

# The checkerboard copula and dependence concepts

Liyuan Lin\*      Ruodu Wang<sup>†</sup>      Ruixun Zhang<sup>‡</sup>      Chaoyi Zhao<sup>§</sup>

24th April 2024

## Abstract

We study the problem of choosing the copula when the marginal distributions of a random vector are not all continuous. Inspired by three motivating examples including simulation from copulas, stress scenarios, and co-risk measures, we propose to use the checkerboard copula, that is, intuitively, the unique copula with a distribution that is as uniform as possible within regions of flexibility. We show that the checkerboard copula has the largest Shannon entropy, which means that it carries the least information among all possible copulas for a given random vector. Furthermore, the checkerboard copula preserves the dependence information of the original random vector, leading to two applications in the context of diversification penalty and impact portfolios.

**Keywords:** Orthant dependence; positive and negative association; Shannon entropy; Co-VaR; simulation

## 1 Introduction

The copula theory has been actively studied over the past few decades with many applications in statistics, finance, engineering, and the natural sciences; for an introduction, see the monographs of [Nelsen \(2006\)](#) and [Joe \(2014\)](#).

It is well known through Sklar's theorem ([Nelsen \(2006, Theorem 2.10.9\)](#)) that the copula of a random vector is unique if and only if it has continuous marginal distributions. [Genest and Nešlehová \(2007\)](#) discussed difficulties in identifying copulas for discrete distributions. The purpose of this

---

\*Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Waterloo, Canada. [1891lin@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:1891lin@uwaterloo.ca)

<sup>†</sup>Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Waterloo, Canada. [wang@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:wang@uwaterloo.ca)

<sup>‡</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Center for Statistical Science, and National Engineering Laboratory for Big Data Analysis and Applications, Peking University, China. [zhangruixun@pku.edu.cn](mailto:zhangruixun@pku.edu.cn)

<sup>§</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, China; Sloan School of Management, MIT, United States. [zhaochaoyi@pku.edu.cn](mailto:zhaochaoyi@pku.edu.cn)

paper is to understand whether it is possible to identify a canonical copula for a random vector in some sense if it does not have continuous marginal distributions.

To answer this question, we seek inspiration from three applications. Let  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  be a  $d$ -dimensional random vector with  $d \geq 2$ , which may have non-unique copulas. Denote by  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$  the set of all copulas of  $\mathbf{X}$ . For a random variable  $X$ , its probability integral transform  $U$  is a uniform random variable on  $[0, 1]$  satisfying  $F^{-1}(U) = X$  almost surely (a.s.), where  $F$  is the distribution function of  $X$  and  $F^{-1}$  is the quantile function of  $X$ . Let  $(U_1, \dots, U_d)$  be any vector of probability integral transforms of  $X_1, \dots, X_d$  with a joint distribution  $C$ ; certainly,  $C$  is a copula of  $\mathbf{X}$ . All random variables live in an atomless probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ .

1. **Simulating from the copula of  $\mathbf{X}$ .** One of the most popular applications of copulas in finance is to model default correlation, as famously done by [Li \(2000\)](#); see [McNeil et al. \(2015\)](#) for discussions. In such applications, one needs to simulate from the copula of  $\mathbf{X}$ , where  $\mathbf{X}$  may have non-continuous marginal distributions (e.g., losses from default events). Assume that we can simulate  $\mathbf{X}$ , and we also have knowledge of all marginal distributions of  $\mathbf{X}$ . How can we find a reasonable copula  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$  to simulate from, that is determined only by  $\mathbf{X}$  but not by any particular modeling choices (such as the Gaussian copula)?
2. **Stressing the distribution of  $\mathbf{X}$ .** In sensitivity analysis and risk management, it is often necessary to stress, or distort, the distribution of  $\mathbf{X}$  to obtain post-stress distributions. In the stressing mechanisms studied by [Millosovich et al. \(2021\)](#), one needs to find a stressed probability measure  $Q_1$  by using  $dQ_1/d\mathbb{P} = g(U_1)$  for a non-negative increasing function  $g$  with  $\int_0^1 g(u)du = 1$ , such as  $g(u) = 2u$ . The simple interpretation of  $Q_1$  is to gradually increase the weight of realizations  $\omega \in \Omega$  at which  $X_1$  is large. Similarly, one can simultaneously stress all components of  $\mathbf{X}$  by considering a measure  $Q$  such that  $dQ/d\mathbb{P} = (1/d) \sum_{i=1}^d g_i(U_i)$  or  $dQ/d\mathbb{P} = c \prod_{i=1}^d g_i(U_i)$  with a normalizing constant  $c > 0$  ( $c = 1$  if  $U_1, \dots, U_d$  are independent), where  $g_i$  are non-negative increasing functions with  $\int_0^1 g_i(u)du = 1$ . If we are only interested in the post-stress distribution  $\hat{F}_1^{Q_1}$  of  $X_1$  under  $Q_1$ , the choice of the copula  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$  is irrelevant. However, the choice of the copula  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$  matters for the distribution  $\hat{F}_i^Q$  of  $X_i$  under  $Q$ , as well as for the distribution  $\hat{F}_i^{Q_1}$  of  $X_i$  under  $Q_1$ .
3. **Computing a co-risk measure.** Co-risk measures (e.g., [Adrian and Brunnermeier \(2016\)](#)) are calculated for the conditional distribution of a random variable  $X_2$  given some event related to  $X_1$ . A classic example is the Marginal Expected Shortfall at level  $p \in (0, 1)$ , which

is defined as, assuming that  $X_1$  is continuously distributed,

$$\rho(X_2|X_1) := \mathbb{E}[X_2|X_1 > F_1^{-1}(p)] = \mathbb{E}[X_2|U_1 > p].$$

Generally,  $\rho$  is the mean of  $X_2$  given a (not necessarily unique)  $p$ -tail event of  $X_1$  in the sense of Wang and Zitikis (2021). This risk measure  $\rho$  does not depend on the choice of  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$  if  $X_1$  is continuously distributed ( $p$ -tail event is unique a.s.); however, it may depend on  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$  if  $X_1$  has some points of mass. Other co-risk measures, such as CoVaR (Adrian and Brunnermeier, 2016), also face the same issue.

All of the above contexts point to the question of choosing a good copula  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$ , which we address in this paper. We first offer a new characterization of all copulas of a given random vector in Section 2 in Theorem 1. In Section 3, we give some intuitive and heuristic arguments for the questions above, leading to the proposal of using the checkerboard copula, that is, the unique copula of  $\mathbf{X}$  that is as uniform as possible in regions where the copulas of  $\mathbf{X}$  are not uniquely determined, formally defined in Definition 1. Although the arguments in Section 3 are heuristic, the use of the checkerboard copula indeed has a theoretical justification, which we present in Section 4. The checkerboard copula has the maximum Shannon entropy among all possible copulas of  $\mathbf{X}$ , as shown in Theorem 2. In Section 5, we show in Theorem 3 that the checkerboard copula preserves various dependence concepts that are satisfied by  $\mathbf{X}$ . This result is intuitive, but the proof requires serious technical analysis. We discuss two applications of our results in diversification penalty and induced order statistics in Section 6. Section 7 concludes the paper.

## 2 Copulas for a discrete random vector

Let  $d \geq 2$  be an integer and  $[d] = \{1, \dots, d\}$ . All inequalities are interpreted component-wise when applied to vectors. All random variables live in an atomless probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . Let  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  be a  $d$ -dimensional random vector,  $F_1, \dots, F_d$  be the marginal distributions of  $\mathbf{X}$ , and  $\text{Ran}(F_i)$  be the range of  $F_i$  for  $i \in [d]$ . By Sklar's theorem, the copula of  $\mathbf{X}$  is uniquely determined on  $\text{Ran}(F_1) \times \dots \times \text{Ran}(F_d)$  but undetermined in other regions. Therefore, when the marginal distribution  $F_i$  is not continuous for some  $i \in [d]$ , the copula of  $\mathbf{X}$  may not be unique. In this section, we give a concrete representation for any copulas of  $\mathbf{X}$ .

We start with the observation that, if a random variable  $X$  is continuously distributed, the random variable

$$U_X := F_X(X)$$

will be uniformly distributed over  $[0, 1]$ , where  $F_X$  is the cumulative distribution function of  $X$ . More generally, regardless of whether  $X$  is continuously distributed, we can define its probability integral transform

$$U_X := F_X(X-) + V_X(F_X(X) - F_X(X-)), \quad (1)$$

where  $F_X(x-) = \lim_{y \uparrow x} F_X(x) = \mathbb{P}(X < x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $V_X \sim \text{U}[0, 1]$  is independent of  $X$ , assumed to exist.<sup>1</sup> The probability integral transform  $U_X$  satisfies  $U_X \sim \text{U}[0, 1]$  and  $F_X^{-1}(U_X) = X$  a.s. (see e.g., [Rüschendorf \(2013, Proposition 1.3\)](#)). Therefore, the probability integral transform (1) converts any random variable  $X$  to a  $\text{U}[0, 1]$  distributed random variable  $U_X$  using  $V_X$ .

We extend this idea to the case of a random vector  $\mathbf{X}$ . Let  $\mathbf{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_d)$  be a random vector with  $\text{U}[0, 1]$  marginals such that  $V_i$  is independent of  $X_i$  for each  $i \in [d]$ . Denote the set of such  $\mathbf{V}$  by  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}$ . Similar to (1), let us define the probability integral transform for  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ :

$$U_i := F_i(X_i-) + V_i(F_i(X_i) - F_i(X_i-)), \quad i \in [d]. \quad (2)$$

It immediately follows that  $U_i \sim \text{U}[0, 1]$  and  $F_i^{-1}(U_i) = X_i$  a.s.. Therefore,  $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_d)$  is a random vector with uniform marginals. This technique of constructing random vectors with uniform marginals has been used in the literature; see e.g., [Moore and Spruill \(1975\)](#) and [Nešlehová \(2007\)](#).

Let  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$  be the copula of  $\mathbf{U}$ . Because  $F_i^{-1}(U_i) = X_i$  a.s. for each  $i \in [d]$ , we have

$$C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}(F_1(x_1), \dots, F_d(x_d)) = \mathbb{P}(U_1 \leq F_1(x_1), \dots, U_d \leq F_d(x_d)) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x_1, \dots, X_d \leq x_d)$$

for any  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Hence,  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$  is a copula of  $\mathbf{X}$ .

According to (2), the copula  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$  is determined by the joint distribution of  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V})$ . In particular, the copula  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$  does not depend on the choice of  $V_i$  for  $i$  such that  $X_i$  is continuously distributed because, for these  $i$ ,  $U_i$  in (2) is a.s. equal to  $F_i(X_i)$ . While for  $i$  such that  $X_i$  is discrete,  $V_i$  does have an impact on the copula  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$ .

In general, the choice of  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}$  for constructing the copula  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$  may not be unique. This is because  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}$  allows two types of dependence that might be present in the construction of  $\mathbf{V}$ : First, the components of  $\mathbf{V}$  may be mutually dependent. Second,  $V_i$  may depend on  $X_j$  for  $i \neq j$ . Naturally, a different choice of  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}$  often leads to a different copula  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$ ; see the following

---

<sup>1</sup>This assumption is safe as we are interested in distributional properties, and we can extend the probability space to include such independent  $V_X$ , if necessary.

example.

**Example 1.** Assume that  $d = 2$ ,  $X_1$  is a constant, and  $X_2$  is continuously distributed. It is well known that any copula is a copula of  $\mathbf{X}$  in this case. For instance, by choosing  $V_1$  to be independent of  $X_2$ ,  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$  is the independence copula, and by choosing  $V_1 = F_2(X_2)$ ,  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$  is the comonotonic copula.

The following result says that all copulas of  $X$  can be realized by some  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$ . Hence, (2) gives a stochastic representation for any copula of  $\mathbf{X}$ . The representation is quite intuitive, but we did not find it in the literature, so we provide a self-contained proof.

**Theorem 1.** *Assume that there exists a continuously distributed random variable independent of a random vector  $\mathbf{X}$ . A copula  $C$  is a copula of  $\mathbf{X}$  if and only if  $C = C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$  for some  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}$ .*

*Proof.* We have seen that  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$  is a copula of  $\mathbf{X}$ . It suffices to show the “only if” statement. Let  $C$  be a copula of  $\mathbf{X}$ , take  $\mathbf{U}' = (U'_1, \dots, U'_d) \sim C$ , and write  $\mathbf{X}' = (F_1^{-1}(U'_1), \dots, F_d^{-1}(U'_d))$ . Because  $C$  is a copula of  $\mathbf{X}$ , for  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}) &= C(F_1(x_1), \dots, F_d(x_d)) = \mathbb{P}(U'_1 \leq F_1(x_1), \dots, U'_d \leq F_d(x_d)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(F_1^{-1}(U'_1) \leq x_1, \dots, F_d^{-1}(U'_d) \leq x_d) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}' \leq \mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\mathbf{X} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbf{X}'$ . Take  $\mathbf{U}^* = (U_1^*, \dots, U_d^*)$  such that  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{U}^*) \stackrel{d}{=} (\mathbf{X}', \mathbf{U}')$ , and we then have  $\mathbf{X} = (F_1^{-1}(U_1^*), \dots, F_d^{-1}(U_d^*))$  a.s.. Furthermore, take  $V' \sim U[0, 1]$  which is independent of  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{U}^*)$ . The existence of  $\mathbf{U}^*$  and  $V'$  is guaranteed by the assumption of the existence of a continuously distributed random variable independent of  $\mathbf{X}$ . For  $i \in [d]$ , let  $\mathbf{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_d)$  be given by

$$V_i = \frac{U_i^* - F_i(X_{i-})}{F_i(X_i) - F_i(X_{i-})} \mathbb{1}_{\{F_i(X_i) > F_i(X_{i-})\}} + V' \mathbb{1}_{\{F_i(X_i) = F_i(X_{i-})\}}.$$

Fix  $i \in [d]$  below. Let  $D_i$  be the set of discontinuity points of  $F_i$ . Note that for  $x \in D_i$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(U_i^* \in [F_i(x-), F_i(x)] | X_i = x) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(U_i^* \in [F_i(x-), F_i(x)] | X_i \neq x) = 0.$$

Because  $U_i^*$  is uniformly distributed over  $[0, 1]$ ,  $U_i^*$  is uniform on  $[F_i(x-), F_i(x)]$  conditional on  $X_i = x \in D_i$ . Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}(U_i^* \leq u | X_i = x) = \frac{u - F_i(x-)}{F_i(x) - F_i(x-)}, \quad u \in [F_i^{-1}(x-), F_i^{-1}(x)].$$

Therefore, for  $u \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(V_i \leq u | X_i) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{U_i^* - F_i(X_{i-})}{F_i(X_i) - F_i(X_{i-})} \leq u \mid X_i\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \in D_i\}} + \mathbb{P}(V' \leq u) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \notin D_i\}} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(U_i^* \leq u(F_i(X_i) - F_i(X_{i-})) + F_i(X_{i-}) \mid X_i) \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \in D_i\}} + u \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \notin D_i\}} \\ &= u \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \in D_i\}} + u \mathbf{1}_{\{X_i \notin D_i\}} = u. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $V_i$  follows  $U[0, 1]$  and is independent of  $X_i$ . Note that, by the construction,  $U_i^*$ ,  $V_i$ , and  $X_i$  satisfy  $U_i^* = F_i(X_{i-}) + V_i(F_i(X_i) - F_i(X_{i-}))$  a.s., and hence  $\mathbf{U}^* \sim C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$ . This shows  $C = C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}}$ .  $\square$

Theorem 1 implies  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}} = \{C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}} : \mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}\}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$  is a singleton if and only if all marginal distributions of  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $F_1, \dots, F_d$ , are continuous functions.

### 3 Motivating arguments for the checkerboard copula

Theorem 1 gives the entire class of copulas for  $\mathbf{X}$ . We now consider which  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}$  can answer the three motivating questions in Section 1, which all point to the same unique choice of  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}$ .

1. **Simulating from the copula of  $\mathbf{X}$ .** A natural approach to simulating from the copula of  $\mathbf{X}$  with some atoms in the marginal distributions is by first simulating a pair of  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{V})$ , and then applying the probability integral transform using (2). Theorem 1 shows that all copulas of  $\mathbf{X}$  can be simulated this way. For this purpose, the simplest and most natural choice of  $\mathbf{V}$  is  $\mathbf{V} \sim U([0, 1]^d)$  which is independent of  $\mathbf{X}$ . In fact, we could not think of an argument against the use of this particular  $\mathbf{V}$  in the context of simulation.
2. **Stressing the distribution of  $\mathbf{X}$ .** To understand how the choice of  $\mathbf{V}$  affects the stressed distribution of  $X_2$ , we look at the simple example in Example 1 with  $g(u) = 2u$ . Choosing  $V_1$  independent of  $X_2$  would lead to  $\hat{F}_2^{Q_1} = F_2$ , whereas choosing  $V_1 = F_2(X_2)$  would lead to  $\hat{F}_2^{Q_1} = (F_2)^2$ . Because we are interested in the effect of stressing  $X_1$  on  $X_2$ , and  $X_1$  is a constant in this example, it is natural to choose a  $V_1$  that affects the distribution of  $X_2$  minimally, which is achieved when  $V_1$  is independent of  $X_2$ . Translating this argument into the general  $d$ -dimensional setting suggests choosing  $\mathbf{V} \sim U([0, 1]^d)$  independent of  $\mathbf{X}$ .
3. **Computing a co-risk measure.** To understand how the choice of  $\mathbf{V}$  affects the value of the co-risk measure, we again look at Example 1. We have  $\rho(X_2 | X_1) = \mathbb{E}[X_2]$  if  $V_1$  is independent of  $X_2$ , and  $\rho(X_2 | X_1) = \text{ES}_p(X_2)$  if  $V_1 = F_2(X_2)$ , where  $\text{ES}_p(X_2) = \mathbb{E}[X_2 | U_2 > p]$  is the Expected Shortfall of  $X_2$  at level  $p$ . The interpretation of  $\rho$  as the mean of  $X_2$  on a tail event

of  $X_1$  suggests that it is natural to choose  $V_1$  independent of  $X_2$ , because  $X_1$  is a constant and its tail event should not affect  $X_2$ .

In all the considerations above,  $\mathbf{V} \sim U([0, 1]^d)$  independent of  $\mathbf{X}$  appears to be a good choice. Let us denote this by  $\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp}$  and the corresponding copula by  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp}$ , where  $\perp$  reflects that independence is used twice to construct  $\mathbf{V}$  (within components of  $\mathbf{V}$  and between  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{X}$ ). From the three motivating examples above, the choice of the particular copula  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp}$  is natural and has several unique features. This choice has been known as the checkerboard copula.

**Definition 1.** The copula  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp}$  is called the *checkerboard copula* of  $\mathbf{X}$ .

The copula  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp}$  is also called the multilinear extension copula of  $\mathbf{X}$ ; see [Genest et al. \(2017\)](#) for its properties, its empirical process, and a history. One notable property is that  $X_1, \dots, X_d$  are independent if and only if  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp}$  is the independence copula.

The rest of the paper focuses on the properties and applications of the checkerboard copula.

## 4 Entropy maximization

Given the natural choice of  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp}$  in the applications in Section 3, it should have some unique properties within the class  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$ . The applications seem to suggest that  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp}$  relies less on external information compared to other choices of  $\mathbf{V}$ . Such consideration is typically studied via entropy. Indeed, as argued by [Jaynes \(1957\)](#), the maximum-entropy distribution should be the only unbiased choice given available information. If a copula  $C$  has a density function  $c$ , then its Shannon (differential) entropy is defined as

$$H(C) = - \int_{[0,1]^d} c(\mathbf{u}) \log c(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}.$$

One problem with the above formulation is that a copula  $C$  often does not have a density. We set  $H(C) = -\infty$  if  $C$  does not have a density, which is intuitive and can be seen as a limiting case. However, even the checkerboard copula  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp}$  may not have a density if the distribution of  $\mathbf{X}$  has some singular continuous part. This issue may be solved by considering other measures of information, but for now, let us stick to the Shannon entropy, which is the most popular notion in information theory. We would like to compare  $H(C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp})$  with  $H(C)$  for  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$ , or equivalently,  $H(C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\mathbf{V}})$  for other choices of  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{X}}$ . The main result of this section is to show that  $H(C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp})$  has the largest entropy among all other choices.

**Theorem 2.** For  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$ , we have  $H(C_{\mathbf{X}}^{\perp}) \geq H(C)$ .

The proof of Theorem 2 essentially boils down to showing the following lemma, which states that the density of the checkerboard copula can be expressed as the conditional expectation for the density of other possible copulas in  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$ . From this lemma and Jensen's inequality, Theorem 2 follows.

**Lemma 1.** *For  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$ , if the density  $c$  of  $C$  exists, then the density  $c^\perp$  of  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^\perp$  exists. Moreover,  $c^\perp(\mathbf{U}) = \mathbb{E}[c(\mathbf{U})|\hat{\mathbf{X}}]$ , where  $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_d) \sim \mathbf{U}([0, 1]^d)$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = (F_1^{-1}(U_1), \dots, F_d^{-1}(U_d))$ , and  $F_1, \dots, F_d$  are the marginals of  $\mathbf{X}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbb{E}[c(\mathbf{U})|\hat{\mathbf{X}}]$  is  $\sigma(\hat{\mathbf{X}})$ -measurable, there exists a function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(\hat{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbb{E}[c(\mathbf{U})|\hat{\mathbf{X}}]$  (in the almost sure sense). Let  $c^\perp$  be a function  $[0, 1]^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$  defined as  $c^\perp(\mathbf{u}) = f(F_1^{-1}(u_1), \dots, F_d^{-1}(u_d))$  for any  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_d) \in [0, 1]^d$ . We claim that  $c^\perp$  is the density of  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^\perp$ . This claim implies that  $c^\perp$  exists and  $c^\perp(\mathbf{U}) = \mathbb{E}[c(\mathbf{U})|\hat{\mathbf{X}}]$ .

To prove this claim, let  $\mathbf{U}^c \sim C$ ,  $\mathbf{U}^\perp \sim C_{\mathbf{X}}^\perp$ , and  $R = \prod_{i=1}^d \text{Ran}(F_i)$ . We first show that  $\int_A c^\perp(\mathbf{u})d\mathbf{u} = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}^\perp \in A)$  for the following two types of the set  $A$ .

- (i) Let  $A = \prod_{i=1}^d [0, a_i]$  with  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \in R$ . We have  $\mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{U} \leq \mathbf{a}\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{\mathbf{X}} \leq (F_1^{-1}(a_1), \dots, F_d^{-1}(a_d))\}}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A c^\perp(\mathbf{u})d\mathbf{u} &= \int_{\prod_{i=1}^d [0, a_i]} f(F_1^{-1}(u_1), \dots, F_d^{-1}(u_d)) du_1 \cdots du_d \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ f(\hat{\mathbf{X}}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{U} \leq \mathbf{a}\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[c(\mathbf{U})|\hat{\mathbf{X}}] \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{\mathbf{X}} \leq (F_1^{-1}(a_1), \dots, F_d^{-1}(a_d))\}} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [c(\mathbf{U}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\mathbf{U} \leq \mathbf{a}\}}] = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}^c \leq \mathbf{a}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}^\perp \leq \mathbf{a}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds because

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}^c \leq \mathbf{a}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \leq (F_1^{-1}(a_1), \dots, F_d^{-1}(a_d))) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}^\perp \leq \mathbf{a}).$$

This further implies that  $\int_A c^\perp(\mathbf{u})d\mathbf{u} = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}^\perp \in A)$  for any  $A = \prod_{i=1}^d A_i$  such that  $A_i \in \{[0, a_i] : a_i \in \text{Ran}(F_i)\} \cup \{(F_i(x_i-), F_i(x_i)) : x_i \text{ is a discontinuity point of } F_i\}$  for  $i \in [d]$ .

- (ii) Let  $A = \prod_{i=1}^k [0, a_i] \times \prod_{j=k+1}^d (s_j, t_j]$  with  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$  such that  $a_i \in \text{Ran}(F_i)$  for  $i \in [k]$  and  $(s_j, t_j] \cap \text{Ran}(F_j) = \emptyset$  for  $j \in [d] \setminus [k]$ . For  $j \in [d] \setminus [k]$ , denote by  $x_j = F_j^{-1}(s_j)$ , and thus  $(s_j, t_j] \subseteq (F_j(x_j-), F_j(x_j))$ . By the definition of  $c^\perp$ , for fixed  $u_i \in [0, a_i]$  and  $i \in [k]$ ,  $c^\perp(u_1, \dots, u_k, v_{k+1}, \dots, v_d)$  is a constant for all  $(v_{k+1}, \dots, v_d) \in \prod_{j=k+1}^d (F_j(x_j-), F_j(x_j))$ .

Therefore, let  $B = \prod_{i=1}^k [0, a_i] \times \prod_{j=k+1}^d (F_j(x_{j-}), F_j(x_j))$ , we have

$$\int_A c^\perp(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = \left( \prod_{j=k+1}^d \frac{t_j - s_j}{F_j(x_j) - F_j(x_{j-})} \right) \int_B c^\perp(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}.$$

Let  $\mathbf{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_d) \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1]^d)$  be independent of  $\mathbf{X}$ , and for  $j \in [d] \setminus [k]$ , denote by  $s'_j = (s_j - F_j(x_{j-})) / (F_j(x_j) - F_j(x_{j-}))$  and  $t'_j = (t_j - F_j(x_{j-})) / (F_j(x_j) - F_j(x_{j-}))$ . Hence,

$$\prod_{j=k+1}^d \frac{t_j - s_j}{F_j(x_j) - F_j(x_{j-})} = \mathbb{P}(V_j \in (s'_j, t'_j) \text{ for all } j \in [d] \setminus [k]).$$

In addition, by (i), we can get

$$\int_B c^\perp(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}^\perp \in B) = \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq F^{-1}(a_i), X_j = x_j \text{ for all } i \in [k], j \in [d] \setminus [k]).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A c^\perp(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} &= \mathbb{P} \left( \bigcap_{j \in [d] \setminus [k]} \{V_j \in (s'_j, t'_j)\} \right) \mathbb{P} \left( \bigcap_{i \in [k], j \in [d] \setminus [k]} \{X_i \leq F^{-1}(a_i), X_j = x_j\} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left( \bigcap_{i \in [k], j \in [d] \setminus [k]} \{X_i \leq F^{-1}(a_i), X_j = x_j, V_i \in [0, 1], V_j \in (s'_j, t'_j)\} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left( \mathbf{U}^\perp \in \prod_{i=1}^k [0, a_i] \times \prod_{j=k+1}^d (s_j, t_j) \right) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}^\perp \in A). \end{aligned}$$

By the same argument, we have  $\int_A c^\perp(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}^\perp \in A)$  for any  $A = \prod_{i=1}^d A_i$  such that  $A_i \in \{[0, a_i] : a_i \in \text{Ran}(F_i)\} \cup \{(s_i, t_i) : (s_i, t_i) \cap \text{Ran}(F_i) = \emptyset\}$  for  $i \in [d]$ .

For any  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \in [0, 1]^d$ , the region  $\prod_{i=1}^d [0, a_i]$  can always be represented by an at most countable disjoint union of regions studied in (i) and (ii). Hence, we can obtain

$$\int_{\prod_{i=1}^d [0, a_i]} c^\perp(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}^\perp \leq \mathbf{a}).$$

This proves our claim that  $c^\perp$  is the density of  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^\perp$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* If  $H(C) = -\infty$ , there is nothing to show. Hence, it suffices to consider the case that  $C$  has a density, which we denote by  $c$ . By Lemma 1, we have  $c^\perp(\mathbf{U}) = \mathbb{E}[c(\mathbf{U}) | \hat{\mathbf{X}}]$  where  $c^\perp$  is the density of  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^\perp$ ,  $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_d) \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1]^d)$ , and  $\hat{\mathbf{X}} = (F_1^{-1}(U_1), \dots, F_d^{-1}(U_d))$  with

$F_1, \dots, F_d$  as the marginals of  $\mathbf{X}$ . Define a function  $g(x) = x \log x$  for  $x \in (0, \infty)$ . It is clear that  $g$  is convex. By the fact that  $\mathbb{E}[c(\mathbf{U})|\hat{\mathbf{X}}] = c^\perp(\mathbf{U})$  and Jensen's inequality, we have

$$H(C_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}^\perp) = -\mathbb{E}[g(c^\perp(\mathbf{U}))] = -\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbb{E}[c(\mathbf{U})|\hat{\mathbf{X}}])] \geq -\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[g(c(\mathbf{U}))|\hat{\mathbf{X}}]] = -\mathbb{E}[g(c(\mathbf{U}))] = H(C).$$

Thus,  $H(C_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}^\perp) \geq H(C)$  for all  $C \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{X}}$ . □

## 5 Checkerboard copula and dependence concepts

In this section, we study how the checkerboard copula preserves dependence concepts. This question is motivated by a problem raised in the context of diversification in [Chen et al. \(2024b\)](#), which we describe in [Section 6.1](#).

### 5.1 Dependence concepts

We first define several notions of positive dependence, introduced and studied by [Lehmann \(1966\)](#), [Esary et al. \(1967\)](#), and [Benjamini and Yekutieli \(2001\)](#), and the corresponding notions of negative dependence, introduced and studied by [Lehmann \(1966\)](#), [Alam and Saxena \(1981\)](#), [Block et al. \(1982, 1985\)](#), [Joag-Dev and Proschan \(1983\)](#), and [Chen et al. \(2024a\)](#).

In what follows, for  $i \in [d]$  and an  $d$ -dimensional random vector  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ , write  $\mathbf{X}_{-i} = (X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_d)$ , and for  $A, B \subseteq [d]$ , write  $\mathbf{X}_A = (X_k)_{k \in A}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_B = (X_k)_{k \in B}$ . A set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is *decreasing* if  $\mathbf{x} \in S$  implies  $\mathbf{y} \in S$  for all  $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{x}$ .

**Definition 2.** A random vector  $\mathbf{X}$  is

- (i) (a) *positively associated* (PA) if for every pair of subsets  $A, B$  of  $[d]$  and any functions  $f$  and  $g$  both increasing or decreasing coordinatewise, provided the covariance below exists,

$$\text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{X}_A), g(\mathbf{X}_B)) \geq 0;$$

- (b) *negatively associated* (NA) if for every pair of disjoint subsets  $A, B$  of  $[d]$  and any functions  $f$  and  $g$  both increasing or decreasing coordinatewise, provided the covariance below exists,

$$\text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{X}_A), g(\mathbf{X}_B)) \leq 0;$$

- (ii) (a) *positively regression dependent* (PRD) if for every  $i \in [d]$ , the random variable  $\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{X}_{-i})|X_i]$  is an increasing function of  $X_i$  for any coordinatewise increasing function  $g$  such that the

conditional expectation exists;

(b) *negatively regression dependent* (NRD) if for every  $i \in [d]$ , the random variable  $\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{X}_{-i})|X_i]$  is a decreasing function of  $X_i$  for any coordinatewise increasing function  $g$  such that the conditional expectation exists;

(iii) (a) *weakly positively associated* (WPA) if for any  $i \in [d]$ , decreasing set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ , and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(X_i \leq x) > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S \mid X_i \leq x) \geq \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S);$$

(b) *weakly negatively associated* (WNA) if for any  $i \in [d]$ , decreasing set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ , and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(X_i \leq x) > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S \mid X_i \leq x) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S);$$

(iv) (a) *positively orthant dependent* (POD) if for all  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}) \geq \prod_{i=1}^d \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq x_i)$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} > \mathbf{x}) \geq \prod_{i=1}^d \mathbb{P}(X_i > x_i)$ ;

(b) *negatively orthant dependent* (NOD) if for all  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{x}) \leq \prod_{i=1}^d \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq x_i)$  and  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} > \mathbf{x}) \leq \prod_{i=1}^d \mathbb{P}(X_i > x_i)$ .

Moreover, we say that a distribution or a copula is PA, PRD, WPA, POD, NA, NRD, WNA, or NOD if the corresponding random vector is.

Note that the definition of PA does not require  $A$  and  $B$  to be disjoint, whereas the definition of NA requires this.

The relationship between the above notions is summarized below (see e.g., [Chen et al. \(2024a\)](#)).

$$\text{PA} \implies \text{WPA}; \quad \text{PRD} \implies \text{WPA}; \quad \text{WPA} \implies \text{POD};$$

$$\text{NA} \implies \text{WNA}; \quad \text{NRD} \implies \text{WNA}; \quad \text{WNA} \implies \text{NOD}.$$

Within the class of multivariate normal distributions, the four concepts of positive dependence are equivalent, and each is equivalent to having nonnegative bivariate correlation coefficients; similarly, the four concepts of negative dependence are equivalent, and each is equivalent to having nonpositive bivariate correlation coefficients.

In the sequel, we use  $\mathfrak{D}$  to represent one of the following: PA, PRD, WPA, POD, NA, NRD, WNA, or NOD. Our question is whether these properties are properties purely based on copulas. It turns out that the checkerboard copula can help answer this question.

## 5.2 The checkerboard copula preserves dependence

We first present a self-consistency property of those negative dependence concepts in the spirit of Joag-Dev and Proschan (1983, Property P<sub>6</sub>) for NA.

**Lemma 2.** *If  $f_1, \dots, f_d$  are increasing functions and  $\mathbf{X}$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$ , then  $(f_1(X_1), \dots, f_d(X_d))$  also satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$ .*

*Proof.* We only show the result for the concepts of negative dependence, as the case of positive dependence is similar.

The self-consistency properties of NA and NOD are shown in Joag-Dev and Proschan (1983, Property P<sub>6</sub>) and Lehmann (1966, Lemma 1), respectively. We will show the properties for NRD and WNA. Let  $\mathbf{Y} = (f_1(X_1), \dots, f_d(X_d))$ .

1. Assume  $\mathbf{X}$  is NRD. Fix  $i \in [d]$ . Let  $g$  be a coordinatewise increasing function and  $g' = g \circ (f_1, \dots, f_{i-1}, f_{i+1}, \dots, f_d)$ . As a result, we have  $g'$  is a coordinatewise increasing function and  $g(\mathbf{Y}_{-i}) = g'(\mathbf{X}_{-i})$ . For any  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ , let  $A_y = \{x : f_i(x) = y\}$ . We have  $\{Y_i = y\} = \{X_i \in A_y\}$ . Therefore,  $\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Y}_{-i})|Y_i = y] = \mathbb{E}[g'(\mathbf{X}_{-i})|X_i \in A_y]$ . Assume  $y_1 < y_2$ . For any  $x_1 \in A_{y_1}$  and  $x_2 \in A_{y_2}$ , we have  $x_1 \leq x_2$ ; hence,  $\mathbb{E}[g'(\mathbf{X}_{-i})|X_i = x_1] \geq \mathbb{E}[g'(\mathbf{X}_{-i})|X_i = x_2]$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[g'(\mathbf{X}_{-i})|X_i \in A_{y_1}] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[g'(\mathbf{X}_{-i})|X_i]|X_i \in A_{y_1}] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[g'(\mathbf{X}_{-i})|X_i]|X_i \in A_{y_2}] = \mathbb{E}[g'(\mathbf{X}_{-i})|X_i \in A_{y_2}], \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Y}_{-i})|Y_i = y_1] \geq \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Y}_{-i})|Y_i = y_2]$ ; hence  $\mathbf{Y}$  is NRD.

2. Assume  $\mathbf{X}$  is WNA. For  $i \in [d]$ , let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$  be a decreasing set, and

$$S_i^f = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d) : (f_1(x_1), \dots, f_{i-1}(x_{i-1}), f_{i+1}(x_{i+1}), \dots, f_d(x_d)) \in S\}.$$

It is clear that  $\{\mathbf{Y}_{-i} \in S\} = \{\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S_i^f\}$ . For any  $\mathbf{x}_1 \leq \mathbf{x}_2$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2 \in S_i^f$ , we have  $f_k(x_{1,k}) \leq f_k(x_{2,k})$  for all  $k \in [d] \setminus \{i\}$ . Furthermore, because  $S$  is decreasing, we have  $\mathbf{x}_1 \in S_i^f$ , which implies  $S_i^f$  is a decreasing set. For any  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(Y_i \leq y) > 0$ , let  $x = \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R} : f_i(t) \leq y\}$ . If  $f_i(x) \leq y$ , we have  $\{Y_i \leq y\} = \{X_i \leq x\}$  and  $\mathbb{P}(X_i \leq x) > 0$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_{-i} \in S|Y_i \leq y) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S_i^f|X_i \leq x) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S_i^f) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_{-i} \in S),$$

which implies that  $\mathbf{Y}$  is WNA. If  $f_i(x) > y$ , we have  $\{Y_i \leq y\} = \{X_i < x\}$  and  $\mathbb{P}(X_i < x) > 0$ .

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_{-i} \in S, Y_i \leq y) &= \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S_i^f, X_i < x) \\
&= \lim_{t \uparrow x} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S_i^f, X_i \leq t) \\
&\leq \lim_{t \uparrow x} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S_i^f) \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq t) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S_i^f) \lim_{t \uparrow x} \mathbb{P}(X_i \leq t) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_{-i} \in S_i^f) \mathbb{P}(X_i < x) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_{-i} \in S) \mathbb{P}(Y_i \leq y),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_{-i} \in S | Y_i \leq y) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y}_{-i} \in S)$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  is WNA.  $\square$

The following theorem demonstrates that the checkerboard copula of  $\mathbf{X}$  preserves the dependence information of  $\mathbf{X}$ .

**Theorem 3.** *A random vector  $\mathbf{X}$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$  if and only if it has a copula that satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$ . Moreover, the copula can be chosen as the checkerboard copula  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^\perp$ .*

*Proof.* The “if” part follows from Lemma 2 because, for  $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_d)$  following the copula of  $\mathbf{X}$  that satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$ , we have  $(X_1, \dots, X_d) = (F_1^{-1}(U_1), \dots, F_d^{-1}(U_d))$  and  $F_i^{-1}$  is increasing for all  $i \in [d]$ .

Now we show the “only if” part. Let  $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_d)$  be the random vector given by (2) with  $\mathbf{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_d) \sim U([0, 1]^d)$  independent of  $\mathbf{X}$ . Hence, we have  $\mathbf{U} \sim C_{\mathbf{X}}^\perp$  and  $C_{\mathbf{X}}^\perp$  is a copula of  $\mathbf{X}$ . Note that, for any  $i \in [d]$ , given  $V_i$ , we have that  $U_i$  is an increasing function of  $X_i$ . Hence, by Lemma 2,  $\mathbf{X}$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$  implies that  $\mathbf{U} | \mathbf{V}$  also satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$ .

Assume  $\mathbf{X}$  is NA. For any given pair of disjoint subsets  $A, B$  of  $[d]$  and any given functions  $f$  and  $g$  both increasing or decreasing coordinatewise, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{U}_A), g(\mathbf{U}_B)) &= \mathbb{E}[\text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{U}_A), g(\mathbf{U}_B) | \mathbf{V})] + \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{U}_A) | \mathbf{V}], \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_B) | \mathbf{V}]) \\
&\leq 0 + \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{U}_A) | \mathbf{V}_A], \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_B) | \mathbf{V}_B]) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from  $\mathbf{U} | \mathbf{V}$  is NA, and the last equality follows from the independence between  $\mathbf{V}_A$  and  $\mathbf{V}_B$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{U}$  is NA.

Assume  $\mathbf{X}$  is NRD. For any fixed  $i$  and  $k$ , by (2), there exist  $x$  and  $v$  such that  $\{U_i = k\} = \{X_i = x, V_i = v\}$ . Then, for any coordinatewise increasing function  $g$ , by the independence between

$V_i$  and  $(X_i, \mathbf{U}_{-i})$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_{-i})|U_i = k] = \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_{-i})|X_i = x, V_i = v] = \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_{-i})|X_i = x].$$

Because  $\mathbf{U}_{-i}$  is a function of  $\mathbf{X}_{-i}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_{-i}$ , we can let  $h$  be the function such that  $g(\mathbf{U}_{-i}) = h(\mathbf{X}_{-i}, \mathbf{V}_{-i})$ . Then, due to the independence between  $\mathbf{V}_{-i}$  and  $\mathbf{X}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_{-i})|X_i = x] = \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{X}_{-i}, \mathbf{V}_{-i})|X_i = x] = \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{X}_{-i}, \mathbf{v}_{-i})|X_i = x] d\mathbf{v}_{-i},$$

where  $\mathbf{v}_{-i} = (v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_d)$ . Therefore, for any  $k_1 \leq k_2$ , there exist  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_{-i})|U_i = k_1] &= \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{X}_{-i}, \mathbf{v}_{-i})|X_i = x_1] d\mathbf{v}_{-i}, \\ \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_{-i})|U_i = k_2] &= \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{X}_{-i}, \mathbf{v}_{-i})|X_i = x_2] d\mathbf{v}_{-i}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by (2), we must have  $x_1 \leq x_2$ . Note that given  $\mathbf{v}_{-i}$ ,  $h(\mathbf{X}_{-i}, \mathbf{v}_{-i})$  is a coordinatewise increasing function of  $\mathbf{X}_{-i}$ . Hence, we have  $\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{X}_{-i}, \mathbf{v}_{-i})|X_i = x_1] \geq \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{X}_{-i}, \mathbf{v}_{-i})|X_i = x_2]$  for any  $\mathbf{v}_{-i}$ . Therefore,  $\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_{-i})|U_i = k_1] \geq \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_{-i})|U_i = k_2]$  and  $\mathbf{U}$  is NRD.

Assume  $\mathbf{X}$  is WNA. For any  $i \in [d]$ , decreasing set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ , and  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(U_i \leq x) > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_{-i} \in S, U_i \leq x) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_{-i} \in S, U_i \leq x | \mathbf{V})] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_{-i} \in S | \mathbf{V}_{-i}) \mathbb{P}(U_i \leq x | V_i)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_{-i} \in S | \mathbf{V}_{-i})] \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(U_i \leq x | V_i)] \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U}_{-i} \in S) \mathbb{P}(U_i \leq x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\mathbf{U}$  is WNA.

Assume  $\mathbf{X}$  is NOD. For any  $t_1, \dots, t_d \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(U_1 \leq t_1, \dots, U_d \leq t_d) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(U_1 \leq t_1, \dots, U_d \leq t_d | V_1, \dots, V_d)] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(U_1 \leq t_1 | V_1) \cdots \mathbb{P}(U_d \leq t_d | V_d)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(U_1 \leq t_1 | V_1)] \cdots \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(U_d \leq t_d | V_d)] \\ &= \mathbb{P}(U_1 \leq t_1) \cdots \mathbb{P}(U_d \leq t_d). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show

$$\mathbb{P}(U_1 > t_1, \dots, U_d > t_d) \leq \mathbb{P}(U_1 > t_1) \cdots \mathbb{P}(U_d > t_d).$$

Hence,  $\mathbf{U}$  is NOD.

In conclusion, if  $\mathbf{X}$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$ , then  $\mathbf{U}$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$ , where  $\mathfrak{D}$  is one of the four concepts of negative dependence.

To show the case of positive dependence, we follow a similar route. We take the same  $\mathbf{U}$  as above. Assume  $\mathbf{X}$  is PA. Because  $U_i|V_i$  is an increasing function of  $X_i$ , by Lemma 2,  $\mathbf{U}|\mathbf{V}$  is also PA. Thus, for any given pair of subsets  $A, B$  of  $[d]$  and any given functions  $f$  and  $g$  both coordinatewise increasing or decreasing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{U}_A), g(\mathbf{U}_B)) &= \mathbb{E}[\text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{U}_A), g(\mathbf{U}_B)|\mathbf{V})] + \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{U}_A)|\mathbf{V}], \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_B)|\mathbf{V}]) \\ &\geq \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{U}_A)|\mathbf{V}_A], \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_B)|\mathbf{V}_B]). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, given  $\mathbf{X}$ ,  $U_i$  is an increasing function of  $V_i$ . Hence,  $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{U}_A)|\mathbf{V}_A]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_B)|\mathbf{V}_B]$  are coordinatewise increasing (or decreasing) with respect to  $\mathbf{V}_A$  and  $\mathbf{V}_B$ , respectively, if  $f$  and  $g$  are both coordinatewise increasing (or decreasing). Because  $\mathbf{V}$  is PA, we have

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{U}_A)|\mathbf{V}_A], \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{U}_B)|\mathbf{V}_B]) \geq 0,$$

implying that  $\mathbf{U}$  is PA. The proofs for other positive dependence concepts are similar. □

## 6 Two applications

We provide two applications in this section to highlight the usefulness of Theorem 3.

### 6.1 An application on diversification penalty

For random variables  $X$  and  $Y$ , let  $X \geq_{\text{st}} Y$  represent  $\mathbb{P}(X > x) \geq \mathbb{P}(Y > x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ; this is called the stochastic order. [Chen et al. \(2024a,b\)](#) studied the problem of diversification penalty; that is, whether

$$X \leq_{\text{st}} \sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i X_i \text{ for all } (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d) \in \Delta_d, \text{ where } X, X_1, \dots, X_d \text{ are identically distributed,} \quad (3)$$

holds under certain marginal distributions and dependence structures. Here,  $\Delta_d$  is the standard simplex defined by  $\Delta_d = \{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d) \in [0, 1]^d : \theta_1 + \dots + \theta_d = 1\}$ . When  $X$  is interpreted as a loss, (3) intuitively means that the non-diversified portfolio  $X$  is less dangerous than the diversified portfolio  $\sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i X_i$ . This seems counter-intuitive at first glance, but it indeed happens in the model of Chen et al. (2024a), where  $X$  has infinite mean.

Define the set, for some dependence concept  $\mathfrak{D}$  in Section 5.1,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{D}} = \{\text{distribution of } X : (3) \text{ holds for all } (X_1, \dots, X_d) \text{ that satisfy } \mathfrak{D}\}.$$

Chen et al. (2024a) showed that the Pareto(1) distribution belongs to  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{WNA}}$ , and hence also to  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NA}}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{NRD}}$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{IN}}$ , where IN stands for independence. Moreover, Chen et al. (2024b, Proposition 1) showed that  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{D}}$  for  $\mathfrak{D}$  being WNA, NA, or IN is closed under strictly increasing convex transforms on the random variables. Our next result, which relies on our Theorem 3, addresses non-strictly increasing  $f$  and other notions of dependence, thus generalizing the above result.

**Proposition 1.** *Each of  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{D}}$  is closed under increasing convex transforms on the random variable.*

*Proof.* Below we first show that each of  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{D}}$  is closed under strictly increasing convex transforms on the random variable, that is, if the distribution of  $X$  is in  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{D}}$ , so is the distribution of  $f(X)$  for a strictly increasing convex  $f$ . Assume that  $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{D}}$ ,  $X$  follows  $F$ , and  $Y = f(X)$ , where  $f$  is strictly increasing and convex. Because  $f$  is strictly increasing, if  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_d)$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$ , so does  $(X_1, \dots, X_d)$ , where  $X_i = f^{-1}(Y_i)$  for  $i \in [d]$ , by Lemma 2. Because each of  $X, X_1, \dots, X_d$  has a distribution  $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{D}}$ , we have  $X \leq_{\text{st}} \sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i X_i$ , and this gives, using the convexity of  $f$ ,

$$Y = f(X) \leq_{\text{st}} f\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i X_i\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i f(X_i) = \sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i Y_i. \quad (4)$$

To address the case that  $f$  is not strictly increasing, Theorem 3 allows us to find the above  $(X_1, \dots, X_d)$  that satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$  and such that  $Y_i = f(X_i)$  for  $i \in [d]$ . In particular, using Theorem 3, we can construct  $(U_1, \dots, U_d)$  that follows the checkerboard copula of  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_d)$  and satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$ , such that

$$(Y_1, \dots, Y_d) = (f \circ g(U_1), \dots, f \circ g(U_d)),$$

where  $g$  is the quantile function of  $X$  and  $f \circ g$  is the quantile function of  $Y$ . Setting  $(X_1, \dots, X_d) = (g(U_1), \dots, g(U_d))$ , we get that  $(X_1, \dots, X_d)$  satisfies  $\mathfrak{D}$ , and this leads to (4).  $\square$

## 6.2 An application on induced order statistics

Here we demonstrate another application of Theorem 3 in characterizing the distribution of induced order statistics. Consider  $N$  independent and identically distributed bivariate random vectors

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \eta_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \xi_2 \\ \eta_2 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} \xi_N \\ \eta_N \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that, for  $i \neq j$ ,  $(\xi_i, \eta_i)$  and  $(\xi_j, \eta_j)$  are independent and identically distributed, but  $\xi_i$  and  $\eta_i$  may be correlated and have different marginal distributions. We rank these bivariate vectors according to their first components,  $\xi_i$ :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_{1:N} \\ \eta_{[1:N]} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{2:N} \\ \eta_{[2:N]} \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} \xi_{N:N} \\ \eta_{[N:N]} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\xi_{1:N} \leq \xi_{2:N} \leq \dots \leq \xi_{N:N}$  are the order statistics of  $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_N$ . The notation  $\eta_{[i:N]}$  represents the  $i$ -th *induced order statistic* (Bhattacharya, 1974), where the order is induced by another variable  $\xi_i$ . The induced order statistics  $\eta_{[1:N]}, \dots, \eta_{[N:N]}$  are also referred to as *concomitants* of the order statistics  $\xi_{1:N}, \dots, \xi_{N:N}$  (David, 1973).

In the context of constructing impact portfolios, Lo et al. (2024) investigated the joint distribution of  $(\eta_{[1:N]}, \dots, \eta_{[N:N]})$ . In particular, they proved a representation theorem for the joint distribution of  $(\eta_{[1:N]}, \dots, \eta_{[N:N]})$  using the copula of  $(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ . Furthermore, they demonstrated that if  $\xi_i$  is not continuously distributed, the representation theorem holds if and only if the copula of  $(\xi_i, \eta_i)$  is chosen as the (bivariate) checkerboard copula in this paper. This reveals a potential application of the checkerboard copula in portfolio construction.

Lo et al. (2024) also showed that the rank of the odd-order moments of induced order statistics relies on the copula of  $(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ . Assume that  $C$  is a copula of  $(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ . Lo et al. (2024, Theorem EC.5) proved that, for any  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ , if  $C$  is PRD, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \eta_{[1:N]}^{2k+1} \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \left( \eta_{[2:N]}^{2k+1} \right) \leq \dots \leq \mathbb{E} \left( \eta_{[N:N]}^{2k+1} \right), \quad (6)$$

and if  $C$  is NRD, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \eta_{[1:N]}^{2k+1} \right) \geq \mathbb{E} \left( \eta_{[2:N]}^{2k+1} \right) \geq \dots \geq \mathbb{E} \left( \eta_{[N:N]}^{2k+1} \right). \quad (7)$$

In particular, the copula  $C$  can be chosen as the checkerboard copula. Therefore, using Theorem 3, we directly obtain the following result.

**Proposition 2.** For any  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ , (6) holds if  $(\xi_i, \eta_i)$  is PRD, and (7) holds if  $(\xi_i, \eta_i)$  is NRD.

The difference between Proposition 2 and Lo et al. (2024, Theorem EC.5) is that the latter imposes the dependence assumption (PRD or NRD) on the copula of  $(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ , while the former imposes a more natural assumption on the random vector  $(\xi_i, \eta_i)$  directly, which is only possible due to our Theorem 3.

## 7 Conclusion

We discussed the choice of copula when the marginal distributions are not necessarily continuous. Among all the choices of copulas for a given random vector, the checkerboard copula is the most convenient and natural selection in applications such as simulating from the copula, stressing the distribution, and computing a co-risk measure. It is shown that the checkerboard copula is the most unbiased choice in the sense that it has the largest Shannon entropy among all possible copulas for a given random vector. Moreover, the checkerboard copula can preserve the dependence information of the underlying random vector. This preservation property is applied to identify suitable distributions in the context of diversification penalty studied by Chen et al. (2024a,b) and to determine the ranks of the moments of induced order statistics in the context of impact portfolios studied by Lo et al. (2024).

## References

- Adrian, T. and Brunnermeier, M. K. (2016). CoVaR. *American Economic Review*, **106**(7), 1705–1741.
- Alam, K. and Saxena, K. M. L. (1981). Positive dependence in multivariate distributions. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, **10**(12), 1183–1196.
- Benjamini, Y. and Yekutieli, D. (2001). The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency. *Annals of Statistics*, **29**(4), 1165–1188.
- Bhattacharya, P. K. (1974). Convergence of sample paths of normalized sums of induced order statistics. *The Annals of Statistics*, **2**(5), 1034–1039.
- Block, H. W., Savits, T. H. and Shaked, M. (1982). Some concepts of negative dependence. *Annals of Probability*, **10**(3), 765–772.
- Block, H. W., Savits, T. H. and Shaked, M. (1985). A concept of negative dependence using stochastic ordering. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **3**(2), 81–86.
- Chen, Y., Embrechts, P. and Wang, R. (2024a). An unexpected stochastic dominance: Pareto distributions, dependence, and diversification. *Operations Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2022.0505>.
- Chen, Y., Embrechts, P. and Wang, R. (2024b). Risk exchange under infinite-mean Pareto models. *arXiv: 2403.20171*.

- David, H. A. (1973). Concomitants of order statistics. *Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute*, **45**(1), 295–300.
- Esary, J. D., Proschan, F. and Walkup, D. W. (1967). Association of random variables, with applications. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **38**(5), 1466–1474.
- Genest, C. and Nešlehová, J. (2007). A primer on copulas for count data. *ASTIN Bulletin*, **37**(2), 475–515.
- Genest, C., Nešlehová, J. G. and Rémillard, B. (2017). Asymptotic behavior of the empirical multilinear copula process under broad conditions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **159**, 82–110.
- Jaynes, E. T. (1957). Information theory and statistical mechanics. *Physical Review*, **106**(4), 620–628.
- Joag-Dev, K. and Proschan, F. (1983). Negative association of random variables with applications. *Annals of Statistics*, **11**(1), 286–295.
- Joe, H. (1997). *Multivariate Models and Dependence Concepts*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Joe, H. (2014). *Dependence Modeling with Copulas*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Lehmann, E. L. (1966). Some concepts of dependence. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **37**(5), 1137–1153.
- Li, D. X. (2000). On default correlation: A copula function approach. *Journal of Fixed Income*, **9**(4): 43–54.
- Lo, A. W., Wu, L., Zhang, R. and Zhao, C. (2024). Optimal impact portfolios with general dependence and marginals. *Operations Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2023.0400>.
- McNeil, A. J., Frey, R. and Embrechts, P. (2015). *Quantitative Risk Management: Concepts, Techniques and Tools*. Revised Edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Milossovich, P., Tsanakas, A. and Wang, R. (2021). A theory of multivariate stress testing. *SSRN*: 3966204.
- Moore, D. S. and Spruill, M. C. (1975). Unified large-sample theory of general chi-squared statistics for tests of fit. *Annals of Statistics*, **3**(3), 599–616.
- Nelsen, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Copulas*. Springer, New York, Second Edition.
- Nešlehová, J. (2007). On rank correlation measures for non-continuous random variables. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **98**(3), 544–567.
- Rüschendorf, L. (2013). *Mathematical Risk Analysis. Dependence, Risk Bounds, Optimal Allocations and Portfolios*. Springer, Heidelberg.
- Wang, R. and Zitikis, R. (2021). An axiomatic foundation for the Expected Shortfall. *Management Science*, **67**, 1413–1429.