps to zero in the worst financial states. This enables us to calculate the probability of the severe loss and the magnitude of the expected significant loss at the same time. In addition, the worst financial

³Note that this procedure does not depend on ξ_T having a log-normal distribution but is the same for any complete financial market.

states are only determined by the given risk constraint (unlike the ES-solution in Basak and Shapiro [2001] and the ES-solution when $L > \widehat{D}_T$ in our model). Hence, with a given VaR constraint, there exists an ES constraint leading to the same optimal investment strategy in a non-concave maximization problem assuming $L \leq \widehat{D}_T$.

The non-concave investor in general shows a gambling-type behaviour. For instance, the benchmark (unconstrained) investor with an option-type payoff ends up either deep in the money or far out-of-money with 0 terminal wealth. The additional risk constraint diminishes the probability of a total loss but cannot always prevent a total loss from happening. In particular, the ES constraint shows the same regulatory effect as a VaR constraint. Hence, when the passive strategy which only invests the minimum amount needed to satisfy the risk constraint comes to force, we obtain the equivalence between a VaR constraint and an ES constraint and this equivalence further implies the ineffectiveness of an ES constraint in non-concave optimization.

If the regulatory threshold L is larger than \widehat{D}_T , the situation is different. As $\widehat{D}_T > D_T$, the regulatory threshold might be substantially larger than the debt level D_T . This case is less likely to occur in practice and implies a rather strict regulation. We know that the non-concave function we consider, is not globally concave but locally concave. The corresponding concave envelope coincides with the concave part of the initial non-concave utility function on the domain $X_T > \widehat{D}_T$. When the regulatory threshold L is set larger than \widehat{D}_T , the risk constraint largely affects the terminal wealth distribution in the concave part. In this sense, a strict regulator intervenes more in the financial institution's portfolio planning problem. Hence, when $L > \widehat{D}_T$, we observe a similar structure of the optimal solution as Basak and Shapiro [2001] except for the worst financial states.

In summary, we conclude that when $L \leq \widehat{D}_T$ an ES constraint has the same regulatory effect as a VaR constraint, and does not prevent a total loss in the worst financial states. When $L > \widehat{D}_T$, the concave part dominates the non-concave part in the problem, and consequently the regulatory constraint shows a similar effect as in the standard constrained concave optimization problem. Further, in none of the cases can the regulatory constraint prevent the non-concave investor's gambling behavior thoroughly but it does control the risky behavior of the investor to some extent.

Due to the equivalence result, we just plot the ES-constrained optimal wealth when $L \leq \widehat{D}_T$ in Figure 4, and Figure 5 plots both the VaR- and ES-constrained wealth when $L > \widehat{D}_T$. We can see from Figure 4(a), (b), (c) that in good financial states (small ξ_T) the constrained wealth is significantly lower than the benchmark wealth. This shows that the financial institution has sacrificed some benefits in the good financial states in order to satisfy the regulatory constraint by investing more in the bad financial states. The "sacrifice" is less obvious in Figure 4(d) and Figure 5. The reason is that the financial institution is wealthier (has more initial wealth) in these situations.





Figure 4: **Optimal terminal wealth under an ES constraint when $L \leq \hat{D}_T$.** This figure plots the constrained optimal three-region (a), (c) and the two-region wealth (b), (d), respectively. In (a) and (b) we assume ϵ to be 0.87% of the initial wealth $x_0 = 100$, which implies $\alpha = 0.5\%$ in the equivalent VaR-constraint. In (c) and (d) we assume that $L = 1.2D_T$ and $\epsilon = 0.98\%x_0$ which implies $\alpha = 0.5\%$ in the equivalent VaR-constraint. Further, we assume that the initial wealth $x_0 = 120$ in (c) and $x_0 = 200$ in (d). Other parameters are chosen according to Table 1.






Figure 5: **Optimal terminal wealth when $L > \hat{D}_T$.**

The figure plots the constrained optimal terminal wealth when $L > \hat{D}_T$. (a) corresponds to the four-region wealth under an ES constraint assuming ϵ is 1.04% of the initial wealth. (b) and (c) correspond to the three-region VaR-constrained wealth and four-region VaR-constrained wealth with $\alpha = 0.5\%$. Further, we assume that $L = 250$ in each case, $x_0 = 250$ in (a) and (b), and $x_0 = 600$ in (c). Note that in (c), the unconstrained solution jumps to zero with a probability which is already less than 0.06%. Other parameters are chosen according to Table 1.

6 The optimal trading strategy with a CRRA utility function

Heretofore, we solve the non-concave utility maximization problem with an ES or a VaR constraint in a complete market. We further establish the equivalence result between an ES and a VaR constraint assuming $L \leq \hat{D}_T$. In this section we provide the optimal trading strategy considering a CRRA utility function. Due to the equivalence result, we only compute the ES-constrained strategy when $L \leq \hat{D}_T$ while providing both VaR- and ES- constrained optimal strategies when $L > \hat{D}_T$. In addition, we use the benchmark strategy for comparison. For simplicity we consider the same Black Scholes market as in Table 1.

Proposition 6.1. The benchmark case

(a) At $t < T$, the optimal benchmark wealth is given by

$$X_t^B = (\lambda_B \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\xi^{\hat{D}_T} / \xi_t, \gamma)) + D_T \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi(j(\xi^{\hat{D}_T} / \xi_t)), \quad (6.1)$$

while the optimal benchmark strategy is given by

$$\pi_t^B = \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma} + \frac{\exp(-r(T-t))}{X_t^B} \left(\frac{\hat{D}_T \Phi'(j(\xi^{\hat{D}_T} / \xi_t))}{\sigma\sqrt{T-t}} - \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma} D_T \Phi(j(\xi^{\hat{D}_T} / \xi_t)) \right).$$

(b) When $t \rightarrow T$, then $\pi_t^B \rightarrow \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma} \left(\frac{X_T^B - D_T}{X_T^B} \right)$ if $\xi_t < \xi^{\hat{D}_T}$, and $\pi_t^B \rightarrow \infty$ if $\xi_t > \xi^{\hat{D}_T}$,

where $j(y) = \frac{\ln(y) + (r + 1/2\theta^2)(T-t)}{\theta\sqrt{T-t}} - \theta\sqrt{T-t}$, $j(y, c) = j(y) + \frac{1}{c}\theta\sqrt{T-t}$,

$\exp(v(\gamma)) = \exp\left(-\left(r + \theta^2/2\right)(T-t)(1 - 1/\gamma) + \frac{1}{2}\theta^2(1 - 1/\gamma)^2(T-t)\right)$, Φ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function and Φ' is the derivative function of Φ .

Proposition 6.2. The ES-constrained case

When $L \leq D_T$:

(a) At $t < T$, if $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon > \xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}}$, the optimal ES-constrained wealth is given by

$$X_t^{ES} = (\lambda_\epsilon \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}}/\xi_t, \gamma)) + D_T \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi(j(\xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}}/\xi_t)) \\ + L \exp(-r(T-t)) (\Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t)) - \Phi(j(\xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}}/\xi_t))),$$

while the optimal ES-constrained strategy is given by

$$\pi_t^{ES} = \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma} + \frac{\exp(-r(T-t))}{X_t^{ES}} \left\{ \frac{\tilde{L}\Phi'(j(\xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}}/\xi_t)) + L\Phi'(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t))}{\sigma\sqrt{T-t}} \right. \\ \left. - \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma} \left(D_T \Phi(j(\xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}}/\xi_t)) + L(\Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t)) - \Phi(j(\xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}}/\xi_t))) \right) \right\}.$$

(b) If $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_\epsilon^{\tilde{L}}$, the optimal wealth is given by

$$X_t^{ES} = (\lambda_\epsilon \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon, \gamma)) + D_T \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t)),$$

while the optimal ES-constrained strategy is given by

$$\pi_t^{ES} = \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma} + \frac{\exp(-r(T-t))}{X_t^{ES}} \left(\frac{\Phi'(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t))((\lambda_\epsilon \bar{\xi}_\epsilon)^{-1/\gamma} + D_T)}{\sigma\sqrt{T-t}} - \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma} D_T \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t)) \right).$$

When $D_T < L \leq \hat{D}_T$:

(a) At $t < T$, if $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon > \underline{\xi}_\epsilon$, the optimal ES-constrained wealth is given by

$$X_t^{ES} = (\lambda_\epsilon \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\epsilon, \gamma)) + D_T \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t)), \\ + L \exp(-r(T-t)) (\Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t)) - \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t))),$$

while the optimal ES-constrained strategy is given by

$$\pi_t^{ES} = \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma X_t^{ES}} (\lambda_\epsilon \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\epsilon, \gamma)) + \frac{L \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi'(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t))}{\sigma X_t^{ES} \sqrt{T-t}}.$$

(b) If $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \underline{\xi}_\epsilon$, the optimal wealth is given by

$$X_t^{ES} = (\lambda_\epsilon \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon, \gamma)) + D_T \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t)),$$

while the optimal ES-constrained strategy is given by

$$\pi_t^{ES} = \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma} + \frac{\exp(-r(T-t))}{X_t^{ES}} \left(\frac{\Phi'(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t))((\lambda_\epsilon \bar{\xi}_\epsilon)^{-1/\gamma} + D_T)}{\sigma\sqrt{T-t}} - \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma} D_T \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t)) \right).$$

When $L > \widehat{D}_T$:

(a) At $t < T$ the optimal ES-constrained wealth is given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^{ES} &= (\lambda_\epsilon \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t, \gamma)) + D_T \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t)) \\ &\quad + L \exp(-r(T-t)) (\Phi(j(\bar{\xi}/\xi_t)) - \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t))), \\ &\quad + ((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_\epsilon^2) \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) (\Phi(j(\xi_\epsilon^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t, \gamma)) - \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}/\xi_t, \gamma))) \\ &\quad + D_T \exp(-r(T-t)) (\Phi(j(\xi_\epsilon^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t)) - \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}/\xi_t))), \end{aligned}$$

while the optimal ES-constrained strategy is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_t^{ES} &= \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma X_t^{ES}} \exp(v(\gamma)) ((\lambda_\epsilon \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\epsilon/\xi_t, \gamma)) + ((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_\epsilon^2) \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} (\Phi(j(\xi_\epsilon^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t, \gamma)) - \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}/\xi_t, \gamma)))) \\ &\quad + \frac{\exp(-r(T-t))}{X_t^{ES} \sigma\sqrt{T-t}} (L \Phi'(j(\bar{\xi}/\xi_t)) + \widehat{D}_T (\Phi'(j(\xi_\epsilon^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t)) - \Phi'(j(\bar{\xi}/\xi_t)))). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 6.3. The VaR-constrained case

When $L > \widehat{D}_T$:

(a) At $t < T$, if $\bar{\xi}_\alpha < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}$, the optimal VaR-constrained wealth is given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^{VaR} &= (\lambda_\alpha \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\alpha/\xi_t, \gamma)) + D_T \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\alpha/\xi_t)) \\ &\quad + L \exp(-r(T-t)) (\Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\alpha/\xi_t)) - \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\alpha/\xi_t))) \\ &\quad + (\lambda_\alpha \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) (\Phi(j(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t, \gamma)) - \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\alpha/\xi_t, \gamma))) \\ &\quad + D_T \exp(-r(T-t)) (\Phi(j(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t)) - \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\alpha/\xi_t))), \end{aligned}$$

while the optimal VaR-constrained strategy is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_t^{VaR} &= \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma X_t^{VaR}} (\lambda_\alpha \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\alpha/\xi_t, \gamma)) + \frac{L \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi'(j(\bar{\xi}_\alpha/\xi_t))}{\sigma X_t^{VaR} \sqrt{T-t}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma X_t^{VaR}} (\lambda_\alpha \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) (\Phi(j(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t, \gamma)) - \Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\alpha/\xi_t, \gamma))) \\ &\quad + \frac{\widehat{D}_T \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi'(j(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t))}{\sigma X_t^{VaR} \sqrt{T-t}} - \frac{((\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha)^{-1/\gamma} + D_T) \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi'(j(\bar{\xi}_\alpha/\xi_t))}{\sigma X_t^{VaR} \sqrt{T-t}}. \end{aligned}$$

(b) If $\bar{\xi}_\alpha \geq \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}$, the optimal wealth is given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^{VaR} = & (\lambda_\alpha \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\alpha / \xi_t, \gamma)) + D_T \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\alpha / \xi_t)) \\ & + L \exp(-r(T-t)) (\Phi(j(\bar{\xi}_\alpha / \xi_t)) - \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\alpha / \xi_t))) \end{aligned}$$

while the optimal VaR-constrained strategy is given by

$$\pi_t^{VaR} = \frac{\theta}{\sigma \gamma X_t^{VaR}} (\lambda_\alpha \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\underline{\xi}_\alpha / \xi_t, \gamma)) + \frac{L \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi'(j(\bar{\xi}_\alpha / \xi_t))}{\sigma X_t^{VaR} \sqrt{T-t}}.$$

The above propositions are shown in the E-companion.

The pre-horizon optimal wealth in Figure 6(a) shows that the constrained wealth is below the benchmark wealth in very good financial states, but is larger than the benchmark wealth in most intermediate states, while ending up with zero as the benchmark wealth in the worst financial states. This implies that the regulatory constraint not only affects the terminal wealth distribution but also controls the risky behaviour in between. Hence, in general, the risk constraint will force the non-concave optimizer to insure at least the regulatory threshold in a large part of the intermediate financial states and reduce the probability that the worst loss happens.

Merton [1969] shows that a CRRA utility maximizer will hold a constant fraction invested in the risky asset assuming the price of the asset follows a geometric Brownian motion. The fraction invested in the risky asset can be seen as the volatility of the portfolio. We can see from Figure 6(b) that the volatility of the portfolio is mostly smaller than the Merton constant in the good and intermediate states but is far above the Merton constant in the worst financial states. This is because in the worst financial states, the financial institution reduces the risky asset in the portfolio. At the same time the value of the whole portfolio is decreasing in ξ_T and even faster than the value of the risky asset in the portfolio. Therefore, the fraction of the wealth invested in the risky asset tends to infinity in the worst financial states.

In addition, we also plot the relative risk exposure in Figure 6(c), which is defined as the volatility of the constrained portfolio divided by the volatility of the benchmark portfolio. We can see that in very good financial states (low ξ_T) the volatility of the constrained portfolio converges to the volatility of the benchmark portfolio. While in most financial states, the volatility of the constrained portfolio is far below the volatility of the benchmark portfolio. This implies that the risk constraint is effective to restrict the risky behavior of the non-concave optimizer.

Figure 7(e) plots the three-region solution in the case $L > \widehat{D}_T$, which preserves the same property as the case $L \leq \widehat{D}_T$ while the four-region VaR-constrained solution in Figure 7(f) is an exception. We can see that the VaR-constrained strategy is more risky than the benchmark strategy. The reason is that with the current parameters the probability of the benchmark

solution being zero is less than 0.06% which is even smaller than α . This case is only possible when both the regulatory threshold and the initial wealth level are very high. In this special case, the concave part of the utility dominates the non-concave part in the optimization problem. Hence, the relative risk exposure shows a similar shape as Basak and Shapiro [2001].




Figure 6: **Pre-horizon ES-constrained wealth, strategy and risk exposure when $L \leq D_T$.** This figure plots (a) the pre-horizon optimal wealth, (b) strategy π_t and (c) relative risk exposure under an ES constraint. We assume that $\epsilon = 0.87\%x_0$ which is equivalent to $\alpha = 0.005$. Other parameters are fixed as in Table 1. The horizontal line in (b) refers to the Merton constant $(\theta/\sigma\gamma)$.




Figure 7: **Pre-horizon VaR-constrained wealth, strategy and risk exposure when $L > \hat{D}_T$.**

This figure plots the relative risk exposure under a VaR constraint. We assume that $L = 250$ and $\alpha = 0.005$. Further, we assume that $x_0 = 250$ in (e), and $x_0 = 600$ in (f). Other parameters are fixed as in Table 1.

7 Conclusion

This paper studies the non-concave optimization with a VaR or an ES constraint, where the non-concavity in our setting is caused by the non-linear payoff to the optimizing economic agent. We solve this optimization problem analytically. Depending on the relationship between the regulatory threshold and the debt level, the structure of the solutions varies, which is different from the concave optimization with a VaR or an ES constraint. Generally speaking, the optimal solution to a non-concave optimization problem with or without risk constraints always has a region where the terminal wealth is zero and hence shows a gambling behavior in general, but the risk constraint does reduce the region where the gambling behavior occurs. Furthermore, we show that in most of the cases (i.e., when the regulatory threshold L is smaller than the tangent point \hat{D}_T of the debt level), a VaR and an ES constraint have the same regulatory effect and lead to the same terminal wealth and consequently identical investment behavior. The numerical analysis shows that the fraction invested in the risky asset of almost all constrained portfolios never surpasses the benchmark portfolio, while the volatility of both the constrained and unconstrained portfolio converges to infinity in the worst financial states. Therefore, we conclude that an ES and a VaR constraint have the same regulatory effect and to some extent control the risky behavior of the non-concave investor. However, they cannot prevent the gambling behavior completely. The equivalence between a VaR constraint and an ES constraint further implies the ineffectiveness of the ES-based regulation in non-concave optimization.

An interesting extension would be to analyse the non-concave optimization with multiple VaR or multiple ES constraints. Especially one could examine whether the equivalence result still holds in such a dynamic setting. Another relevant topic could be to design a more efficient risk measure for the non-concave investor. We will leave these topics for future research.

References

- Carlo Acerbi and Dirk Tasche. On the coherence of expected shortfall. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 26(7):1487–1503, 2002a.
- Carlo Acerbi and Dirk Tasche. Expected shortfall: a natural coherent alternative to value at risk. *Economic notes*, 31(2):379–388, 2002b.
- Carlo Acerbi, Claudio Nardio, and Carlo Sirtori. Expected shortfall as a tool for financial risk management. *arXiv preprint cond-mat/0102304*, 2001.
- John Armstrong and Damiano Brigo. Risk managing tail-risk seekers: Var and expected shortfall vs s-shaped utility. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 101:122–135, 2019a.
- John Armstrong and Damiano Brigo. Statistical arbitrage of coherent risk measures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.10015*, 2019b.
- Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, and David Heath. Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance*, 9(3):203–228, 1999.
- Suleyman Basak and Alexander Shapiro. Value-at-risk-based risk management: optimal policies and asset prices. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 14(2):371–405, 2001.
- Arjan B Berkelaar, Roy Kouwenberg, and Thierry Post. Optimal portfolio choice under loss aversion. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(4):973–987, 2004.
- Carole Bernard, Xiao Jiang, and Ruodu Wang. Risk aggregation with dependence uncertainty. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 54:93–108, 2014.
- Jennifer N Carpenter. Does option compensation increase managerial risk appetite? *The Journal of Finance*, 55(5):2311–2331, 2000.
- An Chen, Peter Hieber, and Thai Nguyen. Constrained non-concave utility maximization: An application to life insurance contracts with guarantees. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 273(3):1119–1135, 2019.
- James Ming Chen. Measuring market risk under the basel accords: Var, stressed var, and expected shortfall. *Stressed VaR, and Expected Shortfall (March 19, 2014)*, 8:184–201, 2014.
- Rama Cont, Romain Deguest, and Giacomo Scandolo. Robustness and sensitivity analysis of risk measurement procedures. *Quantitative Finance*, 10(6):593–606, 2010.
- Domenico Cuoco and Hong Liu. An analysis of var-based capital requirements. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 15(3):362–394, 2006.
- Domenico Cuoco, Hua He, and Sergei Isaenko. Optimal dynamic trading strategies with risk limits. *Operations Research*, 56(2):358–368, 2008.

- Min Dai, Steven Kou, Shuaijie Qian, and Xiangwei Wan. Non-concave utility maximization without the concavification principle. *Available at SSRN 3422276*, 2019.
- Jon Danielsson, Paul Embrechts, Charles Goodhart, Con Keating, Felix Muennich, Olivier Renault, Hyun Song Shin, et al. An academic response to basel ii. *Special Paper-LSE Financial Markets Group*, 2001.
- Yinghui Dong, Sang Wu, Wenxin Lv, and Guojing Wang. Optimal asset allocation for participating contracts under the var and pi constraint. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*, pages 1–26, 2019.
- Zaichao Du and Juan Carlos Escanciano. Backtesting expected shortfall: accounting for tail risk. *Management Science*, 63(4):940–958, 2016.
- Darrell Duffie and Jun Pan. An overview of value at risk. *Journal of Derivatives*, 4(3):7–49, 1997.
- Paul Embrechts, Giovanni Puccetti, and Ludger Rüschendorf. Model uncertainty and var aggregation. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 37(8):2750–2764, 2013.
- Paul Embrechts, Giovanni Puccetti, Ludger Rüschendorf, Ruodu Wang, and Antonela Beleraj. An academic response to basel 3.5. *Risks*, 2(1):25–48, 2014.
- Paul Embrechts, Bin Wang, and Ruodu Wang. Aggregation-robustness and model uncertainty of regulatory risk measures. *Finance and Stochastics*, 19(4):763–790, 2015.
- Laurent El Ghaoui, Maksim Oks, and Francois Oustry. Worst-case value-at-risk and robust portfolio optimization: A conic programming approach. *Operations research*, 51(4):543–556, 2003.
- Xue Dong He, Hanqing Jin, and Xun Yu Zhou. Dynamic portfolio choice when risk is measured by weighted var. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 40(3):773–796, 2015.
- Hanqing Jin and Xun Yu Zhou. Behavioral portfolio selection in continuous time. *Mathematical Finance: An International Journal of Mathematics, Statistics and Financial Economics*, 18(3):385–426, 2008.
- Steven Kou, Xianhua Peng, and Chris C Heyde. External risk measures and basel accords. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 38(3):393–417, 2013.
- Roy Kouwenberg and William T Ziemba. Incentives and risk taking in hedge funds. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 31(11):3291–3310, 2007.
- Hai Lan, Barry L Nelson, and Jeremy Staum. A confidence interval procedure for expected shortfall risk measurement via two-level simulation. *Operations Research*, 58(5):1481–1490, 2010.

Robert C Merton. Lifetime portfolio selection under uncertainty: The continuous-time case. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, pages 247–257, 1969.

Thai Nguyen and Mitja Stadje. Optimal investment for participating insurance contracts under var-regulation. *Journal on Control and Optimization (forthcoming)*, 2020.

Christian Reichlin. Non-concave utility maximization with a given pricing measure. *Available at SSRN 1940277*, 2011.

R Tyrrell Rockafellar and Stanislav Uryasev. Optimization of conditional value-at-risk. *Journal of risk*, 2:21–42, 2000.

Zhen Shi and Bas JM Werker. Short-horizon regulation for long-term investors. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 36(12):3227–3238, 2012.

Pengyu Wei. Risk management with weighted var. *Mathematical Finance*, 28(4):1020–1060, 2018.

Johanna F Ziegel. Coherence and elicibility. *Mathematical Finance*, 26(4):901–918, 2016.

A E-companion to “On the Equivalence between Value-at-Risk and Expected Shortfall in non-concave Optimization”

A.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1

Proof. For a fixed and positive y , we have that $c(y) := U(x(y) - d) - U'(x(y) - d)x(y) = U(I(\lambda y)) - \lambda y I(\lambda y) - \lambda y d$ since $U'(x(y) - d) \equiv \lambda y$ holds for the conjugate function, denoting by I the inverse function of the first derivative of U . Since the utility function is defined on the positive real line and therefore $c(y)$ is a decreasing function in y . The first statement in Lemma 3.1 follows. Next we prove the third and the fourth statement in Lemma 3.1.

Let $I(\lambda y) = z$ and rewrite $c(y)$ as $U(z) - U'(z)z - U'(z)d$. From the Inada and the AE condition we have that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} U(z) - U'(z)z - U'(z)d = \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} U(z) \left(1 - \frac{U'(z)z}{U(z)} \right) - U'(z)d > 0, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} U(z) - U'(z)z - U'(z)d = \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} U(z) \left(1 - \frac{U'(z)z}{U(z)} \right) - U'(z)d < 0. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

In addition, $c(y)$ is a continuous function and hence by the intermediate value theorem for each positive d , $c(y)$ has a zero root. Hence, the third statement in Lemma 3.1 follows.

We have $\partial c^*(y)/\partial y = \lambda(\frac{\lambda y}{\lambda} - x)$ but the monotonicity of the function in y is not clear. We know that there is a one-to-one relationship between x and y in the conjugate function through

$x = I(\lambda y) + d$. We can see that when $s < 0$, $\lambda(\frac{\lambda_2 l}{\lambda} - x) = \lambda(s - I(\lambda y)) < 0$. Therefore, h is a decreasing function in y . We can write the conjugate function as $U(I(\lambda y)) - \lambda y(I(\lambda y) - s)$. It follows from the fourth statement in Lemma 3.1 that $c^*(y)$ has a unique zero root. Hence, we proved the fourth statement in Lemma 3.1. \square

For the convenience of the later proof, we formulate the following lemma.

Lemma A.1.

Defining a new conjugate function $c_\nu(y) := \sup_{x>d} \{U(x+d) - x\lambda y\} = U(x(y)+d) - U'(x(y)+d)x(y) = U(I(\lambda y)) - \lambda y I(\lambda y) + \lambda y d$, $c_\nu(y)$ decreases on $(0, U'(d)/\lambda)$, increases on $(U'(d)/\lambda, \infty)$ and hence has the minimum value $U(d)$.

Proof. It is $\partial c_\nu(y)/\partial y = -\lambda x$, and $x \equiv I(\lambda y) - d$ holds for the conjugate function $c_\nu(y)$. Therefore, $x > 0$ if $y < U'(d)/\lambda$ and vice versa since I is a strictly decreasing function in y . Hence, $c_\nu(y)$ is a decreasing function in y when $y < U'(d)/\lambda$ and reverses to an increasing function in y when $y > U'(d)/\lambda$. Thus, the conjugate function obtains its minimum conjugate at $y = U'(d)/\lambda$ which is $U(d)$. We proved Lemma A.1. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Proof. $L \leq D_T$

We know that when the initial wealth is large enough ($x_0 \geq x_0^1$) the optimal solution (4.3) coincides with the benchmark solution.

In the following we consider the case $x_0^{min} \leq x_0 < x_0^1$. We use the point-wise Lagrangian technique to prove this theorem. First, we show that (4.1) and (4.2) are the argmax of the corresponding static Lagrangian. Due to Lemma A.2 we can choose two Lagrangian multipliers to satisfy the budget constraint and the ES-constraint jointly. The static Lagrangian is

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(X_T) &= U((X_T - D_T)^+) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T X_T - \lambda_2 \xi_T (L - X_T) \mathbb{1}_{X_T < L} \\ &= \begin{cases} U(X_T - D_T) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T X_T & \text{if } X_T > D_T, \\ -\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T X_T - \lambda_2 \xi_T (L - X_T) \mathbb{1}_{X_T < L} & \text{if } 0 \leq X_T \leq D_T. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The Lagrangian is a function with two parts. The first part attains its maximum at $I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T$. The second part is a negative affine function and obtains its maximum values at 0 or at the jump point L since $\lambda_2 < \lambda_\epsilon$. Further, we have $\phi(0) = -\lambda_2 \xi_T L > \phi(L) = -\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T L$. Therefore, 0 is the local maximizer of the second part. Moreover, we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(0) &= U(I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T)) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T D_T + \lambda_2 \xi_T L \\ &= \max_{X_T} \left\{ U(X_T - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T + \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_\epsilon} L \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Lemma 3.1 gives the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of the zero root of (A.3). In addition, when $L \leq D_T$, we have that $\lambda_\epsilon(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_\epsilon}L - D_T) < \lambda_\epsilon(L - D_T) \leq 0$. Therefore, if $\lambda_2 < \lambda_\epsilon$, there is a zero root of (A.3).

In particular, when λ_2 tends to 0, (A.3) uniformly converges to $\max_{X_T}\{U(X_T - D_T) - X_T\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T\}$ (whose zero root is $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}$) on each compact set, and thus the zero root of (A.3) converges to $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}$. When λ_2 tends to λ_ϵ , (A.3) uniformly converges to $\max_{X_T}\{U(X_T - D_T) - X_T\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T + \lambda_\epsilon\xi_T L\}$ (whose zero root is $\xi^{\bar{L}}$), and the zero root of (A.3) converges to $\xi^{\bar{L}}$. Note that if $x_0 \geq x_0^1$, (4.3) is the optimal solution meaning that $x_0 = E[\xi_T(I(U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)\xi_T/\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}}] \geq x_0^1 = E[\xi_T(I(U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)\xi_T/\bar{\xi}_\epsilon) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon}]$. This further implies $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T} \geq \bar{\xi}_\epsilon$. On the contrary, $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon > \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}$ when $x_0 < x_0^1$. Hence, if $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi^{\bar{L}}$, λ_2 is chosen such that $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon$ is the zero root of (A.3). Thus, we proved that (4.1) is the argmax of the static Lagrangian.

In the case $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon > \xi^{\bar{L}}$, we set $\lambda_2 = \lambda_\epsilon$. Then, the affine part of the Lagrangian is constant on $X_T < L$. This means that both L and 0 can be the local maximizer in the affine part. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(I(\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(L) &= U(I(\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T)) - \lambda_\epsilon\xi_T I(\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T) - \lambda_\epsilon\xi_T D_T + \lambda_\epsilon\xi_T L \\ &= \max_{X_T}\{U(X_T - D_T) - X_T\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T + \lambda_\epsilon\xi_T L\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

We know from Lemma 3.1 that (A.4) has a unique zero root which is denoted by $\xi_\epsilon^{\bar{L}}$. Hence, (4.2) is the argmax of the Lagrangian.

$L > D_T$

We know that when x_0 is large enough ($L > \widehat{D}_T$ and $x_0 \geq x_0^2$ or $D_T < L \leq \widehat{D}_T$ and $x_0 \geq x_0^3$) the optimal solution (4.6) coincides with the benchmark solution. In the following we consider the case when the optimal solution does not coincide with the benchmark solution.

By Lemma A.2 we can choose two Lagrangian multipliers λ_ϵ and λ_2^ϵ to satisfy two constraints jointly. The static Lagrangian is

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(X_T) &= U((X_T - D_T)^+) - \lambda_\epsilon\xi_T X_T - \lambda_2^\epsilon\xi_T(L - X_T)\mathbb{1}_{X_T < L} \\ &= \begin{cases} U(X_T - D_T) - \lambda_\epsilon\xi_T X_T & \text{if } L < X_T, \\ U(X_T - D_T) - \lambda_\epsilon\xi_T X_T - \lambda_2^\epsilon\xi_T(L - X_T) & \text{if } D_T < X_T \leq L, \\ -\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T X_T - \lambda_2^\epsilon\xi_T(L - X_T) & \text{if } 0 \leq X_T \leq D_T. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We first prove that the solutions given by Theorem 4.1 are the argmax of Lagrangian in the respective cases.

The Lagrangian has four possible local maximizers: $I(\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T) + D_T$ on the first part, $I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon)\xi_T) + D_T$ or the jump point L on the second part, 0 on the third part.

If $\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon$ we have that $I(\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T) + D_T > L$, and the Lagrangian increases continuously from D_T to $I(\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T) + D_T$ except possibly at L and decreases from then on. If $\xi_T \geq \bar{\xi}_\epsilon$, we have that $I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon)\xi_T) + D_T < L$. The Lagrangian increases continuously from D_T to $I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon)\xi_T) + D_T$

and decreases from then on except possibly at the jump point L .

By Lemma 3.1 we know that on $\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon$,

$$\phi(I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(L) = U(I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T)) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T (L - D_T) - U(L - D_T) > 0,$$

and on $\xi_T \geq \bar{\xi}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi(I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(L) \\ &= U(I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T)) - (\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T) - (\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T D_T \\ & \quad + (\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T L - U(L - D_T) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $\underline{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}$, we have that $I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T \leq L < I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T) + D_T$, and the Lagrangian increases from D_T to the jump point L and decreases from then on. Hence, L is the maximizer.

Therefore, the maximizer X'_T of the Lagrangian defined on $X_T > D_T$ is

$$X'_T = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T) \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon} + L \mathbb{1}_{\underline{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}} + (I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T) + D_T) \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T \geq \bar{\xi}}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Next, we only need to compare the maximum given by (A.5) with $\phi(0)$ in different regions to determine the global maximizer.

On $\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(0) &= U(I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T)) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T D_T + \lambda_2^\epsilon \xi_T L \\ &= \max_{X_T} \left\{ U(X_T - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T + \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T \frac{\lambda_2^\epsilon}{\lambda_\epsilon} L \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Lemma 3.1 provides the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of the zero root of (A.6). Denoting the zero root as ξ^1 and we have that $I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T$ is the global maximizer if $\omega \in \{\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon\} \cap \{\xi_T < \xi^1\}$.

Similarly on $\underline{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}$, we have that $\phi(L) - \phi(0) = U(L - D_T) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T L + \lambda_2^\epsilon \xi_T L$ and $\xi^2 = U(L - D_T)/(\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) L$ is the zero root. Therefore, if $\omega \in \{\underline{\xi}_\epsilon < \xi_T < \bar{\xi}\} \cap \{\xi_T < \xi^2\}$, L is the global maximizer.

Further, on $\xi_T \geq \bar{\xi}$, we get that $\phi(I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(0) = U(I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T)) - (\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T) - (\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T D_T$ of which the zero root is $\xi_\epsilon^{\hat{D}_T}$. Hence, if $\omega \in \{\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\epsilon\} \cap \{\xi_T < \xi_\epsilon^{\hat{D}_T}\}$, $I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon) \xi_T) + D_T$ is the global maximizer. In any other case, 0 is the global maximizer.

For the sake of clarity, we formulate a table of all the important values of ξ_T .

$\underline{\xi}_\epsilon :=$ $U'(L - D_T)/\lambda_\epsilon$	$\bar{\xi}_\epsilon :=$ $U'(L - D_T)/(\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon)$	$\xi^{\hat{D}_T} :=$ $U'(\hat{D}_T - D_T)/\lambda_\epsilon$
$\xi^1 :=$ zero root of (A.6)	$\xi^2 :=$ $U(L - D_T)/L(\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon)$	$\xi_\epsilon^{\hat{D}_T} :=$ $U'(\hat{D}_T - D_T)/(\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon)$

The utility function is concave on $x > D_T$. Assuming $L > \widehat{D}_T$ we have that $\xi^1 > \xi^{\widehat{D}_T} > \underline{\xi}_\epsilon$, $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T} > \bar{\xi}$ and $\xi^2 > \bar{\xi}$. This implies that $\{\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon\} \cap \{\xi_T < \xi^1\} = \{\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon\}$, $\{\underline{\xi}_\epsilon < \xi_T < \bar{\xi}\} \cap \{\xi_T < \xi^2\} = \{\underline{\xi}_\epsilon < \xi_T < \bar{\xi}\}$, and $\{\xi_T > \bar{\xi}\} \cap \{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}\} = \{\xi^{\widehat{D}_T} > \xi_T > \bar{\xi}\}$. Therefore, (4.7) is the argmax of the Lagrangian in this case.

If $L \leq \widehat{D}_T$, we have that $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T} < \bar{\xi}$. Hence, $\{\xi_T > \bar{\xi}\} \cap \{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}\} = \emptyset$, and then $I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon)\xi_T) + D_T$ cannot be the maximizer.

In addition, we know that $\xi^1 > \xi^2$ holds because

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= U(L - D_T) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi^2 L + \lambda_2 \xi^2 L \\ &= \max_{X_T} \left\{ U(X_T - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\epsilon \xi^1 + \lambda_\epsilon \xi^1 \frac{\lambda_2^\epsilon}{\lambda_\epsilon} L \right\} > U(L - D_T) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi^1 L + \lambda_2 \xi^1 L. \end{aligned}$$

If $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon$, λ_2^ϵ is chosen such that $\xi^1 = \bar{\xi}_\epsilon$. If $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon \geq \underline{\xi}_\epsilon$, λ_2^ϵ is chosen such that $\xi^2 = \bar{\xi}_\epsilon$. We have proved that (4.4) and (4.5) are the argmax of the Lagrangian, respectively.

Now we show that Theorem 4.1 is the optimal solution. Suppose there exists another feasible solution Y_T . Consider

$$\begin{aligned} & E[U((X_T^{ES} - D_T)^+)] - E[U((Y_T - D_T)^+)] \\ &= E[(U(X_T^{ES} - D_T)^+) - U((Y_T - D_T)^+)] - \lambda_\epsilon x_0 + \lambda_\epsilon x_0 - \lambda_2 \epsilon + \lambda_2 \epsilon \\ &\geq E[(U(X_T^{ES} - D_T)^+) - U((Y_T - D_T)^+)] - E[\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T X_T^{ES}] + E[\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T Y_T] \quad (A.7) \\ &\quad - E[\lambda_2 \xi_T (L - X_T^{ES}) \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES} < L}] + E[\lambda_2 \xi_T (L - Y_T) \mathbb{1}_{Y_T < L}] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= E[\max_{X_T} \{U((X_T - D_T)^+) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T X_T - \lambda_2 \xi_T (L - X_T) \mathbb{1}_{X_T < L}\}] \\ &\quad - E[U((Y_T - D_T)^+) - \lambda_\epsilon \xi_T Y_T - \lambda_2 \xi_T (L - Y_T) \mathbb{1}_{Y_T < L}] \geq 0. \quad (A.8) \end{aligned}$$

The inequality (A.7) holds because the optimal solution satisfies both constraints with equality. The last inequality (A.8) is due to the fact that the optimal solution is the argmax of the static Lagrangian. The proof is complete. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Proof. $L \leq D_T$

We know that when the initial wealth is large enough ($x_0 \geq x_0^A$) the optimal solution (4.11) coincides with the benchmark solution. In the following we focus on the case when $x_0^{min} \leq x_0 < x_0^A$. We use the point-wise static Lagrangian technique. We first show that (4.9) and (4.10) are the argmax of the static Lagrangian in different cases. By Lemma A.2 we use two positive Lagrangian multipliers λ_α and $\tilde{\lambda}_2$ to capture the initial wealth constraint and the VaR constraint, respectively.

Case 1: $\xi^L \geq \bar{\xi}_\alpha$

In this case, we want to show the argmax of the static Lagrangian is (4.9). The static Lagrangian

is

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(X_T) &= U((X_T - D_T)^+) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T X_T - \tilde{\lambda}_2 \mathbb{1}_{X_T < L} \\ &= \begin{cases} U(X_T - D_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T X_T & \text{if } X_T > D_T, \\ -\lambda_\alpha \xi_T X_T - \tilde{\lambda}_2 \mathbb{1}_{X_T < L} & \text{if } 0 \leq X_T \leq D_T, \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_2 = -(U(I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha)) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha D_T)$.

Note that if $x_0 \geq x_0^4$, (4.11) is the optimal solution meaning that $x_0 = E[\xi_T(I(U'(\hat{D}_T - D_T)\xi_T/\xi^{\hat{D}_T}) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\hat{D}_T}}] \geq x_0^4 = E[\xi_T(I(U'(\hat{D}_T - D_T)\xi_T/\bar{\xi}_\alpha) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha}]$. This further implies $\xi^{\hat{D}_T} \geq \bar{\xi}_\alpha$. Therefore, $\bar{\xi}_\alpha > \xi^{\hat{D}_T}$ when $x_0 < x_0^4$, and hence $\tilde{\lambda}_2$ is positive by Lemma 3.1.

The first part of the Lagrangian attains its maximum $U(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T)) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T D_T$ at $I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T$. The second part may attain its maximum value $-\tilde{\lambda}_2$ at 0 or $-\lambda_\alpha \xi_T L$ at the jump point L .

We search the global maximum of the Lagrangian through comparing the local maximums. We first compare $\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)$ and $\phi(L)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(L) &= U(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T)) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T D_T + \lambda_\alpha \xi_T L \\ &= \max_{X_T} \{U(X_T - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\alpha \xi_T + \lambda_\alpha \xi_T L\}.\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.9})$$

By Lemma 3.1, (A.9) has a unique zero root which is obtained by $\xi^{\tilde{L}} = U'(\tilde{L} - (D_T - L))/\lambda_\alpha$. \tilde{L} is the corresponding tangent point with respect to $D_T - L$. Further, $\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D) > \phi(L)$ in the region $\xi_T < \xi^{\tilde{L}}$ as Lemma 3.1 gives that the conjugate function is a decreasing function of ξ_T .

In addition, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(0) &= U(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T D_T + \tilde{\lambda}_2 \\ &= U(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T D_T - (U(I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha)) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha D_T) \\ &= \max_{X_T} \{U(X_T - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\alpha \xi_T\} - \max_{X_T} \{U(X_T - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha\}.\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.10})$$

From Lemma 3.1, we know that (A.10) is positive in the region $\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha$ and negative otherwise. We only need to compare $\phi(0)$ and $\phi(L)$ in the region $\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(0) - \phi(L) &= -\tilde{\lambda}_2 + \lambda_\alpha \xi_T L \\ &= (U(I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha)) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha D_T) + \lambda_\alpha \xi_T L \\ &> (U(I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha)) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha D_T) + \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha L \\ &= \max_{X_T} \{U(X_T - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha + \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha L\} > 0.\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds because of Lemma 3.1 and $\bar{\xi}_\alpha < \xi^{\tilde{L}}$. Thus, we have proved that (4.9) is the global maximizer in this case.

Case 2: $\xi^{\tilde{L}} < \bar{\xi}_\alpha$

In this case, we want to show that the argmax of the static Lagrangian is (4.10).

The static Lagrangian is

$$\phi(X_T) = \begin{cases} U(X_T - D_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T X_T & \text{if } X_T > D_T, \\ -\lambda_\alpha \xi_T X_T - \lambda_\alpha^2 \mathbb{1}_{X_T < L} & \text{if } 0 \leq X_T \leq D_T, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_2 = \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha L$.

Again the first part attains its maximum $U(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T)) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T D_T$ at $I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T$. The second part may attain its maximum value $-\tilde{\lambda}_2$ at 0 or $-\lambda_\alpha \xi_T L$ at the jump point L .

We know from (A.9) that $\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) > \phi(L)$ in the region $\xi_T < \xi^{\tilde{L}}$. Moreover, $\phi(L) - \phi(0) = \lambda_\alpha (\bar{\xi}_\alpha - \xi_T) L > 0$ in the region $\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha$. Therefore, (4.10) is the global maximizer of the static Lagrangian.

Remark 4. $L = D_T$ implies that $\xi^{\tilde{L}}$ is ∞ . Hence, this case is naturally nested in the case $\xi^{\tilde{L}} > \bar{\xi}_\alpha$.

$L > D_T$

We know that when the initial wealth is large enough ($x_0 > x_0^5$) the optimal solution (4.17) coincides with the benchmark solution. In the following we consider the case when $x_0^{\min} \leq x_0 < x_0^5$. We first prove that (4.15) and (4.16) are the argmax of the Lagrangian respectively. By Lemma A.2 we can choose two positive Lagrangian multipliers λ_α and $\tilde{\lambda}_2$ to satisfy the initial wealth constraint and the VaR constraint jointly.

Case 1: $\bar{\xi}_\alpha < \xi^{\hat{D}_T}$

The static Lagrangian is,

$$\phi(X) = \begin{cases} U(X_T - D_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T X_T - \tilde{\lambda}_2 \mathbb{1}_{X_T < L} & \text{if } X_T > D_T, \\ -\lambda_\alpha \xi_T X_T - \tilde{\lambda}_2 & \text{if } 0 \leq X_T \leq D_T, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_2 = U(I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha)) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha) + \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha (L - D_T) - U(L - D_T)$. $\tilde{\lambda}_2$ is non-negative by the third statement in Lemma 3.1.

The first part of the static Lagrangian obtains its local maximums $\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)$ at $I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T$ or $\phi(L)$ at the jump point L . The second part obtains its local maximum $\phi(0)$ at 0 since it is a negative affine function.

If $\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\alpha$, we know from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(L) &= U(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T)) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + \lambda_\alpha \xi_T (L - D_T) - U(L - D_T) \\ &= \max_{X_T} \{U(X_T + L - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\alpha \xi_T\} - U(L - D_T) > 0.\end{aligned}$$

In addition, since $\underline{\xi}_\alpha < \bar{\xi}_\alpha < \xi^{\hat{D}_T}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(0) &= U(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T)) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T D_T + \tilde{\lambda}_2 \\ &= \max_{X_T} \{U(X_T - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\alpha \xi_T\} + \tilde{\lambda}_2 > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, in this region $I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T$ is the global maximizer.

If $\xi_T > \underline{\xi}_\alpha$, then on $\underline{\xi}_\alpha < \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(L) &= U(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T)) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T D_T - \tilde{\lambda}_2 - U(L - D_T) + \lambda_\alpha \xi_T L \\ &= \max_{X_T} \{U(X_T + L - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\alpha \xi_T\} - \max_{X_T} \{U(X_T + L - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha\} < 0.\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, $\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(L)$ is larger than 0. Moreover, assuming $\bar{\xi}_\alpha < \xi^{\hat{D}_T}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(L) - \phi(0) &= U(L - D_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T L + \tilde{\lambda}_2 \\ &= U(I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha)) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha) + \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha (L - D_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T L \\ &> U(I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha)) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha I(\lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha) + \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha (L - D_T) - \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha L \\ &= \max_{X_T} \{U(X_T - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\alpha \xi_T\} > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, L is the global maximizer on $\underline{\xi}_\alpha < \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha$.

In addition, $\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(0) = U(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T)) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T D - \tilde{\lambda}_2 + \tilde{\lambda}_2 = \max_{X_T} \{U(X_T - D_T) - X_T \lambda_\alpha \xi_T\} > 0$ on $\bar{\xi}_\alpha < \xi_T < \xi^{\hat{D}_T}$. Thus, (4.15) is the argmax of the static Lagrangian in Case 1.

Case 2: $\bar{\xi}_\alpha > \xi^{\hat{D}_T}$

The static Lagrangian is

$$\phi(X) = \begin{cases} U(X_T - D_T) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T X_T - \tilde{\lambda}_2 \mathbb{1}_{X_T < L} & \text{if } X_T > D_T, \\ -\lambda_\alpha \xi_T X_T - \tilde{\lambda}_2 & \text{if } 0 \leq X_T \leq D_T, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_2 = \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha L - U(L - D_T)$.

$\tilde{\lambda}_2$ is non-negative because the utility function is always dominated by the tangent line which intersects the origin and the corresponding tangent point. Therefore, we have $U(L - D_T) <$

$\lambda_\alpha \xi^{\widehat{D}_T} L < \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha L$ assuming $\bar{\xi}_\alpha > \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}$. Hence, $\tilde{\lambda}_2 > 0$.

The static Lagrangian can attain its local maximums at $I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T$, or at L or 0 . We compare the differences of the local maximum values to locate the global maximizer.

We have that $\phi(L) - \phi(0) = (\bar{\xi}_\alpha - \xi_T) \lambda_\alpha L > 0$ on $\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha$. If $\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha$, $\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D) - \phi(L) < \lambda_\alpha (\xi_T - \bar{\xi}_\alpha) L < 0$ holds on $\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha$. In addition, $\phi(0) > \phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)$ holds on $\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha$ assuming $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T} < \bar{\xi}_\alpha$. Thus, we have proved that (4.16) is the argmax of the Lagrangian.

Now we show that Theorem 4.2 indeed gives the optimal solution. Suppose there exists another feasible solution Y_T . We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E[U((X_T^{VaR} - D_T)^+)] - E[U((Y_T - D_T)^+)] \\
&= E[U((X_T^{VaR} - D_T)^+)] - E[U((Y_T - D_T)^+)] - \lambda_\alpha x_0 + \lambda_\alpha x_0 - \tilde{\lambda}_2 \alpha + \tilde{\lambda}_2 \alpha \\
&\geq E[U((X_T^{VaR} - D_T)^+)] - E[U((Y_T - D_T)^+)] - E[\lambda_\alpha \xi_T X_T^{VaR}] + E[\lambda_\alpha \xi_T Y_T] \\
&\quad - E[\tilde{\lambda}_2 \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{VaR} < L}] + E[\tilde{\lambda}_2 \mathbb{1}_{Y_T < L}] \\
&= E[\max_{X_T} \{U((X_T - D_T)^+) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T X_T - \tilde{\lambda}_2 \mathbb{1}_{X_T < L}\}] \\
&\quad - E[U((Y_T - D_T)^+) - \lambda_\alpha \xi_T Y_T - \tilde{\lambda}_2 \mathbb{1}_{Y_T < L}] \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Theorem 4.2 is proved. \square

A.4 Proof of Proposition 6.1

Proof. The optimal terminal wealth is given by Theorem 3.1, which is $X_T^B = (I(\lambda_B \xi_T) + D_T) \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}}$. We know that $\xi_T X_T^B$ is a P-martingale. Hence, we have that

$$X_t^B = E \left[\frac{\xi_T}{\xi_t} X_T^B | \mathcal{F}_t \right].$$

In addition, we know that $\frac{\xi_T}{\xi_t}$ is log-normally distributed. To be more precise,

$$\frac{\xi_T}{\xi_t} = \exp(-(r + \theta^2/2)(T - t) - \theta(W_T - W_t)) \sim LN(-(r + \theta^2/2)(T - t), \theta^2(T - t)).$$

We consider the power utility function $\frac{x^{1-\gamma}}{1-\gamma}$. Therefore, the inverse function of U' is $x^{-1/\gamma}$. Based on these observations, we have the following

$$\begin{aligned}
X_t^B &= E \left[(\lambda_B \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \left(\frac{\xi_T}{\xi_t} \right)^{1-1/\gamma} \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}} | \mathcal{F}_t \right] + D_T \cdot E \left[\frac{\xi_T}{\xi_t} \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}} | \mathcal{F}_t \right] \\
&= (\lambda_B \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(j(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t, \gamma)) + D_T \cdot \exp(-(r(T - t))) \Phi(j(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t)).
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 5. $\left(\frac{\xi_T}{\xi_t}\right)^{1-1/\gamma}$ is log-normally distributed, namely

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{\xi_T}{\xi_t}\right)^{1-1/\gamma} &= \exp(-(r + \theta^2/2)(T-t)(1-1/\gamma) - \theta(1-1/\gamma)(W_T - W_t)) \\ &\sim LN(-(r + \theta^2/2)(T-t)(1-1/\gamma), \theta^2(1-1/\gamma)^2(T-t)).\end{aligned}$$

Remark 6. For a log-normally distributed random variable $Y \sim LN(\mu, \sigma^2)$, the expectation $E[Y \mathbb{1}_{a < Y < b}]$ is given by $\exp(\mu + 1/2\sigma^2)(\Phi(j(b)) - \Phi(j(a)))$, where Φ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function and $j(x) = \frac{\ln(x) - (\mu + \sigma^2)}{\sigma}$.

Remark 7. In a two-asset Black Scholes model, the dynamic of the wealth process is given by

$$dX_t = (r + \pi_t(\mu - r))X_t dt + \pi_t \sigma X_t dW_t, \quad X_0 = x_0.$$

Using Remark 5 and Remark 6, we obtain (6.1). Next, we apply Itô's lemma to obtain the optimal strategy. We omit the term corresponding to dt and just focus on the term with respect to dW_t . We have then that

$$\begin{aligned}dX_t^B &= \dots dt + \left(\frac{\theta}{\gamma} (\lambda_B \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(x(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t, \gamma)) \right. \\ &\quad + (\lambda_B \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi'(x(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t, \gamma)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}} \\ &\quad \left. + D_T \cdot \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi'(x(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}} \right) dW_t \\ &= \dots dt + \left(\frac{\theta}{\gamma} (\lambda_B \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi(x(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t, \gamma)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \widehat{D}_T \cdot \exp(-r(T-t)) \Phi'(x(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}} \right) dW_t.\end{aligned}$$

The following remark will be useful.

Remark 8. If $Y \sim LN(\mu, \sigma^2)$, then $Y^{1-1/\gamma} \sim LN((1-1/\gamma)\mu, (1-1/\gamma)^2\sigma^2)$ with a positive γ . For a positive λ

$$(\lambda Y)^{-1/\gamma} \exp((1-1/\gamma)\mu + 1/2(1-1/\gamma)^2\sigma^2) = \frac{\Phi'(j(b))}{\Phi'(j(b)) + 1/\gamma\sigma} \exp(-r(T-t))(\lambda b)^{-1/\gamma},$$

where $j(b)$ is defined in Remark 6.

With Remark 8, we can get the following equation

$$(\lambda_B \xi_t)^{-1/\gamma} \exp(v(\gamma)) \Phi'(x(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t, \gamma)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}} = (\lambda_B \xi^{\widehat{D}_T})^{-1/\gamma} \Phi'(x(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}} \exp(-r(T-t)).$$

By the definition of $\xi^{\widehat{D}_T} := U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)/\lambda$, we have that $(\lambda_B \xi^{\widehat{D}_T})^{-1/\gamma} = \widehat{D}_T - D_T$. Therefore,

we can obtain the term which corresponds above to the diffusion part,

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_t^B &= \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma}(\lambda_B\xi_t)^{-1/\gamma}\exp(v(\gamma))\Phi(x(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t, \gamma)) + \frac{\widehat{D}_T}{\sigma} \cdot \exp(-r(T-t))\Phi'(x(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t))\frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}} \\ &= \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma}X_t^B + \frac{\exp(-r(T-t))}{\sigma\sqrt{T-t}}\widehat{D}_T\Phi'(x(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t)) - \frac{\theta}{\sigma\gamma}D_T \cdot \exp(-r(T-t))\Phi(x(\xi^{\widehat{D}_T}/\xi_t)).\end{aligned}$$

The last equation holds by rearranging the first term and making the dependence of the strategy on X_t^B explicit. We make use of the following remark to explain the last argument in Proposition 6.1.

Remark 9. $Y \sim LN(\mu, \sigma^2)$, with $j(b)$ defined in Remark 6, we have that when $\sigma \rightarrow 0$,

- i) if $y < b$, $j(b/y) \rightarrow \infty$, $\Phi'(j(b/y)) \rightarrow 0$ and $\Phi(j(b/y)) \rightarrow 1$;
- ii) if $y > b$, $j(b/y) \rightarrow -\infty$, $\Phi'(j(b/y)) \rightarrow 0$ and $\Phi(j(b/y)) \rightarrow 0$.

Using Remark 9, we can obtain the last conclusion in Proposition 6.1. \square

Proposition 6.3 and Proposition 6.2 can be obtained similarly.

A.5 Proof of the existence of Lagrangian multipliers

Lemma A.2. In the constrained optimization problem for any given feasible initial wealth ($x_0 \geq x_0^{min}$), the corresponding Lagrangian multipliers exist such that the budget constraint and the risk constraint are binding simultaneously.

We classify all the optimal solutions we obtained into two groups. The first group contains solutions which depend only on the budget Lagrangian multiplier. The second group contains solutions which depend on two Lagrangian multipliers. We see that all the optimal solutions with constraints belong to the first group except for the ES-solution in the case $L > \widehat{D}_T$. In the first group, the second Lagrangian multiplier can be chosen as a function of the first Lagrangian multiplier assuming the risk constraint is binding. Therefore, as long as we show that the budget Lagrangian multiplier exists, the second Lagrangian multiplier exists as well.

Proof. We first show that the budget Lagrangian multiplier in the first group of solutions exists. Take the two-region ES-constraint solution $X^{ES}(\lambda_\epsilon, \xi_T) = (I(\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon}$ in the case $L \leq D_T$ for example.

We will show that the map $\varphi : \lambda_\epsilon \mapsto E[\xi_T X^{ES}(\lambda_\epsilon, \xi_T)]$ is a strictly decreasing, continuous and surjective function from $(0, \infty)$ to (x_0^{min}, ∞) .

To see that the function φ is a strictly decreasing function is equivalent to showing that for all $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > 0$, $\varphi(\lambda_1) < \varphi(\lambda_2)$. Define $l(\lambda_\epsilon) := (I(\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon}$. Then we have $\varphi(\lambda_1) = E[\xi_T l(\lambda_1)]$ and $\varphi(\lambda_2) = E[\xi_T l(\lambda_2)]$. We know that for $\omega \in \Omega$, $I(\lambda_\epsilon\xi_T) + D_T$ is a strictly decreasing function in λ_ϵ almost surely. Hence, we conclude that $l(\lambda_1) \leq l(\lambda_2)$ and $P(l(\lambda_1) < l(\lambda_2)) > 0$ as long as $\{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon\}$ is not an empty set. Further, we have $\varphi(\lambda_1) = E[\xi_T l(\lambda_1)] < E[\xi_T l(\lambda_2)] = \varphi(\lambda_2)$. Thus, φ is a strictly decreasing function.

It is easy to see that $l(\cdot)$ is a continuous function except for countable many points. Therefore, φ is a continuous function in λ_ϵ .

In addition, if λ_ϵ tends to ∞ then $\varphi(\lambda_\epsilon)$ tends to x_0^{min} and if λ_ϵ tends to zero then φ tends to ∞ . Therefore, φ is a strictly decreasing, continuous and surjective function from $(0, \infty)$ to (x_0^{min}, ∞) . Hence, for each fixed $x_0 \geq x_0^{min}$, there exists a unique λ_ϵ satisfying the budget constraint with an equality.

From equation (A.3), we choose $\lambda_2 = \frac{-(U(I(\lambda_\epsilon \bar{\xi}_\epsilon)) - I(\lambda_\epsilon \bar{\xi}_\epsilon) \lambda_\epsilon \bar{\xi}_\epsilon - \lambda_\epsilon \bar{\xi}_\epsilon D_T)}{\xi_\epsilon L}$ such that the ES-constraint is binding.

The other cases in the first group can be proved with similar arguments.

Next we prove that two Lagrangian multipliers exist simultaneously such that the budget constraint and the ES constraint are binding simultaneously if $L > \widehat{D}_T$.

In the first step of the proof we want to show that for a fixed λ_ϵ and for $0 < \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_\epsilon$, the second constraint always holds.

If λ_2 tends to λ_ϵ , $\bar{\xi} := U'(L - D_T)/(\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2)$ converges to ∞ . Hence, the optimal solution converges to

$$X^{ES} = \begin{cases} I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D & \text{if } \xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon, \\ L & \text{if } \underline{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_T. \end{cases}$$

This implies that $E[(L - X_T^{ES})\xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES} < L}] - \epsilon = -\epsilon < 0$, which obviously satisfies the ES constraint. If $\lambda_2 = 0$, the optimal solution converges to

$$X^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T) \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}},$$

which is the benchmark solution. Since $x_0 < x_0^2$ we have that $E[(L - X_T^{ES})\xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES} < L}] - \epsilon > 0$. For a fixed given λ_ϵ , $E[(L - X_T^{ES})\xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES} < L}] - \epsilon$ is a continuous and decreasing function in λ_2 and thus bijective. By the intermediate value theorem, the zero root of the function exists. We represent the zero root to be $\lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)$, a function of λ_ϵ .

Denoting by $X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)}$ the optimal terminal wealth, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
E[X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} \xi_T] &= E[X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} \xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES} < L}] + E[X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} \xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} \geq L}] \\
&= LE[\xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} < L}] - \epsilon + E[X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} \xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} > L}] \\
&\quad + E[X_T^{ES} \xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} = L}] \\
&= LE[\xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} < L}] - \epsilon + E[X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} \xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} > L}] \\
&\quad + E[L \xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} = L}] \\
&= -\epsilon + E[L \xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} \leq L}] + E[X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} \xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} > L}] \\
&= LE[\xi_T] + E[(X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} - L) \xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} > L}] - \epsilon \\
&= Le^{-rT} - \epsilon + E[(X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} - L) \xi_T \mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} > L}].
\end{aligned}$$

Since by equation (4.7) we have $\mathbb{1}_{X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} > L} = \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < U'(L - D_T)/\lambda_\epsilon}$, we can see that when λ_ϵ tends to zero, $X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)}$ converges to ∞ and $E[X_T^{ES} \xi_T]$ converges to ∞ . On the other hand when λ_ϵ tends to ∞ , $E[X_T^{ES} \xi_T]$ converges to $Le^{-rT} - \epsilon$.

Moreover, $E[X_T^{ES} \xi_T]$ is a continuous function in λ_ϵ and thus as long as $x_0 > Le^{-rT} - \epsilon$, by the intermediate value theorem there exists λ_ϵ such that $E[X_T^{ES, \lambda_\epsilon, \lambda_2(\lambda_\epsilon)} \xi_T] = x_0$. \square