arXiv:2310.09173v1 [econ.TH] 13 Oct 2023

Risk Aversion and Insurance Propensity*

Fabio Maccheroni Massimo Marinacci Ruodu Wang Qinyu Wu

October 16, 2023

Abstract

We provide a new foundation of risk aversion by showing that the propension to exploit insurance opportunities fully describes this attitude. Our foundation, which applies to any probabilistically sophisticated preference, well accords with the commonly held prudential interpretation of risk aversion that dates back to the seminal works of Arrow (1963) and Pratt (1964).

In our main results, we first characterize the Arrow-Pratt risk aversion in terms of propension to *full* insurance and the stronger notion of risk aversion of Rothschild and Stiglitz (1970) in terms of propension to *partial* insurance. We then extend the analysis to comparative risk aversion by showing that the notion of Yaari (1969) corresponds to comparative propension to full insurance, while the stronger notion of Ross (1981) corresponds to comparative propension to partial insurance.

*Maccheroni and Marinacci are with the Department of Decision Sciences and IGIER, Università Bocconi; Wang and Wu are with the Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Waterloo. This work was supported by the Italian Ministry of University and Research [Grant PRIN-2017CY2NCA] and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada [Grants RGPIN-2018-03823 and RGPAS-2018-522590].

1 Introduction

Since the seminal works of Arrow (1963), Pratt (1964), and Rothschild and Stiglitz (1970), risk attitudes have always been related to insurance choices. In this paper, we show how insurance choices fully characterize risk attitudes, in a model-free way that does not rely on the notion of expectation. At a theoretical level, our characterizations provide conceptually compelling explanations of risk attitudes, thus clarifying their normative status. At an empirical level, they show how these attitudes may motivate the most common features of marketed insurance policies.

As both Arrow (1963) and Pratt (1964) observe, risk aversion can be defined as preference for full insurance over no insurance at an actuarially fair premium.[1] To formalize this claim, consider an agent with random wealth w. A full insurance for w at premium π is a contract with random payoff $-w-\pi$ that completely compensates, at cost π, the agent potential loss $-w$. The actuarially fair premium for the loss $-w$ is, by definition, its expectation $\mathbb{E}[-w]$. Thus, the Arrow-Pratt notion of risk aversion amounts to

$$w + \underbrace{(-w - \mathbb{E}[-w])}_{\text{full insurance at fair premium}} \succsim w + \underbrace{0}_{\text{no insurance}} \tag{1}$$

that is, to $\mathbb{E}[w] \succsim w$ for all random wealth levels w. In words, it amounts to a preference for a sure amount over a random one with the same expectation.

Yet, while the concept of full insurance for w at premium π is natural and is, since a long time, common in the insurance practice, the concept of fair pricing is much less so. Arguably, no insurance comes at fair premium in practice. But, as soon as premia deviate from ideal fairness, the Arrow-Pratt notion of risk aversion seems to lose its connection to insurance choices.

Our first contribution is to show that this is not the case. We provide an equivalent definition of risk aversion that is purely based on insurance concepts and does not rely on expectations. Consider an agent who, at the same price π, can either buy full insurance $-w$ or make another investment h that has the same distribution of $-w$. The agent's final payoff is $w+(-w-\pi)$ when full insurance is purchased, it is $w+(h-\pi)$ otherwise. Arrow-Pratt's risk aversion implies that

$$w + \underbrace{(-w-\pi)}_{\text{full insurance at price } \pi} \succsim w + \underbrace{(h-\pi)}_{h \text{ distributed as } -w \text{ at price } \pi} \tag{2}$$

for all random wealth levels w and all premia π.[2] This preference, implied by Arrow-Pratt's risk aversion, has a clear meaning of *propension to full insurance* and it does not make use of expected values.

Our first main result, Theorem 1, shows that this propension to full insurance is equivalent to Arrow-Pratt's risk aversion for every reflexive and transitive preference $\succsim$ over random payoffs that depends only on payoffs' distributions. The result, which applies to all probabilistically

[1] In particular, Arrow (1963) develops a 'theory of ideal insurance' based on the premise that agents are risk averse.

[2] Indeed, the sure payoff $-\pi$ on the left-hand side of $\succsim$ is the expectation of the random payoff $w+(h-\pi)$ on the right-hand side (because h and $-w$ are equally distributed).

sophisticated preferences (Machina and Schmeidler, 1992),[3] relies on a novel probability theory finding of independent interest (Lemma 1).

One may then argue that many insurance contracts do not provide full coverage. Some of them, like most property insurance policies, have a deductible-limit form as they impose a deductible and a policy limit. Others, like many health insurance policies, have a proportional form as they reimburse only a fraction of the loss. The resulting notions of propension to partial insurance are natural extensions of (2). For instance, *propension to proportional insurance* requires

$$w + \underbrace{(-\alpha w - \pi)}_{\text{proportional insurance at price } \pi} \succsim w + \underbrace{(h - \pi)}_{h \text{ distributed as } -\alpha w \text{ at price } \pi} \tag{3}$$

for all random wealth levels w, all premia π and all percentage excess levels $1 - \alpha \in [0, 1)$.[4] The definition of *propension to deductible-limit insurance* is analogous.

Our second main result, Theorem 2, shows that propension to proportional insurance and propension to deductible-limit insurance are both equivalent to the Rothschild-Stiglitz notion of risk aversion

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi(f)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\varphi(g)] \text{ for all concave } \varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \implies f \succsim g \tag{4}$$

Like the equivalence of Arrow-Pratt's risk aversion (1) and propension to full insurance (2), also the equivalence between Rothschild-Stiglitz's risk aversion (4) and propension to proportional insurance (3) is model free and based on basic insurance concepts that do not rely on expectations. At a theoretical level, our findings provide definitions of risk aversion that are normatively sound and cognitively accessible. At an empirical level, they show how Rothschild-Stiglitz's risk aversion may underlie two important market phenomena: (i) the prevalence of deductibe-limit and proportional insurance policies in insurance markets, (ii) the fact that insurance policy holders typically have both kinds of contracts in their portfolios rather than either of them.

In our analysis we also consider more general, yet standard, definitions of partial insurance that only require coverage to increase with loss. These obviously include proportional, deductible-limit and their combinations as special cases. We show that the resulting notions of propension to partial insurance correspond again to Rothschild-Stiglitz risk aversion, thus providing further normative support to this popular concept.

We then extend the analysis to the case of comparative risk attitudes. We show that comparative risk aversion in the sense of Yaari (1969) corresponds to comparative propension to full insurance, while the stronger notion of comparative risk aversion due to Ross (1981) corresponds to comparative propension to partial insurance.[5]

Finally, we relate our results to the ones on correlation aversion of Epstein and Tanny (1980), and to the ones on expected-value preferences of the classical de Finetti (1931) and of the recent Pomatto, Strack and Tamuz (2020).

[3]Beyond expected utility, this class includes prospect theory (Kahnemann and Tversky, 1979), rank dependent utility (Quiggin, 1982, Yaari, 1989), beetweenness preferences (Dekel, 1986, Chew, 1989, Gul 1991), cautious expected utility (Cerreia-Vioglio, Dillenberger and Ortoleva, 2015) and, more in general, all preferences under risk with a numerical representation.

[4]The percentage excess level $1 - \alpha$ is the fraction of the loss not covered by the insurance policy. Therefore, when $\alpha = 1$ proportional coverage corresponds to full coverage. As a consequence, propension to proportional insurance is a stronger requirement than propension to full insurance.

[5]In its various forms: proportional, deductible-limit, etc.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Risk

We study an agent who has to choose among actions that yield uncertain monetary payoffs depending on contingencies that are outside the agent control. The uncertainty about contingencies is represented by a probability space (S, Σ, P). Each action corresponds to a random variable

$$f : S \to \mathbb{R}$$

with $f(s)$ interpreted as the, positive or negative, monetary payoff obtained in state s when the action is taken.[6]

The probability measure P is given and, in the tradition of Savage (1954), it is assumed throughout to be *adequate*, that is, either nonatomic on Σ or uniform on a finite partition that generates Σ.[7] Moreover, we restrict our attention to random variables that admit all moments. We call them *random payoffs* and denote their collection by $\mathcal{F}$, with typical elements f, g and h. Formally, we consider

$$\text{either } \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{M}^\infty \text{ or } \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{L}^\infty$$

where $\mathcal{M}^\infty = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{L}^n(S, \Sigma, P)$ and $\mathcal{L}^\infty = \mathcal{L}^\infty(S, \Sigma, P)$.[8] On a first reading, it is convenient to consider convergence of sequences of random payoffs as convergence in all moments. In the appendix, we detail how this assumption can be relaxed.

Each random payoff f induces a distribution $P_f = P \circ f^{-1}$ of deterministic payoffs, called 'lottery' in the decision theory jargon. In particular, $P_f(B)$ is the probability that f yields an outcome in the Borel subset B of the real line.

Definition 1. *Two random payoffs f and g are* equally distributed*, written $f \overset{d}{=} g$, when $P_f = P_g$.*

Equally distributed random payoffs generate the same lottery.

2.2 Risk preferences

The agent preferences are represented by a binary relation $\succsim$ on the space $\mathcal{F}$ of random payoffs. We interpret $f \succsim g$ as 'the agent prefers f to g'. As usual, $\sim$ and $\succ$ denote the symmetric and asymmetric parts of $\succsim$.

Definition 2. *A binary relation $\succsim$ on $\mathcal{F}$ is a* risk preference *when it is a preorder such that*

$$f \overset{d}{=} g \Longrightarrow f \sim g$$

[6] Throughout, we omit punctuation in displayed equations.

[7] Nonatomic means that, for each $A \in \Sigma$ with $P(A) > 0$, there exists $B \in \Sigma$ contained in A such that $0 < P(B) < P(A)$.

[8] We denote by $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, ...\}$ the set of positive integers. The space $\mathcal{M}^\infty$ contains random variables that are commonly used in applications – like normals, log-normals and gammas – with distributions that admit all moments, but may have unbounded support. The space $\mathcal{L}^\infty$, instead, is the usual framework of decision theory. All the results in the main text, with the exception of Proposition 3, hold for both spaces.

Besides the standard assumptions of reflexivity and transitivity, the definition of risk preference requires the agent to be indifferent between equally distributed random payoffs. The fact that only the lottery P_f induced by f matters to the agent is what characterizes choice under risk, hence the name risk preferences. This property, often called *law invariance*, is satisfied by all probabilistically sophisticated preferences, which are basically the risk preferences that admit a numerical representation.[9]

Definition 3. *A risk preference is* continuous *when*

$$f_n \succsim g_n \text{ for all } n \implies \lim_n f_n \succsim \lim_n g_n$$

for all convergent sequences $\{f_n\}$ *and* $\{g_n\}$ *of random payoffs.*

This assumption is weaker than the classical assumption of continuity in distribution.[10]

2.3 Classical risk attitudes

As mentioned in the introduction, there are two classical approaches to risk attitudes. One approach is due to Arrow (1963) and Pratt (1964). It is based on the observation that a random payoff f is 'risky' when it is not constant, that is, when $f \neq \mathbb{E}[f]$. This leads to the definition of *weak* risk attitudes.

Definition 4. *A risk preference* $\succsim$ *is:*

(i) weakly risk averse *when, for all random payoffs* f*,*

$$\mathbb{E}[f] \succsim f$$

(ii) weakly risk propense *when, for all random payoffs* f*,*

$$\mathbb{E}[f] \precsim f$$

(iii) weakly risk neutral *when it is both weakly risk averse and propense.*

The other approach is due to Rothschild and Stiglitz (1970). They show that the relation $\geq_{\text{cv}}$ on $\mathcal{F}$ defined by

$$f \geq_{\text{cv}} g \iff \mathbb{E}[\varphi(f)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\varphi(g)] \text{ for all concave } \varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$$

meaningfully captures the idea that 'f is less risky than g' (for example, in terms of mean preserving spreads). This leads to the definition of *strong* risk attitudes.

Definition 5. *A risk preference* $\succsim$ *is:*

[9]See footnote 3. For instance, *mean-variance preferences*, where$f \succsim_{\text{MV}} g$ if and only if $\mathbb{E}[f] \geq \mathbb{E}[g]$ and $\mathbb{V}[f] \leq \mathbb{V}[g]$, are risk preferences that are not complete, hence do not admit a numerical representation. As well-known, they are strongly, hence weakly, risk averse (as defined below).

[10]Because convergence in $\mathcal{L}^k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ implies convergence in distribution (the converse is obviously false).

(i) strongly risk averse *when, for all random payoffs f and g,*

$$f \geq_{\text{cv}} g \Longrightarrow f \succsim g$$

(ii) strongly risk propense *when, for all random payoffs f and g,*

$$f \geq_{\text{cv}} g \Longrightarrow f \precsim g$$

(iii) strongly risk neutral *when it is both strongly risk averse and propense.*

Clearly, strong risk aversion (propension) implies weak risk aversion (propension). As well-known, they become equivalent for expected utility preferences, but not in general (e.g., for prospect theory). In contrast, strong and weak risk neutrality always coincide, so we can talk of 'risk neutrality' without further qualification.

3 Absolute attitudes

3.1 Insurance contracts and attitudes

As discussed in the introduction, our main objective is to characterize risk attitudes in terms of insurance choices. To tackle this problem we need to answer two questions:

- Which random payoffs can be seen as insurances for the stochasticity of a given initial wealth level?
- When is a random payoff a better hedge (insurance) than another for a given initial wealth level?

To address these questions, we consider an agent with initial net wealth level w. Throughout we allow w to be uncertain, so to be any element of $\mathcal{F}$.[11] With this, the initial net loss of the agent is $-w$.

Definition 6. *Given any initial wealth w, a random payoff f is:*

(i) *a* full insurance *for w, written $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{fi}}(w)$, when*

$$f = -w - \pi$$

for some premium $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$;

(ii) *a* proportional insurance *for w, written $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{pr}}(w)$, when*

$$f = -(1-\varepsilon)\, w - \pi$$

for some premium $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$ and percentage excess $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$;

[11] Sometimes w is called 'background risk'.

(iii) *a* deductible-limit insurance *for* w*, written* $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{dl}}(w)$*, when*

$$f = (-w - \delta)^+ \wedge \lambda - \pi$$

for some premium $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$*, deductible* $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ *and limit* $\lambda \in [0, \infty)$*.*

Full insurances completely cover the loss $-w$ faced by the agent, upon payment of a premium π. Instead, proportional and deductible-limit insurances provide only partial cover: they reimburse either a proportion $1 - \varepsilon$ of the loss or the part of the loss exceeding δ, up to λ. They are the most common and simplest kinds of insurance contracts. Health insurance contracts are typically proportional, while property insurance ones have a deductible-limit form.



Figure 1: Proportional insurance (in red) and deductible-limit insurance (in blue) for loss $-w$

Next we introduce attitudes towards insurance using the types of contracts that we just presented. Observe that an agent with initial wealth w, who purchases insurance f, ends up with final wealth $w + f$.

Definition 7. *A risk preference* $\succsim$ *is:*

(i) propense to full insurance *when, for all* $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ *with* $g \overset{d}{=} f$*,*

$$f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{fi}}(w) \implies w + f \succsim w + g$$

(ii) propense to proportional insurance *when, for all* $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ *with* $g \overset{d}{=} f$*,*

$$f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{pr}}(w) \implies w + f \succsim w + g$$

(iii) propense to deductible-limit insurance *when, for all* $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ *with* $g \overset{d}{=} f$*,*

$$f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{dl}}(w) \implies w + f \succsim w + g$$

These definitions are guided by a common principle: once a kind of insurance is defined for initial wealth level w, propension to insurance (of that kind) means that the agent prefers to purchase these insurances f over generic random payoffs g that are equally distributed (a *ceteris paribus* assumption).[12]

When w is bounded,

$$\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{fi}}(w) = \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{pr}}(w) \cap \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{dl}}(w) \tag{5}$$

Propension to full insurance is thus weaker than propension to either proportional or deductible-limit insurance when $\mathcal{F}$ is $\mathcal{L}^{\infty}$. The next results show that this hierarchy in insurance attitudes corresponds to the hierarchy in risk attitudes.

Theorem 1. *The following properties are equivalent for a risk preference:*

(i) weak risk aversion;

(ii) propension to full insurance.

This theorem provides a foundation for weak risk aversion which is model free, cognitively accessible and normatively sound. It shows how preference for the expectation of a random payoff over the random payoff itself emerges from an arguably minimal requirement of propension to insurance. It is minimal because only the purchase of full insurance is required to be preferred over the purchase of other equally distributed random payoffs. By making no use of expectations, this equivalence also addresses the normative critique of weak risk aversion that hinges on the seemingly *ad hoc* use of expectations over other possible statistics (such as the median).

Theorem 1 relies on a novel result in probability theory of independent interest.

Lemma 1. *The following properties are equivalent for $f \in \mathcal{F}$:*

(i) $\mathbb{E}[f] = 0$*;*

(ii) there exist $h, h' \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $h \overset{d}{=} h'$ and $f \overset{d}{=} h - h'$.

We now move to strong risk aversion.

Theorem 2. *The following properties are equivalent for a continuous risk preference:*

(i) strong risk aversion;

(ii) propension to proportional insurance;

(iii) propension to deductible-limit insurance.

[12]The notions presented in Definition 7 are equivalent to the ones presented in the introduction because $g \overset{d}{=} f$ is equivalent to $g + \pi \overset{d}{=} f + \pi$ and the sets of insurances we consider are closed under the addition of constants, as detailed in Remark A.2 of the appendix.

This result shares the same features of the previous one in terms of model-freedom, cognitive accessibility and normative soundness. It also has clear empirical relevance because proportional and deductible-limit insurances are the most commonly held and law-disciplined insurance policies. On the one hand, Theorem 2 shows that the strong risk aversion of agents may motivate the demand of these two types of insurance contracts. On the other hand, the prevalence of these two contracts in the insurance practice may support the hypothesis of strong risk aversion of policy holders. Moreover, the equivalence between propension to proportional insurance and to deductible-limit insurance, a formally surprising result, may explain why policy holders often have both kinds of contracts in their insurance portfolios.

Together, our results also provide a new perspective on the well-known fact that weak risk aversion is implied by strong risk aversion. When offered equally distributed payoffs, a weakly risk-averse agent only favors full insurance, whereas a strongly risk averse one also favors some forms of partial insurance. In the next section we show that, in these situations, strongly risk averse agents actually favor any kind of partial insurance.

3.2 More insurances

To further develop our analysis, we consider the most general forms of partial insurance. A first principle of insurance contracts is that an insurance policy pays more when the incurred loss is larger. There are two, very similar, ways to formalize this principle, depending on whether we require the insurance payout to be a function of the realized loss. We summarize them in the following definition.

Definition 8. *Given any initial wealth w, a random payoff f is:*

(iv) an indemnity-schedule insurance *for w, written $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{is}}(w)$, when*

$$f = I(-w)$$

for some real-valued increasing[13] *map I defined on the image of $-w$;*

(v) a contingency-schedule insurance *for w, written $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{cs}}(w)$, when*

$$-w(s) > -w(s') \implies f(s) \geq f(s')$$

for almost all states s and s'.

These two notions have a common basic meaning: greater losses cannot lead to smaller insurance payouts. This is best seen by writing condition (iv), due to Arrow (1963), as

$$-w(s) \geq -w(s') \implies f(s) \geq f(s')$$

for all states s and s'. Thus, (iv) is obtained by (v) under the subtle additional requirement that equal losses must lead to equal insurance payouts.

[13] Throughout, "increasing" is in the non-strict sense.

With this, (v) is the most general notion of insurance that we consider.[14] We can now enrich the relation (5) by adding the inclusions:

$$\mathcal{I}^{\text{pr}}(w) \cup \mathcal{I}^{\text{dl}}(w) \subset \mathcal{I}^{\text{is}}(w) \subset \mathcal{I}^{\text{cs}}(w)$$

The next definition is based on a different notion: rather than defining insurance for w, it describes different degrees of coverage for the loss $-w$. Yet, as it will be seen momentarily, it naturally connects to the previous concepts.

Definition 9. *Given any initial wealth w, a random payoff f is a* better hedge *for w than a random payoff g, written $f \geq_w g$, when $f \overset{d}{=} g$ and*

$$P(f \leq t \mid w \leq l) \leq P(g \leq t \mid w \leq l)$$

for all payouts $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and wealth levels $l \in \mathbb{R}$.

This means that f first order stochastically dominates g on the left tails of w. In the language of Epstein and Tanny (1980, p. 18), $f \geq_w g$ if and only if f is *less correlated* (or *less concordant*) with w than g. The next proposition connects the concepts of insurance and hedge.

Proposition 1. *Given any initial wealth w, a random payoff f is a contingency-schedule insurance for w if and only if it is a best hedge for w, that is,*

$$\mathcal{I}^{\text{cs}}(w) = \left\{ f \in \mathcal{F} : f \geq_w g \text{ for all } g \overset{d}{=} f \right\}$$

The implied definitions of propension to insurance and to hedging are completely analogous to the ones given before.

Definition 10. *A risk preference $\succsim$ is:*

(iv) propense to indemnity-schedule insurance *when, for all $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \overset{d}{=} f$,*

$$f \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{is}}(w) \implies w + f \succsim w + g$$

(v) propense to contingency-schedule insurance *when, for all $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \overset{d}{=} f$,*

$$f \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{cs}}(w) \implies w + f \succsim w + g$$

(vi) propense to hedging *when, for all $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \overset{d}{=} f$,*

$$f \geq_w g \implies w + f \succsim w + g$$

We are now ready for an omnibus result on the equivalence of strong risk aversion and propension to partial insurance.

Theorem 3. *The following conditions are equivalent for a continuous risk preference:*

[14] Condition (v) only requires f to be counter-monotonic with w. In fact, it is easy to show that f is a contingency-schedule insurance for w if and only if $[f(s) - f(s')][w(s) - w(s')] \leq 0$ holds $P \times P$ almost surely.

(i) strong risk aversion;

(ii) propension to proportional insurance;

(iii) propension to deductible-limit insurance;

(iv) propension to indemnity-schedule insurance;

(v) propension to contingency-schedule insurance;

(vi) propension to hedging.

Some implications are now easy to see as they follow from our earlier analysis, others are less obvious. Some attitudes, like (ii) and (iii), seem mild, easy to understand and normatively compelling. Others, like (i) and (vi), seem instead more demanding and theoretically sophisticated. Be that as it may, they are all equivalent. In particular, as points (ii)-(v) embody different forms of propension to partial insurance, we can summarize this result as:

$$\text{strong risk aversion} \iff \text{propension to partial insurance} \iff \text{propension to hedging}$$

To the best of our knowledge, the only precursor of this result is the equivalence between (i) and (vi) for expected utility preferences that can be derived from the results Epstein and Tanny (1980). Their result connects risk aversion and hedging propensity for expected utility preferences, but it remains silent about more general preferences and, more importantly for our purposes, about insurance choices.

4 Neutrality

The definitions of *aversion* to the different kinds of insurance and to hedging are obtained from those of *propension* by replacing $\succsim$ with $\precsim$. As usual, *neutrality* is then defined as simultaneous propension and aversion. With this, the counterparts of Theorems 1, 2 and 3 hold as expected. In particular, all definitions of insurance neutrality coincide both with risk neutrality and with hedging neutrality.

The concept of neutrality is important because it serves as a benchmark to connect the absolute attitudes that we studied in the previous section and the comparative ones that we analyze in the next. With this motivation we go a bit deeper in its study. To this end, we introduce two more notions.

Definition 11. *A risk preference $\succsim$ is:*

- monotone *when, for all $w \in \mathcal{F}$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$,*

$$w + \varepsilon \succ w$$

- dependence neutral *when, for all $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$,*

$$g \overset{d}{=} f \implies w + f \sim w + g$$

Monotonicity just requires that the addition of a sure positive payoff is always preferred, a natural assumption when monetary outcomes are considered. Dependence neutrality means that preferences are unaffected by the possible correlation between initial wealth w and two identically distributed investments f and g. It strengthens the requirement of law invariance, which corresponds to $w = 0$, to situations in which background risk is present.

Proposition 2. *The following conditions are equivalent for a risk preference $\succsim$:*

(i) risk neutrality;

(ii) neutrality to full insurance;

(iii) neutrality to hedging;

(iv) dependence neutrality.

Moreover, $\succsim$ is monotone and satisfies any of the equivalent conditions above if and only if, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$f \succsim g \iff \mathbb{E}[f] \geq \mathbb{E}[g] \tag{6}$$

This proposition characterizes risk-neutrality and makes explicit its relation with expected-value preferences. A fundamental feature of these preferences is their consistency with first-order stochastic dominance, $\geq_{\text{fsd}}$. This consistency is crucial in the existing characterizations of expected-value preferences, in particular the classic one of de Finetti (1931) and the more recent one of Pomatto, Strack and Tamuz (2020). In our result, consistency with $\geq_{\text{fsd}}$ is implicit because, in the derivation, it follows from monotonicity and dependence neutrality. Yet, to better connect the approaches, next we provide a characterization of expected value-preferences that makes explicit the role of first order stochastic dominance.

Proposition 3. *Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{M}^\infty$ and P be nonatomic. The following conditions are equivalent for a monotone risk preference $\succsim$:*

(i) $\succsim$ admits an expected-value representation (6);

(ii) for all $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$f \geq_{\text{fsd}} g \implies w + f \succsim w + g$$

(iii) for all $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$f \succsim g \implies w + f \succsim w + g$$

(iv) $\succsim$ is complete and

$$f \succ g \implies w + \tilde{f} >_{\text{fsd}} w + \tilde{g}$$

for some $w, \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $f \overset{d}{=} \tilde{f}$, $g \overset{d}{=} \tilde{g}$ and w is independent of both $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{g}$.

The equivalence of conditions (i) and (ii) is the sought-after characterization of expected-value preferences in terms of first-order stochastic dominance. For perspective, Proposition 3 also reports the earlier characterizations of de Finetti (1931), which in preferential form corresponds to the equivalence of points (i) and (iii), and of Pomatto, Strack and Tamuz (2020), which corresponds to the equivalence of points (i) and (iv).

In comparing condition (ii) with (iii), it is important to contrast the objective premise $f \geq_{\text{fsd}} g$ of the implication in (ii) with the subjective premise $f \succsim g$ of the one in (iii). Implicit in the analysis of de Finetti is the consistency requirement that $f \geq_{\text{fsd}} g$ implies $f \succsim g$. This is why our assumption (ii) is weaker and so our result improves de Finetti's one.

In comparing (ii) with (iv), it is important to observe that the former is not the contrapositive of the latter. Indeed, the equivalence between (i), (ii) and (iii) continues to hold when $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{L}^\infty$, while expected-value preferences on $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ fail to satisfy (iv).

5 Comparative attitudes

We have shown how absolute risk attitudes – both strong and weak – can be characterized in terms of insurance behavior, without recurring to the concept of expectation, and how this leads to novel insights on old and recent results about risk preferences. It is then natural to wonder whether the same exercise can be performed for comparative attitudes.

5.1 Classical comparative risk attitudes

As it is the case for absolute risk attitudes, also comparative attitudes have a weak and a strong form. According to Yaari (1969), agent B (Bob) is *weakly more risk averse than* agent A (Ann) if whenever Ann prefers a sure payoff to a random one, so does Bob. Formally,

$$\gamma \succsim_{\text{A}} f \implies \gamma \succsim_{\text{B}} f$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. With background risk in mind, Ross (1981) introduces a stronger notion: B is *strongly more risk averse than* A if

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} f \geq_{\text{cv}} g \\ g \sim_{\text{A}} f - \rho_{\text{A}} \\ g \sim_{\text{B}} f - \rho_{\text{B}} \end{array}\right\} \implies \rho_{\text{B}} \geq \rho_{\text{A}}$$

for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\rho_{\text{A}}, \rho_{\text{B}} \in \mathbb{R}$. The interpretation becomes transparent once one observes that ρ_{A} (resp. ρ_{B}) is the amount of money Ann (resp. Bob) is willing to pay to replace g with the less risky f. For the ease of exposition, next we introduce a class of risk preferences for which this amount always exists.

Definition 12. *A risk preference $\succsim$ is* secular *when, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g \sim f - \rho$.*

When $\succsim$ is monotone, ρ is the maximum scalar r such that $f - r \succsim g$, that is, the highest amount of money that the agent is willing to pay to trade g with f. Equivalently, $-\rho$ is the

smallest compensation for which the agent accepts this trade. Secularity, implicit in Ross (1981), thus requires that the agent is willing to trade any random payoff with another one for some suitable compensation. Briefly, 'every risk has its price' (see Gollier 2001). This notion allows us to extend Ross' observation that his definition is stronger than the one of Yaari.[15]

Lemma 2. *The following conditions are equivalent for two monotone and secular risk preferences* $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ *and* $\succsim_{\mathrm{B}}$*:*

(i) B *is weakly more risk averse than* A*;*

(ii) for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ *and* $\rho_{\mathrm{A}}, \rho_{\mathrm{B}} \in \mathbb{R}$*,*

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} f = \mathbb{E}[g] \\ g \sim_{\mathrm{A}} f - \rho_{\mathrm{A}} \\ g \sim_{\mathrm{B}} f - \rho_{\mathrm{B}} \end{array}\right\} \implies \rho_{\mathrm{B}} \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}$$

In particular, if B *is strongly more risk averse than* A*, then* B *is weakly more risk averse than* A*.*

This lemma also shows how Yaari's and Ross' notions are the comparative counterparts of the ones of Arrow-Pratt and Rothschild-Stiglitz. Indeed, in both the absolute and comparative cases, the weak notion corresponds to preference for expectation, the strong one to preference for less risky payoffs in general. The parallel does not stop here: the absolute risk notions can be obtained from the comparative ones by assuming agent A to be risk neutral, as next we show.[16]

Lemma 3. *Let* $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ *and* $\succsim_{\mathrm{B}}$ *be monotone and secular risk preferences. If* A *is risk neutral, then:*

1. B *is weakly more risk averse than* A *if and only if* B *is weakly risk averse.*
2. B *is strongly more risk averse than* A *if and only if* B *is strongly risk averse.*

To further elaborate, observe that when a risk preference is monotone and secular the sure amount ρ such that $g \sim f - \rho$ is unique. So, it is possible to define the function

$$(g, f) \mapsto \rho(g, f)$$

for all g and f in $\mathcal{F}$. Intuitively, the greater $\rho(g, f)$ is, the more f is preferred over g. With this, we can interpret ρ as a measure of the strength of preference. Moreover, this function permits the following simple restatements of the comparative concepts that we discussed in this section:

- B is *weakly more risk averse than* A when

$$f = \mathbb{E}[g] \implies \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f)$$

  for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$.

[15] Ross studies the monotone and strictly concave expected utility case.

[16] The result is known for Yaari's definition, we report it for the sake of completeness.

- B is *strongly more risk averse than* A when

$$f \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g \implies \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f)$$

for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$.

The difference in the definitions is now evident. Not only $\mathbb{E}[g] \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g$, but we also have $\mathbb{E}[g] \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} h$ for all $h \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g$. In words, $\mathbb{E}[g]$ is the least risky among the random payoffs that are less risky than g. The sure payoff $\mathbb{E}[g]$ completely eliminates the risk involved in g, while a generic payoff $h \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g$ only reduces it. Thus, Yaari compares the strength of preferences only when risk is eliminated, while Ross compares it also when risk is just reduced.

5.2 Comparative insurance propensity

In light of the previous analysis, the formalization of the concept of comparative propension to full insurance is now natural:

Definition 13. *Let $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\succsim_{\mathrm{B}}$ be monotone and secular risk preferences. We say that* B *is* more propense to full insurance than A *when, for all $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \overset{d}{=} f$,*

$$f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{fi}}(w) \implies \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w + g, w + f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f)$$

In words, Bob is 'more willing to pay than' Ann in order to achieve full insurance for his wealth w. We can now state the comparative version of Theorem 1.

Theorem 4. *The following properties are equivalent for two monotone and secular risk preferences $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\succsim_{\mathrm{B}}$:*

(i) B *is weakly more risk averse than* A*;*

(ii) B *is more propense to full insurance than* A*.*

To move to strong comparative attitudes, first observe that the definitions of comparative propension to proportional insurance, deductible-limit insurance, indemnity-schedule insurance, and contingency-schedule insurance can be obtained by replacing $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{fi}}(w)$ with $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{pr}}(w)$, $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{dl}}(w)$, $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{is}}(w)$, and $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{cs}}(w)$ in Definition 13. Also the comparative version of propension to hedging yields no surprises.

Definition 14. *Let $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\succsim_{\mathrm{B}}$ be monotone and secular risk preferences. We say that* B *is* more propense to hedging than A *when, for all $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \overset{d}{=} f$,*

$$f \geq_{w} g \implies \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w + g, w + f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f)$$

We can now state the comparative version of Theorem 3.

Theorem 5. *The following properties are equivalent for two continuous, monotone, and secular risk preferences $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\succsim_{\mathrm{B}}$:*

(i) B *is strongly more risk averse than* A*;*

(ii) B *is more propense to proportional insurance than* A*;*

(iii) B *is more propense to deductible-limit insurance than* A*;*

(iv) B *is more propense to indemnity-schedule insurance than* A*;*

(v) B *is more propense to contingency-schedule insurance than* A*;*

(vi) B *is more propense to hedging than* A*.*

The interpretations and implications of these comparative results are similar to the absolute ones we discussed in Section 3. In particular,

stronger risk avers. $\iff$ higher propens. to partial insurance $\iff$ higher propens. to hedging

As a consistency check, we conclude by observing that, in light of Lemma 3 and Proposition 2, the absolute attitudes analyzed in Section 3 are obtained by the comparative attitudes studied in this section when agent A is neutral (see Proposition 4 in Appendix A.13).

6 Conclusion

We have shown how the classic, weak and strong, absolute and comparative notions of risk aversion can be completely characterized through insurance choice behavior. Figures 2 and 3 summarize. In them, the superscript 'pi' stands for any one of 'dl, pr, is, cs', since the corresponding set $\mathcal{I}^{\text{pi}}(w)$ describes some class of partial insurance contracts for w.

ABSOLUTE ATTITUDES

Arrow (1963), Pratt (1964) **Weakly risk averse** $f = \mathbb{E}[g] \implies f \succsim g$ risk elimination is preferred	$\iff$	This paper **Propense to full insurance** $f \overset{d}{=} g;\ f \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{fi}}(w) \implies w + f \succsim w + g$ full insurance acquisition is preferred
$\Uparrow$		$\Uparrow$
Rothschild and Stiglitz (1970) **Strongly risk averse** $f \geq_{\text{cv}} g \implies f \succsim g$ risk reduction is preferred	$\iff$	This paper **Propense to partial insurance** $f \overset{d}{=} g;\ f \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{pi}}(w) \implies w + f \succsim w + g$ partial insurance acquisition is preferred

Figure 2: Summary of absolute attitudes

Yaari (1969) **Weakly more risk averse** $f = \mathbb{E}[g] \implies \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g,f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g,f)$ risk elimination is more valued	$\Longleftrightarrow$	This paper **More propense to full insurance** $f \overset{d}{=} g;\ f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{fi}}(w) \Longrightarrow \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w+f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w+g)$ full insurance acquisition is more valued
$\Uparrow$		$\Uparrow$
Ross (1981) **Strongly more risk averse** $f \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g \implies \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g,f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g,f)$ risk reduction is more valued	$\Longleftrightarrow$	This paper **More propense to partial insurance** $f \overset{d}{=} g;\ f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{pi}}(w) \Longrightarrow \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w+f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w+g)$ partial insurance acquisition is more valued

Figure 3: Summary of comparative attitudes

A Proofs and related analysis

A.1 Preamble

Recall that (S, Σ, P) is an adequate probability space. We denote by $\mathcal{L}^0 = \mathcal{L}^0(S, \Sigma, P)$ the space of all measurable functions $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$, by $\mathcal{L}^\infty = \mathcal{L}^\infty(S, \Sigma, P)$ the space of all almost surely (a.s.) bounded elements of $\mathcal{L}^0$, and by $\mathcal{L}^p = \mathcal{L}^p(S, \Sigma, P)$ the space of all elements of $\mathcal{L}^0$ which admit finite absolute p-th moment (for $p \in (0, \infty)$). For $p \in [1, \infty]$, $\|\cdot\|_p$ is the usual (semi-)norm of $\mathcal{L}^p$. By *convergence in* $\mathcal{L}^p$, we mean convergence in this norm. By *convergence in* $\mathcal{M}^\infty = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{L}^n$, we mean convergence in all of the $\|\cdot\|_n$ norms (for $n \in \mathbb{N}$). By *bounded a.s. convergence in* $\mathcal{L}^\infty$, we mean almost sure convergence of a sequence which is bounded in $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ norm. By the Dominated Convergence Theorem, bounded a.s. convergence implies convergence in $\mathcal{M}^\infty$.

We denote by $L^p = L^p(S, \Sigma, P)$ the quotient of $\mathcal{L}^p = \mathcal{L}^p(S, \Sigma, P)$ when almost surely equal measurable functions are identified (e.g. Pollard, 2002). Analogously, $M^\infty = M^\infty(S, \Sigma, P)$ is the quotient of $\mathcal{M}^\infty = \mathcal{M}^\infty(S, \Sigma, P)$.

Given any $f \in \mathcal{L}^0$, the cumulative distribution function $F : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ of f is defined by $F(x) = P(f \leq x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The function F is increasing and right-continuous, with $\lim_{x \to -\infty} F(x) = 0$ and $\lim_{x \to +\infty} F(x) = 1$. Its left-continuous inverse $F^{-1} : (0, 1) \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by $F^{-1}(p) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) \geq p\}$, also denoted by $q_f^-(p)$ or $F_f^{-1}(p)$ when its dependence on f needs to be emphasized. The function F^{-1} is always increasing, and it belongs to $\mathcal{L}^p(\lambda)$ if and only if $f \in \mathcal{L}^p(P)$ (for all $p \in [0, \infty]$), where as usual λ is the Lebesgue measure on $(0, 1)$.

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the collection of all $\upsilon \in \mathcal{L}^0$ having a uniform distribution on $(0, 1)$, i.e. $P(\upsilon \leq t) = t$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. It is without loss to assume $\upsilon(S) = (0, 1)$ for all $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$. For each $f \in \mathcal{L}^0$, $f_\upsilon \in \mathcal{L}^0$ is defined by $f_\upsilon = q_f^- \circ \upsilon$.

Lemma 4. *Let P be nonatomic and $f \in L^0$. Then:*

(i) for each $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$, it holds $f_\upsilon \overset{d}{=} f$;

(ii) there exists $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $f_\upsilon = f$ a.s.

Proof. See, e.g., Lemmas A.23 and A.32 of Föllmer and Schied (2016). ■

In what follows, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by

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

the partition of $(0,1)$ into segments of equal length 2^{-n}. If P is nonatomic and $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Pi_n^\upsilon = \upsilon^{-1}(\Psi_n)$$

is a partition of S in Σ such that $P(E) = 1/2^n$ for all $E \in \Pi_n^\upsilon$. By setting $\Sigma_n^\upsilon = \sigma(\Pi_n^\upsilon) = \upsilon^{-1}(\sigma(\Psi_n))$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have a filtration $\{\Sigma_n^\upsilon\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in Σ. As usual, $\Sigma_\infty^\upsilon = \sigma\left(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n^\upsilon\right)$.

Lemma 5. *Let P be nonatomic and $p \in [1,\infty]$. For each $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$,*

$$\Sigma_\infty^\upsilon = \sigma(\upsilon)$$

and, for each $f \in \mathcal{L}^p$ (resp. $f \in \mathcal{M}^\infty$),

$$\mathbb{E}[f_\upsilon \mid \Sigma_n^\upsilon] \to f_\upsilon$$

almost surely, in $\mathcal{L}^p$ if $p < \infty$, and in bounded a.s. convergence if $p = \infty$ (resp. in $\mathcal{M}^\infty$). In particular, by choosing υ such that $f = f_\upsilon$ a.s., it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[f \mid \Sigma_n^\upsilon] \to f$$

in the above senses. Moreover, for each $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$ and each $f \in \mathcal{L}^p$,

$$q^-_{\mathbb{E}(f_\upsilon \mid \Sigma_n^\upsilon)} = \mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[q_f^- \mid \sigma(\Psi_n)\right] \qquad \lambda\text{-a.s.}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Note that the σ-algebra $\sigma\left(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \Psi_n\right)$ is the Borel σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}(0,1)$ on $(0,1)$ because $\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \Psi_n$ is countable and separates the points of $(0,1)$ (see, e.g., Mackey, 1957, Theorem 3.3). Then,

$$\sigma(\upsilon) = \upsilon^{-1}(\mathcal{B}(0,1)) = \upsilon^{-1}\left(\sigma\left(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \Psi_n\right)\right) = \sigma\left(\upsilon^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \Psi_n\right)\right) = \sigma\left(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \upsilon^{-1}(\Psi_n)\right)$$
$$= \sigma\left(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \Pi_n^\upsilon\right) = \sigma\left(\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n^\upsilon\right) = \Sigma_\infty^\upsilon$$

By the Martingale Convergence Theorem on $\mathcal{L}^1$ and on $\mathcal{L}^p$, $p \in (1,\infty)$ (see Theorems 4.2.11 and 4.4.6 of Durrett, 2019, respectively),

$$\mathbb{E}[f_\upsilon \mid \Sigma_n^\upsilon] \to \mathbb{E}[f_\upsilon \mid \Sigma_\infty^\upsilon]$$

both almost everywhere, and in $\mathcal{L}^p$ if $p < \infty$ (in particular, if $f \in \mathcal{M}^\infty$, convergence in $\mathcal{M}^\infty$ follows). In case $p = \infty$, we have bounded a.s. convergence because f is a.s. bounded. But $\Sigma_\infty^\upsilon = \sigma(\upsilon)$ and f_υ is $\sigma(\upsilon)$-measurable, and so, almost surely

$$f_\upsilon = \mathbb{E}[f_\upsilon \mid \sigma(\upsilon)] = \mathbb{E}[f_\upsilon \mid \Sigma_\infty^\upsilon]$$

This proves the first part of the statement.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Define $G_n = \mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[q_f^- \mid \sigma(\Psi_n)\right]$ on $(0,1)$, and observe that G_n is an increasing function. Moreover, by the change of variable formula (Lemma 6 below),

$$\mathbb{E}_P[f_\upsilon \mid \Sigma_n^\upsilon] = \mathbb{E}_P\left[q_f^- \circ \upsilon \mid \upsilon^{-1}(\sigma(\Psi_n))\right] = \mathbb{E}_\lambda\left[q_f^- \mid \sigma(\Psi_n)\right] \circ \upsilon = G_n \circ \upsilon$$

almost surely. By Lemma A.27 of Föllmer and Schied (2016), we then have, λ-a.s.,

$$q^-_{\mathbb{E}[f_\upsilon \mid \Sigma_n^\upsilon]} = q^-_{G_n \circ \upsilon} = G_n \circ q_\upsilon^- = G_n$$

as desired. ■

We close with two technical results.

Lemma 6. *Let (X, Σ_X, P) be a probability space, (Y, Σ_Y) be a measurable space, $T : X \to Y$ be a measurable function, $g : Y \to \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function such that $g \circ T$ is P-summable. Then g is $P \circ T^{-1}$-summable and, for every sub-σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ of Σ_Y,*

$$\mathbb{E}_P\left[g \circ T \mid T^{-1}(\mathcal{A})\right] = \mathbb{E}_{P \circ T^{-1}}[g \mid \mathcal{A}] \circ T$$

Moreover, for all $A \in \Sigma_Y$, it holds $\mathbb{E}_P[g \circ T \mid T^{-1}(A)] = \mathbb{E}_{P \circ T^{-1}}[g \mid A]$.

Proof. The proof is standard. ■

Lemma 7. *Let $f, g, f', g' \in \mathcal{L}^1$. If $P(f \le x, g \le y) \le P(f' \le x, g' \le y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, then $f + g \ge_{\mathrm{cv}} f' + g'$.*

Proof. See, e.g., Theorem 3.8.2 of Müller and Stoyan (2002). ■

A.2 A remark

The definitions of propension to full (resp. proportional) insurance that we provide in the introduction are equivalent to those appearing in Section 3.

Indeed, $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{pr}}(w)$ if and only if $f = -(1-\varepsilon)w - \pi$ for some $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$. Thus, propension to proportional insurance, as defined by point (ii) of Definition 7, requires

$$w - (1-\varepsilon)w - \pi \succsim w + g$$

for all $w \in \mathcal{F}$, $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$, $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $g \overset{d}{=} -(1-\varepsilon)w - \pi$, that is,

$$w - (1-\varepsilon)w - \pi \succsim w + h - \pi$$

for all $w \in \mathcal{F}$, $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$, $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $h \overset{d}{=} -(1-\varepsilon)w$. The latter is the definition of propension to proportional insurance proposed in the introduction.

The case of full insurance is obtained by considering only the case $\varepsilon = 0$.

A.3 On mean preserving spreads

In this section, we assume that Σ is generated by a partition $\mathcal{S}$ of equiprobable events (called cells), and we fix a risk preference $\succsim$ on $\mathcal{F}$.

Definition 15. *Given $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, we say that g is a* mean preserving spread *of f if, and only if, there exist $\delta \geq 0$ and two distinct cells S_1 and S_2 in $\mathcal{S}$, with $f(S_1) \leq f(S_2)$ such that*[17]

$$g = f - \delta 1_{S_1} + \delta 1_{S_2}$$

Lemma 8. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that g is a mean preserving spread of f satisfying $g = f - \delta 1_{S_1} + \delta 1_{S_2}$ with $f(S_1) < f(S_2)$ and $\delta > 0$. Then there exist $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}, \tilde{w} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that*

$$\tilde{f} \overset{d}{=} \tilde{g},\ \tilde{f} = \eta \tilde{w} \text{ with } \eta \in (-1, 0),\ \text{and } f = \tilde{w} + \tilde{f} \text{ and } g = \tilde{w} + \tilde{g} \tag{7}$$

in particular $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{pr}}(\tilde{w})$, and so $f \succsim g$ if the risk preference $\succsim$ is propense to proportional insurance.

Proof. Denote by $m_i = f(S_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. Let $a = (m_1 - m_2)/\delta - 1 < -1$, and define

$$\tilde{f} = f/(a+1),\ \tilde{g} = \tilde{f} 1_{S \setminus \{S_1, S_2\}} + \tilde{f}(S_1) 1_{S_2} + \tilde{f}(S_2) 1_{S_1},\ \tilde{w} = a\tilde{f}.$$

We aim to show that $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}, \tilde{w}$ satisfy all conditions in (7). It is straightforward to see $\tilde{f} \overset{d}{=} \tilde{g}$. Moreover, it is easy to verify that

$$\tilde{f} = \frac{1}{a}\tilde{w} \text{ with } \frac{1}{a} \in (-1, 0)$$

because $a < -1$, and

$$\tilde{w} + \tilde{f} = a\tilde{f} + \tilde{f} = (a+1)\frac{f}{a+1} = f$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{w} + \tilde{g} &= a\tilde{f} + \tilde{f} 1_{S \setminus \{S_1, S_2\}} + \tilde{f}(S_1) 1_{S_2} + \tilde{f}(S_2) 1_{S_1} \\
&= a\tilde{f} 1_{S \setminus \{S_1, S_2\}} + a\tilde{f}(S_2) 1_{S_2} + a\tilde{f}(S_1) 1_{S_1} + \tilde{f} 1_{S \setminus \{S_1, S_2\}} + \tilde{f}(S_1) 1_{S_2} + \tilde{f}(S_2) 1_{S_1} \\
&= f 1_{S \setminus \{S_1, S_2\}} + (a\tilde{f}(S_2) + \tilde{f}(S_1)) 1_{S_2} + (a\tilde{f}(S_1) + \tilde{f}(S_2)) 1_{S_1} \\
&= f 1_{S \setminus \{S_1, S_2\}} + \left(a\frac{f(S_2)}{a+1} + \frac{f(S_1)}{a+1} \right) 1_{S_2} + \left(a\frac{f(S_1)}{a+1} + \frac{f(S_2)}{a+1} \right) 1_{S_1} \\
&= f 1_{S \setminus \{S_1, S_2\}} + \underbrace{\left(\left(\frac{m_1 - m_2}{\delta} - 1 \right) \frac{m_2}{\frac{m_1 - m_2}{\delta}} + \frac{m_1}{\frac{m_1 - m_2}{\delta}} \right)}_{= m_2 + \delta = f(S_2) + \delta} 1_{S_2} \\
&\qquad + \underbrace{\left(\left(\frac{m_1 - m_2}{\delta} - 1 \right) \frac{m_1}{\frac{m_1 - m_2}{\delta}} + \frac{m_2}{\frac{m_1 - m_2}{\delta}} \right)}_{= m_1 - \delta = f(S_1) - \delta} 1_{S_1} \\
&= g
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. ■

[17] Clearly, f is constant on cells, so $f(S_i)$ is the constant value of f on S_i, for $i = 1, 2$.

Lemma 9. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that g is a mean preserving spread of f. If the risk preference $\succsim$ is continuous and propense to proportional insurance, then $f \succsim g$.*

Proof. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that g is a mean preserving spread of f. Then there exist $\delta \geq 0$ and two distinct cells S_1 and S_2 in $\mathcal{S}$, with $f(S_1) \leq f(S_2)$ such that

$$g = f - \delta 1_{S_1} + \delta 1_{S_2}$$

If $\delta = 0$, then $f = g$ and reflexivity of $\succsim$ yields $f \succsim g$. If $\delta > 0$ and $f(S_1) < f(S_2)$, the previous lemma yields $f \succsim g$. If $\delta > 0$ and $f(S_1) = f(S_2)$, define $f_\varepsilon = f - \varepsilon 1_{S_1} + \varepsilon 1_{S_2}$ with $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
f_\varepsilon &= f - \varepsilon 1_{S_1} + \varepsilon 1_{S_2} = f 1_{S \setminus \{S_1, S_2\}} + (f(S_1) - \varepsilon) 1_{S_1} + (f(S_2) + \varepsilon) 1_{S_2} \\
f_\varepsilon(S_1) &< f_\varepsilon(S_2) \\
g &= f - \delta 1_{S_1} + \delta 1_{S_2} = f - (\varepsilon + (\delta - \varepsilon)) 1_{S_1} + (\varepsilon + (\delta - \varepsilon)) 1_{S_2} \\
&= f_\varepsilon - (\delta - \varepsilon) 1_{S_1} + (\delta - \varepsilon) 1_{S_2}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus g is a mean preserving spread of f_ε with $f_\varepsilon(S_1) < f_\varepsilon(S_2)$ and $\delta - \varepsilon > 0$. By the previous argument $f_\varepsilon \succsim g$ for all $\epsilon \in (0, \delta)$. Letting $\varepsilon_n = \delta / 2^n \to 0$, we have $f_{\varepsilon_n} \to f$, and continuity implies $f \succsim g$. ■

Lemma 10. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that g is a mean preserving spread of f. Then there exist $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}, \tilde{w} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that*

$$\tilde{f} \overset{d}{=} \tilde{g},\ \tilde{f} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{dl}}(\tilde{w}),\ f = \tilde{w} + \tilde{f} \text{ and } g = \tilde{w} + \tilde{g}$$

and so $f \succsim g$ if the risk preference $\succsim$ is propense to deductible-limit insurance.

Proof. For a mean preserving spread g of f, we can write

$$g = f - 2\delta 1_{S_1} + 2\delta 1_{S_2}$$

where $\delta \geq 0$ and $f(S_1) \leq f(S_2)$. Define the events

$$E_1 = \{f \leq f(S_1)\} \setminus S_1 \qquad E_2 = \{f(S_1) < f < f(S_2)\} \qquad E_3 = \{f \geq f(S_2)\} \setminus S_2$$

The events S_1, S_2, E_1, E_2, and E_3 form a measurable partition of S. Define $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}, \tilde{w}$ by the following table:

	E_1	S_1	E_2	S_2	E_3
$\tilde{f}$	δ	δ	δ	$-\delta$	$-\delta$
$\tilde{g}$	δ	$-\delta$	δ	δ	$-\delta$
$\tilde{w}$	$f - \delta$	$f - \delta$	$f - \delta$	$f + \delta$	$f + \delta$

Write $\xi = -f(S_2) - \delta$. One can check $\tilde{f} \overset{d}{=} \tilde{g}$ and

$$\tilde{f} = (-\tilde{w} - \xi)_+ \wedge (2\delta) - \delta$$

in fact

- if $s \in E_1 \cup S_1 \cup E_2$, then $f(s) \leq f(S_2)$, and

$$-\tilde{w}(s) - \xi = -f(s) + \delta + f(S_2) + \delta = f(S_2) - f(s) + 2\delta \geq 2\delta \geq 0$$

  so

$$(-\tilde{w}(s) - \xi)_+ = f(S_2) - f(s) + 2\delta \geq 2\delta$$

  and

$$(-\tilde{w}(s) - \xi)_+ \wedge (2\delta) - \delta = 2\delta - \delta = \delta = \tilde{f}(s)$$

- else $s \in S_2 \cup E_3$, then $f(s) \geq f(S_2)$, and

$$-\tilde{w}(s) - \xi = -f(s) - \delta + f(S_2) + \delta = f(S_2) - f(s) \leq 0$$

  so

$$(-\tilde{w}(s) - \xi)_+ = 0$$

  and

$$(-\tilde{w}(s) - \xi)_+ \wedge (2\delta) - \delta = -\delta = \tilde{f}(s)$$

This implies $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{dl}}(\tilde{w})$. On the other hand, it is easy to see $\tilde{w} + \tilde{f} = f$ and $\tilde{w} + \tilde{g} = g$, as wanted. ■

Lemma 11. *If the risk preference $\succsim$ is continuous, and either propense to proportional insurance or propense to deductible-limit insurance, then*

$$f \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g \implies f \succsim g$$

Proof If $f \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g$ in $\mathcal{F}$, then there exists a sequence $h_0, h_1, \ldots, h_m$ such that $f = h_0$, $g = h_m$ and each h_{k+1} is either a mean-preserving spread of h_k or it is obtained by h_k through the permutation of the values that h_k takes on two cells. In the first case, $h_k \succsim h_{k+1}$ by what we just proved. In the second, $h_k \sim h_{k+1}$ because $\succsim$ is law-invariant. By the transitivity of $\succsim$, we conclude that $f \succsim g$. ■

A.4 A deus ex machina

In what follows, for $f \in L^\infty$, let u_f be the essential supremum of f and ℓ_f be the essential infimum of f, defined by $u_f = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : P(f \leq x) = 1\}$ and $\ell_f = \sup\{x \in \mathbb{R} : P(f \geq x) = 1\}$.

Theorem 6. *Let $k \geq 1$ and $f \in L^k$. Then $\mathbb{E}[f] = 0$ if and only if there exist $g, g' \in L^{k-1}$ such that $g \overset{d}{=} g'$ and $g - g' \overset{d}{=} f$. Moreover,*

(i) if $f \in L^\infty$, it is possible to choose $g, g' \in L^\infty$ so that $\ell_f \leq g, g' \leq u_f$;

(ii) if $f \in M^\infty$, it is possible to choose $g, g' \in M^\infty$;

(iii) if the probability space is finite, it is possible to choose g and g' so that $g - g' = f$.

To prove Theorem 6, we first note that the "if" direction can be verified in a straightforward manner. Suppose that $f \overset{d}{=} g - g'$ for some $g \overset{d}{=} g'$. If $g, g' \in L^1$ then it is obvious that $\mathbb{E}[g - g'] = 0$. In general, Simons (1977) showed that $\mathbb{E}[g - g'] = 0$ even if g, g' are not in L^1, as long as the mean $\mathbb{E}[g - g']$ is well defined, justified by $f \in L^k$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[f] = \mathbb{E}[g - g'] = 0$.

Next, we focus on the more important "only if" direction of Theorem 6. For this, we first prove the case of L^∞, and then the case of L^k, which is much more technically involved.

Proof of Theorem 6 on finite spaces.

We begin with a finite state space $S = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ of equiprobable states. Let $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$ have mean 0, and set $x_i = f(i)$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$. If $f = 0$, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise choose $j_1 \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $x_{j_1} > 0$. Now

$$\min\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{1} x_{j_i} \leq \max\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$$

Assume for some $1 \leq k < n$ to have found distinct $j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that

$$\min\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{j_i} \leq \max\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \qquad \forall m = 1, \ldots, k$$

we next show that there is $j_{k+1} \in J_{k+1} := \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_k\}$ such that

$$\min\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{j_i} \leq \max\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \qquad \forall m = 1, \ldots, k, k+1$$

1. If $x_j = 0$ for some $j \in J_{k+1}$, set $j_{k+1} = j$.
2. If $\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} = 0$, arbitrarily choose $j_{k+1} \in J_{k+1}$.
3. Else $x_j \neq 0$ for all $j \in J_{k+1}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} \neq 0$;
   (a) if $\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} > 0$, it cannot be the case that $x_j \geq 0$ for all elements of $J_{k+1} = \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_k\}$, otherwise we would have

   $$0 < \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} + \sum_{j \in J_{k+1}} x_j = \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j = 0$$

   then it is possible to choose $j_{k+1} \in J_{k+1}$ such that $x_{j_{k+1}} < 0$, and

   $$\min\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \leq x_{j_{k+1}} < \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} + x_{j_{k+1}} < \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} \leq \max\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$$

   (b) else $\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} < 0$, it cannot be the case that $x_j \leq 0$ for all elements of $J_{k+1} = \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_k\}$, otherwise we would have

   $$0 > \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} + \sum_{j \in J_{k+1}} x_j = \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j = 0$$

then it is possible to choose $j_{k+1} \in J_{k+1}$ such that $x_{j_{k+1}} > 0$, and

$$\min\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} < \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i} + x_{j_{k+1}} < x_{j_{k+1}} \leq \max\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$$

In exactly n steps this produces a rearrangement $(x_{j_1}, \ldots, x_{j_n})$ of $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, which by construction satisfies

$$\min\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{j_i} \leq \max\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \qquad \forall m = 1, \ldots, n \tag{8}$$

Define acts $g, g' : S \to \mathbb{R}$ by $g(j_k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} x_{j_i}$ and $g'(j_k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} x_{j_i}$ for each $1 \leq k \leq n$, with the convention $g'(j_1) = 0$. Diagram g and g' as follows:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} & j_1 & j_2 & \cdots & j_{n-1} & j_n \\ g & x_{j_1} & x_{j_1} + x_{j_2} & \cdots & \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_{j_i} & 0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{j_i} \\ g' & 0 & x_{j_1} & \cdots & \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} x_{j_i} & \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_{j_i} \end{array}$$

We have that $g(j_i) - g'(j_i) = f(j_i)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and hence

$$f = g - g'$$

and since states are equally probable, $g \overset{d}{=} g'$. In view of (8), we conclude that

$$f = g - g' \quad ; \quad g \overset{d}{=} g' \quad \text{and} \quad \min_S f \leq g, g' \leq \max_S f \tag{9}$$

This proves the statement for a finite state space.

Proof of Theorem 6 on L^∞.

Now, let S be an infinite state space. Let $f \in L^\infty$. Choose $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $f = f_\upsilon$, by Lemma 5,

$$f_n := \mathbb{E}[f \mid \Sigma_n^\upsilon] \to f$$

both almost everywhere and in L^1. Moreover, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\ell_f \leq f \leq u_f$$

implies

$$\ell_f = \mathbb{E}[\ell_f \mid \Sigma_n^\upsilon] \leq f_n \leq \mathbb{E}[u_f \mid \Sigma_n^\upsilon] = u_f$$

In view of (9), by choosing the standard versions of the f_n, given by

$$f_n(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \int_E f \mathrm{d}P \qquad \forall s \in E \in \Pi_n^\upsilon$$

there exist two sequences $\{g_n\}$ and $\{g_n'\}$ such that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$g_n \overset{d}{=} g_n' \quad , \quad \ell_f \leq g_n, g_n' \leq u_f \quad \text{and} \quad g_n - g_n' = f_n$$

Since $f_n \in L^\infty$, we have $g_n, g_n' \in L^\infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, by the almost everywhere convergence of f_n to f, it follows that

$$g_n - g_n' \xrightarrow{d} f \tag{10}$$

Denote by μ_n the joint distribution of (g_n, g_n'). The sequence $\{\mu_n\}$ is tight since is supported in the compact square

$$C = [\ell_f, u_f] \times [\ell_f, u_f]$$

of $\mathbb{R}^2$. By Prohorov's Theorem, there exists a subsequence $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$ that converges weakly to a probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^2$ with support in C. As P is nonatomic, by a version of Skorhod's Theorem there exists a random vector $(g, g') : S \to \mathbb{R}^2$ with joint distribution μ.[18] By the Continuous Mapping Theorem,[19]

$$g_{n_k} \xrightarrow{d} g \quad , \quad g_{n_k}' \xrightarrow{d} g' \quad \text{and} \quad g_{n_k} - g_{n_k}' \xrightarrow{d} g - g'$$

Since $g_{n_k} \overset{d}{=} g_{n_k}'$ for all $k \geq 1$, we have $g \overset{d}{=} g'$. By (10), we also have $g_{n_k} - g_{n_k}' \xrightarrow{d} f$ and so $g - g' \overset{d}{=} f$. Note that $\ell_f \leq g, g' \leq u_f$ since μ is supported in C. ■

Preparation for the proof on L^k.

We first present some preliminaries. For $f \in L^1$, denote by $\mu_f = P \circ f^{-1}$. Recall that the left quantile $q_f^- : (0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined as $q_f^-(p) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : P(f \leq x) \geq p\}$.

Let $f \in L^1$ with $\mathbb{E}[f] = 0$. We assume that f is not constantly 0. Define

$$H(t) = \int_0^t q_f^- \mathrm{d}\lambda \qquad \forall t \in [0,1]$$

and denote by $a^- = \mu_f((-\infty, 0))$ and $a^+ = \mu_f((-\infty, 0])$. It is easy to see that H is strictly decreasing on $[0, a^-]$, strictly increasing on $[a^+, 1]$, $H(0) = H(1) = 0$, and the minimum value of H is given by $c := H(a^-) = H(a^+) < 0$ which is attained by any point in $[a^-, a^+]$. Moreover, H is convex because q_f is increasing, and hence H is almost everywhere differentiable on $[0,1]$. For $r \in [c, 0]$, define

$$A(r) = \inf\{t \in [0,1] : H(t) = r\} \quad \text{and} \quad B(r) = \sup\{t \in [0,1] : H(t) = r\} \tag{11}$$

Obviously, $A(r) \in [0, a^-]$, $B(r) \in [a^+, 1]$, $A(c) = a^-$, $B(c) = a^+$ and $H \circ A(r) = H \circ B(r) = r$. Moreover, $A(r)$ and $B(r)$ are also both continuous and strictly monotone as H is so on $[0, a^-]$ and $[a^+, 1]$. Define

$$K(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & r > 0 \\ B(r) - A(r) & c \leq r \leq 0 \\ 0 & r < c \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

One can check that K is right-continuous and increasing, with $\lim_{x \uparrow c} K(x) = 0$, $\lim_{x \downarrow c} K(x) = K(c) = a^+ - a^-$ and $K(0) = 1$. Hence, K is a distribution function on $[c, 0]$. More precisely, K is continuous and strictly increasing on $(c, 0]$ and has probability mass $a^+ - a^-$ at c. The functions H and K are plotted in Figure 4.

[18] See, e.g., Theorem 3.1 of Berti, Pratelli and Rigo (2007).

[19] See, e.g., Theorem 4.27 of Kallenberg (2002).



Figure 4: The functions H (left panel) and K (right panel).

Define the function Φ on $[c, 0)$ by

$$\Phi = q_f^- \circ B - q_f^- \circ A \tag{13}$$

It is easy to see that Φ is increasing. Note that $q_f^- \circ A(r) \leq 0 \leq q_f^- \circ B(r)$ for $r \in [c, 0]$ with strict inequalities on $(c, 0)$. It holds that $\Phi \geq \max\{|q_f^- \circ B|, |q_f^- \circ A|\}$. The functions A, B, H, K, Φ have been studied by Wang and Wang (2015) in a different context. An important technical tool that we will use is Lemma 2.4 of Wang and Wang (2015), which says that $\Phi(w)$ where $w \overset{d}{\sim} K$ is in L^{k-1} (the distribution of $\Phi(w)$ is denoted by $\tilde{F}$ in that paper). That is,

$$\int_c^0 (\Phi(r))^{k-1} \mathrm{d}K(r) < \infty \tag{14}$$

Proof of Theorem 6 on L^k.

Consider any $f \in L^k$ with $k \geq 1$ which satisfies $\mathbb{E}[f] = 0$. The case of $f = 0$ is trivial. We assume that f is not constantly 0. Choose $v \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $f = f_v$. Recall the functions A, B defined by (11) and K by (12). We have that $K = B - A$ is continuous and strictly increasing on $(c, 0]$ and has probability mass $a^+ - a^-$ at c. Let $r_1 = c$, and define

$$r_n = \inf\left\{r > r_{n-1} : K(r) - K(r_{n-1}) = \frac{1 - (a^+ - a^-)}{2^{n-1}}\right\} \qquad \forall n \geq 2$$

It is easy to see that the sequence $\{r_n\}$ is contained in $[c, 0)$, and increasing with $K(r_n) - K(r_{n-1}) = (1 - a^+ + a^-)/2^{n-1}$ for $n \geq 2$. Moreover, $r_n \to 0$ because K is strictly increasing on $[c, 0]$ with $K(0) = 1$, and

$$K(r_n) = K(r_1) + \sum_{i=2}^{n} K(r_i) - K(r_{i-1}) = 1 - \frac{1 - a^+ + a^-}{2^{n-1}} \to 1$$

Denote by $T_n = [A(r_n), B(r_n)]$. Further, write $T_0 = \emptyset$, $T_\infty = \lim_{n\to\infty} T_n = (0, 1)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define μ_n by

$$\mu_n(D) = P(f \in D \mid v \in T_n \setminus T_{n-1}) \qquad \forall D \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$$

Note that $\{r_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq [c, 0)$, and A and B are both strictly monotone on $[c, 0]$ satisfying $A \leq B$ and $A(0) = 1 - B(0) = 0$. It holds that $A(r_n), B(r_n) \in (0, 1)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, μ_n is a

compactly supported Borel probability measure. Below we will show $\int_{\mathbb{R}} x \mathrm{d}\mu_n(x) = 0$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\mu_f = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (K(r_n) - K(r_{n-1}))\mu_n \tag{15}$$

where r_0 is any number in $(-\infty, c)$ so that $K(r_0) = 0$. To show the claim, using Lemma 6 and denoting by $m = K(r_n) - K(r_{n-1}) > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
m \int_{\mathbb{R}} x \mathrm{d}\mu_n(x) &= m \int_{\mathbb{R}} x \mathrm{d}\left(P_{\{v\in T_n \setminus T_{n-1}\}} \circ f_v^{-1}\right)(x) = m \int f_v \mathrm{d}P_{\{v\in T_n\setminus T_{n-1}\}} \\
&= m \int q_f^- \mathrm{d}\left(P \circ v^{-1}\right)_{T_n \setminus T_{n-1}} = m \int q_f^- \mathrm{d}\lambda_{T_n\setminus T_{n-1}} \\
&= \int_{T_n} q_f^- \mathrm{d}\lambda - \int_{T_{n-1}} q_f^- \mathrm{d}\lambda \\
&= \int_0^{B(r_n)} q_f^- \mathrm{d}\lambda - \int_0^{A(r_n)} q_f^- \mathrm{d}\lambda - \int_0^{B(r_{n-1})} q_f^- \mathrm{d}\lambda + \int_0^{A(r_{n-1})} q_f^- \mathrm{d}\lambda \\
&= H \circ B(r_n) - H \circ A(r_n) - H \circ B(r_{n-1}) + H \circ A(r_{n-1}) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from $H \circ A(r) = H \circ B(r)$ for all $r \in [c, 0]$. This implies that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} x \mathrm{d}\mu_n(x) = 0$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. To see (15), note that $P(v \in T_n \setminus T_{n-1}) = \lambda(T_n \setminus T_{n-1}) = \lambda(T_n) - \lambda(T_{n-1}) = K(r_n) - K(r_{n-1})$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (K(r_n) - K(r_{n-1}))\mu_n(D) &= P\left(f \in D,\ v \in \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (T_n \setminus T_{n-1})\right) \\
&= P\left(f \in D,\ v \in T_\infty \setminus T_0\right) = \mu_f(D)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have verified (15). Take independent random variables $v : S \to (0,1)$ and $w : S \to \mathbb{N}$ with $v \in \mathcal{U}$ and w such that $P(w = n) = K(r_n) - K(r_{n-1})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the construction of $\{r_n\}$, we have $2P(w = n+1) = P(w = n)$ for all $n \geq 2$. Using the result of Theorem 6 on bounded random variables, on the space $(S, \sigma(v), P)$ there exist identically distributed random variables g_n and g_n' such that $g_n - g_n' \overset{d}{\sim} \mu_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, $q_f^- \circ A(r_n) \leq g_n, g_n' \leq q_f^- \circ B(r_n)$ as the support of μ_n is contained in $[q_f^- \circ A(r_n), q_f^- \circ B(r_n)]$. Define the random variables g and g' by

$$g(s) = g_{w(s)}(s) \quad \text{and} \quad g'(s) = g'_{w(s)}(s) \qquad \forall s \in S$$

First observe that, for all $D \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\{g \in D\} = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \{g \in D,\ w = n\} = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \{g_n \in D,\ w = n\}$$

This shows that g is measurable. Moreover, since g_n and w are independent we have that, for all $D \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\mu_g(D) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} P(w = n)\, \mu_{g_n}(D) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} (K(r_n) - K(r_{n-1}))\mu_{g_n}(D)$$

The same argument for g' and the fact that $g_n \overset{d}{=} g'_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ show that $g \overset{d}{=} g'$; the same argument for $g - g'$ and the fact that $g_n - g'_n \overset{d}{\sim} \mu_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ combining with (15) yield $g - g' \overset{d}{\sim} \mu_f$. It remains to verify that the constructed g is in L^{k-1}. Recall the definition of $\Phi = q_f^- \circ B - q_f^- \circ A$ in (13). We have $|g_n| \leq \Phi(r_n)$ because $q_f^- \circ A(r_n) \leq g_n \leq q_f^- \circ B(r_n)$ and $q_f^- \circ A \leq 0 \leq q_f^- \circ B$. Using (14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\infty > \int_c^0 (\Phi(r))^{k-1} \mathrm{d}K(r) &\geq \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \int_{(r_n, r_{n+1}]} (\Phi(r))^{k-1} \mathrm{d}K(r) \\
&\geq \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} P(w = n+1) (\Phi(r_n))^{k-1} \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} P(w = n) (\Phi(r_n))^{k-1} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} P(w = n) \mathbb{E}\left[|g_n|^{k-1}\right] = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[|g|^{k-1}\right] - K(r_1)\mathbb{E}\left[|g_1|^{k-1}\right]\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\mathbb{E}\left[|g_1|^{k-1}\right] < \infty$ as g_1 is bounded, we have $\mathbb{E}\left[|g|^{k-1}\right] < \infty$. This completes the proof of the necessity statement. ■

A.5 Proof of Lemma 1

It is a direct consequence of Theorem 6, which we proved above. ■

A.6 Proof of Theorem 1

(i) $\implies$ (ii). Let $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \overset{d}{=} f$, if $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{fi}}(w)$, then $f = -w - \pi$ for some $\pi \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$w + f = -\pi = \mathbb{E}[w] + \mathbb{E}[-w - \pi] = \mathbb{E}[w] + \mathbb{E}[g] = \mathbb{E}[w + g] \succsim w + g$$

where the third equality follows from $g \overset{d}{=} -w - \pi$, and the final preference follows from weak risk aversion. Thus propension to full insurance holds.

(ii) $\implies$ (i). For each $h \in \mathcal{F}$, by Lemma 1, there exist $w, w' \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $w \overset{d}{=} w'$ and $h - \mathbb{E}[h] \overset{d}{=} w - w'$. Let $f = -w + \mathbb{E}[h]$ and $g = -w' + \mathbb{E}[h]$, clearly $f \overset{d}{=} g$ and $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{fi}}(w)$. Propension to full insurance implies that $w + f \succsim w + g$, which gives $\mathbb{E}[h] = w + f \succsim w + g = w - w' + \mathbb{E}[h] \overset{d}{=} h$. Law invariance of $\succsim$ yields $w - w' + \mathbb{E}[h] \sim h$, then $\mathbb{E}[h] \succsim w - w' + \mathbb{E}[h] \sim h$ and transitivity implies $\mathbb{E}[h] \succsim h$. Thus weak risk aversion holds. ■

A.7 Proof of Theorem 2

It is a direct consequence of Theorem 3, which we prove below. ■

A.8 Proof of Proposition 1

$\subseteq$. As observed, $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{cs}}(w)$ is the set of all elements of $\mathcal{F}$ that are counter-monotonic with w, that is, such that

$$[f(s) - f(s')][w(s) - w(s')] \leq 0$$

$P \times P$ almost surely. Thus, by Theorem 2.14 of Rüschendorf (2013),[20] if $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{cs}}(w)$, then

$$F_{f,w} \leq G$$

for all joint distributions with marginals F_f and F_w. In particular, if $g \overset{d}{=} f$, then $F_{f,w} \leq F_{g,w}$ which is equivalent to $f \geq_w g$.

$\supseteq$. Assume that $f \geq_w g$ for all $g \overset{d}{=} f$, that is, $F_{f,w} \leq F_{g,w}$ for all $g \overset{d}{=} f$. We want to show that f is counter-monotonic with w. By Theorem 3.1 of Puccetti and Wang (2015), it suffices to show that

$$F_{f,w}(x,y) \leq (F_f(x) + F_w(y) - 1)^+ \qquad \forall (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$$

since the opposite inequality is true for all joint distributions with marginals F_f and F_w.

Let $g \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that $g \overset{d}{=} f$ and g is counter-monotonic with w. If Σ is generated by a finite partition of equiprobable cells, then such a g can be constructed by rearranging the values of f over the cells. Else, we can take $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$ such that a.s. $w = w_\upsilon = F_w^{-1}(\upsilon)$ and define $g = F_f^{-1}(1-\upsilon)$, now $g \overset{d}{=} f$ because $1 - \upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$, and it is counter-monotonic with w because

$$(w, g) = \left(F_w^{-1}(\upsilon), F_f^{-1}(1-\upsilon)\right)$$

$P \times P$ almost surely.

With this, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$F_{f,w}(x,y) \leq F_{g,w}(x,y) = (F_g(x) + F_w(y) - 1)^+ = (F_f(x) + F_w(y) - 1)^+$$

where the first equality follows from Theorem 3.1 of Puccetti and Wang (2015) and the counter-monotonicity of g and w, the second from the fact that $g \overset{d}{=} f$. ■

A.9 Proof of Theorem 3

(i) $\implies$ (vi). Let $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \overset{d}{=} f$ and $f \geq_w g$. By Lemma 7, $w + f \geq_{\text{cv}} w + g$, and strong risk aversion implies $w + f \succsim w + g$. Thus $\succsim$ is propense to hedging.

(vi) $\implies$ (v). Let $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \overset{d}{=} f$ and $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{cs}}(w)$, by Proposition 1, it follows that $f \geq_w g$, and propension to hedging implies $w + f \succsim w + g$. Thus $\succsim$ is propense to contingency-schedule insurance.

(v) $\implies$ (iv) because $\mathcal{I}^{\text{is}}(w) \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{\text{cs}}(w)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{F}$.

(iv) $\implies$ (iii) and (iv) $\implies$ (ii) because $\mathcal{I}^{\text{dl}}(w), \mathcal{I}^{\text{pr}}(w) \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{\text{is}}(w)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{F}$.

(iii) $\implies$ (i) and (ii) $\implies$ (i). The case in which Σ is generated by a finite partition of equiprobable events follows from Lemma 11. Now, let P be nonatomic. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that $f \geq_{\text{cv}} g$. We want to show that $f \succsim g$. Let $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$. By Lemma 4-(i), $f_\upsilon \overset{d}{=} f$ and $g_\upsilon \overset{d}{=} g$. Consider the filtration $\{\Sigma_n^\upsilon : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ that we built for Lemma 5 and note that

$$f_n := \mathbb{E}[f_\upsilon \mid \Sigma_n^\upsilon] \to f_\upsilon \quad \text{and} \quad g_n := \mathbb{E}[g_\upsilon \mid \Sigma_n^\upsilon] \to g_\upsilon$$

[20] There is a typo in both relation (2.39) and the last line of the mentioned theorem of Rüschendorf: the inequality on the left-hand side of the implication should be strict, in both cases.

in $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ with respect to bounded a.s. convergence if $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{L}^\infty$ and in $\mathcal{M}^\infty$ if $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{M}^\infty$. We want to show that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $f_n \geq_{\text{cv}} g_n$. To this end, let F, G and F_n, G_n be the distribution functions of f, g and f_n, g_n, respectively. Define $\varphi, \gamma : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\varphi(p) = \int_0^p F^{-1}(t)\mathrm{d}\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma(p) = \int_0^p G^{-1}(t)\mathrm{d}\lambda$$

As well-known,[21] $f \geq_{\text{cv}} g$ is equivalent to $\varphi \geq \gamma$ with $\varphi(1) = \gamma(1)$. Arbitrarily choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and define φ_n and γ_n in a similar way. Now note that, by Lemma 5, we have λ-a.s.

$$F_n^{-1} = \mathbb{E}_\lambda \left[F^{-1} \mid \sigma(\Psi_n) \right]$$

Therefore, for each $i = 1, \ldots, 2^n$,

$$\varphi_n\left(\frac{i}{2^n}\right) = \int_0^{\frac{i}{2^n}} F_n^{-1}(t)\mathrm{d}\lambda = \int_0^{\frac{i}{2^n}} F^{-1}(t)\mathrm{d}\lambda = \varphi\left(\frac{i}{2^n}\right) \tag{16}$$

A similar argument holds for g and g_n. Thus,

$$\varphi \geq \gamma \Longrightarrow \varphi_n\left(\frac{i}{2^n}\right) \geq \gamma_n\left(\frac{i}{2^n}\right) \qquad \forall i = 1, \ldots, 2^n$$

By definition $\varphi_n(0) = \gamma_n(0) = 0$. The functions φ_n and γ_n are absolutely continuous on $[0,1]$. Moreover, on each segment $[(i-1)/2^n, i/2^n]$, for each $p \in [(i-1)/2^n, i/2^n]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_n(p) &= \int_0^p F_n^{-1}(t)\mathrm{d}\lambda = \int_0^{\frac{i-1}{2^n}} F_n^{-1}(t)\mathrm{d}\lambda + \int_{\frac{i-1}{2^n}}^p \underbrace{F_n^{-1}(t)}_{=c_{i,n}\ \lambda\text{-a.s.}} \mathrm{d}\lambda \\ &= \varphi_n\left(\frac{i-1}{2^n}\right) + c_{i,n}\left(p - \frac{i-1}{2^n}\right)\end{aligned}$$

because $F_n^{-1}(t)$ is λ-a.s. constant on $((i-1)/2^n, i/2^n)$. But then φ_n is affine on $[(i-1)/2^n, i/2^n]$, and the same is true for γ_n. Therefore, the inequality $\varphi_n \geq \gamma_n$ on the points $\{i/2^n : i = 0, \ldots, 2^n\}$ implies $\varphi_n \geq \gamma_n$ on $[0,1]$. As the equality $\varphi_n(1) = \gamma_n(1)$ follows from $\varphi(1) = \gamma(1)$, this proves that $f_n \geq_{\text{cv}} g_n$ in $\mathcal{L}^\infty(S, \Sigma, P)$, but then $f_n \geq_{\text{cv}} g_n$ in $\mathcal{L}^\infty\left(S, \Sigma_n^v, P_{|\Sigma_n^v}\right)$.[22] As n was chosen arbitrarily in $\mathbb{N}$, we conclude that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $f_n \geq_{\text{cv}} g_n$ in $\mathcal{L}^\infty\left(S, \Sigma_n^v, P_{|\Sigma_n^v}\right)$. Now the restriction of $\succsim$ to $\mathcal{L}^\infty\left(S, \Sigma_n^v, P_{|\Sigma_n^v}\right)$ is either propense to deductible-limit insurance or propense to proportional insurance because $\succsim$ satisfies either (iii) or (ii) on $\mathcal{F}$, and we can apply Lemma 11 to conclude that

$$f_n \succsim g_n \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \tag{17}$$

But, as observed, $f_n \to f_v$ and $g_n \to g_v$, thus the continuity of $\succsim$ guarantees that $f_v \succsim g_v$, and law invariance delivers $f \succsim g$, as wanted. ■

The conclusions of Theorem 3 hold also for risk preferences on $\mathcal{L}^p$ for $p \in [1, \infty)$ if continuity is formulated with respect to convergence in $\mathcal{L}^p$. This is because in Lemma 5, we proved that the convergence of $f_n \to f_v$ and $g_n \to g_v$ is in the corresponding sense.

[21] See, e.g., Theorem 3.A.5 of Shaked and Shanthikumar (2007).

[22] Since Σ_n^v is finite, then $\mathcal{L}^\infty\left(S, \Sigma_n^v, P_{|\Sigma_n^v}\right) = \mathcal{M}^\infty\left(S, \Sigma_n^v, P_{|\Sigma_n^v}\right)$.

A.10 Weak monotonicity and weak secularity

Next we introduce weaker notions of monotonicity and secularity that are sufficient for some of the results that follow.

Definition 16. *A risk preference* $\succsim$ *is:*

- weakly monotone *when, for all* $\eta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\eta > \gamma \implies \eta \succ \gamma$$

- weakly secular *(or* solvable*) when, for all* $g \in \mathcal{F}$*, there exists* $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$*, such that* $g \sim \gamma$.

As to the interpretation, weak monotonicity just requires that larger sure payoffs are preferred to smaller ones, weak secularity that every random payoff has a certainty equivalent.

A.11 Proof of Proposition 2

This proof only requires weak monotonicity.

Clearly, (iv) $\implies$ (iii) $\implies$ (ii) $\implies$ (i). For the sake of brevity, call (v) the property

$$f \succsim g \iff \mathbb{E}[f] \geq \mathbb{E}[g]$$

for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$. Let $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$.

(i) $\implies$ (iv) If $g \overset{d}{=} f$, then $\mathbb{E}[w+f] = \mathbb{E}[w] + \mathbb{E}[f] = \mathbb{E}[w] + \mathbb{E}[g] = \mathbb{E}[w+g]$. Risk neutrality delivers

$$w + f \sim \mathbb{E}[w+f] = \mathbb{E}[w+g] \sim w + g$$

and transitivity implies $w + f \sim w + g$. Thus dependence neutrality holds.

(v) $\implies$ (i) Since $\mathbb{E}[f] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f]]$, condition (v) implies $f \sim \mathbb{E}[f]$. Thus risk neutrality holds.

(i) $\implies$ (v) If $f \succsim g$, then risk neutrality yields $\mathbb{E}[f] \sim f \succsim g \sim \mathbb{E}[g]$, and transitivity implies $\mathbb{E}[f] \succsim \mathbb{E}[g]$. If $\mathbb{E}[f] < \mathbb{E}[g]$, weak monotonicity would imply $\mathbb{E}[f] \prec \mathbb{E}[g]$, a contradiction, therefore it must be the case that $\mathbb{E}[f] \geq \mathbb{E}[g]$. Summing up: $f \succsim g \implies \mathbb{E}[f] \geq \mathbb{E}[g]$.

Conversely, if $\mathbb{E}[f] \geq \mathbb{E}[g]$, then:

- either $\mathbb{E}[f] = \mathbb{E}[g]$, then risk neutrality and reflexivity yield $f \sim \mathbb{E}[f] \sim \mathbb{E}[g] \sim g$, and transitivity implies $f \succsim g$;

- or $\mathbb{E}[f] > \mathbb{E}[g]$, then risk neutrality and weak monotonicity yield $f \sim \mathbb{E}[f] \succ \mathbb{E}[g] \sim g$, and transitivity implies $f \succsim g$.

Summing up: $\mathbb{E}[f] \geq \mathbb{E}[g] \implies f \succsim g$. Thus, (v) holds. ■

A.12 Proof of Proposition 3

This proof only requires weak monotonicity.

Let $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$.

(i) $\implies$ (ii). If $f \geq_{\text{fsd}} g$, then $\mathbb{E}[w+f] = \mathbb{E}[w] + \mathbb{E}[f] \geq \mathbb{E}[w] + \mathbb{E}[g] = \mathbb{E}[w+g]$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[w+f] \geq \mathbb{E}[w+g]$ and, by (i), $w + f \succsim w + g$.

(ii) $\implies$ (i). If $f \overset{d}{=} g$, then $f \geq_{\text{fsd}} g \geq_{\text{fsd}} f$. By (ii), we have $w + f \succsim w + g \succsim w + f$ and so $w + f \sim w + g$. Hence, $\succsim$ is dependence neutral, and Proposition 2 implies that $\succsim$ admits an expected-value representation.

(i) $\implies$ (iii). Since $\succsim$ is represented by the expected value, (iii) follows immediately.

(iii) $\implies$ (i) If $f \overset{d}{=} g$, by law invariance, $f \sim g$, by (iii), $w + f \sim w + g$. Thus, (iii) yields dependence neutrality, and Proposition 2 implies that $\succsim$ admits an expected-value representation.

(i) $\implies$ (iv). Since $\succsim$ is represented by the expected value, it is complete. Also, if $f \succ g$, then $\mathbb{E}[f] > \mathbb{E}[g]$; Theorem 1 of Pomatto, Strack and Tamuz (2020) implies that $w + \tilde{f} >_{\text{fsd}} w + \tilde{g}$ for some $w, \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $f \overset{d}{=} \tilde{f}$, $g \overset{d}{=} \tilde{g}$, and w is independent of both $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{g}$.

(iv) $\implies$ (i). If $f \succ g$, then $w + \tilde{f} >_{\text{fsd}} w + \tilde{g}$ for some $w, \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $f \overset{d}{=} \tilde{f}$, $g \overset{d}{=} \tilde{g}$, and w is independent of both $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{g}$. Thus, $f \succ g$ implies $\mathbb{E}[w + \tilde{f}] > \mathbb{E}[w + \tilde{g}]$, whence $\mathbb{E}[f] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}] > \mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}] = \mathbb{E}[g]$ and $\mathbb{E}[f] > \mathbb{E}[g]$. Since $\succsim$ is complete, by contraposition, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[f] \leq \mathbb{E}[g]$ implies $f \precsim g$. In particular, $\mathbb{E}[f] = \mathbb{E}[g]$ implies $f \sim g$. Finally, $\mathbb{E}[f] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f]]$ implies $f \sim \mathbb{E}[f]$. Thus risk neutrality holds. Since $\succsim$ is a (weakly) monotone risk preference, by Proposition 2, it admits an expected-value representation. ■

A.13 Proofs of the results of Section 5

Proof of Lemma 2. This proof only requires weak monotonicity and weak secularity.

Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, $\rho_{\text{A}}, \rho_{\text{B}}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.

(i) $\implies$ (ii). If $f = \mathbb{E}[g]$, then both $f - \rho_{\text{A}}$ and $f - \rho_{\text{B}}$ are sure payoffs. Since $f - \rho_{\text{A}} \succsim_{\text{A}} g$, by (i), $f - \rho_{\text{A}} \succsim_{\text{B}} g \sim_{\text{B}} f - \rho_{\text{B}}$. By weak monotonicity, $\rho_{\text{A}} > \rho_{\text{B}}$ would lead to the contradiction $f - \rho_{\text{B}} \succ_{\text{B}} f - \rho_{\text{A}}$, then it must be the case that $\rho_{\text{B}} \geq \rho_{\text{A}}$.

(ii) $\implies$ (i). If $\gamma \succsim_{\text{A}} g$, then $\mathbb{E}[g] - (\mathbb{E}[g] - \gamma) \succsim_{\text{A}} g$. Now, let $f = \mathbb{E}[g]$, if $g \sim_{\text{A}} f - \rho_{\text{A}}$ (and such a ρ_{A} exists by weak secularity), we have

$$f - (\mathbb{E}[g] - \gamma) = \mathbb{E}[g] - (\mathbb{E}[g] - \gamma) \succsim_{\text{A}} g \sim_{\text{A}} f - \rho_{\text{A}}$$

By weak monotonicity, $\mathbb{E}[g] - \gamma > \rho_{\text{A}}$ would lead to the contradiction $f - \rho_{\text{A}} \succ_{\text{A}} f - (\mathbb{E}[g] - \gamma)$, then it must be the case that $\mathbb{E}[g] - \gamma \leq \rho_{\text{A}}$. Now let ρ_{B} be such that $g \sim_{\text{B}} f - \rho_{\text{B}}$ (and such a ρ_{B} exists by weak secularity). By (ii) and what we have just observed, $\rho_{\text{B}} \geq \rho_{\text{A}} \geq \mathbb{E}[g] - \gamma$, and $f - (\mathbb{E}[g] - \gamma) \geq f - \rho_{\text{B}}$, by weak monotonicity (and reflexivity for the equality case)

$$f - (\mathbb{E}[g] - \gamma) \succsim_{\text{B}} f - \rho_{\text{B}}$$

but then $\gamma = f - (\mathbb{E}[g] - \gamma) \succsim_{\text{B}} f - \rho_{\text{B}} \sim_{\text{B}} g$, so that $\gamma \succsim_{\text{B}} g$.

The final part of the statement is a consequence of the fact that $\mathbb{E}[g]$ dominates any random payoff g according to $\geq_{\text{cv}}$. ■

Lemma 12. *Let $\succsim$ be a monotone and secular risk preference on $\mathcal{F}$. Then:*

1. *for all* $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, $f \succsim g \iff \rho(g, f) \geq 0$;

2. *the certainty equivalent map* $g \mapsto -\rho(g, 0)$ *represents* $\succsim$ *on* $\mathcal{F}$;

3. *if* $f, f', g, g' \in \mathcal{F}$, $f \overset{d}{=} f'$, *and* $g \overset{d}{=} g'$, *then* $\rho(g, f) = \rho(g', f')$.

If moreover $\succsim$ *is continuous, then* $\rho : \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} \to \mathbb{R}$ *is (jointly) sequentially continuous.*

Proof. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$.

1. By definition of $\rho : \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} \to \mathbb{R}$, $g \sim f - \rho(g, f)$. If $f \succsim g$, by transitivity $f \succsim f - \rho(g, f)$, monotonicity then excludes the case $\rho(g, f) < 0$. Conversely, if $\rho(g, f) \geq 0$, monotonicity and reflexivity imply

$$f = (f - \rho(g, f)) + \rho(g, f) \succsim f - \rho(g, f) + 0 \sim g$$

transitivity allows to conclude $f \succsim g$.

2. By definition of $\rho : \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F} \to \mathbb{R}$, $g \sim 0 - \rho(g, 0) = -\rho(g, 0)$, then $-\rho(g, 0)$ is the certainty equivalent of $\mathcal{F}$. With this, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$

$$f \succsim g \iff -\rho(f, 0) \succsim -\rho(g, 0) \iff -\rho(f, 0) \geq -\rho(g, 0)$$

where the latter relation follows by monotonicity.

3. Note $f \overset{d}{=} f'$ implies $f - \rho(g, f) \overset{d}{=} f' - \rho(g, f)$, repeated application of law invariance yield

$$g' \sim g \sim f - \rho(g, f) \sim f' - \rho(g, f)$$

transitivity and the definition of ρ yield $\rho(g, f) = \rho(g', f')$.

Finally, assume that $\succsim$ is continuous. Next we show that, if $k \in \mathbb{R}$, $f_n \to f$ in $\mathcal{F}$, $g_n \to g$ in $\mathcal{F}$, and $\rho(g_n, f_n) \leq k$ (resp. $\geq k$) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\rho(g, f) \leq k$ (resp. $\geq k$). Indeed, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho(g_n, f_n) \leq k$ implies $-\rho(g_n, f_n) \geq -k$, by monotonicity,

$$g_n \sim f_n - \rho(g_n, f_n) \succsim f_n - k$$

by continuity

$$g \succsim f - k$$

but then $f - \rho(g, f) \sim g \succsim f - k$, and monotonicity again yields $\rho(g, f) \leq k$. Analogously, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho(g_n, f_n) \geq k$ implies $\rho(g, f) \geq k$.

Now assume that $f_n \to f$ in $\mathcal{F}$, and $g_n \to g$ in $\mathcal{F}$, and, per contra $\rho(g_n, f_n) \nrightarrow \rho(g, f)$. Then there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $n_m > m$ such that $\rho(g_{n_m}, f_{n_m}) \notin (\rho(g, f) - \eta, \rho(g, f) + \eta)$. Therefore there exists a subsequence $\{(g_{n_l}, f_{n_l})\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\{(g_n, f_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\rho(g_{n_l}, f_{n_l}) \notin (\rho(g, f) - \eta, \rho(g, f) + \eta)$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. But then, either $\rho(g_{n_l}, f_{n_l}) \leq \rho(g, f) - \eta$ for infinitely many l, or $\rho(g_{n_l}, f_{n_l}) \geq \rho(g, f) + \eta$ for infinitely many $l \in \mathbb{N}$. In the first case, there exists a subsequence $\{(g_{n_i}, f_{n_i})\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\{(g_{n_l}, f_{n_l})\}_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\rho(g_{n_i}, f_{n_i}) \leq \rho(g, f) - \eta$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and by the previous observation $\rho(g, f) \leq \rho(g, f) - \eta$, which is absurd. In the second case, the contradiction $\rho(g, f) \geq \rho(g, f) + \eta$ is obtained. This yields the desired joint sequential continuity. ■

Proof of Lemma 3. Let A be risk neutral. Note that for $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ the assumptions of monotonicity and secularity are implied by weak monotonicity. In fact, by Proposition 2, weak monotone and

risk neutral risk preferences are represented by the expected value, so they are monotone. As to secularity, for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$f - (\mathbb{E}[f] - \mathbb{E}[g]) \sim_{\mathrm{A}} \mathbb{E}[f - (\mathbb{E}[f] - \mathbb{E}[g])] = \mathbb{E}[g] \sim_{\mathrm{A}} g$$

that is, $\rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f) = \mathbb{E}[f] - \mathbb{E}[g]$.

We only prove point 2 because point 1 is well known.

2. Let B be strongly more risk averse than A. If $f \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g$, then $\mathbb{E}[f] = \mathbb{E}[g]$. Since A is risk neutral, as observed, $\rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f) = \mathbb{E}[f] - \mathbb{E}[g] = 0$. Since B is strongly more risk averse than A, then

$$\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f) = 0$$

Lemma 12 yields $f \succsim_{\mathrm{B}} g$, and so B is strongly risk averse.

Conversely, if B is strongly risk averse, then

$$f \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g \implies f \succsim_{\mathrm{B}} g$$

Lemma 12 yields $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) \geq 0$. But, as observed, since A is risk neutral, $\rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f) = \mathbb{E}[f] - \mathbb{E}[g] = 0$, and so $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f)$ which shows that B is strongly more risk averse than A. ■

Proof of Theorem 4. This proof only requires weak monotonicity and weak secularity.

(i) implies (ii). Let $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, with $f \overset{d}{=} g$, if $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{fi}}(w)$, then

$$(w + f) - \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f) \sim_{\mathrm{A}} w + g \quad \text{and} \quad (w + f) - \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w + g, w + f) \sim_{\mathrm{B}} w + g$$

but $\gamma = (w + f) - \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f) \in \mathbb{R}$, because $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{fi}}(w)$. By (i), $(w + f) - \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f) \succsim_{\mathrm{B}} w + g \sim_{\mathrm{B}} (w + f) - \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w + g, w + f)$, by weak monotonicity, $\rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f) \leq \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w + g, w + f)$. This shows that B is more propense to full insurance than A.

(ii) implies (i). Let $h \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\gamma \succsim_{\mathrm{A}} h$. By weak secularity there exists $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\gamma \succsim_{\mathrm{A}} h \sim_{\mathrm{A}} \eta$, and by weak monotonicity $\gamma \geq \eta$. By Lemma 1, there exist $w, w' \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $w \overset{d}{=} w'$ and $h - \mathbb{E}[h] \overset{d}{=} w - w'$. Let $f = -w + \mathbb{E}[h]$ and $g = -w' + \mathbb{E}[h]$, clearly $f \overset{d}{=} g$ and $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{fi}}(w)$. By (ii), $\rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f) \leq \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w + g, w + f)$, and by definition of ρ,

$$\underbrace{(w + f) - \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f)}_{=\mathbb{E}[h] - \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w+g, w+f)} \sim_{\mathrm{A}} \underbrace{w + g}_{\overset{d}{=} h} \quad \text{and} \quad (w + f) - \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w + g, w + f) \sim_{\mathrm{B}} w + g$$

Law-invariance yields $(w + f) - \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f) \sim_{\mathrm{A}} h$, but since $(w + f) - \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f)$ is constant then

$$\eta = (w + f) - \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f) \geq (w + f) - \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w + g, w + f) \sim_{\mathrm{B}} w + g \overset{d}{=} h$$

weak monotonicity and law invariance yield $\eta \succsim_{\mathrm{B}} h$, and weak monotonicity again yields $\gamma \succsim_{\mathrm{B}} h$. This shows that B is weakly more risk averse than A. ■

In the following two lemmas, analogous to those of Appendix A.3, we assume that Σ is generated by a partition $\mathcal{S}$ of equiprobable events (called cells), and we fix two continuous, monotone, and secular risk preferences $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\succsim_{\mathrm{B}}$ on $\mathcal{F}$.

Lemma 13. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that g is a mean preserving spread of f. If either (ii) or (iii) of Theorem 5 holds, then $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f)$.*

Proof. When (iii) of Theorem 5 holds, the results follows immediately from Lemma 10. Suppose now that (ii) of Theorem 5 holds. Let

$$g = f - \delta 1_{S_1} + \delta 1_{S_2}$$

with $\delta \geq 0$ and S_1, S_2 two distinct cells in $\mathcal{S}$ such that $f(S_1) \leq f(S_2)$. If $\delta = 0$, then $f = g$, and $\rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f) = \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) = 0$. If $\delta > 0$ and $f(S_1) < f(S_2)$, it follows from Lemma 8 that $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f)$. If $\delta > 0$ and $f(S_1) = f(S_2)$, define $f_\varepsilon = f - \varepsilon 1_{S_1} + \varepsilon 1_{S_2}$ with $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
f_\varepsilon &= f - \varepsilon 1_{S_1} + \varepsilon 1_{S_2} = f 1_{S \setminus \{S_1, S_2\}} + (f(S_1) - \varepsilon) 1_{S_1} + (f(S_2) + \varepsilon) 1_{S_2} \\
f_\varepsilon(S_1) &< f_\varepsilon(S_2) \\
g &= f - \delta 1_{S_1} + \delta 1_{S_2} = f - (\varepsilon + (\delta - \varepsilon)) 1_{S_1} + (\varepsilon + (\delta - \varepsilon)) 1_{S_2} \\
&= f_\varepsilon - (\delta - \varepsilon) 1_{S_1} + (\delta - \varepsilon) 1_{S_2}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus g is a mean preserving spread of f_ε with $f_\varepsilon(S_1) < f_\varepsilon(S_2)$ and $\delta - \varepsilon > 0$. By the previous argument $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f_\varepsilon) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f_\varepsilon)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta)$. Let $\{\varepsilon_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, \delta)$ be such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \varepsilon_n = 0$. By Lemma 12 and continuity of both $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\succsim_{\mathrm{B}}$, it follows that $\rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f_{\varepsilon_n}) \to \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f)$ and $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f_{\varepsilon_n}) \to \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f)$, and so $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f)$. This completes the proof. ■

Lemma 14. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that $f \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g$. If either (ii) or (iii) of Theorem 5 holds, then $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f)$.*

Proof. If $f \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g$ in $\mathcal{F}$, then there exists a sequence $h_0, h_1, \ldots, h_m$ such that $f = h_0$, $g = h_m$ and each h_{k+1} is either a mean-preserving spread of h_k or it is obtained by h_k through the permutation of the values that h_k takes on two cells. By the previous lemma, we have $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_{k+1} - x, h_k - x) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_{k+1} - x, h_k - x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k = 0, 1, \ldots, m-1$ as $h_{k+1} - x$ is either a mean-preserving spread of $h_k - x$ or $h_{k+1} - x \overset{d}{=} h_k - x$. Next, we prove by induction that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$,

$$\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_j - x, h_0 - x) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_j - x, h_0 - x)$$

As we have just observed, for $j = 1$, we have $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_1 - x, h_0 - x) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_1 - x, h_0 - x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that, for $j = k$, $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_k - x, h_0 - x) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_k - x, h_0 - x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$; it then suffices to verify that $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_{k+1} - x, h_0 - x) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_{k+1} - x, h_0 - x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. To see this, denote by $\eta_{\mathrm{A}} = \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_{k+1} - x, h_k - x)$ and $\eta_{\mathrm{B}} = \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_{k+1} - x, h_k - x)$. It holds that

$$h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{A}} \sim_{\mathrm{A}} h_{k+1} - x \quad \text{and} \quad h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}} \sim_{\mathrm{B}} h_{k+1} - x$$

As we have observed above, $\eta_{\mathrm{B}} \geq \eta_{\mathrm{A}}$ and since $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ is monotone we have $h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}} \precsim_{\mathrm{A}} h_{k+1} - x$. Therefore

$$h_0 - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}} - \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}, h_0 - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}) \sim_{\mathrm{A}} h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}} \precsim_{\mathrm{A}} h_{k+1} - x \sim_{\mathrm{A}} h_0 - x - \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_{k+1} - x, h_0 - x)$$

and, by monotonicity, $\rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_{k+1} - x, h_0 - x) \leq \eta_{\mathrm{B}} + \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}, h_0 - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}})$, moreover,

$$h_0 - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}} - \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}, h_0 - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}) \sim_{\mathrm{B}} h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}} \sim_{\mathrm{B}} h_{k+1} - x$$

and so $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_{k+1}-x, h_0-x) = \eta_{\mathrm{B}} + \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}, h_0 - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}})$, by induction $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}, h_0 - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}, h_0 - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}})$, and so

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_{k+1} - x, h_0 - x) &\leq \eta_{\mathrm{B}} + \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}, h_0 - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}) \\ &\leq \eta_{\mathrm{B}} + \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_k - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}, h_0 - x - \eta_{\mathrm{B}}) \\ &= \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(h_{k+1} - x, h_0 - x)\end{aligned}$$

as wanted. ■

Proof of Theorem 5. (i) $\implies$ (vi). Let $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \overset{d}{=} f$ and $f \geq_w g$. By Lemma 7, $w + f \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} w + g$, and (i) implies $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w + g, w + f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f)$. Thus (vi) holds.

(vi) $\implies$ (v). Let $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \overset{d}{=} f$ and $f \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{cs}}(w)$, by Proposition 1, it follows that $f \geq_w g$, and (vi) implies $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w + g, w + f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w + g, w + f)$. Thus (v) holds.

(v) $\implies$ (iv) because $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{is}}(w) \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{cs}}(w)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{F}$.

(iv) $\implies$ (iii) and (iv) $\implies$ (ii) because $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{dl}}(w), \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{pr}}(w) \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{is}}(w)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{F}$.

(iii) $\implies$ (i) and (ii) $\implies$ (i). The case in which Σ is generated by a finite partition of equiprobable events follows from Lemma 14. Now, let P be nonatomic. Let $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that $f \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g$. We want to show that $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f)$.

The sequences $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{g_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ that we introduced in the proof of Theorem 3 in Appendix A.9, have the following properties:

- $f_n, g_n \in \mathcal{L}^\infty\left(S, \Sigma_n^v, P_{|\Sigma_n^v}\right)$ where $\{\Sigma_n^v : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is the filtration that we built for Lemma 5;
- $f_n \geq_{\mathrm{cv}} g_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
- $f_n \to f_v$ and $g_n \to g_v$ in $\mathcal{F}$, with $f_v \overset{d}{=} f$ and $g_v \overset{d}{=} g$.

The restrictions of $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\succsim_{\mathrm{B}}$ to $\mathcal{L}^\infty\left(S, \Sigma_n^v, P_{|\Sigma_n^v}\right)$ are continuous, monotone, and secular risk preferences that either satisfy (ii) or (iii) in this theorem, and we can apply Lemma 14 to conclude that

$$\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g_n, f_n) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g_n, f_n) \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \tag{18}$$

but, by Lemma 12, both ρ_{A} and ρ_{B} are law-invariant and continuous, it follows that

$$\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g, f) = \rho_{\mathrm{B}}(g_v, f_v) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g_v, f_v) = \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(g, f)$$

as wanted. ■

Proposition 4. *Let $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ and $\succsim_{\mathrm{B}}$ be monotone and secular risk preferences.*

1. *If $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ is neutral to full insurance, then* B *is more propense to full insurance than* A *if and only if* B *is propense to full insurance.*
2. *If $\succsim_{\mathrm{A}}$ is neutral to hedging, then* B *is more propense to hedging than* A *if and only if* B *is propense to hedging.*

Proof. Note that by Proposition 2, A is neutral to full insurance if and only if she is neutral to hedging if and only if she is risk neutral.

1. By Theorem 4, B is more propense to full insurance than A if and only if B is weakly more risk averse than A. By Lemma 3, B is weakly more risk averse than A if and only if B is weakly risk averse. By Theorem 1, B is weakly risk averse if and only if B is propense to full insurance.

2. Let $w, f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g \overset{d}{=} f$. Assume that B is more propense to hedging than A. If $f \geq_w g$, then $\mathbb{E}[w+f] = \mathbb{E}[w+g]$ (because $f \overset{d}{=} g$). Since A is risk neutral, as observed in the proof of Lemma 3, $\rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w+g, w+f) = \mathbb{E}[w+f] - \mathbb{E}[w+g] = 0$. Since B is more propense to hedging than A, then

$$\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w+g, w+f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w+g, w+f) = 0$$

Lemma 12 yields $w+f \succsim_{\mathrm{B}} w+g$, and so B is propense to hedging.

Conversely, if B is propense to hedging, then

$$f \geq_w g \implies w+f \succsim_{\mathrm{B}} w+g$$

Lemma 12 yields $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w+g, w+f) \geq 0$. But, as observed in the proof of Lemma 3, since A is risk neutral, $\rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w+g, w+f) = \mathbb{E}[w+f] - \mathbb{E}[w+g] = 0$, and so $\rho_{\mathrm{B}}(w+g, w+f) \geq \rho_{\mathrm{A}}(w+g, w+f)$ which shows that B is more propense to hedging than A. ■

References

[1] K. J. Arrow, Uncertainty and the welfare economics of medical care, *American Economic Review*, 5, 941-973, 1963.

[2] P. Berti, L. Pratelli and P. Rigo, Skorohod representation on a given probability space, *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 137, 277-288, 2007.

[3] S. Cerreia-Vioglio, D. Dillenberger and P. Ortoleva, Cautious expected utility and the certainty effect, *Econometrica*, 83, 693-728, 2015.

[4] S. H. Chew, Axiomatic utility theories with the betweenness property, *Annals of Operations Research*, 19, 273-298, 1989.

[5] B. de Finetti, Sul concetto di media, *Giornale dell'Istituto Italiano degli Attuari*, Anno II, n. 3, 369-396, 1931.

[6] E. Dekel, An axiomatic characterization of preferences under uncertainty: Weakening the independence axiom, *Journal of Economic Theory*, 40, 304-318, 1986.

[7] R. Durrett, *Probability: Theory and examples*, 5th ed., Cambridge University Press, 2019.

[8] L. G. Epstein and S. M. Tanny, Increasing generalized correlation: A definition and some economic consequences, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 13, 16-34, 1980.

[9] H. Föllmer and A. Schied, *Stochastic finance*, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2016.

[10] F. Gul, A theory of disappointment aversion, *Econometrica*, 59, 667-686, 1991.

[11] O. Kallenberg, *Foundations of modern probability*, Springer, Berlin, 1977.

[12] D. Kahneman and A. Tversky, Prospect theory: an analysis of decision under risk, *Econometrica*, 47, 263-292, 1979.

[13] G. W. Mackey, Borel structure in groups and their duals, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 85, 134-165, 1957.

[14] M. J. Machina and D. Schmeidler, A more robust definition of subjective probability, *Econometrica*, 60, 745-780, 1992.

[15] A. Müller and D. Stoyan, *Comparison methods for stochastic models and risks*, Wiley, New York, 2002.

[16] L. Pomatto, P. Strack and O. Tamuz, Stochastic dominance under independent noise, *Journal of Political Economy*, 128, 1877-1900, 2020.

[17] G. Puccetti and R. Wang, Extremal dependence concepts, *Statistical Science*, 30, 485-517, 2015.

[18] D. Pollard, *A user's guide to measure theoretic probability*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[19] J. W. Pratt, Risk aversion in the small and in the large, *Econometrica*, 32, 122-136, 1964.

[20] J. Quiggin, A theory of anticipated utility, *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 3, 323-343, 1982.

[21] M. Rothschild and J. E. Stiglitz, Increasing risk: I. A definition, *Journal of Economic Theory*, 2, 225-243, 1970.

[22] L. Rüschendorf, *Mathematical risk analysis*, Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.

[23] S. A. Ross, Some stronger measures of risk aversion in the small and the large with applications, *Econometrica*, 49, 621-638, 1981.

[24] L. Savage, *The foundations of statistics*, Wiley, New York, 1954.

[25] M. Shaked and J. G. Shanthikumar, *Stochastic orders*, Springer, New York, 2007.

[26] G. Simons, An unexpected expectation, *Annals of Probability*, 5, 157-158, 1977.

[27] B. Wang and R. Wang, Extreme negative dependence and risk aggregation, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 136, 12-25, 2015.

[28] M. E. Yaari, Some remarks on measures of risk aversion and on their uses, *Journal of Economic Theory*, 1, 315-329, 1969.

[29] M. E. Yaari, The dual theory of choice under risk, *Econometrica*, 55, 95-115, 1987.