

Inf-convolution and optimal risk sharing with countable sets of risk measures

Marcelo Brutti Righi^{a,*}
marcelo.righi@ufrgs.br

Marlon Ruoso Moresco^a
marlon.moresco@ufrgs.br

^a*Business School, Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Washington Luiz, 855, Porto Alegre, Brazil, zip 90010-460*

Abstract

The inf-convolution of risk measures is directly related to risk sharing and general equilibrium, and it has attracted considerable attention in mathematical finance and insurance problems. However, the theory is restricted to finite sets of risk measures. This study extends the inf-convolution of risk measures in its convex-combination form to a countable (not necessarily finite) set of alternatives. The intuitive meaning of this approach is to represent a generalization of the current finite convex weights to the countable case. Subsequently, we extensively generalize known properties and results to this framework. Specifically, we investigate the preservation of properties, dual representations, optimal allocations, and self-convolution.

Keywords: Risk measures, Inf-convolution, Risk sharing, Representations, Optimal allocations.

1 Introduction

The theory of risk measures has attracted considerable attention in mathematical finance and insurance since the seminal paper by [Artzner et al. \(1999\)](#). The books by [Pflug and Römisch \(2007\)](#), [Delbaen \(2012\)](#), [Rüschendorf \(2013\)](#), and [Föllmer and Schied \(2016\)](#) are comprehensive expositions of this subject. In these studies, a key topic is the inf-convolution of risk measures directly related to risk sharing and general equilibrium. These problems may be connected with regulatory capital reduction, risk transfer in insurance–reinsurance contracts, and several other applications in classic studies such as [Borch \(1962\)](#), [Arrow \(1963\)](#), [Gerber \(1978\)](#), and [Buhlmann \(1982\)](#), as well as more recent research as in [Landsberger and Meilijson \(1994\)](#), [Dana and Meilijson \(2003\)](#), and [Heath and Ku \(2004\)](#).

*Corresponding author. We thank the Lead Guest Editor, Professor Claudio Fontana, and the two anonymous Reviewers for their constructive comments, which have been useful to improve both the technical quality and presentation of the manuscript. We are grateful for the financial support of FAPERGS (Rio Grande do Sul State Research Council) project number 17/2551-0000862-6 and CNPq (Brazilian Research Council) projects number 302369/2018-0 and 407556/2018-4.

Formally, the inf-convolution of risk measures is defined as

$$\square_{i=1}^n \rho^i(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i(X^i) : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i = X \right\},$$

where X and X^i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, belong to some linear space of random variables over a probability space, and ρ^i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, are risk measures, which are functionals on this linear space.

Convex risk measures, as initially proposed by [Föllmer and Schied \(2002\)](#) and [Frittelli and Rosazza Gianin \(2002\)](#), have recently attracted considerable attention in the context of inf-convolutions, as in several other areas of risk management. This subject is explored in [Barrieu and El Karoui \(2005\)](#), [Burgert and Rüschendorf \(2006\)](#), [Burgert and Rüschendorf \(2008\)](#), [Jouini et al. \(2008\)](#), [Filipović and Svindland \(2008\)](#), [Ludkovski and Rüschendorf \(2008\)](#), [Ludkovski and Young \(2009\)](#), [Acciaio and Svindland \(2009\)](#), [Acciaio \(2009\)](#), [Tsanakas \(2009\)](#), [Dana and Le Van \(2010\)](#), [Delbaen \(2012\)](#), and [Kazi-Tani \(2017\)](#). These studies present a detailed investigation of the properties of inf-convolution as a risk measure per se, as well as optimality conditions for the resulting allocations.

Beyond the usual approach of convex risk measures, some studies have been concerned with inf-convolution in relation to specific properties, as in [Acciaio \(2007\)](#), [Grechuk et al. \(2009\)](#), [Grechuk and Zabarankin \(2012\)](#), [Carlier et al. \(2012\)](#), [Mastrogiovanni and Rosazza Gianin \(2015\)](#), and [Liu et al. \(2020\)](#), particular risk measures, as the recent quantile risk sharing in [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#), [Embrechts et al. \(2020\)](#), [Weber \(2018\)](#), [Wang and Ziegel \(2018\)](#), and [Liu et al. \(2019\)](#), or even specific topics, as in [Liebrich and Svindland \(2019\)](#). Other recent papers dealing, directly or indirectly, with (classical) inf-convolutions are [Bellini et al. \(2021\)](#), [Burzoni et al. \(2022\)](#), [Castagnoli et al. \(2021\)](#), [Kirilyuk \(2021\)](#), [Liebrich \(2021\)](#) and [Wang and Ziegel \(2021\)](#).

However, these studies are restricted to finite sets of risk measures. As observed by [Tsanakas \(2009\)](#), for convex but not positively homogeneous risk measures and without market frictions like transaction costs, risk can usually be reduced arbitrarily by introducing more subsidiaries, and hence there is no incentive to stop this splitting procedure. Under uncertainty and without limitations on which lines to open for risk sharing, using the inf-convolution with $n \rightarrow \infty$ is helpful to get the best allocation and then open the relevant business lines, as it considers all possible divisions.

Thus, in this study, we seek to extend the inf-convolution of risk measures to an infinite countable set of alternatives. Specifically, we consider a collection of risk measures $\rho_{\mathcal{I}} = \{\rho^i, i \in \mathcal{I}\}$, where \mathcal{I} is a nonempty countable set. In this sense, we can think into considering a functional as

$$\rho_{conv}(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i = X \right\}.$$

It is the minimum amount of risk, which may represent capital requirement, for instance, among all possible ways of dividing a risk X into countable fragments and distributing the capital into countable units. Such units could be business lines, agents, lotteries, liquidation times, etc. Thus, such a formulation arises naturally when the agent can pulverize its position in as many fragments as desired. The critical point to be noted is that the split of the position X can be taken at any number of fragments as desired instead of a fixed finite one as in the usual

approach. Thus, the value generated for the resulting risk measure is expected to be smaller than the one resulting from any fixed finite inf-convolution.

However, such adaptation is not possible from a technical point of view since it is ill definite since we cannot assure the convergence of the infinite series $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i)$, which will typically diverge. This is the case in [Tsanakas \(2009\)](#), [Wang \(2016\)](#) and [Liebrich and Svindland \(2019\)](#), where one can easily end with a pathological $-\infty$ value for risk. Hence, it is necessary to make adjustments in order to guarantee the well definiteness of the functional. More specifically, we have to make three adjustments: (i) to consider weights in the risk summation, (ii) to consider weights in the allocations, and (iii) to consider bounded allocations. In what follows, we explain the mathematical and financial/economic reasoning of such adjustments.

We thus use a slightly modified version, with convex combinations instead of simple sum, representing weighting schemes. In the finite case it may be considered as $\mu = \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\} \in [0, 1]^n$, $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i = 1$; this modified version is defined as

$$\rho_{conv}^{\mu,n}(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \rho^i(X^i) : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i = X \right\}.$$

Letting $\hat{\rho}^i = \mu_i \rho^i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ immediately implies that $\rho_{conv}^{\mu,n}(X)$ is a special case of the standard $\square_{i=1}^n \hat{\rho}^i$. [Starr \(2011\)](#) and [Ravanelli and Svindland \(2014\)](#) show that one needs to solve such formulation in general equilibrium theory in order to obtain all Pareto-optimal allocations. In this context, μ are also called Negishi weights, which represent the importance of each ρ^i in the global decision.

Nonetheless, this map is not a monetary risk measure since it fails the usual cash additivity (Translation invariance) property. In [Starr \(2011\)](#) this is not a problem since it deals with usual utilities that do not fulfill this property in general. However, this property is crucial for risk measures. In order to circumvent this issue without jeopardizing the convergence, we consider weights on both summations of risk measures and allocations. In financial matters, such a weighting scheme in the allocations is akin to portfolio weights. In fact, in the traditional approach, we have that allocations are not divisible. However, this indivisibility assumption is not a natural one as we could consider portfolios. Furthermore, notice that the ordering of weighting in the allocations X^i is more flexible than the risk measures since we can freely vary the partition for indicator i , while the risk measures are fixed for each i .

We recognize that, despite the previously exposed reasoning, the weights in both risk summation and allocations are introduced in order to ensure nice mathematical properties while their financial and economical motivations are still elusive. In this sense, we left more concrete economical discussion and applications for future research.

Furthermore, in the countable case, we also need to consider bounded allocations to obtain the desired convergence to guarantee the well definiteness of the convolution. Note that this is always the case for finite \mathcal{I} . Nonetheless, it also has a financial explanation. There may be either regulatory or legal impediments for pooling all risks, which creates bounds on $\{X_i\}$. Such bounds can represent the limit loss a position may support without collapsing the whole institution. Moreover, it may be difficult to create some portfolios, especially those containing risks traded in illiquid markets. Our side constraints are connected with a similar idea in

portfolio theory, where one considers bounded admissible positions to exclude strategies that allow arbitrage. Moreover, the consideration of constrained allocations is not new in the literature. For instance, [Burgert and Rüschendorf \(2006\)](#) and [Burgert and Rüschendorf \(2008\)](#) study a constrained inf-convolution where $X \geq 0$ (or $X \leq 0$) implies that $X^i \geq 0$ (or $X^i \leq 0$) for any i in the allocation. [Wang et al. \(2020\)](#) consider bounded positions for their portfolios an extreme-aggregation measure. Of course, such constraints would hold for the convex weighted allocations.

Under all such reasoning, in this study, we extend the convex combination-based inf-convolution of risk measures to an infinite countable set of alternatives as follows:

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i \mu_i = X, \{X^i\} \text{ is bounded} \right\}.$$

The intuitive principle of this approach is to regard $\mu = \{\mu_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \subset [0, 1]$ such that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mu_i = 1$ as a generalization of convex weights in the finite case. We extensively generalize known properties and results to this framework. More specifically, we investigate the preservation of properties of $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$, dual representations, optimal allocations, and self-convolution. Of course, we do not intend to be exhaustive due to the extent of the related literature. To the best of our knowledge, there is no study in this direction. Furthermore, we can represent our functional in the same vein as the traditional summation under some suitable choices for the conversion. In particular, the two frameworks coincide and are well suited under Positive homogeneity.

Regarding the related literature, the work of [Wang \(2016\)](#) considers a countable allocation, but with $\rho^i = \rho$ for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$, i.e., a fixed risk measure. In his paper, regulatory arbitrage occurs when dividing a position into several fragments results in a reduced capital requirement to the joint position. Similar discussions are provided in [Tsanakas \(2009\)](#) and [Liebrich and Svindland \(2019\)](#), where it is proved that transaction costs should not be neglected in such a setting since one can quickly end up with a pathological $-\infty$ value for risk. In this sense, these authors study the problem of finding cost-optimal portfolio splits under market frictions. In our framework, we generalize such reasoning by allowing different risk measures. Thus, our approach identifies the limit case regarding all possibilities for the agent concerning the division of a position. We also allow for weights in order to allow for distinct degrees of importance for each risk measure. Furthermore, our approach is well defined and directly related to the usual summation approach, even without transaction costs. Thus, for ease of discussion, we assume that no cost occurs in dividing risks.

The study by [Righi \(2019b\)](#) considers an arbitrary set of risk measures and investigates the properties of combinations of the form $\rho = f(\rho_{\mathcal{I}})$, where f is a combination function over a linear space generated by the outcomes of $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}(X) = \{\rho^i(X), i \in \mathcal{I}\}$. Under the lack of a universal choice of the best risk measure from a set of alternatives, one can consider the use of many candidates to benefit from distinct qualities. The inf-convolution is not suitable for such a framework with fixed X . Under our approach for a countable set of candidates, it is possible to split the position to obtain the best allocation.

From a mathematical point of view, the countable \mathcal{I} is a limiting case. The consideration of an arbitrary (not necessarily finite or countable) set of risk measures could be done by

considering a measure (probability) μ over a suitable sigma algebra \mathcal{G} of \mathcal{I} . The problem then becomes

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) d\mu : \int_{\mathcal{I}} X^i d\mu = X \right\}.$$

However, it would be necessary to impose assumptions on \mathcal{G} in order to avoid measurability issues. One of those assumptions is that the maps $i \rightarrow X^i(\omega)$ are measurable for any $\omega \in \Omega$ and every family $\{X^i \in L^\infty, i \in \mathcal{I}\}$, this would imply that \mathcal{G} is the power set, which would leave us without meaningful choices for probability measures. In fact, as a consequence of Ulam's theorem, every probability measure on the power set of a set with cardinality as the power set of \mathbb{N} is a discrete probability measure. In this sense, our approach can be considered the closest connection to the limiting integral case.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the proposed approach and results regarding the preservation of financial and continuity properties from the set of risk measures. In Section 3, we prove results regarding dual representations for the convex, coherent, law-invariant, and comonotonic cases. In Section 4, we explore optimal allocations by considering general results regarding the existence, comonotonic improvement, and law invariance of solutions, as well as the comonotonicity and flatness of distributions. In Section 5, we explore the particular topic of self-convolution and its relation to regulatory arbitrage. In Section 6 we expose concrete examples of our results on specific choices for families of risk measures.

2 Proposed approach

We consider a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. All equalities and inequalities are in the \mathbb{P} -*a.s.* sense. Let $L^0 = L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and $L^\infty = L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be the spaces of (equivalence classes under \mathbb{P} -*a.s.* equality of) finite and essentially bounded random variables, respectively. When not explicit, we consider in L^∞ its strong topology. We define 1_A as the indicator function for an event $A \in \mathcal{F}$. We identify constant random variables with real numbers. A pair $X, Y \in L^0$ is called comonotone if $(X(w) - X(w'))(Y(w) - Y(w')) \geq 0$, $w, w' \in \Omega$ holds $\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}$ -*a.s.* We denote by $X_n \rightarrow X$ convergence in the L^∞ essential supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, whereas $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n = X$ indicates \mathbb{P} -*a.s.* convergence. The notation $X \succeq Y$, for $X, Y \in L^\infty$, indicates second-order stochastic dominance, that is, $E[f(X)] \leq E[f(Y)]$ for any increasing convex function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In particular, $E[X|\mathcal{F}'] \succeq X$ for any σ -algebra $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$.

Let \mathcal{P} be the set of all probability measures on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) . We denote, by $E_{\mathbb{Q}}[X] = \int_{\Omega} X d\mathbb{Q}$, $F_{X, \mathbb{Q}}(x) = \mathbb{Q}(X \leq x)$, and $F_{X, \mathbb{Q}}^{-1}(\alpha) = \inf \{x : F_{X, \mathbb{Q}}(x) \geq \alpha\}$, the expected value, the (increasing and right-continuous) probability function, and its left quantile for $X \in L^\infty$ with respect to $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{P}$. We write $X \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}}{\sim} Y$ when $F_{X, \mathbb{Q}} = F_{Y, \mathbb{Q}}$. We drop subscripts indicating probability measures when $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{P}$. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}$ be the set of probability measures \mathbb{Q} that are absolutely continuous with respect to \mathbb{P} , with Radon–Nikodym derivative $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}$. We denote the topological dual $(L^\infty)^*$ of L^∞ by ba , which is defined as the space of finitely additive signed measures (with finite total variation norm $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$) that are absolutely continuous with respect to \mathbb{P} ; moreover, we let $ba_{1,+} = \{m \in ba : m \geq 0, m(\Omega) = 1\}$ and by abuse of notation, we define $E_m[X] = \int_{\Omega} X dm$ as the bilinear-form integral of $X \in L^\infty$ with respect to $m \in ba_{1,+}$.

We begin with the definition of risk measures and the financial properties we consider in this paper. For more details regarding these properties, we refer to the classic books mentioned in the introduction.

Definition 2.1. *A functional $\rho : L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a risk measure. It may have the following properties:*

- (i) *Monotonicity: If $X \leq Y$, then $\rho(X) \geq \rho(Y)$, $\forall X, Y \in L^\infty$.*
- (ii) *Translation invariance: $\rho(X + C) = \rho(X) - C$, $\forall X \in L^\infty, \forall C \in \mathbb{R}$.*
- (iii) *Convexity: $\rho(\lambda X + (1 - \lambda)Y) \leq \lambda\rho(X) + (1 - \lambda)\rho(Y)$, $\forall X, Y \in L^\infty, \forall \lambda \in [0, 1]$.*
- (iv) *Positive homogeneity: $\rho(\lambda X) = \lambda\rho(X)$, $\forall X \in L^\infty, \forall \lambda \geq 0$.*
- (v) *Law invariance: If $F_X = F_Y$, then $\rho(X) = \rho(Y)$, $\forall X, Y \in L^\infty$.*
- (vi) *Comonotonic additivity: $\rho(X + Y) = \rho(X) + \rho(Y)$, $\forall X, Y \in L^\infty$ with X, Y comonotone.*
- (vii) *Loadedness: $\rho(X) \geq -E[X]$, $\forall X \in L^\infty$.*
- (viii) *Limitedness: $\rho(X) \leq -\text{ess inf } X$, $\forall X \in L^\infty$.*

A risk measure ρ is called *monetary* if it satisfies (i) and (ii), *convex* if it is monetary and satisfies (iii), *coherent* if it is convex and satisfies (iv), *law invariant* if it satisfies (v), *comonotone* if it satisfies (vi), *loaded* if it satisfies (vii), and *limited* if it satisfies (viii). Unless otherwise stated, we assume that risk measures are normalized in the sense that $\rho(0) = 0$. The acceptance set of ρ is defined as $\mathcal{A}_\rho = \{X \in L^\infty : \rho(X) \leq 0\}$.

Let $\rho_{\mathcal{I}} = \{\rho^i : L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ be some (a priori specified) collection of normalized monetary risk measures, where \mathcal{I} is a nonempty infinite countable set. We define the set of weighting schemes $\mathcal{V} = \{\{\mu_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \subset [0, 1] : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mu_i = 1\}$. Otherwise stated we fix $\mu \in \mathcal{V}$ and denote $\mathcal{I}_\mu = \{i \in \mathcal{I} : \mu_i > 0\}$. We could consider $\mu \subset (0, 1]$ and then $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_\mu$ without any harm for our results. We use the notations $\{X^i \in L^\infty, i \in \mathcal{I}\} = \{X^i, i \in \mathcal{I}\} = \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} = \{X^i\}$ for families indexed over \mathcal{I} ; these families should be understood as generalizations of n -tuples. For any $X \in L^\infty$, we define its allocations as

$$\mathbb{A}(X) = \left\{ \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i \mu_i = X, \{X^i\} \text{ is bounded} \right\}.$$

Evidently, $\omega \rightarrow \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i(\omega) \mu_i$ defines a random variable in L^∞ for any $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$, $X \in L^\infty$. We note that the identity $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i \mu_i = X$ should then be understood in the $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$ sense.

The countable case we study can be regarded as $\mathcal{I} = \mathbb{N}$ where the set of allocations $\mathbb{A}(X)$ consists of all sequences $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^\infty$ such that the associated sequence $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i X^i$ converges to X in the $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$ sense. Note that if $\sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{n+k} X^i \mu_i = X$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ by taking $X^i = 0$ for $i > n$. In particular $\{X^1, \dots, X^n, 0, \dots\} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$. We have that $\mathbb{A}(X) \neq \emptyset$ for any X because we can select $X^i = X$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}$. We also note that $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X + Y)$ is equivalent to $\{X^i - Y\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ for any $X, Y \in L^\infty$. Furthermore, if

$\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ and $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(Y)$, then $\{aX^i + bY^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(aX + bY)$ for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $X, Y \in L^\infty$. We now define the core functional in our study.

Definition 2.2. Let $\rho_{\mathcal{I}} = \{\rho^i: L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ be a collection of monetary risk measures and $\mu \in \mathcal{V}$. The μ -weighted inf-convolution risk measure is a functional $\rho_{conv}^\mu: L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ defined as

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X) \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

Remark 2.3. We defined risk measures as functionals that only assume finite values. By abuse of notation, we will also consider ρ_{conv}^μ to be a risk measure, and we will provide conditions whereby it is finite. Since $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of monetary risk measures, then $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) < \infty$ because for any $X \in L^\infty$ we have that $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X) \mu_i \leq \|X\|_\infty < \infty$. Moreover, we note that normalization is not directly inherited from $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$; indeed, $\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) \leq 0$. When ρ_{conv}^μ is convex it is finite if and only if $\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) > -\infty$, which is a well-known fact from convex analysis that a convex function that does not assume ∞ is either finite or $-\infty$ point-wise (see Lemma 16 of Delbaen (2012) for instance).

The following proposition provides useful results regarding well definiteness, representations, and properties of ρ_{conv}^μ .

Proposition 2.4. *We have that*

(i) ρ_{conv}^μ is well defined.

(ii) For any $X \in L^\infty$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{conv}^\mu(X) &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X - X^i) \mu_i : \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(0) \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : n \in \mathbb{N}, \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) If $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of risk measures satisfying positive homogeneity, then $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq \rho^i(X) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu, \forall X \in L^\infty$.

Proof. (i) We must to show that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i$ converges for any $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$. As $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is bounded, there is $y, z \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $y \leq X^i \leq z, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$. By monotonicity and translation invariance it follows that $-z = \rho^i(z) \leq \rho^i(X^i) \leq \rho^i(y) = -y, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$. Thus,

$$-z = -z \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mu_i = - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} z \mu_i \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i \leq - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} y \mu_i = -y \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mu_i = -y.$$

Hence, the claim follows by dominated convergence.

- (ii) For the first relation, we note that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i \mu_i = X$ if and only if $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (X - X^i) \mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (X^i - X) \mu_i = 0$. Thus, by letting $Y^i = X - X^i$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}$, we have that

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X - Y^i) \mu_i : \{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(0) \right\}.$$

Regarding the second relation, first notice that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X \right\} = \inf \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X \right\}.$$

Let $B_n := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X \right\}$ and $B := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^\infty \rho(X^i) \mu_i : \{X^i\} \in \mathbb{A}(X) \right\}$. Such sets depend on X and $B_n \subseteq B_{n+1} \subseteq B \subseteq \mathbb{R}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. As any convergent infinite sum is the limit of finite sums, we obtain $B \subseteq cl(\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n)$. Thus, $cl(B) = cl(\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n)$. If both B and $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n$ are unbounded from below then their infimum coincide to $-\infty$. If they both are bounded from below, we have that $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \inf B = \inf cl(B) = \inf(cl(\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n)) = \inf \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n = \lim_n \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X \right\}$. Therefore, we only need to show that B is unbounded from below if and only if $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n$ is unbounded from below. Since $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n \subseteq B$ we clearly have that if $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n$ is unbounded from below so is B . For the converse, let B be unbounded from below. Then there is a sequence $\{b_j\} \subseteq B$ such that $b_j \downarrow -\infty$. As any b_j is a limit point of a sequence (in n) $\{a_n^j\} \subseteq \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n$, we can find another sequence (in j) $\{a_{n(j)}^j\} \subseteq \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n$, where $n(j)$ is a sufficiently large natural number, such that $a_{n(j)}^j \rightarrow -\infty$. This fact implies that $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n$ is also unbounded from below.

For the third relation, we show that $n \rightarrow \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X \right\}$ is decreasing. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} X^i \mu_i = X \right\} \\ & \leq \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X, X^{n+1} = 0 \right\} \\ & = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the infimum with respect to $n \in \mathbb{N}$ can be replaced by a limit.

- (iii) We assume, toward a contradiction, that there is $X \in L^\infty$ such that $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) > \rho^j(X)$ for some $j \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. Let $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be such that $Y^i = (\mu_j)^{-1} X$ for $i = j$, and $Y^i = 0$ otherwise. Then, $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$. Thus, by positive homogeneity and the definition of ρ_{conv}^μ we have that

$$\rho^j(X) < \rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y^i) \mu_i = \rho^j(X),$$

which is a contradiction. In this case, for any $X \in L^\infty$, we have that $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq \inf_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \rho^i(X) < \infty$.

□

Remark 2.5. We have that our convex approach is related to the countable summation risk sharing problem without weights. Let

$$\mathbb{A}^*(X) := \left\{ \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i = X, \{X^i\} \text{ is bounded} \right\}.$$

note that for each $\{X^i\} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ we have that $\{Y^i = \mu^i X^i\} \in \mathbb{A}^*(X)$. Similarly, if $\{X^i\} \in \mathbb{A}^*(X)$ we have that $\left\{Y^i = \frac{X^i}{\mu^i}, i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu\right\} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$. It is clear that there exist a one to one correspondence between $\mathbb{A}(X)$ and $\mathbb{A}^*(X)$ for all $X \in L^\infty$. Moreover, let

$$\rho_{\mathcal{I}}^* := \left\{ \rho_*^i(X) = \rho^i\left(\frac{X}{\mu_i}\right) \mu_i \forall X \in L^\infty, i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \right\}$$

and

$$\rho_{conv}(X) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \rho_*^i(X^i) : \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \in \mathbb{A}^*(X) \right\}.$$

Note that any $\rho_*^i \in \rho_{\mathcal{I}}^*$ inherits all relevant properties of $\rho^i \in \rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ used in this study. Directly from those definitions we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{conv}(X) &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \rho^i\left(\frac{X^i}{\mu_i}\right) \mu_i : \{X^i\} \in \mathbb{A}^*(X) \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \{\mu_i X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}^*(X) \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X) \right\} = \rho_{conv}^\mu(X). \end{aligned}$$

Of course, under positive homogeneity $\rho_{\mathcal{I}} = \rho_{\mathcal{I}}^*$ for any $i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ and, consequently, our approach becomes the additive risk sharing.

We now present a result regarding the preservation by ρ_{conv}^μ of financial properties of $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$.

Proposition 2.6. ρ_{conv}^μ is monetary. Moreover, if $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of risk measures with convexity, positive homogeneity, law invariance, loadedness, or limitedness, then each property is inherited by ρ_{conv}^μ .

Proof. Monotonicity, translation invariance, convexity, positive homogeneity, loadedness and limitedness are directly obtained from definition of ρ_{conv}^μ . For law invariance, we begin by showing that ρ_{conv}^μ inherits law invariance on the sub-domain

$$L_{\perp}^\infty := \{X \in L^\infty : \exists \text{ uniform on } [0, 1] \text{ r.v. independent of } X\}.$$

To that, let $X, Y \in L_{\perp}^\infty$ with $X \sim Y$ and take some arbitrary $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$. Note that we can have a countable set $\{U^i, i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ of i.i.d. uniform on $[0, 1]$ random variables independent of Y because our probability space is atomless, see Theorem 1 of [Delbaen \(2012\)](#) for instance.

Now take $X^0 = X$, $Y^0 = Y$ and let $Y^i = F_{X^i|X^{i-1}, \dots, X^0}^{-1}(U^i|Y^{i-1}, \dots, Y^0) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$, which is the conditional quantile function. We thus get that $(Y, Y^1, \dots, Y^n) \sim (X, X^1, \dots, X^n) \forall n \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(Y)$. In this sense we obtain $\rho_{conv}^\mu(Y) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y^i) \mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i$. Taking the infimum over $\mathbb{A}(X)$ we get $\rho_{conv}^\mu(Y) \leq \rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$. By reversing roles of X and Y , we obtain Law Invariance on L_\perp^∞ . Now, let $X, Y \in L^\infty$ with $X \sim Y$ and define $\{X_n\} \subset L^\infty$ as $X_n = \frac{1}{n} \lfloor nX \rfloor$ and $\{Y_n\} \subset L^\infty$ as $Y_n = \frac{1}{n} \lfloor nY \rfloor$, where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function. Moreover, it is easy to show that $X_n \sim Y_n, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 3 in Liu et al. (2020) we have that if $X \in L^\infty$ takes values in a countable set, then $X \in L_\perp^\infty$. Thus $\{X_n\} \subset L_\perp^\infty$ and $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X_n) = \rho_{conv}^\mu(Y_n), \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. We have that ρ_{conv}^μ is Lipschitz continuous since it is monetary. In particular, it possesses continuity in $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ norm. Note that $X_{2^n} \rightarrow X$. Thus $|\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) - \rho_{conv}^\mu(Y)| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) - \rho_{conv}^\mu(X_{2^n})| + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\rho_{conv}^\mu(Y) - \rho_{conv}^\mu(Y_{2^n})| = 0$. Hence $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \rho_{conv}^\mu(Y)$. \square

Remark 2.7. (i) Concerning the preservation of subadditivity, that is, $\rho(X + Y) \leq \rho(X) + \rho(Y)$, the result follows by an argument analogous to that for convexity, but with $X + Y$ instead of $\lambda X + (1 - \lambda)Y$. We note that in this case, we have normalization because $\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) \leq 0$, whereas $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq \rho_{conv}^\mu(X) + \rho_{conv}^\mu(0)$, which implies $\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) \geq 0$. If the risk measures of $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ are loaded, we also have normalization because $0 = \rho(0) \geq \rho_{conv}^\mu(0) \geq E[-0] = 0$. Of course, in the case of positive homogeneity, we also obtain normalization.

(ii) Regarding the preservation of comonotonic additivity, let $X, Y \in L^\infty$ be a comonotone pair. Then, $\lambda X, (1 - \lambda)Y$ is also comonotone for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. We note that for any monetary risk measure ρ , comonotonic additivity implies positive homogeneity. Then, we have that

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(X + Y) = 2\rho_{conv}^\mu\left(\frac{X}{2} + \frac{Y}{2}\right) \leq 2\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) + \frac{1}{2}\rho_{conv}^\mu(Y)\right) = \rho_{conv}^\mu(X) + \rho_{conv}^\mu(Y).$$

Thus, we obtain subadditivity for comonotone pairs. If we have, additionally, convexity (and hence coherence) for $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$, then comonotonic additivity is preserved, as shown in Theorem 3.12.

In addition to the usual norm-based continuity notions, \mathbb{P} -a.s. pointwise continuity notions are relevant in the context of risk measures. In the following, we focus on the preservation by ρ_{conv}^μ of continuity properties of $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$

Definition 2.8. A risk measure $\rho : L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called

- (i) *Fatou continuous:* If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n = X$ implies that $\rho(X) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(X_n), \forall \{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ bounded in L^∞ norm and for any $X \in L^\infty$.
- (ii) *Continuous from above:* If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n = X$, with $\{X_n\}$ being decreasing, implies that $\rho(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(X_n), \forall \{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty, X \in L^\infty$.
- (iii) *Continuous from below:* If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n = X$, with $\{X_n\}$ being increasing, implies that $\rho(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(X_n), \forall \{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty, X \in L^\infty$.
- (iv) *Lebesgue continuous:* If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n = X$ implies that $\rho(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(X_n), \forall \{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ bounded in L^∞ norm and $X \in L^\infty$.

Proposition 2.9. *We have that*

(i) *If $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of Lipschitz continuous risk measures in relation to some pseudo metric d , then ρ_{conv}^{μ} is Lipschitz continuous in that pseudo-metric.*

(ii) *If $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of continuous from below risk measures, then ρ_{conv}^{μ} is continuous from below.*

Proof. (i) For each $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we have that $|\rho^i(X) - \rho^i(Y)| \leq Cd(X, Y)$, $C > 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\rho_{conv}^{\mu}(X) - \rho_{conv}^{\mu}(Y)| \\ &= \left| \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X - X^i) \mu_i : \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(0) \right\} - \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y - X^i) \mu_i : \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(0) \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \sup \left\{ \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} [\rho^i(X - X^i) - \rho^i(Y - X^i)] \mu_i \right| : \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(0) \right\} \leq Cd(X, Y). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset L^{\infty}$ be increasing such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n = X \in L^{\infty}$. By the monotonicity of $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ we have that each $\rho^i(X_n - X^i)$ is decreasing in n . Moreover, $i \rightarrow \rho^i(X_n - X^i)$ is bounded above by $\sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \|X_1 - X^i\|_{\infty} < \infty$. Thus, by the monotone convergence Theorem we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{conv}^{\mu}(X_n) &= \inf_n \left\{ \inf_{\{X^i\} \in \mathbb{A}(0)} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X_n - X^i) \mu_i \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\{X^i\} \in \mathbb{A}(0)} \left\{ \inf_n \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X_n - X^i) \mu_i \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\{X^i\} \in \mathbb{A}(0)} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left[\inf_n \rho^i(X_n - X^i) \right] \mu_i \right\} = \rho_{conv}^{\mu}(X). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 2.10. (i) It is important to note that Fatou continuity is not preserved even when \mathcal{I} is finite, as $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n = X$ does not imply the existence of $\{X_n^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X_n) \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n^i = X^i, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$. See Example 9 in [Delbaen \(2002a\)](#), for instance. Accordingly, one should be careful when dual representations that depends of such continuity property are considered.

(ii) If $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of convex risk measures that are continuous from below, then ρ_{conv}^{μ} is convex Lebesgue continuous. This is true because continuity from below is equivalent to Lebesgue continuity for convex risk measures. See Theorem 4.22 in [Föllmer and Schied \(2016\)](#) for instance.

(iii) Robustness is a key concept in the presence of model uncertainty. It implies a small variation in the output functional when there is bad specification. See, for instance, [Cont et al. \(2010\)](#), [Kratschmer et al. \(2014\)](#), and [Kiesel et al. \(2016\)](#). Formally, if d is a pseudo-metric on L^{∞} , then a risk measure $\rho: L^{\infty} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called d -robust if it is continuous with respect to d . In light of Proposition 2.9, we have that the continuity of risk measures

in $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ with respect to d is not generally preserved by ρ_{conv}^{μ} . Consequently, the same is true for d -robustness. Nonetheless, under Lipschitz continuity, we have the preservation of robustness.

3 Dual representations

We now present the main results regarding the representation of ρ_{conv}^{μ} for convex cases. To that, we need the following fundamental result.

Theorem 3.1 (Theorem 2.3 in [Delbaen \(2002b\)](#), Theorem 4.33 in [Föllmer and Schied \(2016\)](#)). *Let $\rho : L^{\infty} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a risk measure. Then,*

(i) *ρ is a convex risk measure if and only if it can be represented as*

$$\rho(X) = \max_{m \in ba_{1,+}} \{E_m[-X] - \alpha_{\rho}^{min}(m)\}, \forall X \in L^{\infty}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\alpha_{\rho}^{min} : ba_{1,+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$, defined as $\alpha_{\rho}^{min}(m) = \sup_{X \in L^{\infty}} \{E_m[-X] - \rho(X)\} = \sup_{X \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho}} E_m[-X]$, is a lower semi-continuous (in the total-variation norm) convex function that is called penalty term.

(ii) *ρ is a coherent risk measure if and only if it can be represented as*

$$\rho(X) = \max_{m \in \mathcal{Q}_{\rho}} E_m[-X], \forall X \in L^{\infty}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_{\rho} \subseteq ba_{1,+}$ is a nonempty, closed, and convex set that is called the dual set of ρ .

Remark 3.2. With the assumption of Fatou continuity, the representations in the previous theorem could be considered over \mathcal{Q} instead of $ba_{1,+}$, but with the supremum not necessarily being attained. Moreover, for convex risk measures, we can define certain subgradients using Legendre–Fenchel duality (i.e., convex conjugates), as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\rho(X) &= \{m \in ba_{1,+} : \rho(Y) - \rho(X) \geq E_m[-(Y - X)] \forall Y \in L^{\infty}\} \\ &= \{m \in ba_{1,+} : E_m[-X] - \alpha_{\rho}^{min}(m) \geq \rho(X)\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\alpha_{\rho}^{min}(m) &= \{X \in L^{\infty} : \alpha_{\rho}^{min}(n) - \alpha_{\rho}^{min}(m) \geq E_{(n-m)}[-X] \forall n \in ba\} \\ &= \{X \in L^{\infty} : E_m[-X] - \rho(X) \geq \alpha_{\rho}^{min}(m)\}, \end{aligned}$$

The negative sign in the expectation above is used to maintain the (anti) monotonicity pattern of risk measures. We note that these subgradient sets could be empty if we consider only \mathcal{Q} instead of $ba_{1,+}$. Moreover, by [Theorem 3.1](#), we could replace the inequalities in the definition of sub-gradients by equalities. Further, it is immediate that $X \in \partial\alpha_{\rho}^{min}(m)$ if and only if $m \in \partial\rho(X)$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a collection of convex risk measures. We have that*

(i) The acceptance set of ρ_{conv}^μ is

$$\mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu} = cl(\mathcal{A}_\mu), \quad (3.3)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_\mu = \{X \in L^\infty : \exists \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X) \text{ s.t. } X^i \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i} \forall i \in \mathcal{I}\} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i} \mu_i$. Moreover, \mathcal{A}_μ is not dense in L^∞ if and only if $\mathcal{A}_\mu \neq L^\infty$.

(ii) The minimal penalty term of ρ_{conv}^μ is

$$\alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) \mu_i, \quad \forall m \in ba_{1,+}. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. We have that ρ_{conv}^μ is a convex risk measure that is either finite or identically $-\infty$. Moreover, it is well known for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min} \mu_i = \sup_{X \in L^\infty} \left\{ E_m[-X] - \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X \right\} \right\},$$

which generates the acceptance set $cl(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i} \mu_i)$ with $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n\} \subset [0, 1]^n$. We now demonstrate the claims.

(i) Let $X \in \mathcal{A}_\mu$. Then, there is $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ such that $X^i \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i} \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$. Thus, $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i \leq 0$. This implies $X \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}$. By taking closures we get $cl(\mathcal{A}_\mu) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}$. We note that \mathcal{A}_μ is not necessarily closed (for reasons similar to those for which ρ_{conv}^μ does not inherit Fatou continuity). For the converse relation, let $X \in int(\mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu})$. Then there is $\{X^i\} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ such that $k = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i < 0$. Since $\rho^i(X^i + \rho^i(X^i) - k) < 0$ for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we have that $Y^i = X^i + \rho^i(X^i) - k \in int(\mathcal{A}_{\rho^i})$ for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Moreover, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} Y^i \mu_i = X + k - k = X$. Then $\{Y^i\} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$, which implies $X \in \mathcal{A}_\mu \subseteq cl(\mathcal{A}_\mu)$. Thus, $int(\mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_\mu$. By taking closures we get $cl(int(\mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu})) = \mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu} \subseteq cl(\mathcal{A}_\mu)$, which gives the required equality. Moreover, let \mathcal{A}_μ be norm-dense in L^∞ . Thus, for any $X \in L^\infty$ and $k > 0$, there is $Y \in \mathcal{A}_\mu$ such that $\|X - Y\|_\infty \leq k$. Thus, $X + k \geq Y$ and, as \mathcal{A}_μ is monotone, we obtain $X + k \in \mathcal{A}_\mu$. As both X and k are arbitrary, $\mathcal{A}_\mu = L^\infty$. The converse relation is trivial.

(ii) We have for any $m \in ba_{1,+}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m) &= \sup_{X \in L^\infty} \left\{ E_m[-X] - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X \right\} \right\} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{X \in L^\infty} \left\{ E_m[-X] - \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i = X \right\} \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) \mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) \mu_i. \end{aligned}$$

For the converse, by Theorem 3.1 and Remark 3.2, we have that

$$\alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m) = \sup_{X \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}} E_m[-X], \quad \mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu} = \left\{ X \in L^\infty : \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(X) \geq E_m[-X] \forall m \in ba_{1,+} \right\}.$$

Moreover, note that if $X \in \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i} \mu_i$, then $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X^i \mu_i$ with $X^i \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Thus, $X \in \mathcal{A}_\mu$ since $\{X^1, \dots, X^n, 0, 0, \dots\} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ and 0 is acceptable for any ρ^i . Then, for any $m \in ba_{1,+}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \mu_i &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \sup \{E_m[-X] \mu_i : X \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i}\} \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n E_m[-X^i] \mu_i : \{X^i \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i}\}_{i=1, \dots, n} \right\} \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ E_m[-X] : X \in \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i} \mu_i \right\} \\
&\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{E_m[-X] : X \in \mathcal{A}_\mu\} \\
&= \sup \{E_m[-X] : X \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}\} = \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min}(m).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min} \mu_i$. Regarding the properties of $m \rightarrow \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \mu_i$, non-negativity is straightforward, whereas convexity follows from the monotonicity of the integral and the convexity of each $\alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}$ because for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $m_1, m_2 \in ba_{1,+}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(\lambda m_1 + (1 - \lambda)m_2) \mu_i &\leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left[\lambda \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m_1) + (1 - \lambda) \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m_2) \right] \mu_i \\
&= \lambda \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m_1) \mu_i + (1 - \lambda) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m_2) \mu_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by Fatou's lemma (which can be used because each $\alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}$ is bounded from below by 0) and by the lower semi-continuity of each $\alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}$ with respect to the total variation norm on ba , for any $\{m_n\}$ such that $m_n \rightarrow m$, we have that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \mu_i \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m_n) \mu_i \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m_n) \mu_i.$$

□

Remark 3.4. (i) Under the assumption of Fatou continuity for both the risk measures in $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ and ρ_{conv}^μ , the claims in Theorem 3.3 could be adapted by replacing the finitely additive measures $m \in ba_{+,1}$ by probabilities $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}$. Moreover, weak* topological concepts could replace the corresponding strong (norm) topological concepts.

(ii) The weighted risk measure is a functional $\rho^\mu : L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $\rho^\mu(X) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X) \mu_i$. Theorem 4.6 in Righi (2019b) states that, assuming Fatou continuity, ρ^μ can be represented using a convex (not necessarily minimal) penalty defined as

$$\alpha_{\rho^\mu}(\mathbb{Q}) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(\mathbb{Q}^i) \mu_i : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{Q}^i \mu_i = \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}^i \in \mathcal{Q} \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \right\}.$$

By the duality of convex conjugates, $\alpha_{\rho^\mu} = \alpha_{\rho^\mu}^{\min}$ if and only if α_{ρ^μ} is lower semi-continuous. Nonetheless, this represents a connection between weighted and inf-convolution functions for countable \mathcal{I} , as in the traditional finite case.

The following corollary provides interesting properties regarding the normalization, finiteness, preservation, dominance, and sub-gradients of ρ_{conv}^μ .

Corollary 3.5. *Let $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a collection of convex risk measures. Then*

- (i) $\left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \mu_i < \infty \right\} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if ρ_{conv}^μ is finite. In this case \mathcal{A}_μ is not dense in L^∞ .
- (ii) ρ_{conv}^μ is normalized if and only if $\left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) = 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \right\} \neq \emptyset$.
- (iii) If $\rho : L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex risk measure with $\rho(X) \leq (\geq \text{ or } =) \rho^i(X) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu, \forall X \in L^\infty$, then $\rho(X) \leq (\geq \text{ or } =) \rho_{conv}^\mu(X), \forall X \in L^\infty$.
- (iv) $\left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : m \in \partial \rho^i(X^i) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \right\} = \bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \partial \rho^i(X^i) \subseteq \partial \rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$ for any $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ and $X \in L^\infty$.
- (v) $\left\{ X \in L^\infty : \exists \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X) \text{ s.t. } X^i \in \partial \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \right\} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \partial \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \mu_i \subseteq \partial \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min}(m)$ for any $m \in ba_{1,+}$.

Proof. (i) By Proposition 2.6, we have $\rho_{conv}^\mu < \infty$. If $\left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \mu_i < \infty \right\} \neq \emptyset$, then there exists $m \in ba_{1,+}$ such that

$$-\infty < E_m[-X] - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \mu_i \leq E_m[-X] - \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min}(m) \leq \rho_{conv}^\mu(X).$$

If $\left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \mu_i < \infty \right\} = \emptyset$, then $\alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min}(m) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \mu_i = \infty, \forall m \in ba_{1,+}$. Hence, $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = -\infty, \forall X \in L^\infty$. Furthermore, if \mathcal{A}_μ is dense in L^∞ , then by (i) in Theorem 3.3, we have $\mathcal{A}_\mu = L^\infty$. Thus, we have $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \inf\{m \in \mathbb{R} : X + m \in L^\infty\} = -\infty, \forall X \in L^\infty$.

- (ii) Let $\left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) = 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \right\} \neq \emptyset$ and m' in this set. Then, $\alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min}(m') = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m') \mu_i = 0$. Hence,

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) = - \min_{m \in ba_{1,+}} \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min}(m) = 0.$$

For the converse relation, let $\left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) = 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \right\} = \emptyset$. Thus, for any $m \in ba_{1,+}$, we have that $\left\{ i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu : \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) > 0 \right\} \neq \emptyset$. Then,

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) = - \min_{m \in ba_{1,+}} \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min}(m) < 0,$$

which implies that ρ_{conv}^μ is not normalized.

- (iii) We prove for the \leq relation since the others are quite similar. By Theorem 3.1 and Remark 3.2, we have that $\alpha_\rho^{\min}(m) \geq \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ for any $m \in ba_{1,+}$. Thus, by

Theorem 3.3, we obtain that

$$\alpha_\rho^{\min}(m) \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \mu_i = \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min}(m).$$

Hence, $\rho(X) \leq \rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$, $\forall X \in L^\infty$.

(iv) Let $m' \in \{m \in ba_{1,+} : m \in \partial \rho^i(X^i) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu\}$. Then,

$$E_{m'}[-X] - \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min}(m') \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left(E_{m'}[-X^i] - \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m') \right) \mu_i \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i \geq \rho_{conv}^\mu(X),$$

which implies $m' \in \partial \rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$.

(v) We fix $m \in ba_{1,+}$. If $X \in \left\{ X \in L^\infty : \exists \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X) \text{ s.t. } X^i \in \partial \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \right\}$, let $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ such that $X^i \in \partial \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. Then,

$$E_m[-X] - \rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left(E_m[-X^i] - \rho^i(X^i) \right) \mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{\min}(m) \mu_i \geq \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min}(m).$$

Thus, $X \in \partial \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{\min}(m)$.

□

Remark 3.6. In the context of item (iii) and under coherence of $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$, by Proposition 2.4 we have that $\rho(X) \leq \rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq \rho^i(X) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$, $\forall X \in L^\infty$ for any convex risk measure ρ such that $\rho(X) \leq \rho^i(X) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$, $\forall X \in L^\infty$. In this sense, we can understand ρ_{conv}^μ as the “lower-convexification” of the non-convex risk measure $\inf_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \rho^i$ in the sense that the former is the largest convex risk measure that is dominated by the latter.

We now present the main results regarding the representation of ρ_{conv}^μ for coherent cases.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a collection of coherent risk measures. Then,*

(i) ρ_{conv}^μ is finite, and its dual set is

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu} = \{m \in ba_{1,+} : m \in \mathcal{Q}_{\rho^i} \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu\} = \bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \mathcal{Q}_{\rho^i}. \quad (3.5)$$

In particular, $\mathcal{Q}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}$ is non empty.

(ii) The acceptance set of ρ_{conv}^μ is

$$\mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu} = clconv(\mathcal{A}_\cup) = cl(\mathcal{A}_\mu), \quad \mathcal{A}_\cup = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i}, \quad (3.6)$$

where $clconv$ denotes the closed convex hull.

Proof. (i) By Proposition 2.6, we have that ρ_{conv}^μ is a coherent risk measure. Since $\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) = 0$, it is finite. In this case, its dual set is composed by the measures $m \in ba_{1,+}$ such that

$\alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m) = 0$. By Theorems 3.1 and 3.3, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu} &= \left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) \mu_i = 0 \right\} \\ &= \left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) = 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \right\} \\ &= \left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : m \in \mathcal{Q}_{\rho^i} \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \right\} = \bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \mathcal{Q}_{\rho^i}.\end{aligned}$$

The convexity and closedness of $\mathcal{Q}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}$ follow from the convexity and lower semicontinuity of $\alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}$. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{Q}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu} = \left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) = 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \right\} = \emptyset$, then by Corollary 3.5, $\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) < 0$, which contradicts coherence.

- (ii) We recall that, by Theorem 3.1 and Remark 3.2, for any coherent risk measure $\rho: L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have $X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ if and only if $E_m[-X] \leq 0 \forall m \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu} &= \bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : E_m[-X] \leq 0 \forall X \in \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ m \in \mathcal{Q} : E_m[-X] \leq 0, \forall X \in \cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \mathcal{A}_{\rho^i} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ m \in \mathcal{Q} : E_m[-X] \leq 0, \forall X \in clconv(\mathcal{A}_\cup) \right\} = \mathcal{Q}_{\rho_{clconv}(\mathcal{A}_\cup)}.\end{aligned}$$

By considering the closed convex hull does not affect is because the map $X \rightarrow E_m[X]$ is linear and continuous for any $m \in \mathcal{Q}$. Thus, $\rho_{conv}^\mu = \rho_{clconv(\mathcal{A}_\cup)}$. Hence, $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu} = \mathcal{A}_{\rho_{clconv}(\mathcal{A}_\cup)} = clconv(\mathcal{A}_\cup)$. We note that \mathcal{A}_\cup is nonempty, monotone (in the sense that $X \in \mathcal{A}_\cup$ and $Y \geq X$ implies $Y \in \mathcal{A}_\cup$), and a cone, as this is true for any \mathcal{A}_{ρ^i} . Moreover, it is evident that $\mathcal{A}_\cup \subseteq \mathcal{A}_\mu$ for normalized risk measures in $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$. Thus, by Theorem 3.3, we have that $\mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu} = clconv(\mathcal{A}_\cup) \subseteq cl(\mathcal{A}_\mu) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}$. \square

Remark 3.8. (i) Similarly to Remark 3.4, under the assumption of Fatou continuity for both the risk measures in $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ and ρ_{conv}^μ , the claims in Theorem 3.3 could be adapted by replacing the finitely additive measures $m \in ba_{+,1}$ by probabilities $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}$. Moreover, weak* topological concepts could replace the corresponding strong (norm) topological concepts.

- (ii) In light of Corollary 3.5, we have, under the hypotheses of Theorem 3.7, that ρ_{conv}^μ is finite and normalized if and only if the condition $\left\{ m \in ba_{1,+} : \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) = 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \right\} \neq \emptyset$ is satisfied. Moreover, both assertions are equivalent to \mathcal{A}_μ not being dense in L^∞ . The intuition for \mathcal{A}_\cup is that some position is acceptable if it is acceptable for any relevant (in the μ sense) member of $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$.

If law invariance is satisfied, as is the case in most practical applications, interesting features are present. In this paper, when dealing with law invariance we always assume that our base probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is atomless. We then introduce the following risk measures:

Example 3.9. (i) Value at risk (VaR): This is a Fatou-continuous, law-invariant, comonotone, monetary risk measure defined as $VaR^\alpha(X) = -F_X^{-1}(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. We have the acceptance set $\mathcal{A}_{VaR^\alpha} = \{X \in L^\infty : \mathbb{P}(X < 0) \leq \alpha\}$.

- (ii) Expected shortfall (ES): This is a Fatou-continuous, law-invariant, comonotone, coherent risk measure defined as $ES^\alpha(X) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^\alpha VaR^s(X) ds$, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $ES^0(X) = VaR^0(X) = -\text{ess inf } X$. We have $\mathcal{A}_{ES^\alpha} = \{X \in L^\infty : \int_0^\alpha VaR^s(X) ds \leq 0\}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{ES^\alpha} = \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q} : \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \right\}$. Note that $ES^1(X) = -E[X]$.

Theorem 3.10 (Theorems 4 and 7 in [Kusuoka \(2001\)](#), Theorem 4.1 in [Acerbi \(2002\)](#), Theorem 7 in [Frittelli and Rosazza Gianin \(2005\)](#)). *Let $\rho : L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a risk measure. Then*

- (i) ρ is a law-invariant, convex risk measure if and only if it can be represented as

$$\rho(X) = \sup_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \left\{ \int_{(0,1]} ES^\alpha(X) dm - \beta_\rho^{\min}(m) \right\}, \quad \forall X \in L^\infty, \quad (3.7)$$

where \mathcal{M} is the set of probability measures on $(0, 1]$, and $\beta_\rho^{\min} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ is defined as $\beta_\rho^{\min}(m) = \sup_{X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho} \int_{(0,1]} ES^\alpha(X) dm$.

- (ii) ρ is a law-invariant, coherent risk measure if and only if it can be represented as

$$\rho(X) = \sup_{m \in \mathcal{M}_\rho} \int_{(0,1]} ES^\alpha(X) dm, \quad \forall X \in L^\infty, \quad (3.8)$$

where $\mathcal{M}_\rho = \left\{ m \in \mathcal{M} : \int_{(u,1]} \frac{1}{v} dm = F_{\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}}^{-1}(1-u), \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho \right\}$.

- (iii) ρ is a law-invariant, comonotone, coherent risk measure if and only if it can be represented as

$$\rho(X) = \int_{(0,1]} ES^\alpha(X) dm \quad (3.9)$$

$$= \int_0^1 VaR^\alpha(X) \phi(\alpha) d\alpha \quad (3.10)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^0 (g(\mathbb{P}(-X \geq x)) - 1) dx + \int_0^\infty g(\mathbb{P}(-X \geq x)) dx, \quad \forall X \in L^\infty, \quad (3.11)$$

where $m \in \mathcal{M}_\rho$, $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is decreasing and right-continuous, with $\phi(1) = 0$ and $\int_0^1 \phi(u) du = 1$, and $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, called distortion, is increasing and concave, with $g(0) = 0$ and $g(1) = 1$. We have that $\int_{(u,1]} \frac{1}{v} dm = \phi(u) = g'_+(u) \forall u \in [0, 1]$.

Remark 3.11. (i) We have that law-invariant convex risk measures ρ are Fatou continuous, see Theorem 2.1 in [Jouini et al. \(2006\)](#) and Proposition 1.1 in [Svindland \(2010\)](#), and $X \succeq Y$ implies that $\rho(X) \leq \rho(Y)$, see Theorem 4.3 in [Bäuerle and Müller \(2006\)](#) and Corollary 4.65 in [Föllmer and Schied \(2016\)](#).

- (ii) Functionals with representation as in (iii) of the last theorem are called spectral or distortion risk measures. This concept is related to capacity set functions and Choquet integrals. Note that Comonotonic Additivity implies coherence for convex risk measures, see Lemma 4.83 of [Föllmer and Schied \(2016\)](#) for instance. In this case, ρ can be represented by $\mathcal{Q}_\rho = \{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q} : \mathbb{Q}(A) \leq g(\mathbb{P}(A)), \forall A \in \mathcal{F}\}$, which is the core of g , if and only

if g is its distortion function. If ϕ is not decreasing (and thus g is not concave), then the risk measure is not convex and cannot be represented as combinations of ES.

- (iii) Without law invariance, we can (see, for instance, Theorem 4.94 and Corollary 4.95 in [Föllmer and Schied \(2016\)](#)) represent a convex, comonotone risk measure ρ by a Choquet integral as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) &= \int (-X)dc \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0 (c(-X \geq x) - 1)dx + \int_0^\infty c(-X \geq x)dx \\ &= \max_{m \in ba_{1,+}^c} E_m[-X], \quad \forall X \in L^\infty,\end{aligned}$$

where $c: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a normalized ($c(\emptyset) = 0$ and $c(\Omega) = 1$), monotone (if $A \subseteq B$ then $c(A) \leq c(B)$), submodular ($c(A \cup B) + c(A \cap B) \leq c(A) + c(B)$) set function that is called capacity and is defined as $c(A) = \rho(-1_A) \forall A \in \mathcal{F}$, and $ba_{1,+}^c = \{m \in ba_{1,+}: m(A) \leq c(A) \forall A \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

We now focus on dual representations under the assumption of law invariance and comonotonic additivity.

Theorem 3.12. *Let $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a collection of convex, law-invariant risk measures. Then,*

- (i) ρ_{conv}^μ is finite, normalized and has penalty term

$$\beta_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \beta_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) \mu_i, \quad \forall m \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (3.12)$$

- (ii) If, in addition, $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of comonotone risk measures, then ρ_{conv}^μ is comonotone, and its distortion function is

$$g = \inf_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} g^i, \quad (3.13)$$

where g^i is the distortion of ρ^i for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

Proof. (i) By Theorem 3.10 and Proposition 2.6, we have that ρ_{conv}^μ is a Fatou continuous convex risk measure with $\rho_{conv}^\mu < \infty$. Moreover, ρ_{conv}^μ is either finite or identically $-\infty$. Regarding finiteness and normalization, we note that $\rho(X) \geq -E[X]$, $\forall X \in L^\infty$ for normalized, convex, law-invariant risk measures by second-order stochastic dominance. Thus,

$$\alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(\mathbb{P}) = \sup_{X \in L^\infty} \{E[-X] - \rho(X)\} \leq \sup_{X \in L^\infty} \{\rho(X) - \rho(X)\} = 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}.$$

By the non-negativity of the penalty terms, we have $\alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(\mathbb{P}) = 0$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}$. Hence, by item (ii) of Corollary 3.5, we conclude that ρ_{conv}^μ is normalized and, consequently, finite. Moreover, the penalty term can be obtained by an argument similar to that in (ii) of Theorem 3.3 by considering the $m \rightarrow \int_{(0,1]} ES^\alpha(X)dm$ linear and playing the role of $m \rightarrow E_m[-X]$ and recalling that acceptance sets of law invariant risk measures are law invariant in the sense that $X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$ and $X \sim Y$ implies $Y \in \mathcal{A}_\rho$.

(ii) By Theorems 3.10, 3.3, and 3.7, as well as Remark 3.11, we have, recalling that ρ_{conv}^μ is finite and Fatou continuous, that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}_{\rho_{conv}^\mu} &= \{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q} : \mathbb{Q}(A) \leq g^i(\mathbb{P}(A)) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \forall A \in \mathcal{F}\} \\ &= \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q} : \mathbb{Q}(A) \leq \inf_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} g^i(\mathbb{P}(A)) \forall A \in \mathcal{F} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

By the properties of the infimum and $\{g^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$, we obtain that $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is increasing and concave, and it satisfies $g(0) = 0$ and $g(1) = 1$. Thus, ρ_{conv}^μ can be represented as a Choquet integral using (3.11), which implies that it is comonotone. \square

Regarding comonotonic additivity, (ii) in Theorem 3.12 remains true if we drop the law invariance of $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$, as shown in the following corollary.

Corollary 3.13. *Let $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a collection of convex, comonotone risk measures. Then, ρ_{conv}^μ is finite, normalized, and comonotone, and its capacity function is*

$$c(A) = \inf_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} c^i(A), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{F}, \quad (3.14)$$

where c^i is the capacity of ρ^i for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

Proof. We note that, by Proposition 2.6, we have $\rho_{conv}^\mu < \infty$ and $\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) = 0 > -\infty$. Let the set function $c : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be defined as $c(A) = \inf_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} c^i(A)$, where c^i is the capacity related to ρ^i for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Thus, by an argument similar to that in Theorem 3.12, if we consider $ba_{1,+}^c = \{m \in ba_{1,+} : m(A) \leq c(A) \forall A \in \mathcal{F}\}$, then the reasoning in Remark 3.11 implies that the claim is true. \square

4 Optimal allocations

An exciting feature of traditional finite inf-convolution is capital allocation. A highly relevant concept is Pareto optimality, which is defined as follows.

Definition 4.1. *We call $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$*

(i) *Optimal for $X \in L^\infty$ if $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i = \rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$.*

(ii) *Pareto optimal for $X \in L^\infty$ if for any $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ such that $\rho^i(Y^i) \leq \rho^i(X^i) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$, we have $\rho^i(Y^i) = \rho^i(X^i) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$.*

Remark 4.2. (i) If ρ_{conv}^μ is normalized, $\{X^i = 0\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is optimal for 0. This implies the condition that if $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(0)$ and $\rho^i(X^i) \leq 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$, then $\rho^i(X^i) = 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$, and therefore $\{X^i = 0\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is also Pareto optimal for 0. This can be understood as a non-arbitrage condition. We note that any optimal allocation must be Pareto optimal and that a risk sharing rule is also a Pareto-optimal allocation.

If $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of monetary risk measures and \mathcal{I} is finite, Theorem 3.1 in Jouini et al. (2008) shows that optimal and Pareto-optimal allocations coincide. In the following proposition, we extend this result to the context of countable \mathcal{I} .

Proposition 4.3. *We have that*

- (i) $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ is optimal for $X \in L^\infty$ if and only if it is Pareto optimal for $X \in L^\infty$.
- (ii) if $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is optimal for $X \in L^\infty$, then so is $\{X^i + C^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$, where $C^i \in \mathbb{R} \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$, and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} C^i \mu_i = 0$.
- (iii) Under sub-additivity of $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ we have that if $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is optimal for $X \in L^\infty$, then so is $\{X^i + Y^i\}$ for any $\{Y^i\}$ that is optimal for 0.

Proof. We prove (i) since both (ii) and (iii) are directly obtained. The ‘‘only if’’ part is straightforward, as in Remark 4.2. For the ‘‘if’’ part, let $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ be not optimal for $X \in L^\infty$. Then, there is $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ such that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y^i) \mu_i < \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i$. Let $k^i = \rho^i(X^i) - \rho^i(Y^i) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ and $k = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} k^i \mu_i > 0$. Moreover, $\{Y^i - k^i + k\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ and

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y^i - k^i + k) \mu_i < \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y^i - \rho^i(X^i) + \rho^i(Y^i)) \mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i.$$

Hence, $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is not Pareto optimal for X . \square

We now determine a necessary and sufficient condition for optimality in the case of convex risk measures.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a family of convex risk measures. Then $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ is optimal for $X \in L^\infty$ if and only if $\bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \partial \rho^i(X^i) = \partial \rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. By Corollary 3.5 we have $\bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \partial \rho^i(X^i) \subseteq \partial \rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$. We assume $\bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \partial \rho^i(X^i) \neq \emptyset$. Then, let $m' \in \{m \in ba_{1,+} : m \in \partial \rho^i(X^i) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu\} \subseteq \partial \rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$. We have that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \left(E_{m'}[-X^i] - \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m') \right) \mu_i \leq E_{m'}[-X] - \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m') = \rho_{conv}^\mu(X).$$

Hence, $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is optimal for $X \in L^\infty$. Regarding the converse, for any $m' \in \partial \rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$, we obtain by an argument similar to that in Theorem 3.3 the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{conv}^\mu(X) &= E_{m'}[-X] - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m') \mu_i \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(E_{m'}[-X] + \sum_{i=1}^n \inf_{Y \in L^\infty} \{E_{m'}[Y] + \rho^i(Y)\} \mu_i \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(E_{m'}[-X] + \inf_{\{Y_1, \dots, Y_n\} \subset L^\infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \{E_{m'}[Y^i] + \rho^i(Y^i)\} \mu_i \right) \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \{E_{m'}[Y^i - X] + \rho^i(Y^i)\} \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n Y^i \mu_i = X \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \{\rho^i(Y^i)\} \mu_i : \sum_{i=1}^n Y^i \mu_i = X \right\} = \rho_{conv}^\mu(X). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \rho^i(X^i) \mu_i$ if and only if $\exists m' \in ba_{1,+}$ such that $\rho^i(X^i) = E_{m'}[-X] + \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m') \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. Hence, $m' \in \{m \in ba_{1,+} : m \in \partial \rho^i(X^i) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu\}$. \square

We have the following corollary regarding subdifferential and optimality conditions.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a collection of convex risk measures. If for any $X \in L^\infty$ there is an optimal allocation, then $\partial \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \partial \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) \mu_i$ for any $m \in ba_{1,+}$.*

Proof. From Corollary 3.5 we have $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \partial \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) \mu_i \subseteq \partial \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m)$ for any $m \in ba_{1,+}$. For the converse relation, if $\partial \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m) = \emptyset$, then the claim is immediately obtained. Let then $X \in \partial \alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m)$. By the definition of Legendre–Fenchel convex-conjugate duality, the optimality condition is equivalent to the existence of $m \in ba_{1,+}$ such that $X^i \in \partial \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. By Theorem 4.4, we have that $X^i \in \partial \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. Then, $X \in \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \partial \alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m) \mu_i$. \square

Under the assumption of law invariance, it is well known that, for finite \mathcal{I} , the minimization problem has a solution under co-monotonic allocations (see, for instance, Theorem 3.2 in Jouini et al. (2008), Proposition 5 in Dana and Meilijson (2003), or Theorem 10.46 in Rüschendorf (2013)). For the extension to general \mathcal{I} , we should extend some definitions and results regarding comonotonicity. We note that if \mathcal{I} is finite, these are equivalent to their traditional counterparts.

Definition 4.6. $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is called \mathcal{I} -comonotone if (X^i, X^j) is comonotone $\forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{I}_\mu \times \mathcal{I}_\mu$.

Lemma 4.7. $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$, $X \in L^\infty$, is \mathcal{I} -comonotone if and only if there exists a class of functions $\{h^i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ that are ($\forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$) Lipschitz continuous and increasing, and satisfy $X^i = h^i(X)$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} h^i(x) \mu_i = x$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular, if $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ is \mathcal{I} -comonotone, then $F_X^{-1}(\alpha) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} F_{X^i}^{-1}(\alpha) \mu_i$, $\forall \alpha \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. For the “if” part, let $X^i, X^j \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ such that $X^i = h^i(X)$ and $X^j = h^j(X)$ for $\{h^i\}_i \in \mathcal{I}$ satisfying the assumptions. Then X^i, X^j are comonotone. For the “only if” part, let $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be \mathcal{I} -comonotone and $X(\Omega) = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \exists \omega \in \Omega \text{ s.t. } X(\omega) = x\}$. Then, for any fixed $\omega \in \Omega$, there is a family $\{x^i = X^i(\omega) \in \mathbb{R} : i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ such that $X(\omega) = x = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} x^i \mu_i \in X(\Omega)$. Moreover, we define $h^i(x) = x^i \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. If there are $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$ such that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i(\omega) \mu_i = x = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i(\omega') \mu_i$, we then obtain $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (X^i(\omega) - X^i(\omega')) \mu_i = 0$. Assuming \mathcal{I} -comonotonicity, we have that $X^i(\omega) = X^i(\omega') \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. Consequently, the map $x \rightarrow \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} h^i(x) \mu_i = Id(x)$ is well defined. Regarding the increasing behavior of h^i , let $x, y \in X(\Omega)$ with $x \leq y$. Then, there are ω, ω' such that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i(\omega) \mu_i = x \leq y = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i(\omega') \mu_i$, which implies $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (X^i(\omega) - X^i(\omega')) \mu_i \leq 0$. Comonotonicity implies that this relation is equivalent to $h^i(x) = X^i(\omega) \leq X^i(\omega') = h^i(y) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. Concerning Lipschitz continuity, for any $x, x + \delta \in X(\Omega)$ with $\delta > 0$ we obtain $0 \leq h^i(x + \delta) - h^i(x) \leq (\mu_i)^{-1} \delta$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. The first inequality is due to the increasing behavior of h^i . The second is because for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$ we have $x + \delta = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{i\}} h^j(x + \delta) \mu_j + h^i(x + \delta) \mu_i \geq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{i\}} h^j(x) \mu_j + h^i(x) \mu_i = h^i(x + \delta) \mu_i + x - h^i(x) \mu_i$. It remains to extend $\{h^i\}$ from $X(\Omega)$ to \mathbb{R} . We first extend it to $cl(X(\Omega))$. If $x \in bd(X(\Omega))$ is only a one-sided boundary point, then the continuous extension poses no problem, as increasing functions are involved. If x can be approximated from both sides, then Lipschitz continuity implies that the left- and right-sided continuous extensions coincide. The extension to \mathbb{R} is performed linearly in each connected

component of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \text{cl}(X(\Omega))$ so that the condition $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} h^i(x) = x$ is satisfied. Then, the main claim is proved. Moreover, let $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ be \mathcal{I} -comonotone. Then, $x \rightarrow \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} h^i(x) \mu_i$ is also Lipschitz continuous and increasing. We recall that $F_{g(X)}^{-1} = g(F_X^{-1})$ for any increasing function $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then, for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we obtain

$$F_X^{-1}(\alpha) = F_{\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} h^i(X) \mu_i}^{-1}(\alpha) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} h^i(F_X^{-1}(\alpha)) \mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} F_{h^i(X)}^{-1}(\alpha) \mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} F_{X^i}^{-1}(\alpha) \mu_i.$$

□

We now prove the following comonotonic-improvement Theorem for arbitrary \mathcal{I} .

Theorem 4.8. *Let $X \in L^\infty$. Then, for any $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$, there is an \mathcal{I} -comonotone $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ such that $Y^i \succeq X^i \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{F}_n be the σ -algebra generated by $\{\omega: k2^{-n} \leq X(\omega) \leq k2^n\} \subset \Omega$ for $k > 0$, $X_n = E[X|\mathcal{F}_n]$, and $X_n^i = E[X^i|\mathcal{F}_n] \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$. Then, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n = X$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} X_n^i = X^i$ for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and $X_n^i \succeq X^i$ for each n each i . By the arguments in Proposition 1 in Landsberger and Meilijson (1994) or Proposition 10.46 in Rüschendorf (2013), we can conclude that every allocation of X taking a countable number of values is dominated by a comonotone allocation. Thus, by Lemma 4.7, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there are Lipschitz continuous, increasing functions $\{h_n^i: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ with $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} h_n^i \mu_i = Id$ such that $Y_n^i = h_n^i(X_n) \succeq X_n^i \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. We note that these functions constitute a bounded, closed, equicontinuous family. Then, by Ascoli's theorem, there is a subsequence of $\{h_n^i\}$ that converges uniformly on $[\text{ess inf } X, \text{ess sup } X]$ to the Lipschitz-continuous and increasing h^i in the $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ sense. Thus, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} h^i \mu_i = Id$ on $[\text{ess inf } X, \text{ess sup } X]$. We then have $Y^i = h^i(X) \succeq X^i \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ by considering uniform limits. Finally, by Lemma 4.7, we obtain that $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is \mathcal{I} -comonotone. It remains to show that $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ belongs to $\mathbb{A}(X)$. We have that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} Y^i \mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} h^i(X) \mu_i = X \mathbb{P} - a.s.$ Hence, $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$. □

We are now in a position to extend the existence of optimal allocations to our framework of law-invariant, convex risk measures.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a collection of law-invariant, convex risk measures. Then,*

- (i) *For any $X \in L^\infty$, there is an \mathcal{I} -comonotone optimal allocation.*
- (ii) *In addition to initial hypotheses, if $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of risk measures that are strictly monotone with respect to \succeq , then every optimal allocation for any $X \in L^\infty$ is \mathcal{I} -comonotone.*
- (iii) *In addition to initial hypotheses, if $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of strictly convex functionals, we have uniqueness of the optimal allocation up to scaling (if $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is optimal for $X \in L^\infty$, then so is $\{X^i + C^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$, where $C^i \in \mathbb{R} \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} C^i \mu_i = 0$).*

Proof. (i) By Theorem 4.8, we can restrict the minimization problem to \mathcal{I} -comonotonic allocations, as, by Theorem 3.10, law-invariant risk measures preserve second-order stochastic dominance. Let $\{Y_n^i = h_n^i(X) \in L^\infty, i \in \mathcal{I}\}_n$ be an optimal sequence for X , i.e. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y_n^i) \mu_i = \rho_{\text{conv}}^\mu(X)$, where $h_n^i: [\text{ess inf } X, \text{ess sup } X] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are increasing, bounded, and Lipschitz-continuous functions. Such sequence always exist because

$\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ is monetary and we can take $h_n^i = -x_n$ for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$, where $x_n \rightarrow \rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$. Thus, each h_n^i is increasing, bounded and Lipschitz continuous while $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(h_n^i(X))\mu_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(-x_n)\mu_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$. By an argument similar to that in Theorem 4.8, we have that h^i is the uniform limit (after passing to a subsequence if necessary) of $\{h_n^i\}$. Thus, $Y_n^i = h_n^i(X) \rightarrow h^i(X) = Y^i$. By continuity in the essential supremum norm, we have that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\rho^i(Y_n^i) - \rho^i(Y^i)| = 0$. As h^i is the uniform limit of $\{h_n^i\}$, we have by dominated convergence, since $|\rho^i(Y_n^i)| \leq \|X\|_\infty < \infty$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, that

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y_n^i)\mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho^i(Y_n^i)\mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y^i)\mu_i.$$

Hence, $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is the desired optimal allocation.

- (ii) We recall that strict monotonicity implies that if $X \succeq Y$ and $X \not\sim Y$, then $\rho^i(X) < \rho^i(Y) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ for any $X, Y \in L^\infty$. Let $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be an optimal allocation for $X \in L^\infty$. Then, by Theorem 4.8, there is an \mathcal{I} -comonotone allocation $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ such that

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i)\mu_i \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y^i)\mu_i.$$

Thus, $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is also optimal. If $X^i = Y^i \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$, then we have the claim. If there is $i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ such that $X^i \neq Y^i$, then we have by strictly monotonicity regarding \succeq that $\rho^i(Y^i) < \rho^i(X^i)$, contradicting the optimality of $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$. Hence, every optimal allocation for X is \mathcal{I} -comonotone.

- (iii) We assume, toward a contradiction, that both $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ and $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ are optimal allocations for $X \in L^\infty$ such that there is $i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ with $X^i \neq Y^i$ and there is no $C^i \in \mathbb{R} \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ such that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} C^i \mu_i = 0$ and $\{X^i + C^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ (otherwise, item (ii) in Proposition 4.3 assures optimality). We note that for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, the family $\{Z^i = \lambda X^i + (1 - \lambda)Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is in $\mathbb{A}(X)$. However, we would have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Z^i)\mu_i < \lambda \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(X^i)\mu_i + (1 - \lambda) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y^i)\mu_i = \rho_{conv}^\mu(X),$$

which contradicts the optimality of both $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ and $\{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ for X . □

Remark 4.10. The examples in Jouini et al. (2008), and Delbaen (2006) show that law invariance is essential to ensure the existence of an \mathcal{I} -comonotone solution as above. However, the uniqueness of this optimal allocation is not ensured outside the scope of strict convexity as in item (iii) of the last Theorem.

If $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of comonotone, law-invariant, convex risk measures, then we can prove an additional result regarding the connection between optimal allocations and the notion of flatness for quantile functions. To this end, the following definitions and Lemma are required. We recall that dF_X^{-1} is the differential of F_X^{-1} .

Definition 4.11. Let g^1, g^2 be two distortions with $g^1 \leq g^2$. A quantile function F_X^{-1} , $X \in L^\infty$, is called flat on $\{x \in [0, 1]: g^1(x) < g^2(x)\}$ if $dF_X^{-1} = 0$ almost everywhere on $\{g^1 < g^2\}$ and $(F_X^{-1}(0^+) - F_X^{-1}(0))(g^2(0^+) - g^1(0^+)) = 0$.

Lemma 4.12 (Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 in Jouini et al. (2008)). Let $\rho: L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a law-invariant, comonotone, convex risk measure with distortion g . Moreover, let $m \in ba_{1,+}$ has a Lebesgue decomposition $m = Z_m \mathbb{P} + m^s$ into a regular part with density Z_m and a singular part m^s . Then,

(i) $g_m: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as $g_m(0) = 0$ and $g_m(t) = \|m^s\|_{TV} + \int_0^t F_{Z_m}^{-1}(1-s) ds$, $0 < t \leq 1$, is a concave distortion.

(ii) For any $m \in \partial\rho(X)$, we have that X and $-Z_m$ are comonotone. Moreover, the measure m' such that $Z_{m'} = E[Z_m|X]$ belongs to $\partial\rho(X)$.

(iii) $\partial\rho(X) = \{m \in ba_{1,+}: g_m \leq g, F_X^{-1} \text{ is flat on } \{g_m < g\}\}$.

Theorem 4.13. Let $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ consist of law-invariant, comonotone, convex risk measures with distortions $\{g^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$, $g = \inf_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} g^i$, and $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ be \mathcal{I} -comonotone. If $F_{X^i}^{-1}$ is flat on $\{g < g^i\} \cap \{dF_X^{-1} > 0\} \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$, then $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is an optimal allocation for $X \in L^\infty$. The converse is true if $(i, \alpha) \rightarrow VaR^\alpha(X^i)g'_m(\alpha)$ is bounded.

Proof. By Theorem 3.12, g is the distortion of ρ_{conv}^μ . Let U be a $[0, 1]$ -uniform random variable (the existence of which is ensured because the space is atomless) such that $X = F_X^{-1}(U)$. We define $m \in ba_{1,+}$ by $m = g(0^+)\delta_0(U) + g'(U)1_{(0,1]}(U)$, where δ_0 is the Dirac measure at 0. It is easily verified using (i) in Lemma 4.12 that $g_m = g$. Moreover, let $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be an \mathcal{I} -comonotone optimal allocation for X (the existence of which is ensured by Theorem 4.9). Thus, in the $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ sense, $g_m \leq g^i$, $-Z_m$ is comonotone with X^i , and, by hypothesis, $F_{X^i}^{-1}$ is flat on $\{g_m < g^i\} \cap \{dF_X^{-1} > 0\}$. By Lemma 4.7, we have $\{dF_X^{-1} = 0\} = \{\alpha \in [0, 1]: dF_{X^i}^{-1}(\alpha) = 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu\}$. Thus, $\{g_m < g^i\} \cap \{dF_X^{-1} = 0\} = \emptyset \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. By (iii) of Lemma 4.12, we have that $m \in \partial\rho^i(X^i) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. Then, by Theorem 4.4, we obtain that $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is an optimal allocation.

For the converse, by Theorem 4.4 and Corollary 4.5, we have that $X^i \in \partial\alpha_{\rho^i}^{min}(m') \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$ for some $m' \in ba_{1,+}$. By Corollary 4.5, we have that $X \in \partial\alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m')$, and by convex-conjugate duality, $m' \in \partial\rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$. Thus, by (ii) in Lemma 4.12, we obtain that $m \in ba_{1,+}$ such that $Z_m = E[Z_{m'}|X]$ belongs to $\partial\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \{m \in ba_{1,+}: m \in \partial\rho^i(X^i) \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu\}$. By Theorem 3.10 and (iii) of Lemma 4.12, we have that $\rho^i(X^i) = \int_0^1 VaR^\alpha(X^i)g'_m(\alpha) d\alpha \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. As $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is an optimal allocation, Theorem 3.12 and Lemma 4.7 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 VaR^\alpha(X)g'_m(\alpha) d\alpha &= \rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \int_0^1 VaR^\alpha(X^i)g'_m(\alpha) d\alpha \mu_i \\ &= \int_0^1 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} VaR^\alpha(X^i) \mu_i g'_m(\alpha) d\alpha \\ &= \int_0^1 VaR^\alpha(X)g'_m(\alpha) d\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

We can make the interchange of sum and integral for dominated convergence because of the boundedness assumption. By continuity, $\int VaR^\alpha(X)d\alpha = -dF_X^{-1}(\alpha)$. Then, we have $\int_0^1 (g_m(\alpha) - g(\alpha))dF_X^{-1}(\alpha) = 0$. As $m \in \partial\rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$, (iii) in Lemma 4.12 implies that $g_m \leq g$, and therefore $g_m = g$ in $\{dF_X^{-1} > 0\}$. Hence, $F_{X^i}^{-1}$ is flat on $\{g < g^i\} \cap \{dF_X^{-1} > 0\} \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$. \square

Remark 4.14. We also have in this context that for any optimal allocation $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$, $F_{X^i}^{-1}$ is flat on $\{g^i \neq g^j\} \cap \{dF_X^{-1} = 0\}$ for any $j \neq i$ in \mathcal{I}_μ sense. To see this, let $t \in \{g^j < g^i\} \cap \{dF_X^{-1} = 0\}$. We note that, by Lemma 4.7, $\{dF_X^{-1} = 0\} = \{\alpha \in [0, 1]: dF_{X^i}^{-1}(\alpha) = 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu\}$. Then, by Lemma 4.12, $g_m(t) < g_i(t)$, and thus $dF_{X^i}^{-1}$ is flat at $\{g_m < g_i\}$. By comonotonicity and Lemma 4.7, the same is true for $dF_{X^j}^{-1}$. By repeating the argument for $t \in \{g^j > g^i\} \cap \{dF_X^{-1} = 0\}$, we prove the claim.

We now follow the approach of Embrechts et al. (2018) by focusing on the robustness of optimal allocations instead of the one for ρ_{conv}^μ . Intuitively, if an optimal allocation is robust, then the true aggregate risk value would be close to the obtained one under a small model misspecification. We now formally define such a concept and prove a result that relates robustness and upper semi continuity. To that, we need the concept of allocation principle, which is defined in the following. Note that from Lemma 4.7, \mathcal{I} -comonotonicity implies the existence of allocation principles.

Definition 4.15. *We define the following:*

(i) $\{h^i: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is an allocation principle if $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu: h^i(X) \in L^\infty \forall X \in L^\infty$, h^i has at most finitely points of discontinuity, and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} h^i \mu_i$ is the identity function. We denote by \mathbb{H} the set of allocation principles.

(ii) let d be a pseudo-metric on L^∞ and $\{h^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{H}$. Then $\{h^i(X)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is d -robust if the map on L^∞ defined as $Y \rightarrow \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(h^i(Y))\mu_i$ is continuous at X in respect to d .

Proposition 4.16. *Let d be a pseudo-metric on L^∞ . If $\{h^i(X)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is a d -robust optimal allocation of $X \in L^\infty$, then ρ_{conv}^μ is upper semi continuous at X with respect to d .*

Proof. Let $\{h^i(X)\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be a d -robust optimal allocation for $X \in L^\infty$, and $\{X_n\} \subset L^\infty$ be such that $X_n \rightarrow X$ in d . Since $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X_n) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(h^i(X_n))\mu_i$, by convergence regarding d we get that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{conv}^\mu(X_n) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(h^i(X_n))\mu_i = \rho_{conv}^\mu(X).$$

\square

Remark 4.17. Regarding the converse statement for proposition 4.16, Theorem 5 of Embrechts et al. (2018), which is focused in quantiles, asserts that even continuity in respect to d is not sufficient for the existence of a robust optimal allocation. It is well known that convex risk measures are not upper semicontinuous with respect to the Levy metric. By Proposition 2.6, if each member of $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ is a convex risk measure, then so is ρ_{conv}^μ . Thus, in this case, there are no robust optimal allocations regarding the Levy metric. In fact, this is a relatively new concept, and even in the finite \mathcal{I} case, there is still not a general sufficient condition. We left for future research a more complete study of general sufficient conditions for robust allocations.

5 Self-convolution and regulatory arbitrage

In this section, we consider the special case $\rho^i = \rho, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$. In this situation, we have that ρ_{conv}^μ is a self-convolution. This concept is fundamental in the context of regulatory arbitrage (as in Wang (2016)), where the goal is to reduce the regulatory capital of a position by splitting it. More specifically, it indicates the gain, in the sense of a decrease in capital requirements that a company achieves by splitting its group structure into sub-companies within a given regulatory framework. The difference between $\rho(X)$ and $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$ is then obtained by a simple rearrangement (sharing) of risk. Thus, there is a reduction in capital requirements and consequently a decrease of opportunity and capital costs simply by arbitrating a splitting arrangement instead of changing a company's business structure. We now adjust this concept to our framework.

Definition 5.1. *The regulatory arbitrage of a risk measure ρ is a functional $\tau_\rho: L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ defined as*

$$\tau_\rho(X) = \rho(X) - \rho_{conv}^\mu(X), \forall X \in L^\infty. \quad (5.1)$$

Moreover, ρ is called

- (i) *free of regulatory arbitrage if $\tau_\rho(X) = 0, \forall X \in L^\infty$;*
- (ii) *of finite regulatory arbitrage if $\tau_\rho(X) < \infty, \forall X \in L^\infty$;*
- (iii) *of partially infinite regulatory arbitrage if $\tau_\rho(X) = \infty$ for some $X \in L^\infty$;*
- (iv) *of infinite regulatory arbitrage if $\tau_\rho(X) = \infty, \forall X \in L^\infty$.*

Remark 5.2. (i) As $\rho_{conv}^\mu \leq \rho < \infty$, we have that τ_ρ is well defined. Our approach is different from that in Wang (2016) because we consider ‘‘convex’’ inf-convolutions instead of direct sums. More specifically, the approach by Wang (2016) is

$$\begin{aligned} R(X) &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(X^i), n \in \mathbb{N}, X^i \in L^\infty, i = 1, \dots, n, \sum_{i=1}^n X^i = X \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(X^i), X^i \in L^\infty, i = 1, \dots, n, \sum_{i=1}^n X^i = X \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

while in our case we have the role for $\{\mu_i\}$. This distinction leads to differences because in our approach convexity rules out regulatory arbitrage, while in Wang (2016) sub-additivity plays this role. In fact, in the approach of Wang (2016), τ_ρ is always sub-additive, whereas in our case, this is not ensured. This fact alters most results and arguments, as it is crucial in his study. For instance, in that approach, a convex but not coherent risk measure ρ is of limited regulatory arbitrage, whereas in ours (see Theorem 5.4 below) it is free of regulatory arbitrage.

- (ii) Most results below would remain true if we considered the general framework of arbitrary $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ and made the adaption $\tau_{\rho_{\mathcal{I}}} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i \mu_i - \rho_{conv}^\mu = \rho^\mu - \rho_{conv}^\mu \geq 0$, where ρ^μ is as Remark 3.4. This formulation could be linked to the gain that sharing may provide over some initial allocation. However, this is beyond our scope in this paper.

We now state general results regarding τ_ρ in our framework. To this end, the following property of risk measures is required.

Definition 5.3. A risk measure $\rho: L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called \mathcal{I} -convex if $\rho(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i \mu_i) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho(X^i) \mu_i$ for any $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \cup_{X \in L^\infty} \mathbb{A}(X)$.

Theorem 5.4. We have the following for a risk measure ρ :

- (i) ρ is \mathcal{I} -convex if and only if it is free of regulatory arbitrage.
- (ii) If ρ is a convex risk measure, then it is free of regulatory arbitrage.
- (iii) If ρ is subadditive, then it is at most of finite regulatory arbitrage.
- (iv) Let $\rho_1, \rho_2: L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be risk measures such that $\rho_1 \leq \rho_2$. If ρ_1 is of finite regulatory arbitrage, then ρ_2 is not of infinite regulatory arbitrage. Moreover, if ρ_2 is of infinite (or partially infinite) regulatory arbitrage, then so is ρ_1 .
- (v) If ρ satisfies positive homogeneity, then $\tau_\rho(0) > 0$ if and only if $\tau_\rho(0) = \infty$.
- (vi) If ρ is loaded, then it is not of infinite regulatory arbitrage. If, in addition, it has the limitedness property, then it is of finite regulatory arbitrage.

Proof. We note that as we consider finite risk measures, it holds that $\tau_\rho(X) = \infty$ if and only if $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = -\infty$. Then,

- (i) We assume that ρ is \mathcal{I} -convex, and let $X \in L^\infty$. Then, $\rho(X) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho(X^i) \mu_i$ for any $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$. By taking the infimum over $\mathbb{A}(X)$, we obtain $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq \rho(X) \leq \rho_{conv}^\mu(X)$. For the converse, we obtain $\rho(X) = \rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho(X^i) \mu_i$ for any $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$, which is \mathcal{I} -convexity.
- (ii) By Corollary 3.5, we have that $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = \rho(X), \forall X \in L^\infty$. As a direct consequence, we obtain that ρ is free of regulatory arbitrage.
- (iii) We begin with the claim that if ρ is subadditive, then it is of partially infinite regulatory arbitrage if and only if it is of infinite regulatory arbitrage. By Proposition 2.6 and Remark 2.7, we have that ρ_{conv}^μ is also subadditive and normalized. We only need to show that partially infinite regulatory arbitrage implies infinite regulatory arbitrage. Let $X \in L^\infty$ be such that $\tau_\rho(X) = \infty$. As ρ is finite, it holds that $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = -\infty$. Let now $Y \in L^\infty$. We have that $\rho_{conv}^\mu(Y) \leq \rho_{conv}^\mu(X) + \rho_{conv}^\mu(Y - X) = -\infty$. Thus, ρ is of infinite regulatory arbitrage. However, we have that $\tau_\rho(0) = \rho(0) - \rho_{conv}^\mu(0) = 0 < \infty$. Then, ρ is not of infinite regulatory arbitrage, and, by the previous claim, it is not of partially infinite regulatory arbitrage either. Thus, ρ is at most of finite regulatory arbitrage.
- (iv) It is evident that, in this case, we have, by abuse of notation, $(\rho_1)_{conv}^\mu \leq (\rho_2)_{conv}^\mu$. If ρ_1 is of finite regulatory arbitrage, then $-\infty < (\rho_1)_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq (\rho_2)_{conv}^\mu(X), \forall X \in L^\infty$. Thus, ρ_2 is also of infinite regulatory arbitrage. If ρ_2 is of infinite regulatory arbitrage, then $(\rho_1)_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq (\rho_2)_{conv}^\mu(X) = -\infty, \forall X \in L^\infty$. Thus, ρ_1 is also of finite regulatory arbitrage. For partially infinite regulatory arbitrage, the reasoning is analogous.

- (v) We only need to prove the “only if” part because the converse is automatically obtained. As $\rho(0) = 0$, $\tau_\rho(0) > 0$ implies $\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) < 0$. Then, there is $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(0)$ such that $\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho(X^i) \mu_i < 0$. As $\{\lambda X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(0) \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$, by the positive homogeneity of ρ , we obtain that

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(0) \leq \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho(\lambda X^i) \mu_i = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho(X^i) \mu_i = -\infty.$$

Hence, $\tau_\rho(0) = \rho(0) - \rho_{conv}^\mu(0) = \infty$.

- (vi) By Proposition 2.6, we have that ρ_{conv}^μ inherits loadedness and limitedness from ρ . The loadedness of ρ implies normalization of ρ_{conv}^μ , and therefore $\tau_\rho(0) = 0$. Thus, ρ is not of infinite regulatory arbitrage. If, in addition, ρ is limited, then for any $X \in L^\infty$, we have that $\tau_\rho(X) \leq E[X] - \text{ess inf } X < \infty$. Hence, we obtain finite regulatory arbitrage for ρ . □

Remark 5.5. A remarkable feature is that is possible to identify τ_ρ as a deviation measure in the sense of Rockafellar et al. (2006), Rockafellar and Uryasev (2013), Righi and Ceretta (2016), Righi (2019a), and Righi et al. (2020). For instance, the bound for τ_ρ in the proof of (vi) is known as lower-range dominance for deviation measures.

6 Examples

In this section, we expose some concrete examples with specific choices for $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ in order to illustrate concepts from the paper. We start with VaR in the context of self-convolution. It was proved in Wang (2016) that VaR^α is of infinite regulatory arbitrage. The following proposition adapts this claim to our framework. For this result, we are considering an atom-less probability space.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Then VaR^α is of infinite regulatory arbitrage.*

Proof. Let $\{i_j\}_{j=1}^{k+1}$ be members of \mathcal{I}_μ such that $\frac{1}{k} < \alpha$. Then $k > 1$. Moreover, let $\{B_j, j = 1, \dots, k\}$ be a partition of Ω such that $\mathbb{P}(B_j) = \frac{1}{k}$ for any $j = 1, \dots, k$. We note that as $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is atomless, such a partition always exists. For fixed $X \in L^\infty$ and some arbitrary real number $m > 0$, let $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be defined as

$$X^i(\omega) = \begin{cases} \frac{m(1 - k1_{B_j}(\omega))}{(k-1)\mu_i}, & \text{for } i = i_j, j = 1, \dots, k, \\ \frac{X(\omega)}{\mu_{i_{k+1}}}, & \text{for } i = i_{k+1}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

for any $\omega \in \Omega$. Thus, $\{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$ because for any $\omega \in \Omega$, the following is true:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} X^i(\omega) \mu_i &= \sum_{j=1}^k \left[\frac{m(1 - k1_{B_j}(\omega))}{(k-1)\mu_{i_j}} \right] \mu_{i_j} + \left[\frac{X(\omega)}{\mu_{i_{k+1}}} \right] \mu_{i_{k+1}} \\ &= \frac{m}{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^k (1 - k1_{B_j}(\omega)) + X(\omega) \\ &= \frac{m}{k-1} (k - k) + X(\omega) = X(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we note that for $i = i_j$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(X^i < 0) = \mathbb{P}\left(1_{B_j} > \frac{1}{k}\right) = \mathbb{P}(1_{B_j} = 1) = \mathbb{P}(B_j) = \frac{1}{k} < \alpha.$$

Thus, $VaR^\alpha(X^i) < 0$. In fact, we have that $VaR^\alpha(-1_{B_j}) = 0$ and thus

$$VaR^\alpha(X^i) = \frac{m}{(k-1)\mu_{i_j}} (kVaR^\alpha(-1_{B_j}) - 1) = -\frac{m}{(k-1)\mu_{i_j}} < 0.$$

As

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} VaR^\alpha(X^i) \mu_i = \sum_{j=1}^k VaR^\alpha(X^i) \mu_{i_j} + VaR^\alpha(X^{i_{k+1}}) \mu_{i_{k+1}} = VaR^\alpha(X) - \frac{mk}{k-1},$$

$VaR^\alpha(X) < \infty$, and $m > 0$ is arbitrary, we obtain that

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq VaR^\alpha(X) - \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{mk}{k-1} = -\infty.$$

Hence, we conclude that $\tau_\rho(X) = \infty$ for any $X \in L^\infty$, which implies that VaR^α is of infinite regulatory arbitrage. \square

Our following example is regarding to ES. This risk measure is governed by the parameter α that represents the tail level. It is clear that ES is non-increasing in α . Consider a situation where each of our countable risk measures is the ES at distinct tail levels. For the finite case, this is studied in [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#), for instance. In our framework, we have that the inf-convolution provides the same risk as the less conservative option.

Corollary 6.2. *Let $\rho^i = ES^{\alpha^i}$, $\alpha^i \in [0, 1] \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$, and $\alpha = \sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu} \alpha^i$. Then $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = ES^\alpha(X)$, $\forall X \in L^\infty$.*

Proof. The result arises as a direct consequence of (ii) in Theorem [3.12](#). \square

A relevant concept in the present context is the dilated risk measure, which is stable under inf-convolution and has a dilatation property with respect to the size of a position. In this particular situation, we can provide explicit solutions for optimal allocations even without law invariance. We now define this concept and extend some interesting related results to our framework.

Definition 6.3. Let $\rho: L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a risk measure, and $\gamma > 0$ be a real parameter. The dilated risk measure with respect to ρ and γ is a functional $\rho_\gamma: L^\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\rho_\gamma(X) = \gamma \rho\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}X\right). \quad (6.1)$$

Proposition 6.4. We have that

- (i) $(\rho_{conv}^\mu)_\gamma = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (\rho^i)_\gamma(X^i) \mu_i : \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X) \right\}$ for any $\gamma > 0$.
- (ii) Let ρ be a convex risk measure and $\{\gamma^i > 0\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$, such that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \gamma^i \mu_i = \gamma$. If $\rho^i = \rho_{\gamma^i} \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$, then $\left\{ \frac{\gamma^i}{\gamma} X \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is optimal for $X \in L^\infty$ and $\rho_{conv}^\mu = \rho_\gamma$.

Proof. (i) For any $\gamma > 0$ and $X \in L^\infty$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (\rho^i)_\gamma(X^i) \mu_i : \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X) \right\} &= \gamma \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}X^i\right) \mu_i : \{X^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X) \right\} \\ &= \gamma \inf \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho^i(Y^i) \mu_i : \{Y^i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}X\right) \right\} \\ &= \gamma \rho_{conv}^\mu\left(\frac{1}{\gamma}X\right) = (\rho_{conv}^\mu)_\gamma(X). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) We obtain from Theorem 3.3 that

$$\alpha_{\rho_{conv}^\mu}^{min}(m) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho_{\gamma^i}}^{min}(m) \mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \gamma^i \alpha_\rho^{min}(m) \mu_i = \gamma \alpha_\rho^{min}(m) = \alpha_{\rho_\gamma}^{min}(m), \forall m \in ba.$$

Thus, $\rho_{conv}^\mu = \rho_\gamma$. It is straightforward to note that $\left\{ \frac{\gamma^i}{\gamma} X \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \in \mathbb{A}(X)$. We then obtain that

$$\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho_{\gamma^i}\left(\frac{\gamma^i}{\gamma} X\right) \mu_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \gamma^i \rho\left(\frac{1}{\gamma^i} \frac{\gamma^i}{\gamma} X\right) \mu_i = \gamma \rho\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} X\right) = \rho_\gamma(X) \leq \rho_{conv}^\mu(X).$$

Hence, $\left\{ \frac{\gamma^i}{\gamma} X \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is optimal for $X \in L^\infty$. □

Remark 6.5. It is evident that, for convex risk measures, $\alpha_{\rho_\gamma}^{min} = \gamma \alpha_\rho^{min}$. Moreover, a convex risk measure is coherent if and only if $\rho = \rho_\gamma$ pointwise for any $\gamma > 0$. Under normalization, $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} \rho_\gamma$ defines the smallest coherent risk measure that dominates ρ . Further, we note that for any $X \in L^\infty$, $\{\gamma^i \gamma^{-1} X\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is \mathcal{I} -comonotone, which is in consonance with Theorem 4.9 when the risk measures in $\rho_{\mathcal{I}}$ are law invariant.

A typical example of dilated measure is the Entropic risk measure (Ent). This is a Fatou-continuous, law-invariant, convex risk measure defined as $Ent^\gamma(X) = \frac{1}{\gamma} \log(E[e^{-\gamma X}])$, $\gamma \geq 0$. Its acceptance set is defined as $\mathcal{A}_{Ent^\gamma} = \{X \in L^\infty : E[e^{-\gamma X}] \leq 1\}$, and the penalty term is $\alpha_{Ent^\gamma}^{min}(\mathbb{Q}) = \frac{1}{\gamma} E\left[\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \log\left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}\right)\right]$. It is clear that Ent_γ is a dilated risk measure with Ent_1 as basis. In this case, we have the following result for inf-convolution.

Corollary 6.6. *Let $\rho^i = Ent_{\gamma^i}$, $\gamma^i > 0$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}_\mu$, and $\gamma = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \gamma^i \mu_i$. Then $\rho_{conv}^\mu(X) = Ent_\gamma(X)$, $\forall X \in L^\infty$ and $\left\{ \frac{\gamma^i}{\gamma} X \right\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is optimal for $X \in L^\infty$.*

Proof. Direct from item (ii) in Proposition 6.4. □

References

- Acciaio, B., 2007. Optimal risk sharing with non-monotone monetary functionals. *Finance and Stochastics* 11, 267–289.
- Acciaio, B., 2009. Short note on inf-convolution preserving the fatou property. *Annals of Finance* 5, 281–287.
- Acciaio, B., Svindland, G., 2009. Optimal risk sharing with different reference probabilities. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 44, 426 – 433.
- Acerbi, C., 2002. Spectral measures of risk: A coherent representation of subjective risk aversion. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 26, 1505–1518.
- Arrow, K., 1963. Uncertainty and welfare economics of medica care. *The American Economic Rewview* 53, 941 – 973.
- Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J., Heath, D., 1999. Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance* 9, 203–228.
- Barrieu, P., El Karoui, N., 2005. Inf-convolution of risk measures and optimal risk transfer. *Finance and Stochastics* 9, 269–298.
- Bäuerle, N., Müller, A., 2006. Stochastic orders and risk measures: Consistency and bounds. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 38, 132–148.
- Bellini, F., Koch-Medina, P., Munari, C., Svindland, G., 2021. Law-invariant functionals on general spaces of random variables. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics* 12, 318–341.
- Borch, K., 1962. Equilibrium in a reinsurance market. *Econometrica* 30, 424 – 444.
- Buhlmann, H., 1982. The general economic premium principle. *ASTIN Bulletin* 14, 13 – 21.
- Burgert, C., Rüschendorf, L., 2006. On the optimal risk allocation problem. *Statistics & Decisions* 24, 153 – 171.
- Burgert, C., Rüschendorf, L., 2008. Allocation of risks and equilibrium in markets with finitely many traders. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 42, 177 – 188.
- Burzoni, M., Munari, C., Wang, R., 2022. Adjusted expected shortfall. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 134, 106297.
- Carlier, G., Dana, R.A., Galichon, A., 2012. Pareto efficiency for the concave order and multivariate comonotonicity. *Journal of Economic Theory* 147, 207 – 229.

- Castagnoli, E., Cattelan, G., Maccheroni, F., Tebaldi, C., Wang, R., 2021. Star-shaped risk measures. arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.15790 .
- Cont, R., Deguest, R., Scandolo, G., 2010. Robustness and sensitivity analysis of risk measurement procedures. *Quantitative Finance* 10, 593–606.
- Dana, R., Meilijson, I., 2003. Modelling agents’ preferences in complete markets by second order stochastic dominance. Working Paper .
- Dana, R.A., Le Van, C., 2010. Overlapping sets of priors and the existence of efficient allocations and equilibria for risk measures. *Mathematical Finance* 20, 327–339.
- Delbaen, F., 2002a. Coherent risk measures. Lectures given at the Cattedra Galileiana at the Scuola Normale di Pisa, March 2000, Published by the Scuola Normale di Pisa .
- Delbaen, F., 2002b. Coherent risk measures on general probability spaces, in: Sandmann, K., Schönbucher, P.J. (Eds.), *Advances in Finance and Stochastics: Essays in Honour of Dieter Sondermann*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 1–37.
- Delbaen, F., 2006. Hedging bounded claims with bounded outcomes, in: Kusuoka, S., Yamazaki, A. (Eds.), *Advances in Mathematical Economics*. Springer, Tokyo, pp. 75–86.
- Delbaen, F., 2012. Monetary Utility Functions. Lecture Notes: University of Osaka.
- Embrechts, P., Liu, H., Mao, T., Wang, R., 2020. Quantile-based risk sharing with heterogeneous beliefs. *Mathematical Programming* 181, 319 – 347.
- Embrechts, P., Liu, H., Wang, R., 2018. Quantile-based risk sharing. *Operations Research* 66, 936–949.
- Filipović, D., Svindland, G., 2008. Optimal capital and risk allocations for law- and cash-invariant convex functions. *Finance and Stochastics* 12, 423–439.
- Föllmer, H., Schied, A., 2002. Convex measures of risk and trading constraints. *Finance and stochastics* 6, 429–447.
- Föllmer, H., Schied, A., 2016. *Stochastic Finance: An Introduction in Discrete Time*. 4 ed., de Gruyter.
- Frittelli, M., Rosazza Gianin, E., 2005. Law invariant convex risk measures. *Advances in mathematical economics* 7, 33–46.
- Frittelli, M., Rosazza Gianin, E., 2002. Putting order in risk measures. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 26, 1473–1486.
- Gerber, H., 1978. Pareto-optimal risk exchanges and related decision problems. *ASTIN Bulletin* 10, 25 – 33.
- Grechuk, B., Molyboha, A., Zabaranin, M., 2009. Maximum Entropy Principle with General Deviation Measures. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 34, 445–467.

- Grechuk, B., Zabarankin, M., 2012. Optimal risk sharing with general deviation measures. *Annals of Operations Research* 200, 9–21.
- Heath, D., Ku, H., 2004. Pareto equilibria with coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance* 14, 163–172.
- Jouini, E., Schachermayer, W., Touzi, N., 2006. Law invariant risk measures have the Fatou property. *Advances in Mathematical Economics* 9, 49–71.
- Jouini, E., Schachermayer, W., Touzi, N., 2008. Optimal risk sharing for law invariant monetary utility functions. *Mathematical Finance* 18, 269–292.
- Kazi-Tani, N., 2017. Inf-convolution of choquet integrals and applications in optimal risk transfer. Working Paper .
- Kiesel, R., Rühlicke, R., Stahl, G., Zheng, J., 2016. The wasserstein metric and robustness in risk management. *Risks* 4, 32.
- Kirilyuk, V., 2021. Risk measures in the form of infimal convolution. *Cybernetics and Systems Analysis* 57, 30–46.
- Kratschmer, V., Schied, A., Zahle, H., 2014. Comparative and qualitative robustness for law-invariant risk measures. *Finance and Stochastics* 18, 271–295.
- Kusuoka, S., 2001. On law invariant coherent risk measures. *Advances in mathematical economics* 3, 158–168.
- Landsberger, M., Meilijson, I., 1994. Co-monotone allocations, bickel-lehmann dispersion and the arrow-pratt measure of risk aversion. *Annals of Operations Research* 52, 97–106.
- Liebrich, F.B., 2021. Risk sharing under heterogeneous beliefs without convexity. arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.05791 .
- Liebrich, F.B., Svindland, G., 2019. Risk sharing for capital requirements with multidimensional security markets. *Finance and Stochastics* 23, 925–973.
- Liu, F., Wang, R., Wei, L., 2019. Inf-convolution and optimal allocations for tail risk measures. Working Paper .
- Liu, P., Wang, R., Wei, L., 2020. Is the inf-convolution of law-invariant preferences law-invariant? *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 91, 144 – 154.
- Ludkovski, M., Rüschemdorf, L., 2008. On comonotonicity of pareto optimal risk sharing. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 78, 1181 – 1188.
- Ludkovski, M., Young, V.R., 2009. Optimal risk sharing under distorted probabilities. *Mathematics and Financial Economics* 2, 87–105.
- Mastrogioacomo, E., Rosazza Gianin, E., 2015. Pareto optimal allocations and optimal risk sharing for quasiconvex risk measures. *Mathematics and Financial Economics* 9, 149–167.

- Pflug, G., Römisch, W., 2007. *Modeling, Measuring and Managing Risk*. 1 ed., World Scientific.
- Ravanelli, C., Svindland, G., 2014. Comonotone pareto optimal allocations for law invariant robust utilities on \mathbb{L} . *Finance and Stochastics* 18, 249–269.
- Righi, M., 2019a. A composition between risk and deviation measures. *Annals of Operations Research* 282, 299–313.
- Righi, M., 2019b. A theory for combinations of risk measures. Working Paper .
- Righi, M., Ceretta, P., 2016. Shortfall Deviation Risk: an alternative to risk measurement. *Journal of Risk* 19, 81–116.
- Righi, M.B., Müller, F.M., Moresco, M.R., 2020. On a robust risk measurement approach for capital determination errors minimization. *Insurance: Mathematic and Economics* 95, 199–211.
- Rockafellar, R., Uryasev, S., 2013. The fundamental risk quadrangle in risk management, optimization and statistical estimation. *Surveys in Operations Research and Management Science* 18, 33–53.
- Rockafellar, R., Uryasev, S., Zabarankin, M., 2006. Generalized deviations in risk analysis. *Finance and Stochastics* 10, 51–74.
- Rüschendorf, L., 2013. *Mathematical Risk Analysis*. Springer.
- Starr, R., 2011. *General Equilibrium Theory: An Introduction*. 2 ed., Cambridge University Press.
- Svindland, G., 2010. Continuity properties of law-invariant (quasi-)convex risk functions on L^∞ . *Mathematics and Financial Economics* 3, 39–43.
- Tsanakas, A., 2009. To split or not to split: Capital allocation with convex risk measures. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 44, 268 – 277.
- Wang, R., 2016. Regulatory arbitrage of risk measures. *Quantitative Finance* 16, 337–347.
- Wang, R., Wei, Y., Willmot, G.E., 2020. Characterization, robustness, and aggregation of signed choquet integrals. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 45, 993–1015.
- Wang, R., Ziegel, J., 2018. Scenario-based risk evaluation. Working Paper .
- Wang, R., Ziegel, J.F., 2021. Scenario-based risk evaluation. *Finance and Stochastics* 25, 725–756.
- Weber, S., 2018. Solvency ii, or how to sweep the downside risk under the carpet. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 82, 191 – 200.