

Risk–insurance parity

Benjamin Côté*

Ruodu Wang[†]

Qinyu Wu[‡]

December 11, 2025

Abstract

Risk aversion and insurance are two prominent and interconnected concepts in economics and finance. To explore their fundamental connection, we introduce risk–insurance parity, which associates various classes of insurance contracts with different notions of risk aversion. We show that the classic notions—both weak and strong—of risk aversion can be characterized by propensity to different classes of insurance contracts, generalizing recent results on propensity to full, proportional, and deductible-limit contracts in the literature. We obtain full characterizations of the classes of insurance indemnity functions that correspond to weak and strong risk aversion. Risk–insurance parity allows us to define two new notions of risk aversion, between weak and strong, characterized by insurance propensity to deductible-only and limit-only contracts respectively.

Keywords: Risk aversion, preference relations, insurance propensity, proportional insurance, deductible-limit insurance.

1 Introduction

Weak risk aversion, introduced by [Arrow \(1963\)](#) and [Pratt \(1964\)](#), and strong risk aversion, introduced by [Rothschild and Stiglitz \(1970\)](#), are classical concepts at the cornerstone of the theory of choice under risk. While both concepts coincide in the commonly employed expected utility (EU) decision theory framework, they are not always equivalent, for example in the dual utility model of [Yaari \(1987\)](#) and the more general rank-dependent utility (RDU) model; see [Cohen \(1995\)](#) for a summary. Properly understanding risk aversion and its implications is of high relevance to

*Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Waterloo, Canada. b3cote@uwaterloo.ca

[†]Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Waterloo, Canada. wang@uwaterloo.ca

[‡]Center for Algorithms, Data, and Market Design at Yale (CADMY), Yale University, CT. qinyu.wu@yale.edu

economics, as it is the compulsion propelling an agent facing risk to buy insurance. A risk-averse agent will indeed, by definition, seek to reduce their risk and prefer actions contributing to this. Such actions include the purchase of insurance, which by design transfers (a part of) uncertainty to the insurer. Risk aversion thus underlies the very purpose of insurance.

To be precise, however, both definitions of risk aversion suppose individuals are compelled to buy insurance *when sold at the pure premium*. In practice, insurance is never sold at actuarially fair premium. To infer risk aversion of an agent from behaviors in an insurance context is therefore not as straightforward as it may seem. An individual who accepts to pay a higher premium would definitely be categorized as being risk averse, but one who refuses to buy insurance may also be risk averse; only, the overpriced premium occults their behavior towards fairly priced insurance. To examine whether an individual participates in an insurance contract or abstains is thus not a reliable approach in investigating their risk aversion.

Recently, [Maccheroni et al. \(2025\)](#) took the approach of examining whether an individual prefers to participate in an insurance contract over any other equally distributed contracts; they qualify such an attitude as being *insurance propense*. Proceeding as such thus dispels considerations on the fairness of premium and singles out the risk-reduction preferences. One of their results indicates that weak risk aversion is equivalent to insurance propensity to full-indemnity contracts, observed for every risk and every premium. Note the equivalence: Insurance propensity is no longer simply a behavioral consequence of risk aversion, it entirely characterizes it. [Maccheroni et al. \(2025\)](#) also proved that strong risk aversion is equivalent to insurance propensity to all proportional-indemnity contracts, when observed for all risks, all proportions and all premiums. Strong risk aversion is also equivalent to insurance propensity to all deductible-limit contracts, when observed for all risks, all deductibles, all limits and all premiums.

Proportional-indemnity and deductible-limit contracts are quite different types of contracts, and it is perhaps surprising that insurance propensity to either is equivalent. This begs the question as to whether there are other sets of contracts under which insurance propensity is equivalent to weak or strong risk aversion. One also wonders whether the multiple layers of exhaustiveness (risks, premiums, proportions, deductibles, limits) are necessary for the risk aversion behaviors to emerge, as such exhaustiveness makes experimental studies on the elicitation of preferences much more difficult or even infeasible.

In Section 4, we answer both questions by characterizing the sets of contracts with respect to which insurance propensity is equivalent to risk aversion. We call this property *risk–insurance parity*: *first* risk–insurance parity when the underlying concept of risk is weak risk aversion, *second*

risk–insurance parity when it is strong risk aversion. We work with a general framework for risk preferences, with no assumptions on the preferences other than a form of continuity and choice under risk. Risk–insurance parity is defined to hold for *all* continuous risk preferences. We show that full-indemnity contracts are the only types of contracts satisfying first risk–insurance parity, but the exhaustiveness of the premiums can be substantially relaxed. We also provide a complete characterization of contract sets satisfying second risk–insurance parity. This characterization complements the results of [Maccheroni et al. \(2025\)](#) by showing that the scope of contracts required to characterize risk aversion can be narrowed substantially, notably by fixing a premium or a premium principle. Our narrowing results offer a deeper understanding of how insurance and risk aversion are connected, and they bring the results of [Maccheroni et al. \(2025\)](#) closer to the behavioral situation that is observed in real life, where a policyholder is only presented one premium (and not *all* premiums simultaneously) when purchasing insurance.

Beyond providing another perspective on classical concepts of risk aversion, risk–insurance parity offers a way to define new notions of risk aversion, by letting them arise from insurance propensity to specific classes of contracts. In [Section 5](#), we proceed to investigate insurance propensity to deductible-only and limit-only contracts. Each leads us, through risk–insurance parity, to define new concepts of risk aversion: respectively, right-handle risk aversion and left-handle risk aversion. These new concepts fall strictly between weak and strong risk aversion, and they are quite customary compared to these classical notions: Both have an interpretation in terms of mean-preserving spreads and, in the dual utility model, can be characterized by a criterion on the shape of the weighting function.

The paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we collect some preliminaries on the risk preferences. [Section 3](#) introduces insurance contracts and insurance propensity. [Sections 4](#) and [5](#) contain our main results mentioned above. [Section 6](#) provides some additional technical remarks; for instance, we show that the notion of monotone risk aversion of [Quiggin \(1992\)](#) is not equivalent to insurance propensity for any Lipschitz-continuous contract set. [Section 7](#) concludes.

2 Preliminaries on the theory of choice under risk

We fix an atomless probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Let \mathcal{S} be the set of all simple random variables.¹ We will refer to $X \in \mathcal{S}$ as a risk random variable, where positive values represent actual losses and negative values represent surpluses. Its distribution is given by the pushforward measure $\mathbb{P} \circ X^{-1}$. We use $\mathbb{E}[X]$ to represent the expectation of X under \mathbb{P} . For simplicity, we regard any real number

¹A random variable is simple if it only takes a finite number of values.

$x \in \mathbb{R}$ as a constant (or degenerate) random variable. Let $\mathbb{1}_A$ denote the indicator function of a set A , that is, $\mathbb{1}_A(\omega) = 1$ if $\omega \in A$ and $\mathbb{1}_A(\omega) = 0$ otherwise. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, we use the notation: $x \wedge y = \min\{x, y\}$, $x \vee y = \max\{x, y\}$, and $x_+ = \max\{x, 0\}$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$, and $[0] = \emptyset$. Throughout, terms such as “increasing” and “convex” are always understood in the non-strict sense.

Definition 1 (Risk preference). A binary relation \succsim on \mathcal{S} is *law invariant* if for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ with $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$, both $X \succsim Y$ and $Y \succsim X$ hold, where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ signifies equality in distribution. A *risk preference* is a law-invariant and transitive binary relation on \mathcal{S} .

Law invariance is also called probabilistic sophistication (Machina and Schmeidler, 1992). In what follows, \succsim will always be a risk preference. We say a risk preference is *continuous* if it is continuous under bounded convergence. Specifically, a sequence $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ is said to converge to $X \in \mathcal{S}$ in terms of bounded convergence, denoted by $X_n \xrightarrow{B} X$, if $X_n \rightarrow X$ pointwise and $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|X_n\| < \infty$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the L^∞ norm. A preference \succsim is continuous if for any such sequences $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in \mathcal{S} with $X_n \xrightarrow{B} X$ and $Y_n \xrightarrow{B} Y$, it holds that

$$X_n \succsim Y_n \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \quad \implies \quad X \succsim Y. \quad (1)$$

To select bounded convergence as mode of convergence for the continuity of risk preferences is upheld by Chew and Mao (1995), notably. For complete risk preferences,² continuity ensures the existence of a continuous representing function (Herden, 1989, Proposition 3.4) and is equivalent to the sometimes preferred, generally weaker, assumption of hemicontinuity (Ward, 1954, Lemma 3). Continuity plays a part in being able to characterize risk aversion wholly from the insurance propensity to a restricted set of contracts. In what follows, we always assume risk preferences are continuous; we continue to state it in formal results.

Besides continuity, we do not make any further assumption on risk preferences; and thus, we remain in arguably a very general framework for choice under risk. In particular, we do not assume risk preferences are complete, meaning a decision-maker could be indecisive between two risks. This is the case, e.g., for mean-variance preferences (Markowitz, 1952) and other incomplete decision models (e.g., Dubra et al., 2004).

Next, we present two classical notions of risk aversion. Below is the definition of weak risk aversion, introduced by Arrow (1963) and Pratt (1964).

²A risk preference is complete if for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, at least one of $X \succsim Y$ and $Y \succsim X$ holds.

Definition 2 (Weak risk aversion). A risk preference \succsim exhibits *weak risk aversion* if $\mathbb{E}[X] \succsim X$ for all $X \in \mathcal{S}$.

Weak risk aversion means preferring sure payoffs over uncertain payoffs with the same expected value. One may however argue that riskiness is more complex a notion than a certainty–uncertainty dichotomy, and thus the definition of risk aversion should account for such nuances. This leads to the concept of strong risk aversion, as put forth in the seminal paper by [Rothschild and Stiglitz \(1970\)](#). The definition of strong risk aversion is given in Definition 3 below; it requires to introduce the convex order first.

The convex order \leq_{cx} is a partial order on \mathcal{S} defined by stating that

$$X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y \text{ if } \mathbb{E}[\psi(X)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\psi(Y)] \text{ holds for every convex function } \psi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}. \quad (2)$$

One may consult [Müller and Stoyan \(2002, Chapter 1\)](#) and [Shaked and Shanthikumar \(2007, Chapter 3\)](#) for an overview of the convex order and its properties. Note that we treat X and Y as losses instead of surpluses, and hence a larger element in convex order means higher risk. Up to a sign flip, convex order (for losses) is economically equivalent to concave order (for gains) in the sense that $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$ if and only if $-Y \leq_{\text{cv}} -X$ (and equivalently $Y \leq_{\text{cv}} X$), where \leq_{cv} is defined via (2) by changing convex functions to concave functions. Concave order is closely related to the concept of mean-preserving spread introduced by [Rothschild and Stiglitz \(1970\)](#) in the context of increasing risk for gain distributions.

Definition 3 (Strong risk aversion). A risk preference exhibits *strong risk aversion* if, for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$, we have $X \succsim Y$.

As signified by their names, strong risk aversion implies weak risk aversion; this is evident from their respective definitions, since $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq_{\text{cx}} X$ for any $X \in \mathcal{S}$.

3 Contracts and insurance propensity

We present the insurance setting upon which our results on insurance propensity are designed. We introduce indemnity functions, premiums and premium principles, building blocks of (insurance) contracts. A formal definition of insurance propensity closes the section, along with some additional comments on the setting assumptions.

3.1 Indemnity functions

An indemnity function is a nonconstant increasing function $I : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and represents the amount paid to the agent after risks have concretized. The random variable $I(X)$ is understood as $\omega \mapsto I(X(\omega))$. The elementary requirement for I to be increasing ensures that indemnities are not reduced as losses aggravate. Although typical insurance losses are nonnegative, we allow I to be defined on and take values in \mathbb{R} , which should be seen as a natural extension from the practical range. Similarly, all our parameters, including the premiums, the deductibles, and the limits, are allowed to take values in \mathbb{R} . The reason of this extension is that concepts of risk aversion are defined for both positive and negative random variables, and therefore we cannot only restrict to positive losses; this is consistent with the setting of [Maccheroni et al. \(2025\)](#). Conceptually, such an extension does not create troubles, as we work with bounded random variables, and we can shift negative values to positive values by adding a constant background wealth. To be precise, when the risk random variable X takes negative values, we should interpret it as $X = Z - w$, where $Z \geq 0$ is the actual loss, and w is the constant surplus of the decision maker. The payment $I(X)$ should then be interpreted also as an indemnity on Z with surplus w . This interpretation fits well with our study, as all notions of risk aversion that we consider are invariant under translation, allowing us to make constant shifts.

Some examples of indemnity functions are presented below.

1. **Full.** When I is the identity function, $I(x) = x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we call I a *full-indemnity function*; it pays the totality of a loss.
2. **Proportional.** For $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we call $I : x \mapsto \alpha x$ a *proportional-indemnity function* and α is called the coinsurance proportion. Proportional indemnities are common for health insurance policies, which often let insureds pay a fraction of their expenses to deter overuse of health services.
3. **Deductible.** The function $I : x \mapsto (x - d)_+$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, with $d \in \mathbb{R}$, is called a *deductible-indemnity function*, with d being the deductible. Deductibles are common for insurance policies as they allow insurers to screen out small claims and avoid the operational cost of processing these.
4. **Limit.** The function $I : x \mapsto x \wedge \lambda$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, is referred to as a *limit-indemnity function*, with λ being the limit. Limits are included in insurance policies to protect the insurer from having to pay for very large claims which could compromise their solvency.
5. **Deductible-limit.** Some indemnity schedules combine both deductible and limit: $I : x \mapsto (x - d)_+ \wedge \lambda$, where $d \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda > 0$; we say it is a *deductible-limit indemnity function*.

Property insurance policies usually include both a deductible and a limit.

6. **Fixed.** For the function $I : x \mapsto \kappa \mathbb{1}_{\{x \geq \tau\}}$, where $\kappa, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$, we call I a *fixed-indemnity function*, κ is the amount, and τ is the trigger. Fixed-indemnity functions do not satisfy the so-called “no-sabotage” requirement $|I(x) - I(y)| \leq |x - y|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. An agent facing a loss just below trigger τ is incentivized to fraudulently worsen it to receive payment κ rather than nothing. Fixed indemnities are seen for governmental aid during crises, when concern is less the ethics of payees than promptness and simplicity of procedures. Fixed indemnities are also common for critical illness insurance, where the policyholder has strong non-financial incentive for its risk not to worsen.

3.2 Premium principles and contract sets

A premium is a real number $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$ representing the amount paid by the agent to participate in a contract. Premiums are usually nonnegative because they are a loss for the agent; however, as for indemnities, we do not make this restriction. (An agent could *be paid* to participate in a contract.)

A premium principle is a functional $\rho : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ that is law invariant.³ It serves the same role as a premium; only, it accounts for the distribution of the risk underlying to the contract. Law invariance is a widely undisputed axiom for insurance pricing (Wang et al., 1997), and all common insurance premium principles are law invariant (see e.g., the textbook Dickson, 2017). Although the literature abounds in recommendations for additional, desirable properties of premium principles (e.g., Denneberg, 1990b, Wang et al., 1997), we do not require any for our analysis besides law invariance. We do not even suppose monotonicity. The absence of such requirements comes from the fact that we will be comparing identically distributed risks, and premium principles will only serve to bridge elements of \mathcal{S} to one another.

A *contract (function)* is a mapping $C : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ with one of the following two forms, both common in insurance practice:

- (a) $C(X) = \pi - I(X)$, with an indemnity I and a premium π ; such a contract will be called a *standard contract*;
- (b) $C(X) = \rho(I(X)) - I(X)$, with an indemnity I and premium principle ρ ; such a contract will be called a *ρ -priced contract*.

Standard contracts are a special case of ρ -priced contracts where ρ is simply a constant. Note

³We say a functional $\rho : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is law invariant if $\rho(X) = \rho(Y)$ whenever $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$.

that ρ -priced contracts use both the distribution of X via the functional $\rho \circ I$ and its outcome via the function I .

Contract functions induce certain dependence structures. Two random variables $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ are *comonotonic* when $(X(\omega_1) - X(\omega_2))(Y(\omega_1) - Y(\omega_2)) \geq 0$ for all $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega$. Two random variables $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ are *counter-monotonic* when X and $-Y$ are comonotonic; see [Puccetti and Wang \(2015\)](#) for a summary on these concepts. Since indemnity functions are increasing, X and $C(X)$ are always counter-monotonic for any contract C .

A *contract set*, which will be commonly denoted by \mathcal{C} , is a set of contracts. It is called a *standard contract set* if all contracts in \mathcal{C} are standard, and it is called a *ρ -priced contract set* if all contracts in \mathcal{C} are ρ -priced for the same ρ . To be specific, a standard contract set has the form:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{std}} = \{C : X \mapsto \pi - I(X) \mid \pi \in A, I \in \mathcal{I}\},$$

and a ρ -priced contract set has the form:

$$\mathcal{C}_\rho = \{C : X \mapsto \rho(I(X)) - I(X) \mid I \in \mathcal{I}\},$$

where $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, and \mathcal{I} is a set of nonconstant increasing functions from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} .

3.3 Insurance propensity

We say that a contract is an *insurance* contract if its underlying random variable is precisely the risk faced by the agent who purchases it. Insurance propensity of an agent with risk preference \succsim means that, with consideration of the risk they are currently facing, they always prefer participating in an insurance contract over any other identically distributed contract.

Definition 4 (Insurance propensity). A risk preference \succsim exhibits *insurance propensity* to a contract set \mathcal{C} if

$$X + C(X) \succsim X + C(Y) \quad \text{for all } X, Y \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } C \in \mathcal{C} \text{ with } X \stackrel{d}{=} Y. \quad (3)$$

Our definition of insurance propensity is slightly different to the formulation in [Maccheroni et al. \(2025\)](#), but they are shown to be mathematically equivalent; see Section 6.1. Let us give a simple example to put insurance propensity in context.

Example 1. An agent owns a house, whose fire-hazard loss is represented by $X \in \mathcal{S}$. An insurance representative comes for a survey and, for various contracts, presents them the choice to insure

their own home against fire or to choose anyone else's house and receive the indemnity amount if it burns down. Suppose all houses are identical. Suppose that we observe the actions of the agent when presented with different contracts:

- $C_A : X \mapsto 750 - X$, they chose to insure their house;
- $C_B : X \mapsto 1000 - 0.5X$, they chose to insure their house;
- $C_C : X \mapsto 60 - 500\mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq 2000\}}$, they chose to bet on their neighbor's house burning down.

The agent tells the representative they would make the same choices no matter the distribution of X . With this information, the representative concludes that the agent is insurance propense to $\mathcal{C} = \{C_A, C_B\}$, but not to $\mathcal{C}' = \{C_A, C_B, C_C\}$.

Insurance propensity should not be understood as whether an individual wants to participate in a contract or not. It really is whether an individual prefers an insurance contract over identically distributed contracts. In Example 1, the house owner is not given the choice of abstaining in participating to any contract, an option they could prefer despite being risk averse. This decision rather depends on the degree of their risk aversion and whether the premium mirrors it adequately. Also, since X is nonnegative in the example, contract C_A is clearly more advantageous than C_B : however, let us insist that insurance propensity does not describe choice between different contracts but rather between different underlying risks applied to the same contract.

The situation in Example 1 is obviously fictional as, for legal reasons, one is prohibited to buy insurance for another person's property in most countries; this restriction helps deter arson.

Recall that the random variables X and $C(X)$ are counter-monotonic. Insurance propensity can therefore be understood as preference for counter-monotonicity in a specific set of situations. Our objective is to examine what this set must comprise for risk aversion to emerge. Eventually, what influences preferences is the dependence relation between X and $C(Y)$, and how it compares with the dependence relation between X and $C(X)$. This approach notably circumvents the considerations on whether the premium in C is actuarially fair, which is a highly non-trivial question; see, e.g., [Bühlmann \(1980\)](#) and [Borch \(1985\)](#). Such considerations rather relate to the marginal distribution of $C(Y)$, which is the same as $C(X)$. Because the suitability of a premium principle usually depends on the context of its application (for instance, see [Cummins, 1988](#), [Wang, 2000](#) and [Gaillardetz and Lakhmiri, 2011](#)), to circumvent these considerations thus also contributes to let our analysis be applicable to a very general context of choice under risk.

4 Analysis of first and second risk–insurance parity

This section contains the first part of our main results, wherein we examine first and second risk–insurance parity. The full characterization of each, in Theorems 1–3 below, allows for a deeper understanding of the close connection, put forth in Maccheroni et al. (2025), between insurance propensity and classical notions of risk aversion.

4.1 First risk–insurance parity

Weak risk aversion is the focus of this subsection. We examine under which contract sets insurance propensity coincides with weak risk aversion.

Definition 5 (First risk–insurance parity). We say that a contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies *first risk–insurance parity* when for all continuous risk preferences, insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} is equivalent to weak risk aversion.

We characterize first risk–insurance parity for standard contract sets in the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *A standard contract set satisfies first risk–insurance parity if and only if it comprises full-indemnity contracts whose premiums form a dense set in \mathbb{R} .*

The main reason why one needs to consider all π in a \mathbb{R} -dense set is that full-indemnity contracts offer no flexibility in relying on the full space of \mathcal{S} : all randomness is removed after one participates in an insurance contract. Hence, to recover the weak risk aversion behavior, one needs to fish out the specific contract whose premium is the expectation of the risk underlying the contract. A solution to this issue is to consider a ρ -priced contract set, rather than a standard contract set, to be able to exploit the exhaustiveness of random variables in reducing the amount of contracts needed for first risk–insurance parity.

We introduce the *range property* of a premium principle ρ :

$$\{\rho(X + a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \text{ is dense in } \mathbb{R} \text{ for each } X \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (\text{RP})$$

This property is very weak. In particular, (RP) is weaker than cash-additivity,⁴ a property often argued to be desirable for premium principles, see e.g. Denuit et al. (2005, Section 2.2.3). All monetary risk measures introduced by Föllmer and Schied (2016) satisfy cash additivity and hence (RP); indeed they satisfy the stronger property that $\{\rho(X + a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\} = \mathbb{R}$ for each $X \in \mathcal{S}$.

⁴A premium principle ρ is cash-additive if $\rho(X + b) = \rho(X) + b$ for all $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and all $X \in \mathcal{S}$.

Theorem 2. *A ρ -priced contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies first risk–insurance parity if it comprises solely a full-indemnity contract and the premium principle ρ satisfies the range property (RP).*

The range property (RP) allows for the vastness of considered random variables to be translated to the premiums and hence allows to get rid of the exhaustiveness of premiums of Theorem 1. The situation in Theorem 2 is closer to the reality of a policyholder than Theorem 1 since for any risk a policyholder insures, they will only be proposed one premium by the company (often a function of the distribution of risk — i.e., the contract is ρ -priced). The policyholder makes their decision in consideration of that premium and not of all premiums which could have been proposed.

Example 2. An agent is given the choice to fully insure their own house against fire or to bet on anyone’s house burning down. Assume that all houses are identical and that the agent is not an arsonist. The insurance company offers the same price for each contract: the 95%-quantile of the loss. If no matter the value of the houses, the probability of fire or the possible damages, the agent always prefers to insure their own home, we deduce that they are weakly risk averse, since $\mathcal{C} = \{C : X \mapsto \text{VaR}_{0.95}(X) - X\}$ satisfies first risk–insurance parity by Theorem 2. A similar deduction would not have been possible if, say, participating in the contracts was free in all situations (e.g., due to a government program). Indeed, $\mathcal{C} = \{C : X \mapsto -X\}$ does not satisfy first risk–insurance parity by Theorem 1.

Remark 1. We are close to an “only if” statement in Theorem 2. As we have established in the proof of Theorem 1, weak risk aversion may only effectively induce insurance propensity to full-indemnity contracts, no matter whether standard or ρ -priced. The issue rather comes from requiring (RP) to hold for all $X \in \mathcal{S}$, since, in the proof of Theorem 2, we only need it to hold for the set \mathcal{Z} of random variables where \mathcal{Z} is the smallest set satisfying

$$\text{for every } X \in \mathcal{S}, \text{ there exist } Z, W \in \mathcal{Z} \text{ such that } X \stackrel{d}{=} Z - W + \mathbb{E}[X] \text{ and } Z \stackrel{d}{=} W. \quad (4)$$

Adding an “only if” statement would require a complete analysis of the set \mathcal{Z} , which is beyond the scope of this paper. We leave it as an open question. In particular, we remark the complexity of such a task by noting that \mathcal{Z} is strictly smaller than \mathcal{S} : degenerate random variables, for example, are not required to be in \mathcal{Z} since any $Z, W \in \mathcal{Z}$, $Z \stackrel{d}{=} W$, can yield $Z - W = 0$ by taking Z and W to be comonotonic. There may also not be a single smallest set \mathcal{Z} , and thus one would be required to rather examine the set \mathfrak{Z} of all possible sets \mathcal{Z} satisfying (4). It is then easy to see that, if (RP) does not hold for any $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathfrak{Z}$ (with \mathcal{Z} replacing \mathcal{S}), then there exists some $b \in \mathbb{R}$ which may not be approached by a sequence of full-indemnity insurance contracts. As a result, for some $X \in \mathcal{S}$

with $\mathbb{E}[X] = b$, the relation $\mathbb{E}[X] \not\prec X$ will be true for some insurance propense \succsim , by following a reasoning similar to the one in the proof of Theorem 2.

Insurance propensity to full-indemnity contracts does not suffice to characterize strong risk aversion. This does not come as a surprise: it is well-known in the economics literature that weak and strong risk aversion coincide only under some specific settings, see, e.g., [Cohen \(1995\)](#). Let us present an example of a risk preference that is insurance propense to full-indemnity contracts but not strongly risk averse.

Example 3. Let $X \succsim Y$ if and only if $\text{Var}(X) = 0$ or $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$. It is easy to show that \succsim satisfies reflexivity, transitivity, law invariance and continuity. Moreover, \succsim is insurance propense to full-indemnity contracts since any premium has zero variance. Taking any $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ with $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$ that are non-degenerate and not identically distributed, we have $X \not\prec Y$, and hence \succsim is not strongly risk averse.

4.2 Second risk–insurance parity

We now turn to strong risk aversion. We examine under which contract sets insurance propensity coincides with strong risk aversion.

Definition 6 (Second risk–insurance parity). We say that a contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies *second risk–insurance parity* when for all continuous risk preferences, insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} is equivalent to strong risk aversion.

A characterization of all contract sets satisfying second risk–insurance parity is provided in the next theorem. For a contract set \mathcal{C} and $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, we say that \mathcal{C} *connects* (X, Y) if for some $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ there exist a sequence of contracts $\{C_i : i \in [k]\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and two sequences of random variables $\{Z_i : i \in [k]\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $\{W_i : i \in [k]\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that $W_i \stackrel{d}{=} Z_i$ for every $i \in [k]$, and $X = Z_1 + C_1(Z_1)$, $Y = Z_k + C_k(W_k)$, and

$$Z_{i+1} + C_{i+1}(Z_{i+1}) = Z_i + C_i(W_i) \quad \text{for every } i \in [k-1]. \quad (5)$$

Intuitively, the above conditions mean that X and Y are linked via a sequence of random variables expressible in the form “risk plus contract”. Equation (5) states that each non-insurance position is equal to the next insurance position in this sequence.

Define $\succsim^{\mathcal{C}}$ by

$$X \succsim^{\mathcal{C}} Y \iff \mathcal{C} \text{ connects } (X, Y)$$

and let $\succsim_*^{\mathcal{C}}$ be the smallest transitive and closed superset of $\succsim^{\mathcal{C}}$ (that is, it is the intersection of all transitive and closed supersets of $\succsim^{\mathcal{C}}$).⁵

Theorem 3. *A contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies second risk–insurance parity if and only if, for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$ implies $X \succsim_*^{\mathcal{C}} Y$.*

Theorem 3 applies to both standard and ρ -priced contract sets. Although Theorem 3 provides a complete characterization of second risk–insurance parity, the condition therein is abstract and may be difficult to verify for a given contract set, since one has no guidance in how to construct the sequence of insurance/non-insurance positions from (5). To address this, we present sufficient conditions in Lemma 1 below that are more transparent and practically verifiable. This condition traces the construction of mean-preserving spreads, which underlies the characterization of convex order as established in Rothschild and Stiglitz (1970). The definition of mean-preserving spreads follows.

Definition 7 (Mean preserving spreads). We say that a random variable $Y \in \mathcal{S}$ is a *mean-preserving spread* of $X \in \mathcal{S}$ when

$$Y \stackrel{d}{=} X - \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_2} \quad (6)$$

for some $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ and $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\delta_1 \mathbb{P}(A_1) = \delta_2 \mathbb{P}(A_2)$ and $X(\omega_1) \leq X(\omega_2)$ for all $\omega_1 \in A_1$ and $\omega_2 \in A_2$. A mean preserving spread is *simple* if $\delta_1 = \delta_2$.

For $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, we have that $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$ if and only if Y can be obtained from X through a finite number of (simple) mean-preserving spreads (Rothschild and Stiglitz, 1970, Lemma 1). This fact enables a focused analysis on pairs of random variables where one is obtained from the other via a simple mean-preserving spread when examining second risk–insurance parity. Note that one may transform a mean preserving spread into multiple ones of smaller magnitude. Applying this idea for constructing the intermediary positions in (5), we obtain the following lemma, which provides sufficient conditions for risk–insurance parity in combination with Theorem 3.

Lemma 1. *A contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies second risk–insurance parity if for every $X \in \mathcal{S}$, $\delta > 0$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \text{Supp}(X)$ with $x_1 < x_2$, $\mathbb{P}(X = x_1) = \mathbb{P}(X = x_2)$, there are sequences $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $\{Z_{i,n} : i, n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, and $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_i = \delta$, and, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$C_i(Z_{i,n})(\omega_1) - C_i(Z_{i,n})(\omega_2) = \delta_i \quad \text{for all } \omega_1 \in \{X = x_1\}, \omega_2 \in \{X = x_2\}, n \in \mathbb{N} \quad (7)$$

⁵Recall that any relation on \mathcal{S} can be viewed as a set on $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$. A superset of $A \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ is any set containing all elements of A . As we work with bounded convergence for our definition of continuity, the closure of A is understood in terms of the topology induced by bounded convergence. Note that the intersection of transitive relations yields a transitive relation; the intersection of closed sets is a closed set.

and

$$Z_{i,n} + C_i(Z_{i,n}) \xrightarrow{B} X - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (8)$$

Equation (7) mirrors (5) in that it ensures that the next risk position, once insurance propensity is evoked, produces the next mean-preserving spread in the sequence guiding our construction; each may effectively be approached by an insurance contract due to (8).

Remark 2. There are no “only if” part in Lemma 1 despite mean-preserving spreads entirely characterizing the convex order, and thus, strong risk aversion. This is because there are other ways to decompose a mean preserving spread into smaller ones than how we proceeded in the lemma. In particular, one would have to account for the possibility of mean-preserving spreads on other events than the ones through which Y is defined in (6), successively cancelling each other.

Next, we give some examples of standard contract sets satisfying second risk–insurance parity, as a result from Theorem 3. The proof of each item relies on Lemma 1, showcasing the facilitated applicability that its more technical conditions confer.

Proposition 1. *Let Π be a dense subset of \mathbb{R} . The following standard contract sets satisfy second risk–insurance parity:*

- (i) *letting $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $\pi_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the set \mathcal{C} comprising $C_\alpha : X \mapsto \pi_0 - \alpha X$ for all $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$;*
- (ii) *letting $d_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda_0 > 0$, the set \mathcal{C} comprising $C_{\lambda, \pi} : X \mapsto \pi - (X - d_0)_+ \wedge \lambda$ for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$ and all $\pi \in \Pi$;*
- (iii) *letting $\pi_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda_0 > 0$, the set \mathcal{C} comprising $C_{\lambda, d} : X \mapsto \pi_0 - (X - d)_+ \wedge \lambda$ for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$ and all $d \in \Pi$;*
- (iv) *letting $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\kappa_0 > 0$, the set \mathcal{C} comprising $C_{\kappa, \pi} : X \mapsto \pi - \kappa \mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq \tau_0\}}$ for all $\kappa \in (0, \kappa_0]$ and all $\pi \in \Pi$;*
- (v) *letting $\pi_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\kappa_0 > 0$, the set \mathcal{C} comprising $C_{\kappa, \tau} : X \mapsto \pi_0 - \kappa \mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq \tau\}}$ for all $\kappa \in (0, \kappa_0]$ and all $\tau \in \Pi$.*

From their respective equivalence with strong risk aversion, insurance propensity for any set of contracts \mathcal{C} in Proposition 1 implies insurance propensity for all the others, and for all other contract set satisfying second risk–insurance parity. Note that if a contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies the conditions in Lemma 1, then any contract set that is larger than \mathcal{C} also satisfies those conditions. This directly leads to the following result.

Proposition 2. *For two contract sets \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 , if \mathcal{C}_1 satisfies second risk–insurance parity and $\mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_2$, then \mathcal{C}_2 also satisfies second risk–insurance parity.*

Combining Proposition 1 with Proposition 2, one directly recovers the results from Theorem 3 (i)–(iv) of [Maccheroni et al. \(2025\)](#). The arguably small contract sets in Proposition 1 are practical in that they allow to establish strong risk aversion after verifying insurance propensity in a limited set of situations. Meanwhile, the larger contract sets provided by Proposition 2 extends this insurance propensity to a greater set of situations, and are hence practical for applications thereafter. Let us provide an example.

Example 4. We consider again the situation in Example 1 where a house owner is surveyed by an insurance representative. After answering that they prefer to insure their house when presented contract $C_B : X \mapsto 1000 - 0.5X$, the house owner specifies to the representative that their decision was not driven by the premium of the contract (1000) nor the coinsurance proportion (0.5); they would have made the same choice no matter these numbers. In addition to the information that the distribution of X has no incidence either, the representative now knows that the house owner would be lying if they said they would not choose to insure their house when presented contract C_C . In fact, the representative should leave immediately because they already know the house owner’s answers for every other contract in their survey.

First and second risk–insurance parity are distinct properties; none implies the other. More precisely, from their respective characterizations in Theorems 1–3, we see that they are mutually exclusive. This is obvious from the fact that weak and strong risk aversion are not equivalent in general. For instance, the standard contract set of all full-indemnity contracts does not satisfy second risk–insurance parity: for any $Z \in \mathcal{S}$ and full-indemnity contract C , the random variable $Z + C(Z)$ is degenerate, and therefore any non-degenerate $X \in \mathcal{S}$ cannot be connected to any other random variables. On the other hand, the standard contract sets comprising fixed-indemnity contracts described in Proposition 1 parts (iv) or (v) satisfy second risk–insurance parity. As demonstrated in Theorem 1, they fail to satisfy first risk–insurance parity.

A subtlety in Lemma 1 is that it is trickier to satisfy (8) for ρ -priced contract sets. Indeed, if $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a sequence of ρ -priced contracts, then $C_i(Z_{i,n}) = \rho(I_i(Z_{i,n})) - I_i(Z_{i,n})$ for some sequence of indemnity function $\{I_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. When analyzing the convergence property of the sequence $C_i(Z_{i,n}) : n \in \mathbb{N}$, both the distribution of the indemnity $I_i(Z_{i,n})$ and the corresponding contract price $\rho(I_i(Z_{i,n}))$ vary with the underlying risk $Z_{i,n}$. This introduces complexity into the convergence analysis, as both components are subject to variation across the sequence. In the next result, we present two examples of ρ -priced contract sets satisfying second risk–insurance parity.

Proposition 3. *The following ρ -priced contract sets satisfy second risk–insurance parity:*

- (i) *for any premium principle ρ and $\lambda_0 > 0$, the set \mathcal{C} comprising $C_{\lambda,d} : X \mapsto \rho((X - d)_+ \wedge \lambda) - (X - d)_+ \wedge \lambda$ for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$ and all $d \in \mathbb{R}$;*
- (ii) *for any premium principle ρ and $\kappa_0 > 0$, the set \mathcal{C} comprising $C_{\kappa,\tau} : X \mapsto \rho(\kappa \mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq \tau\}}) - \kappa \mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq \tau\}}$ for all $\kappa \in (0, \kappa_0]$ and all $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$.*

We now introduce the *matching property*:

$$\{b \in \mathbb{R} : \rho(X - b) = \gamma b\} \text{ is nonempty for each } X \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \gamma > 0. \quad (\text{MP})$$

We call **(MP)** the matching property because typically, $\rho(X - b)$ is decreasing in b , and γb is increasing in b , so we naturally expect that they match at some point $b \in \mathbb{R}$ under mild regularity conditions. For instance, if $b \mapsto \rho(X - b)$ is decreasing and continuous (satisfied by all common premium principles), then **(MP)** holds, and this includes the case where ρ is a constant (as in a standard contract). Properties **(RP)** and **(MP)** may not be familiar, but they are implied by standard properties in the literature. The next result gives another example of a ρ -priced contract set satisfying second risk–insurance parity.

Proposition 4. *Let ρ be a premium principle satisfying the matching property **(MP)**. For any $\alpha_0 \in (0, 1)$, the ρ -priced contract set \mathcal{C} comprising $C_\alpha : X \mapsto \rho(\alpha X) - \alpha X$ for all $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$ satisfies second risk–insurance parity.*

For proportional-indemnity contracts, the choice of premium principle cannot reduce the range of coinsurance proportions required to be in the contract set, compared to standard contracts, Proposition **1(i)**, because premium principles do not help in achieving the exhaustiveness of contracts to satisfy (7) for all $X \in \mathcal{S}$: they get subtracted out. A similar observation can be made for the deductible-limit and fixed-indemnity contract sets in Proposition 3. Thus, comparing Propositions **1** and **3–4**, we note that the use of premium principles does not allow for a sensible reduction of the number of contracts in each sets, as much as it did for first risk–insurance propensity.

The premium principle does not need to satisfy the matching property in the ρ -priced contract sets of Proposition 3 because deductible-limit and fixed-indemnity contracts are insensible to translations in the risk when the same translation is also applied to the deductible or the trigger. This is not the case for proportional-indemnity contracts.

5 Risk–insurance parity with deductible and limit contracts

This section contains the second part of our main results. Whereas in the previous section risk–insurance parity served to highlight the connection between insurance propensity and existing notions of risk aversion, we now employ risk–insurance parity as a way of defining new notions of risk aversion, by letting this behavior arise from insurance propensity to a given contract set that is practically relevant.

In Propositions 1 and 3, as well as Maccheroni et al. (2025), the deductibles and limits are always present together for contracts inducing strong risk aversion. This leads us naturally to the question of what types of risk aversion would be equivalent to insurance propensity to deductible-only contracts and limit-only contracts, respectively. These types of contracts and their approximations are common in health and property insurance practice. It turns out that the induced notions of risk aversion are strictly between weak and strong, and both are, to the best of our knowledge, new to the literature. Each new notion has an intuitive formulation based on mean-preserving spreads and a concise and explicit characterization within the dual utility model (as all considered notions of risk aversion are equivalent for the expected utility model).

We first define the new notions of risk aversion through mean-preserving spreads, and then discuss risk–insurance parity pertaining to each. This reverse-route organization helps to develop intuition about the notions of risk aversion before providing the keystone results characterizing their equivalence to insurance propensity to deductible and limit contract sets. The specific design of these notions of risk aversion was, in fact, driven by the risk–insurance parity results.

5.1 Right- and left-handle mean-preserving spreads

Before introducing the new notions of risk aversion, we first define two types of mean-preserving spreads.

Definition 8 (Left-/right-handle mean preserving spreads). Consider a mean preserving spread as in (6). We say that it is a *left-handle mean-preserving spread* if $X(\omega_1) = \min X$ for all $\omega_1 \in A_1$. It is a *right-handle mean-preserving spread* if $X(\omega_2) = \max X$ for all $\omega_2 \in A_2$.

The new mean-preserving spreads in Definition 8 are called left-handle and right-handle as one may imagine a handle at each of the extremities of the distribution: Pulling on the left handle to produce a mean-preserving spread may only decrease the value of outcomes that are minimal for X ; pulling on the right handle may only increase the values of outcomes that are maximal for X .




Figure 1: (Center top.) The initial distribution on which the mean-preserving spreads (MPS) are performed. (Left.) A left-handle mean-preserving spread. (Center bottom.) A mean-preserving spread that is neither left- or right-handle. (Right.) A right-handle mean-preserving spread. Each block represents an atom of probability mass.

An illustration of these types of mean-preserving spreads is provided in Figure 1 and makes the analogy more clear.

Remark 3. Every mean-preserving spread is expressible as the result of a sequence of simple ones. Thus, due to the transitivity and continuity of risk preferences, there is no discrepancy between aversion to mean-preserving spreads and to simple mean-preserving spreads. However, the possibility of δ_1 and δ_2 taking distinct values, and thus A_1 and A_2 not being equiprobable, has an incidence for left- or right-handle mean-preserving spreads, as it truly adds a layer of flexibility in their respective definitions. A left-handle (resp. right-handle) mean-preserving spread cannot be turned into many simple ones if $\delta_1 < \delta_2$ (resp. $\delta_1 > \delta_2$).

As we already stated above, for $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, we have that $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$ if and only if Y can be obtained from X through a finite number of mean-preserving spreads. The finite number can be zero, in which case $X \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} Y$. In a similar vein, we define stochastic orders pertaining to left- or right-handle mean-preserving spreads as follows: For $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$,

- We say that X is dominated by Y in left-handle convex order, denoted by $X \leq_{\text{lhcx}} Y$ if Y can be obtained from X through a finite number of left-handle mean-preserving spreads.
- We say that X is dominated by Y in right-handle convex order, denoted by $X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Y$ if Y can be obtained from X through a finite number of right-handle mean-preserving spreads.

It is straightforward to verify that both orders satisfy reflexivity, transitivity and antisymmetry. In the following result, we provide a characterization of left- and right-handle convex orders in terms

of the compared random variables' distributions.

Proposition 5. *For $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, let $(X^{\text{co}}, Y^{\text{co}})$ be comonotonic with $X^{\text{co}} \stackrel{d}{=} X$ and $Y^{\text{co}} \stackrel{d}{=} Y$. Suppose $X \not\stackrel{d}{=} Y$. The following two statements hold:*

- (i) $X \leq_{\text{lhcx}} Y$ if and only if $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[Y]$, $\min X > \min Y$, and $X^{\text{co}} \leq Y^{\text{co}}$ a.s. on the event $\{X^{\text{co}} > \min X\}$.
- (ii) $X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Y$ if and only if $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[Y]$, $\max X < \max Y$, and $X^{\text{co}} \geq Y^{\text{co}}$ a.s. on the event $\{X^{\text{co}} < \max X\}$.

Directly from Proposition 5, we have that $X \leq_{\text{lhcx}} Y$ or $X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Y$ implies that the distribution functions of X and Y possess the single-crossing property. This is consistent with the fact that the left- and right-handle convex orders are strictly stronger than the convex order.

The following corollary is a direct consequence of Proposition 5, which states that two loss random variables can be compared under the left-handle convex order if and only if their surplus counterparts can be compared under the right-handle convex order.

Corollary 1. *For $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, $X \leq_{\text{lhcx}} Y$ if and only if $-X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} -Y$.*

We give an additional closedness property of left- and right-handle convex orders, which will be convenient in the proofs of some results.

Proposition 6. *The partial orders \leq_{rhcx} and \leq_{lhcx} are closed with respect to bounded convergence.*

5.2 Right- and left-handle risk aversion and risk–insurance parity

We introduce below right-handle risk aversion. To the best of our knowledge, this notion is new to the literature.

Definition 9 (Right-handle risk aversion). A risk preference \succsim exhibits *right-handle risk aversion* if, for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ where $X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Y$, it holds that $X \succsim Y$.

Right-handle risk aversion represents fear of the worst-case scenario: a right-handle risk averse individual will prefer to reduce the variability of their loss when it also means it reduces their worst possible outcome. This leaves some room for risk-loving behaviors. For example, the individual may like to gamble small amounts of money, while still preferring to insure their house.

A direct consequence of Proposition 5 is that $\mathbb{E}[X] \leq_{\text{rhcx}} X$ for all $X \in \mathcal{S}$. Hence, right-handle risk aversion is stronger than weak risk aversion. On the other hand, because right-handle risk aversion is defined using a specific case of mean-preserving spreads, it is weaker than strong risk aversion. The dual-utility characterization in Section 5.3 shows that these inclusions hold strictly.

Remark 4. Under the expected utility (EU) framework, weak risk aversion and strong risk aversion are equivalent in that they are both characterized by a concave utility function. Since right-handle risk aversion lies conceptually between weak and strong risk aversion, it is also characterized by concavity of utility functions in the EU framework.

In line with the main considerations of this article, we now examine under which set of contracts insurance parity and right-handle risk aversion are equivalent.

Definition 10 (Right-handle risk–insurance parity). A contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies *right-handle risk–insurance parity* when, for all continuous risk preferences, insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} is equivalent to right-handle risk aversion.

For a deductible-indemnity standard contract with premium π and deductible d , let $\theta = \pi + d$. We will refer to θ as the *price parameter* of the deductible contract.

Theorem 4. *A standard (resp. ρ -priced, with any premium principle ρ) contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies right-handle risk–insurance parity if it comprises precisely*

- (a) *deductible-indemnity contracts whose price parameters (resp. deductibles) are dense in \mathbb{R} ;*
- (b) *any, possibly none, full-indemnity contracts.*

Theorem 4 shows that deductible-indemnity contracts are indeed the type of contracts inducing right-handle risk aversion through risk–insurance parity. Insurance contracts of this type provide a coverage for risks greater than the deductible, but the portion of the risk below that deductible remains uncovered. This observation provides some high-level insight to explain the asymmetry in right-handle risk aversion.

We are now interested in whether other types of contract sets may satisfy right-handle risk–insurance parity. In other terms, we aim to characterize right-handle risk–insurance parity analogously to the results on first and second risk–insurance parity in the previous section. To proceed, we will need to restrict our attention to Lipschitz-continuous (LC) indemnity functions, that is, I satisfying $|I(x) - I(y)| \leq |x - y|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. While we did not require it thus far, this assumption is common for indemnity functions to deter sabotage; see, e.g., [Huberman et al. \(1989, Section 4\)](#). By the revelation principle ([Myerson, 1979](#), [Harris and Townsend, 1981](#)), non-LC indemnity functions (incentivizing sabotage) never produce an insurance contract that is Pareto optimal; thus, their relevance in insurance contexts is limited and exclusively tied to external considerations. Proportional, deductible and limit indemnity functions satisfy LC; fixed indemnity functions do

not, as we discussed in Section 3.1. An *LC contract set* is a contract set such that the indemnity functions of its elements are LC.

It turns out that deductible-only contract sets are the only LC contract sets that satisfy right-handle risk–insurance parity. This is made explicit in the following theorem.

Theorem 5. *A LC contract set satisfying right-handle risk–insurance parity exclusively contains deductible-indemnity or full-indemnity contracts.*

We now give the following characterization of right-handle risk–insurance parity for LC standard contract sets.

Proposition 7. *A standard LC contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies right-handle risk–insurance parity if and only if it comprises precisely*

- (a) *deductible-indemnity contracts whose price parameters are dense in \mathbb{R} ;*
- (b) *any, possibly none, full-indemnity contracts.*

Disregarding the LC assumption, one may construct noncontinuous contracts that, when added to the deductible-only contract set, still preserve right-handle risk–insurance parity; see Example 5 in Appendix A.13. However, including such irregular contracts would significantly complicate the analysis and obscure the interpretability of the characterization result. In particular, the necessity part of Proposition 7 would become more cumbersome to formulate, weakening both the elegance and the clarity of the theoretical insight.

While Theorems 4 and 5 apply to both standard and ρ -priced contract sets, obtaining a result similar to Proposition 7 for ρ -priced contract sets is arduously feasible. The exhaustiveness of price parameters is intricate to translate to ρ -price contract sets, since it will vary with ρ and depend on the set of indemnity random variables required when establishing that insurance propensity implies right-handle risk aversion.

We next define left-handle risk aversion, the symmetric counterpart to right-handle risk aversion.

Definition 11 (Left-handle risk aversion). A risk preference \succsim exhibits *left-handle risk aversion* if, for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ where $X \leq_{\text{hcx}} Y$, it holds that $X \succsim Y$.

Left-handle risk aversion represents an aversion to the fact that the realized loss is too low. A left-handle-risk-averse decision-maker prefers to reduce their best-case-scenario outcome if it means less variability in their loss. An example of such would be an individual who prefers to buy a

cheaper lottery ticket, with a smaller jackpot, over a pricier lottery ticket with a bigger jackpot. In terms of insurance-related risks, left-handle risk aversion is perhaps less natural as individuals buying insurance usually worry less about their minimal loss than the catastrophic case of total loss. From its symmetry with right-handle risk aversion, left-handle risk aversion is strictly between weak and strong risk aversion.

Next, we are interested in the set of contracts under which insurance propensity and left-handle risk aversion coincide.

Definition 12 (Left-handle risk–insurance parity). A contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies *left-handle risk–insurance parity* when, for all continuous risk preferences, insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} is equivalent to left-handle risk aversion.

Let us introduce an alternate formulation of limit-indemnity contracts: consider the ρ -priced contract $C_\zeta : X \mapsto \rho(X \wedge \zeta - \zeta) - (X \wedge \zeta - \zeta)$ with $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$. This adjustment represents taking a portion of the premium and considering it as a basis for the indemnity; this is to allow ζ to exert shifts in the distribution, as a deductible does for deductible-indemnity contracts. We will refer to ζ as the *level parameter* of the limit-indemnity contract.

Theorem 6. A standard (resp. ρ -priced, with any premium principle ρ) contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies left-handle risk–insurance parity if it comprises precisely

- (a) limit-indemnity contracts whose premiums (resp. level parameters) are dense in \mathbb{R} ;
- (b) any, possibly none, full-indemnity contracts.

Limit-only insurance contracts provide full coverage below the limit, but no coverage above; this connects to the asymmetric behavior in left-handle risk aversion. In view of Theorem 6, the fact that left-handle risk aversion seems perhaps unnatural for insured risks explains why, in practice, limits are seen as benefiting the insurer more than the insured; they are usually imposed for solvency considerations of the insurance company.

LC contract sets satisfying left-handle risk–insurance parity exclusively comprise limit-only contracts, as indicated in the next theorem.

Theorem 7. A LC contract set satisfying right-handle risk–insurance parity exclusively contains limit-indemnity or full-indemnity contracts.

We now give the following characterization of left-handle risk–insurance parity for standard LC contract sets.

Proposition 8. *A standard LC contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies left-handle risk–insurance parity if and only if it comprises precisely*

- (a) *limit-indemnity contracts whose premiums are dense in \mathbb{R} ;*
- (b) *any, possibly none, full-indemnity contracts.*

We speak of *dual-handle risk aversion* when both left-handle and right-handle risk aversion hold. A contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies *dual-handle risk–insurance parity* if insurance parity to \mathcal{C} is equivalent to dual-handle risk aversion. Combining Propositions 7 and 8, we directly obtain the following result.

Corollary 2. *A standard LC contract set \mathcal{C} satisfies dual-handle risk–insurance parity if and only if it comprises precisely*

- (a) *deductible-indemnity contracts whose price parameters are dense in \mathbb{R} ;*
- (b) *limit-indemnity contracts whose premiums are dense in \mathbb{R} ;*
- (c) *any, possibly none, full-indemnity contracts.*

In the dual utility model, dual-handle risk aversion has an interpretation in terms of diversification incentives; see the next subsection.

5.3 Right- and left-handle risk aversion in the dual utility model

Let us characterize right-, left- and dual-handle risk aversion in the dual utility model of Yaari (1987). In this model, risk preferences are represented as follows: For $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$X \succsim Y \iff U_h(-X) \geq U_h(-Y)$$

with $U_h : \mathcal{S} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ being defined as

$$U_h(Z) = \int_{-\infty}^0 (h(\mathbb{P}(Z > t)) - 1) dt + \int_0^{\infty} h(\mathbb{P}(Z > t)) dt, \quad Z \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (9)$$

where $h : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a weighting function that is increasing and satisfies $h(0) = 1 - h(1) = 0$. A weighting function h is *star-shaped* at $a \in [0, 1]$ when $h(\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)x) \leq \lambda h(a) + (1 - \lambda)h(x)$ holds true for all $\lambda, x \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem 8. *In the dual utility model, an agent is*




Figure 2: A weighting function that is both star-shaped at 0 and at 1 but not convex (in dark blue), a convex weighting function (in red), and a weighting function that is dominated by the identity, but not convex nor star-shaped at 0 or 1 (in yellow).

- (i) *right-handle risk averse if and only if the weighting function is star-shaped at 1;*
- (ii) *left-handle risk averse if and only if the weighting function is star-shaped at 0;*
- (iii) *dual-handle risk averse if and only if the weighting function is star-shaped at both 0 and 1.*

Convexity is a stronger property than star-shapedness at 0 or 1: it corresponds to star-shapedness at every point. In the dual utility model, an agent is strongly risk averse if and only if their weighting function is convex (Yaari, 1987, Theorem 2). Similarly, an agent is weakly risk averse if and only if their weighting function is dominated by the identity function (see Chateauneuf and Cohen, 1994, Corollary 1), and this property of the weighting function is weaker than star-shapedness at 0 or 1. We provide an illustration of a weighting function that is both star-shaped at 0 and 1 in Figure 2.

It is straightforward to check that star-shapedness at both 0 and 1 implies *dual superadditivity*, that is, $h(x) + h(y) \leq h(x + y)$ and $\tilde{h}(x) + \tilde{h}(y) \geq \tilde{h}(x + y)$ for x, y with $x + y \in [0, 1]$, where $\tilde{h}(t) = 1 - h(1 - t)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Dual superadditivity is connected to a specific form of diversification. A preference relation \succsim exhibits diversification (Dekel, 1989) if

$$X \stackrel{d}{=} Y \implies \lambda X + (1 - \lambda)Y \succsim X \text{ for } \lambda \in [0, 1], \quad (10)$$

meaning that combining equally preferable payoffs is desirable. Ghossoub et al. (2025, Theorem 2) showed that dual subadditivity is equivalent to a concept called pseudo-convexity introduced by Aouani et al. (2021), which is in turn equivalent to diversification restricted to counter-monotonic random variables (Principi et al., 2025, Proposition 8). Therefore, we have the following implications

for the dual utility model.

- (a) Weak risk aversion implies that (10) holds when $\lambda X + (1 - \lambda)Y$ is a constant.
- (b) Dual-handle risk aversion implies that (10) holds when X and Y are counter-monotonic.
- (c) Strong risk aversion implies that (10) holds for all X, Y .

Since the condition that $\lambda X + (1 - \lambda)Y$ is a constant is stronger than counter-monotonicity, the above three implications illustrate the relative strengths of the three notions of risk aversion in terms of their diversification incentives in the dual utility model: Weakly risk-averse agents diversify when risks fully vanish after hedging; dual-handle risk-averse agents diversify when risks are perfectly negatively dependent; strongly risk-averse agents diversify in all cases.

6 Additional technical discussions

This section collects some additional discussions on results from the previous sections.

6.1 On the definition of insurance propensity

Maccheroni et al. (2025) defined insurance propensity in a form slightly different from ours.

Definition 13. A risk preference exhibits *insurance propensity* to a contract set \mathcal{C} in the sense of Maccheroni et al. (2025) when for any $X, Z, Z' \in L^\infty$ where $Z \stackrel{d}{=} Z'$, it holds that

$$Z = C(X) \text{ for some } C \in \mathcal{C} \implies X + Z \succsim X + Z'.$$

Note that if $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$, then $C(X) \stackrel{d}{=} C(Y)$ for any contract C . Therefore, the notion of insurance propensity in the sense of Maccheroni et al. (2025) is stronger than the one defined in Definition 4. In fact, the converse implication can also be established with the aid of the following lemma.

Lemma 2. For any $Z, Z' \in L^\infty$ such that $Z \stackrel{d}{=} Z'$ and any function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if for some $X \in L^\infty$ it holds that $Z = f(X)$, then there exists $Y \in L^\infty$ such that $Z' = f(Y)$ and $Y \stackrel{d}{=} X$.

Proof. Because $Z \stackrel{d}{=} Z'$, there exists a measure-preserving bijection $\xi : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ so that $Z'(\omega) = Z(\xi(\omega))$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Take Y given by $Y(\omega) = X(\xi(\omega))$, $\omega \in \Omega$. \square

For this work, we preferred to express insurance propensity as per Definition 4 simply because it added clarity in our statements and proofs.

6.2 Monotone risk aversion and monotone risk–insurance parity

Monotone risk aversion was introduced by [Quiggin \(1992\)](#); see [Cohen \(1995\)](#) for a review on the concept. Similar to left- and right-handle risk aversion, this form of risk aversion also falls strictly in-between weak and strong risk aversion.

Definition 14 (Monotone risk aversion, monotone risk–insurance parity). A risk preference \succsim exhibits *monotone risk aversion* if for every $X, Y, \Theta \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $Y = X + \Theta$, where X, Θ are comonotonic and $\mathbb{E}[\Theta] = 0$, it holds that $X \succsim Y$. A set of contracts \mathcal{C} satisfies *monotone risk–insurance parity* when, for all continuous risk preferences, insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} is equivalent to monotone risk aversion.

We introduced monotone risk–insurance parity to show that no LC contract set satisfies it.

Proposition 9. *No LC contract set satisfies monotone risk–insurance parity.*

While right-handle, left-handle and monotone risk aversion all belong to the middle grounds between weak and strong risk aversion, they are strictly different concepts of risk aversion. This is evident when juxtaposing [Propositions 7, 8 and 9](#).

6.3 Extending the space of random variables

Most of our previous results were stated for risk preferences defined on \mathcal{S} , the set of simple random variables. In this section, we discuss how our results translate to larger sets of random variables. Let L^∞ be the set of all essentially bounded random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and L^p be the set of all random variables with finite absolute p th moment, $p \in [1, \infty)$. In this section, for a risk preference defined on L^p for $p \in [1, \infty)$, continuity is with respect to L^p -norm. For a risk preference defined on L^∞ , continuity is with respect to bounded convergence, as in the main part of our paper.

The following proposition indicates that our definition of insurance propensity could have equivalently been formulated on L^p , for any $p \in [1, \infty]$. Extending the space to L^p is useful for applications where potential losses may be unbounded. To deal with potentially unbounded random variables, in this section we will make the assumption that any contract’s indemnity function is bounded or Lipschitz continuous. This assumption is made to ensure proper integrability, and it is consistent with the similar assumption in [Section 5.2](#).

Proposition 10. *For a contract C and a continuous risk preference defined on L^p , $p \in [1, \infty]$, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $X + C(X) \succsim X + C(Y)$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ where $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$;

(ii) $X + C(X) \succsim X + C(Y)$ for all $X, Y \in L^p$ where $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$.

Our main results on first and second risk–insurance parity extend to L^p spaces, as shown in the next result.

Proposition 11. *The statements of Theorems 1–4 and 6, Propositions 1–4, and Lemma 1 hold for continuous risk preferences defined on L^p , for $p \in [1, \infty]$. In the case of Theorem 3, let \succsim_*^C be defined using the corresponding notion of continuity.*

It is straightforward to check that the result of Theorem 8 also extends to risk preferences defined on L^p for $p \in [1, \infty]$, under the additional assumption that the distortion function h yields a finite value of U_h on L^p .

Remark 5. In Definitions 9 and 11, right-handle and left-handle risk aversions are defined in terms of subsets of mean-preserving spreads. Although the definitions only directly impose preference conditions for discrete and mixed random variables, this has nontrivial implications on continuous random variables because of continuity (see e.g., Theorem 8, which has restrictions for comparing general distributions). This is the same for strong risk aversion, which can equivalently be stated in terms of mean-preserving mass transfers and continuity (Rothschild and Stiglitz, 1970).

Remark 6. Continuity with respect to the L^p norm complicates the arguments that were used in the proof of Theorems 5 and 7, since Proposition 6 no longer holds with respect to such continuity; see also Remark 2 above. We leave it as an open question whether these results continue to hold when extending the space of random variables to L^p .

6.4 Risk propensity and insurance aversion

All results of this paper also hold when trading “risk aversion” for “risk propensity (also called risk seeking)” and “insurance propensity” for “insurance aversion” in their statements. This is obvious as it simply amounts to switching “ \succsim ” to “ \precsim ” everywhere. In particular, this means that every type of risk–insurance parity also describes the equivalence between insurance aversion to a contract set satisfying it and corresponding risk propensity.

7 Conclusion

We introduced the notion of risk–insurance parity to examine the equivalence relation between risk aversion and insurance propensity to a set of contracts. Different concepts of risk aversion envisaged obviously tie to different sets of contracts for insurance propensity. [Maccheroni et al.](#)

(2025) first investigated such equivalence relations; we provided a full characterization of them. First risk–insurance parity treats of weak risk aversion, and we proved that it is satisfied only by full-indemnity contract sets. Second risk–insurance parity treats of strong risk aversion; we also characterized it fully and provided several examples of contract sets satisfying it.

We expanded the insurance-propensity notion by also considering ρ -priced contract sets and not just standard contract sets. The use of premium principles allowed for a sensible reduction in the size of contract sets satisfying first risk–insurance parity, even reducing it to only one contract. The impact was more limited in the case of second risk–insurance parity, though.

Risk–insurance parity moreover offers a way to define new notions of risk aversion, letting them be equivalent to insurance propensity to a contract set. From this approach, we designed two new notions of risk aversion: right-handle risk aversion and left-handle risk aversion. Right-handle risk aversion is equivalent to insurance propensity to deductible-only contracts. Left-handle risk aversion is equivalent to insurance propensity to limit-only contracts. Both of them also have an interpretation in terms of mean-preserving spreads. In the dual utility model, they correspond to star-shapedness of the weighting function at 1 and 0, respectively. Finally, we offered some remarks on our results and, in particular, discussed some limitations arising when extending the space of random variables under analysis regarding continuity of risk preferences. We also showed that there are no LC contract set for which insurance propensity corresponds to monotone risk aversion.

Acknowledgments

Ruodu Wang is supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (RGPIN-2018-03823, RGPAS-2018-522590) and Canada Research Chairs (CRC-2022-00141).

References

- Aouani, Z., Chateauneuf, A., and Ventura, C. (2021). Propensity for hedging and ambiguity aversion. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, **97**, 102543.
- Arrow, K. J. (1963). Uncertainty and the welfare economics of medical care. *American Economic Review*, **53**(5), 941–973.
- Borch, K. H. (1985). A theory of insurance premiums. *Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance*, 192–208.
- Bühlmann, H. (1980). An economic premium principle. *ASTIN Bulletin*, **11**(1), 52–60.
- Chateauneuf, A. and Cohen, M. (1994). Risk seeking with diminishing marginal utility in a non-expected utility model. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, **9**(1), 77–91.
- Chew, H. S. and Mao, H. M. (1995). A Schur concave characterization of risk aversion for non-expected utility preferences. *Journal of Economic Theory*, **67**(2), 402–435.

- Cohen, M. D. (1995). Risk-aversion concepts in expected-and non-expected-utility models. *Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance Theory*, **20**, 73–91.
- Cummins, J. D. (1988). Risk-based premiums for insurance guaranty funds. *Journal of Finance*, **43**(4), 823–839.
- Dekel, E. (1989). Asset demand without the independence axiom. *Econometrica*, **57**, 163–169.
- Denneberg, D. (1990). Premium calculation: Why standard deviation should be replaced by absolute deviation. *ASTIN Bulletin*, **20**, 181–190.
- Denuit, M., Dhaene, J., Goovaerts and M.J., Kaas, R. (2005). *Actuarial Theory for Dependent Risks*. Wiley, Chichester.
- Dickson, D. (2017). *Insurance Risk and Ruin*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dubra, J., Maccheroni, F. and Ok, E. A. (2004). Expected utility theory without the completeness axiom. *Journal of Economic Theory*, **115**(1), 118–133.
- Föllmer, H. and Schied, A. (2016). *Stochastic Finance. An Introduction in Discrete Time*. (Fourth Edition.) Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Gaillardetz, P., and Lakhmiri, J. Y. (2011). A new premium principle for equity-indexed annuities. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, **78**(1), 245–265.
- Ghossoub, M., Ren, Q. and Wang, R. (2025). Counter-monotonic risk allocations and distortion risk measures. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*, forthcoming.
- Harris, M. and Townsend, R. M. (1981). Resource allocation under asymmetric information. *Econometrica*, **49**(1), 33–64.
- Herden, G. (1989). On the existence of utility functions. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, **17**(3), 297–313.
- Huberman, G., Mayers, D. and Smith Jr, C. W. (1983). Optimal insurance policy indemnity schedules. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, **14**(2) 415–426.
- Maccheroni, F., Marinacci, M., Wang, R. and Wu, Q. (2025). Risk aversion and insurance propensity. *American Economic Review*, **115**(5), 1597–1649.
- Machina, M. J. and Schmeidler, D. (1992). A more robust definition of subjective probability. *Econometrica*, **60**(4), 745–780.
- Markowitz, Harry M. (1952). Portfolio selection. *Journal of Finance*, **7**: 77–91.
- Müller, A. and Stoyan, D. (2002). *Comparison Methods for Stochastic Models and Risks*. Wiley.
- Myerson, R. B. (1979). Incentive compatibility and the bargaining problem. *Econometrica*, **47**(1), 61–73.
- Pratt, J. W. (1964). Risk aversion in the small and in the large. *Econometrica*, **32**(1/2), 122–136.
- Principi, G., Wakker, P. and Wang, R. (2025). Anticomonicity for preference axioms: The natural counterpart to comonicity. *Theoretical Economics*, **20**(3), 831–855.
- Puccetti, G. and Wang R. (2015). Extremal dependence concepts. *Statistical Science*, **30**(4), 485–517.
- Quiggin, J. (1992). Increasing risk: another definition. In *Progress in decision, utility and risk theory*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 239–248.
- Rothschild, M. and Stiglitz, J. E. (1970). Increasing risk: I. A definition. *Journal of Economic Theory*, **2**(3),

225—243.

Rüschendorf, L. (2013). *Mathematical Risk Analysis. Dependence, Risk Bounds, Optimal Allocations and Portfolios*. Springer, Heidelberg.

Shaked, M. and Shanthikumar, J. G. (2007). *Stochastic Orders*. Springer, New York.

Ward, L. E. (1954). Partially ordered topological spaces. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, **5**(1), 144–161.

Wang, S., Young, V. R. and Panjer, H. H. (1997). Axiomatic characterization of insurance prices. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **21**(2), 173–183.

Wang, S. S. (2000). A class of distortion operators for pricing financial and insurance risks. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*, **67**(1), 15–36.

Yaari, M. E. (1987). The dual theory of choice under risk. *Econometrica*, **55**(1), 95–115.

A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

For the “if” statement: Let $\mathcal{C} = \{C_\pi : X \mapsto \pi - X \mid X \in \mathcal{S}, \pi \in \Pi\}$ where Π is dense in \mathbb{R} . The statement that first risk–insurance parity holds for \mathcal{C} was proved in [Maccheroni et al. \(2025, Theorem 1\)](#) for the case $\Pi = \mathbb{R}$, under either of the following settings: the space of all bounded random variables, or the space of random variables with finite moments of all orders. Our proof is a simple modulation of theirs, accounting for other dense sets by leveraging continuity of risk preferences, and the space \mathcal{S} of simple random variables. First, we show that weak risk aversion implies insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} . For any $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$, and any $C_\pi \in \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$X + C_\pi(X) = \pi = \mathbb{E}[X + C_\pi(Y)] \succsim X + C_\pi(Y),$$

where the preference relation follows from weak risk aversion.

Next, we show that insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} implies weak risk aversion. Let $X \in \mathcal{S}$. There exists a bounded sequence of random variables $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, each piecewise constant on finitely many events with equal probability, such that $X_n \xrightarrow{B} X$; see [Maccheroni et al. \(2025, Lemma 5\)](#). Furthermore, we can assume that $\mathbb{E}[X_n] \in \Pi$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as Π is dense in \mathbb{R} . By [Maccheroni et al. \(2025, Lemma 1\)](#), for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $Z_n, W_n \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $X_n \stackrel{d}{=} Z_n - W_n + \mathbb{E}[X_n]$ and $Z_n \stackrel{d}{=} W_n$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_n] = Z_n + C_{\mathbb{E}[X_n]}(Z_n) \succsim Z_n + C_{\mathbb{E}[X_n]}(W_n) = Z_n - W_n + \mathbb{E}[X_n] \stackrel{d}{=} X_n.$$

The law invariance of \succsim implies $\mathbb{E}[X_n] \succsim X_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, we conclude that $\mathbb{E}[X] \succsim X$ by continuity of the risk preference.

For the “only if” statement: We show that, whenever \mathcal{C} does not satisfy the conditions in the statement, meaning \mathcal{C} comprises other types of contract or Π is not dense in \mathbb{R} , there exist a continuous risk preference such that weak risk aversion and insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} are not equivalent. First, suppose \mathcal{C} includes a standard contract, say $C^* : X \mapsto \pi^* - I^*(X)$, that is not a full indemnity contract. Define the risk preference \succsim_a as

$$X \succsim_a Y \iff X = \mathbb{E}[Y] \text{ or } X \stackrel{d}{=} Y.$$

The relation \succsim_a is law-invariant, transitive and weakly risk averse. It is also continuous because bounded convergence implies convergence of expectations. There exists $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that $I^*(x) \neq x$ on A . Consider a random variable $Z \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\mathbb{P}(Z \in A) \in (0, 1)$, yielding $Z + C^*(Z) \neq \pi^*$. Thus, for any $W \in \mathcal{S}$, $W \stackrel{d}{=} Z$, we have $Z + C^*(Z) \neq \mathbb{E}[Z + C^*(W)]$, so $Z + C^*(Z) \not\succsim Z + C^*(W)$. Hence, Z^* is not insurance propense to \mathcal{C} ; and thus, \mathcal{C} does not satisfy first risk–insurance parity. Next, suppose that \mathcal{C} only includes full-indemnity standard contracts $C_\pi : X \mapsto \pi - X$, $\pi \in \Pi$, but Π is not dense in \mathbb{R} . We will show that there exists a continuous risk preference that is insurance propense to \mathcal{C} but not weakly risk averse. Define \succsim by

$$X \succsim Y \iff \begin{array}{l} X = \mathbb{E}[Y], \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[Y] \text{ can be approached by a sequence in } \Pi, \\ \text{or } X \stackrel{d}{=} Y. \end{array}$$

The relation \succsim is transitive, law invariant and continuous, because bounded convergence implies convergence of expectations. Note that for any $Z \in \mathcal{S}$ and $C_\pi \in \mathcal{C}$, $\pi \in \Pi$, we have $Z + C_\pi(Z) = \mathbb{E}[Z + C_\pi(W)] = \pi$. Hence, \succsim is insurance propense to \mathcal{C} ; however, by definition, it is not weakly risk averse. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Suppose that \mathcal{C} comprises solely a full-indemnity contract and the premium principle ρ satisfies the range property (RP), i.e., $\mathcal{C} = \{C_\rho : X \mapsto \rho(X) - X\}$. Weak risk aversion implying insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} follows directly from Theorem 1 and law invariance of ρ . Conversely, assume that insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} holds, and we will argue that it implies weak risk aversion. For any $X \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists a bounded sequence of random variables $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, each piecewise constant on finitely many events with equal probability, such that $X_n \xrightarrow{B} X$; see Maccheroni et al. (2025, Lemma 5). By Maccheroni et al. (2025, Lemma 1), there exist $Z_n, W_n \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $X_n \stackrel{d}{=} Z_n - W_n + \mathbb{E}[X_n]$

and $Z_n \stackrel{d}{=} W_n$. Furthermore, because ρ satisfies (RP), there exists $\{b_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that $\rho(Z_n + b_n) = \mathbb{E}[X_n]$. The law invariance of ρ yields $\rho(W_n + b_n) = \rho(Z_n + b_n) = \mathbb{E}[X_n]$ because $Z_n + b_n \stackrel{d}{=} W_n + b_n$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_n] = (Z_n + b_n) + C_\rho(Z_n + b_n) \succsim (Z_n + b_n) + C_\rho(W_n + b_n) = Z_n - W_n + \mathbb{E}[X_n] \stackrel{d}{=} X_n,$$

where the preference relation follows from insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} and $Z_n + b_n \stackrel{d}{=} W_n + b_n$. It follows from law invariance of \succsim that $\mathbb{E}[X_n] \succsim X_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, $\mathbb{E}[X] \succsim X$ by continuity of risk preferences. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

For the “if” statement: Assume \mathcal{C} satisfies the conditions in the theorem’s statement. Let us first show that, for any continuous risk preference \succsim , strong risk aversion implies insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} . Choose any $Z \in \mathcal{S}$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}$. The increasingness of indemnity functions imply that Z and $C(Z)$ are counter-monotonic. Hence, for any $W \in \mathcal{S}$ with $W \stackrel{d}{=} Z$, it holds that $C(W) \stackrel{d}{=} C(Z)$, and we have $Z + C(Z) \leq_{\text{cx}} Z + C(W)$, see e.g., [Rüschendorf \(2013, Corollary 3.28\)](#). Therefore, $Z + C(Z) \succsim Z + C(W)$ since \succsim is strongly risk averse.

Let us next prove that, for any continuous risk preference \succsim , insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} implies strong risk aversion. Because $\succsim_*^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the smallest continuous risk preference that is insurance propense to \mathcal{C} , if for some $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, $X \succsim_*^{\mathcal{C}} Y$ holds true, then $X \succsim Y$ holds also true for every other risk preference that is insurance propense to \mathcal{C} . Since $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$ implies $X \succsim_*^{\mathcal{C}} Y$, then $\succsim_*^{\mathcal{C}}$ is strong risk averse, and so is all continuous risk preferences that is insurance propense to \mathcal{C} .

For the “only if” statement, suppose that $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$ does not imply $X \succsim_*^{\mathcal{C}} Y$. Then, $\succsim_*^{\mathcal{C}}$ itself is an example of a continuous risk preference that is insurance propense to \mathcal{C} , by definition, but not strong risk averse. Thus, \mathcal{C} does not satisfy second risk–insurance parity. \square

A.4 Proof of Lemma 1

Suppose that \mathcal{C} satisfies the conditions in the lemma’s statement. The argument supporting that strong risk aversion implies insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} is the same as in the proof of Theorem 3 and we will not repeat it. We next prove that insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} implies strong risk aversion.

For $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$ if and only if Y is the result of finitely many simple mean-preserving spreads of X ([Rothschild and Stiglitz, 1970, Lemma 1](#)). It suffices to prove $X \succsim Y$ for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ differing by only one simple mean-preserving spread, and the general case will follow

by transitivity of \succsim . The case where $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$ (i.e., they differ by zero mean-preserving spreads) is trivial by law invariance and reflexivity of \succsim . Furthermore, again evoking transitivity, we may assume X is constant on A_1 and A_2 : otherwise, re-express Y as the result of multiple simple mean-preserving spreads, breaking down A_1 and A_2 in smaller equiprobable parts following the masses of X . Let $x_1 = X(A_1)$ and $x_2 = X(A_2)$.

We can assume $x_1 < x_2$. The case where $x_1 = x_2$ will follow by continuity of the risk preference: Define sequences of random variables $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ where $X_n = X - 2^{-n}\mathbb{1}_{A_1} + 2^{-n}\mathbb{1}_{A_2}$ and $Y_n = X_n - \delta\mathbb{1}_{A_1} + \delta\mathbb{1}_{A_2}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $X_n \xrightarrow{B} X$, $Y_n \xrightarrow{B} Y$, $X_n \leq_{\text{cx}} Y_n$ and $X_n(A_1) < X_n(A_2)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We can moreover assume $A_1 = \{X = x_1\}$ and $A_2 = \{X = x_2\}$, implying $\mathbb{P}(X = x_1) = \mathbb{P}(X = x_2)$, and the general case will follow by a similar argument, letting $X_n = X - 2^{-n}\mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\} \setminus A_1} + 2^{-n}\mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\} \setminus A_2}$ and evoking continuity.

For the sake of clarity, let us restate what our problem has been reduced to from the arguments above: For any $X \in \mathcal{S}$, $\delta > 0$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \text{Supp}(X)$ with $\mathbb{P}(X = x_1) = \mathbb{P}(X = x_2)$, let $Y = X - \delta\mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \delta\mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}}$. We must establish $X \succsim Y$ by relying on the insurance propensity of \succsim to contracts in \mathcal{C} . Let $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $\{Z_{i,n} : i \in \mathbb{N}, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfy the conditions given in the lemma's statement for that choice of X , x_1 , x_2 and δ .

Note that (7) implies that, for every $i, n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a measure-preserving bijection $\xi_{i,n} : \{X = x_1\} \rightarrow \{X = x_2\}$ such that

$$C_i(Z_{i,n})(\omega) - C_i(Z_{i,n})(\xi_{i,n}(\omega)) = \delta_i \quad \text{for every } \omega \in \{X = x_1\} \quad (11)$$

and

$$C_i(Z_{i,n})(\xi_{i,n}^{-1}(\omega)) - C_i(Z_{i,n})(\omega) = \delta_i \quad \text{for every } \omega \in \{X = x_2\}. \quad (12)$$

Define $W_{i,n}$ such that

$$W_{i,n}(\omega) = \begin{cases} Z_{i,n}(\omega), & \omega \in \Omega \setminus \{X \in \{x_1, x_2\}\}, \\ Z_{i,n}(\xi_{i,n}(\omega)), & \omega \in \{X_1 = x_1\}, \\ Z_{i,n}(\xi_{i,n}^{-1}(\omega)), & \omega \in \{X_2 = x_2\}, \end{cases} \quad \text{for every } i, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It is clear that $W_{i,n} \stackrel{d}{=} Z_{i,n}$. Also, from (11) and (12), we have

$$C_i(W_{i,n}) = C_i(Z_{i,n}) - \delta_i\mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \delta_i\mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}}, \quad \text{for every } i, n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (13)$$

Combining all this, we have

$$Z_{i,n} + C_i(Z_{i,n}) \succsim Z_{i,n} + C_i(W_{i,n}) = Z_{i,n} + C_i(Z_{i,n}) - \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}}, \quad \text{for every } i, n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where the risk-preference relation comes from the insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} . Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain, evoking (8) and continuity of risk preferences,

$$X - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}} \succsim X - \sum_{j=1}^i \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^i \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}}, \quad \text{for every } i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since this is true for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, transitivity of risk preferences allows to conclude

$$X \succsim X - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}} = X - \delta \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \delta \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}} = Y.$$

Hence, we complete the proof. \square

A.5 Proof of Proposition 1

First, each set indeed comprises valid standard contracts, i.e., they are decreasing and of the form $x \mapsto \pi - I(x)$. Consider any $X \in \mathcal{S}$, $\delta > 0$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \text{Supp}(X)$ with $x_1 < x_2$ and $\mathbb{P}(X = x_1) = \mathbb{P}(X = x_2)$. We prove, for each item, the existence of the sequences indicated in Lemma 1, thus yielding second risk-insurance parity.

Proof of (i): Define the sequence $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \delta_j = \delta$ and $\delta_i/(\delta_i + x_2 - x_1 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j) \leq \alpha_0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that this sequence will exist no matter how small the difference between x_2 and x_1 . Set $\alpha_i = \delta_i/(\delta_i + x_2 - x_1 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $Y \in \mathcal{S}$, letting $f_\alpha(Y) = (Y - \pi_0)/(1 - \alpha)$, we note

$$f_\alpha(Y) + C_\alpha(f_\alpha(Y)) = \frac{(Y - \pi_0)}{(1 - \alpha)} + \pi_0 - \alpha \frac{(Y - \pi_0)}{(1 - \alpha)} = Y, \quad \alpha \in (0, \alpha_0).$$

Let $C_i : X \mapsto \pi_0 - \alpha_i X$ and $Z_{i,n} = f_{\alpha_i}(X - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}})$ for all $i, n \in \mathbb{N}$ to show that there exist sequences $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{Z_{i,n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfying (7) and (8).

Proof of (ii): Choose $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ that satisfies $\delta_i \leq \lambda_0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_i = \delta$. Take $\pi^* \in \Pi$ such that $x_1 - d_0 < \pi^* < x_2 - d_0$, and define the sequence of contracts $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ where $C_i : X \mapsto \pi^* - (X - d_0)_+ \wedge \delta_i$. Define the function

$$g_{\pi, \lambda, d}(Y) = Y - \pi + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\{Y - \pi \geq d\}}, \quad \text{for any } \pi, \lambda, d \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } Y \in \mathcal{S},$$

which will be used throughout the remaining proof items. We note

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{\pi^*, \delta_i, d_0}(Y) + C_i(g_{\pi^*, \delta_i, d_0}(Y)) &= Y - \pi^* + \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{Y - \pi^* \geq d_0\}} + \pi^* - (Y - \pi^* + \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{Y - \pi^* \geq d_0\}} - d_0)_+ \wedge \delta_i \\
&= Y - \pi^* + \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{Y - \pi^* \geq d_0\}} + \pi^* - \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{Y - \pi^* \geq d_0\}} \\
&= Y, \quad \text{for any } Y \in \mathcal{S}.
\end{aligned}$$

From there, it is standard to show that sequences $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{Z_{i,n} : i, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with $Z_{i,n} = g_{\pi^*, \delta_i, d_0}(X - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}})$, for every $i, n \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfy (7) and (8).

Proof of (iii): Choose $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $\delta_i \leq \lambda_0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_i$, and $d^* \in \Pi$ such that $x_1 - \pi_0 < d^* < x_2 - \pi_0$. The sequences $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, with $C_i : X \mapsto \pi_0 - (X - d^*)_+ \wedge \delta_i$, and $\{Z_{i,n} : i, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $Z_{i,n} = g_{\pi_0, \delta_i, d^*}(X - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}})$, satisfy (7) and (8).

Proof of (iv): Take $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ to be such that $\delta_i \leq \kappa_0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_i = \delta$. Choose $\pi^* \in \Pi$ satisfying $x_1 - \tau_0 < \pi^* < x_2 + \tau_0$. It is straightforward to verify that the sequences $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $C_i : X \mapsto \pi^* - \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq \tau_0\}}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\{Z_{i,n} : i, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $Z_{i,n} = g_{\pi^*, \delta_i, \tau_0}(X - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}})$, satisfy (7) and (8).

Proof of (v): Again, take $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ to be such that $\delta_i \leq \kappa_0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_i = \delta$. Choose $\tau_* \in \Pi$ satisfying $x_1 - \pi_0 < \tau_* < x_2 - \pi_0$. Letting $C_i : X \mapsto \pi_0 - \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq \tau_*\}}$ and $Z_{i,n} = g_{\pi_0, \delta_i, \tau_*}(X - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}})$, for every $i, n \in \mathbb{N}$, shows that the criteria in (7) and (8) are met. \square

A.6 Proof of Proposition 3

Consider any $X \in \mathcal{S}$, $\delta > 0$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \text{Supp}(X)$ with $\mathbb{P}(X = x_1) = \mathbb{P}(X = x_2)$ and $x_1 < x_2$. For each item, we show the existence of sequences $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $\{Z_{i,n} : i, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$, with $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_i = \delta$, satisfying (7) and (8). Hence, second risk-insurance parity follows by Lemma 1.

For item (i): Define $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ so that it satisfies $\delta_i \leq \lambda_0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_i = \delta$. Let $d^* \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $x_1 < d^* < x_2$. For the sake of clarity, we write $W_i = X - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}}$ and $b_i = \rho(\delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{W_i \geq d^*\}})$.

Define the function

$$h_{\pi, \lambda, d}(Y) = Y - \pi + \lambda \mathbb{1}_{\{Y - \pi \geq d\}}, \quad \text{for any } \lambda, d \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } Y \in \mathcal{S},$$

which will be used also for item (ii). Let $d_i = d^* - b_i$. For every $i, n \in \mathbb{N}$, choose $C_i : X \mapsto$

$\rho((X - d_i)_+ \wedge \delta_i) - (X - d_i)_+ \wedge \delta_i$ and $Z_{i,n} = h_{\delta_i, d_i}(W_i - b_i)$. We note that

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{i,n} + C_i(Z_{i,n}) &= W_i - b_i + \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{W_i - b_i \geq d_i\}} + \rho((W_i - b_i + \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{W_i - b_i \geq d_i\}} - d_i)_+ \wedge \delta_i) \\
&\quad - (W_i - b_i + \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{W_i - b_i \geq d_i\}} - d_i)_+ \wedge \delta_i \\
&= W_i - b_i + \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{W_i \geq d^*\}} + \rho(\delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{W_i \geq d^*\}}) - \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{W_i \geq d^*\}} \\
&= W_i - b_i + \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{W_i \geq d^*\}} + b_i - \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{W_i \geq d^*\}} \\
&= W_i \quad \text{for any } i, n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

The remaining steps to verify that $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{Z_{i,n} : i, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfy (7) and (8) are straightforward once (14) is given.

For item (ii): Similarly to item (i), define $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ so that it satisfies $\delta_i \leq \kappa_0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_i = \delta$. Take $\tau^* \in \mathbb{R}$ so that $x_1 < \tau_0 < x_2$. Set $b_i = \rho(\delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{W_i \geq d^*\}})$ and let $\tau_i = \tau^* - b_i$. The sequences $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $C_i : X \mapsto \rho(\delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq \tau_i\}}) - \delta_i \mathbb{1}_{\{X \geq \tau_i\}}$, and $\{Z_{i,n} : i, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $Z_{i,n} = h_{\delta_i, \tau_i}(W_i - b_i)$, satisfy (7) and (8). \square

A.7 Proof of Proposition 4

Consider any $X \in \mathcal{S}$, $\delta > 0$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \text{Supp}(X)$ with $\mathbb{P}(X = x_1) = \mathbb{P}(X = x_2)$ and $x_1 < x_2$. We show the existence of sequences $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $\{Z_{i,n} : i, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$, with $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_i = \delta$, satisfying (7) and (8). Second risk-insurance parity thus follows by Lemma 1.

Let $\{\delta_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be such that $\delta_i / (\delta_i + x_2 - x_1 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j) \leq \alpha_0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_i = \delta$. Note that this sequence will always exist no matter how close x_1 and x_2 . Set $\alpha_i = \delta_i / (\delta_i + x_2 - x_1 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $Y \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, choose $b_{Y,\alpha}$ such that $\rho(Y + \alpha b_{Y,\alpha}) = -(1 - \alpha)b_{Y,\alpha}$; the existence of $b_{Y,\alpha}$ is guaranteed by ρ satisfying (MP). Let $f_\alpha(Y) = Y / (1 - \alpha) + b_{\alpha Y / (1 - \alpha), \alpha}$, and note that for any $Y \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&f_\alpha(Y) + C_\alpha(f_\alpha(Y)) \\
&= \frac{Y}{(1 - \alpha)} + b_{\alpha Y / (1 - \alpha), \alpha} + \rho\left(\alpha \left(\frac{Y}{(1 - \alpha)} + b_{\alpha Y / (1 - \alpha), \alpha}\right)\right) - \alpha \left(\frac{Y}{(1 - \alpha)} + b_{\alpha Y / (1 - \alpha), \alpha}\right) \\
&= Y + (1 - \alpha)b_{\alpha Y / (1 - \alpha), \alpha} + \rho\left(\frac{\alpha Y}{(1 - \alpha)} + \alpha b_{\alpha Y / (1 - \alpha), \alpha}\right) = Y. \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

Choose $C_i : X \mapsto \rho(\alpha_i X) - \alpha_i X$ and $Z_{i,n} = f_{\alpha_i}(X - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_1\}} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j \mathbb{1}_{\{X=x_2\}})$, for every $i, n \in \mathbb{N}$. With (15) in mind, it is straightforward to show that $\{C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{Z_{i,n} : i, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfy (7) and (8). \square

A.8 Proof of Proposition 5

For (i): We first consider necessity. Assume that $X \leq_{\text{lhcx}} Y$ and $X \not\stackrel{d}{=} Y$. The condition that $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[Y]$ and $\min X > \min Y$ follow directly from the definition of left-handle mean-preserving spreads. Let $\{A_i : i \in [n]\}$ be a partition of Ω such that X^{co} and Y^{co} are both constant on each A_i , choosing $n \in \mathbb{N}$ accordingly. Denote by $x_i = X^{\text{co}}(A_i)$ and $y_i = Y^{\text{co}}(A_i)$ for all $i \in [n]$. Because X^{co} and Y^{co} are comonotonic, we can assume that $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n$ and $y_1 \leq y_2 \leq \dots \leq y_n$. Choose k^* such that $x_{k^*} = \min X$ and $x_{k^*+1} > \min X$. If the property of $\mathbb{P}(X \leq t | X > \min X) \geq \mathbb{P}(Y^{\text{co}} \leq t | X^{\text{co}} > \min X)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ does not hold, then $x_t > y_t$ for some $t > k^*$. This leads to a contradiction, as the left-handle mean-preserving spread does not strictly reduce the value for any point other than the minimal one. Next, we address sufficiency. Suppose that $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[Y]$, $\min X > \min Y$, and $\mathbb{P}(X \leq t | X > \min X) \geq \mathbb{P}(Y^{\text{co}} \leq t | X^{\text{co}} > \min X)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Apply the same notation in the proof of the necessity part: we have $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_{k^*} > y_1$ and $x_i \leq y_i$ for all $i > k^*$. Let r^* be the index such that $y_{r^*} < x_1$ and $y_{r^*+1} \geq x_1$. Because $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mathbb{E}[Y]$, it holds that $\sum_{i=1}^{r^*} (y_i - x_i) \mathbb{P}(A_i) = \sum_{j=r^*}^n (x_j - y_j) \mathbb{P}(A_j)$; let these quantities be represented by K . For all $z > 0$, define

$$\zeta(z) = \inf \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{i=1}^{\min(k, r^*)} (y_i - x_i) \mathbb{P}(A_i) > z \right\};$$

$$\xi(z) = \inf \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N} : \sum_{j=r^*}^{\min(k, n)} (x_j - y_j) \mathbb{P}(A_j) > z \right\}.$$

Let $z_1 < z_2 < \dots < z_\ell$ denote the ℓ points where either ζ or ξ are discontinuous, and $z_0 = 0$. Consider the following sequence of random variables: $X_0 = X$ and

$$X_i = X_{i-1} - \frac{z_i - z_{i-1}}{\mathbb{P}(A_{\zeta(z_i)})} \mathbb{1}_{A_{\zeta(z_i)}} + \frac{z_i - z_{i-1}}{\mathbb{P}(A_{\xi(z_i)})} \mathbb{1}_{A_{\xi(z_i)}}, \quad \text{for every } i \in [\ell]. \quad (16)$$

Then, we have $X_\ell \stackrel{d}{=} Y$, and (16) is a left-handle mean-preserving spread for every $i \in [\ell]$. Hence, $X \leq_{\text{lhcx}} Y$. The proof for item (ii) is similar and thus omitted. \square

A.9 Proof of Proposition 6

We prove the claim for \leq_{lhcx} ; the case of \leq_{rhcx} then follows directly by Corollary 1. Consider two sequences of random variables $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $\{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that $X_n \xrightarrow{B} X$ and $Y_n \xrightarrow{B} Y$ for some $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, and $X_n \leq_{\text{lhcx}} Y_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We aim to prove that

$X \leq_{\text{hcx}} Y$. Applying Proposition 5(i), it is sufficient to verify that $\min X \geq \min Y$ and $X^{\text{co}} \leq Y^{\text{co}}$ on $\{X^{\text{co}} > \min X\}$, where $(X^{\text{co}}, Y^{\text{co}})$ are comonotonic with $X^{\text{co}} \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} X$ and $Y^{\text{co}} \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} Y$.

First, it is well-known that convex order is closed under bounded convergence. Note that left-handle convex order is stronger than convex order, and thus, we have $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$. This implies $\min X \geq \min Y$. Next, we prove $X^{\text{co}} \leq Y^{\text{co}}$ on $\{X^{\text{co}} > \min X\}$. Let V be a uniform random variable on $[0, 1]$; see Föllmer and Schied (2016, Proposition A.31) for its existence on an atomless space. Denote by q_Z the quantile function of $Z \in \mathcal{S}$, i.e., $q_Z(s) = \inf\{t : \mathbb{P}(Z \leq t) \geq s\}$ for $s \in (0, 1)$. It holds that $(q_X(V), q_Y(V))$ are comonotonic. Further, denote by $\alpha_0 = \mathbb{P}(X = \min X)$. It suffices to verify that for any $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ with $\beta > \alpha > \alpha_0$,

$$\int_{\alpha}^{\beta} q_X(s) ds \leq \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} q_Y(s) ds. \quad (17)$$

To see this, because $X_n \xrightarrow{\text{B}} X$ and $Y_n \xrightarrow{\text{B}} Y$, we have $q_{X_n} \rightarrow q_X$ and $q_{Y_n} \rightarrow q_Y$ bounded almost surely. Hence, it is straightforward to verify that for large enough n , $q_{X_n}(s) > \min X_n$ for all $s \in [\alpha, \beta]$. It follows from $X_n \leq_{\text{hcx}} Y_n$ and Proposition 5(i) that $q_{X_n}(s) \leq q_{Y_n}(s)$ for all $s \in [\alpha, \beta]$. Therefore,

$$\int_{\alpha}^{\beta} q_X(s) ds = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} q_{X_n}(s) ds \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} q_{Y_n}(s) ds = \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} q_Y(s) ds.$$

Hence, (17) have been verified, and this completes the proof. \square

A.10 Proof of Theorem 4

Suppose that \mathcal{C} does not contain full-indemnity contracts; their possible inclusion follows directly from Theorem 1 and the fact that weak risk aversion is weaker than right-handle risk aversion.

For standard contract sets: Suppose that

$$\mathcal{C} = \{C_{\pi, d} : X \mapsto \pi - (X - d)_+ \mid (\pi, d) \in \Theta\},$$

and $\{\pi + d : (\pi, d) \in \Theta\}$ is dense in \mathbb{R} . We first argue that, for any continuous risk preference \succsim , right-handle risk aversion implies insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} . Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$ with $X \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} Y$. For $C_{\pi, d} \in \mathcal{C}$, we aim to verify that $X + C_{\pi, d}(X) \succsim X + C_{\pi, d}(Y)$. The case that $X \leq d$ is trivial. We assume that $\mathbb{P}(X > d) > 0$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1 &= X \wedge d - X + Y - d, \quad Z_2 = X - X \wedge d \text{ and } Z_3 = X - Y; \\ A_1 &= \{Y > d, X < Y\}, \quad A_2 = \{Y < d, X > d\} \text{ and } A_3 = \{X > Y > d\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to check that Z_1 , Z_2 and Z_3 are nonnegative on A_1 , A_2 and A_3 , respectively. By standard calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X + C_{\pi,d}(Y) &= \pi + X - (Y - d)_+ = \pi + X \wedge d - Z_1 \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + Z_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_2} + Z_3 \mathbb{1}_{A_3} \\ &= X + C_{\pi,d}(X) - Z_1 \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + Z_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_2} + Z_3 \mathbb{1}_{A_3}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Since $X(\omega) + C_{\pi,d}(X(\omega)) = \max\{X + C_{\pi,d}(X)\}$ for all $\omega \in A_2 \cup A_3$, it follows from (18) and Proposition 5 that $X + C_{\pi,d}(X) \leq_{\text{rhcx}} X + C_{\pi,d}(Y)$. Therefore, right-handle risk aversion implies $X + C_{\pi,d}(X) \lesssim X + C_{\pi,d}(Y)$.

Next, we prove that, for any risk preference \lesssim , insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} implies right-handle risk aversion. Consider any $Y \in \mathcal{S}$ resulting of a right-handle mean-preserving spread of some $X \in \mathcal{S}$: for some $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$, we have $Y = X - \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_2}$ with $\delta_1 \mathbb{P}(A_1) = \delta_2 \mathbb{P}(A_2)$ and $X(\omega) = \max X$ for all $\omega \in A_2$. We will prove that $X \lesssim Y$. The general case for $X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Y$ follows by transitivity.

For now, let us assume that $\mathbb{P}(A_2) = k\mathbb{P}(A_1)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies $k\delta_2 = \delta_1$. Take $d^*, \pi^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $d^* + \pi^* = \max X$ and $C_{d^*, \pi^*} \in \mathcal{C}$; from the condition $\{d + \pi : (d, \pi) \in \Theta\}$ is dense in \mathbb{R} , these d^* and π^* exist. Partition A_2 into k equiprobable events and denote these events $A_2^{(1)}, \dots, A_2^{(k)}$. Let $Z = X - \pi^* + \delta_2 \sum_{i=1}^k i \mathbb{1}_{A_2^{(i)}}$.

Because A_1 and $A_2^{(1)}$ are equiprobable, there exists a bijection $\xi : A_2^{(1)} \rightarrow A_1$ such that $\mathbb{P}(B) = \mathbb{P}(\xi(B))$ for every \mathcal{F} -measurable $B \subseteq A_2^{(1)}$. Define $W \in \mathcal{S}$ such that

$$W(\omega) = \begin{cases} X(\omega) - \pi^*, & \omega \in \Omega \setminus (A_1 \cup A_2), \\ \max X - \pi^* + k\delta_2, & \omega \in A_1, \\ X(\xi(\omega)) - \pi^*, & \omega \in A_2^{(1)}, \\ \max X - \pi^* + (i-1)\delta_2, & \omega \in A_2^{(i)}, i \in \{2, \dots, k\}, \text{ if } k > 1. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Thus, $Z \stackrel{d}{=} W$ and $C_{\pi^*, d^*}(W) = C_{\pi^*, d^*}(Z) - \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_2}$; see Table 1 for an illustration. We have

$$\begin{aligned} Z + C_{\pi^*, d^*}(Z) &= Z + \pi^* - (Z - d^*)_+ \\ &= (\pi^* + Z) \wedge (\pi^* + d^*) \\ &= \left(X + \delta_2 \sum_{i=1}^k i \mathbb{1}_{A_2^{(i)}} \right) \wedge \max X = X, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

	$\Omega \setminus (A_1 \cup A_2)$	A_1	$A_2^{(1)}$	$A_2^{(2)}$	\dots	$A_2^{(k)}$
Z	$X(\omega) - \pi^*$	$X(\omega) - \pi^*$	$\max X - \pi^* + \delta_2$	$\max X - \pi^* + 2\delta_2$	\dots	$\max X - \pi^* + k\delta_2$
W	$X(\omega) - \pi^*$	$\max X - \pi^* + k\delta_2$	$X(\xi(\omega)) - \pi^*$	$\max X - \pi^* + \delta_2$	\dots	$\max X - \pi^* + (k-1)\delta_2$
$C_{\pi^*, d^*}(Z)$	π^*	π^*	$\pi^* - \delta_2$	$\pi^* - 2\delta_2$	\dots	$\pi^* - k\delta_2$
$C_{\pi^*, d^*}(W)$	π^*	$\pi^* - k\delta_2$	π^*	$\pi^* - \delta_2$	\dots	$\pi^* - (k-1)\delta_2$
$Z + C_{\pi^*, d^*}(Z)$	$X(\omega)$	$X(\omega)$	$\max X$	$\max X$	\dots	$\max X$
$Z + C_{\pi^*, d^*}(W)$	$X(\omega)$	$X(\omega) - k\delta_2$	$\max X + \delta_2$	$\max X + \delta_2$	\dots	$\max X + \delta_2$

Table 1: Illustration of the contracts' construction for the proof of Theorem 4.

where the last equality holds because $X(\omega) = \max X$ for all $\omega \in \bigcup_{i=1}^k A_2^{(i)}$. Therefore,

$$X = Z + C_{\pi^*, d^*}(Z) \succsim Z + C_{\pi^*, d^*}(W) = Z + C_{\pi^*, d^*}(Z) - \delta \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + \delta \mathbb{1}_{A_2} = X - \delta \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + \delta \mathbb{1}_{A_2} = Y,$$

where the risk preference is established from the insurance propensity assumption.

Next, consider the case that $\mathbb{P}(A_1)/\mathbb{P}(A_2)$ is a rational number that is equal to m/n , where $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, we can partition A_1 into m equally probable events, denoted by $\{A_1^{(i)} : i \in [m]\}$. Let $X_0 = X$, and for $i \in [m]$, define

$$X_i = X_{i-1} - \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{A_1^{(i)}} + \frac{\delta_2}{m} \mathbb{1}_{A_2}.$$

It is straightforward to see that $X_m = Y$, and X_i is a right-handle mean preserving spread of X_{i-1} for $i \in [m]$. Noting that $\mathbb{P}(A_2) = n\mathbb{P}(A_1^{(i)})$ for $i \in [m]$, and it follows from the previous arguments that $X_{i-1} \succsim X_i$. The transitivity of \succsim further implies $X \succsim Y$.

Let us now consider the general case that $\mathbb{P}(A_1)/\mathbb{P}(A_2) \in \mathbb{R}$. There exist sequences of rational numbers $\{p_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{q_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $p_i \uparrow \mathbb{P}(A_1)$ and $q_i \uparrow \mathbb{P}(A_2)$, respectively. Let $\{A_1^{(i)} : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and $\{A_2^{(i)} : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be two sequences satisfying $A_1^{(i)} \uparrow A_1$, $A_2^{(i)} \uparrow A_2$, and $\mathbb{P}(A_1^{(i)}) = p_i$ and $\mathbb{P}(A_2^{(i)}) = q_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Define

$$Y_i = X - \delta_1^{(i)} \mathbb{1}_{A_1^{(i)}} + \delta_2^{(i)} \mathbb{1}_{A_2^{(i)}},$$

where the sequences $\{\delta_1^{(i)} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{\delta_2^{(i)} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfy $\delta_1^{(i)} \rightarrow \delta_1$, $\delta_2^{(i)} \rightarrow \delta_2$, and $\delta_1^{(i)} \mathbb{P}(A_1^{(i)}) = \delta_2^{(i)} \mathbb{P}(A_2^{(i)})$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By the previous arguments for the case that $\mathbb{P}(A_1)/\mathbb{P}(A_2)$ is a rational number, we have $X \succsim Y_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The fact that $Y_i \xrightarrow{B} Y$ and the continuity of \succsim yield $X \succsim Y$.

For ρ -priced contract sets. For the “if” statement: Take any premium principle ρ . Suppose that

$$\mathcal{C} = \{C_d : X \mapsto \rho((X - d)_+) - (X - d)_+ \mid d \in \Pi\},$$

and Π is dense in \mathbb{R} . The argument supporting that right-handle risk aversion implies insurance

propensity to \mathcal{C} is the same as for standard contract sets, but switching π for $\rho((X - d)_+)$ in (18). For the converse implication, consider any $Y \in \mathcal{S}$ resulting of a right-handle mean-preserving spread of some $X \in \mathcal{S}$: for some $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{F}$, $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$, we have $Y = X - \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_2}$ with $\delta_1 \mathbb{P}(A_1) = \delta_2 \mathbb{P}(A_2)$ and $X(\omega) = \max X$ for all $\omega \in A_2$. We will prove that $X \succsim Y$. The general case for $X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Y$ follows by transitivity. Assume $\mathbb{P}(A_2) = k\mathbb{P}(A_1)$, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Partition A_2 into k equiprobable events and denote them by $A_2^{(1)}, \dots, A_2^{(k)}$.

Let $\pi^* = \rho((X + \delta_2 \sum_{i=1}^k i \mathbb{1}_{A_2^{(i)}} - \max X)_+)$. Consider the sequence $\{d_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \Pi$ converging to $d^* = \max X - \pi^*$; such a limit exist because Π is dense in \mathbb{R} . For ease of exposition, suppose $d^* \in \Pi$; the general case follows by continuity.

Write $Z = X - \pi^* + \delta_2 \sum_{i=1}^k i \mathbb{1}_{A_2^{(i)}}$, and define W as in (19). Therefore, $Z \stackrel{d}{=} W$ and $C_{d^*}(W) = C_{d^*}(Z) - \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_2}$; see above. Note that

$$\rho((Z - d^*)_+) = \rho\left(\left(X + \delta_2 \sum_{i=1}^k i \mathbb{1}_{A_2^{(i)}} - \max X\right)_+\right) = \pi^*.$$

Sharing the similar arguments of (20) yields $Z + C_d^*(Z) = X$. It follows that

$$X = Z + C_{d^*}(Z) \succsim Z + C_{d^*}(W) = Z + C_{d^*}(W) - \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_2} = X - \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_2} = Y$$

with the risk preference established from the insurance propensity assumption, and noting that $\rho((Z - d^*)_+) = \rho((W - d^*)_+)$ by law invariance. The remaining arguments allowing to extend the results to general A_1 and A_2 are the same as for standard contract sets. \square

A.11 Proof of Theorem 5

We argue that the implication right-handle risk aversion \implies insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} only holds true if \mathcal{C} contains deductible-only or full-indemnity contracts exclusively. Define the risk preference \succsim as such

$$X \succsim Y \iff X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Y.$$

By Proposition 6, \succsim is continuous. Therefore, for \mathcal{C} to satisfy right-handle risk-insurance parity, we must have

$$Z + C(Z) \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Z + C(W), \quad \text{for every } C \in \mathcal{C}, \text{ and } Z, W \in \mathcal{S} \text{ with } Z \stackrel{d}{=} W. \quad (21)$$

Otherwise, \succsim is right-handle risk averse but not insurance propense to \mathcal{C} . Below we aim to verify that if there is $C \in \mathcal{C}$ that is neither a deductible-only nor a full-indemnity contract, then we can construct $Z, W \in \mathcal{S}$ with $Z \stackrel{d}{=} W$ such that $Z + C(Z) \not\prec_{\text{rhcx}} Z + C(W)$. It is straightforward to check that a contract C is either a deductible-only or a full-indemnity contract if and only if, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, its indemnity function satisfies that $(I(y) - I(x))/(y - x) > 0$ for some $x < y$ implies $(I(z) - I(y))/(z - y) = 1$ for all $z > y$. Hence, we assume by contradiction that there is $C \in \mathcal{C}$ such that its indemnity function satisfies

$$\frac{I(y_0) - I(x_0)}{y_0 - x_0} \in (0, 1] \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{I(z_0) - I(y_0)}{z_0 - y_0} \in [0, 1) \quad \text{for some } x_0 < y_0 < z_0. \quad (22)$$

The indemnity function I is thus LC. Define $Z, W \in \mathcal{S}$ with joint probability masses as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}(Z = x_0, W = z_0) = \mathbb{P}(Z = y_0, W = x_0) = \mathbb{P}(Z = z_0, W = y_0) = \frac{1}{3}.$$

Obviously, we have $Z \stackrel{d}{=} W$. Write $X = Z + C(X)$ and $Y = Z + C(W)$; it holds that for $i = 1, 2, 3$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X = x_i) = \mathbb{P}(Y = y_i) = \frac{1}{3}.$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= x_0 + \pi - I(x_0), \quad x_2 = y_0 + \pi - I(y_0), \quad x_3 = z_0 + \pi - I(z_0); \\ y_1 &= x_0 + \pi - I(z_0), \quad y_2 = y_0 + \pi - I(x_0), \quad y_3 = z_0 + \pi - I(y_0). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (22) that

$$x_1 \leq x_2 < x_3, \quad y_2 > x_2 \text{ and } y_3 > x_2.$$

This implies $X^{\text{co}} \not\preceq Y^{\text{co}}$ on the event $\{X^{\text{co}} < \max X\}$, where $(X^{\text{co}}, Y^{\text{co}})$ are comonotonic with $X^{\text{co}} \stackrel{d}{=} X$ and $Y^{\text{co}} \stackrel{d}{=} Y$. Proposition 5(ii) yields $X \not\prec_{\text{rhcx}} Y$, leading to a contradiction. Therefore, we have concluded that \mathcal{C} only contains deductible-only or full-indemnity contracts. For a ρ -priced contract, replace π by $\rho(I(Z))$ above and the argument remains the same. \square

A.12 Proof of Proposition 7

From Theorems 4 and 5, it only remains to argue that the set of price parameters, denoted by Π , must be dense in \mathbb{R} . Suppose Π is not dense in \mathbb{R} , and we will show that there exists a

continuous risk preference for which insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} does not imply right-handle risk aversion. Define the risk preference \succsim by

$$X \succsim Y \iff \begin{array}{l} X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Y \text{ and } \max X \text{ can be approached by a sequence in } \Pi, \\ \text{or either } X = \mathbb{E}[Y] \text{ or } X \stackrel{d}{=} Y. \end{array}$$

It is straightforward to verify that \succsim is law invariant and transitive. In the proof of Proposition 6, we argued that for sequences $\{X_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $\{Y_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that $X_n \xrightarrow{B} X$, $Y_n \xrightarrow{B} Y$ and $X_n \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Y_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, either $\max X_n \rightarrow \max X$ or $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$. Thus, \succsim is continuous. Consider any $Z \in \mathcal{S}$ and $C_\theta \in \mathcal{C}$ that has the form $C_\theta(X) = \pi + (X - d)_+$ with $\pi + d = \theta$. If $\max Z < d$, then $Z + C_\theta(Z) = \mathbb{E}[Z + C_\theta(W)]$ for every $W \in \mathcal{S}$, $W \stackrel{d}{=} Z$; and $Z + C_\theta(Z) \succsim Z + C_\theta(W)$. If $\max Z \geq d$, we have $\theta = \max(Z + C_\theta(Z))$. We also previously argued, in the proof of the “if” direction, that $Z + C_\theta(Z) \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Z + C_\theta(W)$ for every $W \in \mathcal{S}$ with $W \stackrel{d}{=} Z$. Thus, $Z + C_\theta(Z) \succsim Z + C_\theta(W)$ also for this case. The continuous risk preference \succsim is therefore insurance propense to \mathcal{C} . However, by definition, it is not right-handle risk averse. \square

A.13 A counterexample to Proposition 7 in the absence of LC

Example 5. Consider the standard contract set \mathcal{C} comprising all deductible-indemnity contracts, for every combination of premium $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$ and deductible $d \in \mathbb{R}$. By Theorem 4, \mathcal{C} satisfies right-handle risk–insurance parity. Define $I_* : X \mapsto X + k\mathbb{1}_{\{Y > \tau\}}$ for some $k > 0$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that I_* is not LC. Define $C_* : X \mapsto \pi - I_*(X)$, where $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $\mathcal{C}^* = \mathcal{C} \cup \{C_*\}$. We will show that \mathcal{C}^* also satisfies right-handle risk–insurance parity. Because $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}^*$, the claim that, for every continuous risk preference, insurance propense to \mathcal{C}^* implies right-handle risk aversion holds directly. We must show that right-handle risk aversion implies insurance propensity to $\{C_*\}$. We aim to verify that

$$X + C_*(X) \succsim X + C_*(Y) \quad \text{for every } X, Y \in \mathcal{S} \text{ with } X \stackrel{d}{=} Y.$$

The case that $Z \leq \tau$ follows directly from the “if” direction of Theorem 1 and the fact that right-handle risk aversion is stronger than weak risk aversion. We next suppose that $\mathbb{P}(X > \tau) > 0$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1 &= Y + k - X - k\mathbb{1}_{\{X > \tau\}}, \quad Z_2 = X + k - Y \text{ and } Z_3 = X - Y; \\ A_1 &= \{Y > \tau, X < Y\}, \quad A_2 = \{Y < \tau, X > \tau\} \text{ and } A_3 = \{X > Y > \tau\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that Z_1 , Z_2 and Z_3 are nonnegative respectively on A_1 , A_2 and A_3 . We have

$$\begin{aligned} X + C_*(Y) &= \pi + X - Y - k\mathbb{1}_{\{Y > d\}} = \pi + X - X - k\mathbb{1}_{\{Y > d\}} - Z_1\mathbb{1}_{A_1} + Z_2\mathbb{1}_{A_2} + Z_3\mathbb{1}_{A_3} \\ &= X + C_*(X) - Z_1\mathbb{1}_{A_1} + Z_2\mathbb{1}_{A_2} + Z_3\mathbb{1}_{A_3}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Because $X + C_*(X)(\omega) = \max(X + C_*(X))$ for all $\omega \in A_2 \cup A_3$, we have $X + C_*(X) \leq_{\text{rhcx}} X + C_*(Y)$ from (23) and Proposition 5. Hence, right-handle risk aversion implies $X + C_*(X) \succeq X + C_*(Y)$.

A.14 Proof of Theorem 6

For any $X, Y \in \mathcal{S}$, $X \leq_{\text{lhcx}} Y$ if and only if $-X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} -Y$; see Corollary 1. In the case of standard contract sets, note that, for any $Z \in \mathcal{S}$, $\pi, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\pi - Z \wedge \lambda = -((\lambda - \pi) - ((-Z) - (-\lambda))_+),$$

that is: for C a limit-only contract, $X \mapsto -C(-X)$ is a deductible-only contract. For ρ -priced contract sets, we note that, for any $Z \in \mathcal{S}$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$, it holds that

$$\rho(Z \wedge \zeta - \zeta) - (Z \wedge \zeta - \zeta) = -(-\rho(-((-Z) - (-\zeta))_+) - ((-Z) - (-\zeta))_+).$$

In other words, for a ρ -priced contract C of the form specified in the theorem statement, $X \mapsto -C(-X)$ is a ρ^* -priced deductible-indemnity contract with deductible $-\zeta$, where $\rho^*(X) = -\rho(-X)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{S}$. In both cases, when re-expressing $-X$ in terms of an insurance contract, we have $-X = -Z + (-C(-Z))$, and thus everything follows from the proof of Theorem 4 by symmetry.

A.15 Proof of Theorem 7

The result follows from Theorem 5 once we evoke the same symmetry argument as in the proof of Theorem 6.

A.16 Proof of Proposition 8

The result follows directly from 7 by symmetry. Note that for a limit-only contract $C_{\pi, \lambda}(X) = \pi - Z \wedge \lambda$ the contract $X \mapsto -C_{\pi, \lambda}(-X)$ is a deductible-only contract that has premium $\lambda - \pi$ and deductible $-\lambda$; therefore, the condition for exhaustiveness of price parameters in Proposition 7 becomes simply one on premiums here, as the λ 's cancel out.

A.17 Proof of Theorem 8

For (ii): We first show that a weighting function h satisfies star-shapedness at 1 if and only if the following condition holds:

$$\frac{h(y) - h(x)}{y - x} \leq \frac{1 - h(z)}{1 - z} \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq x < y \leq z < 1. \quad (24)$$

Suppose that (24) holds. Then, letting $y = x$, we have

$$h(z) \leq \frac{z - x}{1 - x} + \frac{1 - z}{1 - x} h(x) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq x < z < 1. \quad (25)$$

Taking $\lambda = (z - x)/(1 - x)$, (25) becomes

$$h(\lambda + (1 - \lambda)x) \leq \lambda + (1 - \lambda)h(x), \quad \text{for all } x, \lambda \in (0, 1),$$

which is exactly star-shapedness at 1. Conversely, star-shapedness at 1 implies (25). Thus,

$$\frac{h(y) - h(x)}{y - x} \leq \frac{1 - h(y)}{1 - y} \leq \frac{1 - h(z)}{1 - z}.$$

where the inequalities follow directly from two distinct applications of (25). We have conclude that satisfies star-shapedness at 1 is equivalent to the condition in (24).

Next, we argue that the agent is right-handle risk averse if and only if their weighting function satisfies (24). First, suppose that the agent is right-handle risk averse. Let B_0, \dots, B_3 be a measurable partition of Ω , and $p_i = \mathbb{P}(B_i)$. Define X and Y as such:

$$X = 0\mathbb{1}_{B_0} - \mathbb{1}_{B_1} - 2\mathbb{1}_{B_2} - 3\mathbb{1}_{B_3} \quad \text{and} \quad Y = p_2\mathbb{1}_{B_0} - \mathbb{1}_{B_1} - (2 + p_0)\mathbb{1}_{B_2} - 3\mathbb{1}_{B_3}.$$

It is straightforward to check that $X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Y$, and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 + h(p_1 + p_2 + p_3) + h(p_1 + p_2) + h(p_1) \\ &= U_h(-X) \geq U_h(-Y) \\ &= (1 - p_2) + (1 + p_2)h(p_1 + p_2 + p_3) + (1 + p_0)h(p_1 + p_2) + (1 - p_0)h(p_1). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\frac{1 - h(p_1 + p_2 + p_3)}{1 - (p_1 + p_2 + p_3)} - \frac{h(p_2 + p_1)}{p_2} \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } p_1, p_2, p_3 \in [0, 1] \text{ with } p_1 + p_2 + p_3 \leq 1.$$

Let $x = p_1$, $y = p_1 + p_2$ and $z = p_1 + p_2 + p_3$. The above equation reduces to (24).

Conversely, suppose that (24) holds. Loss functions in (9) are translation invariant; for convenience, let us suppose X, Y are nonpositive (so that $-X, -Y$ are nonnegative). Let $Y = X - \delta_1 \mathbb{1}_{A_1} + \delta_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_2}$ such that $\delta_1 \mathbb{P}(A_1) = \delta_2 \mathbb{P}(A_2)$ and $X(\omega) = \max X$ for all $\omega \in A_2$; the general case where $X \leq_{\text{rhcx}} Y$ will follow from law invariance, transitivity and continuity of the induced risk preference.

Also, assume X is constant on A_1 ; otherwise, partition A_1 into $A_1^{(1)}, \dots, A_1^{(n)}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where X is constant on each and consider successive right-hand mean-preserving spreads with $\delta_1^{(i)} = \delta_1$, $A_2^{(i)} = A_2$ and $\delta_2^{(i)} = \delta_2 \mathbb{P}(A_1^{(i)}) / \mathbb{P}(A_1)$ for every $i \in [n]$.

Then, for any weighting function h that is star-shaped at 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_h(-X) - U_h(-Y) &= \int_0^{\max(-Y)} (h(\mathbb{P}(-X > x)) - h(\mathbb{P}(-Y > x))) dx \\ &= \int_{\max X}^{\max Y} (1 - h(\mathbb{P}(Y < x))) dx - \int_0^{\max X} (h(\mathbb{P}(Y < x)) - h(\mathbb{P}(X < x))) dx \\ &\geq \delta_2 (1 - h(1 - \mathbb{P}(A_2))) - \delta_1 \sup_{x \in [0, \max X]} (h(\mathbb{P}(Y < x)) - h(\mathbb{P}(X < x))) \\ &\geq \delta_2 (1 - h(1 - \mathbb{P}(A_2))) - \delta_1 \frac{\mathbb{P}(A_1)}{\mathbb{P}(A_2)} (1 - h(1 - \mathbb{P}(A_2))) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (24) and the observation that $\mathbb{P}(X < x) \leq \mathbb{P}(Y < x) \leq 1 - \mathbb{P}(A_2)$ for every $x \in [0, \max X]$.

For (i): The proof follows a similar argument as for Theorem 8 and is thus omitted for brevity. The statement of item (iii) follows directly from (ii) and (i). \square

A.18 Proof of Proposition 9

It is evident that the set of full-indemnity contracts (write $\mathcal{C}^{\text{full}}$) does not satisfy monotone risk-insurance parity because monotone risk aversion is stronger in general than weak risk aversion. Next, suppose that for some contract set $\mathcal{C} \not\subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\text{full}}$, monotone risk aversion implies insurance propensity to \mathcal{C} . We will prove by contradiction that this is absurd.

Define the relation \succsim by

$$X \succsim Y \iff \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists } \Theta \in \mathcal{S} \text{ such that} \\ Y \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} X + \Theta, \mathbb{E}[\Theta] = 0, \text{ and } X \text{ and } \Theta \text{ are comonotonic.} \end{array} \quad (26)$$

For any random vector (X, Y) , let $(X^{\text{co}}, Y^{\text{co}})$ be its comonotonic version, meaning $X \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} X^{\text{co}}$, $Y \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} Y^{\text{co}}$, and $(X^{\text{co}}, Y^{\text{co}})$ is comonotonic. Note that the right-hand side of (26) is equivalent to

requiring that for $\Theta = Y^{\text{co}} - X^{\text{co}}$, we have that Θ and X^{co} are comonotonic. It is straightforward to verify that \succsim is transitive, law invariant, and continuous. It is also monotone risk averse by definition. Suppose that \succsim is insurance propense to \mathcal{C} ; we will show that this creates a contradiction.

Consider any $C \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}^{\text{full}}$, with premium π and indemnity function I . Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $x < y$. By increasingness and LC, $x - I(x) \leq y - I(y)$. By LC, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$I(y + \varepsilon) - I(x) < y - x. \quad (27)$$

Let $z = y + \varepsilon$, and note that $y - I(y) \leq z - I(z)$.

Define $Z, W \in \mathcal{S}$ with joint probability masses as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}(Z = x, W = x) = \mathbb{P}(Z = y, W = z) = \mathbb{P}(Z = z, W = y) = \frac{1}{3}.$$

Write $X^* = Z + C(Z)$, $Y^* = Z + C(W)$ and $\Theta^* = Y^{*\text{co}} - X^{*\text{co}}$. By insurance propensity, $X^* \succsim Y^*$, so Θ^* and $X^{*\text{co}}$ must be comonotonic. Since $x - I(x) < y - I(z)$ by (27), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X^{*\text{co}} = x + \pi - I(x), Y^{*\text{co}} = x + \pi - I(x)) &= \mathbb{P}(X^{*\text{co}} = y + \pi - I(y), Y^{*\text{co}} = y + \pi - I(z)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X^{*\text{co}} = z + \pi - I(z), Y^{*\text{co}} = z + \pi - I(y)) = \frac{1}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X^{*\text{co}} = x + \pi - I(x), \Theta^* = 0) &= \mathbb{P}(X^{*\text{co}} = y + \pi - I(y), \Theta^* = I(y) - I(z)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X^{*\text{co}} = z + \pi - I(z), \Theta^* = I(z) - I(y)) = \frac{1}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, Θ^* and $X^{*\text{co}}$ are comonotonic if and only if $I(y) = I(z)$. Therefore, for $X^* \succsim Y^*$ to possibly hold, we must have either $I(y) = I(y + \varepsilon)$ or $x - I(x) = y - I(y)$ (as we had arbitrarily assumed $x - I(x) < y - I(y)$). Since the choices of x and y were arbitrary, this must hold for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. One can check that this implies that I is one of the following cases: a constant function, the identity function or a limit-indemnity function.

Next, let $b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $b < c$. By increasingness and LC, $b - I(b) \leq c - I(c)$. Assume that $b - I(b) < c - I(c)$. By LC, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$I(c) - I(b - \varepsilon) < c - b. \quad (28)$$

Let $a = b - \varepsilon$, and note that $a - I(a) \leq b - I(b)$.

Define $Z^\dagger, W^\dagger \in \mathcal{S}$ with joint probability masses as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}(Z^\dagger = a, W^\dagger = b) = \mathbb{P}(Z^\dagger = b, W^\dagger = a) = \mathbb{P}(Z^\dagger = c, W^\dagger = c) = \frac{1}{3}.$$

Write $X^\dagger = Z + C(Z)$, $Y^\dagger = Z + C(W)$ and $\Theta^\dagger = Y^{\dagger\text{co}} - X^{\dagger\text{co}}$. By insurance propensity, $X^\dagger \succsim Y^\dagger$, so Θ^\dagger and $X^{\dagger\text{co}}$ must be comonotonic. Since $b - I(a) < c - I(c)$ by (28), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X^{\dagger\text{co}} = a + \pi - I(a), Y^{\dagger\text{co}} = a + \pi - I(b)) &= \mathbb{P}(X^{\dagger\text{co}} = b + \pi - I(b), Y^{\dagger\text{co}} = b + \pi - I(a)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X^{\dagger\text{co}} = c + \pi - I(c), Y^{\dagger\text{co}} = c + \pi - I(c)) = \frac{1}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X^{\dagger\text{co}} = a + \pi - I(a), \theta^\dagger = I(a) - I(b)) &= \mathbb{P}(X^{\dagger\text{co}} = b + \pi - I(b), \Theta^\dagger = I(b) - I(a)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(X^{\dagger\text{co}} = c + \pi - I(c), \Theta^\dagger = 0) = \frac{1}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, Θ^\dagger and $X^{\dagger\text{co}}$ are comonotonic if and only if $I(a) = I(b)$. Therefore, for $X^* \succsim Y^*$ to possibly hold, we must have either $I(b - \varepsilon) = I(b)$ or $b - I(b) = c - I(c)$ (as we had arbitrarily assumed $b - I(b) < c - I(c)$). Since the choices of b and c were arbitrary, this must hold for every $b, c \in \mathbb{R}$. It is straightforward to see that this implies that I is one of the following cases: a constant function, the identity function or a deductible-indemnity function.

Combining this with the previous information on the shape of I , we obtain that I is either constant (not a valid indemnity function) or the identity function, which contradicts that $C \notin \mathcal{C}^{\text{full}}$. The risk preference \succsim is thus not insurance propense to \mathcal{C} as soon as $\mathcal{C} \not\subseteq \mathcal{C}^{\text{full}}$, and, as we have already argued, the set of full-indemnity contracts does not satisfy monotone risk–insurance parity. The argument also holds for a ρ -priced contract by simply switching π for $\rho(I(Z))$ above. \square

A.19 Proof of Proposition 10

The implications (ii) \implies (i) is evident. To prove the converse implication (i) \implies (ii), take any $X, Y \in L^p$ such that $X \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} Y$, and define

$$X_n = 2^{-n} \lfloor 2^n \max(\min(X, n), -n) \rfloor; \quad Y_n = 2^{-n} \lfloor 2^n \max(\min(Y, n), -n) \rfloor, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We have $X_n, Y_n \in \mathcal{S}$, $X_n \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} Y_n$, and so,

$$X_n + C(X_n) \succsim X_n + C(Y_n) \quad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

If $p < \infty$, we have $X_n + C(X_n) \xrightarrow{L^p} X + C(X)$ and $X_n + C(Y_n) \xrightarrow{L^p} X + C(Y)$, where $\xrightarrow{L^p}$ means convergence with respect to the L^p norm. If $p = \infty$, we have $X_n + C(X_n) \xrightarrow{B} X + C(X)$ and $X_n + C(Y_n) \xrightarrow{B} X + C(Y)$. Therefore, $X + C(X) \succsim X + C(Y)$ by continuity of \succsim . \square

A.20 Proof of Proposition 11

Take any X, Y in L^p . For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\Psi_n = \left\{ \left(\frac{0}{2^n}, \frac{1}{2^n} \right], \left(\frac{1}{2^n}, \frac{2}{2^n} \right], \dots, \left(\frac{2^n - 1}{2^n}, \frac{2^n}{2^n} \right) \right\}$$

and $\Pi_n = U^{-1}(\Psi_n)$ where U is a uniformly distributed random variable on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Define $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\Pi_n)$ and

$$X_n = \mathbb{E} [F_X^{-1}(U) | \mathcal{F}_n]; \quad Y_n = \mathbb{E} [F_Y^{-1}(U) | \mathcal{F}_n].$$

Maccheroni et al. (2025, Theorem 3) showed that if $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, then $X_n \leq_{\text{cx}} Y_n$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P}_{|\mathcal{F}_n})$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $p < \infty$, as $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}_n = \mathcal{F}$, we have $X_n \xrightarrow{L^p} X$ and $X_n \xrightarrow{L^p} X$ by martingale convergence in L^p . If $p = \infty$, as $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}_n = \mathcal{F}$, we have $X_n \xrightarrow{B} X$ and $X_n \xrightarrow{B} X$ by martingale convergence.

If \succsim is insurance propense to some set of contracts \mathcal{C} on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, it is as well for $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P}_{|\mathcal{F}_n})$, from Proposition 10 and since $\mathcal{S}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P}_{|\mathcal{F}_n}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Using all those facts, and evoking continuity and law invariance of \succsim , it is sufficient, for most of the proofs above, to prove the claim on atomic probability spaces (emulated by $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P})$), and the general case will follow. This is equivalent to leaving our probability space as it is but proving the claim for risk preferences defined on \mathcal{S} . Other specifics for each proofs are easily resolved by evoking continuity of \succsim . \square