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Abstract

A property, or statistical functional, is said to be elicitable if it minimizes expected loss for some loss function. The study of which properties are elicitable sheds light on the capabilities and limits of empirical risk minimization. While several recent papers have asked which properties are elicitable, we instead advocate for a more nuanced question: how many dimensions are required to indirectly elicit a given property? This number is called the elicitation complexity of the property. We lay the foundation for a general theory of elicitation complexity, including several basic results about how elicitation complexity behaves, and the complexity of standard properties of interest. Building on this foundation, we establish several upper and lower bounds for the broad class of Bayes risks. We apply these results by proving tight complexity bounds, with respect to identifiable properties, for variance, financial risk measures, entropy, norms, and new properties of interest. We then show how some of these bounds can extend to other practical classes of properties, and conclude with a discussion of open directions.

1 Introduction

Loss functions are used throughout statistics and machine learning, in tasks ranging from estimation and model selection, to forecast ranking and comparison [1, 2]. In particular, through the ubiquitous paradigm of empirical risk minimization (ERM) a model is chosen to minimize a loss function (perhaps with regularization) averaged over a data set. To understand the asymptotic behavior of ERM, and to understand the design tradeoffs in choosing the loss function more broadly, we may ask what property the loss elicits. Here a property is simply a functional assigning a value, or vector of values, to each distribution, and a loss elicits a property if for each distribution, the property value uniquely minimizes the expected loss. Therefore, the study of which properties are elicitable can be viewed as the study of which statistics are computable via ERM [3–5]. (See also §3.)

The literature of property elicitation takes its roots in statistics [1, 2, 6, 7], branching more recently into machine learning [3–5, 8], economics [9, 10], and finance [11–15]. A line of work initiated by Savage [6] looks at questions of characterization: which losses elicit the mean of a distribution, or more generally the expectation of a vector-valued random
variable [5, 16], and which real-valued properties are elicited by some loss [3, 9, 17]. Apart from special cases, the characterization of elicitable vector-valued properties remains open, with partial progress appearing in the last few years [4, 5, 15]. Recently, a parallel thread of research has been underway in finance, to understand which financial risk measures, among several in use or proposed to help regulate the risks of financial institutions, are elicitable (cf. references above). More often than not, these papers have concluded that the risk measures under consideration are not elicitable, with notable exceptions being generalized quantiles (e.g., value-at-risk, expectiles) and expected utility [12, 13].

All through the recent literature on property elicitation, one question has been central: which properties are elicitable? Yet it is clear that all properties are “indirectly” elicitable if one first elicits the distribution using a standard proper scoring rule (cf. [1]). Hence, if a statistical property is found not to be elicitable, such as the variance, rather than abandoning it one should ask how many dimensions are required to elicit it. In the present work, we therefore turn our attention to the more nuanced question: how elicitable are properties? Specifically, we adapt and generalize the notion of elicitation complexity introduced by Lambert et al. [17], which captures how many prediction dimensions one needs to maintain in an ERM procedure for the property in question. Bounds on elicitation complexity therefore bound the difficulty in computing properties indirectly via ERM.

Our main results, which give bounds on elicitation complexity for a large class of risk measures, are heavily inspired by recent work of Fissler and Ziegel [15], who show that spectral risk measures of support $k$ have elicitation complexity at most $k + 1$. Spectral risk measures, which include conditional value at risk (CVaR), also known as expected shortfall, are among those under consideration in the finance community. Their result shows that, while not elicitable in the classical sense, the elicitation complexity of spectral risk measures is still low, and hence one can develop reasonable regression and “backtesting” procedures for them [18, 19]. Our results extend to these and many other risk measures (see § 6.6), often providing matching lower bounds on the complexity as well. Other related work has appeared in machine learning, giving what could be considered bounds on elicitation complexity with respect to linear and convex-elicitable properties [4, 20]; see § 7, 8.

Our contributions are the following. We introduce a general definition of elicitation complexity with respect to a given class of properties, which is flexible enough to capture previous definitions in the literature, yet brings several advantages (§ 2). We argue for identifiable properties as a canonical class to measure complexity, and provide additional motivation through the connection to empirical risk minimization (§ 3). We provide a foundation in § 4 by establishing the complexity of several basic properties such as expectations and quantiles, as well as bounds on the complexities of pairs of properties. In § 5, we give our main results: general upper and lower bounds on elicitation complexity which apply to the broad class of Bayes risks, the optimal expected loss as a function of the underlying distribution. We then apply these results in § 6 to several specific properties of interest, including Shannon entropy and variations, norms of distributions, and several risk measures of interest. We conclude with a discussion of other classes of properties (§ 7) and open questions (§ 8).
2 Definitions

Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be a set of outcomes and $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \Delta(\mathcal{Y})$ a set of probability measures. The goal of elicitation is to learn something about the distribution $p \in \mathcal{P}$, specifically some function or property $\Gamma(p)$ such as the mean or variance, by minimizing a loss function. Note that when $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^k$, we will assume the Borel $\sigma$-algebra, and when $\mathcal{Y}$ is generic, the $\sigma$-algebra will be left implicit, but the relevant functions need to be measurable and $\mathcal{P}$-integrable (see Definition 2).

In the context of expected values, we will often use the identity random variable $Y : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{Y}$, $Y(y) = y$, to represent the outcome itself, as in $\Gamma(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[Y]$. For nontrivial random variables, we will usually write $X : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^k$, and as is typical, leave the dependence on $Y$ implicit as in $\mathbb{E}_p[X]$. In some situations, however, e.g. for finite $\mathcal{Y}$, it is clearer to explicitly express random variables as a function of $Y$, in which case we will write $\phi : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^k$, thought of simply as a function, as in $\mathbb{E}_p[\phi(Y)]$.

Note that when $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$, it would be more natural in many cases to discuss properties of random variables of the form $Y : \Omega \to \mathcal{Y}$, such as $\Gamma(Y) = \mathbb{E}[Y]$, where now $\Omega$ is the outcome set endowed with some fixed base measure $\mu$. In most examples, such as all risk measures discussed in this paper, $\Gamma$ would depend on $Y$ only through its law $p$, in which case it is also natural to design loss functions which depend only on $y = Y(\omega)$ rather than allowing them direct access to $\omega \in \Omega$. Thus, without loss of generality we could define $\Gamma(p) \doteq \Gamma(Y)$ where $p$ is the law of $Y$, and let the outcome set again be $\mathcal{Y}$, and $Y$ be the identity map; e.g. $\Gamma(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[Y]$. The above transformation is the reasoning behind the notation in this paper.

With notation in hand, we can now introduce our central object of study, a property.

**Definition 1.** A property is a function $\Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k$, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which associates a desired report value to each distribution. The level set $\Gamma_r \doteq \{p \in \mathcal{P} | r = \Gamma(p)\}$ is the set of distributions $p$ corresponding to report value $r$. We will also consider $\Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^N$, and set-valued $\Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k$.

Given a property $\Gamma$, we are interested in the existence of a loss function whose expectation under $p$ is minimized by $\Gamma(p)$. A loss function can be thought of as incentivizing a selfish risk-neutral agent to reveal the correct value of the property according to their private belief.

**Definition 2.** A function $g : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is $\mathcal{P}$-integrable if it is measurable (with respect to the underlying $\sigma$-algebra, often left implicit) and integrable with respect to each $p \in \mathcal{P}$.

**Definition 3.** Let $\mathcal{R}$ be an abstract report space (often a finite set or a subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$). A loss function, or simply loss, is a function $L : \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $L(r, \cdot)$ is $\mathcal{P}$-integrable for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$. A loss $L$ elicits a property $\Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{R}$ if for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$, $\{\Gamma(p)\} = \text{argmin}_r L(r, p)$, where $L(r, p) \doteq \mathbb{E}_p[L(r, Y)]$. A property is elicitable if some loss elicits it.

For example, when $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$, the mean $\Gamma(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[Y]$ is elicitable via squared loss $L(r, y) = (r - y)^2$, and the median via $L(r, y) = |r - y|$. (In both cases, these statement hold for $\mathcal{P}$ for which the relevant expectations are finite.)

Note that as alluded to in Definition 1, the literature sometimes defines $\Gamma$ to be set-valued, in which case the condition in Definition 3 becomes $\Gamma(p) = \text{argmin}_r L(r, p)$, i.e., the set of minimizers of the expected loss is given by $\Gamma[5]$. Rather than developing the notation needed
to compose multi-valued maps to define elicitation complexity for these general properties, we instead refer to set-valued properties only when needed, notably in Theorem 1 and §6.2, and otherwise assume single-valued properties.

To motivate the need for elicitation complexity, consider the well-known necessary condition for elicitability, that the level sets of the property be convex.

**Proposition 1** (Osband [7]). If \( \Gamma \) is elicitable, the level sets \( \Gamma_r \) are convex for all \( r \in \Gamma(P) \).

Note that Proposition 1 is not sufficient; for example, the mode convex level sets but is not elicitable [21]. While the mean \( \Gamma(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[Y] \) has convex level sets, one easily checks that the variance \( \text{Var}(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[(Y - \mathbb{E}_p[Y])^2] \) does not, and hence is not elicitable [7, 9]. (See Figure 1(L,R).) Note however that writing \( \text{Var}(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[Y^2] - \mathbb{E}_p[Y]^2 \) suggests the following approach: first elicit the property \( \hat{\Gamma}(p) = (\mathbb{E}_p[Y], \mathbb{E}_p[Y^2]) \), and then use this information to compute \( \text{Var}(p) \). It is well-known [2, 6] that such a \( \hat{\Gamma} \) is elicitable as the expectation of a vector-valued random variable \( \phi(y) = (y, y^2) \), using for example \( L(r, y) = \|r - \phi(y)\|_2^2 \).

The above variance example suggests the notion of *indirect elicitation*, where we first elicit a “intermediate” property \( \hat{\Gamma} \), and then use the resulting value to compute the desired property \( \Gamma \). We say a property is \( k \)-elicitable if it can be obtained as a function of a \( k \)-dimensional elicitable property. The *elicitation complexity* of a property is then simply the minimum dimension \( k \) needed for it to be \( k \)-elicitable.

**Definition 4.** Let \( \mathcal{E}_k(P) \) denote the class of all elicitable properties \( \Gamma : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k \), and \( \mathcal{E}(P) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{E}_k(P) \). When \( P \) is implicit we simply write \( \mathcal{E} \).
Definition 5. A property $\Gamma$ is $k$-elicitable with respect to class $C \subseteq \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$ if there exists $\hat{\Gamma} \in C \cap \mathcal{E}_k(\mathcal{P})$ and $f$ such that $\Gamma = f \circ \hat{\Gamma}$. The elicitation complexity of $\Gamma$ is defined as $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) = \min\{k : \Gamma \text{ is } k\text{-elicitable with respect to } C\}$.

Note that if no suitable property for $\Gamma$ exists in $C$, its elicitation complexity will be undefined.

To illustrate the definition, from the variance example above we have $\Gamma(p) = \text{Var}(p)$, $\hat{\Gamma}(p) = (\mathbb{E}_p[Y], \mathbb{E}_p[Y^2]) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by $f(r) = r_2 - r_1^2$. Hence, we conclude $\text{Var}$ is 2-elicitable, so that $\text{elic}_C(\text{Var}) \leq 2$, meaning the elicitation complexity is at most 2.

Remark 1. It is important to note that if a property is not elicitable, it can still be 1-elicitable, and thus we have not yet shown $\text{elic}_C(\text{Var}) = 2$ for any $C$. In other words, $\Gamma \notin \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$ does not imply $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) \geq 2$. As a simple example, consider the property $\Gamma(p) = (\mathbb{E}_p[Y])^2$, where $\mathcal{Y} = \{-1, 0, 1\}$. Clearly, the level sets of $\Gamma$ are not convex: $\Gamma((0, 0, 0)) = \Gamma((0, 0, 1)) = 1$ but $\Gamma((a, 0, 1 - a)) < 1$ for all $0 < a < 1$. (See Figure 1(M).) However, $\Gamma$ is easily indirectly elicited via $\hat{\Gamma}(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[Y] \in \mathbb{R}^1$, with the simple link $f(r) = r^2$, and hence we conclude $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) = 1$ whenever $\hat{\Gamma} \in C$, such as $C$ being the set of linear properties (expected values). To show lower bounds for $\text{elic}_C$ we will need more tools, which we introduce in § 5. See § 6.1 for their application to the variance, showing that indeed $\text{elic}_C(\text{Var}) = 2$ where $C$ is the class of identifiable properties, a choice we define and motivate below.

2.1 Relationship to definitions in the literature

The literature has seen several variations on the definition of elicitation complexity, which fall into three broad categories: (1) different choices of the class $C$, (2) variations on the type of loss function allowed, and (3) different requirements on the link function $f$. Before discussing these variations, we first note an important point: some restriction, either on $C$, $L$, or $f$, is necessary, as otherwise all properties would be 1-elicitable.

Remark 2. The (set-theoretic) cardinalities of $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R}^N$ are the same, as are those of $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$, and hence there exists a bijection $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^Q$ [22, Theorem 2.3]. Taking $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$ for example, any probability measure defined on the Borel $\sigma$-algebra is uniquely determined by its cumulative distribution function (CDF) $F$ which is in turn uniquely determined by its values on the rationals $\{F(q) | q \in \mathbb{Q}\}$. Let $g : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^Q$ be the map which converts probability measure $p$ to its CDF and evaluates it on the rationals. Then $h = \varphi^{-1} \circ g$ is an injective map between $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathbb{R}$. Thus, given some property $\Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k$, we let $\hat{\Gamma} = h$ encode each distribution into a single real number, which we elicit with $L(\hat{r}, y) = L^*(h^{-1}(\hat{r}), y)$ for some proper loss function $L^* : \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}$ which elicits entire distributions [1], and finally take $f = \Gamma \circ h^{-1}$ so that $f \circ \hat{\Gamma} = \Gamma \circ h^{-1} \circ h = \Gamma$. We conclude that if $C = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P})$ is the set of all elicitable properties, then $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) = 1$ for all properties $\Gamma$.

Note that Remark 2 does not subsume Remark 1 about the case $\Gamma(p) = (\mathbb{E}_p[Y])^2$, as there we can show $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) = 1$ for a much restricted class $C$, namely all expected values.

We now turn to the restrictions on $C$, $L$, and $f$ which have appeared in the literature.

1. Class of properties $C$. Choices of $C$ in the literature include continuous properties [3], linear properties (expectations) [4], and properties whose components are themselves elicitable [17] meaning every $\hat{\Gamma} \in C$, $\hat{\Gamma} : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k$, should have $(\hat{\Gamma})_i$ be elicitable for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. 
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In this paper, we focus on the case where \( C \) is the class of identifiable properties, which we define below in \( \S \) 2.2. We will further discuss variations on \( C \) in \( \S \) 7.

2. Varying the loss function. Some classes of properties are naturally defined by restrictions on the loss function. For example, for reasons of optimization in ERM, it is common to restrict to convex or strongly convex loss functions, where \( C \) would be the class of properties elicited by those losses. The restriction of Lambert et al. [17] that properties have elicitable components could also be cast as the restriction that the loss function \( L \) be separable, meaning \( L(r, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} L(r_i, y) \), where \( r \in \mathbb{R}^k \). Another interesting variation which has recently appeared in the literature is a loss function which is allowed multiple independent realizations of the random variable \( Y \), that is, of the form \( L(r, y_1, \ldots, y_m) \) [23, 24]. These multi-observation loss functions can sometimes reduce the complexity, to 1 for the variance, and to 2 for the 2-norm (see \( \S \) 6.3), though they require a much stronger assumption on the information available to the loss.

3. Restricting the link function. Fissler and Ziegel [15] propose a definition of complexity as the smallest \( k \) such that \( \Gamma \) is a component of a \( k \)-dimensional elicitable property. In essence, this requires the link function to be extremely simple: \( f(r) = r_1 \), the first component of \( r \in \mathbb{R}^k \). It would also be natural to restrict to the broader class of continuous, or differentiable, link functions.

2.2 Identifiable elicitation complexity.

We saw from Proposition 1 that the level sets of an elicitable property must be convex. The class \( C \) of properties we work with most in this paper uses a stronger condition: not only must the level sets be convex, but they must be the intersection of a linear subspace with \( \mathcal{P} \). This condition is equivalent to the existence of an identification function, a functional describing the level sets of a property via a linear constraint [3, 7, 17]. (Note that the definition we adopt corresponds to a strong identification function from Steinwart et al. [3].)

Definition 6. A \( \mathcal{P} \)-integrable function \( V : \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^k \) is an identification function for \( \Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k \), or identifies \( \Gamma \), if for all \( r \in \Gamma(\mathcal{P}) \) it holds that \( p \in \Gamma_r \iff V(r, p) = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^k \), where as with \( L(r, p) \) above we write \( V(r, p) = \mathbb{E}_p[V(r, Y)] \). \( \Gamma \) is identifiable if there exists a \( V \) identifying it.

One can check for example that \( V(r, y) = y - r \) identifies the mean \( \Gamma(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[Y] \). More generally, the expected value \( \Gamma(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[\phi(Y)] \) of some \( \phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^k \) has identification function \( V(r, y) = r - \phi(y) \).

We can now define the class of identifiable properties. Similar to \( k \)-elicitability, we will also say a property is \( k \)-identifiable if it is the link of a \( k \)-dimensional identifiable property.

Definition 7. Let \( \mathcal{I}_k(\mathcal{P}) \) denote the class of all identifiable properties \( \Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k \), and \( \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P}) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{I}_k(\mathcal{P}) \). When \( \mathcal{P} \) is implicit we simply write \( \mathcal{I} \).

Definition 8. A property \( \Gamma \) is \( k \)-identifiable if there exists \( \hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{I}_k(\mathcal{P}) \) and \( f \) such that \( \Gamma = f \circ \hat{\Gamma} \). The identification complexity of \( \Gamma \) is defined as \( \text{id}(\Gamma) = \min\{k : \Gamma \text{ is } k \text{-identifiable}\} \).
Note that according to our definitions, we trivially have $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) \geq \text{idem}(\Gamma)$ when both are defined. To illustrate Definition 8, recall the variance example, where $\Gamma(p) = \text{Var}(p)$, $\hat{\Gamma}(p) = (\mathbb{E}_p[Y], \mathbb{E}_p[Y^2]) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by $f(r) = r_2 - r_1^2$, which showed $\text{elic}_C(\text{Var}) \leq 2$. By observing that $\hat{\Gamma}$ is identifiable as an expectation, namely by $V(r, y) = (y - r_1, y^2 - r_2)$, we see that $\Gamma \in \mathcal{E}_2(\mathcal{P}) \cap \mathcal{I}_2(\mathcal{P})$ and thus we have the stronger statement $\text{elic}_C(\text{Var}) \leq 2$. As in fact $\text{elic}_C(\text{Var}) = 1$ from Remark 2, we now have a hope of proving a nontrivial tight bound $\text{elic}_C(\text{Var}) = 2$; this is what we show in § 6.1.

While several of our results (in § 5) hold for general $C$, we will often restrict to identifiable properties by taking $C = \mathcal{I}$ (in § 4, 6), a choice we now justify. First, identifiability is a very natural condition, in some sense capturing first-order optimality of a loss function: for a differentiable loss $L$ for $\Gamma$, under suitable regularity conditions the derivative $V(r, y) = \nabla_r L(r, y)$ will identify $\Gamma$, provided $\mathbb{E}_p[L]$ has no inflection points or spurious local minima [25]. Second, identifiability is a very weak condition; many of the classes $C$ mentioned above can be thought of as subsets of $\mathcal{I}$. For example, linear properties (expectations) are identifiable, and continuous component-wise elicitable properties are identifiable if they are not locally constant [3, 9]. Moreover, properties elicited by differentiable convex losses are identifiable by the observation above regarding first-order optimality.

Finally, to underscore these points, observe that for many natural examples, $\text{elic}_C$ is lower than $\text{elic}_C$ for the choices of $C$ above, and thus lower bounds on $\text{elic}_C$ are stronger. For example, consider the first-component-link definition of Fissler and Ziegel [15] for the squared mean $\Gamma(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[Y]^2$ when $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$. As we saw in Remark 1, this property has $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) = 1$, yet as it is not directly elicitable, it has complexity 2 under the Fissler–Ziegel definition. (This is achieved, for example, via the property $\hat{\Gamma}(p) = (\mathbb{E}_p[Y]^2, \mathbb{E}_p[Y])$, elicited by $L(r, y) = (r_2 - y)^2 + 1\{r_1 \neq r_2^2\}$.) Similarly, under the component-wise-elicitable $C$ of Lambert et al. [17], the property $\Gamma(p) = \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p(\{y\})$ for finite $\mathcal{Y}$ has complexity $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) = |\mathcal{Y}| - 1$, whereas we show in Example 6.2 that $\text{elic}_C(\text{Var}) = 2$, where $\mathcal{I}^{\text{fin}}$ is a slight generalization of identifiability to allow for finite-valued properties.

In summary, modulo regularity assumptions on $\mathcal{E}_k(\mathcal{P})$, we believe our choice of $C = \mathcal{I}$ is better suited to studying the difficulty of eliciting properties: viewing $f$ as a (potentially dimension-reducing) link function, our definition captures the minimum number of dimensions needed in an ERM computation of the property in question, or the number of reports in a single-agent elicitation setting, followed by a simple one-time application of $f$. Nonetheless, the choice of $C$ is often only relevant for our lower bounds, as our upper bounds give losses explicitly; our main lower bound (Theorem 2) merely requires $\Gamma$ to have convex level sets, which is necessary by Proposition 1.

### 3 Motivation from Empirical Risk Minimization

Before giving our results, we briefly explain the relevance of elicitation complexity to empirical risk minimization (ERM). Recall that in many statistical learning settings, one seeks to minimize a given loss $\ell$, such as the 0-1 loss $\ell(r, y) = 1\{r \neq y\}$ in classification. Such losses may be difficult to directly optimize, however, as is the case with the 0-1 loss [26]. A common approach therefore is to instead choose a surrogate loss $L$ which is easier to optimize, and optimize $L$ instead, usually followed by a link function $f$ [27]. For example, support vector
After clipping

Let us verify that the various relationships hold between the minimizers of these losses. We describe the property \( \Gamma \) of a strictly positive calibration function \([28]\). Guarantees about rates typically rely on a well but not be close to optimizing \( \ell \) due to the discontinuity (as a simple example, consider \( \ell(r, y) = \mathbb{1}\{r \neq y\} \) and \( L(r, y) = (r - y)^2 \) over \( r, y \in \mathbb{R} \)). Agarwal and Agarwal \([4]\) give such a condition for classification problems, and the general version corresponds to the existence of a strictly positive calibration function \([28]\). Guarantees about rates typically rely on a stronger uniform continuity property (e.g., Theorem 3.22 of Steinwart and Christmann \([28]\)).

For asymptotic calibration, there is an additional requirement that \( f \) and \( \ell \) satisfy some type of continuity. Intuitively, if \( \ell \circ f \circ \Gamma^L \) is not continuous, one can optimize \( L \) arbitrarily well but not be close to optimizing \( \ell \) due to the discontinuity (as a simple example, consider \( \ell(r, y) = \mathbb{1}\{r \neq y\} \) and \( L(r, y) = (r - y)^2 \) over \( r, y \in \mathbb{R} \)). Agarwal and Agarwal \([4]\) give such a condition for classification problems, and the general version corresponds to the existence of a strictly positive calibration function \([28]\). Guarantees about rates typically rely on a stronger uniform continuity property (e.g., Theorem 3.22 of Steinwart and Christmann \([28]\)).

As a concrete example, consider the hinge loss \( L(r, y) = \max\{0, 1 - ry\} \) where \( \mathcal{Y} = \{+1, -1\} \) and \( r \in \mathbb{R} \). As discussed above, SVMs use hinge loss as a convex surrogate for 0-1 loss \( \ell(r, y) = \mathbb{1}\{r \neq y\} \), where the minimizer of hinge is followed by the link \( f(r) = \text{sgn}(r) \). Let us verify that the various relationships hold between the minimizers of these losses. After clipping \( r \) to the range \([-1, 1] \) (as all other values of \( r \) are strictly dominated), we can describe the property \( \Gamma^L \) elicited by the hinge loss, and its level sets \( \Gamma^L_r \), as follows:

\[
\Gamma^L(r) = \begin{cases} 
-1 & 0 \leq p(+1) < 1/2 \\
[-1, 1] & p(+1) = 1/2 \\
1 & 1/2 < p(+1) \leq 1
\end{cases}
\quad \text{and} \quad
\Gamma^L_r = \begin{cases} 
\{p : p(-1) \geq 1/2\} & r = -1 \\
\{p : p(+1) \geq 1/2\} & r = 1 \\
\{(1/2, 1/2)\} & r \in (-1, 1)
\end{cases}
\]

By inspection, taking \( f(r) = \text{sgn}(r) \) for \( r \neq 0 \), and \( f(0) = \{-1, 1\} \), gives \( \Gamma^\ell = f \circ \Gamma^L \) as desired. Moreover, Steinwart and Christmann \([28, \text{Theorem 3.34, 3.36}\] show that hinge loss achieves asymptotic, and indeed uniform, calibration.

These observations show that, fundamentally, the desirable surrogates for \( \ell \) depend on \( \Gamma^L \) and \( f \) rather than \( L \) directly, so any loss eliciting \( \Gamma^\ell \) will provide the desired consistency. Implicit in this claim, however, is the assumption that the learning algorithm is considering an unrestricted (or sufficiently rich) set of hypotheses. If the model class is restricted, then different choices of surrogates which elicit \( \Gamma^L \) will affect the final \( \ell \)-risk achieved. (See e.g. \([29]\] for an illustration with linear regression.) Therefore, tools which provide a variety of loss functions can also be important.

In other learning settings, the natural problem is not necessarily to minimize a particular loss \( \ell \). For example, in regression for a given \( x \) there will typically be a distribution over \( y \)
values in the population, so some summary statistic needs to be output. In such settings, it is natural to specify the problem directly in terms of the desired property \( \Gamma \) and seek an elicitable \( \Gamma^L \) and link \( f \) such that \( \Gamma = f \circ \Gamma^L \). As long as \( \Gamma \) satisfies suitable continuity properties, learning guarantees similar to consistency can be provided.

In summary, therefore, upper bounds on \( \text{elic}_C(\Gamma) \) give statistically-consistent (surrogate) losses and link functions for a given property of interest \( \Gamma \), where \( \Gamma = \Gamma^\ell \) if a loss \( \ell \) is given instead. Moreover, the upper bound \( \text{elic}_C(\Gamma) \leq k \) says that the range of the intermediate property \( \Gamma^L \) is a function to \( \mathbb{R}^k \), meaning that the dimension of the underlying hypothesis can be taken to be at most \( k \). (Note, this is the dimension of the range of the hypothesis, not the number of parameters.) Similarly, lower bounds \( \text{elic}_C(\Gamma) \geq k \) show that for any such surrogate loss and link to exist, with respect to the class \( C \), then the dimension of the hypothesis must be at least \( k \). While most of our results will be for the choice \( C = \mathcal{I} \), many also apply to convex-elicitable properties; see §7 and §8 for further discussion.

4 Basic Complexity Results

In this section, we make some simple, but useful, observations about elicitation complexity with respect to identifiable properties, i.e. \( C = \mathcal{I} \). As alluded to in §2.2, the choice \( C = \mathcal{I} \) is a very broad class of properties, but still restrictive enough that we can still prove meaningful lower bounds on \( \text{elic}_\mathcal{I}(\Gamma) \).

4.1 Upper bounds

It is natural to start with some trivial upper bounds. Clearly, whenever \( p \in \mathcal{P} \) can be uniquely determined by some number of elicitable parameters then the elicitation complexity of every property is at most that number: one can simply elicit the entire distribution and then the link function simply computes the desired property. The following propositions give two notable applications of this observation. We adopt the convention that \( F \) denotes a cumulative distribution function (CDF).

**Proposition 2.** When \( |\mathcal{Y}| = n \), every property \( \Gamma \) has \( \text{elic}_\mathcal{I}(\Gamma) \leq n - 1 \).

*Proof.* Letting \( \mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\} \), a distribution \( p \) is uniquely determined by its first \( n - 1 \) components \( p(y_1), \ldots, p(y_{n-1}) \), each of which are elicitable and identifiable. Take for example \( L_i(r, y) = (r - 1 \{y = y_i\})^2 \) and \( V_i(r, y) = r - 1 \{y = y_i\} \).

**Proposition 3.** When \( \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R} \), every property \( \Gamma \) has \( \text{elic}_\mathcal{I}(\Gamma) \leq \infty \) (countable).

*Proof.* Since a distribution is determined by the values of its CDF \( F \) on a dense set, let \( \{q_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \) be an enumeration of the rational numbers, and define \( \hat{\Gamma}(F)_i = F(q_i) \). This \( \hat{\Gamma} \) is elicited by \( L(\{r_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, y) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} 2^{-i}(r_i - 1_{y \leq q_i})^2 \) and identified by \( V(\{r_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, y)_j = (r_j - 1_{y \leq q_j}) \), and with an appropriate link we can compute \( \Gamma \).

Note that the restrictions above on \( \mathcal{Y} \) may easily be placed on \( \mathcal{P} \) instead. For example, finite \( \mathcal{Y} \) is equivalent to \( \mathcal{P} \) having support on a finite subset of \( \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R} \), or even being piecewise constant on some disjoint events.
In particular, Proposition 2 and 3 apply to the identity property $\Gamma_{id}(p) = p$. A natural complementary lower bound is as follows: when the class of distributions $\mathcal{P}$ is sufficiently rich, the bounds in these Propositions are tight for the identity, i.e. the complexity of eliciting the whole distribution via identifiable properties is maximal. (Contrast with Remark 2, where we saw that $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) = 1$ when $C$ is too large.) We first state two versions of the condition that $\mathcal{P}$ be “rich”. Note that these conditions are satisfied by, for example, the set of all mixtures of univariate Gaussian distributions. Of course, there are many other such conditions that would suffice.

**Condition 1.** Let $k$ be given. For all distinct $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}$, $\text{affdim}(\{(F(x_1), \ldots, F(x_k))^\top : F \in \mathcal{P}\}) = k$. Moreover, for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^k$ there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^k, F, F', F'' \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, such that $F = \lambda F' + (1 - \lambda)F''$ and for all $i$ we have $F(x_i) = \alpha_i$ but $F'(x_i) \neq \alpha_i \neq F''(x_i)$.

**Condition 2.** Let $k$ be given. The set $\mathcal{P}$ is convex, and there exists a $\mathcal{P}$-integrable $\phi : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^k$ with $\text{affdim} \{(\mathbb{E}_p[\phi(Y)] : p \in \mathcal{P}) = k$, where $\text{affdim}$ is the dimension of the affine hull.

**Lemma 1.** Let $\Gamma_{id} : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P}$ be the identity, $\Gamma_{id} : p \mapsto p$. If $\mathcal{Y}$ is finite, then $\text{elic}_\mathcal{P}(\Gamma_{id}) = \text{affdim} \mathcal{P}$; in particular, if $\mathcal{P}$ is the entire probability simplex, then $\text{elic}_\mathcal{P}(\Gamma_{id}) = |\mathcal{Y}| - 1$. If $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$ and there is an unbounded set of $k$ satisfying Condition 1 or 2, then $\text{elic}_\mathcal{P}(\Gamma_{id}) = \infty$.

We defer the proof of Lemma 1 to the end of §4.3, as it makes use of the examples therein.

### 4.2 Redundancy and refinement

It is easy to create redundant properties in various ways. For example, given elicitable properties $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ the property $\Gamma = \{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2\}$ clearly contains redundant information. (We will use curly braces to combine properties when the order is irrelevant.) A concrete case is $\Gamma = \{\text{mean squared}, \text{variance}, \text{2nd moment}\}$, which, as we have seen, has $\text{elic}_\mathcal{P}(\Gamma) \leq 2$. Straightforwardly, however, adding properties to such a list cannot lower its overall complexity, and moreover cannot increase it beyond the sum of the individual complexities either (i.e. elicitation complexity is sub-additive).

**Lemma 2.** For all properties $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_m$, and classes $\mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \text{elic}_\mathcal{C}(\Gamma_i) \leq \text{elic}_\mathcal{C}(\{\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_m\}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \text{elic}_\mathcal{C}(\Gamma_i) .$$

**Proof.** For the first inequality, letting $k = \text{elic}_\mathcal{C}(\{\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_m\})$, we have an elicitable $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{C}$, $\hat{\Gamma} : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k$, and $f$ such that $(\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_m) = f \circ \hat{\Gamma}$. Letting $g$ be the link which picks out the coordinates of $\Gamma_i$, we have $\Gamma_i = (g \circ f) \circ \hat{\Gamma}$, thus establishing $\text{elic}(\Gamma_i) \leq k$. For the second, for any elicitable $\hat{\Gamma}_i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $f_i$ with $\Gamma_i = f_i \circ \hat{\Gamma}_i$, we of course can take $\hat{\Gamma} = (\hat{\Gamma}_1, \ldots, \hat{\Gamma}_m)$ and $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_m)$ so that $(\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_m) = f \circ \hat{\Gamma}$.

The following definitions and lemma capture various aspects of a lack of redundancy, which together ensure that the second inequality of Lemma 2 will be tight.

**Definition 9.** Property $\Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k$ in $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P})$ is balanced if $\text{idem}(\Gamma) = k$. 
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Note that there are two ways for a property to fail to be balanced. First, as the examples above suggest, \( \Gamma \) can be “redundant” so that it is a link of a lower-dimensional identifiable property. Balance can also be violated if more dimensions are needed to identify the property than to specify it. This is the case with most of the properties in § 6, e.g., the variance which is a 1-dimensional property but which we will show has \( \text{id} \text{en}(\text{Var}) = 2 \).

**Definition 10.** Properties \( \Gamma, \Gamma' \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P}) \) are independent if \( \text{id} \text{en}(\{\Gamma, \Gamma'\}) = \text{id} \text{en}(\Gamma) + \text{id} \text{en}(\Gamma') \).

**Lemma 3.** If \( \Gamma, \Gamma' \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{P}) \) are independent and balanced, then \( \text{elic}_I(\{\Gamma, \Gamma'\}) = \text{elic}_I(\Gamma) + \text{elic}_I(\Gamma') \).

**Proof.** Let \( \Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k \) and \( \Gamma' : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^{k'} \). Unfolding our definitions, we have \( \text{elic}_I(\{\Gamma, \Gamma'\}) \geq \text{id} \text{en}(\{\Gamma, \Gamma'\}) = \text{id} \text{en}(\Gamma) + \text{id} \text{en}(\Gamma') = k + k' \). For the upper bound, we simply take losses \( L \) and \( L' \) for \( \Gamma \) and \( \Gamma' \), respectively, and elicit \( \{\Gamma, \Gamma'\} \) via \( \tilde{L}(r, r', y) = L(r, y) + L'(r', y) \).

To illustrate the lemma, \( \text{elic}_I(\text{Var}) = 2 \) as we will show in § 6.1, yet \( \Gamma = \{\mathbb{E}[Y], \text{Var}\} \) has \( \text{elic}_I(\Gamma) = 2 \), so clearly the mean and variance are not both independent and balanced. (As we have remarked, variance is not balanced.) However, the mean and second moment satisfy both by Lemma 5.

Similar to redundancy, we can think of one property refining another, in the sense of encoding strictly more information.

**Definition 11.** \( \Gamma' \) refines \( \Gamma \) if for all \( p, p' \in \mathcal{P} \) we have \( \Gamma'(p) = \Gamma'(p') \implies \Gamma(p) = \Gamma(p') \), or more succinctly, if for all \( p \in \mathcal{P} \), \( \Gamma_{\Gamma'(p)} \subseteq \Gamma_{\Gamma(p)} \).

Note that Definition 11 is equivalent to the existence of a function \( f \) such that \( \Gamma = f \circ \Gamma' \). Thus, a property which refines another cannot have lower elicitation complexity. This observation actually applies to any class \( \mathcal{C} \), and not just \( \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{I} \).

**Lemma 4.** If \( \Gamma' \) refines \( \Gamma \) then \( \text{elic}_C(\Gamma') \geq \text{elic}_C(\Gamma) \).

**Proof.** If \( \Gamma' \) is \( k \)-elicitable with respect to \( \mathcal{C} \), then there exists an elicitable \( \hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{C} \) such that \( \Gamma' = g \circ \hat{\Gamma} \). But then \( \Gamma = f \circ g \circ \hat{\Gamma} \), so it is also \( k \)-elicitable with respect to \( \mathcal{C} \).

### 4.3 Specific properties: expectations and quantiles

One well-studied class of properties are those where \( \Gamma \) is the expectation of some vector-valued random variable, often called the linear case. All such properties are elicitable and identifiable [5, 6, 8], with complexity bounded by the dimension of the random variable, but of course the complexity can be lower if the range of \( \Gamma \) is not full-dimensional.

**Lemma 5.** Let \( \mathcal{P} \) be convex, \( \phi : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^k \) be \( \mathcal{P} \)-integrable, and let \( \Gamma(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[\phi(Y)] \). Then \( \text{elic}_I(\Gamma) = \text{affdim}(\Gamma(\mathcal{P})) \), the dimension of the affine hull of the range of \( \Gamma \).

**Proof.** Let \( \ell = \text{affdim}(\Gamma(\mathcal{P})) \). Take any \( p', p'' \in \mathcal{P} \) with \( \Gamma(p') \neq \Gamma(p'') \) and let \( r_0 = \Gamma(\frac{1}{2}p' + \frac{1}{2}p'') = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma(p') + \frac{1}{2}\Gamma(p'') \). Then \( \mathcal{V} = \text{span}\{\Gamma(p) - r_0 : p \in \mathcal{P}\} \) is a vector space of dimension \( \ell \) and basis \( v_1, \ldots, v_\ell \). Let \( M = [v_1 \ldots v_\ell] \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times \ell} \). Now define \( V : \Gamma(\mathcal{P}) \times \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^\ell \) by \( V(r, y) = M^+(X(y) - r) \). Clearly \( \mathbb{E}_p[X] = r \implies V(r, p) = 0 \), and by properties of the
pseudoinverse $M^+$, as $E_p[X] - r \in \text{im } M$, $M^+(E_p[X] - r) = 0 \implies E_p[X] - r = 0$. Thus $\text{idem}(\Gamma) \leq \ell$. As $\dim \text{span}\{\{V(r_0, p) : p \in \mathcal{P}\}\} = \dim \mathcal{V} = \ell$, by Lemma 11, $\text{idem}(\Gamma) = \ell$.

Elicitability follows by letting $\Gamma(p) = M^+(E_p[X] - r_0) = E_p[M^+(X - r_0)] \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ with link $f(r') = Mr' + r_0$; $\Gamma$ is of course elicitable as a linear property.

Another important case is when $\Gamma$ consists of some number of quantiles: for sufficiently rich sets of distributions, distinct quantiles are independent and balanced, so their elicitation complexity is the number of quantiles being elicited. (Note the distinction between this result and those in the literature concerned with the separability of loss functions eliciting a collection of quantiles [7, 15].)

**Lemma 6.** Let $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ be a class of probability measures, with continuous and invertible CDFs, satisfying Condition 1. Let $q_\alpha$, denote the $\alpha$-quantile function. Then if $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k \in (0, 1)$ are all distinct, $\Gamma = \{q_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, q_{\alpha_k}\}$ has $\text{elic}_{\Gamma}(\Gamma) = k$.

**Proof.** The function $V(r, y)_i = \mathbb{1}\{y \leq r_i\} - \alpha_i$ identifies $\Gamma$, as $E_FV(r, Y) = 0 \iff \forall i \ F(r_i) = \alpha_i \iff \forall i \ r_i = q_{\alpha_i}(F)$. Thus, as quantiles are elicitable, $\text{elic}_{\Gamma}(\Gamma) \leq k$.

For the lower bound, Condition 1 gives us some $r$ and $F, F', F'' \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\Gamma(F) = r$ and $\Gamma(F') \neq r \neq \Gamma(F'')$ but $F = \lambda F' + (1 - \lambda)F''$. As we also have $E_FV(r, Y) = 0$ from the above, and $\text{span}\{E_FV(r, Y) : F' \in \mathcal{P}\} = \text{span}\{(F'(r_1), \ldots, F'(r_k))^\top - (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)^\top : F' \in \mathcal{P}\} = \mathbb{R}^k$ by Condition 1, the result now follows from Lemma 11 in the appendix.

The quantile example in particular allows us to see that all complexity classes, including $\infty$, are occupied. In fact, our results to follow will show something stronger: even for real-valued properties $\gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}$, all classes are occupied. We state this result here, deferring the proof to §6.4 as we rely on bounds for functions of expectations and spectral risk measures.

**Proposition 4.** Let $\mathcal{P}$ satisfy Condition 1 or 2 for all $k \geq 1$. Then for all $k \geq 1$ there exists $\gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\text{elic}_{\Gamma}(\gamma) = k$.

Having completed our examples, we can now prove Lemma 1.

**Proof of Lemma 1.** For finite $\mathcal{Y}$, observe that the identity mapping is linear and apply Lemma 5. For infinite $\mathcal{Y}$, observe that $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$ refines all properties. For a given $k$, Assumptions 1 and 2 establish the existence of a property with elicitation complexity $k$ by Lemma 6 or Lemma 5 respectively. Thus by Lemma 4 $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$ has elicitation complexity at least $k$. By assumption there is no finite upper bound on $k$, so the result follows from the upper bound of $\infty$ (countable) in Proposition 3.

## 5 Eliciting the Bayes Risk

In this section we prove two theorems that provide our main tools for proving upper and lower bounds respectively on elicitation complexity. Of course many properties are known to be elicitable, and the losses that elicit them provide such an upper bound for that case. We provide such a construction for properties that can be expressed as the pointwise minimum of an indexed set of random variables $\{X_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$,

$$\gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \gamma(p) = \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}} E_p[X_a]. \quad (2)$$
As we will see in §6, there are many properties of interest that take this form. Interestingly, our construction does not elicit the minimum directly, but as a joint elicitation of the minimum value and the index that realizes this value. The form (3) is that of a scoring rule for the linear property $p \mapsto \mathbb{E}_p[X_a]$, except that here the index $a$ itself is also elicited.

**Theorem 1.** Let $\{X_a\}_{a \in \mathcal{A}}$ be a set of $\mathcal{F}$-integrable random variables indexed by $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$. If $\inf_a \mathbb{E}_p[X_a]$ is attained for all $p \in \mathcal{P}$, then the loss function
\[
L((r,a),y) = H(r) + h(r)(X_a(y) - r)
\]
elicits the set-valued property $\hat{\Gamma} : p \mapsto \{(\gamma(p), a) : \mathbb{E}_p[X_a] = \gamma(p)\}$, where $\gamma$ is defined in (2), $h : \gamma(\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is any strictly decreasing function, and $H(r) = \int_{r_0}^r h(x)dx$ for $r_0 \in \gamma(\mathcal{P})$.

Proof. Working with gains instead of losses, we will show the equivalent result that $S((r,a),p) = g(r) + dg_r(\mathbb{E}_p[X_a] - r)$ elicits $\hat{\Gamma} : p \mapsto \{(\gamma(p), a) : \mathbb{E}_p[X_a] = \gamma(p)\}$ for $\gamma(p) = \max_a \mathbb{E}_p[X_a]$. Here $g$ is convex with strictly increasing and positive subgradient $dg$.

For any fixed $a$, we have by the subgradient inequality,
\[
S((r,a),p) = g(r) + dg_r(\mathbb{E}_p[X_a] - r) \leq g(\mathbb{E}_p[X_a]) = S((\mathbb{E}_p[X_a], a),p),
\]
as $dg$ is strictly increasing, $g$ is strictly convex, so $r = \mathbb{E}_p[X_a]$ is the unique maximizer. Now letting $\tilde{S}(a,p) = S((\mathbb{E}_p[X_a], a),p)$, we have
\[
\arg\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \tilde{S}(a,p) = \arg\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} g(\mathbb{E}_p[X_a]) = \arg\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_p[X_a],
\]
because $g$ is strictly increasing. We now have
\[
\arg\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}, r \in \mathbb{R}} S((r,a),p) = \left\{(\mathbb{E}_p[X_a], a) : a \in \arg\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}_p[X_a]\right\}. \quad \square
\]

We briefly mention various forms of Theorem 1 which have appeared in the literature. Most recently, a similar result appears independently in the Master’s thesis of Jonas Brehmer [30]. The loss function of Fissler and Ziegel [15] for expected shortfall is a special case of Theorem 1, and indeed a careful inspection of the former gave the inspiration for the latter. Finally, earlier work of Peter Grünwald [31, 32] gives a version of Theorem 1 in the context of the minimum description length (MDL) principle. Briefly, given a loss function $L$, one defines a codelength $\beta \mathbb{E}_p[L(H,Y)] + C(\beta)$ for some fixed function $C$, which can be interpreted itself as a new loss function with arguments $\beta$ and $H$. The expected codelength is then jointly minimized for the $H$ that minimizes the expected loss $\mathbb{E}_p[L(H,Y)]$ and for a $\beta$ that happens to be in one-to-one correspondence with $\mathbb{E}_p[L(H,Y)]$. The results in these MDL works cover “simple” losses $L$, such as $L(H,y) = g(|H - y|)$ for some $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, as well as losses with a finite number of reports and outcomes (e.g. in classification contexts).

Note that we make no restriction on the class $C$ of properties to which $\hat{\Gamma}$ belongs. Thus, while we will most often apply Theorem 1 to identifiable properties as in Corollary 2, the upper bound is quite general and broadly applicable. For example, we use this upper bound for the choice $C = \mathcal{F}^\infty$ (a generalization of identifiable properties) in §6.2. Note also that Theorem 1 does not characterize all loss functions to elicit the joint property $\hat{\Gamma}$; see §6.1 for an example where additional losses are possible.
To illustrate Theorem 1, let us return to the variance example. As is well-known, we can write \( \text{Var}(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[(Y - \mathbb{E}_p[Y])^2] \). But observe that as squared loss elicits the mean, we must have \( \min_a \mathbb{E}_p[(Y - a)^2] = \mathbb{E}_p[(Y - \mathbb{E}_p[Y])^2] = \text{Var}(p) \), and thus the variance can be expressed in the form (2) where \( X_a = (Y - a)^2 \). The theorem then tells us that \( \tilde{\Gamma}(p) = (\text{Var}(p), \mathbb{E}_p[Y]) \) is elicitable. This example suggests a natural way to obtain a property of the form (2): take an arbitrary loss function \( L \) and define \( X_a = L(a, Y) \). In this case the pointwise minimum corresponds to the Bayes risk, the minimum possible expected loss under some given distribution \( p \).

**Definition 12.** Given loss function \( L : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R} \) on some prediction set \( \mathcal{A} \), the Bayes risk of \( L \) is defined as \( L(p) := \inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} L(a, p) \).

Our main application of Theorem 1 is showing that the Bayes risk of a loss eliciting a \( k \)-dimensional property is itself \((k + 1)\)-elicitable. We will see several examples of Bayes risks, in a variety of contexts, in §6. That the infimum in Definition 12 is attained below follows from the fact that \( L \) elicits \( \Gamma \).

**Corollary 1.** If \( L : \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R} \) is a loss function eliciting \( \Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k \), then the loss

\[
L^*((r, a), y) = L'(a, y) + H(r) + h(r)(L(a, y) - r)
\]

elicits \( \{L, \Gamma\} \), where \( h : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) is any positive strictly decreasing function, \( H(r) = \int_0^r h(x)dx \), and \( L' \) is any surrogate loss eliciting \( \Gamma \).

We now turn to our second theorem which provides lower bounds for the elicitation complexity of the Bayes risk. A first observation, which follows from standard convex analysis, is that \( L \) is concave, and thus it is unlikely to be elicitable directly, as the level sets of \( L \) are likely to be non-convex. To show a lower bound greater than 1, however, we will need much stronger techniques. In particular, while \( L \) must be concave, it may not be strictly so. Indeed, \( L \) must be flat between any two distributions which share a minimizer. Crucial to our lower bound is the fact that whenever the minimizer of \( L \) differs between two distributions, \( L \) is essentially strictly concave between them.

**Lemma 7.** Let \( \mathcal{P} \) be convex, and suppose loss \( L \) with Bayes risk \( L \) elicits \( \Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k \). Then for any \( p, p' \in \mathcal{P} \) with \( \Gamma(p) \neq \Gamma(p') \), we have \( L(\lambda p + (1 - \lambda)p') > \lambda L(p) + (1 - \lambda)L(p') \) for all \( \lambda \in (0, 1) \).

Note that while we will assume convexity of \( \mathcal{P} \) in much of what follows, as a result of this lemma, this condition is not generally necessary. For non-convex \( \mathcal{P} \), the inequality in Lemma 7 would simply hold for any \( \lambda \in (0, 1) \) such that \( \lambda p + (1 - \lambda)p' \in \mathcal{P} \).

With this lemma in hand we can prove our lower bound. The crucial insight is that an identification function for the Bayes risk of a loss eliciting a property can, through a link, be used to identify that property. Corollary 1 tells us that \( k + 1 \) parameters suffice for the Bayes risk of a \( k \)-dimensional property, and our lower bound shows this is often necessary. Only \( k \) parameters suffice, however, when the property value itself provides all the information.

\[\text{Note that one could easily lift the requirement that } \Gamma \text{ be a function, and allow } \Gamma(p) \text{ to be the set of minimizers of the loss (cf. [33]). We will use this additional power in Example 6.4.}\]
required to compute the Bayes risk; for example, dropping the $y^2$ term from squared loss gives $L(x, y) = x^2 - 2xy$ and $\mathbb{L}(p) = -\mathbb{E}_p[\gamma]^2$, which yields $\text{elic}_C(\mathbb{L}) = 1$ for any reasonable choice of $C$ (e.g. $C = \mathcal{I}$). Thus the theorem splits the lower bound into two cases.

**Theorem 2.** Let $\mathcal{P}$ be convex, and let class of properties $C$ be given. If $L$ elicits $\Gamma$, then $\text{elic}_C(\mathbb{L}) \geq \text{elic}_C(\Gamma)$, with equality if $\mathbb{L} = f \circ \Gamma$ for some function $f$.

**Proof.** Let $\ell = \text{elic}_C(\mathbb{L})$, so that we have some $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{E}_\ell \cap C$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{L} = g \circ \hat{\Gamma}$. We show by contradiction that $\hat{\Gamma}$ refines $\Gamma$. Otherwise, we have $p, p'$ with $\hat{\Gamma}(p) = \hat{\Gamma}(p')$, and thus $\mathbb{L}(p) = \mathbb{L}(p')$, but $\Gamma(p) \neq \Gamma(p')$. Lemma 7 would then give us some $p_\lambda = \lambda p + (1 - \lambda)p'$ with $\mathbb{L}(p_\lambda) > \mathbb{L}(p)$, but as the level sets $\hat{\Gamma}_\ell$ are convex by Proposition 1, we would have $\hat{\Gamma}(p_\lambda) = \hat{\Gamma}(p)$, which would imply $\mathbb{L}(p_\lambda) = \mathbb{L}(p)$. Thus, $\hat{\Gamma}$ must refine $\Gamma$, so by Lemma 4, $\text{elic}_C(\mathbb{L}) = \ell \geq \text{elic}_C(\hat{\Gamma}) \geq \text{elic}_C(\Gamma)$. If $\mathbb{L} = f \circ \Gamma$ then $\Gamma$ refines $\mathbb{L}$, so we also have $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) \geq \text{elic}_C(\mathbb{L})$. \hfill $\square$

The most difficult requirement of Theorem 2 is showing $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) = k$. An important special case is therefore $C = \mathcal{I}$, as we can bring to bear the basic results of §4 to actually apply the theorem. We state this special case below, along with two natural conditions that imply a stronger lower bound. In most applications, these conditions essentially mean that $\mathbb{L}$ is not a link of $\Gamma$. For both conditions, $L$ is a loss eliciting $\Gamma$, and $\mathbb{L}$ its Bayes risk.

**Condition 3.** $L$ is non-constant on every non-singleton level set of $\Gamma$.

**Condition 4.** $L$ is non-constant on some level set $\Gamma_r$ of $\Gamma$ with co-dimension $k$, meaning $\text{span} \Gamma_r$ has co-dimension $k$ as a subspace of $\text{span} \mathcal{P}$.

**Corollary 2.** Let $\mathcal{P}$ be convex, and let $L$ elicit some $\Gamma \in \mathcal{I}_k$ with $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) = k$. If $\mathbb{L} = f \circ \Gamma$ for some $f : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$, then $\text{elic}_C(\mathbb{L}) = k$. If at least one of Condition 3 or 4 hold, then $\text{elic}_C(\mathbb{L}) = k + 1$.

**Proof.** For the upper bound, note that $\Gamma \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P})$ implies $(L, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P})$, as if $V(a, y)$ identifies $\Gamma$, then $V'(r, a, y) = (L(a, y) - r, V(a, y))$ identifies $(L, \Gamma)$. Corollary 1 then gives $\text{elic}_C(\mathbb{L}) \leq k + 1$. For the lower bounds, Theorem 2 gives $\text{elic}_C(\mathbb{L}) \geq k$ with equality if $\mathbb{L}$ is a link of $\Gamma$. It remains to show the stronger lower bound of $k + 1$ under Conditions 3 or 4. That is, given $\hat{\Gamma} : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^\ell$ and $g$ from Theorem 2, so that $\hat{\Gamma}$ is elicitable and identifiable and $\mathbb{L} = g \circ \hat{\Gamma}$, we wish to show $\ell \geq k + 1$.

First, assume Condition 4 holds, so that for some $r \in \Gamma(\mathcal{P})$, the co-dimension of $\text{span} \Gamma_r$ is $k$ as a subspace of $\text{span} \mathcal{P}$. By the proof of Theorem 2, $\hat{\Gamma}$ refines $\Gamma$, and in particular, there is some $\hat{r} \in \hat{\Gamma}(\mathcal{P})$ such that $\hat{\Gamma}_\ell \subseteq \Gamma_r$. Hence $\text{span} \hat{\Gamma}_\ell$ is a subspace of $\text{span} \Gamma_r$, so we have $\ell \geq \text{codim} \text{span} \hat{\Gamma}_\ell \geq \text{codim} \text{span} \Gamma_r = k$, with equality if and only if $\text{span} \hat{\Gamma}_\ell = \text{span} \Gamma_r$. Now suppose $\ell = k$ for a contradiction. As $\hat{\Gamma}$ is identifiable, its identification function $\hat{V}$ would satisfy $\hat{V}(\hat{r}, p) = 0$ for all $p \in \text{span} \hat{\Gamma}_\ell$, and thus $\hat{\Gamma}_\ell = \mathcal{P}_\cap \text{span} \hat{\Gamma}_\ell = \mathcal{P}_\cap \text{span} \Gamma_r = \Gamma_r$. Since by assumption $\mathbb{L}$ is non-constant on $\Gamma_r = \hat{\Gamma}_\ell$, we have distributions $p, p' \in \hat{\Gamma}_\ell$ with $\mathbb{L}(p) \neq \mathbb{L}(p')$, which contradicts $\mathbb{L}$ being a link of $\hat{\Gamma}$: $\mathbb{L}(p) = g(\hat{\Gamma}(p)) = g(\hat{r}) = g(\hat{\Gamma}(p')) = \mathbb{L}(p')$.

Finally, we will show that Condition 3 implies Condition 4 in this context, completing the proof. By assumption, $\text{elic}_C(\Gamma) = k$, which implies $\text{iden}(\Gamma) = k$. If no level set of $\Gamma$ had co-dimension $k$, then for all $r \in \Gamma(\mathcal{P})$, we would have some $V'_r : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^{k-1}$ such that $\mathbb{E}_p V'_r(Y) = 0 \iff p \in \Gamma_r$ for $p \in \mathcal{P}$. But then taking $V'(r, y) := V'_r(y)$ would show $\text{iden}(\Gamma) < k$. Thus, $\text{span} \Gamma_r$ has co-dimension $k$ in $\text{span} \mathcal{P}$ for at least one $r \in \Gamma(\mathcal{P})$. \hfill $\square$
6 Examples and Applications

We now give several applications of our results. Several upper bounds are novel, as well as all lower bounds greater than 2. In the examples, unless we refer to $\mathcal{Y}$ explicitly we will assume $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$. In each setting, we also make several standard regularity assumptions which we suppress for ease of exposition; for example, for the variance and quantile we assume finite first and second moments (which must span $\mathbb{R}^2$). All applications require $\mathcal{P}$ to be “sufficiently rich” in some sense, though for many this is a light restriction. For example, in many cases our results hold for any $\mathcal{P}$ containing the set $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mix}}$ of all finite mixtures of Gaussian distributions. For omitted proofs and other details, see § C.

6.1 Variance

In § 2 we showed that $\text{elic}_\mathcal{F}(\text{Var}) \leq 2$. As a warm up, let us see how to recover this statement together with a matching lower bound using our results on the Bayes risk. As we show in § 5, we can view Var as the Bayes risk of squared loss $L(r, y) = (r - y)^2$, which of course elicits the mean. Formally, we have

$$L(p) = \min_{r \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_p[(r - Y)^2] = \mathbb{E}_p[(\mathbb{E}_p[Y] - Y)^2] = \text{Var}(p).$$

As the mean is identifiable, and the variance is not simply a function of the mean, Corollary 2 gives $\text{elic}_\mathcal{F}(\text{Var}) = 2$.

Corollary 3. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be convex and contain $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mix}}$ (or any set of distributions with at least two possible variances for each mean, and for which $\text{elic}_\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{E}[Y]) = 1$). Then $\text{elic}_\mathcal{F}(\text{Var}) = 2$.

With the variance we can observe that Corollary 1 does not give a full characterization of loss functions eliciting $(L, \Gamma)$. For $(\text{Var}, \mathbb{E}[Y])$, Corollary 1 gives losses such as $L((r, a), y) = e^{-a}((r - y)^2 - a) - e^{-a}$, but in fact there are losses which cannot be represented by the form $(4)$; for example,

$$L^*((r, a), y) = a^2 + a(r - y)(2r + y + 1) + (r - y)^2((r + y)^2 + r + y + 1).$$

This $L^*$ was generated via squared loss $L_A$ with respect to the Malahanobis norm $\| \cdot \|_A$ for $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1/2 \\ -1/2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ defined as follows,

$$L_A(z, y) = \|z - \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix}\|_A^2 = (z - \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix})^T \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1/2 \\ -1/2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} (z - \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix}),$$

which elicits the first two moments; $L^*$ is then given by applying the invertible link function $(z_1, z_2) \mapsto (z_1, z_2 - z_2^2)$.

6.2 Mode and Modal Mass

In the case of finite $\mathcal{Y}$, with $\mathcal{P}$ taken to be the probability simplex (all distributions over $\mathcal{Y}$), we define the modal mass $\gamma(p) = \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p(\{y\})$ as the highest probability assigned to any outcome. In other words, the modal mass is the probability assigned to the mode of $p$, defined by $\text{mode}(p) = \arg\max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p(\{y\})$, which we note is set-valued in general. The mode of $p$ is elicitable via 0-1 loss $L(r, y) = 1\{r \neq y\}$. (Here $1$ denotes the indicator function.)
The modal mass is not elicitable, however, as evidenced by its nonconvex level sets, and hence we turn to its elicitation complexity.

The form of the modal mass is reminiscent of eq. (2) from Theorem 1, and indeed $-\gamma$ is the minimum expected value over $X_a(y) = -1 \{ y = a \}$. More directly, we can see that $\gamma$ is 1 minus the Bayes risk of 0-1 loss: $\gamma(p) = \max_{r \in Y} \mathbb{E}_p 1 \{ r = y \} = 1 - \min_{r \in Y} \mathbb{E}_p 1 \{ r \neq y \} = 1 - L(p)$. Unfortunately, we cannot immediately apply Corollary 2, as the mode is not identifiable. (Indeed, no nonconstant finite-valued property is identifiable.)

To work around this technical barrier while keeping with the spirit of our framework, we replace $\mathcal{I}$ with the class $\mathcal{I}^{\text{fin}}$ of of properties which are identifiable after possibly conditioning on some elicitable finite property. Formally, let us define $\mathcal{I}'_k$ to be the class of properties $\Gamma = (\Gamma', \Gamma'')$ where $\Gamma' : \mathcal{P} \ni \{ 1, \ldots, m \}$ is elicitable, and $\Gamma'' \in \mathcal{I}_{k-1}(\Gamma'_i)$ for all $i \in \{ 1, \ldots, m \}$, where $\Gamma'_i = \{ p \in \mathcal{P} : \Gamma'(p) = i \}$ is a level set of $\Gamma'$. (Recall that $\ni$ implies a set-valued function; all nonconstant elicitable finite properties are set-valued, but only on the boundary of each level set $\Gamma'_i$ [10, 33].) That is, $\Gamma$ is a product of an elicitable finite property, and a vector-valued (or real-valued) property which is identifiable conditioned on that finite property. We then take $\mathcal{I}_{k}^{\text{fin}} = \mathcal{I}'_k \cup \mathcal{I}_k$, and $\mathcal{I}^{\text{fin}} = \bigcup_k \mathcal{I}_k^{\text{fin}}$. Note that any elicitable finite property $\Gamma$ is trivially in $\mathcal{I}_1^{\text{fin}}$, by taking $\Gamma' = \Gamma$.

With this formalism in hand, we see that $\Gamma = (\text{mode}, \gamma) \in \mathcal{I}_2^{\text{fin}}$: as observed above, mode($\cdot$) is finite and elicitable, and the function $V_a(r, y) = 1 \{ y = a \} - r$ identifies $\gamma$ conditioned on mode($\cdot$), that is, with respect to the distributions with mode $a$. Theorem 1 now applies to give $\text{elic}_{\mathcal{I}^{\text{fin}}}^2(\gamma) \leq 2$. Moreover, a generalization of Corollary 2 gives $\text{elic}_{\mathcal{I}^{\text{fin}}}^2(\gamma) = 2$; we omit the proof, which follows from the fact that $\text{elic}_{\mathcal{I}^{\text{fin}}}^2(\text{mode}) = 1$, as the mode is nonconstant but in $\mathcal{I}_1^{\text{fin}}$ even though $\text{iden}(\text{mode}) = |Y| - 1$, and $\gamma$ is nonconstant on the level sets of the mode. As discussed in §2, this low complexity gives an interesting contrast to the component-wise-elicitable $\mathcal{C}$ of Lambert et al. [17], where $\text{elic}_{\mathcal{C}}(\gamma) = |Y| - 1$, the maximum possible complexity.

For sufficiently rich choices of distributions $\mathcal{P}$ over $Y = \mathbb{R}$, however, the mode is no longer elicitable [21], where here the mode is defined for e.g. continuous densities as the argmax of the density value. In this setting, given a parameter $\beta$, it is natural to define the midpoint of a modal interval as the property $\text{mi}_\beta(p) = \text{argmax}_{a \in \mathbb{R}} p([a - \beta, a + \beta])$, namely, the midpoint of the interval of width $2\beta$ with the maximum probability mass. Similarly, we define the modal mass of width $\beta$ as the mass of the modal interval, $\gamma_\beta(p) = \max_{a \in \mathbb{R}} p([a - \beta, a + \beta])$. As in the finite case, the modal interval is elicitable via the loss $L(r, y) = 1 \{ |r - y| > \beta \}$, and the modal mass is 1 minus its Bayes risk, $\gamma_\beta(p) = 1 - L(p)$. Interestingly, recent work shows that the mode has infinite identification complexity, and despite the modal interval being elicitable, neither the modal interval nor modal mass have finite identification complexity either [34]. In other words, while $\text{mi}_\beta$ is directly elicitable, we have $\text{elic}_{\mathcal{I}}(\text{mode}) = \text{elic}_{\mathcal{I}}(\text{mi}_\beta) = \text{elic}_{\mathcal{I}}(\gamma_\beta) = \infty$. These lower bounds may appear to contradict results showing that real-valued properties are elicitable if and only if they are identifiable [3, 9], but such results require the property in question to be continuous, and $\text{mi}_\beta$ is not. Intuitively, these lower bounds suggest that the loss $L$ eliciting $\text{mi}_\beta$ will be hard to optimize in practice.
6.3 Convex Functions of Means: Entropy and Norms

Another source of examples come in the form $\gamma(p) = G(\mathbb{E}_p[X])$ for some strictly convex function $G : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{P}$-integrable $X : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^k$. To avoid degeneracies, we assume $\text{affdim} \{ \mathbb{E}_p[X] : p \in \mathcal{P} \} = k$, i.e., the property $\Gamma : p \mapsto \mathbb{E}_p[X]$ is balanced. Letting $\{ dG_p \}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$ be a selection of subgradients of $G$, the loss $L(r, y) = -(G(r) + dG_r \cdot (X(y) - r))$ elicits $\Gamma$, and moreover we have $\gamma(p) = -L(p)$; see e.g. [5]. By Lemma 5, $\text{elic}_\Gamma(\Gamma) = k$. One easily checks that $L = (G) \circ \Gamma$, so now by Corollary 2, $\text{elic}_\Gamma(\gamma) = k$ as well. We summarize this discussion in the following Corollary.

**Corollary 4.** Let $\mathcal{P}$ be convex, and let $X : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^k$ be $\mathcal{P}$-integrable such that $\text{affdim} \{ \mathbb{E}_p[X] : p \in \mathcal{P} \} = k$. Then for any strictly convex $G : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}$, the property $\gamma : p \mapsto G(\mathbb{E}_p[X])$ has $\text{elic}_\Gamma(\gamma) = k$.

As a special case (up to a minus sign), consider the Bayes risk of a proper loss $L$, which elicits the identity property $\Gamma_{\text{id}} : p \mapsto p$, and is known to have the same form as eliciting an expectation [1]. (One common example is log loss, $L(p, y) = -\log p(y)$, which one can easily check is proper, i.e. $\text{elicit}_\Gamma(\gamma) = \Gamma_{\text{id}}$, using facts about Kullback-Leibler divergence.) By Corollary 2, as clearly $L = L \circ \Gamma_{\text{id}}$, we immediately have $\text{elic}_\gamma(\Gamma_{\text{id}}) = \text{elic}_\gamma(\Gamma_{\text{id}})$. Under the appropriate assumptions, Lemma 1 then gives $\text{elic}_\gamma(\Gamma_{\text{id}}) = |\mathcal{Y}| - 1$ for $\mathcal{Y}$ finite and $\text{elic}_\gamma(\Gamma_{\text{id}}) = \infty$ for $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$. We now give two important cases of this observation, both in the case of Lebesgue densities.

Shannon entropy is given by $H(p) = -\int_{\mathcal{Y}} p(y) \log p(y)dy$ when $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$ and $H(p) = -\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p(y) \log p(y)$ when $|\mathcal{Y}| < \infty$. As is well-known, Shannon entropy is the Bayes risk of log loss, $L(p, y) = -\log p(y)$, which elicits $\Gamma_{\text{id}}$, thus giving maximal elicitation complexity for $H$. More broadly, generalized entropy functions (cf. [35]) which are strictly concave will have maximal identifiable elicitation complexity. For example, for $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$, Tsallis/Havrda–Charvát entropy $H_{HC}(p) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}(1-\int_{\mathcal{Y}} p(y)^\alpha dy)$ and Rényi entropy $H_R(p) = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \log(\int_{\mathcal{Y}} p(y)^\alpha dy)$ are both strictly concave [36], so we have infinite complexity when $\alpha < 1$ (and $\alpha > 1$ as well for $H_R$), and similarly for the finite $\mathcal{Y}$ case.

We can also now see the complexity of eliciting certain norms of the distribution. For $\beta > 1$, consider $\gamma_\beta(p) = \|p\|_\beta = (\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p(y)^\beta)^{1/\beta}$ when $|\mathcal{Y}| < \infty$. As the function $G(p) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} p(y)^\beta$ is strictly convex when $\beta > 1$, we know from the above that $\text{elic}_\gamma(G) = |\mathcal{Y}| - 1$, and thus $\text{elic}_\gamma(\gamma_\beta) = |\mathcal{Y}| - 1$ as well. Similarly, when $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$ we define $\gamma_\beta(p) = \|p\|_\beta = (\int_{\mathcal{Y}} p(y)^\beta dy)^{1/\beta}$, and we conclude $\text{elic}_\gamma(\gamma_\beta) = \infty$. In fact, most nontrivial/nondegenerate norms will have maximal elicitation complexity, as their sublevel sets will be strictly convex.

The following Corollary summarizes the above discussion.

**Corollary 5.** When $\mathcal{Y}$ is finite, and $\mathcal{P}$ is the probability simplex, we have $\text{elic}_\gamma(H) = \text{elic}_\gamma(H_{HC}) = \text{elic}_\gamma(H_R) = \text{elic}_\gamma(\gamma_\beta) = |\mathcal{Y}| - 1$. For $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$, if $\mathcal{P}$ is a convex family of Lebesgue densities satisfying Condition 1 or 2, we have $\text{elic}_\gamma(H) = \text{elic}_\gamma(H_{HC}) = \text{elic}_\gamma(H_R) = \text{elic}_\gamma(\gamma_\beta) = \infty$. (Here we assume $\alpha < 1$ for $H_{HC}$, $\alpha \neq 1$ for $H_R$, and $\beta > 1$.)

As an aside, recent work considers loss functions which depend on multiple outcomes $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_k$ which are assumed to be independent with law $p$ [23]. Under this model, i.e. where $C_k$ is the set of $k$-outcome elicitable (and identifiable) properties, the $\beta$-norm for finite $\mathcal{Y}$ and integer $\beta$ has $\text{elic}_{C_\beta}(\gamma_\beta) = 1$. A special case is the so-called collision probability, $\|p\|_2,
which arises in property testing among other applications [37]. Remarkably, the complexity drops from $\text{elic}_T(\gamma_3) = |\mathcal{Y}| - 1$ to $\text{elic}_C(\gamma_0) = 1$ with access to just one additional outcome. These results also apply to Rényi entropy for integer $\alpha \geq 2$, with the only difference being the need for a link function $f = \log$.

6.4 Expected Shortfall and Spectral Risk Measures

One important application of our results on the elicitation complexity of the Bayes risk is the elicitability of various financial risk measures. One of the most popular financial risk measures is expected shortfall $ES_\alpha: \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}$, also called conditional value at risk (CVaR) or average value at risk (AVaR), which we define as follows (cf. [38, eq.(18)], [39, eq.(3.21)]):

$$ES_\alpha(p) = \inf_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_p \left[ \frac{1}{\alpha}(z - Y)1_{z \geq Y} - z \right] \right\} = \inf_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_p \left[ \frac{1}{\alpha}(z - Y)(1_{z \geq Y} - \alpha) - Y \right] \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

We will assume $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}_+$, the nonnegative reals. Despite the importance of elicitation to financial regulation [11, 40], $ES_\alpha$ is not elicitable [2]. It was recently shown by Fissler and Ziegel [15], however, that $\text{elic}_T(ES_\alpha) \leq 2$. They also consider the broader class of spectral risk measures, which can be represented as $\rho_p(\mu) = \int_{[0,1]} ES_\alpha(p) d\mu(\alpha)$, where $\mu$ is a probability measure on $[0,1]$ (cf. [38, eq. (36)]). In the case where $\mu$ has finite support $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i \delta_{\alpha_i}$, for distinct point distributions $\delta_{\alpha_i}, \beta_i > 0$, we can rewrite $\rho_p$ using the above as:

$$\rho_p(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i ES_{\alpha_i}(p) = \inf_{z \in \mathbb{R}^k} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_p \left[ \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\beta_i}{\alpha_i} (z_i - Y)(1_{z_i \geq Y} - \alpha_i) - Y \right] \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

For simplicity, let us assume $\mu(\{1\}) = 0$.\footnote{Naturally, if $\mu(\{1\}) = 1$, the property is elicitable as an expectation $\mathbb{E}_p[-Y]$, so $\text{elic}_T(\rho_p) = 1$. If $0 < \mu(\{1\}) < 1$, as long as $\{q_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, q_{\alpha_k}, \mathbb{E}_p[-Y]\}$ is balanced, we would still conclude $\text{elic}_T(\rho_p) \leq k + 1$.} Fissler and Ziegel conclude $\text{elic}_T(\rho_p) \leq k + 1$.

We show how to recover these results together with matching lower bounds. It is well-known that the infimum in eq. (6) is attained by the $k$ (distinct) quantiles $q_{\alpha_1}(p), \ldots, q_{\alpha_k}(p)$, which are identifiable, so we conclude $\text{elic}_T(\rho_p) \leq k + 1$ by Theorem 1, and in particular the property $\{\rho_p, q_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, q_{\alpha_k}\}$ is elicitable. The family of losses from Corollary 1 coincide with the characterization of Fissler and Ziegel [15] (see §C.3). The matching lower bound follows from Corollary 2, as $\text{elic}_T(\{q_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, q_{\alpha_k}\}) = k$ whenever the $\alpha_i$ are distinct by Lemma 6.

**Corollary 6.** Let $\mathcal{P}$ be convex and satisfy Condition 1 for $k + 1$, and contain all mixtures of Pareto distributions (or any set of distributions where there are at least two possible $\rho_p$ values for a given vector of quantiles $q_{\alpha_1}(p), \ldots, q_{\alpha_k}(p)$). Then $\text{elic}_T(\rho_p) = k + 1$.

We now have the examples we need to prove Proposition 4.

**Proof of Proposition 4.** If $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies Condition 1, given $k \geq 1$, let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{k-1}$ be distinct values in $(0,1)$. Then we have $\text{elic}_T(\rho_p) = k$ from Corollary 6 where $\rho_p$ is defined in eq. (6). (For $k = 1$ note that $\text{elic}_T(q_{0.5}) = 1$.) Otherwise, let $\phi : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^k$ be the random variable from Condition 2. By Corollary 5, letting $\gamma(p) = \|\mathbb{E}_p[\phi(Y)]\|^2$, we have $\text{elic}_T(\gamma) = k$. \hfill \Box
6.5 A New Risk Measure: The Variantile

The \( \tau \)-expectile, a type of generalized quantile introduced by Newey and Powell [41], is defined as the solution \( x = \mu_\tau \) to the equation \( \mathbb{E}_p[|1_{x \geq Y} - \tau|(x - Y)] = 0 \), where \( \tau \in (0, 1) \). (This also shows \( \mu_\tau \in \mathbb{I}_1 \).) Here we propose the \( \tau \)-variantile, an asymmetric variance-like measure analogous to the \( \tau \)-expectile: just as the mean is the solution \( x = \mu \) to the equation \( \mathbb{E}_p[x - Y] = 0 \), and the variance is \( \text{Var}(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[(\mu - Y)^2] \), we define the \( \tau \)-variantile \( \text{Var}_\tau \) by \( \text{Var}_\tau(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[|1_{\mu_\tau \geq Y} - \tau|(|\mu_\tau - Y|^2] \). As the expectile can be thought of as a compromise between the mean and a quantile, the variantile can be thought of a compromise between the variance and a “superquantile” (see § 6.4). Therefore, we expect that variantiles may have applications as a new tractable measure of risk.

It is well-known that \( \mu_\tau \) can be expressed as the minimizer of an \textit{asymmetric least-squares} problem: the loss \( L(x, y) = |1_{x \geq y} - \tau|(x - y)^2 \) elicits \( \mu_\tau \) [2, 41]. Hence, as the variance is in fact a Bayes risk for the mean, so is the \( \tau \)-variantile for the \( \tau \)-expectile:

\[
\mu_\tau(p) = \arg\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_p[|1_{x \geq Y} - \tau|(x - Y)^2] \implies \text{Var}_\tau(p) = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}_p[|1_{x \geq Y} - \tau|(x - Y)^2].
\]

We now see the pair \( \{\mu_\tau, \text{Var}_\tau\} \) is elicitable by Corollary 1, and thus obtain a tight complexity bound from Corollary 2.

Corollary 7. Let \( \mathcal{P} \) be convex and contain \( \mathcal{G}_{\text{mix}} \) (or any set of distributions where there are at least two possible \( \tau \)-variantiles for each \( \tau \)-expectile, and for which \( \text{elicit}_\mathcal{I}(\mu_\tau) = 1 \)). Then \( \text{elicit}_\mathcal{I}(\text{Var}_\tau) = 2 \).

More generally, Herrmann et al. [42] introduce a multivariate expectile. Observing that univariate asymmetric least-squares can be written \( L(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}|y - x|(|y - x| + (2\tau - 1)(y - x)) \), they generalize this loss to higher dimensions by replacing \( |\cdot| \) with \( \|\cdot\|_2 \) and letting \( 2\tau - 1 \) now be an arbitrary vector in the open unit ball (just as \( -1 < 2\tau - 1 < 1 \)). The minimizer of this loss is the multivariate expectile, \( \mu_\tau^{(k)}(p) \), where \( k \) is the dimension of the vector space. We can analogously define our multivariate variantile; the pair are given as follows,

\[
\mu_\tau^{(k)}(p) = \arg\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^k} \mathbb{E}_p[\|Y - x\|_2(\|Y - x\|_2 + \langle \tau, Y - x \rangle)] \tag{7}
\]

\[
\implies \text{Var}_\tau^{(k)}(p) = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^k} \mathbb{E}_p[\|Y - x\|_2(\|Y - x\|_2 + \langle \tau, Y - x \rangle)], \tag{8}
\]

where now \( Y \in \mathbb{R}^k \), and \( \tau \in \mathbb{R}^k \) is a vector in the open unit ball, i.e., \( \|\tau\|_2 < 1 \). Just as in the univariate case, we obtain a tight complexity bound.

Corollary 8. Let \( \mathcal{P} \) be convex and contain \( \mathcal{G}_{\text{mix}} \) (or any set of distributions where there are at least two possible \( \tau \)-variantiles for each multivariate \( \tau \)-expectile, and for which \( \text{elicit}_\mathcal{I}(\mu_\tau^{(k)}) = k \)). Then \( \text{elicit}_\mathcal{I}(\text{Var}_\tau^{(k)}) = k + 1 \).

6.6 Other Risk Measures

Several other risk measures have appeared in the finance literature, as well as from uncertainty quantification in engineering. To begin, consider the broad class risk measures arising
from the “risk quadrangles” of Rockafellar and Uryasev [39], which are given by the following relationships between a risk $R$, deviation $D$, error $E$, and a statistic $S$, all functions from random variables to the reals:

$$R(X) = \min_C \{ C + E(X - C) \}, \quad D(X) = \min_C \{ E(X - C) \}, \quad S(X) = \arg\min_C \{ E(X - C) \} .$$

Note that fixing a particular form for $E$ then fixes the other three. Our results apply readily to the expectation quadrangle case, where $E(X) = \mathbb{E}[e(X)]$ for some $e : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In this case, under appropriate conditions, Corollary 2 implies $\text{elic}_I(R) = \text{elic}_I(D) = 2$ provided $S$ is non-constant and identifiable. (For these statements to make sense, one must first consider $R$ and $D$ as functions of the distribution of $X$, which is possible here as they are both law-invariant when $E$ is of expectation type; see §2.) This includes several of their examples, e.g. truncated mean, log-exp, and rate-based. Beyond the expectation case, the authors show a Mixing Theorem, where they consider

$$D(X) = \min_C \min_{B_1, \ldots, B_k} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i E_i(X - C - B_i) \mid \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i B_i = 0 \right\} = \min_{B'_1, \ldots, B'_k} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i E_i(X - B'_i) \right\} .$$

Once again, if the $E_i$ are all of expectation type and the $S_i$ identifiable, Theorem 1 gives $\text{elic}_I(D) = \text{elic}_I(R) \leq k+1$, with a matching lower bound from Corollary 2, under appropriate assumptions, provided the $S_i$ are all independent (Definition 10). Finally, the Reverting Theorem for a pair $E_1, E_2$ can be seen as a special case of the above where one replaces $E_2(X)$ by $E_2(-X)$. Consequently, our results give tight complexity bounds for several other examples, including superquantiles (the same as spectral risk measures), the quantile-radius quadrangle, and optimized certainty equivalents of Ben-Tal and Teboulle [43].

Our results explain the existence of regression procedures for some of these risk/deviation measures. For example, a procedure called superquantile regression was introduced in Rockafellar et al. [44], to fit models to spectral risk measures. (As another example, consider superexpectations [45].) In light of Theorem 1, one could interpret superquantile regression as simply performing regression on the $k$ different quantiles in tandem with their joint Bayes risk. In fact, our results show that any risk/deviation generated by mixing several expectation quadrangles will have a similar procedure, in which the $B'_i$ variables are simply computed along side the measure of interest. Even more broadly, such regression procedures exist for any Bayes risk.

Finally, we briefly consider coherent risk measures, a class containing spectral risk measures and several other examples above. Among other properties, coherent risk measures satisfy positive homogeneity, in the sense that $\rho(\alpha X) = \alpha \rho(X)$ where $\alpha \geq 0$. It is well-known that coherent risk measures can be characterized by their dual representation,

$$\rho(X) = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{E}[QX] , \quad (9)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}$ is a convex set of random variables called the risk envelope [46, 47]. Despite the similarity of eq. (9) to eq. (2), Theorem 1 typically does not apply directly, as often the envelope $\mathcal{Q}$ is an infinite-dimensional set, yielding trivial upper bounds. For example, expected shortfall at level $\alpha$ is usually given with $\mathcal{Q} = \{ Q : 0 \leq Q \leq 1/\alpha \} [47]$. That said,
if one can show that the potential optimizers within \( Q \) can be parameterized by a small number of real-valued parameters, as we saw for expected shortfall in eq. (5), and sufficient continuity holds with respect to those parameters, the theorem would apply.

7 Other Classes of Properties

While we focused on the class of identifiable properties in the examples above, we now illustrate how the bounds in § 5 apply to other classes of properties. We have already discussed one other class, allowing for finite-valued properties, in § 6.2. In this section, we will consider linear properties (expectations), and properties elicited by smooth strictly convex, and strongly convex, loss functions. (We discuss general convex losses briefly in § 8.) These cases are all of interest in the machine learning literature; see, e.g., [4]. Recall that a differentiable function \( G : A \to \mathbb{R} \) is \( \mu \)-strongly convex if for all \( x, y \in A \) we have \( \mu \| x - y \|^2 \leq (\nabla G(x) - \nabla G(y)) \cdot (x - y) \).

Definition 13. Let \( \mathcal{C}_{\text{lin}} \) denote the class of bounded linear properties, i.e., those of the form \( \Gamma : p \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)] \) for some \( \mathcal{P} \)-integrable \( \phi : Y \to \mathbb{R}^k \) where \( \mathcal{R} := \Gamma(\mathcal{P}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k \) is a bounded set. Let \( \mathcal{C}_{\text{strict}} \) denote the class of bounded properties \( \Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{R} \) elicited by a differentiable and Lipschitz-continuous loss function which is strictly convex, and \( \mathcal{C}_{\text{strong}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\text{strict}} \) further require the loss to be strongly convex. (In the above, \( k \) is any positive integer.)

To begin, we formally introduce our three other classes, and show a natural nesting which gives inequalities of their respective complexities. Note that we only have \( \mathcal{C}_{\text{strict}} \subseteq \mathcal{I} \) from the differentiability assumption on \( L \); removing this assumption and studying general convex losses is an important future direction which we discuss in § 8.

Proposition 5. We have \( \mathcal{C}_{\text{lin}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\text{strong}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\text{strict}} \subseteq \mathcal{I} \). In particular, for all properties \( \Gamma \), we have \( \text{elic}_\mathcal{I}(\Gamma) \leq \text{elic}_{\mathcal{C}_{\text{strict}}}(\Gamma) \leq \text{elic}_{\mathcal{C}_{\text{strong}}}(\Gamma) \leq \text{elic}_{\mathcal{C}_{\text{lin}}}(\Gamma) \).

Proof. Let \( \Gamma \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{lin}} \), so that \( \Gamma(p) = \mathbb{E}[\phi(Y)] \) for some \( \phi \). Taking \( L(r, y) = \| r \|^2 - 2r \cdot \phi(y) \), which is differentiable and Lipschitz continuous on the (assumed bounded) domain of \( r \), and furthermore strongly convex with constant \( \mu = 2 \), showing \( \Gamma \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{strong}} \). The inclusion \( \mathcal{C}_{\text{strong}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\text{strict}} \) is immediate from the definition. Finally, let \( L(r, y) \) be a differentiable, Lipschitz-continuous, strictly convex loss function eliciting \( \Gamma \). Letting \( V(r, y) = \nabla_r L(r, y) \), we have \( \Gamma(p) = r \iff \nabla_r \mathbb{E}[L(r, Y)] = 0 \). As \( L \) is Lipschitz continuous, the dominated convergence theorem gives us \( \nabla_r \mathbb{E}[L(r, Y)] = 0 \iff \mathbb{E}[\nabla_r L(r, Y)] = 0 \). Conversely, as \( \mathbb{E}[L(r, Y)] \) is strictly convex, we have \( \nabla_r \mathbb{E}[L(r, Y)] = 0 \) implies optimality of \( r \), which in turn gives \( \Gamma(p) = r \). This shows \( \mathcal{C}_{\text{strict}} \subseteq \mathcal{I} \), which completes the chain of inclusions. As \( \Gamma_{\text{id}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{lin}} \), and every property is a link of \( \Gamma_{\text{id}} \), the corresponding complexities are all well-defined, and the inequalities follow immediately from the inclusions.

We now turn to versions of our upper and lower bounds for strictly and strongly convex losses. Examining the form \( L((r, a), y) = H(r) + h(r)(L(a, y) - r) \) from eq. (4), which established the main upper bound, we see that as long as \( h \) does not decrease “too quickly” relative to the curvature of \( L \), the loss \( L((r, a), y) \) should still be strictly convex in \((a, y)\).
Theorem 3. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be convex, and let $\Gamma \in C_{\text{strict}}$, $\Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k$, be elicited by a twice-differentiable, bounded, strictly convex loss function $L$. If $\text{idem}(\Gamma) = k$, and Condition 3 or 4 hold, and there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\forall y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad \alpha \nabla^2_a L(\cdot, y) \succ \nabla_a L(\cdot, y)\nabla_a L(\cdot, y)^\top,$$

then $\text{elic}_{C_{\text{strict}}}(L) = k + 1$.

Intuitively, Theorem 3 tells us that as long as $L$ is “convex enough”, its curvature is sufficient to offset the decreasing effect of the $h(r)$ coefficient in eq. (3). This result shows a bound for strongly convex losses $L$ as well. The Hessian of a strongly convex $L$ satisfies $\nabla^2_a L(\cdot, y) \succeq \mu I$ for some $\mu > 0$. Thus, letting $\lambda$ be the supremum of largest eigenvalue of $\nabla_a L(\cdot, y)\nabla_a L(\cdot, y)^\top$ over all $a$, which is finite by boundedness of $L$ and compactness of the range of $\Gamma$, we can simply take $\alpha = 2\lambda/\mu$ and proceed as in Theorem 3. In fact, using a different proof technique, we can lift the twice-differentiability assumption as well.

Theorem 4. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be convex, and let $\Gamma \in C_{\text{strong}}$, $\Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k$, be elicited by a differentiable, bounded, strongly convex $L$. If $\text{idem}(\Gamma) = k$, and Condition 3 or 4 hold, then $\text{elic}_{C_{\text{strong}}}(L) = k + 1$.

We note a brief application of these results to the variantile introduced in §6.5. In the univariate case, it is clear that asymmetric least-squares is strongly convex. In fact, this strong convexity holds in the multivariate version $L(x, y) = \|y - x\|_2(\|y - x\|_2 + \langle \tau, y - x \rangle)$ as well, though the proof is not as straightforward (§D.1). Herrmann et al. additionally show that $L$ is differentiable [42, Theorem 4.1], and $L$ elicits the $\tau$-expectile $\mu^\tau(k)$ by definition (eq. (7)). Thus, assuming Condition 3, $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is bounded, and $\mathcal{P}$ is sufficiently rich to satisfy $\text{idem}(\mu(k)) = k$, Theorem 4 gives us $\{\mu^\tau(k), \text{Var}_\tau^k\} \in C_{\text{strong}}$, and $\text{elic}_{C_{\text{strong}}}(\text{Var}_\tau^k) = k + 1$ in particular.

8 Discussion and Open Questions

We introduce a theory of elicitation complexity which captures the difficulty (number of prediction dimensions) needed to perform statistically-calibrated empirical risk minimization (ERM), with respect to some class of “nice” statistical properties. We first give basic techniques to prove upper and lower bounds on the complexity of simple properties with respect to the class $\mathcal{I}$ of identifiable properties, a natural class of properties whose level sets can be expressed via linear constraints. We then leverage these basic results to give tight complexity bounds for the large class of Bayes risks, including several applications of note such as spectral risk measures, norms, and entropy. Our results also offer an explanation for procedures like superquantile regression, and extend this logic to all Bayes risks. Finally, we demonstrate how our main results can apply to other classes of properties besides identifiable properties, such as those elicited by smooth convex loss functions.

There are many natural open problems in elicitation complexity. Perhaps the most apparent are the characterizations of the complexity classes $\{\Gamma : \text{elic}(\Gamma) = k\}$, and in particular, determining the elicitation complexity of non-elicitable properties. Subsequent to our work, the complexity of the mode is shown to be infinite [34], while that of the smallest confidence interval [33] remains open. We identify several other future directions below.
Tighter characterization for Bayes risks. Consider a loss $L$ eliciting some property $\Gamma$ of elicitation complexity $k$. The intuitive conclusion of Corollary 2 is that the elicitation complexity of the Bayes risk $L$ is $k + 1$, unless $L$ happens to be a link of $\Gamma$. Yet we lack a characterization of properties for which it is possible that $L = f \circ \Gamma$ for some link $f$. We conjecture that this relationship is only possible if $\Gamma$ is link of a linear property, i.e., $\Gamma(p) = \varphi(\mathbb{E}_p[g(Y)])$ for some invertible $\varphi$ and arbitrary $g$. (For intuition, note that $L(p)$ must have slope zero along level sets.)

General convex losses. In §7 we discussed three property classes more restrictive than $\mathcal{I}$ (identifiable properties), including those elicited by strictly convex, and strongly convex, smooth loss functions. Subsequent to our work, it was shown that $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{C}_{\text{strict}}$ under suitable smoothness, continuity, and other regularity assumptions; in other words, under these assumptions, every identifiable property is elicitable via a smooth and strictly convex loss [48]. Interestingly, when relaxing the smoothness and strictness requirements to the natural class $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cvx}}$ of properties elicited by any convex loss, it is no longer clear that $\text{elic}_\mathcal{C}_{\text{cvx}}(\Gamma) \geq \text{elic}_\mathcal{I}(\Gamma)$. Studying $\text{elic}_\mathcal{C}_{\text{cvx}}$ is an interesting future direction, as the class $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cvx}}$ is obviously relevant to the practice of ERM in its favorable optimization qualities, yet it still forces enough structure to prevent $\text{elic}_\mathcal{C}_{\text{cvx}}(\Gamma) = 1$ for all properties $\Gamma$ [20]. While some results for $\text{elic}_\mathcal{C}_{\text{cvx}}$ have appeared in the machine learning literature, often for specific special cases such as finite properties with relevance to classification or ranking [4, 20, 27], a general theory is still lacking.

Conditional elicitation. Another interesting line of questioning follows from the notion of conditional elicitation: properties which are elicitable as long as the value of some other elicitable property is known. This notion was introduced by Emmer et al. [11], who showed that the variance and expected shortfall are both conditionally elicitable, on the mean $\mathbb{E}_p[Y]$ and quantile $q_\alpha(p)$, respectively. Intuitively, knowing that $\Gamma$ is elicitable conditional on an elicitable $\Gamma'$ would suggest that perhaps the pair $\{\Gamma, \Gamma'\}$ is elicitable; Fissler and Ziegel [15] note that it is an open question whether this joint elicibility holds in general. From our results, we now see a broad class of properties for which this joint elicibility does hold: the Bayes risk $L$, of a loss $L$ eliciting $\Gamma$, is elicitable conditioned on $\Gamma$, and the pair $\{\Gamma, L\}$ is jointly elicitable from Theorem 1. We give a counter-example in Figure 2, however, with a property which is conditionally elicitable but not jointly.

General vector-valued properties. Figure 2 also illustrates the subtlety of characterizing all elicitable vector-valued properties, perhaps the most fundamental open question in this literature. Indeed, even nontrivial examples of vector-valued properties which were not simply a vector of real-valued elicitable properties (or a link of such a vector of properties) were sparse before Theorem 1. It may be that some crucial insight lies in the difference between the seemingly similar properties in Figure 2, which could be the key to characterizing all elicitable vector-valued properties. One interesting question toward this general characterization is the following: do there exist elicitable properties which are not links of properties having at least one elicitable component? Note that this question is trivial without allowing for link functions, due to examples such as $\Gamma(Y) = (\mathbb{E}[Y] + \text{Var}[Y], \mathbb{E}[Y] - \text{Var}[Y])$ where we take an elicitable property $(\mathbb{E}[Y], \text{Var}[Y])$ and apply an invertible link to disrupt.
the elicitability of each component.

Figure 2: Depictions of the level sets of two properties on outcomes $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, one elicitable and the other not (at least not by a twice differentiable loss function). **Left:** The property depicted is $\Gamma(p) = (p_3, p_1 + p_2 p_3)$, an example taken from [5] which is shown not to be elicitable by any twice differentiable loss function. **Right:** Let $\gamma(p)$ be implicitly defined as the solution $r$ to the equation $\frac{1}{3} \sin(r) p_1 + \frac{1}{4} \cos(r) p_2 + p_3 = r$. One can check that the loss $L(r, y) = 6r^2 + 4\cos(r)\mathbb{1}\{y = 1\} - 3\sin(r)\mathbb{1}\{y = 2\} - 12r\mathbb{1}\{y = 3\}$ elicits $\gamma$. The property depicted is $\Gamma = (L, \gamma)$, which is elicitable by Theorem 1.

Interestingly, both properties are conditionally elicitable, conditioned on $\Gamma'(p) = p_3 = \mathbb{E}_p[\mathbb{1}\{Y = 3\}]$, as illustrated by the planes: the height of the plane (the intercept $(p_3, 0, 0)$ for example) is elicitable as an expected value, and conditioned on this plane, the properties are both linear and thus links of expected values, which are also elicitable.
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A Proof of Lemma 7

Lemma 8 ([33]). Let $G : X \to \mathbb{R}$ convex for some convex subset $X$ of a vector space $V$, and let $d \in \partial G_x$ be a subgradient of $G$ at $x$. Then for all $x' \in X$ we have

$$d \in \partial G_x' \iff G(x) - G(x') = d(x - x').$$

Lemma 9. Let $G : X \to \mathbb{R}$ convex for some convex subset $X$ of a vector space $V$. Let $x, x' \in X$ and $x_\lambda = \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)x'$ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. If there exists some $d \in \partial G_{x_\lambda} \setminus (\partial G_x \cup \partial G_{x'})$, then $G(x_\lambda) < \lambda G(x) + (1 - \lambda)G(x')$.

Proof. By the subgradient inequality for $d$ at $x_\lambda$ we have $G(x) - G(x_\lambda) \geq d(x - x_\lambda)$, and furthermore Lemma 8 gives us $G(x) - G(x_\lambda) > d(x - x_\lambda)$ since otherwise we would have $d \in \partial G_x$. Similarly for $x'$, we have $G(x') - G(x_\lambda) > d(x' - x_\lambda)$.

Adding $\lambda$ of the first inequality to $(1 - \lambda)$ of the second gives

$$\lambda G(x) + (1 - \lambda)G(x') - G(x_\lambda) > \lambda d(x - x_\lambda) + (1 - \lambda)d(x' - x_\lambda)$$

$$= \lambda(1 - \lambda)d(x - x') + (1 - \lambda)\lambda d(x' - x) = 0,$$

where we used linearity of $d$ and the identity $x_\lambda = x' + \lambda(x - x')$. 

Lemma 7 follows from the following result.

Lemma 10. Let $P$ be convex. Suppose loss $L$ with Bayes risk $L$ elicits (set-valued) $\Gamma : P \Rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$. Then for any $p, p' \in P$ with $\Gamma(p) \cap \Gamma(p') = \emptyset$, we have $L(\lambda p + (1 - \lambda)p') > \lambda L(p) + (1 - \lambda)L(p')$ for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. Let $G = -L$, which is the expected score function for the (positively-oriented) scoring rule $S = -L$. By Theorem 2 of [33], we have some subset $D \subseteq \partial G$ of subgradients of $G$, and bijection $\varphi : \Gamma(P) \to D$, such that $\Gamma(p) = \varphi^{-1}(D \cap \partial G_p)$. In other words, $\Gamma$ is a relabeling of (some) subgradients of $G$: there is a subgradient $d_r = \varphi(r)$ associated to each report value $r \in \Gamma(P)$, and $d_r \in \partial G_p \iff r \in \Gamma(p)$.

Observe that for any distributions $q, q' \in P$, if $\Gamma(q) \cap \Gamma(q') = \emptyset$, then for any $r \in \Gamma(q)$ and $d_r = \varphi(r)$, we have $d_r \in \partial G_q \setminus \partial G_{q'}$. Otherwise, since $d_r \in D \cap \partial G_q$ by definition, we would have $d_r \in D \cap \partial G_{q'}$ as well, and thus $r = \varphi^{-1}(d_r) \in \varphi^{-1}(D \cap \partial G_{q'}) = \Gamma(q')$, a contradiction.

Assume first that $\Gamma(p_\lambda), \Gamma(p)$, and $\Gamma(p')$ are all disjoint sets. By the above observation, taking any $d \in \varphi(\Gamma(p_\lambda))$, we have $d \in \partial G_{p_\lambda}$ but $d \notin \partial G_p \cap \partial G_{p'}$. The conclusion then follows by Lemma 9.

Otherwise, we have $r \in \Gamma(p_\lambda) \cap \Gamma(p)$ without loss of generality, and letting $d_r = \varphi(r)$, we have $d_r \in \partial G_{p_\lambda} \cap \partial G_p$ by definition of $\varphi$. Now assume for a contradiction that $G(p_\lambda) = \lambda G(p) + (1 - \lambda)G(p')$. By Lemma 8 for $d_r$ we have $G(p) - G(p_\lambda) = d_r(p - p_\lambda) = (1 - \lambda)d_r(p_\lambda - p')$. Solving for $G(p)$ and substituting into the previous equation gives $(1 - \lambda)$ times the equation $G(p_\lambda) = d_r(p_\lambda - p') + G(p')$, and applying Lemma 8 one more gives $d_r \in \partial G_{p'}$. We now have a contradiction to the observation above, as we have assumed $\Gamma(p) \cap \Gamma(p') = \emptyset$. 

We now show how Lemma 7 follows from Lemma 10. Note that, as remarked just after the lemma statement in Section 5, the restriction that $P$ be convex is not crucial to our
results. For non-convex $\mathcal{P}$, one would extend the Bayes risk $L$ to the convex hull $\text{conv} \mathcal{P}$ of $\mathcal{P}$, by writing $L(p) = \arg\inf_{r \in \mathcal{R}} L(r, p)$, where of course $\mathcal{R} = \Gamma(\mathcal{P})$. One can then extend $\Gamma$ by adding new reports, suggested by Theorem 2 of [33], so that $\Gamma$ is non-redundant and nonempty on $\text{conv} \mathcal{P}$, but coincides with its previous definition on $\mathcal{P}$. Lemma 10 then follows as usual, and since $L$ and $\mathcal{P}$ are unchanged on $\mathcal{P}$, the result holds that $L(\lambda p + (1 - \lambda)p') > \lambda L(p) + (1 - \lambda)L(p')$ for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that $\lambda p + (1 - \lambda)p' \in \mathcal{P}$. We would then modify Condition 4 so that the level set $\Gamma$ contains three collinear distributions $p, p', \hat{p}$, meaning $\hat{p} = \lambda p + (1 - \lambda)p'$ for $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, with $L(p) \neq L(p')$.

Restatement of Lemma 7: Let $\mathcal{P}$ be convex, and suppose loss $L$ with Bayes risk $L$ elicits $\Gamma : \mathcal{P} \to \mathbb{R}^k$. Then for any $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\Gamma(p) \neq \Gamma(p')$, we have $L(\lambda p + (1 - \lambda)p') > \lambda L(p) + (1 - \lambda)L(p')$ for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. Let $G = -L$, which is the expected score function for the (positively-oriented) scoring rule $S = -L$. By Theorem 2 of [33], we have some $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \partial G$ and function $\phi : \Gamma(\mathcal{P}) \to \mathcal{D}$ such that $\Gamma(p) = \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{D} \cap \partial G_p)$. In other words, as our $\Gamma$ is a function, there is a subgradient $d_r = \phi(r)$ associated to each report value $r \in \Gamma(\mathcal{P})$, and $d_r \in \partial G_p \iff r = \Gamma(p)$. Thus, as we have $p, p' \in \mathcal{P}$ with $r = \Gamma(p) \neq \Gamma(p') = r'$, we also have $d_r \in \partial G_p \setminus \partial G_{p'}$ and $d_r \in \partial G_{p'} \setminus \partial G_p$.

By Lemma 9, if $\Gamma(p_{\lambda}, \Gamma(p)$, and $\Gamma(p')$ are all distinct, then we are done. Otherwise, we have $\Gamma(p_{\lambda}) = \Gamma(p)$ without loss of generality, which implies $d_r \in \partial G_{p_{\lambda}}$ by definition of $\phi$. Now assume for a contradiction that $G(p_{\lambda}) = \lambda G(p) + (1 - \lambda)G(p')$. By Lemma 8 for $d_r$ we have $G(p) - G(p_{\lambda}) = d_r(p - p_{\lambda}) = \frac{(1 - \lambda)}{\lambda}d_r(p_{\lambda} - p')$. Solving for $G(p)$ and substituting into the previous equation gives $(1 - \lambda)$ times the equation $G(p_{\lambda}) = d_r(p_{\lambda} - p') + G(p')$, and applying Lemma 8 one more gives $d_r \in \partial G_{p'}$, a contradiction.

B Identification Lower Bounds

Lemma 11. Let $\Gamma \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P})$ be given, and suppose for some $r \in \Gamma(\mathcal{P})$ there exists $V : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^k$ with $\mathbb{E}_p[V] = 0$ for all $p \in \Gamma_r$. If $\text{span}(\{\mathbb{E}_p[V] : p \in \mathcal{P}\}) = \mathbb{R}^k$ and some $\hat{p} \in \Gamma_r$ can be written $p = \lambda p' + (1 - \lambda)p''$ where $p', p'' \notin \Gamma_r$, then $\text{idem}(\Gamma) \geq k$.

Proof. The proof proceeds in two parts. First, we show that the conditions regarding $V$ suffice to show that $\text{codim}(\text{span}(\Gamma_r)) \geq k$ in $\text{span}(\mathcal{P})$. Second, we show that this means (any flat subset of) $\Gamma_r$ cannot be identified by a $W : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^\ell$ for $\ell < k$. We will denote by $M_V$ and $M_{\hat{V}}$ the linear operators on $\text{span}(\mathcal{P})$ corresponding to $V$ and $\mathcal{W}$, respectively, given by their expected value, e.g., $M_V(p) = \mathbb{E}_p[V]$.

Let $V$ and $r$ as in the statement of the lemma be given. By definition, $\text{codim}(\text{span}(\Gamma_r)) = \dim(\text{span}(\mathcal{P})/\text{span}(\Gamma_r))$, where $S_1/S_2$ is the quotient space of $S_1$ by $S_2$. Let $\pi_{\Gamma_r} : \text{span}(\mathcal{P}) \to \text{span}(\mathcal{P})/\text{span}(\Gamma_r)$ denote the projection from $\text{span}(\mathcal{P})$ to its quotient by $\text{span}(\Gamma_r)$. By the universal property of quotient spaces, there is a unique $T_V : \text{span}(\mathcal{P})/\text{span}(\Gamma_r) \to \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $M_V = T_V \circ \pi_{\Gamma_r}$. By the rank nullity theorem, $\dim(\text{span}(\mathcal{P})/\text{span}(\Gamma_r)) = \dim(\text{ker}(T_V)) + \dim(\text{im}(T_V))$. By assumption $\dim(\text{im}(T_V)) = \dim(\text{im}(M_V)) = k$, so $\text{codim}(\text{span}(\Gamma_r)) \geq k$.

Now assume for a contradiction that $\Gamma = f \circ \hat{\Gamma}$, with $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P})$, with $\ell < k$. Let $r'$ denote the level set such that $p \in \Gamma_r$. Since $\Gamma_r \subseteq \Gamma_r$, $\text{idem}(\Gamma_r) \geq \ell \geq k$. Let $W : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{R}^\ell$
We will express the proof of Condition 3 in terms of random variables rather than distributions. By the rank nullity theorem, \( \dim(\text{span}(\mathcal{P})/\text{span}(\hat{\Gamma}_r)) = \dim(\ker(T_W)) + \dim(\text{im}(T_W)). \) Thus \( \dim(\ker(T_W)) \geq k - \ell > 0. \) To complete the proof we need to show that this means there is a \( q \in \mathcal{P} - \hat{\Gamma}_r \) such that \( \pi_{\hat{\Gamma}_r}(q) \in \ker(T_W). \)

To this end, let \( q'' \in \text{span}(\mathcal{P}). \) Then \( q'' = \sum_i \lambda_i q_i, \) with \( q_i \in \mathcal{P} \) for all \( i. \) Thus \( \pi_{\hat{\Gamma}_r}(q'') = \pi_{\hat{\Gamma}_r}(\sum_i \lambda_i q_i) = \sum_i \lambda_i \pi_{\hat{\Gamma}_r}(q_i) \) and so \( \text{span}(\mathcal{P})/\text{span}(\hat{\Gamma}_r) = \text{span}\{ \pi_{\hat{\Gamma}_r}(q') \mid q' \in \mathcal{P} \}. \) Since \( p = \lambda p' + (1 - \lambda)p'' \) where \( p', p'' \notin \Gamma_r, \pi_{\hat{\Gamma}_r}(p) = 0 \) is not an extreme point of the convex set \{ \pi_{\hat{\Gamma}_r}(q') \mid q' \in \mathcal{P} \}. \) Since \( \dim(\ker(T_W)) > 0, \) this means there exists \( q \in \mathcal{P} - \hat{\Gamma}_r \) such that \( \pi_{\hat{\Gamma}_r}(q) \in \ker(T_W). \) This contradicts the assumption that \( W \) identifies \( \hat{\Gamma}_r, \) completing the proof.

\[ \square \]

\section*{C \hspace{1em} Omitted Proofs from Section 6}

\subsection*{C.1 \hspace{1em} Complexity of Variantiles}

We will express the proof of Condition 3 in terms of random variables rather than distributions. Let \( X \) be random variable whose law is in \( \mathcal{P}, \) and \( \mu_r \) its \( \tau \)-expectile. Suppose the law of \( X' = \mu_r + \lambda(X - \mu_r) \) is also in \( \mathcal{P}. \) Then we have

\[
\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_{\mu_r \geq X'} - \tau(\mu_r - X')] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_{\mu_r \geq X} - \tau|\lambda(\mu_r - X)| = \lambda \cdot 0 = 0, \]

meaning \( \mu_r \) is the \( \tau \)-expectile for \( X' \) as well. The variantile changes, however, whenever \( \text{Var}_\tau(X) \neq 0 \) and \( \lambda \neq 1: \)

\[
\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_{\mu_r \geq X'} - \tau(\mu_r - X')^2] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}_{\mu_r \geq X} - \tau|\lambda^2(\mu_r - X)^2] = \lambda^2 \text{Var}_\tau(X). \]

As \( X \) being Normally distributed implies \( X' \) is also, and nonzero variance implies nonzero variantile, the above suffices to show Condition 3 for any \( \mathcal{P} \) containing all Normal distributions, establishing Corollary 7.

The multivariate case follows similarly. Let \( X \) be a vector-valued random variable, of dimension \( k, \) whose law is in \( \mathcal{P}, \) and let \( z \in \mathbb{R}^k \) be its \( \tau \)-expectile \( z = \mu_r^{(k)}(X). \) Define \( X' = z + \lambda(X - z), \) and suppose the law of \( X' \) is also in \( \mathcal{P}. \) We now have

\[
\mu_r^{(k)}(X') = \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^k} \mathbb{E}[\|X' - x\|_2(\|X' - x\|_2 + \langle \tau, X' - x \rangle)]
\]

\[
= \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^k} \mathbb{E}[\|z + \lambda(X - z) - x\|_2(\|z + \lambda(X - z) - x\|_2 + \langle \tau, z + \lambda(X - z) - x \rangle)]
\]

\[
= \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^k} \lambda^2 \mathbb{E}[\|X - z + \frac{1}{\lambda}(z - x)\|_2(\|X - z + \frac{1}{\lambda}(z - x)\|_2 + \langle \tau, X - z + \frac{1}{\lambda}(z - x) \rangle)]
\]

\[
= z. \]

Turning to the multivariate variantile, we similarly have

\[
\text{Var}_\tau^{(k)}(X') = \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^k} \mathbb{E}[\|X' - x\|_2(\|X' - x\|_2 + \langle \tau, X' - x \rangle)],
\]

\[
= \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^k} \lambda^2 \mathbb{E}[\|X - z + \frac{1}{\lambda}(z - x)\|_2(\|X - z + \frac{1}{\lambda}(z - x)\|_2 + \langle \tau, X - z + \frac{1}{\lambda}(z - x) \rangle)]
\]

\[
= \lambda^2 \text{Var}_\tau^{(k)}(X), \]
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which again gives a different value whenever $\operatorname{Var}^{(k)}(X) \neq 0$ and $\lambda \neq 1$. As multivariate Normal distributions satisfy the required closure property, taking $X$ to be Normal with a positive-definite covariance matrix will give a nonzero quantile, giving Condition 3 for Corollary 8.

### C.2 Complexity of Spectral Risk Measures

Let $\mathcal{P}_s$ be any family of distributions with finite expectations such that for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ there is some $p \in \mathcal{P}_s$ with support contained in $[a, \infty)$. We note that Pareto distributions are such a family. Let $\mathcal{P}$ contain all mixtures of distributions in $\mathcal{P}_s$. We will show that for any $\alpha_1 < \cdots < \alpha_k$, there are two distributions $p, p'$ with $q_{\alpha_i}(p) = q_{\alpha_i}(p')$ but $\rho_\mu(p) \neq \rho_\mu(p')$. The intuition is simple: modify the distribution $p$ beyond its last quantile $q_{\alpha_k}(p)$ by moving mass toward increasing values, thus keeping the quantiles the same but increasing the expected value of the tail.

Let $p_1$ be any mixture of distributions from $\mathcal{P}_s$, let $\alpha_{k+1}$ such that $\alpha_k < \alpha_{k+1} < 1$, and take $a > q_{\alpha_{k+1}}(p_1)$. Let $p_2$ be any distribution in $\mathcal{P}_s$ with support on $[a, \infty)$, and take $p = (\alpha_k/\alpha_{k+1})p_1 + (1 - \alpha_k/\alpha_{k+1})p_2$. By construction, we have $q_{\alpha_k}(p) = q_{\alpha_{k+1}}(p_1) < a$.

To construct $p'$ we will simply replace $p_2$ with a distribution of higher mean, which will not modify the relevant quantiles. To this end, let $a' = 1 + \mathbb{E}_{p_2}[Y]$, let $p'_2 \in \mathcal{P}_s$ with support on $[a', \infty)$, and take $p' = (\alpha_k/\alpha_{k+1})p_1 + (1 - \alpha_k/\alpha_{k+1})p'_2$. By the same logic as above, we have $q_{\alpha_k}(p) = q_{\alpha_{k+1}}(p_1)$, which implies $q_{\alpha_k}(p) = q_{\alpha_k}(p')$ for all $i$, as the distributions only differ in the interval $[a, \infty)$ and $a > q_{\alpha_k}(p) = q_{\alpha_k}(p')$. Note, however, that we do have $\mathbb{E}_{p'_2}[Y] > a' = \mathbb{E}_{p_2}[Y]$.

Using the interpretation of $\text{ES}_\alpha$ as the expected value of $Y$ conditioned on being beyond the $\alpha$ quantile, we have,

$$
\text{ES}_{\alpha_i}(p) = (\alpha_k/\alpha_{k+1})\text{ES}_{\alpha_i}(p_1) + (1 - \alpha_k/\alpha_{k+1})\mathbb{E}_{p_2}[Y]
< (\alpha_k/\alpha_{k+1})\text{ES}_{\alpha_i}(p_1) + (1 - \alpha_k/\alpha_{k+1})\mathbb{E}_{p'_2}[Y]
= \text{ES}_{\alpha_i}(p').
$$

Taking a linear combination of these inequalities, with coefficients $\beta_i$, gives Condition 3 and thus Corollary 6.

### C.3 Losses for Expected Shortfall

Corollary 1 gives us a large family of losses eliciting $\{\text{ES}_\alpha, q_\alpha\}$ (see footnote 1). Letting $L(a, y) = \frac{1}{a}(a - y)I_{a \geq y} - a$, we have $\text{ES}_\alpha(p) = \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} L(a, p) = \underline{L}(p)$. Thus may take

$$
L((r, a), y) = L'(a, y) + H(r) + h(r)(L(a, y) - r),
$$

where $h(r)$ is positive and decreasing, $H(r) = \int_0^r h(x)dx$, and $L'(a, y)$ is any other loss for $q_\alpha$, the full characterization of which is given in Gneiting [2, Theorem 9]:

$$
L'(a, y) = (I_{a \geq y} - \alpha)(f(a) - f(y)) + g(y),
$$
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where is \( f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) is nondecreasing and \( g \) is an arbitrary \( \mathcal{P} \)-integrable function.\(^3\) Hence, losses of the following form suffice:

\[
L((r, a), y) = (1_{a \geq y} - \alpha)(f(a) - f(y)) + \frac{1}{\alpha} h(r)1_{a \geq y}(a - y) - h(r)(a + r) + H(r) + g(y) .
\]

Comparing our \( L((r, a), y) \) to the characterization given by Fissler and Ziegel [15, Cor. 5.5], we see that we recover all possible scores for this case, at least when restricting to the assumptions stated in their Theorem 5.2(iii). Note however that due to a differing convention in the sign of \( \text{ES}_\alpha \), their loss is given by \( L((-x_1, x_2), y) \).

\section{Omitted Proofs from Section 7}

\textit{Proof of Theorem 3.} For the lower bound, note that the conditions of the Theorem imply \( \text{elic}_I(\Gamma) = k \), and as Condition 3 or 4 are assumed to hold, Corollary 2 gives us \( \text{elic}_I(L) = k + 1 \). By Proposition 5, we conclude \( \text{elic}_{\text{strict}}(L) \geq k + 1 \).

For the upper bound, let \( L \in [0, B] \) without loss of generality, so that \( L \in [0, B] \). Note that the pair \( (L, \Gamma) \) is bounded. Take \( h(r) = \alpha + B - r \), the \( L^*(r, a), y \) we obtain from Corollary 1, eq. (4), is given by

\[
L^*((r, a), y) = \frac{r^2}{2} + (\alpha + B - r)L(a, y) .
\]

As \( L \) is twice differentiable, we may verify the strict (joint) convexity of \( L^* \) by checking that its Hessian is positive definite,

\[
\nabla_{(r,a)}^2 L^*(\cdot, y) = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & -\nabla_a L(\cdot, y) \\
-\nabla_a L(\cdot, y) & (\alpha + B - r)\nabla_a^2 L(\cdot, y)
\end{bmatrix} .
\]

By the Schur complement theorem, \( \nabla_{(r,a)}^2 L^*(\cdot, y) \) is positive definite if any only if

\[
(\alpha + B - r)\nabla_a^2 L(\cdot, y) - (-\nabla_a L(\cdot, y))(1)^{-1}(-\nabla_a L(\cdot, y))^\top \succ 0 ,
\]

which is implied by the condition (10) as \( B - r \geq 0 \) and thus \( (B - r)\nabla_a^2 L(\cdot, y) \succ 0 \). Moreover, Lipschitz continuity and differentiability of \( L \) implies the same of \( L^* \). We have now shown \( (L, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{strict}} \), giving the result. \( \square \)

\textit{Proof of Theorem 4.} As in Theorem 3, our conditions together with Corollary 2 and Proposition 5 give the lower bound. For the upper bound, fix the outcome \( y \in \mathcal{Y} \) and let \( F(a) := L(a, y) \). We have by assumption that \( L \) (and thus \( F \)) is \( \mu \)-strongly convex for

\(^3\)Note that Gneiting [2] assumes \( L(x, y) \geq 0, L(x, x) = 0 \) , \( L \) is continuous in \( x \), \( dL/dx \) exists and is continuous in \( x \) when \( y \neq x \); we add \( g \) because we do not normalize.
some $\mu > 0$. Taking $L^*$ in eq. (13), and letting $C = \alpha + B$, we have

$$L^*((r,a), y) - L^*((s,b), y) - \nabla_{(s,b)}L^*((s,b), y)$$

\begin{align*}
&= \frac{1}{2}r^2 + (C - r)F(a) - \frac{1}{2}s^2 - (C - s)F(b) - \left((s - F(b))(r - s) + (C - s)\nabla F(b) \cdot (a - b)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(r-s)^2 + (C - r)F(a) - (C - s)F(b) + F(b)(r - s) - (C - s)\nabla F(b) \cdot (a - b) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(r-s)^2 + (C - r)\left(F(a) - F(b)\right) - (C - s)\nabla F(b) \cdot (a - b) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}(r-s)^2 + (C - r)\left|\frac{1}{2}\langle a - b \rangle + (s-r)\nabla F(b) \cdot (a - b)\right| \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}(r-s)^2 + \left(C - B\right)\left|\frac{1}{2}\langle a - b \rangle + (s-r)\nabla F(b) \cdot (a - b)\right|^2,
\end{align*}

which as the third term is nonnegative, shows $L^*$ to be $\frac{1}{2}$-strongly convex.

\[\square\]

**D.1 Strongly Convex Loss for Multivariate Expectiles**

Define $\Lambda_{\tau}(v) = \|v\|_2(\|v\|_2 + \langle \tau, v\rangle)$, so that the loss in eq. (8) is simply $L(x, y) = \Lambda_{\tau}(y - x) = \|y - x\|_2(\|y - x\|_2 + \langle \tau, y - x \rangle)$. We simply show that $\Lambda_{\tau}$ is strongly convex. (In what follows, we drop the subscript in the norm and write $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_2$.)

The proof given in Herrmann et al. [42, Theorem 4.3] that $\Lambda_{\tau}$ is strictly convex proceeds by showing $D(v, w) = \frac{1}{2}\Lambda_{\tau}(v) + \frac{1}{2}\Lambda_{\tau}(w) - \Lambda_{\tau}(\frac{1}{2}v + \frac{1}{2}w)$ is strictly positive. This is done by expanding $4 \cdot D$,

$$4D(v, w) = \|v - w\|^2 + 2\|v\|\langle \tau, v\rangle + 2\|w\|\langle \tau, w\rangle - \|v + w\|\langle \tau, v + w\rangle,$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

and giving a result [42, Theorem 4.2] showing that $D(v, w) \geq 0$ whenever $\|\tau\| \leq 1$, with an inequality for $v \neq w$ if $\|\tau\| < 1$. (This implies convexity as $\Lambda_{\tau}$ is continuous [49].)

By standard results [50, Proposition B.1.1.2], strong convexity of $\Lambda_{\tau}$ would follow by showing $D(v, w) \geq c\|v - w\|^2$ for some $c$. Examining eq. (16), we see that all terms apart from the $\|v - w\|^2$ term are linear in $\tau$. Thus, replacing $\tau$ by $\tau/\|\tau\|$ in eq. (16) still satisfies [42, Theorem 4.2], giving us

\begin{align*}
0 \leq &\|v - w\|^2 + 2\|v\|\langle \tau/\|\tau\|, v\rangle + 2\|w\|\langle \tau/\|\tau\|, w\rangle - \|v + w\|\langle \tau/\|\tau\|, v + w\rangle \\
= &\frac{1}{\|\tau\|} \left(\|\tau\|^2\|v - w\|^2 + 2\|v\|\langle \tau, v\rangle + 2\|w\|\langle \tau, w\rangle - \|v + w\|\langle \tau, v + w\rangle\right) \\
= &\frac{1}{\|\tau\|} \left(D(v, w) - (1 - \|\tau\|)\|v - w\|^2\right).
\end{align*}

Thus, letting $c = 1 - \|\tau\| > 0$, we have strong convexity of $\Lambda_{\tau}$.