

GENERALIZING SUPER/SUB MOT USING WEAK L^1 TRANSPORT

ERHAN BAYRAKTAR AND DOMINYKAS NORGILAS

ABSTRACT. In this article we revisit the weak optimal transport (WOT) problem, introduced by Gozlan, Roberto, Samson and Tetali [20]. We work on the real line, with barycentric cost functions, and as our first result give the following characterization of the set of optimal couplings for two probability measures μ and ν : every optimizer couples the left tails of μ and ν using a submartingale, the right tails using a supermartingale, while the central region is coupled using a martingale.

We then consider a constrained optimal transport problem, where admissible transport plans are only those that are optimal for the WOT problem with L^1 costs. The constrained problem generalizes the (sub/super-) martingale optimal transport problems, studied by Beiglöck and Juillet [13], and Nutz and Stebegg [28] among others.

Finally we introduce a generalized *shadow measure* and establish its connection to the WOT. This extends and generalizes the results obtained in (sub/super-) martingale settings.

1. INTRODUCTION

For two probability measures on Polish spaces \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} , denoted by $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$, and a cost function $c : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the *weak* optimal transport (WOT) problem is to

$$(1.1) \quad \text{minimize } \Pi(\mu, \nu) \ni \pi \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{X}} c(x, \pi_x) \mu(dx),$$

where $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ is the set of probability measures on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ with first and second marginals μ and ν , respectively, and, for each $\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$, $(\pi_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ is the μ -a.s. unique family of probability measures such that $\pi(dx, dy) = \mu(dx) \pi_x(dy)$.

This type of transportation cost first appeared in the works of Marton [27, 26] and Talagrand [32, 33], where the authors studied the concentration of measure phenomenon via transport-entropy inequalities. The rather recent works of Gozlan et al. [20, 19] (see also Aliberti et al. [2]), on the other hand, provide a first systematic study of this problem, including general definitions and Kantorovich-type duality results. [20] stimulated several research groups to further study (1.1) in various contexts (see, for example, [1, 17, 18, 30, 29]). Together with duality, essentially all the fundamental theoretical results of the classic optimal transport (existence of optimizers, cyclical monotonicity, stability) were extended to the weak setting,

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

E-mail addresses: erhan@umich.edu, dnorgil@ncsu.edu.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60G42; Secondary: 49N05.

Key words and phrases. Optimal transport, barycentric costs, stochastic order, martingales.

E. Bayraktar is partially supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-2106556 and by the Susan M. Smith chair.

see [5, 4, 8, 18]. Consult also [7] for a list of applications and connections of weak optimal transport to other fields (including Schrödinger problem, Brenier-Strassen theorem, optimal mechanism design, linear transfers and semimartingale transport).

1.1. Our contribution. In this paper we investigate (1.1) on the real line (so that $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$, and $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$), and with *barycentric* costs. In particular, for a convex $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the goal is to

$$(1.2) \quad \text{minimize } \pi \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} h \left(x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x(dy) \right) \mu(dx) \quad \text{over } \Pi(\mu, \nu).$$

This case (in one and higher dimensions) has received particular attention, see [1, 5, 17, 18, 19, 20, 30, 29, 3, 6].

Section 3: WOT with L^1 costs. We first study (1.2) with $h(\cdot) = |\cdot|$. In this case we show that $\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ is an optimizer for (1.2) *if and only if* it has a rather simple structure (see Theorem 3.1): there exists $x^- \leq x^+$ (which are explicitly given in terms of the so-called potential functions of the underlying measures (see Definition 3.6)) such that

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{\pi}_x &\geq x \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}(\pi_x) \subseteq (-\infty, x^-], & \text{for all } x \leq x^-, \\ \bar{\pi}_x &= x \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}(\pi_x) \subseteq [x^-, x^+], & \text{for all } x^- < x < x^+, \\ \bar{\pi}_x &\leq x \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}(\pi_x) \subseteq [x^+, \infty), & \text{for all } x^+ \leq x, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\eta}$ and $\text{supp}(\eta)$ denote the mean and the support of a measure η . (1.3) essentially means that π is optimal if and only if it couples the left (resp. right) tails of μ and ν using a submartingale (resp. supermartingale), while the restrictions of both measures to the central region (x^-, x^+) are coupled via martingale.

We next investigate the implications of the decomposition (1.3) (obtained for the absolute value cost function) to the more general problem (1.2) when h is an arbitrary convex function. In particular, we show that even in this case any optimizer of (1.2) admits decomposition (1.3); see Corollary 3.2. From this we conclude that the only interesting cases of the problem (1.3) essentially are those with marginals that are either in convex increasing or convex decreasing order (i.e., either $\mu \leq_{ci} \nu$ or $\mu \leq_{cd} \nu$, so that the marginals can be coupled using submartingale or supermartingale, respectively).

The proof of the above result (i.e., that the decomposition (1.3) is still valid for the optimizers of (1.2) with general h) relies on the following equivalence obtained in [20]:

$$(1.4) \quad \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} h \left(x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x(dy) \right) \mu(dx) = \inf_{\mu^* \leq_c \nu} \inf_{\pi^* \in \Pi(\mu, \mu^*)} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} h(x - y) \pi^*(dx, dy).$$

(Here \leq_c denotes the convex order, i.e., if $\eta \leq_c \chi$, then there exists a martingale coupling of η and χ and vice versa; see section 2 for precise definitions.) While there are many optimal couplings for (1.2), there is only one μ^* that minimizes the right hand side of (1.4). In particular, there exists a μ -a.s. unique map $T^* : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that the push-forward measure $\mu^* = T^*(\mu)$ is optimal; see [19, 1, 29, 6]. An important feature of μ^* (or, equivalently, of T^*) is that it does not depend on the cost function h (we note that this feature fails in higher

dimensions, see [1, Example 2.4]). Using this, together with the fact that (1.3) is valid when $h(\cdot) = |\cdot|$, we obtain that (see Proposition 3.1)

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} x \mapsto (T^*(x) - x) & \quad \text{is positive and decreasing on } (-\infty, x^-), \\ T^*(x) & = x \quad \text{for all } x \in [x^-, x^+], \\ x \mapsto (T^*(x) - x) & \quad \text{is negative and decreasing on } (x^+, \infty). \end{aligned}$$

With (1.5) (and also the equality (1.4)) at hand, we then come back to the general problem (1.2) and (by borrowing some results from [18]) deduce the decomposition (1.3).

Section 4: Constrained Optimal Transport. For a given cost function $c : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and a pair of marginals (μ, ν) , the main goal of the classical optimal transport theory is to minimize $\pi \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} cd\pi$ over the set of couplings $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$. In this section the goal is similar: we aim to

$$(1.6) \quad \text{minimize } \pi \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} c(x, y)\pi(dx, dy) \quad \text{over } \Pi^*(\mu, \nu),$$

where $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu) \subseteq \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ is the set of couplings that satisfy (1.3). In other words, leveraging the results of section 3, we have that the only admissible couplings (for (1.6)) are those that solve (1.2) with $h(\cdot) = |\cdot|$.

The problem (1.6) generalizes the martingale and supermartingale optimal transport problems that were explicitly studied for various specific cost functions; see, for example, [13, 28, 22, 24, 14, 10]. In particular, if $\mu \leq_c \nu$, then $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$ reduces to the set of martingale couplings, while if $\mu \leq_{cd} \nu$ (resp. $\mu \leq_{ci} \nu$), then $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$ corresponds to the set of supermartingale (resp. submartingale) couplings of μ and ν .

The set $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$ is convex and compact (see Lemma 4.1) and, in particular, the problem (1.6) admits an optimizer (see Corollary 4.1). While the structure of the optimizers, in general, depends on the cost function, (by considering the quadratic cost) we are able to identify (among all elements of $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$) two canonical couplings, in the sense that they produce the smallest and largest correlation, respectively, of random variables $X \sim \mu$ and $Y \sim \nu$ (see Proposition 4.1).

Section 5: Generalized shadow measure. As our last contribution we provide a systematic way to build elements of $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$, i.e., couplings of (μ, ν) that optimizes (1.2) with $h(\cdot) = |\cdot|$. Our method relies on the notion of the *generalized shadow measure of μ in ν* , denoted by $S^\nu(\mu)$, which was introduced in the martingale and supermartingale settings in [13] and [28], respectively, and further studied in [12, 14, 9, 10, 25].

Consider two measures on the real line, μ and ν , such that $\mu(\mathbb{R}) \leq \nu(\mathbb{R})$. Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu} = \{\theta : \theta(\mathbb{R}) = \mu(\mathbb{R}), \theta \leq \nu\}$ be the possible target laws of μ in ν . In the case we can embed μ in ν using a martingale (resp. supermartingale), [13] (resp. [28]) showed that there exists a canonical choice for the target law in $\mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}$: the shadow measure $S^\nu(\mu)$ is the smallest element of $\mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}$ with respect to convex order \leq_c (resp, convex decreasing order \leq_{cd}). In both cases, $S^\mu(\nu)$ can be uniquely identified as a second (distributional) derivative of a certain convex function. In particular, there exists $s_{\mu, \nu} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (that depends on μ and ν through the potential functions of these measures) that is convex, and $s''_{\mu, \nu}(dx) = S^\nu(\mu)(dx)$.

From the results of [12] and [9] we then have an important observation: the same convex $s_{\mu,\nu}$ works (i.e., it identifies the shadow measure) in the martingale and supermartingale settings. In this paper we show that, in fact, the convexity of $s_{\mu,\nu}$ prevails for arbitrary (μ, ν) (and not only for those measures that can be joined via martingale or supermartingale), and thus the second derivative of $s_{\mu,\nu}$ still corresponds to a measure - this is precisely our generalized shadow measure $S^\nu(\mu)$ (see Lemma 5.2).

While Lemma 5.2 identifies $s''_{\mu,\nu} = S^\nu(\mu)$ as an element of $\mathcal{T}_{\mu,\nu}$, in Theorem 5.1 we show that $S^\nu(\mu)$ is a canonical element with respect to WOT and convex order. In particular,

$$(1.7) \quad S^\nu(\mu) \text{ minimizes } \theta \mapsto \inf_{\Pi(\mu,\theta)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx) \text{ over } \mathcal{T}_{\mu,\nu}.$$

However, there could be many minimizers θ^* of (1.7). Nevertheless, they all have the same mean, while the shadow measure has the smallest variance. In other words, $S^\nu(\mu) \leq_c \theta^*$ for any other minimizer θ^* .

Finally, we follow the approaches of [14] and [10], and, using the shadow measure, construct a large family of couplings within $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$, the so-called *shadow couplings*. In particular, let $\hat{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}([0, 1] \times \mathbb{R})$ be an element of $\Pi(\text{Leb}_{[0,1]}, \mu)$, i.e., some coupling of the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$ and μ (in the language of [14], $\hat{\mu}$ is a *lift* of μ). Then each $\hat{\mu}$ induces a parametrization $(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]})_{0 \leq u \leq 1}$ of μ , where $\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}(dx) := \int_0^u \hat{\mu}(dv, dx)$: we have that $\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}(A) \leq \hat{\mu}_{[0,v]}(A) \leq \hat{\mu}_{[0,1]}(A) = \mu(A)$ for all Borel $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \leq u \leq v \leq 1$. We then show that (see Theorem 5.2), for each lift $\hat{\mu}$,

*there exists the unique measure $\hat{\pi}$ on $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ that couples $\hat{\mu}$ and ν ,
and sends each $\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}$ to the shadow measure $S^\nu(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]})$.*

By integrating out the Lebesgue measure we then have that $\int_0^1 d\hat{\pi}$ corresponds to a coupling of μ and ν , and which, in particular, belongs to $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$. At least in the martingale setting, [14] showed that this type of couplings appear as optimizers to a certain weak optimal transport problems.

2. MEASURES AND CONVEX ORDER

For $k \geq 1$, let \mathcal{M}^k (respectively \mathcal{P}^k) be the set of (Borel) measures (respectively probability measures) on \mathbb{R}^k with finite total mass and finite first moment. When $k = 1$, we will use the notation $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}^1$ (resp. $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^1$), so that if $\eta \in \mathcal{M}$ (resp. $\eta \in \mathcal{P}$), then $\eta(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$ (resp. $\eta(\mathbb{R}) = 1$) and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x| \eta(dx) < \infty$. Given a measure $\eta \in \mathcal{M}$ (not necessarily a probability measure), define $\bar{\eta} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x \eta(dx)$ to be the first moment (or mean) of η (and then $\bar{\eta}/\eta(\mathbb{R})$ is the barycentre of η). Let \mathcal{I}_η be the smallest interval containing the support of η , and let $\{\ell_\eta, r_\eta\}$ be the endpoints of \mathcal{I}_η (the support itself is the smallest closed set of full mass). If η has an atom at ℓ_η then ℓ_η is included in \mathcal{I}_η , and otherwise it is excluded, and similarly for r_η . For any Borel $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{M}^k$, we write $\eta|_B$ for the restriction of η to B .

For $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ let $\mathcal{D}(\alpha, \beta)$ denote the set of non-decreasing, convex functions $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\lim_{z \downarrow -\infty} \{f(z)\} = 0, \quad \lim_{z \uparrow \infty} \{f(z) - (\alpha z - \beta)\} = 0.$$

Then, when $\alpha = 0$, $\mathcal{D}(0, \beta)$ is empty unless $\beta = 0$ and then $\mathcal{D}(0, 0)$ contains one element, the zero function.

For $\eta \in \mathcal{M}$, define the functions $P_\eta, C_\eta : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ by

$$P_\eta(k) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (k - x)^+ \eta(dx), \quad k \in \mathbb{R},$$

and

$$C_\eta(k) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} (x - k)^+ \eta(dx), \quad k \in \mathbb{R},$$

respectively. Then $P_\eta(k) \geq 0 \vee (\eta(\mathbb{R})k - \bar{\eta})$ and $C_\eta(k) \geq 0 \vee (\bar{\eta} - \eta(\mathbb{R})k)$. Also, the Put-Call parity holds: $C_\eta(k) - P_\eta(k) = (\bar{\eta} - \eta(\mathbb{R})k)$.

The following properties of P_η can be found in Chacon [15], and Chacon and Walsh [16]: $P_\eta \in \mathcal{D}(\eta(\mathbb{R}), \bar{\eta})$ and $\{k : P_\eta(k) > (\eta(\mathbb{R})k - \bar{\eta})^+\} = \{k : C_\eta(k) > (\bar{\eta} - \eta(\mathbb{R})k)^+\} = (\ell_\eta, r_\eta)$. Conversely (see, for example, Proposition 2.1 in Hirsch et al. [21]), if h is a non-negative, non-decreasing and convex function with $h \in \mathcal{D}(k_m, k_f)$ for some numbers $k_m \geq 0$ and $k_f \in \mathbb{R}$ (with $k_f = 0$ if $k_m = 0$), then there exists the unique measure $\eta \in \mathcal{M}$, with total mass $\eta(\mathbb{R}) = k_m$ and first moment $\bar{\eta} = k_f$, such that $h = P_\eta$. In particular, η is uniquely identified by the second derivative of h in the sense of distributions. Furthermore, P_η and C_η are related to the potential U_η , defined by

$$U_\eta(k) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} |k - x| \eta(dx), \quad k \in \mathbb{R},$$

by $U_\eta = C_\eta + P_\eta$. We will call P_η (and C_η) a modified potential. Finally note that all three second derivatives C_η'', P_η'' and $U_\eta''/2$ identify the same underlying measure η .

For $\eta, \chi \in \mathcal{M}$, let

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{P}(\eta, \chi) := \{\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{D}(\eta(\mathbb{R}), m) \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{R} : P_\chi - \tilde{P} \text{ is convex}\}.$$

For $\eta, \chi \in \mathcal{M}$, we write $\eta \leq \chi$ if $\eta(A) \leq \chi(A)$ for all Borel measurable subsets A of \mathbb{R} , or equivalently if

$$\int f d\eta \leq \int f d\chi, \quad \text{for all non-negative } f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Since η and χ can be identified as second derivatives of P_χ and P_η respectively, we have $\eta \leq \chi$ if and only if $P_\chi - P_\eta$ is convex, i.e., P_η has a smaller curvature than P_χ . Note that there is one-to-one correspondence between measures $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\theta(\mathbb{R}) = \eta(\mathbb{R})$ and $\theta \leq \chi$, and functions $\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\eta, \chi)$.

We further introduce some relevant stochastic orders. For $\eta, \chi \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\eta(\mathbb{R}) \leq \chi(\mathbb{R})$, we write $\eta \leq_c \chi, \eta \leq_{cd} \chi, \eta \leq_{ci} \chi, \eta \leq_{pc} \chi, \eta \leq_{pcd} \chi, \eta \leq_{pci} \chi$ if $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\eta \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\chi$ for all $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that are convex, convex and non-increasing, convex and non-decreasing, non-negative and convex, non-negative, convex and non-increasing, and non-negative, convex and non-decreasing, respectively. (Note that if $\eta \leq_c \chi$, or $\eta \leq_{cd} \chi$, or $\eta \leq_{ci} \chi$, then automatically $\eta(\mathbb{R}) = \chi(\mathbb{R})$.) If $\eta(\mathbb{R}) = \chi(\mathbb{R})$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\eta \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} f d\chi$ for all non-decreasing $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then we write $\eta \leq_{sto} \chi$.

For $\eta, \chi \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\eta(\mathbb{R}) = \chi(\mathbb{R})$, we write $\pi \in \Pi(\eta, \chi)$ if $\pi \in \mathcal{M}^2$ and

$$\pi(A \times \mathbb{R}) = \eta(A) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(\mathbb{R} \times A) = \chi(A), \quad \text{for all Borel } A \subseteq \mathbb{R}.$$

Note that the (scaled) product measure $(\eta \otimes \chi)/\eta(\mathbb{R})$ is an element of $\Pi(\eta, \chi)$. We will often represent $\pi \in \Pi(\eta, \chi)$ via disintegration with respect to η : $\pi(dx, dy) = \pi_x(dy)\eta(dx)$, where $(\pi_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}}$ is a (η -a.s. unique) family of probability measures satisfying $\pi_x \in \mathcal{P}$ for η -a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

For $\eta, \chi \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\eta(\mathbb{R}) = \chi(\mathbb{R})$, we write $\pi \in \Pi_M(\eta, \chi)$ if $\pi \in \Pi(\eta, \chi)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} y\pi_x(dy) = x$ for η -a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e., $\Pi_M(\eta, \chi)$ denotes the set of martingale couplings of η and χ . Due to Strassen [31] we have that $\Pi_M(\eta, \chi) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\eta \leq_c \chi$. Similarly, we write $\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi)$ (resp. $\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi)$) if $\pi \in \Pi(\eta, \chi)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} y\pi_x(dy) \leq x$ (resp. $\int_{\mathbb{R}} y\pi_x(dy) \geq x$) for η -a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e., $\Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi)$ (resp. $\Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi)$) denotes the set of supermartingale (resp. submartingale) couplings of η and χ . Then $\Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi) \neq \emptyset$ (resp. $\Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi) \neq \emptyset$) if and only if $\eta \leq_{cd} \chi$ (resp. $\eta \leq_{ci} \chi$).

3. WEAK OPTIMAL TRANSPORT

Fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) = \nu(\mathbb{R})$, and a convex $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with $h(0) = 0$. The goal of the Weak Optimal Transport (WOT) theory is to determine the value

$$(3.1) \quad V_h(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y\pi_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx) = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(x - \bar{\pi}_x) \mu(dx),$$

and the associated optimal couplings.

Remark 3.1. *The assumption that h is non-negative with $h(0) = 0$ is not restrictive. Indeed, if $\tilde{h} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex, then, for any $a \in [\tilde{h}'(0-), \tilde{h}'(0+)]$, $x \mapsto \hat{h}(x) = [\tilde{h}(x) - \tilde{h}(0) - ax]$ is convex, $\hat{h}(0) = 0 \in [\hat{h}'(0-), \hat{h}'(0+)]$, and therefore $\hat{h} \geq 0$ on \mathbb{R} . In particular, $V_{\hat{h}}(\mu, \nu) = V_{\tilde{h}}(\mu, \nu) - \tilde{h}(0) - a(\bar{\mu} - \bar{\nu})$, and both problems share the same optimizers.*

3.1. WOT with L^1 costs. In this section we consider a cost function $k \mapsto h(k) = |k|$, and thus in what follows write $V := V_h$, where V_h is defined in (3.1).

From the previous works we already know that there exists an optimizer $\pi^* \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$, so that

$$(3.2) \quad V(\mu, \nu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y\pi_x^*(dy) \right| \mu(dx),$$

however, it is not unique. Hence, the goal is to compute the value (3.2) and explicitly construct (at least one)

$$\pi^* \in \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y\pi_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx).$$

First, observe that by Jensen's inequality we have that

$$(3.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y\pi_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx) \geq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y\pi_x(dy) \right) \mu(dx) \right| = |\bar{\mu} - \bar{\nu}|, \quad \pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu).$$

The natural question is then, for which $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ does there exist $\pi^* \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y\pi_x^*(dy) \right| \mu(dx) = |\bar{\mu} - \bar{\nu}|.$$

Then any such coupling is automatically optimal for (3.2).

Suppose $\mu \leq_c \nu$. Then $\bar{\mu} = \bar{\nu}$. On the other hand, we also have that $\Pi_M(\mu, \nu) \neq \emptyset$, and thus there exists $\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) = x$ for μ -a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that

$$V(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_M(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx) = 0 = |\bar{\mu} - \bar{\nu}|.$$

As the next lemma shows, we can obtain a similar result in the cases when either $\mu \leq_{cd} \nu$ or $\mu \leq_{ci} \nu$. (Note that if $\mu \leq_c \nu$ then both $\mu \leq_{cd} \nu$ and $\mu \leq_{ci} \nu$.)

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu \leq_{cd} \nu$ (resp. $\mu \leq_{ci} \nu$). Then for any $\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi_{Sup}(\mu, \nu)$ (resp. $\hat{\pi} \in \Pi_{Sub}(\mu, \nu)$) we have that*

$$V(\mu, \nu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx) = |\bar{\mu} - \bar{\nu}| = (\bar{\mu} - \bar{\nu})$$

$$\left(\text{resp. } V(\mu, \nu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \hat{\pi}_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx) = |\bar{\mu} - \bar{\nu}| = (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu}) \right).$$

Proof. We only prove the case $\mu \leq_{cd} \nu$ (the case $\mu \leq_{ci} \nu$ follows by symmetry). If $\mu \leq_{cd} \nu$ then $\bar{\nu} \leq \bar{\mu}$ and $\Pi_{Sup}(\mu, \nu) \neq \emptyset$. Since, for any $\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi_{Sup}(\mu, \nu) \subseteq \Pi(\mu, \nu)$, we have that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \leq x$ for μ -a.e. x , it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \right) \mu(dx) = (\bar{\mu} - \bar{\nu}) = |\bar{\mu} - \bar{\nu}|.$$

This, combined with (3.3), proves the claim. \square

In order to deal with the general case we introduce two constants:

$$(3.4) \quad p_{\mu, \nu} := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \{P_{\mu}(k) - P_{\nu}(k)\} \quad \text{and} \quad c_{\mu, \nu} := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \{C_{\mu}(k) - C_{\nu}(k)\}.$$

Using that $\mu(\mathbb{R}) = \nu(\mathbb{R})$ together with the Put-Call parity we then have that

$$p_{\mu, \nu} = c_{\mu, \nu} + (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu}).$$

Now, note that $p_{\mu, \nu}, c_{\mu, \nu} \in \mathbb{R}_+$. This can be easily seen by observing that $k \mapsto \{P_{\mu}(k) - P_{\nu}(k)\}$ (resp. $k \mapsto \{C_{\mu}(k) - C_{\nu}(k)\}$) is continuous, and converges to 0 (resp. $(\bar{\mu} - \bar{\nu})$) when $k \rightarrow -\infty$ and to $(\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu})$ (resp. 0) when $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Further observe that,

$$p_{\mu, \nu} = \inf \{m \geq 0 : P_{\nu}(k) + m \geq P_{\mu}(k), k \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

$$c_{\mu, \nu} = \inf \{m \geq 0 : C_{\nu}(k) + m \geq C_{\mu}(k), k \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Indeed, if $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (resp. $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$) is another constant such that $P_{\nu}(k) + p \geq P_{\mu}(k)$ (resp. $C_{\nu}(k) + c \geq C_{\mu}(k)$) for all $k \in \mathbb{R}$, then $p \geq P_{\mu}(k) - P_{\nu}(k)$ (resp. $c \geq C_{\mu}(k) - C_{\nu}(k)$) for all $k \in \mathbb{R}$, and thus $p_{\mu, \nu} \leq p$ (resp. $c_{\mu, \nu} \leq c$).

Moreover, if $p_{\mu, \nu} > 0$ (resp. $c_{\mu, \nu} > 0$), then there exists $k_p \in \mathbb{R}$ (resp. $k_c \in \mathbb{R}$) such that $P_{\nu}(k_p) + p_{\mu, \nu} = P_{\mu}(k_p)$ (resp. $C_{\nu}(k_c) + c_{\mu, \nu} = C_{\mu}(k_c)$); see Bayraktar et al. [Lemma B.6 and its proof][9].

On the other hand, if $p_{\mu, \nu} = 0$ (resp. $c_{\mu, \nu} = 0$), then $P_{\nu} \geq P_{\mu}$ (resp. $C_{\nu} \geq C_{\mu}$) on \mathbb{R} , which is equivalent to $\mu \leq_{cd} \nu$ (resp. $\mu \leq_{ci} \nu$), and thus Lemma 3.1 applies. Hence, without loss of generality, in what follows we can assume that $p_{\mu, \nu} > 0$ and $c_{\mu, \nu} > 0$.

Consider $k \mapsto \tilde{P}_{\mu,\nu}(k)$ defined by

$$(3.5) \quad \tilde{P}_{\mu,\nu}(k) := P_\nu(k) + p_{\mu,\nu}, \quad k \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Note that $\tilde{P}_{\mu,\nu} \geq P_\mu$ on \mathbb{R} , and (since we assumed that $p_{\mu,\nu} > 0$)

$$\left\{ k \in \mathbb{R} : \tilde{P}_{\mu,\nu}(k) = P_\mu(k) \right\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Let

$$(3.6) \quad x_{\mu,\nu}^- := \inf \left\{ k \in \mathbb{R} : \tilde{P}(k) = P_\mu(k) \right\}, \quad x_{\mu,\nu}^+ := \sup \left\{ k \in \mathbb{R} : \tilde{P}(k) = P_\mu(k) \right\}.$$

Now note that $x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+ \in \mathbb{R}$. Indeed, $\lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} \left\{ \tilde{P}_{\mu,\nu}(k) - P_\mu(k) \right\} = p_{\mu,\nu} > 0$ and thus $-\infty < x_{\mu,\nu}^- \leq x_{\mu,\nu}^+ < \infty$. Hence we only need to argue that $x_{\mu,\nu}^+ < \infty$. This follows by observing that (by the Put-Call parity and the assumption that $c_{\mu,\nu} > 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \tilde{P}_{\mu,\nu}(k) - P_\mu(k) \right\} &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ P_\nu(k) - P_\mu(k) \right\} + p_{\mu,\nu} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ C_\nu(k) - C_\mu(k) \right\} - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu}) + p_{\mu,\nu} = c_{\mu,\nu} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by the continuity of P_ν and P_μ , we have that $\tilde{P}(k) = P_\mu(k)$ for $k \in \{x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+\}$.

We now split μ into three sub-probability measures $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0, \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+ \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mu = \eta_{\mu,\nu}^- + \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0 + \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+$:

$$(3.7) \quad \eta_{\mu,\nu}^- := \mu|_{(-\infty, x_{\mu,\nu}^-)}, \quad \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0 := \mu|_{[x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+]}, \quad \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+ := \mu|_{(x_{\mu,\nu}^+, \infty)}.$$

Define

$$(3.8) \quad \Delta_{\mu,\nu}^- := P'_\mu(x_{\mu,\nu}^- -), \quad \Delta_{\mu,\nu}^+ := P'_\mu(x_{\mu,\nu}^+ +),$$

where $f'(k-)$ (resp. $f'(k+)$) denotes the left (resp. right) derivative, at $k \in \mathbb{R}$, of a convex function $x \mapsto f(x)$. Note that $\Delta_{\mu,\nu}^\pm \in \partial \tilde{P}_{\mu,\nu}(x^\pm)$, where $\partial f(x)$ denotes the sub-differential (provided it exists) at $x \in \mathbb{R}$, of $k \mapsto f(k)$. Then, by construction,

$$\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-(\mathbb{R}) = \Delta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \quad \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+(\mathbb{R}) = 1 - \Delta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \quad \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0(\mathbb{R}) = \Delta_{\mu,\nu}^+ - \Delta_{\mu,\nu}^-.$$

Now the goal is to also split ν into $\chi_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+ \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\nu = \chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0 + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+$, but with an additional requirement that $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^- \leq_{ci} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-$, $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^0 \leq_c \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0$ and $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+ \leq_{cd} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+$. Set

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^- &:= \nu|_{(-\infty, x_{\mu,\nu}^-)} + (\Delta_{\mu,\nu}^- - \tilde{P}'_{\mu,\nu}(x_{\mu,\nu}^-)) \delta_{x_{\mu,\nu}^-}, \\ \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+ &:= \nu|_{(x_{\mu,\nu}^+, \infty)} + (\Delta_{\mu,\nu}^+ - \tilde{P}'_{\mu,\nu}(x_{\mu,\nu}^+)) \delta_{x_{\mu,\nu}^+}, \\ \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0 &:= \nu - \chi_{\mu,\nu}^- - \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0 \in \mathcal{M}$ be as in (3.7) and (3.9). Then*

$$\eta_{\mu,\nu}^- \leq_{ci} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-, \quad \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0 \leq_c \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0, \quad \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+ \leq_{cd} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+.$$

Proof. In order to ease the notation we suppress the dependence on (μ, ν) and write $\eta^- = \eta_{\mu,\nu}^-$, and similarly for other quantities.

First consider η^- and χ^- . By construction, $\chi^-(\mathbb{R}) = \eta^-(\mathbb{R})$, and, since $\tilde{P} \geq P_\mu$ on $(-\infty, x^-]$ and $\tilde{P}(x^-) = P_\mu(x^-)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\eta^-}(k) &= (P_\mu(k) - \{P_\mu(x^-) + \Delta^-(k - x^-)\}) I_{\{k \leq x^-\}} \\ &\leq (\tilde{P}(k) - \{P_\mu(x^-) + \Delta^-(k - x^-)\}) I_{\{k \leq x^-\}} \\ &= (\tilde{P}(k) - \{\tilde{P}(x^-) + \Delta^-(k - x^-)\}) I_{\{k \leq x^-\}} = C_{\chi^-}(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\eta^- \leq_{ci} \chi^-$.

By symmetry, $\eta^+ \leq_{cd} \chi^+$. Indeed, by construction we have that $\chi^+(\mathbb{R}) = \eta^+(\mathbb{R})$, and, since $\tilde{P} \geq P_\mu$ on $[x^+, \infty)$ and $\tilde{P}(x^+) = P_\mu(x^+)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\eta^+}(k) &= (P_\mu(k) - \{P_\mu(x^+) + \Delta^+(k - x^+)\}) I_{\{k \geq x^+\}} \\ &\leq (\tilde{P}(k) - \{P_\mu(x^+) + \Delta^+(k - x^+)\}) I_{\{k \geq x^+\}} \\ &= (\tilde{P}(k) - \{\tilde{P}(x^+) + \Delta^+(k - x^+)\}) I_{\{k \geq x^+\}} = P_{\chi^+}(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, consider η^0 and χ^0 . It is clear that $\chi^0(\mathbb{R}) = \eta^0(\mathbb{R})$, and thus we are left to argue that $\eta^0 \leq_c \chi^0$. For this it is enough to show that $P_{\eta^0} \leq P_{\chi^0}$ on \mathbb{R} , and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P_{\eta^0}(k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P_{\chi^0}(k)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\eta^0}(k) &= (P_\mu(k) - \{P_\mu(x^-) + \Delta^-(k - x^-)\}) I_{k \in [x^-, x^+]} + (P_\mu(x^+) + \Delta^+(k - x^+)) I_{\{k > x^+\}} \\ &\leq (\tilde{P}(k) - \{P_\mu(x^-) + \Delta^-(k - x^-)\}) I_{k \in [x^-, x^+]} + (P_\mu(x^+) + \Delta^+(k - x^+)) I_{\{k > x^+\}} \\ &= (\tilde{P}(k) - \{\tilde{P}(x^-) + \Delta^-(k - x^-)\}) I_{k \in [x^-, x^+]} + (\tilde{P}(x^+) + \Delta^+(k - x^+)) I_{\{k > x^+\}} \\ &= P_{\chi^0}(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the desired asymptotic behaviour at ∞ also follows. We conclude that $\mu^0 \leq_c \nu^0$. \square

We now define a set of candidate optimal couplings $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu) \subseteq \Pi(\mu, \nu)$:

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \pi^* \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu) \quad \text{if} \quad \pi^* \in \Pi(\mu, \nu) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{\mu, \nu}^* &:= \pi_{\mu, \nu}^- + \pi_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \pi_{\mu, \nu}^+, \quad \text{where} \\ \pi_{\mu, \nu}^- &\in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-), \quad \pi_{\mu, \nu}^0 \in \Pi_M(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0), \quad \pi_{\mu, \nu}^+ \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by construction and Lemma 3.2, $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$ is non-empty.

We are now ready to state and prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) = \nu(\mathbb{R})$ and $\min\{p_{\mu, \nu}, c_{\mu, \nu}\} > 0$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mu, \nu) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x^*(dy) \right| \mu(dx) = (\overline{\chi_{\mu, \nu}^-} - \overline{\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-}) + (\overline{\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+} - \overline{\chi_{\mu, \nu}^+}) \\ &= V(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-) + V(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+), \quad \text{for all } \pi^* \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, any optimizer for $V(\mu, \nu)$ is of the form (3.10).

Proof. Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we ease the notation by suppressing the dependence on (μ, ν) , and write $\eta^- = \eta_{\mu, \nu}^-$, etc.

We first compute the total weak transport cost with respect to an arbitrary $\pi^* \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x^*(dy) \right| \mu(dx) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x^*(dy) \right| \eta^-(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x^*(dy) \right| \eta^0(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x^*(dy) \right| \eta^+(dx) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x^-(dy) \right| \eta^-(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x^0(dy) \right| \eta^0(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x^+(dy) \right| \eta^+(dx) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x^-(dy) - x \right) \eta^-(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x^+(dy) \right) \eta^+(dx) \\
&= (\overline{\chi^-} - \overline{\eta^-}) + (\overline{\eta^+} - \overline{\chi^+});
\end{aligned}$$

the first equality uses that $\mu = \eta^- + \eta^0 + \eta^+$ (see (3.7)), while for the remaining equalities we used the definition of π^* (see (3.10)).

We will now show that, for an arbitrary $\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx) \geq (\overline{\chi^-} - \overline{\eta^-}) + (\overline{\eta^+} - \overline{\chi^+}),$$

which will finish the proof of the first statement.

Fix $\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx) &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \right| \eta^-(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \right| \eta^+(dx) \\
&\geq \left| \overline{\eta^-} - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \eta^-(dx) \right| + \left| \overline{\eta^+} - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \eta^+(dx) \right|,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Jensen's inequality.

Now define $\tilde{\pi}^-(dx, dy) := \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \eta^-(dx)$ and note that $\tilde{\pi}^- \in \Pi(\eta^-, \tilde{\chi}^-)$ for some $\tilde{\chi}^- \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\tilde{\chi}^- \leq \nu$ and $\tilde{\chi}^-(\mathbb{R}) = \eta^-(\mathbb{R})$. Similarly, $\tilde{\pi}^+(dx, dy) := \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \eta^+(dx)$ is such that $\tilde{\pi}^+ \in \Pi(\eta^+, \tilde{\chi}^+)$ for some $\tilde{\chi}^+ \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\tilde{\chi}^+ \leq \nu$ and $\tilde{\chi}^+(\mathbb{R}) = \eta^+(\mathbb{R})$. It follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx) \geq \left| \overline{\eta^-} - \overline{\tilde{\chi}^-} \right| + \left| \overline{\eta^+} - \overline{\tilde{\chi}^+} \right|.$$

Therefore, in order to finish the proof, it is sufficient to show that

$$\left| \overline{\eta^-} - \overline{\tilde{\chi}^-} \right| + \left| \overline{\eta^+} - \overline{\tilde{\chi}^+} \right| \geq (\overline{\chi^-} - \overline{\eta^-}) + (\overline{\eta^+} - \overline{\chi^+}).$$

We will achieve this by showing that

$$(3.11) \quad \left| \overline{\eta^-} - \overline{\tilde{\chi}^-} \right| \geq (\overline{\chi^-} - \overline{\eta^-}) \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \overline{\eta^+} - \overline{\tilde{\chi}^+} \right| \geq (\overline{\eta^+} - \overline{\chi^+}).$$

First, note that since χ^- is a restriction of ν to $(-\infty, x^-)$ (together with an appropriate amount of mass at x^-), any other measure $\hat{\chi}^- \leq \nu$ with $\hat{\chi}^-(\mathbb{R}) = \chi^-(\mathbb{R})$ has a larger mean. Indeed,

$$\chi^-((-\infty, k]) \geq \tilde{\chi}^-((-\infty, k]), \quad k \in \mathbb{R},$$

i.e., $\chi^- \leq_{sto} \tilde{\chi}^-$. Equivalently,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(k) \chi^-(dk) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(k) \tilde{\chi}^-(dk), \quad \text{for all non-decreasing } k \mapsto f(k),$$

and by taking $k \mapsto f(k) = k$ we obtain that $\overline{\chi^-} \leq \overline{\tilde{\chi}^-}$.

In fact, if $k \mapsto g(k)$ is convex and non-decreasing, using that $\eta^- \leq_{ci} \chi^- \leq_{sto} \tilde{\chi}^-$ we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(k) \eta^-(dk) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(k) \chi^-(dk) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(k) \tilde{\chi}^-(dk)$$

(i.e., $\eta^- \leq_{ci} \chi^- \leq_{ci} \tilde{\chi}^-$), so that $\overline{\eta^-} \leq \overline{\chi^-} \leq \overline{\tilde{\chi}^-}$. It follows that

$$\left| \overline{\eta^-} - \overline{\tilde{\chi}^-} \right| = \overline{\tilde{\chi}^-} - \overline{\eta^-} \geq \overline{\chi^-} - \overline{\eta^-}.$$

We now use a symmetric argument for $\eta^+, \chi^+, \tilde{\chi}^+$. Observe that

$$\chi^+((k, \infty)) \geq \tilde{\chi}^+((k, \infty)), \quad k \in \mathbb{R},$$

and therefore $\tilde{\chi}^+ \leq_{sto} \chi^+$, or equivalently,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(k) \tilde{\chi}^+(dk) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(k) \chi^+(dk), \quad \text{for all non-decreasing } k \mapsto f(k).$$

Then, if $k \mapsto g(k)$ is convex and non-increasing, using that $\eta^+ \leq_{cd} \chi^+$, we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} g(k) \eta^+(dk) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(k) \chi^+(dk) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} g(k) \tilde{\chi}^+(dk)$$

(i.e., $\eta^+ \leq_{cd} \chi^+ \leq_{cd} \tilde{\chi}^+$), so that $\overline{\eta^+} \geq \overline{\chi^+} \geq \overline{\tilde{\chi}^+}$. It follows that

$$\left| \overline{\eta^+} - \overline{\tilde{\chi}^+} \right| = \overline{\eta^+} - \overline{\tilde{\chi}^+} \geq \overline{\eta^+} - \overline{\chi^+}.$$

Combining both cases shows that

$$V(\mu, \nu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x^*(dy) \right| \mu(dx) = (\overline{\chi_{\mu, \nu}^-} - \overline{\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-}) + (\overline{\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+} - \overline{\chi_{\mu, \nu}^+}).$$

Furthermore, recall that by Lemma 3.2, $\eta_{\mu, \nu}^- \leq_{ci} \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-$ and $\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+ \leq_{cd} \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+$. Then from Lemma 3.1 we further have that $V(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-) = (\overline{\chi_{\mu, \nu}^-} - \overline{\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-})$ and $V(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+) = (\overline{\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+} - \overline{\chi_{\mu, \nu}^+})$.

Finally, if $\tilde{\pi}$ is another optimizer of (3.1), then (3.11) must hold with equality, and thus $\overline{\tilde{\chi}^-} = \overline{\chi^-}$ and $\overline{\tilde{\chi}^+} = \overline{\chi^+}$. But then since $\chi^- \leq_{sto} \tilde{\chi}^-$ and $\tilde{\chi}^+ \leq_{sto} \chi^+$ (and all measures are sub-measures of ν), we must have that $\tilde{\chi}^\pm = \chi^\pm$. In addition, the second marginal of $\tilde{\pi}^0(dx, dy) := \tilde{\pi}_x(dy) \eta^0(dx)$ is then given by $(\nu - \tilde{\chi}^- - \tilde{\chi}^+) = \chi^0$. This proves the second statement of the theorem and thus finishes the proof. \square

3.2. Connection to Wasserstein projection of μ on $\{\hat{\mu} \in \mathcal{M} : \hat{\mu} \leq_c \nu\}$. In this section we work with $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) = \nu(\mathbb{R})$ and a convex $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $h(0) = 0$. Define

$$\bar{V}_h(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} h(x - y) \pi(dx, dy).$$

We follow Backhoff-Veraguas et al. [6] and call $S : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ *admissible* if

- i) S is non-decreasing,
- ii) S is 1-Lipschitz,

iii) the push-forward measure $S(\mu)$ satisfies $S(\mu) \leq_c \nu$.

Gozlan et al. [19] (see also Alfonsi et al. [1] for an equivalent result in higher dimensions) showed that

$$(3.12) \quad V_h(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\hat{\mu} \leq_c \nu} \bar{V}_h(\hat{\mu}, \mu) = \inf_{\text{admissible } S} \bar{V}_h(S(\mu), \mu).$$

In particular, there exists an admissible (μ -a.s. unique) map T^* , such that

$$V_h(\mu, \nu) = \bar{V}_h(T^*(\mu), \mu) \quad \text{for all convex } h \geq 0 \text{ with } h(0) = 0,$$

i.e., the optimizer T^* (and the induced push-forward measure $\mu^* := T^*(\mu)$) does not depend on the choice of the convex cost function h . Furthermore, the map T^* can be uniquely identified by one of the following conditions (see Backhoff-Veraguas et al. [6]):

- (1) $S(\mu) \leq_c T^*(\mu) \leq_c \nu$ for all admissible S ,
- (2) T^* is the unique admissible map which has slope 1 on each interval $(T^*)^{-1}(I)$, where I is irreducible¹ w.r.t. $(T^*(\mu), \nu)$.

Recall $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+ \in \mathcal{M}$ given by (3.7) and (3.9). Now let T^-, T^+ be the optimal maps for $V_h(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)$ and $V_h(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)$, respectively, i.e., for any convex $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with $h(0) = 0$ we have that

$$(3.13) \quad V_h(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-) = \bar{V}_h(T^-(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-), \eta_{\mu,\nu}^-) \quad \text{and} \quad V_h(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+) = \bar{V}_h(T^+(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+), \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+).$$

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) = \nu(\mathbb{R})$ and $\min\{p_{\mu,\nu}, c_{\mu,\nu}\} > 0$. Define $\hat{T} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by*

$$\hat{T}(x) = \begin{cases} T^-(x), & x < x_{\mu,\nu}^- \\ x, & x_{\mu,\nu}^- \leq x \leq x_{\mu,\nu}^+ \\ T^+(x), & x_{\mu,\nu}^+ < x. \end{cases}$$

Then $T^* = \hat{T}$.

Corollary 3.1. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) = \nu(\mathbb{R})$ and $\min\{p_{\mu,\nu}, c_{\mu,\nu}\} > 0$. Then the optimal map T^* is such that $x \mapsto D(x) := (T^*(x) - x)$ is non-increasing, and*

$$D > 0 \text{ on } (-\infty, x_{\mu,\nu}^-), \quad D = 0 \text{ on } [x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+], \quad D < 0 \text{ on } (x_{\mu,\nu}^+, \infty).$$

Proof. Since T^- (resp. T^+) is optimal for $V_h(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)$ (resp. $V_h(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)$) and $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^- \leq_{ci} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-$ (resp. $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+ \leq_{cd} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+$), by Gozlan and Juillet [18, Theorem 3.2] we further have that $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^- \leq_{sto} T^-(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-)$ (resp. $T^+(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+) \leq_{sto} \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+$), and therefore $T^*(x) = T^-(x) \geq x$ for μ -a.e. $x \leq x_{\mu,\nu}^-$ (resp. $T^*(x) = T^+(x) \leq x$ for μ -a.e. $x \geq x_{\mu,\nu}^+$). Combining this with the representation of T^* in terms of the quantile function of $T^*(\mu)$ (see Alfonsi et al. [1, Theorem 2.6]), we immediately have that D is non-increasing. Finally, if $D(x) = 0$ for some $x < x_{\mu,\nu}^-$ (resp. $x > x_{\mu,\nu}^+$), then $D = 0$ on $[x, x_{\mu,\nu}^-]$ (resp. $[x_{\mu,\nu}^+, x]$), which contradicts the definition of $x_{\mu,\nu}^-$ (resp. $x_{\mu,\nu}^+$). \square

¹Two measures $\eta, \chi \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\eta(\mathbb{R}) = \chi(\mathbb{R})$ satisfies $\eta \leq_c \chi$ if and only if $\bar{\eta} = \bar{\chi}$ and $P_\eta \leq P_\chi$ on \mathbb{R} . By the continuity of the potential functions, the set $U := \{k \in \mathbb{R} : P_\eta(k) < P_\chi(k)\}$ is open and thus can be represented as a countable union of disjoint open intervals, $U = \bigcup_n I_n$. These intervals I_n are called irreducible w.r.t. (η, χ) .

Remark 3.2. *The assumption $\min\{p_{\mu,\nu}, c_{\mu,\nu}\} > 0$ covers the most general case. If $\mu \leq_{cd} \nu$ (resp. $\mu \leq_{ci} \nu$) we have that $p_{\mu,\nu} = 0 < c_{\mu,\nu}$ (resp. $c_{\mu,\nu} = 0 < p_{\mu,\nu}$). In this case, set $k_{\mu,\nu}^- := -\infty$ (resp. $k_{\mu,\nu}^+ := +\infty$). Then the statement of Proposition 3.1 still holds (but with this modified value of $k_{\mu,\nu}^-$ (resp. $k_{\mu,\nu}^+$)). Note that, in the case $\mu \leq_c \nu$, we take $k_{\mu,\nu}^- = -\infty < +\infty = k_{\mu,\nu}^+$ and then $x \mapsto T^*(x) = x$ is optimal.*

Proof of Proposition 3.1. By Lemma 3.2, $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^- \leq_{ci} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-$ and $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+ \leq_{cd} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+$, and therefore $\sup\{k \in \text{supp}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-)\} \leq \sup\{k \in \text{supp}(\chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)\} = x_{\mu,\nu}^-$ and $x_{\mu,\nu}^+ = \inf\{k \in \text{supp}(\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)\} \leq \inf\{k \in \text{supp}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+)\}$, respectively. It follows that $T^-(x) \leq x_{\mu,\nu}^-$ for all $x < x_{\mu,\nu}^-$ and $T^+(x) \geq x_{\mu,\nu}^+$ for all $x > x_{\mu,\nu}^+$. Then since T^- (resp. T^+) is admissible w.r.t. $(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)$ (resp. $(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)$), from the definition of \hat{T} we immediately have that \hat{T} is admissible w.r.t. (μ, ν) . Indeed, the definition of T^- as an optimal map for $V_h(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)$ implies that $T^-(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-) \leq_c \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-$ (by symmetry we then also conclude that $T^+(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+) \leq_c \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+$). Moreover, since $\hat{T}(x) = x$ for $x \in [x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+]$, we have that $\hat{T}(\mu)|_{[x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+]} = \mu|_{[x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+]} = \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0 \leq_c \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0$, where $\chi_{\mu,\nu}^0$ corresponds to the restriction of ν to $(x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+)$ together with appropriate amounts of mass at the boundaries (recall (3.9)). Hence $\hat{T}(\mu) \leq_c \chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0 + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+ = \nu$.

Furthermore, $P_{\hat{T}(\mu)}(k) = P_\nu(k)$ for $k \in \{x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+\}$, and therefore for any irreducible interval I_n w.r.t. $(\hat{T}(\mu), \nu)$ we have that both, I_n and $\hat{T}^{-1}(I_n)$, belong to either $(-\infty, x_{\mu,\nu}^-)$, or $[x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+]$, or $(x_{\mu,\nu}^+, \infty)$. But $\hat{T} = T^-$ (resp. $\hat{T} = T^+$) on $(-\infty, x_{\mu,\nu}^-)$ (resp. $(x_{\mu,\nu}^+, \infty)$), and thus \hat{T} and T^- (resp. T^+) share the same irreducible intervals on $(-\infty, x_{\mu,\nu}^-)$ (resp. $(x_{\mu,\nu}^+, \infty)$). It follows that \hat{T} has slope 1 on $\hat{T}^{-1}(I_n)$ for every irreducible I_n satisfying either $I_n \subseteq (-\infty, x_{\mu,\nu}^-)$ or $I_n \subseteq (x_{\mu,\nu}^+, \infty)$. On the other hand, if $I_n \subset [x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+]$, then $\hat{T}^{-1}(I_n) = I_n$, and therefore (since $\hat{T}(x) = x$ for all $x \in [x_{\mu,\nu}^-, x_{\mu,\nu}^+]$), \hat{T} also has slope 1 for such I_n . We conclude that \hat{T} has slope 1 on each $\hat{T}^{-1}(I_n)$. Since this last property is satisfied only by T^* , we conclude that $\hat{T} = T^*$. \square

We can now use the results of Proposition 3.1 and give a version of Theorem 3.1 for general cost functions h .

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) = \nu(\mathbb{R})$ and $\min\{p_{\mu,\nu}, c_{\mu,\nu}\} > 0$. Suppose $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is convex and $h(0) = 0$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} V_h(\mu, \nu) &= V_h(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-) + V_h(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+) \\ &= \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} h\left(x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x(dy)\right) \eta_{\mu,\nu}^-(dx) \\ &\quad + \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} h\left(x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x(dy)\right) \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, and since $h(0) = 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} V_h(\mu, \nu) &= \bar{V}_h(T^*(\mu), \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(x - T^*(x))\mu(dx) \\ &= \int_{(-\infty, x_{\mu, \nu}^-)} h(x - T^-(x))\eta_{\mu, \nu}^- + \int_{(x_{\mu, \nu}^+, \infty)} h(x - T^+(x))\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+ \\ &= \bar{V}_h(T^-(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-), \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-) + \bar{V}_h(T^+(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+), \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+) \\ &= V_h(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-) + V_h(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $\eta_{\mu, \nu}^- \leq_{ci} \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-$, by Gozlan and Juillet [18, Theorem 3.2] we have that

$$V_h(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-) = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} h\left(x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y\pi_x(dy)\right) \eta_{\mu, \nu}^-(dx).$$

Since $\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+ \leq_{cd} \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+$, a symmetric argument shows that

$$V_h(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+) = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} h\left(x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y\pi_x(dy)\right) \eta_{\mu, \nu}^+(dx),$$

which finishes the proof. \square

4. CONSTRAINED OPTIMAL TRANSPORT

For fixed marginals $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$, recall the definition of $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu) \subseteq \Pi(\mu, \nu)$; see (3.10). Note that, due to Theorem 3.1,

$$(4.1) \quad \Pi^*(\mu, \nu) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x - \bar{\pi}_x| \mu(dx).$$

The main goal of this section is to identify some canonical elements of this set.

For a (measurable) cost function $c : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, in this section we consider the following variant of the optimal transport problem:

$$(4.2) \quad \inf_{\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} c(x, y) \pi(dx, dy).$$

We first observe that (4.2) generalizes the (sub/super-) martingale optimal transport problems introduced by Beiglböck et al. [11], Beiglböck and Juillet [13], and Nutz and Stebegg [28]. Indeed, due to Lemma 3.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \leq_c \nu &\iff \Pi^*(\mu, \nu) = \Pi_M(\mu, \nu), \\ \mu \leq_{cd} \nu &\iff \Pi^*(\mu, \nu) = \Pi_{Sup}(\mu, \nu), \\ \mu \leq_{ci} \nu &\iff \Pi^*(\mu, \nu) = \Pi_{Sub}(\mu, \nu). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$. Then, $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$, as in (4.1), is convex and compact (wrt weak topology induced by the continuous and bounded functions).*

Lemma 4.1 ensures that, under mild regularity conditions for c , the problem (4.2) admits an optimizer. The proof of Corollary 4.1 is based on the standard (lower semi-continuity and compactness) arguments (see, for example, Beiglböck et al. [11, Theorem 1]), and thus omitted.

Corollary 4.1. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$. Suppose $c : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is lower semi-continuous and $c(x, y) \geq -K(|x| + |y|)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, for some constant $K > 0$.*

Then there exists $\pi^ \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$ satisfying*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} c(x, y) \pi^*(dx, dy) = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} c(x, y) \pi(dx, dy).$$

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let $\pi^1, \pi^2 \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$. Then, for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we have that $\pi := \alpha\pi^1 + (1 - \alpha)\pi^2$ is an element of $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$, $\pi_x = \alpha\pi_x^1 + (1 - \alpha)\pi_x^2$, and thus also $\overline{\pi_x} = \alpha\overline{\pi_x^1} + (1 - \alpha)\overline{\pi_x^2}$ for μ -a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then using the convexity of $|\cdot|$ it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x - \overline{\pi_x}| \mu(dx) \leq \alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x - \overline{\pi_x^1}| \mu(dx) + (1 - \alpha) \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x - \overline{\pi_x^2}| \mu(dx) = V(\mu, \nu)$$

(recall (3.1)), and thus $\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$, which proves the convexity of $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$.

We now turn to compactness. Since $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ is compact and $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu) \subseteq \Pi(\mu, \nu)$, it is enough to show that $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$ is closed. However, due to Corollary 3.1, we have that any $\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$ is of the form (3.10). Hence the claim follows if $\Pi_M(\eta, \chi)$, $\Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi)$ and $\Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi)$ are all closed (provided they are non-empty) for some fixed $\eta, \chi \in \mathcal{P}$.

The closedness of $\Pi_M(\eta, \chi)$ was proved by Beiglböck et al. [11] We now argue (by suitably modifying the arguments of Beiglböck et al. [11]) that $\Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi)$ (and thus, by symmetry, also $\Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi)$) is closed.

Fix $\eta \leq_{cd} \chi$ so that $\Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi) \neq \emptyset$. Now note that

$$\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi) \iff \int_{\mathbb{R}} I_A(x)(y - x) \pi(dx, dy) \leq 0 \quad \forall \text{ Borel } A \subseteq \mathbb{R}.$$

By standard approximation arguments we can replace I_A by any non-negative, continuous and bounded $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. It follows that

$$\Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi) = \bigcap_{f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}), f \geq 0} \mathcal{I}_f := \bigcap_{f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}), f \geq 0} \left\{ \pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu) : \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)(y - x) \pi(dx, dy) \leq 0 \right\}.$$

Since the sub-level sets of a continuous function are closed, using the continuity (wrt the weak convergence) of $\pi \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)(y - x) \pi(dx, dy)$ (see Beiglböck et al. [11, Lemma 2.2.]), we conclude that each \mathcal{I}_f (and thus also $\Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi)$) is closed. \square

Remark 4.1. *In fact one can prove Lemma 4.1 in a more general setting. Fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$, $\tilde{h} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and consider*

$$\Pi_h^*(\mu, \nu) := \operatorname{argmin}_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{h}(x, \pi_x) \mu(dx).$$

If \tilde{h} is convex wrt the second variable, then using the same arguments as in Lemma 4.1 we arrive to the convexity of $\Pi_h^(\mu, \nu)$.*

Furthermore, if in addition \tilde{h} is lower semi-continuous (with respect to the product topology) and bounded from below (in particular, if it satisfies Condition (A) of Backhoff-Veraguas et al. [5, Definition 2.7]), then $\pi \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{h}(x, \pi_x) \mu(dx)$ is lower semi-continuous (see Backhoff-Veraguas et al. [5, Proposition 2.8]). Since the level sets of a lower semi-continuous function are closed, it follows that $\Pi_h^(\mu, \nu)$ is a closed subset of $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$, and thus compact.*

Note that the above applies to $(x, \eta) \mapsto \tilde{h}(x, \eta) := h(x - \bar{\eta})$, where $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is convex with $h(0) = 0$ (as in section 3.2).

Since each $\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$ is of the form (3.10), it follows that

$$(4.3) \quad \inf_{\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)} \int cd\pi = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-)} \int cd\pi + \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_M(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0)} \int cd\pi + \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+)} \int cd\pi.$$

We further note that $(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \eta_{\mu, \nu}^-) \leq_{cd} (\chi_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-)$ and

$$(4.4) \quad \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+)} \int cd\pi = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_M(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0)} \int cd\pi + \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+)} \int cd\pi.$$

Indeed, by construction we have that $x_{\mu, \nu}^+$ corresponds to the *maximal barrier* for $(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \eta_{\mu, \nu}^+) \leq_{cd} (\chi_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+)$ in the sense of Nutz and Stebegg [28, Proposition 3.2], and thus every $\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+)$ couples $\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0 \leq_c \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0$ using a martingale (recall that the supports of both measures $\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0 \leq_c \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0$ are contained in $[x_{\mu, \nu}^-, x_{\mu, \nu}^+]$, while the supports of $\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+ \leq_{cd} \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+$ are contained in $[x_{\mu, \nu}^+, \infty)$). A symmetric argument shows that

$$(4.5) \quad \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-, \eta_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \chi_{\mu, \nu}^- + \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0)} \int cd\pi = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-)} \int cd\pi + \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_M(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0)} \int cd\pi.$$

In the next section we consider (4.3) for some specific cost functions.

4.1. Spence-Mirrlees costs. Nutz and Stebegg [28] considered the supermartingale optimal transport problems with cost functions c that satisfy certain *twist* conditions. A function $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *first-order Spence-Mirrlees* if

$$(4.6) \quad f(x_2, \cdot) - f(x_1, \cdot) \text{ is strictly increasing for all } x_1 < x_2,$$

and *second-order Spence-Mirrlees* if

$$(4.7) \quad f(x_2, \cdot) - f(x_1, \cdot) \text{ is strictly convex for all } x_1 < x_2.$$

Then f is the *supermartingale Spence-Mirrlees* if f is second-order Spence-Mirrlees and $(-f)$ is first-order Spence-Mirrlees.

Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and consider $(x, y_1), (x, y_2), (x', y') \in \Gamma$ with $y_1 < y_2$. Then Γ is

- (i) second-order left-monotone if $y' \notin (y_1, y_2)$ whenever $x < x'$,
- (ii) second-order right-monotone if $y' \notin (y_1, y_2)$ whenever $x > x'$.

Furthermore, let $(\Gamma, M) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ and consider $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)$ with $x_1 < x_2$. The pair (Γ, M) is supermartingale (resp. submartingale)

- (i) first-order left-monotone if $y_1 \leq y_2$ whenever $x_2 \notin M$ (resp. $x_1 \notin M$),
- (ii) first-order right-monotone if $y_2 \leq y_1$ whenever $x_1 \notin M$ (resp. $x_2 \notin M$).

Then we have the following

Theorem 4.1 (Nutz and Stebegg [28]). *Suppose $\eta, \chi \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\eta \leq_{cd} \chi$. Then there exists (nondegenerate, in the sense of Nutz and Stebegg [28, Definition 7.5]) $(\Gamma^I, M^I) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ that is supermartingale first-order right-monotone and second-order left-monotone (resp. $(\Gamma^D, M^D) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ that is supermartingale first-order left-monotone and second-order*

right-monotone) and the unique coupling $\pi^I \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi)$ (resp. $\pi^D \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi)$), the so-called increasing (resp. decreasing) supermartingale coupling, such that

$\pi^I(\Gamma^I) = 1$ and $\pi^I|_{M^I \times \mathbb{R}}$ is a martingale (resp. $\pi^I(\Gamma^I) = 1$ and $\pi^I|_{M^D \times \mathbb{R}}$ is a martingale).

Furthermore, π^I (resp. π^D) is the unique optimizer of $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi)} \int f d\pi$ and $\inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta, \chi)} \int f d\pi$ if f and $(-f)$ (resp. $(-f)$ and f) are supermartingale Spence-Mirrlees, respectively.

Theorem 4.1 completely solves (4.4) for supermartingale Spence-Mirrlees cost functions. Hence it remains to solve $\inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^-)} \int c d\pi$. However, the solution depends on c (within the class of supermartingale Spence-Mirrlees cost functions.)

Using the symmetric arguments to those of Nutz and Stebegg [28], one can show that, for $\eta \leq_{ci} \chi$, there exists the unique $\tilde{\pi}^I \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi)$ (resp. $\tilde{\pi}^D \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi)$) that is supported by $(\tilde{\Gamma}^I, \tilde{M}^I)$ (resp. $(\tilde{\Gamma}^D, \tilde{M}^D)$), which is submartingale first-order left-monotone and second-order left-monotone (resp. submartingale first-order right-monotone and second-order right-monotone). π^I and $\tilde{\pi}^I$ (resp. π^D and $\tilde{\pi}^D$) are similar in the sense that both couplings mimic the left-curtain (resp. right-curtain) martingale coupling (see Beiglböck ad Juillet [13]) on their respective *martingale* points, M^I and \tilde{M}^I (resp. M^D and \tilde{M}^D). However, the behaviour of π^I and $\tilde{\pi}^I$ (resp. π^D and $\tilde{\pi}^D$) differ on strict supermartingale and strict submartingale points respectively; there π^I (resp. π^D) mimics the *antitone* (resp. *quantile*) coupling, and thus is supported on a decreasing (resp. increasing) map, while $\tilde{\pi}^I$ (resp. $\tilde{\pi}^D$) is supported on an increasing (resp. decreasing) map, mimicking the behaviour of the quantile (resp. antitone) coupling.

The above differences of $\pi^I, \pi^D, \tilde{\pi}^I, \tilde{\pi}^D$ are also reflected in the optimal transport problems for which these couplings appear as optimizers.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\eta, \chi \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\eta \leq_{ci} \chi$. If c (resp. $-c$) is supermartingale Spence-Mirrlees, then neither the decreasing submartingale coupling $\tilde{\pi}^D \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi)$, nor the increasing submartingale coupling $\tilde{\pi}^I \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi)$, maximizes*

$$\Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi) \ni \pi \mapsto \int c d\pi.$$

In particular, an optimizer is submartingale first-order right-monotone and second order left-monotone (resp. submartingale first-order left-monotone and second-order right-monotone).

Using Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 we can characterize the optimizers of (4.3) for the costs satisfying supermartingale Spence-Mirrlees conditions:

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$, and suppose that π^* is an optimizer of (4.3). Then*

- (i) *If c is supermartingale Spence-Mirrlees, then $\pi^*|_{[x_{\mu, \nu}^-, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}}$ is the (unique) increasing supermartingale coupling $\pi^I \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+)$, while $\pi^*|_{(-\infty, x_{\mu, \nu}^-] \times \mathbb{R}}$ is submartingale first-order right-monotone and second-order left-monotone.*
- (ii) *If $(-c)$ is supermartingale Spence-Mirrlees, then $\pi^*|_{[x_{\mu, \nu}^-, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}}$ is the (unique) decreasing supermartingale coupling $\pi^D \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \eta_{\mu, \nu}^+, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0 + \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+)$, while $\pi^*|_{(-\infty, x_{\mu, \nu}^-] \times \mathbb{R}}$ is submartingale first-order left-monotone and second-order right-monotone.*

Proof. Proof of Lemma 4.2 Let $(I_k)_{k \geq -1}$ be the irreducible components of $\eta \leq_{ci} \chi$ in the sense of Nutz and Stebegg [28, Proposition 3.4] (but with necessary adjustments required for the submartingale setting). In particular, $I_0 := (-\infty, x^*)$ (where $x^* := \inf\{k \in \mathbb{R} : C_\eta(k) = C_\chi(k)\}$) is the maximal barrier), $(I_k)_{k=1, \dots, N}$ (with $N \leq \infty$) are the open components (i.e., disjoint open intervals) of $(x^*, \infty) \cap \{C_\eta < C_\chi\}$, and $I_{-1} = \mathbb{R} \setminus \bigcup_{k \geq 0} I_k$. Let $\mu_k = \mu|_{I_k}$ for $-1 \leq k \leq N$. Then there exists the unique decomposition $\chi = \sum_{k \geq -1} \chi_k$, s.t.

$$\mu_{-1} = \nu_{-1}, \quad \eta_0 \leq_{ci} \chi_0, \quad \eta_k \leq_c \chi_k \text{ for all } k \geq 1.$$

Let $(J_k)_{k \geq 0}$ be such that each J_k is I_k , together with its endpoints in the case χ_k has atoms at these endpoints. Any $\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi)$ is a sum of couplings of (η_k, χ_k) .

Define $\Sigma := (I_{-1} \times I_{-1}) \bigcup_{k \geq 0} (I_k \times J_k)$. Let $(\Gamma, M) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2) \times \mathbb{R}$ be nondegenerate, where $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma$, $M := M_0 \cup M_1$ with Borel sets $M_0 \subseteq I_0$ and $M_1 \cup_{k \neq 0} I_k$.

For any finite measures π, π' on \mathbb{R}^2 (with finite first moment) with the same first marginal π^1 , we call π' a (M_0, M_1) -competitor of π if

$$(4.8) \quad \overline{\pi'_x} \geq \overline{\pi_x} \text{ for } \pi^1\text{-a.e. } x \in M_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\pi'_x} = \overline{\pi_x} \text{ for } \pi^1\text{-a.e. } x \in M_1.$$

Now suppose that, in the case π is finitely supported on Γ , $\int f d\pi \geq \int f d\pi'$ for any (M_0, M_1) -competitor π' (of π) that is concentrated on Σ (here $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is any Borel function). This is precisely a submartingale version of Nutz and Stebegg [?, Theorem 5.2].

Now consider $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in \Gamma$ with $x_1 < x_2$, and define

$$\pi := \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \delta_{(x_1, y_1) + \delta_{(x_2, y_2)}} \right\}, \quad \pi' := \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \delta_{(x_1, y_2) + \delta_{(x_2, y_1)}} \right\}.$$

Suppose that $y_2 < y_1$, so that

$$\overline{\pi_{x_1}} > \overline{\pi'_{x_1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\pi_{x_2}} < \overline{\pi'_{x_2}}.$$

Suppose that $x_1 \notin M$ (so that it does not affect the definition of a competitor, see (4.8)).

Suppose that $x_2 \in M_1$, so that $x_2 \in I_k$ for some $k \neq 0$. Then $y_2 \in J_k$. On the other hand, since $x_1 \notin M$, we must have that $x_1 \in I_0$ and thus also $y_1 \in J_0$. But J_k is located to the right of J_0 . It follows that $y_1 \leq y_2$.

Now suppose that $x_2 \notin M_1$. Then $x_2 \in I_0$, and it follows that π' is a (M_0, M_1) -competitor of π . Furthermore, $x_i \in I_0$ and thus $y_i \in J_0$, for $i = 1, 2$, and thus π' is supported on Σ . It follows that

$$0 \leq 2 \left(\int c d\pi - \int c d\pi' \right) = c(x_2, y_2) - c(x_1, y_2) - (c(x_2, y_1) - c(x_1, y_1)).$$

But the right-hand side of the equality is strictly negative if c first-order Spence-Mirrlees, and thus we again conclude that $y_1 \leq y_2$.

Combining both cases we conclude that (Γ, M) is submartingale first-order left-monotone, whenever c is first-order Spence-Mirrlees.

Now suppose that $(-c)$ is first-order Spence-Mirrlees, $y_1 < y_2$, and $x_2 \notin M$. Then $x_1 < x_2 < x^*$ and thus both $x_1, x_2 \in I_0$, and also both $y_1, y_2 \in J_0$. Furthermore, since $y_1 < y_2$, we have that $\overline{\pi_{x_1}} < \overline{\pi'_{x_1}}$, and thus π' is again a (M_0, M_1) -competitor of π . It follows that

$$0 \leq 2 \left(\int c d\pi - \int c d\pi' \right) = c(x_1, y_1) - c(x_2, y_1) - (c(x_1, y_2) - c(x_2, y_2)).$$

But the right-hand side is strictly negative since $(-c)$ is first order Spence-Mirrlees. We conclude that (Γ, M) is submartingale first-order right-monotone, whenever $(-c)$ is first-order Spence-Mirrlees.

Furthermore, we can follow verbatim the proof of Nutz and Stebegg [28, Proposition 7.8 (iii)-(iv)] and conclude that (Γ, M) is second-order left-monotone (resp. right-monotone), whenever c (resp. $(-c)$) is second-order Spence-Mirrlees.

The above (together with a submartingale version of Nutz and Stebegg [28, Theorem 5.2]) proves a submartingale version of Nutz and Stebegg [28, Proposition 7.8]. Then following the lines of the first part of the proof Nutz and Stebegg [28, Corollary 9.4] we conclude that an optimizer of $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta, \chi)} \int c d\pi$ is submartingale first-order right-monotone and second-order left-monotone (resp. submartingale first-order left-monotone and second-order right-monotone), whenever c (resp. $(-c)$) is supermartingale Spence-Mirrlees. \square

Remark 4.2. *In general there are more than one submartingale coupling of $\mu \leq_{ci} \nu$, that is submartingale first-order right-monotone and second-order left-monotone, or submartingale first-order left-monotone and second-order right-monotone. See Nutz and Stebegg [28, Section 10] for an equivalent statement in the supermartingale setting. However, one can modify the increasing and decreasing submartingale couplings $\tilde{\pi}^I, \tilde{\pi}^D$ on their respective martingale points to obtain couplings with aforementioned monotonicity properties.*

For example, let \tilde{M}^D be the martingale points of $\tilde{\pi}^D$, and let $\nu^{\tilde{M}^D}$ be the second marginal of $\tilde{\pi}^D|_{\tilde{M}^D \times \mathbb{R}}$. Then if $\tilde{\pi}^{lc, \tilde{M}^d}$ denote the left-curtain martingale coupling of $\mu|_{\tilde{M}^D \leq c} \nu^{\tilde{M}^D}$ (which is second-order left-monotone), it follows that $\pi := \tilde{\pi}^D|_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \tilde{M}^D} + \tilde{\pi}^{lc, \tilde{M}^d}$ is submartingale first-order right-monotone and second-order left-monotone.

By modifying the increasing submartingale coupling $\tilde{\pi}^I$ on its martingale points we can similarly obtain a submartingale coupling that is submartingale first-order left-monotone and second-order right-monotone.

The question whether these couplings are optimizers of $\int c d\pi$ for some class of costs functions c (and thus canonical), we leave for the future research.

While we were not able to explicitly solve (4.3) for supermartingale Spence-Mirrlees costs, we can give a positive answer in the case we relax the second-order Spence-Mirrlees condition. This leads us to the cost function $(x, y) \mapsto c(x, y) = \pm(x - y)^2$.

For marginals $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$, we have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} (x - y)^2 \pi(dx, dy) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^2 \mu(dx) + \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} -xy \pi(dx, dy) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} y^2 \nu(dy), \quad \text{for all } \pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu),$$

and therefore

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} (x - y)^2 \pi(dx, dy) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} xy \pi(dx, dy),$$

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} (x - y)^2 \pi(dx, dy) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} xy \pi(dx, dy).$$

The above corresponds to the set of couplings in $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$ that produce the largest and smallest correlation of random variables $X \sim \mu$ and $Y \sim \nu$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $\tilde{\pi}^D, \tilde{\pi}^I \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)$ be the decreasing and increasing submartingale couplings, respectively. Let $\pi^D, \pi^I \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)$ be the decreasing and increasing supermartingale couplings, respectively. Let $\pi^M \in \Pi_M(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^0, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0)$ be an arbitrary martingale coupling.*

Define

$$\pi^{min} := \tilde{\pi}^D + \pi^M + \pi^I \quad \text{and} \quad \pi^{max} := \tilde{\pi}^I + \pi^M + \pi^D.$$

Then π^{min} and π^{max} produce (among the elements of $\Pi^*(\mu, \nu)$) the smallest and largest covariance of $X \sim \mu$ and $Y \sim \nu$, respectively.

Proof. Since, for any $\eta, \chi \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\eta \leq_c \chi$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} xy\pi(dx, dy) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^2\eta(dx), \quad \text{for all } \pi \in \Pi_M(\eta, \chi),$$

we have that

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{\pi \in \Pi_M(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^0, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} xy\pi(dx, dy) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\pi \in \Pi_M(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^0, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} xy\pi(dx, dy) = \Pi_M(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^0, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0).$$

Therefore, solving (4.3) with $c(x, y) = \pm xy$ is equivalent to (separately) solving

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} c(x, y)\pi(dx, dy) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)} \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}} c(x, y)\pi(dx, dy).$$

Let $c(x, y) = -xy$. Then, for $x_1 < x_2$, we have that

$$y \mapsto -c(x_2, y) - (-c(x_1, y)) = (x_2 - x_1)y$$

is strictly increasing (and thus $(-c)$ is first-order Spence-Mirrlees, see (4.6)) and linear (and thus both c and $(-c)$ fail to be second-order Spence-Mirrlees, see (4.7); but they are still convex). In particular c is *relaxed* supermartingale Spence-Mirrlees (in the sense of Nutz and Stebegg [28, Definition 9.1]), and thus by Nutz and Stebegg [28, Corollary 9.4] we have that

$$- \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} xy\pi(dx, dy) = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} -xy\pi(dx, dy) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} xy\pi^I(dx, dy).$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 4.2 and its proof, we have that any maximizer of

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} -xy\pi(dx, dy)$$

is submartingale first-order right-monotone. Since $\tilde{\pi}^D \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)$ is submartingale first-order right-monotone, the submartingale version of Nutz and Stebegg [28, Corollary 9.4] then gives that

$$- \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} xy\pi(dx, dy) = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} -xy\pi(dx, dy) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} xy\tilde{\pi}^D(dx, dy).$$

Combining all three optimization problems we conclude that

$$\inf_{\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} xy\pi(dx, dy) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} xy\pi^{min}(dx, dy).$$

Using symmetric arguments we obtain that

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi^*(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} xy \pi(dx, dy) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} xy \pi^{\max}(dx, dy).$$

□

Remark 4.3. *One could investigate (4.3) beyond Spence-Mirrlees costs functions. For example, consider $c(x, y) = \pm|x - y|$. In the martingale setting when $\mu \leq_c \nu$,*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi_M(\mu, \nu)} \int cd\pi$$

was studied by Hobson and Neuberger [24], and Hobson and Klimmek [23]. However, the supermartingale (and thus also submartingale) version of their results are not yet present in the literature.

5. GENERALIZED SHADOW MEASURE

Fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) \leq \nu(\mathbb{R})$, and define

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu} := \{\theta \in \mathcal{M} : \theta(\mathbb{R}) = \mu(\mathbb{R}), \theta \leq \nu\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}$ is the set of all target measures for μ in ν . It is easy to see that $\mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu} \neq \emptyset$. Indeed, $(\mu(\mathbb{R})/\nu(\mathbb{R}))\nu \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}$. Furthermore, if $\mu = (\mu_1 + \mu_2)$ for some $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, then note that, for any $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu_1, \nu}$, we have that $\mathcal{T}_{\mu_2, \nu - \theta} \neq \emptyset$.

In the cases when $\mu \leq_{pc} \nu$ and $\mu \leq_{pcd} \nu$, Beiglböck et al. [12] and Bayraktar et al. [9], respectively, investigated the so-called *shadow* measure that arises as a second (distributional) derivative of a convex function $k \mapsto P_\nu(k) - (P_\nu - P_\mu)^c(k)$, where f^c denotes the largest convex minorant (i.e., convex hull) of $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Here we study this measure for arbitrary μ and ν , and establish an interesting connection to the optimal transport with weak L^1 costs (recall Section 3).

Define

$$p_{\mu, \nu} = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \{P_\mu(k) - P_\nu(k)\} \quad \text{and} \quad c_{\mu, \nu} = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \{C_\mu(k) - C_\nu(k)\}.$$

(This generalizes the definition of $p_{\mu, \nu}, c_{\mu, \nu}$, given in (3.4) for probability measures.) Similarly as for (3.4), note that $k \mapsto \{P_\mu(k) - P_\nu(k)\}$ is continuous, $\lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} \{P_\mu(k) - P_\nu(k)\} = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{P_\mu(k) - P_\nu(k)\} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{(\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu}) - k(\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))\}$, from which we conclude that $p_{\mu, \nu} \in [0, \infty)$. In particular, if $p_{\mu, \nu} > 0$, then $p_{\mu, \nu} = (P_\mu(k^*) - P_\nu(k^*))$ for some $k^* \in \mathbb{R}$. A similar argument shows that $c_{\mu, \nu} \in [0, \infty)$, and, in the case $c_{\mu, \nu} > 0$, $c_{\mu, \nu} = (C_\mu(k^*) - C_\nu(k^*))$ for some $k^* \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, if $p_{\mu, \nu} = 0$ (resp. $c_{\mu, \nu} = 0$) then $\mu \leq_{pcd} \nu$ (resp. $\mu \leq_{pci} \nu$) and we can embed μ into ν using a supermartingale (resp. submartingale).

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) \leq \nu(\mathbb{R})$. The second (distributional) derivative of $k \mapsto (P_\nu - P_\mu)^c(k)$ corresponds to a (unique) measure $\theta_{\mu, \nu} \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $P_{\theta_{\mu, \nu}}(k) = (P_\nu - P_\mu)^c(k) + p_{\mu, \nu}$, $k \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, $\theta_{\mu, \nu}(\mathbb{R}) = (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))$ and $\overline{\theta_{\mu, \nu}} = \bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu, \nu} - p_{\mu, \nu}$.*

Proof. Define $k \mapsto h(k) := (P_\nu - P_\mu)^c(k) + p_{\mu, \nu}$. In order to prove the claim we need to show that $h \in \mathcal{D}(\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}), \bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu, \nu} - p_{\mu, \nu})$. (Uniqueness is immediate since the measures

are uniquely identified by their potential functions.) Convexity of h is clear, and thus we are left to show that h is non-decreasing and has a correct asymptotic behaviour.

Observe that, by the definitions of $p_{\mu,\nu}$ and $c_{\mu,\nu}$, and the Put-Call parity, we have that $(P_\nu(k) - P_\mu(k)) \geq \max\{-p_{\mu,\nu}, (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu})\}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, $(P_\nu - P_\mu)^c(k) \geq \max\{-p_{\mu,\nu}, (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu})\}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that $P_\nu(k) - P_\mu(k) + p_{\mu,\nu} \geq h(k) \geq \max\{0, (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu})\} \geq 0$, $k \in \mathbb{R}$, which we will now use to deduce the desired properties of h .

First, we have that

$$(5.1) \quad 0 \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} h(k) \leq p_{\mu,\nu},$$

and thus, since h is convex, h must also be non-decreasing. This also shows that, in the case $p_{\mu,\nu} = 0$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} h(k) = 0$. We now argue that $\lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} h(k) = 0$ holds when $p_{\mu,\nu} > 0$ as well. Indeed, in this case, for some $k_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that

$$0 \leq h(k_1) \leq P_\nu(k_1) - P_\mu(k_1) + p_{\mu,\nu} = 0,$$

which, combined with the convexity of h and (5.1), shows that $\lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} h(k) = 0$. (Indeed, if $h'(k_-) < 0$ for some $k_- \in (-\infty, k_1]$, then for a small enough $k < k_-$ we must have that $h(k) > p_{\mu,\nu}$, and thus also $\lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} h(k) > p_{\mu,\nu}$, a contradiction. Hence $h(k) = 0$ for all $k \leq k_1$, from which the asymptotic behaviour follows.)

Secondly, we also have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{(\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu})\} \\ & \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h(k) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{(\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} - p_{\mu,\nu})\}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus in the case $c_{\mu,\nu} = 0$ we immediately have that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h(k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{(\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu})\}.$$

If $c_{\mu,\nu} > 0$, then $C_\nu(k_2) - C_\mu(k_2) = -c_{\mu,\nu}$ for some $k_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, which by the Put-Call parity is equivalent to

$$P_\nu(k_2) - P_\mu(k_2) + p_{\mu,\nu} = (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k_2 - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu}).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k_2 - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu}) &= P_\nu(k_2) - P_\mu(k_2) + p_{\mu,\nu} \\ &\geq h(k_2) \\ &\geq \max\{0, (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k_2 - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu})\} \\ &\geq (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k_2 - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu}), \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$h(k_2) = (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k_2 - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu}).$$

Then, (similarly as for the asymptotic behaviour at $-\infty$) if $h'(k_+) > (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))$ for some $k_+ \in [k_2, +\infty)$, then for a large enough $k > k_+$, $h(k) > (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu})$, and thus (by the convexity of h) also $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h(k) > \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{(\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu})\}$,

a contradiction. It follows that $h(k) = (\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu})$ for all $k \geq k_2$, and thus $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h(k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{(\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}))k - (\bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu})\}$.

Combining the convexity, monotonicity and the asymptotic behaviour (at $-\infty$ and ∞) of $k \mapsto h(k)$, we conclude that $h \in \mathcal{D}(\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}), \bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu})$, which finishes the proof. \square

We now introduce the generalized shadow measure, which we uniquely identify by the associated potential function of a special form.

Lemma 5.2 (Generalized shadow measure). *The second (distributional) derivative of $k \mapsto P_\nu(k) - (P_\nu - P_\mu)^c(k)$ corresponds to the unique measure $S^\nu(\mu) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu,\nu}$ that satisfies*

$$P_{S^\nu(\mu)}(k) = P_\nu(k) - (P_\nu - P_\mu)^c(k) - p_{\mu,\nu}, \quad k \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{S^\nu(\mu)} = \bar{\mu} + p_{\mu,\nu} - c_{\mu,\nu}.$$

Proof. Define $k \mapsto h(k) := (P_\nu - P_\mu)^c + p_{\mu,\nu}$. We need to show that $(P_\nu - h) \in \mathcal{P}(\mu, \nu)$ (see (2.1)) (and that the underlying measure has a correct mean), which is equivalent to $(P_\nu - h) \in \mathcal{D}(\mu(\mathbb{R}), \bar{\mu} + p_{\mu,\nu} - c_{\mu,\nu})$ and $[P_\nu - (P_\nu - h)] = h$ being convex. The latter, however, immediately follows from the definition of h .

We now show that $(P_\nu - h) \in \mathcal{D}(\mu(\mathbb{R}), \bar{\mu} + p_{\mu,\nu} - c_{\mu,\nu})$. By Lemma 5.1 we have that $h \in \mathcal{D}(\nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu(\mathbb{R}), \bar{\nu} - \bar{\mu} + c_{\mu,\nu} - p_{\mu,\nu})$ and therefore $\lim_{|k| \rightarrow \infty} \{P_\nu(k) - h(k)\} = \lim_{|k| \rightarrow \infty} \max\{0, \mu(\mathbb{R})k - (\bar{\mu} + p_{\mu,\nu} - c_{\mu,\nu})\}$. Hence the claim follows if $(P_\nu - h)$ is convex. But this is immediate from Beiglböck et al. [14, Lemma 2.3]. \square

For any $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu,\nu}$, define

$$p_\theta := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \{P_\mu(k) - P_\theta(k)\}.$$

Note that, $\lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} \{P_\mu(k) - P_\theta(k)\} = 0$ and (since $\theta(\mathbb{R}) = \mu(\mathbb{R})$) $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{P_\mu(k) - P_\theta(k)\} = \bar{\theta} - \bar{\mu}$, and therefore $p_\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Moreover,

$$p_\theta = - \inf_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \{P_\theta(k) - P_\mu(k)\} = -(P_\theta - P_\mu)^c(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{R}$$

and, in particular, $\inf\{m \geq 0 : P_\theta + m \geq P_\mu \text{ on } \mathbb{R}\} = p_\theta$. Using the Put-Call parity we further have that $p_\theta = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \{C_\mu(k) - C_\theta(k)\} - \bar{\mu} + \bar{\theta}$, and by defining

$$c_\theta := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \{C_\mu(k) - C_\theta(k)\} \in \mathbb{R},$$

we obtain that $\bar{\theta} = \bar{\mu} + p_\theta - c_\theta$.

Lemma 5.3. *Fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) \leq \nu(\mathbb{R})$, and let $S^\nu(\mu)$ be the shadow measure as in Lemma 5.2. Then*

$$p_{S^\nu(\mu)} = p_{\mu,\nu} \quad \text{and} \quad c_{S^\nu(\mu)} = c_{\mu,\nu}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.2 we have that $S^\nu(\mu) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu,\nu}$, and therefore $\overline{S^\nu(\mu)} = \bar{\mu} + p_{S^\nu(\mu)} - c_{S^\nu(\mu)}$. On the other hand, by Lemma 5.2 we also have that $\overline{S^\nu(\mu)} = \bar{\mu} + p_{\mu,\nu} - c_{\mu,\nu}$. Hence it is enough to prove that $p_{S^\nu(\mu)} = p_{\mu,\nu}$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} p_{S^\nu(\mu)} &= -(P_{S^\nu(\mu)} - P_\mu)^c \\ &= -((P_\nu - P_\mu) - (P_\nu - P_\mu)^c - p_{\mu,\nu})^c = -((P_\nu - P_\mu)^c - (P_\nu - P_\mu)^c - p_{\mu,\nu})^c = p_{\mu,\nu}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality is a direct consequence of Beiglböck et al. [14, Lemma 2.4]. \square

The next lemma describes a special minimality (in terms of potential functions) property of the shadow measure.

Lemma 5.4. *Fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) \leq \nu(\mathbb{R})$, and let $S^\nu(\mu)$ be the shadow measure. Then, for all $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}$,*

$$P_\mu(k) \leq P_{S^\nu(\mu)}(k) + p_{S^\nu(\mu)} \leq P_\theta(k) + p_\theta, \quad k \in \mathbb{R},$$

and $p_{S^\nu(\mu)} \leq p_\theta$.

Proof. First, $P_\mu \leq P_\theta + p_\theta$ on \mathbb{R} , and therefore

$$P_\nu - P_\theta - p_\theta \leq P_\nu - P_\mu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}.$$

Since $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}$, we have that $(\nu - \theta) \in \mathcal{M}$, and therefore $k \mapsto [P_\nu(k) - P_\theta(k) - p_\theta] = [P_{\nu-\theta}(k) - p_\theta]$ is convex. It follows that

$$P_\nu - P_\theta - p_\theta \leq (P_\nu - P_\mu)^c \leq P_\nu - P_\mu \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R},$$

from which (using Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3) we conclude that

$$P_\mu(k) \leq P_{S^\nu(\mu)}(k) + p_{S^\nu(\mu)} = P_\nu(k) - (P_\nu - P_\mu)^c(k) - p_{\mu, \nu} + p_{S^\nu(\mu)} \leq P_\theta(k) + p_\theta \quad k \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow -\infty$ we obtain that $p_{S^\nu(\mu)} \leq p_\theta$. \square

Corollary 5.1. *Fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) \leq \nu(\mathbb{R})$. Then for all $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}$ we have that*

$$C_\mu(k) \leq C_{S^\nu(\mu)}(k) + c_{S^\nu(\mu)} \leq C_\theta(k) + c_\theta, \quad k \in \mathbb{R},$$

and $c_{S^\nu(\mu)} \leq c_\theta$.

Proof. Since, for all $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}$, $\bar{\theta} = \bar{\mu} + p_\theta - c_\theta$, the claim immediately follows from Lemma 5.4 and the Put-Call parity. \square

While Lemma 5.4 characterizes the shadow measure in terms of its potential function, the next result provides a characterization in terms of minimal (weak) transportation cost.

Now recall the setting of Section 3. For each $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}$ consider

$$V(\mu, \theta) = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \theta)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x(dy) \right| \mu(dx),$$

which is equivalent to (3.1) since $\mu(\mathbb{R}) = \theta(\mathbb{R})$.

Theorem 5.1. *Fix $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) \leq \nu(\mathbb{R})$. The shadow measure (of μ in ν) $S^\nu(\mu)$, as in Lemma 5.2, is the unique element of $\mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}$ satisfying*

- (1) $S^\nu(\mu) \in \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}} V(\mu, \theta)$,
- (2) $S^\nu(\mu) \leq_c \theta^*$, for all $\theta^* \in \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}} V(\mu, \theta)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $\min\{p_{S^\nu(\mu)}, c_{S^\nu(\mu)}\} > 0$. Note that, by Lemma 5.4 we have that $\min\{p_\theta, c_\theta\} \geq \min\{p_{S^\nu(\mu)}, c_{S^\nu(\mu)}\} > 0$.

Fix $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu, \nu}$. Then by Theorem 3.1 we have that

$$V(\mu, \theta) = V(\eta_{\mu, \theta}^-, \chi_{\mu, \theta}^-) + V(\eta_{\mu, \theta}^+, \chi_{\mu, \theta}^+) = (\overline{\chi_{\mu, \theta}^-} - \overline{\eta_{\mu, \theta}^-}) + (\overline{\eta_{\mu, \theta}^+} - \overline{\chi_{\mu, \theta}^+}).$$

Since $S^\nu(\mu) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu,\nu}$, the goal is to show that

$$\overline{(\chi_{\mu,\theta}^- - \eta_{\mu,\theta}^-)} \geq \overline{(\chi_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^- - \eta_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^-)} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{(\eta_{\mu,\theta}^+ - \chi_{\mu,\theta}^+)} \geq \overline{(\eta_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^+ - \chi_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^+)}.$$

We will only treat the first inequality, the second inequality can be obtained using symmetric arguments.

By Lemma 5.4, we have that $x_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^- \leq x_{\mu,\theta}^-$. Then, let S_θ be a restriction of $S^\nu(\mu)$ to $(-\infty, x_{\mu,\theta}^-)$ together with an appropriate amount of mass $\alpha \leq S^\nu(\mu)(\{x_{\mu,\theta}^-\})$ such that $S_\theta(\mathbb{R}) = S_\theta((-\infty, x_{\mu,\theta}^-]) = \chi_{\mu,\theta}^-(\mathbb{R})$. Then $P_{S_\theta} = P_{S^\nu(\mu)}$ on $(-\infty, x_{\mu,\theta}^-]$, P_{S_θ} is linear on $(x_{\mu,\theta}^-, \infty)$ with slope $\chi_{\mu,\theta}^-(\mathbb{R})$, $P_{S_\theta}(x_{\mu,\theta}^-) + p_{S^\nu(\mu)} = P_{\chi_{\mu,\theta}^-}(x_{\mu,\theta}^-) + p_\theta = P_\mu(x_{\mu,\theta}^-)$ and $P_{\chi_{\mu,\theta}^-} + p_\theta \geq P_{S_\theta} + p_{S^\nu(\mu)} \geq P_\mu$ on $(-\infty, x_{\mu,\theta}^-)$. It follows that $\eta_{\mu,\theta}^- \leq_{ci} S_\theta \leq_{ci} \chi_{\mu,\theta}^-$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (5.2) \quad \overline{(\chi_{\mu,\theta}^- - \eta_{\mu,\theta}^-)} &\geq \overline{(S_\theta - \eta_{\mu,\theta}^-)} \\ &= \overline{(S_\theta - \chi_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^- - \eta_{\mu,\theta}^- - \eta_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^-)} + \overline{(\chi_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^- - \eta_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^-)} \\ &= \overline{(\chi_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^- - \eta_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^-)}. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality is obtained as follows. Recall that $x_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^- \leq x_{\mu,\theta}^-$, $P_{S_\theta} = P_{S^\nu(\mu)}$ on $(-\infty, x_{\mu,\theta}^-]$, $P_{S^\nu(\mu)}(x) + p_{S^\nu(\mu)} = P_\mu(x)$ for $x \in \{x_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^-, x_{\mu,\theta}^-\}$, and $P_{S_\theta} + p_{S^\nu(\mu)} \geq P_\mu$ on $(-\infty, x_{\mu,\theta}^-]$. Therefore $(\eta_{\mu,\theta}^- - \eta_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^-) \leq_c (S_\theta - \chi_{\mu,S^\nu(\mu)}^-)$, and thus these measures have equal means. We conclude that $S^\nu(\mu) \in \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu,\nu}} V(\mu, \theta)$.

Furthermore, if $\hat{\theta} \in \arg \min_{\mathcal{T}_{\mu,\nu}} V(\mu, \theta)$, then we must have that $S_{\hat{\theta}} \leq_{ci} \chi_{\mu,\hat{\theta}}^-$ and (5.2) holds with equality. It follows that $S_{\hat{\theta}} \leq_c \chi_{\mu,\hat{\theta}}^-$ and therefore $p_{\hat{\theta}} = p_{S^\nu(\mu)}$. By symmetry, $c_{\hat{\theta}} = c_{S^\nu(\mu)}$, and, by combining Lemma 5.4 and Corollary 5.1, we conclude that $S^\nu(\mu) \leq_c \hat{\theta}$. This finishes the proof. \square

We next present the associativity property of the shadow measure. It is the main ingredient in the construction of the lifted shadow couplings.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\mu(\mathbb{R}) \leq \nu(\mathbb{R})$, and suppose that $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$ for some $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}$. Then*

$$S^\nu(\mu_1 + \mu_2) = S^\nu(\mu_1) + S^{\nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)}(\mu_2).$$

Furthermore, $p_{S^\nu(\mu)} = p_{S^\nu(\mu_1)} + p_{S^{\nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)}(\mu_2)}$.

Proof. Note that $\mu_2(\mathbb{R}) \leq (\nu - S^\nu(\mu_1))(\mathbb{R}) = \nu(\mathbb{R}) - \mu_1(\mathbb{R})$, so that $\mathcal{T}_{\mu_2, \nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)} \neq \emptyset$, and therefore $S^{\nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)}(\mu_2)$ is well-defined.

By Lemma 5.2 we have that, on \mathbb{R} ,

$$P_{S^\nu(\mu_1 + \mu_2)} = P_\nu - ((P_\nu - P_{\mu_1}) - P_{\mu_2})^c - p_{\mu_1 + \mu_2, \nu} = P_\nu - ((P_\nu - P_{\mu_1})^c - P_{\mu_2})^c - p_{\mu_1 + \mu_2, \nu},$$

where the second equality follows from Beiglböck et al. [14, Lemma 2.4]. Now, using Lemma 5.2 for the inner convex hull and taking the constant $p_{\mu_1, \nu}$ outside the outer convex hull we have that

$$P_{S^\nu(\mu_1 + \mu_2)} = P_\nu - ((P_\nu - P_{S^\nu(\mu_1)}) - P_{\mu_2})^c + p_{\mu_1, \nu} - p_{\mu_1 + \mu_2, \nu} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}.$$

Since $S^\nu(\mu_1) \leq \nu$, $(\nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)) \in \mathcal{M}$, and therefore $(P_\nu - P_{S^\nu(\mu_1)}) = P_{\nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{S^\nu(\mu_1 + \mu_2)} &= P_\nu - (P_{\nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)} - P_{\mu_2})^c + p_{\mu_1, \nu} - p_{\mu_1 + \mu_2, \nu} \\ &= P_\nu - \left(P_{\nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)} - P_{S^\nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)(\mu_2)} \right) + p_{\mu_2, \nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)} + p_{\mu_1, \nu} - p_{\mu_1 + \mu_2, \nu} \\ &= P_{S^\nu(\mu_1)} + P_{S^\nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)(\mu_2)} + p_{\mu_2, \nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)} + p_{\mu_1, \nu} - p_{\mu_1 + \mu_2, \nu} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 5.2 for the second equality. Taking second (distributional) derivatives proves the associativity property.

For the second assertion, note that, since $\lim_{k \rightarrow -\infty} P_\theta(k) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathcal{M}$, we must have that $p_{\mu_2, \nu - S^\nu(\mu_1)} + p_{\mu_1, \nu} = p_{\mu_1 + \mu_2, \nu}$. Then Lemma 5.3 completes the proof. \square

We finish this paper with the result regarding the existence of shadow couplings.

In the rest of this section we work with $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$ (or, more generally, with measures that have equal total mass). We first recall the notions of the lift of μ and the lifted couplings of μ and ν , given in the introduction.

Let $\lambda = \text{Leb}_{[0,1]}$ be the Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$. A lift of μ is a measure $\hat{\mu}$ on $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$ with first and second marginals given by λ and μ , respectively (i.e., $\hat{\mu} \in \Pi(\lambda, \mu)$). For each $\hat{\mu} \in \Pi(\lambda, \nu)$, define a family of measures on \mathbb{R} , $(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]})_{u \in [0,1]}$, by setting, for each $u \in [0, 1]$,

$$\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}(A) = \hat{\mu}([0, u] \times A), \quad \text{for all Borel } A \subseteq \mathbb{R}.$$

For a fixed lift $\hat{\mu}$, let $\hat{\Pi}(\hat{\mu}, \nu)$ be the set of probability measures on $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, such that $\hat{\pi}(A \times B \times \mathbb{R}) = \hat{\mu}(A \times B)$ and $\hat{\pi}([0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \times B) = \nu(B)$, for all Borel $A \subseteq [0, 1]$, $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$. For each lift $\hat{\mu} \in \Pi(\lambda, \nu)$, there exists the unique $\hat{\pi} \in \hat{\Pi}(\hat{\mu}, \nu)$, such that*

$$\int_0^u d\hat{\pi} \in \Pi(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}, S^\nu(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]})), \quad \text{for all } u \in [0, 1].$$

In particular, $\int_0^1 d\hat{\pi} \in \Pi^(\mu, \nu)$.*

Several canonical lifts (that then lead to canonical lifted couplings using Theorem 5.2) can be found in [14].

In order to prove Theorem 5.2, we will need one auxiliary result. Recall the definitions of $x_{\mu, \nu}^-, x_{\mu, \nu}^+$ (given by (3.6)), of $\eta_{\mu, \nu}^-, \eta_{\mu, \nu}^0, \eta_{\mu, \nu}^+$ (given by (3.7)), and of $\chi_{\mu, \nu}^-, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^0, \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+$ (given by (3.9)).

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$. For each lift $\hat{\mu} \in \Pi(\lambda, \nu)$ define*

$$\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^- = \hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}|_{(-\infty, x_{\mu, \nu}^-)}, \quad \hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^0 = \hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}|_{[x_{\mu, \nu}^-, x_{\mu, \nu}^+]}, \quad \hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^+ = \hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}|_{(x_{\mu, \nu}^+, \infty)}, \quad \text{for all } u \in [0, 1].$$

Then

$$S^\nu(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}) = S^{X_{\mu, \nu}^-}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^-) + S^{X_{\mu, \nu}^0}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^0) + S^{X_{\mu, \nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^+), \quad \text{for all } u \in [0, 1].$$

Proof. We use similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

First, by Lemma 3.2, and the fact that $\chi_{\mu, \nu}^+$ is the restriction of ν to $(x_{\mu, \nu}^+, \infty)$ (together with an appropriate amount of mass at $x_{\mu, \nu}^+$), we have that $\eta_{\mu, \nu}^+ \leq_{cd} \chi_{\mu, \nu}^+ \leq_{cd} \theta^+$ and $\overline{\chi_{\mu, \nu}^+} > \overline{\theta^+}$ for

any other possible target law $\theta^+ \in \mathcal{T}_{\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \nu}$ (of $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+$ in ν). Using Lemma 3.1 we then conclude that

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x(dy) \right| \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+(dx) &= \overline{\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+} - \overline{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+} \\ &< \overline{\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+} - \overline{\theta^+} \\ &= \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \theta^+)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| x - \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \pi_x(dy) \right| \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+(dx), \end{aligned}$$

and thus $\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+$ is the unique element of $\operatorname{argmin}_{\theta^+ \in \mathcal{T}_{\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \nu}} V(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \theta^+)$. It follows that $S^\nu(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+) = \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+$. (Note that in this case $S^\nu(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+)$ reduces to the supermartingale shadow measure of [28].)

Now observe that $\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+ \leq \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+ \leq_{cd} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+ \leq \nu$, and therefore $\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+ \leq \eta_{\mu,\nu}^+ \leq_{pcd} \nu$. Hence, by applying [9, Lemma 3.12] we obtain that $\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+ \leq_{pcd} S^\nu(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+)$ and

$$S^\nu(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+) = S^{S^\nu(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+)}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+) = S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+)$$

(where we again use that all the shadow measures are in fact the supermartingale shadow measures of [28]). By the associativity of the shadow measure (Lemma 5.5) it then follows that

$$S^\nu(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+) = S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+) + S^{\nu - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+)}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^- + \hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^0).$$

We are left to show that

$$(5.4) \quad S^{\nu - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+)}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^- + \hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^0) = S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^-}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^-) + S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^0}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^0).$$

First note that

$$\eta_{\mu,\nu}^- + \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0 \leq_{ci} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0 \leq \nu - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+).$$

Furthermore, $\chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0$ is a restriction of $\nu - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+)$ to $(-\infty, x_{\mu,\nu}^+)$ (again, with an appropriate amount of mass at $x_{\mu,\nu}^+$). Hence,

$$\eta_{\mu,\nu}^- + \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0 \leq_{ci} \chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0 \leq_{ci} \theta \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0} \leq_{ci} \overline{\theta}$$

for any other $\theta \in \mathcal{T}_{\eta_{\mu,\nu}^- + \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0, \nu - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+)}$. Using Lemma 3.1, and similarly as in (5.3), we

conclude that $S^{\nu - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+)}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^- + \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0) = \chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0$.

Furthermore, since $\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^- + \hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^0 \leq \eta_{\mu,\nu}^- + \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0$, we also have that $\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^- + \hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^0 \leq \eta_{\mu,\nu}^- + \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0 \leq_{pci} \nu - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+)$. Then using a submartingale version of [9, Lemma 3.12] we obtain that

$$\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^- + \hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^0 \leq_{pci} S^{\nu - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+)}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^- + \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0) = \chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0$$

and

$$S^{\nu - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+)}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^- + \hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^0) = S^{\nu - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^+)}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^- + \eta_{\mu,\nu}^0)(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^- + \hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^0) = S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^- + \hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^0).$$

Then using (5.4), it follows that we are left to show that

$$S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^- + \hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^0) = S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^-}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^-) + S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^0}(\hat{\mu}_{\mu,\nu}^0).$$

Applying the associativity of the shadow measure we have that

$$S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^- + \hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^0) = S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^-) + S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0 - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-}}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^-)(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^0),$$

and thus we need to show that

$$S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^-) = S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^-}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^-) \quad \text{and} \quad S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0 - S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^- + \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-}}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^-)(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^0) = S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^0}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^0).$$

This can be done by repeating the above arguments, adapted to the submartingale and martingale settings, respectively. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.2. For each lift $\hat{\mu} \in \Pi(\lambda, \mu)$, and the corresponding parametrization $(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]})_{u \in [0,1]}$, let $(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^-)_{u \in [0,1]}$, $(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^0)_{u \in [0,1]}$ and $(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^+)_{u \in [0,1]}$ be the families of measures as in Lemma 5.6. Note that these families of measures correspond (up to the scaling with total mass) to the lifts of $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-$, $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^0$ and $\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+$, respectively. Then using the results of [14] and [10], we have that there exists the unique couplings $\hat{\pi}^- \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)$, $\hat{\pi}^0 \in \Pi_M(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^0, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0)$, $\hat{\pi}^+ \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)$ such that, for all $u \in [0, 1]$,

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_0^u d\hat{\pi}^- &\in \Pi_{Sub}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^-, S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^-}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^-)), \\ \int_0^u d\hat{\pi}^0 &\in \Pi_M(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^0, S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^0}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^0)), \\ \int_0^u d\hat{\pi}^+ &\in \Pi_{Sup}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^+, S^{\chi_{\mu,\nu}^+}(\hat{\mu}_{[0,u]}^+)). \end{aligned}$$

Then, if we define $\hat{\pi} = \hat{\pi}^- + \hat{\pi}^0 + \hat{\pi}^+$, using Lemma 5.6 we conclude that $\hat{\pi}$ satisfies the required properties.

For the uniqueness, if $\tilde{\pi}$ is another element of $\hat{\Pi}(\hat{\mu}, \nu)$ that satisfies the stated properties, then using Lemma 5.6 and the uniqueness of couplings $\hat{\pi}^- \in \Pi_{Sub}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^-, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^-)$, $\hat{\pi}^0 \in \Pi_M(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^0, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^0)$, $\hat{\pi}^+ \in \Pi_{Sup}(\eta_{\mu,\nu}^+, \chi_{\mu,\nu}^+)$ satisfying (5.5), we conclude that $\tilde{\pi} = \hat{\pi}^- + \hat{\pi}^0 + \hat{\pi}^+ = \hat{\pi}$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Aurélien Alfonsi, Jacopo Corbetta, and Benjamin Jourdain. Sampling of probability measures in the convex order and approximation of martingale optimal transport problems. *Available at SSRN 3072356*, 2017.
- [2] J-J Alibert, Guy Bouchitté, and Thierry Champion. A new class of costs for optimal transport planning. *European Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 30(6):1229–1263, 2019.
- [3] Julio Backhoff-Veraguas, Daniel Bartl, Mathias Beiglböck, and Manu Eder. Adapted wasserstein distances and stability in mathematical finance. *Finance and Stochastics*, 24(3):601–632, 2020.
- [4] Julio Backhoff-Veraguas, Mathias Beiglböck, Martin Huesmann, and Sigrid Källblad. Martingale benamou–brenier: a probabilistic perspective. *The Annals of Probability*, 48(5):2258–2289, 2020.
- [5] Julio Backhoff-Veraguas, Mathias Beiglböck, and Gudmun Pammer. Existence, duality, and cyclical monotonicity for weak transport costs. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 58(6):203, 2019.
- [6] Julio Backhoff-Veraguas, Mathias Beiglböck, and Gudmund Pammer. Weak monotone rearrangement on the line. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 25:1–16, 2020.
- [7] Julio Backhoff-Veraguas and Gudmund Pammer. Applications of weak transport theory. *Bernoulli*, 28(1):370–394, 2022.

- [8] Julio Backhoff-Veraguas and Gudmund Pammer. Stability of martingale optimal transport and weak optimal transport. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 32(1):721–752, 2022.
- [9] Erhan Bayraktar, Shuoqing Deng, and Dominykas Norgilas. A potential-based construction of the increasing supermartingale coupling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.03450 (to appear in the Annals of Applied Probability)*, 2021.
- [10] Erhan Bayraktar, Shuoqing Deng, and Dominykas Norgilas. Supermartingale shadow couplings: the decreasing case. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.11732*, 2022.
- [11] Mathias Beiglböck, Pierre Henry-Labordere, and Friedrich Penkner. Model-independent bounds for option prices—a mass transport approach. *Finance and Stochastics*, 17(3):477–501, 2013.
- [12] Mathias Beiglböck, David Hobson, and Dominykas Norgilas. The potential of the shadow measure. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 27:1–12, 2022.
- [13] Mathias Beiglböck and Nicolas Juillet. On a problem of optimal transport under marginal martingale constraints. *The Annals of Probability*, 44(1):42–106, 2016.
- [14] Mathias Beiglböck and Nicolas Juillet. Shadow couplings. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 374(7):4973–5002, 2021.
- [15] Rafael V Chacon. Potential processes. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 226:39–58, 1977.
- [16] Rafael V Chacon and John B Walsh. One-dimensional potential embedding. *Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg*, 10:19–23, 1976.
- [17] Max Fathi and Yan Shu. Curvature and transport inequalities for markov chains in discrete spaces. *Bernoulli*, 24(1):672–698, 2018.
- [18] Nathael Gozlan and Nicolas Juillet. On a mixture of brenier and strassen theorems. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 120(3):434–463, 2020.
- [19] Nathael Gozlan, Cyril Roberto, Paul-Marie Samson, Yan Shu, and Prasad Tetali. Characterization of a class of weak transport-entropy inequalities on the line. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 54(3):1667–1693, 2018.
- [20] Nathael Gozlan, Cyril Roberto, Paul-Marie Samson, and Prasad Tetali. Kantorovich duality for general transport costs and applications. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 273(11):3327–3405, 2017.
- [21] Francis Hirsch and Bernard Roynette. A new proof of kellerer’s theorem. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 16:48–60, 2012.
- [22] David Hobson and Martin Klimmek. Model-independent hedging strategies for variance swaps. *Finance and Stochastics*, 16(4):611–649, 2012.
- [23] David Hobson and Martin Klimmek. Robust price bounds for the forward starting straddle. *Finance and Stochastics*, 19(1):189–214, 2015.
- [24] David Hobson and Anthony Neuberger. Robust bounds for forward start options. *Mathematical Finance: An International Journal of Mathematics, Statistics and Financial Economics*, 22(1):31–56, 2012.
- [25] David G Hobson and Dominykas Norgilas. The left-curtain martingale coupling in the presence of atoms. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 29(3):1904–1928, 2019.
- [26] Katalin Marton. Bounding $\bar{\{d\}}$ -distance by informational divergence: a method to prove measure concentration. *Annals of Probability*, 24(2):857–866, 1996.
- [27] Katalin Marton. A measure concentration inequality for contracting markov chains. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 6(3):556–571, 1996.
- [28] Marcel Nutz and Florian Stebegg. Canonical supermartingale couplings. *The Annals of Probability*, 46(6):3351–3398, 2018.
- [29] Yan Shu. Hamilton-jacobi equations on graph and applications. *Potential Analysis*, 48(2):125–157, 2018.
- [30] Yan Shu. From hopf–lax formula to optimal weak transfer plan. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 52(3):3052–3072, 2020.
- [31] Volker Strassen. The existence of probability measures with given marginals. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 36(2):423–439, 1965.

- [32] Michel Talagrand. Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces. *Publications Mathématiques de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Scientifiques*, 81:73–205, 1995.
- [33] Michel Talagrand. New concentration inequalities in product spaces. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 126(3):505–563, 1996.