TRANSACTIONS OF SOCIETY OF ACTUARIES 1966 VOL. 18 PT. 1 NO. 52

Ga-1951 MALE MORTALITY TABLE PROJECTED WITH SCALE C TO 1970-ACTUARIAL NOTE

G. B. SAKSENA

CONSIDERABLE amount of time and effort is needed in the preparation of a mortality table from the experience of assured lives. Actuaries are thus led to various devices to keep pace with the improvement in mortality with lapse of time; for example, rating-down of ages, using a conservative rate of interest, and, quite recently, the use of projection scales.

The latest available mortality table of annuitants (Ga-1951) was prepared by Mr. Ray M. Peterson. His tables were published in TSA, Volume IV, on pages 246–307. Mr. Peterson also provided in his paper two projection scales which could be used to determine rates of mortality at any future date after 1951.

Recently Mr. Gordon J. Munro prepared the (static) Ga-1951 Mortality Table projected to 1960 (TSA, XII, 353-68), using the Projection Scale C as given by Mr. Peterson. The author has now prepared the (static) Ga-1951 Male Mortality Table using Projection Scale C to 1970 in the hope that this table can be used for the next few years. The author has not prepared a corresponding female mortality table, as the male table could be used for females by rating down the age by five years, as in the case of the 1937 Standard Annuity Table.

The values of q_x were first derived by using the formula $q_x^{1970} = q_x^{1951} \cdot (1 - 0.01r_x)^{19}$, where r_x was taken from Table 1 of Mr. Munro's paper. The radix for age five was chosen 9999.9999 (the same as that used by Mr. Peterson for the Ga-1951 Mortality Table) to prepare the Ga-1951 Mortality Table Projection C to 1970. Monetary functions were computed at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in order to facilitate comparisons with Mr. Munro's tables.

The values of q_x as computed above were found to be extremely irregular. It was, therefore, decided to "graduate" the projected table by a Gompertz formula similar to that used in the 1937 Standard Annuity Table (*TASA*, XXXIX, 8). The constants used were:

$$\log_{10} c = .042$$
,

 $10^4 \operatorname{colog}_{10} p_x = A_x + 10^{.042(x-18.85)}$

where

$$A_x = 0.000014032 (x^2 - 14x + 177)(x - 35)^2 \text{ for ages } 5-35 ;$$

= 0 for ages 35-105 ;
= 152.1 $\frac{(x - 105)^2}{110 - x}$ for ages 105-110.

For the Seniority Table, the following formula was used:

$$w - x = \frac{\log_{10} \left[1 + (1/c)^{x-y} \right]}{\log_{10} c}.$$

Table 1 gives the "graduated" and the "ungraduated" values of q_{x} ; Table 2 gives the "graduated" values of l_x , d_x , q_x , together with the values of D_x , N_x , and \ddot{a}_x based on "graduated" table; and Table 3 provides the Table of Uniform Seniority based on "graduated" table.

TABLE 1

	Values of q_x			VALUES OF q_x			Values of q_x	
ACE x	Ungradu- ated	Graduated	AGE x	Ungradu- ated	Graduated	AGE x	Ungradu- ated	Graduated
$\begin{array}{c} 5 \\ \hline 6 \\ \hline 7 \\ \hline 12 \\ \hline 7 \\ \hline 12 \\ \hline 7 \\ \hline 12 \\ \hline 12 \\ \hline 12 \\ \hline 13 $	0.000,440 .000,409 .000,379 .000,375 .000,375 .000,376 .000,381 .000,381 .000,407 .000,417 .000,417 .000,441 .000,444 .000,445 .000,454 .000,524 .000,546 .000,570 .000,524 .000,546 .000,570 .000,627 .000,660 .000,697 .000,630 .000,830 .000,833 .000,943 .001,082	0.000,444 .000,417 .000,384 .000,377 .000,374 .000,375 .000,380 .000,387 .000,387 .000,380 .000,480 .000,407 .000,418 .000,431 .000,444 .000,458 .000,458 .000,458 .000,505 .000,505 .000,522 .000,541 .000,587 .000,587 .000,615 .000,647 .000,944 .000,944 .000,944 .000,944 .000,944 .000,944 .000,944 .000,944 .000,944 .000,944 .000,945 .000,047 .000,647 .0	41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 53 53 54 55 55 55 55 57 57 58 60 61 63 63 63 63 63 64 65 68 68 68 68 71 71	0.001,726 .001,929 .002,180 .002,478 .003,201 .003,621 .003,621 .003,621 .004,079 .004,573 .005,099 .004,573 .005,659 .006,551 .007,530 .008,815 .007,530 .008,812 .006,875 .007,530 .008,814 .009,684 .000,474 .009,684 .000,474 .001,474 .011,322 .012,248 .013,281 .014,451 .014,451 .015,802 .017,376 .017,376 .019,227 .021,412 .023,711 .025,974 .030,948 .034,332	0.001,957 .002,156 .002,374 .002,615 .003,494 .003,165 .003,494 .003,848 .004,238 .004,667 .005,140 .005,611 .006,234 .006,864 .007,559 .008,323 .009,164 .000,911,109 .012,230 .014,820 .016,313 .017,954 .017,955 .026,322 .028,955 .031,848	76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 85 85 85 85 90 91 90 91 93 94 95 94 95 94 95 94 95 94 101 102 103 104 105	0.057,193 0.063,679 0.070,984 0.079,077 0.087,783 0.096,960 0.106,580 0.116,600 0.127,022 0.137,825 0.149,077 0.160,882 0.149,077 0.160,882 0.173,336 0.186,540 0.200,594 0.212,555 0.225,161 0.238,524 0.252,765 0.302,223 0.321,515 0.342,526 0.365,462 0.365,462 0.390,538 0.417,979 0.450,096 0.457,605	0.056, 182 0.061, 708 0.067, 756 0.074, 374 0.081, 609 0.089, 514 0.098, 143 0.107, 553 0.117, 805 0.128, 961 0.141, 088 0.154, 250 0.168, 515 0.183, 951 0.200, 622 0.218, 592 0.237, 920 0.258, 657 0.280, 848 0.304, 523 0.329, 702 0.356, 383 0.384, 546 0.414, 144 0.445, 103 0.477, 316 0.510, 639 0.524, 891 0.579, 854 0.615, 266
36 37 38 39 40	.001,161 .001,250 .001,347 .001,456 0.001,575	.001,207 .001,330 .001,465 .001,613 0.001,777	72 73 74 75	.038,109 .042,212 .046,705 0.051,575	.038,512 .042,338 .046,536 0.051,138	107 108 109 110	0.671,554 0.761,722 0.870,434 1.000,000	0.700,526 0.761,723 0.860,084 1.000,000

Ga-51 MALE MORTALITY TABLE PROJECTED WITH SCALE C TO 1970 UNGRADUATED AND GRADUATED RATES OF MORTALITY

TABLE 2

Ga-51 MALE MORTALITY TABLE PROJECTED WITH SCALE C TO 1970 COMMUTATION COLUMNS AT 3½ PER CENT INTEREST BASED ON "GRADUATED" TABLE

						<u> </u>
x	l_x	dz	<i>q</i> x	D_{x}	N_x	ä _x
5	9,999.9999	4.4400	0.000,444	8,419.7316	224,011.2535	26.6055
6	9,995.5599	4.1681	.000,417	8,131.3944	215,591 5219	26.5135
7	9,991.3918	3,9666	.000,397	7,853.1436	207,460.1275	26.4175
ö	9,987.4232	3,6332	000,364	7,304.3001	102 022 4178	20.3173
10	9,970,8262	3,7325	.000.374	7,074,8866	184,697,1486	26,1060
11	9,976.0937	3.7410	.000,375	6,833.0826	177,622.2620	25.9945
12	9,972.3527	3.7895	.000,380	6,599.5365	170,789.1794	25.8790
13	9,968.5632	3.8578	.000,387	6,373.9407	164,189.6429	25.7595
14	9,904.7054	3.9400	.000,390	5,945,4838	151,615,7022	25.5084
16	9,956.7054	4.1619	.000,418	5,742.0909	145,714.2049	25.3765
17	9,952.5435	4.2895	.000,431	5,545.5949	139,972.1140	25.2402
18	9,948.2540	4.4170	.000,444	5,355.7534	134,426.5191	25.0995
20	0 030 2827	4.3343	000,438	4 905 1444	123 808 4223	24 8038
21	9,934,5814	4.8481	.000,488	4,823.9437	118,903.2779	24.6486
22	9,929.7333	5.0145	.000,505	4,658 5406	114,079.3342	24.4882
23	9,924.7188	5.1807	.000,522	4,498.7324	109,420.7936	24.3226
24	9,919.5581	5.5005	.000,341	4,344.3323	104,922.0012	24.1515
26	9,908,5899	5.8163	.000.587	4.051.0048	96.382.5768	23,7923
27	9,902.7736	6.0902	.000,615	3,911.7168	92,331.5720	23.6038
28	9,896.6834	6.4032	.000,647	3,777.1122	88,419.8552	23.4094
29	9,890.2802	0.7748	.000,685	3,047.0220	84,042.7430	23.208/
31	9,883.3034	7 7134	000,729	3 309 7223	77.474 4408	22 7885
32	9,868.5869	8.3094	.000,842	3,282.1904	74,074.7185	22.5687
33	9,860.2775	9.0123	.000,914	3,168.5283	70,792.5281	22.3424
34	9,851.2652	9.8310	.000,998	3,058,5819	67,023.9998	22.1090
36	9 830 6474	11.8656	.001.207	2,849,2432	61,613,2155	21.6244
37	9,818.7818	13.0590	.001,330	2,749.5693	58,763.9723	21.3721
38	9,805.7228	14.3654	.001,465	2,653.0554	56,014.4030	21.1132
39	9,791.3574	15.7935	.001,013	2,559.5833	53,301.34/0	20.84//
40	9,758,1927	19.0968	.001.957	2.381.3051	48.332.7260	20.2967
42	9,739.0959	20.9975	.002,156	2,296.2753	45,951.4209	20.0113
43	9,718.0984	23.0708	.002,374	2,213.8401	43,655.1456	19.7192
44	9,095.0270	25.3525	.002,615	2,133.8980	41,441.3033	10 1152
46	9.641.8264	30.5164	.003.165	1.981.0855	37,251,0617	18.8034
47	9,611.3100	33.5819	.003,494	1,908.0342	35,269.9762	18.4850
48	9,577.7281	36.8551	.003,848	1,837.0700	33,361.9420	18.1004
49	9,540.8730	40.4342	.004.667	1,701.0856	29,756,7551	17.4928
51	9,456.1003	48.6044	.005,140	1,635.8905	28,055.6695	17.1501
52	9,407.4959	53.2558	.005,661	1,572.4464	26,419.7790	16.8017
53	9,354.2401	58.3143	.000,234	1,510.0/13	24,847.3320	16 0888
55	9.232.1186	69.7856	.007.559	1.391.8170	21.886.1746	15.7249
56	9,162.3330	76.2581	.008,323	1,334:5858	20,494.3576	15.3563
57	9,086.0749	83.2648	.009,164	1,278.7227	19,159.7718	14.9835
58	8 011 0717	90.8384	011 109	1,224.1589	16 656 8902	14.0008
60	8,812.9686	107.7826	.012.230	1,118.6681	15,486.0620	13.8433
61	8,705.1860	117.1979	.013,463	1,067.6200	14,367.3939	13.4574
62	8,587.9881	127.2740	014,820	1,017.6296	13,299.7739	13.0094
64	8,322,6945	149 4257	.017.954	920.6225	11.313.4985	12.2890
65	8,173.2688	161.4956	.019,759	873.5204	10,392.8760	11.8977
66	8,011.7732	174.2080	.021,744	827.3048	9,519.3556	11.5065
67	7,837.5652		.023,925	781.9477	8,092.0508	11.1159
69	7,448,6868	215.6767	.028.955	693.7381	7,172,6735	10.3392
70	7,233.0101	230.3569	.031,848	650.8705	6,478.9354	9.9543
71	7,002.6532	245.2679	.035,025	608.8324	5,828.0649	9.5725
73	6.497.1440	275.0761	.038,512	527.3234	4.651.5918	8,8211
74	6,222.0688	289.5502	.046,536	487.9203	4,124.2684	8.4528
75	5,932.5186	303.3771	.051,138	449.4826	3,636.3481	8.0901
76	5,629.1415	316.2564	.056,182	412.0743	3,180.8055	7.7337
78	4.985.0376	337.7662	.067.756	340.6600	2,399.0200	7.0423
79	4,647.2714	345.6362	.074,374	306.8389	2,058.3600	6.7083
80	4,301.6352	351.0521	.081,609	274.4136	1,751.5211	6.3828
81 82	3,950.5831	353.0325	0.098.143	243.4900	1,233,6109	5.7591
	0,000.000	1			-,	

TABLE 2-Continued

x	l_x	d _x	q_x	Dz	Nx	ä _x
83	3,243.9351	348.8950	0.107,553	186.6479	1,019.4078	5.4617
84	2,895.0401	341.0502	0.117,805	160.9404	832.7599	5.1743
85	2,553.9899	329,3651	0.128,961	137.1796	671.8195	4.8974
86	2,224,6248	313.8679	0.141.088	115.4481	534.6399	4.6310
87	1,910,7569	294.7343	0.154.250	95,8065	419, 1918	4.3754
88	1.616.0226	272.3240	0.168.515	78.2883	323.3853	4.1307
89	1.343.6986	247.1747	0.183.951	62.8942	245.0970	3.8970
90	1.096.5239	219.9868	0.200.622	49.5891	182.2028	3.6743
91	876.5371	191.6040	0.218.592	38,3000	132.6137	3.4625
92	684.9331	162.9593	0.237.920	28,9159	94.3137	3.2617
93	521.9738	135.0122	0.258.657	21,2910	65.3978	3.0716
94	386.9616	108.6774	0.280.848	15.2502	44.1068	2.8922
95	278.2842	84.7439	0.304.523	10.5963	28.8566	2.7233
96	193.5403	63.8106	0.329.702	7,1203	18,2603	2.5645
97	129.7297	46.2335	0.356.383	4.6113	11,1400	2.4158
98	83,4962	32,1081	0.384.546	2.8676	6.5287	2.2767
99	51.3881	21.2821	0.414.144	1.7052	3.6611	2.1470
100	30, 106, 027	13.400.283	0.445.103	0.965.202.56	1.955.897.02	2.0264
101	16.705.744	7.973.919	0.477.316	0.517.476.33	0.990.694.46	1.9145
102	8.731.825	4.458.810	0.510.639	0.261.330.05	0.473.218.13	1.8108
103	4.273.015	2.328.327	0.544.891	0.123.560.14	0.211.888.08	1.7149
104	1.944.688	1.127.635	0.579.854	0.054.331.73	0.088.327.94	1.6257
105	0.817.053	0.502.705	0.615.266	0.022.055.33	0.033.996.21	1.5414
106	0.314.348	0.205.544	0.653.873	0.008.198.49	0.011.940.88	1.4565
107	0.108.804	0.076.220	0.700.526	0.002.741.75	0.003.742.39	1.3650
108	0.032.584	0.024.820	0.761.723	0.000.793.32	0.001.000.64	1.2613
109	0.007.764	0.006.678	0.860.084	0.000.182.64	0.000.207.32	1.1351
110	0.001.086	0.001.086	1.000.000	0.000.024.68	0.000.024.68	1.0000

TABLE 3

Ga-51 MALE MORTALITY TABLE PROJECTED with Scale C to 1970 TABLE OF UNIFORM SENIORITY BASED ON "GRADUATED" TABLE

		1	
Difference of Ages (Years)	Addition to Older Age (Years)	Difference of Ages (Years)	Addition to Older Age (Years)
0	7.1674 6.6795 6.2157 5.7758 5.3596 4.9667 4.5966 4.2487 3.9225 3.6171 3.3319 3.0659 2.8184 2.5885 2.3752 2.1777 1.9951 1.8265 1.6710 1 5278	21	$\begin{array}{c} 1.2749\\ 1.1638\\ 1.0618\\ 0.9684\\ 0.8828\\ 0.8045\\ 0.7329\\ 0.6675\\ 0.6077\\ 0.5532\\ 0.5034\\ 0.4580\\ 0.4166\\ 0.3789\\ 0.3446\\ 0.3133\\ 0.2848\\ 0.2589\\ 0.2353\\ 0.2138\\ \end{array}$
20	1.3960		

DISCUSSION OF PRECEDING PAPER

WILLIAM H. CROSSON:

It is quite useful to have presented before the Society of Actuaries the tables derived by projecting the Ga-1951 table to various years. Mr. Munro projected the male table to 1960 (TSA, XII, 353), and Mr. Saksena projects the male table to 1970.

Mr. Saksena has gone beyond Mr. Munro by graduating the resulting mortality rates. A Makeham graduation of the Ga-1951 table was considered and was rejected, and a modified Whittaker-Henderson Type B graduation was used instead. Now, after projecting nineteen years, we find that we can use a Gompertz graduation. This is certainly an unexpected, but fortunate, development. I hope that Mr. Saksena can accommodate us by describing how he arrived at the particular graduation in the note and by presenting a discussion of the closeness of fit of the graduated to the ungraduated projected mortality rates.

Since the table has been regraduated, the name of the table should suggest this fact, to distinguish the table from the corresponding ungraduated table. I would suggest "The Ga-1951 Male Mortality Table Projected with Scale C to 1970 (Regraduated)."

(AUTHOR'S REVIEW OF DISCUSSION)

G. B. SAKSENA:

I must thank Mr. William H. Crosson for his remarks regarding my actuarial note.

The values of q_x and u_x were plotted on several types of graph papers in order to determine whether or not a mathematical curve could be fitted to the projected table, and after several attempts it was found that a Gompertz curve could be satisfactorily fitted between the ages of 35 and 105 (the most essential range of the table). Mr. Crosson is surprised that a Gompertz curve could be fitted to the projected table, whereas the Ga-51 table could not be graduated by the Makeham or the Gompertz Law. On this point the author has the following comments.

A few years ago the author requested and obtained from Mr. Peterson the crude data from which he constructed the Ga-51 table with a view to fitting a Gompertz or a Makeham curve to the Ga-51 table. Because so many adjustments had been made to the crude data before arriving at the final Ga-51 table, the author found it extremely difficult to graduate it applying the various criteria of good graduation described in Mr. Miller's

186 Ga-51 MALE MORTALITY TABLE PROJECTED TO 1970

monograph on graduation and still preserve some resemblance to the published table. He had to abandon the project. In the author's opinion the "kink" in the rates of mortality at the higher ages is not an essential feature of the crude data. It is simply due to the paucity of the exposures and deaths at ages above 95 (see TSA, IV, 290-91). We have always been taught that rates of mortality progress smoothly from age to age. and this is exactly what the author has tried to provide by fitting the Gompertz curve from age 35 to age 105. As a matter of fact, if the rates of mortality for the males and females were compared in the Ga-51table, the male mortality rates are lower than the female rates from ages 103 to 110, primarily due to the fact that both mortality tables have been forced to terminate at age 110. This feature could not be attributed to the crude data available to Mr. Peterson when the total number of deaths for males over age 95 were 16 and for females 0. As a test, the author used the rates of mortality at ages above 90 as given by Mr. Peterson, instead of the graduated rates, to study the effect on \ddot{a}_x , and the maximum difference at age 5 is 0.0015. The author agrees that there should be some kind of evidence to show the quality of the graduation, and would have done some form of comparison to prove this point. Unfortunately, it is not feasible to make any mathematical comparisons due to the fact that this is a projected table so that it is not possible to compare the actual with the expected deaths (which would be normally possible for a table compiled from actual exposures and deaths). The comparison that could be made would be a graphical one. Table 1 supplied with the actuarial note provides the ungraduated and the graduated rates of mortality. The author plotted the values of q's on various types of graph paper, and the changes in the curvature and the slopes of the tangents of the ungraduated rates are exceedingly irregular. The graduated rates of mortality, of course, proceed with mathematical smoothness and cross and recross the ungraduated rates as they should in order to preserve the over-all fidelity of the ungraduated rates. The greatest advantage of using the graduated rates of mortality is the facility with which one could compute joint life functions. If the ungraduated rates were used, this facility would be lost, and computation of joint life functions would be a monumental task. The author was not quite sure which of the two rates of mortality would be more acceptable to actuaries in general, and that is why in Table 1 he provided both rates of mortality. The author prefers to use the graduated rates due to the advantages enumerated above.