

Risk sharing with Lambda value at risk under heterogeneous beliefs

Peng Liu*

Andreas Tsanakas[†]Yunran Wei[‡]

August 7, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we study the risk sharing problem among multiple agents using Lambda value at risk as their preferences under heterogeneous beliefs, where the beliefs are represented by several probability measures. We obtain semi-explicit formulas for the inf-convolution of multiple Lambda value at risk under heterogeneous beliefs and the explicit forms of the corresponding optimal allocations. To show the interplay among the beliefs, we consider three cases: homogeneous beliefs, conditional beliefs and absolutely continuous beliefs. For those cases, we find more explicit expressions for the inf-convolution, showing the influence of the relation of the beliefs on the inf-convolution. Moreover, we consider the inf-convolution of one Lambda value at risk and a general risk measure, including expected utility, distortion risk measures and Lambda value at risk as special cases, with different beliefs. The expression of the inf-convolution and the form of the optimal allocation are obtained. Finally, we discuss the risk sharing for another definition of Lambda value at risk.

Key-words: Lambda value at Risk; Value-at-Risk; Risk sharing; Inf-convolution; Distortion risk measure; Expected shortfall; CoVaR; CoES

1 Introduction

The Pareto-optimal risk sharing problem has been studied extensively with the preferences of agents represented by some risk measures since the introduction of convex or coherent risk measures by [Artzner et al. \(1999\)](#), [Föllmer and Schied \(2002\)](#) and [Frittelli and Rosazza Gianin \(2005\)](#). For instance, convex risk measures were used in [Barrieu and El Karoui \(2005\)](#), [Jouini et al.](#)

*School of Mathematics, Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Essex, UK. Email: peng.liu@essex.ac.uk

[†]Bayes Business School (formerly Cass), City, University of London, London, UK. Email: a.tsanakas.1@city.ac.uk

[‡]School of Mathematics and Statistics, Carleton University, Canada. Email: Yunran.Wei@carleton.ca

(2008) and Filipović and Svindland (2008) to investigate the risk sharing problem, showing the existence of the optimal allocation which are *comonotonic*¹ under the assumption of law-invariance. Recently, more focus has been put on the risk sharing problem for non-convex risk measures such as quantile-based risk measures including Value-at-Risk (VaR) and Expected Shortfall (ES) as special cases (e.g., Embrechts et al. (2018), Liu et al. (2022) and Weber (2018)) and distortion riskmetrics including inter-quantile-range, Gini deviation and mean-median deviation as examples (e.g., Lauzier et al. (2023b)), showing that the optimal allocation is pairwise countermonotonic defined in Lauzier et al. (2023a).

In the above papers, the agents are assumed to enjoy the same belief on the distribution of the future risk. However, in the current regulatory frameworks (e.g., BCBS Standards (2016)), internal models are extensively used, leading to heterogeneous opinions for different agents on the same future risk. Moreover, the belief heterogeneity may also stem from the asymmetric information accessed by the agents. We refer to Embrechts (2017) for the discussion of application of internal models in banking and insurance and Xiong (2013) for the discussion in finance. The model/belief heterogeneity in the risk sharing problem has been considered by some papers in the literature. For instance, the risk sharing for VaR or ES under heterogeneous beliefs was studied in Embrechts et al. (2020), which showed that optimal risk allocations are pairwise countermonotonic with model heterogeneity. Liu (2020) investigated the comonotonic risk sharing with heterogeneous beliefs for distortion risk measures and Liebrich (2022) studied the risk sharing for consistent risk measures with model heterogeneity and obtained the sufficient condition for the existence of the optimal allocations. Model heterogeneity was also studied in the optimal insurance and reinsurance designs; see Amarante et al. (2015), Chi (2019), Boonen and Ghossoub (2020), Asimit et al. (2021) and the references therein.

In this paper, we use Lambda value at risk (Λ VaR) to represent the agents' preference. As an extension of VaR, Λ VaR was introduced by Frittelli et al. (2014) by changing the fixed probability level to a probability/loss function $1 - \Lambda$. The Λ function can be chosen either increasing (relatively risk-averse) or decreasing (relatively risk-seeking), representing decision makers' individual risk appetite as shown in Frittelli et al. (2014). The choice of Λ function based on data was studied in Hitaj et al. (2018). Compared with VaR, one advantage is that Lambda value at risk is able to distinguish the tail risk for decreasing Λ functions in the similar spirit of Loss VaR proposed in Bignozzi et al. (2020). For increasing Λ , Λ VaR may incorporate some additional requirement such as risk manager's judgement in the process of risk management; see Bellini and Peri (2022). Moreover, the recent literature shows that Λ VaR satisfies some other

¹We say X_1, \dots, X_n are comonotonic if there exist non-decreasing functions f_1, \dots, f_n satisfying $f_1(x) + \dots + f_n(x) = x$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $X_1 = f_1(X_1 + \dots + X_n), \dots, X_n = f_n(X_1 + \dots + X_n)$.

desirable properties. In [Han et al. \(2024\)](#), it showed that AVaR with increasing Λ function satisfies quasi-star-shapedness, which is a property weaker than quasi-convexity and penalizing some kind of concentration. In addition, AVaR with increasing Λ functions also satisfy cash subadditivity, which is useful to measure the future financial loss with stochastic interest rates; see [El Karoui and Ravanelli \(2009\)](#) and [Han et al. \(2024\)](#). We refer to [Bellini and Peri \(2022\)](#) for the monotonicity, locality and other properties, and [Burzoni et al. \(2017\)](#) for robustness, elicibility and consistency.

Risk sharing problem for AVaR under homogeneous belief was studied in [Liu \(2024\)](#) and [Xia and Hu \(2024\)](#), where the expressions of the inf-convolution and the forms of the optimal allocation were derived. The AVaR was also applied to optimal reinsurance with model homogeneity in [Balbás et al. \(2023\)](#). Moreover, the application of AVaR to robust portfolio selection and sensitivity analysis can be seen in [Han and Liu \(2024\)](#) and [Ince et al. \(2022\)](#). In this paper, we will put our focus on the risk sharing problem with AVaR and belief heterogeneity, extending many results in the literature. In [Section 3](#), we study the inf-convolution of multiple AVaR with heterogeneous beliefs, where the beliefs are represented by a set of probability measures. We obtain the semi-explicit formula for the inf-convolution and the explicit forms of the optimal risk allocations, which has the similar form to the pairwise countermonotonicity. The relation of the beliefs play an crucial role in the risk sharing problem; see e.g., [Chi \(2019\)](#). To study the interplay between the beliefs, we consider three cases: homogeneous beliefs, conditional beliefs and absolutely continuous beliefs. For the homogeneous beliefs, we show that the inf-convolution of AVaR is still a AVaR for the general Λ functions, extending the results in [Liu \(2024\)](#) and [Xia and Hu \(2024\)](#), where the monotonicity of the Λ functions is typically required. In particular, our results include the case that some AVaR have increasing Λ functions and others have decreasing Λ functions, demonstrating that the agents may have relatively different risk appetites. The conditional beliefs reflect the asymmetric information obtained by the agents such that each agent has slightly different concern. Under this setup, we also obtain the explicit formula for the inf-convolution of AVaR, showing that the inf-convolution of AVaR under conditional beliefs is also a AVaR under a new conditional belief. It is worth mentioning that conditional beliefs are closely related to the conditional risk measures proposed in the literature to measure the systemic risk such as CoVaR ([Adrian and Brunnermeier \(2016\)](#) and [Girardi and Tolga Ergün \(2013\)](#)) and CoES ([Mainik and Schaanning \(2014\)](#)). The risk sharing problem in this case can be interpreted as risk sharing with some Co-risk measures (CoAVaR, a new conditional risk measure proposed in [Section 3](#)). For the third case, we consider the risk sharing between two agents and suppose one probability measure is absolutely continuous with another one. Under this assumption, we find a more explicit formula for the inf-convolution of AVaR. Note that we also give the results

for the inf-convolution of VaR for the last two cases, which are also new to the literature.

In Section 4, we study the inf-convolution of one Λ VaR and a general monotone risk measure with belief heterogeneity. The expression of the inf-convolution and the form of the optimal allocation are derived. Then we consider two cases: conditional beliefs and absolutely continuous beliefs. For the conditional beliefs, we obtain the results for the inf-convolution of one Λ VaR and one ES/distortion risk measure/expected utility/ Λ VaR⁺. For the absolutely continuous beliefs, we find the formula for the inf-convolution of one Λ VaR and one ES/expected utility. In Section 5, we consider the inf-convolution of one Λ VaR⁺ (a new definition of Lambda value at risk) and a general monotone risk measure with belief heterogeneity. We obtain the expression of the inf-convolution, which is very complicated, and the forms of the optimal allocation. our results include the inf-convolution of two Λ VaR⁺ under heterogeneous beliefs as a special case. The results here are not explicit and very different from the previous sections and they are very complicated as it involves the shape of the Λ function and the best case of risk aggregation under dependence uncertainty. This means that Λ VaR⁺ is very different from Λ VaR in term of the application in risk sharing problem.

The notation and definitions are displayed in Section 2 and all the proofs are delegated to Appendix A-D.

2 Notation and Definitions

For a given atomless probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, let L^∞ denote the collection of all bounded random variables. Moreover, let \mathcal{X} be a set of random variables containing L^∞ . We suppose \mathcal{X} has good enough properties to conduct our study such as $\mathcal{X} = L^p$ for some $p \geq 0$, where L^p represents the set of all random variables with finite p -th moments. Throughout this paper, we suppose all probability measures $\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_n$ live on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) and the corresponding probability spaces are atomless. For any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, the positive value of X represents the financial loss and its distribution function under \mathbb{Q} is denoted as $F_X^{\mathbb{Q}}$. For a mapping $\rho : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we say ρ is *law-invariant* under \mathbb{Q} if for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$X \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}}{=} Y \Rightarrow \rho(X) = \rho(Y), \quad (1)$$

where $\stackrel{\mathbb{Q}}{=}$ stands for equality in distribution under \mathbb{Q} ; ρ is *monotone* if $X \leq Y$ implies $\rho(X) \leq \rho(Y)$; and ρ is *cash-additive* if $\rho(X+c) = \rho(X)+c$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. We say ρ is a *monetary* risk measure if ρ is monotone and cash-additive. For more details on risk measures, one can refer to Föllmer and Schied (2016). For simplicity, throughout the paper, we use the notation $\rho^{\mathbb{Q}}$ to represent that ρ is law-invariant under \mathbb{Q} . For $X \in \mathcal{X}$, $(F_X^{\mathbb{Q}})^{-1}$ represents its left-quantile

under \mathbb{Q} , which is defined by

$$(F_X^{\mathbb{Q}})^{-1}(p) = \inf\{x : F_X^{\mathbb{Q}}(x) \geq p\}, \quad p \in (0, 1]$$

with the convention that $\inf \emptyset = \infty$. For any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, we denote by $U_X^{\mathbb{Q}}$ a uniform random variable on $[0, 1]$ under \mathbb{Q} such that $X = (F_X^{\mathbb{Q}})^{-1}(U_X^{\mathbb{Q}})$ a.s. under \mathbb{Q} . The existence of such $U_X^{\mathbb{Q}}$ for any random variable X is guaranteed by e.g., Lemma A.32 of [Föllmer and Schied \(2016\)](#).

Next, we define the inf-convolution. For a random variable $X \in \mathcal{X}$, define the set of *allocations* of X as

$$\mathbb{A}_n(X) = \left\{ (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n X_i = X \right\}.$$

In this paper, we suppose the agents may have heterogeneous beliefs, represented by some probability measures $\mathbb{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_n$. The *inf-convolution* of risk measures $\rho_1^{\mathbb{Q}_1}, \dots, \rho_n^{\mathbb{Q}_n}$ is the mapping $\square_{i=1}^n \rho_i^{\mathbb{Q}_i} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$, defined as

$$\square_{i=1}^n \rho_i^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X_i) : (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X) \right\}.$$

Note that ρ_i is law-invariant under \mathbb{Q}_i , where \mathbb{Q}_i represents the belief of the i -th agent.

An n -tuple $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$ is called an *optimal allocation* of X for $(\rho_1^{\mathbb{Q}_1}, \dots, \rho_n^{\mathbb{Q}_n})$ if $\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X_i) = \square_{i=1}^n \rho_i^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X)$. Note that $\square_{i=1}^n \rho_i^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X)$ can be interpreted as the smallest possible aggregate capital for the total risk X in financial system if $\rho_i^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X_i)$ represents the capital charge for the i -th financial institution to hold the risky position X_i . More economic interpretations on the inf-convolution can be found at e.g., [Delbaen \(2012\)](#), [Rüschendorf \(2013\)](#) and [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#).

For risk measures (ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n) and a total risk X , an allocation $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$ is *Pareto-optimal* if for any allocation $(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$, $\rho_i(Y_i) \leq \rho_i(X_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ implies $\rho_i(Y_i) = \rho_i(X_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. For finite-valued monetary risk measures, it is shown in [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#) that an allocation of the inf-convolution is optimal if and only if it is Pareto-optimal. Note that ΛVaR (defined in (2)) does not satisfy cash-additivity; see [Frittelli et al. \(2014\)](#) and [Bellini and Peri \(2022\)](#). Hence it is not a monetary risk measure. However, one can still show that the optimal allocation of the inf-convolution of ΛVaR is Pareto-optimal.

Finally, we define the Lambda value at risk. For $\Lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and a probability measure

\mathbb{Q} , the Lambda value at risk are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) &= \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F_X^{\mathbb{Q}}(x) \geq 1 - \Lambda(x)\}, \\ \Lambda\text{VaR}^{+,\mathbb{Q}}(X) &= \sup\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F_X^{\mathbb{Q}}(x) < 1 - \Lambda(x)\},\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

where $\inf \emptyset = \infty$ and $\sup \emptyset = -\infty$. Note that $\Lambda\text{VaR}(X) = \Lambda\text{VaR}^+(X)$ if Λ is increasing; Otherwise, it may not be true; see Proposition 6 of [Bellini and Peri \(2022\)](#). We refer to [Bellini and Peri \(2022\)](#) for two other definitions of ΛVaR . If Λ is a constant, then $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ boils down to $\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}}$, i.e., $\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ at level $p \in [0, 1]$ is given by

$$\text{VaR}_p^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = \Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = (F_X^{\mathbb{Q}})^{-1}(1 - p), \quad X \in \mathcal{X},$$

for $\Lambda = p$. Moreover, by definition, $\text{VaR}_1^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = -\infty$. Although VaR has been criticized from different angles, it has been widely applied in practice for risk management due to its simplicity and possession of some nice properties; see [McNeil et al. \(2015\)](#) and the references therein for more detailed discussion on VaR. Compared to VaR, ΛVaR is more flexible in the choice of Λ functions; it satisfies cash subadditivity and quasi-star-shapedness; and ΛVaR^+ is able to capture the tail risk for decreasing Λ functions; see e.g., [Frittelli et al. \(2014\)](#), [Hitaj et al. \(2018\)](#) and [Han et al. \(2024\)](#).

We denote \mathcal{H} as the collection of all $\Lambda : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where Λ is right-continuous. Hereafter, for any Λ , we denote $\lambda^- = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \Lambda(x)$ and $\lambda^+ = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \Lambda(x)$. We say that a constant λ is *attainable* for Λ if there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Lambda(x) = \lambda$.

The interplay among $\mathbb{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_n$ plays an important role in the inf-convolution, which is our main concern in this paper. This can be seen from the following proposition. We say a mapping $\rho : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *cash-supadditive* if $\rho(X + c) \geq \rho(X) + c$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $c \geq 0$. Note that both $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{+,\mathbb{Q}}$ satisfy cash supadditivity if Λ is decreasing; see Proposition 2 of [Han and Liu \(2024\)](#).

Proposition 1. *Suppose \mathbb{Q}_1 and \mathbb{Q}_2 are mutually singular, and ρ_2 is cash-supadditive. Then for $X \in \mathcal{X}$,*

$$\rho_1^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho_2^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = -\infty.$$

The conclusion in Proposition 1 implies that for any two monetary risk measures ρ_1 and ρ_2 , $\rho_1^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho_2^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = -\infty$ if \mathbb{Q}_1 and \mathbb{Q}_2 are mutually singular. In contrast, if $\mathbb{Q}_1 = \mathbb{Q}_2$, then $\rho_1^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho_2^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) > -\infty$ for many monetary risk measures ρ_1 and ρ_2 ; see e.g., [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#) for quantile-based risk measures and [Filipović and Svindland \(2008\)](#) for convex risk measures.

3 Inf-convolution of multiple Λ VaR

In this section, we investigate the inf-convolution of n Lambda value at risk with heterogeneous beliefs represented by $\mathbb{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_n$, respectively. Suppose $\mathcal{X} \supseteq L^\infty$. We find an expression of the inf-convolution and also the corresponding optimal allocation, covering the results of the inf-convolution of Λ VaR or VaR with homogeneous or heterogeneous beliefs in [Liu \(2024\)](#), [Embrechts et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#). We first introduce the following notation. Let $\Pi_n(\Omega) = \{(A_1, \dots, A_n) : \cup_{i=1}^n A_i = \Omega, A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset, i \neq j\}$. For $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda_i^- \leq \lambda_i^+ < 1$, let

$$\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n y_i : \mathbb{Q}_i \left(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, A_i \right) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i) \text{ for some } (A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega) \right\}.$$

Note that $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) \in [-\infty, \infty)$.

Theorem 1. *For $\Lambda_i \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda_i^- \leq \lambda_i^+ < 1$, we have*

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) = \Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X).$$

Moreover, if the minimizer of $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X)$ exists denoted by $(y_1^*, \dots, y_n^*, A_1^*, \dots, A_n^*)$, then the optimal allocation is given by

$$X_i = \left(X - \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^* \right) \mathbb{1}_{A_i^*} + y_i^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3)$$

Note that Theorem 1 is very general covering Theorems 1, 2, 4 of [Liu \(2024\)](#) and Theorem 4 of [Embrechts et al. \(2020\)](#) as special cases. Compared with the results in [Liu \(2024\)](#), our results in Theorem 1 offer semi-explicit formulas for the inf-convolution. Later, we will specify the relation of $\mathbb{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_n$ to obtain more explicit formulas for the inf-convolution. Moreover, Theorem 1 does not explicitly show when the inf-convolution is $-\infty$. The discussion on the finiteness of $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X)$ is complicated as it heavily relies on the properties of Lambda functions and the relationship between \mathbb{Q}_i ; see [Liu \(2024\)](#) and Proposition 1 in Section 2. This will be discussed in the next two propositions. Finally, note that if all Λ_i are constants, then Theorem 1 boils down to Theorem 4 of [Embrechts et al. \(2020\)](#), where the inf-convolution of VaR has been studied with belief heterogeneity.

Next, let us discuss the finiteness of $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X)$. Let $x \wedge y = \min(x, y)$, $x \vee y = \max(x, y)$, $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n x_i = \min_{i=1}^n x_i$ and $\bigvee_{i=1}^n x_i = \max_{i=1}^n x_i$.

Proposition 2. *For $\Lambda_i \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda_i^- \leq \lambda_i^+ < 1$, we have*

(i) If $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i)}{\lambda_i^-} \leq 1$ for some $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$, then $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) = -\infty$;

(ii) If $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i)}{\lambda_i^+} > 1$ for all $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$, then $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) > -\infty$.

As we can see from Proposition 2, cases (i) and (ii) cannot cover all scenarios. The discussion of other cases may require more information on the Lambda functions. We next consider all monotone Lambda functions with the same direction.

Proposition 3. *Suppose all $\Lambda_i \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda_i^- \leq \lambda_i^+ < 1$ are decreasing. Then we have the following conclusion.*

(i) If $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i)}{\lambda_i^+} < 1$ for some $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$, then $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) = -\infty$;

(ii) If $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i)}{\lambda_i^+} > 1$ for all $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$, then $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) > -\infty$.

Suppose all $\Lambda_i \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda_i^- \leq \lambda_i^+ < 1$ are increasing. Then we have the following conclusion.

(i) If $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i)}{\lambda_i^-} \vee \bigvee_{j \neq i} \frac{\mathbb{Q}_j(A_j)}{\lambda_j^+} \right) < 1$ for some $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$, then $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) = -\infty$;

(ii) If for some $\varepsilon > 0$, $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i)}{\lambda_i^-} \vee \bigvee_{j \neq i} \frac{\mathbb{Q}_j(A_j)}{\lambda_j^+} \right) > 1 + \varepsilon$ for all $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$, then $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) > -\infty$.

If $\mathbb{Q}_1 = \dots = \mathbb{Q}_n = \mathbb{P}$, we have the following more explicit expression for the inf-convolution. Let $\Lambda^*(x) = \sup_{y_1 + \dots + y_n = x} (1 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i(y_i))$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We say Λ^* is attainable if for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n y_i = x$ such that $1 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i(y_i) = \Lambda^*(x)$.

Theorem 2. *For $\Lambda_i \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda_i^- \leq \lambda_i^+ < 1$, if Λ^* is attainable, then we have*

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X) = \Lambda^* \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X).$$

Moreover, if additionally $x^* = \Lambda^* \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X) > -\infty$ and Λ^* is right-continuous at x^* , then the optimal allocation is given by (3) with (y_1^*, \dots, y_n^*) satisfying $1 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i(y_i^*) = \Lambda^*(x^*)$ and (A_1^*, \dots, A_n^*) satisfying $\mathbb{P}(X > x^*, A_i^*) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i^*)$.

Note that in Theorem 2, we do not require any monotonic properties of Lambda functions. The lambda functions are very general with only one requirement on the attainability of Λ^* . Hence, it extends the results of Theorems 1, 2, 4 of Liu (2024), which investigates the inf-convolution of multiple Λ VaR with monotone and general Lambda functions for homogeneous beliefs. In particular, Theorem 2 covers the case that some Λ VaR have increasing Λ functions and others have decreasing Λ functions, demonstrating that the agents may have relatively different risk appetites.

We can also remove the assumption on the attainability of Λ^* in Theorem 2 to obtain another expression. Let $\Lambda^{y_{n-1}}(x) = \left(\Lambda_n(x - y_{n-1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Lambda_i(y_i - y_{i-1}) \right) \wedge 1$ for $n \geq 2$, where $y_{n-1} = (y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})$ and $y_0 = 0$.

Proposition 4. For $\Lambda_i \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda_i^- \leq \lambda_i^+ < 1$, we have

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X) = \inf_{y_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Lambda^{y_{n-1}} \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X).$$

Next, we study how the interplay among $\mathbb{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_n$ can affect the inf-convolution. Let us first consider the case $\mathbb{Q}_i(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot|B_i)$ for some $B_i \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}(B_i) > 0$. If \mathbb{P} represents the physical probability, and $\mathbb{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_n$ are the beliefs of the agents, then those \mathbb{Q}_i demonstrate that the agents' may have slightly different concern on the occurrence of the events due to the asymmetric information or being subject to different regulating agencies. For $B_1, \dots, B_n \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n \in \mathcal{H}$, if $\mathbb{P}(\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) > 0$, let $\Lambda^\diamond(x) = \sup_{y_1 + \dots + y_n = x} \left(1 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_i)\Lambda_i(y_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\cap_{i=1}^n B_i)} \right)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 3. Suppose $\mathbb{Q}_i(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot|B_i)$ for some $B_i \subset \Omega$ with $\mathbb{P}(B_i) > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. For $\Lambda_i \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda_i^- \leq \lambda_i^+ < 1$, if $\mathbb{P}(\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) = 0$, then

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) = -\infty;$$

If $\mathbb{P}(\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) > 0$ and Λ^\diamond is attainable, then

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) = \Lambda^\diamond \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X),$$

where $\mathbb{Q}(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot|\cap_{i=1}^n B_i)$. Moreover, if additionally $x^* = \Lambda^\diamond \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) > -\infty$ and Λ^\diamond is right-continuous at x^* , then the optimal allocation is given by (3) with (y_1^*, \dots, y_n^*) satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_i)\Lambda_i(y_i^*)}{\mathbb{P}(\cap_{i=1}^n B_i)} = \Lambda^\diamond(x^*)$ and (A_1^*, \dots, A_n^*) satisfying $\mathbb{P}(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^*, (\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) \cap A_i^*) \leq \mathbb{P}(B_i)\Lambda_i(y_i^*)$.

In this special case, the interplay among $\mathbb{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_n$ is characterized by the relationship between the sets B_1, \dots, B_n . Following the conclusion in Proposition 3, those sets B_1, \dots, B_n appear in the expressions of the inf-convolution and the optimal allocation, suggesting the influence of the relation of $\mathbb{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_n$ on the inf-convolution. If all Lambda functions in Proposition 3 are assumed to be constants, then we immediately derive the explicit formulas for the inf-convolution of multiple VaR under conditional beliefs.

Corollary 1. Suppose $\mathbb{Q}_i(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot|B_i)$ for some $B_i \subset \Omega$ with $\mathbb{P}(B_i) > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. For

$\alpha_i \in (0, 1)$, if $\mathbb{P}(\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) = 0$, then

$$\square_{i=1}^n \text{VaR}_{\alpha_i}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) = -\infty;$$

If $\mathbb{P}(\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) > 0$, then

$$\square_{i=1}^n \text{VaR}_{\alpha_i}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) = \text{VaR}_{1 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha_i \mathbb{P}(B_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\cap_{i=1}^n B_i)}}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X),$$

where $\mathbb{Q}(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot | \cap_{i=1}^n B_i)$.

Note that the results in Corollary 1 extends the elegant formula for the inf-convolution of VaR under homogeneous beliefs to the case with conditional beliefs; see Corollary 2 of Embrechts et al. (2018).

It is worth mentioning that the results in Proposition 3 can be explained from the perspective of Co-risk measures. Recently, Co-risk measures are introduced to assess the systemic risk. Let $B \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\mathbb{P}(B) > 0$. For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the conditional VaR (CoVaR), conditional ES (CoES) are defined as

$$\text{VaR}_{\alpha}^{\mathbb{P}}(X|B) = \inf\{x : \mathbb{P}(X \leq x|B) \geq 1 - \alpha\}, \quad \text{ES}_{\alpha}^{\mathbb{P}}(X|B) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^{\alpha} \text{VaR}_t^{\mathbb{P}}(X|B) dt.$$

One can refer to Adrian and Brunnermeier (2016) and Girardi and Tolga Ergün (2013) for CoVaR, Mainik and Schaanning (2014) for CoES. Analogously, conditional Λ VaR (Co Λ VaR) can be defined as

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X|B) = \inf\{x : \mathbb{Q}(X \leq x) \geq \Lambda(x)\},$$

where $\mathbb{Q}(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot|B) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\cdot \cap B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)}$. Note that $\Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) = \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X|B_i)$. Hence, the results in Theorem 3 can be interpreted as the risk sharing using multiple Co Λ VaR to represent the preference of the agents.

Next, we consider a different relation among $\mathbb{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Q}_n$, i.e., all the $n - 1$ probability measures are absolutely continuous with respect to one probability measure. Due to the complexity of the problem, we here only consider the case $n = 2$.

Theorem 4. Suppose $\mathbb{Q}_2 \ll \mathbb{Q}_1$ and denote $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_2}{d\mathbb{Q}_1}$ by η . For $\Lambda_i \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda_i^- \leq \lambda_i^+ < 1$, we have

$$\Lambda_1 \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \Lambda_2 \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : g_x((1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x) - \Lambda_1(y))_+) \leq \Lambda_2(x - y), \text{ for some } y \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

where $g_x(t) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta \mathbb{1}_{\{X > x, U_{\eta}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \leq x_t\}})$, $t \in [0, 1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)]$, with $\mathbb{Q}_1(X > x, U_{\eta}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \leq x_t) = t$.

In Theorem 4, we do not obtain explicit formulas as the previous propositions. This is due to the complexity of the relation between \mathbb{Q}_1 and \mathbb{Q}_2 , which can be observed from the expression of g_x depending on the joint distribution of (X, η) under \mathbb{Q}_1 . Let us next see some examples of g_x :

- (i) If X and η are comonotonic, then $g_x(t) = \int_{F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)}^{F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)+t} (F_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(s) ds$, $t \in [0, 1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)]$;
- (ii) If X and η are countermonotonic, then $g_x(t) = \int_0^t (F_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(s) ds$, $t \in [0, 1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)]$;
- (iii) If X and η are independent under \mathbb{Q}_1 , then $g_x(t) = \int_0^{t/(1-F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x))} (F_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(s) ds$, $t \in [0, 1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)]$ with the convention that $0/0 = 0$.

Note that Theorem 4 can be simplified when Lambda functions are constants.

Corollary 2. Suppose $\mathbb{Q}_2 \ll \mathbb{Q}_1$ and denote $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_2}{d\mathbb{Q}_1}$ by η . For $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\text{VaR}_{\alpha_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{VaR}_{\alpha_2}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : g_x((1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x) - \alpha_1)_+) \leq \alpha_2 \right\},$$

where $g_x(t) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta \mathbb{1}_{\{X > x, U_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \leq x_t\}})$, $t \in [0, 1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)]$, with $\mathbb{Q}_1(X > x, U_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \leq x_t) = t$.

Example 1. Under the assumption of Corollary 2, we have the following examples.

- (i) If X and η are countermonotonic, then

$$\text{VaR}_{\alpha_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{VaR}_{\alpha_2}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)}^{F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x) \vee (1-\alpha_1)} (F_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(s) ds \leq \alpha_2 \right\};$$

- (ii) If X and η are comonotonic, then

$$\text{VaR}_{\alpha_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{VaR}_{\alpha_2}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \int_0^{(1-F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)-\alpha_1)_+} (F_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(s) ds \leq \alpha_2 \right\};$$

- (iii) If X and η are independent under \mathbb{Q}_1 , then

$$\text{VaR}_{\alpha_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{VaR}_{\alpha_2}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \int_0^{(1-F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)-\alpha_1)_+ / (1-F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x))} (F_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(s) ds \leq \alpha_2 \right\}$$

with the convention that $0/0 = 0$.

4 Inf-convolution of Λ VaR and one monotone risk measure with heterogenous beliefs

Throughout this section, we set $\mathcal{X} = L^\infty$. We investigate the risk sharing problem between two agents, i.e., the inf-convolution of Λ VaR $^{\mathbb{Q}_1}$ and a monotone risk measure $\rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}$, where \mathbb{Q}_2 may be different from \mathbb{Q}_1 . Note that ρ is very general including many commonly used risk measures as special cases.

Theorem 5. *Suppose $\Lambda \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda^- \leq \lambda^+ < 1$ and ρ is monotone. Then we have*

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_B + y\mathbb{1}_{B^c})\}. \quad (4)$$

Moreover, the existence of the optimal allocation of the inf-convolution is equivalent to the existence of the minimizer of (4). If (x^*, y^*, B^*) is the minimizer, then one optimal allocation is given by

$$X_1^* = x^* \mathbb{1}_{B^*} + (X - y^*) \mathbb{1}_{(B^*)^c}, \quad X_2^* = (X - x^*) \mathbb{1}_{B^*} + y^* \mathbb{1}_{(B^*)^c}. \quad (5)$$

Note that the expression of the inf-convolution in Theorem 5 involves an optimization problem with three parameters (x, y, B) , where B is a measurable set contained in \mathcal{F} . The set B makes this optimization problem complicated. The optimal allocation in (5) may not be pairwise comonotonic. Let us now consider the case $\mathbb{Q}_i(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot | B_i)$ for some $B_i \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}(B_i) > 0$. Under this setup, the parameter B in (4) can be fixed for each x .

Proposition 5. *Suppose $\mathbb{Q}_i(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot | B_i)$ for some $B_i \subset \Omega$ with $\mathbb{P}(B_i) > 0$, $i = 1, 2$. Moreover, suppose $\Lambda \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda^- \leq \lambda^+ < 1$ and ρ is monotone. Then we have*

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + y\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c})\}, \quad (6)$$

where $A_x = \emptyset$ if $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c) \geq (1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1)$ and $A_x = (B_1 \cap B_2^c) \cup (B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \{U_X^{\mathbb{P}} < \alpha_x\})$ if $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c) < (1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1)$ with α_x satisfying $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \{U_X^{\mathbb{P}} < \alpha_x\}) = (1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1) - \mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c)$. Moreover, the existence of the optimal allocation of the inf-convolution is equivalent to the existence of the minimizer of (6). If (x^*, y^*) is the minimizer, then one optimal allocation is given by

$$X_1^* = x^* \mathbb{1}_{A_{x^*}} + (X - y^*) \mathbb{1}_{A_{x^*}^c}, \quad X_2^* = (X - x^*) \mathbb{1}_{A_{x^*}} + y^* \mathbb{1}_{A_{x^*}^c}. \quad (7)$$

Our conclusion in Theorem 5 extends the results of Embrechts et al. (2020) for $n = 2$,

where the inf-convolution of VaR or ES with heterogeneous beliefs is considered. If $\mathbb{Q}_1 = \mathbb{Q}_2$, then Theorem 5 coincides with the results in Theorem 3 of Liu (2024). We notice that for the scenario that $\mathbb{Q}_1 = \mathbb{Q}_2$ and Λ is a constant, Theorem 5 somehow extends the results in Theorem 2 of Liu et al. (2022) (ρ is considered to be a monetary tail risk measure) and Theorem 5.3 of Wang and Wei (2018) (ρ is a distortion risk measure). The result of Theorem 5 is still new even if Λ VaR is reduced to VaR.

Let $\mathcal{G} = \{g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid g \text{ is increasing and left-continuous satisfying } g(0) = 0 \text{ and } g(1) = 1\}$. For $g \in \mathcal{H}$, the distortion risk measure $\rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is defined as

$$\rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = \int_0^1 \text{VaR}_t^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) dg(t).$$

Distortion risk measure is a popular class of risk measures applied in insurance pricing, performance evaluation, decision theory and many other topics; see e.g., Föllmer and Schied (2016), Wang (1996), Wang (2000), Cherny and Madan (2009) and Yaari (1987). Note that if $\mathbb{Q}(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot|B)$ for some $B \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\mathbb{P}(B) > 0$, then $\rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$ corresponds to the Co-distortion risk measures introduced in Dhaene et al. (2022). For an increasing function u , the expected utility is defined as $\mathbb{E}_u^{\mathbb{Q}} : X \mapsto \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}(u(X))$.

In the following proposition, let $\mathbb{Q}_i(\cdot) = \mathbb{P}(\cdot|B_i)$ for some $B_i \subset \Omega$ with $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2) > 0$, and $\mathbb{Q}(\cdot) = \mathbb{Q}(\cdot|B_1 \cap B_2)$. Applying Proposition 5, we obtain the inf-convolution of Λ VaR and $\text{ES}/\rho_g/\mathbb{E}_u/\Lambda_1\text{VaR}^+$ under heterogenous beliefs, respectively. In order to simplify the expression, we suppose λ^+ is attainable for Λ , i.e., there is $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Lambda(x) = \lambda^+$.

Corollary 3. *Suppose $\Lambda \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda^- \leq \lambda^+ < 1$ and λ^+ is attainable. Then the following conclusion holds with $\beta = \frac{(1-\lambda^+)\mathbb{P}(B_1) - \mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c)}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)}$ and $\mathbb{Q}(\cdot) = \mathbb{Q}(\cdot|B_1 \cap B_2)$.*

(i) *For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, if $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) \leq \lambda^+$, then $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{ES}_{\alpha}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = -\infty$; if $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) > \lambda^+$ then*

$$\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{ES}_{\alpha}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^{\alpha} \text{VaR}_{1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_2)(\beta-t)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)}}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) dt, & \alpha \leq \beta \\ -\infty, & \alpha > \beta \end{cases};$$

(ii) *For $g \in \mathcal{G}$, if $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) \leq \lambda^+$, then $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = -\infty$; if $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) > \lambda^+$ then*

$$\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \begin{cases} \int_{[0, \beta)} \text{VaR}_{1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_2)(\beta-t)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)}}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) dg, & g(\beta) = 1 \\ -\infty, & g(\beta) < 1 \end{cases};$$

(iii) *For an increasing function u , if $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) \leq \lambda^+$, then $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \mathbb{E}_u^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = -\infty$; if $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) >$*

λ^+ , then

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \mathbb{E}_u^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left(x + (1 - \beta_x)u(-\infty) + \int_0^{\beta_x} u \left(\text{VaR}_{1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_2)(\beta_x - t)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)}}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) - x \right) dt \right),$$

where $u(-\infty) = \lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} u(y)$ and $\beta_x = \frac{(1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1) - \mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c)}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)}$;

(iv) For $\Lambda_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda_1^- \leq \lambda_1^+ < 1$, if $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) \leq \lambda^+$, then $\Lambda_1 \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = -\infty$; if $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) > \lambda^+$, then

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \Lambda_1 \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \bar{\Lambda}^x \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}}(X),$$

where $\bar{\Lambda}^x(z) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_1)\Lambda(x) + \mathbb{P}(B_2)\Lambda_1(z-x)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)} \wedge 1$.

We mention that the results in Corollary 3 extend the results in the literature in the sense that Λ is not a constant and the second risk measure is not law-invariant under \mathbb{Q}_1 . For instance, (ii) of Corollary 3 exactly extends Theorem 5.3 of Wang and Wei (2018) (ρ is a distortion risk measure which is law-invariant under \mathbb{Q}_1) in these two directions. It is worth mentioning that (iv) of Corollary 3 is a new result even for the case $\mathbb{Q}_1 = \mathbb{Q}_2$.

Let us now consider the case $\mathbb{Q}_2 \ll \mathbb{Q}_1$. Instead of finding a simplified version of Theorem 5 for this case, we apply Theorem 5 directly to some specific ρ . For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, let $\text{LES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{1-\alpha}^1 \text{VaR}_t^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) dt$, which represents the lower conditional tail expectation.

Corollary 4. Suppose $\mathbb{Q}_2 \ll \mathbb{Q}_1$ with $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_2}{d\mathbb{Q}_1}$ denoted by η . For $\Lambda \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda^- \leq \lambda^+ < 1$, we have the following conclusions.

(i) For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left(t + \frac{1 - \lambda^+}{\alpha} \text{LES}_{1-\lambda^+}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta(X - t)_+) \right);$$

(ii) For an increasing function u , we have

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \mathbb{E}_u^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left(x + u(-\infty)\Lambda(x)\text{ES}_{\Lambda(x)}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta) + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta u(X - x)\mathbb{1}_{\{U_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1} < 1 - \Lambda(x)\}})\right),$$

where $u(-\infty) = \lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} u(y)$.

Note that in (i) of Corollaries 3 and 4, if Λ is a constant, then the results coincide with the special case of Theorem 5 of Embrechts et al. (2020), where the semi-explicit formula is offered. For the case $\mathbb{Q}_2 \ll \mathbb{Q}_1$, it might be difficult to find more explicit expression for the inf-convolution of $\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}$ and $\rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}_2}$ or $\Lambda_1 \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_2}$.

5 Inf-convolution of ΛVaR^+ and a monotone risk measure

The inf-convolution of multiple ΛVaR^+ under heterogeneous beliefs is a very challenging problem even if we suppose the beliefs are homogeneous; see the discussion for homogeneous beliefs in Liu (2024). One important feature of ΛVaR^+ is to capture the tail risk for decreasing Λ ; see Frittelli et al. (2014) and Hitaj et al. (2018). In this section, we focus on the inf-convolution of $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1}$ and a monotone risk measure $\rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}$, which includes the inf-convolution of two ΛVaR^+ as a special case. Let $\mathcal{X} = L^\infty$. For any $\Lambda \in \mathcal{H}$, we denote $\Lambda_x(z) = \inf_{x \leq t \leq z} \Lambda(t)$, $z \geq x$. Then $\Lambda_x(z)$ is decreasing and right-continuous for $z \geq x$. If Λ is decreasing and right-continuous, then $\Lambda_x(z) = \Lambda(z)$, $z \geq x$; and if Λ is increasing, then $\Lambda_x(z) = \Lambda(x)$, $z \geq x$. The following result is valid for general $\Lambda \in \mathcal{H}$. The notation $U \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}}{\sim} U[0, 1]$ means $U \sim U[0, 1]$ under \mathbb{Q} .

Theorem 6. *Suppose $\Lambda \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda^- \leq \lambda^+ < 1$, and ρ is monotone and law-invariant under \mathbb{Q}_2 . Then we have*

$$\Lambda\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \geq x} \inf_{U \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\sim} U[0, 1]} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x, y}^{-1}(U))\}, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\Lambda_{x, y}(z) = \begin{cases} 0, & z < x \\ 1 - \Lambda_x(z), & x \leq z < y \\ 1, & z \geq y \end{cases}.$$

Moreover, the optimal allocation of the inf-convolution exists if and only if the minimizer of (8) exists. If (x^*, y^*, U^*) is the minimizer, then one optimal allocation is given by

$$X_1^* = \Lambda_{x^*, y^*}^{-1}(U^*), \quad X_2^* = X - \Lambda_{x^*, y^*}^{-1}(U^*). \quad (9)$$

In the case of $\rho = \Lambda_1\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_2}$ for $\Lambda_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ with $0 < \lambda_1^- \leq \lambda_1^+ < 1$, it follows from Theorem 6 that the optimal risk allocation for risk sharing between $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1}$ and $\Lambda_1\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_2}$ has the form of (9), which is neither comonotonic nor pairwise countermonotonic. This means that the optimal risk sharing for multiple $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}}$ is a very different problem from the cases with convex risk measures or quantile-based risk measures in the literature. The expression of the inf-convolution in (8) is an optimization problem involving three parameters (x, y, U) , where $U \sim U[0, 1]$ under \mathbb{Q}_1 . Note that the distribution of U under \mathbb{Q}_2 depends on the relation between \mathbb{Q}_1 and \mathbb{Q}_2 . Moreover, the expression in (8) and also the optimal allocation in (9) show that shape of Λ function plays an important role in both the expression of the inf-convolution and the form of the optimal allocations, which is very different from the results of ΛVaR displayed in Sections 3 and 4.

We are also aware that the conclusion in Theorem 6 is complicated in the sense that it involves $\inf_{U \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\sim} U[0,1]} \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(U))$, which is a very difficult problem even if $\mathbb{Q}_1 = \mathbb{Q}_2$. For $\mathbb{Q}_1 = \mathbb{Q}_2$, $\inf_{U \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\sim} U[0,1]} \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(U))$ corresponds to the problem of robust risk aggregation with dependence uncertainty, i.e., finding the value of $\inf_{X \sim F, Y \sim G} \rho(X + Y)$, where the marginal distributions are known but the dependence structure is completely unknown. We refer to Wang and Wang (2016), Jakobsons et al. (2016), Blanchet et al. (2023), Han and Liu (2024) and the references therein for the discussion on the robust risk aggregation.

In order to simplify (8), we consider a special case of Λ functions. This makes it easier to find more explicit expressions of the inf-convolution for concrete examples of ρ .

Proposition 6. For $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < 1$, let $\Lambda(z) = (1 - \lambda_1)\mathbb{1}_{\{z < x_1\}} + (1 - \lambda_2)\mathbb{1}_{\{z \geq x_1\}}$. Under the assumption of Theorem 6, we have

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \geq x \vee x_1} \inf_{(B_1, B_2) \in \mathcal{B}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}} \left\{ x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2} \left(X - x\mathbb{1}_{B_1} - x \vee x_1 \mathbb{1}_{B_2} - y\mathbb{1}_{(B_1 \cup B_2)^c} \right) \right\}, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} = \{(B_1, B_2) : \mathbb{Q}_1(B_1) = \lambda_1, \mathbb{Q}_2(B_2) = \lambda_2 - \lambda_1, B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset\}$.

Note that the optimization problem in (10) is much easier than that in (8) because it only has parameters (x, y, B_1, B_2) .

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we consider the inf-convolution of multiple ΛVaR under heterogenous beliefs. We obtain the general expression for the inf-convolution and the corresponding optimal allocations. Then we discuss three different cases: i) homogeneous beliefs; ii) conditional beliefs; iii) absolute continuous beliefs. For all these cases, we obtain more explicit expressions of the inf-convolution. The inf-convolution of one $\Lambda \text{VaR}/\Lambda \text{VaR}^+$ and a general risk measures with belief heterogeneity are also discussed. There are still some unsolved problems such as the inf-convolution of multiple ΛVaR^+ under heterogeneous beliefs, which deserves further study.

References

- Adrian, T. and Brunnermeier, M. K. (2016). CoVaR. *American Economic Review*, **106**(7), 1705–1741.
- Amarante, M., Ghossoub, M. and Phelps, E. (2015). Ambiguity on the insurer’s side: The demand for insurance. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, **58**, 61–78.

- Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J.-M. and Heath, D. (1999). Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance*, **9**(3), 203–228.
- Asimit, V. A., Boonen, T. J., Chi, Y. and Chong, W. F. (2021), Risk sharing with multiple indemnity environments. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **295**(2), 587–603.
- Barrieu, P. and El Karoui, N. (2005). Inf-convolution of risk measures and optimal risk transfer. *Finance and Stochastics*, **9**, 269–298.
- BCBS Standards: Minimum capital requirements for Market Risk. January 2016. Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. Bank for International Settlements, Basel (2016).
- Bellini, F. and Peri, I. (2022). An axiomatization of Λ -quantiles. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, **13**(1), 26–38.
- Bignozzi, V., Burzoni, M. and Munari, C. (2020). Risk measures based on benchmark loss distributions. *The Journal of Risk and Insurance*, **87**(2), 437–475.
- Blanchet, J., Lam, H., Liu, Y. and Wang, R. (2023). Convolution bounds on quantile aggregation. *arXiv*: 2007.09320.
- Boonen, T. J., and Ghossoub, M. (2020). Bilateral risk sharing with heterogeneous beliefs and exposure constraints. *ASTIN Bulletin*, **50**(1), 293–323.
- Burzoni, M., Peri, I. and Ruffo, C.M. (2017). On the properties of the Lambda value at risk: robustness, elicibility and consistency. *Quantitative Finance*, **17**, 1735–1743.
- Chi, Y. (2019). On the optimality of a straight deductible under belief heterogeneity. *ASTIN Bulletin*, **49**(1), 243–262.
- Corbetta, J. and Peri, I. (2018). Backtesting Lambda value at risk. *The European Journal of Finance*, **24**, 1075–1087.
- Cherny, A. S. and Madan, D. (2009). New measures for performance evaluation. *Review of Financial Studies*, **22**(7), 2571–2606.
- Delbaen, F. (2012). *Monetary Utility Functions*. Osaka University Press, Osaka.
- Dhaene, J., Laeven, R. J. and Zhang, Y. (2022). Systemic risk: Conditional distortion risk measures. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **102**, 126–145.
- El Karoui, N. and Ravanelli, C. (2009). Cash subadditive risk measures and interest rate ambiguity. *Mathematical Finance*, **19**(4), 562–590.
- Embrechts, P. (2017). A Darwinian view on internal models. *Journal of Risk*, **20**(1), 1–21.
- Embrechts, P., Liu, H. and Wang, R. (2018). Quantile-based risk sharing. *Operations Research*, **66**(4), 936–949.
- Embrechts, P., Liu, H., Mao, T. and Wang, R. (2020). Quantile-based risk sharing with heterogeneous beliefs. *Mathematical Programming Series B*, **181**(2), 319–347.

- Filipović, D. and Svindland, G. (2008). Optimal capital and risk allocations for law- and cash-invariant convex functions. *Finance and Stochastics*, **12**, 423–439.
- Föllmer, H. and Schied, A. (2002). *Convex measures of risk and trading constraints*. *Finance and Stochastics*, **6**(4) 429–447.
- Föllmer, H. and Schied, A. (2016). *Stochastic Finance. An Introduction in Discrete Time*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, Fourth Edition.
- Balbás, A., Balbás, B. and Balbás, R. (2023). Lambda-quantiles as fixed points. *SSRN*: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4583950>.
- Frittelli, M. and Rosazza Gianin, E. (2005). Law-invariant convex risk measures. *Advances in Mathematical Economics*, **7**, 33–46.
- Frittelli, M., Maggis, M., and Peri, I. (2014). Risk Measures on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ and Value at Risk with Probability/Loss function. *Mathematical Finance*, **24**(3), 442–463.
- Girardi, G. and Tolga Ergün, A. (2013). Systemic risk measurement: Multivariate GARCH estimation of CoVaR. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, **37**(8), 3169–3180.
- Han, X. and Liu, P. (2024). Robust Λ -quantiles and extreme probabilities. *arXiv:2406.13539*.
- Han, X., Wang, Q., Wang, R. and Xia, J. (2024). Cash-subadditive risk measures without quasi-convexity. *arXiv: 2110.12198*.
- Hitaj, A., Mateus, C. and Peri, I. (2018). Lambda value at risk and regulatory capital: a dynamic approach to tail risk. *Risks*, **6**, 17.
- Jakobsons, E., Han, X. and Wang, R. (2016). General convex order on risk aggregation. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*, **2016**(8), 713–740.
- Ince, A., Peri, I. and Pesenti, S. (2022). Risk contributions of lambda quantiles. *Quantitative Finance*, **22**(10), 1871–1891.
- Jouini, E., Schachermayer, W. and Touzi, N. (2008). Optimal risk sharing for law invariant monetary utility functions. *Mathematical Finance*, **18**(2), 269–292.
- Kusuoka, S. (2001). On law invariant coherent risk measures. *Advances in Mathematical Economics*, **3**, 83–95.
- Lauzier, J.G., Lin, L. and Wang, R. (2023a) Pairwise counter-monotonicity. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **111**, 279–287.
- Lauzier, J.G., Lin, L. and Wang, R. (2023b) Risk sharing, measuring variability, and distortion riskmetrics. *arXiv:2302.04034*.
- Liebrich, F.B. (2022) Risk sharing under heterogeneous beliefs without convexity. *arXiv:2108.05791*.
- Liu, F., Mao, T., Wang, R. and Wei, L. (2022). Inf-convolution, optimal allocations, and model

- uncertainty for tail risk measures. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **47**(3), 2494–2519.
- Liu, H. (2020). Weighted comonotonic risk sharing under heterogeneous beliefs. *ASTIN Bulletin*, **50**(2):647–673.
- Liu, P. (2024). Risk sharing with Lambda value at risk. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.2023.0246>.
- Mainik, G. and Schaanning, E. (2014). On dependence consistency of covar and some other systemic risk measures. *Statistics & Risk Modeling*, **31**(1), 49–77.
- Makarov, G. (1981). Estimates for the distribution function of a sum of two random variables when the marginal distributions are fixed. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications*, **26**, 803–806.
- McNeil, A. J., Frey, R. and Embrechts, P. (2015). *Quantitative Risk Management: Concepts, Techniques and Tools*. Revised Edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rockafellar, R. T. and Uryasev, S. (2002). Conditional value-at-risk for general loss distributions. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, **26**(7), 1443–1471.
- Rüschendorf, L. (1982). Random variables with maximum sums. *Advances in Applied Probability*, **14**, 623–632.
- Rüschendorf, L. (2013). *Mathematical Risk Analysis. Dependence, Risk Bounds, Optimal Allocations and Portfolios*. Springer, Heidelberg.
- Wang, S. (1996). Premium calculation by transforming the layer premium density. *ASTIN Bulletin*, **26**(1), 71–92.
- Wang, S. (2000). A class of distortion operators for pricing financial and insurance risks. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, **67**, 15–36.
- Wang, B. and Wang, R. (2016). Joint mixability. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **41**(3), 808–826.
- Wang, R. and Wei, Y. (2020). Characterizing optimal allocations in quantile-based risk sharing. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **93**, 288–300.
- Weber, S. (2018). Solvency II, or how to sweep the downside risk under the carpet. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **82**, 191–200.
- Xiong, W. (2013). Bubbles, crises, and heterogeneous beliefs. In: Fouque, J.-P., Langsam, J. (eds.) *Handbook for Systemic Risk*, 663–713. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Yaari, M. E. (1987). The dual theory of choice under risk. *Econometrica*, **55**(1), 95–115.
- Xia, Z. and Hu, T. (2024). Optimal risk sharing for lambda value-at-risk. *Advances in Applied Probability*, <https://doi.org/10.1017/apr.2024.27>.

A Proof of Section 2

Proof of Proposition 1. Note that cash supadditivity implies $\rho(X + c) \leq \rho(X) + c$ for $c \leq 0$. Moreover, there exists $A \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathbb{Q}_1(A) = 0$ and $\mathbb{Q}_2(A) = 1$. It follows from the law-invariance of ρ_1 and ρ_2 and the cash supadditivity of ρ_2 that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho_2^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) &\leq \rho_1^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(-c\mathbb{1}_A) + \rho_2^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X + c\mathbb{1}_A) \\ &= \rho_1^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(0) + \rho_2^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X + c) \leq \rho_1^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(0) + \rho_2^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) + c \rightarrow -\infty \end{aligned}$$

as $c \rightarrow -\infty$. Hence, $\rho_1^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho_2^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = -\infty$. This completes the proof. \square

B Proof of Section 3

In this section, we give all of the proofs of the results in Section 3.

Proof of Theorem 1. We first show that $\square_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) \geq \Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X)$. For $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$, let $x = \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X_i)$ and $y_i = \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X_i)$. Note that $0 < \lambda_i^- \leq \lambda_i^+ < 1$ implies $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. By the definition of $\Lambda_i \text{VaR}$ and the right continuity of Λ_i , we have $\mathbb{Q}_i(C_i) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i)$ with $C_i = \{X_i > y_i\}$. We denote $D_i = C_i \cup (\cup_{i=1}^n C_i)^c$. Then it follows that

$$\{X > x\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n X_i > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \right\} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n C_i.$$

For $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$, let $A_i \subset D_i$. Then we have

$$\{X > x, A_i\} \subset \{X > x, D_i\} = \{X > x, C_i\} \subset C_i.$$

Using the fact $\mathbb{Q}_i(C_i) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i)$, we have $\mathbb{Q}_i(X > x, A_i) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i)$. This implies $\sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X_i) = x \geq \Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X)$. By the arbitrary of $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$, we have $\square_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) \geq \Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X)$.

Next we show the inverse inequality. Suppose there exist $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$ such that $\mathbb{Q}_i(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, A_i) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i)$. Let $X_i = (X - x)\mathbb{1}_{A_i} + y_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $x = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$. Then $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$. Direct computation gives

$$\Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X_i) = y_i + \Lambda_i^{y_i} \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_{A_i}),$$

where $\Lambda_i^{y_i}(z) = \Lambda_i(z + y_i)$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that $\mathbb{Q}_i((X - x)\mathbb{1}_{A_i} > 0) = \mathbb{Q}_i(X > x, A_i) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i) =$

$\Lambda_i^{y_i}(0)$. By definition, we have $\Lambda_i^{y_i} \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}((X-x)\mathbf{1}_{A_i}) \leq 0$. Hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n y_i = x.$$

This implies $\square_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n y_i$. By the arbitrary of y_i , we have $\square_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) \leq \Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X)$. One can directly check that X_i^* , $i = 1, \dots, n$ is the optimal allocation. We complete the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. Case (i). Note that $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i)}{\lambda_i^-} \leq 1$ for some $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$ implies $\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i) \leq \lambda_i^-$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence, for any (y_1, \dots, y_n) , it follows that $\mathbb{Q}_i(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, A_i) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i)$. Consequently, $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) = -\infty$.

Case (ii). Let $x^* = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \text{ess-inf}^{\mathbb{Q}_i} X$. For any (y_1, \dots, y_n) with $\sum_{i=1}^n y_i < x^*$ and $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$, there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\mathbb{Q}_i(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, A_i) = \mathbb{Q}_i(A_i) > \lambda_i^+ \geq \Lambda_i(y_i)$. Hence, $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) \geq x^* > -\infty$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. We first consider the case that $\Lambda_i \in \mathcal{H}$ is decreasing. If $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i)}{\lambda_i^+} < 1$ for some $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$, then $\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i) < \lambda_i^+$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Note that $\lim_{y_i \rightarrow -\infty} \Lambda(y_i) = \lambda_i^+$. Hence, there exists y_i^0 such that $\Lambda(y_i) \geq \mathbb{Q}_i(A_i)$ for all $y_i < y_i^0$. It follows that $\mathbb{Q}_i(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, A_i) \leq \mathbb{Q}_i(A_i) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i)$ if $y_i \leq y_i^0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. This implies $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) = -\infty$. The second statement is shown in (ii) of Proposition 2.

Next, we consider the case that $\Lambda_i \in \mathcal{H}$ is increasing. If $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i)}{\lambda_i^-} \vee \bigvee_{j \neq i} \frac{\mathbb{Q}_j(A_j)}{\lambda_j^+} \right) < 1$ for some $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$, then there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i) < \lambda_i^-$ and $\mathbb{Q}_j(A_j) < \lambda_j^+$ for $j \neq i$. Note that there exists $y_j^0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{Q}_j(A_j) \leq \Lambda_j(y_j^0)$ for all $j \neq i$. Moreover, for any $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$, it follows that $\mathbb{Q}_j(X > y_i + \sum_{j \neq i} y_j^0, A_j) \leq \mathbb{Q}_j(A_j) \leq \Lambda_j(y_j)$ for $j \neq i$, and $\mathbb{Q}_i(X > y_i + \sum_{j \neq i} y_j^0, A_i) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i)$. By the arbitrary of y_i , we have $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) = -\infty$.

We next show the last statement. Suppose by contradiction that $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) = -\infty$. Then there exist $(y_1^{(m)}, \dots, y_n^{(m)})$ satisfying $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^{(m)} = -\infty$, and $(A_1^{(m)}, \dots, A_n^{(m)}) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$ such that $\mathbb{Q}_i(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^{(m)}, A_i^{(m)}) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i^{(m)})$. Without loss of generality, we can assume $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} y_i^{(m)} = y_i$. Let $E_1 = \{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : y_i = -\infty\}$ and $E_2 = \{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : y_i > -\infty\}$. By the fact that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^{(m)} = -\infty$, we have $E_1 \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, there exists $m_0 > 0$ such that $\mathbb{Q}_i(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^{(m)}) = 1$ for all $m \geq m_0$. Hence, it follows that $\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i^{(m)}) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i^{(m)})$ for all $m \geq m_0$. Note that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda_i(y_i^{(m)}) = \lambda_i^-$ for all $i \in E_1$. Hence, for any $0 < \eta < \varepsilon$, there exists $m_1 \geq m_0$ such that $\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i^{(m)}) \leq \lambda_i^-(1 + \eta)$ for all $m \geq m_1$ and $i \in E_1$. This implies $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\mathbb{Q}_i(A_i^{(m)})}{\lambda_i^-} \vee \bigvee_{j \neq i} \frac{\mathbb{Q}_j(A_j)}{\lambda_j^+} \right) \leq 1 + \eta < 1 + \varepsilon$ for $m > m_1$, which is a contradiction of the assumption. Hence, $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X) > -\infty$. We complete the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. By Theorem 1, we have

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n y_i : \mathbb{P} \left(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, A_i \right) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i) \text{ for some } (A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega) \right\}.$$

Note that $\mathbb{P}(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, A_i) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i)$ for some $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$ if and only if $\mathbb{P}(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i(y_i)$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X) &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n y_i : (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{P} \left(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i(y_i) \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{i=1}^n y_i = x, \mathbb{P}(X > x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i(y_i) \right\} \\ &= \inf \{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{P}(X > x) \leq \Lambda^*(x) \} = \Lambda^* \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

For the optimal allocation, note that the right continuity of Λ^* at x^* implies $\mathbb{P}(X > x^*) \leq \Lambda^*(x^*)$. Moreover, there exist (y_1^*, \dots, y_n^*) and (A_1^*, \dots, A_n^*) such that $1 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i(y_i^*) = \Lambda^*(x^*)$ and $\mathbb{P}(X > x^*, A_i^*) \leq \Lambda_i(y_i^*)$. Hence, $(y_1^*, \dots, y_n^*, A_1^*, \dots, A_n^*)$ is the minimizer of $\Gamma_{\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n}(X)$. Using Theorem 1, the claimed allocation is an optimal allocation. \square

Proof of Proposition 4. In light of (11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X) &= \inf \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{i=1}^n y_i = x, \mathbb{P}(X > x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i(y_i) \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{y}_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \Lambda^{\mathbf{y}_{n-1}} \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{P}}(X). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Theorem 3. By Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) \\ = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n y_i : \mathbb{P} \left(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, B_i \cap A_i \right) \leq \mathbb{P}(B_i) \Lambda_i(y_i) \text{ for some } (A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{N}_n = \{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subset \{1, \dots, n\} : m = 1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$. For $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \in \mathcal{N}_n$, we denote $C_{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} = \left(\bigcap_{i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} B_i \right) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} B_i \right)$. Then for $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}, \{i'_1, \dots, i'_{m'}\} \in \mathcal{N}_n$, we have $C_{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} \cap C_{\{i'_1, \dots, i'_{m'}\}} = \emptyset$ if $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \neq \{i'_1, \dots, i'_{m'}\}$. Moreover, it follows that $\bigcup_{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \in \mathcal{N}_n} C_{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} = \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n B_i \right) \setminus \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n B_i \right)$. Next, for each $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$, we do some operations on it. We fix $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \in \mathcal{N}_n$. For each $i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$, we do the following operations:

$$A_i \rightarrow A_i \setminus C_{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}}, \quad A_j \rightarrow A_j \cup (A_i \cap C_{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}}),$$

where $j = \min(\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_m\})$. The new sets after the operations are denoted by (A'_1, \dots, A'_n) . Clearly, $(A'_1, \dots, A'_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$ and $B_i \cap A'_i \subset B_i \cap A_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $A'_i \cap C_{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} = \emptyset$ for all $i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$. Those operations will be done for all $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \in \mathcal{N}_n$. The final sets are denoted by (A''_1, \dots, A''_n) . Clearly, $(A''_1, \dots, A''_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$ and $B_i \cap A''_i \subset B_i \cap A_i$. Moreover, it follows that $A''_i \cap C_{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} = \emptyset$ for all $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \in \mathcal{N}_n$ satisfying $i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$. This implies $B_i \cap A''_i = (\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) \cap A''_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. By the construction of A''_i , it follows that $(\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) \cap A_i \subset B_i \cap A''_i$, which together with the fact $B_i \cap A''_i \subset B_i \cap A_i$ implies $(\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) \cap A_i = (\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) \cap A''_i = B_i \cap A''_i$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n y_i : \mathbb{P} \left(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, B_i \cap A_i \right) \leq \mathbb{P}(B_i) \Lambda_i(y_i) \text{ for some } (A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega) \right\} \\ & \leq \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n y_i : \mathbb{P} \left(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, (\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) \cap A_i \right) \leq \mathbb{P}(B_i) \Lambda_i(y_i) \text{ for some } (A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the inverse inequality is trivial. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \square_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) \\ & = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n y_i : \mathbb{P} \left(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, (\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) \cap A_i \right) \leq \mathbb{P}(B_i) \Lambda_i(y_i) \text{ for some } (A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbb{P}(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, (\cap_{i=1}^n B_i) \cap A_i) \leq \mathbb{P}(B_i) \Lambda_i(y_i)$ for some $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in \Pi_n(\Omega)$ and some $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}(X > \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, \cap_{i=1}^n B_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(B_i) \Lambda_i(y_i)$ for some $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Using this conclusion and the attainability of Λ^\diamond , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \square_{i=1}^n \Lambda_i \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}(X) & = \inf \left\{ x : x = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, \mathbb{P}(X > x, \cap_{i=1}^n B_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(B_i) \Lambda_i(y_i) \right\} \\ & = \inf \left\{ x : x = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, \mathbb{Q}(X > x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_i) \Lambda_i(y_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\cap_{i=1}^n B_i)} \right\} \\ & = \inf \{ x : \mathbb{Q}(X > x) \leq \Lambda^\diamond(x) \} = \Lambda^\diamond \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X). \end{aligned}$$

One can easily check that the claimed allocation is optimal. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. Using Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Lambda_1 \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \Lambda_2 \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) \\ & = \inf \{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{Q}_1(X > x, A^c) \leq \Lambda_1(y), \mathbb{Q}_2(X > x, A) \leq \Lambda_2(x - y), \text{ for some } y \in \mathbb{R}, A \in \mathcal{F} \} \\ & = \inf \{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{Q}_1(X > x, A^c) \leq \Lambda_1(y), \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta \mathbf{1}_{\{X > x, A\}}) \leq \Lambda_2(x - y), \text{ for some } y \in \mathbb{R}, A \in \mathcal{F} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $f(t) = \mathbb{Q}_1(X > x, U_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \leq t)$, $t \in [0, 1]$. Clearly, f is an increasing and continuous function. Let f^{-1} denote the left-quantile of f . Define $A_{x,t} = \{U_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \leq f^{-1}(t)\}$ for $t \in [0, 1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)]$. Let $t_0 = \mathbb{Q}_1(X > x, A)$. Then it follows that $\mathbb{Q}_1(X > x, A_{x,t_0}) = \mathbb{Q}_1(X > x, A)$ and

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta \mathbb{1}_{\{X > x, A_{x,t_0}\}}) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(F_\eta^{-1}(U_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1}) \mathbb{1}_{\{X > x, A_{x,t_0}\}}) \leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta \mathbb{1}_{\{X > x, A\}}).$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Lambda_1 \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \Lambda_2 \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) \\ &= \inf \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \mathbb{Q}_1(X > x, A_{x,t}^c) \leq \Lambda_1(y), \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta \mathbb{1}_{\{X > x, A_{x,t}\}}) \leq \Lambda_2(x - y), \text{ for some } y \in \mathbb{R}, t \in [0, 1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)] \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : 1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x) - t \leq \Lambda_1(y), g_x(t) \leq \Lambda_2(x - y), \text{ for some } y \in \mathbb{R}, t \in [0, 1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)] \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : g_x((1 - F_X^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x) - \Lambda_1(y))_+) \leq \Lambda_2(x - y), \text{ for some } y \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

C Proof of Section 4

In this section, we provide all the proofs of results in Section 4.

Proof of Theorem 5. For any x, y and B satisfying $\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)$, let $X_1 = x \mathbb{1}_B + (X - y) \mathbb{1}_{B^c}$. Direct calculation gives

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - X_1) \leq x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - X_1) = x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x) \mathbb{1}_B + y \mathbb{1}_{B^c}).$$

This implies $\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) \leq x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x) \mathbb{1}_B + y \mathbb{1}_{B^c})$. By the arbitrary of x, y and B satisfying $\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)$, we have

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) \leq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \left\{ x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x) \mathbb{1}_B + y \mathbb{1}_{B^c}) \right\}.$$

We next show the inverse inequality. For any $X_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, let $x_1 = \Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1)$ and $U_{X_1} \sim U[0, 1]$ under \mathbb{Q}_1 such that $X_1 = (F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(U_{X_1})$ a.s. under \mathbb{Q}_1 . Define $Y_1 = x_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{U_{X_1} \leq 1 - \Lambda(x_1)\}} + (X + m) \mathbb{1}_{\{U_{X_1} > 1 - \Lambda(x_1)\}}$ with $m > (x_1 - \text{ess-inf}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} X) \vee (\text{ess-sup}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} |X| + \text{ess-sup}^{\mathbb{Q}_2} |X_1| + |x_1|)$, where $\text{ess-inf}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}$ and $\text{ess-sup}^{\mathbb{Q}_i}$ represent the ess-inf and ess-sup under \mathbb{Q}_i , $i = 1, 2$. Note that U_{X_1} can be chosen such that $\{U_{X_1} \leq t\} \subset \{X_1 \leq (F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(t)\}$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. By the definition of ΛVaR and the right continuity of Λ , we have $F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x_1) \geq 1 - \Lambda(x_1)$, which implies $x_1 \geq F_{X_1}^{-1}(1 - \Lambda(x_1))$.

Hence we have $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(Y_1) = x_1$, and $X_1 \leq Y_1$ for all $w \in \Omega$. By monotonicity of ρ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - X_1) &\geq x_1 + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - Y_1) \\ &= x_1 + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x_1)\mathbb{1}_{\{U_{X_1} \leq 1 - \Lambda(x_1)\}} - m\mathbb{1}_{\{U_{X_1} > 1 - \Lambda(x_1)\}}) \\ &\geq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_B + y\mathbb{1}_{B^c})\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrary of X_1 , we obtain

$$\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) \geq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_B + y\mathbb{1}_{B^c})\}.$$

Combing the above conclusions, we have (4) holds.

We next show that the existence of the optimal allocation implies the existence of the minimizer of (4). Suppose there exists $X_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - X_1) = \Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X)$. Following the same argument as above to show the inverse inequality, let $x_1 = \Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1)$ and $Y_1 = x_1\mathbb{1}_{\{U_{X_1} \leq 1 - \Lambda(x_1)\}} + (X + m)\mathbb{1}_{\{U_{X_1} > 1 - \Lambda(x_1)\}}$ with $m > (x_1 - \text{ess-inf}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} X) \vee (\text{ess-sup}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} |X| + \text{ess-sup}^{\mathbb{Q}_2} |X_1| + |x_1|)$ such that $X_1 \leq Y_1$ for all $w \in \Omega$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - X_1) &\geq \Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(Y_1) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - Y_1) \\ &= x_1 + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x_1)\mathbb{1}_{\{U_{X_1} \leq 1 - \Lambda(x_1)\}} - m\mathbb{1}_{\{U_{X_1} > 1 - \Lambda(x_1)\}}) \\ &\geq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_B + y\mathbb{1}_{B^c})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - X_1) = \Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X)$ and (4), we have

$$x_1 + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x_1)\mathbb{1}_{\{U_{X_1} \leq 1 - \Lambda(x_1)\}} - m\mathbb{1}_{\{U_{X_1} > 1 - \Lambda(x_1)\}}) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_B + y\mathbb{1}_{B^c})\}.$$

This implies $(x_1, -m, \{U_{X_1} \leq 1 - \Lambda(x_1)\})$ is the minimizer of (4).

Now suppose (x^*, y^*, B^*) is the minimizer of (4). We next check (X_1^*, X_2^*) given in (5) is an optimal allocation. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1^*) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X_2^*) &\leq x^* + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x^*)\mathbb{1}_{B^*} + y^*\mathbb{1}_{(B^*)^c}) \\ &= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_B + y\mathbb{1}_{B^c})\} \\ &= \Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1^*) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X_2^*) = \Lambda\text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X)$ and (X_1^*, X_2^*) is an optimal allocation. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 5. In light of Theorem 5, we have

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B)=1-\Lambda(x)} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X-x)\mathbf{1}_B + y\mathbf{1}_{B^c})\}.$$

If $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c) \geq (1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1)$, then there exists $D \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $D \subseteq B_1 \cap B_2^c$ and $\mathbb{Q}_1(D) = 1 - \Lambda(x)$. Using the law-invariance of ρ under \mathbb{Q}_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B)=1-\Lambda(x)} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X-x)\mathbf{1}_B + y\mathbf{1}_{B^c})\} &\leq \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X-x)\mathbf{1}_D + y\mathbf{1}_{D^c})\} \\ &= \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(y)\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $y < \text{ess-inf}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X-x)$, we have $(X-x)\mathbf{1}_B + y\mathbf{1}_{B^c} \geq y$ a.s. under \mathbb{Q}_2 . It follows from the monotonicity and law-invariance of ρ that $\rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X-x)\mathbf{1}_B + y\mathbf{1}_{B^c}) \geq \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(y)$. Using the monotonicity of ρ again, we have $\inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B)=1-\Lambda(x)} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X-x)\mathbf{1}_B + y\mathbf{1}_{B^c})\} \geq \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(y)\}$. Consequently,

$$\inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B)=1-\Lambda(x)} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X-x)\mathbf{1}_B + y\mathbf{1}_{B^c})\} = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(y)\}.$$

Next, we consider the case $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c) < (1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1)$. Let $y < \text{ess-inf}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X-x)$ and $A_x = (B_1 \cap B_2^c) \cup (B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \{U_X^{\mathbb{P}} < \alpha_x\})$ with α_x satisfying $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \{U_X^{\mathbb{P}} < \alpha_x\}) = (1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1) - \mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c)$. For any $B \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)$ and $z \geq y$, we have

$$\mathbb{Q}_2((X-x)\mathbf{1}_B + y\mathbf{1}_{B^c} \leq z) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(X \leq z+x, B \cap B_2) + \mathbb{P}(B^c \cap B_2)}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)} = 1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(X > z+x, B \cap B_2)}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)}.$$

Observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(X > z+x, A_x \cap B_2) = \mathbb{P}(X > z+x, B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \{U_X^{\mathbb{P}} \leq \alpha_x\}) \leq \mathbb{P}(X > z+x, B_1 \cap B_2 \cap B_3)$$

for any $B_3 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2 \cap B_3) \geq (1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1) - \mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c)$. Note that $\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)$ implies $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2 \cap B) \geq (1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1) - \mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c)$. Hence we have $\mathbb{P}(X > z+x, A_x \cap B_2) \leq \mathbb{P}(X > z+x, B_1 \cap B_2 \cap B) \leq \mathbb{P}(X > z+x, B \cap B_2)$. This implies

$$\mathbb{Q}_2((X-x)\mathbf{1}_B + y\mathbf{1}_{B^c} \leq z) \leq \mathbb{Q}_2((X-x)\mathbf{1}_{A_x} + y\mathbf{1}_{A_x^c} \leq z)$$

for $z \geq y$. For $z < y$, clearly,

$$\mathbb{Q}_2((X-x)\mathbf{1}_B + y\mathbf{1}_{B^c} \leq z) = \mathbb{Q}_2((X-x)\mathbf{1}_{A_x} + y\mathbf{1}_{A_x^c} \leq z) = 0.$$

By the law-invariance and monotonicity of ρ , we have for $B \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)$ and $y < \text{ess-inf}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - x)$, $\rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + y\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) \leq \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_B + y\mathbb{1}_{B^c})$, which implies

$$\inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B)=1-\Lambda(x)} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_B + y\mathbb{1}_{B^c})\} = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + y\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c})\}.$$

Hence, (6) holds. The conclusion on optimal allocation follows from the same reasoning as the proof of Theorem 5. The details are omitted. We complete the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 3. We first consider (i). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} x + \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + y\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) &= \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^\alpha \text{VaR}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) \leq \lambda^+$, then there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c) \geq (1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1)$. Hence, $A_x = \emptyset$. By Proposition 5, we have $\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}} \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(x + y) = -\infty$.

Next, we consider the case $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) > \lambda^+$. For $z \geq x + y$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_2(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c} \leq z) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(A_x^c \cap B_2) + \mathbb{P}(X \leq z, A_x \cap B_2)}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)} \\ &= 1 - \beta_x + \frac{\mathbb{P}(X \leq z, B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \{U_X^{\mathbb{P}} \leq \alpha_x\})}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\beta_x = \frac{(1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1) - \mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c)}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)}$. If $\alpha > \beta$, then there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha > \beta_x$. It follows that $\mathbb{Q}_2(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c} \leq z) \geq 1 - \beta_x > 1 - \alpha$ for all $z \geq x + y$, which implies $\text{VaR}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) \leq x + y \rightarrow -\infty$ as $y \rightarrow -\infty$ for $t \in (\beta_x, \alpha)$. Hence, $\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) \leq \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^\alpha \text{VaR}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) dt = -\infty$.

We next consider the case $\alpha \leq \beta$. Letting $y \leq \text{ess-inf}^{\mathbb{Q}_2} X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} - x$, we have $\mathbb{Q}_2(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c} < x + y) = 0$, implying $\text{VaR}_t(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) \geq x + y$ for $t \in (0, 1)$. With the aid of (12) and noting that $\alpha \leq \beta_x$, direct computation shows for $0 < t < \alpha$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{VaR}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) &= \inf\{z \geq x + y : 1 - \beta_x + \frac{\mathbb{P}(X \leq z, B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \{U_X^{\mathbb{P}} \leq \alpha_x\})}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)} \geq 1 - t\} \\ &= \text{VaR}_{1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_2)(\beta_x - t)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)}}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Consequently, we have

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^\alpha \text{VaR}_{1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_2)(\beta_x - t)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)}}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) dt = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^\alpha \text{VaR}_{1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_2)(\beta - t)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)}}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) dt.$$

Next, we consider (ii). Note that

$$x + \rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + y\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) = \rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}).$$

If $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) \leq \lambda^+$, then there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c) \geq (1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1)$. Hence, $A_x = \emptyset$. By Proposition 5, we have $\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}} \rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(x + y) = -\infty$.

Next, we consider the case $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) > \lambda^+$. If $g(\beta) < 1$, then there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(\beta_x) < 1$. By (12), we have $\mathbb{Q}_2(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c} \leq z) \geq 1 - \beta_x$ for all $z \geq x + y$, which implies $\text{VaR}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) \leq x + y \rightarrow -\infty$ as $y \rightarrow -\infty$ for all $t \in [\beta_x, 1)$. Hence, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\beta_x = \beta$, we have

$$\inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) = \lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} \int_0^1 \text{VaR}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) dg(t) = -\infty.$$

Now, we assume $g(\beta) = 1$. By (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho_g^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) &= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{[0, \beta)} \text{VaR}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c}) dg(t) \\ &= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{[0, \beta)} \text{VaR}_{1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_2)(\beta_x - t)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)}}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) dg(t) = \int_{[0, \beta)} \text{VaR}_{1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_2)(\beta - t)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)}}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) dg(t). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider (iii). If $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) \leq \lambda^+$, then there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2^c) \geq (1 - \Lambda(x))\mathbb{P}(B_1)$. Hence, $A_x = \emptyset$. By Proposition 5, we have $\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \mathbb{E}_u^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}} (x + u(y)) = -\infty$.

Next, we consider the case $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) > \lambda^+$. It follows from Proposition 5 and (13) that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \mathbb{E}_u^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) &= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \{x + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_2} u((X - x)\mathbb{1}_{A_x} + y\mathbb{1}_{A_x^c})\} \\ &= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left(x + (1 - \beta_x)u(-\infty) + \int_0^{\beta_x} u \left(\text{VaR}_{1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_2)(\beta_x - t)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)}}^{\mathbb{Q}}(X) - x \right) dt \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $u(-\infty) = \lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} u(y)$.

Finally, we consider (iv). Similarly as above, if $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) \leq \lambda^+$, then by Proposition 5, we have $\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \Lambda_1 \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{x, y \in \mathbb{R}} (x + y) = -\infty$.

Next, we consider the case $\mathbb{Q}_1(B_2) > \lambda^+$. In light of Proposition 5 and (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \Lambda_1 \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_2}(X) \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} \left\{ x + \sup \left\{ z \geq y : 1 - \beta_x + \frac{\mathbb{P}(X \leq x + z, B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \{U_X^{\mathbb{P}} \leq \alpha_x\})}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)} < 1 - \Lambda_1(z) \right\} \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \rightarrow -\infty} \sup \left\{ z \geq y : 1 - \beta_x + \frac{\mathbb{P}(X \leq z, B_1 \cap B_2 \cap \{U_X^{\mathbb{P}} < \alpha_x\})}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)} < 1 - \Lambda_1(z - x) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R} : 1 - \beta_x + \frac{\mathbb{P}(X \leq z, B_1 \cap B_2)}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)} < 1 - \Lambda_1(z - x) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R} : \frac{\mathbb{P}(X \leq z, B_1 \cap B_2)}{\mathbb{P}(B_2)} < \beta_x - \Lambda_1(z - x) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R} : \frac{\mathbb{P}(X \leq z, B_1 \cap B_2)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)} < 1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_1)\Lambda(x) + \mathbb{P}(B_2)\Lambda_1(z - x)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)} \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sup \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R} : F_X^{\mathbb{Q}}(z) < 1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_1)\Lambda(x) + \mathbb{P}(B_2)\Lambda_1(z - x)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)} \right\} = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \bar{\Lambda}^x \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}}(X),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\Lambda}^x(z) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(B_1)\Lambda(x) + \mathbb{P}(B_2)\Lambda_1(z - x)}{\mathbb{P}(B_1 \cap B_2)} \wedge 1$. We complete the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 4. We first consider (i). In light of Theorem 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) &= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \left\{ x + \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - x)\mathbb{1}_B + y\mathbb{1}_{B^c}) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \left\{ \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_B + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{B^c}) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

It shows in Rockafellar and Uryasev (2002) that $\text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) = \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left(t + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - t)_+) \right)$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) &= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \left\{ \text{ES}_\alpha^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X\mathbb{1}_B + (x + y)\mathbb{1}_{B^c}) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ t + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}((X - t)_+\mathbb{1}_B + (x + y - t)_+\mathbb{1}_{B^c}) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \left\{ t + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta(X - t)_+\mathbb{1}_B) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ t + \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{\Lambda(x)}^1 \text{VaR}_s^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta(X - t)_+) ds \right\} \\
&= \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ t + \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{\lambda^+}^1 \text{VaR}_s^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta(X - t)_+) ds \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we consider (ii). It follows from Theorem 5 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \mathbb{E}_u^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) &= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \left\{ x + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(u(X - x)\mathbb{1}_B + u(y)\mathbb{1}_{B^c}) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B) = 1 - \Lambda(x)} \left\{ x + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(u(X - x)\mathbb{1}_B + u(-\infty)\mathbb{1}_{B^c}) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $u(-\infty) \leq u(X - x)$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Lambda \text{VaR}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} \square \mathbb{E}_u^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{\mathbb{Q}_1(B)=1-\Lambda(x)} \left\{ x + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta u(X - x) \mathbf{1}_B) + u(-\infty) \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta \mathbf{1}_{B^c}) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ x + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta u(X - x) \mathbf{1}_{\{U_\eta^{\mathbb{Q}_1} < 1-\Lambda(x)\}}) + u(-\infty) \int_0^{\Lambda(x)} \text{VaR}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(\eta) dt \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

D Proof of Section 5

In this section, we offer all the proofs of the results in Section 5.

Proof of Theorem 6. For $x \in \mathbb{R}, y \geq x$ and $U \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\approx} U[0, 1]$, we have $\Lambda \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1}(\Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(U)) = x$. Hence,

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho(X) \leq \Lambda \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1}(\Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(U)) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(U)) = x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(U)).$$

Using the arbitrary of $x \in \mathbb{R}, y \geq x$ and $U \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\approx} U[0, 1]$, we have

$$\Lambda \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) \leq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \geq x} \inf_{U \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\approx} U[0, 1]} \left\{ x + \rho(X - \Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(U)) \right\}.$$

Next, we show the inverse inequality. For $X_1 \in \mathcal{X}$, we let $x_1 = \Lambda \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1)$ and $U_{X_1} \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\approx} U[0, 1]$. We choose U_{X_1} such that $\{U_{X_1} \leq t\} \subset \{X_1 \leq (F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(t)\}$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. This implies $\{(F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(U_{X_1}) \leq x\} = \{U_{X_1} \leq F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x)\} \subset \{X_1 \leq (F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x))\} \subset \{X_1 \leq x\}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, $X_1 \leq (F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(U_{X_1})$ for all $w \in \Omega$. By definition, $F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x) \geq 1 - \Lambda(x)$ for all $x \geq x_1$. This implies $F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x) \geq \Lambda_{x_1, y}(x)$ for $x_1 \leq x \leq y$. If $y \geq \text{ess-sup}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} X_1$, then $F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x) = 1 \geq \Lambda_{x_1, y}(x)$ for $x \geq y$. Hence, if $y \geq \text{ess-sup}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} X_1$, we have $F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}(x) \geq \Lambda_{x_1, y}(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Combing all the above results, we have $X_1 \leq (F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(U_{X_1}) \leq \Lambda_{x_1, y}^{-1}(U_{X_1})$ if $y \geq \text{ess-sup}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} X_1$. It follows that for $y \geq \text{ess-sup}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} X_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda \text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - X_1) &\geq x_1 + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x_1, y}^{-1}(U_{X_1})) \\
&\geq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \geq x} \inf_{U \stackrel{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\approx} U[0, 1]} \left\{ x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x, y}^{-1}(U)) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrary of X_1 , we have

$$\Lambda\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) \geq \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \geq x} \inf_{U \overset{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\sim} U[0,1]} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(U))\}.$$

Hence, we obtain (8).

Next, we show the optimal allocation of the inf-convolution exists if and only if the minimizer of (8) exists. Suppose $(X_1, X - X_1)$ is the optimal allocation of the inf-convolution. Then we have $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - X_1) = \Lambda\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X)$. Let $x_1 = \Lambda\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1)$ and $y_1 > x_1 \vee \text{ess-sup}^{\mathbb{Q}_1} X_1$. We choose $U_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}$ such that $X_1 \leq (F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(U_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})$ for all $w \in \Omega$. Using the above argument, we have $(F_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})^{-1}(U_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}) \leq \Lambda_{x_1, y_1}^{-1}(U_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})$. By the monotonicity of ρ , we have $\Lambda\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1}(X_1) + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - X_1) \geq x_1 + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x_1, y_1}^{-1}(U_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1}))$. This implies $x_1 + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x_1, y_1}^{-1}(U_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \geq x} \inf_{U \overset{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\sim} U[0,1]} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(U))\}$. Hence, $(x_1, y_1, U_{X_1}^{\mathbb{Q}_1})$ is the minimizer of (8). Moreover, if (x_1, y_1, U) is the minimizer of (8), one can easily check that $(\Lambda_{x_1, y_1}^{-1}(U), X - \Lambda_{x_1, y_1}^{-1}(U))$ is the optimal allocation of the inf-convolution. We complete the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 6. Direct calculation shows that if $x < x_1$, then $\Lambda_{x,y}(z) = \lambda_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq z < x_1\}} + \lambda_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{x_1 \leq z < y\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{z \geq y\}}$; if $x \geq x_1$, then $\Lambda_{x,y}(z) = \lambda_2 \mathbb{1}_{\{x \leq z < y\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{z \geq y\}}$. Hence, we have $\Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(t) = x \mathbb{1}_{\{0 < t \leq \lambda_1\}} + x \vee x_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda_1 < t \leq \lambda_2\}} + y \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda_2 < t < 1\}}$. For any $U \overset{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\sim} U[0, 1]$, it follows that $\Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(U) = x \mathbb{1}_{\{0 < U \leq \lambda_1\}} + x \vee x_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda_1 < U \leq \lambda_2\}} + y \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda_2 < U < 1\}}$. Note that $\mathbb{Q}(0 < U \leq \lambda_1) = \lambda_1$, $\mathbb{Q}(\lambda_1 < U \leq \lambda_2) = \lambda_2 - \lambda_1$ and $\mathbb{Q}(\lambda_2 < U < 1) = 1 - \lambda_2$, and those three sets are disjoint. Consequently, in light of Theorem 6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda\text{VaR}^{+, \mathbb{Q}_1} \square \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X) &= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \geq x} \inf_{U \overset{\mathbb{Q}_1}{\sim} U[0,1]} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - \Lambda_{x,y}^{-1}(U))\} \\ &= \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \inf_{y \geq x \vee x_1} \inf_{(B_1, B_2) \in \mathcal{B}_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}} \{x + \rho^{\mathbb{Q}_2}(X - x \mathbb{1}_{B_1} - x \vee x_1 \mathbb{1}_{B_2} - y \mathbb{1}_{(B_1 \cup B_2)^c})\}. \end{aligned}$$

\square