

Robust convex risk measures

Marcelo Righi*

Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul

marcelo.righi@ufrgs.br

Abstract

We study the general properties of robust convex risk measures as worst-case values under uncertainty on random variables. We establish general concrete results regarding convex conjugates and sub-differentials. We refine some results for closed forms of worst-case law invariant convex risk measures under two concrete cases of uncertainty sets for random variables: based on the first two moments and Wasserstein balls.

Keywords: Risk measures; Robustness; Uncertainty; Convex analysis; Partial information; Wasserstein distance.

1 Introduction

The theory of risk measures in mathematical finance has become mainstream, especially since the landmark paper of [Artzner et al. \(1999\)](#). For a comprehensive review, see the books of [Delbaen \(2012\)](#) and [Follmer and Schied \(2016\)](#). A risk measure is a functional ρ over some set \mathcal{X} of random variables (see below formal definitions of the concepts exposed in this introduction), where $\rho(X)$ is then the monetary value for the risk of X .

Knightian uncertainty is a very important risk management feature because it prevents perfect information from being attained. In this setup, decision-makers face the consequences of their risk assessments under partial information. Thus, considering uncertainty sets to determine the value of a risk measure allows us to make robust decisions. For risk measures, in order to deal with such uncertainty, it is usual to consider a worst-case approach, i.e., by considering a risk measure ρ^{WC} that is a point-wise supremum of a base risk measure ρ over some uncertainty set.

A usual stream is linked to scenarios, where $\rho^{WC}(X) = \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \rho_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$, and thus robustness is over probability chosen, as considered in [Wang and Ziegel \(2021\)](#), [Bellini et al. \(2018\)](#) and [Fadina et al. \(2024\)](#), for instance. A more general possibility is to deal with uncertainty over the choice of the risk measure, as in [Righi \(2023\)](#) and [Wang and Xu \(2023\)](#) for instance, where $\rho^{WC}(X) = \sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho_i(X)$. In both cases, the uncertainty set is fixed for any $X \in \mathcal{X}$; thus, the analysis is well documented. For instance, the penalty term for ρ^{WC} , a key feature in the literature of risk measures computed as the convex conjugate, is given as the lower semicontinuous convex envelope of $\inf_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_{\rho_i}$, i.e., the point-wise infimum of the individual penalty terms.

*We thank professor Marlon Moresco for insightful comments. We are grateful for the financial support of CNPq (Brazilian Research Council) projects number 302369/2018-0 and 401720/2023-3.

A more intricate setup regards uncertainty regarding the random variables and how they affect risk measures. It is a prominent topic in the mainstream literature since it is linked to model uncertainty and risk. In this case, the uncertainty depends on the random variables as

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} \rho(Z),$$

where \mathcal{U}_X is the uncertainty set specific for X . Thus, by varying X , there is a variation on the set where the supremum is taken. This approach is very relevant for distributionally robust optimization. See [Esfahani and Kuhn \(2018\)](#) for a detailed discussion.

In this paper, we then study the general properties of worst-case convex risk measures under uncertainty on random variables on L^p spaces. More specifically, we are interested in the properties of the map $X \mapsto \rho^{WC}(X)$. Our study is the first paper to deal with such features for general convex risk measures. The goal of most papers in this stream (see the mentioned paper below) is to develop closed forms over specific uncertainty sets, mostly for distortion risk measures or other specific classes of risk measures, instead of the properties of ρ^{WC} as a risk measure per se. Exceptions are [Moresco et al. \(2023\)](#), where it is studied on a dynamic setup the interplay between the primal properties of ρ^{WC} and those for \mathcal{U}_X , and [Righi et al. \(2024\)](#), where risk measures over sets of random variables are studied. Nonetheless, none of such papers deal with the features we approach in this study or in the same generality we do.

In [Theorem 1](#), we prove results that establish its convex conjugate, also known as penalty term, in the specialized risk measures literature. We show that the penalty term becomes

$$\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \min_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}} \{\alpha_{\rho}(Y) + \alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q})\},$$

where \mathbb{Q} is some element of L^q , the usual topological dual of L^p , and $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq L^q$ is the usual set for dual representation of ρ . The key ingredient is to use worst-case expectations $g_Y(X) = \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} E_Y[-Z]$, for $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$, as building blocks. With such a penalty term for dual representation, we can provide more concrete formulations for key tools in the risk measures literature, such as the acceptance sets, as well as refine results for closed forms of worst-case convex risk measures for specific choices of the uncertainty sets \mathcal{U}_X . Most papers in the literature, such as in [Bartl et al. \(2020\)](#), [Bernard et al. \(2023\)](#), [Cornilly et al. \(2018\)](#), [Cornilly and Vanduffel \(2019\)](#), [Shao and Zhang \(2023b\)](#), and [Hu et al. \(2024\)](#), focus on developing closed forms over specific uncertainty sets, mostly for distortion risk measures or other specific classes of risk measures, instead of the more general features we address in this paper.

In [Theorem 2](#), from the obtained penalty term, we provide results to establish sub-differentials for worst-case convex risk measures. We then link the sub-differential with the building blocks g_Y and characterize it as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \rho^{WC}(X) &= \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}: g_{Y^{\mathbb{Q}}}(X) - \alpha_{\rho}(Y^{\mathbb{Q}}) = \rho^{WC}(X), \mathbb{Q} \in \partial g_{Y^{\mathbb{Q}}}(X) \right\} \\ &= \text{clconv} \left(\bigcup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{C}_X} \partial g_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $Y^{\mathbb{Q}}$ belongs to the argmin of the penalty term regarding to \mathbb{Q} , and C_X is the argmax of dual representation for X . This characterization is crucial for robust optimization problems. Intuitively, this approach introduces an adversary whose problem is inner maximization to account for the impact of the model uncertainty. Such worst-case situations are naturally difficult to address for optimization. In this sense, recent work has been considered, especially by showing the problem is equivalent to usual convex ones or even finite-dimensional as in [Pflug et al. \(2012\)](#), [Wozabal \(2014\)](#), [Cai et al. \(2023\)](#), [Pesenti et al. \(2022\)](#), [Pesenti and Jaimungal \(2023\)](#), [Blanchet et al. \(2022\)](#), [Li \(2018\)](#), [Chen and Xie \(2021\)](#), [Liu et al. \(2022\)](#). However, none of these papers deal with the topic of the sub-differential as we do in the current paper.

In [Theorem 3](#), we develop closed forms for worst-case law invariant convex risk measures under sets for random variables based on mean and variance. More specifically, we obtain for the mean-variance uncertainty set $\mathcal{U}_X = \{Z \in L^2: E[Z] = E[X], \sigma(Z) \leq \sigma(X)\}$ the closed form as

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = -E[X] + \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ \sigma(X) \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) \right\}.$$

This is a generalization of the results for this set exposed in [Li \(2018\)](#), [Cornilly et al. \(2018\)](#), [Cornilly and Vanduffel \(2019\)](#), [Chen and Xie \(2021\)](#), [Shao and Zhang \(2023b\)](#), [Shao and Zhang \(2023a\)](#), [Zhao et al. \(2024\)](#), [Zuo and Yin \(2024\)](#) and [Cai et al. \(2023\)](#), which study the class of spectral or concave distortion risk measures. This result may be understood as a generalization even for non-concave distortion risk measures since the cited authors show that the worst-case risk measure of a non-concave distortion is the same as taking its concave envelope, using techniques such as concentration of distributions and isotonic projections in order to make the problem convex. We explore concrete examples of popular risk measures under this setup, with a connection between our result and the cited literature.

In [Theorem 4](#), we obtain a closed form for worst-case law invariant convex risk measures over closed balls in the Wasserstein distance. Closed balls around X under some suitable distance are typical choices for uncertainty sets, and the Wasserstein metric is prominent since it is related to quantiles in its one-dimensional form. We show that in this case the penalty term simplifies to

$$\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) - \epsilon \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q,$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is the desired radius of the ball. Moreover, the closed form becomes

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = \rho(X) + \epsilon M, \quad M = \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \partial \rho(X)} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q.$$

Thus, the key ingredient is the supremum norm of the sub-differential set of ρ at X . We also provide other equivalent results for this closed form and identify its argmax elements. These results generalize the literature since the papers deal with specific cases and risk measures. In [Bartl et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Li and Tian \(2023\)](#), it is investigated the worst-case of optimized certainty equivalents and shortfall risks over such balls, [Hu et al. \(2024\)](#) study the case of expectiles, while in [Liu et al. \(2022\)](#), the result is obtained for concave spectral risk measures. None of such papers expose a general approach as we do. We also expose concrete examples or risk measures, relating our results to the literature.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we define our setup and prove the general results regarding the worst-case convex risk measure, with emphasis on dual representations and sub-differentials. In Section 3, we address the case of partial information on sets for random variables based on mean and variance, with a focus on the closed form for the worst-case risk measure. In Section 4, we study the case of uncertainty on closed balls for the Wasserstein metric in order to specialize results from the general setup and determine equivalent closed forms for the worst-case risk measure.

2 Robust convex risk measures

Consider the real-valued random result X of any asset ($X \geq 0$ is a gain and $X < 0$ is a loss) that is defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. All equalities and inequalities are considered almost surely in \mathbb{P} . We define $X^+ = \max(X, 0)$, $X^- = \max(-X, 0)$, and 1_A as the indicator function for an event A . Let $L^p := L^p(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be the space of (equivalent classes of) random variables such that $\|X\|_p^p = E[|X|^p] < \infty$ for $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $\|X\|_\infty = \text{ess sup } |X| < \infty$ for $p = \infty$, where E is the expectation operator. Further, let $F_X(x) = P(X \leq x)$ and $F_X^{-1}(\alpha) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F_X(x) \geq \alpha\}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be, respectively, the distribution function and the (left) quantile of X .

For any $A \subseteq L^p$, we define \mathbb{I}_A as its characteristic function on L^p , which assumes 0 if $X \in A$, and ∞ , otherwise. For any $f: L^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its sub-gradient at $X \in L^p$ is $\partial f(X) = \{Y \in L^q : \rho(Z) - \rho(X) \geq E[(Z - X)Y] \forall Z \in L^p\}$. We say $f: L^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Gâteaux differentiable at $X \in L^p$ when $t \mapsto \rho(X + tZ)$ is differentiable at $t = 0$ for any $Z \in L^p$ and the derivative defines a continuous linear functional on L^p . When not explicit, it means that definitions and claims are valid for any fixed L^p , $p \in [1, \infty]$ with its usual p-norm. We denote by clconv the closed convex hull of a set in L^p . As usual, L^q , $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ is the usual dual of L^p . For L^∞ , we consider the dual pair (L^∞, L^1) , where we call weak topology for its weak* topology. Let \mathcal{Q} be the set of all probability measures on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) that are absolutely continuous with respect to \mathbb{P} , with Radon–Nikodym derivative $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \in L^q$. With some abuse of notation, we treat probability measures as elements of L^q .

A functional $\rho: L^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a risk measure, and it may possess the following properties:

- (i) Monotonicity: if $X \leq Y$, then $\rho(X) \geq \rho(Y)$, $\forall X, Y \in L^p$.
- (ii) Translation Invariance: $\rho(X + c) = \rho(X) - c$, $\forall X \in L^p, \forall c \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (iii) Convexity: $\rho(\lambda X + (1 - \lambda)Y) \leq \lambda\rho(X) + (1 - \lambda)\rho(Y)$, $\forall X, Y \in L^p, \forall \lambda \in [0, 1]$.
- (iv) Positive Homogeneity: $\rho(\lambda X) = \lambda\rho(X)$, $\forall X \in L^p, \forall \lambda \geq 0$.
- (v) Law Invariance: if $F_X = F_Y$, then $\rho(X) = \rho(Y)$, $\forall X, Y \in L^p$.
- (vi) Comonotonic additivity: $\rho(X + Y) = \rho(X) + \rho(Y)$ for any comonotonic pair (X, Y) .

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

We now focus on exposing our proposed approach for robust convex risk measures. We begin with the formal definition of worst-case risk measure.

Definition 1. *Let ρ be a risk measure. Its worst-case version is given as*

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} \rho(Z),$$

where \mathcal{U}_X is closed and bounded set with $X \in \mathcal{U}_X$ for any $X \in L^p$.

Remark 1. (i) When ρ fulfills monotonicity, we have that ρ^{WC} is real valued because \mathcal{U}_X is bounded. More precisely, we have for any $X \in L^p$ that

$$\infty > \rho(-\|\mathcal{U}_X\|_p) \geq \rho \geq \rho(\|\mathcal{U}_X\|_p) > -\infty.$$

(ii) There is preservation for the worst-case determination for operations preserved under point-wise supremum. More specifically, we have: if $\rho_1 \geq \rho_2$, then $\rho_1^{WC} \geq \rho_2^{WC}$; $(\lambda\rho)^{WC} = \lambda\rho^{WC}$ for any $\lambda \geq 0$; $(\rho+c)^{WC} = \rho^{WC} + c$ for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$; and $(\sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho_i)^{WC} = \sup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \rho_i^{WC}$, where \mathcal{I} is arbitrary non-empty set.

We now state a simple but useful result regarding the preservation by the worst-case ρ^{WC} of main properties from the base risk measure ρ .

Proposition 1. *We have that $\mathcal{A}_{\rho^{WC}} = \{X \in L^p : \mathcal{U}_X \subseteq \mathcal{A}_\rho\}$. Also, we have the following sufficient conditions for ρ^{WC} to preserve properties from ρ :*

(i) *Monotonicity: if $X \leq Y$ implies for any $X' \in \mathcal{U}_X$, there is $Y' \in \mathcal{U}_Y$ such that $X' \leq Y'$, $\forall X, Y \in L^p$.*

(ii) *Translation Invariance: if $\mathcal{U}_{X+c} = \mathcal{U}_X - c$, $\forall X \in L^p$, $\forall c \in \mathbb{R}$.*

(iii) *Convexity: $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda X + (1-\lambda)Y} \subseteq \lambda\mathcal{U}_X + (1-\lambda)\mathcal{U}_Y$, $\forall X, Y \in L^p$, $\forall \lambda \in [0, 1]$.*

(iv) *Normalization: if $\mathcal{U}_0 = \{0\}$.*

(v) *Positive Homogeneity: $\mathcal{U}_{\lambda X} = \lambda\mathcal{U}_X$, $\forall X \in L^p$, $\forall \lambda \geq 0$*

(vi) *Law Invariance: $F_X = F_Y$ implies $\mathcal{U}_X = \mathcal{U}_Y$, $\forall X, Y \in L^p$.*

Proof. The claims for the acceptance and Law Invariance are trivial. For (i)-(v), the claim follows similar steps from Proposition 2 in [Moresco et al. \(2023\)](#). \square

Dual representations are a key feature in the theory of risk measures. From Theorems 2.11 and 3.1 of [Kaina and Rüschendorf \(2009\)](#), a map $\rho : L^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $p \in [1, \infty)$, is a convex risk measure if and only if it can be represented as:

$$\rho(X) = \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \{E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q})\}, \forall X \in L^p,$$

where

$$\alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) = \sup_{X \in L^p} \{E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \rho(X)\} = \sup_{X \in \mathcal{A}_\rho} E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X].$$

Moreover, ρ is continuous in the L^p norm and continuous in the bounded \mathbb{P} -a.s. convergence (Lebesgue continuous). For $p = \infty$, Theorem 4.33 Corollary 4.35 in [Follmer and Schied \(2016\)](#) assures that the claim holds if and only if ρ is Lebesgue continuous. In any case, the maximum can be taken over the weakly compact $\mathcal{Q}' := \{\mathbb{Q} \in L^q: \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) < \infty\}$.

We now prove a dual representation for worst-case convex risk measures. Our building blocks will be worst-case expectations defined as $g_Y(X) = \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} E_Y[-Z]$ for $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$. In the following, when not made explicit, we assume that ρ is a convex risk measure and the uncertainty sets possess properties (i)-(iv) of Proposition 1.

Lemma 1. *We have that:*

- (i) g_Y is a convex risk measure for any $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$, with $\alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q}) = \sup\{E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X]: \mathcal{U}_X \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{-E_Y}\}$.
- (ii) $\alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q}) \leq 0$ for any $\mathbb{Q} = Y$, and $\alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q}) = \infty$ for any $\mathbb{Q} \not\ll Y$.
- (iii) $\rho^{WC}(X) = \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \{g_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q})\}$ for any $X \in L^p$, and $\mathcal{A}_{\rho^{WC}} = \{X \in L^p: g_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) \leq \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) \forall \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}\}$.
- (iv) $g_Y(X) = \max_{Z \in \text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X)} E_Y[-Z]$ for any $X \in L^p$ and any $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Proof. For (i), let $g_Y(X) = \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} E_Y[-Z]$ for some $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$. Thus, each g_Y is a finite convex risk measure by Proposition 1 considering a base risk measure $X \mapsto E[-X]$. Hence, it can be represented over

$$\alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q}) = \sup\{E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X]: X \in \mathcal{A}_{g_Y}\} = \sup\{E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X]: \mathcal{U}_X \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{-E_Y}\}.$$

Regarding (ii), for the first claim on α_{g_Y} , since $X \in \mathcal{U}_X$ for any $X \in L^p$ we have by straightforwardly calculation that

$$\alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q}) = \sup_{X \in L^p} \left\{ E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-Z] \right\} \leq 0.$$

Regarding the second claim, we can take $A \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{Q}(A) > 0$ but $Y(A) = 0$. Then, if $X \in \mathcal{A}_{g_Y}$, then also $X_n = X - n1_A \in \mathcal{A}_{g_Y}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case, we get that

$$\alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q}) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X_n] = E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n\mathbb{Q}(A) = \infty.$$

For (iii), the first claim follows since $\rho^{WC}(X) = \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \{\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q})\}$. The claim on the acceptance set follows as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\rho^{WC}} &= \{X \in L^p: g_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) \leq 0 \forall \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}\}. \\ &= \{X \in L^p: g_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) \leq \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) \forall \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}\}. \end{aligned}$$

For (iv), by (i), we have each g_Y as a finite convex risk measure. Thus, the supremum is not altered when taken over the weakly compact $\text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X)$, and $Z \mapsto E_Y[-Z]$ is linear and bounded, hence weakly continuous, the supremum is attained in the definition and $g_Y(X) = E_Y[-Z_X]$ for some $Z_X \in \text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X)$. \square

Theorem 1. *We have that*

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \{E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_{\rho^{WC}}(\mathbb{Q})\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}$ is obtained as

$$\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \min_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}} \{\alpha_{\rho}(Y) + \alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q})\}, \quad \forall \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}. \quad (2)$$

Proof. By Lemma 1, g_Y is a convex risk measure for any $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$, which is represented over α_{g_Y} . We claim that $Y \mapsto g_Y(X)$ is weak continuous for each X . Fix then $X \in L^p$ and let $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ weakly, i.e. $E_{Y_n}[Z] \rightarrow E_Y[Z]$ for any $Z \in L^p$. Let now $f_n, f: \text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as $f_n(Z) = E_{Y_n}[-Z]$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f(Z) = E_Y[-Z]$. By recalling that $\text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X)$ is weakly compact by Alaoglu Theorem, we then have that $\{f_n\}$ is tight, i.e. for each $\epsilon > 0$ there is a weakly compact subset $U_{\epsilon} \subseteq \text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X)$ and $N_{\epsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sup_{X \in X_{\epsilon}} f_n(X) \geq \sup_{X \in L^p} f_n(X) - \epsilon, \quad \forall n \geq N_{\epsilon}.$$

Recall that the hypo-graph of a map $j: \text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$\text{hyp } j = \{(Z, r) \in \text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X) \times \mathbb{R} : j(Z) \geq r\}.$$

Since $E_{Y_n}[Z_n] \rightarrow E_Y[Z]$ for any $Z_n \rightarrow Z$, we then have that $\{f_n\}$ hypo-converges to f , i.e. $d((Z, r), \text{hyp } f_n) \rightarrow d((Z, r), \text{hyp } f)$ for any $(Z, r) \in \text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X)$, with d the usual product metric on $\text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X) \times \mathbb{R}$. Thus, under tightness, we have that hypo-convergence implies convergence of the supremum; see Proposition 7.3.5 of [Aubin and Frankowska \(2009\)](#) for instance. By Lemma 1, we have that $g_Y(X) = \max_{Z \in \text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X)} E_Y[-Z]$. Then, we obtain that

$$g_{Y_n}(X) = \sup_{Z \in \text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X)} E_{Y_n}[-Z] \rightarrow \sup_{Z \in \text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X)} E_Y[-Z] = g_Y(X).$$

Thus, $Y \mapsto g_Y(X)$ is weak continuous. Now fix $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}$ and let $h: L^p \times \mathcal{Q}' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given as

$$h(X, Y) = E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] + \alpha_{\rho}(Y) - g_Y(X).$$

This map is linear and continuous in the first argument, taken on the convex set L^p . In contrast, it is convex and weak lower semicontinuous in the second argument, taken on the weakly compact \mathcal{Q}' . By Lemma 1, we have that $\rho^{WC}(X) = \max_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}'} \{g_Y(X) - \alpha_{\rho}(Y)\}$. Thus, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{\rho^{WC}}(\mathbb{Q}) &= \sup_{X \in L^p} \left\{ E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} \sup_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}'} \{E_Y[-Z] - \alpha_{\rho}(Y)\} \right\} \\ &= \sup_{X \in L^p} \inf_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}'} \left\{ E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] + \alpha_{\rho}(Y) - \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} E_Y[-Z] \right\} \\ &= \inf_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}'} \left\{ \alpha_{\rho}(Y) + \sup_{X \in L^p} \left\{ E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} E_Y[-Z] \right\} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \inf_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}'} \{ \alpha_\rho(Y) + \alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q}) \}.$$

The third inequality follows from the Sion minimax theorem, see [Sion \(1958\)](#), which holds since h possesses sufficient properties. By the weak lower semicontinuity of $Y \mapsto \alpha_\rho(Y) + \alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q})$, the infimum is attained in \mathcal{Q}' . Since $\alpha_\rho(Y) = \infty$ for any $Y \notin \mathcal{Q}'$, the minimum is not altered if taken over \mathcal{Q} . This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 2. (i) It is intuitive that while ρ^{WC} is a supremum on L^p constrained to be taken over \mathcal{U}_X , in its turn $\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}$ is an infimum over \mathcal{Q} taken on a subset of L^q , the dual space of L^p , adjusted by the penalty of expectations over all \mathcal{U}_X .

(ii) We have that $\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}(\mathbb{Q}) \leq \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) + \alpha_{g_{\mathbb{Q}}}(\mathbb{Q}) \leq \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q})$. This inequality can also be deduced from $\rho^{WC} \geq \rho$. Further, by [Lemma 1](#), the infimum in [\(2\)](#) can be taken only over those $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $\mathbb{Q} \ll Y$.

(iii) Notice that we have not used any property beyond convexity and lower semicontinuity for ρ , ρ^{WC} and g_Y in the proof. Thus, the claim remains valid without the Monetary properties, as in general convex analysis, for instance, by letting the proper domain of the penalty be contained in some general subset of L^q instead of \mathcal{Q} .

Positive Homogeneity, and thus coherence, leads to a simpler dual representation. [Theorem 2.9](#) in [Kaina and Rüschendorf \(2009\)](#) assures that a map $\rho: L^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $p \in [1, \infty)$, is a coherent risk measure if and only if it can be represented as

$$\rho(X) = \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho} E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X], \quad \forall X \in L^p,$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_\rho \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ is a nonempty, closed, and convex set that is called the dual set of ρ . For $p = \infty$, [Corollaries 4.37 and 4.38](#) in [Follmer and Schied \(2016\)](#) assures that the claim holds under Lebesgue continuity.

We then have a direct Corollary in the presence of Positive Homogeneity, and thus coherence, of the base risk measure and the uncertainty set.

Corollary 1. *If in addition to the conditions of [Theorem 1](#) we have Homogeneity Positivity for both ρ and \mathcal{U}_X for any $X \in L^p$, then $\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}$ is the characteristic function of $\text{clconv} \left(\bigcup_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho} \mathcal{Q}_{g_Y} \right)$, where \mathcal{Q}_{g_Y} is the dual set of g_Y .*

Proof. Under these circumstances, by [Proposition 1](#), each g_Y is also a coherent risk measure. The claim now follows as

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho} \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-Z] = \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \bigcup_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho} \mathcal{Q}_{g_Y}} E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] = \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \text{clconv} \left(\bigcup_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho} \mathcal{Q}_{g_Y} \right)} E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X].$$

\square

In convex analysis, sub-differentials play a critical role in optimization. For a convex risk measure ρ , [Theorem 21](#) and [Proposition 14](#) of [Delbaen \(2012\)](#), for $p = \infty$, and [Theorem 3](#) of

Ruszczynski and Shapiro (2006), for $p \in [1, \infty)$, assure that

$$\partial\rho(X) = \{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}: \rho(X) = E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q})\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Furthermore, ρ is Gâteaux differentiable at X if and only if $\partial\rho(X) = \{\mathbb{Q}\}$ is a singleton, which in this case the derivative turns out to be defined by \mathbb{Q} , i.e. the map $Z \mapsto E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-Z]$.

We now prove a result for explicit representations for the sub-gradient of the worst-case convex risk measure. As in the case for the penalty term and dual representation, the sub-gradient has as building blocks the auxiliary maps g_Y and the base risk measure ρ . With some abuse of notation in the context of Gateaux differential, we treat \mathbb{Q} and the continuous linear functional it defines as the same.

Theorem 2. *We have for any $X \in L^p$ that:*

$$(i) \quad \partial\rho^{WC}(X) = \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}: g_{Y^{\mathbb{Q}}}(X) - \alpha_{\rho}(Y^{\mathbb{Q}}) = \rho^{WC}(X), \mathbb{Q} \in \partial g_{Y^{\mathbb{Q}}}(X) \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where $Y^{\mathbb{Q}}$ belongs to the argmin of (2) regarding to \mathbb{Q} .

(ii)

$$\partial\rho^{WC}(X) = \text{clconv} \left(\bigcup_{\mathbb{Q} \in C_X} \partial g_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) \right), \quad \forall X \in L^p,$$

where C_X is the argmax of (1) for X . In particular, ρ^{WC} is Gâteaux differentiable at X if and only if $g_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is Gâteaux differentiable at X for any $\mathbb{Q} \in C_X$ with the same derivative.

(iii) If $T_X = \arg \max\{\rho(Z): Z \in \mathcal{U}_X\} = \arg \max\{E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-Z]: Z \in \mathcal{U}_X\} \neq \emptyset$ for any $\mathbb{Q} \in \partial\rho^{WC}(X)$, then

$$\partial\rho^{WC}(X) = \text{clconv} \left(\bigcup_{\substack{Y \in \bigcup \\ Z \in T_X} \partial g_Y(X)} \right).$$

Proof. Fix $X \in L^p$. For (i), we have that $\mathbb{Q} \in \partial g_{Y^{\mathbb{Q}}}(X)$ if and only if $E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_{g_{Y^{\mathbb{Q}}}}(\mathbb{Q}) = g_{Y^{\mathbb{Q}}}(X)$. Then, by using the penalty term from Theorem 1 we directly have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\rho^{WC}(X) &= \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}: E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_{\rho}(Y^{\mathbb{Q}}) - \alpha_{g_{Y^{\mathbb{Q}}}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \rho^{WC}(X) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}: g_{Y^{\mathbb{Q}}}(X) - \alpha_{\rho}(Y^{\mathbb{Q}}) = \rho^{WC}(X), \mathbb{Q} \in \partial g_{Y^{\mathbb{Q}}}(X) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Concerning (ii), Theorem 2.4.18 in Zalinescu (2002) assures that for $\{\pi_t\}_{t \in T}$ a family of convex functions over L^p , with T a compact topological space, and $\pi = \sup_{t \in T} \pi_t$, if $t \mapsto \pi_t(X)$ are upper semicontinuous and π is continuous, then

$$\partial f(X) = \text{clconv} \left(\bigcup_{t \in T(X)} \partial \pi_t(X) \right) + N_{\text{dom } \pi}(X),$$

where $T(X) = \{t \in T: \pi_t(X) = f(X)\}$, and $N_A(X) = \{Y \in L^q: E[(Z - X)Y] \leq 0 \forall Z \in A\}$.

We now claim that we can use such a result in our framework. We have that the maximum on (1) can be taken on the weakly compact \mathcal{Q}' . Let for each $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}'$ a functional on L^p be defined as

$$\pi_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = g_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}).$$

We have that these maps are convex. Also, we have, as in the proof of Theorem 1, that $\mathbb{Q} \mapsto \pi_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$ is weak upper semicontinuous for any $X \in L^p$. Further, it is clear that $\rho^{WC} = \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}'} \pi_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Moreover, as a convex risk measure, ρ^{WC} is continuous. Further, it is straightforward that $N_{L^2}(X) = \{0\}$. Hence, applying the result we have that

$$\partial \rho^{WC}(X) = \text{clconv}(\{\partial g_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) : \pi_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = \rho^{WC}(X)\}), \forall X \in L^2.$$

The claim for the Gâteaux derivative is straightforwardly obtained from such sub-differential.

Regarding (iii), the claim follows because for any $Z \in T_X$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q} \in \partial \rho^{WC}(X) &\iff E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_{\rho}(Y_{\mathbb{Q}}) - \alpha_{g_{Y_{\mathbb{Q}}}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \rho(Z) \\ &\iff E_{Y_{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Z] - \alpha_{\rho}(Y) = \rho(Z) \text{ and } E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q}) = E_{Y_{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Z] \\ &\iff Y_{\mathbb{Q}} \in \partial \rho(Z) \text{ and } \mathbb{Q} \in \partial g_{Y_{\mathbb{Q}}}(X) \\ &\iff \mathbb{Q} \in \bigcup_{Y \in \partial \rho(Z)} \partial g_Y(X). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain that

$$\partial \rho^{WC}(X) = \bigcup_{Z \in T_X} \bigcup_{Y \in \partial \rho(Z)} \partial g_Y(X).$$

Since sub-differentials are closed and convex, we can safely take clconv operation. \square

3 Mean and variance

On the next sections, we have that $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ atomless. A case of interest is when the uncertainty set is based on moments of the random variable. In particular, mean and variance as $\mathcal{U}_X = \{Z \in L^2 : E[Z] = E[X], \sigma(Z) \leq \sigma(X)\}$. \mathcal{U}_X fits into our approach for any $X \in L^2$ since it is a closed, bounded, even convex set such that $X \in \mathcal{U}_X$. Furthermore, this family fulfills properties (ii)-(vi) of Proposition 1. However, it is not a monotone set; thus, the resulting worst-case risk measure may not be monetary. A consequence is that the penalty term $\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}$ from dual representation must be considered on $\{\mathbb{Q} \in L^q : E[\mathbb{Q}] = 1\}$. We address this case in this section and, thus, restrict our analysis to L^2 .

Worst-case formulations under this uncertainty set are well documented for spectral risk measures, which are precisely the risk measures satisfying all properties (i)-(vi). Such maps can be represented as weighting (spectral) schemes of Value at Risk (VaR), which is defined as $VaR^{\alpha}(X) = -F_X^{-1}(\alpha)$. Thus, distortion/spectral risk measures are represented as

$$\rho_{\phi}(X) = \int_0^1 VaR^u(X) \phi(u) du, \forall X \in L^2,$$

where $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a non-increasing functional such that $\int_0^1 \phi(u) du = 1$. For details on such representation, see [Follmer and Schied \(2016\)](#) for $p = \infty$ and [Filipović and Svindland \(2012\)](#) for $p \in [1, \infty)$. In this case, results in [Li \(2018\)](#), [Cornilly et al. \(2018\)](#), [Cornilly and Vanduffel \(2019\)](#), [Cai et al. \(2023\)](#), [Pesenti et al. \(2022\)](#) allow to conclude that

$$(\rho_\phi)^{WC}(X) = -E[X] + \sigma(X) \|\phi - 1\|_2,$$

where the 2-norm is taken over $[0, 1]$. These authors also derive a closed form when ρ is coherent and law invariant, relying on the fact that in this case $\rho = \sup_{\phi \in \Phi_\rho} \rho_\phi$, where Φ_ρ . In this case the worst-case risk measure becomes

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = -E[X] + \sigma(X) \sup_{\phi \in \Phi_\rho} \|\phi - 1\|_2.$$

We now expose a closed-form solution for the worst-case risk measure when the base ρ is a law invariant convex risk measure. Our result is given in terms of \mathcal{Q} and α_ρ , which are in general more tractable than Φ_ρ .

Theorem 3. *Let ρ be a law invariant convex risk measure and $\mathcal{U}_X = \{Z \in L^2 : E[Z] = E[X], \sigma(Z) \leq \sigma(X)\}$. Then, we have that:*

(i)

$$\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \min_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ \alpha_\rho(Y) + \mathbb{I}_{\left\{1 + \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 V : E[V]=0, \|V\|_2 \leq 1\right\}}(\mathbb{Q}) \right\}, \forall \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

(ii)

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = -E[X] + \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ \sigma(X) \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) \right\}, \forall X \in L^2. \quad (4)$$

(iii) the argmax for any $X \in L^2$ is

$$X^* = E[X] + \frac{\sigma(X) \left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right)}{\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2}, \text{ where } \mathbb{Q}^* \text{ is in the argmax of (4) for } X.$$

(iv)

$$\partial \rho^{WC}(X) = \text{clconv} \left(\left\{ 1 + \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 \frac{X - E[X]}{\|X - E[X]\|_2} : \mathbb{Q} \in C_X \right\} \right), \forall X \in L^2,$$

where C_X is the argmax of (4) for X . In particular, ρ^{WC} is Gâteaux differentiable at X if and only if $\left\{ \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 : \mathbb{Q} \in C_X \right\}$ is a singleton.

Proof. For (i), under Law Invariance and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ atomless, we have the special Kusuoka representation, see for instance Theorem 2.2 of [Filipović and Svindland \(2012\)](#),

$$\rho(X) = \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho} \left\{ \int_0^1 F_{-X}^{-1}(u) F_{\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}}^{-1}(u) du - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) \right\}, \forall X \in L^2.$$

Since each \mathcal{U}_X is law invariant, Proposition 1 which implies that the same property holds for

the auxiliary maps g_Y , $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$, which become $g_Y(X) = \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} f_Y(-X)$, where

$$f_Y: X \mapsto \sup_{X' \sim X} E_Y[X'] = \int_0^1 F_X^{-1}(u) F_{\frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}}}^{-1}(u) du.$$

It is an easy task to show that $\phi_Y(u) := F_{\frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}}}^{-1}(1-u)$ defines a valid distortion/spectral risk measure $X \mapsto f_Y(-X)$ for any $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$. Thus, in view of the above discussion, we get that

$$g_Y(X) = -E[X] + \sigma(X) \|\phi_Y - 1\|_2, \quad \forall X \in L^2, \forall Y \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

Moreover, by some calculation we also have $\|\phi_Y - 1\|_2 = \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2$. We show it for continuous F_X by recalling that $U := F_X(X)$ has uniform distribution over $(0, 1)$. Nonetheless, the general case follows similar steps with more algebra under the modified distribution of X given as $\tilde{F}_X(x, \lambda) = \mathbb{P}(X < x) + \lambda \mathbb{P}(X = x)$, where $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. In this case if \tilde{U} is independent of X and uniformly distributed over $(0, 1)$, then we also have that $U := \tilde{F}_X(X, \tilde{U})$ follows an uniform distribution over $(0, 1)$. We get that

$$\left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 = \left(\int_0^1 \left(F_{\frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}}}^{-1}(1-u) - 1 \right)^2 du \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left(\int_0^1 (\phi_Y(u) - 1)^2 du \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \|\phi_Y - 1\|_2.$$

Therefore, it is then clear that the auxiliary g_Y are coherent, and their penalty term are characteristic functions on dual sets \mathcal{Q}_{g_Y} . Thus, the result follows by noticing that the dual sets of the negative expectation and the 2-norm are, respectively, $\{1\}$ and $\{V \in L^2: \|V\|_2 \leq 1\}$

For (ii), from Lemma 1 we have that the maps g_Y are building blocks for ρ as

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \{g_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q})\}, \quad \forall X \in L^2.$$

Thus, we then get for any $X \in L^2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{WC}(X) &= E[X] + \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \{ \sigma(X) \|\phi_{\mathbb{Q}} - 1\|_2 - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}) \} \\ &= E[X] + \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ \sigma(X) \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Regarding (iii), for the argmax, if X is constant, then the claim is trivial since $\mathcal{U}_X = \{X\}$. Thus, fix non-constant $X \in L^2$ and let $X^* = E[X] + \sigma(X) \left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right) \left(\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 \right)^{-1}$, where \mathbb{Q}^* is the argmax of (4) for X . It is straightforward to verify that $X^* \in \mathcal{U}_X$. It only remains to show that $\rho(X^*) = \rho^{WC}(X)$. We have that $\rho(X^*) = -E[X] + \rho \left(\sigma(X) \left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right) \left(\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 \right)^{-1} \right)$. Furthermore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho \left(\sigma(X) \left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right) \left(\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 \right)^{-1} \right) \\ &= \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ \frac{\sigma(X)}{\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2} E_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right) \right] - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\sigma(X)}{\left\| \frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2} \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ E_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\left(\frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right) \right] - \frac{\left\| \frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2}{\sigma(X)} \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}) \right\} \\
&= \frac{\sigma(X)}{\left\| \frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2} \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ E \left[\left(\frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{dQ}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right) \right] - \frac{\left\| \frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2}{\sigma(X)} \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}) \right\} \\
&\leq \sigma(X) \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ \left\| \frac{dQ}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 - \frac{\alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q})}{\sigma(X)} \right\} \\
&= \sigma(X) \left\| \frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 - \alpha_{\rho}(Q^*) \\
&= \frac{\sigma(X)}{\left\| \frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2} \left[\left(\frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right)^2 \right] - \frac{\left\| \frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2}{\sigma(X)} \alpha_{\rho}(Q) \\
&\leq \rho \left(\sigma(X) \left(\frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right) \left(\left\| \frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 \right)^{-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain that

$$\rho(X^*) = -E[X] + \sigma(X) \left\| \frac{dQ^*}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 - \alpha_{\rho}(Q^*) = \rho^{WC}(X).$$

For (iv), we proceed as in Theorem 2, by letting for each $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}'$ a functional on L^2 be defined as

$$\pi_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = -E[X] + \sigma(X) \left\| \frac{dQ}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}).$$

Moreover, ρ^{WC} is convex and bounded above in any set $[U, V] = \{X \in L^2 : U \leq X \leq V\}$. Thus, by Theorem 1.4 in Gao and Xanthos (2024) we have that ρ^{WC} is continuous. By recalling that the expectation and the 2-norm are both Gâteaux differentiable with respective derivatives 1 and $\frac{X}{\|X\|_2}$, we have that

$$\partial \pi_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = \left\{ 1 + \left\| \frac{dQ}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 \frac{X - E[X]}{\|X - E[X]\|_2} \right\}.$$

Further, it is straightforward that $N_{L^2}(X) = \{0\}$. Hence, applying the result we have that

$$\partial \rho^{WC}(X) = \text{clconv} \left(\left\{ 1 + \left\| \frac{dQ}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 \frac{X - E[X]}{\|X - E[X]\|_2} : \pi_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = \rho^{WC}(X) \right\} \right), \forall X \in L^2.$$

The claim for the Gâteaux derivative is straightforwardly obtained from such sub-differential. This concludes the proof. \square

Under the presence of Positive Homogeneity, the problem becomes more tractable, with concrete penalty terms and sub-gradient. We now expose a Corollary regarding this context.

Corollary 2. *If in addition to the conditions of Theorem 3, ρ fulfills Positive Homogeneity, then:*

(i)

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = -E[X] + \sigma(X) \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2, \forall X \in L^2.$$

(ii) $\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}$ is the characteristic function of

$$\left\{ 1 + \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 V : E[V] = 0, \|V\|_2 \leq 1 \right\}.$$

(iii) ρ^{WC} is Gâteaux differentiable at any $X \in L^2$ with derivative

$$1 + \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 \frac{X - E[X]}{\|X - E[X]\|_2}.$$

Proof. For (i), the result holds since α_ρ is the characteristic function of \mathcal{Q}_ρ . Regarding (ii), Positive Homogeneity implies that $\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}$ is the characteristic function of $\mathcal{Q}_{\rho^{WC}}$. The result follows by noticing that the dual sets of the negative expectation and the 2-norm are, respectively, $\{1\}$ and $\{V \in L^2 : \|V\|_2 \leq 1\}$. For (iii), the claim follows by recalling that the expectation and the 2-norm are both Gâteaux differentiable with respective derivatives 1 and $\frac{X}{\|X\|_2}$. \square

We conclude this section by exposing some concrete examples of closed-form expressions under Theorem 3. We consider both risk measures that already appear in the literature of worst-case under mean and variance uncertainty sets in order to clarify that our approach nests existing results and risk measures for which closed-form solutions are a novelty.

Example 1. (i) When ρ is comonotone additive, we then recover the result from the literature, with $\rho^{WC}(X) = -E[X] + \sigma(X)\|\phi - 1\|_2$. A typical example in this situation is Expected Shortfall (ES), that is functional $ES^\alpha : L^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$ES^\alpha(X) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^\alpha VaR^u du, \alpha \in (0, 1).$$

In this case the spectral function is $\phi(u) = \frac{1}{\alpha} 1_{(0, \alpha)}(u)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. The worst-case of ES becomes

$$(ES^\alpha)^{WC}(X) = -E[X] + \sigma(X) \left\| \frac{1}{\alpha} 1_{(0, \alpha)} - 1 \right\|_2 = -E[X] + \sigma(X) \sqrt{\frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha}}.$$

Of course, under our approach, we have the same result. The dual set of ES is defined as

$$\mathcal{Q}_{ES^\alpha} = \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q} : \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \right\}.$$

Thus, it is clear that $\sqrt{\frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1} \geq \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2$. For the converse inequality, for each $X \in L^2$, we have that $\frac{\mathbb{Q}X}{d\mathbb{P}} = \frac{1}{\alpha} 1_{X \leq F_X^{-1}(\alpha)} \in \mathcal{Q}_{ES^\alpha}$. Then, we obtain that

$$\max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_\rho} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 \geq \sup_{X \in L^2} \left\| \frac{1}{\alpha} 1_{X \leq F_X^{-1}(\alpha)} - 1 \right\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha}}.$$

- (ii) A risk measure in the conditions of the Theorem that is not comonotone is the Expectile Value at Risk (Exp), linked to the concept of an expectile. It is a functional $Exp : L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ directly defined as an argmin of a scoring function, which is given by

$$Exp^\alpha(X) = - \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} E[\alpha[(X - x)^+]^2 + (1 - \alpha)[(X - x)^-]^2] = -e^\alpha(X), \alpha \in (0, 1).$$

By [Bellini et al. \(2014\)](#), the Exp is a law invariant coherent risk measure for $\alpha \leq 0.5$. In addition, this measure is the only example of elicitable coherent risk measure that does not collapse to the mean. See [Ziegel \(2016\)](#) for details. The dual set of Exp can be given by

$$\mathcal{Q}_{Exp^\alpha} = \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q} : \exists a > 0, a \leq \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \leq a \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha} \right\}.$$

In order to obtain $(Exp^\alpha)^{WC}$, we must to compute $\max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_{Exp^\alpha}} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2$. Due to the nature of \mathcal{Q}_{Exp^α} , this is a tricky quest. Nonetheless, in Proposition 9 of [Bellini et al. \(2014\)](#) a formulation for Exp is given as

$$Exp^\alpha(X) = \max_{\gamma \in [\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}, 1]} \{(1 - \gamma)ES^\tau(X) + \gamma E[-X]\}, \tau = \frac{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{\gamma}}{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} - 1}.$$

Thus, we can represent it as

$$Exp^\alpha(X) = \max_{\gamma \in [\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}, 1]} \rho_{\phi_\gamma}(X), \phi_\gamma(u) = (1 - \gamma) \frac{1}{\tau} \mathbf{1}_{(0, \tau)(u)} + \gamma.$$

In this case, by Theorem 3 we have that in order to obtain $(Exp^\alpha)^{WC}$, we must to compute $\max_{\gamma \in [\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}, 1]} \|\phi_\gamma - 1\|_2$. According to [Hu et al. \(2024\)](#), this maximum is attained for $\gamma^* = \frac{1}{2(1-\alpha)}$, leading to $\|\phi_{\gamma^*} - 1\|_2 = \frac{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} - 1}{2\sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}}$. Hence, we have that

$$(Exp^\alpha)^{WC}(X) = -E[X] + \sigma(X) \frac{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} - 1}{2\sqrt{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}}.$$

- (iii) Another example in the setup of Theorem without comonotonic additivity is the Mean plus Semi-Deviation (MSD). Such risk measure is the functional $MSD^\beta : L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$MSD^\beta(X) = -E[X] + \beta \|(X - E[X])^-\|_2, \beta \in [0, 1].$$

This risk measure is studied in detail by [Fischer \(2003\)](#), and it is a well-known law invariant coherent risk measure, which belongs to loss-deviation measures discussed by [Righi \(2019\)](#). The dual set of this measure can be represented by

$$\mathcal{Q}_{MSD^\beta} = \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q} : \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} = 1 + \beta(V - E[V]), V \geq 0, \|V\|_2 = 1 \right\}.$$

Notice that for any $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_{MSD^\beta}$ we have that

$$\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 = \beta \|V - E[V]\|_2 = \beta \sqrt{E[V^2] - E[V]^2}.$$

Since $V \geq 0$ and $E[V^2] = 1$, we have that $\|V - E[V]\|_2 \leq 1$. By taking $V = \frac{(X - E[X])^-}{\|(X - E[X])^-\|_2}$ for $X \in L^2$, we have that $\|V - E[V]\|_2 = 1$. Hence, we have that

$$MSD^{WC}(X) = -E[X] + \sigma(X) \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}_{MSD^\beta}} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 = -E[X] + \beta \sigma(X), \forall X \in L^2.$$

(iv) A class of law invariant convex, not necessarily coherent, risk measures are the shortfall risks (SR). Such maps are defined as $SR^l: L^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$SR_l(X) = \inf \{m \in \mathbb{R}: E[l(X - m)] \leq l_0\},$$

where l is a strictly convex and increasing loss function, and l_0 is an interior point in the range of l . The intuition is that such maps connect convex risk measures and the expected utility theory since maximizing expected utility is equivalent to minimizing the expected loss. A concrete and popular choice for utility/loss function is the power functions given as $l(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2 1_{x \geq 0}$. We then have that its penalty term is given, according to Example 4.118 of [Follmer and Schied \(2016\)](#), as

$$\alpha_{SR^l}(\mathbb{Q}) = (2l_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_2.$$

We are then, in order to determine $(SR_l)^{WC}$, interested in the value of

$$\max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ \sigma(X) \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 - (2l_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_2 \right\}.$$

By recalling that $\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} - 1 \right\|_2 = \left(\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_2^2 - 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we have that making $y = E \left[\left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right)^2 \right] = \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_2^2$, the goal then becomes to determine the value of

$$\max_{y \in [1, S]} \left\{ \sigma(X)(y - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} - (2l_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} y^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\},$$

where S is the L^2 bound of the weakly compact \mathcal{Q} . Thus, the critical point is obtained for $y = E \left[\left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right)^2 \right] = \frac{2l_0}{\sigma^2(X) - 2l_0}$, which is valid when both $\sigma(X) > (2l_0)^{1/2}$ and $2l_0 \geq \frac{\sigma^2(X)}{2}$. Assuming this is the case, then we have that

$$(SR_l)^{WC}(X) = -E[X] + \frac{\sigma(X) \sqrt{4l_0 - \sigma^2(X)} - 2l_0}{\sqrt{\sigma^2(X) - 2l_0}}.$$

4 Wasserstein balls

Another case of potential interest for uncertainty sets is closed balls under some suitable metric centered at $X \in L^p$ with some specified radius $\epsilon > 0$. A prominent example in the literature is the Wasserstein distance or order $p \in [1, \infty)$ as

$$d_{W_p}(X, Z) = \left(\int_0^1 |F_X^{-1}(u) - F_Z^{-1}(u)|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad p \in [1, \infty).$$

For $p = \infty$ it is possible to define $d_{W_\infty}(X, Z) = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} d_{W_p}(X, Z)$. For a detailed discussion on this metric, see Villani (2021), while Esfahani and Kuhn (2018) is a reference for its use in robust decision-making.

In this context, our uncertainty sets then become $\mathcal{U}_X = \{Z \in L^p: d_{W_p}(X, Z) \leq \epsilon\}$. As closed balls, this kind of uncertainty set directly lies in our framework, with the additional feature of being convex. This family fulfills properties (i), (ii), (iii), and (vi) of Proposition 1. It is, however, not normalized, which will also make ρ^{WC} not possess such a property. It is also not Positive Homogeneity. Consequently, coherence is beyond the scope of this section.

For spectral risk measures, as is for the case exposed in the last section, the worst-case is well documented. For instance, Liu et al. (2022) obtains the following formulation $\rho^{WC}(X) = \rho(X) + \epsilon \|\phi\|_q$. Outside this context, there are results for specific risk measures, such as Shortfall Risks in Bartl et al. (2020) and Expectiles in Hu et al. (2024).

We now expose a closed-form solution for the worst-case risk measure when the base ρ is a law invariant convex risk measure. Our result is given in terms of p-norms and sub-differentials for both the penalty and the risk measure. This result is easily tractable, especially when the base risk measure is Gâteaux differentiable.

Lemma 2. $\rho^{WC}(X) \leq \rho(X) + k_X$ for any $X \in L^p$, where $k_X = \sup\{|\rho(X) - \rho(Z)|: Z \in \mathcal{U}_X\}$. If $B_X = \arg \max\{\rho(Z): Z \in \mathcal{U}_X\} \neq \emptyset$, then $\rho^{WC}(X) = \rho(X) + k_X$.

Proof. For any $Z \in \mathcal{U}_X$, we have that $\rho(Z) \leq |\rho(Z) - \rho(X)| + \rho(X) \leq \rho(X) + k_X$. By taking the supremum over \mathcal{U}_X we obtain $\rho^{WC}(X) \leq \rho(X) + k_X$. If $B_X \neq \emptyset$, then the map $Z \mapsto |\rho(Z) - \rho(X)|$ attains its supremum in \mathcal{U}_X , which coincides to k_X . \square

Remark 3. Two sufficient conditions for B_X to be not-empty, even compact are:

- (i) \mathcal{U}_X is compact: since ρ is continuous, the supremum is attained. In this case, since B_X is closed, it is also compact.
- (ii) ρ is weak continuous and \mathcal{U}_X convex: by recalling that ρ is weak lower semicontinuous, it is weak continuous if and only if it is weak upper semicontinuous. Since, in this case, the supremum can be taken over the weakly compact \mathcal{U}_X , the supremum is attained. In this case, B_X is also weak compact.

Theorem 4. Let ρ be convex law invariant and $\mathcal{U}_X = \{Z \in L^p: d_{W_p}(X, Z) \leq \epsilon\}$ for any $X \in L^p$. Then, we have:

(i)

$$\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}) - \epsilon \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q, \quad \forall \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

(ii)

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = \sup\{\rho(Z) : \|X - Z\|_p \leq \epsilon\} = \rho(X) + \epsilon K = \rho(X) + \epsilon M, \quad \forall X \in L^p,$$

$$\text{where } K = \min_{\mathbb{Q} \in \partial \rho^{WC}(X)} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q \text{ and } M = \max_{\mathbb{Q} \in \partial \rho(X)} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q.$$

(iii) the argmax is

$$X^* = \begin{cases} (X - \epsilon M)1_A + X1_{A^c}, & \mathbb{P}(A) = \frac{1}{M}, & p = 1, \\ X - k \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}}^{\frac{q}{p}}, & \mathbb{Q}^* = \arg \min \left\{ \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q : \mathbb{Q} \in \partial \rho^{WC}(X) \right\} & p \in (1, \infty), \\ X - \epsilon, & & p = \infty, \end{cases}$$

where k solves $d_{W_p}(X^*, X) = \epsilon$.

(iv)

$$\partial \rho^{WC}(X) = \text{clconv} \left(\left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q} : F_{\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}} = F_{\frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}}}, Y \in C_X \right\} \right), \quad \forall X \in L^p.$$

Proof. For (i), consider again the the family of maps

$$f_Y : X \mapsto \sup_{X' \sim X} E_Y[X'] = \int_0^1 F_X^{-1}(u) F_{\frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}}}^{-1}(u) du, \quad Y \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

In this case the auxiliary maps g_Y , $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$ become $g_Y(X) = \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{U}_X} f_Y(-X)$. Since the expectation is Lipschitz continuous regarding to the Wasserstein metric, we have by Hölder inequality that the following holds for any $X, Z \in L^p$:

$$|f_Y(X) - f_Y(Z)| \leq d_{W_p}(X, Z) \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q \leq \epsilon \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q.$$

If $p = 1$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let Z_n be such that $\mathbb{P}(Z_n = X + n\epsilon) = \frac{1}{n} = 1 - \mathbb{P}(Z_n = X)$. Then, it is clear that $Z_n \in \mathcal{U}_X$, and we also have the following convergence:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_Y(Z_n) = f_Y(X) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{1/n} F_{n\epsilon}^{-1}(u) F_{\frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}}}^{-1}(u) du = f_Y(X) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_{\infty}.$$

If $p \in (1, \infty)$, then take Z^p such that

$$F_{Z^p}^{-1} = F_X^{-1} + \epsilon \left(F_{\frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}}}^{-1} \right)^{q-1} \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q^{-q/p}.$$

Then, direct calculation leads to both $Z^p \in \mathcal{U}_X$ and

$$f_Y(Z^p) = f_Y(X) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q.$$

For $p = \infty$, take $Z = X + \epsilon$, which is in \mathcal{U}_X . It is straightforward to verify that

$$f_Y(Z) = f_Y(X) + \epsilon = f_Y(X) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_1.$$

Thus, in any case for $p \geq 1$ we have that

$$\sup\{|f_Y(X) - f_Y(Z)|: Z \in \mathcal{U}_X\} = \epsilon \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q, \forall Y \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

By Lemma 1, the supremum in g_Y is always attained in $\text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X) = \mathcal{U}_X$. Thus, by Lemma 2 we obtain that

$$g_Y(X) = \sup_{Z \in \text{clconv}(\mathcal{U}_X)} f_Y(-Z) = f_Y(-X) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q, \forall X \in L^p.$$

In this case, the penalty term becomes

$$\alpha_{g_Y}(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{I}_{\{F_{\mathbb{Q}}=F_Y\}}(\mathbb{Q}) - \epsilon \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q.$$

Thus, in view of Theorem 1, and recalling that α_ρ is law invariant, the penalty term for ρ^{WC} becomes

$$\alpha_{\rho^{WC}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \min_{Y \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ \alpha_\rho(Y) + \mathbb{I}_{\{F_{\mathbb{Q}}=F_Y\}}(\mathbb{Q}) - \epsilon \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q \right\} = \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) - \epsilon \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q, \forall \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}.$$

Regarding (ii), from the penalty term obtained in (i), we have that ρ^{WC} is given as the sup-convolution. See Ekeland and Temam (1999) or Zalinescu (2002) for details, between ρ and the concave function defined as

$$X \mapsto - \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in L^q} \{E[X\mathbb{Q}] - \epsilon \|\mathbb{Q}\|_p\} = -\mathbb{I}_{\|X\|_p \leq \epsilon}.$$

We then have for any $X \in L^p$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{WC}(X) &= \sup_{Z \in L^p} \{\rho(X - Z) - \mathbb{I}_{\|Z\|_p \leq \epsilon}\} \\ &= \sup_{\|Z\|_p \leq \epsilon} \rho(X - Z) \\ &= \sup\{\rho(Z): \|X - Z\|_p \leq \epsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\mathbb{Q} \in \partial\rho^{WC}(X)$, we have that

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q \leq \rho(X) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q.$$

By taking the infimum over $\mathbb{Q} \in \partial\rho^{WC}(X)$ we have that $\rho^{WC}(X) \leq \rho(X) + \epsilon K$. Notice that the infimum is attained since the q-norm is weakly lower semicontinuous, and the sub-differential

is a weakly compact set. For the converse relation, take

$$\mathbb{Q}^* = \arg \min \left\{ \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q : \mathbb{Q} \in \partial \rho^{WC}(X) \right\}.$$

Of course, $\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q = K$. We have for any $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}$ that

$$\rho^{WC}(X) \geq E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q \geq E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}) + \epsilon K.$$

By taking the maximum over \mathcal{Q} we have that $\rho^{WC}(X) \geq \rho(X) + \epsilon K$. For the last equality in the claim, take $\mathbb{Q} \in \partial \rho(X)$. We then have that

$$\rho^{WC}(X) \geq E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q = \rho(X) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q.$$

By taking the supremum over $\partial \rho(X)$, we have that $\rho^{WC}(X) \geq \rho(X) + \epsilon M$. For the converse inequality, since $\mathbb{Q}^* \in \partial \rho^{WC}(X)$ we have that

$$\rho(X) + \epsilon K = \rho^{WC}(X) = E_{\mathbb{Q}^*}[-X] - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}^*) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q = E_{\mathbb{Q}^*}[-X] - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}^*) + \epsilon K.$$

Thus, $\mathbb{Q}^* \in \partial \rho(X)$. In this case, $K \leq \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \partial \rho(X)} \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q = M$. Hence, $\rho^{WC}(X) = \rho(X) + \epsilon K \leq \rho(X) + \epsilon M$. The fact that the supremum in the definition of M is attained is a direct application of the James Theorem since $\partial \rho(X)$ is weakly compact and the q -norm is the supremum of a linear map, $X \mapsto E_{\mathbb{Q}}[X]$, over the unit ball in L^p .

For (iii), regarding the argmax, for $p = 1$, let X^* be such that $\mathbb{P}(X^* = X - \epsilon K) = \frac{1}{K} = 1 - \mathbb{P}(X^* = X)$. For $p \in (1, \infty)$, let $X^* = X - k \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}}^{\frac{q}{p}}$. Notice that $X^* \in L^p$. We can take k such that $d_{W_p}(X^*, X) = \epsilon$. Then, we have that $X^* \in \mathcal{U}_X$. We also have that $|X - X^*|^p = k^p \frac{d\mathbb{Q}^*}{d\mathbb{P}}^q$. For $p = \infty$, let $X^* = X - \epsilon$. Recall that $d_{W_p}(X, X^*) \leq \|X - X^*\|_p$. Thus, for any $p \geq 1$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(X^*) - \rho^{WC}(X) &\geq E_{\mathbb{Q}^*}[-X^*] - \alpha_{\rho}(\mathbb{Q}^*) - E_{\mathbb{Q}^*}[-X] + \alpha_{\rho^{WC}}(\mathbb{Q}^*) \\ &= E_{\mathbb{Q}^*}[X - X^*] - \epsilon K \\ &= \|X - X^*\|_p K - \epsilon K \\ &\geq \epsilon K - \epsilon K = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We then have that $\rho^{WC}(X) = \rho(X^*)$. Hence, X^* is the argmax.

Concerning (iv), the claim follows since, for any $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$,

$$\partial g_Y(X) = \partial \left(f_Y(-X) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q \right) = \left\{ \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q} : F_{\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}} = F_{\frac{dY}{d\mathbb{P}}} \right\}.$$

This concludes the proof. □

From Theorem 4, the role of sub-differentials in determining features for the worst-case risk measure is clear. We now expose a Corollary that collects facts regarding sub-differentials of ρ^{WC} specific for the setup in this section.

Corollary 3. *In the conditions and notations of Theorem 4, we have the following for any $X \in L^p$:*

- (i) $\mathbb{Q}^* \in \partial\rho(X^*)$.
- (ii) ρ and ρ^{WC} are Gâteaux differentiable at X if and only if the derivative coincides.
- (iii) if $p = 1$, $\partial\rho(X^*) \subseteq \partial\rho(X)$.
- (iv) if $p \in (1, \infty)$, then for any $\mathbb{Q} \in \partial\rho(X^*)$, $\mathbb{Q} \in \partial\rho(X)$ if and only if $\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q = M$.
- (v) if $p = \infty$, then $\partial\rho^{WC}(X) = \partial\rho(X^*) = \partial\rho(X)$.

Proof. For (i), since $\mathbb{Q}^* \in \partial\rho(X)$, by Theorem 4 we have that

$$E_{\mathbb{Q}^*}[-X^*] - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}^*) = E_{\mathbb{Q}^*}[-X] + E_{\mathbb{Q}^*}[X - X^*] - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}^*) \geq \rho(X) + \epsilon M = \rho(X^*).$$

Thus, $\mathbb{Q}^* \in \partial\rho(X^*)$.

Concerning (ii), the if part is trivial. For the only if, by Theorem 4 we have that $\mathbb{Q}^* \in \partial\rho(X) \cap \partial\rho^{WC}(X)$. If both ρ and ρ^{WC} are Gâteaux differentiable at X , then both sub-differential sets are singletons. Thus, the derivative of ρ and ρ^{WC} is \mathbb{Q}^* .

For (iii), let $p = 1$ and $\mathbb{Q} \in \partial\rho(X^*)$. We then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(X) + \epsilon M &= E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X^*] - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) \\ &= E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) + \epsilon M \mathbb{Q}(X^* = X - \epsilon M) \\ &\leq E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) + \epsilon M. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\rho(X) \leq E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q})$. Hence, $\mathbb{Q} \in \partial\rho(X)$.

For (iv), let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $\mathbb{Q} \in \partial\rho(X^*)$. Since $\rho(X^*) = \rho^{WC}(X)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(X) + \epsilon M = R(X) &\geq E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q \\ &= \rho(X^*) + E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-(X - X^*)] + \epsilon \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q \\ &\geq \rho(X^*) = \rho(X) + \epsilon M. \end{aligned}$$

We then get that

$$\rho(X) + \left(M - \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q \right) = E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - \alpha_\rho(\mathbb{Q}).$$

Thus, $\mathbb{Q} \in \partial\rho(X) \iff M \leq \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q$. Hence, by the definition of M we must to have

$$M = \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q.$$

The claim for (v) is trivial since, in this case, $\rho^{WC}(X) = \rho(X^*) = \rho(X) + \epsilon$. \square

We now expose some concrete examples for closed-form expressions under Theorem 4. As in the last section, we consider both risk measures that already appear in the literature of worst-case under uncertainty over closed balls of the Wasserstein metric and risk measures for which closed-form solutions are a novelty.

Example 2. (i) For spectral risk measures, given in terms of the spectral map $\phi: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $\rho_\phi(X) = \int_0^1 VaR^u(X)\phi(u)du$, Liu et al. (2022) obtains the following formulation

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = \rho(X) + \epsilon\|\phi\|_q.$$

We recover such results in our approach as follows. Fix $X \in L^p$. We have that

$$\rho_\phi(X) = - \int_0^1 F_X^{-1}(u) F_{\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_X}{d\mathbb{P}}}^{-1}(u) du,$$

for any $\mathbb{Q}_X \in \partial\rho_\phi(X)$. Thus, as in the proof of Theorem 3, we have that $\|\phi\|_q = \left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}_X}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_q$ for any $\mathbb{Q}_X \in \partial\rho_\phi(X)$. Hence, we obtain the closed form as

$$\rho^{WC}(X) = \rho(X) + \epsilon\|\phi\|_q.$$

For the particular case of ES, we then obtain that

$$(ES^\alpha)^{WC}(X) = \begin{cases} ES^\alpha(X) + \frac{1}{\alpha}\epsilon, & p = 1 \\ ES^\alpha(X) + \left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}\epsilon, & p \in (1, \infty) \\ ES^\alpha(X) + \epsilon, & p = \infty. \end{cases}$$

(ii) A special case of the literature is studied in Bartl et al. (2020), where it is investigated the worst-case of optimized certainty equivalents (OCE) and shortfall risks (SR). SR was exposed in Example 1 and the OCE is a map $OCE_l: L^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$OCE_l(X) = \inf_{m \in \mathbb{R}} \{E[l(X - m)] + m\},$$

where l is the loss function as for the SR. See Ben-Tal and Teboulle (2007) for details on such maps. These authors obtain a robust formulation as

$$(OCE_l)^{WC}(X) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \{OCE_{l_\lambda}(X) + \lambda\epsilon\} \text{ and } (SR_l)^{WC}(X) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} SR_{l_\lambda}(X + \lambda\epsilon),$$

where l_λ is a transform defined as

$$l_\lambda(x) = \sup_{l(y) < \infty} \{l(y) - \lambda|x - y|^p\}.$$

This is in consonance with our approach since, in our case, the infimum is taken over q -norms of elements in the sub-differential of $(OCE_l)^{WC}$ and $(SR_l)^{WC}$. We now show that this coincides with our result. We show for OCE over L^1 . The claims for SR or

$p > 1$ follow similarly. By Theorem 4.122 of [Follmer and Schied \(2016\)](#) or Theorem 4.2 in [Ben-Tal and Teboulle \(2007\)](#), we have that OCE^l is represented over $\alpha(\mathbb{Q}) = E \left[l^* \left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right) \right]$, where l^* is the convex conjugate of l . This penalty term based on conjugate l^* is sometimes called divergence between \mathbb{Q} and \mathbb{P} . Further, for each $\lambda \geq 0$, we have by calculation that $(l^\lambda)^*(y) = l^*(y) - \mathbb{I}_{|y| \leq \lambda}$. We then obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \{OCE_{l^\lambda}(X) + \lambda\epsilon\} &= \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - E \left[l' \left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right) \right] + \mathbb{I}_{\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \leq \lambda} + \epsilon\lambda \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{\{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}: \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \leq M\}} \left\{ E_{\mathbb{Q}}[-X] - E \left[l' \left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right) \right] + \mathbb{I}_{\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \leq \lambda} + \epsilon\lambda \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\lambda \geq M} \left\{ OCE^l(X) + \epsilon\lambda \right\} = OCE^l(X) + \epsilon M. \end{aligned}$$

The second to last equation holds since for any $\lambda \in (0, M)$, there is $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \leq M$ but $\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} > \lambda \right) > 0$, which implies $\mathbb{I}_{\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \leq \lambda} = \infty$.

- (iii) For this example, we study again the risk measure induced by expectiles (Exp). It is Gâteaux differentiable at any $X \in L^1$ with derivative \mathbb{Q}_X defined as

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_X}{d\mathbb{P}} = \frac{\alpha 1_{X < e^\alpha(X)} + (1 - \alpha) 1_{X \geq e^\alpha(X)}}{E[\alpha 1_{X < e^\alpha(X)} + (1 - \alpha) 1_{X \geq e^\alpha(X)}]}.$$

Thus, under Theorem 3, we have that

$$(Exp^\alpha)^{WC}(X) = Exp^\alpha(X) + \epsilon \frac{1 - \alpha}{E[P(X, \alpha)]},$$

where $P: L^1 \times (0, 1) \rightarrow L^1$ is defined as $P(X, \alpha) = \alpha 1_{X < e^\alpha(X)} + (1 - \alpha) 1_{X \geq e^\alpha(X)}$. Direct calculation shows that this value is equals to $Exp^\alpha(X) + \epsilon \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha}$ if and only if $\alpha = 1/2$. In which case we obtain that $Exp^\alpha(X) = -E[X]$ and

$$(Exp^\alpha)^{WC}(X) = -E[X] + \epsilon \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha}.$$

This closed form aligns with Theorem 2 in [Hu et al. \(2024\)](#). [Bellini and Di Bernardino \(2017\)](#) points out that under some conditions on the map $\alpha \mapsto F_X^{-1}(\alpha)$, we have that $e^\alpha = F_X^{-1}(\alpha)$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Under this circumstances, we have that

$$(Exp^\alpha)^{WC}(X) = Exp^\alpha(X) + \epsilon \frac{1 - \alpha}{2\alpha(1 - \alpha)}.$$

This can also be interpreted as a worst-case formula for VaR.

- (iv) Consider the MSD again. For any $X \in L^2$, we have the derivative defined as

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_X}{d\mathbb{P}} = 1 + \beta \left(\frac{(X - E[X])^-}{\|(X - E[X])^-\|_2} - E \left[\frac{(X - E[X])^-}{\|(X - E[X])^-\|_2} \right] \right).$$

We then have that $\left\| \frac{d\mathbb{Q}_X}{d\mathbb{P}} \right\|_2 = \sqrt{1 + \beta^2}$ for any $X \in L^2$. Hence, in light of Theorem 4, we

get that

$$(MSD^\beta)^{WC}(X) = MSD^\beta(X) + \epsilon\sqrt{1 + \beta^2}.$$

- (v) The Entropic risk measure (ENT) is a map that depends on the user's risk aversion through the exponential utility function. It is the prime example of a law invariant convex risk measure that is not coherent. Formally, it is the map $ENT^\gamma: L^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$ENT^\gamma(X) = \frac{1}{\gamma} \log E[e^{-\gamma X}], \quad \gamma > 0$$

Its penalty is the relative entropy as

$$\alpha_{ENT^\gamma}(\mathbb{Q}) = \frac{1}{\gamma} E \left[\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \log \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \right].$$

This risk measure is Gâteaux differentiable for any $X \in L^1$ with $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_X}{d\mathbb{P}} = \frac{e^{-\lambda X}}{E[e^{-\lambda X}]}$. Thus, by Theorem 4 we have for any $X \in L^p$ that

$$(Ent^\gamma)^{WC}(X) = Ent^\gamma(X) + \epsilon \left\| \frac{e^{-\lambda X}}{E[e^{-\lambda X}]} \right\|_q.$$

For a particular case when $X \in L^2$ such that X follows a Normal distribution, i.e. $X \sim N(\mu, \sigma) = N(E[X], \sigma(X))$, we have that $e^{-\lambda X}$ is log-normally distributed. By recalling that $E[e^X] = e^{\mu + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}$, we have by direct calculation that

$$\left\| \frac{e^{-\lambda X}}{E[e^{-\lambda X}]} \right\|_2 = e^{\frac{\gamma^2 \sigma(X)^2}{2}}.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$(Ent^\gamma)^{WC}(X) = Ent^\gamma(X) + \epsilon e^{\frac{\gamma^2 \sigma(X)^2}{2}}.$$

References

- Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J.-M., and Heath, D. (1999). Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance*, 9(3):203–228.
- Aubin, J.-P. and Frankowska, H. (2009). *Set-valued analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bartl, D., Drapeau, S., and Tangpi, L. (2020). Computational aspects of robust optimized certainty equivalents and option pricing. *Mathematical Finance*, 30(1):287–309.
- Bellini, F. and Di Bernardino, E. (2017). Risk management with expectiles. *The European Journal of Finance*, 23(6):487–506.
- Bellini, F., Klar, B., Müller, A., and Gianin, E. R. (2014). Generalized quantiles as risk measures. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 54:41 – 48.

- Bellini, F., Laeven, R. J. A., and Rosazza Gianin, E. (2018). Robust return risk measures. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 12(1):5–32.
- Ben-Tal, A. and Teboulle, M. (2007). An old-new concept of convex risk measures: The optimized certainty equivalent. *Mathematical Finance*, 17(3):449–476.
- Bernard, C., Pesenti, S. M., and Vanduffel, S. (2023). Robust distortion risk measures. *Mathematical Finance*.
- Blanchet, J., Chen, L., and Zhou, X. Y. (2022). Distributionally robust mean-variance portfolio selection with wasserstein distances. *Management Science*, 68(9):6382–6410.
- Cai, J., Li, J. Y.-M., and Mao, T. (2023). Distributionally robust optimization under distorted expectations. *Operations Research*.
- Chen, Z. and Xie, W. (2021). Sharing the value-at-risk under distributional ambiguity. *Mathematical Finance*, 31(1):531–559.
- Cornilly, D., Rüschendorf, L., and Vanduffel, S. (2018). Upper bounds for strictly concave distortion risk measures on moment spaces. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 82:141–151.
- Cornilly, D. and Vanduffel, S. (2019). Equivalent distortion risk measures on moment spaces. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 146:187–192.
- Delbaen, F. (2012). *Monetary utility functions*. Osaka University Press.
- Ekeland, I. and Temam, R. (1999). *Convex analysis and variational problems*. SIAM.
- Esfahani, P. and Kuhn, D. (2018). Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the wasserstein metric: performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming*, 171(1-2):115–166.
- Fadina, T., Liu, Y., and Wang, R. (2024). A framework for measures of risk under uncertainty. *Finance and Stochastics*, 28:363–390.
- Filipović, D. and Svindland, G. (2012). The canonical model space for law-invariant convex risk measures is Π . *Mathematical Finance*, 22(3):585–589.
- Fischer, T. (2003). Risk capital allocation by coherent risk measures based on one-sided moments. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 32(1):135–146.
- Föllmer, H. and Schied, A. (2016). *Stochastic finance: an introduction in discrete time*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH.
- Gao, N. and Xanthos, F. (2024). A note on continuity and consistency of measures of risk and variability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09766*.
- Hu, Y., Chen, Y., and Mao, T. (2024). An extreme worst-case risk measure by expectile. *Advances in Applied Probability*, pages 1–20.

- Kaina, M. and Rüschendorf, L. (2009). On convex risk measures on lp-spaces. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 69(3):475–495.
- Li, J. Y.-M. (2018). Closed-form solutions for worst-case law invariant risk measures with application to robust portfolio optimization. *Operations Research*, 66(6):1533–1541.
- Li, W. and Tian, D. (2023). Robust optimized certainty equivalents and quantiles for loss positions with distribution uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04396*.
- Liu, F., Mao, T., Wang, R., and Wei, L. (2022). Inf-convolution, optimal allocations, and model uncertainty for tail risk measures. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(3):2494–2519.
- Moresco, M., Mailhot, M., and Pesenti, S. (2023). Uncertainty propagation and dynamic robust risk measures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12856*.
- Pesenti, S., Wang, Q., and Wang, R. (2022). Optimizing distortion riskmetrics with distributional uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.04889*.
- Pesenti, S. M. and Jaimungal, S. (2023). Portfolio optimization within a wasserstein ball. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 14(4):1175–1214.
- Pflug, G. C., Pichler, A., and Wozabal, D. (2012). The 1/N investment strategy is optimal under high model ambiguity. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 36(2):410 – 417.
- Righi, M., Horta, E., and Moresco, M. (2024). Set risk measures. *Working Paper*.
- Righi, M. B. (2019). A composition between risk and deviation measures. *Annals of Operations Research*, 282(1):299–313.
- Righi, M. B. (2023). A theory for combinations of risk measures. *Journal of Risk*, 25:1–35.
- Ruszczynski, A. and Shapiro, A. (2006). Optimization of risk measures. *Probabilistic and randomized methods for design under uncertainty*, pages 119–157.
- Shao, H. and Zhang, Z. G. (2023a). Distortion risk measure under parametric ambiguity. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 311(3):1159–1172.
- Shao, H. and Zhang, Z. G. (2023b). Extreme-case distortion risk measures: A unification and generalization of closed-form solutions. *Mathematics of Operations Research*.
- Sion, M. (1958). On general minimax theorems. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 8(1):171–176.
- Villani, C. (2021). *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58. American Mathematical Soc.
- Wang, R. and Ziegel, J. F. (2021). Scenario-based risk evaluation. *Finance and stochastics*, 25(4):725–756.
- Wang, W. and Xu, H. (2023). Preference robust distortion risk measure and its application. *Mathematical Finance*, 33(2):389–434.

- Wozabal, D. (2014). Robustifying convex risk measures for linear portfolios: A nonparametric approach. *Operations Research*, 62(6):1302–1315.
- Zalinescu, C. (2002). *Convex analysis in general vector spaces*. World scientific.
- Zhao, M., Balakrishnan, N., and Yin, C. (2024). Extremal cases of distortion risk measures with partial information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13637*.
- Ziegel, J. F. (2016). Coherence and elicibility. *Mathematical Finance*, 26(4):901–918.
- Zuo, B. and Yin, C. (2024). Worst-cases of distortion riskmetrics and weighted entropy with partial information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19075*.