DEPARTEMENT TOEGEPASTE ECONOMISCHE WETENSCHAPPEN

ONDERZOEKSRAPPORT NR 9532

The Compound Poisson Approximation for a Portfolio of Dependent Risks

by

Marc J. GOOVAERTS

Jan DHAENE

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Naamsestraat 69, B-3000 Leuven

ONDERZOEKSRAPPORT NR 9532

**The Compound Poisson Approximation
for a Portfolio of Dependent Risks**

by

Marc J. GOOVAERTS

Jan DHAENE

THE COMPOUND POISSON APPROXIMATION FOR A PORTFOLIO OF DEPENDENT RISKS

by

M.J. Goovaerts, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and Universiteit Amsterdam

and

J. Dhaene, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

Abstract

A very well known approximation of the aggregate claims distribution in the individual risk theory model with mutually independent individual risks is the compound Poisson approximation. In this paper, we relax the assumption of independency and show that the same compound Poisson approximation will still perform well under certain circumstances.

Keywords

Individual model, dependent risks, compound Poisson approximation

Leuven, October 5, 1995

1 Introduction

Consider a portfolio consisting of n risks labelled from 1 to n . Risk i produces a claim amount X_i during a certain reference period. The aggregate claims of the portfolio during the reference period is denoted by

$$S^{ind} = X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n \quad (1.1)$$

The distribution function of S^{ind} is denoted by F^{ind} :

$$F^{ind}(s) = \Pr(S^{ind} \leq s)$$

As in Bowers et al.(1986) we represent each X_i as

$$X_i = I_i \cdot V_i \quad (i=1,2,\dots,n) \quad (1.2)$$

where I_i is a Bernoulli random variable with $\Pr(I_i = 1) = q_i = 1 - \Pr(I_i = 0)$ and V_i is the claim amount produced by risk i . In the sequel we will assume that V_i is non-negative. The total number of claims produced by the portfolio is denoted by I and is given by

$$I = I_1 + I_2 + \dots + I_n \quad (1.3)$$

Usually the following assumption is made concerning the risks X_i :

assumption (A): *The individual risks X_i are mutually independent.*

A very well known approximation of the distribution of S^{ind} under this assumption, is the compound Poisson approximation, i.e. F^{ind} is approximated by F^{cP} with

$$F^{cP}(s) = \sum_{n=0}^s \Pr(K = n) F^{*n}(s) \quad (s=0,1,\dots) \quad (1.4)$$

where K is a Poisson distributed random variable with parameter λ given by

$$\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \quad (1.5)$$

and $F(s)$ is the distribution given by

$$F(s) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \Pr(V_i \leq s | I_i = 1) \quad (1.6)$$

In order to be able to state results for the error related to this approximation, we introduce the following distance between the distributions F_X and F_Y of random variables X and Y

$$d(F_X, F_Y) = \sup_J |\Pr(X \in J) - \Pr(Y \in J)| \quad (1.7)$$

where the supremum is taken over all events J .

Remark that, apart from a constant factor, $d(.,.)$ is the total variation distance.

Gerber (1984) proved that, under assumption (A), the following result holds

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cP}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n q_i^2 \quad (1.8)$$

Michel (1987) proved that if the conditional claim amounts $V_i|I_i = 1$ all have the same distribution and if assumption (A) holds, that

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cP}) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n q_i^2 \quad (1.9)$$

which is an improvement of Gerber's bound if $\lambda > 1$.

In this paper we will further work within the framework of Michel's "quasi-homogeneous" portfolio but without assuming the mutual independence of the risks involved.

We will use a result of Chen (1975) to show that in certain cases the compound Poisson approximation as defined in (1.4) will still be usable for approximating a portfolio of mutually dependent risks.

2 The Chen-Stein method

From now on, we will relax the independency assumption (A) and consider the following assumption concerning the dependency of the risks.

assumption (B): *The individual risks X_i ($i=1,2,...,n$) are dependent such that the indicators I_i are mutually dependent, but the conditional claim amounts $V_i|I_i = 1$ are mutually independent.*

Hence, the occurrence of a claim for a certain risk is dependent of the occurrence of a claim for the other risks. On the other hand, the conditional claim amount of each risk does not depend on the conditional claim amounts of the other risks.

For a portfolio of insurances which provide a fixed amount in case a claim occurs, the conditional claim amounts are deterministic so that assumption (B) holds in this case. For a portfolio of insurances which compensate the loss incurred after a claim, it will often be the occurrences of claims that will be more or less strongly dependent, while the dependency of the conditional claim amounts will be much weaker. Hence, in this case assumption (B) will often offer a first attempt to describe the dependency between the risks.

In the sequel, we will consider a portfolio which is quasi-homogeneous in the sense that the conditional claim amounts $V_i|I_i = 1$ all have the same distribution F , say. We will consider the compound Poisson approximation F^{cp} defined by (1.4) and (1.5) for the distribution F^{ind} of this portfolio.

The following lemma is an extension of a result of Michel (1987) who proved it if assumption (A) holds.

Lemma 1

Let F^{ind} be the aggregate claims distribution of a portfolio for which assumption (B) holds and where all the conditional claim amounts have the same distribution F . Then the distance between F^{ind} and F^{cp} defined by (1.4) is bounded by

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cp}) \leq d(F_I, F_K)$$

where F_I is the distribution of the number of claims of I defined in (1.3) and F_K is the distribution of a Poisson distributed random variable with parameter λ given by (1.5).

Proof:

Let S^{cp} be the random variable with distribution F^{cp} then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(S^{ind} \in J) - \Pr(S^{cp} \in J) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^n \Pr(S^{ind} \in J | I = k) \Pr(I = k) - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Pr(S^{cp} \in J | K = k) \Pr(K = k) \end{aligned}$$

Now remark that under assumption (B)

$$\Pr(S^{ind} \in J | I = k) = \Pr(S^{cp} \in J | K = k)$$

so that

$$\Pr(S^{ind} \in J) - \Pr(S^{cP} \in J) \leq \sum_{k=0}^n (\Pr(I = k) - \Pr(K = k)) \cdot \Pr(S^{ind} \in J | I = k)$$

Now let $J_0 = \{k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} | \Pr(I = k) > \Pr(K = k)\}$

then we find

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(S^{ind} \in J) - \Pr(S^{cP} \in J) &\leq \sum_{k \in J_0} (\Pr(I = k) - \Pr(K = k)) \\ &\leq \sup_J (\Pr(I \in J) - \Pr(K \in J)) \end{aligned}$$

The desired result then follows from

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cP}) = \sup_J |\Pr(S^{ind} \in J) - \Pr(S^{cP} \in J)| = \sup_J (\Pr(S^{ind} \in J) - \Pr(S^{cP} \in J))$$

Q.E.D.

For each Bernoulli random variable $I_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, n)$ we now define the set of dependence $B_i \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$I_j \text{ is independent of } I_i \text{ if and only if } j \notin B_i \quad (j=1, 2, \dots, n)$$

Further, define

$$b_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in B_i} q_i q_j \quad (2.1)$$

$$b_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{i \neq j \in B_i} E(I_i I_j) \quad (2.2)$$

The following result can be found in Chen (1975).

Lemma 2

Using the same notation as in Lemma 1 and assuming that (B) holds we have that

$$d(F_I, F_K) \leq (b_1 + b_2) \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda}}{\lambda}$$

A more general version of this result appears in Arratia et al. (1990). They refer to this approach as the Chen-Stein method and present several applications of it. One of such applications is the study of longest repetitive patterns in random sequences, see e.g.

Waterman (1995). In the following theorem we show that the Chen-Stein method can also be useful in individual risk theory.

Theorem 1

Let F^{ind} be the aggregate claims distribution under assumption (B). If all the conditional claim amounts have the same distribution F , then the distance between F^{ind} and F^{cP} defined in (1.4) is bounded by

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cP}) \leq (b_1 + b_2) \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda}}{\lambda}$$

where λ , b_1 and b_2 are defined by (1.5), (2.1) and (2.2) respectively.

Proof:

The proof follows immediately from Lemma 1 and Lemma 2.

Q.E.D.

The bound presented in Theorem 1 will work best for dealing with local dependence, corresponding to situations in which the sets of dependence B_i have only a few elements so that b_1 and b_2 are small. The approximations are usefull only if second moments are well behaved. Remark that when the dependence structure is local, finding the Chen-Stein bounds involves the same effort as computing first and second moments of the total number of claims.

Let us now look at the special case that assumption (A) holds. Then we find that

$B_i = \{i\} (i = 1, 2, \dots, n)$ and hence $b_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n q_i^2$, $b_2 = 0$ so that we obtain from Theorem 1

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cP}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n q_i^2 \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda}}{\lambda} \quad (2.3)$$

If $\lambda < 1$ we find

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cP}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n q_i^2$$

which is a special case of Gerber's (1984) more general result.

For $\lambda > 1$ we find from (2.3)

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cP}) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^n q_i^2$$

which is Michel's (1987) bound.

3 Example

In order to demonstrate the usefulness of Theorem 1 for certain real life situations, we give the following illustration.

Consider a portfolio consisting of $(m+n)$ life insurances providing a death benefit. There are m couples (wife and husband) in the portfolio and all death benefits are equal to 1 (which means that in fact we are looking at the total number of deaths during the reference period). Then we can write the aggregate claims as

$$S^{ind} = \sum_{i=1}^m (X_i + X'_i) + \sum_{i=m+1}^n X_i$$

We assume that all risks are mutually independent, except for the “coupled” risks. This means that the only dependence that occurs is the dependence between the risks of a wife and her husband.

The sets of dependence are then given by

$$B_i = B'_i = \{i, i'\} \quad (i=1, 2, \dots, m)$$

$$B_i = \{i\} \quad (i=m+1, \dots, n)$$

and hence

$$\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^m (q_i + q'_i) + \sum_{i=m+1}^n q_i$$

$$b_1 = \sum_{i=1}^m (q_i + q'_i)^2 + \sum_{i=m+1}^n q_i^2$$

$$b_2 = 2 \sum_{i=1}^m (q_i \cdot q'_i + \text{cov}(X_i, X'_i))$$

From Theorem 1 we find the following error bound for the (compound) Poisson approximation of this portfolio.

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cP}) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \left[(q_i + q_i')^2 + 2q_i q_i' + 2 \text{cov}(X_i, X_i') \right] + \sum_{i=m+1}^n q_i^2 \right\} \quad (3.1)$$

We denote Michel's upperbound (1.9), which is valid under the independence assumption (A) by M :

$$M = \frac{1}{\lambda} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m (q_i^2 + q_i'^2) + \sum_{i=m+1}^n q_i^2 \right\}$$

Hence, from (3.1) we find

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cP}) \leq M + \frac{2}{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^m (2q_i q_i' + \text{cov}(X_i, X_i')) \quad (3.2)$$

If we don't have any information about $\text{cov}(X_i, X_i')$ then we can use the following upperbound for this covariance:

$$\text{cov}(X_i, X_i') = \sqrt{q_i(1-q_i)q_i'(1-q_i')} \text{corr}(X_i, X_i') \leq \sqrt{q_i(1-q_i)q_i'(1-q_i')}$$

In order to establish the effect on the bound from introducing dependence in the portfolio, assume that all claim probabilities are of the same order, let us say all are equal to q , then we find

$$\lambda = (m+n)q \quad \text{and} \quad M = q$$

so that (3.2) becomes

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cP}) \leq M + \frac{2m}{m+n} [2q + (1-q) \text{corr}(X_i, X_i')] \quad (3.3)$$

which shows that increasing the relative number of couples or increasing the correlation coefficients will lead to an increased bound.

As a numerical illustration consider the case that $q \leq \frac{10}{11}$ and

$$\Pr(X_i' = 1 | X_i = 1) = 1,1q$$

This means that

$$\text{corr}(X_i, X_i') = 0,1 \frac{q}{1-q}$$

Further, let $\frac{m}{m+n} = 0,05$, which means that 10 % of the portfolio consists of couples.

Then we find from (3.3)

$$d(F^{ind}, F^{cP}) \leq 1,21q$$

which indicates that the bound is increased by ± 20 % if 10 % of the portfolio consists of couples with dependent risks and if the mortality rate of a person is increased by 10 %, given the mortality of his spouse during the reference year.

References

Arratia, R.A.; Goldstein, L. and Gordon, L. (1990). Poisson approximation and the Chen-Stein method. *Statistical Science*, 5, pp. 403-434.

Bowers, N.L.; Gerber, H.U.; Hickman, J.C.; Jones, D.A. and Nesbitt, C.J. (1986). *Actuarial Mathematics*. Society of Actuaries, Itasca, IL.

Chen, L.H.Y. (1975). Poisson approximation for dependent trials. *Ann. Probab.*, 3, pp. 534-545.

Gerber, H.U. (1984). Error bounds for the compound Poisson approximation. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, vol.3, pp. 191-194.

Michel, R. (1987). An improved error bound for the compound Poisson approximation. *ASTIN Bulletin*, vol. 17, pp. 165-169.

Waterman, S. (1995). Hearing distant echoes: using extremal statistics to probe evolutionary origins. Chapter 4 of: *Calculating the secrets of life. Applications of the mathematical sciences in molecular biology*, Lander, E.S. and Waterman, M.S. (editors). National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.