

# Set-Valued Dynamic Risk Measures for Processes and Vectors

Yanhong Chen <sup>\*</sup>      Zachary Feinstein <sup>†</sup>

March 2, 2021

## Abstract

The relationship between set-valued risk measures for processes and vectors on the optional filtration is investigated. The equivalence of risk measures for processes and vectors and the equivalence of their penalty function formulations are provided. In contrast with scalar risk measures, this equivalence requires an augmentation of the set-valued risk measures for processes. We utilize this result to deduce a new dual representation for risk measures for processes in the set-valued framework. Finally, the equivalence of multiportfolio time consistency between set-valued risk measures for processes and vectors are provided; to accomplish this, an augmented definition for multiportfolio time consistency of set-valued risk measures for processes is proposed.

## 1 Introduction

Coherent risk measures for multi-period models were introduced by [5, 6]. These risk measures allow for the risk of cash flows to be quantified in an axiomatic framework. Though these risk measures appear distinct from the more traditional risk measures of, e.g., [3, 4, 17, 18], risk measures applied to processes can be proven to be equivalent to these more traditional risk measures via the optional filtration.

Within this work, we are concerned with dynamic risk measures. That is, those risk measures which allow for updates to the minimal capital requirement over time due to revealed information as encoded in a filtration. We refer the interested reader to [24, 9, 10, 11, 19, 6] for a partial list

---

<sup>\*</sup>Hunan University, College of Finance and Statistics, Changsha, China 410082. Research is partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11901184) and Natural Science Foundation of Hunan Province (No. 2020JJ5025).

<sup>†</sup>Stevens Institute of Technology, School of Business, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA. [zfeinste@stevens.edu](mailto:zfeinste@stevens.edu)

of relevant literature for dynamic risk measures for processes. As highlighted in [1], as with the static risk measures, these dynamic risk measures for processes can be found to be equivalent to risk measures over random variables through the use of the optional filtration. Utilizing the optional  $\sigma$ -algebra, the equivalence of time consistency (i.e., risk preferences are consistent over time) for traditional dynamic risk measures and those for processes are also found to be equivalent.

Set-valued risk measures were introduced in [23, 20, 22] and extended to the dynamic framework in [12, 13]. All of those works present risk measures for random vectors. Set-valued risk measures were introduced so as to consider risks in markets with frictions. Such risk measures have, more recently, been utilized for quantifying systemic risk in [16, 2]. In [7, 8], set-valued risk measures for processes were introduced. However, as demonstrated in those works, the equivalence of risk measures for processes and risk measures for random vectors no longer holds except under certain strong assumptions. This limits the application of known results for, e.g., multiportfolio time consistency as proven in [14, 15] to set-valued risk measures for processes without rigorous direct proof.

In this work we prove a new relation between set-valued risk measures for processes and those for random vectors (on the optional filtration). Notably, the formulation for equivalence indicates that risk measures for processes at time  $t$  need to be augmented to capture the risks prior to time  $t$  due to the non-existence of a unique “0” element in the set-valued framework; such an augmentation is not necessary in the scalar case as in, e.g., [1]. By utilizing this new equivalence relation, we are able to derive a novel dual representation for set-valued risk measures for processes akin to that done in [1]. Additionally, we extend these results to present the equivalent formulation for multiportfolio time consistency; since the equivalence between risk measure settings requires an augmentation, we present a new definition for time consistency for risk measures for processes.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we present preliminary and background information on the set-valued risk measures of interest within this work, i.e., as functions of stochastic processes and random vectors. Section 3 demonstrates the equivalence of these risk measures both in primal and dual representations. With the focus on dynamic risk measures, the equivalence of multiportfolio time consistency for processes and vectors is presented in Section 4. Section 5 concludes.

## 2 Set-valued risk measures

In this section we will summarize the definitions for set-valued risk measures. First, in Section 2.1, we will provide details of the filtrations and the spaces of claims of interest within this work. Section 2.2 will provide the necessary background on risk measures for processes as defined in, e.g., [7, 8]. Section 2.3 will provide the necessary background on risk measures for random vectors as defined in, e.g., [12, 13].

### 2.1 Background and notation

Fix a finite time horizon  $T \in \mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$  and denote  $\mathbb{T} := \{0, 1, \dots, T\}$  and  $\mathbb{T}_t := \{s \in \mathbb{T} \mid s \geq t\}$  for  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ . Fix a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$  with  $\mathcal{F}_0$  the trivial  $\sigma$ -algebra. Without loss of generality, take  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_T$ . Let  $d \geq 1$  be the number of assets under consideration. Denote by  $\mathcal{L}_t := L_d^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t) := L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}; \mathbb{R}^d)$  the linear space of equivalence classes of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable functions  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\|X\|_\infty = \text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} |X(\omega)| < +\infty$  where  $|\cdot|$  is an arbitrary but fixed norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{L}_t^0 := L_d^0(\mathcal{F}_t) := L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}; \mathbb{R}^d)$  the linear space of equivalence classes of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable functions  $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and by  $\mathcal{L}_t^1 := L_d^1(\mathcal{F}_t) := L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_t, \mathbb{P}; \mathbb{R}^d)$  those elements with bounded 1-norm, i.e.,  $X \in \mathcal{L}_t^0$  such that  $\|X\|_1 = \int_\Omega |X(\omega)| d\mathbb{P} < +\infty$ . Throughout this work, we consider the weak\* topology on  $\mathcal{L}_t$  such that the dual space of  $\mathcal{L}_t$  is  $\mathcal{L}_t^1$ . Throughout we will consider the simplified notation  $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{L}_T$ ,  $\mathcal{L}^0 := \mathcal{L}_T^0$ , and  $\mathcal{L}^1 := \mathcal{L}_T^1$ .

Fix  $m \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  of the assets to be eligible for covering the risk of a portfolio. Denote by  $M := \mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\}^{d-m}$  the subspace of eligible assets. Write  $\mathcal{L}_{t,+} := \{X \in \mathcal{L}_t \mid X \in \mathbb{R}_+^d, \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}\}$  for the closed convex cone of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random vectors with  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. non-negative components, and write  $\mathcal{L}_{t,++} := \{X \in \mathcal{L}_t \mid X \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^d, \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}\}$  for the closed convex cone of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random vectors with  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. positive components. We denote by  $\mathcal{L}_t(B)$  those random vectors in  $\mathcal{L}_t$  that take  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. values in  $B$  and denote  $M_t := \mathcal{L}_t(M)$ . Denote  $M_{t,+} := M_t \cap \mathcal{L}_{t,+}$ ,  $M_{t,+}^+ := \{u \in \mathcal{L}_t^1 \mid E[u^\top m] \geq 0 \text{ for any } m \in M_{t,+}\}$  and  $M_{t,+}^\perp := \{u \in \mathcal{L}_t^1 \mid E[u^\top m] = 0 \text{ for any } m \in M_{t,+}\}$ . The multiplication between a random variable  $\lambda \in L_1^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t)$  and a set of random vectors  $B_t \subseteq \mathcal{L}_t$  is understood as in the elementwise sense, i.e.,  $\lambda B_t := \{\lambda X \mid X \in B_t\}$  with  $(\lambda X)(\omega) = \lambda(\omega)X(\omega)$ . Given a set  $A \subseteq M_t$ ,  $\text{cl}(A)$  means the closure of  $A$  and  $\text{co}(A)$  means the convex hull of  $A$ . Denote  $\mathcal{P}(M_t; M_{t,+}) := \{D \subseteq M_t \mid D = D + M_{t,+}\}$  and  $\mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+}) := \{D \subseteq M_t \mid D = \text{cl co}(D + M_{t,+})\}$ , where the  $+$  sign denotes usual Minkowski addition, are the spaces of upper and closed-convex upper sets respectively. We will denote  $\Gamma_t(w)$  with  $w \in \mathcal{L}_t^1 \setminus \{0\}$  by  $\Gamma_t(w) = \{u \in \mathcal{L}_t \mid w^\top u \geq 0\}$ . As will be utilized in the dual representations

presented below, the Minkowski subtraction for sets  $A, B \subseteq M_t$  is defined as

$$A - \cdot B = \{m \in M_t \mid B + \{m\} \subseteq A\}.$$

Define  $\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$  the space of all  $d$ -dimensional adapted stochastic processes  $X := (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$  with  $\|X\|_{\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}} := \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \inf \left\{ r \in \mathbb{R} \mid \sup_{t \in \mathbb{T}} |X_{t,i}| \leq r \right\} < +\infty$ .  $\mathcal{A}^{1,d}$  denotes the space of all  $d$ -dimensional adapted stochastic processes  $a$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} |\Delta a_{t,i}|] < +\infty$ , where  $a_{-1,i} := 0$  and  $\Delta a_{t,i} := a_{t,i} - a_{t-1,i}$ . As is standard in the literature (see, e.g., [11]), for any time  $0 \leq r \leq s \leq T$ , we define the projection  $\pi_{r,s}(X)_t := \mathbb{I}_{\{r \in [0,t]\}} X_{t \wedge s}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  for any  $d$ -dimensional adapted stochastic process  $X$ . Denote  $\mathcal{R}_{r,s}^{\infty,d} := \pi_{r,s}(\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d})$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{r,s}^{1,d} := \pi_{r,s}(\mathcal{A}^{1,d})$  and use the notation  $\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d} := \pi_{0,T}(\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d})$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} := \pi_{t,T}(\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d})$  and  $\mathcal{A}_t^{1,d} := \pi_{t,T}(\mathcal{A}^{1,d})$ . Write  $\mathcal{R}_+^{\infty,d} := \{X \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d} \mid X_{t,i} \geq 0 \text{ for any } t \in \mathbb{T}, i = 1, \dots, d\}$ . Throughout this work we will consider the coarsest topologies such that  $\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_t^{1,d}$  form a dual pair (and vice versa).

Denote by  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})$  the set of probability measures  $\mathbb{Q}$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  which are absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ . Denote  $\mathcal{M}_t(\mathbb{P}) := \{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P}) \mid \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{P} \text{ on } \mathcal{F}_t\}$ . We will use a  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost sure version of the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -conditional expectation of  $X \in \mathcal{L}$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}}[X] &:= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[X | \mathcal{F}_t] := E[\xi_{t,T}(\mathbb{Q})X | \mathcal{F}_t] \\ \xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}_i) &:= \begin{cases} \frac{E[\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_i}{d\mathbb{P}} | \mathcal{F}_s]}{E[\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_i}{d\mathbb{P}} | \mathcal{F}_t]} & \text{on } \{E[\frac{d\mathbb{Q}_i}{d\mathbb{P}} | \mathcal{F}_t] > 0\} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

for times  $t \leq s \in \mathbb{T}$ . For  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})^d$ , we will utilize the vector representation  $\xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}) := (\xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}_1), \dots, \xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}_d))^{\top}$  for any time  $t \leq s \in \mathbb{T}$ . We further define the function  $w_t^s : \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})^d \times \mathcal{L}_t^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_s^0$  for any  $t, s \in \mathbb{T}$  with  $t < s$  by

$$w_t^s(\mathbb{Q}, w) := \text{diag}(w)\xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}),$$

for any  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})^d$  and  $w \in \mathcal{L}_t^1$ , where  $\text{diag}(w)$  denotes the diagonal matrix with the components of  $w$  on the main diagonal. By convention, for any  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ ,  $w_t^t(\mathbb{Q}, w) = w$  for any  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})^d$  and  $w \in \mathcal{L}_t^1$ .

As we seek to relate risk measures for random vectors to those of processes, as in [1], we consider the optional filtration, i.e., let  $\bar{\Omega} = \Omega \times \mathbb{T}$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{F}} = \sigma(\{A_t \times \{t\} \mid A_t \in \mathcal{F}_t, t \in \mathbb{T}\})$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t = \sigma(\{D_r \times \{r\}, D_t \times \mathbb{T}_t \mid D_r \in \mathcal{F}_r, r < t, D_t \in \mathcal{F}_t\})$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  and  $\bar{\mathbb{P}} = \mathbb{P} \otimes \mu$  where  $\mu = (\mu_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is

some adapted reference process such that  $\sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_t = 1$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\min_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_t > \epsilon) = 1$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . Under this measure on the optional  $\sigma$ -algebra, the expectation is given by  $\bar{\mathbb{E}}[X] := \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} X_t \mu_t]$  for any bounded measurable function  $X$  on  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}})$ . A random variable  $X = (X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  on  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}})$  is  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -measurable if and only if  $X_r$  is  $\mathcal{F}_r$ -measurable for all  $r = 0, \dots, t$  and  $X_r = X_t$  for any  $r > t$ . Denote  $\bar{\mathcal{L}} := L_d^\infty(\bar{\mathcal{F}})$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_t := L_d^\infty(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^0 := L_d^1(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}^1 := L_d^1(\bar{\mathcal{F}})$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^1 := L_d^1(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t)$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}_t := L_d^\infty(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t; M)$ . As on the original probability space, denote by  $\bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})$  the set of probability measures  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$  on  $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}})$  which are absolutely continuous with respect to  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ . The following theorem, adapted from [1], provides a representation for these probability measures on the optional  $\sigma$ -algebra.

**Theorem 2.1.** *For any probability measure  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})$ , there exist a probability measure  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})$  and an optional random measure  $\psi \in \Psi(\mathbb{P}) := \{\psi \in \mathcal{R}_+^{\infty,1} \mid \sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \psi_t = 1 \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}\}$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[ \sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \psi_t X_t \right] \quad (1)$$

for any  $X \in L_1^\infty(\bar{\mathcal{F}})$ .

Conversely, any  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P})$  and  $\psi \in \Psi(\mathbb{Q})$  define a probability measure  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} := \mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi$  such that (1) holds.

*Proof.* This follows directly from Theorem 3.4 and Remark B.1 of [1].  $\square$

As we often are interested in those probability measures that are equivalent to  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$  on the filtration, we present the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.2.** *Let  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})$  with decomposition  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi$  (as defined in Theorem 2.1). Then, for any time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ , it follows that*

$$\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \bar{\mathbb{P}} \text{ on } \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{P} \text{ on } \mathcal{F}_t \\ \psi_s = \mu_s \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. } \forall s < t. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* This follows directly from [1, Lemma B.5].  $\square$

We wish to note that, from Corollary 2.2, it follows that

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}}_t(\bar{\mathbb{P}}) := \{\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}}) \mid \bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \bar{\mathbb{P}} \text{ on } \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t\} = \{\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi \mid \mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_t(\mathbb{P}), \psi_s = \mu_s \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. } \forall s < t\}.$$

As for the original probability space, we will use a  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost sure version of the  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -conditional expectation of  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ . Denote by  $\bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X] := \bar{\mathbb{E}}^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X \mid \bar{\mathcal{F}}_t]$  as the conditional expectation of  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ .

This  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -almost sure version can be provided by  $\bar{\xi}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$  construction as for the original probability space; in the following corollary we provide an equivalent representation.

**Corollary 2.3.** *For  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})$  with decomposition  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi$ , the conditional expectation of  $X \in L_1^\infty(\bar{\mathcal{F}})$  given  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$  takes the form*

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[X] = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} X_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \left( \mathbb{I}_{\sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \psi_r < 1} \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{\psi_s}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \psi_r} X_s \right] + \mathbb{I}_{\sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \psi_r = 1} \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{\mu_s}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r} X_s \right] \right) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.$$

*Proof.* First, by Theorem 2.1,  $\bar{\mathbb{E}}_t \left[ \frac{d\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}{d\bar{\mathbb{P}}} \right] = 0$  on  $\{\sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \psi_r = 1\}$ . Therefore, the result trivially follows by [1, Corollary B.3] and the  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}$ -a.s. extension of the  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -conditional expectation.  $\square$

We further define the functions  $\bar{w}_t^s : \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbb{P}^d) \times \bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^1 \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^0$  for any  $t, s \in \mathbb{T}$  with  $t < s$  by

$$\bar{w}_t^s(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) := \sum_{r=1}^{t-1} \bar{w}_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + \text{diag}(\bar{w}_t) \left[ \sum_{r=t}^{s-1} \bar{\xi}_{t,s}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + \bar{\xi}_{t,s}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})_s \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s} \right]$$

where  $\bar{\xi}_{t,s}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$  is defined comparably to  $\xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q})$  for  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{P}^d)$ . By convention, for any  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ ,  $\bar{w}_t^t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) = \bar{w}$  for any  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\bar{\mathbb{P}})^d$  and  $\bar{w} \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_t^1$ . We wish to note that, through the decomposition of  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$  as in Theorem 2.1, an equivalent formulation for  $\bar{w}_t^s(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w})$  can be given in the style of Corollary 2.3.

We wish to conclude this section with a brief result relating the topologies of  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$ . This will be utilized later in this work.

**Lemma 2.4.** (i) *Let  $X^i \rightarrow X$  in  $\sigma(\bar{\mathcal{L}}, \bar{\mathcal{L}}^1)$ . Then  $X_t^i \rightarrow X_t$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_t, \mathcal{L}_t^1)$  and  $X^i \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \rightarrow X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}, \mathcal{A}_t^{1,d})$  for every time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .*

(ii) *Fix  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ . Let  $X_s^i \rightarrow X_s$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_s, \mathcal{L}_s^1)$  for every  $s < t$  and  $X^i \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \rightarrow X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}, \mathcal{A}_t^{1,d})$ . Then  $X^i \rightarrow X$  in  $\sigma(\bar{\mathcal{L}}, \bar{\mathcal{L}}^1)$ .*

*Proof.* (i) Let  $X^i \rightarrow X$  in  $\sigma(\bar{\mathcal{L}}, \bar{\mathcal{L}}^1)$ . And fix  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .

(a) Let  $Z_t \in \mathcal{L}_t^1$  and define  $Y := \frac{1}{\mu_t} Z_t \mathbb{I}_{\{t\}} \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^1$ .

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_t^\top X_t^i] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_s Y_s^\top X_s^i\right] = \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X^i] \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X] = \mathbb{E}[Z_t^\top X_t].$$

(b) Let  $a \in \mathcal{A}_t^{1,d}$ . Define  $Y := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{1}{\mu_s} \Delta a_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^1$ .

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Delta a_s^\top X_s^i\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_s Y_s^\top X_s^i\right] = \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X^i] \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X] = \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Delta a_s^\top X_s\right].$$

- (ii) Fix  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ . Let  $X_s^i \rightarrow X_s$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_s, \mathcal{L}_s^1)$  for every  $s < t$  and  $X^i \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \rightarrow X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d}, \mathcal{A}_t^{1, d})$ . Let  $Y \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}^1$  and define  $Z_s := \mu_s Y_s \in \mathcal{L}_s^1$  for every  $s < t$  and  $\Delta a_s := \mu_s Y_s$  for every  $s \in \mathbb{T}_t$  (with  $\Delta a_s := 0$  for  $s < t$ ) so that  $a_r = \sum_{s=0}^r \Delta a_s$  defines  $a \in \mathcal{A}_t^{1, d}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X^i] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_s Y_s^\top X_s^i\right] = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}[Z_s^\top X_s^i] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Delta a_s^\top X_s^i\right] \\ &\rightarrow \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \mathbb{E}[Z_s^\top X_s] + \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Delta a_s^\top X_s\right] = \bar{\mathbb{E}}[Y^\top X]. \end{aligned}$$

□

## 2.2 Risk measures for processes

In this section we wish to provide a quick overview of the definition of set-valued risk measures for processes as defined in [7, 8]. Herein we present an axiomatic framework for such functions in Definition 2.5. We then summarize prior results on the primal representation w.r.t. an acceptance set. We conclude this section with considerations for a novel dual representation for these conditional risk measures.

**Definition 2.5.** A function  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  for  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  is called a **set-valued conditional risk measure for processes** if it satisfies the following properties for all  $X, Y \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d}$ ,

- (i) *Cash invariant:* for any  $m \in M_t$  and  $X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d}$ ,

$$\rho_t(X + m \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}) = \rho_t(X) - m;$$

- (ii) *Monotone:*  $\rho_t(X) \subseteq \rho_t(Y)$  if  $X \leq Y$  component-wise;

- (iii) *Finite at zero:*  $\rho_t(0) \neq \emptyset$  is closed and  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -decomposable, and  $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{\rho}_t(0) = M) = 0$  where  $\tilde{\rho}_t(0)$  is a  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random set such that  $\rho_t(0) = L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t; \tilde{\rho}_t(0))$ .

A conditional risk measure for processes at time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  is said to be:

- *Normalized:* if  $\rho_t(X) = \rho_t(X) + \rho_t(0)$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d}$ ;
- *Conditionally convex* if for all  $X, Y \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d}$  and all  $\lambda \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t; [0, 1])$

$$\rho_t(\lambda X + (1 - \lambda)Y) \supseteq \lambda \rho_t(X) + (1 - \lambda) \rho_t(Y);$$

- *Conditionally positive homogeneous if for all  $X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$  and all  $\lambda \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t; \mathbb{R}_{++})$*

$$\rho_t(\lambda X) = \lambda \rho_t(X);$$

- *Conditionally coherent if it is conditionally convex and conditionally positive homogeneous;*
- *Closed if the graph of  $\rho_t$*

$$\text{graph } \rho_t := \{(X, u) \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \times M_t \mid u \in \rho_t(X)\}$$

*is closed in the product topology;*

- *Conditionally convex upper continuous (c.u.c.) if*

$$\rho_t^-[D] := \{X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \mid \rho_t(X) \cap D \neq \emptyset\}$$

*is closed for any  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -conditionally convex set  $D \in \mathcal{G}(M_t; -M_{t,+})$ .*

**A dynamic risk measure for processes** is a sequence of conditional risk measures for processes  $(\rho_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ . And a dynamic risk measure for processes is said to have one of the above properties if  $\rho_t$  has the corresponding property for any  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .

As is typical in the literature, herein, we will extend risk measures for processes to  $\mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$  by defining  $\rho_t(X) := \rho_t \circ \pi_{t,T}(X)$  for any  $X \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$ .

We now wish to consider the primal representation of a set-valued conditional risk measure for processes. That is, for any risk measure, let the *acceptance set* be defined as those claims that do not require the addition of any eligible assets in order to be “acceptable” to the risk manager:

$$A_t := \{X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \mid 0 \in \rho_t(X)\}.$$

As shown in [7, 8], these acceptance sets uniquely define the risk measure via the relation

$$\rho_t(X) = \{m \in M_t \mid X + m\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \in A_t\}$$

for any  $X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$ .

With this construction of risk measures for processes, we wish to give a consideration of the dual representation. The following dual representation is novel in the literature for set-valued risk measures for processes, we will leave the proof until Section 3.2. Though this result can be proven using the duality theory of [21] and following the same logic as the proof of [14, Corollary



2.4], we will take a different approach by utilizing the prior results on risk measures for vectors and the yet-to-be-proven equivalence between these formulations. For this result, we first need to consider the set of dual variables

$$\mathcal{W}_t := \left\{ (\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{M}_t(\mathbb{P})^{d \times (T-t+1)} \times (M_{t,+}^+ \setminus M_t^+)^{T-t+1} \mid w_t^s(\mathbb{Q}_s, w_s) \in \mathcal{L}_{s,+}^1, \forall s \in \mathbb{T}_t \right\}.$$

Notably  $(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t$  implies  $w_s \geq 0$   $\mathbb{Q}_s$ -a.s. since  $w_t^s(\mathbb{Q}_s, w_s) \in \mathcal{L}_{s,+}^1$ .

**Corollary 2.6.** *A function  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  is a closed conditionally convex risk measure if and only if*

$$\rho_t(X) = \bigcap_{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t} \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right] - \cdot \alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $\alpha_t$  is the minimal conditional penalty function given by

$$\alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) = \bigcap_{Y \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-Y_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right].$$

$\rho_t$  is additionally **conditionally coherent** if and only if

$$\rho_t(X) = \bigcap_{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right],$$

for

$$\mathcal{W}_t^{\max} = \left\{ (\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t \mid \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top E_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [Z_s] \geq 0 \text{ for any } Z \in A_t \right\}.$$

We wish to conclude this section with a brief introduction to a time consistency notion, called multiportfolio time consistency, for these set-valued risk measures for processes. This notion for risk measures for processes was introduced in [7]. We will revisit this definition in Section 4.

**Definition 2.7.** *A dynamic risk measure for processes  $(\rho_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is **multiportfolio time consistent** if for any times  $t < s \in \mathbb{T}$ :*

$$\rho_s(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_s(Y) \Rightarrow \rho_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{[t,s]} + X\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{[t,s]} + Y\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s})$$

for any  $X \in \mathcal{R}_s^{\infty,d}$ ,  $Z \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$ , and  $B \subseteq \mathcal{R}_s^{\infty,d}$ .

## 2.3 Risk measures for vectors

In this section we wish to provide a quick overview of the definition of set-valued risk measures for random vectors as defined in [12, 13]. Herein we present an axiomatic framework for such functions in Definition 2.8 with emphasis on the special case on the optional filtration. We then summarize prior results on the primal representation w.r.t. an acceptance set. We conclude this section with considerations for a dual representation for these conditional risk measures.

**Definition 2.8.** *A function  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  for  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  is called a **set-valued conditional risk measure for vectors** on  $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$  if it satisfies the following properties for all  $X, Y \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ ,*

(i) *Cash invariant: for any  $m \in \bar{M}_t$  and  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ ,*

$$\bar{R}_t(X + m) = \bar{R}_t(X) - m;$$

(ii) *Monotone:  $\bar{R}_t(X) \subseteq \bar{R}_t(Y)$  if  $X \leq Y$  component-wise;*

(iii) *Finite at zero:  $\bar{R}_t(0) \neq \emptyset$  is closed and  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -decomposable, and  $\bar{\mathbb{P}}(\bar{R}_t(0) = \tilde{M}_t) = 0$  where  $\tilde{R}_t(0)$  is a  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -measurable random set such that  $\bar{R}_t(0) = L^\infty(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t; \tilde{R}_t(0))$ .*

A conditional risk measure for vectors at time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  is said to be:

- Normalized if  $\bar{R}_t(X) = \bar{R}_t(X) + \bar{R}_t(0)$  for every  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ ;
- Time decomposable if

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \bar{R}_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \bar{R}_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$$

for any  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ ;

- Conditionally convex if for all  $X, Y \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$  and all  $\lambda \in L^\infty(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t; [0, 1])$

$$\bar{R}_t(\lambda X + (1 - \lambda)Y) \supseteq \lambda \bar{R}_t(X) + (1 - \lambda) \bar{R}_t(Y);$$

- Conditionally positive homogeneous if for all  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$  and all  $\lambda \in L^\infty(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t; \mathbb{R}_{++})$

$$\bar{R}_t(\lambda X) = \lambda \bar{R}_t(X);$$

- Conditionally coherent if it is conditionally convex and conditionally positive homogeneous;

- Closed if the graph of  $\bar{R}_t$

$$\text{graph } \bar{R}_t := \{(X, u) \in \bar{\mathcal{L}} \times \bar{M}_t \mid u \in \bar{R}_t(X)\}$$

is closed in the product topology;

- Conditionally convex upper continuous (c.u.c.) if

$$\bar{R}_t^-[D] := \{X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}} \mid \bar{R}_t(X) \cap D \neq \emptyset\}$$

is closed for any  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_t$ -conditionally convex set  $D \in \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; -\bar{M}_{t,+})$ .

A **dynamic risk measure for vectors** is a sequence of conditional risk measures for vectors  $(\bar{R}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ . A dynamic risk measure for processes is said to have one of the above properties if  $\bar{R}_t$  has the corresponding property for any  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .

**Remark 2.9.** We wish to note that the time decomposable property presented above is, as far as the authors are aware, novel to this work. Notably, any conditionally convex risk measure is time decomposable.

We now wish to consider the primal representation of a set-valued conditional risk measure for vectors. That is, for any risk measure, let the *acceptance set* be defined as those claims that do not require the addition of any eligible assets in order to be “acceptable” to the risk manager:

$$\bar{A}_t := \{X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}} \mid 0 \in \bar{R}_t(X)\}.$$

As shown in [12], these acceptance sets uniquely define the risk measure via the relation

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \{m \in \bar{M}_t \mid X + m \in \bar{A}_t\}$$

for any  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ .

We now wish provide a dual representation for risk measures for vectors. For comparison to the dual representation presented above for risk measures for processes, we present the dual representation provided first in [14]. For this result, we first need to consider the set of dual variables

$$\bar{\mathcal{W}}_t := \{(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_t(\bar{\mathbb{P}})^d \times (\bar{M}_{t,+}^+ \setminus \bar{M}_t^\perp) \mid \bar{w}_t^T(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_+^1\}$$

As above,  $(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$  implies  $\bar{w} \geq 0$   $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ -a.s.

**Corollary 2.10.** [14, Corollary 2.4] A function  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  is a **closed conditionally convex risk measure** if and only if

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \bigcap_{(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t} \left[ \left( \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-X] + \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w}) \right) \cap \bar{M}_t - \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \right],$$

where  $\bar{\alpha}_t$  is the minimal conditional penalty function given by

$$\bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) = \bigcap_{Y \in \bar{A}_t} \left( \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Y] + \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w}) \right) \cap \bar{M}_t.$$

$\bar{R}_t$  is additionally **conditionally coherent** if and only if

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \bigcap_{(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max}} \left( \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-X] + \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w}) \right) \cap \bar{M}_t,$$

for

$$\bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max} = \{ (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t \mid \bar{w}_t^T(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{A}_t^+ \}.$$

We wish to conclude this introduction to risk measures for vectors with a consideration of multiportfolio time consistency. This notion for risk measures for vectors is a modification of that introduced in [12, 13]; we demonstrate in Proposition 2.12 that this coincides with the typical definition for time decomposable risk measures.

**Definition 2.11.** A dynamic risk measure for vectors  $(\bar{R}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is **multiportfolio time consistent** if for any times  $t < s \in \mathbb{T}$ :

$$\bar{R}_s(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_s(Y) \Rightarrow \bar{R}_t(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_t(Y)$$

for any  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $B := \{(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{s-1}, b_s) \mid b_r \in B_r, r < s, b_s \in B_s\}$  for arbitrary sequence of sets  $B_r \subseteq \mathcal{L}_r$  for  $r < s$  and  $B_s \subseteq \mathcal{R}_s^{\infty, d}$ .

**Proposition 2.12.** Let  $(\bar{R}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  be a normalized, time decomposable risk measure.  $(\bar{R}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is multiportfolio time consistent if and only if for any times  $t < s \in \mathbb{T}$ :

$$\bar{R}_s(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_s(Y) \Rightarrow \bar{R}_t(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_t(Y)$$

for any  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $B \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{L}}$ .

*Proof.* This result follows trivially via the application of the recursive relation  $\bar{R}_t(X) = \bigcup_{Z \in \bar{R}_s(X)} \bar{R}_t(-Z)$

for any times  $t < s$  and  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$  which can be shown to be equivalent to multiportfolio time consistency as given in Definition 2.11 and the more general version provided in the statement of this proposition.  $\square$

**Remark 2.13.** Throughout much of the remainder of this work, the restriction of set-valued risk measures for vectors to a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra is utilized. Herein we will define  $R_t : \mathcal{L}_t \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  to be the restriction of a set-valued risk measure (with filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_s)_{s \in \mathbb{T}}, \mathbb{P})$ ) to  $\mathcal{L}_t$ . The primal and dual representation of such risk measures will be utilized extensively below defined in analogous ways to those provided above. Notably, the penalty function  $\alpha_{R_t}$  for these restricted risk measures only depends on a single dual variable  $w \in M_{t,+}^+$ , i.e.,  $\alpha_{R_t}(w)$  does *not* depend on a vector of probability measures  $\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_t(\mathbb{P})^d$ .

### 3 Equivalence of risk measures for processes and vectors

In this section we will focus on the relation between set-valued risk measures for processes and vectors. This was studied under restrictive conditions in [7] which match many of the same properties of the scalar setting (i.e., a full space of eligible assets  $M = \mathbb{R}^d$  and the strong normalization property  $\rho_t(0) = \mathcal{L}_{t,+}$ ). Herein we drop these restrictions and determine the equivalence for both the primal and dual representations. Notably, this equivalence requires the introduction an augmentation of the risk measure for processes with a series of risk measures for vectors on the original filtered probability space; when the aforementioned strong assumptions are imposed these augmenting risk measures can be dropped without incident.

#### 3.1 Relation for primal representations

First, we wish to compare the relation between set-valued risk measures for processes and for vectors through their axiomatic definitions. This is akin to the results presented in [1] for scalar risk measures. Notably, in comparison to that work, the set-valued risk measures for vectors in the optional filtration are a larger class than those for processes rather than the equivalence as found for scalar risk measures. To recover the equivalence of these risk measures, we need to augment the risk measures for processes with the restricted set-valued risk measures for vectors are discussed in Remark 2.13.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Fix time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .*

- (i) *Any conditional risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of conditional risk measures  $R_s : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  (restricted to  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -measurable random vectors),*

$s = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$ , defines a time decomposable conditional risk measure for random vectors on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  via

$$\bar{R}_t(X) := \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} R_s(X_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \rho_t(X) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}. \quad (3)$$

Additionally, if  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}, \rho_t$  are normalized, conditionally convex, or conditionally coherent, then the corresponding risk measure  $\bar{R}_t$  has the same property.

(ii) Any conditional risk measure for random vectors on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  defines a conditional risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and a series of conditional risk measures  $R_s : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  restricted to  $\mathcal{F}_s$ -measurable random vectors,  $s = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$ , via

$$\rho_t(X) := \bar{R}_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t})_t \quad (4)$$

$$R_s(Z) := \bar{R}_t(Z \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}})_s, \quad s = 0, 1, \dots, t-1. \quad (5)$$

Additionally, if  $\bar{R}_t$  is normalized, conditionally convex, or conditionally coherent, then the corresponding risk measures  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}, \rho_t$  have the same property.

(iii) If  $\bar{R}_t$  is time decomposable then it can be decomposed into form (3) such that  $\rho_t$  and  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}$  are defined as in (4) and (5) respectively. Additionally, if  $\bar{R}_t$  is conditionally convex and either closed or conditionally convex upper continuous then  $\rho_t$  and  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}$  have the same property and vice versa.

*Proof.* (i) It is easy to check that  $\bar{R}_t$  defined in (3) is a time decomposable conditional risk measure on the optional filtration as defined in Definition 2.8. This is done directly by considering the equivalent definitions for the risk measure for processes and the sequence of conditional risk measures. Due to simplicity, we omit the direct constructions herein.

(ii) It is easy to check that  $\rho_t$  defined in (4) is a risk measure for processes and  $R_s$ , for  $s < t$ , defined in (5) is a conditional risk measure for vectors on  $\mathcal{L}_s$ . Notably, for  $\rho_t$ , the result follows directly from [7, Proposition 3.4] with only verification required as we no longer require the full eligible space, i.e.,  $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ; due to simplicity of those results, we omit those proofs. However, due to the updated definition for finiteness at zero, that result needs to be proven for  $\rho_t$  separately from the approach of [7] but still follows trivially by construction (recalling that  $\mathbb{P}(\min_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mu_t > \epsilon) = 1$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ ) and thus we omit the details.

(iii) If  $\bar{R}_t$  is time decomposable and  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$  then:

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \bar{R}_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \bar{R}_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} R_s(X_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \rho_t(X) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.$$

Finally, we want to study the closedness properties for conditionally convex risk measures.

(a) **Closed:**

- Assume  $\bar{R}_t$  is closed. First, we will show that  $R_s$  is closed for any  $s < t$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{graph } R_s &= \{(X_s, m_s) \in \mathcal{L}_s \times M_s \mid m_s \in R_s(X_s)\} \\ &= \{(X_s, m_s) \in \mathcal{L}_s \times M_s \mid m_s \in \bar{R}_t(X_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}})_s\} \\ &= \{(X, m) \in \bar{\mathcal{L}} \times \bar{M}_t \mid m \in \bar{R}_t(X)\} \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \\ &= (\text{graph } \bar{R}_t) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $(X_s^i, m_s^i)_{i \in I} \subseteq \text{graph } R_s \rightarrow (X_s, m_s)$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_s, \mathcal{L}_s^1)$ . By Lemma 2.4 and assumption, it must follow that  $(X_s^i \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}, m_s^i \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + m^0 \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}^c})_{i \in I} \rightarrow (X_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}, m_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + m^0 \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}^c}) \in \text{graph } \bar{R}_t$  for arbitrary  $m^0 \in \bar{R}_t(0)$ . Therefore closedness is proven as  $(X_s, m_s) \in \text{graph } R_s$ . Consider now the closedness of  $\rho_t$ . By the same logic as above,

$$\text{graph } \rho_t = \{(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}, m_t) \mid (X, m) \in \text{graph } \bar{R}_t\}.$$

Therefore, as above by concatenation with  $(0, m^0) \in \text{graph } \bar{R}_t$ ,  $\text{graph } \rho_t$  is closed.

- Assume  $\rho_t$  and  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}$  are all closed risk measures.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{graph } \bar{R}_t &= \{(X, m) \in \bar{\mathcal{L}} \times \bar{M}_t \mid m \in \bar{R}_t(X)\} \\ &= \{(X, m) \in \bar{\mathcal{L}} \times \bar{M}_t \mid m_s \in R_s(X_s) \forall s < t, m_t \in \rho_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t})\} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} (\text{graph } R_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + (\text{graph } \rho_t) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $(X^i, m^i) \subseteq \text{graph } \bar{R}_t \rightarrow (X, m)$  in the product topology. By the above construction and Lemma 2.4, it must follow that  $(X_s, m_s) \in \text{graph } R_s$  for every time  $s < t$  and  $(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}, m_t) \in \text{graph } \rho_t$ . Therefore closedness is proven as  $(X, m) \in \text{graph } \bar{R}_t$ .

(b) **Conditionally convex upper continuous:**

- Assume  $\bar{R}_t$  is conditionally convex upper continuous. First we will show that  $R_s$  is conditionally convex upper continuous. Let  $D_s \in \mathcal{G}(M_s; -M_{s,+})$  be closed and conditionally convex.

$$\begin{aligned}
R_s^- [D_s] &= \{X_s \in \mathcal{L}_s \mid R_s(X_s) \cap D_s \neq \emptyset\} \\
&= \{X_s \in \mathcal{L}_s \mid \bar{R}_t(X_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}})_s \cap D_s \neq \emptyset\} \\
&= \{X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}} \mid \bar{R}_t(X)_s \cap D_s \neq \emptyset\} \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \\
&= \bar{R}_t^- [D_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \bar{M}_t \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}^c}] \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $X_s^i \subseteq R_s^- [D_s] \rightarrow X_s$  in  $\sigma(\mathcal{L}_s, \mathcal{L}_s^1)$ . By Lemma 2.4 and assumption, it must follow that  $X_s^i \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \rightarrow X_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \in \bar{R}_t^- [D_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \bar{M}_t \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}^c}]$ . Therefore conditional convex upper continuity is proven as  $X_s \in R_s^- [D_s]$ . Consider now the conditional convex upper continuity of  $\rho_t$ . Let  $D_t \in \mathcal{G}(M_t; -M_{t,+})$  be closed and conditionally convex. By the same logic as above,

$$\rho_t^- [D_t] = \bar{R}_t^- \left[ \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} M_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + D_t \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \right] \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.$$

Therefore, as above,  $\rho_t^- [D_t]$  must be closed and the result follows.

- Assume  $\rho_t$  and  $(R_s)_{s=0}^{t-1}$  are all conditionally convex upper continuous. Let  $D \in \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; -\bar{M}_{t,+})$  be closed and conditionally convex. By decomposability in the optional filtration,  $D = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} D_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + D_t \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$  for  $D_s \in \mathcal{G}(M_s; -M_{s,+})$  closed and conditionally convex for every time  $s \leq t$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{R}_t^- [D] &= \{X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}} \mid \bar{R}_t(X) \cap D \neq \emptyset\} \\
&= \{X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}} \mid \bar{R}_t(X)_s \cap D_s \neq \emptyset \forall s \leq t\} \\
&= \{X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}} \mid R_s(X_s) \cap D_s \neq \emptyset \forall s < t, \rho_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}) \cap D_t \neq \emptyset\} \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} R_s^- [D_s] \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \rho_t^- [D_t] \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $X^i \subseteq \bar{R}_t^- [D] \rightarrow X$  in  $\sigma(\bar{\mathcal{L}}, \bar{\mathcal{L}}^1)$ . By Lemma 2.4 and assumption, it must follow that  $X_s^i \rightarrow X_s \in R_s^- [D_s]$  for every  $s < t$  and  $X^i \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \rightarrow X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \in \rho_t^- [D_t]$ . Therefore conditional convex upper continuity is proven as  $X \in \bar{R}_t^- [D]$ .

□



Given these results on the equivalence of risk measures for processes and vectors, we wish to consider the special case in which every asset is eligible to cover risk, i.e.,  $M = \mathbb{R}^d$ . This setting provides a simpler equivalent relation insofar as the restricted risk measures  $R_s$  utilized in Theorem 3.1 above can be fully defined by its value at 0. This setting more clearly demonstrates the relationship with scalar risk measures, as  $R_s(0) = \mathcal{L}_{s,+}$  in the  $d = 1$  asset setting for any choice of normalized risk measure with closed values.

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $M = \mathbb{R}^d$ . The equivalences in Theorem 3.1 can be simplified insofar as the conditional risk measures  $R_s$  can be replaced with (conditionally convex) upper sets  $C_s$ , i.e.,*

$$C_s := \bar{R}_t(0)_s$$

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} [-X_s + C_s] \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \rho_t(X) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.$$

*Proof.* This follows trivially from Theorem 3.1 by noting that  $R_s(X \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}) = R_s(0) - X_s$  by cash invariance for this choice of eligible assets. Therefore the full risk measure  $R_s$  is no longer required, but only the risk measure at 0 which we denote  $C_s$ .  $\square$

We conclude this section on the equivalence of primal representations by providing the relation between acceptance sets for processes and vectors on the optional filtration.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Fix time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .*

- (i) *Consider a conditional risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of conditional risk measures  $R_s : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_s; M_{s,+})$ ,  $s = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$ , and  $\bar{R}_t$  is defined as (3), then  $\bar{A}_t = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} A_{R_s} \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + A_t \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$ .*
- (ii) *Given a conditional risk measure for random vectors on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$ , define  $\rho_t$  and  $R_s$  via (4) and (5) respectively, then  $A_t = \{X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \mid X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \in \bar{A}_t\}$  and  $A_{R_s} = (\bar{A}_t)_s$  for every  $s = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$ .*

*Proof.* This result follows directly by construction of the equivalences in Theorem 3.1.  $\square$

## 3.2 Relation for dual representations

Before presenting the following results, we want the reader to recall the dual representations for risk measures for processes in Corollary 2.6 and vectors in Corollary 2.10. We also wish to highlight the form for the penalty functions for risk measures  $R_s : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  as provided in Remark 2.13. Finally, we wish to remind the reader that any conditionally convex risk measure for vectors is time decomposable by construction as given in Remark 2.9.

**Lemma 3.4.** Fix time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .

- (i) Consider a closed conditionally convex risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of closed conditionally convex risk measures  $R_s : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$ ,  $s < t$ . The associated closed conditionally convex risk measure on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  defined in (3) has dual representation w.r.t. the penalty function

$$\bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) = \bar{\alpha}_t(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w}) = \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha_{R_s}(\bar{w}_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \alpha_t(W_t(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w})) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$$

where  $W_t(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w}) := (\hat{\mathbb{Q}}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t$  is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{s,i}}{d\mathbb{P}} &:= \frac{\psi_{s,i}}{\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_i}[\psi_{s,i}]} \xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}_i) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_i}[\psi_{s,i}] > 0} + \frac{\mu_s}{\mathbb{E}_t[\mu_s]} \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_i}[\psi_{s,i}] = 0}, \\ w_{s,i} &:= \frac{\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_i}[\psi_{s,i}]}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r} \bar{w}_{t,i} \end{aligned}$$

for indices  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and times  $s \in \mathbb{T}_t$ .

- (ii) Consider a closed conditionally convex risk measure for random vectors on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$ . The associated closed conditionally convex risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of closed conditionally convex risk measures  $R_s : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  defined in (4) and (5), respectively, have dual representations w.r.t. the penalty functions

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{R_s}(w_s) &= \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{P}}, w_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}})_s, \\ \alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) &= (\bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w))_t, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) := (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$  is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w} &:= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \text{diag}(\mathbb{I}_{\{w_s > 0\}}) w_s \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}, \\ \left( \frac{d\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_i}{d\bar{\mathbb{P}}} \right)_s &:= \mathbb{I}_{\{s \in [0, t)\}} + \frac{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r}{\mu_s} \left( \frac{w_{s,i}}{\sum_{r \in \mathbb{T}_t} \mathbb{I}_{\{w_{r,i} > 0\}} w_{r,i}} \mathbb{I}_{\sum_{r \in \mathbb{T}_t} \mathbb{I}_{\{w_{r,i} > 0\}} w_{r,i} > 0} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{I}_{\sum_{r \in \mathbb{T}_t} \mathbb{I}_{\{w_{r,i} > 0\}} w_{r,i} = 0} \right) \xi_{t,s}(\mathbb{Q}_{s,i}) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \end{aligned}$$

for indices  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$  and times  $s \in \mathbb{T}_t$ .

*Proof.* (i) Recall the definition of the minimal penalty function  $\bar{\alpha}_t$  from Corollary 2.10, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) &= \bigcap_{Z \in \bar{A}_t} \left( \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Z] + \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w}) \right) \cap \bar{M}_t \\ &= \left\{ u \in \bar{M}_t \mid \bar{w}^\top u \geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in \bar{A}_t} \bar{w}^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Z] \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Consider now the decomposition of the acceptance set  $\bar{A}_t$  as given in Corollary 3.3. Additionally, assume  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_i = \mathbb{Q}_i \otimes \psi_i$  be the decomposition as provided in Corollary 2.2 for each component  $i$  of the vector of measures  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_t(\bar{\mathbb{P}})^d$ . From this relation, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) &= \left\{ u \in \bar{M}_t \mid \bar{w}^\top u \geq \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z_s \in A_{R_s}} \bar{w}^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Z_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}] + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \bar{w}^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-Z \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}] \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ u \in \bar{M}_t \mid \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \bar{w}_s^\top u_s \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} + \bar{w}_t^\top u_t \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \geq \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_{R_s}} \bar{w}_s^\top (-Z_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \bar{w}_t^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{1}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r} \operatorname{diag}(\psi_s)(-Z_s) \right] \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t} \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \left\{ u_s \in M_s \mid \bar{w}_s^\top u_s \geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_{R_s}} \bar{w}_s^\top (-Z_s) \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.} \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \\ &\quad + \left\{ u_t \in M_t \mid \bar{w}_t^\top u_t \geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \bar{w}_t^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{1}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r} \operatorname{diag}(\psi_s)(-Z_s) \right] \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.} \right\} \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}.\end{aligned}$$

By construction of  $(\hat{\mathbb{Q}}, w) = W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w})$ ,

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_s}[Y_s] = \bar{w}_t^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}} \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{1}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r} \operatorname{diag}(\psi_s) Y_s \right]$$

for any  $Y \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d}$ . Therefore the result trivially follows so long as  $W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \mathcal{W}_t$ . In fact,

$$W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) = (\hat{\mathbb{Q}}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t \text{ holds by the relation } w_t^s(\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_s, w_s) = \frac{\mu_s}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r} \bar{w}_t^T(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w})_s \in \mathcal{L}_{s,+}^1.$$

(ii) First, recall the definition of the minimal penalty function  $\alpha_{R_s}$  for  $R_s : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  as provided in Remark 2.13, i.e.,

$$\alpha_{R_s}(w) = \bigcap_{Z \in A_{R_s}} \{(-Z + \Gamma_s(w)) \cap M_s\} = \left\{ u \in M_s \mid w^\top u \geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_{R_s}} w^\top (-Z) \bar{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.} \right\}$$

for any  $w \in \mathcal{L}_{s,+}^1 \setminus M_s^\perp$ . Using the construction of  $A_{R_s}$  as given in Corollary 3.3, the construction of  $\alpha_{R_s}$  in this lemma is trivial since  $(\bar{\mathbb{P}}, w \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$  by inspection.

Second, recall the definition of the minimal penalty function  $\alpha_t$  for the risk measure  $\rho_t$  for

processes as given in Corollary 2.6, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) &= \bigcap_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-Z_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right] \\
&= \left\{ u \in M_t \mid \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top u \geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-Z_s] \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \right\} \\
&= \left\{ u \in M_t \mid \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \operatorname{diag}(\mathbb{I}_{\{w_s > 0\}}) u \geq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \operatorname{diag}(\mathbb{I}_{\{w_s > 0\}}) \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-Z_s] \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

for any  $(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t$ . The terminal equality above follows from the construction of the eligible assets and  $w_s \geq 0$   $\mathbb{Q}_s$ -a.s.. By construction of  $(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) = \bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w)$ ,

$$\left( \bar{w}^\top \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}} [Y] \right)_r = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [Y_s]$$

for any  $Y \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $r \in \mathbb{T}_t$ . Therefore, using the construction of  $A_t$  as given in Corollary 3.3, the definition of  $\alpha_t$  as provided in this lemma holds so long as  $\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$ . In fact,  $\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$  holds by the relation  $\bar{w}_t^\top (\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w)) = (1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \mu_r) \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{1}{\mu_s} w_t^s(\mathbb{Q}_s, w_s) \mathbb{I}_{\{s\}} \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}_+^1$ .

□

**Remark 3.5.** We wish to highlight that, in the full eligible space setting  $M = \mathbb{R}^d$  with the notation given in Corollary 3.2, the penalty function representation simplifies insofar as  $\alpha_{R_s}(\bar{w}_s) = \Gamma_s(\bar{w}_s)$  if  $\bar{w}_s \in C_s^+$  and  $\emptyset$  otherwise.

We, additionally, wish to consider the relation between the dual representations for conditionally coherent risk measures. This is provided in the following corollary utilizing the maximal set of dual variables.

**Corollary 3.6.** *Fix time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ .*

- (i) *Consider a closed conditionally coherent risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty, d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of closed conditionally coherent risk measures  $R_s : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$ . The associated closed conditionally coherent risk measure on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  defined in (3) has dual representation w.r.t. the set of dual variables*

$$\bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max} = \{ (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t \mid \bar{w}_s \in \mathcal{W}_{R_s}^{\max} \forall s = 0, \dots, t-1, W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max} \}.$$

- (ii) *Consider a closed conditionally coherent risk measure for random vectors on the optional*

filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$ . The associated closed conditionally coherent risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of closed conditionally coherent risk measures  $R_s : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  defined in (4) and (5), respectively, have dual representations w.r.t. the set of dual variables

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_{R_s}^{\max} &= \bigcup_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}} \in \bar{\mathcal{M}}_t(\bar{\mathbb{P}})^d} \{\bar{w}_s \mid (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max}\}, \\ \mathcal{W}_t^{\max} &= \{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t \mid \bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max}\}.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.4 utilizing the indicator notion of the penalty functions, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) &= \begin{cases} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Gamma_t(w_s) \cap M_t & \text{if } (\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max} \\ \emptyset & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ \alpha_{R_s}(w_s) &= \begin{cases} \Gamma_s(w_s) \cap M_s & \text{if } w_s \in \mathcal{W}_{R_s}^{\max} \\ \emptyset & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) &= \begin{cases} \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w}) \cap \bar{M}_t & \text{if } (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t^{\max} \\ \emptyset & \text{else.} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

□

We now wish to use the results of this section in order to prove the dual representation for risk measures for processes as presented in Corollary 2.6.

*Proof of Corollary 2.6.* Let  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  be some closed conditionally convex risk measure for processes. Additionally, fix a sequence of closed and conditionally convex risk measures  $R_s : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(M_s; M_{s,+})$  for  $s < t$ . Theorem 3.1 guarantees the existence and uniqueness of a closed conditionally convex risk measure on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  such that  $\rho_t(X) = \bar{R}_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t})_t$  for any  $X \in \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d}$ . Consider, also, the decomposition of the penalty function from Lemma 3.4 to determine that  $\alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) = \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w})_t$  for specifically constructed  $(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) = \bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w)$ . Utilizing the dual representation for risk measures for vectors:

$$\rho_t(X) = \left( \bigcap_{(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t} \left[ \left( \bar{\mathbb{E}}_t^{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}[-X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}] + \bar{\Gamma}_t(\bar{w}) \right) \cap \bar{M}_t - \bar{\alpha}_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \right] \right)_t$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \bigcap_{(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}} \left[ - \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \frac{\psi_s}{1 - \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} \psi_r} X_s \right] + \Gamma_t(\bar{w}_t) \right) \cap M_t - \cdot \bar{\alpha}_t(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w})_t \right] \\
&= \bigcap_{(\mathbb{Q} \otimes \psi, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t} \left[ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_s} [-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right] - \cdot \alpha_t(\hat{\mathbb{Q}}, w) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where  $(\hat{\mathbb{Q}}, w) = W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w})$  is defined as in Lemma 3.4(i). It remains to show that  $\{(w_t^s(\mathbb{Q}_s, w_s))_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \mid (\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t\} = \{(w_t^s(W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w})_s))_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \mid (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t\}$ . First, by construction,  $\{W_t(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \mid (\bar{\mathbb{Q}}, \bar{w}) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t\} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_t$  which implies  $\supseteq$  in the desired equality. Second, for any  $(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t$  there exists  $\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}_t$  (as constructed in Lemma 3.4(ii)) so that  $w_t^s(\mathbb{Q}_s, w_s) = w_t^s(W_t(\bar{W}_t(\mathbb{Q}, w))_s)$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{T}_t$  which implies  $\subseteq$  in the desired equality. Thus the proof in the convex case is complete.

For the conditionally coherent case. Define

$$\beta_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) = \begin{cases} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Gamma_t(w_s) \cap M_t & \text{if } \text{ess inf}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top E_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [Z_s] = 0 \text{ P-a.s.} \\ \emptyset & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then from the positive homogeneity of  $\rho$ , we have that  $\beta_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \subseteq \alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w)$ , which yields that

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right] - \cdot \alpha_t(\mathbb{Q}, w) \subseteq \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right] - \cdot \beta_t(\mathbb{Q}, w).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right] - \cdot \left( \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right], \\
&\sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right] - \cdot \emptyset = M_t,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain that

$$\rho_t(X) \subseteq \bigcap_{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right].$$

Finally, from (2), it follows that  $u_t \in \rho_t(X)$  if and only if

$$\text{ess inf}_{(\mathbb{Q}, w) \in \mathcal{W}_t} \left\{ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top u_t + \text{ess sup}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top E_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [-Z_s] + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top E_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s} [X_s] \right\} \geq 0.$$

Assume  $u \in \bigcap_{(Q,w) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} \left[ \left( \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-X_s] + \Gamma_t(w_s) \right) \cap M_t \right]$ . Then, immediately,

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{(Q,w) \in \mathcal{W}_t^{\max}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top u + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top E_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-Z_s] + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top E_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[X_s] \geq 0 \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Additionally and clearly,

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{(Q,w) \in \mathcal{W}_t \setminus \mathcal{W}_t^{\max}} \left\{ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top u + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top E_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-Z_s] + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top E_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[X_s] \right\} \geq 0 \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Hence,  $\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{(Q,w) \in \mathcal{W}_t} \left\{ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top u + \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{Z \in A_t} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top E_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[-Z_s] + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{T}_t} w_s^\top E_t^{\mathbb{Q}_s}[X_s] \right\} \geq 0 \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$  which implies that  $u \in \rho_t(X)$  and the equivalence is shown.  $\square$

## 4 Equivalence of multiportfolio time consistency

Though multiportfolio time consistency of set-valued risk measures for processes was presented in [7], in this work we find a slight variation of that definition is useful for this work. In particular, motivated by Theorem 3.1, we consider a joint definition on both the risk measure for processes  $\rho_t$  and the series of conditional risk measures  $R_s$ .

**Definition 4.1.** *The pair  $(\rho_t, (R_s^t)_{s=0}^{t-1})_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is multiportfolio time consistent if:*

- (i)  $\rho$  is multiportfolio time consistent as in Definition 2.7;
- (ii) for any times  $t < s$ ,  $X_r \in \mathcal{L}_r$  and  $B_r \subseteq \mathcal{L}_r$  for  $r \in [t, s)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} R_r^s(X_r) &\subseteq \bigcup_{Y_r \in B_r} R_r^s(Y_r) \quad \forall r \in [t, s) \\ \Rightarrow \rho_t \left( \sum_{r=t}^{s-1} X_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + Z \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s} \right) &\subseteq \bigcup_{Y_t \in B_t} \cdots \bigcup_{Y_{s-1} \in B_{s-1}} \rho_t \left( \sum_{r=t}^{s-1} Y_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + Z \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s} \right) \quad \forall Z \in \mathcal{R}_s^{\infty, d}; \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) for any times  $r < t < s$ ,  $X_r \in \mathcal{L}_r$  and  $B_r \subseteq \mathcal{L}_r$ :

$$R_r^s(X_r) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y_r \in B_r} R_r^s(Y_r) \Rightarrow R_r^t(X_r) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y_r \in B_r} R_r^t(Y_r).$$

We now wish to turn to the final main result of this work – the equivalence of multiportfolio time consistency for set-valued risk measures for processes and vectors. This is, again, akin to the results presented for scalar risk measures in [1]. Fundamentally, as the following proof is demonstrated for the definition of multiportfolio time consistency, these results can be used to

construct the various equivalent formulations as well; in particular, we wish to highlight the recursive formulation presented in [12, 7] and the cocycle condition for penalty functions in [13].

**Theorem 4.2.** (i) Consider a multiportfolio time consistent pair  $(\rho, R)$ . The associated time decomposable risk measure on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}_t : \bar{\mathcal{L}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\bar{M}_t; \bar{M}_{t,+})$  defined in (3) is multiportfolio time consistent.

(ii) Consider a multiportfolio time consistent, time decomposable risk measure for random vectors on the optional filtration  $\bar{R}$ . The associated risk measure for processes  $\rho_t : \mathcal{R}_t^{\infty,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_t; M_{t,+})$  and series of risk measures  $R_s^t : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_s; M_{s,+})$ ,  $s = 0, \dots, t-1$  for  $t = 0, \dots, T$ , defined in (4) and (5) are jointly multiportfolio time consistent.

*Proof.* Throughout we will fix times  $t < s$ .

(i) Let  $B := \{(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{s-1}, b_s) \mid b_r \in B_r, r < s, b_s \in B_s\}$  for arbitrary sequence of sets  $B_r \subseteq \mathcal{L}_r$  for  $r < s$  and  $B_s \subseteq \mathcal{R}_s^{\infty,d}$  and  $X \in \bar{\mathcal{L}}$  such that:

$$\bar{R}_s(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_s(Y).$$

By construction, this implies  $R_r^s(X_r) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y_r \in B_r} R_r^s(Y_r)$  for every  $r < s$  and  $\rho_s(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y_s \in B_s} \rho_s(Y_s \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s})$ . Immediately, from the third condition of multiportfolio time consistency, we know  $R_r^t(X_r) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y_r \in B_r} R_r^t(Y_r)$  for every  $r < t$ , it remains to show that  $\rho_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_t(Y \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t})$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_t(X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}) &\subseteq \bigcup_{Y_t \in B_t} \dots \bigcup_{Y_{s-1} \in B_{s-1}} \rho_t\left(\sum_{r=t}^{s-1} Y_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + X \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}\right) \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{Y_t \in B_t} \dots \bigcup_{Y_{s-1} \in B_{s-1}} \bigcup_{Y_s \in B_s} \rho_t\left(\sum_{r=t}^{s-1} Y_r \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + Y_s \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}\right) = \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_t(Y), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inclusion follows from the second condition of multiportfolio time consistency and the second inclusion from the first condition of multiportfolio time consistency.

Therefore, by construction of  $\bar{R}_t$  it immediately follows that  $\bar{R}_t(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_t(Y)$ .

(ii) Note, first, since  $(\bar{R}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$  is time decomposable, from Theorem 3.1, we have that

$$\bar{R}_t(X) = \sum_{r=0}^{t-1} R_r^t(X_r) \mathbb{I}_{\{r\}} + \rho_t(X) \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_t}$$

for any time  $t \in \mathbb{T}$ . For this proof, we will only directly demonstrate the first condition of multiportfolio time consistency; the latter two properties follow from identical arguments.



Fix  $X \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$  and  $B \subseteq \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$  such that

$$\rho_s(X) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_s(Y).$$

This implies, by the decomposition of  $\bar{R}_s$ , that

$$\bar{R}_s(Z\mathbb{I}_{[t,s]} + X\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_s(Z\mathbb{I}_{[t,s]} + Y\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s})$$

for any  $Z \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$ . Utilizing multiportfolio time consistency of  $\bar{R}$ , we recover

$$\bar{R}_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{[t,s]} + X\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \bar{R}_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{[t,s]} + Y\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s})$$

for any  $Z \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$ . By the decomposition of  $\bar{R}_t$ , we immediately conclude

$$\rho_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{[t,s]} + X\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Y \in B} \rho_t(Z\mathbb{I}_{[t,s]} + Y\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}_s})$$

for any  $Z \in \mathcal{R}^{\infty,d}$ , i.e.,  $\rho$  is multiportfolio time consistent. □

From Theorems 3.1 and 4.2 and using results in [13, 14], one can steadily deduce some equivalent characterizations of multiportfolio time consistency for set-valued dynamic risk measures for processes, such as the cocycle condition on the sum of minimal penalty function and supermartingale relation.

**Remark 4.3.** Consider the setting in which all assets are eligible, i.e., assume that  $M = \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\rho$  be a multiportfolio time consistent risk measure for processes (see Definition 2.7) and define  $R_s : \mathcal{L}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{L}_s; \mathcal{L}_{s,+})$  by

$$R_s(X_s) := -X_s + \mathcal{L}_{s,+}, \quad X_s \in \mathcal{L}_s.$$

By monotonicity,  $(\rho, R)$  is multiportfolio time consistent. Therefore, by the above lemma,  $\rho$  is multiportfolio time consistent if and only if the associated risk measure for vectors  $\bar{R}$  is multiportfolio time consistent.

We wish to conclude this discussion by remarking that, in this discrete time setting, it is sufficient to consider multiportfolio time consistency defined for single time steps only through

a sequential application of the recursive definition (i.e., setting  $s = t + 1$ ). This is discussed in, e.g., [13] as well.

## 5 Conclusion

In this work we demonstrated the equivalence between set-valued risk measures for processes with those for random vectors on the optional filtration. Such considerations allow for the application of results from one stream of literature for the other. In particular, we highlight that the set-valued risk measures for vectors is a more mature field with more results on dual representations and equivalent forms for multiportfolio time consistency. Herein, we used this equivalence to prove a new dual representation for risk measures for processes. We also wish to highlight that the equivalence of these risk measures allows for the generalization of, e.g., the cocycle condition on the sum of minimal penalty functions or the supermartingale relation for multiportfolio time consistency for risk measures for vectors to risk measures for processes. We caution the reader that such extensions, while following the results of this work, will require the use of a series of conditional risk measures for vectors on the original filtration in addition to the risk measure for processes which is *not* necessary if considering scalar risk measures as presented in [1].

## References

- [1] Beatrice Acciaio, Hans Föllmer, and Irina Penner. Risk assessment for uncertain cash flows: Model ambiguity, discounting ambiguity, and the role of bubbles. *Finance and Stochastics*, 16(4):669–709, 2012.
- [2] Çağın Ararat and Birgit Rudloff. Dual representations for systemic risk measures. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 14(1):139–174, 2020.
- [3] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, and David Heath. Thinking coherently. *Risk*, 10:68–71, 1997.
- [4] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, and David Heath. Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance*, 9(3):203–228, 1999.
- [5] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, David Heath, and Hyejin Ku. Coherent multiperiod risk measurement. 2002. Working paper.

- [6] Philippe Artzner, Freddy Delbaen, Jean-Marc Eber, David Heath, and Hyejin Ku. Coherent multiperiod risk adjusted values and Bellman’s principle. *Annals OR*, 152(1):5–22, 2007.
- [7] Yanhong Chen and Yijun Hu. Time consistency for set-valued dynamic risk measure for bounded discrete-time processes. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 12(3):305–333, 2018.
- [8] Yanhong Chen and Yijun Hu. Set-valued dynamic risk measures for bounded discrete-time processes. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 23(3):2050017, 2020.
- [9] Patrick Cheridito, Freddy Delbaen, and Michael Kupper. Coherent and convex risk measures for bounded càdlàg processes. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 112(1):1–22, 2004.
- [10] Patrick Cheridito, Freddy Delbaen, and Michael Kupper. Coherent and convex risk measures for unbounded càdlàg processes. *Finance and Stochastics*, 9(3):349–367, 2005.
- [11] Patrick Cheridito, Freddy Delbaen, and Michael Kupper. Dynamic monetary risk measures for bounded discrete-time processes. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 11(3):57–106, 2006.
- [12] Zachary Feinstein and Birgit Rudloff. Time consistency of dynamic risk measures in markets with transaction costs. *Quantitative Finance*, 13(9):1473–1489, 2013.
- [13] Zachary Feinstein and Birgit Rudloff. Multi-portfolio time consistency for set-valued convex and coherent risk measures. *Finance and Stochastics*, 19(1):67–107, 2015.
- [14] Zachary Feinstein and Birgit Rudloff. A supermartingale relation for multivariate risk measures. *Quantitative Finance*, 18(12):1971–1990, 2018.
- [15] Zachary Feinstein and Birgit Rudloff. Time consistency for scalar multivariate risk measures. *Preprint*, 2021.
- [16] Zachary Feinstein, Birgit Rudloff, and Stefan Weber. Measures of systemic risk. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 8(1):672–708, 2017.
- [17] Hans Föllmer and Alexander Schied. Convex measures of risk and trading constraints. *Finance and Stochastics*, 6(4):429–447, 2002.
- [18] Marco Frittelli and Emanuela Rosazza Gianin. Putting order in risk measures. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 26(7):1473–1486, 2002.
- [19] Marco Frittelli and Giacomo Scandolo. Risk measures and capital requirements for processes. *Mathematical Finance*, 16(4):589–612, 2006.
- [20] Andreas H. Hamel. A duality theory for set-valued functions I: Fenchel conjugation theory. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, 17(2):153–182, 2009.

- [21] Andreas H. Hamel, Frank Heyde, Andreas Löhne, Birgit Rudloff, and Carola Schrage. Set optimization - a rather short introduction. In A. Hamel, F. Heyde, A. Löhne, B. Rudloff, and C. Schrage, editors, *Set Optimization and Applications in Finance*, PROMS series. Springer, 2015.
- [22] Andreas H. Hamel, Frank Heyde, and Birgit Rudloff. Set-valued risk measures for conical market models. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 5(1):1–28, 2011.
- [23] Elyes Jouini, Moncef Meddeb, and Nizar Touzi. Vector-valued coherent risk measures. *Finance and Stochastics*, 8(4):531–552, 2004.
- [24] Frank Riedel. Dynamic coherent risk measures. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 112(2):185–200, 2004.