

NONLINEAR RESERVING AND MULTIPLE CONTRACT MODIFICATIONS IN LIFE INSURANCE

MARCUS C. CHRISTIANSEN AND BOUALEM DJEHICHE

ABSTRACT. Insurance cash flows become reserve dependent whenever contract conditions are modified during the contract term while maintaining actuarial equivalence. As a result, insurance cash flows and prospective reserves depend on each other in a circular way, and it is a non-trivial problem to solve that circularity and make cash flows and reserves well-defined. The literature offers answers to that question in case of one or two contract modifications under Markovian assumptions. This paper studies multiple contract modifications in a general non-Markovian framework.

1. INTRODUCTION

Life insurance products typically comprise implicit options. This involves guaranteed components as well as rights to modify contract conditions during the contract term, see e.g. Gatzert (2009) for an overview. In recent years insurers and regulators paid increasing attention to the proper pricing and reserving for contracts with implicit options. In the actuarial literature there are numerous papers on market evaluations of implicit financial guarantees, but the mathematical modelling of premium payment modifications and modifications of insurance coverage is still underdeveloped. This paper helps to close that gap.

The prospective reserve of a life insurance contract is defined as the conditional expectation of the aggregated and discounted future insurance cash flow given the currently available information. Traditionally, the insurance cash flow is defined first, and then the prospective reserve is defined and calculated on the basis of that cash flow. However, in case that the insurance cash flow depends also on the prospective reserve, then we have a circular structure and the classical definition of the prospective reserve becomes an implicit equation for which existence and uniqueness of a solution are in general unclear. In a Markovian framework Djehiche & Löfdahl (2016) showed that the circularity problem is equivalent to solving a backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE). In case that the cash flow satisfies certain Lipschitz conditions, then the BSDE has a unique solution and the prospective reserve and the cash flow are well-defined. In this paper we generalize that concept to a non-Markovian framework, which automatically includes popular semi-Markovian models.

In Djehiche & Löfdahl (2016) the cash flow at a certain time point may depend on the reserve at the same time but not on the reserve at earlier time points. This restriction is fine when we model surrender options, but it excludes various other

Date: This version November 15, 2019.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 60H10, 91B30.

Key words and phrases. Implicit options, prospective reserve, nonlinear semi-Markov chain, Backward SDEs, Thiele equation.

modifications of premium payments and insurance coverage. For example, think of a free policy option where the insurance cash flow after exercising the option depends on the reserve at the time of exercising the option. One possibility is to adhere to the BSDE approach, but the mild Lipschitz conditions that Djehiche & Löfdahl (2016) use have to be replaced with much more restrictive Lipschitz conditions that are usually not satisfied in practice. Instead, in this paper we suggest a recursive scheme that runs forward in time through the contract modifications. Our results differ from the existing literature in two ways: First, we allow for an unbounded number of contract modifications. Second, we give precise definitions of actuarial equivalence at contract modifications and then derive as a result the fact that at start of the contract we may ignore future contract modifications, whereas in the literature the latter result is usually an assumption. Our approach helps to clarify the mathematical definition of actuarial equivalence at contract modifications, in particular when there are multiple contract modifications.

The most widely studied kinds of reserve dependent insurance cash flows are surrender payments upon lapse, see e.g. Møller & Steffensen (2007) and references therein. In case that the Cantelli Theorem applies, surrender may be simply ignored, see e.g. Milbrodt & Stracke (1997). If actuarial equivalence is not fully maintained but the dependence on the reserve is linear, explicit formulas are still within reach, see Christiansen et al. (2014). If the dependence is not necessarily linear but at least Lipschitz continuous, then the BSDE concept of Djehiche & Löfdahl (2016) gives a general answer on how to define and calculate reserves in the presence of lapse. The second most studied option is the free policy option, see e.g. the advanced calculation concepts in Buchardt et al. (2015) and Buchardt & Møller (2015) which follow the popular approach to ignore the free policy option when the cash flow is defined initially by arguing that future contract modifications are conducted in a reserve neutral way. While this approach avoids the circularity issue in the definitions of cash flows and reserves, it stays vague on mathematical definition of actuarial equivalence.

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we define the state dynamics of a life insurance policy and its corresponding life insurance cash flow. We also show the link to martingale theory, which becomes relevant in the sections to follow. Section 3 introduces the prospective reserve as the solution of a backward stochastic differential equation and extends the results of Djehiche & Löfdahl (2016) to non-Markovian frameworks. In section 4 we add the possibility of an unbounded number of contract modifications and discuss the definition and calculation of prospective reserves under actuarial equivalence conditions.

2. LIFE INSURANCE POLICY MODELING

2.1. State dynamics of a life insurance policy. In the multi-state framework within life insurance, the evolution of an insurance policy on the state space $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{N}_0$ is usually described by an \mathcal{S} -valued càdlàg (right continuous with left limits) pure jump process X , starting at a deterministic state $X(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$, defined on the completed filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}^0, \mathbb{F}^0 = (\mathcal{F}_t^0)_{0 \leq t < \infty}, P)$, where \mathbb{F}^0 is the completed natural filtration of X , which satisfies the usual conditions. The dynamics of X shall be determined by a family of \mathbb{F} -progressively measurable jump intensities $\Lambda := (\lambda_{ij})_{ij}$.

To X we associate the indicator process $I_i(t) = \mathbf{1}_{\{X(t)=i\}}$ whose value is 1 if X is in state i at time t and 0 otherwise, and the counting processes defined by

$$N_{ij}(t) := \#\{\tau \in (0, t] : X(\tau-) = i, X(\tau) = j\}, \quad N_{ij}(0) = 0,$$

which count the number of jumps from state i into state j during the time interval $(0, t]$. Since X is càdlàg, I_i and N_{ij} are càdlàg as well. Moreover, by the relationship

$$X(t) = \sum_i i I_i(t), \quad I_i(t) = I_i(0) + \sum_{j:j \neq i} (N_{ji}(t) - N_{ij}(t)),$$

the state process, the indicator processes, and the counting processes carry the same information which is represented by the natural filtration \mathbb{F}^0 of X . Let $0 = T_0 < T_1 < T_2 < \dots$ denote the jump times of the process and

$$N(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{T_n \leq t\}} = \sup\{n, T_n \leq t\} = \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} N_{ij}(t).$$

For each $t \geq 0$, let $U(t)$ be the time spent in the current state $X(t)$, i.e.

$$U(t) = t - T_{N(t)}, \quad \text{i.e. } U(t) = t - T_n, \text{ if } T_n \leq t < T_{n+1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Two popular models for the pure jump process have been considered in the literature, cf. Christiansen (2012):

Example 2.1 (Markov models). *The process X is assumed to be Markovian.*

Example 2.2 (semi-Markov models). *The process $\tilde{X} := (X, U)$ is assumed to be Markovian.*

2.2. Life insurance cash flow. A standard life insurance payment process $A(t)$ of accumulated contractual benefits less premiums payable during the time interval $[0, t]$ is of the form

$$dA(t) = \sum_i I_i(t) dA_i(t) + \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} \beta_{ij}(t-) dN_{ij}(t),$$

where A_i is a progressively measurable process specifying accumulated payments during sojourns at time t if the policy is in state i . We assume that each A_i decomposes into an absolutely continuous part and a purely discontinuous part:

$$dA_i(t) = \alpha_i(t) dt + A_i(t) - A_i(t-),$$

where α_i is a progressively measurable process, an, when different from zero, $A_i(t) - A_i(t-)$ is an endowment or a lump sum payable at time t if the policyholder is then in state i . Furthermore, β_{ij} is a progressively measurable process with pathwise left limits, specifying a transition payment due immediately upon a transition from state i to state j at time t . We generally assume that there is a finite maximum contract time $T < \infty$, i.e. $dA_i(t) = 0$ and $\beta_{ij}(t) = 0$ for all $t > T$.

2.3. Associated martingales. In the sequel, we make the following standing assumption:

(A1) The intensities $(\lambda_{ij})_{ij}$ satisfy

$$E \left[\int_0^T \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij}(t) dt \right] < \infty.$$

Mimicking the proof of Lemma 21.13 in Rogers & Williams (2000), the compensated processes associated with the counting processes N_{ij} , defined by

$$M_{ij}(t) = N_{ij}(t) - \int_{(0,t]} I_i(s-) \lambda_{ij}(s) ds, \quad M_{ij}(0) = 0,$$

are zero mean, square integrable and mutually orthogonal P -martingales whose predictable quadratic variations are

$$\langle M_{ij} \rangle_t = \int_{(0,t]} I_i(s-) \lambda_{ij}(s) ds.$$

We call $M := \{M_{ij}, i \neq j\}$ the accompanying martingale of the counting process $N := \{N_{ij}, i \neq j\}$ or of the process X . Let $(Z_{ij}, i \neq j)$ be a family of predictable processes and set

$$\|Z(t)\|_{\Lambda}^2 := \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} Z_{ij}^2(t) I_i(t-) \lambda_{ij}(t), \quad 0 < t \leq T.$$

Consider the local martingale

$$W(t) = \int_0^t Z(s) dM(s) := \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} \int_0^t Z_{ij}(s) dM_{ij}(s).$$

Then, the optional variation of the local martingale W is

$$[W](t) = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} |Z(s) \Delta M(s)|^2 = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} |Z_{ij}(s) \Delta M_{ij}(s)|^2$$

and its compensator is

$$\langle W \rangle_t = \int_{(0,t]} \|Z(s)\|_{\Lambda}^2 ds.$$

Provided that

$$(2.1) \quad E \left[\int_{(0,T]} \|Z(s)\|_{\Lambda}^2 ds \right] < \infty,$$

W is a square-integrable martingale and its optional variation satisfies

$$E [[W](t)] = E \left[\sum_{0 < s \leq t} |Z(s) \Delta M(s)|^2 \right] = E \left[\int_{(0,t]} \|Z(s)\|_{\Lambda}^2 ds \right].$$

Moreover, the following Doob's inequality holds:

$$E \left[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \int_0^t Z(s) dM(s) \right|^2 \right] \leq 4E \left[\int_{(0,T]} \|Z(s)\|_{\Lambda}^2 ds \right].$$

If \tilde{Z} is another predictable process that satisfies (2.1), setting

$$\langle Z(t), \tilde{Z}(t) \rangle_{\Lambda} := \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} Z_{ij}(t) \tilde{Z}_{ij}(t) I_i(t-) \lambda_{ij}(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

and considering the martingale

$$\tilde{W}(t) = \int_0^t \tilde{Z}(s) dM(s) := \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_{ij}(s) dM_{ij}(s),$$

it is easy to see that

$$E \left[[W, \tilde{W}](t) \right] = E \left[\int_{(0,t]} \langle Z(s), \tilde{Z}(s) \rangle_{\Lambda} ds \right].$$

Since $X(0)$ is deterministic and the filtration \mathbb{F}^0 generated by X is the same as the filtration generated by the family of counting processes $\{N_{ij}, i \neq j\}$, we state the following martingale representation theorem (see e.g. Brémaud (1981), Theorem T11 or Rogers & Williams (2000), IV-21, Theorem 21.15).

Proposition 2.3 (Martingale representation theorem). *If \mathcal{L} is a (right-continuous) square-integrable \mathbb{F}^0 -martingale, there exists a unique $(dP \times \int_0^\cdot \lambda_{ij}(s^-) ds)$ -almost everywhere family of predictable processes $Z_{ij}, i \neq j$, satisfying*

$$E \left[\int_{(0,T]} \|Z(s)\|_{\Lambda}^2 ds \right] < \infty$$

such that

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{L}(t) = \mathcal{L}(0) + \int_0^t Z(s) dM(s), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

In fact the form of the process Z can be made explicit as shown in the following Proposition.

Proposition 2.4 (Explicit martingale representation). *Let ζ be an integrable random variable. The unique right-continuous process \mathcal{L} defined by $\mathcal{L}_t := E[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_t^0]$, $t \geq 0$, satisfies (2.2) for Z defined as*

$$Z_{ij}(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n < t \leq T_{n+1}\}} \left(E[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, T_{n+1} = t, X(T_{n+1}) = j] - E[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, N(t) = n] \right).$$

Proof. First of all, suppose that X has at most one jump. Then, according to Chou & Meyer (1975) we have

$$\mathcal{L}(t) = \mathcal{L}(0) + \sum_{j:j \neq x_0} \int_0^t \left(E[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_0^0, T_1 = s, X(T_1) = j] - \frac{E[\zeta \mathbb{1}_{\{s < T_1\}} | \mathcal{F}_0^0]}{E[\mathbb{1}_{\{s < T_1\}} | \mathcal{F}_0^0]} \right) dM_{x_0 j}(s)$$

almost surely for each $t > 0$. The fraction in the integrand almost surely equals $E[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_0^0, N(s) = 0]$. The statement remains true for any enlargement of the initial information \mathcal{F}_0^0 , see Chou & Meyer (1975). Following the construction in Elliott (1976), by applying the single jump result on the inter-arrival times $S_{n+1} := T_{n+1} - T_n$, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(T_n + t) - \mathcal{L}(T_n) &= \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} \int_{T_n}^{T_n+t} \left(E[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, S_{n+1} = s - T_n, X(T_n + S_{n+1}) = j] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - E[\zeta | \mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, N(s) = n] \right) dM_{ij}(s) \end{aligned}$$

for $T_n < t \leq T_n + S_{n+1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. \square

Corollary 2.5. *Let $(\zeta(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be an integrable process such that $\zeta(t) - \zeta(0)$ is \mathcal{F}_t^0 -measurable for each $t \geq 0$. Then we almost surely have*

$$(2.3) \quad E[\zeta(t) | \mathcal{F}_t^0] = \zeta(t) - \zeta(0) + \int_0^t Z(s) dM(s), \quad t \geq 0,$$

for Z defined as

$$Z_{ij}(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n < t \leq T_{n+1}\}} \left(E[\zeta(t-) | \mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, T_{n+1} = t, X(T_{n+1}) = j] - E[\zeta(t-) | \mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, N(t) = n] \right).$$

Proof. By applying Proposition 2.4 on the martingale

$$E[\zeta(t) | \mathcal{F}_t^0] - (\zeta(t) - \zeta(0)) = E[\zeta(0) | \mathcal{F}_t^0]$$

and using that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n < t \leq T_{n+1}\}} \left(E[\zeta(0) | \mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, T_{n+1} = t, X(T_{n+1}) = j] - E[\zeta(0) | \mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, N(t) = n] \right) \\ &= \sum_i I_i(t-) \left(E[\zeta(0) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}^0, \Delta N_{ij}(t) = 1] - E[\zeta(0) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}^0, \Delta N(t) = 0] \right) \\ &= \sum_i I_i(t-) \left(E[\zeta(t-) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}^0, \Delta N_{ij}(t) = 1] - E[\zeta(t-) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}^0, \Delta N(t) = 0] \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n < t \leq T_{n+1}\}} \left(E[\zeta(t-) | \mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, T_{n+1} = t, X(T_{n+1}) = j] - E[\zeta(t-) | \mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, N(t) = n] \right) \end{aligned}$$

almost surely for each $t > 0$, we end up with equation (2.3). \square

3. PROSPECTIVE RESERVES

Following Norberg (1991, 1992), we recall the conditional expectation formulation of the prospective reserve for the above life insurance policy, given the jump intensities $\Lambda = (\lambda_{ij})_{ij}$ and a discount rate δ . We assume that δ is a bounded and progressively measurable process.

Definition 3.1. *The prospective reserve associated with the payment process A , the matrix Λ and discount rate δ is*

$$(3.1) \quad Y(t) := E \left[\int_{(t,T]} e^{-\int_t^s \delta(u) du} dA(s) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^0 \right],$$

where the pair (Λ, δ) is called the basis of the prospective reserve.

3.1. Linear reserving. By linear reserving we mean the case where the payment processes α_i and β_{ij} do not depend on the current reserve, but they may depend on the whole path X provided they are progressively measurable, i.e.

$$\alpha_i(t)(\omega) := \alpha_i(t, X(\cdot \wedge t), \omega), \quad \beta_{ij}(t)(\omega) := \beta_{ij}(t, X(\cdot \wedge t), \omega).$$

We assume that

- (A2) the sojourn payments A_i are continuous,
- (A3) the payment processes α_i and β_{ij} are progressively measurable and satisfy

$$E \left[\int_0^T \left(\sum_i |\alpha_i(t)|^2 + \|\beta(t)\|_{\Lambda}^2 \right) dt \right] < \infty.$$

The payment process becomes

$$(3.2) \quad dA(t) = \sum_i I_i(t) \alpha_i(t) dt + \sum_i \sum_{j:j \neq i} \beta_{ij}(t-) dN_{ij}(t).$$

Noting that, in view of (A3), the process defined by

$$d\tilde{M}_i(t) := \sum_{j:j \neq i} \beta_{ij}(t-) dM_{ij}(t)$$

is a square integrable \mathbb{F}^0 -martingale, the payment process (3.2) can be written as

$$(3.3) \quad dA(t) = \sum_i I_i(t) \gamma_i(t) dt + \sum_i d\tilde{M}_i(t),$$

with

$$\gamma_i(t) := \alpha_i(t) + \sum_{j:j \neq i} \beta_{ij}(t-) \lambda_{ij}(t), \quad i \in \mathcal{S},$$

where we have used the fact that $X(t-) = X(t)$ holds dt -a.e. since X is càdlàg.

Using the martingale property of the \tilde{M}_i 's, the prospective reserve (3.1) of the life insurance contract becomes

$$(3.4) \quad Y(t) = E \left[\int_t^T e^{-\int_t^s \delta(u) du} \gamma_{X(s)}(s) ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^0 \right], \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

which may be written as

$$e^{\int_0^t \delta(u) du} Y(t) + \int_0^t e^{-\int_0^s \delta(u) du} \gamma_{X(s)}(s) ds = \hat{M}(t),$$

where \hat{M} is the square integrable martingale defined by

$$\hat{M}(t) = E \left[\int_0^T e^{-\int_0^s \delta(u) du} \gamma_{X(s)}(s) ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^0 \right].$$

By the Martingale Representation Theorem, there exists a unique $(dP \times I_i(s-) \lambda_{ij}(s) ds$ -a.e.) family of predictable processes Z_{ij} , $i \neq j$, satisfying

$$E \left[\int_{(0,T]} \|Z(s)\|_{\Lambda}^2 ds \right] < \infty$$

such that

$$e^{-\int_0^t \delta(u) du} d\hat{M}(t) = Z(t) dM(t).$$

Proposition 3.2 (Backward SDE formulation of the prospective reserve). *The prospective reserve Y , given in (3.1), associated with the payment process A , the matrix Λ and discount rate δ satisfies the BSDE*

$$(3.5) \quad -dY(t) = \left(\delta(t)Y(t) + \gamma_{X(t)}(t) \right) dt - Z(t) dM(t), \quad Y(T) = 0,$$

for Z defined as

$$(3.6) \quad Z_{ij}(t) := E[Y(t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}^0, X(t) = j] - E[Y(t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}^0, X(t) = i].$$

Proof. By applying Corollary 2.3 on the process

$$\zeta(t) := \int_t^T e^{-\int_t^s \delta(u) du} \gamma_{X(s)}(s) ds,$$

we obtain that

$$(3.7) \quad Y(t)e^{-\int_0^t \delta(u)du} = -\int_0^t e^{-\int_0^s \delta(u)du} \gamma_{X(s)}(s) ds + \int_0^t \tilde{Z}(s)dM(s)$$

for $\tilde{Z}_{ij}(s) := E[\zeta(t)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, T_{n+1} = t, X(T_{n+1}) = j] - E[\zeta(t)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n}^0, N(t) = n]$ on $\{T_n < s \leq T_{n+1}\}$. Since $dM_{ij}(s) = I_i(s^-)dM_{ij}(s)$ for all $i \neq j$ and all $s > 0$, the integrands $\tilde{Z}_{ij}(s)$ can be equivalently replaced by

$$I_i(s^-)\tilde{Z}_{ij}(s) = I_i(s^-) \left(E[\zeta(s)|\mathcal{F}_{s^-}^0, X(s) = j] - E[\zeta(s)|\mathcal{F}_{s^-}^0, X(s) = i] \right).$$

Integration by parts yields that

$$d \left(Y(t)e^{-\int_0^t \delta(u)du} \right) = e^{-\int_0^t \delta(u)du} dY(t) - Y(t)e^{-\int_0^t \delta(u)du} \delta(t)dt,$$

so equation (3.7) can be rewritten to

$$-e^{-\int_0^t \delta(u)du} dY(t) = e^{-\int_0^t \delta(u)du} \left(\delta(t)Y(t)dt + \gamma_{X(t)}(t) \right) dt - e^{-\int_0^t \delta(u)du} Z(t)dM(t)$$

since $E[\zeta(t)|\mathcal{F}_{t^-}^0, X(t) = j] = e^{-\int_0^t \delta(u)du} E[Y(t)|\mathcal{F}_{t^-}^0, X(t) = j]$. Equation (3.5) follows now from the Radon-Nikodym Theorem. \square

Note that the BSDE (3.5) differs from the stochastic Thiele equations according to Norberg (1992) and Møller (1993), since we additionally use the decomposition (3.3).

Example 3.3 (Markov models). *If X is a Markov process, i.e. a process whose intensities λ_{ij} are deterministic functions of time, then $E[Y(t)|\mathcal{F}_{t^-}^0, X(t)] = E[Y(t)|X(t)]$ almost surely and (3.6) is of the form*

$$Z_{ij}(t) = E[Y(t)|X(t) = j] - E[Y(t)|X(t) = i].$$

Furthermore, if the payment processes α_i and β_{ij} are deterministic functions in t , it can be shown (see e.g. Møller (1993), Djehiche & Löfdahl (2016)) that $Y(t) = V(t, X(t))$ and $Z_{ij}(t) = V(t, j) - V(t, i)$ for some deterministic function $V(t, z)$ that solves the standard Thiele equation.

Example 3.4 (semi-Markov models). *If X is a semi-Markov process, i.e. a process whose intensities have the form $\lambda_{ij}(t) = \lambda_{ij}(t, U(t))$, then $E[Y(t)|\mathcal{F}_{t^-}^0, X(t)] = E[Y(t)|U(t), X(t)]$ almost surely and (3.6) can be replaced by the representation*

$$Z_{ij}(t) = E[Y(t)|U(t), X(t) = j] - E[Y(t)|U(t), X(t) = i].$$

Furthermore, if the payment processes are of the form $\alpha_i(t) = \alpha_i(t, U(t))$ and $\beta_{ij}(t) = \beta_{ij}(t, U(t))$ for deterministic functions $\alpha_i(t, u)$ and $\beta_{ij}(t, u)$, it can be shown (cf. Møller (1993)) that $Y(t) = V(t, X(t), U(t))$ and $Z_{ij}(t) = V(t, j, U(t)) - V(t, i, U(t))$ for some deterministic function $V(t, z, u)$ which solves the semi-Markov Thiele equation.

3.2. Nonlinear reserving. By nonlinear reserving we mean the case where the payment processes α_i and β_{ij} may depend on the current reserve $(Y(t), Z(t))$, as well as they may depend on the whole path X provided they are progressively measurable such as the case

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha_i(t)(\omega) &:= \alpha_i(t, \omega, X(\cdot \wedge t), Y(t), Z(t)), \\ \beta_{ij}(t)(\omega) &:= \beta_{ij}(t, \omega, X(\cdot \wedge t), Y(t), Z(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Assume that the processes $\gamma_i(t)(\omega) = \gamma_i(t, \omega, Y(t), Z(t))$ defined by

$$\gamma_i(t) := \alpha_i(t) + \sum_{j, j \neq i} \beta_{ij}(t-) \lambda_{ij}(t), \quad i \in \mathcal{S},$$

satisfies

(A3) There is some real $C \geq 0$ such that P -a.s., for all $t \in [0, T]$, $y, \bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}$, $z = (z_{ij})$, $\bar{z} = (\bar{z}_{ij})$, $z_{ij}, \bar{z}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$|\gamma_i(t, \omega, y, z) - \gamma_i(t, \omega, \bar{y}, \bar{z})| \leq C (|y - \bar{y}| + \|z - \bar{z}\|_\Lambda), \quad i \in \mathcal{S}$$

(A4) $E \left[\int_0^T |\gamma_{X(t)}(t, \omega, 0, 0)|^2 dt \right] < \infty$.

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose that (3.8) holds. Under the assumptions (A3) and (A4), there exists a unique solution (Y, Z) to (3.5) such that*

$$E \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y(t)|^2 + \int_0^T \|Z(t)\|_\Lambda^2 dt \right] \leq CE \left[\int_0^T |\gamma_{X(t)}(t, \omega, 0, 0)|^2 dt \right]$$

and

$$Z_{ij}(t) = E[Y(t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}^0, X(t) = j] - E[Y(t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}^0, X(t) = i], \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

Moreover, (3.4) holds

Proof. Existence and uniqueness of the BSDE follow from Theorem 5.1. in Cohen & Elliott (2012). Equation (3.5) and integration-by-parts imply that $\tilde{Y}(t) := e^{-\int_0^t \delta(u) du} Y(t)$ satisfies

$$-d\tilde{Y}(t) = \gamma_{X(t)}(t) dt - e^{-\int_0^t \delta(u) du} Z(t) dM(t), \quad \tilde{Y}(T) = 0,$$

which, in turn, implies that

$$\tilde{Y}(t) = E \left[\int_t^T e^{-\int_0^s \delta(u) du} \gamma_{X(s)}(s) ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_t^0 \right].$$

By multiplying the latter line with $e^{\int_0^t \delta(u) du}$ we obtain (3.4). Finally, apply Proposition 3.2 in order to obtain the representation for Z . \square

Definition 3.6 (Nonlinear prospective reserve). *The unique solution Y in Proposition 3.5 is the nonlinear prospective reserve of a life insurance contract with payment processes (3.8).*

Example 3.7 (Markov models). *If X is a Markov process, i.e. whose intensities λ_{ij} are deterministic functions of time, and if the payment processes are of the form $\alpha_i(t) = \alpha_i(t, Y(t), Z(t))$ and $\beta_{ij}(t) = \beta_{ij}(t, Y(t), Z(t))$ for deterministic functions $\alpha_i(t, y, z)$ and $\beta_{ij}(t, y, z)$, it can be shown (see e.g. Djehiche & Löfdahl (2016)) that $Y(t) = V(t, X(t))$ and $Z_{ij}(t) = V(t, j) - V(t, i)$ for some deterministic function V which solves the nonlinear Thiele equation.*

Example 3.8 (semi-Markov models). *If X is a semi-Markov process and if the payment processes are of the form*

$$\alpha_i(t) = \alpha_i(t, U(t), Y(t), Z(t)), \quad \beta_{ij}(t) = \beta_{ij}(t, U(t), Y(t), Z(t))$$

for deterministic functions $\alpha_i(t, u, y, z)$ and $\beta_{ij}(t, u, y, z)$, following the same arguments as in Djehiche & Löfdahl (2016), it can be shown that $Y(t) = V(t, X(t), U(t))$ and $Z_{ij}(t) = V(t, j, U(t)) - V(t, i, U(t))$ for some deterministic function V which solves the nonlinear semi-Markov Thiele equation.

4. CONTRACT MODIFICATIONS

In this section we additionally take into consideration contract modifications. We model the evolution of the insurance policy as a pair of jump processes (X, J) , where X is the state of the policy and J describes the different modes of the policy.

4.1. State space expansion. Let (X, J) be càdlàg jump processes, defined on the filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}, P)$, where \mathcal{F}_t is the completed natural filtration of (X, J) which satisfies the usual conditions. Let $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathbb{N}$ be the state space of J , i.e. the set of possible modes of the insurance contract. The \mathbb{F} -stopping times $0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots$ shall describe the times at which a switch from one mode to another occurs. We suppose that $(X(0), J(0))$ is deterministic and that $\tau_n \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely for n to infinity. Moreover, we assume that

(A5) The jump processes X and J have no simultaneous jumps.

This assumption is common in the actuarial literature for modelling lapse and contract modifications. It could be relaxed, but at the cost of a tedious notation, so we prefer to claim it here.

For X and J we define corresponding counting processes

$$\begin{aligned} N_{ij}^0(t) &:= \#\{\tau \in (0, t] : X(\tau-) = i, X(\tau) = j\}, & N_{ij}^0(0) &= 0, \\ N_{kl}^1(t) &:= \#\{\tau \in (0, t] : J(\tau-) = k, J(\tau) = l\}, & N_{kl}^1(0) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

and set

$$N^0(t) := \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} N_{ij}^0(t), \quad N^1(t) := \sum_{k,l:k \neq l} N_{kl}^1(t), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Let $\Lambda^0 = (\lambda_{ij}^0)_{ij}$ and $\Lambda^1 = (\lambda_{kl}^1)_{kl}$ denote progressively measurable jump intensities of the processes X and J , where we assume that

$$\lambda_{ij}^0(t) = \lambda_{ij}^0(t, J(t)).$$

This means that under each mode $k \in \mathcal{J}$, X is a pure jump process with random intensities $\lambda_{ij}^0(t, k)$. We assume that

(A6)

$$E \left[\int_0^T \left(\sum_{i,j,k:i \neq j} \lambda_{ij}^0(t, k) + \sum_{k,l:k \neq l} \lambda_{kl}^1(t) \right) dt \right] < \infty.$$

Assumptions (A5) and (A6) imply that $\tilde{X} := (X, J)$ can be seen as a state space expansion of the process X with corresponding counting processes $((N_{ij}^0)_{ij}, (N_{kl}^1)_{kl})$ and associated martingales

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ij}^0(t) &= N_{ij}^0(t) - \int_{(0,t]} \mathbf{1}_{\{X(s-)=i\}} \lambda_{ij}^0(s, J(s)) ds, & M_{ij}^0(0) &= 0, \\ M_{kl}^1(t) &= N_{kl}^1(t) - \int_{(0,t]} \mathbf{1}_{\{J(s-)=k\}} \lambda_{kl}^1(s) ds, & M_{kl}^1(0) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

That means that all results from the previous sections for the process X can be transferred to the expanded jump process $\tilde{X} := (X, J)$.

Example 4.1 (Markovian survival model). *The Markov survival models with surrender and free policy options studied in Buchardt et al. (2015) and Buchardt & Møller (2015) can be seen as a special class of the modulated policyholder model suggested above. As*

an example, let $\mathcal{J} = \{0, 1\}$ where 0 stands for a standard policy mode and 1 denotes the free policy mode. Assume further that the state X of the policyholder takes values in $\mathcal{S} = \{0, 1, 2\}$ where 0=alive, 1=dead and 2=surrender. If we assume $\tilde{X} := (X, J)$ to be a Markov process with state space $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} := \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}$ where

$$(0, 0) = \text{alive}, (1, 0) = \text{dead}, (2, 0) = \text{surrender}, (0, 1) = \text{alive free policy}, \\ (1, 1) = \text{dead free policy}, (2, 1) = \text{surrender free policy},$$

and intensities

$$\lambda_{00,10} = \mu_{ad}, \lambda_{00,20} = \mu_{as}, \lambda_{01,11} = \mu_{ad}^f, \lambda_{01,21} = \mu_{as}^f, \lambda_{00,01} = \mu_{af},$$

we obtain the survival model suggested in Buchardt & Møller (2015), Section 3.2.

4.2. Modifications without actuarial equivalence. If maintaining of actuarial equivalence is not an objective at contract modifications, then we can simply transfer the results from Section 3 to the expanded process $\tilde{X} := (X, J)$.

Suppose that the payment process $A(t)$ is of the form

$$dA(t) = \sum_i I_i(t) \alpha_i(t, J(t)) dt + \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} \beta_{ij}(t-, J(t-)) dN_{ij}^0(t),$$

where $\alpha_k(t, k)$ and $\beta_{ij}(t, k)$ are progressively measurable processes which satisfy

$$(4.1) \quad E \left[\int_0^T \left(\sum_i |\alpha_i(t, J(t))|^2 + \|\beta(t, J(t))\|_{\Lambda^0}^2 \right) dt \right] < \infty.$$

Note here that $J(t-) = J(t)$ whenever $dN_{ij}^0(t)$ is not zero. Setting

$$\gamma_i(t, k) := \alpha_i(t, k) dt + \sum_{j:j \neq i} \beta_{ij}(t, k) \lambda_{ij}^0(t, k), \quad i \in \mathcal{S}, k \in \mathcal{J}$$

and using the martingales associated with $(N_{ij}^0)_{ij}$, the prospective reserve at time t satisfies

$$(4.2) \quad Y(t) := E \left[\int_t^T e^{-\int_t^s \delta(u) du} \gamma_{X(s)}(s, J(s)) ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right].$$

By applying the results from Section 3 on the expanded state space process $\tilde{X} = (X, J)$, we can show that the prospective reserve (4.2) is the unique solution of the BSDE

$$(4.3) \quad -dY(t) = \left(\delta(t)Y(t) + \gamma_{X(t)}(t, J(t)) \right) dt - Z^0(t) dM^0(t) - Z^1(t) dM^1(t), \quad Y(T) = 0,$$

where $Z^0 = (Z_{ij}^0, i \neq j)$ and $Z^1 = (Z_{kl}^1, k \neq l)$ are unique predictable processes satisfying

$$(4.4) \quad E \left[\int_{(0,T]} \left(\|Z^0(s)\|_{\Lambda^0}^2 + \|Z^1(s)\|_{\Lambda^1}^2 \right) ds \right] < \infty.$$

Since \mathbb{F} is the natural filtration of (X, J) and the two processes have no simultaneous jumps, by following the arguments in the proof of Proposition 3.2 we can

show that Z^0 and Z^1 take the form

(4.5)

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{ij}^0(t) &= \sum_k \mathbf{1}_{\{J(t^-)=k\}} \left(E[Y(t)|\mathcal{F}_{t^-}, \tilde{X}(t) = (j, k)] - E[Y(t)|\mathcal{F}_{t^-}, \tilde{X}(t) = (i, k)] \right), \\ Z_{kl}^1(t) &= \sum_i \mathbf{1}_{\{X(t^-)=i\}} \left(E[Y(t)|\mathcal{F}_{t^-}, \tilde{X}(t) = (i, l)] - E[Y(t)|\mathcal{F}_{t^-}, \tilde{X}(t) = (i, k)] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Example 4.2 (The Markovian case and Thiele's equation). *Assuming that each of the intensities $\lambda_{ij}^0(t, k)$ and $\lambda_{kl}^1(t)$ are deterministic functions of (t, k) and t , respectively, the process $\tilde{X} = (X, J)$ is a Markov process. Assume further that the discount factor δ is deterministic and continuous in t and the processes $\alpha_i(t, k)$ and $\beta_{ij}(t, k)$ are deterministic functions. Since (X, J) is Markov, the prospective reserve (4.2) becomes*

$$Y(t) = E \left[\int_t^T e^{-\int_t^s \delta(u) du} \gamma_{X(s)}(s, J(s)) ds \mid X(t), J(t) \right] = V(t, X(t), J(t))$$

for some deterministic function $V : [0, T] \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In particular, we may apply the Feynman-Kac's formula (cf. Lemma 2.1 in Djehiche & Löfdahl (2016)) to see that the function

$$V(t, i, k) = E \left[\int_t^T e^{-\int_t^s \delta(u) du} \gamma_{X(s)}(s, J(s)) ds \mid X(t) = i, J(t) = k \right]$$

is differentiable in t and satisfies the following ordinary differential equation

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} V(t, i, k) - \delta(t)V(t, i, k) + \gamma_i(t, k) + Q_0 V(t, i, k) + Q_1 V(t, i, k) = 0, \\ V(T, i, k) = 0, \quad (i, k) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{J}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0 V(t, i, k) &= \sum_{j: j \neq i} \lambda_{ij}^0(t, k) (V(t, j, k) - V(t, i, k)), \\ Q_1 V(t, i, k) &= \sum_{l: l \neq k} \lambda_{kl}^1(t) (V(t, i, l) - V(t, i, k)), \end{aligned}$$

which is nothing but a modulated version of the celebrated Thiele equation. Indeed, in terms of the modulated Sum-at-Risk in mode k ,

$$R_{ij}(t, k) := \beta_{ij}(t, k) + V(t, j, k) - V(t, i, k),$$

the equation (4.6) can be rearranged to take the form

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt} V(t, i, k) - \delta(t)V(t, i, k) + \alpha_i(t, k) + Q_1 V(t, i, k) + \sum_{j: j \neq i} R_{ij}(t, k) \lambda_{ij}^0(t, k) = 0, \\ V(T, i, k) = 0, \quad (k, i) \in \mathbb{J} \times \mathcal{S}. \end{cases}$$

4.3. Modifications that maintain actuarial equivalence. Here we study contract modifications under the objective that changes should be reserve neutral. We assume that the payment process $A(t)$ is of the form

$$(4.7) \quad dA(t) = \left(\prod_{m=0}^{N^1(t^-)} \rho_m \right) \left(\sum_i I_i(t) \alpha_i(t, J(t)) dt + \sum_{i: i \neq j} \beta_{ij}(t^-, J(t^-)) dN_{ij}^0(t) \right)$$

where the factors ρ_m , $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\rho_0 := 1$ describe actuarial adjustments at the times of the mode changes, so they are assumed to be non-negative and \mathcal{F}_{τ_m} -adapted random variables. The m -th actuarial adjustment ρ_m shall be chosen in such a way that the m -th modification does not affect the prospective reserve at time τ_m . However, there are several ways to mathematically interpret that objective.

From now on we suppose that $(\Lambda^0, \Lambda^1, \delta)$ represents a technical basis. For the sake of a convenient notation we define $\xi_m := J(\tau_m)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let Y be defined by

$$(4.8) \quad Y(t) := E \left[\int_{(t,T]} e^{-\int_t^s \delta(u) du} dA(s) \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right].$$

Furthermore, for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ let $Y^k(t)$ be the prospective reserve that corresponds to the payment process

$$\sum_i I_i(t) \alpha_i(t, k) dt + \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} \beta_{ij}(t-, k) dN_{ij}^0(t).$$

Example 4.3. Consider the survival model suggested in Buchardt & Møller (2015), Section 3, where the state X of the policyholder takes values in $\mathcal{S} = \{0, 1, 2\}$ where 0=alive, 1=dead and 2=surrender. Let $\mathcal{J} = \{0, 1\}$ where 0 stands for a standard policy mode and 1 denotes the free policy mode.

- When the policy is in mode 0, the payments consist of a benefit rate $b(t)$, a premium rate $\pi(t)$ and a payment $b_{ad}(t)$ upon death at time t , i.e. we have

$$\alpha_0(t, 0) = b(t) - \pi(t), \quad \beta_{01}(t, 0) = b_{ad}(t).$$

Payment upon surrender at time t is

$$(4.9) \quad \beta_{02}(t, 0) = (1 - \kappa) Y^0(t),$$

where κ is a given constant in $[0, 1]$. Therefore,

$$\gamma_{X(t)}(t, 0) = \left(b(t) - \pi(t) + \lambda_{01}(t, 0) b_{ad}(t) + \lambda_{02}(t, 0) (1 - \kappa) Y^0(t) \right) I_0(t).$$

- When the policy is in mode 1, the free policy regime, the premiums $\pi(t)$ are waived and the benefits are reduced by the adjustment factor ρ_1 ,

$$\gamma_{X(t)}(t, 1) = \rho_1 \left(b(t) + \lambda_{01}(t, 1) b_{ad}(t) + \lambda_{02}(t, 1) (1 - \kappa) Y^1(t) \right) I_0(t),$$

where the third addend in the bracket is the payment upon surrender $\beta_{12}(t, 1) = (1 - \kappa) Y^1(t)$ in mode 1.

Following Buchardt & Møller (2015), the adjustment factor ρ_1 is determined by

$$\rho_1 = \frac{Y^0(\tau_1)}{Y^1(\tau_1)},$$

which is equivalent to the actuarial equivalence condition

$$(4.10) \quad Y(\tau_1) = Y^0(\tau_1),$$

i.e. the prospective reserve at the time of regime change τ_1 is invariant with respect to the regime change.

There are at least two ways to generalize (4.10) to multiple regime-changes. Let $Y^{\{1, \dots, m-1\}}$ and $Y^{\mathbb{N} \setminus \{m\}}$ be the hypothetical prospective reserves of life insurance contracts where the m -th regime change and where the m -th and all following regime changes are skipped, respectively, i.e.

$$(4.11)$$

$$Y^{\{1, \dots, m-1\}}(\tau_m) = \rho_1 \cdots \rho_{m-1} Y^{\xi_{m-1}}(\tau_m),$$

$$(4.12) \quad Y^{\mathbb{N} \setminus \{m\}}(\tau_m) = E \left[\rho_1 \cdots \rho_{m-1} (Y^{\xi_{m-1}}(\tau_m) - Y^{\xi_{m-1}}(\tau_{m+1})) + Y(\tau_{m+1}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m} \right].$$

Aiming for contract modifications to be reserve neutral, we could call for either of the following conditions:

- (P1) At time τ_m the prospective reserve should equal the hypothetical prospective reserve of a contract where the m -th and all following regime changes are skipped, i.e.

$$(4.13) \quad Y(\tau_m) = Y^{\{1, \dots, m-1\}}(\tau_m), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

- (P2) At time τ_m the prospective reserve should equal the hypothetical prospective reserve of a contract where only the m -th regime change is skipped, i.e.

$$(4.14) \quad Y(\tau_m) = Y^{\mathbb{N} \setminus \{m\}}(\tau_m), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Remark 4.4. *There are further plausible ways to define actuarial equivalence, different from (4.10). Another reasonable condition for Example 4.3 is to claim that the prospective reserve at time τ_1 should equal the reserve of a contract where the modification option has not been exercised yet, i.e.*

$$Y(\tau_1) = Y_0(\tau_1) \quad \text{where } Y_0(t) := E[Y(t) | \mathcal{F}_{t-}, X(t), J(t) = 0].$$

Since $Y_0(\tau_1) = Y(\tau_1) - Z_{01}^0(\tau_1)$ for Z_{01}^0 as defined in (4.5), we obtain

$$\rho_1 = \frac{Y(\tau_1) - Z_{01}^0(\tau_1)}{Y^1(\tau_1)}$$

such that the process γ in mode 1 takes the form

$$\gamma_{X(t)}(t, 1) = \gamma_{X(t)}(t, 1, Y(\tau_1), Z^0(\tau_1)).$$

Plugging that form of γ into (4.3) defines a non-linear BSDE problem. For $t > \tau_1$ the process γ depends on past values of (Y, Z^0) such that Proposition 3.5 does not apply here. In order to guarantee existence and uniqueness of a solution, the Lipschitz constant for γ cannot be freely chosen as in (A3) but needs to be sufficiently small, see e.g. Cheridito & Nam (2017). The maximal Lipschitz constants in Cheridito & Nam (2017) are too small for realistic contracts.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose that the random variables $Y(\tau_m)$ and $\rho_1 \cdots \rho_m Y^{\xi_m}(\tau_m)$ have an integrable majorant jointly for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

- (a) Equation (4.13) holds if and only if

$$(4.15) \quad \rho_m Y^{\xi_m}(\tau_m) = Y^{\xi_{m-1}}(\tau_m)$$

almost surely on $\{\omega \in \Omega : \rho_1(\omega) \cdots \rho_{m-1}(\omega) \neq 0\}$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

- (b) Equation (4.14) holds if and only if

$$(4.16) \quad \rho_m E \left[Y^{\xi_m}(\tau_m) - Y^{\xi_m}(\tau_{m+1}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m} \right] = E \left[Y^{\xi_{m-1}}(\tau_m) - Y^{\xi_{m-1}}(\tau_{m+1}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m} \right]$$

almost surely on $\{\omega \in \Omega : \rho_1(\omega) \cdots \rho_{m-1}(\omega) \neq 0\}$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. The definition of the process Y implies that

$$(4.17) \quad Y(\tau_m) = E[\rho_1 \cdots \rho_m (Y^{\xi_m}(\tau_m) - Y^{\xi_m}(\tau_{m+1})) + Y(\tau_{m+1}) | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m}]$$

for each $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

- (a) For the proof of part (a) see the Proposition 4.7 below, which includes this Proposition as a special case.

(b) Plugging (4.12) and (4.17) into (4.14) shows that condition (4.14) is equivalent to (4.16). \square

Proposition 4.5 allows us to calculate the actuarial adjustment factors $(\rho_m)_{m \geq 1}$ by a forward recursion on the basis of the non-modulated prospective reserves $(Y^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ only, where the latter can be obtained as explained in section 3. Once the actuarial adjustments $(\rho_m)_{m \geq 1}$ are explicitly known, in a second step we can then calculate the regime-modulated reserve Y , also according to section 3.

Definition 4.6 (Prospective reserve under contract modifications). *Suppose that the factors $(\rho_m)_{m \geq 1}$ are a solution of the recursive schemes (4.15) and (4.16), satisfying the integrability assumptions of Proposition 4.5. Then Y according to (4.8) is the prospective reserve of the unique life insurance contract of the form (4.7) that satisfies the equivalence properties (4.13) and (4.14), respectively.*

4.4. Modifications that maintain actuarial equivalence after deductions. Additionally to the payments process in (4.7) let there be deductions (or fees) taken from the current reserve at contract modifications, i.e.

$$(4.18) \quad dA(t) = \left(\prod_{m=0}^{N^1(t-)} \rho_m \right) \left(\sum_i I_i(t) \alpha_i(t, J(t)) dt + \sum_{i,j:i \neq j} \beta_{ij}(t-, J(t-)) dN_{ij}^0(t) \right) + \sum_{m=1}^{N^1(t)} \phi_m,$$

where the deductions $(\phi_m)_m$ are assumed to be \mathcal{F}_{τ_m} -adapted random variables. Including deductions in condition (4.14) leads to the following generalized condition:

(P1') At time τ_m the prospective reserve should equal the hypothetical deducted prospective reserve of a contract where the m -th and all following regime changes are skipped, i.e.

$$(4.19) \quad Y(\tau_m) = Y^{\{1, \dots, m-1\}}(\tau_m) - \phi_m, \quad m \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\phi_m = f_m(Y^{\{1, \dots, m-1\}}(\tau_m))$ and $f_m(y) = f_m(y, \omega)$ shall be \mathcal{F}_{τ_m} -adapted for each y .

Note that (4.11) is still true here.

Proposition 4.7. *Suppose that the random variables $Y(\tau_m)$ and $\rho_1 \cdots \rho_m Y^{\xi_m}(\tau_m)$ have an integrable majorant jointly for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

(a') Equation (4.19) holds if and only if

$$(4.20) \quad \rho_m Y^{\xi_m}(\tau_m) = Y^{\xi_{m-1}}(\tau_m) - \frac{f_m(\rho_1 \cdots \rho_{m-1} Y^{\xi_{m-1}}(\tau_m))}{\rho_1 \cdots \rho_{m-1}}$$

almost surely on $\{\omega \in \Omega : \rho_1(\omega) \cdots \rho_{m-1}(\omega) \neq 0\}$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, equation (4.19) implies that

$$Y(0) = Y^0(0) \quad \text{and} \quad Y(\tau_m) = \rho_1 \cdots \rho_m Y^{\xi_m}(\tau_m), \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. The definition of the process Y implies that

$$(4.21) \quad Y(\tau_m) = E[\rho_1 \cdots \rho_m (Y^{\xi_m}(\tau_m) - Y^{\xi_m}(\tau_{m+1})) + \phi_{m+1} + Y(\tau_{m+1}) | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m}]$$

for each $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. First suppose that (4.19) holds. Applying this equation for m and $m + 1$ on the left hand side and on the right hand side of (4.21), respectively, yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \rho_1 \cdots \rho_{m-1} Y^{\zeta_{m-1}}(\tau_m) - \phi_m \\ &= \rho_1 \cdots \rho_m Y^{\zeta_m}(\tau_m) + E[-Y(\tau_{m+1}) + Y(\tau_{m+1}) | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m}], \end{aligned}$$

i.e. equation (4.20) holds. Now suppose that (4.20) is satisfied, i.e. we know that $\rho_1 \cdots \rho_{m-1} Y^{\zeta_{m-1}}(\tau_m) - \phi_m = \rho_1 \cdots \rho_m Y^{\zeta_m}(\tau_m)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Using the latter equation for $m + 1$ on the right hand side of (4.21) and rearranging terms leads to

$$Y(\tau_m) - \rho_1 \cdots \rho_m Y^{\zeta_m}(\tau_m) = E[Y(\tau_{m+1}) - \rho_1 \cdots \rho_{m+1} Y^{\zeta_{m+1}}(\tau_{m+1}) | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m}].$$

Iterative application of the latter equation gives

$$Y(\tau_m) - \rho_1 \cdots \rho_m Y^{\zeta_m}(\tau_m) = E[Y(\tau_{m+r}) - \rho_1 \cdots \rho_{m+r} Y^{\zeta_{m+r}}(\tau_{m+r}) | \mathcal{F}_{\tau_m}]$$

for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$. By taking the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$ and applying the dominated convergence theorem, we get

$$(4.22) \quad Y(\tau_m) - \rho_1 \cdots \rho_m Y^{\zeta_m}(\tau_m) = 0, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}$$

since $Y^{\zeta_{m+r}}(\tau_{m+r})$ and $\rho_1 \cdots \rho_{m+r} Y^{\zeta_{m+r}}(\tau_{m+r})$ converge to zero almost surely. In order to see that, recall that for almost each $\omega \in \Omega$ there is an $r' = r'(\omega)$ such that $\tau_{r'} > T$, but all kinds of reserves are constantly zero beyond the maximum contract time T . This kind of reasoning also applies for $m = 0$, i.e.

$$Y(\tau_0) - Y^{\zeta_0}(\tau_0) = 0,$$

which can be simplified to $Y(0) - Y^0(0) = 0$. Moreover, using (4.20) and (4.11) in (4.22) yields

$$Y(\tau_m) = \rho_1 \cdots \rho_{m-1} Y^{\zeta_{m-1}}(\tau_m) - \phi_m = Y^{\{1, \dots, m-1\}}(\tau_m) - \phi_m,$$

which is condition (4.19). \square

Proposition 4.7 allows us to calculate the actuarial adjustment factors $(\rho_m)_{m \geq 1}$ by a forward recursion on the basis of the non-modulated prospective reserves $(Y^k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ only, where the latter can be obtained as explained in section 3. Once the actuarial adjustments $(\rho_m)_{m \geq 1}$ are explicitly known, in a second step we can then calculate the modulated reserve Y , also according to section 3.

Definition 4.8 (Prospective reserve under contract modifications including fees). *Suppose that the factors $(\rho_m)_{m \geq 1}$ are a solution of the recursive scheme (4.20) such that the integrability assumptions of Proposition 4.5 are satisfied. Then Y according to (4.8) is the prospective reserve of the unique life insurance contract of the form (4.7) that satisfies the equivalence property (4.19), respectively.*

Proposition 4.7 in particular concludes that

$$Y(0) = Y^0(0),$$

i.e. under principle (P1) or (P1') an actuary may ignore any future contract modifications at the beginning of the contract. While we derive this fact as a result of (P1) or (P1'), in the literature it often appears as an assumption without the underlying equivalence condition being specified.

REFERENCES

- [BMS15] K. Buchardt, T. Møller, and K. B. Schmidt, *Cash flows and policyholder behaviour in the semi-Markov life insurance setup*, *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* **2015** (2015), no. 8, 660–688.
- [BM15] K. Buchardt and T. Møller, *Life insurance cash flows with policyholder behavior*, *Risks* **3** (2015), no. 3, 290–317.
- [Brè81] P. Brémaud, *Point Processes and Queues: Martingale Dynamics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1981.
- [CN17] P. Cheridito and K. Nam, *BSEs, BSDEs and fixed-point problems.*, *The Annals of Probability* **45** (2017), no. 6, 3795–3828.
- [CM75] C.-S. Chou and P.-A. Meyer, *Sur la représentation des martingales comme intégrales stochastiques dans les processus ponctuels. In: Séminaire de Probabilités IX Université de Strasbourg (pp. 226-236)*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1975.
- [Chr12] M. C. Christiansen, *Multistate models in health insurance*, *Advances in Statistical Analysis* **96**(2) (2012), 155–186.
- [CE15] S. N. Cohen and R. J. Elliott, *Stochastic calculus and applications*, Birkhäuser, 2015.
- [CE12] S. N. Cohen and R. J. Elliott, *Existence, Uniqueness and Comparisons for BSDEs in General Spaces*, *Annals of Probability* **40**(5) (2012), 2264–2297.
- [CDD14] M. C. Christiansen, M. M. Denuit, and J. Dhaene, *Reserve-dependent benefits and costs in life and health insurance contracts*, *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **57** (2014), 132–137.
- [DL16] B. Djehiche and B. Löfdahl, *Nonlinear reserving in life insurance: Aggregation and mean-field approximation*, *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **69** (2016), 1–13.
- [Ell76] R. J. Elliott, *Stochastic integrals for martingales of a jump process with partially accessible jump times*, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie ver. Geb* **36** (1976), 213–266.
- [Gat09] N. Gatzert, *Implicit options in life insurance: An overview*, *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Versicherungswissenschaft* **98** (2009), no. 2, 141–164.
- [Møl93] C. M. Møller, *A stochastic version of Thiele's differential equation*, *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* **1** (1993), 1–16.
- [MS97] H. Milbrodt and A. Stracke, *Markov models and Thiele's integral equations for the prospective reserve*, *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **19** (1997), no. 3, 187–235.
- [MS07] T. Møller and M. Steffensen, *Market-valuation methods in life and pension insurance*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [Nor91] R. Norberg, *Reserves in life and pension insurance*, *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* **1991** (1991), no. 1, 3–24.
- [Nor92] R. Norberg, *Hattendorff's theorem and Thiele's differential equation generalized*, *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* **1992** (1992), no. 1, 2–14.
- [Nor05] R. Norberg, *Anomalous PDEs in Markov chains: domains of validity and numerical solutions*, *Finance and Stochastics* **9** (2005), no. 4, 519–537.
- [RW00] L. C. G. Rogers and D. Williams, *Diffusions, Markov Processes and Martingales-Volume 2: Itô Calculus.*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, CARL VON OSSIETZKY UNIVERSITY, OLDENBURG, GERMANY

E-mail address: marcus.christiansen@uni-oldenburg.de

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KTH ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, 100 44, STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

E-mail address: boualem@kth.se