

# Mean and risk decomposition with applications in capital and risk management

Weihao Choo<sup>a,\*</sup>, Piet de Jong<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Actuarial Studies Macquarie University, NSW 2109, Australia.*

---

## Abstract

This paper proposes a framework to analyze mean and risk across layers of loss. Loss layers characterise coverages in property and casualty insurance and reinsurance. The framework yields optimal pricing, risk and capital decisions.

Everything is a function of VaR spacings

*Keywords:* Layers, distortion, value-at-risk, spacing, excess-of-loss, mean density, risk density.

---

## 1. Introduction

Wang (1996) defines the layer  $[k, k + dk]$  of random loss  $x \geq 0$  as the amount of  $x$  in excess of  $k$  with the excess capped at  $dk$ . Thus the layer is  $L_{k+dk} - L_k$  where  $L_k \equiv \min(x, k)$ . Then  $x$  is the sum of layers covering  $[0, \infty]$  as illustrated in Figure 1. Letting  $dk \rightarrow 0$  yields

$$x = \int_0^\infty dL_k = \int_0^\infty L'_k dk = \int_0^\infty (x > k) dk, \quad (1)$$

where  $dL_k$  is the infinitesimally small layer  $[k, k + dk]$  and  $(x > k)$  is an indicator function equal to 1 if  $x > k$  and 0 otherwise. A proof of (1) follows by noting the final integral in (1) is  $\int_0^x dk = x$ .

Equation (1) decomposes  $x$  into infinitely many layers. Each layer is a random variable and is comonotonic with all other layers since  $L_k$  is non-decreasing in  $x$ . Integrating these layers over an arbitrary interval yields a larger layer:

$$\int_a^b dL_k = L_b - L_a = \min(x, b) - \min(x, a).$$

---

\*Corresponding author

Email address: [weihao.choo@mq.edu.au](mailto:weihao.choo@mq.edu.au) (Weihao Choo)



Figure 1: Any  $x$  is the sum of layers  $[k, k+dk]$  covering  $[0, \infty]$ . The grey shaded area represents values of layers counted in  $x$ .

If  $x$  has distribution function  $F$ , the mean of layer  $dL_k$  is  $\{1 - F(k)\}dk$ . Wang (1996) calls  $1 - F$  the layer premium density of  $x$  as it identifies the insurance premium of each layer and integrates to the overall mean:  $\int_0^\infty \{1 - F(k)\}dk = E(x)$  where  $E$  is the expectation. In addition Wang (1996) distorts the layer premium density by replacing original probabilities with distorted probabilities. The distorted layer premium density delivers premiums with a risk loading.

Loss layers are important insurance and reinsurance quantities, particularly for property and casualty. Insurance and excess-of-loss reinsurance typically cover the loss layer between an excess and a limit. Capital shortfall is the loss layer starting from available capital. Layer means, and risks, are critical inputs to pricing, capital and risk decisions.

This paper extends results in Wang (1996) by defining layers on the percentile or value-at-risk (VaR) scale. VaRs capture the shape and scale of the loss distribution, and hence provide comparability across loss distributions. VaRs are standard constructs in insurance and financial markets. For example Solvency II insurance regulation applies 90% and 99.5% VaRs (Eling et al., 2007) in capital requirements. Banking regulations Basel II and more recently Basel III also reference VaRs in risk measurement (Chernobai et al., 2008).

The development in this paper yields a framework to form optimal pricing, capital and risk decisions. Focus is usually on layers with large mean or risk. The framework yields solutions and insights to insurance and financial problems which are difficult or awkward to express and solve using standard statistical approaches.

Remaining sections of this paper are structured as follows. Section 2 provides a motivating example for the remaining development of this paper by considering an order sample. Sections 3 to ?? formalise and discuss layer means or “mean densities.” Risk densities are covered in sections 6 to 8. Remaining sections apply mean and risk densities to optimise pricing, risk and capital decisions.

## 2. Motivating example

Whilst (1) provides the key initial mathematical result, the following example provides further motivation for the developments in this paper.

Consider 100 ordered observations of an insurance loss  $x$ :  $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_{100}$ . The statistics  $x_{i+1} - x_i$  and  $(100 - i)(x_{i+1} - x_i)$  are called the spacing and normalised spacing, respectively, in the order statistics (Shaked and Shanthikumar, 2007). Spacings are of interest in engineering, for example corresponding to elapsed times between successive failures of components forming a system.

Spacings define layers of an insurance loss. In terms of spacings, the sample mean of  $x$  is

$$\bar{x} = x_1 + \frac{99}{100}(x_2 - x_1) + \dots + \frac{100 - i}{100}(x_{i+1} - x_i) + \dots + \frac{1}{100}(x_{100} - x_{99}) , \quad (2)$$

of which the mean contribution of layer  $[x_i, x_{i+1}]$  given the sample is

$$m_i \equiv \left( \frac{100 - i}{100} \right) (x_{i+1} - x_i) ,$$

then  $m_i$  is the spacing  $x_{i+1} - x_i$  multiplied by the proportion or probability  $1 - i/100$  of an observation exceeding  $x_i$ . Adding up all  $m_i$  yields the overall mean  $\bar{x}$ . A layer is a portion of every loss outcome crossing an interval.

The following are important and exploitable points of the above setup:

- Two factors drive the magnitude of  $m_i$ : the exceedance probability  $1 - i/100$  and spacing  $x_{i+1} - x_i$ . The exceedance probability decreases with  $i$ . The spacing may increase or decrease. If the distribution is right skewed, as is typical for insurance losses, increasing  $i$ , leads to increased spacings. Greater skewness implies larger spacings. The overall behaviour of  $m_i$  characterises the shape of the loss distribution.
- Loss layers are expressed using sample values representing empirical percentiles or values-at-risk (VaRs) of  $x$ . For example the top 5 loss layer covers losses above the 95th percentile. In contrast, current literature expresses loss layers in absolute amounts, for example between 1 and 2 million dollars. VaR layers are considered in this paper as they adjust to the shape and scale of the loss distribution, and can be interpreted probabilistically.
- Individual layer means  $m_i$  are building blocks for assessing expected coverage and related quantities. For example  $m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_{75}$  is the mean insured loss if coverage is limited to the 75th percentile. The sum  $m_{95} + m_{96} + m_{97} + m_{98} + m_{99}$  is the mean of excess losses above the 95th percentile, and represents the expected shortfall if capital is held at the 95th percentile, or the expected excess-of-loss reinsurance coverage above the 95th percentile.
- The risk-adjusted layer mean replaces the exceedance probability  $1 - i/100$  in  $m_i$  with a distorted probability  $1 - \Phi(i/100)$ , yielding

$$\tilde{m}_i = \left\{ 1 - \Phi \left( \frac{i}{100} \right) \right\} (x_{i+1} - x_i) .$$

Distorted probabilities shape layer means, yield distorted risk measures (Wang, 1996) and are used in cumulative prospect theory (Tversky and Kahneman, 1992).

### 3. VaR layers

The following modifies the layer decomposition of  $x$  in (1) using the motivating example in §2. Consider a continuous random loss  $x \geq 0$  with distribution function  $F$  and inverse distribution function  $F^-$ . For  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ , the  $\alpha$ -Value-at-Risk ( $\text{VaR}_\alpha$ ) of  $x$  is  $V_\alpha \equiv F^-(\alpha)$  and

$$x = \int_0^1 dL_\alpha = \int_0^1 L'_\alpha d\alpha = \int_0^1 (x > V_\alpha) V'_\alpha d\alpha, \quad L_\alpha \equiv \min(x, V_\alpha), \quad (3)$$

where  $L_\alpha$  is indexed on VaR thresholds or exceedance probabilities instead of absolute loss amounts as in (1). This definition of  $L_\alpha$  is applied to remaining developments in this paper. Then  $dL_\alpha$  represents the  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$  layer  $[V_\alpha, V_{\alpha+d\alpha}]$ , and corresponds to layer  $[\ell_{\alpha n}, \ell_{\alpha n+1}]$  in §2 assuming  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The width of the  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$  layer is  $V_{\alpha+d\alpha} - V_\alpha \approx V'_\alpha d\alpha$  and  $V'_\alpha$  is called the VaR-spacing, the continuous analogue to the discrete spacing  $\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i$ .

Endpoints of VaR layers self-adjust to the shape and scale of the loss distribution. The probability of the loss reaching the  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$  layer is fixed at  $\alpha$ , hence the mean and risk of VaR layers are comparable across loss distributions. In contrast layers indexed on the absolute scale as in §1 are at different probability thresholds depending on the loss distribution.

The  $\text{VaR}_{[\alpha, \beta]}$  layer of  $x$  is the random variable

$$\int_\alpha^\beta dL_\pi = L_\beta - L_\alpha = \min(V_\beta, x) - \min(V_\alpha, x).$$

This is for example the insured loss for a policy with deductible  $V_\alpha$  and limit  $V_\beta$ , or the reinsured loss under an excess-of-loss reinsurance arrangement. When capital  $V_\alpha$  is held against loss  $x$ , then  $L_\alpha$  is the capital used and  $L_1 - L_\alpha$  is the capital shortfall. VaR layers characterise losses. For example the  $L_1 - L_\alpha$  layer represents additional losses contributed by the highest  $1 - \alpha$  portion of possible outcomes.

From (3), any random variable  $x \geq 0$  can be thought of as a sum of  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$  layers over  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ . This paper uses (3) to decompose and analyse the mean and risk of  $x$  across VaR layers. The analysis yields solutions and insights to common pricing, risk and capital problems.

### 4. The mean density

The mean density is defined analogous to (2):

$$m_\alpha \equiv E(L'_\alpha) = E\{(x > V_\alpha) V'_\alpha\} = (1 - \alpha) V'_\alpha, \quad 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \quad (4)$$

where  $E$  is the expectation. The mean density  $m_\alpha$  is the product of  $1 - \alpha$ , the probability of  $x$  reaching the  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$  layer, and the  $\text{VaR}$ -spacing  $V'_\alpha$ , measuring layer width.

As  $\alpha$  increases,  $1 - \alpha$  decreases reflecting reduced likelihood of reaching higher layers. On the other hand for a right skewed loss distribution,  $V'_\alpha$  increases where the probability density is decreasing. The behaviour of the mean density depends on the relative movements in  $1 - \alpha$  and  $V'_\alpha$ . For example, the exponential distribution has a constant mean density whereas the Pareto distribution has an increasing mean density due to more rapidly increasing  $\text{VaR}$  spacings. These examples are discussed below.

Using (3),

$$E(x) = E \left( \int_0^1 dL_\alpha \right) = \int_0^1 m_\alpha d\alpha .$$

Integrating  $m_\alpha$  over subsets of the unit interval yields mean values and values of layers representing for example insurance coverage with a deductible and limit:

$$\int_\alpha^\beta m_\pi d\pi = E \left( \int_\alpha^\beta dL_\pi \right) = E(L_\beta - L_\alpha) , \quad (5)$$

representing, for example, the mean covered loss or pure premium under an insurance or reinsurance arrangement with deductible  $V_\alpha$  and limit  $V_\beta$ , and the expected capital shortfall ( $\alpha = \gamma, \beta = 1$ ) or capital usage ( $\alpha = 0, \beta = \gamma$ ) when capital  $V_\gamma$  is held against  $x$ . Section 6 discusses risk values of  $\text{VaR}$  layers, also a critical input to these decisions when volatility is of concern. Applications of mean and risk densities are discussed in §11 and beyond.

Example mean densities for common probability distributions are (In all cases  $b > 0$  is a scale parameter)

- The uniform distribution over  $[0, b]$  yields

$$V_\alpha = b\alpha, \quad V'_\alpha = b, \quad m_\alpha = (1 - \alpha)b ,$$

and the mean density is linearly decreasing. Spacings are equal over all  $\text{VaR}$  layers, and losses are less likely to reach higher layers, hence the mean density is decreasing. The mean density is also proportional to scale, and this is case in general. (Not sure I understand the last sentence).

- The exponential with mean  $b$  is

$$F(x) = 1 - e^{-x/b}, \quad V_\alpha = -b \ln(1 - \alpha), \quad V'_\alpha = \frac{b}{1 - \alpha}, \quad m_\alpha = b ,$$

and the mean density is constant since increasing  $\text{VaR}$  spacings exactly offset decreasing probabilities of reaching higher layers.

- The Pareto with shape parameter  $c > 1$  is

$$F(x) = 1 - \left( \frac{b}{b+x} \right)^c, \quad V_\alpha = b \left\{ (1-\alpha)^{-1/c} - 1 \right\},$$

$$V'_\alpha = \frac{b}{c(1-\alpha)^{1/(c+1)}}, \quad m_\alpha = \frac{b}{c(1-\alpha)^{1/c}}.$$

The mean density increases to infinity as  $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ : increasing VaR spacing more than offsets decreasing probabilities.

- The Weibull distribution with shape parameter  $k > 0$ ,

$$F(x) = 1 - e^{-(x/b)^k}, \quad V_\alpha = b \left\{ -\ln(1-\alpha) \right\}^{1/k},$$

$$V'_\alpha = \frac{b \left\{ -\ln(1-\alpha) \right\}^{1/(k-1)}}{k(1-\alpha)}, \quad m_\alpha = \frac{b \left\{ -\ln(1-\alpha) \right\}^{1/(k-1)}}{k}.$$

Setting  $k = 1$  yields the exponential distribution and  $m_\alpha = b$ . Reducing  $k$  increases skewness and yields increasing  $m_\alpha$ . Vice versa if  $k > 1$ .

Figure 2 plots mean densities for the above distributions with parameters satisfying  $E(x) = 1$ . Hence mean densities in Figure 2 all integrate to one. For the exponential distribution, the overall mean value is spread uniformly across VaR layers. For the Pareto distribution, the bulk of the overall mean value is captured by higher VaR layers due to an increasing mean density. The opposite applies to the uniform distribution.

The constant mean density for the exponential distribution provides a benchmark for assessing skewness of the loss distribution. A decreasing mean density (for example uniform distribution and Weibull distribution for  $k > 1$ ) implies VaR spacings increase at a lower rate compared to the exponential, and hence lower skewness. Vice versa for an increasing mean density (for example Pareto distribution and Weibull distribution for  $k < 1$ ). The derivative of the mean density is

$$m'_\alpha = (1-\alpha)V''_\alpha - V'_\alpha.$$

Hence the mean density is increasing if and only if  $(1-\alpha)V''_\alpha/V'_\alpha > 1$ .

## 5. Properties of mean densities

The mean density  $m_\alpha$  defined in (4) is non-negative for any loss  $x \geq 0$ . Further if  $y = g(x)$  where  $g > 0$  is increasing then

$$V_\alpha(y) = g\{V_\alpha(x)\}, \quad m_\alpha(y) = (1-\alpha)g'\{V_\alpha(x)\}V'_\alpha = m_\alpha(x)g'\{V_\alpha(x)\}.$$

In particular if  $y = cx$  then  $m_\alpha(y) = cm_\alpha(x)$ .




Figure 2: Mean densities for uniform ( $b = 2$ ), exponential ( $b = 1$ ), Pareto ( $b = 0.5$ ,  $c = 1.5$ ) and Weibull ( $b = 1.13$ ,  $k = 2$ ) distributions. The area underneath each curve is 1.

The mean density  $m_\alpha$  uniquely characterises the loss distribution:

$$F^-(\alpha) \equiv V_\alpha = \int_0^\alpha \frac{m_\pi}{1-\pi} d\pi .$$

Larger values of  $m_\pi$ , especially when  $\pi$  is close to  $\alpha$ , implies larger  $V_\alpha$ .

If  $f$  is the density corresponding to the distribution  $F$  then the

$$m_\alpha = \frac{1 - F(V_\alpha)}{f(V_\alpha)} ,$$

and hence the mean density is the reciprocal of the hazard rate at percentile  $\alpha$  (Hogg and Klugman, 2009). The result follows by noting  $F(V_\alpha) = \alpha$  and  $V'_\alpha = 1/f(V_\alpha)$ .

## 6. Risk associated with layers

This section discusses “risks” associated with loss layers, where risk is measured using distorted probabilities. Means and risks are critical inputs to decision making for pricing, capital and risk management. Distortion risks are important inputs to decisions where volatility is of concern. For example distortion risks form premium loadings and capital buffers on insurance losses, and risk premiums on investment returns. Mean values are insufficient as they do not capture the spread and skewness of the distribution of outcomes. Applying various distortion operators generates different distortion risk measures. Examples are discussed in Wang (1995), Wang (2000) and Choo and De Jong (2009), and include the proportional hazards risk, conditional-tail-expectation and expected-maximal-loss.

Wang (1996) distorts the distribution function  $F$  with a distortion  $\Phi$  to arrive at the distorted distribution function  $\Phi \circ F$ . Here  $\Phi$  is an increasing, convex distortion operator satisfying  $\Phi(0) = 0$  and  $\Phi(1) = 1$ . The distorted risk of  $x$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(x) - E(x) &= \int_0^\infty [1 - \Phi\{F(x)\}] dx - \int_0^\infty \{1 - F(x)\} dx \\ &= \int_0^\infty [F(x) - \Phi\{F(x)\}] dx , \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{E}$  calculates expectations using  $\Phi \circ F$ . Distortion risks are positive since  $\Phi$  is convex and thus  $\Phi\{F(x)\} < F(x)$  for all  $x$ . Applying integration by parts to the first integral above yields

$$\mathcal{E}(x) - E(x) = E\{x\Phi'(u)\} - E(x) = \text{cov}\{x, \Phi'(u)\} = \sigma_x \sigma_{\Phi'} \text{cor}\{x, \Phi'(u)\} ,$$

where  $u \equiv F(x)$ . which is the loss aversion premium (Choo and De Jong, 2009), where  $\text{cov}$  and  $\text{cor}$  compute covariance and correlation under  $F$ , and  $\sigma_x$  and  $\sigma_\phi$  are standard deviations.



Since  $x = \int_0^1 dL_\alpha$ , the distorted risk of a VaR layer is the difference between distorted and original mean values:

$$r_\alpha \equiv \mathcal{E}(L'_\alpha) - \mathbb{E}(L'_\alpha) = \{1 - \Phi(\alpha)\}V'_\alpha - (1 - \alpha)V'_\alpha = \{\alpha - \Phi(\alpha)\}V'_\alpha . \quad (6)$$

This result follows since the distorted probability of  $x > V_\alpha$  is  $1 - \Phi\{F(V_\alpha)\} = 1 - \Phi(\alpha) > 1 - \alpha$  since  $\Phi$  is convex. Hence distortion increases the probability of  $x$  reaching a VaR layer, and the risk density is proportional to the amount of increase. The increase  $\alpha - \Phi(\alpha)$  represents the extent of distortion at  $\alpha$ .

The end points of VaR layers are unchanged at  $V_\alpha = F^-(\alpha)$ , even though the  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$  of the distorted distribution is  $F^-\{\Phi^-(\alpha)\}$ . Therefore end points of VaR layers are fixed and specified using the original distribution, and distortion only affects the probability the loss reaching various layers.

Integrating  $r_\alpha$  over all  $\alpha$  yields the distorted risk of  $x$ :

$$\int_0^1 r_\alpha d\alpha = \int_0^1 \{\mathcal{E}(L'_\alpha) - \mathbb{E}(L'_\alpha)\} d\alpha = \mathcal{E}(x) - \mathbb{E}(x) .$$

Alternatively,  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$  layers for all  $\alpha$  are comonotonic, and distortion risks of comonotonic random variables are additive (Wang et al., 1997). The distorted risk of the  $\text{VaR}_{[\alpha, \beta]}$  layer is

$$R_{[\alpha, \beta]} \equiv \int_\alpha^\beta r_\pi d\pi = \mathcal{E}(L_\alpha - L_\beta) - \mathbb{E}(L_\alpha - L_\beta) ,$$

The premium for the insured loss is  $\mathbb{E}(L_\alpha - L_\beta) + \theta R_{[\alpha, \beta]}$  where  $\theta > 0$  is a profit margin. Further  $R_{[0, \beta]}$  is the risk of losses capped at  $V_\beta$ , and  $R_{[\alpha, 1]}$  is the risk of losses in excess of  $V_\alpha$ . These two risks are important inputs when setting capital for example. The risk density  $r_\alpha$  spreads the overall risk of  $x$  across VaR layers. Generally there is more focus on higher risk layers when making decisions. Applications of mean and risk densities are further discussed in §11.

## 7. Percentile risk ratios

The risk ratio at percentile  $\alpha$  is the ratio between risk and mean densities:

$$r_\alpha^* \equiv \frac{r_\alpha}{m_\alpha} = \frac{\{\alpha - \Phi(\alpha)\}V'_\alpha}{(1 - \alpha)V'_\alpha} = \frac{\alpha - \Phi(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha} . \quad (7)$$

Risk ratios indicate the level of risk relative to mean. Risk ratios depend on the distortion operator  $\Phi$  but are independent of the loss distribution since VaR spacing  $V'_\alpha$  is a multiplicative factor in both  $r_\alpha$  and  $m_\alpha$ .

Risk ratios are larger at higher layers, since

$$\frac{dr_\alpha^*}{d\alpha} = \frac{1 - \Phi(\alpha) - (1 - \alpha)\Phi'(\alpha)}{(1 - \alpha)^2} \geq 0 .$$

The inequality holds since

$$1 - \Phi(\alpha) = \int_{\alpha}^1 \Phi'(u) du \geq \int_{\alpha}^1 \Phi'(\alpha) du = (1 - \alpha)\Phi'(\alpha) ,$$

noting  $\Phi$  is convex implying  $\Phi'$  is increasing. Thus higher VaR layers are riskier than lower VaR layers as a proportion of mean values. End points of risk ratios are  $r_0^* = 0$  and  $r_1^* = \Phi'(1) - 1$ .

Given the risk ratios  $r_{\alpha}^*$ , the overall risk and risk ratio of a VaR layer is

$$\int_{\alpha}^{\beta} r_{\pi}^* m_{\pi} d\pi, \quad \frac{\int_{\alpha}^{\beta} r_{\pi}^* m_{\pi} d\pi}{\int_{\alpha}^{\beta} m_{\pi} d\pi} .$$

Hence the overall risk ratio is a weighted average of individual risk ratios, with weights given by mean density values. The overall risk ratio and hence risk are high if the mean density is larger at higher layers since larger risk ratios are then weighted more heavily. For example the Pareto has a higher risk and risk ratio than the uniform, exponential and Weibull due to an increasing mean density. Examples are further discussed in the next section.

The risk ratios  $r_{\alpha}^*$  over  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$  uniquely characterises the distortion operator  $\Phi$ . Therefore an alternative formulation of  $\Phi$  is to specify risk ratios across all VaR layers and then set

$$\Phi(\alpha) = \alpha - (1 - \alpha)r_{\alpha}^* .$$

The condition  $\Phi(0) = 0$  requires  $r_0^* = 0$ . Increasing and convex  $\Phi$  respectively require  $1 + r_{\alpha}^* - (1 - \alpha)(r_{\alpha}^*)' > 0$  and  $2(r_{\alpha}^*)' - (1 - \alpha)(r_{\alpha}^*)'' > 0$ .

## 8. Example risk ratios and risk densities

The following are risk ratios based on distortion operators discussed in Wang (1995) and Choo and De Jong (2009). As highlighted in the previous section, risk ratios only depend on the distortion operator. Multiplying risk ratios with the mean density yields the risk density.

- Assume  $\Phi(v) = (v > c)(v - c)/(1 - c)$  where  $0 \leq c \leq 1$ . The overall distortion risk of  $x$  is the conditional-tail-expectation  $E(x|x > V_c) - E(x)$ , the expected value of losses above  $c$ -VaR in excess of the mean loss. The risk ratio is

$$r_{\alpha}^* = (\alpha \leq c) \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} + (\alpha > c) \frac{c}{1 - c} .$$

Risk ratio in this case increases from zero until the  $c$ -VaR layer, and remains constant at  $c/(1 - c)$  for all higher layers. Larger  $c$  yields higher risk ratios across all VaR layers, hence  $c$  indicates risk aversion.

- Assume the power distortion operator  $\Phi(v) = v^n$  where  $n \geq 1$ . If  $n$  is an integer, the distortion risk is  $E\{\max(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n)\} - E(x)$  or the expected-maximal-loss in excess of the mean loss, where  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n$  are independent copies of  $x$ . The risk ratio in this case is

$$r_\alpha^* = \frac{\alpha - \alpha^n}{1 - \alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \alpha^i,$$

where the final expression assumes integer  $n$ , and is a polynomial of degree  $n - 1$  with unit coefficients. Larger  $n$  yields higher risk ratios for all  $\alpha$ , hence  $n$  indicates risk aversion.

- Assume the proportional hazards transform,  $\Phi(v) = 1 - (1 - v)^{1/\gamma}$  where  $\gamma \geq 1$ . The distortion risk is  $\int_0^\infty \{S(x)\}^{1/\gamma} dx - \int_0^\infty S(x) dx$  where  $S$  is the survival function. The risk ratio is

$$r_\alpha^* = \frac{\alpha - \{1 - (1 - \alpha)^{1/\gamma}\}}{1 - \alpha} = (1 - \alpha)^{1/\gamma - 1} - 1.$$

Higher  $\gamma$  increases risk ratios.

The four panels in Figure 3 graph mean and risk densities using a power distortion operator  $\Phi(v) = v^3$  and loss distributions in Figure 2. The risk ratio is  $r_\alpha^* = \alpha(1 + \alpha)$ . For the uniform loss distribution, risk is highest around median VaR layers since increasing risk ratios are applied to a decreasing mean density. Risk is generally higher at higher VaR layers for the exponential, Pareto and Weibull loss distributions. Pareto has the highest overall risk, since higher risk ratios are applied to higher mean densities at higher VaR layers. Pareto has an increasing mean density due to its skewness.

## 9. Volatility density and volatility ratio

Volatility densities are similar to risk densities and indicate the volatility of each VaR layer. Volatility is measured by standard deviation. Unlike risk densities, volatility densities do not integrate to the overall loss standard deviation. This paper focuses on risk densities due to their additivity. In addition distortion risk captures the skewness of loss distributions, and standard deviation is a more appropriate risk measure for symmetric distributions.

The volatility density is the standard deviation of  $\ell_\alpha$ :

$$s_\alpha \equiv \sqrt{\text{var}(\ell_\alpha)} = \sqrt{\alpha(1 - \alpha)} V'_\alpha, \quad (8)$$

since the  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$  layer is Bernoulli distributed with probability  $1 - \alpha$  and scale  $V'_\alpha$ . The volatility ratio is the ratio between volatility and mean densities:

$$s_\alpha^* \equiv \frac{s_\alpha}{m_\alpha} = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha(1 - \alpha)} V'_\alpha}{(1 - \alpha) V'_\alpha} = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha}},$$




Figure 3: Mean densities (blue area) and risk densities (red area) for the 4 loss distributions in Figure 2. The distortion operator is  $\Phi(v) = v^3$  and the risk ratio is  $r_\alpha^* = \alpha(1 + \alpha)$ .

and is the coefficient of variation of  $\ell_\alpha$ . Similar to risk ratios, volatility ratios are increasing and are independent of the loss distribution. Volatility ratio starts at zero at the bottom VaR layer, and increases to infinity at the top VaR layer.

Integrating  $s_\alpha$  over  $[a, b]$  yields the volatility of the  $[a, b]$ -VaR layer:

$$S_{[a,b]} \equiv \int_a^b \sqrt{\alpha(1-\alpha)} V'_\alpha d\alpha = \sqrt{b(1-b)} V_b - \sqrt{a(1-a)} V_a - \int_a^b \frac{0.5 - \alpha}{\sqrt{\alpha(1-\alpha)}} V_\alpha d\alpha .$$

The first integral above is a weighted sum of VaR spacings between  $a$ -VaR and  $b$ -VaR, where weights are symmetric about, and highest at, the median. Larger  $S_{[a,b]}$  implies greater volatility over the  $[a, b]$ -VaR layer. In addition  $S_{[a,b]}$  is an upper bound on the standard deviation of the  $[a, b]$ -VaR layer:

$$\sqrt{\text{var}(L_{[a,b]})} \leq S_{[a,b]} , \quad (9)$$

since the standard deviation of a sum ( $L_{[a,b]}$ ) is less than the sum of standard deviations ( $S_\alpha$ ). VaR layers are comonotonic but not linearly dependent, hence equality in (9) does not hold in general.

When  $a = 0$  and  $b = 1$  the integral of the volatility density is

$$S_{[0,1]} = \int_0^1 \frac{\alpha - 0.5}{\sqrt{\alpha(1-\alpha)}} V_\alpha d\alpha = \int_{0.5}^1 \frac{\alpha - 0.5}{\sqrt{\alpha(1-\alpha)}} (V_\alpha - V_{1-\alpha}) d\alpha \geq \sqrt{\text{var}(x)} .$$

Hence overall loss volatility as measured by the volatility density is the weighted difference between VaRs above and below the median, and in general exceeds the loss standard deviation.

## 10. Calculation using simulation losses

Previous sections define mean, risk and volatility densities for a continuous loss random variable. It is common for insurance and financial companies to simulate future outcomes to make decisions. Given an ordered sample of simulated losses  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n$ , calculate mean, risk and volatility densities as follows:

- Set VaRs equal to ordered observations:  $V_{i/n} = \ell_i$ . The  $i/n$ -VaR layer is  $(x > \ell_i)(\ell_{i+1} - \ell_i)$  where  $x$  is random.
- The mean density is  $m_{i/n} = (1 - i/n)V'_{i/n}$ , for  $i = 0, \dots, n - 1$  where the derivative  $V'_{i/n} = n(V_{(i+1)/n} - V_{i/n})$  and  $V_0 = 0$ .
- Risk ratios are computed using the specified distortion operator:  $r_{i/n}^* = \{i/n - \Phi(i/n)\}/(1 - i/n)$ . The risk density is  $r_{i/n} = m_{i/n} * r_{i/n}^*$ .

- Volatility ratios are  $s_{i/n}^* = \sqrt{(i/n)/(1-i/n)}$ . The volatility density is the product  $s_{i/n} = m_{i/n} * s_{i/n}^*$ .

Overall mean, risk and volatility are the respective sums (rather than integrals)

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{m_{i/n}}{n}, \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{r_{i/n}}{n}, \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{s_{i/n}}{n}.$$

Taking sums over other subsets yield mean, risk and volatility over corresponding VaR layers. Manipulating the first summation above yields the arithmetic mean  $\sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i/n$ .

## 11. Applications

Remaining sections of this paper apply mean and risk densities to common problems in risk and capital management. Existing statistical tools provide identical solutions to some of the problems. However mean and risk densities offer a more elegant solution, and yield additional insights.

Capital covers adverse loss outcomes. Capital is usually set equal to VaR with a fixed threshold. For example Solvency II insurance regulation references 90% and 99.5% VaRs (Eling et al., 2007). VaR based capital limits the probability of shortfall – 10% and 0.5% respectively in Solvency II. VaR based capital adjusts to the shape and scale of the loss distribution. Given a fixed threshold, VaR increases with scale and skewness of the loss distribution.

Conflicting considerations are involved when deciding how much capital to hold. Higher capital reduces the probability and extent of a shortfall. However holding capital involves an opportunity cost. An optimal capital amount balances shortfall and opportunity cost.

Higher risk requires more capital. Understanding key sources of risk yields optimal risk management decisions to reduce required capital, such as reinsurance purchase and limiting loss coverage.

The following notation is used in the following sections:

$$M_{[\alpha,\beta]} = \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} m_{\pi} d\pi, \quad R_{[\alpha,\beta]} = \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} r_{\pi} d\pi, \quad R_{[\alpha,\beta]}^* = \frac{R_{[\alpha,\beta]}}{M_{[\alpha,\beta]}}.$$

## 12. Pricing loss layers

The following applies mean and risk densities to pricing loss layers. Given loss  $x$ , suppose the layer  $L_{[a,b]}$  is insured (or reinsured). Hence  $V_a$  is the deductible or excess and  $V_b$  is the limit. The payout is  $x - V_a$  if  $x > V_a$ , and is capped at  $V_b - V_a$ . The premium is

$$M_{[a,b]} + R_{[a,b]} = \int_a^b (m_{\alpha} + r_{\alpha}) d\alpha = \int_a^b \{1 - \Phi(\alpha)\} V_{\alpha}' d\alpha$$

$$= \{1 - \Phi(b)\}V_b - \{1 - \Phi(a)\}V_a + \int_a^b V_\alpha \phi(\alpha) d\alpha ,$$

where  $M_{[a,b]}$  is the pure premium and  $R_{[a,b]}$  is the risk loading. Incremental premium changes from changing the deductible and the limit are respectively given by derivatives

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial a} \{M_{[a,b]} + R_{[a,b]}\} = -(m_a + r_a), \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial b} \{M_{[a,b]} + R_{[a,b]}\} = m_b + r_b .$$

Refer to mean and risk densities in Figure 3. The premium  $M_{[a,b]} + R_{[a,b]}$  is the area over  $[a, b]$ . For exponential and Pareto distributions, premium increases at an increasing rate when the limit increases, and at a decreasing rate for uniform and Weibull distributions. Similar conclusions are drawn for the deductible. For all distributions, the risk loading forms a larger portion of the premium compared to the pure premium at higher VaR layers. Intuitively, if premium cost was a secondary concern, the consumer would select a higher deductible and higher limit when faced with exponential and Pareto losses, so that most of the mean and risk are insured. On the other hand, a lower deductible and lower limit are more appropriate for uniform and Weibull loss distributions.

### 13. Setting limits on insured loss

Insurers typically impose a limit  $V_l$  on an insured loss to manage risk. The following proposes a solution for  $l$ . Suppose a profit margin  $\pi$  is charged on the mean loss  $M_{[0,l]}$ , noting only the  $[0, l]$ -VaR layer is insured. The insurer's risk is  $R_{[0,l]}$  with cost  $kR_{[0,l]}$ , where  $k$  is the cost per unit risk. If  $R_{[0,l]}$  is the capital held then  $k$  is the cost of capital.

A profitable  $l$  ensures profit margin exceeds cost of risk in dollar terms:

$$\pi M_{[0,l]} \geq kR_{[0,l]}, \quad \frac{R_{[0,l]}}{M_{[0,l]}} = R_{[0,l]}^* \leq \pi/k$$

where  $R_{[0,l]}^*$  is the risk ratio over the  $[0, l]$ -VaR layer. Since  $R_{[0,l]}^*$  increases in  $l$ ,  $l$  is set to ensure that the insurer's risk ratio does not exceed  $\pi/k$ , the ratio between profit margin and cost per unit risk. Higher  $\pi$  or lower  $k$  permits higher loss limit. Write the risk ratio  $R_{[0,l]}^*$  as

$$R_{[0,l]}^* = \frac{\int_0^l m_\alpha r_\alpha^* d\alpha}{\int_0^l m_\alpha d\alpha}, \quad r_\alpha^* = \frac{\alpha - \Phi(\alpha)}{1 - \alpha}$$

where  $r_\alpha^*$  increases with  $\alpha$  and is independent of the loss distribution. A skewed loss distribution with increasing mean density emphasizes larger values of  $r_\alpha^*$ , and thus has higher  $R_{[0,l]}^*$  given  $l$ . This implies skewed loss distributions require a lower loss limit.

If  $l$  is arbitrarily set then positive profitability requires profit margin

$$\pi \geq k \frac{R_{[0,l]}}{M_{[0,l]}} ,$$

the product of the risk cost and risk ratio over  $[0, l]$ -VaR layer. Increasing either component increases the profit margin.

#### 14. Setting capital based on expected shortfall

Suppose capital is held to limit expected shortfall to a proportion  $l$  of overall mean loss. In contrast capital is typically held to limit shortfall probability to  $l$ . Hence capital is  $c$ -VaR or  $V_c$  where the threshold  $c$  is solved from

$$\frac{M_{[c,1]}}{M_{[0,1]}} = l . \quad (10)$$

An equivalent standard statistical expression is

$$\frac{E\{\max(x - V_c, 0)\}}{E(x)} = l .$$

Equation (10) sets the relative area above  $c$  under the mean density at  $l$ . Figure 4 provides an illustration for a Weibull distribution. Figure 4 also illustrates capital derived by limiting shortfall probability, where area is computed over  $[V_c, \infty]$  under the probability density as opposed to the mean density.

For an exponential loss distribution, the mean density is flat and (10) reads  $1 - c = l$  therefore  $c = 1 - l$ . For example if expected shortfall is 0.5% of the overall mean loss then capital is the 99.5% VaR. Setting shortfall probability at  $l$  also yields capital  $(1 - l)$ -VaR. Thus fixing expected shortfall and shortfall probability yield identical capital for the exponential loss distribution. For a Pareto loss distribution with increasing mean density, solving (10) yields

$$\int_c^1 \frac{1}{(1 - \alpha)^{1/\gamma}} d\alpha = l \int_0^1 \frac{1}{(1 - \alpha)^{1/\gamma}} d\alpha, \quad c = 1 - l^{\gamma/(\gamma-1)} .$$

In this case capital exceeds  $(1 - l)$ -VaR, and decreases with shape parameter  $\gamma$ . Generally for an increasing mean density,  $M_{[1-l,1]} > lM_{[0,1]}$  thus  $c > 1 - l$ , and vice versa for a decreasing mean density. Hence the VaR threshold varies with the shape of the loss distribution. Higher skewness increases the threshold and reduces shortfall probability. Expected shortfall is more superior than shortfall probability when determining capital, since the shape of the loss distribution is reflected in the VaR threshold.

The scale of the loss distribution does not affect the VaR threshold in (10), since scale factors are present in numerator and denominator. The VaR threshold depends only on the shape parameter and shortfall proportion  $l$ . Scale is reflected only when capital is computed from the VaR threshold.






Figure 4: The left panel shows capital with fixed expected shortfall (red area under the mean density). The right panel shows capital with fixed shortfall probability (red area under the probability density).

## 15. Minimising expected capital surplus and shortfall

The following sets capital by considering both expected surplus and shortfall. An opportunity cost  $j$  is attached to every unit of capital surplus, since surplus is better used in other areas. The corresponding cost of capital shortfall is  $k$ , for example the borrowing cost under distress. The overall expected cost is

$$\Gamma = j(V_c - M_{[0,c]}) + kM_{[c,1]} = kE\{\max(V_c - x, 0)\} + jE\{\max(x - V_c, 0)\},$$

where  $V_c - M_{[0,c]}$  is expected surplus and  $M_{[c,1]}$  is expected shortfall. The final expression above is the equivalent standard statistical expression. Setting the derivative of  $\Gamma$  with respect to  $c$  to zero yields

$$j(V'_c - m_c) - km_c = 0, \quad jc - k(1 - c) = 0, \quad c = \frac{k}{j + k} = \frac{1}{1 + (k/j)^{-1}}.$$

Hence the VaR threshold in this setup increases with the relative unit shortfall cost. If  $j = k$  then  $c = 0.5$ , and  $c$  increases when  $k$  increases relative to  $j$ . In addition any capital  $V_{c^*}$  implies relative shortfall cost  $k/j = c^*/(1 - c^*)$ . For example, 99.5% VaR capital implies  $k/j = 199$ , thus the unit cost of shortfall is approximately 200 times the unit cost of surplus.

## 16. Reinsurance and loss transformation

Suppose an insurer faces loss  $x$ , and enters into a reinsurance arrangement whereby a portion  $t_\alpha$  of every  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$  layer is reinsured and the remaining portion

$1 - t_\alpha$  is retained. Hence  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$  layer and its mean and risk all reduce by  $t_\alpha$ . The retained loss and the mean and risk densities are, respectively,

$$\tilde{x} \equiv \int_0^1 (x > V_\alpha)(1 - t_\alpha) dV_\alpha, \quad \tilde{m}_\alpha \equiv (1 - t_\alpha)m_\alpha, \quad \tilde{r}_\alpha \equiv (1 - t_\alpha)r_\alpha. \quad (11)$$

Risk ratios are unchanged after reinsurance:  $\tilde{r}_\alpha/\tilde{m}_\alpha = r_\alpha/m_\alpha$ . The loss distribution is altered by reinsurance and is further discussed below.

The set of values of  $t_\alpha$  over  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$  defines the “reinsurance structure.” Typical reinsurance structures are “quota share”:  $t_\alpha = t$  and “excess-of-loss”:  $t_\alpha = (\alpha > d)$ . Quota share covers a constant proportion  $t$  of all layers. Excess-of-loss covers all VaR layers above  $d$ .

The loss distribution after reinsurance is characterised by  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$ s  $\tilde{V}_\alpha$  where  $\tilde{V}'_\alpha = (1 - t_\alpha)V'_\alpha$ . VaR spacings are reduced by the reinsurance applicable to the layer. Applying integration by parts yields

$$\tilde{V}_\alpha = \int_0^\alpha (1 - t_s)V'_s ds = (1 - t_\alpha)V_\alpha + \int_0^\alpha V_s t'_s ds.$$

For quota share,  $t'_\alpha = 0$  therefore  $\tilde{V}_\alpha = (1 - t)V_\alpha$ . Losses reduce by a portion  $t$ . For excess-of-loss,  $t'_\alpha = (\alpha = d)$ , the Dirac delta function, and  $\tilde{V}_\alpha = (\alpha \leq d)V_\alpha + (\alpha > d)V_d$ . Under this arrangement, all losses below  $V_d$  are retained and losses above  $V_d$  are capped at  $V_d$ . Hence the retained loss is  $L_{[0,d]}$ .

The reinsurance structure can be tailored to yield a target loss distribution or mean and risk density. If the target mean density is  $\tilde{m}_\alpha$  then from (11) the reinsurance structure is  $t_\alpha = 1 - \tilde{m}_\alpha/m_\alpha$ . Similarly for a target risk density. If the loss distribution has  $\text{VaR}_\alpha$   $\tilde{V}_\alpha$  then  $t_\alpha = 1 - \tilde{V}'_\alpha/V'_\alpha$ . In all cases the reinsurance structure computes the ratio between target and original quantities.

Consider a Pareto distributed loss with shape parameter  $\gamma > 1$  and scale parameter  $\beta > 0$ . Reinsurance is purchased to transform the loss distribution into an exponential with scale  $\tilde{\beta} > 0$ . The reinsurance structure is

$$t_\alpha = 1 - \frac{\tilde{\beta}(1 - \alpha)^{-1}}{\beta\gamma^{-1}(1 - \alpha)^{-(1/\gamma+1)}} = 1 - \tilde{\beta}\beta^{-1}\gamma(1 - \alpha)^{1/\gamma}$$

Hence reinsurance is  $1 - \tilde{\beta}\beta^{-1}\gamma$  at the zero VaR layer, and increases monotonically to 1 at the highest VaR layer. This result is intuitive since the Pareto is thicker tailed than the exponential. Hence in order to transform the loss from Pareto to exponential, minimum reinsurance is required for small losses and larger losses are increasingly reinsured. Note  $\tilde{\beta} \leq \beta/\gamma$  since  $0 \leq t_\alpha \leq 1$ .

## 17. Optimal excess-of-loss reinsurance

Suppose excess-of-loss reinsurance with excess  $d$  is purchased. The problem is to calculate an optimal  $d$  for the insurer. The retained risk is  $R_{[0,d]}$  with unit cost  $k$ . Reinsurance may be priced in two ways:

- Fixed profit margin: reinsurance cost is a margin  $\theta$  on the expected loss. The overall cost to the insurer is

$$\Gamma = kR_{[0,d]} + \theta M_{[d,1]}$$

with derivative  $kr_d - \theta m_d$ . Then the optimal  $d$  satisfies

$$\frac{r_d}{m_d} = r_d^* = \frac{d - \Phi(d)}{1 - d} = \frac{\theta}{k}$$

or the risk ratio at  $d$  is equal to the ratio between the reinsurer's profit margin and the insurer's unit risk cost. A higher profit margin or lower risk cost increases the excess for the insurer.

- Risk based pricing: reinsurance cost is a margin  $\theta$  on the reinsured risk, and the reinsurer has risk density  $\hat{r}_\alpha$ . The overall cost to the insurer is

$$\Gamma = kR_{[0,d]} + \theta \hat{R}_{[d,1]}$$

with derivative  $kr_d - \pi \hat{R}_d$ . The optimal  $d$  satisfies

$$kr_d = \theta \hat{r}_d, \quad kr_d^* = \theta \hat{r}_d^*, \quad k\{d - \Phi(d)\} = \theta\{d - \hat{\Phi}(d)\},$$

where  $\hat{\Phi}$  is the reinsurer's distortion operator.

In both cases the optimal reinsurance retention is independent of the loss distribution.

## 18. Optimal combination of reinsurance and capital

Suppose XoL reinsurance with threshold  $V_c$  is purchased, and capital is set at  $V_c$ . Hence there is zero shortfall: VaR layers above  $c$  are covered by reinsurance, and VaR layers below  $c$  are covered by held capital. The problem is to derive an optimal  $V_c$  – the XoL threshold and capital. Holding capital involves servicing cost, at  $\pi$  per unit. The reinsurer charges a loading equal to the risk of the  $[c, 1]$ -VaR layer. These yield an overall cost

$$p(c) = \{\pi V_c + E(\ell_{[0,c]})\} + \left\{ \int_c^1 r_\alpha d\alpha + E(\ell_{[c,1]}) \right\} = E(x) + \pi V_c + \int_c^1 r_\alpha d\alpha,$$

and the derivative with respect to  $c$  is

$$p'(c) = \pi V'_c - r_c = V'_c \{\pi - c + \Phi(c)\}$$

hence the payout is minimise when  $c$  satisfies  $c - \Phi(c) = \pi$ . The optimal XoL purchase and capital buffer do not depend on the loss distribution, only on the distortion operator  $\Phi$ .

### 19. Combining quota share and excess-of-loss reinsurance

Suppose a combination of quota share and excess-of-loss reinsurance is deployed. The aim is to minimise cost subject to retained mean loss  $M$ . Hence minimise

$$\Gamma = k(1-t)r_{[0,d]} + j_1r_{[d,1]} + j_2tr_{[0,d]} - \lambda \{(1-t)m_{[0,d]} - M\}$$

where  $t$  and  $d$  are parameters of quota share and excess-of-loss reinsurance, respectively. In addition  $k$ ,  $j_1$  and  $j_2$  are respective cost per unit risk for the insurer, excess-of-loss and quota share reinsurers.  $\lambda$  is the Lagrange multiplier.

The solutions  $t$ ,  $d$  and  $\lambda$  are

$$t = xxx, \quad d = xxx, \quad \lambda = xxx .$$

- Chernobai, A. S., S. T. Rachev, and F. J. Fabozzi (2008). *Operational risk: a guide to Basel II capital requirements, models, and analysis*, Volume 180. John Wiley & Sons.
- Choo, W. and P. De Jong (2009). Loss reserving using loss aversion functions. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 45(2), 271–277.
- Eling, M., H. Schmeiser, and J. Schmit (2007). The solvency ii process: Overview and critical analysis. *Risk Management and Insurance Review* 10(1), 69.
- Hogg, R. V. and S. A. Klugman (2009). *Loss distributions*, Volume 249. John Wiley & Sons.
- Shaked, M. and J. G. Shanthikumar (2007). *Stochastic orders*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman (1992). Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 5(4), 297–323.
- Wang, S. (1995). Insurance pricing and increased limits ratemaking by proportional hazards transforms. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 17(1), 43–54.
- Wang, S. (1996). Premium Calculation by Transforming the Premium Layer Density. *ASTIN Bulletin* 26(1), 71–92.
- Wang, S. (2000). A class of distortion operators for pricing financial and insurance risks. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* 67(1), 15–36.
- Wang, S., V. Young, and H. Panjer (1997). Axiomatic characterization of insurance prices. *Insurance Mathematics and Economics* 21(2), 173–183.