

COMPARING APPROXIMATIONS FOR RISK MEASURES OF SUMS OF NONINDEPENDENT LOGNORMAL RANDOM VARIABLES

Steven Vanduffel,^{*} Tom Hoedemakers,[†] and Jan Dhaene[‡]

ABSTRACT

In this paper we consider different approximations for computing the distribution function or risk measures related to a discrete sum of nonindependent lognormal random variables. Comonotonic upper and lower bound approximations for such sums have been proposed in Dhaene et al. (2002a,b). We introduce the comonotonic “maximal variance” lower bound approximation. We also compare the comonotonic approximations with two well-known moment-matching approximations: the lognormal and the reciprocal Gamma approximations. We find that for a wide range of parameter values the comonotonic “maximal variance” lower bound approximation outperforms the other approximations.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider and compare the performance of approximations for the distribution function (d.f.) and risk measures related to a random variable (r.v.) S given by

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{Z_i}. \quad (1.1)$$

Here the α_i are nonnegative real numbers and (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n) is a multivariate normal random vector.

The accumulated value at time n of a series of future deterministic saving amounts α_i can be written in the form (1.1), where Z_i denotes the random accumulation factor over the period $[i, n]$. The present value of a series of future deterministic payments α_i also can be written in the form (1.1), where Z_i now denotes the random discount factor over the period $[0, i]$. We refer readers to Dhaene et al. (2005) for more details.

The valuation of Asian or basket options in a Black and Scholes model and the setting of provisions and required capitals in an insurance context boils down to the evaluation of risk measures related to the distribution function of a random variable S as defined in equation (1.1).

We will investigate how to (approximately) compute risk measures such as quantiles (Q) and conditional tail expectations (CTE) of the r.v. S defined in equation (1.1). These risk measures are defined by

^{*} Steven Vanduffel, PhD, is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Faculty of Economics and Econometrics of the Universiteit van Amsterdam, Roeterstraat 11, 1018 WB Amsterdam, the Netherlands, and the Faculty of Applied Economics of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Naamsestraat 69, B-3000, Leuven, Belgium. He is also an advisor of Fortis Central Risk Management (Belgium), steven.vanduffel@econ.kuleuven.be.

[†] Tom Hoedemakers, PhD, is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Faculty of Applied Economics of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Naamsestraat 69, B-3000, Leuven, Belgium, and University Center of Statistics, W. de Croylaan 54, 3001 Heverlee, Belgium, tom.hoedemakers@econ.kuleuven.be.

[‡] Jan Dhaene, PhD, is a Professor at The Faculty of Economics and Econometrics of the Universiteit van Amsterdam, Roeterstraat 11, 1018 WB Amsterdam, the Netherlands, and the Faculty of Applied Economics of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Naamsestraat 69, B-3000, Leuven, Belgium, jan.dhaene@econ.kuleuven.be.

$$Q_p[S] = \inf\{s \in R | F_S(s) \geq p\}, \quad p \in (0, 1) \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$CTE_p[S] = E[S | S > Q_p[S]], \quad p \in (0, 1), \quad (1.3)$$

where $F_S(s) = \Pr[S \leq s]$ and by convention, $\inf\{\emptyset\} = +\infty$. Notice that the quantile risk measure is often called the Value-at-Risk, whereas the conditional tail expectation coincides with the Tail-Value-at-Risk. The latter holds true because S is a continuous r.v.; see, for instance, Dhaene et al. (2004).

The r.v. S defined in equation (1.1) in general will be a sum of nonindependent lognormal r.v.'s. Its d.f. cannot be determined analytically and is too cumbersome to work with. Several techniques for approximating this d.f. have been proposed in the literature.

Moment-matching methods approximate the unknown d.f. by a given d.f. in such a way that the first moments coincide; see, for instance, Klugman, Panjer, and Willmot (1998) for an inventory of distributions that can be used for this purpose. In this respect, practitioners often use a moment-matching *lognormal approximation* for the distribution of S . The lognormal approximation is chosen such that its first two moments are equal to the corresponding moments of S .

The present value of a constant continuous perpetuity with lognormal return process has a *reciprocal (or inverse) Gamma distribution*; see, for instance, Dufresne (1990) or Milevsky (1997). Notice that this present value can be considered as the limiting case of the random variable S as defined above. Motivated by the latter observation, Milevsky and Posner (1998) and Milevsky and Robinson (2000) propose a moment-matching *reciprocal Gamma approximation* for the d.f. of S such that the first two moments match. They use this technique for deriving closed-form approximations for the price of Asian and basket options. Although these moment-matching approximations find their origin in the continuous setting of the discussed problem, it makes sense also to test their accuracy in the real-life discrete setting that we investigate in this paper.

Dhaene et al. (2002a,b) derive *comonotonic upper and lower bound approximations* (in the convex order sense) for the d.f. of S . The lower bound approximation, which is given by $E[S|\Lambda]$ for an appropriate choice of the conditioning r.v. Λ , in particular is extremely accurate; see, for instance, Vanduffel et al. (2003). In view of its importance for practical applications, we will focus here on deterministic sums of type (1.1). We point out that in this paper presented approximations can also be generalized to the case of stochastic sums. This was first done by Huang, Milevsky, and Wang (2004) for the moment-matching approximations and by Hoedemakers, Darkiewicz, and Goovaerts (2005) for the comonotonic approximations. Huang, Milevsky, and Wang compare the performance of different approximations for the probability that a person outlives his or her money in the case of a lifelong continuous consumption pattern. As a special case, they also consider approximations for such a probability for the deterministic case, that is, when the consumption period is fixed. On the other hand, Hoedemakers, Darkiewicz, and Goovaerts (2005) use the concept of comonotonicity to derive approximations for the present value of life annuities.

Our paper is most related to Huang, Milevsky, and Wang (2004), but instead of comparing the approximations of the ruin probabilities, we will evaluate the performance of the above mentioned techniques by comparing the approximated values of quantiles and conditional tail expectations of r.v.'s S as defined in equation (1.1), and in this case Z_i represents the random discount factor over the period $[0, i]$. The results of these paper are then threefold. First, in the case of the comonotonic lower bound approximation, we propose a new choice for the conditioning r.v. Λ , and we provide theoretical evidence that supports this choice. Throughout this paper we call this the “maximal variance” lower bound approximation. Second, we show that for a wide range of reasonable parameter values for the lognormal return process and time horizon, the “maximal variance” lower bound approximation often outperforms the comonotonic upper bound and both moment-matching methods. Finally, we show that even in the limiting case of a constant continuous perpetuity, when S is guaranteed to be reciprocal Gamma distributed, the “maximal variance” lower bound approximation still performs very well. Overall, we believe it is the best all-round candidate to accurately approximate the risk measures of S .

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the comonotonic approximations, and we focus on the optimal choice of the conditioning r.v. Λ in the case of the comonotonic lower bound $E[S|\Lambda]$. We also propose a new conditioning r.v. that is likely to make the variance of the approximation “as close as possible” to the exact variance. In Section 3 we briefly recall the mathematical techniques behind the reciprocal Gamma and lognormal moment-matching techniques. Finally, in Section 4 we compare the comonotonic approximations with the moment-matching techniques, using an extensive Monte Carlo simulation as the benchmark.

2. COMONOTONIC APPROXIMATIONS

2.1 General Results

In this section we briefly repeat some results related to the comonotonic lower and upper bounds for the d.f. of the r.v. S defined in equation (1.1). For proofs and more details, we refer readers to Dhaene et al. (2002a,b).

A central concept in the theory on comonotonic r.v.’s is the concept of convex order. A r.v. X is said to precede a r.v. Y in the convex order sense, denoted $X \leq_{cx} Y$, if their means are equal and if their corresponding stop-loss premia are ordered uniformly for all retentions d , that is, $E[(X - d)_+] \leq E[(Y - d)_+]$ for all d .

Replacing the copula describing the dependency structure of the terms in the sum (1.1) by the comonotonic copula yields a convex order upper bound for S . On the other hand, applying Jensen’s inequality to S provides us with a lower bound. These results are formalized in the following theorem, which is taken from Kaas, Dhaene, and Goovaerts (2000).

Theorem 1

Let the r.v. S be given by equation (1.1), where the α_i are nonnegative real numbers and the random vector (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n) has a multivariate normal distribution. Consider the conditioning r.v. Λ , given by

$$\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i Z_i. \tag{2.1}$$

Also consider r.v.’s S^l and S^c defined by

$$S^l = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{E[Z_i] + \frac{1}{2}(1-r_i^2)\sigma_{Z_i}^2 + r_i\sigma_{Z_i}\Phi^{-1}(U)} \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$S^c = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{E[Z_i] + \sigma_{Z_i}\Phi^{-1}(U)}, \tag{2.3}$$

respectively. Here U is a Uniform(0, 1) r.v. and Φ is the cumulative d.f. of the $N(0, 1)$ distribution. Further, the coefficients r_i are defined by

$$r_i = \frac{\text{cov}[Z_i, \Lambda]}{\sigma_{Z_i} \sigma_{\Lambda}}. \tag{2.4}$$

For the r.v.’s S , S^l , and S^c , the following convex order relations hold:

$$S^l \leq_{cx} S \leq_{cx} S^c. \tag{2.5}$$

A random vector is said to be comonotonic if all its components are nondecreasing functions of the same r.v. This means that S^c is a comonotonic sum. It implies that the quantiles and conditional tail

expectations of S^c are given by the sum of the corresponding risk measures for the marginals involved; see, for instance, Dhaene et al. (2004):

$$Q_p[S^c] = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \sigma_{Z_i} \Phi^{-1}(p)}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$CTE_p[S^c] = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{Z_i}^2} \frac{\Phi(\sigma_{Z_i} - \Phi^{-1}(p))}{1 - p}, \quad p \in (0, 1). \quad (2.7)$$

Provided that all coefficients r_i are positive, the terms in S^l are also nondecreasing functions of the same r.v. U . Hence, S^l will also be a comonotonic sum in this case. This implies that the quantiles and conditional tail expectations related to S^l can be computed by summing the corresponding risk measures for the marginals involved. Hence, assuming that all r_i are positive, we find the following expressions for quantiles and conditional tail expectations of S^l :

$$Q_p[S^l] = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \frac{1}{2}(1-r_i^2)\sigma_{Z_i}^2 + r_i\sigma_{Z_i}\Phi^{-1}(p)}, \quad p \in (0, 1), \quad (2.8)$$

$$CTE_p[S^l] = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{Z_i}^2} \frac{\Phi(r_i\sigma_{Z_i} - \Phi^{-1}(p))}{1 - p}, \quad p \in (0, 1). \quad (2.9)$$

Finally, notice that the expected values of the r.v.'s S , S^c , and S^l are all equal:

$$\mathbb{E}[S] = \mathbb{E}[S^l] = \mathbb{E}[S^c] = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{Z_i}^2}, \quad (2.10)$$

whereas their variances are given by

$$\text{Var}[S] = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \mathbb{E}[Z_j] + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{Z_i}^2 + \sigma_{Z_j}^2)} (e^{\text{cov}[Z_i, Z_j]} - 1), \quad (2.11)$$

$$\text{Var}[S^l] = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \mathbb{E}[Z_j] + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{Z_i}^2 + \sigma_{Z_j}^2)} (e^{r_i r_j \sigma_{Z_i} \sigma_{Z_j}} - 1), \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$\text{Var}[S^c] = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \mathbb{E}[Z_j] + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{Z_i}^2 + \sigma_{Z_j}^2)} (e^{\sigma_{Z_i} \sigma_{Z_j}} - 1), \quad (2.13)$$

respectively.

2.2 The ‘‘Maximal Variance’’ Lower Bound Approach

In the series of papers about the concept of comonotonicity and its applications, one almost always takes Λ such that it can be seen as a kind of first-order approximation of S ; see, for instance, Dhaene et al. (2002b). In this subsection we propose a new choice for the conditioning random variable Λ . To do so, recall that if $X \leq_{\text{cx}} Y$ and X and Y are not equal in distribution, then $\text{Var}[X] < \text{Var}[Y]$ must hold. An equality in variance would imply that $X = Y$. This indicates that if we replace S by the less convex S^l , the best approximation arises when the variance of S^l is ‘‘as close as possible’’ to the variance of S . Indeed, in this case the d.f. of S^l is also ‘‘close’’ to the unknown d.f. of S . This means that we have to choose the coefficients γ_i of the conditioning variable Λ defined in equation (2.1) such that the variance of S^l is maximized.

We will now prove that the first-order approximation of the variance of S^l will be maximized for the following choice of the parameters γ_i :

$$\gamma_i = \alpha_i e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{Z_i}^2}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2.14)$$

From equation (2.12) we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Var}[S^l] &\approx \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \mathbb{E}[Z_j] + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{Z_i}^2 + \sigma_{Z_j}^2)} (r_i r_j \sigma_{Z_i} \sigma_{Z_j}) \\
 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \mathbb{E}[Z_j] + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{Z_i}^2 + \sigma_{Z_j}^2)} \left(\frac{\text{Cov}[Z_i, \Lambda] \text{Cov}[Z_j, \Lambda]}{\text{Var}[\Lambda]} \right) \\
 &= \frac{(\text{Cov}[\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{Z_i}^2} Z_i, \Lambda])^2}{\text{Var}[\Lambda]} \\
 &= \left(\text{Corr} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{Z_i}^2} Z_i, \Lambda \right] \right)^2 \text{Var} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{Z_i}^2} Z_i \right]. \tag{2.15}
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the first-order approximation of $\text{Var}[S^l]$ is maximized when Λ is given by

$$\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i e^{\mathbb{E}[Z_i] + \frac{1}{2}\sigma_{Z_i}^2} Z_i. \tag{2.16}$$

In the remainder of this paper, we always assume that the conditioning r.v. Λ is given by equation (2.16). Notice that this optimal choice for Λ is slightly different from the choice that was made for this r.v. in Dhaene et al. (2002b). Numerical comparisons reveal that the choice proposed here in general leads to more accurate approximations.

One can easily prove that the first-order approximation for $\text{Var}[S^l]$ with Λ given by equation (2.16) is equal to the first-order approximation of $\text{Var}[S]$. This observation gives an additional indication that this particular choice for Λ will provide a good fit.

We emphasize that the conditioning r.v. Λ as defined in equation (2.16) does not necessarily maximize the variance of S^l , but has to be understood as an approximation for the optimal Λ . Theoretically, one could use numerical procedures to determine the optimal Λ , but this would outweigh one of the main features of the convex bounds, namely, that the quantiles and conditional tail expectations (and other actuarial quantities such as stop-loss premiums) can easily be determined analytically. Having a ready-to-use approximation that can be implemented easily is important from a practical point of view.

3. TWO WELL-KNOWN MOMENT-MATCHING APPROXIMATIONS

In this section we briefly describe the reciprocal Gamma and the lognormal moment-matching approximations. These two methods are frequently used to approximate the d.f. of the r.v. S defined by equation (1.1).

3.1 The Reciprocal Gamma Approximation

The r.v. X is said to be Gamma distributed when its probability density function (p.d.f.) is given by

$$f_X(x; \alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{\beta^\alpha \Gamma(\alpha)} x^{\alpha-1} e^{-x/\beta}, \quad x > 0, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > 0$, and $\Gamma(\cdot)$ denotes the Gamma function:

$$\Gamma(\alpha) = \int_0^\infty u^{\alpha-1} e^{-u} du \quad (\alpha > 0). \tag{3.2}$$

Consider now the r.v. $Y = 1/X$. This r.v. is said to be reciprocal (or inverse) Gamma distributed. Its p.d.f. is given by

$$f_Y(y; \alpha, \beta) = f_X(1/y; \alpha, \beta)/y^2, \quad y > 0. \tag{3.3}$$

In the sequel we will additionally assume that $\alpha > 2$, which ensures that the first two moments of Y will exist. It is straightforward to prove that the quantiles and conditional tail expectations of Y are given by

$$Q_p[Y] = \frac{1}{F_X^{-1}(1-p; \alpha, \beta)}, \quad p \in (0, 1) \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$CTE_p[Y] = \frac{F_X(F_X^{-1}(1-p; \alpha, \beta); \alpha-1, \beta)}{(1-p)(\alpha-1)\beta}, \quad p \in (0, 1), \quad (3.5)$$

where $F_X(\cdot; \alpha, \beta)$ is the cumulative d.f. of the Gamma distribution with parameters α and β . Since the Gamma distribution is readily available in many statistical software packages, these risk measures can easily be determined.

The first two moments of the reciprocal Gamma distributed r.v. Y are given by

$$E[Y] = \frac{1}{\beta(\alpha-1)} \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$E[Y^2] = \frac{1}{\beta^2(\alpha-1)(\alpha-2)}. \quad (3.7)$$

Expressing the parameters α and β in terms of $E[Y]$ and $E[Y^2]$ gives

$$\alpha = \frac{2E[Y^2] - E[Y]^2}{E[Y^2] - E[Y]^2} \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\beta = \frac{E[Y^2] - E[Y]^2}{E[Y]E[Y^2]}. \quad (3.9)$$

The d.f. of the r.v. defined in equation (1.1) is now approximated by a reciprocal Gamma distribution with mean and variance given by equations (2.10) and (2.11), respectively. The coefficients α and β of the reciprocal Gamma approximation follow from equations (3.8) and (3.9). The reciprocal Gamma approximations for the quantiles and the conditional tail expectations are then given by equations (3.4) and (3.5).

The reciprocal Gamma moment-matching method appears naturally in the case where one wants to approximate the d.f. of stochastic present values. Indeed, for the limiting case of the constant continuous perpetuity

$$S_\infty = \int_0^\infty \exp \left[-\left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right) \tau - \sigma B(\tau) \right] d\tau, \quad (3.10)$$

where $B(\tau)$ represents a standard Brownian motion and $\mu > \sigma^2/2$, the risk measures can be calculated very easily because Dufresne (1990) proved that S_∞^{-1} is Gamma distributed with parameters $2\mu/\sigma^2 - 1$ and $\sigma^2/2$. An elegant proof for this result can be found in Milevsky (1997).

Expression (3.10) can be seen as a continuous counterpart of a discounted sum such as in equation (3.4), and one intuitively expects that the present value of a finite discrete annuity with a normal log return process with independent periodic returns can be approximated by a reciprocal Gamma distribution, provided that the time period involved is long enough. This idea was set forward and explored in Milevsky and Posner (1998), Milevsky and Robinson (2000), and Huang, Milevsky, and Wang (2004).

3.2 The Lognormal Approximation

The r.v. X is said to be lognormal distributed if its p.d.f. is given by

$$f_X(x; \mu, \sigma^2) = \frac{1}{x\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(\log x - \mu)^2/2\sigma^2}, \quad x > 0, \quad (3.11)$$

where $\sigma > 0$.

The quantiles and conditional tail expectations of X are given by

$$Q_p[X] = e^{\mu + \sigma\Phi^{-1}(p)}, \quad p \in (0, 1) \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$CTE_p[X] = e^{\mu + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2} \frac{\Phi(\sigma - \Phi^{-1}(p))}{1 - p}, \quad p \in (0, 1). \quad (3.13)$$

The first two moments of X are given by

$$E[X] = e^{\mu + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2} \quad (3.14)$$

and

$$E[X^2] = e^{2\mu + 2\sigma^2}. \quad (3.15)$$

Expressing the parameters μ and σ^2 of the lognormal distribution in terms of $E[X]$ and $E[X^2]$ leads to

$$\mu = \log \left(\frac{E[X]^2}{\sqrt{E[X^2]}} \right) \quad (3.16)$$

and

$$\sigma^2 = \log \left(\frac{E[X^2]}{E[X]^2} \right). \quad (3.17)$$

The same procedure as the one explained in the previous subsection can be followed to obtain a lognormal approximation for S , with the first two moments matched. Dufresne (2002) obtains a lognormal limit distribution for S as the volatility σ tends to zero, and this provides a theoretical justification for the use of the lognormal approximation.

4. COMPARING THE APPROXIMATIONS

To compare the performance of the different approximations presented above, we consider the r.v. S_n , which is defined as the random present value of a series of n deterministic unit payment obligations due at times $1, 2, \dots, n$, respectively:

$$S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n e^{-Y_1 - Y_2 - \dots - Y_i} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n e^{Z_i}, \quad (4.1)$$

where the r.v. Y_i is the random return over the period $[i - 1, i]$ and $e^{-(Y_1 + Y_2 + \dots + Y_i)} = e^{Z_i}$ is the random discount factor over the period $[0, i]$. We will assume that the periodical returns Y_i are i.i.d. r.v.'s with mean $(\mu - \sigma^2/2)$ and variance σ^2 . Notice that S_n is a r.v. of the general type defined in equation (1.1).

The provision or reserve to set up at time 0 for these future unit payment obligations can be determined as $Q_p[S_n]$ or $CTE_p[S_n]$, with p sufficiently large. A provision equal to $Q_{0.95}[S_n]$, for instance, will guarantee that all payments can be made with a probability of 0.95; see, for instance, Dhaene et al. (2005).

As the time unit that we consider is long (one year), assuming a Gaussian model for the returns seems to be appropriate, at least approximately, by the Central Limit Theorem. Empirical studies that confirm our theoretical setup can be found in Cesari and Cremonini (2003) and Levy (2004).

To compute the comonotonic approximations for quantiles and conditional tail expectations, notice that $E[Z_i]$, $\sigma_{Z_i}^2$, and r_i are given by

$$E[Z_i] = -i \left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right), \quad (4.2)$$

$$\sigma_{Z_i}^2 = i \sigma^2, \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$r_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^i \sum_{k=j}^n \gamma_k}{\sqrt{i \sum_{j=1}^n (\sum_{k=j}^n \gamma_k)^2}}, \quad (4.4)$$

with γ_k given by

$$\gamma_k = e^{E[Z_k] + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{Z_k}^2}, \quad k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Notice that the correlation coefficients r_i are positive, so that formulas (2.8) and (2.9) can be applied.

Now we will compare the performance of the different approximation methods that were presented in Sections 2 and 3: the comonotonic upper bound method (*UB*), comonotonic “maximal variance” lower bound method (*LB*), reciprocal Gamma method (*RG*), and lognormal method (*LN*).

We will compare the different approximations for quantiles and conditional tail expectations with the values obtained by a Monte Carlo simulation. The simulation results are based on generating 500,000 random paths. The estimates obtained from this time-consuming simulation will serve as a benchmark. The random paths are based on antithetic variables to reduce the variance of the Monte Carlo estimate.

The tables that we will present display the results obtained by a Monte Carlo simulation (*MC*) for the risk measure at hand, as well as the deviations of the different approximation methods, relative to the Monte Carlo-based result. For the quantiles and conditional tail expectations, these deviations are defined as follows:

$$\frac{Q_p[S_n^{\text{approx}}] - Q_p[S_n^{MC}]}{Q_p[S_n^{MC}]} \times 100\%$$

and

$$\frac{CTE_p[S_n^{\text{approx}}] - CTE_p[S_n^{MC}]}{CTE_p[S_n^{MC}]} \times 100\%,$$

where S_n^{approx} corresponds to one of the approximation methods and S_n^{MC} denotes the Monte Carlo simulation result. The figures displayed in bold in the tables correspond to the best approximations; this means the ones with the smallest deviation, relative to the Monte Carlo result. In the tables we also present the standard error (s.e.) of the Monte Carlo estimates. The standard error is formally defined as the square root of the estimated error variance and is expressed here as a percentage of the Monte Carlo estimate.

Table 1 summarizes the results for the 0.95 quantiles for different yearly volatilities σ and for a yearly time horizon of $n = 20$ and 40, respectively. The yearly expected return μ has been set equal to 7.5%. The “maximal variance” lower bound approach turns out to fit the quantiles the best for all values of the parameters. Its quantiles fall almost always in the 95% confidence interval around $Q_p[S_n^{MC}]$. It appears that the performances of the lognormal and reciprocal Gamma approximations are worse for higher levels of volatility and for longer time horizons. As far as the reciprocal Gamma approximation is concerned, this result seems surprising given the convergence of the d.f. of S_n to a reciprocal Gamma

Table 1
Approximations for the 0.95 Quantile of S_n for Different Horizons and Volatilities
 ($\mu = 0.075$, Yearly Payments of 1)

n	Method	σ			
		0.05	0.15	0.25	0.35
20	UB	+3.24%	+8.02%	+9.36%	+7.50%
	LB	-0.01%	+0.02%	+0.00%	+0.35%
	RECG	+0.07%	-0.15%	-4.28%	-14.27%
	LN	-0.16%	-0.06%	+2.99%	+9.04%
	MC (\pm s.e.)	12.1957 (0.04%)	20.4592 (0.10%)	41.5854 (0.25%)	106.1389 (0.30%)
40	UB	+4.39%	+10.26%	+9.42%	+1.47%
	LB	+0.00%	-0.06%	+0.06%	-0.83%
	RECG	+0.06%	-0.55%	-8.52%	-19.70%
	LN	-0.23%	+0.58%	+9.73%	+9.96%
	MC (\pm s.e.)	15.4733 (0.04%)	30.4033 (0.16%)	87.7482 (0.32%)	427.0793 (0.49%)

distribution. Note, however, that the variance of S_∞ exists only provided that $\mu > 3 \sigma^2/2$; see equation (3.7). This explains why for $\sigma = 0.25$ and $\sigma = 0.35$ both moment-matching methods are less accurate.

Table 2 compares the different approximations for some selected quantiles of S_{20} , with a fixed yearly volatility $\sigma = 0.15$ and a yearly expected return $\mu = 0.075$. The results are in line with the previous ones. The lower bound approach outperforms all the others, for high as well as for low values of p .

Table 3 displays the approximated and simulated 95% conditional tail expectations for the same set of parameters as in Table 1. Again the “maximal variance” lower bound approach performs the best as an approximation for the conditional tail expectations.

In Table 4 we test the sensitivity of the results with respect to the yearly expected return μ . This table reports the approximations for $Q_{0.95}[S_{40}]$ for different yearly expected returns μ and for a fixed yearly volatility $\sigma = 0.15$. The results show that the higher the yearly expected return μ , the better are any of the proposed approximations. Also in this case, the “maximal variance” lower bound approximation seems to provide the best fit.

At some point, however, for increasing horizon and periodicity of the cash flows, the (limiting) reciprocal Gamma approximation must outperform the lower bound approximation. In Table 5 we compare the performances of the different approximations when increasing the yearly horizon, whereas in Table 6 we also increase the periodicity of the payments. More precisely, in Table 5 we consider yearly unit payments, whereas in Table 6 we assume quarterly payments of 0.25 each. These tables confirm that increasing the periodicity and the total horizon positively impacts the performance of the reciprocal Gamma approximation.

Table 2
Approximations for Some Selected Quantiles of S_{20}
 ($\mu = 0.075$, $\sigma = 0.15$, Yearly Payments of 1)

Method	p				
	0.95	0.90	0.75	0.50	0.25
UB	+8.02%	5.62%	+1.93%	-2.25%	-6.33%
LB	+0.02%	-0.06%	+0.03%	-0.01%	+0.00%
RECG	-0.15%	-0.74%	-0.86%	-0.42%	+0.57%
LN	-0.06%	+0.65%	+1.36%	+0.92%	-0.65%
MC (\pm s.e.)	20.4592 (0.10%)	17.8221 (0.06%)	14.2191 (0.05%)	11.1986 (0.01%)	8.9199 (0.04%)

Table 3
Approximations for the 0.95 Conditional Tail Expectation of S_n for Different Horizons and Volatilities
 ($\mu = 0.075$, Yearly Payments of 1)

n	Method	σ			
		0.05	0.15	0.25	0.35
20	UB	+4.19%	+10.98%	+14.17%	+12.98%
	LB	-0.02%	-0.14%	-0.36%	-0.59%
	RECG	+0.21%	+1.18%	-0.98%	-15.41%
	LN	-0.38%	-1.88%	-0.94%	+4.56%
	MC (\pm s.e.)	12.8231 (1.04%)	24.4591 (2.16%)	59.6646 (2.90%)	198.0164 (3.27%)
40	UB	+5.86%	+15.11%	+16.87%	+10.45%
	LB	+0.09%	-0.25%	-0.59%	-0.84%
	RECG	+0.28%	+0.87%	-7.49%	-40.77%
	LN	-0.48%	-2.38%	+4.18%	+12.77%
	MC (\pm s.e.)	16.3994 (1.55%)	38.2515 (2.61%)	149.8569 (3.25%)	1206.0858 (3.59%)

Finally, in Table 7 we consider continuous perpetuities and confront the lower bound approximation with the exact reciprocal Gamma distribution. We consider different values of the volatility parameter σ while μ is chosen equal to $\mu = 0.075$, and we compare the exact results for the 0.95 quantile of a constant continuous perpetuity (distributed like reciprocal Gamma) with the “maximal variance” lower bound approximation. The lower bound approximation has been obtained by a numerical evaluation of the quantile function of the “maximal variance” lower bound approximation for S_∞ , which is given by

$$Q_p[S'_t] = \int_0^\infty e^{-\left(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right)\tau + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\tau(1-r^2(\tau)) + r(\tau)\sigma\sqrt{\tau}\Phi^{-1}(p)} d\tau,$$

with $\Lambda = \int_0^\infty \exp[-(\mu - \sigma^2)\tau] B(\tau)d\tau$ and $r(\tau) = \text{corr}[Y(\tau), \Lambda]$. We note that also in this case the “maximal variance” lower bound approximation provides rather accurate approximate results.

From the tables, one can observe that, generally speaking, the moment-matching techniques perform poorly for high levels of p and/or σ , while the “maximal variance” comonotonic lower bound continues to produce accurate approximations, also in these extreme cases.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper we compare in a discrete setting some approximation methods for a standard actuarial and financial problem: the determination of quantiles and conditional tail expectations of the present

Table 4
Approximations for $Q_{0.95}[S_{40}]$ for Different Expected Returns
 ($n = 40$, $\sigma = 0.15$, Yearly Payments of 1)

Method	μ		
	0.05	0.075	0.10
UB	+9.93%	+10.26%	+10.49%
LB	+0.15%	-0.06%	+0.02%
RECG	-1.05%	-0.55%	-0.13%
LN	+1.24%	+0.58%	+0.29%
MC (\pm s.e.)	47.6988 (0.16%)	30.4033 (0.16%)	20.8469 (0.13%)

Table 5
Approximations for $Q_{0.95}[S_n]$ for Different Horizons
 ($\mu = 0.075, \sigma = 0.15, \text{Yearly Payments of } 1$)

Method	<i>n</i>		
	40	100	250
UB	+10.26%	+12.45%	+12.67%
LB	-0.06%	+0.09%	+0.16%
RECG	-0.55%	-0.19%	-0.05%
LN	+0.58%	+2.01%	+2.23%
MC (s.e)	30.4033 (0.16%)	36.2960 (0.14%)	36.5572 (0.17%)

value of a series of cash flows, when discounting is performed by a Brownian motion process. We introduce the comonotonic “maximal variance” lower bound approximation, and we test the accuracy of the comonotonic approximations and two moment-matching approximations by comparing these approximations with the estimates obtained from extensive Monte Carlo simulations.

Overall, the comonotonic “maximal variance” lower bound approach provides the best fit and leads to accurate approximations under varying parameter assumptions, which are in line with realistic market values.

The comonotonic approach has the additional advantage that it gives rise to easily computable approximations for any risk measure that is additive for comonotonic risks. Examples of such risk measures are the distortion risk measures that were introduced in the actuarial literature by Wang (2000).

Also notice that the comonotonic approximations that we presented here can easily be transformed to the case when accumulating saving amounts to a final value, as well as to the case where the cash flow payments vary from period to period; see Dhaene et al. (2005). Furthermore, Vanduffel, Dhaene, and Goovaerts (2004) show that in the case of positive cash flow payments followed by negative withdrawals, the comonotonic approximations often can be used to approximate the relevant risk measures. For all these mentioned cases the moment-matching methods are less appropriate.

On the other hand, notice that Huang, Milevsky, and Wang (2004) show in a continuous setting how the moment-matching approximations also can be used in the case where the variable *n* in equation (1.1) is itself stochastic. Also, the comonotonic approximations can be used in this case. Indeed, Hoedemakers, Darkiewicz, and Goovaerts (2005) use the theory on comonotonicity to obtain in a discrete setting approximations for the present value of a life annuity and a portfolio of life annuities.

Table 6
Approximations for $Q_{0.95}[S_n]$ for Different Horizons
 ($\mu = 0.075, \sigma = 0.15, \text{Quarterly Payments of } 0.25$)

Method	<i>n</i>	
	40	100
UB	+10.21%	+12.30%
LB	-0.10%	-0.03%
RECG	-0.49%	-0.16%
LN	+0.49%	+1.86%
MC (\pm s.e.)	30.6718 (0.16%)	36.7083 (0.17%)

Table 7
**Maximal Variance Lower Bound Approximations for 0.95 Quantile of
 Constant Continuous Perpetuity for Different Volatilities
 ($\mu = 0.075$)**

n	Method	σ		
		0.05	0.15	0.25
∞	LB RECC	-0.02% 27.2786	+0.01% 37.1132	-0.96% 219.2890

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge financial support by the Onderzoeksfonds K.U.Leuven (GOA/02: Actuariële, financiële en statistische aspecten van afhankelijkheden in verzekerings- en financiële portefeuilles). They are also indebted to E. Shiu and two anonymous referees for their valuable comments that helped them significantly improve the paper.

REFERENCES

- CESARI, RICCARDO, AND DAVID CREMONINI. 2003. Benchmarking, Portfolio Insurance and Technical Analysis: A Monte Carlo Comparison of Dynamic Strategies of Asset Allocation. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 27(6): 987–1011.
- DHAENE, JAN, MICHEL DENUIT, MARC J. GOOVAERTS, ROB KAAS, AND DAVID VYNCKE. 2002a. The Concept of Comonotonicity in Actuarial Science and Finance: Theory. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 31(1): 3–33.
- . 2002b. The Concept of Comonotonicity in Actuarial Science and Finance: Applications. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 31(2): 133–61.
- DHAENE, JAN, STEVEN VANDUFFEL, QIHE TANG, MARC J. GOOVAERTS, ROB KAAS, AND DAVID VYNCKE. 2004. Solvency Capital, Risk Measures and Comonotonicity: A Review. www.kuleuven.ac.be/insurance.
- DHAENE, JAN, STEVEN VANDUFFEL, MARC J. GOOVAERTS, ROB KAAS, AND DAVID VYNCKE. 2005. Comonotonic Approximations for Optimal Portfolio Selection Problems. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* 72(2): 253–301.
- DUPRESNE, DANIEL. 1990. The Distribution of a Perpetuity with Applications to Risk Theory and Pension Funding. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* 9: 39–79.
- . 2002. The Log-Normal Approximation in Financial and Other Computations. *Advances in Applied Probability* 36: 747–73.
- HOEDEMAKERS, TOM, GRZEGORZ DARKIEWICZ, AND MARC J. GOOVAERTS. 2005. Accurate Approximations for Life Annuity Contracts in a Stochastic Financial Environment. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*. Forthcoming.
- HUANG, HUAXIONG, MOSHE A. MILEVSKY, AND JIN WANG. 2004. Ruined Moments in Your Life: How Good Are the Approximations? *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 34(3): 421–47.
- KAAS, ROB, JAN DHAENE, AND MARC J. GOOVAERTS. 2000. Upper and Lower Bounds for Sums of Random Variables. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 27(2): 151–68.
- KLUGMAN, STUART A., HARRY H. PANJER, AND GORDON E. WILLMOT. 1998. *Loss Models from Data to Decisions*. New York: John Wiley.
- LEVY, HAIM. 2004. Asset Return Distributions and the Investment Horizon. *Journal of Portfolio Management* (Spring): 47–62.
- MILEVSKY, MOSHE A. 1997. The Present Value of a Stochastic Perpetuity and the Gamma Distribution. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 20(3): 243–50.
- MILEVSKY, MOSHE A., AND STEVEN E. POSNER. 1998. Asian Options, the Sum of Lognormals, and the Reciprocal Gamma Distribution. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 33(3): 409–22.
- MILEVSKY, MOSHE A., AND CHRIS ROBINSON. 2000. Self-annuitization and Ruin in Retirement. *North American Actuarial Journal* 4(4): 112–24.
- VANDUFFEL, STEVEN, JAN DHAENE, AND MARC J. GOOVAERTS. 2004. On the Evaluation of “Saving-Consumption” Plans. *Journal of Pension Economics and Finance* 4(1): 17–30.
- VANDUFFEL, STEVEN, JAN DHAENE, MARC J. GOOVAERTS, AND ROB KAAS. 2003. The Hurdle-Race Problem. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 33(2): 405–13.
- WANG, SHAUN S. 2000. A Class of Distortion Operators for Pricing Financial and Insurance Risks. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* 67(1): 15–36.

Discussions on this paper can be submitted until April 1, 2006. The authors reserve the right to reply to any discussion. Please see the Submission Guidelines for Authors on the inside back cover for instructions on the submission of discussions.