

# How much is optimal reinsurance degraded by error?

Yinzhi Wang and Erik Bølviken  
Department of Mathematics  
University of Oslo

December 10, 2019

## **Abstract**

The literature on optimal reinsurance does not deal with how much the effectiveness of such solutions are degraded by errors in parameters and models. The issue is investigated through both asymptotics and numerical studies. It is shown that the rate of degradation is often  $O(1/n)$  as the sample size  $n$  of historical observations becomes infinite. Criteria based on Value at Risk are exceptions that may achieve only  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ . These theoretical results are supported by numerical studies. A Bayesian perspective on how to integrate risk caused by parameter error is offered as well.

## **Key words and phrases**

Asymptotics, Bayesian, Conditional Value at Risk, frequentist, risk over expected surplus, Value at Risk.

## 1 Introduction

Reinsurance is extensively used by insurance companies to reduce net risk exposure and lower the reserve. This yields savings in capital cost which must be balanced against reinsurance expenses, and this creates an issue of optimality as to what is the best trade-off. The problem was first attacked by Borch (1960) who showed that stop-loss reinsurance minimizes the variance of the expected loss for a given level of reinsurance, and Arrow (1963) arrived at the same type of contract by maximizing the expected utility of a risk-averse insurer's terminal wealth. Both Borch and Arrow assumed reinsurance premium to be proportional to the expected reinsurance pay-out, the so-called expected premium principle. The lack of realism here was realized by Borch himself, and it is not surprising that there have in recent decades been a considerable upsurge of contributions based on other ways of pricing reinsurance, for example Young (1999); Kaluszka (2001); Chi and Tan (2013) and Cong and Tan (2016). In practice such premia depend strongly on the state of the market and may be highly fluctuating from one year to another. An insurance company would from offers it has received from reinsurers know something about the pricing schemes it faces, but such information is not publicly available, and academic work must therefore use so-called premium principles as proxies for market prices, as we do in this paper. A long list of them has been compiled in Young (2004).

Then there is the question of how the trade-off between net reserve and reinsurance cost should be put in mathematical form. Many possibilities have found their way into actuarial literature, for example Kaluszka (2004); Cai et al. (2008); Balbás et al. (2009) and Cheung et al. (2014) have minimized retained loss under some risk function; whereas Gajek and Zagrodny (2004) and Guerra and Centeno (2008) maximize expected utility of wealth under different utility functions. Much of the present paper is concerned with Value at Risk (VaR) and Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR) against the insurer's expected profit. CVaR is a coherent risk measure and is much more in vogue by theorists than VaR which does not satisfy the sub-additivity property; consult Artzner et al. (1999). Yet Value at Risk is arguably the more important from an industry point view since it is under current regulatory schemes directly linked to the cost of capital. Single layer contracts (i.e. excess of loss with an upper limit) may under either risk measure be optimal for single risks or at least close to that. Precise results of this nature was established by Cheung et al. (2014) under the expected premium principle whereas Chi et al. (2017) under much more general conditions arrive at multi-layer contracts, but those often reduce, at least approximately, to single-layer ones under certain plausible constraints on the reinsurance pricing functions introduced in Bølviken and Wang (2019). Some of these results are reviewed in Section 2 as motivation for the subsequent error study based on single-layer contracts.

What is not known at all is to what extent the optimality is upheld when there are errors in models and parameters. Optimal contracts are derived under estimated parameters or under a postulated claim size distribution that can't really be justified, and the solutions are no longer optimal under the true parameters or distribution. The question is how far from the optimum we have now moved. Are criteria so sensitive that the solutions become very bad or do they on the contrary remain close to the optimum? How much historical data are needed to fit parameters and distributions? The issue is a question of degradation with contracts derived under estimated models evaluated under the true one so that it is possible to investigate how much worse they have become. Asymptotic studies as the number of historical observations  $n$  becomes infinite are carried out in Section 3. It

will turn out that the degradation rate is often  $O(1/n)$  rather than the more usual  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ , but in important special cases only the latter can be achieved. The coefficient of the leading error term is identified, and it is possible to use it operatively for numerical approximation, but when risk has to be computed by Monte Carlo in the first place, it is often just as easy to implement a bootstrap (which amounts to nested simulations). The numerical study presented in Section 4 makes use of this tool. A Bayesian perspective is offered in Section 5 and compared to the frequentist one numerically.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Notation and formulation

Let  $X$  be the total claim losses of a single portfolio of non-life insurance policies over a certain period of time (often one year) and let  $I = I(X)$  be the loss ceded to a reinsurer. Natural restrictions on  $I(x)$  are

$$0 \leq I(x) \leq x \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq I(x_2) - I(x_1) \leq x_2 - x_1 \quad \text{if} \quad x_1 \leq x_2, \quad (2.1)$$

where the first condition is obvious since the reinsurer will never pay out more than the original claim. The second condition, known as the slow growth property is there to avoid moral hazard; consult Chi and Tan (2011). It is equivalent to a derivative  $dI(x)/dx$  between 0 and 1 where it exists, and it is crucial for the optimum results cited in Section 2.5.

The retained risk of the insurer is

$$R_I(X) = X - I(X) \quad (2.2)$$

with the subscript  $I$  denoting the quantity to be optimized over. Associated with  $R_I(X)$  there is a risk measure, for example Value at Risk (VaR) or Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR). Although it will in Section 3 be necessary to highlight that these quantities depend on an underlying parameter vector  $\theta$  of the distribution function  $F(x; \theta)$  of  $X$ , we can do without that for now. Their mathematical definitions at level  $\epsilon$  are then

$$\text{VaR}_{R_I} = \inf\{x | 1 - F_{R_I}(x) \leq \epsilon\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{CVaR}_{R_I} = E\{R_I(X) | R_I(X) \geq \text{VaR}_{R_I}\} \quad (2.3)$$

with  $F_{R_I}(x)$  the distribution function of  $R_I(X)$ . Generic symbol for risk measures in this paper is  $\rho_{R_I}$ .

The optimum problem considered in most of this paper is the trade-off between a risk measure and the expected surplus of the insurer for which a mathematical expression under a given reinsurance treaty must be developed. If  $\pi$  is the premium collected from clients and  $\pi_I$  the reinsurance premium under  $I(X)$ , the economic summary of the operations is

$$A_I = \pi - X + I(X) - \pi_I - \beta \rho_{R_I}, \quad (2.4)$$

where the last term on the right takes into account the cost of holding solvency capital through the cost of capital rate  $\beta \geq 0$ . Note that this formulation attaches cost to the entire net solvency

capital  $R_I(X)$ , not only to the part above the average as in Chi et al. (2017). Our choice seems to us industrially plausible. Let  $G_I = E(A_I)$  be the expected surplus of the reinsurer. Taking expectations in (2.4) yields

$$G_I = \{\pi - E(X)\} - \{\pi_I - E\{I(X)\}\} - \beta\rho_{R_I}, \quad (2.5)$$

which subtracts the expected surplus of the reinsurer and the capital cost from the expected surplus of the insurer when no reinsurance has been bought.

## 2.2 Premia

In their simplest form premia are based on fixed loadings  $\gamma$  and  $\gamma_r$  (both positive) so that

$$\pi = (1 + \gamma)E(X) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_I = (1 + \gamma_r)E\{I(X)\} \quad (2.6)$$

with  $\gamma_r > \gamma$  in practice. The reinsurance part is inadequate since prices in that market is likely to increase with risk beyond a fixed coefficient  $\gamma_r$ . A more general formulation, used for example in Chi et al. (2017); Bølviken and Wang (2019), is to introduce a market factor  $M(Z)$  so that

$$\pi_I = E\{I(X)M(Z)\}. \quad (2.7)$$

Here  $Z$  is a positive random variable correlated with  $X$ . The dependence between  $X$  and  $Z$  is typically captured by a bivariate copula. Possible formulations of the market factor can be found in Chi et al. (2017). It is traditionally assumed that  $E\{M(Z)\} = 1$ , but that will be relaxed below.

A reformulation of  $\pi_I$  and the expected reinsurer surplus taken from Bølviken and Wang (2019) will be needed later. Suppose  $U = F(X)$  is the uniform under  $X$ . Then

$$\pi_I = E\{I(X)M(Z)\} = E\{E\{I(X)M(Z)|U\}\} = E\{I(X)E\{M(Z)|U\}\},$$

with the last identity being due to  $X = F^{-1}(U)$  having been fixed by  $U$ . Hence

$$\pi_I = E\{I(X)W\{F(X)\}\} \quad \text{where} \quad W(u) = E\{M(Z)|u\} \quad (2.8)$$

which implies that the reinsurer expected surplus becomes

$$\pi(I) - E\{I(X)\} = \int_0^\infty (W\{F(x)\} - 1)I(x)dF(x).$$

Introduce

$$K(u) = \int_u^1 \{W(v) - 1\}dv, \quad 0 \leq u \leq 1 \quad (2.9)$$

and note that  $dK(u)/du = -(W(u) - 1)$  so that integration by parts yields

$$\pi(I) - E\{I(X)\} = \int_0^\infty K\{F(t)\}dI(t). \quad (2.10)$$

### 2.3 Properties of the K-function.

How  $K(u)$  varies will provide useful information about the optimum reinsurance functions in Section 2.5. It is reasonable to assume as in Bølviken and Wang (2019) that  $W(u)$  is an increasing function of  $u$  which is a form of positive dependence between  $X$  and  $M(Z)$ . Then  $K(u)$  either increases to a maximum before decreasing to  $W(1) = 0$  or decreases everywhere. Of particular interest are the values at  $u = 0$  and  $u = 1 - \epsilon$ . First note that (2.8) and (2.9) yield

$$K(0) = E\{M(Z)\} - 1 \quad (2.11)$$

so that  $K(0) = 0$  if  $E\{M(Z)\} = 1$ . The latter is a common assumption in actuarial literature which goes back to Bühlmann (1980), yet it will be suggested in the next section that  $E\{M(Z)\}$  may well be larger. It is in either case easy to verify that

$$K(u) \geq 0, \quad (2.12)$$

if  $W(u)$  is increasing in  $u$ . Suppose  $W(u_m) = 1$  which implies that  $W(u) \leq 1$  for  $u \leq u_m$  and  $W(u) \geq 1$  for  $u > u_m$ . This means that  $K(u) \geq 0$  for  $u > u_m$  since the integrand in (2.9) is positive everywhere while

$$K(u) = K(0) - \int_0^u (W(v) - 1),$$

and the integrand on the right is negative when  $u \leq u_m$  so that again  $K(u) \geq 0$ .

### 2.4 Criteria for optimization

Many contributors to reinsurance optimum theory work with an expected utility function. If  $\mathcal{U}(y)$  is the utility of wealth  $y$ , the aim is to select  $I(X)$  so that

$$\mathcal{C}_I = E(\mathcal{U}\{R_I(X)\}) \quad (2.13)$$

is maximized; consult Arrow (1963); Kaluszka and Okolewski (2008) and Guerra and Centeno (2008). Another popular approach is through the risk-adjusted surplus of the reinsurer. This is a Lagrangian set-up of the form

$$\mathcal{C}_I = G_I - \lambda \rho_{R_I}, \quad (2.14)$$

where  $\lambda > 0$  is a coefficient pricing risk; see Balbás et al. (2009); Tan et al. (2011); Jiang et al. (2017) and Weng and Zhuang (2017). If (2.14) is maximized for given values of the coefficient  $\lambda > 0$ , the resulting solutions define an efficient frontier of the Markowitz type with the minimum risk  $\rho_I$  obtainable for a given value of the expected surplus  $G_I$ .

A related criterion is to minimize risk over expected surplus so that

$$\mathcal{C}_I = \frac{\rho_{R_I}}{G_I}. \quad (2.15)$$

The resulting solution is also located on the Markowitz frontier and corresponds to a certain  $\lambda$  and a certain view on risk. To see this suppose  $I$  and  $I_\lambda$  minimize (2.15) and (2.14) with  $G_I$  and  $G_{I_\lambda}$  their expected gains. If it is possible to select  $\lambda$  so that  $G_I = G_{I_\lambda}$ , then  $I$  must minimize (2.15) and  $I_\lambda$  (2.14).

## 2.5 One-layer contracts and optimality

One-layer contracts are defined mathematically as

$$I_{\mathbf{a}}(x) = \max(x - a_1, 0) - \max(x - a_2, 0) \quad (2.16)$$

with  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2)^T$  a vector. The rest of the paper will examine the loss in effectiveness when  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are calculated from estimated parameters. This is relevant because such contracts are often optimal or at least not too far from that, and the discussion will also throw light on why VaR and CVaR based criteria behave so differently with respect to estimation error.

The optimum  $I(X)$  under the risk-adjusted surplus (2.14) was identified by Chi et al. (2017) who established a link to certain functions  $\psi_v(x)$  for the VaR risk measure and  $\psi_c(x)$  for CVaR. Indeed, let  $x_\epsilon$  be the  $1 - \epsilon$  percentile for  $X$  and  $\mathcal{I}(B)$  the indicator function for the event  $B$ . Then

$$\psi_v(x) = -K\{F(x)\} + (\lambda + \beta)\mathcal{I}(x \leq x_\epsilon) \quad (2.17)$$

and

$$\psi_c(x) = \psi_v(x) + (\lambda + \beta)\mathcal{I}(x > x_\epsilon) \frac{1 - F(x)}{\epsilon}. \quad (2.18)$$

With  $\psi(x)$  either of  $\psi_v(x)$  or  $\psi_c(x)$  the optimum reinsurance function is

$$I(x) = \int_0^x \mathcal{I}_{\psi(t) > 0} dt, \quad (2.19)$$

which is a multi-layer reinsurance contract with the number of layers depending on how many times  $\psi(x)$  crosses 0. It was argued in Bølviken and Wang (2019) that the optimum solutions under the conditions in Section 2.3 are of the form

$$I(x) = I_{\mathbf{a}}(x) + I_{\mathbf{b}}(x) \quad (2.20)$$

with  $\mathbf{b} = (0, b_2)^T$  and  $b_2 \leq a_1$ . The prerequisite for a  $b$ -layer starting at the origin is

$$\psi(0) = -(E\{M(Z)\} - 1) + \lambda + \beta > 0,$$

which is always satisfied when  $E\{M(Z)\} = 1$ , but not when  $E\{M(Z)\} > 1$ . An argument for the stronger condition  $E\{M(Z)\} > 1 + \gamma$  has been put forward in Bølviken and Wang (2019). Now  $\psi(0) < 0$  if  $\lambda < \gamma - \beta$  with (2.20) reducing to a single layer if the price on risk is smaller than the loading minus the cost of capital.

These results have impact on the upper cut-off point  $a_2$  too. Since  $K\{F(x_\epsilon)\} = K(1 - \epsilon)$ , it follows from (2.17) that

$$\psi_v(x_\epsilon) = -K(1 - \epsilon) + \beta + \lambda$$

while  $\psi_v(x) = -K\{F(x)\} \leq 0$  if  $x > x_\epsilon$ . Reinsurance layers thus do not extend beyond  $x_\epsilon$  while there is a change of sign there if  $K(1 - \epsilon) < \beta + \lambda$ . This appears most common in practice, and gives  $a_2 = x_\epsilon$  as an optimal upper limit when VaR is the risk measure. That changes with CVaR where the form of the function  $\psi_c(x)$  in (2.18) shows that the optimum  $a_2 > x_\epsilon$ . This difference has profound impact of the asymptotic theory in the next section since criteria functions based on CVaR become smooth with second order derivatives at the optimum points whereas there is a singularity at  $a_2 = x_\epsilon$  for VaR.

### 3 Degradation

#### 3.1 Formulation

In practice the distribution of  $X$  depends on unknown parameters, for example the claim intensity  $\mu$  and expectation  $\xi$  and shape parameter  $\alpha$  of the claim severities, but we have only access to estimated quantities which means that the reinsurance solutions are some distance from the real optimum. To put the problem in mathematical form let the unknown parameters hiding under the distribution function  $F(x; \boldsymbol{\theta})$  be a vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n_\theta})^T$  and consider some class of reinsurance treaties defined by varying  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{n_a})^T$ . It will be convenient to rewrite the criterion  $C_I$  in (2.15) as  $C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  with the vector  $\mathbf{a}$  defining the class of reinsurance arrangements under consideration and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  as the parameters under which it has been calculated.

The problem is that we do not have access to the true parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , only an estimated one  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ . Suppose  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$  define optimal reinsurance contracts under  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ , then

$$C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \min_{\mathbf{b}} C(\mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad \text{and} \quad C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \min_{\mathbf{b}} C(\mathbf{b}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}), \quad (3.1)$$

and we are interested in the difference

$$D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (3.2)$$

where  $C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  evaluates how well the optimal coefficient  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$  obtained under the estimate vector  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  works when  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is the true one. Note that  $D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq 0$ , and the question is how much estimation error has made it grow.

#### 3.2 The bootstrap

One approach is through the bootstrap which yields the mean and variance and even the distribution of  $D(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . This means that the historical data is simulated from the estimate which is then re-estimated as (say)  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^*$  and an alternative optimal reinsurance treaty  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}^*$  calculated. The distribution of  $D(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is then identified with

$$D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}), \quad (3.3)$$

which can be examined by repeating the simulations 50 or 100 times. In practice this amounts to nested bootstrapping since the criterion  $C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$  is typically computed by Monte Carlo. The bootstrap approach is used in Section 4.

#### 3.3 Asymptotics for smooth criteria

Many of the criteria used in theory of optimal reinsurance are smooth functions of the coefficient vector  $\mathbf{a}$  in the sense that they are twice differentiable with respect to  $\mathbf{a}$ . That will normally be the case when the risk measure in (2.15) is convex as in Cheung et al. (2014) and Gajek and Zagrodny (2004) or when  $C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  in (2.13) is minus the expectation of a utility function  $\mathcal{U}(X)$  of the cedent.



It may also apply to CVaR-based criteria since the objective function is smooth at the optimal coefficient vector  $\mathbf{a}$ , as was remarked in Section 2.5, and Proposition 3.1 below may be valid for CVaR too. Theoretical insight into how much parameter error degrades optima can under these circumstances be gained through standard asymptotics by letting the number of observations  $n$  behind the estimate  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  become infinite. Usually  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  then becomes Gaussian with mean  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and some covariance matrix  $\Sigma/n$ . The precise formulation is

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{N} \sim N(0, \Sigma) \quad (3.4)$$

with  $\Sigma$  depending on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . Let  $C^{aa} = (c_{ij}^{aa})$  and  $C^{a\theta} = (c_{ij}^{a\theta})$  where

$$c_{ij}^{aa} = \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial a_i \partial a_j} \quad \text{and} \quad c_{ij}^{a\theta} = \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial a_i \partial \theta_j} \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n_\theta \quad (3.5)$$

be second order derivative matrices of  $C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ . There is then the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.1.** *If  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  is asymptotically Gaussian as in (3.4) and  $C(\mathbf{a}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$  twice differentiable in  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , then as  $n \rightarrow \infty$*

$$nD(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{N}^T Q \mathbf{N} \quad \text{where} \quad Q = \frac{1}{2}(C^{a\theta})^T (C^{aa})^{-1} (C^{a\theta}). \quad (3.6)$$

The asymptotic distribution of  $D(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is thus a Gaussian quadratic form, consult Appendix A.1 for the proof. Mean and standard deviation in the asymptotic distribution are calculated on p. 424 in Provost and Mathai (1992) and become

$$E\{D(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} = \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}(Q\Sigma) + o(1/n) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{sd}\{D(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} = \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{2\text{tr}(Q\Sigma Q\Sigma)} + o(1/n), \quad (3.7)$$

where  $o(1/n)$  represents quantities for which  $o(1/n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The operator  $\text{tr}$  is the trace of a matrix (the sum of its diagonal elements).

What is lost by not knowing  $\theta$  is of order  $1/n$ . The bias  $E\{D(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}$  is always positive. This is not immediate from (3.7) left, but the fact that  $Q$  in (3.6) right is positive definite shows that it must be so. Practical calculation requires the second order derivatives of  $C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  which must be carried out numerically.

### 3.4 Asymptotics for non-smooth criteria

The argument leading to Proposition 3.1 is based on an ordinary Taylor expansion and doesn't work for the VaR criterion which is not differentiable at the optimum point  $a_2 = x_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . Consider the one-layer contract (2.16) known from Section 2.5 to be optimal or close to that under a wide class of reinsurance premium principles. To formulate the asymptotic result we need the gradient vector of the  $1 - \epsilon$  percentile  $x_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  with respect to  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ ; i.e.

$$\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_{n_\theta})^T, \quad g_i = \frac{\partial x_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_\theta, \quad (3.8)$$

and also

$$V = \frac{\mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{N}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{g}^T \Sigma \mathbf{g}}} \quad (3.9)$$

with  $\mathbf{N}$  the same Gaussian vector as in the preceding section which implies that  $V$  is Gaussian  $(0, 1)$ . We also need the coefficients

$$h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \{1 + \beta C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\} C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) / a_1 \quad \text{and} \quad h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2 K(1 - \epsilon) / a_1. \quad (3.10)$$

**Proposition 3.2.** *If  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  is asymptotically Gaussian as in (3.4), and  $C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  is the VaR over expected gain criterion, then as  $n \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\sqrt{n} D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \xrightarrow{d} \{h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})(-V)_+ + h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})V\} \sqrt{\mathbf{g}^T \Sigma \mathbf{g}}, \quad (3.11)$$

where  $V$  is Normal  $(0, 1)$ .

Note that degradation now shrinks at the rate  $1/\sqrt{n}$  instead of  $1/n$  as in Proposition 3.1. Expectation and variance in the asymptotic distribution become

$$E\{D(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \sqrt{\mathbf{g}^T \Sigma \mathbf{g}} \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$\text{Var}\{D(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} = \frac{1}{4n} \{(1 - 1/\pi)h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2 + 2h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + 2h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2\} \mathbf{g}^T \Sigma \mathbf{g}. \quad (3.13)$$

All these results are verified in Appendix A.2.

## 4 Numerical study

### 4.1 Candidate models

In non-life insurance, the stochastic model for the total loss  $X$  is typically split into separate models for the claim numbers  $N$  and the individual losses  $Y_i$ , called the claim frequency and the claim severity distribution, respectively. The collective risk model for  $X$  is then given as

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i.$$

The claim severities are commonly assumed identically distributed and independent of each other and of the claim number (Kaas et al., 2001; Klugman et al., 2012). In this study, we restrict our attention to the choice of the claim severity distributions, fixing the claim frequency distribution at the Poisson distribution with fixed intensity  $\mu$  for all policies. Three classic right-skewed distributions are considered for claim severities, namely, the Gamma, the Lognormal and the Pareto. The Gamma distribution used throughout this paper is parameterized as

$$f(y) = \frac{y^{\alpha-1} e^{-y/\beta}}{(\beta)^\alpha \Gamma(\alpha)}, \quad y > 0$$

Model	Parameters	Skewness coef.	99% Res.	99.5% Res.
Gamma( $\alpha, \beta$ )	(0.44, 22.50)	3.00	938.79	995.07
Lognormal( $\sigma, \xi$ )	(1.71, 1.09)	7.88	866.56	925.99
Pareto( $\alpha, \beta$ )	(3.60, 26.00)	5.78	955.23	1024.67

Table 4.1: Parameter values and properties for claim severity distributions

with a shape parameter  $\alpha$  and a scale parameter  $\beta$  so that  $E(y) = \alpha\beta$ . The Pareto distribution, which is also called the Pareto type II or the Lomax distribution, has two parameters, the shape  $\alpha$  and the scale  $\beta$ . The pdf is given by

$$f(y) = \frac{\alpha/\beta}{(1 + y/\beta)^{\alpha+1}}, \quad y > 0.$$

Additionally, the Gaussian distribution  $N(E(X), \text{sd}(X))$  is used for approximating the total loss distribution, where

$$E(X) = E(N) E(Y_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{sd}(X) = \sqrt{\text{Var}(N) E(Y_i)^2 + E(N) \text{Var}(Y_i)}.$$

## 4.2 Parameter settings

Table 4.1 summarizes the choice of parameter values for the claim severity distributions with corresponding skewness coefficients and 99% and 99.5% reserves ( $\epsilon = 0.01$  and  $0.005$ , respectively). These parameter values are calibrated so they have a common mean of (approximately) 10 and a standard deviation of 15. The claim frequency distribution follows Poisson( $J\mu T$ ), where  $J = 1000$  is the number of policies and  $\mu = 0.05$  the claim intensity during one year ( $T = 1$ ). The loading factors are  $\gamma = 0.1$  and  $\gamma_r = 0.2$ , respectively.

The total claim amount is simulated by means of Monte Carlo for all sorts of models and stored in the computer prior to search for the best coefficients. The number of simulation is  $m = 1000000$  and the procedure is described in Algorithm 1 in Appendix B. The sample size is varied between  $n = 5000, 500, 50$ , representing a large, medium and small sample size, respectively. Then (2.15) is minimized by R function `optim` using the NelderMead method (Nelder and Mead, 1965). This method seems more natural to use for the VaR-based criteria than the Quasi-Newton method (Wright and Nocedal, 1999) since it does not require the derivatives of the objective function. Also, A bisection based optimization algorithm is performed in Fortran to verify the results.

## 4.3 Results

The examples in this section have been run with

$$M(Z) = (1 + \gamma_r) e^{\omega Z} / E(e^{\omega Z}), \tag{4.1}$$

where  $\omega \geq 0$  is called the tilting parameter. By letting  $Z = I(X)$ ,  $\pi_I$  in (2.7) becomes

$$\pi_I = (1 + \gamma_r) E\{I(X) e^{\omega I(X)}\} / E\{e^{\omega I(X)}\}. \tag{4.2}$$

This formulation is similar to the Esscher premium principle but is modified such that the expected premium principle is included as a special case, namely, when  $\omega = 0$ . In the rest of the paper (4.2) is referred as the mixed Esscher premium principle.

Table 4.2 displays the optimal coefficients and corresponding minimized ratio for the VaR-based criterion under different premium principles in an error-free environment. The results are computed under the three candidate claim severity distributions, with the Gaussian approximation as a comparison. For both of the premium principles, the optimized ratio of risk over surplus seems stable regardless of the choice of the claim severity distribution, while the upper limit  $a_2$  varies a lot since it depends on the heaviness of the claim severity distribution. Also, the lower bound  $a_1$  and ratio are much higher for the mixed Esscher principle, which demonstrate that the cedent has the incentive to transfer more loss if the reinsurance premium is less costly. The curves in Figure 4.1 illustrate the change of the ratio as a function of the lower bound  $a_1$  with varying claim severity distributions and the Gaussian approximation. It again verifies the choice of the claim severity distributions does not make too much difference on deciding the optimal ratio. Table 4.3 and 4.4 show the optimal values under different reinsurance risk loading  $\gamma_r$  and tilting parameter  $\omega$ , respectively. In all examples, the cost of capital rate  $\beta$  is not taken into account, but they can be incorporated easily.

Model	Expected Prem.			Mixed Esscher Prem.		
	$a_1$	$a_2 - a_1$	$C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$	$a_1$	$a_2 - a_1$	$C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$
Gaussian	531.5	264.4	12.43	598.6	197.3	13.33
Gamma	523.3	312.7	12.46	605.0	231.0	13.64
Lognormal	516.7	349.9	12.39	604.6	262.0	13.79
Pareto	516.9	344.1	12.37	602.1	259.0	13.71

Table 4.2: The optimal results for the VaR-based criterion for both the expected and the mixed Esscher premium principles when  $\epsilon = 0.01$ ,  $\gamma = 0.1$ ,  $\gamma_r = 0.2$ ,  $\omega = 0.001$  and  $\beta = 0$ .

Then the degradation of the optimal ratio due to parameter error is examined through the bootstrap method introduced in Section 3.2. Table 4.5 and 4.6 illustrate how far the optimum now have moved when the number of historical observations  $n$  varies with  $\pi_I$  computed by the expected premium and the mixed Esscher premium principle, respectively. It can be seen that the degradation  $D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$  shrinks approximately at the rate of  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$  for all claim severity distributions, except the case when  $n = 50$ . It makes sense since the asymptotics works for large samples. More importantly, it is not rational for the cedent to buy reinsurance when only few data are available, as the error is rather large in this case. It is also possible to gain some insights on the number of samples needed through the degradation analysis. As an example, Table 4.7 reports the amount of data that are required under different significance levels based on the root mean squared error (RMSE). The Gamma distribution is examined with different standard deviations, representing a light tail and comparatively heavy tail. The required sample size at each level further verifies that the degree of degradation is of order  $1/\sqrt{n}$  and shows that it depends on the heaviness of the underlying model.




Figure 4.1: The ratio  $C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  as a function of the lower bound  $a_1$  under the expected premium principle.

Model	$n$	$E(\hat{a}_1^*)$	$E(\hat{a}_2^*)$	$E(C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))$	$C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$	$E[D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]$	$sd[D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]$
Gamma	5000	522.9	835.7	12.71	12.46	0.255	0.364
	500	520.4	832.4	13.35	12.40	0.893	1.212
	50	493.6	790.5	17.66	12.49	5.207	5.783
Lognormal	5000	513.7	861.5	12.68	12.39	0.289	0.418
	500	518.1	872.7	13.17	12.23	0.786	1.012
	50	538.8	919.2	15.47	12.14	3.081	3.982
Pareto	5000	516.1	853.4	12.75	12.33	0.378	0.463
	500	510.6	849.4	13.56	12.66	1.187	1.423
	50	525.8	998.1	16.35	13.13	3.980	4.892

Table 4.5: Nested bootstrapping errors of  $D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$  under VaR with varying claim size distribution when  $\pi_I$  is calculated by the expected premium principle.

Model	$n$	$E(\hat{a}_1^*)$	$E(\hat{a}_2^*)$	$E(C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^*, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}))$	$C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$	$E[D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]$	$sd[D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})]$
Gamma	5000	614.2	848.2	13.85	13.64	0.208	0.259
	500	654.9	896.0	14.39	13.59	0.803	1.008
	50	694.4	945.7	17.49	13.79	3.695	4.055
Lognormal	5000	598.2	856.0	13.95	13.73	0.221	0.272
	500	524.7	746.4	14.14	13.33	0.812	0.977
	50	572.7	800.5	16.18	13.17	3.011	3.289
Pareto	5000	572.5	814.4	13.86	13.56	0.298	0.334
	500	683.3	1005.5	16.25	14.74	1.534	1.693
	50	579.2	769.4	15.17	12.59	2.580	2.841

Table 4.6: Nested bootstrapping errors of  $D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$  under VaR with varying claim size distribution when  $\pi_I$  is calculated by the mixed Esscher premium principle.

Model	Std	5% RMSE		15% RMSE		25% RMSE	
		$n$	RMSE[ $D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ ]	$n$	RMSE[ $D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ ]	$n$	RMSE[ $D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ ]
Gamma (4, 2.5)	5	120000	0.0494	11000	0.1536	5800	0.2469
Gamma (0.44, 22.5)	15	150000	0.0539	21000	0.1489	8800	0.2491

Table 4.7: The number of observations needed for Gamma distribution with different standard deviations when  $\pi_I$  is calculated by the expected premium principle.

## 5 A Bayesian approach

### 5.1 Method

The Bayesian paradigm expresses prior belief about the parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  as a probability distribution, the so-called prior, which is updated on observing historical data  $(n, \mathbf{y})$ , where  $n$  is the number of incidents and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$  their size. Now let  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\mu, \boldsymbol{\zeta})$ , representing the parameters from the claim frequency and the claim severity distribution, respectively. The posterior distribution is via Bayes' rule

$$p(\mu, \boldsymbol{\zeta} | n, \mathbf{y}) \propto f(n, \mathbf{y} | \mu, \boldsymbol{\zeta}) p(\mu, \boldsymbol{\zeta}), \quad (5.1)$$

where  $p(\mu, \boldsymbol{\zeta})$  is the prior density of  $(\mu, \boldsymbol{\zeta})$  and  $f(n, \mathbf{y} | \mu, \boldsymbol{\zeta})$  the likelihood of the observations. The symbol  $\propto$  signifies that a normalising constant that does not depend on  $(\mu, \boldsymbol{\zeta})$  has been omitted. In many applications  $n$  is a realization of a Poisson variable with known exposure  $A$ , so that its parameter is  $\mu A$ . If claim frequency is stochastically independent of claim severity and the same applies to  $(n, \mathbf{y})$ , the posterior distribution of  $(\mu, \boldsymbol{\zeta})$  boils down to

$$p(\mu, \boldsymbol{\zeta} | n, \mathbf{y}) = p(\mu | n) p(\boldsymbol{\zeta} | \mathbf{y}), \quad (5.2)$$

with  $p(\mu|n)$  and  $p(\zeta|\mathbf{y})$  the posterior distributions for  $\mu$  and  $\zeta$ . This opens for another way of taking parameter error into account. As a basis for setting up the the reinsurance contract replace the former  $f(x; \mu, \zeta)$  or rather its estimate  $f(x; \hat{\mu}, \hat{\zeta})$  with the so-called posterior predictive distribution

$$p(x|n, \mathbf{y}) = \int p(x|\mu, \zeta)p(\mu|n)p(\zeta|\mathbf{y})d\mu d\zeta,$$

and parameter uncertainty is incorporated automatically. The risk measure  $\rho_I$  and the expected gain of the cedent  $G_I$  earlier calculated under  $(\hat{\mu}, \hat{\zeta})$ , now depend on  $p(x|n, \mathbf{y})$  in which the uncertainty of  $(\mu, \zeta)$  is embedded.

We need posterior quantities to express the risk over surplus ratio  $\mathcal{C}_I$ , for example

$$x_{\epsilon|n, \mathbf{y}} = \text{VaR}_{\epsilon}(X|n, \mathbf{y}) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_I(X|n, \mathbf{y}) = E\{I(X)W\{F(X)\}|n, \mathbf{y}\}, \quad (5.3)$$

where  $I(\cdot)$  and  $R_I(\cdot)$  are defined earlier, see Section 2. With VaR as a risk measure,  $\mathcal{C}_I$  in this posterior setting becomes

$$\mathcal{C}_I = \frac{x_{\epsilon|n, \mathbf{y}} - I(x_{\epsilon|n, \mathbf{y}})}{\gamma E(X|n, \mathbf{y}) - \beta x_{\epsilon|n, \mathbf{y}} - \pi_I(X|n, \mathbf{y}) + E\{I(X|n, \mathbf{y})\} + \beta I(x_{\epsilon|n, \mathbf{y}})}, \quad (5.4)$$

but the posterior density function  $p(x|n, \mathbf{y})$  is complicated, and there is no closed form. Monte Carlo is a way around. For a single simulation  $X^*$ , draw

$$\mu^* \sim p(\mu|n), \quad \zeta^* \sim p(\zeta|\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{and} \quad X^* \sim p(x|\mu^*, \zeta^*), \quad (5.5)$$

and repeating  $m$  times yields a posterior sample  $X_1^*, \dots, X_m^*$  depending on  $(n, \mathbf{y})$ . The symbol  $*$  here marks for posteriors. The quantities in (5.4) are replaced by their Monte Carlo analogues. Those are

$$x_{\epsilon|n, \mathbf{y}} \approx X_{(\epsilon m)}^*$$

for the ordered sample  $X_{(1)}^* \geq \dots \geq X_{(m)}^*$  of  $X_1^*, \dots, X_m^*$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} E(X|n, \mathbf{y}) &\approx \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i^*, \\ I(X|n, \mathbf{y}) &\approx \sum_{i=1}^m \max(X_i^* - a_1, 0) - \max(X_i^* - a_2, 0), \\ \pi_I(X|n, \mathbf{y}) &\approx \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m I(X_i^*)W\{F(X_i^*)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The optimal coefficient  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_B = (\hat{a}_1, \hat{a}_2)$  under  $p(x|n, \mathbf{y})$  can then be computed numerically with the corresponding value of  $\mathcal{C}_I$ . Evaluation of the procedure is a problem of its own. The degradation in (3.2) can still be written

$$D(\mu, \zeta) = C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_B; \mu, \zeta) - C(\mathbf{a}; \mu, \zeta), \quad (5.6)$$

but in a Bayesian model the true parameters  $(\mu, \zeta)$  are random. One way to go about would then be to draw  $(\mu, \zeta)$  from their priors, generate Monte Carlo historical data  $(n, \mathbf{y})$  given  $(\mu, \zeta)$  and then  $X_1^*, \dots, X_m^*$ . The entire procedure is summarized in Table 5.1.

Step	Procedure
1.	$\mu \sim p(\mu), \quad \zeta \sim p(\zeta)$
2.	$n \sim \text{Poisson}(\mu A), \quad \mathbf{y} \sim f(\zeta)$
3.	$X_1, \dots, X_m$ , where $X_i \sim p(x \mu, \zeta)$ , see Algorithm 1 for details
4.	$\mu_1^*, \dots, \mu_m^* \sim p(\mu n), \quad \zeta_1^*, \dots, \zeta_m^* \sim p(\zeta \mathbf{y})$
5.	$X_1^*, \dots, X_m^*$ , where $X_i^* \sim p(x \mu_i^*, \zeta_i^*)$ , see Algorithm 3 for details
6.	$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_B = \underset{\mathbf{b}}{\text{argmin}} C(\mathbf{b}; X_1^*, \dots, X_m^*)$
7.	$\mathbf{a} = \underset{\mathbf{b}}{\text{argmin}} C(\mathbf{b}; X_1, \dots, X_m)$
8.	$D(\mu, \zeta) = C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_B; X_1, \dots, X_m) - C(\mathbf{a}; X_1, \dots, X_m)$

Table 5.1: Simulation procedure of the Bayesian method.

Repeat the procedure  $m_b$  times yields  $m_b$  replications of  $D(\mu, \zeta)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{E}\{D(\mu, \zeta)\} &\approx \frac{1}{m_b} \sum_{i=1}^{m_b} D_i(\mu, \zeta), \\ \text{sd}\{D(\mu, \zeta)\} &\approx \sqrt{\frac{1}{m_b - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_b} (D_i(\mu, \zeta) - \text{E}\{D(\mu, \zeta)\})^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We have in the numerical study below followed a slightly different track in order to compare with the frequentist method. Instead of drawing  $(\mu, \zeta)$ ,  $(\mu, \zeta)$  is fixed as  $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$  with the prior placed around it. The degradation in (5.6) now becomes

$$D(\mu_0, \zeta_0) = C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_B; \mu_0, \zeta_0) - C(\mathbf{a}_0; \mu_0, \zeta_0), \quad (5.7)$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_0$  are the optimum under  $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$ . The difference is that  $(\mu, \zeta)$  in Step 1 in Table 5.1 is replaced by  $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$  and Monte Carlo historical data  $(n, \mathbf{y})$  are generated given  $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$  each time. We then get a different version of  $\text{E}\{D(\mu_0, \zeta_0)\}$  and  $\text{sd}\{D(\mu_0, \zeta_0)\}$  by replicating the above procedure  $m_b$  times.

## 5.2 Implementation issues

The degree of prior knowledge can be expressed through informative or non-informative priors. Among the informative ones conjugates are popular since the functional form of the posterior can be calculated with easy implementation in the computer. Non-informative priors are used to reflect minimal knowledge and there is no consensus as to how it should be constructed. Often used in scientific literature and included here is the Jeffreys prior, which has the form

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto \sqrt{\det I(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \quad \text{with} \quad I(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\text{E}\left\{\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}^2} \log f(y, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \mid \boldsymbol{\theta}\right\}.$$



The Jeffreys priors for the claim frequency and candidate claim severity distributions are

$$\text{Poisson: } p(\mu) \propto \sqrt{1/\mu},$$

$$\text{Gamma: } p(\alpha, \beta) \propto \sqrt{(\alpha\phi(\alpha) - 1)/\beta}, \text{ with } \phi(\alpha) = \frac{d^2}{d\alpha^2} \log \Gamma(\alpha),$$

$$\text{Lognormal: } p(\xi, \sigma^2) \propto \sigma^{-3},$$

$$\text{Pareto: } p(\alpha, \beta) \propto \left( \beta(\alpha + 1)\sqrt{(\alpha(\alpha + 2))} \right)^{-1},$$

and corresponding posteriors can be written up to some unknown constant. Note for the Lognormal parameters a slightly different prior is used, which is

$$p(\xi, \sigma^2) \propto \sigma^{-2}.$$

This prior corresponds with a flat prior on  $\log(\sigma)$  and leads to a relatively simple posterior with closed form; that's why it is quite often used in practice.

Table 5.2 lists conjugate prior distributions for the Poisson claim frequency and various claim severity distributions. The conjugate prior typically allows the use of Gibbs sampling, which is less computationally intensive. For those parameters that do not have conjugates, we use the Gamma distribution as informative priors. In this case, the corresponding posterior distribution ends up as a non-standard and analytically intractable function. Metropolis-Hastings (MH) is a suitable method to generate the parameters.

Model	Model Para.	Prior	Hyper Para.	Posterior Para.
Poisson	$\mu$	Gamma	$\alpha_0$ $\beta_0$	$\alpha_0 + n$ $\beta_0/(\beta_0 A + 1)$
Gamma	$(1/\beta) \alpha$	Gamma	$\alpha_0$ $\beta_0$	$\alpha_0 + \alpha n$ $[\sum_{i=1}^n y_i + 1/\beta_0]^{-1}$
Lognormal	$1/\sigma^2$	Gamma	$\alpha_0$ $\beta_0$	$\alpha_0 + n/2$ $[1/\beta_0 + (n-1)/2 \text{Var}(\ln y) + \kappa_0/(2(n+\kappa_0))(E(\ln y) - \xi_0)^2]^{-1}$
	$\xi \sigma^2$	Normal	$\xi_0$ $\kappa_0$	$n E(\ln y)/(\kappa_0 + n) + \kappa_0 \xi_0/(\kappa_0 + n)$ $\sigma^2/(\kappa_0 + n)$
Pareto	$\alpha \beta$	Gamma	$\alpha_0$ $\beta_0$	$\alpha_0 + n$ $[\sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + y_i/\beta) + 1/\beta_0]^{-1}$

Table 5.2: Conjugate priors for the claim frequency and the claim severity distribution.

### 5.3 Numerical results

Table 5.3 presents values of the true parameters  $(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$  and the hyper parameters in the informative priors. We investigate how the results are influenced by varying the historical portfolio size  $J_h$  from

$10^5$  to  $10^3$ , which corresponds to have an expected sample size  $n$  from 5000 to 50. The simulation results for both the non-informative and informative priors are shown in Table 5.4 and 5.5, with the reinsurance priced according to the expected premium principle and the VaR as the risk measure.

The optimal ratio  $C(\mathbf{a}; \mu_0, \zeta_0)$  under the true parameters is presented in the first column, below each candidate model. As expected, the error increases when the sample size decreases regardless of the prior choice, but the rate of degradation seems unclear from the two tables. In general, the informative prior gives smaller  $E[D(\mu_0, \zeta_0)]$  and  $sd[D(\mu_0, \zeta_0)]$  compared to the non-informative ones, especially when there are few observations. When sample size is large, the posterior distribution is robust to prior assumptions. With a limited amount of data, the value of the error can be still accepted if there is strong knowledge of the prior. Compared with the results of the bootstrap method in Table 4.5, the discrepancy between these two methods is minor when data are sufficient. However, the errors evaluated using the Bayesian method with an informative prior are relatively smaller than the bootstrap method when the sample size is small. In a word, with strong prior belief about the parameters, the Bayesian method might be preferred to the frequentist method, in particular with limited historical data. The results for the mixed Esscher premium principle are quite similar and not included here.

Model	Para.	$(\mu_0, \zeta_0)$	Hyper Para.
Poisson	$\mu$	0.05	$(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = (0.25, 0.2)$
Gamma	$\alpha$	0.44	$(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = (10, 0.1)$
	$\beta$	22.50	$(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = (1, 0.1)$
Lognormal	$\xi$	1.71	$(\xi_0, \kappa_0) = (2, 100)$
	$\sigma$	1.09	$(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = (8, 0.1)$
Pareto	$\alpha$	3.60	$(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = (40, 0.1)$
	$\beta$	26.00	$(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = (3000, 0.01)$

Table 5.3: The values of true and hyper parameters in claim frequency and claim severity distributions

Model	$J_h$	$E(a_1^*)$	$E(a_2^*)$	$E(C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_B, \mu_0, \zeta_0))$	$E[D(\mu_0, \zeta_0)]$	$sd[D(\mu_0, \zeta_0)]$
Gamma (12.46)	$10^5$	523.2	838.5	12.63	0.173	0.2405
	$10^4$	529.0	867.7	12.75	0.294	0.5087
	$10^3$	530.8	975.7	13.62	1.158	2.1511
Lognormal (12.40)	$10^5$	516.9	868.6	12.55	0.151	0.2344
	$10^4$	510.9	864.7	12.92	0.523	0.6417
	$10^3$	491.9	851.9	13.25	0.847	1.3896
Pareto (12.37)	$10^5$	518.7	865.8	12.56	0.188	0.2642
	$10^4$	520.2	892.1	13.00	0.626	0.8994
	$10^3$	514.6	997.1	13.93	1.556	2.4950

Table 5.4: Bayesian errors with the informative priors for  $(\mu, \zeta)$  under VaR when premium is calculated based on expected premium principle.

Model	$J_h$	$E(a_1^*)$	$E(a_2^*)$	$E(C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_B, \mu_0, \zeta_0))$	$E[D(\mu_0, \zeta_0)]$	$sd[D(\mu_0, \zeta_0)]$
Gamma (12.46)	$10^5$	522.9	827.5	12.74	0.281	0.2589
	$10^4$	525.6	850.0	12.94	0.486	0.8025
	$10^3$	554.3	1095.6	14.32	1.860	3.3671
Lognormal (12.40)	$10^5$	517.2	871.0	12.61	0.209	0.3041
	$10^4$	520.2	895.4	12.89	0.694	0.9066
	$10^3$	546.4	1160.8	14.25	1.851	3.4457
Pareto (12.37)	$10^5$	516.6	861.3	12.63	0.257	0.3491
	$10^4$	508.1	862.9	13.15	0.777	1.0834
	$10^3$	519.7	1005.5	15.00	2.625	3.4847

Table 5.5: Bayesian errors with the non-informative priors for  $(\mu, \zeta)$  under VaR when premium is calculated based on expected premium principle.

## 6 Concluding discussion

This paper have discussed the reinsurance optimization problem by examining how much the solution is affected by errors in the parameters and models. Since the single layer contracts are often optimal or close to optimal in many situations, it is of great relevance to examine how estimation errors degrade the single layer solutions. More specifically, the problem is formulated under a more general reinsurance pricing function and an industrially plausible criterion, which is the ratio of VaR(or CVaR) against the expected gain of the cedent. Then the degradation of the single layer contracts is investigated through both asymptotics and numerical studies. It is shown that the rate of degradation is often  $O(1/n)$  as the the sample size  $n$  of historical observations becomes infinite, but criteria based on VaR are exceptions that may achieve only  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ . This result is verified in the numerical study. We also point out that the choice of the claim severity distribution does not seem important on determining the optimal ratio, given that the distributions are calibrated to have the same mean and standard deviation. In this case, the simple Gaussian distribution for the risk might be a reasonable alternative. The Bayesian approach offers a different way of estimating and evaluating parameter errors. The numerical results are similar to what we have in the frequentist method when there are sufficient data. While with a limited amount of data, the errors from the Bayesian approach are relatively smaller, but they depend on how much prior information we have for the parameters. One question has not been tackled is how the model uncertainty or error influences the optimal solutions. It is worth investigating the impact when the true family of claim severity distribution deviates from the assumed one. Whether or not the Gaussian distribution is a sensible approximation for the total loss in this optimization problem can be examined through a similar manner. We leave this for future research.

## References

Arrow, K. J. (1963). Uncertainty and the welfare economics of medical care. *The American economic review* 53(5), 941–973.

- Artzner, P., F. Delbaen, J.-M. Eber, and D. Heath (1999). Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical Finance* 9(3), 203–228.
- Balbás, A., B. Balbás, and A. Heras (2009). Optimal reinsurance with general risk measures. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 44(3), 374–384.
- Bølviken, E. and Y. Wang (2019). Optimal reinsurance for risk over surplus ratios. working paper.
- Borch, K. (1960). *An Attempt to Determine the Optimum Amount of Stop Loss Reinsurance*. Norges Handelshøyskoles særtrykk-serie. Nr. 35. Uden forlag.
- Bühlmann, H. (1980). An economic premium principle. *ASTIN Bulletin: The Journal of the IAA* 11(1), 52–60.
- Cai, J., K. S. Tan, C. Weng, and Y. Zhang (2008). Optimal reinsurance under VaR and CTE risk measures. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 43(1), 185–196.
- Cheung, K., K. Sung, S. Yam, and S. Yung (2014). Optimal reinsurance under general law-invariant risk measures. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* 2014(1), 72–91.
- Chi, Y., X. S. Lin, and K. S. Tan (2017). Optimal reinsurance under the risk-adjusted value of an insurers liability and an economic reinsurance premium principle. *North American Actuarial Journal* 21(3), 417–432.
- Chi, Y. and K. S. Tan (2011). Optimal reinsurance under VaR and CVaR risk measures: a simplified approach. *ASTIN Bulletin: The Journal of the IAA* 41(2), 487–509.
- Chi, Y. and K. S. Tan (2013). Optimal reinsurance with general premium principles. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 52(2), 180–189.
- Cong, J. and K. S. Tan (2016). Optimal VaR-based risk management with reinsurance. *Annals of Operations Research* 237(1-2), 177–202.
- Gajek, L. and D. Zagrodny (2004). Optimal reinsurance under general risk measures. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 34(2), 227 – 240.
- Guerra, M. and M. Centeno (2008). Optimal reinsurance policy: The adjustment coefficient and the expected utility criteria. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 42(2), 529 – 539.
- Jiang, W., H. Hong, and J. Ren (2017, dec). On pareto-optimal reinsurance with constraints under distortion risk measures. *European Actuarial Journal* 8(1), 215–243.
- Kaas, R., M. Goovaerts, J. Dhaene, and M. Denuit (2001). *Modern Actuarial Risk Theory – Using R*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- Kaluszka, M. (2001). Optimal reinsurance under mean-variance premium principles. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 28(1), 61–67.
- Kaluszka, M. (2004). Mean-variance optimal reinsurance arrangements. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* 2004(1), 28–41.

- Kaluszka, M. and A. Okolewski (2008). An extension of arrow’s result on optimal reinsurance contract. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* 75(2), 275–288.
- Klugman, S., H. Panjer, and G. Willmot (2012). *Loss Models: From Data to Decisions*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley.
- Nelder, J. A. and R. Mead (1965, 01). A Simplex Method for Function Minimization. *The Computer Journal* 7(4), 308–313.
- Provost, S. B. and A. Mathai (1992). *Quadratic forms in random variables: theory and applications*. M. Dekker.
- Tan, K. S., C. Weng, and Y. Zhang (2011). Optimality of general reinsurance contracts under CTE risk measure. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 49(2), 175–187.
- Weng, C. and S. C. Zhuang (2017). CDF formulation for solving an optimal reinsurance problem. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* 2017(5), 395–418.
- Wright, S. and J. Nocedal (1999). Numerical optimization. *Springer Science* 35(67-68), 7.
- Young, V. R. (1999). Optimal insurance under Wang’s premium principle. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 25(2), 109–122.
- Young, V. R. (2004). Premium principles. *Encyclopedia of Actuarial Science* 3.

## Appendices

### A Proofs of degradation asymptotics

#### A.1 Proof of Proposition 3.1.

The argument is a standard one using Taylor expansions. Indeed, from (3.3)

$$D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_a} \frac{\partial C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial a_i} (\hat{a}_i - a_i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_a} \sum_{j=1}^{n_a} \frac{\partial^2 C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial a_i \partial a_j} (\hat{a}_i - a_i)(\hat{a}_j - a_j) + \mathcal{E}_1$$

with  $\mathcal{E}_1$  a remainder term. The linear term vanishes since the partial derivatives are zero at the minimum. Hence, with the matrix  $C^{aa}$  introduced in Section 3.3,

$$D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{a})^T C^{aa} (\hat{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{a}) + \mathcal{E}_1, \tag{A.1}$$

where we must replace  $\hat{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{a}$  with its relationship to  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}$ . Note that

$$\frac{\partial C(\mathbf{a}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}{\partial a_i} = \frac{\partial C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial a_i} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_a} \frac{\partial^2 C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial a_i \partial a_j} (\hat{a}_j - a_j) + \sum_{k=1}^{n_\theta} \frac{\partial^2 C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial a_i \partial \theta_k} (\hat{\theta}_k - \theta_k) + \mathcal{E}_{i2}$$

with  $\mathcal{E}_{i2}$  another remainder. Both first order derivatives are zero so that on matrix form this may be rewritten

$$C^{aa}(\hat{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{a}) + C^{a\theta}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \mathcal{E}_2 = 0$$

with  $\mathcal{E}_2 = (\mathcal{E}_{12}, \dots, \mathcal{E}_{n_a2})^T$  and where  $C^{a\theta}$  was defined above. The matrix  $C^{aa}$  is the second order derivatives at a minimum and is therefore positive definite and can be inverted. This yields

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{a} = -(C^{aa})^{-1}C^{a\theta}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) - (C^{aa})^{-1}\mathcal{E}_2,$$

and when this is inserted for  $\hat{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{a}$  in the expression for  $D(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , it follows that

$$D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta})^T Q(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \mathcal{E}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}_2^T (C^{aa})^{-1}\mathcal{E}_2$$

with  $Q$  as in (3.6) right. It follows that the asymptotic distribution of  $D(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is that of a quadratic form under normal variables, as stated above if the remainder terms vanish. We need to argue that  $n\mathcal{E}_1 \rightarrow 0$  and  $\sqrt{n}\mathcal{E}_2 \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and both limits are consequences of second order derivatives being uniformly bounded .

## A.2 Proof of Proposition 3.2.

Let  $\rho_{R_i}$  in the risk over expected gain criterion (2.15) be Value at Risk which is now denoted  $R(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  under the one-layer contract  $I = I_{\mathbf{a}}$  so that  $C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = R(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/G(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ . It is convenient to proceed in terms of

$$C_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{R(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \quad \text{where} \quad G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = G(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \beta R(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

with degradation

$$D_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = C_0(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - C_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Note that

$$C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{C_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 - \beta C_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})},$$

and  $C_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  have minimum at the same  $\mathbf{a}$  while the original degradation  $D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  has a simple asymptotic relationship to  $D_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . Indeed,

$$D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{C_0(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 - \beta C_0(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} - \frac{C_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{1 - \beta C_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \frac{C_0(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) - C_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\{1 - \beta C_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\}^2} + o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$$

after a Taylor argument around  $C_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ . The error term  $o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$  comes from the discrepancy  $\hat{\mathbf{a}} - \mathbf{a}$  being of order  $1/\sqrt{n}$ . Hence after inserting for  $C_0(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $C_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  it follows that

$$D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \{1 + \beta C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\}^2 D_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + o_p(1/\sqrt{n}), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

and the asymptotic distribution of  $D(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is inherited from that of  $D_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ .

Value at risk for the insurer under  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$  and  $\mathbf{a}$  are

$$R(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = a_1 \quad \text{and} \quad R(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = (x_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \hat{a}_2)_+ + \hat{a}_1 = (a_2 - \hat{a}_2)_+ + \hat{a}_1,$$

so that

$$D_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{(a_2 - \hat{a}_2)_+}{G_0(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} + \left( \frac{\hat{a}_1}{G_0(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} - \frac{a_1}{G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \right),$$

and the second term has to be linearized. When Taylor's formula is invoked around  $(a_1, a_2)$ , the linear term in  $\hat{a}_1 - a_1$  vanishes since the partial derivative is 0 at the optimum  $a_1$ , but the second partial derivative must be calculated. Recall that

$$G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \gamma\pi - \int_{a_1}^{a_2} K\{F(x)\}dx,$$

from which it follows that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial a_2} \left( \frac{a_1}{G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} \right) = -\frac{a_1}{G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2} \frac{\partial G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial a_2} = \frac{a_1 K\{F(a_2, \boldsymbol{\theta})\}}{G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2} = \frac{a_1 K(1 - \epsilon)}{G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2},$$

since  $F(a_2, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1 - \epsilon$ . Hence

$$D_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{(a_2 - \hat{a}_2)_+}{G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} + \frac{a_1 K(1 - \epsilon)}{G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2} (\hat{a}_2 - a_2) + o_p(1/\sqrt{n}).$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{G_0(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \frac{1}{G(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + \beta R(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})} = \frac{C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/a_1}{1 + \beta C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})},$$

and when this with the expression for  $D_0(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  are inserted into (A.4) some straightforward calculations yield

$$D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})(a_2 - \hat{a}_2)_+ + h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})(\hat{a}_2 - a_2) + o_p(1/\sqrt{n}), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where

$$h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \{1 + \beta C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\}C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})/a_1 \quad \text{and} \quad h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2 K(1 - \epsilon)/a_1$$

are the coefficients in (3.10).

The asymptotic properties of  $D(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  follows from the representation (A.5). Recall that  $\hat{a}_2 - a_2 = x_\epsilon(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - x_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  for which a standard argument shows that

$$\sqrt{n}\{x_\epsilon(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - x_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{g}^T \mathbf{N} = V \sqrt{\mathbf{g}^T \Sigma \mathbf{g}}$$

with  $\mathbf{g}$  the gradient vector (3.8),  $\mathbf{N}$  the normal vector in (3.4) and  $V$  as in (3.9). Since  $\mathbf{N}$  has mean zero expectations and covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ , it follows that  $V$  is the standard normal. Slutsky's theorem applied to (A.5) with  $\hat{a}_2 - a_2$  replaced by  $x_\epsilon(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) - x_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  now yields the limit

$$\sqrt{n}D(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \xrightarrow{d} \{h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})(-V)_+ + h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})V\} \sqrt{\mathbf{g}^T \Sigma \mathbf{g}},$$

which is (3.11) in Proposition 3.2.

To verify the expressions (3.12) and (3.13) for the mean and variance let  $\varphi(v) = (2\pi)^{-1/2}e^{-v^2/2}$  and note that

$$E(-V)_+ = \int_{-\infty}^0 (-v)\varphi(v) = 1/\sqrt{2\pi} \quad \text{whereas} \quad E(V) = 0,$$

and (3.12) follows. For the variance

$$\begin{aligned} E\{h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})(-V)_+ + h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})V\}^2 &= E\{h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2(-V)_+^2 + 2h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})(-V)_+V + h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})V^2\} \\ &= h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2\frac{1}{2} + 2h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})\frac{1}{2} + h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}\{h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})(-V)_+ + h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})V\} &= h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2/2 + h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2 - E\{(-V)_+\}^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - 1/\pi)h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2 + h_1(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) + h_2(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (3.13).

## B Simulation Algorithms

---

**Algorithm 1** The total loss and its quantile simulation

---

Input:  $m, \epsilon, J, \mu, T, f_Y(\cdot; \zeta)$

- 1: **for**  $i = 1, \dots, m$  **do**
  - 2:      $X_i^* = 0$
  - 3:     Draw  $N^* \sim \text{Poisson}(J\mu T)$
  - 4:     **for**  $j = 1, \dots, N^*$  **do**
  - 5:         Draw  $Y^*$  from  $f_Y(y; \zeta)$
  - 6:          $X_i^* = X_i^* + Y^*$
  - 7:     **end for**
  - 8: **end for**
  - 9: Sort as  $X_{(1)}^* \leq \dots \leq X_{(m)}^*$
  - 10:  $q_\epsilon = X_{((1-\epsilon)m)}^*$
  - 11: **return**  $q_\epsilon$
-



---

**Algorithm 2** The nested bootstrap algorithm

---

Input:  $m, J, T, \hat{\mu}, \hat{\zeta}, f_Y(\cdot; \zeta), C(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$

- 1: Draw  $\hat{N}^* \sim \text{Poisson}(J\hat{\mu}T)$ ,  $\hat{Y}_1^*, \dots, \hat{Y}_n^* \sim f_Y(y, \hat{\zeta})$
  - 2:  $\hat{\mu}^* \stackrel{MLE}{\leftarrow} \hat{N}^*/JT$ ,  $\hat{\zeta}^* \stackrel{MLE}{\leftarrow} \hat{Y}_1^*, \dots, \hat{Y}_n^*$
  - 3: **for**  $i = 1, \dots, m$  **do**
  - 4:      $X_i^{**} = 0$
  - 5:     Draw  $\hat{N}^{**} \sim \text{Poisson}(J\hat{\mu}^*T)$
  - 6:     **for**  $k = 1, \dots, \hat{N}^{**}$  **do**
  - 7:         Draw  $\hat{Y}^{**}$  from  $f_Y(y; \hat{\zeta}^*)$
  - 8:          $X_i^{**} = X_i^{**} + \hat{Y}^{**}$
  - 9:     **end for**
  - 10: **end for**
  - 11: **return**  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}^* = \underset{\mathbf{b}}{\text{argmin}} C(\mathbf{b}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i^*)$
- 

---

**Algorithm 3** Bayesian method for degradation evaluation

---

Input:  $m, J_h, J, T, \mu_0, \zeta_0, f_Y(\cdot; \zeta), p(\mu|n), p(\zeta|\mathbf{y}), C(\mathbf{a}, \mu, \zeta)$

- 1: Draw  $n \sim \text{Poisson}(J_h\mu_0T)$ ,  $\mathbf{y} \sim f_Y(y; \zeta_0)$
  - 2: **for**  $i = 1, \dots, m$  **do**
  - 3:      $X_i^* = 0$
  - 4:     Draw  $\mu^* \sim p(\mu|n)$ ,  $\zeta^* \sim p(\zeta|\mathbf{y})$
  - 5:     Draw  $N^* \sim \text{Poisson}(J\mu^*T)$
  - 6:     **for**  $k = 1, \dots, N^*$  **do**
  - 7:         Draw  $Y^*$  from  $f_Y(y; \zeta^*)$
  - 8:          $X_i^* = X_i^* + Y^*$ ,
  - 9:     **end for**
  - 10: **end for**
  - 11: **return**  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_B^* = \underset{\mathbf{b}}{\text{argmin}} C(\mathbf{b}, \mu^*, \zeta^*)$
-

$\gamma_r$	Gaussian			Gamma			Lognormal			Pareto		
	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2 - \hat{a}_1$	$C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2 - \hat{a}_1$	$C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2 - \hat{a}_1$	$C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2 - \hat{a}_1$	$C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$
0.2	531.5	264.4	12.43	523.3	312.7	12.46	516.7	349.9	12.39	516.9	344.1	12.37
0.3	584.7	211.2	13.19	580.9	255.1	13.34	573.7	292.9	13.33	573.4	287.7	13.28
0.4	615.0	180.9	13.65	614.9	221.1	13.88	608.7	257.9	13.92	607.5	253.5	13.87
0.5	635.7	160.2	13.97	638.6	197.4	14.26	633.9	232.7	14.36	632.1	228.9	14.29
0.6	651.5	144.4	14.21	656.9	179.1	14.56	653.8	212.7	14.70	651.4	209.7	14.62
0.7	664.0	131.9	14.40	671.6	164.4	14.80	670.0	196.6	14.97	667.1	193.9	14.89

Table 4.3: The optimal reinsurance coefficients for different risk loadings  $\gamma_r$ .

$\omega$	Gaussian			Gamma			Lognormal			Pareto		
	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2 - \hat{a}_1$	$C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2 - \hat{a}_1$	$C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2 - \hat{a}_1$	$C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$	$\hat{a}_1$	$\hat{a}_2 - \hat{a}_1$	$C(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$
0.001	598.5	197.4	13.33	605.0	231.0	13.64	604.6	262.0	13.79	602.1	259.0	13.71
0.002	633.3	162.6	13.80	648.3	187.7	14.26	654.7	211.8	14.54	650.8	210.2	14.45
0.003	656.0	139.9	14.11	676.5	159.5	14.66	688.1	178.4	15.03	683.5	177.5	14.93
0.004	672.4	123.5	14.34	697.0	139.0	14.94	712.6	154.0	15.37	707.4	153.6	15.27
0.005	685.0	110.9	14.51	712.7	123.3	15.16	731.2	135.4	15.63	726.0	135.1	15.53
0.006	695.2	100.7	14.65	725.1	110.9	15.32	745.9	120.6	15.83	740.5	120.6	15.72

Table 4.4: The optimal reinsurance coefficients for different titling parameter  $\omega$ .