


## **General Disclaimer**

### **One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document**

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.
- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.
- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.
- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.
- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS - 1963

AD 673972


DIFFUSION APPROXIMATIONS IN COLLECTIVE RISK THEORY

BY  
DONALD L. IGLEHART

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 111  
July 8, 1968

SUPPORTED BY THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE AND NASA UNDER  
CONTRACT Nonr-225(53)(NR-042-002)  
WITH THE OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

DEPARTMENT OF OPERATIONS RESEARCH  
AND  
DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA



This document has been approved  
for public release and sale; its  
distribution is unlimited

DIFFUSION APPROXIMATIONS IN COLLECTIVE RISK THEORY

By

Donald L. Iglehart

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 111

July 8, 1968

Supported by the Army, Navy, Air Force and NASA under  
Contract Nonr-225(53) (NR-042-002)  
with the Office of Naval Research\*

\*This research was partially supported by the Office of Naval  
Research under Contract N00014-67-A-0112-0031 (NR-047-055)  
and NSF Grant GP-8790.

Gerald J. Lieberman, Project Director

Reproduction in Whole or in Part is Permitted for  
any Purpose of the United States Government

DEPARTMENT OF OPERATIONS RESEARCH

and

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

## NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Collective risk theory is concerned with the random fluctuations of the total assets of an insurance company. The company has an initial capital  $u$  and policyholders pay a gross risk premium of  $a$  per unit time. At random instants of time, claims are made against the company for random amounts. The principal objectives of the theory are to obtain the distributions of the total assets of the company at time  $t$  and the time to ruin. Calculations of these distributions are usually very involved and use difficult analytical methods. In this paper explicit approximations are obtained for these distributions.

Approximations of the type obtained here can be developed for other applied models which involve the sum of a random number of random variables. In particular, a compound Poisson process is a special case of the processes considered in this paper.

# DIFFUSION APPROXIMATIONS IN COLLECTIVE RISK THEORY<sup>1/</sup>

by

Donald L. Iglehart  
Stanford University

## 1. Introduction

Collective risk theory is concerned with the random fluctuations of the total assets, the risk reserve, of an insurance company. Consider a company which only writes ordinary insurance policies such as accident, disability, fire, health, and whole life. The policyholders pay premiums regularly and at certain random times make claims to the company. A policyholder's premium, the gross risk premium, is a positive amount composed of two components. The net risk premium is the component calculated to cover the payments of claims on the average, while the security risk premium, or safety loading, is the component which protects the company from large deviations of claims from the average and also allows an accumulation of capital. When a claim occurs the company pays the policyholder a positive amount called the positive risk sum.

On the other hand, an insurance company which only writes life annuity policies represents the mirror image of the situation described above. In this case the company pays out an annuity regularly to the policyholder while the death of a policyholder places the corresponding reserve at the company's disposal. For this case we speak of negative risk premiums and negative risk sums.

For many insurance companies, of course, one would find both

---

<sup>1/</sup> This work was supported by Office of Naval Research contracts Nonr-225(53) and N00014-67-A-0112-0031 and NSF Grant GP-8790.

positive and negative premiums and risk sums present. As a mathematical model for this situation we shall assume that claims occur at the jumps of a renewal process,  $\{N(t) : t \geq 0\}$ , and that the successive risk sums form a sequence of independent, identically distributed random variables,  $\{X_i : i = 1, 2, \dots\}$ , with  $E\{X_i\} = \mu > 0$ . Furthermore, we shall assume that the initial risk reserve of the company is  $u > 0$  and that the policyholders pay a gross risk premium of  $\underline{a} > 0$  per unit time. If we let the risk reserve at time  $t$  be  $X(t)$  and let  $S_0 = 0$ ,  $S_i = X_1 + \dots + X_i$ , then we have

$$(1) \quad X(t) = u + at - S_{N(t)}, \quad t > 0 .$$

Also we define  $T$ , the first time the company has a non-positive risk reserve, by

$$T = \inf\{t > 0 : X(t) \leq 0\} .$$

The principal problems of collective risk theory have been to calculate the distributions of  $X(t)$  and  $T$ , usually for the case where  $\{N(t) : t \geq 0\}$  is a Poisson process. Many of the results for these distributions are complicated expressions which have been obtained by involved analytical methods. For a comprehensive treatment of the theory up to 1955 the reader should consult Cramér (1955). A more recent account of portions of the theory is available in Takács (1967), Chapter 7.

Our objective in this paper is to obtain approximations for the

distributions of  $X(t)$ ,  $T$ , and other functionals of  $X(t)$  by applying the theory of weak convergence of probability measures on function spaces. We shall define a sequence of risk reserve process  $\{X_n(t) : t \geq 0\}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , and show that these processes converge weakly to a Brownian motion process with a drift. For this limit process we shall be able to explicitly calculate the density of the first passage time corresponding to the random variable  $T$ . The distributions of the random variables derived from the limit process are then proposed as approximations for the process  $X_n(t)$  for large  $n$ .

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 a number of concepts and results required from weak convergence theory are introduced. Section 3 contains a proof of the convergence of a sequence of risk reserve processes. Finally in Section 4 the distributions of quantities derived from the limiting Brownian motion process are discussed.

## 2. Preliminaries on Weak Convergence

In this section we shall assemble those concepts and results from weak convergence theory which we shall need for our application to collective risk theory. For a comprehensive development of weak convergence of probability measures we recommend the excellent book of Billingsley (1968).

Let  $S$  be a metric space and  $\mathcal{S}$ , the class of Borel sets, be the  $\sigma$ -field generated by the open sets of  $S$ . If  $P_n$  and  $P$  are probability measures on  $\mathcal{S}$  which satisfy

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S f dP_n = \int_S f dP$$



for every bounded, continuous, real-valued function  $f$  on  $S$ , we shall say that  $P_n$  converges weakly to  $P$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and write  $P_n \Rightarrow P$ . In the case where  $S = R^k$ ,  $k$ -dimensional Euclidean space, weak convergence is equivalent to ordinary weak convergence of the distribution functions associated with  $P_n$  to that associated with  $P$ . However, for the function spaces we shall consider weak convergence is a deeper concept.

For the applications to be discussed in this paper it is convenient to introduce the following terminology used in [1]. Let  $X$  be a measurable mapping from the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P})$  into a metric space  $S$ ; measurability of  $X$  means that  $X^{-1}\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{B}$ . We shall call  $X$  a random element of  $S$ . In particular, if  $S = R^1$ , we call  $X$  a random variable; if  $S = R^k$ , we call  $X$  a random vector; and if  $S$  is a function space, we call  $X$  a random function. The distribution of  $X$  is the probability measure  $P = \mathcal{P}X^{-1}$  on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ . We shall say a sequence  $\{X_n\}$  of random elements of  $S$  converges in distribution to the random element  $X$ , and write

$$X_n \Rightarrow X ,$$

if the distribution  $P_n$  of  $X_n$  converges weakly to the distribution  $P$  of  $X$ :  $P_n \Rightarrow P$ . While this definition requires that the range  $S$  and topology be the same for the random elements  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots$ , the domains  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P})$  may be different.

One of the most useful results in weak convergence theory for applications is the continuous mapping theorem which is an analog of the

Mann-Wald theorem for the Euclidean case; cf. [1], Section 5. Let  $h$  be a measurable mapping of  $S$  into another metric space  $S'$  with  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{G}'$  of Borel sets. Each probability measure  $P$  on  $(S, \mathcal{G})$  induces on  $(S', \mathcal{G}')$  a unique probability measure  $Ph^{-1}(A) = P(h^{-1}A)$  for  $A \in \mathcal{G}'$ . Let  $D_h$  be the set of discontinuities of  $h$ . Then we have

Theorem 1. If  $P_n \Rightarrow P$  and  $P(D_h) = 0$ , then  $P_n h^{-1} \Rightarrow Ph^{-1}$ .

In applications often we take  $S' = R^1$  and thus  $h$  is a functional on the random elements of  $S$ .

Now let  $S$  be a separable metric space with metric  $m$  and  $X_n$  and  $Y_n$  be random elements of  $S$  with the same domain  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, P)$ . Then, since  $S$  is separable,  $m(X_n, Y_n)$  is a random variable; cf. [1], Appendix II. We say that  $m(X_n, Y_n)$  converges in probability to 0 and write  $m(X_n, Y_n) \xrightarrow{P} 0$  if

$$P\{m(X_n, Y_n) \geq \epsilon\} \rightarrow 0$$

for each positive  $\epsilon$ . Then we have the useful result

Theorem 2. If  $X_n \Rightarrow X$  and  $m(X_n, Y_n) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ , then  $Y_n \Rightarrow X$ .

The metric spaces  $S$  of interest in this paper are  $C[0,1]$  and  $D[0,1]$ . The space  $C[0,1]$  (which we shall abbreviate as  $C$ ) is the space of all real-valued continuous functions on  $[0,1]$  with the uniform metric,  $\rho(x,y) = \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |x(t) - y(t)|$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote the class of Borel sets of  $C$ . With this metric  $C$  is a complete, separable metric space. The space  $D[0,1]$ , abbreviated  $D$ , is the space of all

real-valued functions  $x(t)$  on  $[0,1]$  that are right-continuous and have left limits:

- (i) for  $0 < t < 1$ ,  $x(t+) = \lim_{s \rightarrow t} x(s)$  exists and  $x(t) = x(t+)$ ;  
(ii) for  $0 < t \leq 1$ ,  $x(t-) = \lim_{s \rightarrow t} x(s)$  exists.

Skorohod (1956) has introduced the following topology on  $D$ . Let  $\Lambda$  denote the class of strictly increasing, continuous mappings of  $[0,1]$  onto itself. For  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $\lambda(0) = 0$  and  $\lambda(1) = 1$ . For  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  let<sup>2/</sup>  
 $\|\lambda\| = \sup_{s \neq t} \left| \log \frac{\lambda t - \lambda s}{t - s} \right|$ . The metric  $d(x,y)$ , for  $x$  and  $y$  in  $D$ , is defined to be the infimum of those positive  $\epsilon$  for which there exists a  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  such that

$$\|\lambda\| \leq \epsilon$$

and

$$\sup_t |x(t) - y(\lambda t)| \leq \epsilon.$$

With this metric  $D$  is a complete separable metric space.

A useful result connecting weak convergence in  $C$  and  $D$  was recently obtained by Liggett and Rosén (1968).

Theorem 3. (Liggett and Rosén). Let  $\{X_n\}$  be a sequence of random functions in  $(D,d)$ ,  $\{Y_n\}$  a sequence of random functions in  $(C,\rho)$ , and  $X$  a random function in  $(C,\rho)$ . If  $d(X_n, Y_n) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ , then

$$X_n \Rightarrow X \text{ in } (D,d) \text{ if and only if}$$

$$Y_n \Rightarrow X \text{ in } (C,\rho).$$

<sup>2/</sup> For functions  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  we shall write  $\lambda t$  for  $\lambda(t)$ .

To prepare for our application we state a special case of a functional central limit theorem of Prohorov (1956), Theorem 3.1. Let  $X_1^{(n)}, \dots, X_n^{(n)}$  be a triangular array of random variables defined on some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P})$ , which are independent and identically distributed for each value of  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Furthermore, assume that  $E[X_1^{(n)}] = 0$ ,  $\sigma^2[X_1^{(n)}] = \sigma_n^2 > 0$ ,  $\sigma_n^2 \rightarrow \sigma^2 > 0$ , and that  $E[(X_1^{(n)})^{2+\epsilon}]$  is bounded in  $n$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ . Now construct the random functions  $Y_n$  in  $C$  by setting

$$Y_n(t, \omega) = \frac{S_{[nt]}^{(n)}(\omega)}{\sqrt{n}\sigma} + (nt - [nt]) \frac{X_{[nt]+1}^{(n)}}{\sqrt{n}\sigma}$$

for  $[nt]n^{-1} \leq t < ([nt]+1)n^{-1}$ . Then we have

Theorem 4. (Prohorov).  $Y_n \Rightarrow W$ , where the distribution of  $W$  is Wiener measure and  $W(0) = 0$ .

Now define  $X_n(t, \omega) = \frac{S_{[nt]}^{(n)}(\omega)}{\sqrt{n}\sigma}$  for  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ . Since  $d(X_n, Y_n) \xrightarrow{P} 0$

and  $W$  is in  $(C, \rho)$ , Theorem 3 implies that  $X_n \Rightarrow W$ .

In collective risk theory, however, we are interested in sums of a random number of random variables. Let  $\{Y_i\}$  be a sequence of independent, identically distributed positive random variables with  $E(Y_1) = \lambda^{-1} > 0$ . The random variable  $Y_1$  will represent the time between the  $(i-1)^{st}$  claim and the  $i^{th}$  claim. Let  $N(t)$ , the number of claims (renewals) in time  $t$ , be defined by

$$N(t) = \max\{k : \sum_{i=1}^k Y_i \leq t\} \quad t \geq 0,$$

with  $N(t) = 0$  if  $Y_1 > t$ . The random function  $N(nt)$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ , is therefore an element of  $D$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . It follows immediately from the functional central limit theorem for  $N(n \cdot)$ , [1, Theorem 18.3], that  $N(n \cdot)/n \Rightarrow \Lambda$ , where  $\Lambda$  is the constant-valued random function whose value at  $t$  is  $\lambda t$ . Now let  $Z_n(t, \omega) = S_{N(nt)}^{(n)} / \sqrt{n} \sigma$ . An immediate application of the method used in [1, Theorem 18.1] yields,

Theorem 5.  $Z_n \Rightarrow W \circ \Lambda$ , where  $W \circ \Lambda(t) = W(\lambda t)$ .

It should be noted that for this theorem the random elements  $X_n$  and  $N(n \cdot)/n$  need not be independent.

### 3. Weak Convergence of Risk Reserve Processes

In this section we shall construct a sequence of risk reserve processes  $\{X_n(t)\}$  and then use the results of Section 2 to prove that they converge weakly. For the  $n^{\text{th}}$  process let  $u_n > 0$  be the initial risk reserve,  $a_n > 0$  be the gross risk premium per unit time, and  $\{X_i^{(n)}\}$  be the sequence of independent identically distributed risk sums defined on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P})$  with  $E[X_i^{(n)}] = \mu_n > 0$  and  $\sigma^2[X_i^{(n)}] = \sigma_n^2 > 0$ . Assume that the claims occur at the jumps of the renewal process  $\{Y_i\}$  described in Section 2 also defined on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{P})$ . Finally, the process  $X_n(t)$  is obtained from (1) by compressing the original time scale by a factor of  $n^{-1}$ . Thus we have

$$X_n(t) = u_n + a_n \cdot nt = S_{N(nt)}^{(n)} \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1,$$

where  $S_0^{(n)} = 0$  and  $S_i^{(n)} = X_1^{(n)} + \dots + X_i^{(n)}$ . Clearly,  $X_n$  is an

element of  $D[0,1]$ . With this set-up we can proceed to the proof of our main result.

Theorem 6. If  $u_n = un^{-1/2} + o(n^{-1/2})$ ,  $a_n = an^{-1/2} + o(n^{-1/2})$ ,  $\mu_n = \mu n^{-1/2} + o(n^{-1/2})$ ,  $\sigma_n^2 \rightarrow \sigma^2 > 0$ , and  $E[(X_1^{(n)})^{2+\epsilon}]$  is bound in  $n$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ , then

$$n^{-1/2} X_n \Rightarrow u + \Gamma + \sigma \lambda^{1/2} W,$$

where  $\Gamma$  is the constant-valued random function whose value at  $t$  is  $(a - \mu\lambda)t$ .

Proof: Applying Theorem 5, we have that

$$n^{-1/2} [S_{N(n\cdot)}^{(n)} - \mu_n N(n\cdot)] \Rightarrow \sigma W \circ \Lambda$$

Since  $n^{-1/2} \mu_n N(n\cdot) \Rightarrow M$ , where  $M(t) = \lambda \mu t$  with probability 1, an application of Theorems 1 and 2 implies that

$$-n^{-1/2} S_{N(n\cdot)}^{(n)} + M \Rightarrow -\sigma W \circ \Lambda = \sigma W \circ \Lambda.$$

Consequently, we have immediately the fact that

$$n^{-1/2} X_n \Rightarrow u + \Gamma + \sigma W \circ \Lambda, \text{ but}$$

since  $\lambda^{1/2} W$  has the same distribution as  $W \circ \Lambda$  the proof of the theorem is complete.

Theorems 5, and 6 have been stated and proved for random elements of  $D[0,1]$ . A similar theory could be developed for random elements

of  $D[0, N]$  using the metric  $d_N$  which is defined like  $d$  but over the interval  $[0, N]$ . A topology has been developed by Stone (1963) for the space  $D[0, \infty)$  which essentially requires convergence for each metric  $d_N$ ,  $N > 0$ . Using the results of [8] together with the necessary and sufficient condition for weak convergence given by Skorohod (1956) we have versions of Theorems 5 and 6 which are valid for  $D[0, \infty)$ , that is the stochastic processes are defined for all values of  $t \geq 0$ . From here on we shall use this version of Theorem 6.

#### 4. The Distribution of Functionals of the Limit Process

The principal contribution of functional central limit theorems, such as Theorem 6, is that they enable one to obtain limit theorems for a large class of functionals of the process. Collective risk theory has been mainly concerned with the functionals which represent the total assets of the insurance company at time  $t$ , namely  $X_n(t)$ , and of the time to ruin,  $T_n$ , which is defined as

$$T_n = \inf\{t > 0 : X_n(t) \leq 0\}$$

if the set  $\{t \geq 0 : X_n(t) \leq 0\}$  is not empty and  $+\infty$  otherwise.

Since the projection  $\pi_t : D[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which is defined by  $\pi_t(x) = x(t)$  is measurable and continuous almost everywhere with respect to the measure on  $D[0, \infty)$  corresponding to  $u + \Gamma + \sigma\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}W$ , an application of Theorem 1 yields

Theorem 7. Under the hypotheses of Theorem 6, the

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}\{n^{-\frac{1}{2}}X_n(t) \leq x\} &= \Pr\{u + (a-\mu\lambda)t + \sigma\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}W(t) \leq x\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\lambda t}} \int_{-\infty}^x \exp\left\{-\frac{(y-[u+(a-\lambda\mu)t])^2}{2\sigma^2\lambda t}\right\} dy . \end{aligned}$$

Similar results could be obtained, of course, for the finite-dimensional distributions of  $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}X_n$ .

Turning now to the time to ruin problem, we define the random variable

$$T = \inf\{t > 0 : u + (a-\lambda\mu)t + \sigma\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}W(t) \leq 0\}$$

if the set is non-empty and  $+\infty$  otherwise. Again the mapping  $\tau : D[0, \infty) \rightarrow R^1 \cup \{+\infty\}$  defined by  $\tau(x) = \inf\{t > 0 : x(t) \leq 0\}$  if the set is non-empty and  $+\infty$  otherwise is measurable and almost everywhere continuous with respect to the measure on  $D[0, \infty)$  corresponding to  $u + \Gamma + \sigma\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}W$ . Thus another application of Theorem 1 yields

Theorem 8. Under the conditions of Theorem 6, the

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}\{T_n \leq t\} = \Pr\{T \leq t\} ,$$

where the density  $f_T$  of  $T$  is given by

$$f_T(t) = \frac{c^{-1}e^{-bc}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}[c^2t^{-1} + (bc)^2t]\right\} , \quad t > 0 ,$$

with  $b = (a-\lambda\mu)/\sigma\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $c = u/\sigma\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Furthermore, the probability of



ultimate ruin for the limit process is given by

$$\Pr\{T < \infty\} = \exp\{-2 bc\} .$$

The density of  $T$  and the probability of ultimate ruin are easily obtained from the Laplace transform of the distribution of  $T$  given by Darling and Siegert (1953).

In a similar manner one could develop a limit theorem for the distribution of the first time  $X_n(t)$  reached a specified level, conditional on ruin not having occurred. The Laplace transform of the limiting distribution is given in [3].

Theorems 7 and 8 give explicit expressions for the limiting behavior of the distributions of greatest concern for collective risk theory. They immediately suggest the use of the limit distribution as an approximation for the distributions associated with  $X_n(\cdot)$  for  $n$  large. It would be interesting to compare these approximations with those given, for example, in [2]. While there is considerable similarity in the functional forms of the two sets of approximations, those given in this paper seem to be more natural and are valid for a larger class of underlying distributions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] BILLINGSLEY, P. (1968). Weak Convergence of Probability Measures.  
To appear.
- [2] CRAMÉR, H. (1955). Collective risk theory. Jubilee Volume of Försäkringsaktiebolaget Skandia. Nordiska Bokhandeln, Stockholm, 1-92.
- [3] DARLING, D. and SIEGERT, A. (1953). The first passage time problem for a continuous Markov process. Ann. Math. Stat. 24 624-639.
- [4] LIGGETT, T. and B. ROSEN (1968). A note on the correspondence between weak convergence in the function spaces  $C[0,1]$  and  $D[0,1]$ . To appear.
- [5] PROHOROV, Yu. (1956). Convergence of random processes and limit theorems in probability theory. Theor. Probability Appl. 1 157-214. (English translation.)
- [6] TAKÁCS, L. (1967). Combinatorial Methods in the Theory of Stochastic Processes. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- [7] SKOROHOD, A. (1956). Limit theorems for stochastic processes. Theor. Probability Appl. 1 262-290. (English translation.)
- [8] STONE, C. (1963). Weak convergence of stochastic processes defined on semi-infinite time intervals. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 14 694-696.

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D		
<i>(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)</i>		
1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) Departments of Operations Research and Statistics Stanford University Stanford, California		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
		2b. GROUP
3. REPORT TITLE  Diffusion Approximations in Collective Risk Theory		
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) Technical Report, July 8, 1968		
5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial)  Iglehart, Donald L.		
6. REPORT DATE July 8, 1968	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 13	7b. NO. OF REFS 8
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. Nonr-225(53)	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)  Technical Report No. 111	
8b. PROJECT NO. NR-042-002	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report) Technical Report No. 1, Contract N00014-67-A-0112-0031 (NR-047-055)	
10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES  Distribution of this document is unlimited		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Also supported by NSF Grant GP-8790	12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Logistics and Mathematical Statistics Branch Office of Naval Research Washington, D. C. 20360	
13. ABSTRACT  Collective risk theory is concerned with the random fluctuations of the total assets of an insurance company. The company has an initial capital $u$ and policyholders pay a gross risk premium of $a$ per unit time. At the jumps of a renewal process claims are made against the company for random amounts with the average claim being $\mu$ . A sequence of risk reserve processes which measure the companies assets at time $t$ are defined and the theory of weak convergence of probability measures on function spaces is applied to show that the sequence converges weakly to a limiting diffusion process. This diffusion is Brownian motion with a drift. Weak convergence theory also yields a limit theorem for the distribution of time to ruin. The density for this limit distribution is given explicitly.		

DD FORM 1473  
JAN 64

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

UNCLASSIFIED

Security Classification

KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Collective risk theory Diffusion approximations Functional central limit theorem Ruin probability Weak convergence						

**INSTRUCTIONS**

**1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY:** Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (corporate author) issuing the report.

**2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:** Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

**2b. GROUP:** Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

**3. REPORT TITLE:** Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parentheses immediately following the title.

**4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES:** If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

**5. AUTHOR(S):** Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

**6. REPORT DATE:** Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

**7a. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES:** The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

**7b. NUMBER OF REFERENCES:** Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

**8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER:** If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

**8b, 8c, & 8d. PROJECT NUMBER:** Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

**9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S):** Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

**9b. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S):** If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (either by the originator or by the sponsor), also enter this number(s).

**10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES:** Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those

imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

- (1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."
- (2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."
- (3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."
- (4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."
- (5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

**11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES:** Use for additional explanatory notes.

**12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY:** Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (paying for) the research and development. Include address.

**13. ABSTRACT:** Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U).

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

**14. KEY WORDS:** Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, roles, and weights is optional.