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## PAYMENT OF CASH VALUE IN ADDITION TO FACE AMOUNT

## MELVIN L. GOLD AND DAVID T. WILSON*

TTHE topic of this paper is of more than an academic interest, since this type of policy fulfils the specifications of a "split-dollar" or "minimum-deposit" sales approach quite adequately.
The problem of determining the level premium for a policy providing for payment of the reserve in addition to the face amount has been treated a number of times in the actuarial literature (RAIA, XXII, 216; Life Contingencies-Jordan 120; TSA, VIII, 10; The Proceedings of the Conference of Actuaries in Public Practice, X, 99, and XI, 115). However, in actual practice it is the cash value (not the reserve) which is paid in addition to the face amount as a death benefit. This is understandable, since only rarely does the insured know what the policy reserves are. Where the cash values are equal to the net level reserves the mathematics is relatively straightforward. This paper concerns the situation where cash values are less than the net level reserves.

Setting down the classic retrospective formula,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i}^{n} P_{x}^{c}(1+i)^{n-t+1}={ }_{n} V_{x}+\left(M_{x}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)(1+i)^{x+n} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $x=$ issue age
$t=$ policy year
$n=$ number of years during which additional benefit is returned $P_{v^{t}}=$ net premium payable in th policy year

$$
M_{z}^{\prime}=\sum_{x}^{\infty} v^{t} \cdot \frac{C_{t}}{D_{t}}
$$

${ }_{n} V_{z}=$ terminal reserve at end of $n$ years.
Varying the parameter $P_{x}^{t}$, we have the following:
If $P_{x}^{t}=P_{x}^{N L}$ for $1 \leq t \leq n$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{z}^{N L} \cdot g_{n}={ }_{n} V_{z}+(1+i)^{x+n}\left(M_{x}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right), \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

giving the formula for the net level premium where the cash value is equal to the full net level reserve.
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If

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{x}^{1}=c_{x} \\
& P_{x}^{t}=\beta_{x}^{P P T} \quad \text { for } \quad 2 \leq t \leq n
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta_{x}^{F P T} \cdot \ddot{s}_{n-1]}={ }_{n} V_{x}+(1+i)^{x+n}\left(M_{x}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)-(1+i)^{n} c_{x} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

giving the formula for the net premium where the cash value is equal to the full preliminary term reserve.

If

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{x}^{1}=\beta_{x}-\left({ }_{10} P_{x+1}-c_{x}\right) \\
& P_{x}^{t}=\beta_{z} \quad \text { for } \quad 2 \leq t \leq n
\end{aligned}
$$

then
$\beta_{x} \cdot \tilde{s}_{n}={ }_{n} V_{ \pm}+(1+i)^{x+n}\left(M_{3}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)+(1+i)^{n}\left({ }_{19} P_{x+1}-c_{x}\right)$.
Formulas (3) and (4) will suffice for the net premiums where the cash value is equal to the CRVM reserve and where there is no uniform equivalent amount concept.

If
$P_{x}^{1}=P_{z}^{N L}-\left(P_{x}^{N L}-c_{z}\right)$
$P_{z}^{t}=P_{z}^{N L}+\left(P_{x}^{N L}-c_{z}\right) \frac{D_{z}}{N_{z+1}-N_{z}+t} \quad$ for $\quad 2 \leq t \leq s$,
and

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{x}^{t}=P_{x}^{N L} \quad \text { for } \quad s<t \leq n, \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{x}^{N L} \cdot \bar{s}_{n} & ={ }_{n} V_{x}+(1+i)^{x+n}\left(M_{x}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right) \\
& +\left(P_{x}^{N L}-c_{x}\right)\left[(1+i)^{n}-\ddot{s}_{x-1]}(1+i)^{n-1} \frac{D_{x}}{N_{x+1}-N_{x+1}}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

gives the formula for net premiums for cash values which grade uniformly from the first full preliminary term reserve into the net level reserve at the end of the sth year. If $s$ is greater than $n$ (the cash values reach the net level reserve after attained age $x+n$ ), then the term $g_{n-1]}+\dot{a}_{x+n: \overline{z-n}]}$ is substituted for $\bar{s}_{s-1]}(1+i)^{n-c}$ in formula (5).

If
and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{x}^{1}=\Delta D P_{x}-K \\
& P_{x}^{t}=\Lambda D P_{z} \quad \text { for } \quad 2 \leq t \leq n
\end{aligned}
$$

then

$$
{ }_{n} C V_{x}=\text { Cash value at end of } n \text { years, }
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }^{A D} P_{z} \cdot \ddot{s}_{n \bar{n}}={ }_{n} C V_{z}+(1+i)^{x+n}\left(M_{x}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)+K(1+i)^{n} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Multiplying equation (6) by $v^{n}$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }^{\Delta D} P_{x} \cdot \ddot{a}_{\bar{n}}={ }_{n} C V_{x} \cdot v^{n}+(1+i)^{x}\left(M_{x}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)+K . \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

However, the values so arrived at could possibly be negative during the early years, which presents a practical if not legal problem in defining the death benefits. Now let $a$ be the largest integer for which ${ }_{a} C V_{*} \leq 0$, then (6.1) becomes

$$
\begin{align*}
& { }^{A D} P_{x}\left(\vec{a}_{x: a \mid}+\frac{D_{x+a}}{D_{x}} \vec{a}_{n-a}\right)=A_{x: a \mid}^{1} \\
& \quad+\frac{D_{x+a}}{D_{x}}\left[v_{n}^{n-a} C V_{x}+(1+i)^{x+a}\left(M_{x+a}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)\right]+K . \tag{6.2}
\end{align*}
$$

If $K$ is a constant, then this is the net premium formula producing a normal set of cash values which grade uniformly from an initial expense allowance.

However, if

$$
\begin{equation*}
K=\left[\left(.02+.25^{\Delta D} P_{x}^{O L}\right) \searrow .03\right] E L A+\left[.4^{A D} P_{z} \ngtr .04 E L A\right] \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $E L A$ is the equivalent level amount, then we have net premium formulas for a face plus cash value plan generating "minimum values." Our problem now is to derive the ELA.

Now, by definition, the net single premium for the policy is

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{x}^{\prime}={ }^{1 D} P_{z} \cdot \vec{a}_{x: \bar{\pi}}+{ }^{a} P_{x}\left(\ddot{a}_{x}-\ddot{a}_{x ; \pi}\right)-K . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting the value of $K$ from equation (6.2) in equation (8), we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.A_{x}^{\prime}={ }^{A D} P_{x} \cdot \vec{a}_{x ; n}+{ }^{a} P_{x}\left[\vec{a}_{x}-\vec{a}_{x ; n}\right]+A_{x ; a}^{1}\right] \\
& +\frac{D_{z+a}}{D_{x}}\left[v^{n-a} \cdot{ }_{n} C V_{x}+(1+i)^{x+a}\left(M_{x+a}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)\right] \\
& -{ }^{A D} P_{x}\left[\ddot{a}_{x: a}+\frac{D_{x+a}}{D_{x}} a_{\overline{n-a}}\right] \\
& =A_{z: a \mid}^{1}+\frac{D_{x+a}}{D_{x}}\left[v^{n-a} \cdot{ }_{n} C V_{x}+(1+i)^{x+a}\left(M_{x+a}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)\right]  \tag{9}\\
& +{ }^{\Delta D} P_{x}\left[\vec{a}_{x: n}-\vec{a}_{x: a \mid}-\frac{D_{x+a}}{D_{x}} a_{n=a}\right]+{ }^{a} P_{x}\left[a_{x}-a_{x: n}\right] \\
& =A_{x: a \mid}^{1}+\frac{D_{x+a}}{D_{x}}\left[v^{n-a} \cdot{ }_{n} C V_{x}+(1+i)^{x+a}\left(M_{x+a}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)\right] \\
& +\frac{D_{x+a}}{D_{x}}\left[{ }^{\Delta D} P_{x}\left(\tilde{a}_{x+a ; \bar{n}-a \mid}-a_{n-a}\right)+{ }^{a} P_{z}\left(a_{x+a}-\tilde{a}_{x+a ; \bar{n} \bar{a}]}\right)\right],
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { or } \\
& \quad \begin{aligned}
E L A & =A_{x: a}^{1}+\frac{D_{x+a}}{D_{x}}\left[v^{n-a} \cdot{ }_{n} C V_{x}+(1+i)^{x+a}\left(M_{x+a}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)\right] \\
+ & \frac{\frac{D_{x+a}}{D_{x}}\left[{ }^{A D} P_{x}\left(\ddot{a}_{x+a: \overline{n-a}}-\ddot{a}_{n=a}\right)+{ }^{a} P_{x}\left(\bar{a}_{x+a}-\ddot{a}_{x+a: \overline{n-a}}\right)\right]}{A_{x}}
\end{aligned}
\end{align*}
$$

Equations (6.2), (7), and (10) enable us to calculate adjusted premiums for a face plus cash value policy with "minimum values." Values of $1,000 M_{x}^{\prime}$ based on the 1958 CSO Table at various interest rates are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Values of $1,000 M_{x}^{\prime}$ Based on 1958 CSO Table

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Male } \\ \text { Issue Age } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{2.5}{\text { Per Cent }}$ | $\stackrel{2.75}{\text { Per Cent }}$ | ${ }_{\text {Per }}{ }^{3} \mathrm{Cent}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.25 \\ \text { Per Cent } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{3.5}{\text { Per Cent }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 849.117128 | 695.816979 | 572.070059 | 472.011771 | 390.944423 |
| 1 | 842.209811 | 688.926468 | 565.196273 | 465.154628 | 384.103843 |
| 2 | 840.534655 | 687.259454 | 563.537341 | 463.503720 | 382.460901 |
| 3 | 839.123167 | 685.858244 | 562.146309 | 462.122768 | 381.089932 |
| 4 | 837.800490 | 684.548393 | 560.849129 | 460.838106 | 379.817637 |
| 5 | 836.563102 | 683.325986 | 559.641485 | 459.645012 | 378.638883 |
|  | 835.399028 | 682.178803 | 558.510907 | 458.530760 | 377.540682 |
| 7 | 834.305346 | 681.103613 | 557.453853 | 457.491492 | 376.518859 |
|  | 833.271224 | 680.089449 | 556.459215 | 456.515958 | 375.562018 |
|  | 832.286304 | 679.125888 | 555.516499 | 455.593588 | 374.659507 |
| 10 | 831.341092 | 678.203423 | 554.616181 | 454.714834 | 373.801750 |
| 11 | 830.418905 | 677.305619 | 553.742059 | 453.863714 | 372.972973 |
| 12 | 829.504303 | 676.417366 | 552.879335 | 453.025726 | 372.158954 |
| 13 | 828.590293 | 675.531848 | 552.021355 | 452.194364 | 371.353322 |
|  | 827.656087 | 674.628966 | 551.148674 | 451.350804 | 370.537845 |
| 15. | 826.696330 | 673.703647 | 550.2564 | 450.490468 | 369.708159 |
| 16. | 825.712840 | 672.757753 | 549.346656 | 449.615261 | 368.866170 |
| 17 | 824.700731 | 671.786703 | 548.414905 | 448.721129 | 368.008052 |
| 18 | 823.662018 | 670.792552 | 547.463303 | 447.810159 | 367.135886 |
|  | 822.604877 | 669.783225 | 546.499520 | 446.889762 | 366.256823 |
| 20 | 821.543031 | 668.771873 | 545.5361 | 445.971984 | 365.382379 |
| 21 | 820.477310 | 667.759301 | 544.573953 | 445.057548 | 364.513224 |
| 22 | 819.414344 | 666.751804 | 543.618905 | 444.152101 | 363.654692 |
| 23. | 818.360280 | 665.755174 | 542.676452 | 443.260758 | 362.811575 |
|  | 817.315341 | 664.769576 | 541.746693 | 442.383551 | 361.983832 |
| 25. | 816.285131 | 663.800235 | 540.834489 | 441.524991 | 361.175642 |
| 26. | 815.269497 | 662.846934 | 539.939557 | 440.684726 | 360.386584 |
| 27. | 814.263235 | 661.904727 | 539.057188 | 439.858262 | 359.612361 |
| 28. | 813.266512 | 660.973724 | 538.187426 | 439.045580 | 358.852887 |
| 29 | 812.274554 | 660.049425 | 537.326024 | 438.242657 | 358.104346 |
| 30. | 811.282941 | 659.127696 | 536.469102 | 437.445844 | 357.363296 |
| 31. | 810.292254 | 658.209069 | 535.617136 | 436.655558 | 356.630091 |
|  | 809.298485 | 657.289826 | 534.766668 | 435.868572 | 355.901711 |
| 33. | 808.302392 | 656.370674 | 533.918349 | 435.085475 | 355.178682 |
|  | 807.300383 | 655.448313 | 533.069134 | 434.303449 | 354.458386 |
| 35. | 806.289104 | 654.519684 | 532.216224 | 433.519922 | 353.738450 |
|  | 805.257270 | 653.574485 | 531.350202 | 432.726276 | 353.010978 |
|  | 804.198442 | 652.606918 | 530.465838 | 431.917783 | 352.271687 |
| 38. | 803.102830 | 651.608174 | 529.555193 | 431.087280 | 351.514104 |
|  | 801.953807 | 650.563290 | 528.604790 | 430.222616 | 350.727265 |
|  | 800.743421 | 649.465283 | 527.608492 | 429.318392 | 349.906414 |
|  | 799.460806 | 648.304584 | 526.557865 | 428.367169 | 349.044983 |
| 42 | 798.099567 | 647.075731 | 525.448247 | 427.364969 | 348.139580 |
| 43. | 796.657418 | 645.777005 | 524.278382 | 426.310913 | 347.189629 |
|  | 795.128983 | 644.403923 | 523.044541 | 425.201905 | 346.192568 |
|  | 793.509452 | 642.952544 | 521.743509 | 424.035336 | 345.146289 |
| 46. | 791.791327 | 641.416554 | 520.369973 | 422.806738 | 344.047039 |
| 4 | 789.964727 | 639.787562 | 518.916806 | 421.510060 | 342.889679 |
| 48 | 788.020659 | 638.058028 | 517.377694 | 420.140017 | 341.669790 |
|  | 785.948055 | 636.218629 | 515.744786 | 418.690001 | 340.381812 |

TABLE 1-Condinued

| Male <br> Issue Age | $\stackrel{2.5}{\text { Per Cent }}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.75 \\ \text { Per Cent } \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{\text {Per }}^{3} \text { Cent }$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.25 \\ \text { Per Cent } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.5 \\ \text { Per Cent } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50. | 783.736878 | 634.261023 | 514.011160 | 417.154275 | 339.020997 |
| 51. | 781.375291 | 632.175343 | 512.168596 | 415.525999 | 337.581658 |
| 52 | 778.852538 | 629.952747 | 510.209841 | 413.799236 | 336.058946 |
| 53 | 776.161658 | 627.587796 | 508.130689 | 411.970774 | 334.450447 |
| 54. | 773.291269 | 625.071216 | 505.923602 | 410.034502 | 332.751223 |
| 55. | 770.231168 | 622.394837 | 503.582065 | 407.985252 | 330.957195 |
| 56. | 766.969751 | 619.549325 | 501.098599 | 405.817051 | 329.063617 |
| 57. | 763.491717 | 616.522204 | 498.463042 | 403.521639 | 327.063782 |
| 58. | 759.780916 | 613.300351 | 495.664751 | 401.090396 | 324.950723 |
|  | 755.820507 | 609.870145 | 492.692730 | 398.514463 | 322.717318 |
| 60 | 751.595299 | 606.219495 | 489.537387 | 395.786262 | 320.357606 |
| 61. | 747.085092 | 602.332083 | 486.185560 | 392.895192 | 317.863063 |
| 62. | 742.273886 | 598.195324 | 482.627398 | 389.833582 | 315.227752 |
| 63. | 737.143127 | 593.794543 | 478.851329 | 386.592341 | 312.444561 |
|  | 731.672153 | 589.113368 | 474.844418 | 383.161282 | 309.505493 |
| 65. | 725.838436 | 584.133960 | 470.592577 | 379.529308 | 306.401834 |
| 66. | 719.615878 | 578.835579 | 466.079350 | 375.683390 | 303.123291 |
| 67. | 712.973403 | 573.193408 | 461.284944 | 371.607759 | 299.657316 |
| 68. | 705.877339 | 567.180621 | 456.188010 | 367.285446 | 295.990437 |
|  | 698.291901 | 560.768805 | 450.766018 | 362.698610 | 292.108547 |
| 70. | 690.193668 | 553.940189 | 445.005585 | 357.837263 | 288.004273 |
| 71. | 681.568904 | 546.685284 | 438.900402 | 352.697449 | 283.675380 |
| 72. | 672.417649 | 539.006240 | 432.453980 | 347.283494 | 279.126613 |
| 73. | 662.747676 | 530.911670 | 425.675224 | 341.604217 | 274.366449 |
|  | 652.571992 | 522.414502 | 418.576586 | 335.671343 | 269.405741 |
| 75. | 641.881826 | 513.509438 | 411.155244 | 329.483778 | 264.244572 |
| 76. | 630.648601 | 504.174765 | 403.394754 | 323.029114 | 258.873615 |
| 77. | 618.821494 | 494.370497 | 395.263643 | 316.282568 | 253.273342 |
| 78. | 606.332718 | 484.042916 | 386.719317 | 309.210334 | 247.416896 |
|  | 593.102152 | 473.128535 | 377.711429 | 301.772457 | 241.272544 |
| 80. | 579.066626 | 461.578280 | 368.201877 | 293.939365 | 234.817339 |
| 81. | 564.183985 | 449.360709 | 358.167325 | 285.693843 | 228.038666 |
| 82. | 548.427304 | 436.457090 | 347.595033 | 277.027485 | 220.931229 |
| 83. | 531.790068 | 422.865504 | 336.486099 | 267.943279 | 213.499102 |
| 84. | 514.275652 | 408.592128 | 324.848229 | 258.449585 | 205.750722 |
| 85. | 495.885199 | 393.641290 | 312.687571 | 248.553442 | 197.693394 |
| 86. | 476.612089 | 378.011009 | 300.005125 | 238.257670 | 189.330939 |
| 87. | 456.446227 | 361.696502 | 286.799636 | 227.563233 | 180.665656 |
| 88. | 435.370810 | 344.687632 | 273.065527 | 216.467628 | 171.697036 |
| 89. | 413.352279 | 326.960869 | 258.786475 | 204.959712 | 162.417596 |
| 90. | 390.330933 | 308.471857 | 243.929576 | 193.015072 | 152.809297 |
| 91. | 366.213641 | 289.149765 | 228.440956 | 180.592700 | 142.840832 |
| 92. | 340.866180 | 268.891507 | 212.241269 | 167.631492 | 132.469100 |
| 93. | 314.108406 | 247.558225 | 195.223336 | 154.048532 | 121.617894 |
| 94. | 285.709234 | 224.971218 | 177.249134 | 139.737134 | 110.216499 |
| 95. | 255.382654 | 200.910101 | 158.148149 | 124.565469 | 98.159073 |
| 96. | 222.564949 | 174.935885 | 137.578395 | 108.266799 | 85.237183 |
| 97. | 186.051953 | 146.107274 | 114.803797 | 90.264661 | 70.999001 |
| 98. | 142.615166 | 111.895497 | 87.842349 | 69.004747 | 54.225316 |
| 99. | 84.645590 | 66.348813 | 52.033551 | 40.838290 | 32.054741 |

## DISCUSSION OF PRECEDING PAPER

## CECIL J. NESBITT:

The subject of this paper is difficult because there are several stages in the mathematics where more than one reasonable choice exists, and the various choices made lead to different outcomes. It is important, then, to have full specifications of each problem to be solved and a complete definition of notations used. To illustrate, let us consider a problem corresponding to the authors' formula (5). We might specify full preliminary term insurance for the first year with cash value of zero at the end of the year. For the next $s-1$ years, we might specify modified net premiums (cash value premiums) $\beta$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta=v q_{x+t}\left(1+{ }_{t+1} C V\right)+v p_{x+t \cdot t+1} C V-{ }_{\imath} C V,(1 \leq t<s), \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ${ }_{\ell} C V$ denotes the cash value at the end of year $t$. We have already specified ${ }_{1} C V=0$, and we further specify $. C V=. V$, where ${ }_{\bullet} V$ is the reserve on some net-level premium basis with annual premium $P$. For years $s$ to $n$, we require

$$
\begin{equation*}
P=v q_{x+1}\left(1+{ }_{t+1} V\right)+\nabla p_{x+t \cdot t+1} V-{ }_{t} V, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with ${ }_{n} V$ to be the ordinary life net level-premium reserve ${ }_{n} V_{x}$, or some other appropriate value, depending on the net level-premium assumption for years $n+h, h>0$. From equations (1) and (2), we find

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\left(\beta-v q_{x+t}\right)(1+i)^{n-t}=\Delta\left[(1+i)^{n-t} C V\right] & (1 \leq t<s), \\
\left(P-v q_{x+t}\right)(1+i)^{n-t}=\Delta\left[(1+i)^{n-t} t\right] & (s \leq t<n) .
\end{array}
$$

On summing, and noting that $. C V=. V$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta \delta_{s-1}(1+i)^{n-s}+P_{\overline{n-1}}-(1+i)^{x+n}\left(M_{x+1}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)={ }_{n} V . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

As yet, we have not specified $P$ fully. One possibility is to require that $P=P^{N L}$, as given by the authors' formula (2), then ${ }^{2} V=. V^{N L}$, the net level-premium reserve at the end of $s$ years for an insurance of 1 plus the net level-premium reserve, with ${ }_{n} V={ }_{n} V_{x}$. If such $P^{N L}$ is substituted in our formula (3), then $\beta$ may be determined as

$$
\beta=\left\{V_{x}+(1+i)^{x+n}\left(M_{x+1}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)-P^{N L} \xi_{\overline{n-n}}\right\} / \overline{\delta_{\overline{-1}}}(1+i)^{n-4}
$$

and is sufficient to provide the death benefits of $1+C V, 2 \leq t \leq s$ for years 2 to $s$, and to provide ${ }^{\prime} V^{N L}$ at the end of $s$ years. Here, the ${ }^{\circ} C V$ grade from 0 at $t=1$ to.$V^{N L}$ at $t=s$, but would not necessarily agree
with the authors' values based on their formula (5). Their formula resolves the indeterminacy of our formula (3), which has two unknowns, $\beta$ and $P$, by requiring that

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{x}+\beta \frac{N_{x+1}-N_{x+s}}{D_{x}}=P \frac{N_{x}-N_{x+1}}{D_{x}} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

or, that net level-premiums of $P$ shall be equivalent to net premiums of $c_{x}$ in the first year and of $\beta$ in years 2 to $s$.

By utilizing our formula (4), to substitute for $\beta$ in our equation (3), one obtains the authors' formula (5), with their $P^{N L}$ replaced by $P$. The $P$ so obtained is not the same as the $P^{N L}$ of the authors' formula (2) but is more subtle, being the net level premium for an insurance of 1 plus the cash values which depend on $\beta$, which depends on $P$ through our relation (4).

In the foregoing, we have assumed $s\langle n$. If $s\rangle n$, further specification would be necessary, particularly in regard to ${ }_{n} V$. However, if the specifications are clearly set out, then it is generally easy to write equations such as (1) and (2) for the various insurance years, and then by summation obtain the required premiums and cash values.

The authors' formulas (6) and following leave one uncertain, as they have not defined what they mean by ${ }_{n} C V_{x}$ and ${ }^{9} P_{x}$. I expect that their formulas present only one of a number of choices that would yield adjusted premiums for a face plus cash value policy with "minimum values," and some clarification of their choice would be desirable.

The primary purpose of the paper seems to be to provide formulas for cash value premiums, and these would lead to formulas for the cash values. There remains the question as to what formulas would be used for reserves, which question is analogous for this type of insurance to that considered by D. C. Baillie in his "Actuarial Note-Cash Value as Death Benefit," which appears in this number of the Transactions.

## FRANKLIN C. SMITH:

Since I have been doing a considerable amount of work in this same area, I was interested in the authors' treatment of this subject.

In the section of the paper which deals with the case in which the additional death benefit is the Commissioners' Reserve, the authors state that their formulas can be used "where there is no uniform equivalent amount concept." Since the plan under consideration involves varying death benefits, I fail to see how there can be no uniform equivalent amount concept. Furthermore, in my opinion the authors have not used the Commissioners' Method to produce formula (4). Since their approach
would produce reserves which are larger than Commissioners' Reserves, there can be no legal objection. I merely object to the use of the label "Commissioners' Reserve."

I believe that the derivation of working formulas for the case in which the added death benefit is the Commissioner's Reserve is more complicated than the paper shows. For example, let us consider an $n$-pay life plan with the added death benefit in effect for $n$ years where $n<20$. Then, in my opinion the equation corresponding to the authors' equation (4) should be
$\beta d_{n}=A_{x+n} V^{n}+(1+i)^{2}\left(M_{x}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)+E L R A \cdot{ }_{10} P_{x+1}-\left(1+{ }_{1} V\right) c_{x}$,
which contains the three unknowns $\beta, E L R A$, and ${ }_{1} V$. A second equation can be obtained by writing a prospective formula for the first reserve; thus

$$
{ }_{1} V=E L R A \cdot A_{x+1}-\beta \ddot{u}_{x+1: n-1}
$$

and a third equation can be obtained by writing a retrospective formula for the same reserve; thus

$$
{ }_{1} V=\left\{\beta-c_{x}-\left[E L R A \cdot{ }_{19} P_{x+1}-\left(1+{ }_{1} V\right) c_{z}\right]\right\}(1+i)
$$

from which

$$
{ }_{1} V=\left(\beta-E L R A \cdot{ }_{19} P_{x+1}\right) \mu_{x}
$$

From these three equations we can get

$$
\beta=\frac{A_{x+n} V^{n}+(1+i)^{x}\left(M_{x+1}^{\prime}-M_{x+n}^{\prime}\right)}{\vec{a}_{n}-\frac{\vec{x}_{x: \bar{n}}}{\vec{a}_{x: 20 \mid}}+\left(1-\frac{\vec{a}_{x: \bar{n}}}{\vec{a}_{x: 20}}\right) k_{x}} .
$$

At the end of this discussion I have appended the results for a fifteen-pay life issued at age 50 with both the authors' treatment and mine. In this material $P$ denotes the factor used to obtain the added death benefit.

An attack similar to the above can be used on any basic plan in those cases which are not eligible for full preliminary term valuation.

The authors derive formulas for grading from the first full preliminary term reserve to the sth net level reserve. The paper does not treat the problem of grading from a non-zero first year Commissioners' Reserve to a subsequent net level reserve. It may be remarked that such cases can be handled, but, since they involve five equations in five unknowns, I shall not take time to do so here.

In discussing the case in which the added death benefit is the minimum cash value, the authors introduce the symbol ${ }^{-} P_{z}$ in equation (8) without
defining it. Furthermore, since the basic plan has not been described, it is not possible to deduce with certainty just what this symbol represents. I suspect that the basic plan is an ordinary life plan with the added benefit payable for $n$ years and with the premium reducing at the end of $n$ years. If this surmise is correct, then ${ }^{a} P_{x}$ must denote the adjusted premium after the $n$th year, and it should be pointed out that ${ }^{A D} P_{x}$ and ${ }^{a} P_{x}$ must be in the same ratio as the gross premiums for the respective periods.

## APPENDIX

15-Pay Life, Age at Issue 50
1958 CSO 3 Per Cent

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GOLD AND W } \\ & P=54 \\ & \beta=54 \\ & E L R A=1 \end{aligned}$ | N <br> 149 <br> 177 <br> 20 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}  & \text { Suitr } \\ P & =54 . \\ \beta & =54 \\ E L R A & =11 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 731 \\ & 731 \\ & .48 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Amount of Insurance | Commissioners' Reserve | Year | Amount of Insurance | Commissioners' Reserve |
| 1. | \$1,014.13 | \$ 9.19 |  | \$1,009.18 | \$ 9.18 |
| 2. | 1,061.19 | 56.52 | 2. | 1,056.52 | 56.52 |
| 3. | 1,108.80 | 104.42 | 3. | 1,104.43 | 104.43 |
| 4. | 1,156.91 | 152.83 |  | 1,152.85 | 152.85 |
| 5. | 1,205.45 | 201.68 | 5 | 1,201.71 | 201.71 |
| 6. | 1,254.35 | 250.89 | 6. | 1,250.93 | 250.93 |
| 7. | 1,303.50 | 300.37 | 7. | 1,300.42 | 300.42 |
| 8. | 1,352.80 | 350.01 |  | 1,350.07 | 350.07 |
|  | 1,402.12 | 399.68 |  | 1,399.74 | 399.74 |
| 10. | 1,451.33 | 449.25 | 10. | 1,449.32 | 449.32 |
| 11. | 1,500.26 | 498.56 | 11. | 1,498.63 | 498.63 |
| 12. | 1,548.77 | 547.46 | 12. | 1,547.53 | 547.53 |
| 13. | 1,596.65 | 595.76 | 13. | 1,595.82 | 595.82 |
|  | 1,643.72 | 643.26 |  | 1,643.29 | 643.29 |
|  | 1,689.73 | 689.73 |  | 1,689.73 | 689.73 |

## ERSTON L. MARSHALL:

I am not entirely sure whether it is quite safe for me to make my appearance at this particular time. Several years ago one of our younger actuaries told me that I did not know how unpopular I was among the younger generation of actuaries. He himself had completed all his associateship examinations, except Part 4.

My rather insignificant actuarial note appeared in the program of the October meeting of the American Institute of Actuaries exactly thirty years ago. It did not make much impression and lay dormant for several years until the Education Committee discovered it and recommended it for reading for Part 4 of the examinations. Some of the students took a
look at it and decided that, since they had not heard of any such policy as I described, they would spend their study time more profitably on some more important subject. And that was all right until the Examination Committee discovered it and commenced putting it into Part 4 of the examinations. Then they blamed me because they did not pass it.

It is quite obvious that Mr. Gold was one of those who took my actuarial note more seriously. I want to congratulate him and Mr. Wilson on their excellent paper. It is appropriate at this time of course, because, as stated in their paper, the cash value is the amount that is usually paid on that type of policy. When I presented my original paper, however, practically no one was issuing that kind of a policy, and my only excuse for presenting it was the fact that legislators of some of the states periodically submitted bills to their legislatures that would require all life insurance companies to pay the entire reserve in addition to the face amount of the policy on all forms of policies, the theory, of course, being that otherwise the company was confiscating the reserve.

So, I did not invent the policy. In fact, I did not prepare the policy for any company. But a number of years previously when I was a young consulting actuary, I was asked by a very small western company, not now in existence, to furnish reserves for a policy of this type that had been prepared for it by another actuary of whom I had never heard and who had died before furnishing the company with any table of reserves for the policy. When some of my more experienced actuarial friends were unable to tell me where to find such reserves or how to compute them, I had to try it myself. It was then that I discovered that, by preparing a new kind of commutation column, I could compute the reserve about as easily as for more usual policy forms. And I want to congratulate Professor Jordan, Professor Nesbitt, Professor Greville, and Mr. Nowlin on their improvements over my method of approach and development of the formula.

I also wish to thank Mr. Gold and Mr. Wilson for the pleasant experience of having my paper referred to thirty years after it was presented. I hope that, when they are old men, they will have a similar pleasure. It has been said that that is one form of immortality.

## (AUTHORS' REVIEW OF DISCUSSION)

## MELVIN L. GOLD AND DAVID T, WILSON:

The purpose of the paper was to provide some formulas for net premiums producing cash values less than net level reserves. As was so aptly remarked, "there are several stages in the mathematics where more than
one reasonable choice exists." I would like to thank Professor Nesbitt and Mr. Smith for showing us what happens if we follow different tangents.

As Professor Nesbitt brought out, there is a subtle difference between the net level premiums of equations (2) and (5). Thus, if a policy is brought out where cash values grade to the net level reserves at duration $s$ and where the reserves are net level all the way, at time $s$ the cash values and reserves are not necessarily identical. Mr. Smith presumed correctly; the basic plan is an ordinary life plan with the added benefit payable for $n$ years and with the premium reducing at the end of $n$ years and ${ }^{a} P_{x}$ is the adjusted premium after the $n$th year.

I would like to thank Dr. Marshall for giving us some background material on his classical paper and for his kind remarks. It is not every day that a younger actuary has his paper commented on by a man of Dr. Marshall's renown.

