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## INTRODUCTION

IN ORDER to explain the title and purpose of this paper, let us first consider some examples. Suppose tables of values are calculated at 3 per cent and $3 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent, and an approximation at 4 per cent is desired. Many actuaries would use a formula that is tantamount to

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(4 \%) \fallingdotseq 2 f\left(3 \frac{1}{2} \%\right)-f(3 \%) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Others might use the formula

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(4 \%) \fallingdotseq \frac{\left[f\left(3 \frac{1}{2} \%\right)\right]^{2}}{f(3 \%)} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The question arises as to which one gives the better approximation. This paper will show that, for most of the values desired by actuaries, the latter is superior.

Similarly, the approximation given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(4 \%) \fallingdotseq(1+\Delta)^{3} f\left(2 \frac{1}{2} \%\right) \fallingdotseq 3 f\left(3 \frac{1}{2} \%\right)-3 f(3 \%)+f\left(2 \frac{1}{2} \%\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

is usually not so good as that given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(4 \%)=e^{\log f(4 \%)} \fallingdotseq e^{(1+\Delta)^{2} \log f\left(2+\frac{1}{2}\right)} \fallingdotseq \frac{\left[f\left(3 \frac{1}{2} \%\right)\right]^{8}}{[f(3 \%)]^{8}} \times f\left(2 \frac{1}{2} \%\right) . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the purposes of this paper, formulas with the characteristics of (1) and (3) are designated as "arithmetic formulas," and those comparable with (2) and (4) are called "geometric formulas," because of their analogies with the general terms of arithmetic and geometric series.

It will be noted that geometric formulas can be obtained from arithmetic formulas by changing the coefficients to exponents and addition to multiplication.

It will be further noted that the use of geometric formulas for a par-
ticular function is identical to the use of arithmetic formulas for the logarithm of that function whenever the function is positive for the range considered.

This device should serve as an aid in extending the investigation of geometric formulas into the areas of osculatory interpolation and graduation. The scope of this paper is limited to the application of Newton's formula.

## THEORY

Let us define the terms $R_{n+1}(x), S_{n+1}(x), U_{x}$, and $V_{x}$ as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{n+1}(x)= & {\left[(x-a)(x-b) \ldots(x-l) \frac{d^{n+1}}{d \xi^{n+1}} u_{\xi}\right]\left[\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\right] } \\
S_{n+1}(x)= & {\left[(x-a)(x-b) \ldots(x-l) \frac{d^{n+1}}{d \theta^{n+1}} \log u_{\theta}\right]\left[\frac{1}{(n+1)!}\right] } \\
U_{x}= & u_{a}+(x-a) \frac{\Delta}{b} u_{a}+(x-a)(x-b){\underset{\Delta}{\Delta c}}^{2} u_{a}+\ldots \\
& +(x-a)(x-b) \ldots(x-k) \mathbb{A}^{n} u_{a}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& V_{x}=\log u_{a}+(x-a) \frac{\mathbb{b}}{\mathbb{d}} \log u_{a}+(x-a)(x-b) \frac{\mathbb{4}_{b c}^{2}}{} \log u_{a} \\
& +(x-a)(x-b) \ldots(x-k) \underset{b c \ldots l}{\mathbb{\Lambda n}_{n}^{n}} \log u_{a},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\xi$ and $\theta$ are values in the interval including all the arguments involved, as defined on page 57 of Harry Freeman's Finite Differences for Actuarial Students (Cambridge University Press, 1962).

It is proved on pages 56 and 57 of the book by Freeman that

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{n+1}(x)=u_{x}-U_{x} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly,

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{n+1}(x)=\log u_{x}-V_{x} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We will state the following nine theorems for instances when $u_{x}$ is positive, the proofs of which are given in the Appendix:

Theorem I: If $S_{n+1}(x)$ is positive and if

$$
u_{x}\left[1-e^{-S_{n+1}(x)}\right]<R_{n+1}(x),
$$

then

$$
\left|u_{x}-e^{v_{x}}\right|<\left|u_{x}-U_{x}\right| .
$$

Theorem II: If $S_{n+1}(x)$ is positive and if
then

$$
R_{n+1}(x)<u_{x}\left[e^{-S_{n+1}(x)}-1\right]
$$

$$
\left|u_{x}-e^{v_{x}}\right|<\left|u_{x}-U_{x}\right|
$$

Theorem III: If $S_{n+1}(x)$ is negative and if
then

$$
R_{n+1}(x)<u_{x}\left[1-e^{-S_{n+1}(x)}\right]
$$

$$
\left|u_{x}-e^{V_{x}}\right|<\left|u_{x}-U_{x}\right|
$$

Theorem IV: If $S_{x+1}(x)$ is negative and if
then

$$
u_{x}\left[e^{-S_{n+1}(x)}-1\right]<R_{n+1}(x)
$$

$$
\left|u_{x}-e^{V_{x}}\right|<\left|u_{x}-U_{x}\right|
$$

Theorem V: If $0<S_{n+1}(x)$ and
then

$$
u_{x}\left[1-e^{-S_{n+1}(x)}\right]<\left|R_{n+1}(x)\right|
$$

$$
\left|u_{x}-e^{V_{x}}\right|<\left|u_{x}-U_{x}\right|
$$

Theorem VI: If $S_{n+1}(x)<0$ and
then

$$
u_{x}\left[e^{-S_{n+1}(x)}-1\right]<\left|R_{+1}(x)\right|
$$

$$
\left|u_{x}-e^{V_{x}}\right|<\left|u_{x}-U_{x}\right|
$$

Theorem VII: If
then

$$
\left|u_{x}\left[1-e^{-s_{n+1}(x)}\right]\right|<\left|R_{n+1}(x)\right|
$$

$$
\left|u_{x}-e^{v_{x}}\right|<\left|u_{x}-U_{x}\right|
$$

Theorem VIII: If $0<S_{n+1}(x)$ and

$$
u_{x}\left[S_{n+1}(x)\right]<\left|R_{n+1}(x)\right|
$$

then

$$
\left|u_{x}-e^{v_{x}}\right|<\left|u_{x}-U_{x}\right|
$$

Theorem IX: If

$$
\left|S_{n+1}(x)\right|<1
$$

and

$$
u_{x}\left[\left|S_{n+1}(x)\right|+(0.72) S_{n+1}^{2}(x)\right]<\left|R_{n+1}(x)\right|
$$

then

$$
\left|u_{x}-e^{V_{x}}\right|<\left|u_{x}-U_{x}\right|
$$

The theorems might be paraphrased by saying that, for geometric interpolation or extrapolation to give a greater degree of accuracy than arithmetic interpolation or extrapolation, it is sufficient that $u_{x}$ be positive throughout the range of arguments and that the premises in any one of the nine theorems be true.

Examination of the first four theorems reveals that additional conclusions which may be derived are that $R_{n+1}(x)$ is positive in Theorems I and IV and is negative in Theorems II and III. If this additional conclusion in each of these theorems is made a premise and combined with the converse of the second premise in each theorem, we deduce conclusions which are converse to those in the first four theorems. Additionally, we can also see that the first premises of the theorems are now additional conclusions.

This analysis reveals not only that the second premise in each of the first four theorems is sufficient but that it is necessary, if we ignore the trivial cases when either $R_{n+1}(x)$ or $S_{n+1}(x)$ is zero. This means, of course, that, if the second premise in any one of the first six theorems is not true, then arithmetic interpolation or extrapolation would be more accurate than geometric interpolation or extrapolation.

The premise in Theorem VII is also both necessary and sufficient; however, the second premise in each of Theorems VIII and IX is sufficient but not necessary, the purpose of these latter theorems being to set forth conditions not involving the exponential functions.

To determine that a geometrical formula gives a higher degree of accuracy than an arithmetical formula, it is sufficient for practical purposes when second and higher differences are ignored to show that

$$
\left(u_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(u_{x}\right)\left(u_{x}^{\prime \prime}\right) .
$$

When this expression is true, when the range of arguments is sufficiently small that $\xi$ can be deemed to equal $\theta$, and when the difference intervals are sufficiently small that

$$
1-e^{-S_{n+1}(x)} \fallingdotseq S_{n+1}(x),
$$

then the premises of either Theorem I or Theorem III are satisfied.
It can be shown without too much difficulty that the premises in at least one of the theorems are satisfied for the functions

$$
(1+i)^{n}, \quad \nabla^{n}, \quad a_{n 1}, \quad s_{n}, \quad a_{x}, \quad A_{x}, \quad \text { and } \quad P_{x}
$$

whenever first differences only are used, differences are taken with respect to the interest rate, and the function is assumed to be a polynomial of
degree higher than 2. Except for the functions $(1+i)^{n}$ and $\imath^{n}$, the algebra becomes involved when second and higher differences are used.

It is not surprising that geometric methods give exact values when differences are taken with respect to $n$ for the functions $(1+i)^{n}$ and $v^{n}$. It is more interesting that arithmetic methods give better values for $s_{n}$ and $a_{n}$ when differences are taken with respect to $n$ except for $s_{n}{ }^{n}$ when $n$ is such that $(1+i)^{n}$ is greater than or approximately equal to 2 . The

TABLE 1
Illustrations of Actual and Extrapolated Values
(Differences with Respect to the Interest Rate)

| $f(4 \%)$ | Actual | Exthapolated prom $3 \%$ and $3 \frac{1}{3} \%$ Values |  | Extrapolated prom $2 \frac{1}{2} \%, 3 \%$, AND $3 \frac{1}{2} \%$ Values |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Geometric | Arithmetic | Geometric | Arithmetic |
| $(1+i)^{3}$. | 1.12486 | 1.12494 | 1.12471 | 1.12486 | 1.12486 |
| $(1+i)^{33}$ | 3.64838 | 3.65119 | 3.57155 | 3.64835 | 3.63767 |
| $(1+i)^{100}$ | 50.50495 | 50.62295 | 43.16418 | 50.50380 | 47.73204 |
| $v^{3}$. | . 88900 | . 88893 | . 88874 | . 88900 | . 88900 |
| $2^{33}$ | . 27409 | . 27388 | . 26566 | . 27410 | . 27565 |
| $y^{100}$ | . 01980 | . 01975 | . 01209 | . 01980 | . 02473 |
| $S_{3} 7$. | 3.12160 | 3.12163 | 3.12155 | 3.12160 | 3.12160 |
| $5_{331}$. | 66.20953 | 66.10756 | 65.60458 | 66.21335 | 66.14414 |
| $s_{\text {ien }}$. | 1237.62370 | 1225.28223 | 1117.93558 | 1239.64521 | 1198.52043 |
| $a_{3}$. | 2.77509 | 2.77492 | 2.77466 | 2.77509 | 2.77510 |
| $a_{\text {a }}^{\text {a }}$. | 18.14765 | 18.10575 | 18.01462 | 18.14883 | 18.16513 |
| $a \cdot$ | 24.50500 | 24.20408 | 23.71195 | 24.54558 | 24.78367 |
| $\ddot{4}_{10}$ | 22.8855 | 22.7319 | 22.4851 | 22.8986 | 22.9820 |
| $d_{56}$ | 13.1156 | 13.0939 | 13.0637 | 13.1166 | 13.1215 |
| $\Delta_{50}$ | 3.3747 | 3.3741 | 3.3737 | . 33747 | 3.3747 |
| $A_{10}$. | . 11979 | . 11860 | . 10964 | . 11975 | . 12344 |
| $A_{55}$. | . 49555 | . 49429 | . 49078 | . 49559 | . 49624 |
| $A_{\text {s00 }}$. | . 87020 | . 87000 | . 86975 | . 87020 | . 87021 |
| $P_{10}$. | . 00523 | . 00521 | . 00509 | . 00523 | . 00526 |
| $P_{55}$. | . 03778 | . 03775 | . 03770 | . 03778 | . 03779 |
| $P_{80}$. | . 25786 | . 25786 | . 25785 | . 25789 | . 25789 |

reason for the latter is that when $(1+i)^{n}$ exceeds 2 , the function $s_{n}$ tends to behave more like an exponential function than a linear one.

## ILLUSTRATIONS

It is likely that most people are more interested in practice than in theory. Practical demonstrations are not only easier to follow but also give a visual indication of the magnitude of the superior degree of accuracy of geometric methods over arithmetic methods in various instances.

The middle two columns of Table 1 show values of various functions at

4 per cent interest as extrapolated from 3 per cent and $3 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent tables. The last two columns of the table give values extrapolated from $2 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent, 3 per cent, and $3 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent values. (The functions using life contingencies were based on "United States White Males: 1959-61.")

Table 2 presents values of various functions at 4 per cent interest as extrapolated from values five and ten years less than the duration or age associated with the function.

TABLE 2
Illustrations of Actual and Extrapolated Values
(Differences with Respect to the Duration or Age)

| $f(4 \%)$ | Actual | Geometric | Arithmetic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(1+i)^{100}$. | 50.50495 | 50.50495 | 48.90344 |
| $s_{15}$. | 20.02359 | 26.61337 | 18.59589 |
| 530. | 56.08494 | 58.24357 | 53.51374 |
| $a_{30}$. | 17.29203 | 17.95758 | 17.65383 |
| $\ddot{a}_{55}$. | 13.1156 | 13.2927 | 13.1508 |
| $a_{\text {a }}$. | 3.3747 | 3.4244 | 3.1741 |
| $A_{55}$ | . 49555 | 50320 | . 49420 |
| $A^{20}$ | . 87020 | 88052 | 87792 |
| $P_{55}$ | 03778 | . 03784 | . 03610 |
|  | 25786 | . 25713 | 24034 |
| $N_{56} \div 10,000$ | 12.2927 | 12.7643 | 10.7863 |
| $N_{\text {b0 }} \div 100 \ldots$ | 4.5585 | 6.5447 | negative |

CONCLUSION
Obviously, best results arise from the choice of an interpolation formula producing a curve that most closely follows that of the actual curve of the function being interpolated or extrapolated.

Many actuaries may find this paper useful for practical applications. Others may find it a stimulus for further investigation. There are many opportunities for further investigation of the subject and related aspects, and it is hoped there will be substantial discussion and further papers by those with more time and mathematical ability than the author.

## APPENDIX

Whenever $S_{n+1}(x)$ is positive, we have, using formula (6),

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{V_{x}}=e^{\log u_{x}-S_{n+1}(x)}=u_{x} e^{-S_{n+1}{ }^{(x)}}<u_{x} . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly, whenever $S_{n+1}(x)$ is negative,

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{x}<e^{v_{x}} . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Theorem I is easily proved by applying formulas (5) and (6) to

$$
u_{x}\left[1-e^{-s_{n+1}(x)}\right]<R_{n+1}(x),
$$

which gives

$$
u_{x}-u_{x} e^{V_{x}-\log u_{x}}<u_{x}-U_{x},
$$

resulting in

$$
u_{x}-e^{\nabla_{x}<u_{x}-U_{x}}
$$

This expression and (7) give

$$
U_{x}<e^{\nabla_{x}}<u_{x} .
$$

Hence,

$$
U_{x}-u_{x}<e^{v_{x}}-u_{x}<0
$$

and

$$
\left|u_{x}-e^{V_{x}}\right|<\left|u_{x}-U_{x}\right| .
$$

Theorem II is similarly proved by deriving that

$$
0<u_{x}-e^{V_{x}}<U_{x}-u_{x} .
$$

Theorem III is proved by using (8) to derive

$$
u_{x}<e^{\nabla_{x}}<U_{x} .
$$

Theorem IV is proved by deriving that $0<e^{V_{x}}-u_{x}<u_{x}-U_{x}$.
Theorem V is a corollary of Theorems I and II.
Theorem VI is a corollary of Theorems III and IV.
Similarly, Theorem VII is a corollary of Theorems V and VI.
Theorem VIII is derived from Theorem V by using the general relationship,

$$
1-e^{-\nu}<y,
$$

if $y$ is not zero.
Theorem IX is obviously true for the case when $S_{n+1}(x)$ is positive by reference to Theorem VIII. It is proved from Theorem VI for the case when $S_{n+1}(x)$ is negative by showing that

$$
u_{x}\left[e^{\left|s_{n+1}(x)\right|}-1\right]<u_{x}\left[\left|S_{n+1}(x)\right|+0.72 S_{n+1}^{2}(x)\right]
$$

when

$$
\left|S_{n+1}(x)\right|<1 .
$$

