

Extended Convolution Bounds on the Fréchet Problem: Robust Risk Aggregation and Risk Sharing

Peng Liu*

Yang Liu†

Houhan Teng‡

Abstract

In this paper, we provide extended convolution bounds for the Fréchet problem and discuss related implications in quantitative risk management. First, we establish a new form of inequality for the Range-Value-at-Risk (RVaR). Based on this inequality, we obtain bounds for robust risk aggregation with dependence uncertainty for (i) RVaR, (ii) inter-RVaR difference and (iii) inter-quantile difference, and provide sharpness conditions. These bounds are called extended convolution bounds, which not only complement the results in the literature (convolution bounds in [Blanchet et al. \(2025\)](#)) but also offer results for some variability measures. Next, applying the above inequality, we study the risk sharing for the averaged quantiles (corresponding to risk sharing for distortion risk measures with special inverse S-shaped distortion functions), which is a non-convex optimization problem. We obtain the expression of the minimal value of the risk sharing and the explicit expression for the corresponding optimal allocation, which is comonotonic risk sharing for large losses and counter-comonotonic risk sharing for small losses or large gains. Finally, we explore the dependence structure for the optimal allocations, showing that the optimal allocation does not exist if the risk is not bounded from above.

Key-words: Robust risk aggregation; Risk sharing; Range-Value-at-Risk (RVaR); Quantiles; Inter-RVaR difference; Inter-quantile difference; Distortion risk measures; Dependence uncertainty

1 Introduction

The [Fréchet \(1951\)](#) problem in probability theory concerns the characterization of possible distributions of $f(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ if the distributions of the random variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n are known, but their joint dependence structure is unspecified, where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function. Typically, f is the sum, and we denote the sum variable by $S = X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n$. Formally, given the set of feasible joint distributions with some fixed marginal distributions (formulated from [Dall’Aglio \(1956\)](#)), the problem seeks to determine sharp bounds on functionals of S , such as its cumulative distribution function (cdf) or quantiles. This problem dates back to

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

†School of Science and Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China. Email: yangliu16@cuhk.edu.cn

‡School of Science and Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China. Email: s2447087@link.cuhk.edu.cn

Hoeffding (1940) and the classical Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds establish the preliminary theory on the possible dependence structure. Further, if $n = 2$, analytical results on the largest possible distribution (equivalently, the largest quantiles) of S were derived in Makarov (1981) and Rüschendorf (1982). However, if $n \geq 3$, the problem becomes substantially more complex when optimizing among all admissible copulas to obtain the best-possible bounds for some specific functionals. This problem has a deep connection with measure theory, functional analysis and optimal transport, as it involves constrained optimization over spaces of probability measures; see Embrechts and Puccetti (2006) and Nutz and Wang (2022).

Beyond its theoretical significance, the Fréchet problem of the sum variable plays a crucial role in risk management, where dependence assumptions significantly impact the evaluation of risk measures on S such as Value-at-Risk (VaR; quantile) and Expected Shortfall (ES). In practice, some data from different correlated products are separately collected and thus no dependence information is available; see Embrechts et al. (2013) and Embrechts et al. (2015). Even if the data are available, the estimation of the dependence structure typically has low accuracy, resulting in a lot of uncertainty on the choice of the dependence structure; see e.g., Chapter 8 of McNeil et al. (2015). Consequently, sharp bounds for some risk functionals under dependence uncertainty indicate the worst/best-case (robust) risk aggregation and evaluation, which is hence of great significance. Besides, the Fréchet problem has a wide application in different areas of operations research, including assembling line crew scheduling (Hsu (1984)), matching theory (Boerma et al. (2023)), worst-case portfolio selection (Chen et al. (2022)), multiple statistical hypothesis testing (Vovk et al. (2022)), etc; a comprehensive discussion was given in Blanchet et al. (2025). Consequently, recent technical advances in optimal transport (Bartl et al. (2022)), copula theory (Koike et al. (2024)), variational methods and numerical optimization (Shapiro et al. (2021)) have been incorporated into the study of the Fréchet problem, thereby enabling more precise characterizations in probability theory and furnishing additional tools for these various disciplines.

In the field of quantitative risk management, the Fréchet problem is often referred to as the risk aggregation problem with dependence uncertainty, which is inherently challenging due to its nature. Explicit expressions are only available in some special cases of the marginal distributions. For general marginal distributions, only bounds are available for robust quantiles in the literature; see e.g., the dual bounds in Theorem 4.17 of Rüschendorf (2013). The explicit expression for robust quantiles is only available for marginal distributions with monotone densities; see e.g., Wang et al. (2013), Bernard et al. (2014) and Jakobsons et al. (2016), where the worst-case dependence structure is a combination of joint-mixability (see Wang and Wang (2016)) and mutual exclusivity (introduced in Dhaene and Denuit (1999)). Recently, Blanchet et al. (2025) offered a so-called convolution bound, which is proved to be the sharp bound for robust RVaR and quantiles under some specific cases, especially including the case that all the marginal distributions have monotonic densities in the same direction on their tail parts. Here, RVaR (Range-Value-at-Risk) is a two-parameter class of non-convex risk measures, including both VaR and ES as special cases, which will be defined in (2.1). In general, computational

and optimization approaches, such as rearrangement algorithms (Embree et al. (2013)), scheduling (Boudt et al. (2018)), neural networks (Eckstein et al. (2020)), and linear programming formulations (Altschuler and Boix-Adserà (2021)), have been developed to approximate the sharp bounds numerically, albeit with their own drawbacks. It is worth noting that the convolution bound is closely linked to the RVaR inequality in Embree et al. (2018), which is used to address risk-sharing problems among multiple agents with risk preferences characterized by RVaR.

Indeed, the Fréchet problem offers a distinctive perspective on studying the risk sharing problem, as risk sharing can be viewed as the “inverse” of risk aggregation. The risk sharing problem concerns redistributing a total risk among multiple participants, requiring the determination of the optimal allocations. This problem has a long history, dating back to the seminal work of Borch (1962), which studied risk sharing through the framework of expected utility. Over the past two decades, researchers have explored risk sharing problems using risk measures to represent participants’ risk preferences since the introduction of coherent and convex risk measures in Artzner et al. (1999), Föllmer and Schied (2002) and Frittelli and Rosazza Gianin (2005). For instance, Barrieu and El Karoui (2005), Jouini et al. (2008), Filipović and Svindland (2008) and Delbaen (2012) examined risk sharing problems based on risk measures satisfying convexity and law invariance, leading to comonotonic optimal allocations. Moreover, Embree et al. (2018) investigated risk sharing for RVaR, derived the minimal value of risk sharing (called inf-convolution) and provided explicit expressions for optimal allocations in both cooperative and competitive settings; see also Embree et al. (2020). Besides, some other non-convex risk measures were also studied in the risk sharing problem such as VaR-type distortion risk measures (Weber (2018)), Lambda VaR (Liu (2025)), inter-quantile difference (Lauzier et al. (2025)) and general non-convex risk measures (Liebrich (2024)).

In this paper, we focus on the theoretical aspect of the Fréchet problem rather than the application side, and we elaborate on our contribution as follows. First, we establish a new type of upper and lower bounds for robust risk aggregation with RVaR under dependence uncertainty in Section 4.1. We show that those bounds are sharp as upper bounds if the marginal distributions have increasing densities on their upper-tail parts and also sharp as lower bounds if the marginal distributions have decreasing densities on their lower-tail parts. These bounds use a general structure of averaged quantiles to obtain new forms of bounds, and offer new sharpness results for robust RVaR compared with those in Blanchet et al. (2025). Specifically, while the convolution bound for robust RVaR in Blanchet et al. (2025) is a sharp lower bound if the marginal distributions exhibit increasing densities on their lower-tail parts, our derived bound achieves sharpness for lower bound if marginal distributions have decreasing densities on their lower-tail parts.

Second, we obtain two more types of upper bounds for the difference between two RVaRs and that between two quantiles, called inter-RVaR difference (IRD) and, for a special case, inter-quantile difference (IQD) respectively in Section 4.2. Note that IRD extends the inter-ES proposed in Bellini et al. (2022) as an alternative to the standard deviation to measure the variability of risks. It is well known that IQD is

frequently used to find the outliers and measure the statistical dispersion in statistics. Moreover, IQD is also a tool to quantify the variability of risks; see [Bellini et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Lauzier et al. \(2025\)](#). Importantly, we find that the robust IRD (resp., IQD) equals the difference between the two robust RVaR (resp., quantiles). Hence, the explicit expressions are derived based on the robust RVaR and quantiles for marginal distributions with monotone densities on both upper- and lower-tail parts. We offer two different sharp upper bounds for IRD under different assumptions on the marginal distributions: the first condition requires the marginals to have decreasing densities on their upper-tail parts and increasing densities on their lower-tail parts; whereas the second requires decreasing densities on both upper- and lower-tail parts, respectively. Commonly used continuous distributions in finance or risk management (e.g., Gaussian, lognormal, t, exponential, and Pareto) mostly fall into either of the two categories. Those two expressions for the sharp upper bound of IRD together with their different assumptions demonstrate the complexity of the robust risk aggregation for IRD and also the usefulness of our new bounds established in [Section 4.1](#). The sharp upper bound for the difference between two quantiles requires the marginals to have densities that are monotone in the same direction on both upper- and lower-tail parts, respectively, which is valid for almost all the commonly used continuous distributions. All three types of bounds established in our paper are generally called extended convolution bounds, as they can be viewed as an extension of the convolution bounds from RVaR and quantiles to the corresponding variability measures introduced in [Bellini et al. \(2022\)](#).

Third, we study the risk sharing problem for some averaged quantiles, which is equivalent to the risk sharing problem for distortion risk measures with some special inverse S-shaped distortion functions. This class of distortion risk measures represents the decision maker's typical attitude: risk aversion for large losses and risk-seeking for small losses or gains; see [Yaari \(1987\)](#) and [Tversky and Kahneman \(1992\)](#). Clearly, this problem is non-convex and challenging. It turns out that the inf-convolution has a very simple form: the lower-tail ES, which is an averaged quantile below a specified quantile of the total risk. Moreover, the optimal allocation, which is Pareto-optimal, exists if and only if the total risk is bounded from above. The structure of the optimal allocation consists of two parts: The upper-tail part of the total risk is shared comonotonically, and the lower-tail part of the risk is shared counter-monotonically. This optimal allocation is consistent with the agents' risk attitudes: risk-aversion for large losses and risk-seeking for small losses or large gains. If the total risk is not bounded from above, the optimal allocation does not exist, where the proof is based on the analysis of the dependence structure of the optimal allocations. Instead, in this case, we find a sequence of sub-optimal allocations such that the risk exposures generated by those allocations converge to the inf-convolution. We emphasize that our optimal allocation is the combination of the existed optimal allocations for convex risk measures and quantile-based risk measures in the literature; see e.g., [Jouini et al. \(2008\)](#) and [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#). Although we only solve the risk sharing problem for distortion risk measures with some special inverse S-shaped distortion functions, we emphasize that to best of our knowledge, this is the first non-constrained risk sharing result for this class of distortion risk measures with the distortion functions exaggerating the probability

of large losses and the probability of large gains simultaneously. It sheds light on the further investigation into the risk sharing for general inverse-S-shaped distortion risk measures.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We give some notation and definitions in Section 2. We establish a new inequality for RVaR in Section 3. Based on this new inequality, we obtain some bounds on risk aggregation for RVaR, the difference between two RVaR and the difference between two quantiles in Section 4. Employing this inequality, we study the risk sharing problem for the averaged quantiles and obtain the condition for the existence of the Pareto-optimal allocations and the forms of the Pareto-optimal allocations in Section 5. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2 Notation and Definitions

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be an atomless probability space and $\mathcal{X} = L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be the set of all random variables, and $\mathcal{X}_1 = L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be the set of all random variables with finite mean. Correspondingly, we denote the set of all distributions of the random variables in \mathcal{X} by \mathcal{M} , and by \mathcal{M}_1 the set of all distributions of the random variables in \mathcal{X}_1 . To ease the notation, we treat almost surely equal random variables and events as identical and set $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Throughout this paper, we use $U[a, b]$ with $a < b$ to represent the uniform distribution on $[a, b]$. For any $X \in \mathcal{X}$, let $U_X \sim U[0, 1]$ such that $F_X^{-1}(U_X) = X$ and U_X is usually called the probability transform of X (e.g., Proposition 7.2 of McNeil et al. (2015)); The existence of such U_X is guaranteed (e.g., Lemma A.32 of Föllmer and Schied (2016)). In this paper, the probability measure (μ) and the distribution function (F) are considered equivalent. Either of them may be used according to the context. Moreover, terms like “increasing” and “decreasing” are in the non-strict sense.

Next, we introduce a family of risk measures: the average quantile functional R . For any $I \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ with $|I| > 0$, the functional $R_I : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$R_I(\mu) = \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I q_t^-(\mu) dt,$$

where $|I|$ is the length of I under the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} and $q_t^-(\mu) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \mu((-\infty, x]) \geq t\}$ is the left quantile of distribution μ with $t \in (0, 1]$. As R_I is a law-invariant risk measure, we abuse the notation $R_I(X)$ with $R_I(\mu)$ for a random variable $X \sim \mu$. This abuse may also apply to other law-invariant risk measures in our paper.

Remark 1. (i) In fact, one could also define R_I using $q_t^+(\mu)$, which does not affect the value of the functional as $q_t^-(\mu) \neq q_t^+(\mu)$ only holds at a countable number of points over $(0, 1)$.

(ii) Further, let $I \subseteq [0, 1]$ be a union of finite many intervals and denote by \bar{I} the closure of I . As the integral value does not change if the integral region is changed within countable many points, we have $R_I(\mu) = R_{\bar{I}}(\mu)$. Thus, without loss of generality, we always write any interval in I as a closed one.

The average quantile functional includes the classic risk measure, Range-Value-at-Risk (RVaR), as a special case in the following way:

$$\text{RVaR}_{\beta, \beta+\alpha}(\mu) = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{\beta}^{\beta+\alpha} q_{1-t}^+(\mu) dt = R_{[1-\beta-\alpha, 1-\beta]}(\mu), \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $0 < \beta < \beta + \alpha \leq 1$. Note that RVaR was first introduced by [Cont et al. \(2010\)](#) as a family of robust risk measures, and it was further applied to the risk sharing and optimal reinsurance problem as the preference functional in [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#) and [Fadina et al. \(2025\)](#). Note that RVaR includes ES and LES (Left ES) as special cases in the following way: For $p \in (0, 1]$,

$$\text{ES}_p(\mu) = \frac{1}{p} \int_{1-p}^1 q_u^-(\mu) du = R_{[1-p, 1]}(\mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{LES}_p(\mu) = \frac{1}{p} \int_0^p q_u^-(\mu) du = R_{[0, p]}(\mu), \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}_1.$$

Moreover, both $q_{\beta}^-(\mu)$ and $q_{\beta}^+(\mu)$ for $\beta \in (0, 1)$ appear as the limits of some R_I via

$$\lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} R_{[\beta-\alpha, \beta]}(\mu) = q_{\beta}^-(\mu) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} R_{[\beta, \beta+\alpha]}(\mu) = q_{\beta}^+(\mu), \quad \mu \in \mathcal{M}.$$

For $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) \in \mathcal{M}^n$, let $\Gamma(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ be the set of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^n with one-dimensional marginals μ_1, \dots, μ_n . For a probability measure μ on $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n))$, define $\lambda_{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}$ via

$$\lambda_{\mu}((-\infty, x]) = \mu(\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 + \dots + x_n \leq x\}), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In other words, λ_{μ} is an aggregated probability measure of the sum variable $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, where the random vector (X_1, \dots, X_n) follows the n -dimensional distribution μ . Moreover, let $\Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \{\lambda_{\mu} : \mu \in \Gamma(\boldsymbol{\mu})\}$ be the set of all aggregated probability measures with specified marginals $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. Define an approximate standard simplex

$$\Delta_n = \left\{ (\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in (0, 1) \times [0, 1]^n : \sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i = 1 \right\}.$$

Note that Δ_n is neither open nor closed; hence, we use the term ‘‘approximate’’. For real numbers $x_i, i \in [n]$, we use the notation $\bigvee_{i=1}^n x_i = \max_{i \in [n]} x_i$ and $\bigwedge_{i=1}^n x_i = \min_{i \in [n]} x_i$. Finally, for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ and $r \in (0, 1)$, let μ^{r+} be the probability measure given by

$$\mu^{r+}(-\infty, x] = \max \left\{ \frac{\mu(-\infty, x] - r}{1 - r}, 0 \right\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.2)$$

which is called the r -tail distribution of μ in [Rockafellar and Uryasev \(2002\)](#). Indeed, μ^{r+} is the distribution measure of the random variable $q_U^-(\mu)$, where $U \sim U[r, 1]$. Equivalently, μ^{r+} is the distribution measure of μ restricted beyond its r -quantile (assuming no mass at this point). In this paper, a statement that μ admits a decreasing (resp., increasing) density beyond its r -quantile is equivalent to the one that μ^{r+} admits a decreasing

(resp., increasing) density on its support. An analogous definition applies to the probability measure μ^{r-} :

$$\mu^{r-}(-\infty, x] = \min \left\{ \frac{\mu(-\infty, x]}{r}, 1 \right\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

That is, μ^{r-} is the distribution measure of the random variable $q_V^-(\mu)$, where $V \sim U[0, r]$. A statement that μ admits a decreasing (resp., increasing) density below its r -quantile is equivalent to the one that μ^{r-} admits a decreasing (resp., increasing) density on its support.

3 New RVaR Inequality

In this section, we establish a new inequality for RVaR. This inequality will play a crucial role in establishing the bounds for risk aggregation with dependence uncertainty and in analyzing the risk sharing problem later. Before showing our result, we first display Propositions 1 and A.1 of [Blanchet et al. \(2025\)](#) (originally from Theorem 4.1 of [Liu and Wang \(2021\)](#)) as below, which will be used frequently later.

Lemma 1 (Propositions 1 and A.1 of [Blanchet et al. \(2025\)](#)). *Suppose $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $0 \leq r < r + s \leq 1$. We have*

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{r+})} \text{LES}_{\frac{s}{1-r}}(\nu), \quad \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) = \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(r+s)-})} \text{ES}_{\frac{s}{r+s}}(\nu).$$

Next, we offer a new inequality for RVaR.

Theorem 1 (New RVaR Inequality). *Let $0 < r < r + s \leq 1$, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \geq 0$ and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n > 0$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + \bigvee_{i=1}^n \beta_i \leq 1 - r$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \leq s$. Then for $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, we have*

$$R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{1 - r - \beta_i}{s} R_{[r, r+\alpha_i] \cup [r+\alpha_i+\beta_i, 1]}(\mu_i) + \left(1 - \frac{1 - r - \beta_i}{s} \right) R_{[r+\alpha_i, r+\alpha_i+\beta_i]}(\mu_i) \right]. \quad (3.1)$$

Moreover, (3.1) holds for $r = 0$ if $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$.

Proof. First, we suppose $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$ and $r > 0$. Let $X_i \sim \mu_i^{r+}, i \in [n]$ (note that we define the notation in Equation (2.2)) and $S = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Throughout the proof, we assume $\alpha_i, \beta_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + \bigvee_{i=1}^n \beta_i \leq 1$. By Theorem 1 of [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#), for $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \beta_i \leq u \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$, we have

$$R_{[1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i - u, 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i]}(S) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1 - \alpha_i - \beta_i, 1 - \alpha_i]}(X_i).$$

Letting $0 < t < 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$ and $(\bigvee_{i=1}^n \beta_i) \vee t < u \leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$, it is easy to check

$$R_{[1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i - u, 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i - t]}(S) \leq R_{[1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i - u, 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i]}(S) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1 - \alpha_i - \beta_i, 1 - \alpha_i]}(X_i).$$

Then, replacing X_i with $-X_i$, it follows that

$$R_{[\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + u]}(S) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\alpha_i, \alpha_i + \beta_i]}(X_i).$$

Letting $u = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$, we have

$$R_{[\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t, 1]}(S) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\alpha_i, \alpha_i + \beta_i]}(X_i).$$

Using the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}(S) = \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i - t\right) R_{[\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t, 1]}(S) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t\right) R_{[0, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t]}(S),$$

we further have

$$\mathbb{E}(S) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t\right) R_{[0, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t]}(S) \geq \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i - t\right) \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\alpha_i, \alpha_i + \beta_i]}(X_i),$$

which can be rewritten as

$$R_{[0, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t]}(S) \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E}(X_i) - \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i - t\right) R_{[\alpha_i, \alpha_i + \beta_i]}(X_i) \right).$$

Noting that $\mathbb{E}(X_i) = (1 - \beta_i) R_{[0, \alpha_i] \cup [\alpha_i + \beta_i, 1]}(X_i) + \beta_i R_{[\alpha_i, \alpha_i + \beta_i]}(X_i)$, we have

$$R_{[0, \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t]}(S) \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t} \sum_{i=1}^n \left((1 - \beta_i) R_{[0, \alpha_i] \cup [\alpha_i + \beta_i, 1]}(X_i) - \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i - t - \beta_i\right) R_{[\alpha_i, \alpha_i + \beta_i]}(X_i) \right). \quad (3.2)$$

By Lemma 1, we have

$$\sup_{X'_i \sim \mu_i, i \in [n], S' = \sum_{i=1}^n X'_i} R_{[r, r+s]}(S') = \sup_{X_i \sim \mu_i^{r+}, i \in [n], S = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i} R_{[0, \frac{s}{1-r}]}(S).$$

Combining the above equation with (3.2) and letting $\frac{s}{1-r} = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{X'_i \sim \mu_i, i \in [n], S' = \sum_{i=1}^n X'_i} R_{[r, r+s]}(S') \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + t} \sum_{i=1}^n \left((1 - \beta_i) R_{[0, \alpha_i] \cup [\alpha_i + \beta_i, 1]}(X_i) - \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j - t - \beta_i\right) R_{[\alpha_i, \alpha_i + \beta_i]}(X_i) \right). \end{aligned}$$

As $X_i \sim \mu_i^{r+}$ and $X'_i \sim \mu_i$, for any $I \subseteq [0, 1]$ being a union of finite many intervals, we have $R_I(X_i) = R_{r+(1-r)I}(X'_i)$ for $i \in [n]$. Taking $\alpha'_i = (1-r)\alpha_i$ and $\beta'_i = (1-r)\beta_i$, we obtain

$$R_{[r, r+s]}(S') \leq \frac{1-r}{\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha'_i + (1-r)t} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\left(1 - \frac{\beta'_i}{1-r}\right) R_{[r, r+\alpha'_i] \cup [r+\alpha'_i+\beta'_i, 1]}(X'_i) - \left(1 - t - \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha'_j + \beta'_i}{1-r}\right) R_{[r+\alpha'_i, r+\alpha'_i+\beta'_i]}(X'_i) \right).$$

By taking $\alpha'_i = \alpha_i$, $\beta'_i = \beta_i$ for $i \in [n]$ and noticing that $s = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha'_i + (1-r)t$, the above inequality can be rewritten as

$$R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{1-r-\beta_i}{s} R_{[r, r+\alpha_i] \cup [r+\alpha_i+\beta_i, 1]}(\mu_i) + \left(1 - \frac{1-r-\beta_i}{s}\right) R_{[r+\alpha_i, r+\alpha_i+\beta_i]}(\mu_i) \right].$$

We establish the claim for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$ and $r > 0$.

For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $r > 0$, suppose $X_i \sim \mu_i$, $i \in [n]$ and let $S = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Define $X_i^{(m)} = (X_i \wedge m) \vee (-m)$ and $S^{(m)} = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{(m)}$ for $m \geq 1$. Clearly, $X_i^{(m)}$ has a finite mean, and as $m \rightarrow \infty$, $X_i^{(m)} \rightarrow X_i$ and $S^{(m)} \rightarrow S$ a.e.. Using the above conclusion, we have

$$R_{[r, r+s]}(S^{(m)}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{1-r-\beta_i}{s} R_{[r, r+\alpha_i] \cup [r+\alpha_i+\beta_i, 1]}(X_i^{(m)}) + \left(1 - \frac{1-r-\beta_i}{s}\right) R_{[r+\alpha_i, r+\alpha_i+\beta_i]}(X_i^{(m)}) \right].$$

As $r > 0$, letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ and applying the monotone convergence theorem for sufficiently large m in the above inequality, we establish the claim for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $r > 0$.

For the case $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$ and $r = 0$, letting $r \downarrow 0$ in (3.1), we obtain the desired result. This completes the proof. \square

Note that in (3.1), it is possible that some I for R_I has a length of zero. The only possible case is $\alpha_i = 0$ and $r + \alpha_i + \beta_i = 1$, implying the length of $[r, r + \alpha_i] \cup [r + \alpha_i + \beta_i, 1]$ is zero and $\frac{1-r-\beta_i}{s} = 0$. Hence, the value of $\frac{1-r-\beta_i}{s} R_{[r, r+\alpha_i] \cup [r+\alpha_i+\beta_i, 1]}(\mu_i)$ is understood as zero.

In Theorem 1 of Embrechts et al. (2018), it shows that for $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \geq 0$ and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n > 0$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + \bigvee_{i=1}^n \beta_i < 1$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)$, we have

$$R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1-\alpha_i-\beta_i, 1-\alpha_i]}(\mu_i), \quad (3.3)$$

where $r + s = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$ and $s = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \beta_i$. Clearly, the individual and aggregate risk measures in (3.3) are all RVaR. However, the individual risk measures in the new RVaR inequality in (3.1) are more complicated,

involving the linear combinations of R_I with I being a union of two intervals. The aggregate risk measure still has the form of RVaR. This new RVaR inequality helps establish new risk aggregation bounds and sharpness conditions. It is also very useful to investigate risk sharing for different distortion risk measures with more complex distortion functions than that of Embrechts et al. (2018).

Further, by setting $1 - r - \beta_i = s$ for the bound in Theorem 1, we immediately arrive at a simplified upper bound displayed in the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Let $0 < r < r + s \leq 1$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in (0, 1 - r)$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = s$. Then for $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, we have*

$$R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r, r+\alpha_i] \cup [1-s+\alpha_i, 1]}(\mu_i). \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover, (3.4) holds for $r = 0$ if $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$.

By setting $r = 0$, Corollary 1 states that the lower tail of the aggregate risk can be controlled by the summation of the lower tail and the upper tail of the individual risks. Later, we will see that the inequality in Corollary 1 plays a crucial role to solve the risk sharing problem in Section 5.

4 Extended Convolution Bounds

In this section, we obtain some bounds for the risk aggregation with dependence uncertainty for RVaR, the difference between two RVaR, and the difference between two quantiles. The bound for RVaR is a complement to the results in Blanchet et al. (2025) by providing a different form and more sharpness results. The bounds for the difference between two RVaR and the difference between two quantiles are new to the literature. We call those bounds extended convolution bounds.

4.1 RVaR Aggregation Upper and Lower Bounds

Theorem 2 (RVaR aggregation upper bound). *For either $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $0 < r < r + s \leq 1$, or $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$ and $0 \leq r < r + s \leq 1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) \leq \inf_{\substack{\beta \in (1-r)\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq 1-r-s}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1-r-\beta_0}{s}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r+\beta_i, r+\beta_i+\beta_0]}(\mu_i) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1-r-\beta_0}{s} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r, r+\beta_i] \cup [r+\beta_i+\beta_0, 1]}(\mu_i) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Moreover, (4.1) holds as an equality for $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$ in the following cases:

- (i) each of μ_1, \dots, μ_n admits an increasing density beyond its r -quantile;
- (ii) $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i [q_r^+(\mu_i), q_1^-(\mu_i)] \leq 1 - r$.

Proof. In light of (3.1) and using the assumption $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i + \bigvee_{i=1}^n \beta_i = 1 - r$ and the transformations $\beta_i \rightarrow \beta_0$, $i \in [n]$, $\alpha_i \rightarrow \beta_i$, $i \in [n]$, we have, for $\beta \in (1 - r)\Delta_n$ and $\beta_0 \geq 1 - r - s$,

$$R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1 - r - \beta_0}{s}\right) \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r+\beta_i, r+\beta_i+\beta_0]}(\mu_i) + \frac{1 - r - \beta_0}{s} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r, r+\beta_i] \cup [r+\beta_i+\beta_0, 1]}(\mu_i).$$

We obtain (4.1) by taking the supremum on the left-hand side of the above inequality over $\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)$ and infimum on the right-hand side of the above inequality over $\beta \in (1 - r)\Delta_n$ and $\beta_0 \geq 1 - r - s$.

Next, we show that (4.1) is an equality for cases (i) and (ii). If case (i) holds, then each of $\mu_1^{r+}, \dots, \mu_n^{r+}$ admits an increasing density. Define (Equation (3.4) in Jakobsons et al. (2016))

$$T_{s_n} = h(U)\mathbf{1}_{\{U < s_n\}} + d(s_n)\mathbf{1}_{\{U > s_n\}},$$

where $U \sim U[0, 1]$, $h(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i(x) - (n - 1)y(x)$, $d(x) = -\frac{1}{1-x} \int_{-y_i(x)}^{y(x)-y_i(x)} z \mu_i^{r+}(dz)$ for $x \in (0, 1)$, and $s_n = \inf\{x \in (0, 1) : h(x) \leq d(x)\}$ with y, y_i , $i \in [n]$ being the continuous functions on $(0, 1)$ satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i^{r+}(-\infty, -y_i(x)) = x, \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_i^{r+}[-y_i(x), y(x) - y_i(x)) = 1 - x, \quad x \in (0, 1).$$

In light of Lemma 3.4 of Jakobsons et al. (2016) and using the fact that each of $\mu_1^{r+}, \dots, \mu_n^{r+}$ admits an increasing density, there exist $X_i \sim \mu_i^{r+}$ such that $T_{s_n} = \sum_{i=1}^n -X_i$. Moreover, using Lemma 3.3 of Jakobsons et al. (2016), we could find $\beta' \in \Delta_n$ with $\beta'_0 \geq 1 - \frac{s}{1-r}$ such that

$$R_{[0, 1-s/(1-r)]}(-S) = \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1-\beta'_i-\beta'_0, 1-\beta'_i]}(-X_i)$$

with $S = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. The detail of construction of such β' and β'_0 is omitted as it is only involving tedious computation using Lemma 3.3 of Jakobsons et al. (2016). One can refer to the proof of Theorem 1 of Blanchet et al. (2025) for the similar computation. Note that the above equation can be rewritten as

$$R_{[s/(1-r), 1]}(S) = \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\beta'_i, \beta'_i+\beta'_0]}(X_i).$$

Using the fact

$$\mathbb{E}(S) = \frac{s}{1-r} R_{[0, s/(1-r)]}(S) + \frac{1-r-s}{1-r} R_{[s/(1-r), 1]}(S),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{[0,s/(1-r)]}(S) &= \frac{1-r}{s} \left(\mathbb{E}(S) - \frac{1-r-s}{1-r} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\beta'_i, \beta'_i + \beta'_0]}(X_i) \right) \\ &= \frac{1-r}{s} \sum_{i=1}^n \left((1-\beta'_0) R_{[0, \beta'_i] \cup [\beta'_i + \beta'_0, 1]}(X_i) + \left(\beta'_0 - \frac{1-r-s}{1-r} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\beta'_i, \beta'_i + \beta'_0]}(X_i) \right). \end{aligned}$$

There exist $U' \sim U[0, 1]$ and (Y_1, \dots, Y_n) such that (Y_1, \dots, Y_n) is independent of U' and has the same distribution as (X_1, \dots, X_n) . Define

$$X'_i = Y_i \mathbb{1}_{\{U' > r\}} + q_{U'}^-(\mu_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{U' < r\}}, \quad i \in [n], \quad \text{and} \quad S' = \sum_{i=1}^n X'_i.$$

Clearly, $X'_i \sim \mu_i$ and $S' = (\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{U' > r\}} + (\sum_{i=1}^n q_{U'}^-(\mu_i)) \mathbb{1}_{\{U' < r\}}$. Note that $R_{[r,s]}(S') = R_{[0,s/(1-r)]}(S)$. Letting $\beta_0 = (1-r)\beta'_0$ and $\beta_i = (1-r)\beta'_i$, $i \in [n]$, we have $\beta \in (1-r)\Delta_n$, $\beta_0 \geq 1-r-s$ and

$$\begin{aligned} R_{[r,s]}(S') &= \frac{1-r}{s} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\left(1 - \frac{\beta_0}{1-r} \right) R_{[r, r+\beta_i] \cup [r+\beta_i+\beta_0, 1]}(X'_i) + \left(\frac{\beta_0}{1-r} - \frac{1-r-s}{1-r} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r+\beta_i, r+\beta_i+\beta_0]}(X'_i) \right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{1-r-\beta_0}{s} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r+\beta_i, r+\beta_i+\beta_0]}(\mu_i) + \frac{1-r-\beta_0}{s} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r, r+\beta_i] \cup [r+\beta_i+\beta_0, 1]}(\mu_i), \end{aligned}$$

implying the inverse inequality of (4.1). Hence, (4.1) holds as an equality.

If case (ii) holds, then $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i^{r+} [q_0^+(\mu_i^{r+}), q_1^-(\mu_i^{r+})] \leq 1$. Hence, there exist $X_i \sim \mu_i^{r+}$, $i \in [n]$ such that $-X_i$, $i \in [n]$ are lower mutually exclusive. Hence, in light of Lemma EC.2 of Blanchet et al. (2025), there exist $X_i \sim \mu_i^{r+}$ and $\beta' \in \Delta_n$, $\beta'_0 \geq 1 - \frac{s}{1-r}$ such that

$$R_{[0, 1-s/(1-r)]}(-S) = \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1-\beta'_i-\beta'_0, 1-\beta'_i]}(-X_i)$$

with $S = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Repeating the procedure in the proof of case (i), we can show that (4.1) holds as an equality. \square

As a comparison, Theorem 1 of Blanchet et al. (2025) gives the following (upper) convolution bound

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) \leq \inf_{\substack{\beta \in (1-r)\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq s}} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1-\beta_i-\beta_0, 1-\beta_i]}(\mu_i). \quad (4.2)$$

As stated in Blanchet et al. (2025), the bound (4.2) is sharp if each of μ_1, \dots, μ_n admits a decreasing density beyond its r -quantile. However, it is not clear whether it is still sharp if each of μ_1, \dots, μ_n admits an increasing density beyond its r -quantile. Our Theorem 2 complements the result in Blanchet et al. (2025) by offering some new bound which is sharp for the case of marginals with increasing densities on their upper-tail

parts. In practice, although most of the distributions have decreasing densities on their upper-tail parts, some distributions with increasing densities on the upper-tail parts still exist such as Beta distribution or triangular distribution. Moreover, the result in Theorem 2 is crucial to find the sharp bound for the best-case scenario when the marginals have decreasing densities; see Theorem 3 below.

Before proceeding to the lower bound, we first obtain a simplified sharp bound if the marginal distributions are homogeneous. For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, let

$$c_n(\mu) = \inf \left\{ x \in \left(0, \frac{1}{n}\right) : \frac{(n-1)q_{(n-1)x}^-(\mu) + q_{1-x}^-(\mu)}{n} \leq R_{[(n-1)x, 1-x]}(\mu) \right\}$$

with the convention that $\inf \emptyset = 1/n$.

Proposition 1 (RVaR aggregation upper bound: homogeneous marginal). *If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ has an increasing density on its support, and $0 < r < r+s \leq 1$ with $\frac{s}{1-r} \leq nc_n(\mu)$, then we have*

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda_n(\mu)} R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) = nR_{[r, r+\frac{s}{n}] \cup [1-s+\frac{s}{n}, 1]}(\mu). \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. Suppose $\mu_1 = \dots = \mu_n = \mu$, which has an increasing density on its support. Denote by $\tilde{\mu}$ the distribution measure of $-X_i$, where $X_i \sim \mu$. Hence, $\tilde{\mu}$ has a decreasing density. Denote by $\tilde{\nu}$ the distribution measure of $-\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, where $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \sim \nu$. For $0 \leq r < r+s \leq 1$, write $t = 1 - r - s$. Using Lemma 1, we have

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda_n(\mu)} R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) = - \inf_{\tilde{\nu} \in \Lambda_n(\tilde{\mu})} R_{[1-r-s, 1-r]}(\tilde{\nu}) = - \inf_{\tilde{\nu} \in \Lambda_n(\tilde{\mu}^{(t+s)-})} \text{ES}_{\frac{s}{t+s}}(\tilde{\nu}). \quad (4.4)$$

Note that $\tilde{\mu}^{(t+s)-}$ has a decreasing density on its support. Hence, by Theorem 5.2 of Bernard et al. (2014), we have for any $p \in (0, nc_n(\mu)]$,

$$\inf_{\nu \in \Lambda_n(\mu)} \text{ES}_p(\nu) = \frac{n}{p} \int_0^{\frac{p}{n}} \left((n-1)q_{(n-1)u}^-(\mu) + q_{1-u}^-(\mu) \right) du. \quad (4.5)$$

Using (4.5), for $\frac{s}{t+s} \leq nc_n(\mu)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-\inf_{\tilde{\nu} \in \Lambda_n(\tilde{\mu}^{(t+s)-})} \text{ES}_{\frac{s}{t+s}}(\tilde{\nu}) &= -\frac{n(t+s)}{s} \int_0^{\frac{s}{n(t+s)}} \left((n-1)q_{(n-1)u}^-(\tilde{\mu}^{(t+s)-}) + q_{1-u}^-(\tilde{\mu}^{(t+s)-}) \right) du \\
&= -\frac{n(t+s)}{s} \int_0^{\frac{s}{n(t+s)}} \left((n-1)q_{(n-1)(t+s)u}^-(\tilde{\mu}) + q_{(1-u)(t+s)}^-(\tilde{\mu}) \right) du \\
&= -\frac{n(t+s)}{s} \left(\int_0^{\frac{(n-1)s}{n}} \frac{1}{t+s} q_v^-(\tilde{\mu}) dv + \int_{t+s-\frac{s}{n}}^{t+s} \frac{1}{t+s} q_v^-(\tilde{\mu}) dv \right) \\
&= -\frac{n}{s} \left(\int_0^{\frac{(n-1)s}{n}} q_v^-(\tilde{\mu}) dv + \int_{t+s-\frac{s}{n}}^{t+s} q_v^-(\tilde{\mu}) dv \right) \\
&= \frac{n}{s} \left(\int_{1-t-s}^{1-t-s+\frac{s}{n}} q_v^-(\mu) dv + \int_{1-\frac{(n-1)s}{n}}^1 q_v^-(\mu) dv \right) \\
&= nR_{[r, r+\frac{s}{n}] \cup [1-s+\frac{s}{n}, 1]}(\mu).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Combining (4.4) and (4.6), we have (4.3). \square

Based on the result in Theorem 2, we immediately obtain a lower bound for the risk aggregation of RVaR with fixed marginal distributions but unknown dependence structure.

Theorem 3 (RVaR aggregation lower bound). *For either $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $0 \leq r < r+s < 1$, or $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$ and $0 \leq r < r+s \leq 1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) &\geq \sup_{\substack{\beta \in (r+s)\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq r}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{r+s-\beta_0}{s} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r+s-\beta_i-\beta_0, r+s-\beta_i]}(\mu_i) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{r+s-\beta_0}{s} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[0, r+s-\beta_i-\beta_0] \cup [r+s-\beta_i, r+s]}(\mu_i) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Moreover, (4.7) holds as an equality for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$ in the following cases:

(i) each of μ_1, \dots, μ_n admits a decreasing density below its $(r+s)$ -quantile;

(ii) $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i(q_0^+(\mu_i), q_{r+s}^-(\mu_i)) \leq r+s$.

Proof. Denote by $\tilde{\mu}_i$ the distribution measure of $-X_i$, where $X_i \sim \mu_i$, and by $\tilde{\nu}$ the distribution measure of $-\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, where $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \sim \nu$. Then we have

$$\inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) = -\sup_{\tilde{\nu} \in \Lambda(\tilde{\mu})} R_{[1-r-s, 1-r]}(\tilde{\nu}).$$

Applying Theorem 2, we immediately establish the claim. \square

It is worth mentioning that Theorem A.1 of Blanchet et al. (2025) gives the following (lower) convolution

bound

$$\inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) \geq \sup_{\substack{\beta \in (r+s)\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq s}} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\beta_i, \beta_i + \beta_0]}(\mu_i). \quad (4.8)$$

It is shown in [Blanchet et al. \(2025\)](#) that (4.8) is a sharp bound if each marginal distribution admits an increasing density below its $(r+s)$ -quantile. However, it is not clear whether the bound is sharp for the case with decreasing densities on the lower-tail parts. Our Theorem 3 fills in this gap by providing a bound which is sharp for the best case of RVaR if all marginal distributions admit decreasing densities on their lower-tail parts. This gap is actually significant because many commonly used distributions in finance and risk management have decreasing densities on their lower-tail parts, including exponential, Pareto, and some gamma and chi distributions. It is reasonable to expect that the bounds in Theorems 2 and 3 approximate the exact values whenever the marginals are close to satisfying the sharpness conditions. Moreover, our results in Theorems 2 and 3 are the building blocks to consider the worst case value of the difference between two RVaR in Section 4.2.

Applying Proposition 1, we immediately obtain a simplified sharp lower bound if the marginal distributions are homogeneous as below. For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$, we denote by $\tilde{\mu}$ the distribution measure of $-X$ with $X \sim \mu$.

Proposition 2 (RVaR aggregation lower bound: homogeneous marginal). *If $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ has a decreasing density on its support, and $0 \leq r < r+s < 1$ with $\frac{s}{r+s} \leq nc_n(\tilde{\mu})$, then we have*

$$\inf_{\nu \in \Lambda_n(\mu)} R_{[r, r+s]}(\nu) = nR_{[0, \frac{(n-1)s}{n}] \cup [r + \frac{(n-1)s}{n}, r+s]}(\mu).$$

4.2 Inter-RVaR Difference Aggregation Upper Bounds

For $0 \leq r_1 < s_1 \leq r_2 < s_2 \leq 1$, the inter-RVaR difference is defined as

$$\text{IRD}_{[r_1, s_1], [r_2, s_2]}(\mu) = R_{[r_2, s_2]}(\mu) - R_{[r_1, s_1]}(\mu),$$

which can be viewed as an example of the variability measures introduced in [Bellini et al. \(2022\)](#). If $r_1 = 1 - s_2 = 0$ and $s_1 = 1 - r_2$, then $\text{IRD}_{[r_1, s_1], [r_2, s_2]}(\mu) = \text{ES}_{1-r_2}(\mu) - \text{LES}_{1-r_2}(\mu)$, which is the inter-ES difference introduced by [Bellini et al. \(2022\)](#). If $s_2 \downarrow r_2 = 1 - r$ and $r_1 \uparrow s_1 = r$, then $\text{IRD}_{[r_1, s_1], [r_2, s_2]}$ converges to the inter-quantile difference

$$\text{IQD}_r^+(\mu) = q_{1-r}^+(\mu) - q_r^-(\mu), \quad r \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right],$$

which was given by [Bellini et al. \(2022\)](#). An alternative definition of inter-quantile difference was introduced by [Lauzier et al. \(2025\)](#) in the study of risk sharing, i.e.,

$$\text{IQD}_r^-(\mu) = q_{1-r}^-(\mu) - q_r^+(\mu), \quad r \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right),$$

which is the limit of $\text{IRD}_{[r_1, s_1], [r_2, s_2]}(\mu)$ as $r_2 \uparrow s_2 = 1 - r$ and $s_1 \downarrow r_1 = r$. Note that those risk measures can be used to evaluate the variability of the financial losses or risk as an alternative of variance. Before discussing the robust risk aggregation for IRD, we introduce some concepts and obtain a general result on the robust risk aggregation of the difference between two tail risk measures.

For $p \in (0, 1)$, we say $\rho : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is a p -upper-tail risk measure if $\rho(\mu_1) = \rho(\mu_2)$ for all $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $\mu_1^{p+} = \mu_2^{p+}$; we say $\rho : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is a p -lower-tail risk measure if $\rho(\mu_1) = \rho(\mu_2)$ for all $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $\mu_1^{p-} = \mu_2^{p-}$. Note that here the domain of ρ can be restricted to \mathcal{M}_1 . The p -upper-tail risk measure is the so-called p -tail risk measure introduced and studied in [Liu and Wang \(2021\)](#). We say $\rho : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ satisfies *monotonicity* if $\rho(\mu_1) \leq \rho(\mu_2)$ for all $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ satisfying $q_t^-(\mu_1) \leq q_t^-(\mu_2)$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$.

Clearly, for $0 < r < s < 1$, $R[r, s]$ is an r -upper-tail risk measure and also an s -lower-tail risk measure; q_r^+ is an r -upper-tail risk measure and $(r + \varepsilon)$ -lower-tail risk measure for some $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - r$; q_r^- is an r -lower-tail risk measure and $(r - \varepsilon)$ -upper-tail risk measure for some $0 < \varepsilon < r$. We refer to [Liu and Wang \(2021\)](#) for properties, applications and more examples on p -upper-tail risk measures.

Theorem 4. For $0 < r \leq s < 1$, suppose that $\rho_1 : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is an s -upper-tail risk measure and $\rho_2 : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is an r -lower-tail risk measure. If ρ_1 and ρ_2 are monotone risk measures, for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^n$, we have

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} (\rho_1(\nu) - \rho_2(\nu)) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} \rho_1(\nu) - \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} \rho_2(\nu).$$

Proof. Clearly, we have

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} (\rho_1(\nu) - \rho_2(\nu)) \leq \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} \rho_1(\nu) - \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} \rho_2(\nu).$$

Next, we show the inverse inequality. In light of Theorem 3 of [Liu and Wang \(2021\)](#), we have

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} \rho_1(\nu) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu^{s+})} \rho_1^*(\nu) = \sup_{U_i \sim U[s, 1]} \rho_1^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{U_i}^-(\mu_i) \right),$$

where ρ_1^* is the generator of ρ_1 satisfying $\rho_1(\mu) = \rho_1^*(\mu^{s+})$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$. Next, we show that

$$\inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu)} \rho_2(\nu) = \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\mu^{r-})} \rho_2^*(\nu) = \inf_{V_i \sim U[0, r]} \rho_2^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V_i}^-(\mu_i) \right), \quad (4.9)$$

where ρ_2^* satisfies $\rho_2(\mu) = \rho_2^*(\mu^{r-})$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$. For any (V_1, \dots, V_n) with $V_i \sim U[0, r]$, $i \in [n]$, there exist (V'_1, \dots, V'_n) and U' such that $(V'_1, \dots, V'_n) \stackrel{d}{=} (V_1, \dots, V_n)$ and $U' \sim U[0, 1]$ is independent of (V'_1, \dots, V'_n) , where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ means equality in distribution. Let

$$X_i = q_{V'_i}^-(\mu_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{U' < r\}} + q_{U'}^-(\mu_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{U' > r\}}, \quad i \in [n].$$

Then we have $X_i \sim \mu_i$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n X_i = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V'_i}^-(\mu_i) \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{U' < r\}} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{U'}^-(\mu_i) \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{U' > r\}}.$$

Note that $\text{ess-sup} \sum_{i=1}^n q_{V'_i}^-(\mu_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n q_r^-(\mu_i)$. Hence, we have

$$\rho_2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right) = \rho_2^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V'_i}^-(\mu_i) \right) = \rho_2^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V_i}^-(\mu_i) \right).$$

Using the arbitrariness of V_i , we have

$$\inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \rho_2(\nu) \leq \inf_{V_i \sim U[0, r]} \rho_2^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V_i}^-(\mu_i) \right).$$

For $X_i \sim \mu_i$, $i \in [n]$, let $S = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Let $(V_1, \dots, V_n) \stackrel{d}{=} (U_{X_1}, \dots, U_{X_n})/U_S < r$. Direct computation shows $\mathbb{P}(V_i \leq x) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(U_{X_i} \leq x, U_S < r)}{r} \leq \frac{x}{r} \wedge 1$ for $x \in [0, 1]$. Hence, there exist $V'_i \sim U[0, r]$, $i \in [n]$ such that $V'_i \leq V_i$, $i \in [n]$. Note that the monotonicity of ρ_2 implies the monotonicity of ρ_2^* . Consequently, we have

$$\rho_2(S) = \rho_2^*(S/U_S < r) = \rho_2^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V_i}^-(\mu_i) \right) \geq \rho_2^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V'_i}^-(\mu_i) \right),$$

implying

$$\inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \rho_2(\nu) \geq \inf_{V_i \sim U[0, r]} \rho_2^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V_i}^-(\mu_i) \right).$$

We establish the claim (4.9).

For any (U_1, \dots, U_n) and (V_1, \dots, V_n) with $U_i \sim U[s, 1]$ and $V_i \sim U[0, r]$, $i \in [n]$, there exist (U'_1, \dots, U'_n) , (V'_1, \dots, V'_n) , and U' such that $(U'_1, \dots, U'_n, V'_1, \dots, V'_n) \stackrel{d}{=} (U_1, \dots, U_n, V_1, \dots, V_n)$ and $U' \sim U[0, 1]$ is independent of $(U'_1, \dots, U'_n, V'_1, \dots, V'_n)$. Let

$$X_i = q_{U'_i}^-(\mu_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{U' > s\}} + q_{U'}^-(\mu_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{r < U' \leq s\}} + q_{V'_i}^-(\mu_i) \mathbb{1}_{\{U' \leq r\}}.$$

Clearly, $X_i \sim \mu_i$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n X_i = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{U'_i}^-(\mu_i) \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{U' > s\}} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{U'}^-(\mu_i) \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{r < U' \leq s\}} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V'_i}^-(\mu_i) \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{U' \leq r\}}.$$

Note that $\text{ess-inf} \sum_{i=1}^n q_{U'_i}^-(\mu_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n q_s^-(\mu_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n q_r^+(\mu_i) \geq \text{ess-sup} \sum_{i=1}^n q_{V'_i}^-(\mu_i)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right) - \rho_2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right) &= \rho_1^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{U'_i}^-(\mu_i) \right) - \rho_2^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V'_i}^-(\mu_i) \right) \\ &= \rho_1^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{U_i}^-(\mu_i) \right) - \rho_2^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V_i}^-(\mu_i) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Using the arbitrariness of U_i and V_i , we have

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} (\rho_1(\nu) - \rho_2(\nu)) \geq \sup_{U_i \sim U[s,1]} \rho_1^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{U_i}^-(\mu_i) \right) - \inf_{V_i \sim U[0,r]} \rho_2^* \left(\sum_{i=1}^n q_{V_i}^-(\mu_i) \right),$$

which shows the inverse inequality. We complete the proof. \square

Applying Theorem 4, we obtain the following results.

Corollary 2 (IRD aggregation upper bound). *(i) For either $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $0 < r_1 < s_1 \leq r_2 < s_2 \leq 1$, or $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$ and $0 \leq r_1 < s_1 \leq r_2 < s_2 \leq 1$, we have*

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \text{IRD}_{[r_1, s_1], [r_2, s_2]}(\nu) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} R_{[r_2, s_2]}(\nu) - \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} R_{[r_1, s_1]}(\nu).$$

(ii) For $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $0 < r \leq s < 1$, we have

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} (q_s^+(\nu) - q_r^-(\nu)) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_s^+(\nu) - \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_r^-(\nu).$$

(iii) For $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}^n$ with continuous $q^-(\mu_1), \dots, q^-(\mu_n)$ on $(0, 1)$ and $0 < r < s < 1$, we have

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} (q_s^-(\nu) - q_r^+(\nu)) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} (q_s^+(\nu) - q_r^-(\nu)) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_s^+(\nu) - \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_r^-(\nu).$$

Proof. The claims in (i) and (ii) follow directly from Theorem 4. We next focus on (iii). Note that q_s^- is an $\frac{r+s}{2}$ -upper-tail risk measure and q_r^+ is an $\frac{r+s}{2}$ -lower-tail risk measure. Moreover, both q_s^- and q_r^+ are monotone risk measures. Hence, applying Theorem 4, we have

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} (q_s^-(\nu) - q_r^+(\nu)) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_s^-(\nu) - \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_r^+(\nu).$$

By (ii), we have

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} (q_s^+(\nu) - q_r^-(\nu)) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_s^+(\nu) - \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_r^-(\nu).$$

Moreover, it follows from Lemma 4.4 of [Bernard et al. \(2014\)](#) and the continuity of $q_t^-(\mu_1), \dots, q_t^-(\mu_n)$ on $(0, 1)$ that $\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_t^+(\nu)$ is continuous on $(0, 1)$, which further implies $\inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_t^-(\nu)$ is continuous on $(0, 1)$. Hence, we have

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_t^+(\nu) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_t^-(\nu), \quad \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_t^+(\nu) = \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_t^-(\nu), \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

Consequently,

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} (q_s^-(\nu) - q_r^+(\nu)) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} (q_s^+(\nu) - q_r^-(\nu)).$$

This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 4 suggests that robust risk aggregation of the difference between two tail risk measures with dependence uncertainty equals the difference between two robust tail risk measures if the two regions of the tails do not intersect. This is because the worst-case dependence structure only concerns the dependence in the tail corner of the marginals. In light of Corollary 2, in order to find the (sharp) bound of the robust IRD, it suffices to find the (sharp) bound for robust RVaR, which are given in Theorems 1 and A.1 of [Blanchet et al. \(2025\)](#) and Theorems 2 and 3 of this paper.

Note that (ii) of Corollary 2 shows that for $r \in (0, 1)$, the largest possible difference between $q_r^+(\nu)$ and $q_r^-(\nu)$ has the following expression:

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} (q_r^+(\nu) - q_r^-(\nu)) = \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_r^+(\nu) - \inf_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} q_r^-(\nu),$$

which is strictly positive in most cases, even if all μ_i have decreasing densities.

In light of Theorems 2-3 and Corollary 2 of the current paper and Theorems 1-2 and A.1-A.2 of [Blanchet et al. \(2025\)](#), we immediately obtain the bounds for robust IRD and the difference between two quantiles. In what follows, we only present the sharp bounds and the corresponding conditions on the marginal distributions.

Applying Theorem 3 and Corollary 2 of this paper and Theorems 1 and A.1 of [Blanchet et al. \(2025\)](#), we immediately arrive at the following results.

Proposition 3. *Suppose $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$ and $0 \leq r_1 < s_1 \leq r_2 < s_2 \leq 1$.*

(i) *If each of μ_1, \dots, μ_n admits a decreasing density beyond its r_2 -quantile and an increasing density below its s_1 -quantile, then*

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \text{IRD}_{[r_1, s_1], [r_2, s_2]}(\nu) = \inf_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in (1-r_2)\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq s_2 - r_2}} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1-\beta_i - \beta_0, 1-\beta_i]}(\mu_i) - \sup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in s_1\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq s_1 - r_1}} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\beta_i, \beta_i + \beta_0]}(\mu_i).$$

(ii) *If each of μ_1, \dots, μ_n admits a decreasing density beyond its r_2 -quantile and below its s_1 -quantile respec-*

tively, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \text{IRD}_{[r_1, s_1], [r_2, s_2]}(\nu) &= \inf_{\substack{\beta \in (1-r_2)\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq s_2 - r_2}} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1-\beta_i - \beta_0, 1-\beta_i]}(\mu_i) \\ &\quad - \sup_{\substack{\beta \in s_1\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq s_1 - r_1}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{r_1 + s_1 - \beta_0}{s_1} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r_1 + s_1 - \beta_i - \beta_0, r_1 + s_1 - \beta_i]}(\mu_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{r_1 + s_1 - \beta_0}{s_1} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[0, r_1 + s_1 - \beta_i - \beta_0] \cup [r_1 + s_1 - \beta_i, r_1 + s_1]}(\mu_i) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In light of Theorem 2 and Corollary 2 of this paper and Theorem A.1 of Blanchet et al. (2025), we obtain the following results.

Proposition 4. Suppose $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$ and $0 \leq r_1 < s_1 \leq r_2 < s_2 \leq 1$.

(i) If each of μ_1, \dots, μ_n admits an increasing density beyond its r_2 -quantile and below its s_1 -quantile, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \text{IRD}_{[r_1, s_1], [r_2, s_2]}(\nu) &= \inf_{\substack{\beta \in (1-r_2)\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq 1-s_2}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1-r_2-\beta_0}{s_2-r_2} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r_2+\beta_i, r_2+\beta_i+\beta_0]}(\mu_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1-r_2-\beta_0}{s_2-r_2} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r_2, r_2+\beta_i] \cup [r_2+\beta_i+\beta_0, 1]}(\mu_i) \right\} \\ &\quad - \sup_{\substack{\beta \in s_1\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq s_1-r_1}} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\beta_i, \beta_i+\beta_0]}(\mu_i). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) If each of μ_1, \dots, μ_n admits an increasing density beyond its r_2 -quantile and a decreasing density below its s_1 -quantile, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} \text{IRD}_{[r_1, s_1], [r_2, s_2]}(\nu) &= \inf_{\substack{\beta \in (1-r_2)\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq 1-s_2}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{1-r_2-\beta_0}{s_2-r_2} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r_2+\beta_i, r_2+\beta_i+\beta_0]}(\mu_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1-r_2-\beta_0}{s_2-r_2} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r_2, r_2+\beta_i] \cup [r_2+\beta_i+\beta_0, 1]}(\mu_i) \right\} \\ &\quad - \sup_{\substack{\beta \in s_1\Delta_n \\ \beta_0 \geq s_1-r_1}} \left\{ \left(1 - \frac{r_1 + s_1 - \beta_0}{s_1} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[r_1 + s_1 - \beta_i - \beta_0, r_1 + s_1 - \beta_i]}(\mu_i) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{r_1 + s_1 - \beta_0}{s_1} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[0, r_1 + s_1 - \beta_i - \beta_0] \cup [r_1 + s_1 - \beta_i, r_1 + s_1]}(\mu_i) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining Corollary 2 of this paper with Theorems 2 and A.2 of Blanchet et al. (2025), we obtain the following results.

Proposition 5. For $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $0 < r \leq s < 1$, if each of μ_1, \dots, μ_n has a density that is monotone in the

same direction beyond its s -quantile and also monotone in the same direction below its r -quantile, then we have

$$\sup_{\nu \in \Lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu})} (q_s^+(\nu) - q_r^-(\nu)) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in (1-s)\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1-\beta_i-\beta_0, 1-\beta_i]}(\mu_i) - \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in r\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\beta_i, \beta_i+\beta_0]}(\mu_i).$$

The sharp bounds given in Propositions 3-5 are the upper bounds that are valid for all $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_1^n$ and $0 \leq r_1 < s_1 \leq r_2 < s_2 \leq 1$ or $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}^n$ and $0 < r_1 < s_1 \leq r_2 < s_2 \leq 1$. Note that the sharp bounds in (ii) of Proposition 3 and (i) and (ii) of Proposition 4 are based on the results in Theorems 2 and 3, showing their applications to risk aggregation for other risk measures. It is also worth mentioning that based on Theorem 3, (ii) of Proposition 3 gives a sharp upper bound for IRD if the marginals have decreasing densities on their upper-tail parts and lower-tail parts respectively. This assumption is valid for many practically used distributions in finance and risk management, such as exponential, Pareto, and some gamma and chi distributions.

The extended convolution bounds developed in this section, particularly the sharp bounds, can be applied directly in risk management, including risk evaluation under dependence uncertainty (conservative regulatory capital calculation; e.g., Embrechts et al. (2013) and Eckstein et al. (2020)), portfolio optimization under dependence uncertainty (e.g., Pflug and Pohl (2018), Chen et al. (2022) and Blanchet et al. (2025)) and optimal insurance/reinsurance design under dependence uncertainty (e.g., Fadina et al. (2025)). Other applications in operations research can be seen in the discussion in Section 1.

5 Risk Sharing

In this section, we consider the risk sharing problem among n agents, where their preferences are represented by some risk functionals $\rho_i : \mathcal{X}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i \in [n]$. For a total risk $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$, the set of all possible allocations of X is denoted by

$$\mathbb{A}_n(X) = \left\{ (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in (\mathcal{X}_1)^n : \sum_{i=1}^n X_i = X \right\}.$$

The *inf-convolution* of ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n is defined as

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \rho_i(X) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(X_i) : (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X) \right\}, \quad X \in \mathcal{X}_1.$$

In this section, we use risk functionals R_{I_1}, \dots, R_{I_n} to represent the agents' preferences, where $I_i = [0, \beta_i] \cup [1 - \beta + \beta_i, 1]$ for all $i \in [n]$ with a parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\beta} := (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in (0, 1)^n$ satisfying $\beta = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i$ and $0 < \beta < 1$. We aim to find the *optimal allocation* for the inf-convolution, i.e., finding $(X_1^*, \dots, X_n^*) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X_i^*) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X). \quad (5.1)$$

The central object in our investigation of risk sharing is the form taken by $R_{[0,\alpha]\cup[\gamma,1]}$ with $0 \leq \alpha < \gamma \leq 1$. In the risk sharing context, the motivation of using such preference functionals can be interpreted from the fact that for $\lambda \in (0, 1)$,

$$\lambda \mathbb{E}(X) + (1 - \lambda) R_{I_i}(X) = \int_0^1 q_{1-s}^-(X) dg_{\lambda,i}(s) := \rho_{g_{\lambda,i}}(X), \quad (5.2)$$

where

$$g_{\lambda,i}(s) = \lambda s + \frac{1 - \lambda}{\beta} (s \wedge (\beta - \beta_i)) \mathbf{1}_{[0, 1 - \beta_i]}(s) + \frac{1 - \lambda}{\beta} (s - 1 + \beta) \mathbf{1}_{[1 - \beta_i, 1]}(s) \quad (5.3)$$

is a distortion function. Hence, the above risk functionals $\rho_{g_{\lambda,i}}$ can be viewed as either a Yaari's dual utility or a distortion risk measure; see [Yaari \(1987\)](#) and Chapter 4 of [Föllmer and Schied \(2016\)](#). Note that the distortion function $g_{\lambda,i}$ has the inverse S-shape, exaggerating the probabilities for both large losses and large gains. If X is the possible random loss in future, then the distortion risk measure defined above represents the decision maker's attitude: risk aversion for large losses and risk-seeking for small losses or gains; see [Yaari \(1987\)](#) and [Tversky and Kahneman \(1992\)](#). The distortion risk measures with general distortion functions are also popular in insurance pricing, performance evaluation and other applications; see e.g., [Wang \(1996\)](#), [Wang \(2000\)](#), [Cherny and Madan \(2009\)](#) and [Föllmer and Schied \(2016\)](#). Note that the risk sharing for $\lambda \mathbb{E}(X) + (1 - \lambda) R_{I_i}(X)$ is equivalent to the risk sharing for R_{I_i} in terms of the optimal risk allocations. This motivates us to consider the risk sharing for R_{I_i} .

For monetary risk measures¹, optimality with respect to the sum (referred to as the sum optimality) is equivalent to Pareto optimality (e.g., Proposition 1 of [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#)). Clearly, R_I and $\rho_{g_{\lambda,i}}$ are monetary risk measures. More economic interpretation on the inf-convolution can be found in e.g., Chapter 10 of [Rüschendorf \(2013\)](#).

We next give the definition of comonotonicity and counter-comonotonicity for n random variables to interpret the optimal allocations. We say (X_1, \dots, X_n) are *comonotonic* if there exist increasing functions f_i , $i \in [n]$ such that $X_i = f_i(X_1 + \dots + X_n)$ for all $i \in [n]$; we say (X_1, \dots, X_n) are *counter-comonotonic* if $(-X_i, X_j)$ are comonotonic for any $i \neq j$. We refer to [Dhaene et al. \(2002\)](#) for an overview on comonotonicity, and [Lauzier et al. \(2023\)](#) for the characterization on counter-comonotonicity.

Our result for Problem (5.1) is displayed as follows. In what follows, $x_+ := x \vee 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 5 (Risk sharing for the average quantile). *For $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)^n$ satisfying $\beta \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X) = R_{[0,\beta]}(X). \quad (5.4)$$

¹We say a mapping $\rho : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a monetary risk measure if it satisfies cash invariance, i.e., $\rho(X + c) = \rho(X) + c$ for $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and monotonicity, i.e., $\rho(X) \leq \rho(Y)$ for $X \leq Y$; see e.g., Chapter 4 of [Föllmer and Schied \(2016\)](#).

Moreover, if X is bounded from above, an optimal allocation is given by

$$X_i = (X - t)\mathbb{1}_{A_i} + \frac{X}{n}\mathbb{1}_{A^c} + \frac{t}{n-1}\mathbb{1}_{A \setminus A_i}, \quad i \in [n], \quad (5.5)$$

where $t \geq (q_1^-(X))_+$, $A = \{U_X \leq \beta\}$ and (A_1, \dots, A_n) is a partition of A satisfying $\mathbb{P}(A_i) = \beta_i$ for all $i \in [n]$.

Proof. By Corollary 1, we have

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X) \geq R_{[0, \beta]}(X). \quad (5.6)$$

Hence, it suffices to show the inverse inequality of (5.6). Suppose that X is bounded from above and (X_1, \dots, X_n) is given by (5.5). Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i &= \sum_{i=1}^n (X - t)\mathbb{1}_{A_i} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X}{n}\mathbb{1}_{A^c} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{t}{n-1}\mathbb{1}_{A \setminus A_i} \\ &= (X - t)\mathbb{1}_A + X\mathbb{1}_{A^c} + t\mathbb{1}_A = X, \end{aligned}$$

and thus $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$. We claim that, for each $i \in [n]$,

$$X_i(\omega_1) \leq X_i(\omega_2) \leq X_i(\omega_3) \quad \text{for } \omega_1 \in A_i, \omega_2 \in A^c \text{ and } \omega_3 \in A \setminus A_i \text{ almost surely.} \quad (5.7)$$

Note that $X_i(\omega_2) \leq X_i(\omega_3)$ holds trivially. We next show $X_i(\omega_1) \leq X_i(\omega_2)$. By our construction, we have $X_i(\omega_1) \leq q_\beta^+(X) - t$ and $X_i(\omega_2) \in [q_\beta^+(X)/n, q_1^-(X)/n]$. If $q_\beta^+(X) \leq 0$, then

$$X_i(\omega_1) \leq q_\beta^+(X) - t \leq q_\beta^+(X) \leq \frac{q_\beta^+(X)}{n} \leq X_i(\omega_2).$$

If $q_\beta^+(X) > 0$, then

$$X_i(\omega_1) \leq q_\beta^+(X) - t \leq 0 \leq \frac{q_\beta^+(X)}{n} \leq X_i(\omega_2).$$

Using (5.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{I_i}(X_i) &= \frac{1}{\beta} \mathbb{E} \left[(X - t)\mathbb{1}_{A_i} + \frac{t}{n-1}\mathbb{1}_{A \setminus A_i} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta} \mathbb{E}[X\mathbb{1}_{A_i}] - \frac{\beta_i}{\beta}t + \frac{\beta - \beta_i}{(n-1)\beta}t \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta} \mathbb{E}[X\mathbb{1}_{A_i}] + \frac{\beta - n\beta_i}{(n-1)\beta}t. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\beta} \mathbb{E}[X\mathbb{1}_{A_i}] + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta - n\beta_i}{(n-1)\beta}t = \frac{1}{\beta} \mathbb{E}[X\mathbb{1}_A] = R_{[0, \beta]}(X).$$

Hence, we obtain the inverse inequality of (5.6), implying that (5.4) and (5.5) hold for X being bounded from above.

Next, we consider the case that X is not bounded from above. For $m \geq 1$, let $X^{(m)} = X \wedge m$ and $Z^{(m)} = X - X^{(m)} = (X - m)\mathbb{1}_{\{X > m\}}$. Using the above result, we know that for each $m \geq 1$, there exists $(X_1^{(m)}, \dots, X_n^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X^{(m)})$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X_i^{(m)}) = R_{[0, \beta]}(X^{(m)}) \leq R_{[0, \beta]}(X).$$

Let $Y_1^{(m)} = X_1^{(m)} + Z^{(m)}$. Then we have $(Y_1^{(m)}, X_2^{(m)}, \dots, X_n^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$. In light of Theorem 1 of Embrechts et al. (2018), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & R_{I_1}(X_1^{(m)} + Z^{(m)}) \\ &= \frac{\beta_1}{\beta} R_{[0, \beta_1]}(X_1^{(m)} + Z^{(m)}) + \frac{\beta - \beta_1}{\beta} R_{[1 - \beta + \beta_1, 1]}(X_1^{(m)} + Z^{(m)}) \\ &\leq \frac{\beta_1}{\beta} (R_{[0, \beta_1]}(X_1^{(m)}) + \text{ES}_{\beta_1}(Z^{(m)})) + \frac{\beta - \beta_1}{\beta} (R_{[1 - \beta + \beta_1, 1]}(X_1^{(m)}) + \text{ES}_{\beta - \beta_1}(Z^{(m)})) \\ &= R_{I_1}(X_1^{(m)}) + \frac{\beta_1}{\beta} \text{ES}_{\beta_1}(Z^{(m)}) + \frac{\beta - \beta_1}{\beta} \text{ES}_{\beta - \beta_1}(Z^{(m)}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\frac{\beta_1}{\beta} \text{ES}_{\beta_1}(Z^{(m)}) + \frac{\beta - \beta_1}{\beta} \text{ES}_{\beta - \beta_1}(Z^{(m)}) \leq \frac{2}{\beta} \mathbb{E}[Z^{(m)}] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $m_0 > 1$ such that

$$R_{I_1}(Y_1^{(m)}) \leq R_{I_1}(X_1^{(m)}) + \varepsilon$$

for all $m > m_0$, which implies

$$R_{I_1}(Y_1^{(m)}) + \sum_{i=2}^n R_{I_i}(X_i^{(m)}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X_i^{(m)}) + \varepsilon \leq R_{[0, \beta]}(X) + \varepsilon.$$

By the arbitrariness of ε , we obtain $\square_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X) \leq R_{[0, \beta]}(X)$, which together with (5.6) implies (5.4). The optimal allocation given in (5.5) has been checked in the above proof. This completes the proof. \square

Note that (5.5) is also an optimal allocation if we replace t in (5.5) by a random variable Y satisfying $Y \geq (q_1^-(X))_+$. There are also other types of optimal allocation; see Proposition 6 below. The optimal allocation in (5.5) shows that the risk is equally allocated over A^c and is counter-comonotonic over A , i.e., $(X - t)\mathbb{1}_{A_i} + \frac{t}{n-1}\mathbb{1}_{A \setminus A_i}$, $i \in [n]$ with (A_1, \dots, A_n) being a partition of A satisfying $\mathbb{P}(A_i) = \beta_i$ for all $i \in [n]$ are counter-monotonic restricted to A .

In the literature of risk sharing, the optimal allocation is comonotonic if the risk functionals are law-invariant convex risk measures (see e.g., [Jouini et al. \(2008\)](#) and [Filipović and Svindland \(2008\)](#)), and is counter-comonotonic if the risk functionals are quantile-based risk measures (see e.g., [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#), [Embrechts et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Liu et al. \(2022\)](#)). The optimal allocation in (5.5) exhibits a combination of two types of risk sharing in the literature: comonotonic risk sharing for large losses and counter-comonotonic risk sharing for small losses or large gains, which may be due to the agents' risk attitudes: risk-aversion for large losses and risk-seeking for small losses or large gains.

In Theorem 5, we only give the optimal allocation in (5.5) if X is bounded from above. The existence of the optimal allocation is unknown from Theorem 5 if X is unbounded from above. To answer this question requires the analysis on the dependence structure of the optimal allocations, which is not trivial.

Next, we discuss the dependence structure of (X_1, \dots, X_n, X) with $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$ such that for $\beta \in (0, 1)^n$ satisfying $\beta = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \in (0, 1)$, (5.4) holds.

Proposition 6. *For a random variable $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and a random vector (X_1, \dots, X_n, X) with $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$, (5.4) holds if and only if there exist U_{X_1}, \dots, U_{X_n} and U_X such that*

$$\{U_X \in [0, \beta]\} = \{U_{X_i} \in I_i\}, \quad i \in [n]. \quad (5.8)$$

Moreover, (5.8) implies that one of the following two statements holds:

- (i) $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \{U_{X_i} \in [0, \beta_i]\} = \{U_X \in [0, \beta]\};$
- (ii) The set $\{U_X \in [0, \beta]\} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{U_{X_i} \in [0, \beta_i]\}$ has a positive probability, which is denoted by θ . Meanwhile, random variables X_1, \dots, X_n and X are all constants on the set $\{U_X \in [\beta - \theta, 1]\}$, which actually equals the set $\{U_{X_i} \in [\beta_i, 1 - \beta + \beta_i + \theta]\}$ for all $i \in [n]$.

Proof. Obviously, the equation (5.8) is a sufficient condition for (5.4). We next show the only if part. Let $\beta_0 = 1 - \beta$. Then we have $\sum_{i=0}^n \beta_i = 1$. Note that (5.4) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\beta_i, 1 - \beta + \beta_i]}(X_i) = R_{[\beta, 1]}(X),$$

which is further equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1 - \beta_i - \beta_0, 1 - \beta_i]}(-X_i) = R_{[0, \beta_0]}(-X).$$

Let $Y_i = -X_i$, $i \in [n]$ and $Y = -X$. For $i \in [n]$, define random variables

$$T_i := Y_i \mathbf{1}_{\{U_{Y_i} \leq 1 - \beta_i\}} + m \mathbf{1}_{\{U_{Y_i} > 1 - \beta_i\}},$$

where $m \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $m < \bigwedge_{i=1}^n q_{1-\beta_i-\beta_0}^-(Y_i)$. By the construction of T_i , one could see that for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n T_i > s\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i > s\right\} \cap (\cup_{i=1}^n \{U_{Y_i} > 1 - \beta_i\})^c\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i > s\right) - \mathbb{P}(\cup_{i=1}^n \{U_{Y_i} > 1 - \beta_i\}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i > s\right) - 1 + \beta_0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$q_u^- \left(\sum_{i=1}^n T_i \right) \geq q_{u-1+\beta_0}^- \left(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \right), \quad \forall u \in (1 - \beta_0, 1].$$

Then, combined with the subadditivity of ES, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1-\beta_i-\beta_0, 1-\beta_i]}(Y_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{ES}_{\beta_0}(T_i) \geq \text{ES}_{\beta_0} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n T_i \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta_0} \int_{1-\beta_0}^1 q_u^- \left(\sum_{i=1}^n T_i \right) du \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\beta_0} \int_{1-\beta_0}^1 q_{u-1+\beta_0}^- (Y) du. \end{aligned}$$

Direct computation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\beta_0} \int_{1-\beta_0}^1 q_{u-1+\beta_0}^- (Y) du &= \frac{1}{\beta_0} \int_0^{\beta_0} q_u^- (Y) du \\ &= \text{LES}_{\beta_0} (Y) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[1-\beta_i-\beta_0, 1-\beta_i]}(Y_i), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\sum_{i=1}^n \text{ES}_{\beta_0}(T_i) = \text{ES}_{\beta_0}(\sum_{i=1}^n T_i) = \text{LES}_{\beta_0}(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i)$. By $\sum_{i=1}^n \text{ES}_{\beta_0}(T_i) = \text{ES}_{\beta_0}(\sum_{i=1}^n T_i)$ and by Theorem 5 of [Wang and Zitikis \(2021\)](#), there exist U_{T_i} , $i \in [n]$ and $U_{\sum_{i=1}^n T_i}$ such that $\{U_{T_i} \in [1-\beta_0, 1]\} = \{U_{\sum_{i=1}^n T_i} \in [1-\beta_0, 1]\}$ for all $i \in [n]$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ES}_{\beta_0} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n T_i \right) &= \frac{1}{\beta_0} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n T_i \mathbb{1}_{\{U_{T_i} \in [1-\beta_0, 1]\}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta_0} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \mathbb{1}_{\{U_{T_i} \in [1-\beta_0, 1]\}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta_0} \mathbb{E}(Y \mathbb{1}_{\{U_{T_i} \in [1-\beta_0, 1]\}}) = \text{LES}_{\beta_0}(Y). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that there exists U_Y such that $\{U_Y \in [0, \beta_0]\} = \{U_{T_i} \in [1 - \beta_0, 1]\} = \{U_{Y_i} \in [1 - \beta_i - \beta_0, 1 - \beta_i]\}$ for all $i \in [n]$. Note that $U_X = 1 - U_Y$ and $U_{X_i} = 1 - U_{Y_i}$. Hence, we have $\{U_X \in [1 - \beta_0, 1]\} = \{U_{X_i} \in [\beta_i, \beta_i + \beta_0]\}$ for all $i \in [n]$, which is equivalent to (5.8). We establish the first claim.

Note that (5.8) implies $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \{U_{X_i} \in [0, \beta_i]\} \subseteq \{U_X \in [0, \beta]\}$ and $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \{U_{X_i} \in [\beta_i + \beta_0, 1]\} \subseteq \{U_X \in [0, \beta]\}$. Thus, it would be either case (i) or (ii). For the latter case, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(\{U_X \in [0, \beta]\} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{U_{X_i} \in [0, \beta_i]\}) > 0$, (5.8) implies

$$\{U_X \in [0, \beta]\} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{U_{X_i} \in [0, \beta_i]\} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \{U_{X_i} \in [\beta_i + \beta_0, 1]\}. \quad (5.9)$$

Then, for any $\omega \in \{U_X \in [0, \beta]\} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{U_{X_i} \in [0, \beta_i]\}$ and any $\omega' \in \{U_X \in [\beta, 1]\}$, it follows from (5.8) and (5.9) that $X_i(\omega) \geq X_i(\omega')$ holds for all $i \in [n]$. On the other hand, using (5.9), one has that $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i(\omega) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n X_i(\omega')$. Thus all the above inequalities hold as equalities. By the arbitrariness of ω and ω' , we conclude that random variables X_1, \dots, X_n and X are all constants on $\{U_X \in [\beta, 1]\} \cup (\{U_X \in [0, \beta]\} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{U_{X_i} \in [0, \beta_i]\})$. Hence, there exist U_{X_1}, \dots, U_{X_n} and U_X such that case (ii) holds. \square

In the following Theorem 6, we show that the optimal allocation for (5.4) does not exist if X is not bounded from above, while we find a sequence of allocations $\{(X_1^{(m)}, \dots, X_n^{(m)})\}_{m \geq 1}$ such that the sum risk exposure converges to the lower bound $R_{[0, \beta]}(X)$. For $m \geq 1$, let

$$X_i^{(m)} = (X - m) \mathbf{1}_{A_i} + \frac{X}{n} \mathbf{1}_{A^c} + \frac{m}{n-1} \mathbf{1}_{A \setminus A_i}, \quad i \in [n], \quad (5.10)$$

where $A = \{U_X \leq \beta\}$ and (A_1, \dots, A_n) being a partition of A satisfying $\mathbb{P}(A_i) = \beta_i$ for all $i \in [n]$.

Theorem 6 (Non-existence of the optimal allocation). *For $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)^n$ satisfying $\beta \in (0, 1)$, if X is not bounded from above, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X_i) > R_{[0, \beta]}(X)$$

holds for all $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$. Moreover, the risk allocation $(X_1^{(m)}, \dots, X_n^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$, with $m \geq 1$, defined in (5.10) satisfies

$$\sum_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X_i^{(m)}) = R_{[0, \beta]}(X) + \frac{1}{\beta} \mathbb{E}((X - a_m) \mathbf{1}_{\{X > a_m\}})$$

for $m \geq (q_\beta^-(X) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^n q_{1-\beta+\beta_i}(X))_+$ with $a_m = \frac{nm}{n-1}$, and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X_i^{(m)}) = R_{[0, \beta]}(X).$$

Proof. Suppose that the total risk X is not bounded from above and that the equality (5.4) holds for a risk allocation $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$. Then, by Proposition 6, with $\beta_0 = 1 - \beta$, there exist U_{X_i} , $i \in [n]$ and U_X

such that

$$\{U_X \in [0, \beta]\} = \{U_{X_i} \in I_i\}, \quad i \in [n],$$

which is equivalent to

$$\{U_X \in [\beta, 1]\} = \{U_{X_i} \in [\beta_i, 1 - \beta + \beta_i]\}, \quad i \in [n].$$

Then we have

$$\infty = \text{ess-sup} X \mathbb{1}_{\{U_X \in [\beta, 1]\}} = \text{ess-sup} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \mathbb{1}_{\{U_{X_i} \in [\beta_i, 1 - \beta + \beta_i]\}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n q_{1 - \beta + \beta_i}^-(X_i) < \infty,$$

which leads to a contradiction. Hence, there is no solution for (5.4) if X is unbounded from above.

Next, we focus on the second statment. For $m \geq (q_{\beta}^-(X) \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^n q_{1 - \beta + \beta_i}^-(X))_+$, direct computation shows

$$R_{I_i}(X_i^{(m)}) = \frac{1}{\beta} \mathbb{E} \left((X - m) \mathbb{1}_{A_i} + \left(\frac{X}{n} \vee \frac{m}{n-1} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{U_X > 1 - \beta + \beta_i\}} \right), \quad i \in [n].$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X_i^{(m)}) &= \frac{1}{\beta} \mathbb{E} \left((X - m) \mathbb{1}_A + \left(\frac{X}{n} \vee \frac{m}{n-1} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{U_X > 1 - \beta + \beta_i\}} \right) \\ &= R_{[0, \beta]}(X) - m + \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{X}{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X > a_m\}} \right) + \frac{m}{n-1} (\beta - \beta_i - \mathbb{P}(X > a_m)) \right) \\ &= R_{[0, \beta]}(X) + \frac{1}{\beta} \mathbb{E} (X \mathbb{1}_{\{X > a_m\}}) - \frac{a_m}{\beta} \mathbb{P}(X > a_m), \end{aligned}$$

where $a_m = \frac{nm}{n-1}$. Note that $a_m \mathbb{P}(X > a_m) \leq \mathbb{E}(X \mathbb{1}_{\{X > a_m\}}) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X_i^{(m)}) = R_{[0, \beta]}(X).$$

This completes the proofs. □

In light of Theorems 5 and 6, we obtain the following results on risk sharing for distortion risk measures with special inverse S-shaped distortion functions.

Proposition 7. *For $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)^n$ satisfying $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n \rho_{g_{\lambda, i}}(X) = \lambda \mathbb{E}(X) + (1 - \lambda) R_{[0, \beta]}(X).$$

Moreover, if X is bounded from above, an optimal allocation is given by (5.5); if X is not bounded from above, the optimal allocation does not exist and the risk allocation $(X_1^{(m)}, \dots, X_n^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$, with $m \geq 1$, defined

in (5.10) satisfies

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{g_{\lambda,i}} \left(X_i^{(m)} \right) = \square_{i=1}^n \rho_{g_{\lambda,i}}(X).$$

Proposition 7 shows that the Pareto-optimal risk allocation for $\rho_{g_{\lambda,i}}$ is the combination of comonotonic risk sharing for large losses and counter-monotonic risk sharing for small losses or large gains, consistent with the risk preference represented by $\rho_{g_{\lambda,i}}$: risk aversion for large losses and risk-seeking for small losses or large gains. Finding the optimal risk sharing for distortion risk measures with inverse S-shaped distortion functions is a very challenging problem due to the non-convexity of the corresponding distortion risk measures. Although Proposition 7 only solves a special case, to the best of our knowledge, it is the first result offering the optimal allocations for the non-constrained risk sharing with this class of distortion risk measures with its distortion functions exaggerating the probabilities of large losses and large gains simultaneously. This can be seen from the novelty of the optimal allocations and the condition for the existence of the optimal allocations. Proposition 7 suggests that the optimal allocation exists if and only if X is bounded from above. However, the risk sharing for distortion risk measures with general inverse S-shaped distortion functions is still unknown and will be studied in future.

Note that our result in Theorem 5 solves the dual problem of the one in Theorem 2 of Embrechts et al. (2018). We observe

$$\begin{aligned} \square_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X) &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X_i) : (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X) \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}(X_i)}{\beta} - \frac{1-\beta}{\beta} R_{[\beta_i, 1-\beta+\beta_i]}(X_i) \right) : (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X) \right\} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}(X)}{\beta} - \frac{1-\beta}{\beta} \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\beta_i, 1-\beta+\beta_i]}(X_i) : (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the optimal allocation for $\square_{i=1}^n R_{I_i}(X)$ is the worst allocation for $\sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\beta_i, 1-\beta+\beta_i]}(X_i)$ with $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X)$. Using Theorems 5 and 6, we have the following conclusion.

Proposition 8. *For $X \in \mathcal{X}_1$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)^n$ satisfying $\beta \in (0, 1)$, we have*

$$\sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n R_{[\beta_i, 1-\beta+\beta_i]}(X_i) : (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{A}_n(X) \right\} = \frac{\mathbb{E}(X) - \beta R_{[0, \beta]}(X)}{1 - \beta} = R_{[\beta, 1]}(X).$$

Moreover, if X is bounded from above, an allocation given by (5.5) achieves the supremum; if X is not bounded from above, no allocation can achieve the supremum.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we obtain a new RVaR inequality, differing from the one in [Embrechts et al. \(2018\)](#). Applying this new inequality, we obtain the upper and lower bounds for robust RVaR by assuming fixed marginal distributions and unknown dependence structure, which is sharp if the marginal distributions have increasing densities on their upper-tail parts for the upper bounds and if the marginal distributions have decreasing densities on their upper-tail part for the lower bounds. Those bounds complement the results and fill in some gaps of [Blanchet et al. \(2025\)](#). Moreover, we obtain the sharp upper bounds for the difference between two RVaR and the difference between two quantiles, extending the sharp bounds on RVaR and quantiles to the corresponding variability risk measures. The application of those extended convolution bounds in portfolio optimization and optimal insurance and reinsurance is left for future investigation. Finally, applying the new inequality, we obtain the Pareto-optimal risk allocation for some non-convex averaged quantiles, which corresponds to the Pareto-optimal risk allocation for distortion risk measures with special inverse S-shaped distortion functions exaggerating both the probability of large losses and the probability of large gains. By analyzing the dependence structure of the optimal risk allocation, we show that the optimal allocation does not exist if the risk is unbounded from above. However, we offer a sequence of allocations whose aggregate risk exposure converges to the inf-convolution. The Pareto-optimal risk sharing for distortion risk measures with general inverse S-shaped distortion functions is still an open problem due to the non-convexity nature of the distortion risk measures.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to Ruodu Wang and members of the research group on financial mathematics and risk management at The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen for their useful feedback and conversations. Y. Liu acknowledges financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12401624), The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Shenzhen) University Development Fund (Grant No. UDF01003336) and Shenzhen Science and Technology Program (Grant No. RCBS20231211090814028, JCYJ20250604141203005, 2025TC0010) and is partly supported by the Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Mathematical Foundations for Artificial Intelligence (Grant No. 2023B1212010001).

References

- Altschuler, J. M. and Boix-Adserà, E. (2021). Hardness results for multimarginal optimal transport problems. *Discrete Optimization*, **42**, 100669.
- Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J.-M. and Heath, D. (1999). Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance*, **9**(3), 203–228.

- Barrieu, P. and El Karoui, N. (2005). Inf-convolution of risk measures and optimal risk transfer. *Finance and Stochastics*, **9**, 269–298.
- Bartl, D., Kupper, M., Lux, T. and Papapantoleon, A. (2022). Marginal and dependence uncertainty: bounds, optimal transport, and sharpness. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, **60**(1), 410–434.
- Bellini, F., Fadina, T., Wang, R. and Wei, Y. (2022). Parametric measures of variability induced by risk measures. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **106**, 270–284.
- Bernard, C., Jiang, X. and Wang, R. (2014). Risk aggregation with dependence uncertainty. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **54**, 93–108.
- Bertsimas, D., Brown, D. B. and Caramanis, C. (2011). Theory and applications of robust optimization. *SIAM Review*, **53**(3), 464–501.
- Blanchet, J., Lam, H., Liu, Y. and Wang, R. (2025). Convolution bounds on quantile aggregation. *Operations Research*, **73**(5), 2761–2781.
- Boerma, J., Tsyvinski, A., Wang, R. and Zhang, Z. (2023). Composite sorting. *arXiv*: 2303.06701.
- Boudt, K., Jakobsons, E., and Vanduffel, S. (2018). Block rearranging elements within matrix columns to minimize the variability of the row sums. *JOR - A Quarterly Journal of Operations Research*, **16**, 31–50.
- Borch, K. (1962). Equilibrium in a reinsurance market. *Econometrica*, **30**(3), 424–444.
- Chen, Y., Liu, P., Liu, Y. and Wang, R. (2022). Ordering and inequalities for mixtures on risk aggregation. *Mathematical Finance*, **32**, 421–451.
- Cherny, A. S. and Madan, D. (2009). New measures for performance evaluation. *Review of Financial Studies*, **22**(7), 2571–2606.
- Cont, R., Deguest, R. and Scandolo, G. (2010). Robustness and sensitivity analysis of risk measurement procedures. *Quantitative Finance*, **10**, 593–606.
- Dall’Aglia, G. (1956). Sugli estremi dei momenti delle funzioni di ripartizione doppia. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Serie 3*, **10**, 35–74.
- Delbaen, F. (2012). Monetary Utility Functions. Osaka University Press, Osaka.
- Dhaene, J. and Denuit, M. (1999). The safest dependence structure among risks. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **25**(1), 11–21.
- Dhaene, J., Denuit, M., Goovaerts, M. J., Kaas, R. and Vyncke, D. (2002). The concept of comonotonicity in actuarial science and finance: Theory. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **31**(1), 3–33.
- Eckstein, S., Kupper, M. and Pohl, M. (2020). Robust risk aggregation with neural networks. *Mathematical Finance*, **30**(4), 1229–1272.
- 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.
- Embrechts, P. and Puccetti, G. (2006). Bounds for functions of dependent risks. *Finance and Stochastics*, **10**, 341–352.
- Embrechts, P., Puccetti, G. and Rüschendorf, L. (2013). Model uncertainty and VaR aggregation. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, **37**(8), 2750–2764.

- Embrechts, P., Wang, B. and Wang, R. (2015). Aggregation-robustness and model uncertainty of regulatory risk measures. *Finance and Stochastics*, **19**(4), 763–790.
- Fadina, T., Hu, J., Liu, P., and Xia, Y. (2025). Optimal reinsurance with multivariate risks and dependence uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, **321**(1), 231–242.
- 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.
- Fréchet, M. (1951). Sur les tableaux de corrélation dont les marges sont données. *Annales de l'Université de Lyon. Sect. A*, **14**, 53–77.
- Frittelli, M. and Rosazza Gianin, E. (2005). Law-invariant convex risk measures. *Advances in Mathematical Economics*, **7**, 33–46.
- Hoeffding, V. (1940). Masstabinvariante Korrelationstheorie. *Schriften des Mathematischen Instituts und des Instituts für Angewandte Mathematik der Universität Berlin*, **5**, 181–233.
- Hsu, W.-L. (1984). Approximation algorithms for the assembly line crew scheduling problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **9**(3), 376–383.
- Jakobsons, E., Han, X. and Wang, R. (2016). General convex order on risk aggregation. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*, **2016**(8), 713–740.
- Jouini, E., Schachermayer, W. and Touzi, N. (2008). Optimal risk sharing for law invariant monetary utility functions. *Mathematical Finance*, **18**(2), 269–292.
- Koike, T., Lin, L. and Wang, R. (2024). Joint mixability and notions of negative dependence. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **49**(4), 2786–2802.
- Kremer, M. (1993). The O-Ring theory of economic development. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **108**(3), 551–575.
- Lauzier, J.G., Lin, L. and Wang, R. (2023). Pairwise counter-monotonicity. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **111**, 279–287.
- Lauzier, J.G., Lin, L. and Wang, R. (2025). Risk sharing, measuring variability, and distortion riskmetrics. *Mathematical Finance*, forthcoming.
- Liebrich, F.B. (2024). Risk sharing under heterogeneous beliefs without convexity. *Finance and Stochastics*, **28**, 999–1033.
- 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, F. and Wang, R. (2021). A theory for measures of tail risk. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **46**(3), 1109–1128.
- Liu, P. (2025). Risk sharing with Lambda value at risk. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **50**(1), 313–333.
- 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.
- Nutz, M. and Wang, R. (2022). The directional optimal transport. *Annals of Applied Probability*, **32**(2), 1400–1420.
- Pflug, G. C. and Pohl, M. (2018). A review on ambiguity in stochastic portfolio optimization. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, **26**, 733–757.
- Puccetti, G. and Rüschendorf L. (2012). Computation of sharp bounds on the distribution of a function of dependent risks. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, **236**(7), 1833–1840.
- Puccetti, G. and Wang R. (2015). Extremal dependence concepts. *Statistical Science*, **30**(4), 485–517.
- 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. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- Shapiro, A., Dentcheva, D. and Ruszczyński, A. (2021). *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- Tversky, A. and Kahneman, E. (1992). Advances in prospect theory: cumulative representation of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, **5**, 297–323.
- Vovk, V., Wang, B. and Wang, R. (2022). Admissible ways of merging p-values under arbitrary dependence. *Annals of Statistics*, **50**(1), 351–375.
- 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, R., Peng, L. and Yang, J. (2013). Bounds for the sum of dependent risks and worst Value-at-Risk with monotone marginal densities. *Finance and Stochastics*, **17**(2), 395–417.
- Wang, B. and Wang, R. (2016). Joint mixability. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **41**(3), 808–826.
- Wang, R. and Zitikis, R. (2020). An axiomatic foundation for the Expected Shortfall. *Management Science*, **67**(3), 1413–1429.
- Weber, S. (2018). Solvency II, or how to sweep the downside risk under the carpet. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **82**, 191–200.
- Yaari, M. E. (1987). The dual theory of choice under risk. *Econometrica*, **55**(1), 95–115.