Transactions on Engineering and Technology Research
ISSN: 2960-1797, eISSN: 2960-2246 | Volume 3
ICMEIT 2024

Integration of Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) in Multi-Objective Optimization

Juandan Luo
Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China
flyljd02@sjtu.edu.cn

Abstract. This paper explores the integration of Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) into the field of Multi-Objective Optimization (MOO), offering insights into its mathematical basis, significance in risk assessment, and application in complex decision-making scenarios. It discusses the challenges of MOO, presents traditional solution methods, and examines the advantages and limitations of CVaR. The article highlights the flexibility of CVaR as an objective function, particularly in financial portfolio optimization, and discusses future research directions for enhancing its computational techniques, expanding application areas, and improving responsiveness to real-world dynamics.

Keywords: Multi-Objective Optimization, Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR), Risk Management, Portfolio Optimization, Pareto Optimality.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Multi-objective optimization (MOO) is a critical area in applied mathematics and operational research, addressing problems characterized by multiple, often conflicting, objectives. It's fundamental to various disciplines, from engineering to economics. Mathematically, a multi-objective optimization problem can be expressed as:

$$\min_{\mathrm{x}\in X}(f_1(\mathrm{x}), f_2(\mathrm{x}), \dots, f_k(\mathrm{x}))$$

where $f_i: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$are the objective functions and $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$is the feasible set. The challenge in MOO arises from the need to simultaneously satisfy multiple objectives, which typically do not have a single solution that optimizes all objectives. Instead, solutions are evaluated based on Pareto efficiency, where a solution is Pareto optimal if no objective can be improved without worsening at least one other objective[1].

Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR), also known as Expected Shortfall, is a risk assessment measure that extends beyond the traditional Value-at-Risk (VaR). It's particularly useful in finance for managing and quantifying the risk of investments and portfolios. CVaR is defined for a given VaR level as the expected loss exceeding VaR. Mathematically, for a loss random variable L and a confidence level $\alpha \in (0,1)$, VaR and CVaR are defined as:

$$\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(L) = inf\{l \in \mathbb{R}: P(L \le l) \ge \alpha\}$$
$$\mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(L) = \mathbb{E}[L|L \ge \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(L)]$$

CVaR provides a more robust measure as it accounts for the tail risk beyond VaR, making it a preferred risk measure in scenarios where extreme losses are of concern[2].

The integration of CVaR into multi-objective optimization presents a novel approach to risk management, especially in fields where decision-making involves multiple conflicting objectives under uncertainty. The primary motivation behind this research is to explore and establish a framework where CVaR is applied as a tool for managing risks in multi-objective decision-making scenarios. This approach aims to not only optimize the objectives but also to control the risks associated with the outcomes. The expected outcome is to develop a model that enhances decision-making processes by integrating a sophisticated risk measure into the multi-objective optimization framework. This integration could lead to more robust and reliable solutions in various applications, including finance, engineering, and operational planning.

1.2 Mathematical basis of CVaR model

The CVaR, also known as Expected Shortfall, is a risk measure that extends the concept of Value-at-Risk (VaR). While VaR represents a threshold value such that the probability of a loss exceeding this value is at a certain level, CVaR takes this a step further by considering the expected loss given that this threshold is exceeded. The formal definition of CVaR for a loss random variable L and a given confidence level α can be expressed as follows:

$\mathrm{CVaR}_{\alpha}(L)=\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\int_{\alpha}^{1}\ \mathrm{VaR}_{\beta}(L)d\beta$Here, $\mathrm{VaR}_{\beta}(L)$ is the VaR at level β, and α typically lies in the range (0,1). This definition implies that CVaR is the average of losses that are worse than the VaR, providing a measure of the tail risk of the distribution of L.

From a mathematical standpoint, one of the key properties of CVaR is its subadditivity, which implies that for two independent loss random variables L_1 and L_2, the CVaR of their combined portfolio is less than or equal to the sum of their individual CVaRs. This property makes CVaR a coherent risk measure, preferred over VaR in many financial risk management applications.

$\mathrm{CVaR}_{\alpha}(L_1+L_2)\leq \mathrm{CVaR}_{\alpha}(L_1)+\mathrm{CVaR}_{\alpha}(L_2)$ In single-objective optimization, the CVaR model can be applied to optimize a portfolio under risk considerations. For instance, consider an investment scenario where the objective is to maximize the expected return of a portfolio, subject to a constraint on the risk measured by CVaR. Let r_i be the return of asset $_{\mathrm{i}}$ in the portfolio, and x_i be the proportion of the total investment in asset $_{\mathrm{i}}$. The optimization problem can be formulated as:

$$\max_{\mathrm{x}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_i x_i \quad \text{s.t. } \mathrm{CVaR}_{\alpha}(L(\mathrm{x}))\leq c$$

Here, $L(\mathrm{x})$ represents the loss associated with the portfolio composition x, and c is the maximum acceptable CVaR. This formulation ensures that the portfolio is optimized for maximum return while keeping the risk, as measured by CVaR, within acceptable limits[3-5].

2. Theory and method of multi-objective optimization

2.1 Definition of multi-objective optimization problem

Multi-Objective Optimization (MOO) is a sophisticated and extensive field that focuses on problems involving several objectives that need to be addressed simultaneously. Unlike single-objective optimization, which deals with optimizing a single criterion, MOO deals with optimizing multiple, often conflicting, objectives. This complexity makes MOO a pivotal and intricate area of study in mathematics and its applications.

The formal definition of a multi-objective optimization problem can be constructed within the framework of vector optimization. Let's consider a vector of k objective functions $\mathrm{f}=(f_1,f_2,\dots,f_k)$,, where each $f_i:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ is a real-valued function. The problem is then defined as:

$\min_{\mathrm{x}\in X}\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{x})=\min_{\mathrm{x}\in X}(f_1(\mathrm{x}),f_2(\mathrm{x}),\dots,f_k(\mathrm{x}))$ Here, x represents the decision vector in the feasible region $X\subseteq\mathbb{R}^n$. The "min" operation in this context is not straightforward since it involves vector values, and one vector is not necessarily entirely less than another. Therefore, the concept of Pareto optimality is introduced to handle this complexity.

A solution $\mathrm{x}^*\in X$ is said to be Pareto optimal if there does not exist another $\mathrm{x}\in X$ such that $f_i(\mathrm{x})\leq f_i(\mathrm{x}^*)$ for all i and $f_j(\mathrm{x})<f_j(\mathrm{x}^*)$ for at least one j. This definition implies that a Pareto optimal solution is such that no objective can be improved without degrading at least one of the other objectives[6].

Mathematically, the set of all Pareto optimal solutions forms the Pareto front or Pareto boundary, which is of significant interest in MOO. The Pareto front in a MOO problem represents the trade-offs between the different objectives. For two-objective problems, this can be visualized in a two-dimensional space, but for higher dimensions, the visualization and understanding of the Pareto front become increasingly complex.

The complexity of MOO arises from the need to find not one but a set of solutions representing the trade-offs among the multiple objectives. This necessitates the development of specialized algorithms and methods that can effectively navigate the solution space to identify the Pareto optimal set. Techniques such as evolutionary algorithms, scalarization methods, and decision-making under uncertainty are commonly employed to tackle MOO problems, each with its strengths and limitations.

2.2 Solution

In the domain of multi-objective optimization (MOO), a variety of traditional methods have been developed to tackle the intricacies of optimizing multiple objectives. These methods primarily focus on converting the multi-objective problem into a form that can be handled by standard optimization techniques. The most common approaches include the Weighted Sum Method, the ε-Constraint Method, and the Goal Programming Method.

The Weighted Sum Method is perhaps the most straightforward approach. It involves transforming the multiple objectives into a single aggregated objective function by assigning weights to each objective. Mathematically, for a MOO problem with k objectives, the weighted sum objective function is given by:

$f(\mathrm{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i \cdot f_i(\mathrm{x})$ where w_i represents the weight associated with the i_th objective $f_i(\mathrm{x})$,, and x is the decision vector. The weights w_i are non-negative and usually normalized so that their sum equals one. The solution to this aggregated objective function provides a compromise solution based on the given weights.

The ε-Constraint Method takes a different approach. Here, one of the objectives is selected as the primary objective to be optimized, while the other objectives are converted into constraints with specified bounds. This method is particularly useful when certain objectives have to be satisfied to a minimum acceptable level. The formulation of this method for a problem with two objectives can be illustrated as:

$\min_{\mathrm{x} \in X} f_1(\mathrm{x})$

subject to $f_2(\mathrm{x}) \leq \epsilon$

where ϵ is a user-defined parameter that sets the acceptable level for the second objective. By varying ϵ different solutions on the Pareto front can be obtained[7].

Goal Programming is another prevalent method, especially useful in scenarios where the decision-maker has specific goals for each objective. In this method, each objective is associated with a goal or target level, and the optimization focuses on minimizing the deviations from these goals. The formulation of a goal programming problem can be generalized as:

$\min_{\mathrm{x} \in X} \sum_{i=1}^{k} |f_i(\mathrm{x}) - g_i|$ where g_i is the goal for the i_th objective. This method is particularly effective in decision-making situations where meeting targets is more critical than optimizing any particular objective[8].

Each of these methods has its strengths and limitations. The Weighted Sum Method is simple but may not find solutions on non-convex regions of the Pareto front. The ε-Constraint Method is more flexible but requires a good understanding of the feasible region to set appropriate ϵ values. Goal Programming is user-centric but may lead to solutions that are significantly compromised on certain objectives.

3. Application of CVaR model in multi-objective optimization

The integration of the Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) model into multi-objective optimization (MOO) frameworks represents a sophisticated intersection of risk management and optimization theory. To construct a theoretical framework for the application of the CVaR model in MOO, it is necessary to understand how CVaR can be used as a metric for one of the objectives, typically in scenarios where risk minimization is crucial alongside other objectives like cost, performance, or efficiency.

The essence of CVaR in MOO lies in its ability to quantify the risk associated with extreme outcomes of a decision variable or portfolio. Recall that CVaR, for a given confidence level α, is defined for a loss distribution as the expected loss exceeding the Value-at-Risk (VaR). Mathematically, CVaR is formulated as:

$\mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(L) = \mathbb{E}[L|L \geq \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(L)]$ In the context of MOO, CVaR can be treated as an objective function among others. For instance, consider a scenario with a portfolio optimization problem where the objectives include maximizing return, minimizing risk (as measured by CVaR), and perhaps other financial metrics. The MOO problem can be expressed as a vector optimization problem:

$\underset{\mathrm{x}\in X}{min}(-R(\mathrm{x}), \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(L(\mathrm{x})), \dots)$ Here, $R(\mathrm{x})$ represents the return of the portfolio, $L(\mathrm{x})$ is the loss, and $\mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(L(\mathrm{x})$ is the risk measure. The negative sign with the return objective indicates that the goal is to maximize return (since the optimization framework is minimization). The challenge in this MOO framework is to find a balance between these competing objectives, which might include maximizing return while keeping the risk below a certain threshold.

One way to approach this problem is to use a scalarization technique, such as the weighted sum method, where each objective is assigned a weight, reflecting its relative importance. The optimization problem then becomes:

$\underset{\mathrm{x}\in X}{min}(-w_R R(\mathrm{x}) + w_{\mathrm{CVaR}} \mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(L(\mathrm{x})) + \cdots)$where $w_R$and w_{CVaR} are the weights assigned to the return and CVaR objectives, respectively. However, the complexity arises in choosing appropriate weights and in dealing with the non-linearity and non-convexity that CVaR can introduce into the problem.

4. Case studies

For a practical demonstration of the application of the Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) model, let's consider a case study in financial portfolio optimization, a domain where CVaR is particularly relevant and widely used. This case study involves constructing a portfolio of assets where the objective is to maximize returns while controlling the risk, as measured by CVaR.

In this scenario, the decision-maker, typically a portfolio manager, is faced with the challenge of selecting from a set of n different assets to construct a portfolio. The goal is to find the optimal allocation of capital among these assets to achieve the desired balance between return and risk.

Setting up the Problem: Let $\mathrm{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$represent the vector of capital allocations to n assets, where x_i is the proportion of the total investment in the i-th asset. The return on the portfolio can be defined as a weighted sum of the individual asset returns:

$R(\mathrm{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_i x_i$where r_i is the expected return of the i-th asset. The risk of the portfolio, measured by CVaR at a certain confidence level α, is given by:

$\mathrm{CVaR}_\alpha(L(\mathrm{x})) = \mathbb{E}[L(\mathrm{x})|L(\mathrm{x}) \geq \mathrm{VaR}_\alpha(L(\mathrm{x}))]$ where $L(\mathrm{x})$ is the loss function of the portfolio, typically defined in terms of negative returns.

Optimization Objective: The optimization problem is to maximize the return of the portfolio while keeping the CVaR within acceptable limits. This can be formulated as a multi-objective optimization problem:

$\underset{x \in X}{max} R(\mathrm{x})$
subject to $\mathrm{CVaR}_{\alpha}(L(\mathrm{x})) \leq c$ where c is the maximum acceptable level of CVaR, and the constraints $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i = 1, x_i \geq 0 \forall i$
ensure that the entire capital is allocated and no short selling is allowed[9-11].

Solving this optimization problem involves balancing the trade-off between return and risk. One common approach is to use a scalarization technique, such as the weighted sum method, to convert the multi-objective problem into a single-objective problem. Another approach could involve using algorithms like quadratic programming or Monte Carlo simulations, depending on the complexity of the return and risk models.

In practice, this approach would involve collecting historical data on the returns of the potential assets, estimating the expected returns r_i, and the distribution of the portfolio loss $L(\mathrm{x})$. The portfolio manager would then use this data, along with their risk tolerance (expressed as c and α), to solve the optimization problem and determine the optimal asset allocation.

5. Discuss

In the realm of multi-objective optimization (MOO), the Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) model presents both distinct advantages and certain limitations. Furthermore, comparing CVaR with traditional MOO methods offers insight into its unique place in the spectrum of optimization techniques.

Advantages:

(1) Risk Sensitivity: CVaR provides a more realistic and comprehensive measure of risk than traditional metrics like Variance or Value-at-Risk (VaR). It accounts for the tail risk, thereby capturing extreme losses beyond a certain quantile.
(2) Coherent Risk Measure: CVaR adheres to the four properties of coherent risk measures: monotonicity, sub-additivity, homogeneity, and translation invariance. This coherence makes it a preferred choice in rigorous risk management.
(3) Optimization Flexibility: In MOO, CVaR can be integrated as one of several objectives, offering flexibility in balancing risk with other goals, such as return maximization or cost reduction.
Limitations:
(1) Data Intensity: Accurate computation of CVaR, especially in empirical settings, requires extensive data on loss distributions, which can be a limitation in data-scarce scenarios.
(2) Model Complexity: Incorporating CVaR into MOO problems often increases the complexity of the optimization model, potentially making it more challenging to solve, especially for non-linear or non-convex problems.
(3) Dependence on Distribution Assumptions: The effectiveness of CVaR as a risk measure can be contingent on the accuracy of the underlying statistical models and assumptions about loss distributions[12-15].
Looking forward, there are several potential directions for future research and areas for improvement:

1. Advanced Computational Techniques: As the complexity of integrating CVaR into MOO is a significant challenge, future research can focus on developing more advanced computational algorithms. This could include enhancements in linear programming, quadratic programming, and Monte Carlo simulations, or even exploring machine learning approaches for more efficient data analysis and optimization.
2. Broader Application Areas: While CVaR has seen extensive use in finance, there is potential for its application in other fields where risk management is crucial. Future research could explore the use of CVaR in areas like supply chain management, engineering design, or environmental planning.
3. Dynamic and Adaptive Models: Given the dynamic nature of risk, another area for future research is the development of dynamic CVaR models that adapt over time, accounting for changing market conditions or evolving risk factors. This would make CVaR-based optimization more

responsive and relevant in real-time decision-making scenarios[16].

4. Empirical Studies and Real-world Applications: There is also a need for more empirical studies that apply CVaR in real-world scenarios. Such studies can provide insights into the practical challenges and effectiveness of CVaR in diverse settings, helping to refine the model and its applications.

5. Integration with Other Risk Measures: Exploring the integration of CVaR with other risk measures could provide a more holistic approach to risk assessment. Research in this direction can help in understanding how different risk measures can complement each other for more robust decision-making[17].

In conclusion, the exploration of CVaR in the realm of MOO has opened up numerous possibilities and areas for further investigation. The model's robust approach to risk assessment makes it a valuable tool in various applications, but it also presents challenges that warrant further research and innovation. The future direction in this field is ripe with potential for significant advancements, particularly in developing more efficient algorithms, expanding application areas, and enhancing the model's responsiveness to real-world dynamics.

References

[1] Nguyen, Quoc Phong, et al. "Optimizing conditional value-at-risk of black-box functions." Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34 (2021): 4170-4180.

[2] Filippi, Carlo, Gianfranco Guastaroba, and Maria Grazia Speranza. "Conditional value-at-risk beyond finance: a survey." International Transactions in Operational Research 27.3 (2020): 1277-1319.

[3] Soma, Tasuku, and Yuichi Yoshida. "Statistical learning with conditional value at risk." arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05826 (2020).

[4] Hiraoka, Takuya, et al. "Learning robust options by conditional value at risk optimization." Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32 (2019).

[5] Chapman, Margaret P., et al. "Risk-sensitive safety analysis using Conditional Value-at-Risk." IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 67.12 (2021): 6521-6536.

[6] Ying, Chengyang, et al. "Towards safe reinforcement learning via constraining conditional value-at-risk." arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04436 (2022).

[7] Xuan, Ang, et al. "A conditional value-at-risk based planning model for integrated energy system with energy storage and renewables." Applied Energy 294 (2021): 116971.

[8] Mhammedi, Zakaria, Benjamin Guedj, and Robert C. Williamson. "Pac-bayesian bound for the conditional value at risk." Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33 (2020): 17919-17930.

[9] Kishida, Masako, and Ahmet Cetinkaya. "Risk-aware linear quadratic control using conditional value-at-risk." IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control 68.1 (2022): 416-423.

[10] Kim, Dohyeong, and Songhwai Oh. "TRC: Trust region conditional value at risk for safe reinforcement learning." IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters 7.2 (2022): 2621-2628.

[11] Thomas, Philip, and Erik Learned-Miller. "Concentration inequalities for conditional value at risk." International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR, 2019.

[12] Li, Wei, et al. "A new approach to solve uncertain multidisciplinary design optimization based on conditional value at risk." IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering 18.1 (2020): 356-368.

[13] Yin, Ji, Zhiyuan Zhang, and Panagiotis Tsiotras. "Risk-aware model predictive path integral control using conditional value-at-risk." 2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA). IEEE, 2023.

[14] Lotfi, Reza, et al. "A ROBUST OPTIMIZATION MODEL FOR SUSTAINABLE AND RESILIENT CLOSED-LOOP SUPPLY CHAIN NETWORK DESIGN CONSIDERING CONDITIONAL VALUE AT RISK." Numerical algebra, control & optimization 11.2 (2021).

[15] Kolla, Ravi Kumar, et al. "Concentration bounds for empirical conditional value-at-risk: The unbounded case." Operations Research Letters 47.1 (2019): 16-20.

[16] Wang, Liao, and David D. Yao. "Production Planning with Risk Hedging Under a Conditional Value at Risk Objective." Operations Research (2023).

[17] Zhu, Baolin, et al. "Coordinating a dual-channel supply chain with conditional value-at-risk under uncertainties of yield and demand." Computers & Industrial Engineering 139 (2020): 106181.