

# Set-Valued Dynamic Risk Measures for Processes and Vectors

Yanhong Chen <sup>\*</sup>      Zachary Feinstein <sup>†</sup>

November 30, 2021

## Abstract

The relationship between set-valued risk measures for processes and vectors on the optional filtration is investigated. The equivalence of risk measures for processes and vectors and the equivalence of their penalty function formulations are provided. In contrast with scalar risk measures, this equivalence requires an augmentation of the set-valued risk measures for processes. We utilize this result to deduce a new dual representation for risk measures for processes in the set-valued framework. Finally, the equivalence of multiportfolio time consistency between set-valued risk measures for processes and vectors is provided; to accomplish this, an augmented definition for multiportfolio time consistency of set-valued risk measures for processes is proposed.

## 1 Introduction

Coherent risk measures for multi-period models were introduced by Artzner et al. [5, 6], where time consistency (i.e., risk preferences are consistent over time) of risk measures was shown to be equivalent to Bellman’s principle (i.e., the risk of a portfolio is equivalent to the iterated risks backwards in time). These risk measures allow for the risk of cash flows to be quantified in an axiomatic framework. Though these risk measures appear distinct from the more traditional risk measures of, e.g., Artzner et al. [3, 4], Föllmer and Schied [23] and Frittelli and Rosazza Gianin [24], risk measures applied to processes can be proven to be equivalent to these more traditional risk measures via the optional filtration as demonstrated in, e.g., Acciaio et al. [1].

---

<sup>\*</sup>Hunan University, College of Finance and Statistics, Changsha, China 410082. Research is partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11901184) and Natural Science Foundation of Hunan Province (No. 2020JJ5025).

<sup>†</sup>Stevens Institute of Technology, School of Business, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA. [zfeinste@stevens.edu](mailto:zfeinste@stevens.edu)

Within this work, we are concerned with dynamic risk measures. That is, we consider those risk measures which allow for updates to the minimal capital requirement over time due to revealed information as encoded in a filtration. First, there are many studies about dynamic risk measures for random variables which describe financial positions, for instance: Bion-Nadal [8] studied the dual or robust representation; Bion-Nadal [9, 10] gave the equivalent characterization of time consistency of dynamic risk measures for random variables by a cocycle condition on the minimal penalty function (i.e., such that the penalty functions can be decomposed as a summation over time); Barriau and El Karoui [31] studied some applications of static and dynamic risk measures in the aspect of pricing, hedging and designing derivative; and Delbaen et al. [17] studied the representation of the penalty function of dynamic risk measures for random variables induced by backward stochastic differential equations. There also exist many studies about dynamic risk measures applied to cash flows, for example: Riedel [32] studied the dual representation for time consistent dynamic coherent risk measures for processes with real values; Cheridito et al. [13, 14] studied dynamic risk measures on the space of all bounded and unbounded càdlàg processes, respectively, with real values or generalized real values; Frittelli and Scandolo [25] proposed dynamic risk measures for processes from a perspective of acceptance sets; Cheridito et al. [15] studied dynamic risk measures for bounded discrete-time processes with random variables as values, and provided a dual representation and an equivalent characterization of time consistency in terms of the additivity property of the corresponding acceptance sets; and Acciaio et al. [1] provided supermartingale characterisation (i.e., that the sum of a risk measure and its minimal penalty function form a supermartingale w.r.t. the dual probability measure) of time consistency of dynamic risk measures for processes. As highlighted in [1], as with the static risk measures, these dynamic risk measures for processes can be found to be equivalent to risk measures over random variables through the use of the optional filtration. Utilizing the optional  $\sigma$ -algebra, the equivalence of time consistency for traditional dynamic risk measures and those for processes are also found to be equivalent.

Set-valued risk measures were introduced in Jouini et al. [29], Hamel [26], Hamel et al. [28] and extended to the dynamic framework in Feinstein and Rudloff [18, 19]. All of those works present risk measures for random vectors. Set-valued risk measures were introduced so as to consider risks in markets with frictions. Such risk measures have, more recently, been utilized for quantifying systemic risk in Feinstein et al. [22] and Ararat and Rudloff [2]. In Chen and Hu [11, 12], set-

valued risk measures for processes were introduced. However, as demonstrated in those works, the equivalence of risk measures for processes and risk measures for random vectors no longer holds except under certain strong assumptions. These strong assumptions limit the direct application of known results for, e.g., multiperiod time consistency (i.e., a version of Bellman’s principle for set-valued risk measures) as proven in Feinstein and Rudloff [20, 21] to set-valued risk measures for processes.

In this work we prove a new relation between set-valued risk measures for processes and those for random vectors (on the optional filtration). Notably, the formulation for equivalence indicates that risk measures for processes at time  $t$  need to be augmented to capture the risks prior to time  $t$  due to the non-existence of a unique “0” element in the set-valued framework; such an augmentation is not necessary in the scalar case as in, e.g., [1]. By utilizing this new equivalence relation, we are able to derive a novel dual representation for set-valued risk measures for processes akin to that done in [1]. Additionally, we extend these results to present the equivalent formulation for multiperiod time consistency; since the equivalence between risk measure settings requires an augmentation, we present a new definition for time consistency for risk measures for processes.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we present preliminary and background information on the set-valued risk measures of interest within this work, i.e., as functions of stochastic processes and random vectors. Section 3 demonstrates the equivalence of these risk measures both in primal and dual representations. With the focus on dynamic risk measures, the equivalence of multiperiod time consistency for processes and vectors is presented in Section 4. Section 5 concludes.

## 2 Set-valued risk measures

In this section we will summarize the definitions for set-valued risk measures. We will provide details of the filtrations and the spaces of claims of interest within this work in Section 2.1, and give the necessary background on risk measures for processes as defined in, e.g., [11, 12], and for random vectors as defined in, e.g., [18, 19] in Section 2.2 and Section 2.3, respectively.

## 2.1 Background and notation

Fix a finite time horizon  $T \in \mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$  and denote  $\mathbb{T} := \{0, 1, \dots, T\}$  and  $\mathbb{T}_t := \{s \in \mathbb{T} : s \geq t\}$  for  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ . Furthermore, define the discrete interval  $[t, s) := \{t, t+1, \dots, s-1\}$  for any  $s, t \in \mathbb{T}$  with  $s > t$ . Fix a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$  with  $\mathcal{F}_0$  the complete and trivial  $\sigma$ -algebra. Without loss of generality, take  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_T$ . Let  $d \geq 1$  be the number of assets under consideration and  $|\cdot|$  be an arbitrary but fixed norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $L_t^0(\mathbb{R}^d) := L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}; \mathbb{R}^d)$  (with  $L^0(\mathbb{R}^d) := L_T^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ) denote the linear space of the equivalence classes of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable vector-valued functions, where we specify random vectors  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. Define the space of (equivalence classes of)  $p$ -integrable random  $d$ -vectors for  $p \in \{1, \infty\}$  by  $L_t^p(\mathbb{R}^d) := L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}; \mathbb{R}^d) \subseteq L_t^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  (with  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^d) := L_T^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ). In this way,  $L_t^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$  denotes the linear space of the equivalence classes of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable functions  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  with bounded  $p$  norm where these norms are given by

$$\|X\|_p = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|X|] = \int_{\Omega} |X(\omega)| d\mathbb{P} & \text{if } p = 1 \\ \text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} |X(\omega)| & \text{if } p = \infty. \end{cases}$$

In this paper, we denote the expectation  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[X]$  by  $\mathbb{E}[X]$ , and denote the conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[X|\mathcal{F}_t]$  by  $\mathbb{E}_t[X]$ . Throughout this work, we consider the weak\* topology on  $L_t^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that the dual space of  $L_t^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is  $L_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

Fix  $m \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  of the assets to be eligible for covering the risk of a portfolio. Denote by  $M := \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}^{d-m}$  the subspace of eligible assets (those assets which can be used to satisfy capital requirements, e.g., US dollars and Euros). For any measurable set  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , write  $L_t^p(B) := \{X \in L_t^p(\mathbb{R}^d) : X \in B \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}\}$  for those random vectors that take  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. values in  $B$  for  $p \in \{0, 1, \infty\}$ . In particular, we denote the closed convex cone of uniformly bounded  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random vectors with  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. non-negative components by  $L_t^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$ , and let  $L_t^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_{++}^d)$  be the  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random vectors with  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. strictly positive components. Additionally, we denote  $M_t := L_t^{\infty}(M)$  to be the space of time  $t$  measurable eligible portfolios. Throughout we consider the non-negative eligible portfolios  $M_{t,+} := M_t \cap L_t^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$ , the positive dual cone  $M_{t,+}^* := \{u \in L_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d) : \mathbb{E}[u^{\top} m] \geq 0 \text{ for any } m \in M_{t,+}\}$  and the perpendicular space  $M_{t,+}^{\perp} := \{u \in L_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d) : \mathbb{E}[u^{\top} m] = 0 \text{ for any } m \in M_{t,+}\}$ . Generally, we will define  $C^* := \{u \in L_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d) : \mathbb{E}[u^{\top} m] \geq 0 \text{ for any } m \in C\}$  for any convex

cone  $C \subseteq L_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . (In)equalities between random vectors, stochastic processes and between sets are always understood componentwise in the  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. sense, unless stated otherwise. The multiplication between a random variable  $\lambda \in L_t^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  and a set of random vectors  $B_t \subseteq L_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is understood as in the elementwise sense, i.e.,  $\lambda B_t := \{\lambda X : X \in B_t\}$  with  $(\lambda X)(\omega) = \lambda(\omega)X(\omega)$ . Given a set  $A \subseteq M_t$ ,  $\text{cl}(A)$  means the closure of  $A$  w.r.t. the subspace topology on  $M_t$  and  $\text{co}(A)$  means the convex hull of  $A$ . Denote the spaces of upper and closed-convex upper sets respectively by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{U}(M_t; M_{t,+}) &:= \{D \subseteq M_t : D = D + M_{t,+}\} \\ \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+}) &:= \{D \subseteq M_t : D = \text{cl co}(D + M_{t,+})\},\end{aligned}$$

where the  $+$  sign denotes the usual Minkowski addition. We will denote  $\Gamma_t(w)$  with  $w \in L_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}$  by  $\Gamma_t(w) = \{u \in L_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : w^\top u \geq 0\}$ . As will be utilized in the dual representations presented below, the Minkowski subtraction for sets  $A, B \subseteq M_t$  is defined as

$$A - \bullet B = \{m \in M_t : B + \{m\} \subseteq A\}.$$

The indicator function for some  $D \in \mathcal{F}$  is denoted by  $\mathbb{I}_D : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and defined as

$$\mathbb{I}_D(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \omega \in D \\ 0 & \text{if } \omega \notin D. \end{cases}$$

Define  $\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$  the space of all  $d$ -dimensional adapted stochastic processes  $X := (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$  whose coordinates are in  $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  uniformly over  $t$ .  $\mathcal{A}^{1,d}$  denotes the space of all  $d$ -dimensional adapted stochastic processes  $a$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} |\Delta a_{t,i}|] < +\infty$ , where  $a_{-1,i} := 0$  and  $\Delta a_{t,i} := a_{t,i} - a_{t-1,i}$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$  the element of  $\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$  with the  $j$ -th component equal to 0 for  $j = 0, \dots, t-1$  and 1 for  $j \in \mathbb{T}_t$  and denote by  $\mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}$  the element of  $\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$  where only the  $s$ -th component is equal to 1 and all other are equal to 0. Similarly, for any  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ , denote  $\mathbb{I}_{\{s \in [0,t]\}}$  the indicator function of  $[0, t)$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{I}_{\{s \in [0,t]\}}$  equals 1 if  $s \in [0, t)$  and 0 if  $s \notin [0, t)$ . As is standard in the literature (see, e.g., [15]), for any time  $0 \leq r \leq s \leq T$ , we define the projection  $\pi_{r,s}(X)_t := \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_r} X_{t \wedge s}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  for any  $d$ -dimensional adapted stochastic process  $X$ . Denote  $\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} := \pi_{t,T}(\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d})$  and  $\mathcal{A}_t^{1,d} := \pi_{t,T}(\mathcal{A}^{1,d})$ . The space of non-negative processes is written as

$\mathcal{R}_+^{\infty,d} := \{X \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d} : X_{t,i} \geq 0 \text{ for any } t \in \mathbb{T}, i = 1, \dots, d\}$ . As in [1, 15], a process  $X \in \mathcal{R}_+^{\infty,d}$  describes the evolution of a financial value or the cumulative cash flow on the time  $\mathbb{T}_t$ . Throughout this work we will consider the coarsest topologies (denoted by  $\sigma(\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}, \mathcal{A}_t^{1,d})$ ,  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}_t^{1,d}, \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d})$  respectively) such that  $\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_t^{1,d}$  form a dual pair (and vice versa), i.e., the space of all continuous linear functionals on the topological space  $(\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}, \sigma(\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}, \mathcal{A}_t^{1,d}))$  (resp.  $(\mathcal{A}_t^{1,d}, \sigma(\mathcal{A}_t^{1,d}, \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}))$ ) is  $\mathcal{A}_t^{1,d}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$ ).

Denote by  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})$  the set of probability measures  $\mathbb{Q}$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  which are absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ . Denote those probability measures equal to  $\mathbb{P}$  on  $\mathcal{F}_t$  by  $\mathcal{M}_t(\mathbb{P}) := \{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P}) : \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{P} \text{ on } \mathcal{F}_t\}$ . For any given  $t \leq s \in \mathbb{T}$ , define

$$\mathcal{D}_{t,s} := \{\xi \in L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+) : \mathbb{E}_t[\xi] = 1\}.$$

Then every  $\xi \in \mathcal{D}_{t,s}$  defines a probability measure  $\mathbb{Q}^\xi$  in  $\mathcal{M}_t(\mathbb{P})$  with density  $d\mathbb{Q}^\xi/d\mathbb{P} = \xi$ . Conversely, every  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})$  induces a collection of non-negative random variables  $\xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}) \in \mathcal{D}_{t,s}$  for  $t \leq s \in \mathbb{T}$  where  $\xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q})$  is defined as

$$\xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}) := \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbb{E}_s[\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}]}{\mathbb{E}_t[\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}]} & \text{on } \{\mathbb{E}_t[\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}] > 0\} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As in, e.g., Cheridito and Kupper [16], we will use a  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost sure version of the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -conditional expectation of  $X \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  given by

$$\mathbb{E}_t^\mathbb{Q}[X] := \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{Q}[X|\mathcal{F}_t] := \mathbb{E}_t[\xi_{t,T}(\mathbb{Q})X]$$

for any time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ . For  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})^d$ , we will utilize the vector representation  $\xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}) := (\xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}_1), \dots, \xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}_d))^\top$  for any time  $t \leq s \in \mathbb{T}$ . We further define the function  $w_t^s : \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})^d \times L_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow L_s^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for any  $t, s \in \mathbb{T}$  with  $t < s$  by

$$w_t^s(\mathbb{Q}, w) := \text{diag}(w)\xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}),$$

for any  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})^d$  and  $w \in L_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , where  $\text{diag}(w)$  denotes the diagonal matrix with the compo-

nents of  $w$  on the main diagonal. By convention, for any  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ ,  $w_t^t(\mathbb{Q}, w) = w$  for any  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})^d$  and  $w \in L_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

As we seek to relate risk measures for random vectors to those of processes, as in [1], we consider the optional filtration, i.e.,  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, (\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$  with sample space  $\bar{\Omega} = \Omega \times \mathbb{T}$ ,  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\bar{\mathcal{F}} = \sigma(\{A_t \times \{t\} : A_t \in \mathcal{F}_t, t \in \mathbb{T}\})$ , filtration  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma(\{D_r \times \{r\}, D_t \times \mathbb{T}_t : D_r \in \mathcal{F}_r, r < t, D_t \in \mathcal{F}_t\})$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  and probability measure  $\bar{\mathbb{P}} = \mathbb{P} \otimes \mu$  where  $\mu = (\mu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is some adapted reference process such that  $\sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_t = 1$  and  $\mathbb{P}[\min_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_t > \epsilon] = 1$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . Under this measure on the optional  $\sigma$ -algebra, the expectation is  $\bar{\mathbb{E}}[X] := \bar{\mathbb{E}}^{\bar{\mathbb{P}}}[X] := \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} X_t \mu_t]$  for any measurable function  $X$  on  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}})$ ; we emphasize that this expectation is taken over the optional  $\sigma$ -algebra by utilizing the  $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$  notation throughout this work. A random vector  $X = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  on  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$  is  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -measurable if and only if  $X_r$  is  $\mathcal{F}_r$ -measurable for all  $r = 0, \dots, t$  and  $X_r = X_t$  for any  $r > t$ . Denote  $\bar{L}_t^p(\mathbb{R}^d) := L^p(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t, \bar{\mathbb{P}}; \mathbb{R}^d)$  (with  $\bar{L}^p(\mathbb{R}^d) := \bar{L}_T^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ) for  $p \in \{0, 1, \infty\}$ ; similarly denote the set of  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -measurable random vectors taking value in the measurable set  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , by  $\bar{L}_t^p(B) \subseteq \bar{L}_t^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for  $p \in \{0, 1, \infty\}$ . Often we consider the non-negative orthant  $B = \mathbb{R}_+^d$  or the positive orthant  $B = \mathbb{R}_{++}^d$ . Denote  $\bar{M}_t = \bar{L}_t^\infty(M) := \{X \in \bar{L}_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : X \in M \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}\}$ . Throughout this work, we consider the weak\* topology on  $\bar{L}_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that the dual space of  $\bar{L}_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is  $\bar{L}_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . As on the original probability space, denote by  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})$  the set of probability measures  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$  on  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}})$  which are absolutely continuous with respect to  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ . Denote by  $\bar{\mathbb{E}}^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X]$  as the expectation of  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with respect to the probability measure  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ . We will, further, denote  $\bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w})$  with  $\bar{w} \in \bar{L}_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}$  by  $\bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w}) = \{u \in \bar{L}_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : \bar{w}^\top u \geq 0 \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.}\}$ . The following Theorem 2.1, adapted from [1], provides a representation for these probability measures on the optional  $\sigma$ -algebra.

**Theorem 2.1.** *For any probability measure  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})$  on the optional  $\sigma$ -algebra, there exist a probability measure  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})$  and an optional random measure  $\psi \in \Psi(\mathbb{P}) := \{\psi \in \mathcal{R}_+^{\infty, 1} : \sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \psi_t = 1 \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}\}$  such that*

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}}^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[ \sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \psi_t X_t \right] \quad (1)$$

for any  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ .

Conversely, any  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})$  and  $\psi \in \Psi(\mathbb{P})$  define a probability measure  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} := \mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})$  such that (1) holds.

*Proof.* This follows directly from Theorem 3.4 and Remark B.1 of [1].  $\square$

**Remark 2.2.** We wish to note that the decomposition of  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})$  as  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi$  provided in Theorem 2.1 can be defined with arbitrary  $\psi_s \geq 0$  on  $\{\mathbb{E}_t[\frac{d\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}{d\bar{\mathbb{P}}}] = 0\}$  so long as  $\psi \in \Psi(\mathbb{P})$ . Without loss of generality, we will always consider the modified decomposition  $\mathbb{Q} \otimes \hat{\psi}$  such that:

$$\hat{\psi}_t = \begin{cases} \psi_t & \text{on } \{\tau(\mathbb{Q}) > t\} \\ \frac{\mu_t}{1 - \sum_{s=0}^{\tau(\mathbb{Q})-1} \mu_s} \left(1 - \sum_{s=0}^{\tau(\mathbb{Q})-1} \mu_s\right) & \text{on } \{\tau(\mathbb{Q}) \leq t\} \end{cases}$$

with stopping time  $\tau(\mathbb{Q}) := \min\{t \in \mathbb{T} \mid \mathbb{E}_t[\frac{d\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}{d\bar{\mathbb{P}}}] = 0\}$ .

As we often are interested in those probability measures that are equivalent to  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$  on the filtration, we present the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})$  with decomposition  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi$  (as defined in Theorem 2.1). Then, for any time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ , it follows that*

$$\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \bar{\mathbb{P}} \text{ on } \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t \iff \begin{cases} \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{P} \text{ on } \mathcal{F}_t \\ \psi_s = \mu_s \forall s < t. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* This follows directly from [1, Lemma B.5].  $\square$

We note that, from Corollary 2.3, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{M}}_t(\bar{\mathbb{P}}) &:= \{\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}}) : \bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \bar{\mathbb{P}} \text{ on } \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t\} \\ &= \{\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi : \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_t(\mathbb{P}), \psi \in \Psi(\mathbb{P}), \psi_s = \mu_s \forall s < t\}. \end{aligned}$$

As for the original probability space, we will use a  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost sure version of the  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -conditional expectation of  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Denote by  $\bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X] := \bar{\mathbb{E}}^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X|\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t]$  as the conditional expectation of  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . This  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost sure version can be provided by  $\bar{\xi}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$  construction as for the original probability space, i.e., with

$$\bar{\xi}_{t,s}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})_r := \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{\mathbb{E}}_s[\frac{d\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}{d\bar{\mathbb{P}}}]_r}{\bar{\mathbb{E}}_t[\frac{d\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}{d\bar{\mathbb{P}}}]_r} & \text{on } \{\bar{\mathbb{E}}_t[\frac{d\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}{d\bar{\mathbb{P}}}]_r > 0\} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$



$$= \begin{cases} \left( \frac{1 - \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mu_\tau}{\mu_r} \right) \left( \frac{\psi_r}{1 - \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \psi_\tau} \right) \xi_{t,r}(\mathbb{Q}) & \text{on } \{r \in [t, s), \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \psi_\tau < 1\} \\ \left( \frac{1 - \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mu_\tau}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_s} \mu_\tau} \right) \left( \frac{\sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{T}_s} \psi_\tau}{1 - \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \psi_\tau} \right) \xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}) & \text{on } \{r \geq s, \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \psi_\tau < 1\} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

under decomposition  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi$  with  $\psi$  following the form provided in Remark 2.2. In the following Corollary 2.4 we provide an equivalent representation for the conditional expectation.

**Corollary 2.4.** *For  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})$  with decomposition  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi$ , the conditional expectation of  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$  given  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$  takes the form*

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X] = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} X_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \left( \mathbb{I}_{\{\sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \psi_r < 1\}} \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{\psi_s}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \psi_r} X_s \right] + \mathbb{I}_{\{\sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \psi_r = 1\}} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{\mu_s}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r} X_s \right] \right) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.$$

*Proof.* First, by definition of the conditional expectation and Theorem 2.1,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}} \psi_s X_s \right] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \psi_s \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X]_s + \left( \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \psi_s \right) \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X]_t \right]$$

for any  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ . By matching terms,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X]_s &= X_s \text{ Q-a.s. on } \{\psi_s > 0\} \text{ for } s < t, \\ \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X]_t &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}}[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \psi_s X_s]}{\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \psi_s} \text{ Q-a.s. on } \left\{ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \psi_s > 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that  $\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \psi_s = 1 - \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \psi_s$  by construction, we first recover the  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -a.s. version of the conditional expectation as presented in, e.g., [1, Corollary B.3]. Finally, we recover the representation of the conditional expectation presented within this corollary by taking the  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. version of the  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -conditional expectation through the use of  $\bar{\xi}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$  as presented in (2); in particular,  $\bar{\xi}_{t,T}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})_r = 1$  for every time  $r$  on  $\{\sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \psi_\tau = 1\}$ .  $\square$

We further define the functions  $\bar{w}_t^s : \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})^d \times \bar{L}_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \bar{L}_s^0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for any  $t, s \in \mathbb{T}$  with  $t < s$  by

$$\bar{w}_t^s(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) := \sum_{r=1}^{t-1} \bar{w}_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + \text{diag}(\bar{w}_t) \left( \sum_{r=t}^{s-1} \bar{\xi}_{t,s}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + \bar{\xi}_{t,s}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})_s \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s} \right)$$

where  $\bar{\xi}_{t,s}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$  is defined in (2) comparably to  $\xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q})$  for  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})^d$ . By convention, for any  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ ,  $\bar{w}_t^t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) = \bar{w}$  for any  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})^d$  and  $\bar{w} \in \bar{L}_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . We note that, through the decomposition of  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$  as in Theorem 2.1, an equivalent formulation for  $\bar{w}_t^s(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w})$  can be given in the style of Corollary 2.4.

We conclude this section with a brief result relating the topologies of  $\bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$ . This will be utilized later in this work.

**Lemma 2.5.** (1) Let  $X^n \rightarrow X$  in  $\sigma(\bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \bar{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ . Then  $X_t^n \rightarrow X_t$  in  $\sigma(L_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), L_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$  and  $X^n \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \rightarrow X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}, \mathcal{A}_t^{1,d})$  for every time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .

(2) Fix  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ . Let  $X_s^n \rightarrow X_s$  in  $\sigma(L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), L_s^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$  for every  $s < t$  and  $X^n \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \rightarrow X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}, \mathcal{A}_t^{1,d})$ . Then  $X^n \rightarrow X$  in  $\sigma(\bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \bar{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ .

*Proof.* (1) Let  $X^n \rightarrow X$  in  $\sigma(\bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \bar{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ . And fix  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .

(a) Let  $Z_t \in L_t^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and define  $Y := \mu_t^{-1} Z_t \mathbb{I}_{\{t\}} \in \bar{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_t^\top X_t^n] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_s Y_s^\top X_s^n\right] = \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X^n] \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X] = \mathbb{E}[Z_t^\top X_t].$$

(b) Let  $a \in \mathcal{A}_t^{1,d}$ . Define  $Y := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \mu_s^{-1} \Delta a_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \in \bar{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Therefore we find

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Delta a_s^\top X_s^n\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_s Y_s^\top X_s^n\right] = \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X^n] \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Delta a_s^\top X_s\right].$$

(2) Fix  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ . Let  $X_s^n \rightarrow X_s$  in  $\sigma(L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), L_s^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$  for every  $s < t$  and  $X^n \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \rightarrow X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}, \mathcal{A}_t^{1,d})$ . Let  $Y \in \bar{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $Z_s := \mu_s Y_s \in L_s^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for every  $s < t$  and  $\Delta a_s := \mu_s Y_s$  for every  $s \in \mathbb{T}_t$  (with  $\Delta a_s := 0$  for  $s < t$ ) so that  $a_r = \sum_{s=0}^r \Delta a_s$  defines  $a \in \mathcal{A}_t^{1,d}$ . Then we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X^n] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_s Y_s^\top X_s^n\right] = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}[Z_s^\top X_s^n] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Delta a_s^\top X_s^n\right] \\ &\rightarrow \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}[Z_s^\top X_s] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Delta a_s^\top X_s\right] = \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X]. \end{aligned}$$

□

## 2.2 Risk measures for processes

In this section we provide a quick overview of the definition of set-valued risk measures for processes as defined in [11, 12]. Herein we present an axiomatic framework for such functions in Definition 2.6. We then summarize prior results on the primal representation w.r.t. an acceptance set. We conclude this section with considerations for a novel dual representation for these conditional risk measures.

**Definition 2.6.** *A function  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  for  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  is called a **set-valued conditional risk measure for processes** if it satisfies the following properties for all  $X, Y \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$ ,*

(1) *Cash invariant: for any  $m \in M_t$ ,*

$$\rho_t(X + m\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}) = \rho_t(X) - m;$$

(2) *Monotone:  $\rho_t(X) \subseteq \rho_t(Y)$  if  $X \leq Y$  component-wise;*

(3) *Finite at zero:  $\rho_t(0) \neq \emptyset$  is closed (w.r.t. the subspace topology on  $M_t$ ) and  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -decomposable (i.e.,  $\mathbb{I}_A \rho_t(0) + \mathbb{I}_{A^c} \rho_t(0) \subseteq \rho_t(0)$  for any  $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$ ; see, e.g., Chapter 2 of Molchanov [30]), and  $\mathbb{P}[\tilde{\rho}_t(0) = M] = 0$  where  $\tilde{\rho}_t(0)$  is an  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random set (i.e.,  $\text{graph } \tilde{\rho}_t(0) := \{(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d : x \in \rho_t(0; \omega)\}$  is  $\mathcal{F}_t \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable for Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ; see, e.g., Tahar and Lépinette [7]) such that  $\rho_t(0) = L_t^\infty(\tilde{\rho}_t(0))$ .*

A conditional risk measure for processes at time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  is said to be:

- *Normalized if  $\rho_t(X) = \rho_t(X) + \rho_t(0)$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$ ;*
- *Conditionally convex if for all  $X, Y \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$  and  $\lambda \in L_t^\infty([0, 1])$*

$$\rho_t(\lambda X + (1 - \lambda)Y) \supseteq \lambda \rho_t(X) + (1 - \lambda) \rho_t(Y);$$

- *Conditionally positive homogeneous if for all  $X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$  and  $\lambda \in L_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{++})$*

$$\rho_t(\lambda X) = \lambda \rho_t(X);$$

- *Conditionally coherent if it is conditionally convex and conditionally positive homogeneous;*

- Closed if the graph of  $\rho_t$

$$\text{graph } \rho_t := \{(X, u) \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} \times M_t : u \in \rho_t(X)\}$$

is closed in the product topology;

- Conditionally convex upper continuous (c.u.c.) if

$$\rho_t^-(D) := \{X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} : \rho_t(X) \cap D \neq \emptyset\}$$

is closed for any  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -conditionally convex set  $D \in \mathcal{G}(M_t; -M_{t,+})$ .

**A dynamic risk measure for processes** is a sequence of conditional risk measures for processes  $(\rho_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ . And a dynamic risk measure for processes is said to have one of the above properties if  $\rho_t$  has the corresponding property for any  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .

For the interpretation of these risk measures, recall that  $X \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty, d}$  denotes the evolution of a financial value or the cumulative cash flow over time. As such, for instance, cash invariance implies that an addition of  $m$  eligible assets at time  $t$  to  $X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d}$  which is held until  $T$  will transform the value into  $X + m\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$  and the risk is decreased by  $m$  at time  $t$ .

We now consider the primal representation of a set-valued conditional risk measure for processes. That is, for any risk measure, let the *acceptance set* be defined as those claims that do not require the addition of any eligible asset in order to be “acceptable” to the risk manager:

$$A_{\rho_t} := \{X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} : 0 \in \rho_t(X)\}.$$

As shown in [11, 12], these acceptance sets uniquely define the risk measure via the relation

$$\rho_t^{A_t}(X) = \{m \in M_t : X + m\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \in A_t\}$$

for any  $X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d}$ . Furthermore, as provided by [11, Proposition 2.1], there is a one-to-one relation between the risk measure and its acceptance set so that

$$\rho_t = \rho_t^{A_{\rho_t}} \quad \text{and} \quad A_t = A_{\rho_t^{A_t}}.$$

Throughout this work, we will take the risk measure-acceptance set pair  $(\rho_t, A_t)$  without use of the explicit sub- or superscript notation.

With this construction of risk measures for processes, we give a consideration of the dual representation. The following dual representation – Corollary 2.7 – is novel in the literature for set-valued risk measures for processes, we will leave the proof until Section 3.2. Though this result can be proven using the duality theory of Hamel et al. [27] and following the same logic as the proof of [20, Corollary 2.4], we will take a different approach by utilizing the prior results on risk measures for vectors and the yet-to-be-proven equivalence between these formulations. For this result, we first need to consider the set of dual variables

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_t &:= \left\{ (\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{D}_t : w_s^s(\mathbb{Q}_s, w_s) \in L_s^1(\mathbb{R}_+^d) \forall s \in \mathbb{T}_t \right\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_t &:= \mathcal{M}_t(\mathbb{P})^{d \times (T-t+1)} \times \left( M_{t,+}^* \setminus M_t^\perp \right)^{T-t+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Notably  $(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t$  implies  $w_s \geq 0$   $\mathbb{Q}_s$ -a.s. since  $w_s^s(\mathbb{Q}_s, w_s) \in L_s^1(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$ .

**Corollary 2.7.** *A function  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  is a **closed conditionally convex risk measure** if and only if*

$$\rho_t(X) = \bigcap_{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t} \left( \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left( (\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s)) \cap M_t \right) - \bullet \alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \right), \quad (3)$$

where  $\alpha_t$  is the minimal conditional penalty function given by

$$\alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) = \bigcap_{Y \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left( (\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-Y_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s)) \cap M_t \right).$$

$\rho_t$  is additionally **conditionally coherent** if and only if

$$\rho_t(X) = \bigcap_{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left( (\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s)) \cap M_t \right),$$

for

$$\mathcal{W}_t^{\max} = \left\{ (\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t : \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[Z_s] \geq 0 \text{ for any } Z \in A_t \right\}.$$

We conclude this section with a brief introduction to a time consistency notion, called multi-

portfolio time consistency, for these set-valued risk measures for processes. This notion for risk measures for processes was introduced in [11]. We will revisit this definition in Section 4.

**Definition 2.8.** *A dynamic risk measure for processes  $(\rho_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is **multiportfolio time consistent** if for any times  $t < s \in \mathbb{T}$ :*

$$\rho_s(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_s(Y) \Rightarrow \rho_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{\{[t,s]\}} + X\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{\{[t,s]\}} + Y\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s})$$

for any  $X \in \mathcal{R}_s^{\infty,d}$ ,  $Z \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$ , and  $B \subseteq \mathcal{R}_s^{\infty,d}$ .

Conceptually, a risk measure is multiportfolio time consistent if a cumulative cash flow process  $X$  is guaranteed (almost surely) to be more risky than some collection of cumulative cash flows  $B$  at a time point in the future  $s$  and if all of those cumulative cash flows are identical up to time  $s$ , then  $X$  is also more risky at all earlier times. This can most easily be understood when the collection  $B$  is a singleton, i.e., when comparing two cumulative cash flows  $X$  and  $Y$  directly.

### 2.3 Risk measures for vectors

In this section we provide a quick overview of the definition of set-valued risk measures for random vectors as defined in [18, 19]. Herein we present an axiomatic framework for such functions in Definition 2.9 with emphasis on the special case on the optional filtration. We then summarize prior results on the primal representation w.r.t. an acceptance set. We conclude this section with considerations for a dual representation for these conditional risk measures.

**Definition 2.9.** *A function  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  for  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  is called a **set-valued conditional risk measure for vectors** on  $\bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  if it satisfies the following properties for all  $X, Y \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,*

(1) *Cash invariant: for any  $m \in \bar{M}_t$ ,*

$$\bar{R}_t(X + m) = \bar{R}_t(X) - m;$$

(2) *Monotone:  $\bar{R}_t(X) \subseteq \bar{R}_t(Y)$  if  $X \leq Y$  component-wise;*

(3) *Finite at zero:*  $\bar{R}_t(0) \neq \emptyset$  is closed and  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -decomposable, and such that  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}[\bar{R}_t(0) = M] = 0$  where  $\tilde{R}_t(0)$  is a  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -measurable random set such that  $\bar{R}_t(0) = \bar{L}_t^\infty(\tilde{R}_t(0))$ .

A conditional risk measure for vectors at time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  is said to be:

- Normalized if  $\bar{R}_t(X) = \bar{R}_t(X) + \bar{R}_t(0)$  for every  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ;
- Time decomposable if

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \bar{R}_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \bar{R}_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$$

for any  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ;

- Conditionally convex if for all  $X, Y \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\lambda \in \bar{L}_t^\infty([0, 1])$

$$\bar{R}_t(\lambda X + (1 - \lambda)Y) \supseteq \lambda \bar{R}_t(X) + (1 - \lambda) \bar{R}_t(Y);$$

- Conditionally positive homogeneous if for all  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\lambda \in \bar{L}_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{++})$

$$\bar{R}_t(\lambda X) = \lambda \bar{R}_t(X);$$

- Conditionally coherent if it is conditionally convex and conditionally positive homogeneous;
- Closed if the graph of  $\bar{R}_t$

$$\text{graph } \bar{R}_t := \{(X, u) \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \bar{M}_t : u \in \bar{R}_t(X)\}$$

is closed in the product topology;

- Conditionally convex upper continuous (c.u.c.) if

$$\bar{R}_t^-(D) := \{X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : \bar{R}_t(X) \cap D \neq \emptyset\}$$

is closed for any  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -conditionally convex set  $D \in \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; -\bar{M}_{t,+})$ .

A **dynamic risk measure for vectors** is a sequence of conditional risk measures for vectors  $(\bar{R}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ . A dynamic risk measure for vectors is said to have one of the above properties if  $\bar{R}_t$  has the corresponding property for any  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .

**Remark 2.10.** We note that the time decomposable property presented above is, as far as the authors are aware, novel to this work. Time decomposability conceptually means that the time  $s < t \in \mathbb{T}$  eligible assets required to compensate for the risk of the cumulative cash flows at time  $s$  only depend on the realized portfolio at time  $s$ ; this similarly is true for the eligible assets required to compensate for the random future cash flows at time  $t$ . Notably, by [18, Proposition 2.8], any conditionally convex risk measure is time decomposable.

We now consider the primal representation of a set-valued conditional risk measure for vectors. That is, for any risk measure, let the *acceptance set* be defined as those claims that do not require the addition of any eligible asset in order to be “acceptable” to the risk manager:

$$\bar{A}_{\bar{R}_t} := \{X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : 0 \in \bar{R}_t(X)\}.$$

As shown in [18], these acceptance sets uniquely define the risk measure via the relation

$$\bar{R}_t^{\bar{A}_t}(X) = \{m \in \bar{M}_t : X + m \in \bar{A}_t\}$$

for any  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Furthermore, as with the risk measures for processes and as provided by [18, Remark 2], there is a one-to-one relation between the risk measure and its acceptance set so that

$$\bar{R}_t = \bar{R}_t^{\bar{A}_{\bar{R}_t}} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{A}_t = \bar{A}_{\bar{R}_t^{\bar{A}_t}}.$$

Throughout this work, we will take the risk measure-acceptance set pair  $(\bar{R}_t, \bar{A}_t)$  without use of the explicit sub- or superscript notation.

We now provide a dual representation for risk measures for vectors. For comparison to the dual representation presented above for risk measures for processes, we present the dual representation



provided first in [20]. For this result, we first need to consider the set of dual variables

$$\bar{\mathcal{W}}_t := \left\{ (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_t(\bar{\mathbb{P}})^d \times (\bar{M}_{t,+}^* \setminus \bar{M}_t^\perp) : \bar{w}_t^T(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{L}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^d) \right\}.$$

As above,  $(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$  implies  $\bar{w} \geq 0$   $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -a.s.

**Corollary 2.11.** [20, Corollary 2.4] *A function  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  is a **closed conditionally convex risk measure** if and only if*

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \bigcap_{(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t} \left( (\bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-X] + \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w})) \cap \bar{M}_t - \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \right),$$

where  $\bar{\alpha}_t$  is the minimal conditional penalty function given by

$$\bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) = \bigcap_{Y \in \bar{A}_t} \left( \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Y] + \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w}) \right) \cap \bar{M}_t.$$

$\bar{R}_t$  is additionally **conditionally coherent** if and only if

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \bigcap_{(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max}} \left( \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-X] + \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w}) \right) \cap \bar{M}_t,$$

for

$$\bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max} = \{ (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t : \bar{w}_t^T(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{A}_t^* \}.$$

We conclude this introduction to risk measures for vectors with a consideration of multiportfolio time consistency. This notion for risk measures for vectors is a modification of that introduced in [18, 19]; we demonstrate in Proposition 2.13 that this coincides with the typical definition for time decomposable risk measures.

**Definition 2.12.** *A dynamic risk measure for vectors  $(\bar{R}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is **multiportfolio time consistent** if for any times  $t < s \in \mathbb{T}$ :*

$$\bar{R}_s(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_s(Y) \Rightarrow \bar{R}_t(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_t(Y)$$

for any  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty$  and  $B := \{(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{s-1}, b_s) : b_r \in B_r, r < s, b_s \in B_s\}$  for any arbitrary

sequence of sets  $B_r \subseteq L_r^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for  $r < s$  and  $B_s \subseteq \mathcal{R}_s^{\infty,d}$ .

As for risk measures for processes, conceptually, multiportfolio time consistency allows for the comparison of a single (cumulative) cash flow with a collection of portfolios over time in which a guaranteed ordering must hold backwards in time.

**Proposition 2.13.** *Let  $(\bar{R}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  be a normalized, time decomposable risk measure.  $(\bar{R}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is multiportfolio time consistent if and only if for any times  $t < s \in \mathbb{T}$ :*

$$\bar{R}_s(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_s(Y) \Rightarrow \bar{R}_t(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_t(Y)$$

for any  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $B \subseteq \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

*Proof.* This result follows trivially via the application of the recursive relation  $\bar{R}_t(X) = \bigcup_{Z \in \bar{R}_s(X)} \bar{R}_t(-Z)$  for any times  $t < s$  and  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  which can be shown to be equivalent to multiportfolio time consistency as given in Definition 2.12 and the more general version provided in the statement of this proposition.  $\square$

**Remark 2.14.** Throughout much of the remainder of this work, the restriction of set-valued risk measures for vectors to a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra is utilized. Herein we will define  $R_t : L_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  to be the restriction of a set-valued risk measure (with filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$ ) to  $L_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . The primal and dual representation of such risk measures will be utilized extensively below defined in analogous ways to those provided above; for closed and convex risk measures – as are utilized for the dual representation – the codomain of  $R_t$  is  $\mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+}) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(M_t; M_{t,+})$ . Notably, the penalty function  $\alpha_{R_t}$  for these restricted risk measures only depends on a single dual variable  $w \in M_{t,+}^*$ , i.e.,  $\alpha_{R_t}(w)$  does *not* depend on a vector of probability measures  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_t(\mathbb{P})^d$ .

### 3 Equivalence of risk measures for processes and vectors

In this section we will focus on the relation between set-valued risk measures for processes and vectors. This was studied under restrictive conditions in [11] which match many of the same properties

of the scalar setting (i.e., with a full space of eligible assets  $M = \mathbb{R}^d$  and with the strong normalization property  $\rho_t(0) = L_t^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$ ). Herein we drop these restrictions and determine the equivalence for both the primal and dual representations. Notably, this equivalence requires the introduction of an augmentation of the risk measure for processes with a series of risk measures for vectors on the original filtered probability space; when the aforementioned strong assumptions are imposed these augmenting risk measures can be dropped without incident as detailed in Corollary 3.2.

### 3.1 Relation for primal representations

First, we compare the relation between set-valued risk measures for processes and for vectors through their axiomatic definitions. This is akin to the results presented in [1] for scalar risk measures. Notably, in comparison to that work, the set-valued risk measures for vectors in the optional filtration are a larger class than those for processes rather than the equivalence as found for scalar risk measures. In particular, we find risk measures for vectors on the optional filtration are equivalent to the risk measures for processes augmented with the restricted set-valued risk measures for vectors which are discussed in Remark 2.14. Intuitively, this augmentation is necessary to account for the possible risk prior to the current time that cannot trivially be accounted for by eligible assets; that is, the augmentation is required for the  $M \neq \mathbb{R}^d$  setting. In the full eligible asset setting  $M = \mathbb{R}^d$ , the equivalence of risk measures for processes and vectors no longer requires an augmentation by restricted set-valued risk measures as is detailed in Corollary 3.2 below.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Fix time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .*

(1) *Any conditional risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of conditional risk measures for vectors  $R_s : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  (restricted to  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -measurable random vectors),  $s = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$ , define a time decomposable conditional risk measure for random vectors on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  via*

$$\bar{R}_t(X) := \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} R_s(X_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \rho_t(\pi_{t,T}(X)) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}. \quad (4)$$

*Additionally, if  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}, \rho_t$  are normalized, conditionally convex, or conditionally coherent, then the corresponding risk measure  $\bar{R}_t$  has the same property.*

(2) Any conditional risk measure for random vectors on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  defines a conditional risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and a series of conditional risk measures  $R_s : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  restricted to  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -measurable random vectors,  $s = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$ , via

$$\rho_t(X) := \bar{R}_t(X\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t})_t \quad (5)$$

$$R_s(Z) := \bar{R}_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{\{s\}})_s, \quad s = 0, 1, \dots, t-1. \quad (6)$$

Additionally, if  $\bar{R}_t$  is normalized, conditionally convex, or conditionally coherent, then the corresponding risk measures  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}, \rho_t$  have the same property.

(3) If  $\bar{R}_t$  is time decomposable then it can be decomposed into form (4) such that  $\rho_t$  and  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}$  are defined as in (5) and (6) respectively. Additionally, if  $\bar{R}_t$  is conditionally convex and either closed or conditionally convex upper continuous then  $\rho_t$  and  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}$  have the same property and vice versa.

*Proof.* (1) It is easy to check that  $\bar{R}_t$  defined in (4) is a time decomposable conditional risk measure on the optional filtration as defined in Definition 2.9. This is done directly by considering the equivalent definitions for the risk measure for processes and the sequence of conditional risk measures. Due to simplicity, we omit the direct constructions herein.

(2) It is easy to check that  $\rho_t$  defined in (5) is a risk measure for processes and  $R_s$ , for  $s < t$ , defined in (6) is a conditional risk measure for vectors on  $L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . Notably, for  $\rho_t$ , the result follows directly from [11, Proposition 3.4] with only verification required as we no longer require the full eligible space, i.e.,  $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ; due to simplicity of those results, we omit those proofs. However, due to the updated definition for finiteness at zero, that result needs to be proven for  $\rho_t$  separately from the approach of [11] but still follows trivially by construction (recalling that  $\mathbb{P}[\min_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_t > \epsilon] = 1$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ ) and thus we omit the details.

(3) If  $\bar{R}_t$  is time decomposable and  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  then:

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \bar{R}_t(X\mathbb{I}_{\{s\}})\mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \bar{R}_t(X\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t})\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$$

$$= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} R_s(X_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \rho_t(\pi_{t,T}(X)) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.$$

Finally, we want to study the closedness properties for conditionally convex risk measures.

(a) **Closed:**

- Assume  $\bar{R}_t$  is closed. First, we will show that  $R_s$  is closed for any  $s < t$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{graph } R_s &= \{(X_s, m_s) \in L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \times M_s : m_s \in R_s(X_s)\} \\ &= \{(X_s, m_s) \in L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \times M_s : m_s \in \bar{R}_t(X_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}})_s\} \\ &= \{(X, m) \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \bar{M}_t : m \in \bar{R}_t(X)\}_s \\ &= (\text{graph } \bar{R}_t)_s. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $(X_s^n, m_s^n)_{n \in N} \subseteq \text{graph } R_s \rightarrow (X_s, m_s)$  in  $\sigma(L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), L_s^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$  be a convergent net indexed by the set  $N$ . By Lemma 2.5 and assumption, it must follow that  $(X_s^n \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}, m_s^n \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + m^0 \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}^c}) \rightarrow (X_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}, m_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + m^0 \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}^c}) \in \text{graph } \bar{R}_t$  for any arbitrary  $m^0 \in \bar{R}_t(0)$ . As  $(X_s, m_s) \in \text{graph } R_s$ , closedness is proven. Consider now the closedness of  $\rho_t$ . By the same logic as above,

$$\text{graph } \rho_t = \{(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}, m_t) : (X, m) \in \text{graph } \bar{R}_t\}.$$

Therefore, as above by concatenation with  $(0, m^0) \in \text{graph } \bar{R}_t$ ,  $\text{graph } \rho_t$  is closed.

- Assume  $\rho_t$  and  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}$  are all closed risk measures.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{graph } \bar{R}_t &= \{(X, m) \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \bar{M}_t : m \in \bar{R}_t(X)\} \\ &= \left\{ (X, m) \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \bar{M}_t : \begin{array}{l} m_s \in R_s(X_s) \forall s < t, \\ m_t \in \rho_t(\pi_{t,T}(X)) \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (\text{graph } R_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + (\text{graph } \rho_t) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $(X^n, m^n) \subseteq \text{graph } \bar{R}_t \rightarrow (X, m)$  in the product topology. By the above construction and Lemma 2.5, it must follow that  $(X_s, m_s) \in \text{graph } R_s$  for every time  $s < t$  and  $(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}, m_t) \in \text{graph } \rho_t$ . Therefore closedness is proven as  $(X, m) \in \text{graph } \bar{R}_t$ .

(b) **Conditionally convex upper continuous:**

- Assume  $\bar{R}_t$  is conditionally convex upper continuous. First we will show that  $R_s$  is conditionally convex upper continuous. Let  $D_s \in \mathcal{G}(M_s; -M_{s,+})$  be closed and conditionally convex.

$$\begin{aligned}
R_s^-(D_s) &= \{X_s \in L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : R_s(X_s) \cap D_s \neq \emptyset\} \\
&= \{X_s \in L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : \bar{R}_t(X_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}})_s \cap D_s \neq \emptyset\} \\
&= \{X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : \bar{R}_t(X)_s \cap D_s \neq \emptyset\}_s \\
&= \bar{R}_t^-(D_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \bar{M}_t \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}^c})_s.
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $X_s^n \subseteq R_s^-(D_s) \rightarrow X_s$  in  $\sigma(L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), L_s^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ . By Lemma 2.5 and assumption, it must follow that  $X_s^n \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \rightarrow X_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \in \bar{R}_t^-(D_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \bar{M}_t \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}^c})$ . Therefore conditional convex upper continuity is proven as  $X_s \in R_s^-(D_s)$ . Consider now the conditional convex upper continuity of  $\rho_t$ . Let  $D_t \in \mathcal{G}(M_t; -M_{t,+})$  be closed and conditionally convex. By the same logic as above,

$$\rho_t^-(D_t) = \bar{R}_t^-\left(\sum_{s=0}^{t-1} M_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + D_t \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}\right) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.$$

Therefore, as above,  $\rho_t^-(D_t)$  must be closed and the result follows.

- Assume  $\rho_t$  and  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}$  are all conditionally convex upper continuous. Let  $D \in \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; -\bar{M}_{t,+})$  be closed and conditionally convex. By decomposability in the optional filtration,  $D = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} D_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + D_t \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$  for  $D_s \in \mathcal{G}(M_s; -M_{s,+})$  closed and conditionally convex for every time  $s \leq t$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{R}_t^-(D) &= \{X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : \bar{R}_t(X) \cap D \neq \emptyset\} \\
&= \{X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : \bar{R}_t(X)_s \cap D_s \neq \emptyset \forall s \leq t\} \\
&= \{X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) : R_s(X_s) \cap D_s \neq \emptyset \forall s < t, \rho_t(\pi_{t,T}(X)) \cap D_t \neq \emptyset\} \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} R_s^-(D_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \rho_t^-(D_t) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $X^n \subseteq \bar{R}_t^-(D) \rightarrow X$  in  $\sigma(\bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \bar{L}^1(\mathbb{R}^d))$ . By Lemma 2.5 and assumption,  $X_s^n \rightarrow X_s \in R_s^-(D_s)$  for every  $s < t$  and  $X^n \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \rightarrow X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \in \rho_t^-(D_t)$ . Therefore conditional convex upper continuity is proven as  $X \in \bar{R}_t^-(D)$ .

□

Given these results on the equivalence of risk measures for processes and vectors, we consider the special case in which every asset is eligible to cover risk, i.e.,  $M = \mathbb{R}^d$ . This setting provides a simpler equivalent relation insofar as the restricted risk measures  $R_s$  utilized in Theorem 3.1 above can be fully defined by its value at 0. This setting more clearly demonstrates the relationship with scalar risk measures, as  $R_s(0) = L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$  in the  $d = 1$  asset setting for any choice of normalized risk measure with closed values.

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $M = \mathbb{R}^d$ . The equivalences in Theorem 3.1 can be simplified insofar as the conditional risk measures  $R_s$  can be replaced with (conditionally convex) upper sets  $C_s$ , i.e.,*

$$C_s := \bar{R}_t(0)_s$$

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (-X_s + C_s)\mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \rho_t(\pi_{t,T}(X))\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.$$

*Proof.* This follows from Theorem 3.1 by noting that  $R_s(X\mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}) = R_s(0) - X_s$  by cash invariance for this choice of eligible assets. Therefore the full risk measure  $R_s$  is no longer required, but only the risk measure at 0 which we denote  $C_s$ . □

We conclude this section on the equivalence of primal representations by providing the relation between acceptance sets for processes and vectors on the optional filtration.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Fix time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .*

(1) *Consider a conditional risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of conditional risk measures  $R_s : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  for  $s = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$ , and  $\bar{R}_t$  is defined as (4), then  $\bar{A}_t = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} A_{R_s}\mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + A_t\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$ .*

(2) *Given a conditional risk measure for random vectors on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$ , define  $\rho_t$  and  $R_s$  via (5) and (6) respectively, then  $A_t = \{X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} : X\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \in \bar{A}_t\}$  and  $A_{R_s} = (\bar{A}_t)_s$  for every  $s = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$ .*

*Proof.* This result follows directly by construction of the equivalences in Theorem 3.1. □

### 3.2 Relation for dual representations

Before presenting the following results, we want the reader to recall the dual representations for risk measures for processes in Corollary 2.7 and vectors in Corollary 2.11. We also highlight the form for the penalty functions for risk measures  $R_s : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  as provided in Remark 2.14. Finally, we remind the reader that any conditionally convex risk measure for vectors is time decomposable by construction as given in Remark 2.10.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Fix time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .*

(1) *Let  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  be a closed conditionally convex risk measure for processes and let  $R_s : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$ ,  $s < t$ , be a series of closed conditionally convex risk measures. The associated closed conditionally convex risk measure on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  defined in (4) has dual representation w.r.t. the penalty function*

$$\bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) = \bar{\alpha}_t(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w}) = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha_{R_s}(\bar{w}_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \alpha_t(W_t(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w})) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$$

where  $W_t(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w}) := (\hat{\mathbb{Q}}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t$  is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{s,i}}{d\mathbb{P}} &:= \frac{\psi_{s,i}}{\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_i}[\psi_{s,i}]} \xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}_i) \mathbb{I}_{\{\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_i}[\psi_{s,i}] > 0\}} + \frac{\mu_s}{\mathbb{E}_t[\mu_s]} \mathbb{I}_{\{\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_i}[\psi_{s,i}] = 0\}}, \\ w_{s,i} &:= \frac{\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_i}[\psi_{s,i}]}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r} \bar{w}_{t,i} \end{aligned}$$

for indices  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and times  $s \in \mathbb{T}_t$ .

(2) *Consider a closed conditionally convex risk measure for random vectors on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$ . The associated closed conditionally convex risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of closed conditionally convex risk measures  $R_s : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  defined in (5) and (6), respectively, have dual representations w.r.t. the penalty functions*

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{R_s}(w_s) &= \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{P}}, w_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}})_s, \\ \alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) &= \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w))_t, \end{aligned}$$



where  $\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) := (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$  is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w} &:= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \text{diag}(\mathbb{I}_{\{w_s > 0\}}) w_s \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}, \\ \left( \frac{d\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_i}{d\bar{\mathbb{P}}} \right)_s &:= \mathbb{I}_{\{s \in [0, t)\}} + \frac{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r}{\mu_s} \left( \frac{w_{s,i}}{\bar{w}_{t,i}} \mathbb{I}_{\{\bar{w}_{t,i} > 0\}} + \mathbb{I}_{\{\bar{w}_{t,i} = 0\}} \right) \xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}_{s,i}) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \end{aligned}$$

for indices  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ .

*Proof.* (1) We will prove this result by first demonstrating the decomposition of the penalty function  $\bar{\alpha}_t$ ; once that is demonstrated we will then show that  $W_t(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w}) \in \mathcal{W}_t$  guaranteeing that the decomposition is well-defined. Recall the definition of the minimal penalty function  $\bar{\alpha}_t$  from Corollary 2.11, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) &= \bigcap_{Z \in \bar{A}_t} \left( \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Z] + \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w}) \right) \cap \bar{M}_t \\ &= \left\{ u \in \bar{M}_t : \bar{w}^\top u \geq \text{ess sup}_{Z \in \bar{A}_t} \bar{w}^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Z] \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider now the decomposition of the acceptance set  $\bar{A}_t = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} A_{R_s} \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + A_t \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$  as given in Corollary 3.3. Additionally, assume  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_i = \mathbb{Q}_i \otimes \psi_i$  be the decomposition as provided in Corollary 2.3 for each component  $i$  of the vector of measures  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_t(\bar{\mathbb{P}})^d$ . Recall from Corollary 2.3 that  $\psi_{s,i} = \mu_s$  for every asset  $i$  and time  $s < t$ . Additionally, and as a direct consequence of this equality,  $\sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \psi_{s,i} < 1$  for every asset  $i$ . From this relation, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \\ &= \left\{ u \in \bar{M}_t : \begin{aligned} &\bar{w}^\top u \geq \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \text{ess sup}_{Z_s \in A_{R_s}} \bar{w}^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Z_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}] \\ &+ \text{ess sup}_{Z \in A_t} \bar{w}^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Z \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}] \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ u \in \bar{M}_t : \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \bar{w}_s^\top u_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \bar{w}_t^\top u_t \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \geq \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \text{ess sup}_{Z \in A_{R_s}} \bar{w}_s^\top (-Z_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{ess sup}_{Z \in A_t} \bar{w}_t^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{1}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r} \text{diag}(\psi_s)(-Z_s) \right] \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \left\{ u_s \in M_s : \bar{w}_s^\top u_s \geq \text{ess sup}_{Z \in A_{R_s}} \bar{w}_s^\top (-Z_s) \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \left\{ u_t \in M_t : \bar{w}_t^\top u_t \geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \bar{w}_t^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{\operatorname{diag}(\psi_s)}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r} (-Z_s) \right] \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.$$

Furthermore, by construction of  $(\hat{\mathbb{Q}}, w) = W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w})$ ,

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}} [Y_s] = \bar{w}_t^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{1}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r} \operatorname{diag}(\psi_s) Y_s \right]$$

for any  $Y \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d}$ . Therefore, the desired result follows if  $(\hat{\mathbb{Q}}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t$ . In fact, this holds by the relation  $w_t^s(\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_s, w_s) = \mu_s / (1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r) \bar{w}_t^T(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w})_s \in L_s^1(\mathbb{R}_+^d)$ .

(2) We will prove this result by first demonstrating that  $\alpha_{R_s}$  is the minimal penalty function for  $R_s$ . We will then consider the form of  $\alpha_t$  as provided in the statement of the lemma; we accomplish this by proving that the appropriate representation holds and that  $\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$  so that the representation is well-defined. First, recall the definition of the minimal penalty function  $\alpha_{R_s}$  for the risk measure  $R_s : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  as provided in Remark 2.14, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{R_s}(w) &= \bigcap_{Z \in A_{R_s}} \{(-Z + \Gamma_s(w)) \cap M_s\} \\ &= \left\{ u \in M_s : w^\top u \geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_{R_s}} w^\top (-Z) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for any  $w \in L_s^1(\mathbb{R}_+^d) \setminus M_s^\perp$ . Using the construction of  $A_{R_s} = (\bar{A}_t)_s$  as given in Corollary 3.3, the construction of  $\alpha_{R_s}$  in this lemma is trivial since  $(\bar{\mathbb{P}}, w\mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$  by inspection.

Second, recall the definition of the minimal penalty function  $\alpha_t$  for the risk measure  $\rho_t$  for processes as given in Corollary 2.7, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) &= \bigcap_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [-Z_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \\ &= \left\{ u \in M_t : \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top u \geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [-Z_s] \right\} \\ &= \left\{ u \in M_t : \begin{aligned} &\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \operatorname{diag}(\mathbb{I}_{\{w_s > 0\}}) u \geq \\ &\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \operatorname{diag}(\mathbb{I}_{\{w_s > 0\}}) \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [-Z_s] \end{aligned} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for any  $(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t$ . The terminal equality above follows from the construction of the eligible

assets and  $w_s \geq 0$   $\mathbb{Q}_s$ -a.s.. By construction of  $(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) = \bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w)$ ,

$$\left(\bar{w}^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[Y]\right)_r = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[Y_s]$$

for any  $Y \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $r \in \mathbb{T}_t$ . Therefore, using the construction of  $A_t = \{X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} : X \mathbb{I}_{\{\mathbb{T}_t\}} \in \bar{A}_t\}$  as given in Corollary 3.3, the definition of  $\alpha_t$  as provided in this lemma holds so long as  $\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$ . In fact,  $\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$  holds by the relation

$$\bar{w}_t^\top(\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w)) = \left(1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r\right) \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \mu_s^{-1} w_t^s(\mathbb{Q}_s, w_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \in \bar{L}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^d).$$

□

**Remark 3.5.** We highlight that, in the full eligible space setting  $M = \mathbb{R}^d$  with the notation given in Corollary 3.2, the penalty function representation simplifies insofar as  $\alpha_{R_s}(\bar{w}_s) = \Gamma_s(\bar{w}_s)$  if  $\bar{w}_s \in C_s^*$  and  $\emptyset$  otherwise.

We, additionally, consider the relation between the dual representations for conditionally coherent risk measures. This is provided in the following corollary utilizing the maximal set of dual variables.

**Corollary 3.6.** *Fix time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .*

(1) *Let  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  be a closed conditionally coherent risk measure for processes and let  $R_s : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$ ,  $s < t$ , be a series of closed conditionally coherent risk measures. The associated closed conditionally coherent risk measure on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  defined in (4) has dual representation w.r.t. the set of dual variables*

$$\bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max} = \{(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t : \bar{w}_s \in \mathcal{W}_{R_s}^{\max} \forall s = 0, \dots, t-1, W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max}\}.$$

(2) *Consider a closed conditionally coherent risk measure for vectors on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$ . The associated closed conditionally coherent risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of closed conditionally coherent risk measures  $R_s : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  defined in (5) and (6), respectively, have dual representations w.r.t. the set of dual*

variables

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_{R_s}^{\max} &= \bigcup_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_t(\bar{\mathbb{P}})^d} \{\bar{w}_s : (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max}\}, \\ \mathcal{W}_t^{\max} &= \{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t : \bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max}\}.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.4 utilizing the indicator notion of the penalty functions, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) &= \begin{cases} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Gamma_t(w_s) \cap M_t & \text{if } (\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max} \\ \emptyset & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ \alpha_{R_s}(w_s) &= \begin{cases} \Gamma_s(w_s) \cap M_s & \text{if } w_s \in \mathcal{W}_{R_s}^{\max} \\ \emptyset & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) &= \begin{cases} \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w}) \cap \bar{M}_t & \text{if } (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max} \\ \emptyset & \text{else.} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

□

We now use the results of this section in order to prove the dual representation for risk measures for processes as presented in Corollary 2.7. Specifically, we take advantage of the known dual representation for set-valued risk measures for vectors (Corollary 2.11) and the equivalence of forms for the set-valued risk measures for processes and vectors presented above in order to prove this new dual representation for risk measures for processes.

*Proof of Corollary 2.7.* Let  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  be some closed conditionally convex risk measure for processes. Additionally, fix a sequence of closed and conditionally convex risk measures  $R_s : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  for  $s < t$ . The existence and uniqueness of a closed conditionally convex risk measure on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  such that  $\rho_t(X) = \bar{R}_t(X \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{T}_t})_t$  for any  $X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d}$  is guaranteed by Theorem 3.1. Consider, also, the decomposition of the penalty function from Lemma 3.4 to determine that  $\alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) = \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w})_t$  for specifically constructed  $(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) = \bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w)$ . Utilizing the dual representation for risk measures for vectors as

provided in Corollary 2.11:

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_t(X) &= \left( \bigcap_{(\bar{Q}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t} \left( (\mathbb{E}_t^{\bar{Q}}[-X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}] + \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w})) \cap \bar{M}_t - \cdot \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{Q}, \bar{w}) \right) \right)_t \\
&= \bigcap_{(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t} \left( \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[ - \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{\psi_s}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \psi_r} X_s \right] + \Gamma_t(\bar{w}_t) \right) \cap M_t \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \cdot \bar{\alpha}_t(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w})_t \right) \\
&= \bigcap_{(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t} \left( \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left( (\mathbb{E}_t^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}^s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s)) \cap M_t \right) - \cdot \alpha_t(\hat{\mathbb{Q}}, w) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $(\hat{\mathbb{Q}}, w) = W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w})$  is defined as in Lemma 3.4(1). To recover (3), it remains to show that

$$\{(w_t^s(\mathbb{Q}_s, w_s))_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} : (\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t\} = \{(w_t^s(W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}))_s)_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} : (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t\}.$$

First, by construction,  $\{W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) : (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t\} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_t$  which implies  $\supseteq$  in the desired equality.

Second, for any  $(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t$  there exists  $\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$  (as constructed in Lemma 3.4(2)) so that  $w_t^s(\mathbb{Q}_s, w_s) = w_t^s(W_t(\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w))_s)$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{T}_t$  which implies  $\subseteq$  in the desired equality. Thus the proof in the convex case is complete.

For the conditionally coherent case, define

$$\beta_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) = \begin{cases} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Gamma_t(w_s) \cap M_t & \text{if } \text{ess inf}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}^s}[Z_s] = 0 \text{ P-a.s.} \\ \emptyset & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then from the positive homogeneity of  $\rho$ , we have that  $\beta_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \subseteq \alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w)$ , which yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left( (\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}^s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s)) \cap M_t \right) - \cdot \alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \\
&\subseteq \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left( (\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}^s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s)) \cap M_t \right) - \cdot \beta_t(\mathbb{Q}, w).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}^s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t - \cdot \left( \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t, \\
&\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t - \cdot \emptyset = M_t,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain that

$$\rho_t(X) \subseteq \bigcap_{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t.$$

Finally, from (3), it follows that  $u_t \in \rho_t(X)$  if and only if

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t} \left\{ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top u_t + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-Z_s] + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[X_s] \right\} \geq 0.$$

Assume  $u \in \bigcap_{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} (\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s)) \cap M_t$ . Then, immediately,

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top u + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-Z_s] + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[X_s] \geq 0.$$

Additionally and clearly,

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t \setminus \mathcal{W}_t^{\max}} \left\{ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top u + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-Z_s] + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[X_s] \right\} \geq 0.$$

Hence, the essential infimum taken over the full set of dual variables  $\mathcal{W}_t$  must also be bounded from below by 0, which implies that  $u \in \rho_t(X)$  and the equivalence is shown.  $\square$

## 4 Equivalence of multiportfolio time consistency

Though multiportfolio time consistency of set-valued risk measures for processes was presented in [11], in this work we find that a slight variation of that definition is useful for this work. In particular, motivated by Theorem 3.1, we consider a joint definition of both the risk measure for processes  $\rho_t$  and the series of restricted conditional risk measures for vectors  $R_s$ .

**Definition 4.1.** *The pair  $(\rho_t, (R_s^t)_{s=0}^{t-1})_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is jointly multiportfolio time consistent if:*

(1)  $\rho$  is multiportfolio time consistent as in Definition 2.8;

(2) for any times  $t < s$ ,  $X_r \in L_r^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $B_r \subseteq L_r^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for  $r \in [t, s)$ , and  $Z \in \mathcal{R}_s^{\infty, d}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} R_r^s(X_r) &\subseteq \bigcup_{Y_r \in B_r} R_r^s(Y_r) \quad \forall r \in [t, s) \\ \Rightarrow \rho_t \left( \sum_{r=t}^{s-1} X_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + Z \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s} \right) &\subseteq \bigcup_{Y_t \in B_t} \cdots \bigcup_{Y_{s-1} \in B_{s-1}} \rho_t \left( \sum_{r=t}^{s-1} Y_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + Z \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s} \right); \end{aligned}$$

(3) for any times  $r < t < s$ ,  $X_r \in L_r^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $B_r \subseteq L_r^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ :

$$R_r^s(X_r) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y_r \in B_r} R_r^s(Y_r) \Rightarrow R_r^t(X_r) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y_r \in B_r} R_r^t(Y_r).$$

Conceptually,  $(\rho, R)$  is jointly multiportfolio time consistent if, in addition to multiportfolio time consistency it satisfies two additional consistency properties. (2) If two claims are identical after time  $s \in \mathbb{T}$  and the restricted risk measures (associated with  $\rho_s$ ) on the claims at  $r \in [t, s)$  are ordered as multiportfolio time consistency, then the claims as measured by  $\rho_t$  at time  $t$  must also satisfy the ordering of risks; i.e., the restricted risk measures are consistent in time with the risk measures for processes. And (3) the ordering of portfolios induced by the restricted risk measure at time  $r < t < s \in \mathbb{T}$  associated with  $\rho_s$  should hold for the restricted risk measure at time  $r$  associated with  $\rho_t$  as well. This trivially holds if the restricted risk measure at time  $r$  is independent of the risk measure for processes with which it is associated, i.e.,  $R_r^t = R_r^s$  for  $r < t < s$ ; such a setting is taken in Remark 4.3 below.

We now turn to the final main result of this work – the equivalence of multiportfolio time consistency for set-valued risk measures for processes and vectors. This is, again, akin to the results presented for scalar risk measures in [1]. Fundamentally, as the following proof is demonstrated for the definition of multiportfolio time consistency, these results can be used to construct the various equivalent formulations as well; in particular, we highlight the recursive formulation presented in [18, 11] and the cocycle condition for penalty functions in [19].

**Theorem 4.2.** (1) Consider a jointly multiportfolio time consistent pair of risk measures  $(\rho, R)$ . The associated time decomposable risk measure on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  defined in (4) is multiportfolio time consistent.

(2) Consider a multiportfolio time consistent, time decomposable risk measure for random vectors on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}$ . The associated risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of risk measures  $R_s^t : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(M_s; M_{s,+})$ ,  $s = 0, \dots, t-1$  for  $t = 0, \dots, T$ , defined in (5) and (6) are jointly multiportfolio time consistent.

*Proof.* Throughout we will fix times  $t < s$ .

(1) Let  $B := \{(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{s-1}, b_s) : b_r \in B_r, r < s, b_s \in B_s\}$  for any arbitrary sequence of sets  $B_r \subseteq L_r^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for  $r < s$  and  $B_s \subseteq \mathcal{R}_s^{\infty,d}$  and  $X \in \bar{L}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that:

$$\bar{R}_s(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_s(Y).$$

By construction, this implies  $R_r^s(X_r) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y_r \in B_r} R_r^s(Y_r)$  for every  $r < s$  and  $\rho_s(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y_s \in B_s} \rho_s(Y_s \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s})$ . Immediately, from the third condition of joint multiportfolio time consistency, we know  $R_r^t(X_r) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y_r \in B_r} R_r^t(Y_r)$  for every  $r < t$ , it remains to show that  $\rho_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_t(Y \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t})$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}) &\subseteq \bigcup_{Y_t \in B_t} \cdots \bigcup_{Y_{s-1} \in B_{s-1}} \rho_t\left(\sum_{r=t}^{s-1} Y_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}\right) \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{Y_t \in B_t} \cdots \bigcup_{Y_{s-1} \in B_{s-1}} \bigcup_{Y_s \in B_s} \rho_t\left(\sum_{r=t}^{s-1} Y_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + Y_s \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}\right) = \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_t(Y \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inclusion follows from the second condition of joint multiportfolio time consistency and the second inclusion from the first condition of joint multiportfolio time consistency. Therefore, by construction of  $\bar{R}_t$  it immediately follows that  $\bar{R}_t(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_t(Y)$ .

(2) Note, first, since  $(\bar{R}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is time decomposable, from Theorem 3.1, we have that

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} R_r^t(X_r) \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + \rho_t(\pi_{t,T}(X)) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$$

for any time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ . For this proof, we will only directly demonstrate the first condition of joint multiportfolio time consistency; the latter two properties follow from identical arguments. Fix  $X \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$  and  $B \subseteq \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$  such that

$$\rho_s(\pi_{s,T}(X)) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_s(\pi_{s,T}(Y)).$$



This implies, by the decomposition of  $\bar{R}_s$ , that

$$\bar{R}_s(Z\mathbb{I}_{\{[t,s]\}} + X\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_s(Z\mathbb{I}_{\{[t,s]\}} + Y\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s})$$

for any  $Z \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$ . Utilizing multiportfolio time consistency of  $\bar{R}$ , we recover

$$\bar{R}_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{\{[t,s]\}} + X\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{\{[t,s]\}} + Y\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s})$$

for any  $Z \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$ . By the decomposition of  $\bar{R}_t$ , we immediately conclude

$$\rho_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{\{[t,s]\}} + X\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{\{[t,s]\}} + Y\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s})$$

for any  $Z \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$ , i.e.,  $\rho$  is multiportfolio time consistent. □

From Theorems 3.1 and 4.2 and using results in [19, 20], one can steadily deduce some equivalent characterizations of multiportfolio time consistency for set-valued dynamic risk measures for processes, such as the cocycle condition on the sum of minimal penalty functions and supermartingale relation.

**Remark 4.3.** Consider the setting in which all assets are eligible, i.e., assume that  $M = \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\rho$  be a multiportfolio time consistent risk measure for processes (see Definition 2.8) and define  $R_s : L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d); L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^d))$  by

$$R_s(X_s) := -X_s + L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+^d), \quad X_s \in L_s^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

By monotonicity,  $(\rho, R)$  is jointly multiportfolio time consistent. Therefore, by Theorem 4.2,  $\rho$  is multiportfolio time consistent if and only if the associated risk measure for vectors  $\bar{R}$  is multiportfolio time consistent.

We conclude this discussion by remarking that, in this discrete time setting, it is sufficient to consider multiportfolio time consistency defined for single time steps only through a sequential application of the recursive definition (i.e., setting  $s = t + 1$ ). This is discussed in, e.g., [19] as well.

## 5 Conclusion

In this work we demonstrated the equivalence between set-valued risk measures for processes with those for random vectors on the optional filtration. Such considerations allow for the application of results from one stream of literature to the other. In particular, we highlight that the set-valued risk measures for vectors is a more mature field with more results on dual representations and equivalent forms for multiportfolio time consistency. Herein, we used this equivalence to prove a new dual representation for risk measures for processes. We also highlight that the equivalence of these risk measures allows for the generalization of, e.g., the cocycle condition on the sum of minimal penalty functions or the supermartingale relation for multiportfolio time consistency for risk measures for vectors to risk measures for processes. We caution the reader that such extensions, while following the results of this work, will require the use of a series of conditional risk measures for vectors on the original filtration in addition to the risk measure for processes which is *not* necessary if considering scalar risk measures as presented in [1].

## Acknowledgements

The authors are very grateful to the Editors and the anonymous referees for their comments and suggestions which led to the present greatly improved version of the manuscript.

## References

- [1] Beatrice Acciaio, Hans Föllmer, and Irina Penner. Risk assessment for uncertain cash flows: Model ambiguity, discounting ambiguity, and the role of bubbles. *Finance and Stochastics*, 16(4):669–709, 2012.
- [2] Çağın Ararat and Birgit Rudloff. Dual representations for systemic risk measures. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 14(1):139–174, 2020.
- [3] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, and David Heath. Thinking coherently. *Risk*, 10:68–71, 1997.

- [4] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, and David Heath. Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance*, 9(3):203–228, 1999.
- [5] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, David Heath, and Hyejin Ku. Coherent multiperiod risk measurement. 2002. Working paper, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228548971>.
- [6] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, David Heath, and Hyejin Ku. Coherent multiperiod risk adjusted values and Bellman’s principle. *Annals OR*, 152(1):5–22, 2007.
- [7] Imen Ben Tahar and Emmanuel Lépinette. Vector-valued coherent risk measure processes. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 17(2):1450011, 2014.
- [8] Jocelyne Bion-Nadal. Conditional risk measures and robust representation of convex risk measures. *Ecole Polytechnique, CMAP, preprint no. 557*, 2004.
- [9] Jocelyne Bion-Nadal. Dynamic risk measures: Time consistency and risk measures from BMO martingales. *Finance and Stochastics*, 12(2):219–244, 2008.
- [10] Jocelyne Bion-Nadal. Time consistent dynamic risk processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 119(2):633–654, 2009.
- [11] Yanhong Chen and Yijun Hu. Time consistency for set-valued dynamic risk measure for bounded discrete-time processes. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 12(3):305–333, 2018.
- [12] Yanhong Chen and Yijun Hu. Set-valued dynamic risk measures for bounded discrete-time processes. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 23(3):2050017, 2020.
- [13] Patrick Cheridito, Freddy Delbaen, and Michael Kupper. Coherent and convex risk measures for bounded càdlàg processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 112(1):1–22, 2004.
- [14] Patrick Cheridito, Freddy Delbaen, and Michael Kupper. Coherent and convex risk measures for unbounded càdlàg processes. *Finance and Stochastics*, 9(3):349–367, 2005.
- [15] Patrick Cheridito, Freddy Delbaen, and Michael Kupper. Dynamic monetary risk measures for bounded discrete-time processes. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 11(3):57–106, 2006.

- [16] Patrick Cheridito and Michael Kupper. Composition of time-consistent dynamic monetary risk measures in discrete time. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 14(1):137–162, 2011.
- [17] Freddy Delbaen, Shige Peng, and Emanuela Rosazza Gianin. Representation of the penalty term of dynamic concave utilities. *Finance and Stochastics*, 14(3):449–472, 2010.
- [18] Zachary Feinstein and Birgit Rudloff. Time consistency of dynamic risk measures in markets with transaction costs. *Quantitative Finance*, 13(9):1473–1489, 2013.
- [19] Zachary Feinstein and Birgit Rudloff. Multi-portfolio time consistency for set-valued convex and coherent risk measures. *Finance and Stochastics*, 19(1):67–107, 2015.
- [20] Zachary Feinstein and Birgit Rudloff. A supermartingale relation for multivariate risk measures. *Quantitative Finance*, 18(12):1971–1990, 2018.
- [21] Zachary Feinstein and Birgit Rudloff. Time consistency for scalar multivariate risk measures. *Preprint*, <http://export.arxiv.org/abs/1810.04978v4>., 2021.
- [22] Zachary Feinstein, Birgit Rudloff, and Stefan Weber. Measures of systemic risk. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 8(1):672–708, 2017.
- [23] Hans Föllmer and Alexander Schied. Convex measures of risk and trading constraints. *Finance and Stochastics*, 6(4):429–447, 2002.
- [24] Marco Frittelli and Emanuela Rosazza Gianin. Putting order in risk measures. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 26(7):1473–1486, 2002.
- [25] Marco Frittelli and Giacomo Scandolo. Risk measures and capital requirements for processes. *Mathematical Finance*, 16(4):589–612, 2006.
- [26] Andreas H. Hamel. A duality theory for set-valued functions I: Fenchel conjugation theory. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, 17(2):153–182, 2009.
- [27] Andreas H. Hamel, Frank Heyde, Andreas Löhne, Birgit Rudloff, and Carola Schrage. Set optimization - a rather short introduction. In A. Hamel, F. Heyde, A. Löhne, B. Rudloff, and

- C. Schrage, editors, *Set Optimization and Applications in Finance*, PROMS series. Springer, 2015.
- [28] Andreas H. Hamel, Frank Heyde, and Birgit Rudloff. Set-valued risk measures for conical market models. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 5(1):1–28, 2011.
- [29] Elyes Jouini, Moncef Meddeb, and Nizar Touzi. Vector-valued coherent risk measures. *Finance and Stochastics*, 8(4):531–552, 2004.
- [30] Ilya Molchanov. *Theory of Random Sets*. Probability and Its Applications. Springer, 2005.
- [31] Barrieu Pauline and Nicole El Karoui. Pricing, hedging, and designing derivatives with risk measures. In René. Carmona, editor, *Indifference pricing: theory and applications*, pages 77–144. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [32] Frank Riedel. Dynamic coherent risk measures. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 112(2):185–200, 2004.