

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

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

August 19, 2020

Abstract

This paper studies an optimal asset allocation problem for a **surplus-driven** financial institution facing a Value-at-Risk (VaR) or an Expected Shortfall (ES) constraint corresponding to a **non-concave** optimization problem under constraints. We obtain the closed-form optimal wealth with the ES constraint as well as with the VaR constraint respectively, and explicitly calculate the optimal trading strategy for constant relative risk aversion (CRRA) utility functions. We find that both VaR and ES-based regulation can effectively reduce the probability of default for a **surplus-driven** financial institution. However, the liability holders' benefits cannot be fully protected under either VaR- or ES-based regulation. In addition, we show that the VaR and ES-based regulation can induce the same optimal portfolio choice for a surplus-driven financial institution. This differs from the conclusion drawn in Basak and Shapiro [2001] where the financial institution aims at maximizing the expected utility of the total assets, and ES provides better loss protection.

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

1 Introduction

In order to protect financial institutions' liability holders, a financial regulation mainly serves to ensure the safety of the financial institution, and consequently the stability of the financial system as a whole (Koch-Medina and Munari [2016]). It is common that a financial institution is motivated to achieve a higher surplus, but this **surplus-driven** investment behavior might endanger the liability holders' benefits once default occurs, especially for a company with limited

^{*}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. Fangyuan Zhang acknowledges the financial support given by the DFG for the research project "Zielrente: die Lösung zur alternden Gesellschaft in Deutschland?".

liability. However, the liability holders of financial institutions usually have no control over the investment decisions of the company. Due to the high cost of a personal supervision, the liability holders mostly rely on the financial regulator to protect their benefits .

Value-at-Risk (VaR), defined as the loss that is exceeded under a given probability within a given horizon, has been a dominant standard risk measure used for regulation for the last several decades, e.g. for the European insurance regulation Solvency II and Basel II. Recently, Expected Shortfall (ES), defined as the expected loss conditional on the loss exceeding the VaR level, has been considered as an alternative of VaR and become the underlying risk measure for some regulatory frameworks, see for instance the new banking regulation Basel III and the Swiss Solvency Test. This trend has given rise to an increasing number of debates on VaR and ES, see for instance Embrechts et al. [2014] and the references therein. The risk measure proposed in the financial regulation, e.g. VaR or ES, is used by financial institution to calculate the solvency capital requirement and decide if a given portfolio is acceptable. Hence, the risk measure provides information on the risk of a portfolio while serving as a constraint on the financial institutions' choices of investment strategies. In this study, we aim to investigate the optimal investment strategy of a **surplus-driven** financial institution facing a VaR or an ES constraint, and examine whether VaR or ES-based financial regulation can protect the liability holders' benefits.

The seminal paper by Basak and Shapiro [2001] solves the optimal asset allocation problem under a VaR- or an ES-based constraint, assuming that the financial institution aims at maximizing the expected utility of **the total assets**. Mathematically, this corresponds to a **concave** maximization problem under constraints. They find that the optimal investment strategy under the ES constraint is less risky compared to the one under the VaR constraint. Moreover, the optimal investment strategy under the VaR constraint is even riskier than the benchmark (unconstrained) strategy in the worst financial scenarios. Therefore, their results suggest that ES is a better risk measure.

In order to emphasize the **surplus-driven** characteristic of the financial institution, we explicitly distinguish the equity and liability in the asset structure and assume that the financial institutions make investment decisions maximizing the expected utility of the surplus. To be consistent and comparable with the existing results, we consider the same definition of the risk constraints as Basak and Shapiro [2001]. Hence, our model can be seen as a counterpart model of Basak and Shapiro [2001] but in a non-concave environment. However, the conclusion in our setting differs sharply. Specifically, our findings and contributions are as follows.

- Firstly, we obtain the analytical solution under both VaR and ES constraints (Theorems 4.1 and 4.2), respectively. The analytical solutions to the optimization problem under constraints considering a non-concave utility function are not completely explored in the literature. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to provide the analytical solution under an ES constraint in a non-concave environment. There are some recent studies investigating the non-concave optimization under a VaR constraint (Nguyen and Stadje [2020], Dong and Zheng

[2020]). Unlike the unique type of the solution to a constrained concave optimization problem, there are several types of solutions to a constrained non-concave optimization problem (e.g., two-region, three-region, and four-region solutions), depending on the relationship between the given regulatory threshold (L in the constraint) and the critical point (the liability level in the payoff function of the equity holder or the reference level in the S -shape utility function) where the utility function is discontinuous. Independent of the recent research, we provide the complete solutions under the ES as well as VaR constraint allowing for a random relationship between the regulatory threshold L and the debt level. In addition, we explicitly provide the condition for the existence of different types of solutions, i.e., we calculate the interval of the corresponding initial wealth.

- Secondly, we find that both VaR and ES constraints reduce the probability of default for a **surplus-driven** financial company. If the financial institution aims at maximizing the expected utility of the total assets, the ES constraint effectively restricts the tail-risk-seeking behavior, while a VaR constraint induces the financial company to choose an even riskier strategy compared to the benchmark (unconstrained strategy). However, if the financial institution aims at maximizing the expected utility of the surplus, a VaR and an ES constraint both lead to a less risky strategy compared to the benchmark (unconstrained strategy) and reduce the probability of default. In fact, the benchmark (unconstrained) solution of a **surplus-driven** financial institution shows a gambling behavior. Specifically, the financial institution will completely default (by holding zero terminal wealth) in the worst financial scenarios in order to obtain a higher surplus in a booming market. Thus, in the default scenarios, the liability holders as well as the equity holders are left with nothing. However, by introducing a VaR or an ES constraint, the probability of a default is reduced (actually to the level of the regulatory level α in the risk constraint), but the terminal wealth in the default scenario is still zero. This means on the one hand, the probability of default is reduced because of the regulation, and on the other hand, the benefits of liability holders in the default area are not really protected. Koch-Medina and Munari [2016] claim that an ES-based test does not distinguish the interests of liability holders and shareholders by only looking at the tail behavior of a portfolio,¹ and hence cannot protect the liability holders from the default risk. They argue that the liability holders are more interested in the default area rather than the tail-behavior of a financial institution, and that liability holders being surplus-indifferent (i.e., the surplus will not increase the liability holders' utility) is not yet considered by the financial regulation. Our results verify this argument by explicitly considering the **surplus-driven** characteristic of the financial company.

- Last but not least, a by-product of obtaining analytical solutions is that we find that a VaR and an ES constraint induce the same optimal investment strategy (Corollary 5.1), which is

¹Tail behavior includes both the surplus-driven behavior in a booming financial market and the default behavior in the worst financial state.

different than the conclusion in Basak and Shapiro [2001]. The worst financial scenarios under an ES constraint in Basak and Shapiro [2001] are determined not only by the exogenously given regulation level but also by the financial institution’s risk aversion and initial wealth. However, the worst financial scenarios under an ES constraint in our model only depend on the given risk constraint like in the VaR case. In addition, the optimal investment strategies under both constraints default completely (by holding zero terminal wealth) in the worst financial scenarios. These two observations are the technical reasons for the equivalence. The economical implication is that ES is not superior to VaR in restricting the **surplus-driven** financial company’s tail-risk-seeking behavior.

In addition to the non-linear function of the surplus considered in our setting, the non-concavity broadly exists in the optimization problem, for instance, the option-payoff to the fund manager (Carpenter [2000], Kouwenberg and Ziemba [2007]) and the S -shape utility function by differentiating gains and losses (Berkelaar et al. [2004], He and Zhou [2011]). Although we consider a specific setting, e.g. the asset allocation problem for a surplus-driven financial company facing a VaR or an ES constraint, our results and techniques are general enough to be extended to other **non-concave** optimization problems. A limitation of our work might be that the model is analysed in a *complete* financial market. We leave the relaxation of this limitation as a topic for future research.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: the second section 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. Section 6 computes the optimal trading strategies with a CRRA utility function and examines the properties of the optimal strategies analytically and numerically. The last section concludes. All technical proofs are provided in the E-companion.

1.1 Related Research

Our work is related to several areas of research, for instance the concave/non-concave optimization with/without constraints and the studies regarding the comparison between VaR and ES. A large stream of literature compares VaR and ES by investigating the statistical properties of them. Some studies show that ES is notoriously sensitive to outliers (Cont et al. [2010], Kou et al. [2013]) and hence contrary to VaR, is not a robust measure. Furthermore, VaR is elicitable, while ES is not (Ziegel [2016]). Some studies analyse the two risk measures from axiomatic properties (Artzner et al. [1999], Acerbi et al. [2001], Acerbi and Tasche [2002] and Wang and Zitikis [2019]) and claim that ES being a coherent risk measure is superior to VaR which is not sub-additive. After the seminal paper by Basak and Shapiro [2001], Cuoco et al. [2008] consider 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 of a financial institution maximizing

the expected utility of combined wealth of equity and policyholders. 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, assuming the maximizing utility is concave. These representative studies investigate the influence of VaR and ES constraints on the financial institution, aiming at maximizing the expected utility considering **the total assets**, while the study on the effect of regulation on the **surplus-driven** financial company by explicitly looking at the investment strategy is still missing in the literature. Our paper aims to fill this gap. The study closest to us is Armstrong and Brigo [2019]. They argue that VaR and ES are inefficient in restricting the typical non-concave optimizer with an S -shape utility function by showing that the unconstrained solution coincides with the constrained solution assuming the wealth can take arbitrarily negative large values. In our model, the negative utility is bounded from below and we do not allow the wealth to be negative, which is the key difference between our models.² Moreover, our analytical solutions also contain the case where the constrained solution coincides with the unconstrained solution (i.e. VaR and ES are inefficient) if the initial wealth of the financial institution is too high or the regulation is not sufficiently strict, but this is not always the case.

1.2 Definitions of risk constraints

There are many versions of definitions of VaR and ES, depending on the underlying probability space and the assumption of the loss distribution. Therefore, in this subsection we clarify the definitions of risk constraints used in this paper and explain the differences to the conventional definitions of VaR and ES in statistical studies.

From an axiomatic or statistical point of view, Value-at-Risk is defined as

$$VaR_\alpha(Y) := -\inf\{y | P(Y \leq y) \leq \alpha\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where Y denotes a loss. Hence, VaR denotes a quantile value with respect to a loss distribution.

Correspondingly, Expected Shortfall is defined as

$$ES_\alpha(Y) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^\alpha VaR_\beta(Y) d\beta. \quad (1.2)$$

Therefore, ES denotes the expectation of the loss conditioning on that the loss has exceeded the VaR level. The definition of ES is closely related to VaR, and thus ES is sometimes referred as average VaR or tail VaR.

The above definitions (1.1) and (1.2) of VaR and ES are conventional definitions used in axiomatic or statistical studies on risk measures, see for instance Artzner et al. [1999], Acerbi and Tasche [2002] and Wang and Zitikis [2019]. From the axiomatic or statistical point of view,

²These assumptions are important to obtain the conclusion in Armstrong and Brigo [2019] For the detailed proof, see Armstrong and Brigo [2019].

VaR and ES are a number or a value that describes the risk of a given portfolio. In this paper, we investigate the optimal asset allocation problem of a financial institution facing a VaR or an ES constraint. Hence, we assume that VaR and ES exhibit given and provide the optimal portfolio choice that achieves the acceptable risk level.

The VaR constraint in this paper is defined as

$$P(X_T \leq L) \leq \alpha, \quad (1.3)$$

where X_T is a random variable denoting the terminal wealth, L is a given regulatory threshold and α denotes the regulatory confidence level. If the initial wealth of the financial institution is x_0 , then by satisfying (1.3), the loss of this portfolio is at most $L - x_0$ with probability $1 - \alpha$.

Further, the ES constraint is defined as

$$E[\xi_T(L - X_T)\mathbb{1}_{X_T < L}] \leq \epsilon, \quad (1.4)$$

where ξ_T denotes the unique state price density or pricing kernel in a complete financial market and ϵ is a given number that captures the acceptable level of expected loss. We take (1.4) from Basak and Shapiro [2001] that is also called Limited Expected Loss constraint. By satisfying (1.4), the discounted tail expected loss of the optimal portfolio is restricted within an acceptable level.³

Since we work in a *complete* financial market, the pricing kernel or state price density ξ_T is unique, which implies that the optimal portfolios under discounted expected loss constraint or the expected loss constraint only differ slightly in magnitude. We remark that considering the discounted expected shortfall (1.4) simplifies the proof but does not change the essence of the optimization problem. For a discussion on the choice of the risk constraint under the risk neutral measure Q or the physical measure P , see Gu et al. [2019].

In addition, the expected shortfall constraint (1.4) denotes the tail expected loss conditioning on that the loss has exceeded $L - x_0$ which is the regulated loss level of the VaR constraint (1.3). We remark that the tail expected loss captured by (1.4) does not necessarily correspond to the tail loss conditioning on the loss exceeding the α -quantile of the portfolio loss. However, with a similar technique, the problem can be solved as well if the conditional expectation in (1.4) is changed to condition on the loss exceeding the α -quantile. We further remark that as long as the regulatory threshold L is greater or equal than the implicit VaR-level of the optimal portfolio, the risk constraints (1.3) and (1.4) are binding. For the detailed discussion on the existence of the optimal solution, see the E-companion to this paper.

³Note that the expectation in (1.4) is taken under the unique risk neutral measure Q in the complete financial market. For more on the risk neutral valuation, see for instance section 7 in Björk [2009].

2 The Model

2.1 The financial market

We assume 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 $S = (S_1, \dots, S_m)'$.⁴ 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 for some of the results.

The financial institution endowed with an initial capital 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

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

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

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

⁴Here S is an m -dimensional vector and $'$ denotes the transposed sign.

risk-free rate, if there is no default at maturity, i.e., $X_T > D_T$. In case of default at maturity, 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 surplus function of the financial institution, which can also be considered as the payoff to the equity holders, is determined residually by

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

A surplus-driven financial institution 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 financial institution' 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 implying an infinite liability company. In this model, we consider a limited liability company allowing for default, and therefore exclude the case $U(0) = -\infty$.

Figure 1 is an illustrative example for the utility function of a surplus-driven company, where the utility level equals zero when the wealth level is below the debt level.

The optimal asset allocation problem of the surplus-driven financial institution 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 the maximal allowed expected shortfall, and can be 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.




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

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., $P(X_T \geq L) \geq 1 - \alpha$, which implies the loss of the portfolio is at most $x_0 - L$ with probability $1 - \alpha$. 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 set 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 recovery⁵. 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 loss is already above 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 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

⁵See Broeders and Chen (2010) for a formal analysis of the impact of recovery periods.

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 [2013]. 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 piecewise 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 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.

3.2 The benchmark solution

The general unconstrained non-concave optimization problem has been solved in Reichlin [2013]. Hence, in order to highlight the effect of the additional constraint, we provide the solution to the unconstrained problem in our model without proof.




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

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

Figure 3 depicts the optimal terminal wealth as a function of the state price density in the benchmark case where the dashed line denotes the case of a surplus-driven company and the dotted line denotes the case of a company caring for the total asset instead of only the surplus. Figure 3 shows the gambling behavior of a surplus-driven financial company that chooses to completely default (by holding zero terminal wealth) in worse financial scenarios in order to invest more in a booming market and obtain a higher surplus.

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




Figure 3: The optimal terminal wealth of a financial institution without constraints.

This figure plots the optimal terminal wealth of a financial institution without constraints. We plot the case of a surplus-driven company as well as the case of a company maximizing the expected utility of the total asset with other parameters unchanged. The basic parameters are chosen according to Table 1 in Section 5.

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, there is no feasible solution if $x_0 < x_0^{\min} := Le^{-\int_0^T r_s ds} - \epsilon$. The reason is that 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.

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

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

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

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 $\underline{\xi}_\epsilon = \frac{U'(L - D_T)}{\lambda_\epsilon}$, $\bar{\xi} = \frac{U'(L - D_T)}{\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon}$, $\xi_\epsilon^{\widehat{D}_T} = \frac{U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)}{\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon}$, λ_ϵ and λ_2^ϵ 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 determined by the identity $E[\xi_T(L - I(\bar{\lambda}\xi_T) - D_T)\mathbb{1}_{U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T) > \xi_T \bar{\lambda} \geq U'(L - D_T)} + \xi_T L\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T \bar{\lambda} \geq U'(\widehat{D}_T - D_T)}] = \epsilon$.

Remark 2. When the regulatory threshold is lower than the debt level, i.e., $\mathbf{L} < \mathbf{D}_T$, 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 surplus in this region is zero and hence all the terminal wealth will go to the debt holder. A wealthier surplus-driven company with a higher initial wealth is capable of investing in a larger region. In this case, the company reduces the region of a complete default to meet the risk constraint. Note that the case in which the regulatory threshold is equal to the debt level ($\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{D}_T$) represents a special case. Independent of the initial wealth level, only a two-region solution results. When $\mathbf{D}_T < \mathbf{L} < \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_T$, the situation is similar. From Theorem 3.1, we know that the unconstrained terminal wealth is either larger than the tangent point $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_T$ 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 default region. When $\mathbf{L} > \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_T$, 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

A financial institution operating under a VaR constraint faces the problem

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

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 solution to the VaR-constrained optimization problem (**Problem 2**) is given in the following theorem. The proof is less complex than in the case of an ES constraint and can be found in the E-companion.

Theorem 4.2. a) If $\mathbf{L} \leq \mathbf{D}_T$, the optimal solution to **Problem 2** is:

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

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

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

$$\text{ii) when } x_0 \geq x_0^4$$

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

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

b) If $\mathbf{D}_T < \mathbf{L} \leq \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_T$, 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 where the default happens. This difference in the worst financial scenarios arises from the gambling behavior of a **surplus-driven** company that defaults in the worst financial scenarios in order to gain a larger surplus in a booming market. This further implies that a VaR or ES-based regulation is not capable to prevent the gambling behavior of a **surplus-driven** company completely.

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 $X_T^{VaR} = X_T^{ES}$.

Next, consider the three-region (4.2) solution in Theorem 4.1 given by $X^{ES} = (I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon} + L\mathbb{1}_{\bar{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon}$. On the other hand, $X_T^{VaR} = (I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T)\mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\epsilon} + L\mathbb{1}_{\bar{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_T < \bar{\xi}_\alpha}$ 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. $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon$ is defined as $U'(\bar{\xi}_\epsilon - (D_T - L))/\lambda_\alpha$ and $\bar{\xi}_\alpha$ is defined through $U'(\bar{\xi}_\alpha - (D_T - L))/\lambda_\epsilon$. 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 $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon = \bar{\xi}_\alpha$. 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 $P(\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha) = \alpha$.⁶ (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. When the regulatory threshold is below the tangent point \hat{D}_T , the financial institution is forced to reallocate the wealth distribution in the complete default region in order to satisfy the constraint. Further, the optimal wealth with or without additional risk constraint of a surplus-driven financial institution always jumps to zero (complete default) 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 states (complete default regions) are only determined by the given risk constraint (unlike the ES-solution in Basak and Shapiro [2001] and the ES-solution when $L > \hat{D}_T$ in our model). Hence, with a given VaR constraint, there exists an ES constraint leading to the same optimal investment strategy for a surplus-driven company assuming $L \leq \hat{D}_T$.

The surplus-driven investor in general shows a gambling behaviour. The additional risk constraint diminishes the probability of a total default without preventing it. 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. Further,


⁶Note that this procedure does not depend on ξ_T having a log-normal distribution but is the same for any complete financial market.

this equivalence implies the ineffectiveness of an ES constraint to protect the liability holders considering the surplus-driven behavior of a financial institution.

If the regulatory threshold L is larger than \hat{D}_T , the situation is different (Theorems 4.1 and 4.2). As $\hat{D}_T > D_T$, the regulatory threshold in this case 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 $X_T > \hat{D}_T$. When the regulatory threshold L is set larger than \hat{D}_T , the risk constraint largely affects the terminal wealth distribution in the concave part (see equations (4.7) and (4.15)). In this sense, a strict regulator intervenes more in the financial institution's portfolio planning problem. Hence, when $L > \hat{D}_T$, 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 $L \leq \hat{D}_T$ an ES constraint has the same regulatory effect as a VaR constraint, namely the regulation forces the surplus-driven company to reduce the probability of a total default but cannot prevent the occurrence of a total default. When $L > \hat{D}_T$, 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.⁷ Further, in none of the cases can the regulatory constraint prevent the surplus-driven company's gambling behavior thoroughly, but it does control the probability of a complete default effectively.

Due to the equivalence result, we just plot the ES-constrained optimal wealth when $L \leq \hat{D}_T$ in Figure 4, and Figure 5 plots both the VaR- and ES-constrained wealth when $L > \hat{D}_T$. 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 surplus in the booming financial market in order to satisfy the regulatory constraint by investing more in the worse financial states. The "sacrifice" is less obvious in Figures 4(d) and 5. The reason is that the financial institution is wealthier (has more initial wealth) in these situations.



⁷This solution exists when the initial wealth of the company and the regulatory threshold are both very high. In this case, the complete default occurs with a probability smaller than the regulatory level α .




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 asset allocation problem of a surplus-driven financial institution facing 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 opti-

mal trading strategy considering a CRRA utility function. Due to the equivalence result, we only compute the ES-constrained strategy when $\mathbf{L} \leq \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_T$ while providing both VaR- and ES-constrained optimal strategies when $\mathbf{L} > \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_T$. 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

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

while the optimal benchmark strategy is given by

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

(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 $\xi_t < \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}$, and $\pi_t^B \rightarrow \infty$ if $\xi_t > \xi^{\widehat{D}_T}$,

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

Proposition 6.2. The ES-constrained case

When $\mathbf{L} \leq \mathbf{D}_T$:

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

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

while the optimal ES-constrained strategy is given by

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

(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

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

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 $L > \hat{D}_T$:

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

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

while the optimal ES-constrained strategy is given by

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

Proposition 6.3. The VaR-constrained case

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

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

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

while the optimal VaR-constrained strategy is given by

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

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

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

while the optimal VaR-constrained strategy is given by

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

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 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 surplus-driven company to insure at least the regulatory threshold in a large part of the intermediate financial states and reduce the probability that the complete default happens.

Merton [1969] shows that a CRRA utility maximizer invests a constant fraction in the risky

asset assuming the price of the asset follows a geometric Brownian motion. The fraction invested in the risky asset also represents 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 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.⁸ We can see that in 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 a surplus-driven financial company.

Figure 7(e) plots the three-region solution in the case $L > \hat{D}_T$, which preserves the same property as the case $L \leq \hat{D}_T$ 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 wealth 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].



⁸The relative risk exposure shown in Figures 6(c) and 7 is a direct numerical illustration based on the parameters in Table 1. Due to many different groups of cases, we decided to leave out the detailed calculation in order to avoid unnecessary redundancy.




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 optimal asset allocation problem of a **surplus-driven** financial institution facing a VaR or ES constraint, which mathematically corresponds to a constrained non-concave optimization problem. 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. The analytical solutions given in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 explicitly indicate that VaR and ES-based regulation on the one hand reduces the default probability of a **surplus-driven** financial company and on the other hand cannot prevent the occurrence of a complete default (i.e., holding zero terminal wealth). Furthermore, Corollary 5.1 shows that in most relevant 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 leading to the same terminal wealth and consequently identical investment behavior. This implies that an ES-based regulation is not superior to a VaR-based regulation considering the **surplus-driven** characteristic of a financial company. In addition, the numerical analysis in Section 6 illustrates 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.

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 investigate the influence of the VaR or ES-based regulation in a general equilibrium setting considering the gambling behavior of **surplus-driven** financial companies. 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, 2002.
- 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, 2019.
- 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.
- Tomas Björk. *Arbitrage theory in continuous time*. Oxford university press, 2009.
- Jennifer N Carpenter. Does option compensation increase managerial risk appetite? *The Journal of Finance*, 55(5):2311–2331, 2000.
- Rama Cont, Romain Deguest, and Giacomo Scandolo. Robustness and sensitivity analysis of risk measurement procedures. *Quantitative Finance*, 10(6):593–606, 2010.
- 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.
- Yinghui Dong and Harry Zheng. Optimal investment with s-shaped utility and trading and value at risk constraints: An application to defined contribution pension plan. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 281(2):341–356, 2020.
- Paul Embrechts, Giovanni Puccetti, Ludger Rüschendorf, Ruodu Wang, and Antonela Beleraj. An academic response to basel 3.5. *Risks*, 2(1):25–48, 2014.
- Jiawen Gu, Mogens Steffensen, and Harry Zheng. A note on p-vs. q-expected loss portfolio constraints. *Q-Expected Loss Portfolio Constraints (February 27, 2019)*, 2019.
- Xue Dong He and Xun Yu Zhou. Portfolio choice under cumulative prospect theory: An analytical treatment. *Management Science*, 57(2):315–331, 2011.
- Pablo Koch-Medina and Cosimo Munari. Unexpected shortfalls of expected shortfall: Extreme default profiles and regulatory arbitrage. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 62:141–151, 2016.
- 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.
- 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. Utility maximization with a given pricing measure when the utility is not necessarily concave. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 7(4):531–556, 2013.
- Zhen Shi and Bas JM Werker. Short-horizon regulation for long-term investors. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 36(12):3227–3238, 2012.
- Ruodu Wang and Ricardas Zitikis. An axiomatic foundation for the expected shortfall. *Management Science, Forthcoming*, 2019.
- 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 $\partial c^*(y)/\partial y = \lambda(\frac{\lambda_2 l}{\lambda} - x)$ 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

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

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 $\xi_\epsilon^{\widetilde{L}}$), and the zero root of (A.3) converges to $\xi_\epsilon^{\widetilde{L}}$. 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 $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon \leq \xi_\epsilon^{\widetilde{L}}$, 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 $\bar{\xi}_\epsilon > \xi_\epsilon^{\widetilde{L}}$, 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,

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

We know from Lemma 3.1 that (A.4) has a unique zero root which is denoted by ξ_ϵ^L . Hence, (4.2) is the argmax of the Lagrangian.

$$L > D_T$$

We know that when x_0 is large enough ($L > \hat{D}_T$ and $x_0 \geq x_0^2$ or $D_T < L \leq \hat{D}_T$ 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 $\xi_T < \underline{\xi}_\epsilon$ 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 $\xi_T \geq \bar{\xi}$, 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 $\omega \in \{\xi_T > \bar{\xi}\} \cap \{\xi_T < \xi_\epsilon^{\hat{D}_T}\}$, $I((\lambda_\epsilon - \lambda_2^\epsilon)\xi_T) + D_T$ 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 $L > \hat{D}_T$ we have that $\xi^1 > \xi^{\hat{D}_T} > \underline{\xi}_\epsilon$, $\xi_\epsilon^{\hat{D}_T} > \bar{\xi}$ 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 $\{\xi_T > \bar{\xi}\} \cap \{\xi_T < \xi_\epsilon^{\hat{D}_T}\} = \{\xi_\epsilon^{\hat{D}_T} > \xi_T > \bar{\xi}\}$. Therefore, (4.7) is the argmax of the Lagrangian in this case.

If $L \leq \hat{D}_T$, we have that $\xi_\epsilon^{\hat{D}_T} < \bar{\xi}$. Hence, $\{\xi_T > \bar{\xi}\} \cap \{\xi_T < \xi_\epsilon^{\hat{D}_T}\} = \emptyset$, 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

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

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

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

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

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 ($x_0 \geq x_0^4$) the optimal solution (4.11) coincides with the benchmark solution. In the following we focus on the case when $x_0^{min} \leq x_0 < x_0^4$. 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: $\xi^{\tilde{L}} \geq \bar{\xi}_\alpha$

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, $\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) > \phi(L)$ 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

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

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

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 $U(L - D_T) < \lambda_\alpha \xi^{\hat{D}_T} L < \lambda_\alpha \bar{\xi}_\alpha L$ assuming $\bar{\xi}_\alpha > \xi^{\hat{D}_T}$. 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 $\xi_T > \bar{\xi}_\alpha$, $\phi(I(\lambda_\alpha \xi_T) + D_T) - \phi(L) < \lambda_\alpha (\xi_T - \bar{\xi}_\alpha) L < 0$ 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 $\xi^{\hat{D}_T} < \bar{\xi}_\alpha$. 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 $X_T^B = (I(\lambda_B \xi_T) + D_T) \mathbb{1}_{\xi_T < \xi^{\hat{D}_T}}$. 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

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

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 $I(\lambda_\epsilon \xi_T) + D_T$ 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