

(44)

Proof: idea: Application of Prop. 4.2.2 (Minimum risk estimation) to the special case of

$$X = \mu(\theta_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E[X_{i,1} | \theta_i],$$

$$Y = (\underbrace{X_{1,1} \dots X_{1,n_1}}_{= X_1} \dots \underbrace{X_{r,1} \dots X_{r,n_r}}_{= X_r})' \leftarrow \text{transpose}$$

$$a = (\underbrace{a_{1,1} \dots a_{1,n_1}}_{= a_1} \dots \underbrace{a_{r,1} \dots a_{r,n_r}}_{= a_r})'$$

→ we want to find (a_0, a) w.r.t. the normal equations (4.2.12):

$$a_0 = E[X] - a' \cdot E[Y], \quad \sum X_{i,Y} = a' \cdot \sum Y \quad (*)$$

$$\rightarrow \text{minimizer } \hat{\mu}_{LB} = \hat{Y} = a_0 + a' \cdot Y$$

W.l.o.g. $r=2, n_1=n_2=1$ and $i=1$

$$\rightarrow Y = (X_{1,1}, X_{2,1})' \quad \sum Y = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Var}[X_{1,1}] & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Var}[X_{2,1}] \end{pmatrix}$$

$X_{1,1}, X_{2,1}$
indep. hence uncorrelated

$$\text{and } \sum X_{i,Y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\text{Cov}[X_1, X_{1,1}], \text{Cov}[X_1, X_{2,1}])' = (\text{Cov}[X_1, X_{1,1}], 0)'$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{2nd eq. of } (*) \iff \lambda \leftarrow \text{L.4.2.7} \quad \text{Cov}[X_1, X_{1,1}] = \lambda \text{Cov}[X_1, X_{1,1}] = \lambda \text{Var}[X_{1,1}] = \lambda \psi + \lambda \leftarrow \text{L.4.2.7 (iii)} \quad (**)$$

$$\text{and } 0 = a_{2,1} \text{Var}[X_{2,1}] > 0 \Rightarrow a_{2,1} = 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} E[X_{i,1}] &= E[\mu(\theta_i)] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu_i \\ (*) & \quad a_0 = \mu - (a_{1,1} \mu + a_{2,1} \mu) = \mu (1 - (a_{1,1} + a_{2,1})) \quad (***) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rightarrow (***) & \iff \lambda = a_{1,1} \psi + (a_{1,1} + a_{2,1}) \lambda \\ \Rightarrow a_{1,1} &= \frac{\lambda}{\psi + \lambda} = \frac{\lambda}{\psi + n_i \lambda} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow a_0 &= \mu \cdot \frac{\psi}{\psi + n_i \lambda} \\ \hat{\mu}_{LB} &= \frac{\psi}{\psi + n_i \lambda} \mu + a_{1,1} X_{1,1} = (1-w) \mu + w \bar{X}_i \quad (+) \end{aligned}$$

$w := \frac{n_i \lambda}{\psi + n_i \lambda}$

$$\text{risk } \rho(\hat{\mu}_{LB}) : \rho(\hat{\mu}_{LB}) \stackrel{(4.2.14)}{=} \text{Var}[\mu(\theta_i)] - \text{Var}[\hat{\mu}_{LB}]$$
$$\text{Var}[\hat{\mu}_{LB}] \stackrel{(+)}{=} \text{Var}[w \bar{X}_i] = w^2 (E[\text{Var}[\bar{X}_i | \theta_i]] + \text{Var}[E[\bar{X}_i | \theta_i]])$$

$$\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} w^2 [\psi + \lambda] = \lambda \frac{n_i \lambda}{\psi + n_i \lambda}$$
$$\Rightarrow \rho(\hat{\mu}_{LB}) = \lambda - \lambda \frac{n_i \lambda}{\psi + n_i \lambda} = (1-w) \lambda \Rightarrow \text{proof.}$$

95 Ex. 4.2.10 : Consider the heterogeneity model (Def 4.1.2).

Assume $X_{i,t} \sim \text{Pois}(\theta_i)$, $\theta_i \sim \Gamma(\gamma, \beta)$
 \uparrow number of claims in year i

$\Rightarrow E[X_{i,t} | \theta_i] = \theta_i$ and $\text{Var}[X_{i,t} | \theta_i] = \theta_i$
 and

$E[\theta_i] = \gamma/\beta$ and $\text{Var}[\theta_i] = \gamma/\beta^2$

$\Rightarrow \gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E[\text{Var}[X_{i,t} | \theta_i]] = \gamma/\beta$

$\lambda \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Var}[\mu(\theta_i)] = \gamma/\beta^2$

$\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E[\mu(\theta_i)] = \gamma/\beta$

Th. 4.2.9

$\hat{\mu}_{LB} = (1-w)\mu + w\bar{X}_i$ with

$w = \frac{n_i \lambda}{\gamma + n_i \lambda} = \frac{n_i \gamma/\beta^2}{\gamma/\beta + n_i \gamma/\beta^2} = \frac{n_i}{\beta + n_i}$

Prob. 1, Exerc. 4

$\hat{\mu}_{LB} = \hat{\mu}_B$

Rem. 4.2.11

(i) $\hat{\mu}_{LB} \neq \hat{\mu}_B$ in general (see e.g. Prob. 3, Exerc. 4)

(ii) $w \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{n_i \lambda}{\gamma + n_i \lambda} = \frac{n_i}{\frac{\gamma}{\lambda} + n_i}$ is called credibility weight

\rightarrow the larger w is the less important is the overall information of the portfolio w.r.t. μ in

$\hat{\mu}_{LB} = (1-w)\mu + w \cdot \bar{X}_i$

\rightarrow the larger w the more important or credible is the information w.r.t. to data X_i

- \rightarrow 1. case: w large, if n_i large
- 2. case: w large, if $\frac{\gamma}{\lambda}$ small

Next we want to discuss a refinement of the model of Bühlmann, that is the Bühlmann-Straub model.

\rightarrow Bühlmann's model with an extra parameter $P_{i,t} > 0$

called risk unit per time unit (e.g. year)

\rightarrow weights which stand for the knowledge about the volume of $X_{i,t}$

(46)

→ e.g. $P_{i,t}$ may correspond to the size of a particular house in connection with fire insurance

or one may interpret $P_{i,t}$ as a risk adjustment parameter w.r.t. subclasses (i.e. accounts) of tariff classes, that is categories of policies for the same type of risk (i.e. homogeneous risk categories)

→ e.g. Swiss Motor Liability Tariff:

1. private cars (1.1 private cars 4-wheeled, 1.2 private cars 3-wheeled, ... → further subdivided by e.g. cylinder capacity)
2. automobiles for goods transport (2.1 work transports, 2.2 transport business, ...)
3. motor-cycles (3.1 small motor cycles, ...)
4. buses
5. Special risks
6. Short term risks

→ Def. 4.2.12 (Bühlmann-Straub model)

The Bühlmann-Straub model is the Bühlmann model (Def. 4.2.5) where condition (V) is replaced by

(V)' There exist functions μ, ν s.t. for all $t \geq 1$:

$$\mu(\theta_i) = E[X_{i,t} | \theta_i] \text{ and } \text{Var}[X_{i,t} | \theta_i] = \frac{\nu(\theta_i)}{P_{i,t}}$$

where the weights are pre-specified deterministic risk units.

($\frac{\theta_i}{i \geq 1}$ i.i.d. $\mu(\theta_i), i \geq 1$ and $\nu(\theta_i), i \geq 1$ i.i.d.)

→ Th. 4.2.13 ($\hat{\mu}_{LB}$ w.r.t. the Bühlmann-Straub model)

Set $\mu = E[\mu(\theta_i)]$, $\lambda = \text{Var}[\mu(\theta_i)]$, $\vartheta = E[\nu(\theta_i)]$.

Suppose that $\text{Var}[X_{i,t}] < \infty$, $i, t \geq 1$ and that $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} X_{i,t}$ exists for all i . Then the (linear Bayes estimator $\hat{\mu}_{LB}$ of $\mu(\theta_i)$ (w.r.t. \mathcal{L} in (4.2.5)) is unique and given by

$$\hat{\mu}_{LB} = (1-w)\mu + w\bar{X}_i$$

where $w = \frac{\lambda \cdot P_i}{\vartheta + \lambda \cdot P_i}$, $\bar{X}_i = \frac{1}{P_i} \sum_{t=1}^{n_i} P_{i,t} X_{i,t}$ and $P_i = \sum_{t=1}^{n_i} P_{i,t}$

(47) The corresponding risk is

$$S(\hat{\mu}_{LB}) = (1-w)\lambda$$

Proof: analogous to Th. 4.2.9.

(48)

5. Point processes and their applications

The concept of a point process is a generalization of that of e.g. a Poisson process or a cluster point process, which can be e.g. used for the prediction of claim numbers or total claim amounts given the claim number or total claim amount history.

In order to introduce this concept, we need some notions:

Recall

Def. 5.1 (measure)

Let \mathcal{A} be a σ -algebra on Ω . Then a function $m: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is called measure on \mathcal{A} , if

(i) $m(\emptyset) = 0$,

(ii) $A_j \in \mathcal{A}, j \geq 1, A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset, i \neq j \implies$
 $m\left(\bigcup_{j \geq 1} A_j\right) = \sum_{j \geq 1} m(A_j)$ (σ -additivity) defined as $\int_{\mathbb{R}}$

Ex. 5.2: $m = P$ prob. meas. on \mathcal{A}

Ex. 5.3: $m = \lambda$ Lebesgue-Borel meas. on $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}([0, \infty))$
 \implies unique measure s.t. $\lambda([a, b]) = b - a$ for all $a \leq b$

Ex. 5.4 (product measure): $m = m_1 \otimes m_2$, m_i measure on \mathcal{A}_i , $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2 :=$ smallest σ -alg. containing all sets $A_1 \times A_2, A_i \in \mathcal{A}_i, i=1,2$, $\Omega := \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$
 $\implies m = m_1 \otimes m_2$ unique measure on \mathcal{A} s.t.
 $m(A_1 \times A_2) = m_1(A_1) m_2(A_2)$ for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}_i, i=1,2$

Def. 5.5 (measurable function)

A function $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called \mathcal{A} -measurable, if
 $\{\omega \in \Omega: f(\omega) < t\} \in \mathcal{A}$
 for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Ex: $f = X$ random variable w.r.t. \mathcal{A}

Def. 5.6 (integral w.r.t. m)

The integral of a \mathcal{A} -measurable function f w.r.t. the m , denoted by $\int_{\Omega} f(\omega) m(d\omega)$ can be defined