

# Information Geometry of Risks and Returns

Andrei N. Soklakov\*

We often think of hedging and investments as having different, even competing goals. In reality optimal hedging and optimal investments are intimately connected. One person's optimal investment is another's optimal hedge. This follows from a geometric structure formed by probabilistic representations of market views and risk scenarios. Understanding this geometric structure is fundamental to risk recycling (and to product design in general).

## 1 Introduction

Simple sensitivities (such as delta or vega) play a central role in practical risk management. On the trading floor such sensitivities literally became synonymous with risks.

On a more fundamental level, people worry about scenarios. Risk measures are secondary concepts which attempt to quantify the relevant exposures.

Thinking in terms of scenarios provides common ground to both hedging and investment. Indeed, depending on one's circumstances, the very same scenario might be perceived (and dealt with) as a risk or as an investment opportunity.

The language of scenarios is natural in the framework of *information derivatives* which considers information as the prime underlying of optimal product design [1]. There, any relevant information is captured by probability distributions and one can imagine using the same language to describe risky scenarios. The present work can be seen as an extension of information derivatives to the case of hedging instruments (in addition to the previously considered investment products).

After a short introduction into information derivatives, we show how to interpret all standard first order sensitivities as investment spreads (between investor-expected and market-implied rates of return). This result is interesting in its own right as it lends sharp intuition about returns [2] to the understanding of risks.

The same result teaches us how to compute risk with respect to a product. The ability to compute exposure to a product is key for offering new products on the back of existing inventories.

---

\*Andrei.Soklakov@gmail.com

*The views expressed herein should not be considered as investment advice or promotion. They represent personal research of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of his employers, or their associates or affiliates.*

The consensus market view, the risk scenarios and the view implied by our existing portfolio form a geometric structure. We describe this structure showing how its shape relates to numerical risk measures. This informs the design of hedging products and illuminates a certain duality between hedging and investments. We show, for instance, that an optimal hedge can be implemented by offering an optimal investment to a suitably chosen client.

As a bonus we obtain a geometric theory of rational behaviour. In this theory risk averse actors are trying to be as close as possible to the market. The actors are constrained by their views, but can use different measures to quantify their divergence from the market. The net behaviour is equivalent to maximizing expected utility with individual utility functions.

## 2 Information derivatives

### 2.1 Multiple rationality

Human behaviour is very complex and, as far as we know, does not fit the Procrustean bed of a single-goal optimization. This fact led many researchers to believe in the irrational nature of human behaviour. However, upon closer inspection, many apparently irrational behaviours do appear to have reasons. It is perhaps more accurate to think of humans as *multi-rational* rather than simply irrational.

Indeed, our brains are constantly performing multiple optimizations just to keep us alive. Neurologists routinely speak about physically distinct brain areas responsible for many specialized aspects of hearing, speech, vision, etc. It is important to appreciate multiple rationality as a general neurological phenomenon which goes far beyond our species. Even a humble little ant with its tiny brain simultaneously computes different navigation strategies while searching for the best way home [3].

Neurologically, it is not at all surprising that many strategies stem from well-defined goals of their own. Economically, the apparent rationality of individual strategies explains why we have a great variety of products (financial or otherwise). Different products correspond to different strategies. Products acquire meaning with respect to the specific goals they are designed to serve.

### 2.2 Science of product design

Mathematically, *financial products* are defined by their payoff functions which state how benefits (normally cashflows) depend on the underlying variables.

Without loss of generality we can assume that all individual payoff functions are non-negative, i.e. that individual financial products are *assets*. Indeed, one can always take apart any venture into assets and liabilities and consider the liabilities as a result of shorting assets.

Furthermore, variable amounts of capital can be invested in the same product without changing its nature. The payoff function is therefore defined up to an arbitrary multiplier (commonly called a notional).

One can attempt to build financial products as solutions to a great variety of possible optimizations. However, only a small fraction of theoretical constructions are relevant in the real world. This fact constitutes the main technical challenge of all science. While it is tempting to treat product design as a mathematical problem, the underlying challenge is more scientific than that. Indeed, financial products do not necessarily need new theorems, but they do need to survive in the real world.

A scientific theory of product design should seek consistency with observed facts on all scales from neurology to economics. An example of that is the framework of *information derivatives*. Mathematically, it is built around the basic laws of information processing and rational optimizations. Scientifically, the framework is testing itself against the available neurological and economic data [1].

The simplest example of an information derivative is the *likelihood product* which naturally arises in the context of Bayesian learning [4]. More formally, let  $m(x)$  be the *market-implied* distribution for some underlying variable  $x$  and let  $b(x)$  denote the *investor-believed* distribution for the same variable. One can think of  $m(x)$  as the *prior information* about  $x$  that is already priced by the market and interpret  $b(x)$  as the *posterior information* which describes the investor's final belief (post research). The payoff function  $f(x)$  which defines the *likelihood product* coincides with the likelihood function which connects the prior and the posterior distributions according to Bayes' law

$$b(x) = f(x) m(x). \quad (1)$$

It turns out that the concept of a likelihood product (or a *likelihood investor*<sup>1</sup>) is very useful for understanding a large class of investment strategies. This observation is captured by the *investor equivalence principle* [5]. The principle contains a trivial mathematical statement and a deeper scientific part.

Mathematically, the principle takes any product (bought by any investor) and imagines an (economically equivalent) likelihood investor who happens to buy the exact same product. This can always be done. Indeed, consider an arbitrary product  $F(x)$ , and set

$$\beta_F(x) = F(x) m(x). \quad (2)$$

Since the payoff  $F(x)$  is defined up to a notional multiplier (as is the likelihood function), one can make sure that  $\beta_F(x)$  is a probability distribution and interpret  $F(x)$  as the likelihood function.

The investor equivalence principle encourages us to think in terms of likelihood investors. Therein lies its scientific (as opposed to pure mathematical) content. Somehow this helps us to focus on those financial strategies which survive in the real world.

As a possible demystifying illustration, note that (in most practical circumstances) likelihood products maximize expected returns [4].<sup>2</sup> Return maximization exemplifies a property which engages intuition (at a deep neurological level) [2]. This plays a role throughout the lifecycle of a real-world strategy: from inception to understanding of already live strategies and all the way to terminal decisions.

---

<sup>1</sup>We use the terms *investor* or *hedger* as synonyms of the relevant *strategy* or *product*.

<sup>2</sup>This interpretation breaks down for large transactions with significant impact on the market.

Ultimately, the usefulness of any scientific principle can only be proven by the results it helps to produce. All results of this paper are obtained by following the investor equivalence principle. As a practical point, before proceeding, we want the reader to be comfortable using Eq. (2) to map payoff functions into equivalent distributions and vice versa ( $F \leftrightarrow \beta_F$ ).

The likelihood product is a convenient stepping stone from which we can reach a large class of rational strategies. Using the likelihood function  $f$  as a benchmark, the equation for a more general rational product  $F$  reads

$$\frac{d \ln F}{d \ln f} = \frac{1}{R}, \quad (3)$$

where  $R$  is the investor's relative risk aversion [5]. Mathematically, the payoff elasticity equation (3) is just the necessary (Euler-Lagrange) condition which  $F$  must satisfy to maximize the investor-expected utility  $\int b(x)U(F(x)) dx$ . In this notation  $R = -FU''_{FF}/U'_F$  (the Arrow-Pratt relative risk aversion).

It is important to remember that Eq. (3) describes just a single rational strategy and not the overall behaviour of an entire human person (let alone an economy). We imagine every human brain is populated by many such strategies. The individual strategies can have contradicting goals and compete for limited resources (even within a single brain). Some strategies manage to spread between people. In extreme cases, popular strategies can even organize people, compelling them to create specialized infrastructure such as equity exchanges.

A scientific theory is only ever as good as its connection to reality. The payoff elasticity equation (3) has been tested against the established economic and neurological data (see Sections 4.2 and 4.3 in Ref. [2] including the supplementary paper [6]). This however is only the beginning. As we learn more about neurological implementations of risk aversion one can imagine refining Eq. (3) with more nuanced practical examples.

### 3 Risks as returns

Consider a portfolio of derivative assets with a common underlying variable  $x$  and the combined payoff function  $\Pi(x) \geq 0$ . The price of the portfolio can be written as

$$\text{Price}[\Pi] = \int \Pi(x) m_\sigma(x) dx, \quad (4)$$

where  $m_\sigma(x)$  is the market-implied distribution for  $x$  and where  $\sigma$  is some parameter. The sensitivity of the price with respect to the parameter is

$$\partial_\sigma \text{Price}[\Pi] = \int \Pi(x) \frac{\partial m_\sigma(x)}{\partial \sigma} dx. \quad (5)$$

From the point of view of an investor a small variation  $\delta$  of the parameter  $\sigma$  produces a possible investor-believed distribution

$$b(x) = m_{\sigma+\delta}(x), \quad (6)$$

and the corresponding likelihood product (1)

$$f(x) = \frac{m_{\sigma+\delta}(x)}{m_{\sigma}(x)}. \quad (7)$$

In the simplest case of constant  $R$ , equation (3) gives us the optimal investment product (unit price)

$$F_R^\delta = \frac{f^{1/R}}{\text{Price}[f^{1/R}]} = \frac{(m_{\sigma+\delta}/m_{\sigma})^{1/R}}{\text{Price}[(m_{\sigma+\delta}/m_{\sigma})^{1/R}]}. \quad (8)$$

In the risk-neutral limit ( $\delta, R \rightarrow 0$ ) this becomes the exponential score product

$$F_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} F_\epsilon^\epsilon = \frac{e^{\text{Score}}}{\text{Price}[e^{\text{Score}}]}, \quad \text{Score}(x) = \frac{\partial \ln m_{\sigma}(x)}{\partial \sigma}. \quad (9)$$

Equation (2) applied to the portfolio  $\Pi$  defines

$$\beta_{\Pi}(x) = \frac{\Pi(x)}{\text{Price}[\Pi]} m_{\sigma}(x). \quad (10)$$

The sensitivity per unit price (lets call it *specific sensitivity*) becomes (via Eq. (5))

$$\frac{\partial_{\sigma} \text{Price}[\Pi]}{\text{Price}[\Pi]} = \int \beta_{\Pi}(x) \text{Score}(x) dx, \quad (11)$$

and we can show (see Appendix A.1)

$$\frac{\partial_{\sigma} \text{Price}[\Pi]}{\text{Price}[\Pi]} = E_{\beta_{\Pi}}[\ln F_0] - E_{m_{\sigma}}[\ln F_0]. \quad (12)$$

This equation understands the usual price sensitivity as a spread in expected returns. One of the expectations,  $E_{\beta_{\Pi}}$ , is what a likelihood (growth-optimizing) investor into  $\Pi$  would compute. The other,  $E_{m_{\sigma}}$ , is just the market-implied expectation. The product  $F_0$  is independent from the portfolio  $\Pi$ . The role of  $F_0$  is to capture the market scenario the sensitivity to which we perceive as risk.

The ability of investment products to capture market scenarios suggests the following general definition of risk. The *specific risk* (i.e. risk per unit price) of  $\Pi$  with respect to product  $S$  is defined as the spread in expected returns (growth-optimizing vs market<sup>3</sup>)

$$\frac{\text{Risk}_S[\Pi]}{\text{Price}[\Pi]} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E_{\beta_{\Pi}}[\ln S] - E_m[\ln S]. \quad (13)$$

In the special case of the exponential score product (9), i.e. when  $S = F_0$ , this general definition reduces to the ordinary sensitivities (12). Note also that the general definition need not mention any explicit parameters (such as  $\sigma$  used above). Indeed, the scenario underlying the risk is captured in its entirety by the structure of the product  $S$ .

The above understanding of risks in terms of returns is already quite promising. The human brain is indeed very sensitive to financial returns. This can be seen by examining ordinary marketing materials for retail customers which often specify mortgage or savings rates within a small fraction of a percent over an annual horizon. The ability to feel risks within that kind of accuracy is interesting in its own right. For a more detailed discussion on harnessing returns-based intuition and some relevant neurological facts see Ref. [2].

<sup>3</sup>Here it might be interesting to note that the market expected return  $E_m[\ln S] \leq 0$ .

## 4 Information geometry of risk

Accurate intuition is key to practical decision making. Mapping abstract sensitivities into financial returns (see above) is one possibility to enhance intuition. Using basic geometry is another.

Indeed, large areas of the human brain deal with geometrical concepts. Such areas are very well connected and we routinely engage them as an aid for all sorts of cognitive computations. This is what happens when we think of our friends as “close” or speak about “distant” relatives. The value of the intuition which is gained in this way is difficult to overestimate.

With a bit of calculus Eq. (13) can be rearranged as follows

$$\frac{\text{Risk}_S[\Pi]}{\text{Price}[\Pi]} = D(\beta_\Pi || m) + D(m || \beta_S) - D(\beta_\Pi || \beta_S), \quad (14)$$

where  $\beta_S = Sm$  and  $D(p || q)$  is the Kullback–Leibler divergence (relative entropy)

$$D(p || q) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int p(x) \ln \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} dx. \quad (15)$$

Equation (14) describes risk as a property of the triangle formed by three distributions:  $\beta_\Pi$ ,  $m$  and  $\beta_S$  (which define respectively: the view expressed by our portfolio, the market-implied distribution and the risk scenario).

The quantity on the right-hand side of Eq. (14) is closely connected to the Pythagorean theorem. This connection is in fact a cornerstone within the field of *information geometry* which studies families of probability distributions [7, 8].

The individual divergences on the rhs of Eq. (14) play a role akin to squared distances. This is most easily seen in the limit of a very small triangle (when  $\beta_\Pi$ ,  $m$  and  $\beta_S$  differ from each other by infinitesimal variations of parameters). For large triangles the asymmetry of divergences becomes significant. In general, one has to introduce two kinds of geodesics forming an angle at point  $m$  (see Fig. 1). For a detailed review on the geometry of such triangles see Ref. [9].


When the angle at  $m$  is a right angle the sum of the divergences  $D(\beta_\Pi || m) + D(m || \beta_S)$  exactly compensate the divergence on the hypotenuse  $D(\beta_\Pi || \beta_S)$ . By Eq. (14) this is the case of zero risk (Fig. 1.B).

Positive risk implies that the angle at  $m$  is acute (Fig. 1.C). This is a mathematically precise way of saying that our portfolio and the risk scenario are on the “same side” relative to the market. Negative risk implies an obtuse angle indicating the portfolio and the scenario are on “opposite sides” relative to the market (Fig. 1.A).

Let us take a closer look at the geodesics which form the above discussed (risk-discriminant) angle at  $m$ . To this end let us consider the following couple of one-parameter families

$$p_{\text{mix}}(x, t) = (1 - t)m(x) + t\beta_\Pi(x), \quad (16)$$

$$p_{\text{exp}}(x, t) = \exp\left((1 - t) \ln m(x) + t \ln \beta_S(x) - \psi(t)\right), \quad (17)$$



where the mixture family  $p_{\text{mix}}(x, t)$  interpolates between  $m$  and  $\beta_{\Pi}$  while the exponential family  $p_{\text{exp}}(x, t)$  connects  $m$  with  $\beta_S$ . In both cases  $t \in [0, 1]$  is a free parameter, and  $\psi(t)$  ensures the normalization of  $p_{\text{exp}}(x, t)$ .

The term *geodesic* in information geometry denotes an affine generalization of a straight line. One can see how the above families form straight lines by introducing dual coordinate systems and computing two kinds of tangent vectors [7, 8]:

$$\langle m, \beta_{\Pi} | \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{d}{dt} (p_{\text{mix}}) = \beta_{\Pi} - m, \quad (18)$$

$$|m, \beta_S \rangle \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{d}{dt} (\ln p_{\text{exp}} + \psi) = \ln \beta_S - \ln m. \quad (19)$$

These tangent vectors are  $t$ -independent (i.e. constant along the lines). We see that the mixture family  $p_{\text{mix}}(x, t)$  becomes a straight line in the coordinates which represent a distribution as a vector of probabilities. The dual coordinates, in which the exponential family  $p_{\text{exp}}(x, t)$  traces out a straight line, are logarithmic in probabilities. These are examples of dual geodesics in information geometry.

The mixture geodesics ( $m$ -geodesics for short) and the exponential geodesics ( $e$ -geodesics) illustrated above have clear financial interpretations. Moving along  $p_{\text{mix}}(x, t)$  from the starting point  $\beta_{\Pi}$  in the direction of the market  $m$  is equivalent to converting a  $(1 - t)$ -portion of the portfolio into risk-free cash (at market prices with no transaction costs). Moving along  $p_{\text{exp}}(x, t)$  from  $\beta_S$  to  $m$  attenuates the risk scenario in the same way as a scaled-up risk aversion attenuates an investor's view (see Appendix A.2 for details).


The scalar product between tangent vectors leads naturally to the notion of an angle between geodesics [9]. In the above case of dual geodesics we have

$$\langle m, \beta_{\Pi} | m, \beta_S \rangle = \int (\beta_{\Pi}(x) - m(x)) (\ln \beta_S(x) - \ln m(x)) dx. \quad (20)$$

Comparison with Eq. (13) shows that this scalar product is exactly the specific risk

$$\langle m, \beta_{\Pi} | m, \beta_S \rangle = \frac{\text{Risk}_S[\Pi]}{\text{Price}[\Pi]}. \quad (21)$$

2 Iso-risk foliation



The iso-risk surfaces are **m-flats** orthogonal to the risk geodesic (the **e-geodesic** connecting the market  $m$  with the risk scenario  $\beta_S$ ). Adding a positive amount of  $S$  to the portfolio  $\Pi$  moves the resulting portfolio along the **m-geodesic** towards  $\beta_S$  (adding positive exposure to  $S$ ). The arrow illustrates a **c-projection**  $\beta_{\Pi} \rightarrow \beta_{\Pi'}$ , and  $\bar{S}$  is the reciprocal of  $S$  (discussed in the main text).

The geometric intuition embedded in this equation allows us to see the structure formed by the surfaces of constant risk. Imagine varying  $\beta_{\Pi}$  while keeping the scalar product (21) constant. One can correctly guess that the iso-risk surfaces are intersecting the e-geodesic  $[m, \beta_S]$  at right angles as shown in Fig. 2 (see Appendix A.4 for details).

## 5 Hedging with information derivatives

The above geometric intuition tells us how to approach hedging. A portfolio  $\Pi$  of assets with  $Risk_S[\Pi] \neq 0$  corresponds to the growth-optimal view  $\beta_{\Pi}$  which lies outside the zero risk surface (see e.g. Fig. 2). The purpose of hedging is to eliminate risk, i.e. to move from  $\beta_{\Pi}$  to a new location on the zero risk surface. This can be done in a variety of ways.

Let us take a portfolio  $\Pi$  of assets with  $Risk_S[\Pi] < 0$ . Adding to the portfolio some positive amount of  $S$  would move us along the m-geodesic from  $\beta_{\Pi}$  in the direction of  $\beta_S$  (see Fig. 2). This geodesic intersects the zero risk surface showing that we can use  $S$  as a hedge.

In the above example, the choice of  $S$  as a hedge is natural but not at all unique. We could pick a different point  $\beta_t$  on the (extrapolated) e-geodesic  $\beta_t = p_{\text{exp}}(x, t)$ . The exposure of the resulting hedge to  $S$  is monotonic along the e-geodesic. Indeed, with a slight abuse of notation (see Appendix A.3)

$$Risk_S[\beta_t] = \int_0^t \text{Var}_{\beta_{\tau}}[\ln S] d\tau, \quad (22)$$

where  $\text{Var}_{\beta_{\tau}}[\ln S]$  is the variance of the log-return on  $S$  (according to  $\beta_{\tau}$ ).



Analytical simplicity of the e-geodesic (17) together with the monotonicity of risk (22) make looking for a hedge with a desired amount of risk an easy linear search along the geodesic. The positive values of  $t$  provide a line of products that can be bought as a hedge for negative risk (as per the above example) while the negative values of  $t$  perform the exact same job for hedging positive exposure to  $S$ .

We would like to do more however. We want to optimize hedging in a variety of situations. We may also want to sell our risks (as opposed to quell them by buying insurance assets). The following notes touch upon such applications.

## 5.1 Hedging as optimal transfer

Among all possible moves  $\beta_{\Pi} \rightarrow \beta_{\Pi'}$  to the zero risk surface the ones with the lowest cost are of prime interest. Let us call such moves *c-projections* of  $\beta_{\Pi}$  onto the zero risk manifold (Fig. 2). The problem of moving a distribution in the presence of costs inspired the entire field of *optimal transport*. Let us understand what exactly needs transporting in our case and at what cost.

Take a unit worth of the portfolio ( $\text{Price}[\Pi] = 1$ ). From Eq. (10) we can interpret  $\beta_{\Pi}(x)$  as a distribution of funds across the outcomes  $\{x\}$ . The move  $\beta_{\Pi} \rightarrow \beta_{\Pi'}$  transports the funds between the outcomes. In ideal settings one can think of these outcomes as the Arrow-Debreu securities.

In terms of costs, fund transfers are very different from classical transport. Money can be moved freely across great distances and all the costs are suffered on transactions. Selling one security and buying another attracts instantaneous local costs (independent of how far apart the two securities appear to be). The total cost of hedging a unit worth of the portfolio ( $\text{Price}[\Pi'] = \text{Price}[\Pi] = 1$ ) can be modelled as a sum of the relevant local contributions

$$\text{Cost}(\beta_{\Pi} \rightarrow \beta_{\Pi'}) = \int C(x, \beta_{\Pi'}(x) - \beta_{\Pi}(x)) dx. \quad (23)$$

The first argument of the integrand reflects the costs' local properties (e.g. the dependence on liquidity of the tradable events  $\{x\}$ ). The second argument captures the dependence of costs on the amount of trading. The costs start at zero  $C(x, 0) = 0$  when no trading is necessary and increase  $C(x, y) > 0$  for both buying  $y > 0$  and selling  $y < 0$ . We assume that higher trading volumes attract increasingly higher costs, i.e. that  $C(x, y)$  is smooth and convex with respect to its second argument.

Solving for the c-projection (see Appendix A.5.1) gives us the general structure of the hedge

$$\Pi'(x) - \Pi(x) = M_x(S(x)), \quad (24)$$

where  $M_x()$  is a monotonic map. In summary, a cost-optimal hedge for the risk with respect to product  $S$  is similar to  $S$  up to a local monotonic map.

## 5.2 Pure hedging products

Hedging products are constrained by the combination of risks they are required to have. Any product with non-zero risk necessarily expresses some view on the market. We call a

hedging product *pure* if it expresses as little a view as possible – just enough to implement the required combination of risks.

For example, consider \$1 worth of a hedging product  $H(x)$  with risk

$$\text{Risk}_S[H] = r. \quad (25)$$

Using this as a constraint we want the view

$$\beta_H(x) = H(x) m(x) \quad (26)$$

to be as close as possible to the market-implied  $m$ . In the above geometric picture, the obvious solution is to locate  $\beta_H$  (and with it the required hedge  $H$ ) somewhere on the e-geodesic  $|m, \beta_S\rangle$ . As discussed above this is achieved by setting  $\beta_H = \beta_t$  and finding the value of  $t^*$  such that  $\text{Risk}_S[\beta_{t^*}] = r$ . Found in this way  $\beta_H$  is called the e-projection  $\beta_{t^*}$  of  $m$  onto the iso-risk manifold (25).

Iso-risk manifolds are m-flat, i.e. they can be imagined as sheets spanned by m-geodesics. More precisely, any m-geodesic connecting two points of an iso-risk manifold lies entirely within the manifold. This is a geometric manifestation of the fact that a portfolio of products with the same specific risk has the same specific risk as the constituent products.

The number of constraints of the form (25) does not change this geometric picture. Any collection of such constraints defines an m-flat (an intersection of m-flats is m-flat). This is interesting because the e-projection onto any m-flat is always unique and can be found numerically in a variety of ways including the purely geometric algorithm by Csiszár [10].

Returning for simplicity to the single risk case, the reader can check that finding the pure hedge  $H$  via the e-projection  $\beta_{t^*}$  of  $m$  onto the iso-risk manifold (25) is equivalent to the minimization

$$\beta_H = \arg \min_{\beta} D(\beta || m), \quad \text{Risk}_S[\beta] = r. \quad (27)$$

This appears to be quite specific, so let us see what happens if we replace the relative entropy in (27) with a more general notion of the  $\phi$ -divergence [11, 12, 13]

$$D_{\phi}(\beta || m) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int m(x) \phi\left(\frac{\beta(x)}{m(x)}\right) dx, \quad (28)$$

where  $\phi$  is a strictly convex function such that  $\phi(1) = 0$ . The risk constraint (25) ensures that the optimal  $\beta_H$  is still on the relevant iso-risk flat, but it may be displaced from the point  $\beta_{t^*}$  where the e-geodesic  $|m, \beta_S\rangle$  intersects the flat.

Upgrading  $D$  with  $D_{\phi}$  in (27) gives us the general structure of the optimal pure hedge (see Appendix A.5.3)

$$H(x) = M_{\phi}(S(x)), \quad (29)$$

where  $M_{\phi}$  is a monotonic map (increasing when  $\text{Risk}_S[H] > 0$  is required and decreasing for  $\text{Risk}_S[H] < 0$ ). Once again (i.e. in broad agreement with the optimal transfer (24)) we see the optimal hedging product as a monotonic image of the risk scenario product  $S$ .

### 5.3 Hedge-investment duality and risk recycling

It turns out that hedging and investment products are intimately related. An optimal hedge can be viewed as an optimal investment and vice versa. In this section we clarify this observation. As a bonus, we gain geometric characterization of rational investments. Consider a rational investor with the utility function  $U$  and the believed distribution  $b$ . Let  $F$  be the optimal product for such an investor, i.e.

$$F = \arg \max_{\mathcal{F}} \int b(x)U(\mathcal{F}(x)) dx, \quad \text{Price}[\mathcal{F}] = 1. \quad (30)$$

Let us now compare  $F$  with the pure hedge product (29) defined, as discussed above, by the optimization

$$H = \left( \arg \min_{\beta} D_{\phi}(\beta || m) \right) / m, \quad \text{Risk}_S[\beta] = r. \quad (31)$$

To line up (31) with (30) we recall the definition of the likelihood product (1) and set

$$\phi(x) = -U(x) + U(1); \quad S \propto \exp(-1/f), \quad r = \text{Risk}_S[F]. \quad (32)$$

Under these settings the pure hedging product (31) coincides with the given rational investment (30), i.e.  $H = F$  (see Appendix A.5.4).

This observation provides geometric characterization of rational investments. The phenomenon of risk aversion (which is normally captured by  $U$ ) is described geometrically as minimising the divergence  $D_{\phi}(\beta || m)$  which pushes the traded view  $\beta$  towards the market  $m$ . The investor's real view acts as a constraint. The net behaviour agrees with the expected utility maximization (30).

Above we took a given optimized investment and showed how it can be viewed as a hedge. Let us now explore the opposite direction, i.e. let us start from a hedging problem and see if it can be solved by trading investment products. In doing so we touch upon the very important practical topic of risk recycling.

Imagine being long an asset with some payoff function  $A(x)$ . We compute the exposure  $\text{Risk}_S[A]$  of the asset with respect to a certain product  $S$ , and want to learn how to eliminate this exposure through the selling of investment products. We choose  $D_{\phi}$  and design a pure hedge  $H$  with the same exposure  $\text{Risk}_S[H] = \text{Risk}_S[A]$ . Selling  $H$  would obviously eliminate the unwanted risk, we just need to identify appropriate investors.

Although no amount of mathematics can guarantee the physical presence of such investors on the actual market, we can check the theoretical possibility. To do that we would need to find a possible view  $b$  together with the risk aversion profile  $R$  which happen to lead to  $H$  as an optimal investment product (via the structuring equations (1) and (3)).

In the case of positive exposure,  $\text{Risk}_S[A] > 0$ , we look for players wanting to invest into the risk scenario  $b = \beta_S = S m$ . In the notation of Eq. (1) this is equivalent to setting the likelihood product  $f = S$ . The risk aversion profile is easy to check by computing the payoff elasticity

$$\frac{d \ln H}{d \ln f} = \frac{\mu}{H\phi''(H)}, \quad (33)$$

where  $\mu$  is a positive constant (see Appendix A.5.4). Comparison with Eq. (3) implies positive risk aversion  $R = H\phi''(H)/\mu > 0$ . This shows that  $H$ , which was originally designed as a pure hedging product, may be bought by rational investors (the ones whose risk profile  $R = H\phi''(H)/\mu$ ).

In the case of negative exposure,  $\text{Risk}_S[A] < 0$ , we look for investors with a view that is “opposite” to the scenario  $\beta_S$ . To this end we introduce a reciprocal of  $S$

$$\bar{S} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1/S}{\text{Price}[1/S]}. \quad (34)$$

Directly from the definition (13) we see that  $\text{Risk}_{\bar{S}}[A] = -\text{Risk}_S[A]$  for any  $A$ . Setting  $b = \beta_{\bar{S}} = \bar{S}m$  (i.e. setting  $f = \bar{S}$ ) and repeating the above arguments we see that even in the case of negative exposure one can theoretically find rational investors which would be interested in buying  $H$  from us.

In summary, it is always possible to package an unwanted risk from our inventory in a rational investment product. The marketing materials for such products could contain the implied investors views and risk aversion profiles thus achieving maximal transparency. Whether such investors would be found depends, of course, on the market.

## 5.4 Partially hedged investment products

Trading logistics is an important factor which can influence product design. A good example is the so-called swap format where the counterparties enter a contract which is balanced to require no capital exchange at inception. Originally inspired by the basic delta-one products such as swaps and futures this format gained considerable popularity even among exotics. A very considerable portion of autocallables, for example, is currently traded in the swap format.

In this section we point to the possibility of crafting products with zero initial delta. More generally, a number of first-order risks can be set to desired initial values. Similar to the swap format this can ease trading logistics at inception.

Mathematically, such a possibility hinges on the fact that the generalized notion of risk (13) leads to liner constraints which are easy to incorporate. For example, let us add a risk constraint to the optimization (30), so that

$$F = \arg \max_{\mathcal{F}} \int b(x)U(\mathcal{F}(x)) dx, \quad \text{Price}[\mathcal{F}] = 1, \quad \text{Risk}_S[\mathcal{F}] = r. \quad (35)$$

For the solution of the above optimization we immediately derive (see Appendix A.5.5)

$$\frac{d \ln F}{d \ln f} = \frac{1}{R^*}, \quad R^* = R \cdot \left(1 - \frac{d \ln(1 + \alpha_r \ln S)}{d \ln f}\right)^{-1}, \quad (36)$$

where  $R$  is the familiar Arrow-Pratt relative risk aversion and  $\alpha_r$  is chosen to satisfy the risk constraint in (35). In other words, whenever the risk-constrained optimization (35) is feasible, the solution satisfies the payoff elasticity equation with a modified risk aversion profile (36).

## 6 Summary and outlook

The idea of multiple rationality (grounded in neurology) explains why we have many different products (each with its own rationale). This observation allows us to use rational optimizations at the level of individual products (information derivatives).

Thinking about financial products we discovered an underlying geometric structure which supports both hedging and investments. At the top (conceptual) level, this gives us a geometric description of rational behaviour (a geometric analogue of the expected utility theory). Concepts such as risk aversion and hedging become clarified in the new light. Risk aversion pushes traded views towards the market-implied. Hedging is similar yet with a clear difference – it pushes towards a zero-risk surface (which contains the market view as a point).

At the more detailed level, we understood how to interpret sensitivities as investment spreads, learned how to capture risks using geometric configurations, investigated the general structure of optimal hedging products (both pure hedging and partially hedged products), showed how to quell risks by purchasing insurance assets and how to recycle risks by packaging them into rational investments for sale to suitable clients.

Each of the above results can lead to important developments. Even just the translation of risks into geometric structures may already open interesting perspectives. Indeed, think of the already existing technologies behind automatic image recognition or self-driving cars. Casting risks in geometric terms opens the possibility of using established AI techniques to recognize risk configurations and analyse their evolution in time.

Purely mathematical developments are also easy to foresee. It would be natural, for instance, to explore an even more general definition of specific risk by taking Eq. (14) and replacing  $D$  with a more general Bregman divergence [14].

While we want to encourage a wide range of explorations, it would be prudent to draw attention to an important scientific issue. Several times in the paper we encountered the measure of risk aversion. We treated it as a mathematical quantity requiring only that it should be positive (to exclude gambling behaviours). In reality, of course, there must be additional (much more subtle) limits on the types of risk aversion that can be found in nature. Deeper integration with neurological and economic data is required.

# Appendix

## A.1 Specific risk as a spread in expected returns

From Eq. (9) we derive

$$\text{Score} = \ln F_0 + \ln \text{Price}[e^{\text{Score}}]. \quad (37)$$

Since the  $m_\sigma$ -expectation of Score is zero we proceed

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Score} &= \ln F_0 + \ln \text{Price}[e^{\text{Score}}] - E_{m_\sigma}[\text{Score}] \\ &= \ln F_0 + \ln \text{Price}[e^{\text{Score}}] - E_{m_\sigma}[\ln e^{\text{Score}}] \\ &= \ln F_0 - E_{m_\sigma}[\ln e^{\text{Score}} - \ln \text{Price}[e^{\text{Score}}]] \\ &= \ln F_0 - E_{m_\sigma}[\ln F_0]. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Substituting this into Eq. (11) we obtain Eq (12).

## A.2 Financial meaning of geodesics

### A.2.1 M-geodesics

Imagine derisking the portfolio  $\Pi$  by converting  $(1-t)$ -fraction of it into cash. Assuming this can be done with negligible loss we compute the payoff function of the resulting new portfolio

$$\Pi_t(x) = (1-t)\text{Price}[\Pi] + t\Pi(x). \quad (39)$$

Examining the corresponding growth-optimal view we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\Pi_t}(x) &= \frac{\Pi_t(x)}{\text{Price}[\Pi_t]} m(x) \\ &= (1-t)m(x) + t\beta_\Pi(x) \\ &= p_{\text{mix}}(x, t). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

In other words, moving along the m-geodesic  $p_{\text{mix}}(x, t)$  from  $\beta_\Pi$  to  $m$  describes proportional liquidation of the portfolio.

### A.2.2 E-geodesics

From the definition (17), the e-geodesic  $p_{\text{exp}}(x, t)$  can be written as the family of different geometric averages between  $m$  and  $\beta_S$

$$p_{\text{exp}}(x, t) \propto m^{1-t}(x)\beta_S^t(x). \quad (41)$$

Recalling the relationship between the risk product  $S$  and the risk scenario  $\beta_S = Sm$

$$p_{\text{exp}}(x, t) = \frac{m(x) S^t(x)}{\int m(y) S^t(y) dy}. \quad (42)$$

Moving along the e-geodesic is equivalent to replacing the original risk product  $S$  with

$$S_t(x) = p_{\text{exp}}(x, t)/m(x) \propto S^t(x). \quad (43)$$

In order to compare  $S$  with  $S_t$  we recall the payoff elasticity equation (3) in the relative form [5]

$$\frac{d \ln F_1}{d \ln F_2} = \frac{R_2}{R_1}, \quad (44)$$

where  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  is a pair of investment products corresponding to the pair of risk aversion profiles  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ . Setting  $F_1 = S_t$  and  $F_2 = S$  we compute

$$\frac{R_2}{R_1} = \frac{d \ln S_t}{d \ln S} = t. \quad (45)$$

i.e. moving along the e-geodesic is equivalent to scaling risk aversion (on the risk product).

### A.3 Exposure along the risk geodesic

Note that the rhs of (14) contains only distributions. This fact is interesting because it leads to geometric pictures that are invariant to portfolio size. It is convenient to overload our notation of risk so we can use it at the level of distributions. We define

$$\text{Risk}_S[\beta_\Pi] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\text{Risk}_S[\Pi]}{\text{Price}[\Pi]}. \quad (46)$$

In this paper we are not interested in exploring special pathological examples and so we can assume that the rhs of Eq. (42) is always well defined including the values of  $t \notin [0, 1]$ . Let  $\beta_t(x)$  be the extrapolated version of the e-geodesic  $p_{\text{exp}}(x, t)$  obtained by removing any restriction on the values of  $t$  in Eq. (42). We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Risk}_S[\beta_t] &= \int \left( \beta_t(x) - m(x) \right) \left( \ln \beta_S(x) - \ln m(x) \right) dx \\ &= \int \left( \frac{m(x) S^t(x)}{\int m(y) S^t(y) dy} - m(x) \right) \ln S(x) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Differentiating with respect to the parameter  $t$  and re-combining the expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \text{Risk}_S[\beta_t] &= \frac{\int m(x) S^t(x) \ln^2 S(x) dx}{\int m(y) S^t(y) dy} - \frac{\left( \int m(x) S^t(x) \ln S(x) dx \right)^2}{\left( \int m(y) S^t(y) dy \right)^2} \\ &= \int \beta_t(x) \ln^2 S(x) dx - \left( \int \beta_t(x) \ln S(x) dx \right)^2 \\ &= \text{Var}_{\beta_t}[\ln S], \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where the last equality is really just the standard definition of variance. Since the variance is positive we see the exposure along the risk geodesic changes monotonically (increasing in the direction from  $m$  to  $\beta_S$ ). Integrating this back gives us Eq. (22).

## A.4 Iso-risk foliation

In Appendix A.3 we found that the exposure to  $S$  along the e-geodesic  $|m, \beta_S\rangle$  changes monotonically. This means that the e-geodesic intersects all the iso-risk hyper-surfaces defined by fixing different values of  $\text{Risk}_S$ . Here we show that all such intersections happen at the right angles.

Select a value of risk  $r$  and consider the iso-risk surface  $\Omega_r$  formed by points  $\beta_\Pi$  such that  $\text{Risk}_S[\beta_\Pi] = r$ . Let  $\beta_{t_r}$  be the point of intersection between the e-geodesic  $|m, \beta_S\rangle$  and  $\Omega_r$ . By construction for any arbitrary  $\beta_\Pi \in \Omega_r$  we have

$$\text{Risk}_S[\beta_\Pi] = \text{Risk}_S[\beta_{t_r}], \quad (49)$$

or equivalently

$$\int (\beta_\Pi(x) - m(x)) \ln \frac{\beta_S(x)}{m(x)} dx = \int (\beta_{t_r}(x) - m(x)) \ln \frac{\beta_S(x)}{m(x)} dx. \quad (50)$$

We want to inspect the intersection angle  $\angle \beta_\Pi \beta_{t_r} \beta_S$ . To this end we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \beta_{t_r}, \beta_\Pi | \beta_{t_r}, \beta_S \rangle &= \int (\beta_\Pi(x) - \beta_{t_r}(x)) \ln \frac{\beta_S(x)}{\beta_{t_r}(x)} dx \\ &= \int (\beta_\Pi(x) - m(x)) \ln \frac{\beta_S(x)}{\beta_{t_r}(x)} dx + \int (m(x) - \beta_{t_r}(x)) \ln \frac{\beta_S(x)}{\beta_{t_r}(x)} dx \\ &= \int (\beta_\Pi(x) - m(x)) \left( \ln \frac{\beta_S(x)}{m(x)} - \ln \frac{\beta_{t_r}(x)}{m(x)} \right) dx \\ &\quad + \int (m(x) - \beta_{t_r}(x)) \left( \ln \frac{\beta_S(x)}{m(x)} - \ln \frac{\beta_{t_r}(x)}{m(x)} \right) dx \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Noticing cancellations due to Eq. (50) we proceed

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \beta_{t_r}, \beta_\Pi | \beta_{t_r}, \beta_S \rangle &= \int (\beta_{t_r}(x) - m(x)) \ln \frac{\beta_{t_r}(x)}{m(x)} dx - \int (\beta_\Pi(x) - m(x)) \ln \frac{\beta_{t_r}(x)}{m(x)} dx \\ &= \int (\beta_\Pi(x) - \beta_{t_r}(x)) \ln \frac{m(x)}{\beta_{t_r}(x)} dx \\ &= \langle \beta_{t_r}, \beta_\Pi | \beta_{t_r}, m \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

This means that the angles  $\angle \beta_\Pi \beta_{t_r} \beta_S$  and  $\angle \beta_\Pi \beta_{t_r} m$  are of the same type (both acute, both obtuse or both right). Since  $m$ ,  $\beta_{t_r}$  and  $\beta_S$  lie on the same geodesic, the two angles are complimentary and therefore can only be both right. This completes the proof that the risk geodesic is orthogonal to the corresponding iso-risk hyper-surfaces.

The collection of all iso-risk surfaces constitutes an m-foliation (meaning that every iso-risk surface is m-flat and together they span the entire manifold of probability distributions). Orthogonal to that is an e-foliation. In the above example the risk geodesic  $|m, \beta_S\rangle$  is an element of an e-foliation. Such dual foliations are useful in defining convenient coordinate systems in which some important directions look straight (as in Figs. 1 and 2). For a detailed mathematical treatment of dual foliations and mixed coordinates see Sec. 6.8 of [8].



## A.5 Optimizations

### A.5.1 C-projection

The Lagrangian for finding the c-projection  $\beta_{\Pi} \rightarrow \beta_{\Pi'}$  onto the zero-risk manifold with minimal cost (23) reads

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Pi'} = \int C(x, \beta_{\Pi'}(x) - \beta_{\Pi}(x)) dx - \lambda_c \cdot (\text{Price}[\Pi'] - 1) - \mu_c \cdot \text{Risk}_S[\Pi'], \quad (53)$$

where  $\lambda_c$  and  $\mu_c$  are the Lagrange multipliers ensuring the correct normalization and the zero risk for  $\beta_{\Pi'}$ . Rearranging the terms

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Pi'} = \int \left[ C(x, \beta_{\Pi'}(x) - \beta_{\Pi}(x)) - \lambda_c \beta_{\Pi'}(x) - \mu_c \beta_{\Pi'}(x) \ln S(x) \right] dx + \dots, \quad (54)$$

where the hidden terms do not depend on  $\Pi'$ . Variation with respect to  $\beta_{\Pi'}$  gives the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$C'_2(x, \beta_{\Pi'}(x) - \beta_{\Pi}(x)) = \lambda_c + \mu_c \ln S(x), \quad (55)$$

where  $C'_2$  denotes the derivative of  $C$  with respect to the second argument. Since  $C$  is convex with respect to its second argument, the above equation can be inverted locally (i.e. at every  $x$ ) to expose the difference

$$\beta_{\Pi'}(x) - \beta_{\Pi}(x) = C_2'^{-1}(x, \lambda_c + \mu_c \ln S(x)), \quad (56)$$

where  $C_2'^{-1}$  is monotonic with respect to its second argument. Dividing both sides by  $m(x)$  we arrive at Eq. (24).

### A.5.2 Pure investment products

By a *pure investment product* we mean a solution  $F$  to the problem of maximum expected utility (30). Within the framework of information derivatives such products are structured by solving the pair of equations (1) and (3). This brings into play the key notions of likelihood and risk aversion. Here we recall an alternative form of writing the same result (more standard in mathematics). This is in preparation for understanding the hedge-investment duality where we use both forms (Appendix A.5.4).

The Lagrangian for finding the optimal investment product  $F$  (30) reads

$$\mathcal{L}_F = \int b(x) U(F(x)) dx - \lambda_0 \left( \int m(x) F(x) dx - 1 \right), \quad (57)$$

where  $\lambda_0$  is the Lagrange multiplier. The corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation

$$b(x) U'(F(x)) - \lambda_0 m(x) = 0 \quad (58)$$

immediately gives us the solution

$$F(x) = U'^{-1}(\lambda_0 / f(x)), \quad \text{where } f(x) = b(x) / m(x), \quad (59)$$

$U'^{-1}$  is the inverse function of  $U'$ .

### A.5.3 Pure hedging products – the general structure

As explained in the main text, a *pure hedging product* is defined as a solution  $H$  of the divergence minimization problem with the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_H = D_\phi(\beta_H || m) - \lambda \cdot (\text{Price}[H] - 1) - \mu \cdot (\text{Risk}_S[H] - r), \quad (60)$$

where  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are the Lagrange multipliers for the constraints on the price and the risk of  $H$  respectively. The intuition behind this is very simple: a unit of a pure hedging product is designed to express as little view on the market as possible – just what it needs to have the required risks. More explicitly the Lagrangian reads

$$\mathcal{L}_H = \int m(x) \left[ \phi(H(x)) - \left( \lambda + \mu \ln S(x) \right) H(x) \right] dx + \dots, \quad (61)$$

where the hidden terms do not depend on  $H$ . The variation with respect to  $H$

$$\delta_H \mathcal{L}_H = \int m(x) \left[ \phi'(H(x)) - \left( \lambda + \mu \ln S(x) \right) \right] \delta H(x) dx, \quad (62)$$

and the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\phi'(H(x)) = \lambda + \mu \ln S(x). \quad (63)$$

For a strictly convex function  $\phi$ , the derivative  $\phi'$  is monotonically increasing and therefore invertible. We can therefore compute

$$H(x) = \phi'^{-1}(\lambda + \mu \ln S(x)), \quad (64)$$

where the inverted function  $\phi'^{-1}$  is itself monotonically increasing. The values  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are determined from the constraints (on the price and risk of  $H$ ).

Equation (64) shows that the optimal hedging product is essentially the same as the risk product. More precisely,  $H$  is a monotonic function of  $S$ . Below, in the second half of note A.5.4, we show this function to be monotonically increasing if the positive exposure is required and monotonically decreasing if we want  $\text{Risk}_S[H] < 0$ .

### A.5.4 Hedge-investment duality

#### Investment $\rightarrow$ Hedge

Let  $F$  be a pure investment product of the form (59). We want to see if we can find the optimal pure hedge of the form (64) which coincides with  $F$ .

If we choose  $\phi(x) = -U(x) + U(1)$ , Eq. (64) becomes

$$H(x) = U'^{-1}(-\lambda - \mu \ln S(x)). \quad (65)$$

Comparison to (59) suggests a possible choice of  $S = c \cdot \exp(-1/f)$ , where  $c$  is the notional constant  $c = 1/\text{Price}[\exp(-1/f)]$ . Substituting this into (65) we compute

$$H(x) = U'^{-1}(-\lambda - \mu \ln c + \mu/f(x)). \quad (66)$$

This would coincide with Eq. (59) as long as  $\mu = \lambda_0$  and  $\lambda = -\lambda_0 \ln c$ . We just need to understand the circumstances in which  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  take these exact values. This happens if we equate the risks of  $H$  and  $F$ , i.e. if we require  $\text{Risk}_S[H] = \text{Risk}_S[F]$ . Indeed,  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are the Lagrange multipliers which ensure that  $H$  is of unit price and has the required amount of risk with respect to  $S$ . Both constraints are satisfied by  $H = F$  vindicating the above values of  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$ .

In summary, for any fixed rational investment  $F$  given by the expected utility maximization (30) one can find a pure hedging product  $H$  of the form (31) such that  $H = F$ .

### Hedge $\rightarrow$ Investment

The argument in the main part of the paper requires us to compute the derivative  $d \ln H / d \ln f$ . Before we do that let us go back to Eq. (64) and examine it in a bit more detail. In particular, we need to investigate the sign of  $\mu$  in Eq. (64). This sign determines whether  $H$  is an increasing or a decreasing function of  $S$ .

Let us prove that  $\mu$  in Eq. (64) has the same sign as the required risk (25). To this end, let us consider a less constrained version of the minimization (60) by forgetting about the risk (25). It is easy to see that the solution to this risk-unconstrained version is  $H = 1$  (which is the same as  $\beta_H = m$ ). Because  $\text{Risk}_S[1] = 0$  we conclude that the constraint  $\text{Risk}_S[H] = 0$  in the context of our optimization is in fact equivalent to having no constraints on the risk.

The minimization (60) is a strictly convex optimization with linear constraints. Changing the value of  $r$  to a nonzero value in (25) moves the constraint hyperplane away from the unique minimum point. By strict convexity this results in a monotonic increase of the optimal objective value (for as long as the constraints remain feasible). In other words, the optimal objective  $\mathcal{L}_H^*$  is an increasing function of  $r$  for  $r > 0$  and a decreasing function of  $r$  for  $r < 0$ .

It now remains to recall the interpretation of the optimal Lagrange multipliers as the derivatives of the objective with respect to the relevant constraints:  $\mu = d\mathcal{L}_H^*/dr$ . It follows that  $\mu$  in the solution (64) is positive for  $r > 0$  and negative for  $r < 0$ .

The above arguments provide mathematical rigour for an otherwise completely intuitive result that a pure hedge  $H$  with a positive (negative) exposure to  $S$  is monotonically increasing (decreasing) with  $S$ .

Equation (33) is derived by differentiating Eq. (64) while remembering the sign of  $\mu$ .

### A.5.5 Partially hedged investments

The Lagrangian for the optimization (35) reads

$$\mathcal{L} = \int b(x)U(F(x)) dx - \nu \cdot (\text{Price}[F] - 1) - \rho \cdot (\text{Risk}_S[F] - r), \quad (67)$$

where  $\nu$  and  $\rho$  are the Lagrange multipliers. Writing  $U(F) = u(\ln F)$  and hiding the terms which do not depend on  $F$

$$\mathcal{L} = \int b(x)u(\ln F(x)) dx - \int m(x)(\nu + \rho \ln S(x))F(x) dx + \dots \quad (68)$$

The variation with respect to  $F$

$$\delta_F \mathcal{L} = \int \left[ b(x) \frac{u'(\ln F(x))}{F(x)} - m(x)(\nu + \rho \ln S(x)) \right] \delta F(x) dx \quad (69)$$

and the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$F = \frac{u'(\ln F)}{\nu + \rho \ln S} f, \quad (70)$$

where  $f = b/m$ . Taking the logarithm on both sides and differentiating

$$d \ln F = \frac{u''(\ln F)}{u'(\ln F)} d \ln F + d \ln f - d \ln(1 + \alpha_r \ln S), \quad (71)$$

where  $\alpha_r = \rho/\nu$ . Rearranging the terms

$$\left( 1 - \frac{u''(\ln F)}{u'(\ln F)} \right) \frac{d \ln F}{d \ln f} = 1 - \frac{d \ln(1 + \alpha_r \ln S)}{d \ln f}. \quad (72)$$

Recognizing the Arrow-Pratt definition of relative risk aversion

$$1 - \frac{u''(\ln F)}{u'(\ln F)} = -F \frac{U''(F)}{U'(F)} = R, \quad (73)$$

we arrive at Eq. (36).

## References

- [1] Soklakov, A., “Why quantitative structuring?”, arXiv:1507.07219.
- [2] Soklakov, A., “Economics of disagreement – financial intuition for the Rényi divergence”, *Entropy* **22**(8), 860 (2020).
- [3] Wystrach, A., Schwarz, S., Baniel, A., and Cheng, K., “Backtracking behaviour in lost ants: an additional strategy in their navigational toolkit”, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **280**, 1677 (2013).
- [4] Soklakov, A., “Bayesian lessons for payout structuring”, *Risk*, Sept., 115-119 (2011). arXiv:1106.2882.
- [5] Soklakov, A., “Elasticity theory of structuring”, *Risk*, December, 81-86 (2016). arXiv:1304.7535.
- [6] Soklakov, A., “One trade at a time – unraveling the equity premium puzzle”, published as supplementary materials with Ref. [2], *Entropy* **22**(8), 860 (2020).
- [7] Chentsov, N., N., “Nonsymmetrical distance between probability distributions, entropy and the theorem of Pythagoras”, *Mat. Zametki* **4**(3), 323-332 (1968).
- [8] Amari, S., “Information geometry and its applications”, Springer: Japan, 2016.
- [9] Nielsen, F., “On geodesic triangles with right angles in a dually flat space” in *Progress in Information Geometry: Theory and Applications*, 153 (2021).
- [10] Csiszár, I., “*I*-divergence geometry of probability distributions and minimization problems”, *Ann. Probab.* **3** (1), 146-158 (1975).
- [11] Csiszár, I., “Eine informationstheoretische Ungleichung und ihre Anwendung auf den Beweis der Ergodizität von Markoffschen Ketten”, *Magyar. Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.* **8**, 85-108 (1963).
- [12] Morimoto, T., “Markov processes and the H-theorem”, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **18**(3), 328-331 (1963).
- [13] Ali, S. M. and Silvey, S. D., “A general class of coefficients of divergence of one distribution from another”, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* **28**(1), 131-142 (1966).
- [14] Bregman, L. M., “The relaxation method of finding the common points of convex sets and its application to the solution of problems in convex programming”, *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics* **7**(3), 200-217 (1967).