

A generalization of De Vylder's formula and an application

Rim ADENANE and Florin Avram

16 mai 2020

Table des matières

1	Abstract	1
2	Introduction	2
3	A short review of classical ruin theory	6
4	De Vylder approximation	8
4.1	Proposition :	8
4.2	DeVylder Approximation :	9
5	De Vylder approximation	11
6	Two-point Padé approximations, with low order examples	12
6.1	Corollary :	17
7	The Pollaczek-Khinchine formula	18
7.1	Definition :	18
7.2	Geometric Interpretation :	18

1 Abstract

In 1978 *De Vylder* proposed a method of approximating the ultimate ruin probability in the classical Cramér-Lundberg risk model, by replacing

it via a simpler process with exponential jumps. In this paper we consider a generalization : we approximate the underlying process by a Brownian motion perturbed process with exponential jumps. We show numerically that, as expected, the obtained approximation works typically better, and illustrate this with important applications including the optimization of dividends and the computation of ruin probabilities under reinsurance.

2 Introduction

We recall first the Cramér-Lundberg risk model with an added Brownian perturbation [DG91, AA10]

$$X_t = x + ct + \sigma B(t) - S_t, S_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N_\lambda(t)} C_i. \quad (1)$$

Here $x \geq 0$ is the initial surplus, $c \geq 0$ is the linear premium rate. The C_i 's, $i = 1, 2, \dots$ are independent identically distributed (i.i.d) random variables with distribution $F(z) = F_C(z)$ representing nonnegative jumps arriving after independent exponentially distributed times with mean $1/\lambda$, and $N_\lambda(t)$ denotes the associated Poisson process counting the arrivals of claims on the interval $[0, t]$. Finally, $\sigma B(t), \sigma > 0$ is an independent Brownian perturbation.

First passage theory concerns the first passage times above and below, and the hitting time of a level b . For any process $X_t, t \geq 0$, these are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} T_{b,+} &= T_{b,+}^X = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t > b\}, \\ T_{a,-} &= T_{a,-}^X = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t < a\}, \\ T_{\{b\}} &= T_{\{b\}}^X = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t = b\}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. The upper script X will be typically omitted, as well as the signs $+, -$, when they are clear from the context.

Ruin happens when, for the first time, a jump takes X_t below 0. Risk theory revolved initially around evaluating and minimizing the probability of ruin. As more and more tools were developed, and the need arose, insurance companies became interested in maximizing aspects of company value related to ruin. This lead to the study of optimal dividend policies. As suggested by De Finetti in the 1950's [dF57] – see also [MM61] – an interesting objective

is that of maximizing the expected value of the sum of discounted future dividend payments until the time of ruin.

The most important class of dividend policies is that of a constant barrier at b , which modifies the surplus only when $X_t > b$, by a lump payment bringing the surplus at b , and then keep it there by Skorokhod reflection, until the next negative jump. In financial terms, in the absence of a Brownian component, this amounts to paying out all the income while at b . In case of Brownian perturbation, Skorokhod reflection means keeping the process above the barrier by minimal capital injections (whenever necessary), or below a barrier, by taking out dividends (if necessary) [Sko62].

In presence of the barrier at b , the de Finetti objective (the expected value of the sum of discounted future dividend payments until ruin) has a simple expression [APP07] in terms of the so called “scale function” W introduced by [Sup76, Ber98] :

$$V^b(x) = E_x^b \left[\int_{[0, T_0^b]} e^{-qt} d\Delta_t^b \right] = \begin{cases} \frac{W_q(x)}{W_q'(b)}, & x \leq b \\ x - b + \frac{W_q(b)}{W_q'(b)}, & x > b \end{cases}, \quad (3)$$

where T_0^b is the time of ruin, q denotes the discount rate, Δ_t^b the total local time at b before time t , and E^b the law of the process reflected from above at b and absorbed at 0 and below.

The scale function $W_q(x) : \mathbf{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $q \geq 0$ is defined on the positive half-line by the Laplace transform

$$\widehat{W}_q(s) := \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} W_q(x) dx = \frac{1}{\kappa(s) - q}, \quad \forall s > \Phi_q, \quad (4)$$

where the “symbol” $\kappa(s)$ (also called cumulant generating function) is defined in (9) in Section 3 where we provide the necessary background information, and Φ_q is the unique nonnegative root of the Cramér-Lundberg equation

$$\Phi_q := \sup\{s \geq 0 : \kappa(s) - q = 0\}, \quad q \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

The scale function $W_q(x)$ is continuous and increasing on $[0, \infty)$ [Bin76], [Ber98, Thm. VII.8], [Kyp14, Thm. 8.1]. It may have however many inflection points (such an example is depicted in Figure ??), and these play an important role in the optimization of dividends [APP07, Sch07, APP15]. For convenience, $W_q(x)$ is extended to be 0 on \mathbf{R}_- . An important fact that will

be exploited is that the Laplace transform of our function has a unique non-negative pole Φ_q , see (4) and (5).

This paper aims at computing/approximating the scale function $W_q(x)$, using its moments. The techniques being used are classic : Padé approximation and Laguerre expansions. The order (m, n) Padé approximation of a function $g(x)$ is a rational function in the form

$$R(x) = \frac{a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots + a_mx^m}{1 + b_1x + b_2x^2 + \dots + b_nx^n}$$

for which $R(0) = g(0)$, $R'(0) = g'(0)$, $R''(0) = g''(0)$, ..., $R^{(m+n)}(0) = g^{(m+n)}(0)$. In the context of probability distributions, given a density function $f(x)$ and its Laplace transform $\widehat{f}(s)$, the inverse Laplace transform of the order (m, m) Padé approximant of $\widehat{f}(s)$ provides a matrix exponential approximation of $f(x)$ that matches the first $2m$ moments of $f(x)$ (including m_0). In [ACH11] this approach was used to approximate ruin probabilities. In this paper we develop the same approach to approximate the scale function $W_q(x)$ (Section ??). An extension of the above idea is the so-called two-point Padé approximation which allows to match not only the moments of $W_q(x)$ but also the behavior of the function at 0, i.e., to match $W_q(0)$, $W_q'(0)$, ... (Section 6). For more details of this extension see [ABH18] where ruin probabilities are approximated.

Let us draw attention now to several numeric challenges which were absent in the ruin probability problem.

1. **Optimizing dividends** starts by optimizing the so called “barrier function”

$$H_D(b) := \frac{1}{W_q'(b)}, \quad b \geq 0, \quad (6)$$

and the optimal dividend policy is often simply a barrier strategy at its maximum. This is the case in particular when the barrier function $H_D(b)$ is differentiable with

$$H_D'(0) > 0, \quad EqW_q''(0) < 0 \quad (7)$$

and has a unique local maximum $b^* > 0 \implies W_q''(b^*) = 0$; then this b^* yields the optimal dividend policy, and the optimal barrier function,

$$V(x) := \sup_{b \geq 0} V^{[b]}(x) = V^{[b^*]}(x), \quad (8)$$

turns out to be the largest concave minorant of $W_q(x)$.[§]

2. **The challenge of multiple inflection points.** In the presence of several inflection points, however, the optimal policy is multiband [AM05, Sch07, Loe08, APP15]. The first numerical examples of multiband policies were produced in [AM05, Loe08], with Erlang claims $Erl_{2,1}$. However, it was shown in [Loe08] that multibands cannot occur when $W'_q(x)$ is increasing after its last global minimum b^* (i.e., when no local minima are allowed after the global minimum).

[Loe08] further made the interesting observation that for Erlang claims $ER_{2,1}$ (which are non-monotone), multiband policies may occur for volatility parameters σ smaller than a threshold value, but barrier policies (with non-concave value function!) will occur when σ is large enough.

Figure ?? displays the first derivative $W'_q(x)$, for $\sigma^2/2 \in \{\frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{3}{2}, 2\}$. The last two values yield barrier policies with non-concave value function, due to the presence of an inflection point in the interior of the interval $[0, b^*]$.




FIGURE 1 – Graphs of the Loeffen example for $\kappa(s) = \frac{\sigma^2 s^2}{2} + c s + \lambda \left(\frac{1}{(s+1)^2} - 1 \right)$, $c = \frac{107}{5}$, $\lambda = 10$, $q = \frac{1}{10}$, $\sigma^2/2 \in \{1/2, 1, 3/2, 2\}$.

Below we will investigate whether our approximations are precise enough to yield reasonable approximations for $W''_q(0)$ and the root(s) of $W''_q(\cdot)$.

§. Even when barrier strategies do not achieve the optimum, and multi-band policies must be used instead, constructing the solution must start by determining the global maximum of the barrier function [AM05, Sch07, APP15].

Special features. While our methods consist essentially of Padé approximation and Laguerre-Tricomi-Weeks Laplace transform inversion, we found that exploiting the special features of our problem is useful. These are :

1. including known values of $W_q(0), W'_q(0)$ (using thus two-point Padé approximations).
2. shifting the approximations around Φ_q specified in (5), which transforms $W_q(x)$ into a survival probability. As a consequence, we end up using a certain judicious choice of the Laguerre exponential decay parameter $(?)$, which is usually left to be tuned by the user in the Laguerre-Tricomi-Weeks method [Wei99].

Contents. We briefly review classical ruin theory in Section 3. Padé approximations are provided in Section ??, where we also spell out the simplest algorithm for the computation of the scale function. In Section 6, we derive low-order Padé and two-point Padé approximations of $W_q(x)$, reminiscent of the de Vylder approximation of the ruin probability. Some of these approximations appeared already in [GSS08], where however the Padé method and the fact that they can be easily extended to higher orders is not mentioned. Section ?? offers our personal strategy for inverting Laplace transforms of interest in probability, in the presence of uncertainty. Subsection ?? implements the Laguerre-Tricomi-Weeks Laplace transform inversion with a certain judicious choice of the exponential decay parameter $(?)$, which is believed to be new. Section ?? presents numeric experiments with mixed exponential claims. Section ?? presents experiments with Pareto claims ; since these have heavy tail and, consequently, finitely many moments, we apply “shifted” Padé approximation of the claim distribution. Section ?? includes a computer program required to obtain test cases with exact rational answers, using the Wiener-Hopf factorization ; of course, this is quite convenient for the initial testing of the precision of our algorithms. Finally, Section ?? reviews a more general version of the Laguerre-Tricomi-Weeks Laplace inversion method, which may be of interest for further experiments.

3 A short review of classical ruin theory

The process defined in (1) is a particular example of spectrally negative Lévy processes, with finite mean, which are defined by assuming instead of (1) that S_t is a subordinator with σ -finite Lévy measure $\nu(dx)$ that integrates x ,

but having possibly infinite activity near the origin $\nu(0, \infty) = \infty$ [Ber98] (for (1), the Lévy measure is given by $\nu(dx) = \lambda F(dx) \implies \nu(0, \infty) = \lambda$). A spectrally negative Lévy process is characterized by its Lévy-Khintchine/Laplace exponent/cumulant generating function/symbol $\kappa(s)$ defined by $E_0[e^{sX(t)}] = e^{t\kappa(s)}$, with $\kappa(s)$ of the particular form

$$\kappa(s) = cs + \int_0^\infty (e^{-sx} - 1)\nu(dx) + \frac{\sigma^2 s^2}{2} := s \left(c - \widehat{\nu}(s) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}s \right). \quad (9)$$

Some concepts of interest in classical risk theory are :

— *First passage times* below and above a level a :

$$T_{a,-(+)} := \inf\{t > 0 : X(t) < (>)a\}.$$

— The first first passage quantity to be studied historically was the *eventual ruin probability* :

$$\Psi(x) := P[T_0 < \infty | X(0) = x]. \quad (10)$$

In order that the eventual ruin probability not be identically 1, the parameter

$$p := c - \lambda m_1 = \kappa'(0), \text{ where } m_1 = \int_0^\infty zF(dz),$$

which is called drift or profit rate, must be assumed positive.

The Laplace transform of the ruin probability is explicit, given by the so called Pollaczek-Khinchine formula, which states that the Laplace transform of $\overline{\Psi}(x) = 1 - \Psi(x)$ is :

$$\widehat{\overline{\Psi}}(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} \overline{\Psi}(x) dx = \frac{c - \lambda m_1}{\kappa(s)} = \frac{\kappa'(0)}{\kappa(s)}. \quad (11)$$

The roots with negative real part of the Cramér Lundberg equation

$$\kappa(s) = q, q \geq 0 \quad (12)$$

are important, when such roots exist. They will be denoted by $-\gamma_1, -\gamma_2, \dots, -\gamma_N, N \geq 0$, and ordered by their absolute values $|\gamma_1| \leq |\gamma_2| \leq \dots \leq |\gamma_N|$. $\gamma_1 > 0$ is called the adjustment coefficient, and furnishes the Cramér-Lundberg asymptotic approximation

$$\Psi(u) \sim \frac{\kappa'(0)}{-\kappa'(-\gamma_1)} e^{-\gamma_1 u}.$$

4 De Vylder approximation

An approximation of the ruin probability, in the absence of the Gaussian component, is given explicitly in this section by the *De Vylder* approximation which is a Padé approximation of the *Pollaczek-Khinchin* transform for the classical **Cramér-Lundberg** model.

In the case of exponentially distributed claim size, the main idea of De Vylder is based on replacing the risk reserve process $X(t)$ by another risk process $\tilde{X}(t)$ such that for some $n \geq 1$ the moments up to order n of certain characteristics of $X(t)$ and $\tilde{X}(t)$ coincide.

$$X(t) - u = pt - \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} (C_i - EC_i) = \theta \lambda m_1 t - \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} (C_i - EC_i)$$

Where $p := c - \lambda m_1 = \lambda m_1 \theta > 0$ is the profit rate.

Furthermore, $\tilde{X}(t)$ is chosen in such a way that the ruin probability $\tilde{\Psi}(u)$ of $\tilde{U}(t)$ is easier to determine than $\Psi(u)$.

Let us designate by $\mathcal{K}_k(Y)$ the k -order cumulant of a random variable Y , i.e. the coefficients of the Taylor expansion :

$$\log(\mathbb{E}e^{uY}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{K}_k(Y) \frac{u^k}{k!}$$

4.1 Proposition :

a) The k -order cumulant of a compound Poisson process $L(t)$ is of the form :

$$\mathcal{K}_k(L(t)) = \int_0^t \mathcal{K}_k[X(ds)] ds = \lambda t \int x^k f(x) dx, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

b)

$$\mathcal{K}_1(X(t)) = pt, \quad \mathcal{K}_2(X(t)) = t(\sigma^2 + \lambda \int x^2 f(x) dx), \quad \mathcal{K}_k(X(t)) = (-1)^k \lambda t \int x^k f(x) dx, \quad \forall k \geq 3.$$

4.2 DeVylder Approximation :

The idea of the *De Vylder* approximation is to replace $X(t)$ by $\tilde{X}(t)$, where $\tilde{U}(t)$ has exponentially distributed claim size and :

$$\mathcal{K}_k(X(t)) = \mathcal{K}_k(\tilde{X}(t)) \quad (13)$$

Let $\tilde{\lambda}$, \tilde{p} , \tilde{m} et $\tilde{\theta}$ the new parameters of $\tilde{U}(t)$, representing respectively the average rate of arrival claim, the profit rate, the loading security coefficient, and the average claim reimbursement amounts.

From *proposition 4.2*, this implies that (10) holds if :

$$\begin{cases} p = \theta \lambda m_1 = \tilde{p} = \tilde{\theta} \tilde{\lambda} \tilde{m}_1 \\ \lambda m_2 = 2 \tilde{\lambda} \tilde{m}^2 \\ \lambda m_3 = 6 \tilde{m}^3 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

A computation leads to :

$$\lambda = \frac{2\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{m}^2}{m_2}$$

$$\tilde{\lambda} = \frac{\lambda m_3}{6\tilde{m}^3} = \frac{\lambda m_3}{6(\frac{m_3}{3m_2})^3} = \frac{9m_2^3}{2m_3^2}\lambda$$

And

$$\tilde{\theta} = \frac{\lambda m_1}{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{m}}\theta = \frac{2m_1m_3}{3m_2^2}\theta$$

Now we use the first $2n$ ruin moments $\lambda_1 = \frac{\tilde{m}_1}{\theta}$, $\lambda_2 = \frac{\tilde{m}_2}{2\theta} + (\frac{\tilde{m}^2}{\theta})^2, \dots, \lambda_{2n-1}$. For $n = 1$, one may set up a system for the Padé $(0, 1)$ approximation in 0 , and from the Laplace transform of ruin probability in (4), we obtain :

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\Psi}_{DV}(s) &= \frac{1}{s} - \frac{p}{s(p + \lambda m_2 s/2 - \lambda m_3 s^{2/6} + \dots)} \\ &= \frac{\lambda m_2/2 - \lambda m_3 s/6 + \dots}{p + \lambda m_2 s/2 - \lambda m_3 s^{2/6} + \dots} \approx \frac{a}{s + b} \\ &\Leftrightarrow as(p + \lambda m_2 s/2 - \lambda m_3 s^{2/6} + \dots) \\ &\approx (s + b)(\lambda m_2 s/2 - \lambda m_3 s^{2/6} + \dots) \\ &\Leftrightarrow ap = b\lambda m_2/2, \quad am_2/2 = m_2/2 - bm_3/6 \\ &\Leftrightarrow a = \frac{3\lambda m_2^2}{3\lambda m_2^2 + 2pm_3}, \quad b = \frac{6pm_2}{3\lambda m_2^2 + 2pm_3}.\end{aligned}$$

This leads to the **DeVylder's** famous approximation.

$$\Psi_{DV}(u) \approx ae^{-bu} \tag{15}$$

Hence

$$\Psi_{DV}(u) = \frac{1}{1 + \tilde{\theta}} \exp\left(-\frac{u\tilde{\theta}\mu}{1 + \tilde{\theta}}\right) \quad (16)$$

Where $\mu = \frac{3m_2}{m_3}$, $\tilde{\theta} = \frac{2pm_3}{3\lambda m_2^2} = \frac{2m_1m_3}{3m_2^2}\theta$ represent the exponential reimbursement rate and the relative safety factor in the associated process $\tilde{X}(t)$, respectively.

5 De Vylder approximation

Computing the ruin probability using the Pollaczek-Khinchine formula is not always straightforward, as the problem of finding an inverse Laplace transform of a given expression is not trivial.

A technique in approximating functions whose Laplace transforms are known involves approximating the Laplace transform by a certain rational expression. The rational expression can then be broken down into partial fractions whose inverse Laplace transform is known.

From the idea that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{F}(s) &= \int_0^\infty \overline{F}(x) e^{-sx} dx = \int_0^\infty \overline{F}(x) \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{(-sx)^k}{k!} dx \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{(-s)^k}{k!} \int_0^\infty \overline{F}(x) x^k dx = \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{(-s)^k}{k!} m_{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(s) &= cs + \frac{\sigma^2 s^2}{2} - \lambda s \widehat{F}(s) = cs + \frac{\sigma^2 s^2}{2} - \lambda s \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{(-s)^k}{k!} m_{k+1} \\ &= cs + \frac{\sigma^2 s^2}{2} - \lambda s \left(m_1 - sm_2 + \frac{s^2}{2} m_3 + \dots \right) \end{aligned}$$

Hence if we approximate $\widehat{\Psi}(s)$ by a rational expression, say $\frac{a}{s+b}$ (where a and b are coefficients to be solved for), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Psi}(s) &= \frac{1}{s} - \frac{\kappa'(0)}{\kappa(s)} = \frac{\kappa(s) - s\kappa'(0)}{s\kappa(s)} \approx \frac{a}{s+b} \\ \Rightarrow as\kappa(s) &\approx (s+b)(\kappa(s) - s\kappa'(0)) = (s+b)(\kappa(s) - s(c - \lambda m_1)) \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying a term at the right side of the equation leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa(s) - s(c - \lambda m_1) &= cs + \frac{\sigma^2 s^2}{2} - \lambda s \left(m_1 - sm_2 + \frac{s^2}{2} m_3 + \cdots \right) - cs + s\lambda m_1 \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2 s^2}{2} + \lambda s^2 m_2 - \lambda \frac{s^3}{2} m_3 + \cdots\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}asleft(cs + \frac{\sigma^2 s^2}{2} - \lambda s(m_1 - sm_2 + \cdots))right &\approx (s+b) \left(\frac{\sigma^2 s^2}{2} + \lambda s^2 m_2 - \lambda \frac{s^3}{2} m_3 + \cdots \right) \\ \Rightarrow a \left(c + \frac{\sigma^2 s}{2} - \lambda(m_1 - sm_2 + \cdots) \right) &\approx (s+b) \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} + \lambda m_2 - \lambda \frac{s}{2} m_3 + \cdots \right).\end{aligned}$$

One can solve for the coefficients a and b by truncating the sums and comparing the coefficients of the first few powers of s , which gives us the system

$$a$$

6 Two-point Padé approximations, with low order examples

One may obtain better results by incorporating into the Padé approximation the following initial values, that can be derived easily from the Laplace transform :

$$W_q(0) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} s \widehat{W}_q(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{c}, & \text{if } X \text{ is of bounded variation/Cramér-Lundberg} \\ 0, & \text{if } X \text{ is of unbounded variation} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

$$W'_q(0) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} s \left(\frac{s}{\kappa(s) - q} - W_q(0) \right) = \begin{cases} \frac{q + \nu(0, \infty)}{c^2}, & \text{if } X \text{ is of bounded variation} \\ \frac{2}{\sigma^2}, & \text{if } \sigma > 0, \\ \infty, & \text{if } \sigma = 0 \text{ and } \nu(0, \infty) = \infty \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Furthermore, when the jump distribution has a density f , it holds that :^{||}

$$\begin{aligned} W_q''(0_+) &= \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} s \left(s \left(\frac{s}{\kappa(s) - q} - W_q(0) \right) - W_q'(0_+) \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{c} \left(\left(\frac{\lambda+q}{c} \right)^2 - \frac{\lambda}{c} f(0) \right), & \text{if } X \text{ is of bounded variation} \\ -c \left(\frac{2}{\sigma^2} \right)^2, & \text{if } \sigma > 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Further derivatives at 0 could be computed, but we stop at order 2, since $W_q''(0)$ already requires estimating $f_C(0)$, which is a rather delicate task starting from real data.

We will provide in Proposition 1 below a couple of two-point Padé approximations, when $n = 2$. Before that, it is worth recalling the case of exponential claims.

Example 1. The Cramér-Lundberg model with exponential jumps

Consider the Cramér-Lundberg model with exponential jump sizes with mean $1/\mu$, jump rate λ , premium rate $c > 0$, and Laplace exponent $\kappa(s) = s \left(c - \frac{\lambda}{\mu+s} \right)$, assuming $\kappa'(0) = c - \frac{\lambda}{\mu} > 0$. Let $\gamma = \mu - \lambda/c$ denote the adjustment coefficient, and let $\rho = \frac{\lambda}{c\mu}$. Solving $\kappa(s) - q = 0 \Leftrightarrow cs^2 + s(c\mu - \lambda - q) - q\mu = 0$ for s yields two distinct solutions $\gamma_2 \leq 0 \leq \gamma_1 = \Phi_q$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &= \frac{1}{2c} \left(-(\mu c - \lambda - q) + \sqrt{(\mu c - \lambda - q)^2 + 4\mu qc} \right), \\ \gamma_2 &= \frac{1}{2c} \left(-(\mu c - \lambda - q) - \sqrt{(\mu c - \lambda - q)^2 + 4\mu qc} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The W scale function is :

$$W_q(x) = \frac{A_1 e^{\gamma_1 x} - A_2 e^{\gamma_2 x}}{c(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)} \Leftrightarrow \widehat{W}_q(s) = \frac{s + \mu}{cs^2 + s(c\mu - \lambda - q) - q\mu} \quad (20)$$

where $A_1 = \mu + \gamma_1$, $A_2 = \mu + \gamma_2$.

Furthermore, it is well-known and easy to check that the function $W_q'(x) = H_D(x)^{-1}$ is in this case unimodal with global minimum at

$$b^* = \frac{1}{\gamma_1 - \gamma_2} \begin{cases} \log \frac{(\gamma_2)^2 A_2}{(\gamma_1)^2 A_1} = \log \frac{(\gamma_2)^2 (\mu + \gamma_2)}{(\gamma_1)^2 (\mu + \gamma_1)} & \text{if } W_q''(0) < 0 \Leftrightarrow (q + \lambda)^2 - c\lambda\mu < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } W_q''(0) \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow (q + \lambda)^2 - c\lambda\mu \geq 0 \end{cases},$$

^{||}. This equation is important in establishing the nonnegativity of the optimal dividends barrier.

(21)

since $W_q''(0) = \frac{(\gamma_1)^2(\mu+\gamma_1) - (\gamma_2)^2(\mu+\gamma_2)}{c(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)} \sim (q + \lambda)^2 - c\lambda\mu$ and that the optimal strategy for the de Finetti problem is the barrier strategy at level b^* [APP07].

Proposition 1. 1. To secure both the values of $W_q(0)$ and $W_q'(0)$, take into account (17) and (18), i.e. use the Padé approximation

$$\widehat{W}_q(s) \sim \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i s^i}{cs^n + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b_i s^i}, a_{n-1} = 1, b_{n-1} = ca_{n-2} - \lambda - q.$$

This yields

$$\widehat{W}_q(s) \sim \frac{\frac{1}{m_1} + s}{cs^2 + s \left(\frac{c}{m_1} - \lambda - q \right) - \frac{q}{m_1}}. \quad (22)$$

In view of (20), this yields the same result as approximating the claims by exponential claims, with $\mu = \frac{1}{m_1}$.

2. To ensure $W_q(0) = \frac{1}{c}$, we must only impose the behavior specified in (17), i.e. use the Padé approximation

$$\widehat{W}_q(s) \sim \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i s^i}{cs^n + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b_i s^i}, a_{n-1} = 1.$$

For $n = 2$, this yields

$$\widehat{W}_q(s) \sim \frac{\frac{2m_1}{m_2} + s}{cs^2 + \frac{s(2cm_1 - 2\lambda m_1^2 - m_2 q)}{m_2} - \frac{2m_1 q}{m_2}} = \frac{\frac{1}{\tilde{m}_1} + s}{cs^2 + s \left(\frac{c}{\tilde{m}_1} - \lambda \frac{m_1}{\tilde{m}_1} - q \right) - \frac{q}{\tilde{m}_1}}, \quad (23)$$

where we denoted by $\tilde{m}_1 = \frac{m_2}{2m_1}$ the first moment of the excess density $f_e(x)$. For exponential claims this coincides with (22) (since $f_e(x) = f(x)$). This is the DeVolder B) method [GSS08, (5.6-5.7)], derived therein by assuming exponential claims, with $\mu = \frac{2m_1}{m_2}$, and simultaneously modifying λ to fit the first two moments of the risk process.

3. When the pure Padé approximation is applied, the first step yields

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{W}_q(s) &\sim \frac{s + \frac{3m_2}{m_3}}{s^2 \left(c + \lambda \left(\frac{3m_2^2}{2m_3} - m_1 \right) \right) + s \left(c \frac{3m_2}{m_3} - \frac{3m_1 m_2}{m_3} \lambda - q \right) - \frac{3m_2}{m_3} q} \quad (24) \\ &= \frac{s + \frac{1}{\widehat{m}_3}}{s^2 \left(c + \lambda \left(\frac{\widehat{m}_2}{\widehat{m}_3} - 1 \right) \right) + s \left(c \frac{1}{\widehat{m}_3} - \frac{m_1}{\widehat{m}_3} \lambda - q \right) - \frac{1}{\widehat{m}_3} q}, \quad (25)\end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{m}_i = \frac{m_i}{i m_{i-1}}$ is a so-called "normalized moment" [BHT05].

This is the DeVyllder A) method [GSS08, (5.2-5.4)], derived therein by assuming exponential claims, with $\mu = \frac{3m_2}{m_3}$, and simultaneously modifying both λ and c to fit the first three moments of the risk process.

Lemma 1. In the case of exponential claims, the three approximations given above are exact.

Proof: It suffices to check that for exponential claims all the normalized moments are equal to $m_1 = \mu^{-1}$. \square

In particular, the optimal barrier for exponential claims obtained by the explicit formula (21) is the same. For example, $\mu = 2/5, \lambda = 9/10, c = 1, q = 1/10$ yields

$$W_q(x) \sim 0.6529892.71828^{0.0659646x} - 0.1529892.71828^{-1.51596x}$$

and $b^* = 3.04576$.

The Laplace transform of $\psi(x)$ and $\bar{\psi}(u)$ are respectively given by the so called **Pollaczek-Khinchine** :

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\psi}(s) &= \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} \psi(x) dx = \frac{1}{s} - \frac{1 - \rho}{s - \frac{\lambda}{c}(1 - \widehat{f}(s))} = \frac{1}{s} \left(1 - \frac{1 - \rho}{1 - \rho \widehat{f}_e(s)} \right) = \rho \frac{\widehat{F}_e(s)}{1 - \rho \widehat{f}_e(s)} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \widehat{\bar{\psi}}(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} \bar{\psi}(x) dx = \frac{c(1 - \rho)}{k(s)} = \frac{1 - \rho}{s(1 - \rho \widehat{f}_e(s))}\end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Where $\widehat{f}(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} dF(x)$, $\bar{F}(x) = 1 - F(x)$

$f_e(x) = \overline{F}(x)/m_1$: which denotes the stationary excess density of the claims ;
 $(\int_0^\infty \overline{F}(x)dx = m_1)$
 $\hat{f}_e(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} f_e(x)dx = (1 - \hat{f}(s))/(m_1 s), \widehat{\overline{F}}_e(s) = (1 - \hat{f}_e(s))/s.$

Proof :

Using the Laplace transform of the ruin probability that satisfy the integro-differential equation of [IfM3, eq.(13.9)] which gives :

$$\hat{\psi}(s) = \frac{c\psi(0) - \lambda\widehat{\overline{F}}(s)}{cs(1 - \lambda\widehat{\overline{F}}(s))} \quad (27)$$

Now by substituting $s = 0$ in the denominator we can clearly see that the denominator explodes into zero which means that we have a singularity at this point. We assume that our probability of ruin declines fast enough to have a finite integral .Then in order to have $\widehat{\psi}(0) = \int_0^\infty \psi(x)dx < \infty$ it is necessary to check that the numerator admits also a singularity in zero. To achieve this we'll need a results that's easy to demonstrate based on integration by parts, we obtain the Laplace transformation of the survival function in terms of the density transformation mentioned above, we get :

$$\widehat{\overline{F}}(s) = \frac{1 - \hat{f}(s)}{s}, \quad \widehat{\overline{F}}(0) = \int_0^\infty \overline{F}(x)dx = m_1 \quad (28)$$

As the denominator becomes 0 for $s = 0$ and $\widehat{\psi}(0) < \infty$ then :

$$\psi(0) = \frac{\lambda \int_0^\infty \overline{F}(x)dx}{c} = \frac{\lambda m_1}{c} := \rho. \quad (29)$$

For the survival probability, we use $\overline{\psi}(x) = 1 - \psi(x)$. Thus we obtain

$$\widehat{\overline{\psi}}(s) = \frac{1}{s} - \widehat{\psi}(s)., \quad \overline{\psi}(0) = 1 - \frac{\lambda m_1}{c} = 1 - \rho. \quad (30)$$

Hence the result.

6.1 Corollary :

The ruin probability $\psi(u)$ is 1 for all u when $\rho \geq 1$, and < 1 for all u when $\rho < 1$.

7 The Pollaczek-Khinchine formula

We shall here exploit the decomposition of the claims process as sum of ladder heights. Since our model is a *compound Poisson process*, then the ladder heights are i.i.d.

Let us recall the Laplace transform defined in (4).

We have $\frac{1}{1-\rho\hat{f}_e(s)}$ is expandable in a geometric series, and by inverting the Laplace transform we get :

$$\bar{\psi}(u) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (1-\rho) \rho^n F_e(u)^{\star n} \Leftrightarrow \psi(u) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1-\rho) \rho^n \bar{F}_e(u)^{\star n} \quad (31)$$

Reciprocally, from (9), we calculate its Laplace transform, the convolution becomes product, and easily we find (4).

To intepret this formula, we would need the following definition.

7.1 Definition :

The variable $Y = X_\tau \mid \{\tau < \infty, X_0 = u\} > 0$ is the severity of ruin.

Let S_{τ_-} denotes the first (weak) descending ladder heights past u (defined on $\{\tau_- < \infty\}$ only).

7.2 Geometric Interpretation :

Let's take the graph of **Cramèr-Lundberg** model with initial capital u. Let's assume that on our kth descending ladder heights ruin occurs.

The ruin severity density is denoted by f_e as defined above.

We try to decompose the initial reserve of the Cramèr-Lundberg model as well as the severity of ruin as the sum of the kth ladder heights.

We will call a walk without jumps strictly greater than 1 up/down continuous up/down. So when we take a walk that goes up, the walk will have a finite number of ladder heights down, so the number of ladder heights down is finite, we will denote it by \mathbf{N} . We assume that \mathbf{N} is a geometric variable with parameter ρ .

Thus, for $N = 0$

$$\bar{\psi}(u) = 1 - \rho.$$

and for $N = 1$

$$\bar{\psi}(u) = (1 - \rho) \rho \mathbb{P}(S_{\tau_-} < u)$$

Further, The law of the ladder heights is the law of equilibrium F_e .
Therefore,

$$\bar{\psi}(u) = (1 - \rho) \rho^n F_e(u)^{\star u}$$

So the ruin occurs if and only if the total sum of the heights exceeds u .

Références

- [AA10] Hansjörg Albrecher and Sören Asmussen, *Ruin probabilities*, vol. 14, World Scientific, 2010.
- [ABH18] F Avram, AD Banik, and A Horvath, *Ruin probabilities by padé’s method : simple moments based mixed exponential approximations (renyi, de vyl-der, cramér-lundberg), and high precision approximations with both light and heavy tails*, European Actuarial Journal **9** (2018), no. 1, 273–299.
- [ACH11] F. Avram, DF Chedom, and A. Horvath, *On moments based Padé approximations of ruin probabilities*, Journal of computational and applied mathematics **235** (2011), no. 10, 3215–3228.
- [AM05] P. Azcue and N. Muler, *Optimal reinsurance and dividend distribution policies in the Cramér-Lundberg model*, Mathematical Finance **15** (2005), no. 2, 261–308.
- [APP07] F. Avram, Z. Palmowski, and M. R. Pistorius, *On the optimal dividend problem for a spectrally negative Lévy process*, The Annals of Applied Probability **17** (2007), no. 1, 156–180.
- [APP15] ———, *On Gerber–Shiu functions and optimal dividend distribution for a Lévy risk process in the presence of a penalty function*, The Annals of Applied Probability **25** (2015), no. 4, 1868–1935.
- [Ber98] Jean Bertoin, *Lévy processes*, vol. 121, Cambridge university press, 1998.

- [BHT05] A. Bobbio, A. Horváth, and M. Telek, *Matching three moments with minimal acyclic phase type distributions*, Stochastic Models **21** (2005), 303–326.
- [Bin76] Nicholas H Bingham, *Continuous branching processes and spectral positivity*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications **4** (1976), no. 3, 217–242.
- [dF57] B. de Finetti, *Su un’ipostazione alternativa della teoria collettiva del rischio*, Transactions of the XVth international congress of Actuaries, vol. 2, 1957, pp. 433–443.
- [DG91] F. Dufresne and H.U. Gerber, *Risk theory for the compound poisson process that is perturbed by diffusion*, Insurance : mathematics and economics **10** (1991), no. 1, 51–59.
- [GSS08] Hans U Gerber, Elias SW Shiu, and Nathaniel Smith, *Methods for estimating the optimal dividend barrier and the probability of ruin*, Insurance : Mathematics and Economics **42** (2008), no. 1, 243–254.
- [Kyp14] A. Kyprianou, *Fluctuations of lévy processes with applications : Introductory lectures*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2014.
- [Loe08] R. L. Loeffen, *Stochastic control for spectrally negative lévy processes*, PhD Thesis, University of Bath, 2008.
- [MM61] M. H. Miller and F. Modigliani, *Dividend policy, growth, and the valuation of shares*, The Journal of Business **34** (1961), no. 4, 411–433.
- [Sch07] Hanspeter Schmidli, *Stochastic control in insurance*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [Sko62] A. V. Skorokhod, *Stochastic equations for diffusion processes in a bounded region. ii*, Theory of Probability & Its Applications **7** (1962), no. 1, 3–23.
- [Sup76] V. N. Suprun, *Problem of destruction and resolvent of a terminating process with independent increments*, Ukrainian Mathematical Journal **28** (1976), no. 1, 39–51.
- [Wei99] JAC Weideman, *Algorithms for parameter selection in the weeks method for inverting the laplace transform*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing **21** (1999), no. 1, 111–128.