

# STK4540: Non-life Insurance Mathematics

## First assignment

This assignment consists of two exercises, but the second one is only optional! Focus on Exercise 1 first. The deadline is Thursday 3rd of October at 14:30. To pass the assignment you just need to have **one** correct item out of the 12 items in Exercise 1. Pretty easy! But as a teacher I strongly encourage you to try to solve the whole assignment, including the optional exercise. Good luck!

### Exercise 1

In this exercise we are interested in the law of the minimum and maximum of the claim sizes and the total aggregate claim size associated to an insurance portfolio. Consider a flow of i.i.d. claims  $X_1, \dots, X_n, \dots$  with common distribution function  $F$  such that  $F(0) = 0$ , and a Poisson random variable  $N_\lambda$  independent of the claims with intensity  $\lambda > 0$  describing the count number of claims.

- (a) Consider the random variables  $U_\lambda = \min\{X_1, \dots, X_{N_\lambda}\}$  if  $N_\lambda > 0$  and  $U_\lambda = 0$  and  $V_\lambda = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_{N_\lambda}\}$  if  $N_\lambda > 0$  and  $V_\lambda = 0$  if  $N_\lambda = 0$ . Find the distribution function of  $U_\lambda$  and  $V_\lambda$  in terms of  $\lambda$  and  $F$ .

Assume for the rest of the exercise that we measure the claim sizes uniformly on the unit interval, i.e. the law of  $X_i$  is given by  $\mathcal{L}_{X_i}(B) = P(\omega \in \Omega : X_i(\omega) \in B) = \mu([0, 1] \cap B)$  for Borel sets  $B$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  where  $\mu$  denotes the Lebesgue measure. In particular,  $F_{X_i}(x) = \mathcal{L}_{X_i}((-\infty, x]) = x\mathbf{1}_{\{0 \leq x < 1\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{x \geq 1\}}$ .

- (b) Show that both the sequence  $\{\lambda(1 - V_\lambda)\}_{\lambda > 0}$  and  $\{\lambda U_\lambda\}_{\lambda > 0}$  converge in distribution to an exponential distribution with rate 1. Show that they do not converge in probability.
- (c) Make a short program simulating values of  $U_\lambda$  and  $V_\lambda$  for some  $\lambda$  of your choice (try small and big) and compare the simulated distribution with that of an exponential distribution with rate 1.
- (d) For any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , construct an approximate  $(1 - \alpha)100\%$ -confidence interval for  $\lambda$ .
- (e) Imagine you have a consistent estimator  $\hat{\lambda}$  of  $\lambda$  at your disposal. For any  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , construct an approximate  $(1 - \alpha)100\%$ -confidence interval for the maximum claim size. If for instance  $\alpha = 0.05$  and you observe  $\hat{\lambda}_{obs} = 100$ , what do you expect the maximum claim size to be? Is this reasonable? If then  $\lambda_{obs} = 1000$ , what happens with  $V_\lambda$ ?

- (f) Denote by  $S$  the total aggregate claim amount  $S = \sum_{i=1}^{N_\lambda} X_i$ . Argue that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  we have

$$P(N_\lambda U_\lambda > \varepsilon) \leq P(S > \varepsilon) \leq P(N_\lambda V_\lambda > \varepsilon).$$

- (g) Using (a) and (f) prove that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  the tail distribution of  $S$  can be bounded by

$$\sum_{n=\lfloor \varepsilon \rfloor + 1}^{\infty} (e^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{n}\lambda} - e^{-\lambda}) e^{-\lambda} \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} \leq P(S > \varepsilon) \leq \sum_{n=\lfloor \varepsilon \rfloor + 1}^{\infty} \left(1 - e^{-(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}-1)\lambda}\right) e^{-\lambda} \frac{\lambda^n}{n!},$$

where  $\lfloor \varepsilon \rfloor = \max\{m \in \mathbb{N} : m \leq \varepsilon\}$  denotes the integer part of  $\varepsilon$  and deduce that  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} P(S > \varepsilon) = 1 - e^{-\lambda}$  and  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty} P(S > \varepsilon) = 0$ .

- (h) A *stop-loss* reinsurance contract with retention level  $K > 0$  is a contract where the reinsurer covers losses in the portfolio exceeding a well-defined limit  $K$ , the so-called *ceding company's retention level*. This means that the reinsurer pays for  $R_{SL} = (S - K)_+$ , where  $x_+ = \max\{x, 0\}$ . This type of insurance is useful for protecting the company against insolvency due to excessive claims on the coverage. The net value is then given by  $p(K) = E[R_{SL}] = E[(S - K)_+]$ . Argue that

$$p(K) = E[R_{SL}] = \int_K^\infty P(S > \varepsilon) d\varepsilon.$$

The rest of the exercise will deal with finding bounds for  $p$  in terms of  $K$ . For this purpose it may be useful to recall the following analytical inequalities; for every  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $x < y$  we have

$$e^x(y - x) \leq e^y - e^x \leq e^y(y - x).$$

Also for  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda > 0$  we have

$$\frac{\lambda^{r+1}}{(r+1)!} \leq \sum_{n=r+1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^n}{n!} \leq e^\lambda \frac{\lambda^{r+1}}{(r+1)!}.$$

- (i) Using the information obtained so far, show that

$$e^{-\lambda} f(\varepsilon) \leq P(S > \varepsilon) \leq f(\varepsilon),$$

where

$$f(\varepsilon) = \lambda e^{-\lambda} \sum_{n=\lfloor \varepsilon \rfloor + 1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{n}\right) \frac{\lambda^n}{n!}.$$

- (j) Argue that

$$\lambda e^{-\lambda} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\lfloor \varepsilon \rfloor + 1}\right) \frac{\lambda^{\lfloor \varepsilon \rfloor + 1}}{(\lfloor \varepsilon \rfloor + 1)!} \leq f(\varepsilon) \leq \lambda \frac{\lambda^{\lfloor \varepsilon \rfloor + 1}}{(\lfloor \varepsilon \rfloor + 1)!},$$

and plot upper bounds for  $P(S > \varepsilon)$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$  for different values of  $\lambda$ , say  $\lambda \in \{1, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100\}$ . Find  $\varepsilon$  such that  $P(S > \varepsilon) \approx 0.01$ . Such value is referred to as *reserve*.

- (k) Assume that  $K$  is a positive integer number (this is fine since  $K$  is usually given in terms of a currency). Show that the (fair) price of a stop-loss contract can be bounded by

$$p(K) \leq \lambda e^\lambda \frac{\lambda^{K+1}}{(K+1)!}.$$

Hint: At some point you need to compute the integral of  $\frac{\lambda^{|\varepsilon|+1}}{(|\varepsilon|+1)!}$  w.r.t.  $\varepsilon$  along  $[K, \infty]$ . Chop up the interval  $[K, \infty)$  in pieces of length one and then sum up. Lastly, use the bounds provided in item (h).

- (l) Plot the bounds as a function of  $K$  for different values of  $\lambda$ , say  $\lambda \in \{1, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100\}$ .

## Exercise 2 (optional!)

We consider now the setting of previous exercise (you can use item (a)) for the case where the claim sizes are discrete and uniformly distributed on  $\{0, 1, \dots, M\}$  for a fixed integer level  $M \geq 1$ , i.e. the law of  $X_i$  is given by  $\mathcal{L}_{X_i}(B) = P(\omega \in \Omega : X_i(\omega) \in B) = \frac{1}{M+1} \#(\{0, 1, \dots, M\} \cap B)$  for subsets  $B$  of  $\mathbb{N}$  where  $\#$  denotes the counting measure. In particular,  $P(X_i = k) = \mathcal{L}_{X_i}(\{k\}) = \frac{1}{M+1}$  for all  $k = 0, \dots, M$  also known as discrete uniform distribution.

- (a) Define  $V_\lambda$  as before. Show that the distribution function of  $V_\lambda$  is given by

$$P(V_\lambda \leq k) = e^{-\lambda \frac{M-k}{M+1}}, \quad k = 0, \dots, M.$$

- (b) Consider the sequence  $\lambda_n = n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . Show that  $V_{\lambda_n}$  converges to  $M$  almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hint: Use the first Borel-Cantelli lemma.
- (c) Find an expression for exact probabilities  $p_m = P(S = m)$  for each integer  $m \geq 1$  using Panjer's recursion scheme. You should obtain

$$p_m = \frac{\lambda}{M+1} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^M i p_{m-i}, \quad m \geq M,$$

given  $p_0 = e^{-\lambda \frac{M}{M+1}}$  and  $p_k = 0$  for  $k < 0$ .

- (d) Assume for a moment that  $M = 1$  (Bernoulli case). Find the exact distribution of  $S$  with support on  $\mathbb{N}$  and find  $E[S]$  and  $Var[S]$ .
- (e) Using the previous exercise in the case  $M = 1$  we can prove by CLT that

$$\frac{S - \lambda/2}{\sqrt{\lambda/2}} \rightarrow N(0, 1)$$

in law, where  $N(0, 1)$  denotes a standard normal distribution. Plot the different distributions of the above random variable for say  $\lambda \in \{1, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100, \}$  and compare to the standard normal.

- (f) For  $\lambda = 10$  and  $M = 1$  compute  $P(S \geq 5)$  and  $P(S \geq 10)$  using the exact distribution from (d) and the normal approximation from (e). What do you observe? Comment.