

Distributionally Robust Reward-risk Ratio Programming with Wasserstein Metric

Yong Zhao · Yongchao Liu · Jin Zhang · Xinmin Yang

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract Reward-risk ratio (RR) is a very important stock market definition. In order to capture the situation that the investor does not have complete information on the distribution of the underlying uncertainty, people extend RR model to distributionally robust reward-risk ratio (DRR) model. In this paper, we study the DRR problem where the ambiguity on the distributions is defined through Wasserstein metric. Under some moderate conditions, we show that for a fixed ratio, the DRR problem has the tractable reformulation, which means that we may solve the problem by bisection method. Specifically, we analyze the DRR problems for Sortino-Satchel ratio, Stable Tail Adjusted Return ratio and Omega ratio.

Keywords Distributionally robust optimization · Reward-risk ratio · Wasserstein metric

1 Introduction

One of the most challenging issues in decision analysis is to find an optimal decision under uncertainty. The solvability of a decision problem and the quality of an optimal decision rely heavily on the information regarding the underlying uncertainties. Suppose the decision maker does not have any information other than the range of the values of the uncertainties, then it might be a reasonable option to choose an optimal decision on the basis of the extreme values of the uncertainty in order to mitigate the risks. This kind of decision making framework is known as robust optimization (RO). RO is based on the pessimistic world

Yong Zhao

Department of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610065, China

E-mail: zhaoyongty@126.com

Yongchao Liu

School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, 116024, China

E-mail: lyc@dlut.edu.cn

Jin Zhang

Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hongkong, China

E-mail: zhangjin@hkbu.edu.hk

Xinmin Yang

Department of Mathematics, Chongqing Normal University, Chongqing 400047, China

E-mail: xmyang@cqnu.edu.cn

view by treating all the realizations of the uncertainty equally. In the past two decades, RO problems have been well studied in theory, algorithm and application, see the monograph by Ben-Tal et al. [1] and the survey by Bertsimas et al. [4] for the recent development. If the decision maker has complete information on the distribution of the uncertainties, the problem falls into the form of stochastic programming (SP) which usually requires the knowledge of the probability distributions of the uncertainties. SP is similar in style to RO but takes advantage of the fact that probability distributions governing the data are known or can be estimated. This history of SP can be traced back to the middle of the last century and stochastic programming theory offers a variety of models to address the presence of random data in optimization problems such as chance constrained models, two- and multi-stage models, models involving risk measures. We refer the interested readers to monographs [22, 29] for the recent development.

One of the criticisms of SP is that in many applications the basic assumption of knowing, or even accurately estimating, the probability distribution of the uncertain data is unrealistic. On the other hand, the worst case approach of RO could be too conservative. In fact, the historical data of the uncertainties usually include some endogenous probability information such as mean or covariance. Therefore, an alternative but possibly less pessimistic w.r.t RO and less optimistic w.r.t SP, is the distributionally robust optimization (DRO). DRO problems consider the case that the decision maker is able to construct an ambiguity set of the distributions in terms of historical data, computer simulation or subjective judgments, which contains the true distribution with a certain confidence level. Consequently, the decision maker may hedge against the risk of incomplete information by considering the worst case distribution in the ambiguity set. DRO has found many applications in operations research, finance and management sciences and has been well investigated through a number of research works by Žáčková [38], Dupačová [7], Shapiro and Ahmed [28]. Over the past a few years, it has gained substantial popularity through further contributions by Delage and Ye [6], Hu and Hong [14], Goldfarb and Iyengar [11], Pflug et al. [21, 23], Popescu [24], Wiesemann et al. [33–35] to name a few.

In this paper, we concentrate on the distributionally robust reward-risk ratio optimization problem. Kapsos et al. [17] first propose a so-called distributionally robust Omega ratio model where an investor does not have complete information on the distribution of the underlying uncertainty in portfolio optimization and consequently a robust action is taken against the risk arising from ambiguity of the true distribution. They consider a situation where each distribution in the ambiguity set may be explicitly represented either through a mixture of some known distributions, or a perturbation from a nominal discrete distribution. Tong and Wu [32] investigate DRR optimization problem with composite mixture uncertainties and they transfer the DRR optimization problem into a convex optimization problem through the dual theorem. Liu et al. [18] propose a DRR model where the ambiguity set is constructed through moment conditions. They first utilize Lagrangian dualization to reformulate the DRR optimization problem as a semi-infinite programming problem and further approximate the semi-infinite constraints with the Entropic risk measure. Then the implicit Dinkelbach method is used to solve the approximation problem.

Following the works mentioned above, we are continue to consider the DRR problem but with the ambiguity set is defined through a metric in probability space. Suppose that there are historical data which may help the decision maker to construct an estimation or approximation of the true distribution

of the uncertainties. Accordingly it is reasonable to define the ambiguity set as the ball centered at the estimation with property distance to mitigate the risk of incomplete information such as insufficient number of sample. Different with the works on DRR [17, 18, 32] where the ambiguity set is defined through moment conditions or mixture methods, cannot be more informative than just a set no matter how many data we have, distance type ambiguity set may converge to the true probability with increasing samples and decreasing the diameter of the ball. Motivated by recent works [8, 10, 13, 39] where the authors study DRO problems with ambiguity sets based on the Wasserstein metric, we study DRR optimization problems with the ambiguity set is defined through Wasserstein metric. Indeed, Ji and Lejeune [15] seem to be first to consider the DRR problem with Wasserstein ball type ambiguity set. They focus on the case with discrete probability and then reformulate the DRR problem as a tractable convex problem. Different with Ji and Lejeune's work [15], we investigate the situation of practical interests without the discrete restriction. It is then predictable that a lot of difficulties associated to the continuous random variables should appear and thus we may expect our novelty. Based on some new results in [8, 10], we successfully reformulate the robust ratio problem as a tractable convex problem.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sections 2 and 3, we focus on the distributionally robust fractional programming (DRFP) problem. Particularly, we introduce the general DRFP problem and the Wasserstein metric in Section 2. Then we provide the reformulation of DRFP model where the ambiguity set is defined through Wasserstein metric in Section 3. In Section 4, we apply the theoretical results in Section 3 to DRR problems, specifically for Sortino-Satchel ratio, Stable Tail Adjusted Return ratio and Omega ratio. By virtue of the structures of the Sortino-Satchel ratio model and Stable Tail Adjusted Return ratio, the bisection algorithm is designed to solve the corresponding problem in Section 5. We end up the paper with a conclusion in Section 6.

Throughout the paper, we use the following notations. For vectors $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the inner product of a, b is denoted by $\langle a, b \rangle := a^\top b$. Denote by $[N] := \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Given a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^n , the dual norm is defined as $\|z\|_* := \sup_{\|x\| \leq 1} \langle z, x \rangle$. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a lower semicontinuous convex function, the conjugate of f is defined as $f^*(z) := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \langle z, x \rangle - f(x)$. The indicator function on the set A is defined as $\delta_A(x) = 0$ if $x \in A$; $\delta_A(x) = \infty$ otherwise.

2 Distributionally robust fractional programming and Wasserstein metric

Distributionally robust fractional programming (DRFP): Consider the following fractional programming problem:

$$\max_{x \in X} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P[f(x, \xi)]}{\mathbb{E}_P[g(x, \xi)]}, \quad (1)$$

where x is a decision vector, X is a nonempty convex compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n , $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions, ξ is a random variable on probability space (Ξ, \mathbb{F}, P) with closed convex set $\Xi \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, $\mathbb{E}_P[\cdot]$ denotes the expected value w.r.t. the probability distribution of ξ . The fractional programs (1) have many applications in economic, management science [9]. In this paper, we mainly focus on the application on portfolio, that is, the numerator measures the expected return while the denominator measures the risk of the portfolio. Then the ratio model (1) can be regarded as maximum expected return per unit risk.

In practice, information regarding the true distribution of random variable ξ may not be completely accessible. However, it might be somewhat possible to construct a family of distributions based on empirical data or subjective judgements which contain or approximate the true distribution. Suppose that there are N independent and identically distributed historical samples ξ_1, \dots, ξ_N . Then we may base on the empirical probability P_N to construct an ambiguity set:

$$\mathcal{P} := \{P \in \mathcal{P} : d(P, P_N) \leq \theta\},$$

where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes a predefined distance on the probability space. Instead of knowing the true distribution P , we assume that P can vary in the set \mathcal{P} , which leads to the following distributionally robust scheme for problem (1):

$$\text{DRFP} \quad \max_{x \in X} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P[f(x, \xi)]}{\mathbb{E}_P[g(x, \xi)]}. \quad (2)$$

In this formulation, robustness is in the sense that given the set of probability measures \mathcal{P} , an optimal solution is sought against the worst probability measure which is used to compute the expected value of the objective function. Noticing that problem (2) might not be well-defined since the denominator may turn into zero. Therefore, we always assume that for every $x \in X$ and every $\xi \in \Xi$, $g(x, \xi) > 0$ throughout this paper.

Recall that a popular method for solving minimax distributionally robust optimization problems is to reformulate the inner maximization problem as a semi-infinite programming problem and further as a tractable convex problem through dual method. We follow this mainstream dual based approaches in the literature to handle the DRR problem. Since the objective function (2) is nonlinear w.r.t. the operation of mathematical expectation, it might be very difficult to derive a dual formulation of the robust optimization, especially when the ambiguity set is defined through distance measure. Therefore we consider an equivalent maximization problem with robust constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{(x, \beta) \in X \times \mathbb{R}} \beta \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P[f(x, \xi) - \beta g(x, \xi)] \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

As presented in [18, Proposition 2.1], problems (2) and (3) are equivalent in sense of the same optimal values and optimal solutions as soon as both have finite optimal values and optimal solutions. Thus we may crack DRFP (2) by solving the problem (3).

Wasserstein metric: The Wasserstein metric is defined as a distance function between two probability distributions on a given support space Ξ , which is defined on the space $\mathcal{P}(\Xi)$ of all probability distributions P supported on Ξ with $\mathbb{E}_P[\|\xi\|] = \int_{\Xi} \|\xi\| P(d\xi) < +\infty$.

Definition 2.1 Let \mathcal{L} be the space of all Lipschitz continuous functions $f : \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with Lipschitz constant no larger than 1. Then, the Wasserstein metric $d_w : \mathcal{P}(\Xi) \times \mathcal{P}(\Xi) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$d_w(P, Q) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{L}} \left(\int_{\Xi} f(\xi) P(d\xi) - \int_{\Xi} f(\xi) Q(d\xi) \right), \quad \forall P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi).$$

The Wasserstein distance exhibits the defining properties of a probability distance metric. That is, $d_w(P, Q) = 0$ if and only if $P = Q$, $d_w(P, Q) = d_w(Q, P)$ and $d_w(P, Q) \leq d_w(P, \hat{P}) + d_w(\hat{P}, Q)$ for any probability distribution \hat{P} .

By the Kantorovich-Rubinstein theorem [16], the Wasserstein metric is equivalent to the Kantorovich metric. Then for any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)$, we have

$$d_w(P, Q) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\Xi^2} \|\xi_1 - \xi_2\| \pi(d\xi_1, d\xi_2) \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where π is a joint distribution of ξ_1 and ξ_2 with marginal P and Q , respectively, and the ‘inf’ is taken over all joint distributions π . Definition 2.1 and the optimization problems (4) provide two equivalent characterizations of the Wasserstein metric, which constitute a primal-dual pair of infinite-dimensional linear programs. The decision variable π appearing in the dual linear program can be viewed as a transportation plan for moving a mass distribution P to another one Q . Thus, the Wasserstein distance between P and Q represents the minimum transportation cost.

Having specified the Wasserstein metric, we can now define an ambiguity ball around the nominal distribution. Different decision makers may have different reference distributions, but the most popular way is to set the empirical distribution as the center of the ambiguity set. Suppose there are N independent and identically distributed samples for an unknown true distribution, we may construct an empirical distribution, denoted by P_N , and then define

$$\mathcal{P} := \{P \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi) : d_w(P, P_N) \leq \theta\}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\Xi)$ denotes the set of all probability with support set is contained in Ξ and θ is the ambiguity parameter. Obviously, θ decides the size of the ambiguity set and the forthcoming question is how to choose the size parameter θ ?

Zhao and Guan [39, Proposition 1] have shown that

$$P(d_w(P, P_N) \leq \theta) \geq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\theta^2}{2B^2}N\right), \quad (6)$$

where N is the number of historical data and B is the diameter of Ξ . (6) provides finite sample guarantee property and asymptotic guarantee property. This means that we may adjust the diameter θ of the Wasserstein ball to ensure the ambiguity set contains the true distribution P with given probability threshold. Moreover, (6) implies that the ambiguity set converges to the true distribution P as the sample size N goes to infinity. See [8, 15] for similar statistical evidences.

3 Reformulation

DRO problem with the ambiguity set defined through Wasserstein metric has been well studied in the past decade. Pflug and Wozabal [23] study the distributionally robust coherent risk measure where the ambiguity set is defined by Wasserstein metric under the assumption that the probability space has a finite support. Wozabal [36, 37] conducts a series of DRO problems which studies the Wasserstein distance metric and presents portfolio optimization illustrations. Esfahani and Kuhn [8], as well as Zhao and Guan [39], study data-driven distributionally robust problems with Wasserstein metric defined ambiguity sets. In particular, they analyze the conditions which ensure the tractability of the DRO problem. Ji and Lejeune [15] study the DRR problem with Wasserstein ball type ambiguity set. Particularly, they consider the DRR problem with the ambiguity set is defined as:

$$\mathcal{P}^N := \{P \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi^N) : d_w(P, P_N) \leq \theta\},$$

where the nominal P_N is empirical probability with support set Ξ^N and $\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N)$ denotes the set of all probability with support set is contained in Ξ^N . Based on the recently results on RO by Ben-Tal et al. [2], Ji and Lejeune [15] develop a tractable reformulation and associated algorithmic framework to efficiently solve the DRR problems.

We inherit the investigation of distributionally robust reward-risk ratio problems. Different from Ji and Lejeune's work [15], we remove the limitation that the probability in the ambiguity set has the same discrete support with the nominal. Specifically, we study the DRR problem with ambiguity set (5). Obviously, $\mathcal{P}^N \subset \mathcal{P}$ as $\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N) \subset \mathcal{P}(\Xi)$.

In what follows, we analyze the conditions which ensure that we can solve the DRFP (2) efficiently. For the convenience of exposition, we rewrite (3) as a minimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{(x,\beta) \in X \times \mathbb{R}} -\beta \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P[-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)] \leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Obviously, the problem (7) is a nonconvex semi-infinite problem as there is a bilinear like function $\beta g(x, \xi)$ in the constraints. In general, people cannot expect to solve a nonconvex semi-infinite problem easily. Fortunately, we may take advantage of the special structure of problem (7) to design an efficient algorithm. Note that the objective function $-\beta$ is monotonic, we will use the bisection method to solve (7), that is, fix β first and then increase or decrease β based on the feasibility of β . Indeed, the idea of employing the bisection method is inspired by existing literatures. In particular, Kapsos et al. [17] update β by a fixed step and then check the feasibility; Liu et al. [18] use the bisection method to solve the DRR problem with moment type ambiguity set; Ji and Lejeune [15] on the other hand, design a bisection method for DRR problem with the Wasserstein ball restricted on discrete probability space. We will present the details of the bisection method in Section 5, right here we first provide some results for checking feasibility.

The following results show that, under some moderate conditions, the constraint of problem (7) can be reformulated into the finite dimensional constraint space, and the resulting set of inequalities that provides an equivalent reformulation of the feasible set of (7). As most of the following results are based on or can be get directly from Esfahani and Kuhn's work [8], we sketch the proofs in the appendix for completeness of the paper.

Theorem 3.1 *Suppose that for any fixed $x \in X$, $f(x, \cdot)$ is proper and convex and $-g(x, \cdot)$ is proper and convex in ξ . Then the constraint of problem (7) can be reformulated as:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \leq 0, \\ & (f)^*(x, z_i - u_i - v_i) + (-\beta g)^*(x, u_i) + \sigma_{\Xi}(v_i) - \langle z_i, \xi_i \rangle \leq s_i, \forall i \in [N] \\ & \|z_i\|_* \leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N]. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Next, we study the cases that conjugate dual functions involved in problem (8) have closed form.

Theorem 3.2 *Assume*

- (a) $\Xi := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : C\xi \leq d\}$ where C is a matrix and d is a vector of appropriate dimensions;
- (b) $f(x, \xi) = \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \{a_k(x), \xi\} + b_k(x)$;

$$(c) \quad g(x, \xi) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \{ \langle c_j(x), \xi \rangle + d_j(x) \}.$$

Then the constraint of problem (7) can be reformulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i &\leq 0, \\ \langle \eta_{ij}, -b(x) - A(x)\xi_i \rangle + \beta(d_j(x) + \langle c_j(x), \xi_i \rangle) + \langle \gamma_{ij}, d - C^\top \xi_i \rangle &\leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [J] \\ \|A(x)^\top \eta_{ij} - \beta c_j(x) + C^\top \gamma_{ij}\|_* &\leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [J] \\ \langle \eta_{ij}, e \rangle &= 1, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [J] \\ \gamma_{ij} \geq 0, \eta_{ij} &\geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [J] \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $A(x)$ is a matrix with rows $a_k(x)^\top$, $1 \leq k \leq K$, $b(x)$ is the column vector with entries $b_k(x)$, $1 \leq k \leq K$, e is the vector of with each component being 1 and N is the number of sample.

If the condition (b) in Theorem 3.2 is replaced by

$$(b') \quad f(x, \xi) = \min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \{ \langle a_k(x), \xi \rangle + b_k(x) \},$$

the constraint of problem (7) is equivalent to a system of nonlinear inequalities.

Theorem 3.3 *Assume the conditions (a) and (c) of Theorem 3.2 and (b') hold. Then the constraint of problem (7) can be reformulated as:*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i &\leq 0, \\ (\langle -a_k(x), \xi_i \rangle - b_k(x)) + \beta(\langle c_j(x), \xi_i \rangle + d_j(x)) + \langle \gamma_{ijk}, d - C^\top \xi_i \rangle &\leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [J], k \in [K] \\ \|\beta c_j(x) - a_k(x) - C^\top \gamma_{ijk}\|_* &\leq \lambda, \quad \gamma_{ijk} \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [J], k \in [K]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

When $f(x, \cdot)$ is an affine function:

$$(b'') \quad f(x, \xi) = \langle a(x), \xi \rangle + b(x),$$

we have a more concise reformulation of the constraint of (7).

Corollary 3.1 *Assume the conditions (a) and (c) of Theorem 3.2 and (b'') hold. Then the constraint of problem (7) can be reformulated as:*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i &\leq 0, \\ \langle -a(x), \xi_i \rangle - b(x) + \beta(\langle c_j(x), \xi_i \rangle + d_j(x)) + \langle \gamma_{ij}, d - C^\top \xi_i \rangle &\leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [J] \\ \|a(x) + C^\top \gamma_{ij} - \beta c_j(x)\|_* &\leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [J] \\ \gamma_{ij} &\geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [J]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Remark 3.1 We should keep in mind that the feasible sets of the reformulations for the constraint of problem (7) are nonconvex. If β is fixed to some arbitrary positive value and $a(x), b(x), a_k(x), b_k(x), c_j(x), d_j(x), k \in [K], j \in [J]$ depend linearly on x , the reformulations (11) and (10) reduce to convex inequalities. Furthermore, if the Wasserstein metric is defined in terms of the 1-norm or the ∞ -norm, the reformulations (11) and (10) reduce to linear inequalities. In contrast, the reformulation (9) results in non-convex when the matrix $A(x)$ or the vector $b(x)$ depends on x .

4 Reward-Risk Ratio

Since the pioneering work by Markowitz on mean-variance portfolio selection [19], the return-risk analysis framework has been widely used in financial portfolio management. Two criteria essentially underly the portfolio selection approach: the expected return and the risk. One portfolio is preferred to another if it encompasses higher expected return and lower risk. To overcome the difficulties associated with choosing such variables, Sharpe [30] proposes a ratio optimization which is known as Sharpe ratio. Since the publication of the Sharpe ratio [30], some new performance measures such as STARR ratio, Minimax measure, Sortino ratio, Farinelli-Tibiletti ratio and most recently Rachev ratio and Generalized Rachev ratio have been proposed, for an empirical comparison, see Biglova et al. [5, 25] and the references therein.

In this section, we employ the results in Section 3 to investigate the distributionally robust reward-risk ratios. In this setting, the numerator measures the expected return while the denominator measures the risk. To simplify the discussions, we ignore the transaction fee, therefore the total value of portfolio is $\langle x, \xi \rangle$, where $\xi = [\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n]^\top$ denotes the random returns vector of n assets, x_1, \dots, x_n the fractions of the initial capital invested in n assets.

Sortino-Satchel Ratio: The Sortino ratio [31] is a modification of the Sharpe ratio by penalizing only those returns falling below a user-specified target or required rate of return, while the Sharpe ratio penalizes both upside and downside volatility equally. We consider that the numerator measures the expected return while the denominator measures the expected shortfall of return below the benchmark. The former is regarded as a reward and the latter first order lower partial moment as a risk, that is

$$f(x, \xi) = \langle x, \xi \rangle, \quad g(x, \xi) = \max\{\nu - \langle x, \xi \rangle, 0\},$$

where ν is a target return value set by the decision maker.

Corollary 4.1 *Assume that the condition (a) of Theorem 3.2 holds. Consider the reward function $f(x, \xi) = \langle x, \xi \rangle$ and the risk function $g(x, \xi) = \max\{\nu - \langle x, \xi \rangle, 0\}$. Then the constraint of problem (7) can be reformulated as:*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i &\leq 0, \\ \beta\nu - (1 + \beta)\langle x, \xi_i \rangle + \langle \gamma_{i1}, d - C^\top \xi_i \rangle &\leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ -\langle x, \xi_i \rangle + \langle \gamma_{i2}, d - C^\top \xi_i \rangle &\leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ \|(1 + \beta)x + C^\top \gamma_{i1}\|_* &\leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ \|x + C^\top \gamma_{i2}\|_* &\leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ \gamma_{ij} &\geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [2]. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Proof. By the definition of the conjugacy operator, we have

$$(f)^*(x, z) = \sup_{\xi} \{\langle z, \xi \rangle - \langle x, \xi \rangle\} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } z = x, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$(-\beta g_1)^*(x, u) = \sup_{\xi} \{\langle u, \xi \rangle + \beta(\langle -x, \xi \rangle + \nu)\} = \begin{cases} \beta\nu & \text{if } u = \beta x, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$(-\beta g_2)^*(x, u) = \sup_{\xi} \langle u, \xi \rangle = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u = 0, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $g_1(x, \xi) = \langle -x, \xi \rangle + \nu$, $g_2(x, \xi) = 0$. From Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\Xi}(v) &= \inf_{\gamma \geq 0} \langle \gamma, d \rangle \\ &\text{s.t. } C^T \gamma = v. \end{aligned}$$

By substituting the above expressions into (11), we have the result. \square

Stable Tail Adjusted Return Ratio (STARR): STARR is a variation of the Sortino-Satchel ratio where the expected one-sided deviation is replaced by a coherent risk measure, which can measure Skewness and fat-tails. Here, we employ the well used coherent risk measure, Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR). CVaR, sometimes called expected shortfall has received a great deal of attention as a measure of risk. In a financial context, it has a number of advantages over the commonly used Value-at-Risk (VaR) and has been proposed as the primary tool for banking capital regulation in the draft Basel III standard.

Suppose that $\langle x, \xi \rangle$ has a support contained in $[0, \tau_0]$, then

$$\text{CVaR}_{\alpha}(\langle x, \xi \rangle) = \inf_{\tau \in [0, \tau_0]} \tau + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}_P[\max\{\langle x, \xi \rangle - \tau, 0\}],$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is the confidence level. In fact, if $\tau \leq 0$, we have

$$\tau + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}_P[\max\{\langle x, \xi \rangle - \tau, 0\}] = (1 - \frac{1}{\alpha})\tau + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}_P[\langle x, \xi \rangle],$$

which is increasing as $\tau \rightarrow -\infty$ since $1 - \frac{1}{\alpha} < 0$. If $\tau \geq \tau_0$, we have $\tau + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}_P[\max\{\langle x, \xi \rangle - \tau, 0\}] = \tau$, and since τ is increasing as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. Because $\tau + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}_P[\max\{\langle x, \xi \rangle - \tau, 0\}]$ is convex in τ , then the minimizer of the function lies in $[0, \tau_0]$.

Corollary 4.2 *Suppose that $\langle x, \xi \rangle$ has a support contained in $[0, \tau_0]$ and the condition (a) of Theorem 3.2 hold. Consider $f(x, \xi) = \langle x, \xi \rangle$, $\mathbb{E}_P[g(x, \xi)] = \inf_{\tau} \tau + \frac{1}{\alpha} \mathbb{E}_P[\max\{-\langle x, \xi \rangle - \tau, 0\}]$. Then the constraint of problem (7) can be reformulated as:*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i &\leq 0, \\ \beta(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha})\tau + (-\frac{\beta}{\alpha} - 1)\langle x, \xi_i \rangle + \langle \gamma_{i1}, d - C^T \xi_i \rangle &\leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ \beta\tau - \langle x, \xi_i \rangle + \langle \gamma_{i2}, d - C^T \xi_i \rangle &\leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ \|x + C^T \gamma_{i1} + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} x\|_* &\leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ \|x + C^T \gamma_{i2}\|_* &\leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ \gamma_{ij} &\geq 0, \tau \in [-\tau_0, 0], \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [2]. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Corollary 3.1, we have

$$(f)^*(x, z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } z = x, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\Xi}(v) &= \inf_{\gamma \geq 0} \langle \gamma, d \rangle \\ &\text{s.t. } C^T \gamma = v. \end{aligned}$$

By the expression of $\mathbb{E}_P[g]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_P[g(x, \xi)] = \inf_{\tau} \mathbb{E}_P[\max\{\frac{1}{\alpha}\langle -x, \xi \rangle + (1 - \frac{1}{\alpha})\tau, \tau\}].$$

Let $a_1(x) = -\frac{1}{\alpha}x$, $b_1 = 1 - \frac{1}{\alpha}$, $a_2(x) = 0$ and $b_2 = 1$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}_P[g(x, \xi)] = \inf_{\tau \in [-\tau_0, 0]} \mathbb{E}_P[\max_{1 \leq j \leq 2} \langle a_j(x), \xi \rangle + b_j \tau].$$

Subsequently, by [27, Proposition 3.4], we have

$$\inf_{\tau \in [-\tau_0, 0]} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P[-f(x, \xi) + \beta(\max_{1 \leq j \leq 2} \langle a_j(x), \xi \rangle + b_j \tau)] = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \inf_{\tau \in [-\tau_0, 0]} \mathbb{E}_P[-f(x, \xi) + \beta(\max_{1 \leq j \leq 2} \langle a_j(x), \xi \rangle + b_j \tau)].$$

Therefore, from Corollary 3.1, we have the result. \square

Omega Ratio: The Omega ratio is another alternative for the widely used Sharpe ratio, which is defined as the probability weighted ratio of gains versus losses for some threshold return target. The Omega ratio is upside/downside ratio performance measures, in which reward is the upside deviation and risk is taken as the downside deviation. Kapsos et al. [17] first study the robust Omega ratio where each distribution in the ambiguity set can be explicitly represented either through a mixture of some known distributions, or a perturbation from a nominal discrete distribution. We focus on the case that the ambiguity set is defined as Wasserstein ball. Here, we set

$$f(x, \xi) = \max\{\langle x, \xi \rangle - \nu, 0\}, \quad g(x, \xi) = \max\{\nu - \langle x, \xi \rangle, 0\},$$

where ν is a threshold that partitions the returns to desirable (gain) and undesirable (loss). The choice of the value ' ν ' is left to the investor and can be set for example to be equal to the risk-free rate or zero.

Corollary 4.3 *Assume that the condition (a) of Theorem 3.2 holds. Consider the reward function $f(x, \xi) = \max\{\langle x, \xi \rangle - \nu, 0\}$, the risk function $g(x, \xi) = \max\{\nu - \langle x, \xi \rangle, 0\}$. Then the constraint of problem (7) can be reformulated as:*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i &\leq 0, \\ \eta_{i1}^1(\nu - \langle x, \xi_i \rangle) + \beta(\nu + \langle -x, \xi_i \rangle) + \langle \gamma_{i1}, d - C^\top \xi_i \rangle &\leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ \eta_{i2}^1(\nu - \langle x, \xi_i \rangle) + \langle \gamma_{i2}, d - C^\top \xi_i \rangle &\leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ \|\eta_{i1}^1 x + \beta x + C^\top \gamma_{i1}\|_* &\leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ \|\eta_{i2}^1 x + C^\top \gamma_{i2}\|_* &\leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ \langle \eta_{ij}, e \rangle &= 1, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [2] \\ \gamma_{ij} &\geq 0, \eta_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [2] \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where η_{ij}^1 represents the first component of η_{ij} , $j \in [2]$.

Proof. By some simple calculation, we have

$$(f)^*(x, z) = \sup_{\xi} \{\langle z, \xi \rangle - \max\{\langle x, \xi \rangle - \nu, 0\}\} = \begin{cases} \inf_{\eta \geq 0} \langle \eta, -b(x) \rangle \\ \text{s.t. } A(x)^\top \eta = z \\ \langle \eta, e \rangle = 1 \end{cases}$$

$$(-\beta g_1)^*(x, u) = \sup_{\xi} \{\langle u, \xi \rangle + \beta(\langle -x, \xi \rangle + \nu)\} = \begin{cases} \beta\nu & \text{if } u = \beta x, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$(-\beta g_2)^*(x, u) = \sup_{\xi} \{\langle u, \xi \rangle\} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u = 0, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $A(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x^\top \\ \mathbf{0}^\top \end{bmatrix}$, $b(x) = \begin{bmatrix} -\nu \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{0}$ denotes a vector with each component being 0. By substituting the above expressions into (9), we obtain the result. \square

In the recent work [15], Ji and Lejeune study the DRR problem with Wasserstein ball type ambiguity set and show that for many kinds of ratio such as Sharpe, Sortino-Satchel and Omega ratios, the step of checking feasibility can be completed through solving a convex problem. However, problem (14) shows that for distributionally robust Omega ratio we can not check the feasibility through optimizing convex optimization problem. The reason is that we release the condition in [15] by considering the Wasserstein ball on the general probability space $\mathcal{P}(\Xi)$ rather than on the discrete probability space $\mathcal{P}(\Xi^N)$.

5 Bisection Algorithmic Methods

For a minimization problem with a monotonous objective value in $[a, b]$, the bisection algorithm divides the incumbent interval $[a, b]$ in two equal parts. Then, compute the value of the objective function at the midpoint $\beta = (a + b)/2$ of the interval $[a, b]$. If the problem is feasible at β , there is potentially a better optimal value smaller than β . The search is continued on $[a, \beta]$, otherwise search focuses on the interval $[\beta, b]$. The process continues until the interval is sufficiently small.

In what follows, we mainly analyze the bisection algorithm for DRR problem with Sortino-Satchel ratio and DRR problem with STARR can be analyzed in a similar way.

Assume that the investor has observed N historical samples from the true distribution P and the support set of distribution P is contained in $\Xi = \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n : C\xi \leq d\}$, where C is a matrix and d is a vector of appropriate dimensions. Consider the case that the reward function $f(x, \xi) = \langle x, \xi \rangle$ and the risk function $g(x, \xi) = \max\{\langle x_0, \xi \rangle - \langle x, \xi \rangle, 0\}$, where x_0 is a given historical decision. By Corollary 4.1, we have that the problem (7) can be reformulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf -\beta \\ & \text{s.t. } \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \leq 0 \\ & \quad \langle \beta x_0 - (1 + \beta)x, \xi_i \rangle + \langle \gamma_{i1}, d - C^\top \xi_i \rangle \leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ & \quad -\langle x, \xi_i \rangle + \langle \gamma_{i2}, d - C^\top \xi_i \rangle \leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ & \quad \|x + C^\top \gamma_{i1} + \beta(x - x_0)\|_* \leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ & \quad \|x + C^\top \gamma_{i2}\|_* \leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\ & \quad \gamma_{ij} \geq 0, x \in X, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [2]. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

For simplicity, we rewrite (15) into a more concise form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{(D) } \inf -\beta \\ & \text{s.t. } (x, \lambda, s, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \beta) \in H, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where H denotes the feasible set of (15). Then for each iteration, the feasibility check is done by solving the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{D})_t \quad & \inf \quad -\beta \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad (x, \lambda, s, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \beta) \in H, \\
& \quad \quad \beta = \beta^t,
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where β^t is the middle point of the interval $[\beta_L^t, \beta_U^t]$ which is determined by step $t - 1$.

Given the tolerance level ε , the bisection algorithm to solve problem (15) can be presented as follows:

Algorithm 1: Pseudo-Code of Bisection Algorithm

Step 1: Determine $[\beta_L^0, \beta_U^0]$ such that $\beta^* \in [\beta_L^0, \beta_U^0]$, and set $t = 0, v^0 = \beta_L^0$;

Step 2: Set $\beta^t = (\beta_L^t + \beta_U^t)/2$, and solve the problem D_t ;

Step 3: If D_t is feasibility, then set $v^t = \beta^t$; update interval $[\beta_L^{t+1}, \beta_U^{t+1}] : \beta_L^{t+1} = \beta^t$ and $\beta_U^{t+1} = \beta_U^t$, let $t = t + 1$. Otherwise, set $v^t = v^{t-1}$; update interval $[\beta_L^{t+1}, \beta_U^{t+1}] : \beta_L^{t+1} = \beta_L^t$ and $\beta_U^{t+1} = \beta^t$, let $t = t + 1$;

Step 4: If $\beta_U^t - \beta_L^t \leq \varepsilon$, stop. Return v^t as the optimal value. Otherwise go to **Step 2**.

In Algorithm 1, the suitable values β_L^0 and β_U^0 are determined to ensure that the optimal value β^* belongs to each of the successive intervals $[\beta_L^t, \beta_U^t]$. The cost on time of Algorithm 1 depends highly on the diameter of the interval $[\beta_L^0, \beta_U^0]$. In practice, people may set the interval based on their experience and/or their expectation. For example, set lower bound as unacceptable ratio and the upper bound as highest ratio we can be expected. We will present some numerical methods to determine lower and upper bounds of the ratio in next subsection. Note also $\{\beta_L^t\}$ is an increasing sequence and $\{\beta_U^t\}$ is a decreasing sequence, hence the sequence $\{v^t\}$ is monotone increasing. Therefore, the Algorithm 1 finds the optimal value in a finite number of iterations with given tolerance ε .

5.1 Determine the interval $[\beta_L, \beta_U]$

It is well known that the efficiency of bisection method is highly dependent on the initial interval $[\beta_L, \beta_U]$. In this subsection, we present a method to set the interval $[\beta_L, \beta_U]$. Let us focus on the lower bound β_L first.

Lower bound β_L : For any fixed $x \in X$, denote

$$\beta_L(x) := \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P[f(x, \xi)]}{\mathbb{E}_P[g(x, \xi)]}. \tag{18}$$

Obviously, the optimal ratio β^* such that

$$\beta^* = \max_{x \in X} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P[f(x, \xi)]}{\mathbb{E}_P[g(x, \xi)]} \geq \beta_L(x), \quad \forall x \in X.$$

By the equivalent reformulation (3), we may estimate a lower bounded $\beta_L(x)$ of β^* by solving

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{P})_1 \quad & \max \beta \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{E}_P[-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)] \leq 0, \forall P \in \mathcal{P}, \\
& \quad \quad \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

By using Lagrange dual method, problem (19) can be reformulated as a convex problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{P})'_1 \quad & \max \beta \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \leq 0 \\
& \langle \beta x_0 - (1 + \beta)x, \xi_i \rangle + \langle \gamma_{i1}, d - C^\top \xi_i \rangle \leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\
& -\langle x, \xi_i \rangle + \langle \gamma_{i2}, d - C^\top \xi_i \rangle \leq s_i, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\
& \|x + C^\top \gamma_{i1} + \beta(x - x_0)\|_* \leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\
& \|x + C^\top \gamma_{i2}\|_* \leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\
& \gamma_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [2].
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Again, the investor may setting the lower bound $\beta_L(x)$ by choosing different x , for example, set x as the portfolio choice of last investment process or the equally weighted strategy.

Upper Bound β_U :

Denote

$$\beta_U^N := \max_{x \in X} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{P_N}[f(x, \xi)]}{\mathbb{E}_{P_N}[g(x, \xi)]}, \tag{21}$$

where P_N is the empirical distribution. Obviously, the optimal ratio β^* such that

$$\beta^* = \max_{x \in X} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P[f(x, \xi)]}{\mathbb{E}_P[g(x, \xi)]} \leq \beta_U^N.$$

As P_N is a discrete distribution, problem (21) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{P})_2 \quad & \max_{x, u} \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle x, \xi_i \rangle}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N u_i} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & u_i \geq \langle x_0 - x, \xi_i \rangle, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\
& \sum_{i=1}^N x_i = 1, \\
& u_i \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [N],
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where the auxiliary variable $u = (u_1, \dots, u_N)^\top$ is introduced to deal with the max-function. As problem (P)₂ is a linear fractional program, it can be further reformulated as an equivalent linear programming problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{P})'_2 \quad & \max_{z, v, w} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle z, \xi_i \rangle \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N v_i = 1 \\
& v_i \geq \langle w(x_0 - x), \xi_i \rangle, \quad \forall i \in [N] \\
& \sum_{i=1}^N z_i = w, \\
& v_i \geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [N].
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, the optimal solution of the problem (P)₂ is $x^* = z^* / \sum_{i=1}^N z_i^*$, where z^* is the optimal solution of (P)₂'. Therefore,

$$\beta_U = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{P_N}[f(x^*, \xi)]}{\mathbb{E}_{P_N}[g(x^*, \xi)]}.$$

In [15], Ji and Lejeune present an effective method to derive a lower bound and an upper bound for β . They determine the upper bound via solving two subproblems: maximizing the robust reward measure without restriction on the risk and minimizing the robust risk measure without restriction on the reward. For the lower bound, they provide an estimation at each iteration t by virtue of the bisection algorithm with iterative interval compaction method. See Section 5 of [15] for the details.

6 Conclusions

We consider the distributionally robust reward-risk ratio (DRR) problems, where the ambiguity set is characterized by Wasserstein ball centered at an empirical probability. The paper makes some contributions to the current research in a few aspects. First, it extends the DRR problem with moment or mixture type ambiguity sets [17, 18, 32] to distance type ambiguity set, which ensures that the ambiguity set may converge to rather than include the true probability; second, it extends the SDP reformulation of DRO problem with Wasserstein ball uncertainty of the distributions [8] to the DRR problem; third, it extends the current research on DRR with Wasserstein type ambiguity set which restricted on discrete probability space to the general probability space. It might be possible to take this work further in the following direction: the SDP reformulation relies heavily on the piecewise linear structure of the involved functions, it is very interesting to explore weaker conditions.

Acknowledgements This work was supported in part by the NSFC Grant #11571056, #11431004, the Hongkong Baptist University FRG1/15-16/027 and RC-NACAN-ZHANG J.

7 Appendix

Proof of Theorem 3.1:

By the definition of the Wasserstein metric, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P[-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)] &= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \{ \mathbb{E}_P[-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)] : d_w(P, P_N) \leq \theta \} \\ &= \sup_{\Xi} \int_{\Xi} (-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)) P(d\xi) \\ &\quad \text{s.t. } \pi \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi \times \Xi), P \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi), \\ &\quad \int_{\Xi^2} \|\xi - z\| \pi(d\xi, dz) \leq \theta, \\ &\quad \pi \text{ is a joint distribution of } \xi \text{ and } z \\ &\quad \text{with marginals } P \text{ and } P_N, \text{ respectively.} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

By the law of total probability, $\pi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Q_i$, where Q_i represents the distribution of ξ conditional on $z = \xi_i$. Therefore, we can rewrite (23) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{Q_i \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Xi} (-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)) Q_i(d\xi) \\ \text{s.t. } \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Xi} \|\xi - \xi_i\| Q_i(d\xi) \leq \theta. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Consider its Lagrangian dual problem that can be rewrite as follows:

$$L(\lambda) = \sup_{Q_i \in \mathcal{P}(\Xi)} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Xi} (-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)) Q_i(d\xi) + \lambda(\theta - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{\Xi} \|\xi - \xi_i\| Q_i(d\xi)),$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ is the dual variable of constraint condition of (24). Obviously, the dual problem is

$$\inf_{\lambda \geq 0} L(\lambda).$$

Now, we show that the strong duality result holds. When $\theta > 0$, by virtue of a well-known strong duality result for moment problems [27, Proposition 3.4], there is no duality gap. Hence, we obtain

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P[-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)] = \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} L(\lambda) \quad (25)$$

$$= \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} (-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi) - \lambda\|\xi - \xi_i\|), \quad (26)$$

where the equality (26) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{P}(\Xi)$ contains all the Dirac distributions supported on Ξ .

One can show that the equality (25) continues to hold even for $\theta = 0$. In fact, in which case the Wasserstein ambiguity set reduces to the singleton $\{P_N\}$, $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P[-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)]$ reduces to the sample average $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (-f(x, \xi_i) + \beta g(x, \xi_i))$. For $\theta = 0$, the variable λ in (26) can be increased indefinitely. Since for any given x, β , $-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi) - \lambda\|\xi - \xi_i\|$ is concave w.r.t. ξ , we can show that (26) converges to the sample average $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (-f(x, \xi_i) + \beta g(x, \xi_i))$ as λ tends to infinity. That is, (25) holds for $\theta = 0$.

By introducing auxiliary variables $s_i, i \in [N]$, we can reformulate (26) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\lambda, s_i} \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \\ & \text{s.t. } \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} (-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi) - \lambda\|\xi - \xi_i\|) \leq s_i, \forall i \in [N] \\ & \lambda \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

By virtue of the definition of the dual norm, (27) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\lambda, s_i} \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \\ & \text{s.t. } \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} (-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi) - \max_{\|z_i\|_* \leq \lambda} \langle z_i, \xi - \xi_i \rangle) \leq s_i, \forall i \in [N] \\ & \lambda \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\lambda, s_i} \lambda\theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \\ & \text{s.t. } \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} \min_{\|z_i\|_* \leq \lambda} (-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi) - \langle z_i, \xi - \xi_i \rangle) \leq s_i, \forall i \in [N] \\ & \lambda \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

By the assumptions, f and g are continuous functions, and for any given x, β , $-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi) - \langle z_i, \xi - \xi_i \rangle$ is concave w.r.t. ξ and convex w.r.t. z_i . Since for any finite λ , the set $\{z_i \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|z_i\|_* \leq \lambda\}$ is compact, due to the classical minimax theorem [3, Proposition 5.5.4], (29) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\lambda, s_i} \lambda \theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \\ & \text{s.t. } \min_{\|z_i\|_* \leq \lambda} \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} (-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi) - \langle z_i, \xi - \xi_i \rangle) \leq s_i, \forall i \in [N] \\ & \lambda \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\lambda, s_i, z_i} \lambda \theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \\ & \text{s.t. } \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} (-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi) - \langle z_i, \xi - \xi_i \rangle) \leq s_i, \forall i \in [N] \\ & \|z_i\|_* \leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N]. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

It follows from the definition of conjugacy and the substitution of z_i with $-z_i$, (31) is equivalent to the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\lambda, s_i, z_i} \lambda \theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \\ & \text{s.t. } (f - \beta g + \delta_{\Xi})^*(x, z_i) - \langle z_i, \xi_i \rangle \leq s_i, \forall i \in [N] \\ & \|z_i\|_* \leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N]. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Since for any given x, β , the function $f(x, \xi) - \beta g(x, \xi) + \delta_{\Xi}(\xi)$ is proper, convex and lower semicontinuous w.r.t. ξ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (f - \beta g + \delta_{\Xi})^*(x, z_i) &= \text{cl} \left[\inf_{u_i, v_i} ((f)^*(x, z_i - u_i - v_i) + (-\beta g)^*(x, u_i) + (\delta_{\Xi})^*(v_i)) \right] \\ &= \text{cl} \left[\inf_{u_i, v_i} ((f)^*(x, z_i - u_i - v_i) + (-\beta g)^*(x, u_i) + \sigma_{\Xi}(v_i)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As $\text{cl}[h(x)] \leq 0$ if and only if $h(x) \leq 0$ for any function h . Therefore, from (32), we can conclude that (8) holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2 It follows from the expressions of f and g and the proof of Theorem 3.1 that (29) can be reformulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\lambda, s_i} \lambda \theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \\ & \text{s.t. } \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} \min_{\|z_{ij}\|_* \leq \lambda} (-f(x, \xi) + \beta g_j(x, \xi) - \langle z_{ij}, \xi - \xi_i \rangle) \leq s_i, \forall i \in [N], j \in [J] \\ & \lambda \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $g_j(x, \xi) = \langle c_j(x), \xi \rangle + d_j(x)$. Since $f(x, \xi) = \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \{a_k(x, \xi) + b_k(x)\}$, then for any given $x \in X$, $f(x, \xi)$ is convex w.r.t. ξ . Then, it follows from the proof of Theorem 3.1 that (33) can be re-expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\lambda, s_i, z_{ij}, u_{ij}, v_{ij}} \lambda \theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \\ & \text{s.t. } (f)^*(x, z_{ij} - u_{ij} - v_{ij}) + (-\beta g_j)^*(x, u_{ij}) + \sigma_{\Xi}(v_{ij}) - \langle z_{ij}, \xi_i \rangle \leq s_i, \forall i \in [N], j \in [J] \\ & \|z_{ij}\|_* \leq \lambda, \quad \forall i \in [N], j \in [J]. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

By the definition of the conjugacy operator, we have

$$(f)^*(x, z) = \sup_{\xi} \{ \langle z, \xi \rangle - \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \{ \langle a_k(x), \xi \rangle + b_k(x) \} \} = \begin{cases} \inf_{\eta \geq 0} \langle \eta, -b(x) \rangle \\ \text{s.t. } A(x)^\top \eta = z \\ \langle \eta, e \rangle = 1 \end{cases}$$

$$(-\beta g_j)^*(x, u) = \sup_{\xi} \{ \langle u, \xi \rangle + \beta (\langle c_j(x), \xi \rangle + d_j(x)) \} = \begin{cases} \beta d_j(x) & \text{if } u = -\beta c_j(x), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since

$$\sigma_{\Xi}(v) = \sup_{\xi} \langle v, \xi \rangle \\ \text{s.t. } C\xi \leq d,$$

then it follows from the strong duality of linear programming and the non-empty of the uncertainty set, we have

$$\sigma_{\Xi}(v) = \inf_{\gamma \geq 0} \langle \gamma, d \rangle \\ \text{s.t. } C^\top \gamma = v. \quad (35)$$

By substituting the above expressions into (34), the result holds for $\theta > 0$.

When $\theta = 0$, the optimal value of (9) reduces to the expectation of $-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)$ under the empirical distribution. In fact, for $\theta = 0$, the variable λ can be set to any positive value. Since all samples must belong to the uncertainty set, i.e., $d - C\xi_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, N$, then it is optimal to set $\gamma_{ij} = 0$. This implies that

$$s_i = \min_{\eta_{ij} \geq 0} \{ \langle \eta_{ij}, -b - A(x)\xi_i : \langle \eta_{ij}, e \rangle = 1 \} + \beta \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \{ \langle c_j(x), \xi_i \rangle + d_j(x) \} \\ = \min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \{ -\langle a_k(x), \xi_i \rangle - b_k(x) \} + \beta \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \{ \langle c_j(x), \xi_i \rangle + d_j(x) \} = -f(x, \xi_i) + \beta g(x, \xi_i)$$

at optimality. Therefore, $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i$ represents the sample average of $-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.3 It follows from the expressions of f and g and the proof of Theorem 3.1 that (29) can be reformulated as follows:

$$\inf_{\lambda, s_i} \lambda \theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \\ \text{s.t. } \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} \min_{\|z_{ij}\|_* \leq \lambda} (-f(x, \xi) + \beta g_j(x, \xi) - \langle z_{ij}, \xi - \xi_i \rangle) \leq s_i, \forall i \in [N], j \in [J] \\ \lambda \geq 0, \quad (36)$$

where $g_j(x, \xi) = \langle c_j(x), \xi \rangle + d_j(x)$. Since $f(x, \xi) = \min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \{ \langle a_k(x), \xi \rangle + b_k(x) \}$, then $-f(x, \xi) = \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \{ -\langle a_k(x), \xi \rangle - b_k(x) \}$. Thus, (36) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\inf_{\lambda, s_i} \lambda \theta + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \\ \text{s.t. } \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} \min_{\|z_{ijk}\|_* \leq \lambda} (-f_k(x, \xi) + \beta g_j(x, \xi) - \langle z_{ijk}, \xi - \xi_i \rangle) \leq s_i, \forall i \in [N], j \in [J], k \in [K] \\ \lambda \geq 0, \quad (37)$$

where $f_k(x, \xi) = \langle a_k(x), \xi \rangle + b_k(x)$. Then, it follows from the proof of Theorem 3.1, the result holds for $\theta > 0$.

When $\theta = 0$, the optimal value of (10) reduces to the expectation of $-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)$ under the empirical distribution. In fact, for $\theta = 0$, the variable λ can be set to any positive value. Since all samples must belong to the uncertainty set, i.e., $d - C\xi_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, N$, then it is optimal to set $\gamma_{ij} = 0$. This implies that

$$s_i = \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \{-\langle a_k(x), \xi_i \rangle - b_k(x)\} + \beta \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \{\langle c_j(x), \xi_i \rangle + d_j(x)\} = -f(x, \xi_i) + \beta g(x, \xi_i)$$

at optimality. Therefore, $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i$ represents the sample average of $-f(x, \xi) + \beta g(x, \xi)$. \square

References

1. Ben-Tal, A., El Ghaoui, L., Nemirovski, A.: Robust Optimization. Princeton University Press, NJ (2009)
2. Ben-Tal, A., den Hertog, D., Vial, J.P.: Deriving robust counterparts of nonlinear uncertain inequalities. *Math. Program.* **149**, 265-299 (2015)
3. Bertsekas, D.P.: Convex Optimization Theory. Athena Scientific (2009)
4. Bertsimas, D., Brown, D.B., Caramanis, C.: Theory and applications of robust optimization. *SIAM Rev.* **53**, 464-501 (2011)
5. Biglova, A., Ortobelli, S., Rachev, S., Stoyanov, S.: Different approaches to risk estimation in portfolio theory. *J. Portfol. Manag.* **31**, 103-112 (2004)
6. Delage, E., Ye, Y.: Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Oper. Res.* **58**, 592-612 (2010)
7. Dupačová, J.: Uncertainties in minimax stochastic programs. *Optimization.* **60**, 1235-1250 (2011)
8. Esfahani, P.M., Kuhn, D.: Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the Wasserstein metric: performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. Manuscript, 2015.
9. Frenk, J.B.G., Schaible, S.: Fractional programming. *Handbook of Generalized Convexity and Generalized Monotonicity*, 333-386. Springer, Berlin (2004)
10. Gao, R., Kleywegt, A.J.: Distributionally robust stochastic optimization with Wasserstein distance. Manuscript, 2016.
11. Goldfarb, D., Iyengar, G.: Robust portfolio selection problems. *Math. Oper. Res.* **28**, 1-38 (2003)
12. Gorissen, B.L.: Robust fractional programming. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **166**, 508-528 (2015)
13. Hanasusanto, G., Kuhn, D.: Conic programming reformulations of two-stage distributionally robust linear programs over Wasserstein balls. Manuscript, 2016.
14. Hu, Z., Hong, J.: Kullback-Leibler divergence constrained distributionally robust optimization. Manuscript, 2012.
15. Ji, R., Lejeune, M.A.: Data-driven optimization of reward-risk ratio measures. Manuscript, 2015.
16. Kantorovich, L.V., Rubinshtein, G.S.: On a space of totally additive functions. *Vestn Lening. Univ.* **13**, 52-59 (1958)
17. Kapsos, M., Christofides, N., Rustem, B.: Worst-case robust Omega ratio. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.* **234**, 499-507 (2014)

18. Liu, Y., Meskarian, R., Xu, H.: A semi-infinite programming approach for distributionally robust reward-risk ratio optimization with matrix moments constraints. Manuscript, 2015.
19. Markowitz, H.: Portfolio selection. *J. Financ.* **1**, 77-91 (1952)
20. Martin, R.D., Rachev, S., Siboulet, F.: Phi-alpha optimal portfolios and extreme risk management. *Wilmott.* 70-83 (2003)
21. Pflug, G.Ch., Pichler, A.: Approximations for probability distributions and stochastic optimization problems. *Stochastic Optimization Methods in Finance and Energy*, 163: 343-387. Springer, New York (2011)
22. Pflug, G.Ch., Pichler, A.: *Multistage Stochastic Optimization*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering, Springer (2014)
23. Pflug, G.Ch., Wozabal, D.: Ambiguity in portfolio selection. *Quant. Financ.* **7**, 435-442 (2007)
24. Popescu, I.: Robust mean-covariance solutions for stochastic optimization. *Oper. Res.* **55**, 98-112 (2007)
25. Rachev, S., Jašik, T., Biglova, A., Fabozzi, F.: Risk and return in momentum strategies: Profitability from portfolios based on risk-adjusted stock ranking criteria. Technical report, Department of probability and applied statistics, University of California, Santa Barbara (2005)
26. Rockafellar, R.T., Uryasev, S.: Optimization of conditional value-at-risk. *J. Risk.* **2**, 21-41 (2000)
27. Shapiro, A.: On duality theory of conic linear problems. In *Semi-Infinite Programming: Recent Advances*. M. A. Goberna and M. A. López, eds., 135-165. Kluwer Academic Publishers (2001)
28. Shapiro, A., Ahmed, S.: On a class of minimax stochastic programs. *SIAM J. Optim.* **14**, 1237-1249 (2004)
29. Shapiro, A., Dentcheva, D., Ruszczyński, A.: *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory*. SIAM, Philadelphia (2009)
30. Sharpe, W.F.: Mutual funds performance. *J. Busin.* **39**, 119-138 (1966)
31. Sortino, F.A., Satchell, S.: *Managing Downside Risk in Financial Markets*. Butterworth-Heinemann (2003)
32. Tong, X., Wu, F.: Robust reward-risk ratio optimization with application in allocation of generation asset. *Optimization.* **63**, 1761-1779 (2014)
33. Wiesemann, W., Kuhn, D., Rustem, B.: Robust resource allocations in temporal networks. *Math. Program.* **135**, 437-471 (2012)
34. Wiesemann, W., Kuhn, D., Rustem, B.: Robust markov decision processes. *Math. Oper. Res.* **38**, 153-183 (2013)
35. Wiesemann, W., Kuhn, D., Sim, M.: Distributionally robust convex optimization. *Oper. Res.* **62**, 1358-1376 (2014)
36. Wozabal, D.: A framework for optimization under ambiguity. *Ann. Oper. Res.* **193**, 21-47 (2012)
37. Wozabal, D.: Robustifying convex risk measures for linear portfolios: A nonparametric approach. *Oper. Res.* **62**, 1302-1315 (2014)
38. Žáčková, J.: On minimax solutions of stochastic linear programming problems. *Časopis pro Pěstování Matematiky.* **91**, 423-430 (1966)

-
39. Zhao, C., Guan, Y.: Data-driven risk-averse stochastic optimization with Wasserstein metric. Manuscript, 2015.