

Max-stability under first-order stochastic dominance

Christopher Chambers* Alan Miller† Ruodu Wang‡ Qinyu Wu§

March 21, 2024

Abstract

Max-stability is the property that taking a maximum between two inputs results in a maximum between two outputs. We investigate max-stability with respect to first-order stochastic dominance, the most fundamental notion of stochastic dominance in decision theory. Under two additional standard axioms of monotonicity and lower semicontinuity, we establish a representation theorem for functionals satisfying max-stability, which turns out to be represented by the supremum of a bivariate function. Our characterized functionals encompass special classes of functionals in the literature of risk measures, such as benchmark-loss Value at Risk (VaR) and Λ -quantile.

Keywords: First-order stochastic dominance, max-stability, benchmark-loss VaR, Λ -quantile

1 Introduction

First-order stochastic dominance (FSD) stands out as a widely used preorder in decision theory, among many other notions in the literature (Quirk and Saposnik (1962), Hadar and Russell (1969, 1971) and Rothschild and Stiglitz (1970)). For a comprehensive treatment of these notions of stochastic dominance, see Shaked and Shanthikumar (2007).

For two distribution functions F and G , denote by $F \vee G$ the smallest distribution function that dominates both F and G in FSD; this means $F \vee G(x) = \min\{F(x), G(x)\}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. For a functional ρ defined on a set of distributions, we define max-stability with respect to FSD by

$$\rho(F \vee G) = \rho(F) \vee \rho(G), \quad \text{for all } F, G. \quad (1)$$

*Department of Economics, Georgetown University, USA ✉ cc1950@georgetown.edu

†Faculty of Law, Western University, Canada ✉ alan.miller@uwo.ca

‡Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Waterloo, Canada ✉ wang@uwaterloo.ca

§Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Waterloo, Canada ✉ q35wu@uwaterloo.ca

When ρ represents a preference, the property (1) has the natural interpretation as that either F or G is equally preferable to $F \vee G$.

The max-stability (1) has been studied by [Mao et al. \(2022\)](#), where it was called equivalence in model aggregation under FSD. In the context of [Mao et al. \(2022\)](#), ρ is a risk measure, and the aggregate distribution $F \vee G$ is interpreted as a robust (conservative) distributional model in the sense that it dominates both F and G with respect to FSD. The left-hand side of (1) is the risk evaluation via model aggregation, while the right-hand side is the worst-case risk measure under the set $\{F, G\}$. Therefore, (1) means the equivalence of two robust risk evaluation approaches, which is motivated by problems in robust optimization. [Mao et al. \(2022\)](#) characterized benchmark-loss Value-at-Risk ([Bignozzi et al. \(2020\)](#)) through max-stability, lower semicontinuity and translation-invariance.¹ [Mao et al. \(2022\)](#) also considered second-order stochastic dominance (SSD) and characterized the class of benchmark-adjusted Expected Shortfall ([Burzoni et al. \(2022\)](#)) through max-stability with respect to SSD. Different from [Mao et al. \(2022\)](#), we focus on FSD and do not assume translation-invariance. This broadens the application of the max-stability with respect to FSD and enhances its advantageous properties for a larger range of functionals. In particular, Λ -quantile ([Frittelli et al. \(2014\)](#)) satisfies max-stability with respect to FSD and is not translation invariant.

The main result of this paper is a characterization result for (1), under two further standard axioms of monotonicity for constants and lower semicontinuity. The characterized functional can be written as the supremum of a bivariate function satisfying certain further properties. This characterization generalizes the characterization results in [Mao et al. \(2022\)](#).

We only consider max-stability under FSD in this paper, but this property can be generally defined on other spaces. For instance, in financial mathematics, a risk measure is a functional that takes random variables as input ([Föllmer and Schied \(2016\)](#)). In this setting, max-stability can be defined as $\rho(X \vee Y) = \rho(X) \vee \rho(Y)$, as studied by [Kupper and Zapata \(2021\)](#), where $X \vee Y$ represents the pointwise maximum of X and Y . [Kupper and Zapata \(2021\)](#) showed that in the above setting, decision makers who adopt max-stable risk measures base their assessment on evaluation under the worst-case scenarios.

The paper is structured as follows. In [Section 2](#), we introduce three axioms and present the main characterization result. Additionally, we present two examples that have the representation outlined in the main result. [Section 3](#) contains the proof of the main characterization result and some technical illustrations. [Section 4](#) concludes the paper.

¹A risk measure ρ on a set of distributions satisfies translation-invariance if for $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $G(x) = F(x - m)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ implies $\rho(G) = \rho(F) + m$.

2 The main result

Let \mathcal{M}_C be the set of all distributions on \mathbb{R} with compact support. We use δ_x to represent the point-mass at x , and $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote by $\mathcal{M}_{D,2}$ the set of all two-point distributions and \mathcal{M}_D of all discrete distributions with finite support, that is

$$\mathcal{M}_{D,2} = \{p\delta_x + (1-p)\delta_y : x, y \in \mathbb{R}, p \in [0, 1]\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}_D = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \delta_{x_i} : n \in \mathbb{N}, x_i \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } p_i \in [0, 1] \text{ for } i \in [n], \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1 \right\}.$$

For $F, G \in \mathcal{M}_C$, we write $F \preceq_1 G$ if $F(x) \geq G(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, that is, G dominates F in FSD. For $F, G \in \mathcal{M}_C$, denote by $F \vee G$ the supremum of the set $\{F, G\}$ with respect to FSD. Such supremum always exists and is unique because the ordered space $(\mathcal{M}_C, \preceq_1)$ is a lattice; see e.g., [Kertz and Rösler \(2000\)](#), [Müller and Scarsini \(2006\)](#) and [Mao et al. \(2022\)](#). Moreover, it can be explicitly described by $F \vee G(x) = \min\{F(x), G(x)\}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

We propose the following axioms for $\rho : \mathcal{M}_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Axiom M (Monotonicity for constants). For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $x < y$ implies $\rho(\delta_x) < \rho(\delta_y)$.

Axiom LS (Lower semicontinuity). For $\{F_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_C$ and $F \in \mathcal{M}_C$, if $F_n \xrightarrow{d} F$, where \xrightarrow{d} denotes the weak convergence, then $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(F_n) \geq \rho(F)$.

Axiom MS (Max-stability). For $F, G \in \mathcal{M}_C$, $\rho(F \vee G) = \rho(F) \vee \rho(G)$.

We say that ρ is *consistent with \preceq_1* if $\rho(F) \leq \rho(G)$ whenever $F \preceq_1 G$. Notice that $\rho(G) = \rho(F \vee G) = \rho(F) \vee \rho(G)$ if $F \preceq_1 G$, and therefore **Axiom MS** is stronger than consistency with \preceq_1 .

We propose the main characterization result.

Theorem 1. *Let $\rho : \mathcal{M}_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The following statements are equivalent.*

(i) ρ satisfies **Axioms M, LS and MS**.

(ii) *The representation holds*

$$\rho(F) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(x, F(x)) \text{ for all } F \in \mathcal{M}_C, \tag{2}$$

for some function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ that is decreasing lower-semicontinuous in the second argument and satisfies $\psi(x, 0) < \psi(y, 0)$ for $x < y$.

(iii) The representation (2) holds for some function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ that is increasing lower-semicontinuous in the first argument and decreasing lower-semicontinuous in the second argument and satisfies $\psi(x, 0) < \psi(y, 0)$ for $x < y$.

The implication (iii) \Rightarrow (i) can be checked with standard calculus arguments. Denote by Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 the sets of the functions ψ that satisfy all conditions in (ii) and (iii), respectively. Obviously, we have $\Psi_2 \subseteq \Psi_1$. For $\psi \in \Psi_1$, we define $\rho_\psi(F) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(x, F(x))$ for $F \in \mathcal{M}_C$. To see (ii) \Rightarrow (iii), it suffices to verify that for any $\psi \in \Psi_1$, there exists $\tilde{\psi} \in \Psi_2$ such that $\rho_{\tilde{\psi}} = \rho_\psi$ on \mathcal{M}_C . We claim that this assertion holds by setting $\tilde{\psi}(x, p) = \sup_{t < x} \psi(t, p)$. Indeed, for $F \in \mathcal{M}_C$, we have

$$\rho_{\tilde{\psi}}(F) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \tilde{\psi}(x, F(x)) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{t < x} \psi(t, F(x)) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{x > t} \psi(t, F(x)) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(t, F(t)) = \rho_\psi(F),$$

where the fourth step holds because F is right continuous and ψ is decreasing and lower semicontinuous in the second argument. It remains to show that $\tilde{\psi} \in \Psi_2$. By the definition of $\tilde{\psi}$, one can easily check that it is increasing and lower semicontinuous in the first argument. Notice that $p \mapsto \psi(t, p)$ is decreasing and lower semicontinuous for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\tilde{\psi}$ is the supremum of these functions. This implies that $\tilde{\psi}$ is decreasing and lower semicontinuous in the second argument. In addition, for $x < y$, we have

$$\tilde{\psi}(x, 0) = \sup_{t < x} \psi(t, 0) < \psi\left(\frac{x+y}{2}, 0\right) \leq \sup_{t < y} \psi(t, 0) = \tilde{\psi}(y, 0),$$

where the inequality follows from the strictly increasing monotonicity of $t \mapsto \psi(t, 0)$. Hence, we have concluded that $\tilde{\psi} \in \Psi_2$, and the implication (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) holds.

The most challenging part of Theorem 1 is the implication (i) \Rightarrow (ii). We present the sketch of the proof for (i) \Rightarrow (ii) below, and the detailed proof is put in Section 3. In the first step, we consider the situation that ρ is restricted in $\mathcal{M}_{D,2}$. We will construct such a function ψ in the theorem and verify that the representation holds on $\mathcal{M}_{D,2}$. The second step is to extend the representation to \mathcal{M}_D by using Axiom MS and the fact that any distribution in \mathcal{M}_D can be obtained by finitely many joins acting on $\mathcal{M}_{D,2}$ with respect to \preceq_1 . The last step is the extension from \mathcal{M}_D to \mathcal{M}_C by a standard convergence argument. In the following sections, we assume that ρ satisfies Axioms M, LS and MS.

Example 1 (Benchmark-loss VaR). Let $\psi(x, p) = x - h(p)$, where $h : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is increasing

and upper semicontinuous. In this case, we have

$$\rho(F) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{x - h(F(x))\}, \quad F \in \mathcal{M}_C.$$

Denote $\text{VaR}_\alpha(F)$ by value at risk (VaR) of F at level $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, i.e., $\text{VaR}_0(F) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) > 0\}$ and $\text{VaR}_\alpha(F) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) \geq \alpha\}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. In other words, $\text{VaR}_\alpha(F)$ is the α -left quantile of F . By standard calculus arguments, the functional ρ can be represented based on VaR as

$$\rho(F) = \sup_{\alpha \in [0, 1]} \{\text{VaR}_\alpha(F) - h(\alpha)\}, \quad F \in \mathcal{M}_C.$$

This is a benchmark-loss VaR in [Bignozzi et al. \(2020\)](#). In particular, if $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1]$, and $h(p) = 0$ for $p \in [0, \alpha)$ and $h(p) = \infty$ for $p \in [\alpha, 1]$, then ρ reduces to the left quantile. Notably, in addition to Axioms [MS](#) and [LS](#), [Mao et al. \(2022\)](#) further employs the property of translation invariance to characterize benchmark-loss VaR.

Example 2 (Λ -quantile). Let $\psi(x, p) = x - \infty \mathbb{1}_{\{p \geq \Lambda(x)\}}$, where Λ is a function from \mathbb{R} to $[0, 1]$. In this case, we have

$$\rho(F) = \sup\{x : F(x) < \Lambda(x)\}, \quad F \in \mathcal{M}_C.$$

This is a Λ -quantile in [Frittelli et al. \(2014\)](#) and has been characterized by [Bellini and Peri \(2022\)](#) with a decreasing Λ . Notice that ψ maybe not increasing or lower semicontinuous in the first argument. We define

$$\tilde{\psi}(x, p) = \sup_{t < x} \psi(t, p) = \sup\{t \in (-\infty, x) : \Lambda(t) \leq p\},$$

which is further increasing and lower semicontinuous in the first argument. By the arguments in the proof of [Theorem 1](#) (ii) \Rightarrow (iii), we have

$$\rho(F) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \tilde{\psi}(x, F(x)) = \sup\{x : F(x) < \Lambda(x)\}, \quad F \in \mathcal{M}_C.$$

In particular, if $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $\Lambda(x) = \alpha$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then ρ reduces to the left quantile.

For a nonempty set \mathcal{X} , the *super level set* of a functional $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as $\{x \in \mathcal{X} : f(x) \geq t\}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. [Figure 2](#) shows the super level set of ψ in [Examples 1](#) and [2](#). For any threshold $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the super level set is the region below a curve, where the intersection point with x -axis is t .

In particular, the super level sets of Λ -quantile are L-shaped.




Figure 1: The super level set of ψ that induces VaR, benchmark-loss VaR and Λ -quantile. Left: VaR ($\psi(x, p) = x - \infty \mathbb{1}_{\{p \geq \alpha\}}$); Middle: benchmark-loss VaR ($\psi(x, p) = x - h(p)$); Right: Λ -quantile ($\psi(x, p) = x - \infty \mathbb{1}_{\{p \geq \Lambda(x)\}}$).

3 Proof of (i) \Rightarrow (ii) of the main result

3.1 Proof of the main result on $\mathcal{M}_{D,2}$

In this section, our main purpose is to construct a function ψ that satisfies all conditions in Theorem 1 (ii) such that $\rho(F) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(x, F(x))$ holds for all $F \in \mathcal{M}_{D,2}$.

For $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we abuse the notation by setting $\rho(c) = \rho(\delta_c)$. It follows from consistency with \preceq_1 and Axiom **LS** that the mapping $c \mapsto \rho(c)$ is increasing and left continuous on \mathbb{R} . Denote by $A = \{(x, y, p) : x, y \in \mathbb{R}, x \leq y, p \in [0, 1]\}$. Define $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as a function such that

$$f(x, y, p) = \rho(p\delta_x + (1-p)\delta_y), \quad (x, y, p) \in A. \quad (3)$$

By consistency with \preceq_1 and Axiom **LS**, we have the following properties of f .

- (i) $f(x, x, p) = \rho(x)$; $f(x, y, 0) = \rho(y)$; $f(x, y, 1) = \rho(x)$.
- (ii) $f(x, y, p)$ is increasing and left continuous in x .
- (iii) $f(x, y, p)$ is increasing and left continuous in y .
- (iv) $f(x, y, p)$ is decreasing and right continuous in p .

Further, we use the convention that $\inf \emptyset = \infty$ and define

$$h(x, p) = \inf\{y \in [x, \infty) : f(x, y, p) > \rho(x)\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, p \in [0, 1]. \quad (4)$$

If $h(x, p) < \infty$, then we have

$$f(x, y, p) = \rho(x) \text{ if } y \in [x, h(x, p)] \quad \text{and} \quad f(x, y, p) > \rho(x) \text{ if } y > h(x, p), \quad (5)$$

because $f(x, y, p)$ is increasing and left continuous in y with $f(x, x, p) = \rho(x)$. It follows from Axiom **M** that $h(x, 0) = \rho(x)$, and it is clear that $h(x, 1) = \infty$. The next result gives other properties of h . Proofs of all propositions in this section are provided in Section **3.2**.

Proposition 1. *Let h be defined in (4). The following statements hold.*

- (i) $h(x, p)$ is increasing in x .
- (ii) $h(x, p)$ is increasing and upper semicontinuous in p .

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, denote by

$$A_x = \{(y, p) : y > h(x, p), p \in [0, 1]\} \quad (6)$$

and define $H_x : A_x \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$H_x(y, p) = f(x, y, p), \quad (y, p) \in A_x. \quad (7)$$

Obviously, $(y, 0) \in A_x$ holds for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x < y$, and $H_x(y, 0) = \rho(y)$.

By the definitions of f , h and H_x in (3), (4) and (7), respectively, we can immediately obtain

$$f(x, y, p) = \rho(x)\mathbb{1}_{\{(y,p) \notin A_x\}} + H_x(y, p)\mathbb{1}_{\{(y,p) \in A_x\}}, \quad (x, y, p) \in A. \quad (8)$$

Further, we present the properties of the function defined in (7).

Proposition 2. *Let A_x and H_x be defined in (6) and (7), respectively. The following statements hold.*

- (i) For fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in [0, 1]$, $H_x(y, p)$ is increasing and left continuous in y on the interval $(h(x, p), \infty)$.
- (ii) For fixed $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x \leq y$, $H_x(y, p)$ is decreasing and right continuous in p on the interval $\{p \in [0, 1] : y > h(x, p)\}$.
- (iii) For fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in [0, 1]$, $H_x(y, p)$ is a constant in x on the interval $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : y > h(x, p)\}$.

(iv) For $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x_1 < x_2$, we have $A_{x_2} \subseteq A_{x_1}$. If $(y, p) \in A_{x_1} \setminus A_{x_2}$, then

$$H_{x_1}(y, p) = f(x_1, y, p) \leq f(x_2, y, p) = \rho(x_2).$$

Finally, we define

$$\psi(y, p) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{ H_x(y, p) \mathbb{1}_{\{(y, p) \in A_x\}} - \infty \mathbb{1}_{\{(y, p) \notin A_x\}} \}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}, p \in [0, 1]. \quad (9)$$

The main purpose is to verify that ψ satisfies all conditions in Theorem 1 and $\rho(F) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(y, F(y))$ for all $F \in \mathcal{M}_{D,2}$. We summarize these conclusions into the following result.

Proposition 3. *Let f and ψ be defined in (3) and (9), respectively. The following statements hold.*

- (i) ψ is decreasing and lower semicontinuous in the second argument.
- (ii) $\psi(x, 0) < \psi(y, 0)$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x < y$ and $\psi(x, 1) = -\infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (iii) $\rho(F) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(y, F(y))$ for all $F \in \mathcal{M}_{D,2}$.

Proposition 3 justifies the necessity statement in Theorem 1 on $\mathcal{M}_{D,2}$.

3.2 Proofs of Propositions 1, 2 and 3

Proof of Proposition 1. (i) We prove this statement by contradiction. For $p \in [0, 1]$, assume that there exists $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x_1 < x_2$ and $a_1 > a_2$, where $a_i = h(x_i, p)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let $F = \delta_{x_2}$ and $G = p\delta_{x_1} + (1-p)\delta_{a_1}$. It is clear that $a_1 > a_2 > x_2 > x_1$. Hence, we have $F \vee G = p\delta_{x_2} + (1-p)\delta_{a_1}$. Axiom MS implies

$$f(x_2, a_1, p) = \rho(F \vee G) = \rho(F) \vee \rho(G) = \rho(x_2) \vee f(x_1, a_1, p). \quad (10)$$

By the definition of a_1 and (5), it holds that $f(x_1, a_1, p) = \rho(x_1)$ and $f(x_2, a_1, p) > \rho(x_2)$. Thus, by (10), we get $\rho(x_2) < f(x_2, a_1, p) = f(x_1, a_1, p) = \rho(x_1)$. This contradicts Axiom M.

(ii) Let $p_1, p_2 \in [0, 1]$ satisfying $p_1 \leq p_2$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We have $f(x, y, p_1) \geq f(x, y, p_2)$ for any $y \geq x$. This implies $\{y \in [x, \infty) : f(x, y, p_1) > \rho(x)\} \supseteq \{y \in [x, \infty) : f(x, y, p_2) > \rho(x)\}$. It then follows that $h(x, p_1) \leq h(x, p_2)$, and this gives that $h(x, p)$ is increasing in p .

To see the upper semicontinuity, we need to verify that $\limsup_{p \rightarrow p_0} h(x, p) \leq h(x, p_0)$ holds for any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p_0 \in [0, 1]$. The case that $h(x, p_0) = \infty$ is trivial, and we assume that $h(x, p_0) < \infty$. Note that $h(x, p)$ is increasing in p . It suffices to prove that $p \mapsto h(x, p)$ is right

continuous at p_0 . Let $a_0 = h(x, p_0)$. We assume by contradiction that there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $\{p_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq [0, 1]$ with $p_n \downarrow p_0$ such that $a_n > a_0 + \epsilon_0$, where $a_n = h(x, p_n)$. It follows by (5) that

$$\rho(x) = f(x, a_n, p_n) \geq f(x, a_0 + \epsilon_0, p_n).$$

Since $f(x, y, p)$ is right continuous in p , we have

$$\rho(x) < f(x, a_0 + \epsilon_0, p_0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x, a_0 + \epsilon_0, p_n) = \rho(x),$$

where the inequality follows from the definition of $a_0 = h(x, p_0)$. This yields a contradiction, and we complete the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. (i) and (ii) are easy to see because H_x has the same value of the mapping $(y, p) \mapsto f(x, y, p)$ and f satisfies the corresponding properties.

(iii) For $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in [0, 1]$, let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq y$ and $y > h(x_i, p)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Denote by $F = \delta_{x_2}$ and $G = p\delta_{x_1} + (1 - p)\delta_y$. It holds that $F \vee G = p\delta_{x_2} + (1 - p)\delta_y$. Axiom MS implies

$$f(x_2, y, p) = \rho(F \vee G) = \rho(F) \vee \rho(G) = \rho(x_1) \vee f(x_1, y, p). \quad (11)$$

Since $y > h(x_i, p)$ for $i = 1, 2$, we have $f(x_1, y, p) > \rho(x_1)$. Combining with (11), we obtain $f(x_2, y, p) = f(x_1, y, p)$. This completes the proof of (iii).

(iv) Proposition 1 gives the decreasing monotonicity of A_x in x . By (8), we have $f(x_1, y, p) = H_{x_1}(y, p)$ and $f(x_2, y, p) = \rho(x_2)$ as $(y, p) \in A_{x_1} \setminus A_{x_2}$. Since $x_1 \leq x_2$, consistency with \preceq_1 implies $f(x_1, y, p) \leq f(x_2, y, p)$. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. Denote by $V_x(y, p) = H_x(y, p)\mathbb{1}_{\{(y,p) \in A_x\}} - \infty\mathbb{1}_{\{(y,p) \notin A_x\}}$ for $x, y \in [0, 1]$ and $p \in [0, 1]$, and we have $\psi(y, p) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} V_x(y, p)$. To verify (i), it suffices to show that $p \mapsto V_x(y, p)$ is decreasing and lower semicontinuous for any fixed $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$.

(i) For fixed $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, if $x \geq y$, then $(y, p) \notin A_x$ for any $p \in [0, 1]$. In this case, we have $V_x(y, p) = -\infty$ for all $p \in [0, 1]$. Assume now $x < y$, there exists $p_0 \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\{p \in [0, 1] : (y, p) \in A_x\} = \{p \in [0, 1] : y > h(x, p)\} = [0, p_0),$$

where the last step holds because $h(x, p)$ is increasing and upper continuous in p (see Proposition 1 (ii)). Moreover, it follows from Proposition 2 (ii) that $p \mapsto H_x(y, p)$ is decreasing and right contin-

uous on $[0, p_0)$. Therefore, one can check that $p \mapsto V_x(y, p)$ is decreasing and lower semicontinuous. This completes the proof of (ii).

(ii) When $p = 0$, we have

$$\psi(y, 0) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{H_x(y, 0)\mathbb{1}_{\{(y,0) \in A_x\}} - \infty\mathbb{1}_{\{(y,0) \notin A_x\}}\} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{\rho(y)\mathbb{1}_{\{y > x\}} - \infty\mathbb{1}_{\{y \leq x\}}\} = \rho(y), \quad (12)$$

where we have used the left continuity of $c \mapsto \rho(c)$ in the last step. Axiom **M** implies $\rho(x) = \psi(x, 0) < \psi(y, 0) = \rho(y)$ if $x < y$.

When $p = 1$, noting that $h(x, 1) = \infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\psi(y, 1) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{H_x(y, 1)\mathbb{1}_{\{(y,1) \in A_x\}} - \infty\mathbb{1}_{\{(y,1) \notin A_x\}}\} = -\infty. \quad (13)$$

This completes the proof of (iii).

(iii) Denote by $\rho'(F) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(z, F(z))$. For $x \leq y$ and $p \in [0, 1]$, we define $g(x, y, p) = \rho'(p\delta_x + (1-p)\delta_y)$. We aim to show that $g(x, y, p) = f(x, y, p)$ for any $x \leq y$ and $p \in [0, 1]$. Recall the representation of f in (8). It suffices to show that $g(x, y, p) = H_x(y, p)$ if $(y, p) \in A_x$ and $g(x, y, p) = \rho(x)$ if $(y, p) \notin A_x$. Below we prove this. Fix $x \leq y$ and $p \in (0, 1)$. Let $B_{y,p} = \{t \in \mathbb{R} : (y, p) \in A_t\}$. If $x, t \in B_{y,p}$, then $H_t(y, p) = H_x(y, p) \geq \rho(x)$ by Proposition 2 part (iii). Hence, if $x \in B_{y,p}$, then

$$\sup_{t \in B_{y,p}} H_t(y, p) = H_x(y, p) \geq \rho(x). \quad (14)$$

If $x \notin B_{y,p}$, then for any $t \in B_{y,p}$, Proposition 2 part (iv) yields $t < x$ and

$$H_t(y, p) \leq \rho(x). \quad (15)$$

Putting the above observations together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
g(x, y, p) &= \max \left\{ \sup_{t < x} \psi(t, 0), \sup_{x \leq t < y} \psi(t, p), \sup_{t > y} \psi(t, 1) \right\} && \text{[definition of } g\text{]} \\
&= \max \{ \psi(x, 0), \psi(y, p) \} && \text{[left continuity of } t \mapsto \psi(t, p) \text{ and (13)]} \\
&= \max \{ \rho(x), \psi(y, p) \} && \text{[using (12)]} \\
&= \rho(x) \vee \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{ H_t(y, p) \mathbb{1}_{\{(y, p) \in A_t\}} - \infty \mathbb{1}_{\{(y, p) \notin A_t\}} \} && \text{[definition of } \psi\text{]} \\
&= \rho(x) \vee \sup \{ H_t(y, p) : t \in B_{y, p} \} && \text{[removing } -\infty \text{ from the supremum]} \\
&= H_x(y, p) \mathbb{1}_{\{x \in B_{y, p}\}} + \rho(x) \mathbb{1}_{\{x \notin B_{y, p}\}}. && \text{[using (14) and (15)]} \\
&= f(x, y, p). && \text{[definition of } f\text{]}
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

3.3 Proof of the main result on \mathcal{M}_D

In this section, we aim to show that the representation on $\mathcal{M}_{D,2}$ can be extended to \mathcal{M}_D .

For $F \in \mathcal{M}_D$, we assume that F has the form $F = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \delta_{x_i}$, where $p_i \in [0, 1]$ for $i \in [n]$, $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1$ and $x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n$. Denote by $F_k = \sum_{i=1}^k p_i \delta_{x_i} + (1 - \sum_{i=1}^k p_i) \delta_{x_{k+1}}$ for $k \in [n-1]$. One can easily check that $F = \bigvee_{k=1}^{n-2} F_k$. Applying Axiom **MS** and the representation on $\mathcal{M}_{D,2}$ in Proposition 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(F) &= \max_{k \in [n-1]} \rho(F_k) \\
&= \max_{k \in [n-1]} \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(x, F_k(x)) \\
&= \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \max_{k \in [n-1]} \psi(x, F_k(x)) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi \left(x, \min_{k \in [n-1]} F_k(x) \right) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(x, F(x)),
\end{aligned}$$

where the fourth step holds because ψ is decreasing in its second argument (see Proposition 3 (ii)).

Therefore, the representation on \mathcal{M}_D holds.

3.4 Proof of the main result on \mathcal{M}_C

Let $F \in \mathcal{M}_C$. Denote by $m = \inf\{x : F(x) > 0\}$ and $M = \inf\{x : F(x) \geq 1\}$ the left and right support endpoint of F . Let $T = M - m$. Define a sequence of discrete distributions $\{F_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as

$$F_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x < m, \\ F\left(m + \frac{k}{n}T\right), & m + \frac{k-1}{n}T \leq x < m + \frac{k}{n}T, \quad k \in [n], \\ 1, & x \geq M. \end{cases}$$

Using the representation on \mathcal{M}_D , we have, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\rho(F_n) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(x, F_n(x)) = \rho(m) \vee \max_{k \in [n]} \psi\left(m + \frac{k}{n}T, F\left(m + \frac{k}{n}T\right)\right) \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(x, F(x)).$$

Note that $F_n \xrightarrow{d} F$, and using Axiom **LS** yields

$$\rho(F) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(F_n) \leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(x, F(x)). \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, we will verify that $\rho(F) \geq \psi(x, F(x))$ holds for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. If $x < m$, then $\psi(x, F(x)) = \psi(x, 0) = \rho(x) < \rho(m) \leq \rho(F)$, where the last step follows from consistency with \preceq_1 . If $x \geq M$, then $\psi(x, F(x)) = \psi(x, 1) = -\infty$, which implies $\rho(F) \geq \psi(x, F(x))$. If $x \in [m, M)$, define $G = F(x)\delta_m + (1 - F(x))\delta_x$. It holds that $\rho(G) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(t, G(t)) = \rho(m) \vee \psi(x, F(x)) \geq \psi(x, F(x))$. One can easily check that $G \preceq_1 F$, and consistency with \preceq_1 implies $\rho(F) \geq \rho(G) \geq \psi(x, F(x))$. Therefore, we conclude that $\rho(F) \geq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(x, F(x))$. Combining with (16), we obtain $\rho(F) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi(x, F(x))$. This completes the proof of necessity of Theorem 1.

4 Conclusion

We provide a characterization of functionals satisfying three axioms of monotonicity, lower semicontinuity, and max-stability. Such functionals include the risk measures Λ -quantiles (Frittelli et al. (2014)) and benchmark-loss VaR (Bignozzi et al. (2020)) as special cases.

Four days before posting this manuscript on a public repository, we got aware of a closely related paper by Kupper and Zapata (2024), who also studied functions satisfying max-stability, under the name of maxitivity. Their main results cover a more general setting than our Theorem 1. The motivations and proof techniques in the two papers are completely different.

References

- Bellini, F. and Peri, I. (2022). Short communication: An axiomatization of Λ -quantiles. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, **13**(1), 26–38.
- Bignozzi, V., Burzoni, M. and Munari, C. (2020). Risk measures based on benchmark loss distributions. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, **87**(2), 437–475.
- Burzoni, M., Munari, C. and Wang, R. (2022). Adjusted Expected Shortfall. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, **134**, 106297.
- Hadar, J. and Russell, W. R. (1969). Rules for ordering uncertain prospects. *The American Economic Review*, **59**(1), 25–34.
- Hadar, J. and Russell, W. R. (1971). Stochastic dominance and diversification. *Journal of Economic Theory*, **3**(3), 288–305.
- Föllmer, H. and Schied, A. (2016). *Stochastic Finance. An Introduction in Discrete Time*. (Fourth Edition.) Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Frittelli, M., Maggis, M. and Peri, I. (2014). Risk measures on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ and value at risk with probability/loss function. *Mathematical Finance*, **24**(3), 442–463.
- Kertz, R. P. and Rösler, U. (2000). Complete lattices of probability measures with applications to martingale theory. *IMS Lecture Notes Monograph Series*, **35**, 153–177.
- Kupper, M. and Zapata, J. M. (2021). Large deviations built on max-stability. *Bernoulli*, **27**(2), 1001–1027.
- Kupper, M. and Zapata, J. M. (2024). Maxitive functions with respect to general orders. *arXiv: 2403.06613*.
- Mao, T., Wang, R. and Wu, Q. (2022). Model aggregation for risk evaluation and robust optimization. *arXiv: 2201.06370*.
- Müller, A. and Scarsini, M. (2006). Stochastic order relations and lattices of probability measures. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*. **16**(4), 1024–1043.
- Quirk, J. P. and Saposnik, R. (1962). Admissibility and measurable utility functions. *The Review of Economic Studies*, **29**(2), 140–146.
- Rothschild, M. and Stiglitz, J. E. (1970). Increasing risk: I. A definition. *Journal of Economic Theory*, **2**(3), 225–243.
- Shaked, M. and Shanthikumar, J. G. (2007). *Stochastic Orders*. Springer, New York.