

Comparative Statics for the Subjective

—

Mark Whitmeyer ¹

I study robust comparative statics for risk-averse subjective expected utility (SEU) maximizers. Starting with a finite menu of actions totally ordered by sensitivity to risk, I identify the transformations of her menu that lead a decision-maker to take a lower action, regardless of her particular utility function or belief. My main results reveal that a robust decrease in the action selected is guaranteed by an intuitive steepening of the actions' payoffs and necessitates a slightly weaker such steepening. This basic pattern generalizes to a broad class of non-EU preferences.

¹ Arizona State University, mark.whitmeyer@gmail.com. I thank Chris Chambers, Joseph Whitmeyer, and Kun Zhang for their comments. Draft date: February 21, 2025.

1. Introduction

Decision-making is central to economics, with myriad applications ranging from consumer behavior to policy design. The study of comparative statics—the analysis of how optimal decisions change in response to transformations in the decision environment—is fundamental to the study of decision-making, *is* the study of decision-making.

Traditional comparative statics exercises typically focus on changes in exogenous parameters, such as prices or endowments, while holding other structural aspects of the decision problem fixed, e.g., the decision-maker’s (DM’s) utility function or the form uncertainty takes. Here, we instead explore how transformations of the monetary payoffs associated with a menu of actions robustly influence the choices of a risk-averse subjective-expected-utility (SEU) maximizer.

Our framework is rooted in an SEU setting, where a DM chooses an optimal action given her beliefs and risk preferences (utility function) from a finite menu. We investigate monotone modifications to the state-dependent *monetary* payoffs of actions within the DM’s menu. The key question we address is: under what conditions do such transformations lead a risk-averse DM to systematically choose lower actions from her menu, regardless of her specific utility function (in money) or belief?

We specialize to monotone environments in which the state space is a subset of the real numbers, with higher states yielding higher monetary rewards than lower ones for any fixed action; and the action space is also ordered according to the actions’ sensitivities to the DM’s risk aversion, *in terms of their state-dependent monetary payments*. As shown by [Pease and Whitmeyer \(2023\)](#), this ordering is equivalent to single-crossing differences, given the structure placed upon the setting.

We begin the analysis by studying the case in which the DM’s menu is binary. In [Proposition 3.2](#), we show that a transformation robustly reduces the DM’s action if and only if the lower action, a , improves with respect to the higher action, b , in a natural sense: the good outcome for a must improve, the bad outcome for b must

get worse, and the average monetary reward from a must improve with respect to b 's at a risk-neutral DM's indifference belief. At a high level, these conditions can be decomposed into two parts: first, *both* actions are made riskier (in belief space, steeper), then (state-wise) dominance improvements and deteriorations are effected for a and b .

Moving on to the general finite-action environment, we see that the basic insights from the binary setting persist. In particular, Corollary 3.3 spells out a useful consequence of Proposition 3.2: a collection of pairwise steepenings of the actions' payoffs ensures a robust decrease in the action chosen by the DM. Turning our attention to necessity, Theorem 3.5 reveals that if the DM must choose a lower action after the transformation—irrespective of her risk-averse utility or belief—it must be that for every distinct pair of states and every action that is not inferior to some other action in that pair of states—every *relevant* action—all but the lowest action must become worse, money-wise, in the low state, and all but the highest action must improve in the high state.

In short, Theorem 3.5 reveals that if a transformation robustly leads to a lower action, it must be that in every pair of states, *every* relevant action is made riskier, with the possible exception of only the lowest and highest action. There is a small gap between necessity and sufficiency: this arises because the necessity result concerns only relevant actions, a smaller set than those disciplined by the sufficiency result. Intuitively, relevant actions may nevertheless be dominated by mixtures of actions when the DM is not very risk averse, and become undominated only for high levels of risk aversion. Thus, we only need to guarantee a lower action for a restricted set of utility functions, hence the over-strictness of the proposed sufficient conditions.

We go on in §4 to observe that our basic insight—that robust decreases in action choices are guaranteed by making monetary rewards more sensitive to the state—persists under far more general preferences than expected utility. We look at a DM whose preferences over actions satisfy basic desiderata (e.g., convexity and monotonicity) but may not be probabilistic. In Corollary 4.3, we show that,

nevertheless, a steepening of the actions' monetary rewards effects a robust decrease in the action selected. We finish the paper with several applications.

1.1. Related Papers

The advent of the 1990s brought with it a flurry of comparative statics papers, including the seminal works by [Milgrom \(1994\)](#), [Milgrom and Roberts \(1994\)](#), [Edlin and Shannon \(1998\)](#), and [Milgrom and Shannon \(1994\)](#). The last of these, [Milgrom and Shannon \(1994\)](#), arguably provide the modern foundation for this literature, illustrating that monotone environments provide enough structure for establishing clean general results.

The tools introduced by these works (and their forebears, e.g., [Topkis \(1978\)](#)) have since been widely adopted in economic theory to analyze how structural features of optimization problems affect behavior. Of course, randomness is a central feature of many settings, and so a number of important works study monotone comparative statics in stochastic environments. [Athey \(2002\)](#) is one such paper, as is [Quah and Strulovici \(2009\)](#). Importantly, in these and the others studying comparative statics under uncertainty, the randomness is a *primitive*, and exogenously specified.

Such specified stochasticity is not present in [Quah and Strulovici \(2012\)](#). Instead, they (for all intents and purposes) inhabit an SEU setting, with a random state of the world, and ask when the single-crossing differences property of [Milgrom and Shannon \(1994\)](#) holds, and so monotone comparative statics obtain, for any distribution over states. [Kartik, Lee, and Rappoport \(2023\)](#) tackles a similar problem: as they note, [Quah and Strulovici \(2012\)](#) study “...when single crossing is preserved by positive linear combinations. On the other hand, our [[Kartik, Lee, and Rappoport \(2023\)](#)] problem turns on arbitrary linear combinations preserving single crossing.”

In short, [Quah and Strulovici \(2012\)](#) and [Kartik, Lee, and Rappoport \(2023\)](#) are robust comparative statics exercises, where the robustness is distributional. [Pease and Whitmeyer \(2023\)](#) impose this robustness as well and, notably, show that in

monotone environments, “high” actions are precisely those that become relatively less attractive as a DM becomes more risk averse. Here, in contrast to these works, we ask for robustness both with respect to a DM’s beliefs (distributional) and utility function (preferences).

Two other papers are closely related to this one. In [Pease and Whitmeyer \(2024\)](#), a coauthor and I fix a binary menu of actions, a and b , and ask what transformations of a make it robustly more attractive than a versus b . As an extension of that result, in an earlier draft of that paper (v3 on ArXiv), we provide a sufficient condition when both a and b are altered. Accordingly, [Proposition 3.2](#) partially generalizes this result with the caveat that we also impose structure in this paper that is not imposed in [Pease and Whitmeyer \(2024\)](#). In [Whitmeyer \(2024\)](#), I conduct a related exercise to [Pease and Whitmeyer \(2024\)](#)’s in order to scrutinize [Rabin \(2000\)](#)’s calibration paradox.

2. The Environment

We study [Monotone Decision Problems](#), (A, Θ) , consisting of a compact set of states $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}$; and a finite set of actions, A . $\Delta \equiv \Delta(\Theta)$ is the set of all Borel probability measures on Θ . Each action $a \in A$ is a continuous function $a: \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $a_\theta := a(\theta)$, and monotone in the state: for all $a \in A$, $\theta < \theta'$ implies $a_\theta \leq a_{\theta'}$. We stipulate that no action state-wise dominates another: for any distinct $a, b \in A$, there exist distinct states $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ such that $a_\theta > b_\theta$ and $a_{\theta'} < b_{\theta'}$. Henceforth, we omit the “distinct” modifier when it is obvious.

For a specified pair of actions $a, b \in A$, we define

$$\mathcal{A} := \{\theta \in \Theta: a_\theta > b_\theta\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B} := \{\theta' \in \Theta: a_{\theta'} < b_{\theta'}\}.$$

We specify further that A is totally ordered by \triangleright , where $b \triangleright a$ if $b_\theta < a_\theta \leq a_{\theta'} < b_{\theta'}$ for any pair $(\theta, \theta') \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$. Finally, we impose [Single-Crossing Differences](#):

$$b \triangleright a \quad \text{and} \quad b_\theta \underset{(>)}{\geq} a_\theta \Rightarrow b_{\theta'} \underset{(>)}{\geq} a_{\theta'} \quad \text{for any } \theta' > \theta.$$

A set of actions A undergoes a monotone, order-preserving [Transformation](#) if for each action $a \in A$ there exists a strictly increasing function $\phi_a: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

for each action $a \in A$ its state-dependent payoff is $\hat{a}_\theta = \phi_a(a_\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$; and for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and any pair $a, b \in A$,

$$b_\theta \underset{(>)}{\geq} a_\theta \Rightarrow \hat{b}_\theta \underset{(>)}{\geq} \hat{a}_\theta.$$

That is, the transformations under consideration preserve the ordinal rankings of monetary payoffs both between actions, for every fixed state; and between states, for every fixed action.

There is a decision-maker (DM), who is a risk-averse subjective-utility maximizer, with a belief $\mu \in \Delta$ and a continuous, strictly increasing, and concave utility function, $u: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. \mathcal{U} denotes the class of such utility functions. Given the DM's belief $\mu \in \Delta$ and utility function $u \in \mathcal{U}$, before her set of actions A is transformed, her set of optimal actions is

$$A^* = A^*(\mu, u) := \left\{ a \in A: \mathbb{E}_\mu [u(a_\theta)] \geq \max_{a' \in A} \mathbb{E}_\mu [u(a'_\theta)] \right\}.$$

After A is transformed, her set of optimal actions is

$$\hat{A}^* = \hat{A}^*(\mu, u) := \left\{ a \in A: \mathbb{E}_\mu [u(\phi_a(a_\theta))] \geq \max_{a' \in A} \mathbb{E}_\mu [u(\phi_{a'}(a'_\theta))] \right\}.$$

Definition 2.1. A^* *Dominates* \hat{A}^* *in the Strong Set Order* if for any $\hat{a} \in \hat{A}^*$ and $a \in A^*$, we have $\max\{a, \hat{a}\} \in A^*$ and $\min\{a, \hat{a}\} \in \hat{A}^*$.

Definition 2.2. A transformation *Reduces the DM's Action* if for any $\mu \in \Delta$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}$, A^* dominates \hat{A}^* in the strong set order.

In order to avoid needless repetition, henceforth, when we say a pair of states $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$, we understand them not only to be distinct but with $\theta < \theta'$.

3. The Analysis

3.1. A Binary Menu

We begin with a two-action menu. Recall that for two actions a and b , \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are the sets of states in which a yields a strictly higher payoff than b and vice versa.

Definition 3.1. Fix actions a and b with $b \triangleright a$. We say that they are *Made Steeper* if for all $\theta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\theta' \in \mathcal{B}$,

1. $\hat{b}_\theta \leq b_\theta$;
2. $a_{\theta'} \leq \hat{a}_{\theta'}$; and
3. A **Super-Actuarial Improvement** of a versus b occurs:

$$\frac{\min\{\hat{a}_\theta, a_\theta\} - \hat{b}_\theta}{a_\theta - b_\theta} \geq \frac{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}{\min\{\hat{b}_{\theta'}, b_{\theta'}\} - a_{\theta'}}. \quad (1)$$

Proposition 3.2. With a two-action menu, $\{a, b\}$, a transformation reduces the DM's action if and only if a and b are made steeper.

This partially generalizes Proposition 4.7 in v3 (on ArXiv) of [Pease and Whitmeyer \(2024\)](#),^[2] which provides a sufficient condition for a to become comparatively more attractive than b in a general (not-necessarily-monotone) environment. For any pair $(\theta, \theta') \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$, we see that action b must become worse in the low state (θ) and action a must improve in the high state. In fact, the proposition reduces to first tilting a and b “up”—by raising the payoffs to each in the high state and lowering the payoffs to each in the low state—then effecting a (state-wise) dominance improvement of a and worsening of b .

3.2. Beyond Binary: A Sufficient Condition

For an arbitrary action $a \in A$, let A_{\triangleright}^a denote the set of actions in A that are larger than it:

$$A_{\triangleright}^a := \{b \in A : b \triangleright a\}.$$

We then deduce a corollary of Proposition 3.2:

Corollary 3.3. A transformation reduces the DM's action if for all actions $a \in A$ and for all actions $b \in A_{\triangleright}^a$, a and b are made steeper.

To guarantee that a robustly lower action is taken, we need merely ask that a certain collection of pairwise improvements of low versus high actions manifest. It suffices to make every action steeper, with possible dominance improvements and deteriorations at especially low or high actions.

[2] We do not assume a monotone environment there, however.

3.3. Beyond Binary: A Necessary Condition

For a pair of states $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$, we define the set of **Relevant** actions $A_{\theta, \theta'} \subseteq A$ as

$$A_{\theta, \theta'} := \{a \in A: \nexists b \in A: b_{\theta} \geq a_{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{\theta'} \geq a_{\theta'}, \text{ with at least one inequality strict}\}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that for any pair $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ there are no distinct $a, b \in A_{\theta, \theta'}$ with $a_{\theta} = b_{\theta}$ and $a_{\theta'} = b_{\theta'}$ (no duplicate actions).

We label the actions in $A_{\theta, \theta'}$ according to \triangleright :

$$A_{\theta, \theta'} = \{a^1, \dots, a^m\}, \text{ where } a^1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft a^m.$$

Observe that this implies

$$a_{\theta}^1 > \dots > a_{\theta}^m \quad \text{and} \quad a_{\theta'}^1 < \dots < a_{\theta'}^m.$$

For any $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ and any $A_{\theta, \theta'}$, we let $\underline{a}^{(\theta, \theta')}$ and $\bar{a}^{(\theta, \theta')}$ denote the minimal and maximal actions in $A_{\theta, \theta'}$:

$$\underline{a}^{(\theta, \theta')} = a^1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft a^m = \bar{a}^{(\theta, \theta')}.$$

Naturally, they may not be distinct; *viz.*, $A_{\theta, \theta'}$ may be a singleton.

Definition 3.4. We say that the decision problem *Becomes Relevantly Steeper* if for any pair $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$, $\hat{a}_{\theta}^i \leq a_{\theta}^i$ for all $a^i \in A_{\theta, \theta'} \setminus \{\underline{a}^{(\theta, \theta')}\}$ and $\hat{a}_{\theta'}^i \geq a_{\theta'}^i$ for all $a^i \in A_{\theta, \theta'} \setminus \{\bar{a}^{(\theta, \theta')}\}$.

Theorem 3.5. A transformation reduces the DM's action only if the decision problem becomes relevantly steeper.

What this result means is that for every pair of states all but the lowest relevant action must become (weakly) worse in the low state, and all but the highest relevant action must become (weakly) better in the high state. The contrapositive of the result provides the intuition: if some non-minimal action (a^{i+1}) strictly improves in the low state, we can always find a utility function that makes this improvement improve the attractiveness of this action versus all relevant actions lower than it to a large degree. The strict increase means there is a gap between the old value and

the new value, so we construct a utility function that is kinked in that gap. As this downward drop in slope becomes increasingly severe, the action immediately below a^{i+1} , a^i , becomes increasingly appealing versus *every* action higher than it (including a^{i+1}); so much so that the DM can be arbitrarily optimistic that the state is θ' yet still prefer a^i to all those higher.

Moreover, the indifference beliefs between a^i and each *lower* action, pre- and post-transformation, are precisely the risk-neutral indifference beliefs as these monetary rewards all lie above the kink—on which region the constructed utility function is linear—and these beliefs are all strictly bounded away from 1. Crucially, the indifference belief between i and $i + 1$, post-transformation, is also strictly bounded away from 1, as it is just the risk-neutral indifference belief. Thus, we can find a sufficiently optimistic belief such that a^i is optimal pre-transformation, yet strictly inferior to a^{i+1} post-transformation.

The same essential argument works for establishing the necessity that all but the highest relevant action must become (weakly) better in the high state for a robust decrease in the DM’s action. If not, there is some gap we can exploit with a carefully chosen utility function. Appendix A.2 contains the detailed proof of this theorem. Finally, it is important to note that the structure placed on the environment, as well as the order-preserving aspect of the transformation, are both used in the proof. It is these features that allow us to construct the single-kinked utility function that is so helpful.

4. Beyond Expected Utility

Slightly stronger conditions ensure a robustly lower choice of action for the following abstract setting. We use a similar formulation of preferences to [Rigotti, Shannon, and Strzalecki \(2008\)](#).³ We understand each action $a \in A$ to be an element of \mathbb{R}^Θ , and let $a \gg b$ mean that $a_\theta > b_\theta$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$. We impose that the DM has a preference relation over actions \succeq that is

³ [Renou and Schlag \(2014\)](#) conduct comparative statics in a similarly abstract setting, focusing on a generalized first-order approach.

1. **Strongly Monotone:** If $a \gg b$ then $a \succ b$;
2. **Convex:** If $a \succeq b$ then for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b \succeq b$;
3. **Complete:** For all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^\theta$, $a \succeq b$ or $b \succeq a$; and
4. **Transitive:** If $a \succeq b$ and $b \succeq c$ then $a \succeq c$.

We call such preferences over actions **Regular**. If $a \gg b$, we say that a **Dominates** b . We term an action $a^\lambda = \lambda a + (1 - \lambda)c \succeq b$ (for some $\lambda \in [0, 1]$) a **Mixture** of actions a and c . Observe that strong monotonicity yields that a dominating b implies that $a \succ b$.

Definition 4.1. Fix actions a and b with $b \triangleright a$. We say that they are **Made Commonly Steeper** if

1. b dominates a mixture of a and \hat{b} or $b = \hat{b}$; and
2. \hat{a} dominates a mixture of a and \hat{b} or $\hat{a} = a$.

Proposition 4.2. Suppose a DM's preferences over actions are regular. Then, a transformation reduces the DM's action if a and b are made commonly steeper.

Proof. Let $b \triangleright a$ and suppose a and b are made commonly steeper. Let $a \succ b$. We want to show first that $a \succ \hat{b}$. If $b = \hat{b}$ this is immediate. Now let b dominate a mixture of a and \hat{b} , and suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\hat{b} \succeq a$. Then, for some $\lambda \in [0, 1)$

$$b \succ \lambda a + (1 - \lambda)\hat{b} \succeq a,$$

which is false. Accordingly, $a \succ \hat{b}$.

Second, we want to show that $\hat{a} \succ \hat{b}$. If $\hat{a} = a$, the result is immediate. Now let \hat{a} dominate a mixture of a and \hat{b} . Thus, for some $\gamma \in [0, 1]$,

$$\hat{a} \succ \gamma a + (1 - \gamma)\hat{b} \succeq \hat{b},$$

as desired.

Now let $a \sim b$. We want to show first that $a \succeq \hat{b}$. To that end, we observe that if $b = \hat{b}$, $a \sim b \sim \hat{b}$, as desired; and if b dominates a mixture of a and \hat{b} , for some $\lambda \in [0, 1]$

$$a \sim b \succ \lambda a + (1 - \lambda)\hat{b},$$

so $a \succ \hat{b}$. If $\hat{a} = a$,

$$\hat{a} \sim a \succeq \hat{b},$$

as desired. Now let \hat{a} dominate a mixture of a and \hat{b} . Thus, for some $\gamma \in [0, 1]$,

$$\hat{a} \succ \gamma a + (1 - \gamma)\hat{b} \succeq \hat{b},$$

as desired. ■

Recall that for an arbitrary action $a \in A$, $A_{\triangleright}^a = \{b \in A : b \triangleright a\}$. Then,

Corollary 4.3. *Suppose a DM's preferences over actions are regular. A transformation reduces the DM's action if for any action $a \in A$ and $b \in A_{\triangleright}^a$, a and b are made commonly steeper.*

Naturally, if the DM is an expected utility (EU) maximizer, with some prior $\mu \in \Delta$ and a strictly increasing, concave utility function u , her preferences over actions are regular (as defined above). Here are some other examples of non-EU preferences that are regular (verified in Appendix A.3):

Variational preferences. Following [Maccheroni, Marinacci, and Rustichini \(2006\)](#), suppose a DM solves

$$\max_{a \in A} \min_{p \in \Delta} \{\mathbb{E}_p[u(a_\theta)] + c(p)\},$$

where $c: \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a convex function and u is concave and strictly increasing.

This class of preferences includes as a special case the **Multiplier preferences** of [Hansen and Sargent \(2001\)](#). With those, given some $q \in \Delta$, a DM solves

$$\max_{a \in A} \min_{p \in \Delta} \{\mathbb{E}_p[u(a_\theta)] + C_\varphi(p \parallel q)\},$$

where C_φ is a prior-dependent distortion, defined as

$$C_\varphi(p \parallel q) = \int_{\Theta} \varphi\left(\frac{p(\theta)}{q(\theta)}\right) q(\theta) d\theta,$$

for φ -divergence; and u is strictly increasing and weakly concave.

Smooth ambiguity. Following [Klibanoff, Marinacci, and Mukerji \(2005\)](#), a DM evaluates an action a according to

$$\int_{\Delta} \varphi \left(\int_{\Theta} u(a(\theta)) d\mu(\theta) \right) d\pi,$$

where u and φ are strictly increasing and u and φ are concave.

If there exists a continuous, increasing, and concave U that represents \succeq , the sufficient conditions for a reduction in the DM's action can be weakened slightly. We call such preferences over actions **Strongly Convex**.

Definition 4.4. Fix actions a and b with $b \triangleright a$. We say that they are **Made Weakly Commonly Steeper** if $b \geq \lambda a + (1 - \lambda)\hat{b}$ for some $\lambda \in [0, 1)$ and $\hat{a} \geq \gamma a + (1 - \gamma)\hat{b}$ for some $\gamma \in [0, 1]$.

Proposition 4.5. Suppose a DM's preferences over actions are strongly convex. A transformation reduces the DM's action if for any action $a \in A$ and $b \in A_{\triangleright}^a$, a and b are made weakly commonly steeper.

Proof. If $a \succ (\succeq) b$,

$$U(a) \underset{\succeq}{\geq} U(b) \geq U(\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)\hat{b}) \geq \lambda U(a) + (1 - \lambda)U(\hat{b}),$$

so $a \succ (\succeq) \hat{b}$. Then,

$$U(\hat{a}) \geq U(\gamma a + (1 - \gamma)\hat{b}) \geq \gamma U(a) + (1 - \gamma)U(\hat{b}) \underset{\succeq}{\geq} U(\hat{b}),$$

as desired. ■

5. A Two-State Illustration

Before finishing the paper with a few applications, let us briefly scrutinize a particular two-state environment. Let $\Theta = \{0, 1\}$ and enumerate the set of actions $A = \{a^1, \dots, a^m\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, with $a^1 < \dots < a^m$, so that a_0^i and a_1^i satisfy

$$a_0^1 > \dots > a_0^m \quad \text{and} \quad a_1^1 < \dots < a_1^m.$$




Figure 1: Sufficient Conditions with Expected Utility




Figure 2: Sufficient Conditions with Regular Preferences

Recall also that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $a_0^i \leq a_1^i$, which means that each point (a_0^i, a_1^i) lies on family of strictly decreasing curves in the first quadrant. We specify further that there is a curve on which these points lie that is strictly concave, which is equivalent to no action being weakly dominated for a risk-neutral agent.

The non-EU environment is simpler at first glance: the concavity of the curve on which the points lie ensure that the sufficiency conditions with respect to adjacent points imply the global conditions. However, non-adjacent actions do not affect each other in the EU setting as well.^[4]

Figures 1 and 2 depict a four-action scenario. In both, the four solid points, in red, black, green, and purple, are the vectors of payoffs to the actions a^1 , a^2 , a^3 , and a^4 ; where the x -coordinate is the monetary payoff to the action in state 0 and the y -coordinate is the payoff in state 1. Figure 2 illustrates the environment of §4, whereas Figure 1 concerns the EU setting.

In each figure, the sufficiency conditions of Corollaries 3.3 and 4.3 correspond to the colored regions: each point can be moved anywhere within the shaded region of the same color, with the hollowed+haloed points being specific new points. The shaded regions, themselves, depend on where the new points are. Try it yourself ([Link to EU example](#) and [Link to regular example](#)) by moving the points around!

6. Applications

6.1. Investing in a Risky Asset

An investor with wealth normalized to 0 is choosing how much to allocate between a riskless asset with a deterministic gross return also normalized to 0 and a random gross return of R , which is, therefore, a real-valued random variable. We further assume that it is supported on a closed interval in whose interior 0 lies.

The investor allocates $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ to the risky asset, which yields a stochastic terminal wealth of ρR . Naturally, the realized value of R , r , is the state. By assumption, r takes strictly positive and negative values and so no action dominates another. It

^[4] Please visit Appendix A.4 for a formal result and its proof.

is easy to see that this decision problem is monotone.

Now let us modify the payoff to the risky asset by assuming that there is a strictly increasing, bounded function $\sigma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\sigma(0) = 0$, $\sigma(r) < r$ for all $r < 0$ and $\sigma(r) > 0$ for all $r > 0$. Letting r_+ and r_- denote strictly positive and negative states, we see that Inequality 1 is equivalent to, for all r_+ and r_- and $\rho_2 > \rho_1$,

$$\frac{\rho_1\sigma(r_-) - \rho_2\sigma(r_-)}{\rho_1r_- - \rho_2r_-} \geq \frac{\rho_2\sigma(r_+) - \rho_1\sigma(r_+)}{\rho_2r_+ - \rho_1r_+} \Leftrightarrow \frac{\sigma(r_-)}{r_-} \geq \frac{\sigma(r_+)}{r_+}.$$

Then,

Remark 6.1. *For an SEU DM, demand in the risky asset is not increasing if $\frac{\sigma(r_-)}{r_-} \geq \frac{\sigma(r_+)}{r_+}$ for all $r_+ > 0$ and $r_- < 0$.*

One example of such a transformation is for all positive realizations of R to be scaled by a common $k > 0$ and all negative realizations by a common $s > k$.

6.2. Insurance

A DM with wealth normalized to 0 faces a potential loss of $L > 0$. She can choose any level of insurance coverage ι from a discrete subset of $[0, L]$, containing both 0 and L , at a price $p \in (0, 1)$. Let $\Theta = \{0, 1\}$ be the state space, with 1 the “high” (no loss) state. Thus,

$$a_1^t = -p\iota, \quad \text{and} \quad a_0^t = -L + \iota(1 - p).$$

Let us modify the price to \hat{p} and loss to $\hat{L} > 0$. How does this affect the DM’s purchase? After some algebra, the conditions for Theorem 3.5 simplify to $\hat{p} \leq p$ and $L \leq \hat{L}$. Actuarial fairness simplifies to $\hat{p} \leq p$ and so we conclude that

Remark 6.2. *Demand for insurance must increase if and only if both the per-unit price decreases and the loss amount increases.*

Notably, no amount of a price decrease can make up for a strictly decreased loss amount. Likewise, no increase in the loss amount increase can make up for a strict price increase.

6.3. Introducing a Lower Bound on Risk Aversion

Suppose we discover that the DM is at least as risk averse as an agent with utility function v in the sense that the DM's utility is a strictly increasing and weakly concave transformation of v . That is, we are made aware of a lower bound on the DM's risk aversion. When does this lower the action we know the DM takes versus the case in which our lower bound is risk-neutrality?

Suppose v is such that for all $a \in A$ and $b \in A_{\geq}^a$ and for all $\theta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\theta' \in \mathcal{B}$, $v(b_{\theta}) \leq b_{\theta}$, $v(a_{\theta}) \leq a_{\theta}$, $v(b_{\theta'}) \geq b_{\theta'}$, $v(a_{\theta'}) \geq a_{\theta'}$. In this case, Inequality 1 becomes

$$\frac{v(a_{\theta}) - v(b_{\theta})}{a_{\theta} - b_{\theta}} \geq \frac{v(b_{\theta'}) - v(a_{\theta'})}{b_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'}},$$

which must hold due to the concavity of v and the single-crossing differences assumption.

The point of all of this is to illustrate that under this variety of transformation—introducing a lower bound on risk aversion—our sufficient condition simplifies to a collection of ordinal conditions on the relationship between $v(\cdot)$ and \cdot ; we get the cardinal actuarial-improvement inequalities for free. It is also notable that an increase in the lower bound on risk aversion need not lead to lower actions. To wit, if $v(\cdot) > \cdot$ for all \cdot or $v(\cdot) < \cdot$, then irrespective of v 's shape, the necessary condition in Theorem 3.5 will not hold.

6.4. Ending on a Negative Note

Now let us continue with the theme we ended §6.3 on. Namely, the necessary condition identified in Theorem 3.5 is quite strong and fails in many environments for common modifications. In particular, any change that increases—in turn, lowers—payoffs to every action in every state, violates relevant steepness. Thus, such a change does not reduce the DM's action, i.e., may result in an increased action.

These changes are ubiquitous. They include, for instance, the addition or subtraction of a constant to the actions' monetary rewards. Consequently, changes to the DM's wealth do not reduce her action. Another example is §6.1's investment problem. There, we need the change in the return to be vaguely “S-shaped,” with

an inflection point precisely at the risk-free rate. A global shift up (or down) in the return would not reduce the DM's action. A classic comparative statics environment is that of a monopolist choosing how much quantity to produce: its profit is $\Pi(q) = qP_\theta(q) - c_\theta(q)$, where P_θ is inverse demand and c_θ is its cost. Theorem 3.5 indicates that a pointwise shift up or down in either demand or cost does not reduce the monopolist's action. Subsidies and taxes produce such pointwise shifts, making it difficult to robustly predict pass-through.

References

- Susan Athey. Monotone comparative statics under uncertainty. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(1):187–223, 2002.
- Pierpaolo Battigalli, Simone Cerreia-Vioglio, Fabio Maccheroni, and Massimo Marinacci. A note on comparative ambiguity aversion and justifiability. *Econometrica*, 84(5):1903–1916, 2016.
- Aaron S Edlin and Chris Shannon. Strict single crossing and the strict spence-mirrlees condition: a comment on monotone comparative statics. *Econometrica*, 66(6):1417–1425, 1998.
- Lars Peter Hansen and Thomas J Sargent. Robust control and model uncertainty. *American Economic Review*, 91(2):60–66, 2001.
- Navin Kartik, SangMok Lee, and Daniel Rappoport. Single-crossing differences in convex environments. *Review of Economic Studies*, page rdad103, 2023.
- Peter Klibanoff, Massimo Marinacci, and Sujoy Mukerji. A smooth model of decision making under ambiguity. *Econometrica*, 73(6):1849–1892, 2005.
- Fabio Maccheroni, Massimo Marinacci, and Aldo Rustichini. Ambiguity aversion, robustness, and the variational representation of preferences. *Econometrica*, 74(6):1447–1498, 2006.

- Paul Milgrom. Comparing optima: Do simplifying assumptions affect conclusions? *Journal of Political Economy*, 102(3):607–615, 1994.
- Paul Milgrom and John Roberts. Comparing equilibria. *The American Economic Review*, pages 441–459, 1994.
- Paul Milgrom and Chris Shannon. Monotone comparative statics. *Econometrica*, pages 157–180, 1994.
- Marilyn Pease and Mark Whitmeyer. Safety, in numbers. *Mimeo*, 2023.
- Marilyn Pease and Mark Whitmeyer. How to make an action better. *Mimeo*, 2024.
- Robert R Phelps. *Convex functions, monotone operators and differentiability*, volume 1364. Springer, 2009.
- John K-H Quah and Bruno Strulovici. Comparative statics, informativeness, and the interval dominance order. *Econometrica*, 77(6):1949–1992, 2009.
- John K-H Quah and Bruno Strulovici. Aggregating the single crossing property. *Econometrica*, 80(5):2333–2348, 2012.
- Matthew Rabin. Risk aversion and expected-utility theory: A calibration theorem. *Econometrica*, 68(5):1281–1292, 2000.
- Ludovic Renou and Karl H Schlag. Ordients: Optimization and comparative statics without utility functions. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 154:612–632, 2014.
- Luca Rigotti, Chris Shannon, and Tomasz Strzalecki. Subjective beliefs and ex ante trade. *Econometrica*, 76(5):1167–1190, 2008.
- Donald M Topkis. Minimizing a submodular function on a lattice. *Operations research*, 26(2):305–321, 1978.
- Jonathan Weinstein. The effect of changes in risk attitude on strategic behavior. *Econometrica*, 84(5):1881–1902, 2016.
- Mark Whitmeyer. Calibrating the subjective. *Mimeo*, 2024.

A. Omitted Proofs

A.1. Proposition 3.2 Proof

Proof. Let $b \succ a$. A transformation reducing the DM's action is equivalent to the set of beliefs at which the DM prefers a to b increasing in size—in a set-inclusion sense—for any $u \in \mathcal{U}$. Define

$$\mathcal{C} := \{\theta \in \Theta : a_\theta = b_\theta\},$$

and recall that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are the sets of beliefs for which the DM strictly prefers a to b and vice-versa. Given $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and for fixed pair of states $\theta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\theta' \in \mathcal{B}$, let $\mu_u = \mu_u^{\theta, \theta'}$ and $\hat{\mu}_u = \hat{\mu}_u^{\theta, \theta'}$ be the solutions to

$$\mu u(a_{\theta'}) + (1 - \mu)u(a_\theta) = \mu u(b_{\theta'}) + (1 - \mu)u(b_\theta),$$

and

$$\mu u(\hat{a}_{\theta'}) + (1 - \mu)u(\hat{a}_\theta) = \mu u(\hat{b}_{\theta'}) + (1 - \mu)u(\hat{b}_\theta),$$

respectively.

For any $\theta \in \Theta$, let v_θ denote the corresponding vertex (as a point in the simplex). Then, pre-transformation, the extreme points of the set of beliefs at which the DM prefers a to b is

$$P := \{v_\theta : \theta \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{C}\} \cup \{\mu_{\theta, \theta'} : \theta \in \mathcal{A}, \theta' \in \mathcal{B}\},$$

i.e., the set of vertices at which a is uniquely optimal, and the points on the edges connecting the vertices at which a is uniquely optimal with the vertices at which b is uniquely optimal. \hat{P} denotes the analogous set post-transformation:

$$\hat{P} := \{v_\theta : \theta \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{C}\} \cup \{\hat{\mu}_{\theta, \theta'} : \theta \in \mathcal{A}, \theta' \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

By the Krein-Milman theorem, the sets of beliefs at which the DM prefers a to b pre- and post-transformation are the closed convex hulls of their extreme points. Accordingly, a transformation reduces the DM's action if and only if for any u , \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , $\mu_u \leq \hat{\mu}_u$.

(\Leftarrow) Fix an arbitrary pair of states $\theta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\theta' \in \mathcal{B}$, and let $\hat{b}_\theta \leq b_\theta$, $a_{\theta'} \leq \hat{a}_{\theta'}$, and a be a super-actuarial improvement versus b . Note that this is equivalent to

$$\left(\frac{a_\theta - b_\theta}{\min \{\hat{a}_\theta, a_\theta\} - \hat{b}_\theta} \right) \frac{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}{\min \{\hat{b}_{\theta'}, b_{\theta'}\} - a_{\theta'}} \leq 1. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Define $\underline{a}_\theta := \min \{\hat{a}_\theta, a_\theta\}$ and $\underline{b}_{\theta'} := \min \{\hat{b}_{\theta'}, b_{\theta'}\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_u &= \frac{u(\hat{a}_\theta) - u(\hat{b}_\theta)}{u(\hat{a}_\theta) - u(\hat{b}_\theta) + u(\hat{b}_{\theta'}) - u(\hat{a}_{\theta'})} \geq \frac{u(\underline{a}_\theta) - u(\hat{b}_\theta)}{u(\underline{a}_\theta) - u(\hat{b}_\theta) + u(\hat{b}_{\theta'}) - u(\hat{a}_{\theta'})} \\ &= \frac{\frac{u(\underline{a}_\theta) - u(\hat{b}_\theta)}{\underline{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}}{\frac{u(\underline{a}_\theta) - u(\hat{b}_\theta)}{\underline{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta} + \frac{u(\hat{b}_{\theta'}) - u(\hat{a}_{\theta'})}{\underline{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}} \\ &\geq \frac{\frac{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta)}{a_\theta - b_\theta}}{\frac{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta)}{a_\theta - b_\theta} + \frac{u(\hat{b}_{\theta'}) - u(\hat{a}_{\theta'})}{\underline{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of \underline{a}_θ and the second from the Three-chord lemma (Theorem 1.16 in Phelps (2009)).

The last expression on the right-hand side can be rewritten as

$$\frac{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta)}{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta) + \left(\frac{a_\theta - b_\theta}{\underline{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta} \right) (\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}) \frac{u(\hat{b}_{\theta'}) - u(\hat{a}_{\theta'})}{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

If $\hat{b}_{\theta'} \geq b_{\theta'}$, then by the Three-chord lemma, Expression A2 is weakly greater than

$$\frac{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta)}{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta) + \left(\frac{a_\theta - b_\theta}{\underline{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta} \right) \left(\frac{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}{b_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'}} \right) (u(b_{\theta'}) - u(a_{\theta'}))},$$

which is weakly greater than

$$\frac{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta)}{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta) + u(b_{\theta'}) - u(a_{\theta'})} = \mu_u,$$

by Inequality A1.

If $\hat{b}_{\theta'} < b_{\theta'}$, then by the Three-chord lemma, Expression A2 is weakly greater than

$$\frac{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta)}{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta) + \left(\frac{a_\theta - b_\theta}{\underline{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta} \right) \left(\frac{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'}} \right) (u(\hat{b}_{\theta'}) - u(a_{\theta'}))},$$

which Inequality A1 implies is weakly greater than

$$\frac{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta)}{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta) + u(\hat{b}_{\theta'}) - u(a_{\theta'})} \geq \frac{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta)}{u(a_\theta) - u(b_\theta) + u(b_{\theta'}) - u(a_{\theta'})} = \mu_u,$$

where the inequality follows from the monotonicity of u .

(\Rightarrow) Fix an arbitrary pair of states $\theta \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\theta' \in \mathcal{B}$. There are a number of cases to consider, proved (with the exception of the fourth) by contraposition. First, let $\hat{b}_\theta > b_\theta$. Let

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \leq \min \{a_\theta, \hat{b}_\theta\} \\ \iota x + (1 - \iota) \min \{a_\theta, \hat{b}_\theta\}, & \text{if } \min \{a_\theta, \hat{b}_\theta\} < x, \end{cases}$$

for some $\iota \in (0, 1)$. Then,

$$\mu_u = \frac{\iota a_\theta + (1 - \iota) \min \{a_\theta, \hat{b}_\theta\} - b_\theta}{\iota a_\theta + (1 - \iota) \min \{a_\theta, \hat{b}_\theta\} - b_\theta + \iota (b_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'})},$$

and

$$\hat{\mu}_u = \frac{\iota (\hat{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta)}{\iota (\hat{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta) + \iota (\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'})} = \frac{\hat{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}{\hat{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta + \hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}.$$

By construction, for all sufficiently small $\iota > 0$, $\mu_u - \hat{\mu}_u > 0$.

Second, let $\hat{a}_{\theta'} < a_{\theta'}$. Let

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \leq a_{\theta'} \\ \iota x + (1 - \iota) a_{\theta'}, & \text{if } a_{\theta'} < x, \end{cases}$$

for some $\iota \in (0, 1)$. Then,

$$\mu_u = \frac{a_\theta - b_\theta}{a_\theta - b_\theta + \iota (b_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'})},$$

and

$$\hat{\mu}_u = \frac{\hat{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}{\hat{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta + u(\hat{b}_{\theta'}) - \hat{a}_{\theta'}} \leq \frac{\hat{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}{\hat{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta + \min \{a_{\theta'}, \hat{b}_{\theta'}\} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}} < 1.$$

By construction, for all sufficiently small $\iota > 0$, $\mu_u - \hat{\mu}_u > 0$.

Third, if $a_\theta \geq \hat{a}_\theta$ and $\hat{b}_{\theta'} \geq b_{\theta'}$, but Inequality 1 does not hold, $\mu_u - \hat{\mu}_u > 0$ for a risk-neutral DM.

Fourth, if $\hat{a}_\theta > a_\theta > b_\theta \geq \hat{b}_\theta$ and $b_{\theta'} > \hat{b}_{\theta'} > \hat{a}_{\theta'} \geq a_{\theta'}$, observe that

$$\frac{a_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}{a_\theta - b_\theta} = \frac{a_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}{a_\theta - b_\theta} \geq 1 \geq \frac{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'}} = \frac{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}{\underline{b}_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'}},$$

so Inequality 1 must hold.

Fifth, if $\hat{a}_\theta > a_\theta > b_\theta \geq \hat{b}_\theta$ and $\hat{b}_{\theta'} \geq b_{\theta'}$, but Inequality 1 does not hold, let

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \leq a_\theta \\ \iota x + (1 - \iota)a_\theta, & \text{if } a_\theta < x, \end{cases}$$

for some $\iota \in (0, 1)$. Then,

$$\mu_u - \hat{\mu}_u = \frac{a_\theta - b_\theta}{a_\theta - b_\theta + \iota(b_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'})} - \frac{\iota\hat{a}_\theta + (1 - \iota)a_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}{\iota\hat{a}_\theta + (1 - \iota)a_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta + \iota(\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'})}$$

has the same sign as

$$\frac{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}{b_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'}} - \frac{\iota\hat{a}_\theta + (1 - \iota)a_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}{a_\theta - b_\theta},$$

which equals

$$\frac{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}{b_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'}} - \frac{\iota\hat{a}_\theta + (1 - \iota)a_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}{a_\theta - b_\theta}.$$

As Inequality 1 does not hold, this expression is strictly positive for all sufficiently small $\iota > 0$.

Sixth, and finally, if $a_\theta \geq \hat{a}_\theta$ and $b_{\theta'} > \hat{b}_{\theta'} > \hat{a}_{\theta'} \geq a_{\theta'}$ but Inequality 1 does not hold, let

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \leq \hat{b}_{\theta'} \\ \iota x + (1 - \iota)\hat{b}_{\theta'}, & \text{if } \hat{b}_{\theta'} < x, \end{cases}$$

for some $\iota \in (0, 1)$. Then,

$$\mu_u - \hat{\mu}_u = \frac{a_\theta - b_\theta}{a_\theta - b_\theta + \iota b_{\theta'} + (1 - \iota)\hat{b}_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'}} - \frac{\hat{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}{\hat{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta + \hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}$$

has the same sign as

$$\frac{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}{\iota b_{\theta'} + (1 - \iota)\hat{b}_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'}} - \frac{\hat{a}_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}{a_\theta - b_\theta},$$

which equals

$$\frac{\hat{b}_{\theta'} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}}{\iota b_{\theta'} + (1 - \iota)\hat{b}_{\theta'} - a_{\theta'}} - \frac{a_\theta - \hat{b}_\theta}{a_\theta - b_\theta}.$$

As Inequality 1 does not hold, this expression is strictly positive for all sufficiently small $\iota > 0$. ■

A.2. Theorem 3.5 Proof

Proof. First, we argue that $\hat{a}_\theta^i \leq a_\theta^i$ for all $a^i \in A_{\theta, \theta'} \setminus \{\underline{a}^{(\theta, \theta')}\}$, for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$, is necessary for a transformation to reduce the DM's action. Suppose for the sake of contraposition that there exists some pair $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ and action $a^{i+1} \in A_{\theta, \theta'} \setminus \{\underline{a}^{(\theta, \theta')}\}$ such that $a_\theta^{i+1} < \hat{a}_\theta^{i+1}$. Let

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \leq \min \{a_\theta^i, \hat{a}_\theta^{i+1}\} \\ \iota x + (1 - \iota) \min \{a_\theta^i, \hat{a}_\theta^{i+1}\}, & \text{if } \min \{a_\theta^i, \hat{a}_\theta^{i+1}\} < x, \end{cases}$$

for some $\iota \in (0, 1)$. By construction,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mu} &:= \max_{j < i} \max \left\{ \frac{u(a_\theta^j) - u(a_\theta^i)}{u(a_\theta^j) - u(a_\theta^i) + u(a_{\theta'}^j) - u(a_{\theta'}^i)}, \frac{u(\hat{a}_\theta^j) - u(\hat{a}_\theta^i)}{u(\hat{a}_\theta^j) - u(\hat{a}_\theta^i) + u(\hat{a}_{\theta'}^j) - u(\hat{a}_{\theta'}^i)} \right\} \\ &= \max_{j < i} \max \left\{ \frac{a_\theta^j - a_\theta^i}{a_\theta^j - a_\theta^i + a_{\theta'}^j - a_{\theta'}^i}, \frac{\hat{a}_\theta^j - \hat{a}_\theta^i}{\hat{a}_\theta^j - \hat{a}_\theta^i + \hat{a}_{\theta'}^j - \hat{a}_{\theta'}^i} \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

is strictly less than 1 for all $\iota \in (0, 1)$. On the other hand, as $\iota \downarrow 0$,

$$\bar{\mu} := \min_{j > i} \frac{u(a_\theta^i) - u(a_\theta^j)}{u(a_\theta^i) - u(a_\theta^j) + u(a_{\theta'}^j) - u(a_{\theta'}^i)} = \min_{j > i} \frac{\iota a_\theta^i + (1 - \iota) \min \{a_\theta^i, \hat{a}_\theta^{i+1}\} - a_\theta^j}{\iota a_\theta^i + (1 - \iota) \min \{a_\theta^i, \hat{a}_\theta^{i+1}\} - a_\theta^j + \iota (a_{\theta'}^j - a_{\theta'}^i)}$$

converges to 1.

Finally,

$$\hat{\mu} := \frac{u(\hat{a}_\theta^i) - u(\hat{a}_\theta^{i+1})}{u(\hat{a}_\theta^i) - u(\hat{a}_\theta^{i+1}) + u(\hat{a}_{\theta'}^{i+1}) - u(\hat{a}_{\theta'}^i)} = \frac{\hat{a}_\theta^i - \hat{a}_\theta^{i+1}}{\hat{a}_\theta^i - \hat{a}_\theta^{i+1} + \hat{a}_{\theta'}^{i+1} - \hat{a}_{\theta'}^i} < 1,$$

for all $\iota \in (0, 1)$. We conclude that there exists a belief $\mu \in \Delta$ and a utility function $u \in \mathcal{U}$ such that pre-transformation it is uniquely optimal for the DM to choose action a^i , yet a^i is strictly inferior to some a^j with $j > i$ after the transformation; *viz.*, the transformation does not reduce the DM's action.

Second, we argue that $\hat{a}_{\theta'}^i \geq a_{\theta'}^i$ for all $a^i \in A_{\theta, \theta'} \setminus \{\bar{a}^{(\theta, \theta')}\}$, for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$, is necessary for a transformation to reduce the DM's action. Suppose for the sake of contraposition that there exists a pair $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ and an action $a^i \in A_{\theta, \theta'} \setminus \{\bar{a}^{(\theta, \theta')}\}$ such that $a_{\theta'}^i > \hat{a}_{\theta'}^i$.

Let

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \leq a_{\theta'}^i \\ \iota x + (1 - \iota)a_{\theta'}^i, & \text{if } a_{\theta'}^i < x, \end{cases}$$

for some $\iota \in (0, 1)$. $\underline{\mu}$ is as defined in Expression A3 and remains strictly less than 1 for all $\iota \in (0, 1)$. On the other hand, as $\iota \downarrow 0$,

$$\bar{\mu}^\dagger := \min_{j>i} \frac{u(a_\theta^i) - u(a_\theta^j)}{u(a_\theta^i) - u(a_\theta^j) + u(a_{\theta'}^j) - u(a_{\theta'}^i)} = \min_{j>i} \frac{a_\theta^i - a_\theta^j}{a_\theta^i - a_\theta^j + \iota(a_{\theta'}^j - a_{\theta'}^i)}$$

converges to 1.

Finally,

$$\hat{\mu}^\dagger := \frac{u(\hat{a}_\theta^i) - u(\hat{a}_\theta^{i+1})}{u(\hat{a}_\theta^i) - u(\hat{a}_\theta^{i+1}) + u(\hat{a}_{\theta'}^{i+1}) - u(\hat{a}_{\theta'}^i)} = \frac{\hat{a}_\theta^i - \hat{a}_\theta^{i+1}}{\hat{a}_\theta^i - \hat{a}_\theta^{i+1} + u(\hat{a}_{\theta'}^{i+1}) - \hat{a}_{\theta'}^i} < 1,$$

for all $\iota \in (0, 1)$. We conclude that there exists a belief $\mu \in \Delta$ and a utility function $u \in \mathcal{U}$ such that pre-transformation it is uniquely optimal for the DM to choose action a^i , yet a^i is strictly inferior to some a^j with $j > i$ after the transformation; *viz.*, the transformation does not reduce the DM's action. ■

A.3. Verification of Regularity

Here we verify that the following four properties of the preferences over actions, \succeq , hold for certain non-EU preferences. The properties to be verified are

1. **Strongly Monotone:** If $a \gg b$ then $a \succ b$;
2. **Convex:** If $a \succeq b$ then for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b \succeq b$;
3. **Complete:** For all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^\Theta$, $a \succeq b$ or $b \succeq a$; and
4. **Transitive:** If $a \succeq b$ and $b \succeq c$ then $a \succeq c$.

Variational preferences. A DM solves

$$\max_{a \in A} \min_{p \in \Delta} \{ \mathbb{E}_p[u(a_\theta)] + c(p) \},$$

where $c: \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a convex function and u is concave and strictly increasing.

We assume completeness, and transitivity is immediate. To prove strong monotonicity suppose $a \gg b$. Letting p_a and p_b be the respective minimizers of

$$\mathbb{E}_p[u(a_\theta)] + c(p) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_p[u(b_\theta)] + c(p),$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_a}[u(a_\theta)] + c(p_a) > \mathbb{E}_{p_a}[u(b_\theta)] + c(p_a) \geq \mathbb{E}_{p_b}[u(b_\theta)] + c(p_b),$$

as desired. To prove convexity, suppose

$$\mathbb{E}_{p_a}[u(a_\theta)] + c(p_a) \geq \mathbb{E}_{p_b}[u(b_\theta)] + c(p_b).$$

Given $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, let p^λ minimize

$$\mathbb{E}_p[u(\lambda a_\theta + (1 - \lambda)b_\theta)] + c(p).$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{p^\lambda} u(\lambda a_\theta + (1 - \lambda)b_\theta) + c(p^\lambda) &\geq \lambda \mathbb{E}_{p^\lambda} u(a_\theta) + (1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E}_{p^\lambda} u(b_\theta) + c(p^\lambda) \\ &\geq \lambda [\mathbb{E}_{p_a} u(a_\theta) + c(p_a)] + (1 - \lambda) [\mathbb{E}_{p_b} u(b_\theta) + c(p_b)] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{p_b}[u(b_\theta)] + c(p_b), \end{aligned}$$

so we have convexity.

Smooth ambiguity. The DM evaluates an action according to

$$\int_{\Delta} \varphi \left(\int_{\Theta} u(a(\theta)) d\mu(\theta) \right) d\pi,$$

where u and φ are strictly increasing and u and φ are concave.

Completeness and transitivity are immediate. To verify strong monotonicity, let $a \gg b$, in which case

$$\int_{\Delta} \varphi \left(\int_{\Theta} u(a(\theta)) d\mu(\theta) \right) d\pi > \int_{\Delta} \varphi \left(\int_{\Theta} u(b(\theta)) d\mu(\theta) \right) d\pi,$$

i.e., $a \succ b$. To verify convexity, suppose $a \succeq b$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Delta} \varphi \left(\int_{\Theta} u(\lambda a(\theta) + (1 - \lambda) b(\theta)) d\mu(\theta) \right) d\pi \\ &\geq \lambda \int_{\Delta} \varphi \left(\int_{\Theta} u(a(\theta)) d\mu(\theta) \right) d\pi + (1 - \lambda) \int_{\Delta} \varphi \left(\int_{\Theta} u(b(\theta)) d\mu(\theta) \right) d\pi \\ &\geq \int_{\Delta} \varphi \left(\int_{\Theta} u(b(\theta)) d\mu(\theta) \right) d\pi. \end{aligned}$$

A.4. Binary State Derivation

We consider the binary environment of §5: $\Theta = \{0, 1\}$; and $A = \{a^1, \dots, a^m\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, with $a^1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft a^m$, so that

$$a_0^1 > \dots > a_0^m \quad \text{and} \quad a_1^1 < \dots < a_1^m.$$

We also assume that no action is weakly dominated for a risk-neutral agent. This guarantees (Battigalli, Cerreia-Vioglio, Maccheroni, and Marinacci, 2016; Weinstein, 2016) that no action is weakly dominated for a risk-averse agent. For $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ let μ_i denote the indifference belief between actions a^i and a^{i+1} (pre-transformation). By assumption $\mu_1 < \dots < \mu_{m-1}$. We prove the following result.

Proposition A.1. *A transformation reduces the DM's action if for any action $a^i \in A$, a^i and a^{i+1} are made steeper.*

Proof. Suppose for every action $a^i \in A$, a^i and a^{i+1} are made steeper. For all $i \in \{1, \dots, m-1\}$ let $\hat{\mu}_i$ denote the indifference belief between actions \hat{a}^i and \hat{a}^{i+1} (pre-transformation). By the increase in steepness $\mu_i \leq \hat{\mu}_i$ for all i .

Observe that the transformation's monotonicity guarantees that the state-wise rankings of the actions are preserved. Hence, if the transformation does not shrink the set of rationalizable actions for a risk-neutral DM, we are done as $\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_{m-1}$ are the only relevant indifference beliefs for the DM's decision, and they all move in the "right" direction.

The transformation, may, of course, shrink the set of rationalizable actions. Without loss of generality, we specialize to the first three actions (we know that there must be at least three in this case), and suppose for the sake of contradiction that the indifference belief between \hat{a}^3 and \hat{a}^1 , $\hat{\mu}_\dagger$ is weakly less than μ_1 . This implies that $\hat{\mu}_2 \leq \hat{\mu}_\dagger$, and so we have the chain

$$\mu_1 < \mu_2 \leq \hat{\mu}_2 \leq \hat{\mu}_\dagger,$$

a contradiction. ■