

Optimal measure preserving derivatives revisited

Brendan K. Beare

School of Economics, University of Sydney

January 25, 2022

Abstract

This article clarifies the relationship between pricing kernel monotonicity and the existence of opportunities for stochastic arbitrage. The relationship depends on whether the distribution of the underlying asset payoff is adequate, meaning that it is atomless or is comprised of finitely many equally probable atoms. Under adequacy, pricing kernel nonmonotonicity is equivalent to the existence of a strong form of stochastic arbitrage involving distributional replication of the underlying asset payoff at a lower price. If the adequacy condition is dropped then this equivalence no longer holds, but pricing kernel nonmonotonicity remains equivalent to the existence of a weaker form of stochastic arbitrage involving second-order stochastic dominance of the underlying asset payoff at a lower price. A generalization of the optimal measure preserving derivative is obtained which achieves distributional replication at the minimum cost of all second-order stochastically dominant securities under adequacy.

1 Introduction

This article is intended as a sequel to [Beare \(2011\)](#). In that article I considered the problem of selecting a derivative security written on a market portfolio that achieves the minimum price among all derivative securities delivering the same payoff distribution as the market portfolio. The setting is based on the payoff distribution pricing model of [Dybvig \(1988\)](#), and may be briefly summarized as follows. The sole source of uncertainty is the value of the market portfolio at the end of one period (this is a single period model), which we take to be a nonnegative and finite random variable X governed by a probability measure μ . Let Θ denote the collection of all Borel measurable maps from \mathbb{R}_+ to $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$ that are finite μ -almost everywhere (μ -a.e.). We regard any member of Θ as a derivative security. Each $\theta \in \Theta$ may be purchased at a price $p(\theta)$ equal to its integral with respect to a

finite “risk neutral” measure ν , i.e. at price $p(\theta) = \int \theta d\nu$, and delivers a payoff of $\theta(X)$ at the end of one period. We assume mutual absolute continuity of μ and ν (while allowing both μ and ν to be potentially discrete) and refer to the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\pi = d\nu/d\mu$ as the *pricing kernel*. Mutual absolute continuity should be regarded as a no-arbitrage condition, as it rules out the possibility of purchasing a security at a zero price that pays off with positive probability, or selling a security at a positive price that pays off with zero probability. However, as we will see shortly, it leaves open the possibility of a form of stochastic arbitrage.

We are concerned with the problem of choosing $\theta \in \Theta$ to minimize the price $p(\theta)$ subject to a constraint requiring the distribution of $\theta(X)$ to weakly dominate the distribution of X in some sense. Four such constraints will be relevant: distributional equality, first-order stochastic dominance, concave stochastic ordering, and second-order stochastic dominance. We denote these constraints respectively by $\theta(X) \sim X$, $\theta(X) \succeq_1 X$, $\theta(X) \succeq_{cv} X$, and $\theta(X) \succeq_2 X$. Definitions of the latter three orderings are provided at the beginning of Section 2. If there exists a derivative security $\theta \in \Theta$ satisfying one of these four constraints while having price $p(\theta)$ less than the price of the market portfolio, which is $\int x d\nu(x)$, then we regard this as a form of stochastic arbitrage.

In [Dybvig \(1988\)](#) it is assumed that the market portfolio payoff distribution μ is either atomless, or is comprised of a finite number of equally probable atoms. This assumption turns out to be important for distinguishing between the existence of different forms of stochastic arbitrage. Following the mathematical literature on function rearrangement ([Luxemburg, 1967](#); [Day, 1970](#); [Chong and Rice, 1971](#)) we refer to this property of μ as *adequacy*. Let F and Q denote the (cumulative) distribution function and quantile function of the random variable X , and for $\theta \in \Theta$ let F_θ and Q_θ denote the distribution function and quantile function of the random variable $\theta(X)$. Under adequacy of μ , [Dybvig \(1988\)](#) showed that the minimum constrained price

$$\inf\{p(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta, \theta(X) \sim X\}, \quad (1)$$

called the distributional price of X , is equal to

$$\int_0^1 Q(u)Q_\pi(1-u)du. \quad (2)$$

Under atomlessness of μ , and assuming that π is not constant on any set of positive μ -measure, I showed in [Beare \(2011\)](#) that the minimum constrained price is

achieved by the derivative security

$$\vartheta(x) = Q(1 - F_\pi(\pi(x))), \quad (3)$$

which I termed the *optimal measure preserving derivative*.

We will say that the pricing kernel π is *monotone* if it is equal μ -a.e. to a nonincreasing function. Dybvig (1988) showed under adequacy of μ that the distributional price of the market portfolio, given by (2), is less than the actual price of the market portfolio, given by $\int x d\nu(x)$, if and only if the pricing kernel π is not monotone. This result neatly characterizes the existence of stochastic arbitrage opportunities defined in terms of distributional equality when μ is adequate. The primary goal of this article is to clarify the extent to which it carries over to forms of stochastic arbitrage defined in terms of the orderings \succsim_1 , \succsim_{cv} and \succsim_2 , and the extent to which it depends on the adequacy of μ .

Two recent articles motivate my pursuit of this goal. The first is Post and Longarela (2021). Theorem 1 therein establishes, in a general setting permitting an incomplete options market and nonzero bid-ask spreads for option prices, that a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a stochastic arbitrage opportunity defined in the sense of second-order stochastic dominance is the nonexistence of a monotone pricing kernel implying option prices within the observed bid-ask ranges. Specialized to our simpler setting of a complete and frictionless options market, the result may be stated as follows: If μ assigns all mass to a finite collection of points, then

$$\inf\{p(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta, \theta(X) \succsim_2 X\} \quad (4)$$

is less than the market portfolio price $\int x d\nu(x)$ if and only if the pricing kernel π is not monotone. This is puzzling because the constraint in (4) is weaker than the constraint in (1), and we know from Dybvig (1988) that the minimum constrained price in (1) is less than the market portfolio price if and only if the pricing kernel is not monotone. Two questions naturally arise. The first is the extent to which the distinction between the two characterizations of pricing kernel monotonicity hinges on the differing conditions – adequacy in Dybvig (1988) and finite support in Post and Longarela (2021) – placed on μ . Neither of these conditions on μ implies the other. The second question is whether the constrained minimum in (4) is attained by the optimal measure preserving derivative in (3).

Propositions 1 and 2 in this article provide answers to these two questions.

Proposition 1 shows, without imposing any condition on μ (beyond the no-arbitrage condition of mutual absolute continuity of μ and ν), that the minimum constrained price in (4) is less than the market portfolio price if and only if the pricing kernel is not monotone, and also that the minimum constrained price

$$\inf\{p(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta, \theta(X) \succeq_{cv} X\} \quad (5)$$

is less than the market portfolio price if and only if the pricing kernel is not monotone. On the other hand, it is not true in general that the minimum constrained price in (1) is less than the market portfolio price if and only if the pricing kernel is not monotone, and neither is it true in general that

$$\inf\{p(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta, \theta(X) \succeq_1 X\} \quad (6)$$

is less than the market portfolio price if and only if the pricing kernel is not monotone. Under the assumption that μ is adequate, Proposition 2 shows that the minimum constrained prices in (1), (4), (5) and (6) are all equal to one another, are all less than the market portfolio price if and only if the pricing kernel is not monotone, and are all attained by a generalization of the optimal measure preserving derivative in (3). That generalization takes the special form in (3) under the additional requirements that μ is atomless and that the pricing kernel π is not constant on any set of positive μ -measure, as imposed in Beare (2011).

The second recent article motivating this one is Kleiner, Moldovanu and Strack (2021). The most relevant part is Section S.2.2 in the supplementary material. It is shown there that if μ is atomless, if π is μ -essentially bounded, and if X is integrable, then the minimum constrained prices in (1) and in (5) are equal to one another, and are less than the market portfolio price if and only if the pricing kernel is not monotone. This result is contained in Proposition 2 given here, which relaxes atomlessness to adequacy and drops the essential boundedness and integrability conditions. The proof given by Kleiner, Moldovanu and Strack (2021) relies upon the Hardy-Littlewood rearrangement inequality as in Carlier and Dana (2005) and in Beare (2011), and also upon an inequality of Fan and Lorentz (1954), which they apply fruitfully to a range of problems beyond the one discussed here. The role played by the Fan-Lorentz inequality is replaced in the proofs of Propositions 1 and 2 given here by an older inequality due to Hardy.

The remainder of this article is structured as follows. The new results, Propositions 1 and 2, are presented in Section 2. In Section 3 I discuss the implications

of these results for recent research on stochastic arbitrage under pricing kernel nonmonotonicity. In Appendix A.1 I review for the reader's convenience various results on distributions, quantiles, rearrangements, and disintegration of measures that are used in the proofs of Propositions 1 and 2, given in Appendix A.2.

2 Results

We begin by defining the relations \succsim_1 , \succsim_{cv} and \succsim_2 . Let X and X' be nonnegative and finite random variables. We say that $X \succsim_1 X'$ if $\mathbb{E}u(X) \geq \mathbb{E}u(X')$ for all maps $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ that are nondecreasing. We say that $X \succsim_{cv} X'$ if $\mathbb{E}u(X) \geq \mathbb{E}u(X')$ for all maps $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ that are concave. We say that $X \succsim_2 X'$ if $\mathbb{E}u(X) \geq \mathbb{E}u(X')$ for all maps $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ that are nondecreasing and concave. Table B.1 in Dybvig (1988) provides equivalent reformulations of these definitions in terms of distribution functions, quantile functions, and additive decompositions.

Our first result is as follows.

Proposition 1. *If μ and ν are mutually absolutely continuous with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\pi = d\nu/d\mu$, then the following three conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) $\inf\{p(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta, \theta(X) \succsim_{cv} X\} < \int x d\nu(x).$
- (ii) $\inf\{p(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta, \theta(X) \succsim_2 X\} < \int x d\nu(x).$
- (iii) π is not monotone.

The equivalence of conditions (ii) and (iii) in Proposition 1 is implied by Theorem 1 in Post and Longarela (2021) under the additional requirement that μ has finite support. The equivalence of conditions (i) and (iii) in Proposition 1 follows from the discussion in Section S.2.2 of the supplementary material to Kleiner, Moldovanu and Strack (2021) under the additional requirements that μ is atomless, that π is μ -essentially bounded, and that X is integrable.

Our second result is as follows.

Proposition 2. *If μ and ν are mutually absolutely continuous with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\pi = d\nu/d\mu$, and if μ is adequate, then the following five conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) $\inf\{p(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta, \theta(X) \sim X\} < \int x d\nu(x).$
- (ii) $\inf\{p(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta, \theta(X) \succsim_1 X\} < \int x d\nu(x).$

(iii) $\inf\{p(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta, \theta(X) \succeq_{cv} X\} < \int x d\nu(x)$.

(iv) $\inf\{p(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta, \theta(X) \succeq_2 X\} < \int x d\nu(x)$.

(v) π is not monotone.

Moreover, the four infima in (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) are all equal to one another, and are all attained by the function

$$\vartheta(x) = Q\left(1 - F_\pi(\pi(x)) + \mu\{w : \pi(w) = \pi(x), w \leq x\}\right). \quad (7)$$

The equivalence of conditions (i) and (v) in Proposition 2 is shown in Dybvig (1988). The equivalence of conditions (i), (iii), (iv) and (v) in Proposition 2 therefore follows from Proposition 1. Condition (ii) joins this group of equivalent conditions due to the fact that the relation \succeq_1 is implied by the relation \sim and implies the relation \succeq_2 .

The function ϑ in Proposition 2 is a more general version of the optimal measure preserving derivative introduced in Beare (2011) and stated above in (3). The source of additional generality is the term $\mu\{w : \pi(w) = \pi(x), w \leq x\}$, which is equal to zero under the specificity that μ is atomless and π is not constant on any set of positive μ -measure, as imposed in Beare (2011). Since \succeq_2 is the weakest and \sim the strongest of the four relations \sim , \succeq_1 , \succeq_{cv} and \succeq_2 , to show that ϑ attains the infima in (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) it suffices to show that ϑ attains the infimum in (iv) while also satisfying $\vartheta(X) \sim X$. Our proof that $\vartheta(X) \sim X$ extends the arguments in Beare (2011) by relaxing atomlessness to adequacy and dropping the nonflatness condition on π . The latter is achieved by applying the disintegration theorem discussed in Chang and Pollard (1997), which provides a convenient way to handle the conditioning of probability measures on level sets of random variables.

I now present two examples that demonstrate the pivotal role played by the adequacy condition on μ in Proposition 2. Both examples are very simple and involve a measure μ that assigns all mass to two atoms. The first example shows that (i) and (ii) in Proposition 2 need not be equivalent if μ is not adequate, and that ϑ need not satisfy $\vartheta(X) \sim X$ if μ is not adequate.

Example 1. Suppose that $\{1\}$ and $\{2\}$ are atoms of μ , with $\mu\{1\} = 2/3$ and $\mu\{2\} = 1/3$. Suppose further that ν is a probability measure with $\nu\{1\} = 1/3$ and $\nu\{2\} = 2/3$, so that $\int x d\nu(x) = 5/3$. For any $\theta \in \Theta$, the distribution of $\theta(X)$ assigns mass $2/3$ to the atom $\{\theta(1)\}$ and mass $1/3$ to the atom $\{\theta(2)\}$. We

therefore have $\theta(X) \sim X$ if and only if $\theta(1) = 1$ and $\theta(2) = 2$, implying that condition (i) in Proposition 2 is not satisfied. On the other hand, any function $\theta \in \Theta$ with $\theta(1) = 2$ and $\theta(2) = 1$ satisfies $\theta(X) \succeq_1 X$ and $p(\theta) = 4/3 < 5/3$, so condition (ii) in Proposition 2 is satisfied. Elementary calculations show that the function ϑ in Proposition 2 takes the values $\vartheta(1) = 2$ and $\vartheta(2) = 1$, so ϑ satisfies $\vartheta(X) \succeq_1 X$ but not $\vartheta(X) \sim X$, and has price $p(\vartheta) = 4/3$.

The second example shows that neither (i) nor (ii) in Proposition 2 need be equivalent to (iii), (iv) or (v) if μ is not adequate, and that ϑ may have price exceeding that of the market portfolio if μ is not adequate.

Example 2. Suppose that $\{1\}$ and $\{2\}$ are atoms of μ , with $\mu\{1\} = 1/3$ and $\mu\{2\} = 2/3$. Suppose further that ν is a probability measure with $\nu\{1\} = 1/5$ and $\nu\{2\} = 4/5$, so that $\int x d\nu(x) = 9/5$. For any $\theta \in \Theta$, the distribution of $\theta(X)$ assigns mass $1/3$ to the atom $\{\theta(1)\}$ and mass $2/3$ to the atom $\{\theta(2)\}$. We therefore have $\theta(X) \sim X$ if and only if $\theta(1) = 1$ and $\theta(2) = 2$, implying that condition (i) in Proposition 2 is not satisfied. Furthermore, we have $\theta(X) \succeq_1 X$ if and only if $\theta(1) \geq 1$ and $\theta(2) \geq 2$, implying that condition (ii) in Proposition 2 is not satisfied. The pricing kernel π satisfies $\pi(1) = 3/5$ and $\pi(2) = 6/5$, so π is not monotone (i.e., not nonincreasing on $\{1, 2\}$), and condition (v) in Proposition 2 is satisfied. Conditions (iii) and (iv) in Proposition 2 must therefore also be satisfied, by Proposition 1. Elementary calculations show that the function ϑ in Proposition 2 takes the values $\vartheta(1) = \vartheta(2) = 2$ and therefore satisfies $\vartheta(X) \succeq_1 X$ but not $\vartheta(X) \sim X$, and has price $p(\vartheta) = 2 > 9/5$.

3 Further discussion

The connection between pricing kernel monotonicity and the existence of stochastic arbitrage opportunities has been an active area of research since the documentation of empirical violations of pricing kernel monotonicity with S&P500 index options in Ait-Sahalia and Lo (2000), Jackwerth (2000) and Rosenberg and Engle (2002). It was immediately recognized in these articles that such violations are inconsistent with the existence of a risk-averse agent willing to hold the market portfolio. The empirical failure of pricing kernel monotonicity became known as the pricing kernel puzzle or risk aversion puzzle. In Beare (2011) I drew attention to the relevance of the results in Dybvig (1988) for understanding the implications of pricing kernel nonmonotonicity. The puzzling implication of these results was that, even in the absence of risk aversion, an agent merely preferring more

to less will not hold the market portfolio under pricing kernel nonmonotonicity. This brought into question the centrality of risk aversion in understanding pricing kernel nonmonotonicity. See [Perrakis \(2019, pp. 223–226\)](#) for further discussion of this history.

The results in [Post and Longarela \(2021\)](#) and [Kleiner, Moldovanu and Strack \(2021\)](#) discussed in this article establish that risk aversion is indeed the central issue relevant to understanding pricing kernel nonmonotonicity. Propositions 1 and 2 and Examples 1 and 2 in this article establish that it is the technical condition of adequacy imposed in [Dybvig \(1988\)](#) which broadens the set of stochastic arbitrage opportunities available under pricing kernel nonmonotonicity to include replicating portfolios.

From a pragmatic perspective, adequacy of μ is not a strong condition. Any μ may be approximated arbitrarily well by an adequate measure. This has important implications for the computation of stochastic arbitrage opportunities in practice, which necessarily involves dealing with market frictions and incompleteness. The key methodological contributions to this subject are contained in [Constantinides, Jackwerth and Perrakis \(2009\)](#) and [Post and Longarela \(2021\)](#). In the former article, a linear program was devised whose infeasibility implies the existence of opportunities for stochastic arbitrage in the sense of second-order stochastic dominance. In the latter article, a linear program was devised whose infeasibility is equivalent to the existence of such opportunities for stochastic arbitrage, and whose solution is the minimum cost stochastic arbitrage opportunity. Both articles report the widespread availability of stochastic arbitrage opportunities with S&P500 index options, although transaction costs and bid/ask sizes play an important role in limiting potential gains. If we regard the market for S&P500 index options to be an acceptable real-world approximation to a complete and frictionless market, and treat the adequacy of μ as a technicality of little practical import, then in view of Proposition 2 it may be reasonable to predict that the minimum cost second-order stochastically dominant option portfolio solving the linear program in [Post and Longarela \(2021\)](#) comes close to being first-order stochastically dominant. This prediction could be tested by reporting the outcome of statistical tests of first-order stochastic dominance. A related prediction is that if the linear program in [Post and Longarela \(2021\)](#) was strengthened to a mixed integer-linear program enforcing first-order stochastic dominance, as in [Luedtke \(2008\)](#), then there would be little change in the performance of the selected option portfolios. I leave the empirical assessment of these predictions to future research.

A Mathematical appendix

A.1 Mathematical preliminaries

A.1.1 Distributions, quantiles, and rearrangements

Let (Ω, μ) be a probability space, and let M_+ denote the collection of all nonnegative real valued Borel measurable maps on (Ω, μ) . If $f \in M_+$ then we define the *distribution function* of f to be the map $F_f : \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ given by

$$F_f(x) = \mu\{\omega \in \Omega : f(\omega) \leq x\},$$

and we define the *quantile function* of f to be the map $Q_f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$ given by

$$Q_f(u) = \inf\{x \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+ : F_f(x) \geq u\}.$$

The quantile function of f , or its right-continuous version, is also referred to as the *nondecreasing rearrangement* of f .

Lemma A.1 (Generalized inverses). *If $f \in M_+$ then $Q_f(F_f(x)) \leq x$ for all $x \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$. If also F_f is continuous then $F_f(Q_f(u)) = u$ for all $u \in [0, 1]$.*

Proof. See parts (ii) and (iv) of Lemma 21.1 in [van der Vaart \(1998\)](#). □

Lemma A.2 (Probability integral transforms). *If $f \in M_+$ and if u belongs to the range of F_f , then $\mu\{\omega \in \Omega : F_f(f(\omega)) \leq u\} = u$.*

Proof. See Lemma 1 in [Angus \(1994\)](#). □

Lemma A.3 (Second-order stochastic dominance). *For $f_1, f_2 \in M_+$ the following three conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) $\int_0^y F_{f_1}(x)dx \leq \int_0^y F_{f_2}(x)dx$ for all $y \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$.
- (ii) $\int_0^v Q_{f_1}(u)du \geq \int_0^v Q_{f_2}(u)du$ for all $v \in [0, 1]$.
- (iii) $\int_0^\infty u(f_1(x))d\mu(x) \geq \int_0^\infty u(f_2(x))d\mu(x)$ for all maps $u : \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+ \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$ that are nondecreasing and concave.

Proof. See Proposition 4 in [Thistle \(1989\)](#) for the equivalence of (i) and (ii), and Theorem 1.1.3 in [Whang \(2019\)](#) for the equivalence of (i) and (iii). □

Lemma A.4 (Hardy quantile majorization inequality). *If $f_1, f_2 \in M_+$ have quantile functions Q_{f_1}, Q_{f_2} satisfying condition (ii) in Lemma A.3, and if $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$ is nonincreasing, then*

$$\int_0^v Q_{f_1}(u)g(u)du \geq \int_0^v Q_{f_2}(u)g(u)du \quad \text{for all } v \in [0, 1].$$

Proof. See Theorem 7.1 in Day (1970) or Theorem 9.1 in Chong and Rice (1971) for the case where $Q_{f_1}, Q_{f_2}, Q_{f_1}g$ and $Q_{f_2}g$ are integrable. Since Q_{f_1}, Q_{f_2} and g are nonnegative we may dispense with integrability by applying the monotone convergence theorem. \square

We say that maps $f_1, f_2 \in M_+$ are *comonotonic* if

$$\mu \otimes \mu \{(\omega, \omega') \in \Omega \times \Omega : (f_1(\omega) - f_1(\omega'))(f_2(\omega) - f_2(\omega')) \geq 0\} = 1,$$

or *countermonotonic* if

$$\mu \otimes \mu \{(\omega, \omega') \in \Omega \times \Omega : (f_1(\omega) - f_1(\omega'))(f_2(\omega) - f_2(\omega')) \leq 0\} = 1.$$

Lemma A.5 (Hardy-Littlewood rearrangement inequality). *If $f_1, f_2 \in M_+$ then*

$$\int_0^1 Q_{f_1}(u)Q_{f_2}(1-u)du \leq \int f_1f_2d\mu \leq \int_0^1 Q_{f_1}(u)Q_{f_2}(u)du.$$

The former inequality holds with equality if f_1 and f_2 are countermonotonic, while the latter inequality holds with equality if f_1 and f_2 are comonotonic.

Proof. For the inequalities, see Theorem 10.1 in Day (1970) or Theorem 12.2 in Chong and Rice (1971), and the subsequent remarks therein regarding integrability and nonnegativity. If f_1 and f_2 are countermonotonic then Theorem 2.5.5 in Nelsen (2006) implies that the joint distribution of f_1 and f_2 is its Fréchet-Hoeffding lower bound, and thus Theorem 3.1 in Puccetti and Wang (2015) implies that the joint distribution of f_1 and f_2 is the same as that of $Q_{f_1}(U)$ and $Q_{f_2}(1-U)$, where U is a random variable distributed uniformly on $(0, 1)$. Thus the former inequality holds with equality. If f_1 and f_2 are comonotonic then a symmetric argument using Theorem 2.5.4 in Nelsen (2006) and Theorem 2.1 in Puccetti and Wang (2015) establishes that the latter inequality holds with equality. \square

A.1.2 Disintegration of probability measures

Let (Ω, μ) and M_+ be as in Section A.1.1, and suppose further that Ω is a metric space and μ is Borel. Given any map $f \in M_+$, we will write μf^{-1} for the Borel probability measure on \mathbb{R}_+ assigning measure $\mu\{x : f(x) \in B\}$ to each Borel subset B of \mathbb{R}_+ .

Theorem A.1 (Disintegration theorem). *Given any map $\pi \in M_+$, there exists a collection $\{\mu_z : z \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$ of Borel probability measures on Ω satisfying the following conditions.*

- (i) $\mu_z\{x : \pi(x) = z\} = 1$ for $\mu\pi^{-1}$ -almost all z .
- (ii) $z \mapsto \int f d\mu_z$ is measurable for each $f \in M_+$.
- (iii) $\int f d\mu = \iint f d\mu_{\pi(x)} d\mu(x)$ for each $f \in M_+$.

Proof. See Theorems 1 and 2 in [Chang and Pollard \(1997\)](#). □

A.2 Proofs of Propositions 1 and 2

Lemma A.6. *If μ and ν are mutually absolutely continuous with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\pi = d\nu/d\mu$, then every $\theta \in \Theta$ satisfying $\theta(X) \gtrsim_2 X$ also satisfies*

$$\int \theta d\nu \geq \int_0^1 Q(u)Q_\pi(1-u)du.$$

Proof. The Hardy-Littlewood rearrangement inequality (Lemma A.5) implies that, for any $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\int \theta d\nu = \int \theta \pi d\mu \geq \int_0^1 Q_\theta(u)Q_\pi(1-u)du. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

For any $\theta \in \Theta$ satisfying $\theta(X) \gtrsim_2 X$ we have

$$\int_0^v Q_\theta(u)du \geq \int_0^v Q(u)du$$

for all $v \in [0, 1]$, by Lemma A.3. It therefore follows from the Hardy quantile majorization inequality (Lemma A.4) that

$$\int_0^1 Q_\theta(u)Q_\pi(1-u)du \geq \int_0^1 Q(u)Q_\pi(1-u)du \quad (\text{A.2})$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$ satisfying $\theta(X) \gtrsim_2 X$. Combining (A.1) and (A.2) establishes the claimed inequality. \square

Proof of Proposition 1. We will show that (i) implies (ii), that (ii) implies (iii), and that (iii) implies (i). The fact that (i) implies (ii) is immediate from the fact that the relation \gtrsim_2 is implied by the relation \gtrsim_{cv} . To show that (ii) implies (iii), suppose that (iii) is false. Then $x \mapsto x$ and $x \mapsto \pi(x)$ are countermonotonic, so that the lower bound in the Hardy-Littlewood rearrangement inequality (Lemma A.5) holds with equality:

$$\int_0^1 Q(u)Q_\pi(1-u)du = \int x\pi(x)d\mu(x) = \int xd\nu(x).$$

It therefore follows from Lemma A.6 that (ii) must be false. Thus (ii) implies (iii).

To show that (iii) implies (i), suppose that (iii) is true. In this case we may choose Borel sets A, B with $\mu(A), \mu(B) > 0$ such that

$$\sup A < \inf B \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in A} \pi(x) < \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in B} \pi(x).$$

Given $\epsilon > 0$, define a function $\theta_\epsilon \in \Theta$ by

$$\theta_\epsilon(x) = \begin{cases} x + \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(A)} & \text{for } x \in A \\ x - \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(B)} & \text{for } x \in B \\ x & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We can guarantee that θ_ϵ is nonnegative by choosing ϵ sufficiently small, so that $\theta_\epsilon \in \Theta$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \int \theta_\epsilon d\nu &= \int xd\nu(x) + \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(A)}\nu(A) - \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(B)}\nu(B) \\ &\leq \int xd\nu(x) + \epsilon \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in A} \pi(x) - \epsilon \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in B} \pi(x) < \int xd\nu(x) \end{aligned}$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. Thus (i) will be shown true if we can establish that $\theta_\epsilon(X) \gtrsim_{cv} X$ for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. We may accomplish this by showing that, for any ϵ small enough that

$$\sup A + \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(A)} \leq \inf B - \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(B)}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

we have $\int u(\theta_\epsilon(x))d\mu(x) \geq \int u(x)d\mu(x)$ for all concave maps $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Any

such u has a nonincreasing right-derivative u' and satisfies

$$u\left(x + \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(A)}\right) \geq u(x) + \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(A)}u'\left(x + \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(A)}\right)$$

for all $x \in A$, and

$$u\left(x - \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(B)}\right) \geq u(x) - \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(B)}u'\left(x - \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(B)}\right)$$

for all $x \in B$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int u(\theta_\epsilon(x))d\mu(x) &\geq \int u(x)d\mu(x) + \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(A)} \int_A u'\left(x + \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(A)}\right) d\mu(x) \\ &\quad - \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(B)} \int_B u'\left(x - \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(B)}\right) d\mu(x) \\ &\geq \int u(x)d\mu(x) + \epsilon u'\left(\sup A + \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(A)}\right) - \epsilon u'\left(\inf B - \frac{\epsilon}{\mu(B)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that u' is nonincreasing to obtain the second inequality. Relying again on the fact that u' is nonincreasing, we deduce that $\int u(\theta_\epsilon(x))d\mu(x) \geq \int u(x)d\mu(x)$ if ϵ is chosen small enough to satisfy (A.3). Thus (iii) implies (i). \square

Proof of Proposition 2. Proposition 1 establishes the equivalence of (iii), (iv) and (v), so it suffices for us to show that ϑ attains the infimum in (iv) while also satisfying $\vartheta(X) \sim X$. We first show that $\vartheta(X) \sim X$, considering separately the cases where μ is atomless and where μ is adequate but not atomless. Suppose first that μ is atomless. In this case $F(Q(u)) = u$ for all u by Lemma A.1 and so, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+$, if $\vartheta(x) \leq y$ then

$$1 - F_\pi(\pi(x)) + \mu\{w : \pi(w) = \pi(x), w \leq x\} \leq F(y). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Conversely, if (A.4) is true then, using the fact that $Q(F(y)) \leq y$ (Lemma A.1), we must have $\vartheta(x) \leq y$. We deduce that, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$A_y = \left\{x : \mu\{w : \pi(w) = \pi(x), w \leq x\} \leq F(y) + F_\pi(\pi(x)) - 1\right\},$$

where we define $A_y = \{x : \vartheta(x) \leq y\}$. Our goal is to show that $\mu A_y = F(y)$.

Applying the disintegration theorem (Theorem A.1), we disintegrate μ into a family of probability measures $\{\mu_z : z \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$ on \mathbb{R}_+ satisfying conditions (i), (ii)

and (iii) in Theorem A.1, with Θ playing the role of M_+ . Define

$$B = \{z : \mu\{w : \pi(w) = z\} > 0\},$$

a countable set. For any z such that μ_z has an atom $\{v\}$, condition (iii) in Theorem A.1 implies that

$$\mu\{v\} = \int \mu_{\pi(w)}\{v\}d\mu(w) \geq \mu\{w : \pi(w) = z\}\mu_z\{v\}.$$

The final quantity is positive if $z \in B$, contradicting our supposition that μ is atomless. We deduce that, in the case where μ is atomless, we also have μ_z atomless for each $z \in B$.

Condition (i) in Theorem A.1 implies that

$$\mu_z A_y = \mu_z \left\{ x : \mu\{w : \pi(w) = z, w \leq x\} \leq F(y) + F_\pi(z) - 1 \right\} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

for $\mu\pi^{-1}$ -almost all z . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\{w : \pi(w) = z, w \leq x\} &= \int \mu_{\pi(v)}\{w : \pi(w) = z, w \leq x\}d\mu(v) \\ &= \mu\{v : \pi(v) = z\}\mu_z\{w : w \leq x\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from condition (iii) in Theorem A.1 and the second from condition (i). We may therefore rewrite (A.5) as

$$\mu_z A_y = \mu_z \left\{ x : \mu\{w : \pi(w) = z\}\mu_z\{w : w \leq x\} \leq F(y) + F_\pi(z) - 1 \right\}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Condition (iii) in Theorem A.1 implies that

$$\mu A_y = \int \mu_z A_y d\mu\pi^{-1}(z). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

We will use (A.6) and (A.7) to show that $\mu A_y = F(y)$. In pursuit of this goal, it will be useful to separate the domain of integration in (A.7) into the regions where $z \in B$ and where $z \notin B$.

We first examine the integral over the region where $z \in B$. It follows from (A.6) that, for each $z \in B$,

$$\mu_z A_y = \mu_z \left\{ x : \mu_z\{w : w \leq x\} \leq \frac{F(y) + F_\pi(z) - 1}{\mu\{w : \pi(w) = z\}} \right\}.$$

Since μ_z is atomless for each $z \in B$, the distribution function $x \mapsto \mu_z\{w : w \leq x\}$ corresponding to the probability measure μ_z is continuous for each $z \in B$. Lemma A.2 on the uniformity of probability integral transforms thus ensures that

$$\mu_z A_y = 0 \vee \left(1 \wedge \frac{F(y) + F_\pi(z) - 1}{\mu\{w : \pi(w) = z\}} \right) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

for each $z \in B$. Noting that F_π has a jump of size $\mu\{w : \pi(w) = z\}$ at each $z \in B$, we see that the fraction in (A.8) is equal to or less than zero if and only if $F_\pi(z) \leq 1 - F(y)$, and is greater than one if and only if $F_\pi(z-) > 1 - F(y)$. Let B_y denote the set of all $z \in B$ such that $F_\pi(z-) \leq 1 - F(y) < F_\pi(z)$, either empty or a singleton. Integrating (A.8) over $z \in B$ with respect to $\mu\pi^{-1}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{z \in B} \mu_z A_y d\mu\pi^{-1}(z) &= \mu\pi^{-1}\{z \in B : F_\pi(z-) > 1 - F(y)\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{z \in B_y} (F(y) + F_\pi(z) - 1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

We next examine the integral over the region where $z \notin B$. For $\mu\pi^{-1}$ -almost all $z \notin B$, we deduce from (A.6) that

$$\mu_z A_y = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } F_\pi(z) < 1 - F(y) \\ 1 & \text{if } F_\pi(z) \geq 1 - F(y). \end{cases}$$

Integrating over $z \notin B$ with respect to $\mu\pi^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\int_{z \notin B} \mu_z A_y d\mu\pi^{-1}(z) = \mu\pi^{-1}\{z \notin B : F_\pi(z) \geq 1 - F(y)\}.$$

The set $\{z \notin B : F_\pi(z) = 1 - F(y)\}$ is $\mu\pi^{-1}$ -null due to the fact that F_π has no jumps in this set and takes the constant value $1 - F(y)$. Since $F_\pi(z-) = F_\pi(z)$ at every $z \notin B$, it follows that

$$\int_{z \notin B} \mu_z A_y d\mu\pi^{-1}(z) = \mu\pi^{-1}\{z \notin B : F_\pi(z-) > 1 - F(y)\}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Combining (A.7), (A.9) and (A.10), we obtain

$$\mu A_y = \mu\pi^{-1}\{z : F_\pi(z-) > 1 - F(y)\} + \sum_{z \in B_y} (F(y) + F_\pi(z) - 1).$$

If B_y is empty then $1 - F(y)$ belongs to the range of F_π , and so Lemma A.2 implies

that

$$\mu\pi^{-1}\{z : F_\pi(z) > 1 - F(y)\} = F(y).$$

Emptiness of B_y also implies that $F_\pi(z) > 1 - F(y)$ if and only if $F_\pi(z-) > 1 - F(y)$, so we conclude that $\mu A_y = F(y)$ if B_y is empty. On the other hand, if B_y is a singleton, say $B_y = \{b\}$, then F_π jumps from at most $1 - F(y)$ to above $1 - F(y)$ at b , so that

$$\mu\pi^{-1}\{z : F_\pi(z-) > 1 - F(y)\} = 1 - F_\pi(b).$$

Thus we also have $\mu A_y = F(y)$ if B_y is a singleton. As noted above, B_y must be either empty or a singleton, so we have $\mu A_y = F(y)$ for all y . This establishes that $\vartheta(X) \sim X$ in the case where μ is atomless.

We next show that $\vartheta(X) \sim X$ in the case where μ is adequate but not atomless, meaning that μ allocates mass n^{-1} to each of n points $x_1 < \dots < x_n$. Let m_1, \dots, m_n be the unique permutation of $1, \dots, n$ such that (i) $\pi(x_{m_i}) \geq \pi(x_{m_j})$ whenever $i \leq j$, and (ii) $m_i < m_j$ whenever $\pi(x_{m_i}) = \pi(x_{m_j})$ and $i > j$. For any i , we have $Q(i/n) = x_i$,

$$1 - F_\pi(\pi(x_i)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}(\pi(x_j) > \pi(x_i)) = \frac{m_i}{n} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^i \mathbb{1}(\pi(x_j) = \pi(x_i)), \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mu\{w : \pi(w) = \pi(x_i), w \leq x_i\} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^i \mathbb{1}(\pi(x_j) = \pi(x_i)).$$

Therefore, $\vartheta(x_i) = x_{m_i}$, meaning that ϑ is a permutation of the mass points of μ . This establishes that $\vartheta(X) \sim X$ in the case where μ is adequate but not atomless.

It remains to show that ϑ minimizes $\int \theta d\nu$ over the set of all $\theta \in \Theta$ satisfying $\theta(X) \succeq_2 X$. Lemma A.6 establishes that all such θ satisfy

$$\int \theta d\nu \geq \int_0^1 Q(u)Q_\pi(1-u)du. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

We have shown that $\vartheta(X) \sim X$, which implies that $\vartheta(X) \succeq_2 X$. We are therefore done if we can show that ϑ attains the lower bound in (A.11).

The Hardy-Littlewood rearrangement inequality (Lemma A.5) implies that

$$\int \vartheta d\nu = \int \vartheta \pi d\mu \geq \int_0^1 Q_\vartheta(u)Q_\pi(1-u)du. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

The inequality holds with equality if ϑ and π are countermonotonic, which we now demonstrate. Pick $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\pi(x) > \pi(x')$. Since F_π is nondecreasing and has a jump of size $\mu\{w : \pi(w) = \pi(x)\}$ at $\pi(x)$, we have

$$F_\pi(\pi(x)) \geq F_\pi(\pi(x')) + \mu\{w : \pi(w) = \pi(x)\},$$

and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} F_\pi(\pi(x)) - \mu\{w : \pi(w) = \pi(x), w \leq x\} &\geq F_\pi(\pi(x')) \\ &\quad - \mu\{w : \pi(w) = \pi(x'), w \leq x'\}. \end{aligned}$$

It thus follows from the nondecreasing property of Q that $\vartheta(x) \leq \vartheta(x')$. We conclude that ϑ and π are countermonotonic. The inequality in (A.12) therefore holds with equality. Moreover, since $\vartheta(X) \sim X$, we have $Q_\vartheta = Q$. This shows that ϑ attains the lower bound in (A.11). \square

References

- Aït-Sahalia, Y. & A.W. Lo (2000). Nonparametric risk management and implied risk aversion. *Journal of Econometrics* 94, 9–51.
- Angus, J.E. (1994). The probability integral transform and related results. *SIAM Review* 36, 652–654.
- Beare, B.K. (2011). Measure preserving derivatives and the pricing kernel puzzle. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 47, 689–697.
- Carrier, G. & R.A. Dana (2005). Rearrangement inequalities in non-convex insurance models. *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 41, 483–503.
- Chang, J.T. & D. Pollard (1997). Conditioning as disintegration. *Statistica Neerlandica* 51, 287–317.
- Chong, K.M. & N.M. Rice (1971). Equimeasurable rearrangements of functions. *Queen's Papers in Pure and Applied Mathematics* 28.
- Constantinides, G.M., J.C. Jackwerth & S. Perrakis (2009). Mispricing of S&P 500 index options. *Review of Financial Studies* 22, 1247–1277.
- Day, P.W. (1970). *Rearrangements of measurable functions*. Doctoral thesis, California Institute of Technology.

- Dybvig, P.H. (1988). Distributional analysis of portfolio choice. *Journal of Business* 61, 369–393.
- Fan, K. & G.G. Lorentz (1954). An integral inequality. *American Mathematical Monthly* 61, 626–631.
- Jackwerth, J.C. (2000). Recovering risk aversion from option prices and realized returns. *Review of Financial Studies* 13, 433–451.
- Kleiner, A., B. Moldovanu & P. Strack (2021). Extreme points and majorization: economic applications. *Econometrica* 89, 1557–1593.
- Luedtke, J. (2008). New formulations for optimization under stochastic dominance constraints. *SIAM Journal of Optimization* 19, 1433–1450.
- Luxemburg, W.A.J. (1967). Rearrangement invariant Banach function spaces. *Queen's Papers in Pure and Applied Mathematics* 10.
- Nelsen, R.B. (2006). *An Introduction to Copulas*, 2nd ed. Springer.
- Perrakis, S. (2019). *Stochastic Dominance Option Pricing*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Post, T. & I.R. Longarela (2021). Risk arbitrage opportunities for stock index options. *Operations Research* 69, 100–113.
- Puccetti, G. & R. Wang (2015). Extremal dependence concepts. *Statistical Science* 30, 485–517.
- Rosenberg, J.V. & R.F. Engle (2002). Empirical pricing kernels. *Journal of Financial Economics* 64, 341–372.
- Thistle, P.D. (1989). Ranking distributions with generalized Lorenz curves. *Southern Economic Journal* 56, 1–12.
- van der Vaart, A.W. (1998). *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Whang, Y.-J. (2019). *Econometric Analysis of Stochastic Dominance*. Cambridge University Press.