



**HAL**  
open science

# An $\alpha$ -MaxMin Utility Representation for Close and Distant Future Preferences

Jean-Pierre Dugeon, Thai Ha-Huy

► **To cite this version:**

Jean-Pierre Dugeon, Thai Ha-Huy. An  $\alpha$ -MaxMin Utility Representation for Close and Distant Future Preferences. 2023. hal-04010969v3

**HAL Id: hal-04010969**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04010969v3>**

Preprint submitted on 30 Sep 2023 (v3), last revised 29 Oct 2023 (v5)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# AN $\alpha$ -MAXMIN UTILITY REPRESENTATION FOR CLOSE AND DISTANT FUTURE PREFERENCES\*

Jean-Pierre Drugeon<sup>†</sup> and Thai Ha-Huy<sup>‡</sup>

September 30, 2023

---

\*The authors would like to thank Gaetano Bloise, Alain Chateauneuf, Rose-Anne Dana, and Joanna Franaszek for their insightful comments. Jean-Pierre Drugeon would like to thank PGSE and the support of the *Ambiguity in Dynamic Environments* ANR (co-funded with Queen Mary University, Bielefeld University and Kyoto University) research project. Thai Ha-Huy would like to thank the Labex MME-DII (ANR-11-LBX-0023-01) and Paris School of Economics (campus Jourdan) for support during the writing of this article. He is also grateful to Stefano Bosi and Mikhail Pakhnin, for their encouragement and support in the complicated time of revision. The authors would like to thank both referees and the associate editor for numerous suggestions and remarks that greatly helped improve the article. Finally, they are grateful for a comment from a referee that inspired them to the notion *potentially better* property.

<sup>†</sup>Paris School of Economics and Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Email: jean-pierre.drugeon@cirs.fr

<sup>‡</sup>Université Paris-Saclay, Univ Evry, EPEE, 91025, Evry-Courcouronnes, France; TIMAS, Thang Long University, Hanoi, Vietnam. Email: thai.hahuy@univ-evry.fr

# ABSTRACT

This paper provides a framework for understanding preferences over utility streams across different time periods. We analyze preferences for the close future, for the distant future, and a synthesis of both, establishing a representation involving weights over time periods. Examining scenarios where two utility streams cannot be robustly compared to each other, we introduce notions in which one has more “potential” to be preferred over another, which lead to MaxMin, MaxMax, and  $\alpha$ -MaxMin representations. Finally, we consider temporal bias in the form of violations of stationarity. For close future preferences, we obtain a generalization of quasi-hyperbolic discounting. For distant future preferences, we obtain Banach limits and discuss the relationship with exponential discounting.

KEYWORDS: Axiomatisation, Myopia, Multiple Discounts,  $\alpha$ -MaxMin Criteria, Temporal Biases, Banach Limits, Infinite Dimensional Topologies.

JEL CLASSIFICATION: D11, D15, D90.

## CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Motivation and results . . . . .	1
1.2	Contribution and related literature . . . . .	4
1.3	Contents . . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>PARETO AGGREGATION OF CLOSE FUTURE AND DISTANT FUTURE PREFERENCES</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>AXIOMATIZATION OF <math>\alpha</math>-MAXMIN REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	Representation of the robust preorders . . . . .	12
3.1.1	Representation of close future Order . . . . .	12
3.1.2	Representation of distant future Order . . . . .	13
3.2	MaxMin, MaxMax and $\alpha$ -MaxMin representations . . . . .	14
<b>4</b>	<b>SPECIFICATION OF MULTIPLE DISCOUNT SETS BY STATIONARITY-TYPE AXIOMS</b>	<b>16</b>

4.1	Temporal bias axiom . . . . .	16
4.2	Temporal bias representation of close future preorder . . . . .	17
4.3	Temporal bias representation of distant future preorder . . . . .	20
5	CONCLUSION	<b>21</b>

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 MOTIVATION AND RESULTS

Consider a scenario where a government is required to assess very long-term policies, such as environmental ones. One of its goals is to strike a balance between the welfare of the present generations and that of far remote future generations. The government may rely on the advice of a group of experts to evaluate the close and distant future values of the projects. When evaluating very long-term projects, a scientific committee of this kind can include economists, politicians, environmentalists, and even philosophers. Therefore, pointing out that opinions would significantly differ is anything from surprising. Based on these recommendations, it is assumed that the government establishes two orders  $\succeq_c$  and  $\succeq_d$  representing its preferences for the near and the far remote future.

In the evaluations under the close future order  $\succeq_c$ , the far remote future becomes negligible. Following a substantial body of preferences in the literature, the utility levels of a finite number of generations end up mostly defining the value of the near future. The distant future order,  $\succeq_d$ , as for itself, displays a drastically distinct behavior: the preferences would not change if the utility levels were changed for a finite number of generations. Finally, the government's total order  $\succeq$ , which incorporates both the close and the distant futures, synthesizes these two classes of preferences.

Under standard conditions of axiomatic intertemporal literature, namely translation invariance and positive homogeneity, such orders can be represented by index functions that are constantly additive and positively homogeneous. By adding the natural Pareto condition that the options preferred by both  $\succeq_c$  and  $\succeq_d$  are also preferred by the total order  $\succeq$ , the index function of  $\succeq$  can be represented by a convex combination of the two other ones. Interestingly, the parameter of the convex combination is not a constant but depends on the utility stream at stake. Two configurations emerge: a first where the economic agent desires to smooth the difference between the close and the distant futures and a second that corresponds to

the opposite behavior.

We present the robust preorders  $\succeq_c^*$  and  $\succeq_d^*$  to further investigate the potential for an expert comparison that is unanimous. A given utility stream is robustly superior to another under an order belonging to  $\{\succeq_c, \succeq_d\}$  if and only if this comparison does not depend on the reference stream, in the sense that combining two streams with a third one does not affect the comparison between them. As a result, each order can be characterized by a set of probabilities such that the robust comparison is equivalent to the agreement of every evaluation under these probabilities. In other words, a robust comparison is possible if and only if every expert agrees to it.

These robust pre-orders are generally incomplete and can be represented by a set of weights overtime periods, which reflects the diversity of experts' opinions. For the close future pre-order  $\succeq_c^*$ , this set is a subset of countably additive probabilities, representing different discount rate systems.<sup>1</sup> For the distant future pre-order  $\succeq_d^*$ , the corresponding set builds from a set purely finitely additive probabilities.<sup>2</sup>

For each order  $\succeq_c$  and  $\succeq_d$ , the difference in opinions of experts naturally leads to situations where two utility streams are not robustly comparable, but one has more potential to be preferred than the other one. We present two categories of *potentially better* properties. In the first category, a utility stream is thought to have a greater chance of being preferred if it is robustly superior to every constant stream that is robustly dominated by the other one. Additionally, in the second category, if a stream is not robustly worse than every constant stream that is not robustly better than the other, it has a greater chance of being preferred.

We obtain a MaxMin criterion, where the value of a utility stream is determined by the worst evaluation, under the assumption that having more potential in the first category suggests being favored. We also obtain a MaxMax criterion, where only the best evaluation is taken into account if a stream that has greater potential

---

<sup>1</sup>A countably additive probability can be presented as a real sequence  $(\omega_0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$  such that  $\omega_s \geq 0$  for every  $s$  and  $\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s = 1$ .

<sup>2</sup>They are also known under the name *charges*, see [Bhaskara Rao and Bhaskara Rao \(1983\)](#). The evaluation of a utility stream under a purely finitely additive probability does not change if we change only a finite number of values in this stream. A detailed definition is given in Appendix **A**.

in the second category is preferred. Under a more demanding condition than the aforementioned ones, establishing that the satisfaction of having more potential in both categories implies being better, we obtain an  $\alpha$ -MaxMin representation that encompasses the MaxMin and MaxMax criteria as special cases.

We assume a weakened version of *stationarity* to address the third concern of the article, which is the potential for present biases.<sup>3</sup> Every expert's assessment complies with the *delay-stationary* property, meaning that it becomes independent of the departure date. Therefore, a delayed equivalence assumption is taken into consideration in the case of a close future order. According to this, for every stream, there exists a delayed stream that preserves its robustly improving capacity while mixing with another delayed one. A generalization of the quasi-hyperbolic discounting representation is established. A convex hull of discount rate systems having the feature that the rate of trade-off between a day and its subsequent ones becomes constant from a day in the future makes up the set that defines the resilient order.

Under the same delay-stationarity assumption applied to the close future, in the case of purely finitely additive measures that characterize the distant future robust pre-order, these measures belong to the set of *Banach limits*, which are linear functions on the set  $\ell_\infty$ <sup>4</sup> with a special property that the evaluation of a utility stream under a Banach limit does not change if it is shifted one (or many) period(s) to the future.<sup>5</sup> This property echoes the close future evaluation under exponential discounting for which the comparison between two streams does not change if we shift them to the same date in the future. This property makes Banach limits the counterpart of exponential discounting in the evaluation of the close future.

---

<sup>3</sup>In inter-temporal axiomatic literature, stationarity is usually understood as the comparison between two streams does not depend on the departure date. A weaker version of it can be found in the property *Invariance to stationary relabelling* in [Chambers and Echenique \(2018\)](#).

<sup>4</sup>The set of bounded real sequences  $(x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots)$  such that  $\sup_{s \geq 0} |x_s| < \infty$ .

<sup>5</sup>For every  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $x, y \in \ell_\infty$ , using a Banach limit, the comparison between  $(b, x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots)$  and  $(b, y_0, y_1, y_2, \dots)$  is the same as between  $x$  and  $y$ . For intuition about these objects, one can have in mind the infimum limit *liminf* and the supremum limit *limsup* of utility streams. These functions satisfy every property of Banach limits, minus the linearity. For a rigorous definition, see page 55 in [Becker and Boyd \(1997\)](#).

## 1.2 CONTRIBUTION AND RELATED LITERATURE

A statistician faced with a class of potential probabilities may choose to use the  $\alpha$ -MaxMin anticipated utility criteria, which was initially proposed by [Hurwicz \(1951\)](#), which takes the form of a convex combination of the best and worst evaluations. In an article that is considered as a “Big Bang in decision theory after Savage”,<sup>6</sup> [Gilboa and Schmeidler \(1989\)](#) introduced an approach to taking decisions under uncertainty and the associated MaxMin criteria. By using two distinct approaches, [Kopylov \(2003\)](#) and [Ghirardato et al. \(2004\)](#) established the  $\alpha$ -MaxMin presentation, where  $\alpha$  represents the ambiguous attitude.<sup>7</sup> The recursive version for  $\alpha$ -MaxMin preference in a continuous time configuration was explored by [Beißner et al. \(2020\)](#) as an application in optimization problems, and the differentiability aspects were examined by [Beißner and Werner \(2021\)](#).

[Chambers and Echenique \(2018\)](#) analyzed how regular discounting criteria could reconcile conflicting viewpoints held by different experts; however, another stream of the literature focuses on phenomena related to temporal biases. This parked interest in the quasi-hyperbolic discounting representation, which was first introduced by [Phelps and Pollack \(1968\)](#) and was more recently analyzed by [Laibson \(1997\)](#) and [Montiel Olea and Strzalecki \(2014\)](#).

This study’s main objective is to examine the applicability of such representation while dealing with discounted infinite utility streams. We develop the analysis in three regards.

First, this article considers the arbitrarily remote components of the utility streams. The purpose is to provide alternative representations that would complement the close future, which is largely used in most researches. In this sense, we add an additional concept to the one that is well described in [Brown and Lewis \(1981\)](#) and [Sawyer \(1988\)](#) and is referred to as *myopic economic agent*.<sup>8</sup> While in [Gilles \(1989\)](#),

---

<sup>6</sup>See [Karni et al. \(2022\)](#).

<sup>7</sup>While [Kopylov \(2003\)](#) assumes that the decision-maker conforms to the expected utility on a set called *unambiguous acts*, [Ghirardato et al. \(2004\)](#), using the *unambiguous preference*, derived the set of possible probabilities and the degree of ambiguity attitude. For a survey, see [Trautmann and van de Kuilen \(2015\)](#).

<sup>8</sup>A myopic agent attributes very small values for utilities in the distant future. A very strong



purely finitely additive measures indicate the presence of asset bubbles in exchange and production economies, in our article, they characterize the distant future order and its index function being presented in [Drugeon and Ha-Huy \(2022\)](#).

Usually, the decision is based on a set of different weight systems.<sup>9</sup> The second purpose of this study is to present an approach that aggregates such differences and extends the usual MaxMin criterion to the more general class of  $\alpha$ -MaxMin criteria. This effort echoes contributions of  $\alpha$ -MaxMin in literature on multiple probabilities, such as [Frick et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Chateauneuf et al. \(2021\)](#). Our “potentially better” categories are similar to the notions of “potential” and “security-potential dominance” presented in [Frick et al. \(2022\)](#). We define our notion using the robust order whereas [Frick et al. \(2022\)](#) based their definition on a fundamental being called *objective rational preference*.

The third concern of this article is to encompass general temporal biases within a multiple discounting configuration and present a generalized version of quasi-hyperbolic representation, passing through the robust order and the delay stationarity axiom. In a recent contribution, [Bach et al. \(2023\)](#) generalized the system of axioms in [Chambers and Echenique \(2018\)](#) to the scope for one-step present bias and quasi-hyperbolic discounting, with a property named *delay-Invariance to stationary relabeling* as key axiom.<sup>10</sup> The similarity between this article and [Bach et al. \(2023\)](#) is that, in order to establish quasi-hyperbolic representation or its generalization, they both require a stationarity property that starts at some date in the future.

---

version of myopia, where the agent cares only about what happens before some fixed date but is indifferent afterward, is studied in [de Andrade et al. \(2021\)](#).

<sup>9</sup>For example, in situations with the lack of available information, the ambiguity about the system of appropriate discount rate, or the difference in opinions of the experts that the economic agent consults, etc.

<sup>10</sup>In a different approach, [Drugeon and Ha-Huy \(2023\)](#) focused on recursive time-dependent orders as [Wakai \(2007\)](#), where the discount rate is chosen in *each* period by a comparison between the utility value of the present and that of the future.

### 1.3 CONTENTS

Section 2 describes the Pareto aggregation of close future and distant future preferences. Section 3 presents robust pre-orders and conditions for MaxMin, MaxMax, and  $\alpha$ -MaxMin representations are presented. Section 4 strengthens these results by incorporating them in a temporally-biased multiple discounts configuration. Section 5 concludes the article. The mathematical preparations and the proofs are given in the Appendix.

## 2. PARETO AGGREGATION OF CLOSE FUTURE AND DISTANT FUTURE PREFERENCES

This paper adopts an axiomatic approach to the evaluation of bounded utility streams in a discrete-time configuration. Letters such as  $x, y, z$  will be used for streams of utilities with values in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Denote by  $\ell_\infty$  the set of bounded real sequences.

Notation  $\mathbf{1}$  will denote the constant stream  $(1, 1, \dots)$ . Similarly,  $b\mathbf{1}$  and  $b^*\mathbf{1}$  will be used for constant streams  $(b, b, \dots)$  and  $(b^*, b^*, \dots)$ . The notations  $\lambda, \mu$ , and  $\chi$  will be used for constant scalars.

For every  $x \in \ell_\infty$  and  $T \geq 0$ , let  $x_{[0,T]} = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_T)$  be its *head*  $T + 1$  first components and  $x_{[T+1,\infty)} = (x_{T+1}, x_{T+2}, \dots)$  its *tail* starting from date  $T + 1$ . Given sequences  $x$  and  $y$ , the sequence  $(y_{[0,T]}, x_{[T+1,\infty)})$  denotes  $(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_T, x_{T+1}, x_{T+2}, \dots)$ . The sequence  $(y_{[0,T]}, x)$  denotes  $(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_T, x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots)$ . By convention, if  $T = -1$ , let  $(y_{[0,T]}, x_{[T+1,\infty)})$  be the sequence  $x = (x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots)$ .

An economic agent evaluates utility streams that belong to  $\ell_\infty$ , while attempting to strike a balance between the welfare of the close and the distant futures. She has two original preferences, which are represented by the close future order  $\succeq_c$  and the distant future order  $\succeq_d$ . The distant future order has an opposite tendency and ignores the close future, whereas the close future order ignores the distant future. The economic agent establishes her main preference,  $\succeq$ , based on these two preferences, synthesizing the comparisons made by  $\succeq_c$  and  $\succeq_d$ .

As a constructive example, imagine a situation where a government has to evaluate very long-run policies. The government may rely on the advice of a group of economists, environmentalists, politicians, or even philosophers to evaluate the values of the close and distant future of projects. Each expert shares her opinion on an appropriate discount rate system for the close future as well as some rules for the calculus of the distant future. The evaluation of the close and distant future will be determined based on the experts' advice.

Any expert will recognize that the calculus rule must satisfy two basic properties: positive homogeneity of degree one and additivity. These guarantee that the properties *homogeneity* and *additivity* are satisfied. According to homogeneity, an expert's comparison of two streams after multiplying a positive scalar by both of them remains unchanged. Additivity ensures that by adding a third stream, the expert's comparison of two streams remains intact. In other words, the preferences of an expert do not depend on the reference stream. After having consulted the experts, the preferences are described by two completed orders:  $\succ_c$  and  $\succ_d$ .

The opinions of such experts obviously differ due to their diverse experiences, and the purpose of this article is to propose an axiomatic approach that combines their disparities.

We now return to the basic properties concerning preferences. The intuition behind the orders in the above illustration is presented in Axiom **F1**. For any order  $\hat{\succ} \in \{\succ, \succ_c, \succ_d\}$ , let  $x \sim y$  denote  $x \hat{\succ} y$  and  $y \hat{\succ} x$ . The order  $\hat{\succ}$  is nontrivial if there is  $x$  and  $y$  such that  $x \succ y$  and  $y \not\prec x$ . Let the notation be presented as  $x \hat{\succ} y$ .

**AXIOM F 1.** Every order  $\hat{\succ}$  belonging to  $\{\succ_c, \succ_d, \succ\}$  satisfies the following properties.<sup>11</sup>

- (i) *Completeness, transitivity and monotonicity:* For every  $x, y \in \ell_\infty$ , either  $x \hat{\succ} y$  or  $y \hat{\succ} x$ . If  $x \hat{\succ} y$  and  $y \hat{\succ} z$ , then  $x \hat{\succ} z$ . If  $x_s \geq y_s$  for every  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $x \hat{\succ} y$ .
- (ii) *Archimedeanity:* For  $x \in \ell_\infty$  and real values  $b, b'$  satisfying  $b\mathbf{1} \hat{\succ} x \hat{\succ} b'\mathbf{1}$ , there are  $\lambda, \mu \in (0, 1)$  such that  $(1 - \lambda)b\mathbf{1} + \lambda b'\mathbf{1} \hat{\succ} x \hat{\succ} (1 - \mu)b\mathbf{1} + \mu b'\mathbf{1}$ .

---

<sup>11</sup>These properties are well-known in the literature, and an interested reader may find a detailed discussion about their significance in [Chambers and Echenique \(2018\)](#), [Bach et al. \(2023\)](#), or [Drugeon and Ha-Huy \(2022\)](#).

(iii) *Constant additivity*: For every stream  $x, y$ , constants  $b$  and scalar  $\lambda \in [0, 1)$ ,  $x \hat{\succeq} y$  if and only if  $(1 - \lambda)x + \lambda b\mathbf{1} \hat{\succeq} (1 - \lambda)y + \lambda b\mathbf{1}$ .

(iv) *Nontriviality of the main order*: There exist  $x, y \in \ell_\infty$  such that  $x \succ y$ .

The completeness, transitivity, and monotonicity properties are standard in the literature. Archimedeanity ensures continuity with respect to the sup-norm topology in  $\ell_\infty$ .

The constant additivity property is admittedly less immediate. It guarantees that constant streams are comparison-neutral: mixing two sequences with a constant stream does not alter their comparison. In decision theory literature, this trait is known as *certainty independence*. In the context of intertemporal preferences, this condition states that the utility level of different dates is given in the same unit. As in [Chambers and Echenique \(2018\)](#), this allows us to perform interpersonal (or in the case of this article, intertemporal) comparison of utility.<sup>12</sup>

These conditions, combined with the nontriviality property, have as a consequence that the order  $\hat{\succeq}$  can be represented by an index function  $\hat{I}$ : for every  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\ell_\infty$ ,  $x \hat{\succeq} y$  if and only if  $\hat{I}(x) \geq \hat{I}(y)$ . The function  $\hat{I}$  satisfies constant additivity and homogeneity of degree 1 properties. Precisely, this function is defined as:

$$\hat{I}(x) = \sup\left\{b \text{ such that } x \hat{\succeq} b\mathbf{1}\right\}.$$

For every  $x \in \ell_\infty$ ,  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have:<sup>13</sup>

(i)  $\hat{I}(\lambda x) = \lambda \hat{I}(x)$ ,

(ii)  $\hat{I}(x + b\mathbf{1}) = \hat{I}(x) + b$ .

By convention, if the order  $\hat{\succeq}$  is trivial, we let  $\hat{I}(x) = 0$  for every  $x \in \ell_\infty$ . We then have three index functions  $I_c(x)$ ,  $I_d(x)$  and  $I(x)$  corresponding to the three orders  $\succeq_c$ ,  $\succeq_d$  and  $\succeq$ .

The following axiom details the precise properties of these three orders. The close future order satisfies a myopia property, as described in [Brown and Lewis \(1981\)](#):

<sup>12</sup>See [Chambers and Echenique \(2018\)](#), pages 1331-1332 for a detailed discussion.

<sup>13</sup>The proof of this property can be found in [Drugeon and Ha-Huy \(2022\)](#), Lemma 2.1.

it attributes a very small value for utilities in distant dates. Otherwise, the distant future order attributes no value for the close future. The main order satisfies a version of the Pareto property in aggregating close future and distant future orders.

**AXIOM F 2.** The close future, distant future, and main orders respectively satisfy:

- (i) *Distant future insensitivity:* Consider the close future order  $\succeq_c$ . For every  $x, y, z \in \ell_\infty$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $T_0$  such that for  $T \geq T_0$ ,

$$\left(x_{[0,T]}, y_{[T+1,\infty)}\right) \succeq_c \left(x_{[0,T]}, z_{[T+1,\infty)}\right) - \epsilon \mathbf{1}.$$

- (ii) *Close future insensitivity:* Consider the distant future order  $\succeq_d$ . For every  $x, y, z \in \ell_\infty$ ,

$$\left(y_{[0,T]}, x_{[T+1,\infty)}\right) \sim_d \left(z_{[0,T]}, x_{[T+1,\infty)}\right),$$

for every  $T \geq 0$ .

- (iii) *Consistency:* Consider the main order  $\succeq$ . For  $x, y \in \ell_\infty$ , if  $x \succeq_c y$  and  $x \succeq_d y$ , then  $x \succeq y$ .

It is easy to verify that, under axioms **F1** and **F2**, for every  $x, y \in \ell_\infty$ :

$$\begin{aligned} I_c(x) &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} I_c\left(x_{[0,T]}, y_{[T+1,\infty)}\right), \\ I_d(x) &= I_d\left(y_{[0,T]}, x_{[T+1,\infty)}\right), \text{ for every } T \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

From now on, we always impose **F1** and **F2** on the three orders  $\succeq_c$ ,  $\succeq_d$  and  $\succeq$ .

The consistency condition requires that the main order never contradicts the close future and the distant future orders when these two orders are in agreement with each other. With the nontriviality of the main order, a direct consequence of consistency is that at least one of the two close future and distant future orders is nontrivial.

More specifically, if the distant future order  $\succeq_d$  is trivial, the two orders  $\succeq$  and  $\succeq_c$  are equivalent. The economic agent cares only about the close future. This is the usual situation of literature where the remote future is negligible. Similarly, if the close future order  $\succeq_c$  is trivial, then  $\succeq$  and  $\succeq_d$  do coincide.

We now focus on the relation between the index functions. The evaluation of a utility stream is a convex combination of its close future and distant future values. The parameter of the convex combination is characterized by two following parameters. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_g &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} I(\mathbf{o}\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, \mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}), \\ \chi_\ell &= - \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} I(\mathbf{o}\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, -\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}).\end{aligned}$$

These two values can be interpreted as the perception of the economic agent about the importance of constant gains and losses in the distant future. They both belong to the closed interval  $[0, 1]$ . The case  $\chi_g = \chi_\ell = 1$  corresponds to the configuration where the close future order is trivial and  $\succeq = \succeq_d$ . In opposition to this,  $\chi_g = \chi_\ell = 0$  implies that the distant future order is trivial and  $\succeq = \succeq_c$ , a well-known configuration of the literature.

Lemma 2.1 is crucial in the establishment of the formula linking the close and the distant future values of the utility streams. The value of a stream is a convex combination of its close and distant values. The parameter of this convex combination in use is  $\chi_g$  if the close future value is smaller than the other one. In the reverse situation, it is  $\chi_\ell$  that is selected to determine the weight in the convex combination.

**LEMMA 2.1.** *Consider a stream  $x$ .*

(i) *If  $I_c(x) \leq I_d(x)$ , then*

$$I(x) = (1 - \chi_g)I_c(x) + \chi_g I_d(x).$$

(ii) *If  $I_c(x) \geq I_d(x)$ , then*

$$I(x) = (1 - \chi_\ell)I_c(x) + \chi_\ell I_d(x).$$

We can establish two different behaviors based on Lemma 2.1. The first one corresponds to the situation where the economic agent desires to smooth the difference between the close future and the distant future values. The second one exhibits the opposite behavior.

**PROPOSITION 2.1.** *Consider  $\chi_g$  and  $\chi_\ell$ .*

(i) If  $\chi_g \leq \chi_\ell$ , then, for every stream  $x$ ,

$$I(x) = \min_{\chi_g \leq \lambda \leq \chi_\ell} \left[ (1 - \lambda)I_c(x) + \lambda I_d(x) \right].$$

(ii) If  $\chi_g \geq \chi_\ell$ , then, for every stream  $x$ ,

$$I(x) = \max_{\chi_\ell \leq \lambda \leq \chi_g} \left[ (1 - \lambda)I_c(x) + \lambda I_d(x) \right].$$

As an example, consider the order  $\succeq$  that is represented as follows, with  $0 < \chi_g < \chi_\ell < 1$  and  $D$  a compact subset of  $(0, 1)$ :

$$I(x) = \min_{\chi_g \leq \lambda \leq \chi_\ell} \left[ (1 - \lambda) \min_{\delta \in D} \left( (1 - \delta) \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s x_s \right) + \lambda \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_s \right].$$

In this example, the initial order  $\succeq$  can be decomposed into two suborders  $\succeq_c$  and  $\succeq_d$  with two associated index functions that are available as:

$$I_c(x) = \min_{\delta \in D} \left( (1 - \delta) \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s x_s \right),$$

$$I_d(x) = \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_s.$$

### 3. AXIOMATIZATION OF $\alpha$ -MAXMIN REPRESENTATIONS

We want to study a preorder that represents the unanimous comparison, in the close as well as in the distant future, after the orders  $\succeq_c$  and  $\succeq_d$  have been established. An important question is: what this order's principal properties should be? A simple answer that comes to mind: is that the preorder must preserve the homogeneity and additivity properties since every expert provides her evaluation rule that satisfies them. Such a line of reflect intuitively leads to the well-known definition of a robust order in decision theory: one stream is robustly better than another one if mixing them with a third one does not alter the comparison.

**DEFINITION 3.1.** Consider an order  $\widehat{\succeq} \in \{\succeq_c, \succeq_d\}$ . Let the pre-order  $\widehat{\succeq}^*$  be defined by

$$x \widehat{\succeq}^* y \quad \text{iff for every } \lambda \in (0, 1) \text{ and } z \in \ell_\infty, \text{ we have } (1 - \lambda)x + \lambda z \widehat{\succeq} (1 - \lambda)y + \lambda z.$$

We may also interpret robust dominance as being preferred independently from the reference stream. It is always preferable to mix  $z$  with  $x$  rather than with  $y$  if we begin from  $z$ . Generally, this preorder is not complete. This brings to mind [Bewley \(2002\)](#), whose contribution saw the establishment of a set of probability distributions rather than a single one, due to a lack of completeness. A choice is robustly better than another one if, calculated by every probability of this set, its expected utility is always better than the other one.

Similarly, for each order  $\hat{\succeq} \in \{\succeq_c, \succeq_d\}$ , there exists a set of probabilities (finitely additive or infinitely additive) such that a utility stream  $x$  is robustly  $\hat{\succeq}$ -better than a utility stream  $y$  if and only that is confirmed by every evaluation using these probabilities. In other words, these probabilities characterize the difference between the opinions of the experts.

Section [3.1](#) will present in detail their characterization.

### 3.1 REPRESENTATION OF THE ROBUST PREORDERS

This approach leads to a characterization of the order  $\hat{\succeq}$  by a set of continuous linear functions on  $\ell_\infty$ , similar to [Gilboa and Schmeidler \(1989\)](#) and [Bewley \(2002\)](#). These can be considered as finitely additive measures on the set of natural numbers  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ . Interestingly, they are countably additive in the case of the close future order  $\succeq_c$ , and purely finitely additive in the case of the distant future order  $\succeq_d$ . A rigorous definition of these notions is given in [Appendix A](#).

#### 3.1.1 REPRESENTATION OF CLOSE FUTURE ORDER

Axiom [A1](#) states a strong version of myopia: though there are disagreements between experts about discount rate system to evaluate the close future, their close future evaluations all attribute very small values for sufficiently remote dates. The well-known axiom continuity at infinity in [Chambers and Echenique \(2018\)](#) might be viewed as the close future equivalent of this axiom.

AXIOM A 1. For every  $b \in (0, 1)$ , there exists  $T_0$  such that, for every  $T \geq T_0$ ,

$$\left(\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, 0\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}\right) \succeq_c^* b\mathbf{1}.$$



Under axiom **A1**, the robust preorder  $\succeq_c^*$  is represented by a set of weights  $\Omega_c$  that builds from countably additive probabilities. To be more precised,  $\Omega_c$  is a set of sequences  $\omega = (\omega_0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$  such that  $\omega_s \geq 0$  for every  $s$ , and  $\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s = 1$ . A probability in this set can be considered a possible system of discount rates that is used to evaluate the close future.

**PROPOSITION 3.1.** *Assume that the close future order  $\succeq_c$  is nontrivial. Under axiom **A1**, there exists a set of discount rate systems  $\Omega_c \subset \ell_1$ <sup>14</sup> that is compact with respect to the weak topology in  $\ell_1$  and satisfies the two following properties:*

- (i) *For every  $\omega \in \Omega_c$ ,  $\omega_s \geq 0$ ,  $\forall s$ , and  $\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s = 1$ .*
- (ii) *For every streams  $x$  and  $y$ , we have  $x \succeq_c^* y$  if and only if*

$$\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s x_s \geq \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s y_s,$$

*for every  $\omega \in \Omega_c$ .*

As a remark, observe that for every stream  $x$ ,

$$\inf_{\omega \in \Omega_c} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s x_s \leq I_c(x) \leq \sup_{\omega \in \Omega_c} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s x_s.$$

The economic agent attributes to the close future of  $x$  a value lying between the worst and the best evaluations of experts.

### 3.1.2 REPRESENTATION OF DISTANT FUTURE ORDER

Since the distant future order  $\succeq_d$  does not take into account the close future, the robust preorder  $\succeq_d^*$  satisfies that same property and depends only on the distant future of the utility streams. It is characterized by a set  $\Omega_d$  that builds from purely finitely additive properties.

Under the evaluation of a continuous linear function  $\phi \in \Omega_d$ , the value of a stream  $x$ , denoted  $\phi \cdot x$ , depends only on the distant behavior of  $x$  and does not change if there are only a finite number of changes in the values  $x_s$ . More precisely, for every stream  $y$  and  $T \geq 0$ , we have

$$\phi \cdot (y_{[0,T]}, x_{[T+1,\infty)}) = \phi \cdot x.$$

---

<sup>14</sup>The set of absolutely convergent real sequences  $(\omega_0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$  such that  $\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} |\omega_s| < \infty$ .

Hence, the value  $\phi \cdot x$  can be interpreted as the evaluation under  $\phi$  of the stream  $x$  in the distant future.

**PROPOSITION 3.2.** *Assume that the distant future order  $\succeq_d$  is nontrivial. There exists a set of purely finitely additive probabilities  $\Omega_d$  such that  $x \succeq_d^* y$  if and only if  $\phi \cdot x \geq \phi \cdot y$  for every  $\phi \in \Omega_d$ .*

Observe that for every stream  $x$ ,

$$\inf_{\phi \in \Omega_d} \phi \cdot x \leq I_d(x) \leq \sup_{\phi \in \Omega_d} \phi \cdot x.$$

As in the case of close future value, the economic agent attributes to the distant future of  $x$  a value lying between the worst and the best evaluations of experts.

### 3.2 MAXMIN, MAXMAX AND $\alpha$ -MAXMIN REPRESENTATIONS

Once the robust preorders  $\succeq_c^*$  and  $\succeq_d^*$  have been established, a natural interest arises about situations where the two utility streams are not robustly comparable, but one has more potential to be preferred than the other one. We will define two categories of being potentially better for either of the two orders  $\succeq_c$  or  $\succeq_d$ .

The following defines the first category of potentially better. If  $x$  is robustly better than every constant stream that is robustly dominated by  $y$ , then it is considered as having more potential to be preferred. The second category is defined as  $x$  having more potential to be preferred if it is not robustly worse than a constant stream that is not robustly better than  $y$ .

**DEFINITION 3.2.** *Consider an order  $\widehat{\succeq} \in \{\succeq_c, \succeq_d\}$ .*

- (i) *Under the order  $\widehat{\succeq}$ ,  $x$  is potentially better than  $y$  in the first category if, for every constant  $b$ ,*

$$y \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1} \text{ implies } x \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1}.$$

- (ii) *Under the order  $\widehat{\succeq}$ ,  $x$  is potentially better than  $y$  in the second category if, for every constant  $b$ ,*

$$b\mathbf{1} \not\widehat{\succeq}^* y \text{ implies } \widehat{b}\mathbf{1} \not\widehat{\succeq}^* x.$$

Under the axiom ensuring that having more potential in the first category implies to be preferred, we obtain a MaxMin criterion, where the value of a utility stream is determined by the worst evaluation. Similarly, if a stream that is potentially better in the second category is also the preferred one, we obtain a MaxMax criterion, where only the best evaluation is taken into account. Under a more demanding condition than the aforementioned ones, establishing that the satisfaction of having more potential in both categories implies to be preferred, we obtain an  $\alpha$ -MaxMin representation that encompasses the MaxMin and the MaxMax criteria as special cases.

**PROPOSITION 3.3.** *Consider an order  $\widehat{\succeq} \in \{\succeq_c, \succeq_d\}$  and its corresponding preorder  $\widehat{\succeq}^*$ . Assume that this order is nontrivial.*

- (i) *If for every streams  $x$  and  $y$ ,  $x$  being potentially better than  $y$  in the first category implies  $x \widehat{\succeq} y$ , then the order  $\widehat{\succeq}$  has a MaxMin representation:*

$$\widehat{I}(x) = \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x$$

*for every stream  $x$ .*

- (ii) *If for every streams  $x$  and  $y$ ,  $x$  being potentially better than  $y$  in the second category implies  $x \widehat{\succeq} y$ , then the order  $\widehat{\succeq}$  has a MaxMax representation:*

$$\widehat{I}(x) = \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x$$

*for every stream  $x$ .*

- (iii) *If for every streams  $x$  and  $y$ ,  $x$  being potentially better than  $y$  in both categories implies  $x \widehat{\succeq} y$ , then the order  $\widehat{\succeq}$  has an  $\alpha$ -MaxMin representation: there exists unique  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$  such that for every stream  $x$ ,*

$$\widehat{I}(x) = \alpha \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x + (1 - \alpha) \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x.$$

The MaxMin representation can be considered as a unanimous choice. The economic agent determines that a stream  $x$  has at least value  $b$  if and only if every expert agrees with that evaluation. We can also consider that the agent is very prudent in following the experts' advice. The MaxMax exhibits the exact opposite behavior in

this aspect. The opinion of one expert that  $x$  has at least value  $b$  is sufficient for the agent to have the same conclusion. The  $\alpha$ -MaxMin is a way to balance the two. The agent considers not only the worst but also the best evaluation.

Following two distinct approaches, [Chateauneuf et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Frick et al. \(2022\)](#) are interested in the uniqueness of the  $\alpha$ -MaxMin representation. In this regard, the “potentially better” categories in this article echoes in some way the security and potential dominance properties in [Frick et al. \(2022\)](#).

## 4. SPECIFICATION OF MULTIPLE DISCOUNT SETS BY STATIONARITY-TYPE AXIOMS

### 4.1 TEMPORAL BIAS AXIOM

In order to properly characterize the sets  $\Omega_c$  and  $\Omega_d$ , consider the definition [4.1](#), which characterizes the impatience and stationary properties of the robust preorders. Fix the order  $\hat{\succeq} \in \{\succeq_c, \succeq_d\}$  and its robust preorder  $\hat{\succeq}^*$ . The idea expressed in definition [4.1](#) represents the intuition that the evaluation of every expert becomes stationary, beginning at a sufficiently long date in the future. After a certain time, her comparison between two streams no longer depends on the departure date. The temporal bias phenomenon, one of the main causes for the violation of the stationary property, has only a finite range of influence on the experts. In fact, there exists a date such that their evaluations all become stationary afterward.

**DEFINITION 4.1.**  *$T^*$ -delay stationarity: Let  $T^* \geq 0$ . The order  $\hat{\succeq}$  satisfies  $T^*$ -delay stationarity if for every  $x \in \ell_\infty$  and a constant  $b$  such that*

$$(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x) \hat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1},$$

*we have*

$$(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x) \hat{\succeq}^* (b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*]}, x) \hat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1}.$$

To be more precise, for an order  $\hat{\succeq}$  satisfying this definition:

(i) Case  $T^* = 0$  corresponds to the Stationarity property:

$$x \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1} \text{ implies } x \widehat{\succeq}^*(b, x) \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1}.$$

(ii) Case  $T^* = 1$  corresponds to the Quasi-hyperbolic discounting property:

$$(b, x) \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1} \text{ implies } (b, x) \widehat{\succeq}^*(b, b, x) \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1}.$$

(iii) Case  $T^* \geq 1$  can be considered as a  $T^*$ -steps quasi-hyperbolic discounting property:

$$\underbrace{(b, b, \dots, b, x)}_{T^* \text{ times}} \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1} \text{ implies } \underbrace{(b, b, \dots, b, x)}_{T^* \text{ times}} \widehat{\succeq}^* \underbrace{(b, b, \dots, b, x)}_{T^*+1 \text{ times}} \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1}.$$

The choice to build the impatience and stationarity properties from the comparison of a stream with another constant one is based on the purpose of practicability. It is indeed simpler to ask an economic agent whether she values a utility stream of at least  $b$  or watch her behavior.

In definition 4.1(iii), the comparison  $(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x) \widehat{\succeq}^*(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*]}, x)$  characterizes impatience whereas  $(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*]}, x) \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1}$  features  $T^*$ -delay stationarity. In other words, even while the effect according to preorder  $\widehat{\succeq}^*$  weakens over time, if a combination is robustly better than a constant sequence, it stays robustly better if it is advanced into the future.

## 4.2 TEMPORAL BIAS REPRESENTATION OF CLOSE FUTURE PRE-ORDER

If the close order  $\succeq_c$  satisfies  $T^*$ -delay stationary, one can obtain a characterization for the sets discount rate systems  $\Omega$ . For a stream  $x$ , let  $\mathcal{C}(x)$  be the supremum of the values  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $x \succeq_c^* b\mathbf{1}$ . We can interpret  $\mathcal{C}(x)$  as the lowest evaluation of the close future of  $x$  by experts. A utility stream  $y$  may be robustly improved in close future by mixing with  $x$  if we have

$$\mathcal{C}\left(\frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}y\right) > \mathcal{C}(y).$$

In other words, every expert agrees mixing  $y$  with  $x$  is a better choice than  $y$ . Axiom **A2** states that, there exists a delay-equivalence of  $x$  that keeps its robustly improving capacity on delayed sequences.

AXIOM A2. Let the close future order  $\succeq_c$  satisfy the condition in definition 4.1. For a utility stream  $x$ , let  $b = \mathcal{C}(x)$ . There exists a utility stream  $y$  such that

(i)  $\mathcal{C}\left(\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y\right)\right) = b$ ,

(ii) for every stream  $\hat{y}$  satisfying  $\mathcal{C}\left(\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, \hat{y}\right)\right) = b$ , one has

$$\mathcal{C}\left(\frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, \hat{y}\right)\right) > b \text{ if and only if } \mathcal{C}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, \hat{y}\right)\right) > b.$$

Let us discuss some intuitions for this property. Stationarity of a preference is usually explained by the fact that the evaluation (robust or not) is independent of the departure date. For example, consider the case of a close future index function that is defined as:

$$I_c(x) = \inf_{\delta \in \mathcal{D}} \left[ (1 - \delta) \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \delta^s x_s \right],$$

with  $\mathcal{D}$  is a closed subset of  $(0, 1)$ , as in Chambers and Echenique (2018). This corresponds to a situation where every expert's criterion is stationary, though they may have different discount rates. We can verify easily that the following claim is satisfied: for every  $T \geq 0$ , if  $\mathcal{C}\left(\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T-1]}, \hat{y}\right)\right) = \mathcal{C}(x) = b$ , then

$$\mathcal{C}\left(\frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T-1]}, \hat{y}\right)\right) > b \text{ if and only if } \mathcal{C}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T-1]}, x\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T-1]}, \hat{y}\right)\right) > b.$$

The robustly improving capacity using utility stream  $x$  does not depend on the departure date. As a result, the condition described in Chambers and Echenique (2018) can be viewed as a specific kind of stationarity.

This stationarity property is not satisfied now since it is assumed that each expert may be affected by temporal bias phenomena, hence we are interested in studying a weaker version of it. Axiom **A2** captures this bias phenomena, by assuming the existence of a  $T^*$ -delay equivalence of  $x$ , namely  $\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y\right)$ , with the property that, if we can robustly improve the delayed sequence  $\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, \hat{y}\right)$  by mixing it with  $x$ , then we obtain the same result using  $\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y\right)$ . In other words, the  $T^*$ -delay equivalence  $\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y\right)$  preserves the robustly improving capacity of  $x$  in mixing with delayed streams. We then can interpret the results in Proposition 4.1 as: beginning from the date  $T^*$  in the future, the robustly improving capacity does not depend on the beginning date of the stream. The evaluation of every expert becomes stationary after date  $T^*$ .

**PROPOSITION 4.1.** *Assume axiom **A1**. Assume also that the order  $\succeq_c$  is nontrivial and satisfies the delay stationarity property.*

- (i) Stationarity: *If  $T^* = 0$ , then there exists  $\mathcal{D} \subset (0, 1)$  such that  $\Omega_c$  is the convex hull of probabilities*

$$\left\{ \left( 1 - \delta, (1 - \delta)\delta, \dots, (1 - \delta)\delta^s, \dots \right) \right\}_{\delta \in \mathcal{D}}.$$

- (ii) Quasi-hyperbolic discounting: *Consider the case  $T^* = 1$ . By adding axiom **A2**, there exists  $\mathcal{D} \in (0, 1)^2$  such that  $\Omega_c$  is the convex hull of the probabilities*

$$\left\{ \left( 1 - \delta_o, \delta_o(1 - \delta), \delta_o\delta(1 - \delta), \delta_o\delta^2(1 - \delta), \dots, \delta_o(1 - \delta)\delta^s, \dots \right) \right\}_{(\delta_o, \delta) \in \mathcal{D}}.$$

- (iii)  $T^*$ -steps quasi hyperbolic discounting: *Consider the case  $T^* \geq 1$ . By adding axiom **A2**, there exists  $\mathcal{D} \in (0, 1)^{T^*+1}$  such that  $\Omega_c$  is the convex hull of the set of discount rate systems:*

$$\left\{ \left( 1 - \delta_o, \delta_o(1 - \delta_1), \delta_o\delta_1(1 - \delta_2), \dots, \delta_o\delta_1 \cdots \delta_{T^*-1}(1 - \delta), \dots \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \dots, \delta_o\delta_1 \cdots \delta_{T^*-1}\delta^s(1 - \delta), \dots \right) \right\}_{(\delta_o, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_{T^*-1}, \delta) \in \mathcal{D}}.$$

The Invariance to stationary relabeling property, which was imposed by [Chambers and Echenique \(2018\)](#), presupposes that that for any  $x$  that is equivalent to a constant sequence  $b\mathbf{1}$ ,  $x$  is equivalent to any convex combination between  $x$  and  $(b\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, x)$ , for every  $T$ . Recently, dealing with multiple temporal biased discount rates, working in a similar axiomatic system configuration, [Bach et al. \(2023\)](#) generalized their result with a property that is known as *delay*-Invariance to stationary relabeling, and obtained a multiple quasi-hyperbolic discounting representation. This condition and  $T^*$ -delay stationary have a common point in the sense that they both impose a weaker version of the stationarity property that is usually observed in exponential discounting(s).

The difference between the two mentioned papers and this one essentially comes from the fact that while [Chambers and Echenique \(2018\)](#) and [Bach et al. \(2023\)](#) worked on a complete order  $\succeq$  and established a MaxMin representation of the index function, this study works on a robust preorder  $\succeq^*$ , corresponding to a larger

family of possible orders and index functions, such as the  $\alpha$ -MaxMin representation. Unsurprisingly, the two different approaches involve two rather different systems of axioms.

### 4.3 TEMPORAL BIAS REPRESENTATION OF DISTANT FUTURE PRE-ORDER

Under the condition that  $\succeq_d$  satisfies the  $T^*$ -delay stability property, one can also obtain important properties of the set of purely finitely additive measures that characterize the preorders  $\succeq_d^*$ . The set  $\Omega_d$  builds from Banach limits. This reflects an exponential discounting property where the comparison between two sequences does not depend on the chosen date of the departure.

**PROPOSITION 4.2.** *Assume that the order  $\succeq_d$  is not trivial and satisfies  $T^*$ -delay stability with  $T^* \geq 1$ . Then every purely finitely additive probability  $\phi \in \Omega_d$  is a Banach limit: for every  $x \in \ell_\infty$ ,*

$$\phi \cdot x = \phi \cdot (o, x).$$

From this result, we have  $\phi \cdot x \geq \phi \cdot y$  if and only if  $\phi \cdot (o, x) \geq \phi \cdot (o, y)$ . This property echoes the stationarity of exponential discounting. The comparison between two utility streams under exponential discounting remains the same if we shift them to a future date, similar to the case of Banach limits. As a result, the Banach limits in the evaluation of the distant future can be considered as a counterpart of exponential discounting in the evaluation of the close future.

Axiom **A3** establishes that a utility stream dominates (or is dominated) by a constant one if and only if its values are all greater (or worse) in distant future.

**AXIOM A3.** For any  $x \in \ell_\infty$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

- (i) If there exist  $\epsilon > 0$  and an infinite number of times  $s$  such that  $b > x_s + \epsilon$ , then  $x \not\succeq_d^* b\mathbf{1}$ .
- (ii) If there exist  $\epsilon > 0$  and an infinite number of times  $s$  such that  $x_s > b + \epsilon$ , then  $b\mathbf{1} \not\succeq_d^* x$ .



**PROPOSITION 4.3.** *Assume that under the order  $\succeq_d$ , for every streams  $x$  and  $y$ ,  $x$  being potentially better than  $y$  implies  $x \succeq_d y$ . Adding axiom **A3**, there exists unique  $0 \leq \alpha_d \leq 1$  such that the distant future index function can be represented as:*

$$I_d(x) = \alpha_d \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_s + (1 - \alpha_d) \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_s.$$

## 5. CONCLUSION

This article deviates from the classical method of intertemporal preferences analysis.<sup>15</sup> We offer a new approach to the literature using utility streams rather than choice under uncertainty over a range of states of the world. This approach enables us to characterize preferences by sets of finitely additive probabilities, using techniques well developed in decision theory. This work makes three major contributions: it considers the distant future, it identifies circumstances that guarantee  $\alpha$ -MaxMin representations, and provides a generalized form of multiple quasi-hyperbolic discounting. The method used, which involves robust comparison, may complement the approaches followed by [Chambers and Echenique \(2018\)](#) and [Bach et al. \(2023\)](#) in the studies of temporal preferences.

The results can be used to depict how rational economic agents would behave if they were given advice by a group of experts with a finite range of temporal biases. By observing the choice between couples of streams that “potentially better” comparable, we can determine whether our agent has a MaxMin, MaxMax or  $\alpha$ -MaxMin criteria. The parameter  $\alpha$  could be used as a degree of prudence while considering experts’ opinions. The case  $\alpha = 0$  corresponds to a very high prudence level. The agent exclusively evaluates  $x$  values at least  $b$  if and only if experts unanimously agree with that. Case  $\alpha = 1$  represents an opposite behavior, where the evaluation of at least one expert is sufficient.

The issue of how to incorporate these preferences in an optimization context with long-term policies, for example, optimal growth model with natural resources, espe-

---

<sup>15</sup>To name some contributions in the axiomatic of discounted utilities literature, see the seminal articles by [Koopmans \(1960\)](#) and [Koopmans \(1972\)](#), or more recent ones, [Fishburn and Rubinstein \(1982\)](#) and [Dolmas \(1995\)](#). For a review, see [Bleichrodt et al. \(2008\)](#).

cially the renewable ones, could be of interest. However, in our opinion, this question is complicated, and that should be the subject of another research, hopefully in the close future.

## A. MATHEMATICAL PREPARATIONS

### A.1 TOPOLOGIES

The set of bounded utility streams  $\ell_\infty$  is equipped the sup –norm topology. A sequence of streams  $\{x_n\}_{n=0}^\infty \subset \ell_\infty$  converges to  $x$  in this topology if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \sup_{s \geq 0} |x_{n,s} - x_s| \right] = 0.$$

The set of continuous linear functions defined on  $\ell_\infty$ , namely its *dual*, is denoted by  $(\ell_\infty)^*$ . This set can be decomposed as  $(\ell_\infty)^* = \ell_1 \oplus \ell_1^d$ . The set  $\ell_1$  is constituted by real number sequences  $\omega = (\omega_0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$  such that

$$\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} |\omega_s| < \infty.$$

A sequence of  $\{\omega^n\}_{n=0}^\infty \subset \ell_1$  converges to  $\omega$  in *weak*-topology if for every  $x \in \ell_\infty$ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s^n x_s = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s x_s.$$

Sometimes, instead of  $\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s x_s$ , we can write simply  $\omega \cdot x$ . If  $\omega_s \geq 0$  for every  $s$  and  $\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s = 1$ , we call  $\omega$  a countably additive probability.

The set  $\ell_1^d$  is constituted by purely finitely signed measures.<sup>16</sup> In this article, we will focus only on a special subset of it, the set of purely finitely additive probabilities, with a characterization that will be presented in the second part of this section.

### A.2 CHARACTERIZATION SET OF THE ROBUST PREORDER AND PROBABILITY DECOMPOSITION

Fix an order  $\widehat{\succeq} \in \{\succeq_c, \succeq_d\}$ . Suppose that this order is not trivial. Define  $\widehat{\Omega}$  as:

$$\widehat{\Omega} = \left\{ P \in (\ell_\infty)^* \text{ such that } P \cdot x \geq 0 \text{ for every } x \widehat{\succeq}^* 0 \mathbf{1} \text{ and } P \cdot \mathbf{1} = 1 \right\}.$$

---

<sup>16</sup>See [Dunford and Schwartz \(1966\)](#).

It is obvious the set  $\widehat{\Omega}$  is convex. Moreover, if a stream  $x$  satisfies  $x_s \geq 0$  for every  $x$ , then  $P \cdot x \geq 0$  for every  $P \in \widehat{\Omega}$ . This means a  $P \in \widehat{\Omega}$  can be considered a measure on the set of natural numbers  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , in the sense that for every subset  $S \subset \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , we may define  $P(S)$  as  $P \cdot x$ , where  $x_s = 1$  if  $s \in S$  and  $x_s = 0$  if  $s \notin S$ . Using Theorems 1.23 and 1.24 in [Yosida and Hewitt \(1952\)](#), each  $P$  belonging to  $\widehat{\Omega}$  is a finitely additive probability on  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  and can be decomposed as

$$P = (1 - \lambda)\omega + \lambda\phi,$$

where  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ ,  $\omega$  is a countably additive probability belonging to  $\ell_1$ , and  $\phi$  is a purely finitely additive probability belonging to  $\ell_1^d$ .

To be precise,  $\phi$  satisfies the following property: if  $\tilde{\omega} \in \ell_1$  such that  $\tilde{\omega}_s \geq 0 \forall s$  and for every subset  $S \subset \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , we have  $\sum_{s \in S} \tilde{\omega}_s \leq \phi(S)$ , then  $\tilde{\omega}_s = 0$  for every  $s$ . In other words, the evaluation of  $x \in \ell_\infty$  under  $\phi$ , the value  $\phi \cdot x$ , is not affected if we change only a finite numbers of values  $x_s$ . For every  $x, y \in \ell_\infty$  and  $T \geq 0$ , we obtain  $\phi \cdot (y_{[0, T]}, x_{[T+1, \infty)}) = \phi \cdot x$ . Hence, we can consider  $\phi$  an evaluation of the distant future of utility streams. Function  $\phi$  is called a Banach limit if for every  $x \in \ell_\infty$ , we have  $\phi \cdot x = \phi \cdot (0, x)$ .

This decomposition will be used in the establishment of finitely additive probabilities that characterize the robust order  $\widehat{\succeq}$ , Propositions [3.1](#) and [3.2](#).

For a given convex subset  $\Omega_c \subset \ell_1$ ,  $\omega$  is an exposed point of  $\Omega_c$  if there exists  $x \in \ell_\infty$  such that  $\tilde{\omega} \cdot x > \omega \cdot x$  for every  $\tilde{\omega} \in \Omega_c \setminus \{\omega\}$ . Though in this article, we consider only the exposed points of a convex set in  $\ell_1$ , curious readers may refer to the note of [Radner \(1965\)](#) on the same objects in the space of  $\ell_\infty$ . Recently, [Becker \(2022\)](#) gave an interesting discussion on the subject, concerning not only exposed points, but also Banach limits that appear in Proposition [4.2](#).

## B. PROOF OF LEMMA [2.1](#)

Fix  $x \in \ell_\infty$ . To simplify the exposition, let  $a = I_c(x)$  and  $b = I_d(x)$ . We will prove that the evaluation of the whole stream  $I(x)$  is a convex combination of  $a$  and  $b$  and that the parameter of the convex combination depends on these two values.

According to the monotonicity property, the parameters  $\chi_g$  and  $\chi_\ell$  are limits of

decreasing sequences. Hence, they are well defined.

Now, we prove the following assertion

$$I(x) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} I(a\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, b\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}).$$

This is obviously true if the close future order  $\succeq_c$  is trivial, with a consequence that  $\succeq = \succeq_d$ . Consider the case that  $\succeq_c$  is nontrivial. Fix any  $\epsilon > 0$ . From the distant future insensitivity property, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_c(x) &> I_c((a - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}) \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} I_c((a - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, (b - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for  $T$  that is sufficiently large,  $x \succeq_c ((a - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, (b - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)})$ .

From the close future insensitivity property,

$$\begin{aligned} I_d(x) &\geq I_d((b - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}) \\ &= I_d((a - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, (b - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}), \end{aligned}$$

for every  $T$ . Hence,  $x \succeq_d ((a - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, (b - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)})$ .

According to the consistency property, for every  $T$  that is sufficiently large, we have

$$x \succeq ((a - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, (b - \epsilon)\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}).$$

This implies

$$I(x) \geq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} I(a\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, b\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}) - \epsilon.$$

Using the same arguments, we get

$$I(x) \leq \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} I(a\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, b\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}) + \epsilon.$$

Since  $\epsilon$  is chosen arbitrarily,

$$I(x) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} I(a\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, b\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}).$$

The assertion has been proven. Now, assume that  $I_c(x) \leq I_d(x)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} I(x) &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} I(a\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, b\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}) \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} I(\mathbf{0}\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, (b - a)\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}) + a \\ &= (b - a) \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} I(\mathbf{0}\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, \mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}) + a \\ &= (b - a)\chi_g + a \\ &= (1 - \chi_g)I_c(x) + \chi_g I_d(x). \end{aligned}$$

Consider the case  $I_c(x) \geq I_d(x)$ . Observe that

$$\chi_\ell = 1 - \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} I(\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, \mathbf{0}\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}).$$

Using the same arguments as in the first part of the proof, we have

$$I(x) = (1 - \chi_\ell)I_c(x) + \chi_\ell I_d(x).$$

## C. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.1

Consider the case  $\chi_g \leq \chi_\ell$ . For a stream  $x$ , if  $I_c(x) \leq I_d(x)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(x) &= (1 - \chi_g)I_c(x) + \chi_g I_d(x) \\ &= \min_{\chi_g \leq \lambda \leq \chi_\ell} [(1 - \lambda)I_c(x) + \lambda I_d(x)]. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality comes from  $I_c(x) \leq I_d(x)$  and  $\chi_g \leq \chi_\ell$ .

If  $I_c(x) \geq I_d(x)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(x) &= (1 - \chi_\ell)I_c(x) + \chi_\ell I_d(x) \\ &= \min_{\chi_g \leq \lambda \leq \chi_\ell} [(1 - \lambda)I_c(x) + \lambda I_d(x)]. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality comes from  $I_c(x) \geq I_d(x)$  and  $\chi_g \leq \chi_\ell$ .

Using the same arguments, in the case  $\chi_g \geq \chi_\ell$ , for every stream  $x$ ,

$$I(x) = \max_{\chi_\ell \leq \lambda \leq \chi_g} [(1 - \lambda)I_c(x) + \lambda I_d(x)].$$

## D. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1

Relying upon the same arguments as in Section **A**, there exists a set of finitely additive probabilities  $\Omega_c \subset (\ell_\infty)^*$  such that

$$x \succeq_c^* y \Leftrightarrow P \cdot x \geq P \cdot y,$$

for every  $P \in \Omega_c$ . By [Yosida and Hewitt \(1952\)](#), every  $P \in \Omega_c$  can be decomposed as  $P = (1 - \lambda)\omega + \lambda\phi$ , with  $\omega \in \ell_1$  is a countable additivity probability and  $\phi$  is a purely finitely additive probability.

Suppose that  $\lambda\phi \neq 0$ , or equivalently  $\lambda\phi \cdot \mathbf{1} > 0$ . Fix  $b$  such that  $1 - \lambda < b < 1$ . By axiom **A1**, there exists a large enough  $T_0$  such that for  $T \geq T_0$ ,

$$\left(\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, 0\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}\right) \succeq_c^* b\mathbf{1}.$$

Hence,

$$\left((1 - \lambda)\omega, \lambda\phi\right) \cdot \left(\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, 0\mathbf{1}_{[T+1,\infty)}\right) \geq b,$$

with a direct consequence that  $1 - \lambda \geq b$ , a contradiction.

To sum up, for every  $\left((1 - \lambda), \lambda\phi\right) \in \Omega_c$ ,  $\lambda\phi = 0$ . Hence,  $\Omega_c$  can be considered a subset of probabilities that is included in  $\ell_1$ . Moreover, for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $T$  such that  $\sum_{s=0}^T \omega_s > 1 - \epsilon$  for every  $\omega \in \Omega_c$ . By the Dunford-Petit criterion in [Dunford and Schwartz \(1966\)](#), this implies the weak compactness of  $\Omega_c$  in  $\ell_1$ . This property will be used in the proof of [Proposition 4.1](#).

## E. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.2

Let  $\Omega_d$  be the set of finitely additive probabilities being defined as  $P \in \Omega_d$  if and only if  $P \cdot \mathbf{1} = 1$  and  $P \cdot x \geq 0$  for every  $x$  such that  $x \succeq_d^* 0\mathbf{1}$ . As presented in [Section A](#), by [Yosida and Hewitt \(1952\)](#), a probability  $P \in \Omega_d$  can be decomposed as  $P = (1 - \lambda)\omega + \lambda\phi$ , with  $\omega \in \ell_1$  is a countably additive probability and  $\phi$  is a purely finitely additive probability belonging to  $\ell_d^1$ .

We prove that  $(1 - \lambda)\omega = 0$ . Indeed, suppose the contrary. Then  $\lambda < 1$  and there exists  $T$  such that  $\omega_T > 0$ . Take a constant  $c > 0$  such that  $(1 - \lambda)\omega_T c > \lambda$  and let  $x = \left(-c\mathbf{1}_{[0,T]}, \mathbf{1}\right)$ . For every  $z \in \ell_\infty$  one has  $I_d(x + z) = I_d(\mathbf{1} + z) \geq I_d(z)$ . Hence,  $x \succeq_d^* 0\mathbf{1}$ . Then

$$(1 - \lambda)\omega \cdot x + \lambda\phi \cdot x \geq 0,$$

which implies  $-(1 - \lambda)\omega_T c + \lambda \geq 0$ , a contradiction. This contradiction implies that  $(1 - \lambda)\omega = 0$ , which also implies  $\lambda = 1$ . The weights set  $\Omega_d$  can be considered a subset of purely finitely additive probabilities belonging to  $\ell_d^1$ .

## F. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.3

Fix an order  $\hat{\succeq}$  belonging to  $\{\succeq_c, \succeq_d\}$ . Assume that being potentially better in the first category implies to be preferred. Consider two streams  $x$  and  $y$ , we will prove

that  $x$  is potentially better than  $y$  in the first category if and only if:

$$\inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x \geq \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y.$$

Assume that  $x$  is potentially better than  $y$  under  $\widehat{\succeq}$ . Stream  $y$  robustly dominates a constant one  $b\mathbf{1}$  if and only if  $\inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y \geq b$ . Let  $b = \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y$ . By the very definition of the first category of the potentially better property, we have  $x \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1}$ , with a direct consequence that  $\inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x \geq \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y$ .

Assume that  $\inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x \geq \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y$ . If  $y \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1}$ , then  $\inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x \geq \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y \geq b$ . This implies that  $x \widehat{\succeq}^* b\mathbf{1}$ .

The condition of Proposition 3.3(i) is thus equivalent to: if  $\inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x \geq \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y$ , then  $x \widehat{\succeq} y$ . For every stream  $x$ , let  $b = \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x$  and  $y = b\mathbf{1}$ . Since  $\inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x = \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y$ , we have  $x \widehat{\sim} y$ , with  $\widehat{I}(x) = b$  as a direct consequence.

As for part (ii), using the same arguments, we can prove that if having more potential in the second category implies to be preferred,  $\widehat{I}(x) = \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x$ .

Consider the most interesting part, namely (iii). Using the same arguments as in the proof of part (i), the condition in part (iii) can be rewritten as: if  $\inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x \geq \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y$  and  $\sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x \geq \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y$ , then  $x \widehat{\succeq} y$ .

For every  $x$ , it is obvious that  $\sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x \widehat{\succeq} \widehat{I}(x) \widehat{\succeq} \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x$ . Hence, there exists  $0 \leq \alpha_x \leq 1$  such that

$$\widehat{I}(x) = \alpha_x \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x + (1 - \alpha_x) \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x.$$

If  $\inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x < \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x$ , the value  $\alpha_x$  is unique.

To end the proof and establish an  $\alpha$ -MaxMin representation, we prove that for every streams  $x$  and  $y$  such that  $\inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x < \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x$  and  $\inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y < \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y$ , we obtain  $\alpha_x = \alpha_y$ .

First, observe that we can find  $\lambda > 0$  and a constant  $b$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y + b &= \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x, \\ \lambda \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y + b &= \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\tilde{x} = \lambda y + b$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{I}(\tilde{x}) &= \lambda \widehat{I}(y) + b, \\ \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot \tilde{x} &= \lambda \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y + b, \\ \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot \tilde{x} &= \lambda \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot y + b.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\alpha_{\tilde{x}} = \alpha_y$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot \tilde{x} &= \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x, \\ \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot \tilde{x} &= \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\tilde{x} \sim x$ . This implies  $\widehat{I}(\tilde{x}) = \widehat{I}(x)$ , and  $\alpha_x = \alpha_y$ . Let the common value be  $\alpha$ .

For every stream  $x$ , we have

$$\widehat{I}(x) = \alpha \sup_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x + (1 - \alpha) \inf_{P \in \widehat{\Omega}} P \cdot x.$$

## G. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.1

The proof of this proposition begins by a preparative Lemma G.1. Under the hypothesis that the close future order  $\succeq_c$  satisfies definition 4.1, for each stream  $x$ , the value of the worst-case scenario corresponding to  $(b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x)$ , evaluated under order  $\succeq_c$ , neither change with a shift of the stream to the future nor with a convex combination with this shift. In other words, beginning from  $T^*$ , the robust order satisfies a version of stationarity.

**LEMMA G.1.** *Assume that the order  $\succeq_c$  is not trivial and satisfies the  $T^*$ -delay stationarity property.*

(i) *For any constant  $b$ ,  $(b \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x) \succeq_c^* b \mathbf{1}$  implies:*

$$(b \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x) \succeq_c^* (b \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*]}, x) \succeq_c^* (b \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*+1]}, x) \succeq_c^* \dots \succeq_c^* b \mathbf{1}.$$

(ii) *If  $b^* = \mathcal{C}((b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x))$ , then for any  $T \geq T^*$ ,*

$$\mathcal{C}(b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T]}, x) = b^*.$$



(iii) If  $b^* = \mathcal{C}((b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x))$ , then for any  $T \geq T^*$ ,

$$\mathcal{C}\left(\frac{1}{2}(b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x) + \frac{1}{2}(b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T]}, x)\right) = b^*.$$

*Proof.* The proof of part (i) is obvious, using delay stationary property.

(ii) It is obvious that if  $x \succeq_c^* y$ , then  $\mathcal{C}(x) \geq \mathcal{C}(y)$ . Let  $b^* = \mathcal{C}(b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x)$ . From part (i), for  $T \geq T^*$ ,

$$(b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x) \succeq_c^* (b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T]}, x) \succeq_c^* b^* \mathbf{1}.$$

This implies  $b^* = \mathcal{C}(b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x) \geq \mathcal{C}(b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T]}, x) \geq b^*$ .

(iii) Since  $(b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x) \succeq_c^* (b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T]}, x)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} b^* &= \mathcal{C}\left((b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x)\right) \\ &\geq \mathcal{C}\left(\frac{1}{2}(b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x) + \frac{1}{2}(b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T]}, x)\right) \\ &\geq b^*. \end{aligned}$$

QED

Now, return to the main part of the proof. For each probability  $\omega = (\omega_0, \omega_1, \dots) \in \ell_1$  and  $T \geq 0$ , let  $\omega^T$  be the probability defined as

$$\omega_s^T = \frac{\omega_{T+s}}{\sum_{s'=0}^{\infty} \omega_{T+s'}}.$$

It is worth noting that, for  $x \in \ell_\infty$  and a constant  $b$ ,  $\omega \cdot (b \mathbf{1}_{[0, T-1]}, x) = b$  if and only if  $\omega^T \cdot x = b$ .

Let  $\Omega_c^{T^*} = \{\omega^{T^*} \text{ such that } \omega \in \Omega_c\}$ . First, observe that from axiom **A1**, we have  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$  is a weak compact subset of  $\ell_1$ . Take  $\omega \in \Omega_c$  such that  $\omega^{T^*}$  is an exposed point of  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$ .

We will prove that  $\omega^{T^*} = (\omega^{T^*})^T$  for all  $T \geq 0$ .

From the definition of  $\omega$ , there exists  $x \in \ell_\infty$  such that  $\omega^{T^*} \cdot x < \tilde{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot x$  for every  $\tilde{\omega} \in \Omega_c \setminus \{\omega\}$ . Let  $b^* = \omega^{T^*} \cdot x$ . It is obvious that the following inequality is verified:

$$b^* = \omega \cdot (b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x) < \tilde{\omega} \cdot (b^* \mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x).$$

This implies that  $\mathcal{C}\left(\left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*-1]},x\right)\right)=b^*$ . Obviously,  $\left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*-1]},x\right)\succeq_c^* b^*\mathbf{1}$ . Fix  $T \geq 0$  and from Lemma G.1,

$$\mathcal{C}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*-1]},x\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*+T]},x\right)\right)=b^*.$$

This implies that there exists  $\omega'$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} b^* &= \omega' \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*-1]},x\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*+T]},x\right)\right) \\ &= \min_{\omega \in \Omega_c} \omega \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*-1]},x\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*+T]},x\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

From (i),  $\omega' \cdot \left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*-1]},x\right) \geq b^*$  and  $\omega' \cdot \left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*+T]},x^*\right) \geq b^*$ . It follows that

$$\omega' \cdot \left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*-1]},x\right) = \omega' \cdot \left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*+T]},x^*\right) = b^*.$$

Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} (\omega')^{T^*} \cdot x &= b^*, \\ (\omega')^{T^*} \cdot \left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*+T]},x\right) &= b^*. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\omega^{T^*}$  is an exposed point of  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$ , the first equality implies that  $(\omega')^{T^*} = \omega^{T^*}$ .

Observe that  $\omega \cdot \left(b^*\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*+T]},x\right) = b^*$  is equivalent to  $(\omega^{T^*})^T \cdot x = b^*$ . Moreover,  $(\omega^{T^*})^T$  belongs to  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$ . Indeed, suppose the contrary: from the weak compactness of  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$ , there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that the intersection between  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$  and the open set  $\{\tilde{\omega} \text{ such that } \|\tilde{\omega} - (\omega^{T^*})^T\|_{\ell_1} < \epsilon\}$  is empty. From Hahn-Banach theorem, there exist  $x'$  and a constant  $b$  such that  $\tilde{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot x' > b > \omega^{T^*} \cdot x'$  for every  $\tilde{\omega} \in \Omega_c$ . This implies that  $\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*-1]},x'\right) \succeq_c^* b\mathbf{1}$  and therefore that  $\left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*-1]},x'\right) \succeq_c^* \left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*+T]},x'\right) \succeq_c^* b\mathbf{1}$ , hence  $\omega \cdot \left(b\mathbf{1}_{[0,T^*+T]},x'\right) \geq b$ , which is equivalent to  $(\omega^{T^*})^T \cdot x' \geq b$ , a contradiction.

The probability  $(\omega^{T^*})^T$  belongs to  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$ , and satisfies  $(\omega^{T^*})^T \cdot x = b^*$ . From the definition of  $\omega^{T^*}$  and  $x$ ,  $\omega^{T^*} = (\omega^{T^*})^T$ , for every  $T \geq 0$ . It follows that

$$\omega_s^{T^*} = \frac{\omega_{T^*+T+s}}{\sum_{s'=0}^{\infty} \omega_{T^*+T+s'}} \text{ and } \omega_{s+1}^{T^*} = \frac{\omega_{T^*+T+s+1}}{\sum_{s'=0}^{\infty} \omega_{T^*+T+s'}}.$$

This implies that for every  $T, s$ :

$$\frac{\omega_{s+1}^{T^*}}{\omega_s^{T^*}} = \frac{\omega_{T^*+T+s+1}}{\omega_{T^*+T+s}}.$$

This is equivalent, for some  $\delta > 0$  and for every  $s \geq 0$ , to

$$\frac{\omega_{s+1}^{T^*}}{\omega_s^{T^*}} = \delta,$$

or to  $\omega_s^{T^*} = \delta^s \omega_0^{T^*}$  for every  $s \geq 0$ . Since  $\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \omega_s^{T^*} = 1$ , we have  $0 < \delta < 1$  and  $\omega_s = (1 - \delta)\delta^s$  for  $s \geq 0$ .

To sum up, every exposed point of  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$  has an exponential representation. The set  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$  is weakly compact, according to Theorem 4 in [Amir and Lindentrauss \(1968\)](#),  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$  is the convex hull of its exposed points. This implies the existence of a subset  $D^* \subset (0, 1)$  such that

$$\Omega_c^{T^*} = \text{convex} \left\{ (1 - \delta, (1 - \delta)\delta, \dots, (1 - \delta)\delta^s, \dots) \right\}_{\delta \in D^*}.$$

Part (i), where  $T^* = 0$  is proven.

Consider the case  $T^* \geq 1$ . Observe that if  $\omega^{T^*}$  is an exposed point of  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$ , then  $\omega$  is an exposed point of  $\Omega_c$ . Indeed, in that case, there exists  $x \in \ell_\infty$  such that  $\omega^{T^*} \cdot x < \tilde{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot x$  for every  $\tilde{\omega} \in \Omega_c \setminus \{\omega\}$ . Let  $b = \omega^{T^*} \cdot x$ . It is easy to verify that  $b = \omega \cdot (b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x)$  and  $b < \tilde{\omega} \cdot (b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, x)$ . Hence,  $\omega$  is an exposed point of  $\Omega_c$ .

Consider an exposed point  $\omega$  of  $\Omega_c$ . We will prove that  $\omega^{T^*}$  is an exposed point of  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$ . In this stage of the proof, we need axiom **A2**, to prove that the  $T^*$ -delay equivalence of an exposed point of  $\Omega_c$  is an exposed point of  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$ .

By the choice of  $\omega$ , there exists  $x \in \ell_\infty$  such that  $\omega \cdot x < \tilde{\omega} \cdot x$ , for every  $\tilde{\omega} \in \Omega_c \setminus \{\omega\}$ . Let  $b = \mathcal{C}(x) = \omega \cdot x$ . Consider the utility stream  $y$ , which is a  $T^*$ -delay equivalence of  $x$ , being defined in the statement of axiom **A2**. Taking  $\hat{y} = y$ , from the obvious property  $\mathcal{C}\left(\frac{1}{2}(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y) + \frac{1}{2}(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y)\right) = b$ , one has

$$\mathcal{C}\left(\frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y)\right) = b.$$

Using the same arguments as those used in the proof of Lemma [G.1](#), we obtain

$$\omega \cdot x = \omega \cdot (b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y) = b.$$

Since  $\mathcal{C}\left((c\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y)\right) = b$ , for every  $\tilde{\omega} \in \Omega_c$ ,  $\tilde{\omega} \cdot (b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y) \geq b$ , which is equivalent to  $\tilde{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot y \geq b$ . We prove that for every exposed point  $\hat{\omega}^{T^*}$  of  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$  that differs to  $\omega^{T^*}$ ,  $\hat{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot y > b$ .

Assume the contrary, and consider a point  $\hat{\omega}^{T^*}$ , which is an exposed point and  $\hat{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot y = b$ . There exists  $y'$  such that  $\hat{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot y' < \tilde{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot y'$ , for every  $\tilde{\omega}^{T^*} \in \Omega^{T^*} \setminus \{\hat{\omega}^{T^*}\}$ , including  $\omega^{T^*}$ . Let  $\hat{y} = y' + (b - \hat{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot y') \mathbf{1}$ . The stream  $\hat{y}$  satisfies

$$b = \hat{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot \hat{y} < \tilde{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot \hat{y},$$

for every  $\tilde{\omega}^{T^*} \in \Omega^{T^*} \setminus \{\hat{\omega}^{T^*}\}$ , including  $\omega^{T^*}$ . Moreover, for every  $\tilde{\omega}^{T^*} \in \Omega_c^{T^*}$ ,

$$\tilde{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{2}y + \frac{1}{2}\hat{y} \right) \geq b,$$

with the equality being obtained at  $\tilde{\omega}^{T^*} = \hat{\omega}^{T^*}$ . One has

$$\mathcal{C} \left( \frac{1}{2}(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y) + \frac{1}{2}(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, \hat{y}) \right) = b.$$

Contrary to this, inequality  $\omega^{T^*} \cdot y' > b$  implies  $\omega \cdot (b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, y') > b$ , and

$$\omega \cdot \left( \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, \hat{y}) \right) > b.$$

For any  $\tilde{\omega} \in \Omega_c \setminus \{\omega\}$ ,  $\tilde{\omega} \cdot x > b$ . Hence, the satisfaction of the strict inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\omega} \left( \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, \hat{y}) \right) &= \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\omega} \cdot x + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\omega} \cdot (b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, \hat{y}) \\ &> b. \end{aligned}$$

The compactness of  $\Omega_c$  implies that  $\mathcal{C} \left( \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T^*-1]}, \hat{y}) \right) > b$ , a contradiction. Hence, for every  $\hat{\omega}^{T^*} \in \Omega_c^{T^*} \setminus \{\omega^{T^*}\}$ , one has  $\hat{\omega}^{T^*} \cdot y > b$ . This implies  $\omega^{T^*}$  is an exposed point of  $\Omega_c^{T^*}$ , and has an exponential representation with some discount rate  $\delta$ . It is easy to find  $\delta_0, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_{T^*-1} \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\omega_0 = 1 - \delta_0, \omega_1 = \delta_0(1 - \delta_1), \dots, \omega_{T^*-1} = \delta_0\delta_1 \dots \delta_{T^*-1}(1 - \delta)$  and  $\omega_{T+s} = \delta_0\delta_1 \dots \delta_{T^*-1} \times \delta^s(1 - \delta)$ , for  $s \geq 0$ .

The set  $\Omega_c$  being the convex hull of its exposed points, the proof is completed.

## H. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.2

Fix  $b \leq \inf_{s \geq 0} x_s$ . Obviously, for every  $T \geq T^*$ ,  $(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T]}, x_{[T+1, \infty)}) \succeq_d^* b\mathbf{1}$ . It follows that

$$(b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T]}, x_{[T+1, \infty)}) \succeq^* (b\mathbf{1}_{[0, T+1]}, x_{[T+1, \infty)}).$$

From the head-insensitivity property of the distant future order  $\succeq_d$ ,

$$x \succeq_d^* (\mathbf{o}, x).$$

Hence, for every purely finitely additive probability  $\phi$  belonging to  $\Omega_d$ ,

$$\phi \cdot x \geq \phi \cdot (\mathbf{o}, x).$$

By applying the same arguments with  $-x$  in the place of  $x$ , and  $b \leq -\sup_{s \geq 0} x_s$ , it follows that  $\phi \cdot (-x) \geq \phi \cdot (\mathbf{o}, -x)$ . From the linearity of  $\phi$ , we obtain

$$\phi \cdot x = \phi \cdot (\mathbf{o}, x).$$

## I. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.3

First, observe that for every purely finitely additive probability  $\phi \in \Omega_d$ ,  $x \in \ell_\infty$ , one has

$$\liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_s \leq \phi \cdot x \leq \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_s.$$

Axiom **A3** implies that

$$\inf_{\phi \in \Omega_d} \phi \cdot x = \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_s,$$

$$\sup_{\phi \in \Omega_d} \phi \cdot x = \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_s.$$

Indeed, assume the contrary. Consider the case  $\liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_s < \inf_{\phi \in \Omega_d} \phi \cdot x$ . This implies the existence of  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $b > \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_s + \epsilon$  and  $x \succeq_d^* b\mathbf{1}$ , a contradiction with part (i) of axiom **A3**. For the case in which  $\sup_{\phi \in \Omega_d} \phi \cdot x < \limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} x_s$ , using part (ii), similar arguments lead us to a contradiction.

Therefore, the decomposition is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.3.

## REFERENCES

- AMIR, D. and J. LINDENTRAUSS (1968): The Structure of Weakly Compact Sets in Banach Spaces, *Annals of Mathematics* 88, 35-46.
- BACH D. X., BICH, P. and B. WIGNIOLLE (2023): Prudent aggregation of quasi-hyperbolic experts. *Working paper*.

- BEISSNER, P., Q. LIN and F. RIEDEL (2020): Dynamically Consistent  $\alpha$ -MaxMin Expected Utility, *Mathematical Finance* 30, 1073-1102.
- BEISSNER, P. and J. WERNER (2021): Optimal Allocations with  $\alpha$ -MEU, CEU and CPT, *Working Paper*.
- BECKER, R. A. (2022): Maximal points of convex set in  $\ell_\infty$  revisited, *Pure and Applied Functional Analysis* 7, 2003-2039.
- BECKER, R.A. and J. H. BOYD (1997): Capital Theory, Equilibrium Analysis an Recursive Utility, *Blackwell*.
- BEWLEY, T.F. (2002): Knightian Decision Theory. Part I. *Decisions in Economics and Finance* 25, 79-110.
- BHASKARA RAO, K.P.S. and M. BHASKARA RAO (1983): Theory of Charges. *Academic Press*.
- BLEICHRODT, H., K. ROHDE and P. WAKKER (2008): Koopmans' constant discounting for intertemporal choice: a simplification and a generalisation, *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 52, 341-347.
- BROWN, D. and L. LEWIS (1981): Myopic Economic Agents, *Econometrica* 49, 369-268.
- CHATEAUNEUF, A., X. QU, C. VENTURA and V. VERGOPOULOS (2021): On the Falsifiability of  $\alpha$ -MaxMin, *Working Paper*.
- CHAMBERS, C. and F. ECHENIQUE (2018): On multiple discount rates, *Econometrica* 86, 1325-1346.
- DE ANDRADE, M., L. BASTIANELLO and J. ORRILLO (2021): Future Blindness, *Working Paper*.
- DOLMAS, J. (1995): Time-additive Representations of Preferences when Consumption grows without Bound, *Economic Letters* 47, 317-325.
- DRUGEON, J.-P. and T. HA-HUY (2022): A not so Myopic Axiomatisation of Discounting, *Economic Theory* 73, 349-376.

- DRUGEON, J.-P. and T. HA-HUY (2023): Time-Varying Discount Rates with Recursive Time-Dependent Orders, *Working Paper*.
- DUNFORD N. and J. T. SCHWARTZ (1966): Linear Operators, Part I : general Theory," 3rd ed., *Interscience*, New York, 1966.
- FISHBURN, P. and A. RUBINSTEIN (1982): Time Preference, *International Economic Review* 23, 677-694.
- FRICK, M., R. IJIMA and Y. LE YAOUANQ (2022): Objective Rationality Foundations for (Dynamic)  $\alpha$ -MEU, *Journal of Economic Theory* 200, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2021.105394>.
- GHIRARDATO, P., F. MACCHERONI and M. MARINACCI (2004): Differentiating Ambiguity and Ambiguity Attitude, *Journal of Economic Theory* 118, 133-173.
- GILBOA, I. and D. SCHMEIDLER (1989): MaxMin expected utility with non-unique prior, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 18, 141-153.
- GILLES, C. (1989): Charges as Equilibrium prices and Asset Bubbles, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 18, 155-167.
- HURWICZ, L. (1951): Some Specification Problems and Applications to Econometric Models, *Econometrica* 19, 343-344.
- KARNI, E., F. MACCHERONI and M. MARINACCI (2022): David Schmeidler's contributions to decision theory, *Theory and Decision* **93**: 219-235.
- KOOPMANS, T. J. (1960): Stationary Ordinal Utility and Impatience, *Econometrica* 28, 287-309.
- KOOPMANS, T. J. (1972): T.J. Representation of Preference Orderings over Time. In: *Decision and Organisation*. McGuire, C. and R. Radner, eds. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- KOPYLOV, I. (2003):  $\alpha$ -MaxMin Expected Utility, *Working Paper*.
- LAIBSON, D. (1997): Golden Eggs and Hyperbolic Discounting, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112, 443-478.

- MONTIEL OLEA J. L. and T. STRZALECKI (2014): Axiomatisation and Measurement of Quasi-Hyperbolic discounting, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1449-1499.
- PHELPS, P. and R. POLLACK (1968): On Second-best National Saving and Game-Equilibrium Growth, *Review of Economics Studies* 35, 185-199.
- RADNER, R. (1965): A note on maximal points of convex sets in  $\ell_\infty$ , *Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Probability and Statistics*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- SAWYER, C. (1988): Stationary Recursive Preferences: Myopia and Impatience Reconsidered—the Many Goods Case, *Working Paper*.
- TRAUTMAN, S. T., and G. VAN DE KUILEN (2015): Ambiguity Attitudes, *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of Judgment and Decision Making* 2, 89-116.
- WAKAI, T. (2007): A Model of Utility Smoothing, *Econometrica* 73, 157-63, 2007.
- YOSIDA K. and E. HEWITT (1952): Finitely additive measures. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 72, 46-66.