



**HAL**  
open science

# The De Vylder-Goovaerts conjecture holds true within the diffusion limit

Stefan Ankirchner, Christophette Blanchet-Scalliet, Nabil Kazi-Tani

► **To cite this version:**

Stefan Ankirchner, Christophette Blanchet-Scalliet, Nabil Kazi-Tani. The De Vylder-Goovaerts conjecture holds true within the diffusion limit. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 2019, 56 (2), pp.546-557. 10.1017/jpr.2019.33 . hal-01887402

**HAL Id: hal-01887402**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01887402>**

Submitted on 4 Oct 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# The De Vylder-Goovaerts conjecture holds true within the diffusion limit

Stefan Ankirchner <sup>\*</sup>    Christophette Blanchet-Scalliet <sup>†</sup>  
Nabil Kazi-Tani <sup>‡</sup>

October 4, 2018

The De Vylder and Goovaerts conjecture is an open problem in risk theory, stating that the finite time ruin probability in a standard risk model is greater or equal to the corresponding ruin probability evaluated in an associated model with equalized claim amounts. Equalized means here that the jump sizes of the associated model are equal to the average jump in the initial model between 0 and a terminal time  $T$ . In this paper, we consider the diffusion approximations of both the standard risk model and its associated risk model. We prove that the associated model, when conveniently renormalized, converges in distribution to a Gaussian process satisfying a simple SDE. We then compute the probability that this diffusion hits the level 0 before time  $T$  and compare it with the same probability for the diffusion approximation for the standard risk model. We conclude that the De Vylder and Goovaerts conjecture holds true for the diffusion limits.

*2010 MSC* : 60B10, 60F17, 62P05.

*Keywords* : Risk theory, ruin probability, equalized claims, diffusion approximations.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Stefan Ankirchner, Institute for Mathematics, University of Jena, Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2, 07743 Jena, Germany. Email: [s.ankirchner@uni-jena.de](mailto:s.ankirchner@uni-jena.de), Phone: +49 (0)3641 946275.

<sup>†</sup>Christophette Blanchet-Scalliet, Université de Lyon - CNRS, UMR 5208, Institut Camille Jordan - Ecole Centrale de Lyon, 36 avenue Guy de Collongue, 69134 Ecully Cedex, FRANCE. Email: [christophette.blanchet@ec-lyon.fr](mailto:christophette.blanchet@ec-lyon.fr), Phone: +33472186405

<sup>‡</sup>Nabil Kazi-Tani, ISFA, Université de Lyon 1, 50 Avenue Tony Garnier, 69007 Lyon, France. Email: [nabil.kazi-tani@univ-lyon1.fr](mailto:nabil.kazi-tani@univ-lyon1.fr), Phone: +33 (0)437287474.

S.A. gratefully acknowledges the hospitality and financial support of Ecole Centrale de Lyon during his visit in March 2018.

# 1 Introduction

Ruin theory is concerned with the study of level crossing probabilities of certain stochastic processes with jumps. This has for instance a clear interest in insurance, where the focus is on the probability that the wealth process of a given insurance company reaches a lower level, in particular the level 0: in this case, the jumps represent claim sizes. There are also applications in storage, for example of water in a dam: in that context, the jumps represent water arrival events, such as rainfalls. The probability that the water level reaches critical levels for the dam is important for energy management for instance. We refer the reader to the monograph [3] for further details on applications of Ruin theory to other problems, in particular its duality with Queuing theory.

In this paper, we use the terminology and interpretations from insurance. Let  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots$  be a sequence of positive random variables on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  and let  $T_n := \tau_n - \tau_{n-1}$  ( $\tau_0 := 0$ ). Now define

$$N_t := \# \{n \geq 1 : \tau_n \leq t\}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

the counting process associated to the sequence  $(\tau_n)_{n \geq 0}$ . This last sequence represents the arrival epochs of the claims, and  $N_t$  is the number of claims in the time interval  $[0, t]$ .

Let  $(\xi_i)_{i \geq 0}$  be an i.i.d. sequence of non-negative random variables, defined on the same probability space, with finite second moments, i.e. satisfying  $E(\xi_i^2) < \infty$ . Moreover suppose that the sequence  $(\xi_i)_{i \geq 0}$  is independent of the process  $N$ . The aggregate claim size up to time  $t$  is given by  $\sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \xi_i$ . We assume that the insurer receives premia from customers at a rate  $c \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . The claim surplus process is defined by  $S_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \xi_i - ct$  and the risk reserve process by

$$R_t = x - S_t = x + ct - \sum_{i=1}^{N_t} \xi_i, \quad t \in [0, \infty), \quad (1.1)$$

where  $x \in [0, \infty)$  is the initial reserve. Within the ruin model the insurer's vulnerability to financial distress is measured in terms of the ruin probability up to a given time horizon  $T \in (0, \infty)$ :

$$\rho(x, T) := P\left(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} R_t < 0\right). \quad (1.2)$$

De Vylder and Goovaerts [14] suggested the following modification of the risk reserve process:

$$\tilde{R}_t = x + ct - \frac{N_t}{N_T} \sum_{i=1}^{N_T} \xi_i = x - \tilde{S}_t,$$

with the convention that if  $N_T = 0$ , then  $\frac{N_t}{N_T} \sum_{i=1}^{N_T} \xi_i = 0$ , too. The ruin probability is given in that case by

$$\tilde{\rho}(x, T) := P\left(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{R}_t < 0\right).$$

The processes  $R$  and  $\tilde{R}$  have the same jump times and the same values at times 0 and  $T$ , but the jump sizes of  $\tilde{R}$  are *equalized*, in the sense that each jump of  $\tilde{R}$  is equal to the average jump of  $R$  between times 0 and  $T$ .

The De Vylder and Goovaerts conjecture can then be stated as follows:

**Open problem 1.1.**  $\forall x \geq 0, \forall T > 0$ ,

$$\tilde{\rho}(x, T) \leq \rho(x, T). \quad (1.3)$$

Define

$$\rho_n(x, T) := P\left(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} R_t < 0 \mid N_T = n\right), \quad n \geq 0.$$

As explained in [14], the inequality (1.3) is equivalent to the fact that  $\tilde{\rho}_n(x, T) \leq \rho_n(x, T)$ , for every  $n \geq 0$ , where  $\tilde{\rho}_n$  is defined as  $\rho_n$ , with  $\tilde{R}$  instead of  $R$ . Obviously,  $\tilde{\rho}_0(x, T) = \rho_0(x, T)$ . It is proved in [14] that  $\tilde{\rho}_1(x, T) = \rho_1(x, T)$ ,  $\tilde{\rho}_2(x, T) \leq \rho_2(x, T)$ , and that the probabilities coincide in case of an initial reserve equal to zero:  $\tilde{\rho}(0, T) = \rho(0, T)$ , but the general case has yet to be established. The results in [14] are derived analytically, using polynomial representations for the ruin probabilities.

A progress towards a proof of (1.3) was made in [12], where it is proved, using stop-loss order techniques, that for each  $u \geq 0$ ,

$$\int_u^{+\infty} \tilde{\rho}(x, T) dx \leq \int_u^{+\infty} \rho(x, T) dx.$$

We are not aware of any further articles providing results on Problem (1.1).

Our idea is to approximate both processes  $(S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  and  $(\tilde{S}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  with continuous diffusions. Standard references for these type of approximations, using functional limit theorems, include in particular [9], [8], [2] and [7]. The idea is to rescale both time and space, time in order to let the number of claims increase and space in order to make the claim sizes smaller so that the risk reserve process converges in distribution to a continuous process.

It is well known that the surplus process  $(S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  can be approximated with a Brownian motion with drift (see e.g. Chapter V in [3]). We show that also  $(\tilde{S}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  has a diffusion approximation. Conditional to the terminal value at time  $T$  both diffusion approximations are Brownian bridges. The diffusion rate of the Brownian bridge approximating  $(S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is greater than or equal to the diffusion rate of the Brownian bridge approximating  $(\tilde{S}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ .

Since the probability for a Brownian bridge to hit zero is increasing in the diffusion rate, the ruin probability for the first diffusion approximation is larger than for the second. The De Vylder-Goovaerts conjecture is therefore true for the diffusion limits.

We consider two cases for computing the diffusion limits. In the first case we assume that  $c = \lambda E(\xi_1)$ . In this case the accumulated premia coincide with the expected aggregate claims. In Section 2, we derive the diffusion limits by scaling time with a factor  $m$  while scaling the aggregate claim size with  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$ , and we also characterize the distribution of the limit as the solution of a stochastic differential equation. In the second case, which is dealt with in Section 3, we assume that  $c$  exceeds  $\lambda E(\xi_1)$ . The difference  $\eta := c - \lambda E(\xi_1)$  is usually referred to as the safety loading. We compute the diffusion limits by scaling time with  $1/\eta^2$  and letting  $\eta \downarrow 0$ , which is referred to as the *heavy traffic approximation* in risk theory ([3]).

## 2 Zero safety loading

To deal with diffusion approximations, we introduce  $D[0, T]$ , the space of real càdlàg functions on  $[0, T]$ , i.e. the real functions that are right-continuous and have left-hand limits. We next recall the definition of weak convergence on this space.

We say that a sequence of càdlàg processes  $(X_n)$  converges in distribution to the càdlàg process  $X$  if for every bounded function  $f : D[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is continuous with respect to the Skorohod topology (see e.g. [5]), one has

$$E(f(X_n)) \rightarrow E(f(X)).$$

We make the following assumption on the inter arrival claim times:

**Assumption 2.1.** *There exist positive constants  $\nu$  and  $\kappa$  such that the process*

$$\left( \frac{1}{\kappa\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} (T_j - \nu) \right)_{t \in [0, T]}$$

*converges in distribution in  $D[0, T]$  to a standard Brownian motion as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

Using the Central Limit Theorem, we know that Assumption 2.1 is satisfied if the random variables  $(T_n)_{n \geq 1}$  are independent and identically distributed with mean  $\nu$  and variance  $\kappa^2$ . This is the so-called *renewal theory* framework. In the particular case where the common distribution of the variables  $(T_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is exponential,  $N$  is a *Poisson process*, and the model defined in (1.2) is the

so called *Cramér-Lundberg* model. By analogy with the Poisson case, we write  $\lambda := \frac{1}{\nu}$ .

Assumption 2.1 implies the following convergence (Theorem 14.6 in [5]):

$$\left( \frac{N_{tn} - \lambda tn}{\kappa \lambda^{3/2} \sqrt{n}} \right)_{t \in [0, T]} \Rightarrow (B_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \quad (2.1)$$

where here, and for the remainder of the paper,  $\Rightarrow$  denotes convergence in distribution on  $D := D([0, T])$  and  $B$  is a Brownian motion.

Throughout this section we assume that  $c = \lambda E(\xi_1)$ . Note that in this case the process  $(S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a martingale.

We first characterize the laws of the diffusion limits of  $(S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  and  $(\tilde{S}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  with the help of a Brownian motion. Moreover, we introduce the following constants:

$$\gamma := \sqrt{\lambda V(\xi_1) + \lambda^3 \kappa^2 E[\xi_1]^2}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\sigma := \kappa \lambda^{3/2} E(\xi_1). \quad (2.3)$$

Notice that  $\gamma \geq \sigma$ , and that equality is satisfied if and only if the claims  $\xi_i$  are deterministic.

## 2.1 Limiting diffusions

**Proposition 2.2.** *The process  $\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} S_{tm} \right)_{t \in [0, T]}$  converges in law on  $D[0, T]$  to*

$$U_t := \gamma B_t, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

In the proof of Proposition 2.2 we make use of the continuous mapping theorem, which, for the ease of the reader, we recall here.

**Proposition 2.3** (see e.g. Theorem 2.7 in [5]). *Let  $M$  and  $M'$  be two metric spaces,  $h : M \rightarrow M'$  a measurable mapping and denote by  $D_h$  the set of discontinuities of  $h$ . Let  $(X_n)$  be an  $M$ -valued sequence of random variables converging to a random variable  $X$  in distribution as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $P(X \in D_h) = 0$ , then  $h(X_n)$  converges to  $h(X)$  in distribution as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 2.2.* Let us write

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} S_{tm} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{tm}} (\xi_i - E[\xi_1]) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} E[\xi_1] (N_{tm} - \lambda tm).$$

Define

$$Z_m(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=1}^{tm} (\xi_j - E[\xi_1]).$$

By Donsker's theorem,  $\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{V(\xi_1)}} Z_m(t) \right)_{t \in [0, T]}$  converges in distribution on  $D$ , as  $m$  goes to  $+\infty$ , to a Brownian motion. On the other hand, (2.1) entails that

$$\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} E[\xi_1] (N_{tm} - \lambda tm) \right)_{t \in [0, T]} \Rightarrow (\sigma B_t)_{t \in [0, T]}. \quad (2.4)$$

Let  $W = (W_t)$  be a Brownian motion that is independent of  $B$ . By independence of  $N$  and the sequence  $(\xi_m)_m \geq 1$ , the pair of scaled processes  $(Z_m(t), \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} E[\xi_1] (N_{tm} - \lambda tm))_{t \in [0, T]}$  converges in distribution to  $(\sqrt{V(\xi_1)} W_t, \sigma B_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ .

Since  $\frac{N_{tm}}{m}$  converges in distribution on  $D$  to the function  $\Phi : t \mapsto \lambda t$ , this implies, using Theorem 3.9 in [5] that

$$\left( \frac{N_{tm}}{m}, Z_m(t), \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} E[\xi_1] (N_{tm} - \lambda tm) \right)_{t \in [0, T]} \Rightarrow (\lambda t, \sqrt{V(\xi_1)} W_t, \sigma B_t)_{t \in [0, T]}.$$

Let  $D_0$  the space of non-decreasing functions in  $D$ . As the function  $\Phi$  is continuous and strictly increasing, we can use Theorem 3.1 in [15] to obtain that the mapping defined on  $D_0 \times D$  by  $(y, x) \mapsto x \circ y$  is continuous at  $(\Phi, x')$  for arbitrary  $x' \in D$ . Consequently,  $\Psi : D_0 \times D^2 \rightarrow D^2$ , given by  $\Psi(y, x, z) = (x \circ y, z)$ , is continuous at  $(\Phi, x', z')$  for arbitrary  $x', z' \in D$ . The continuous mapping theorem now implies

$$\left( Z_m \left( \frac{N_{tm}}{m} \right), \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} E[\xi_1] (N_{tm} - \lambda tm) \right)_{t \in [0, T]} \Rightarrow (\sqrt{\lambda V(\xi_1)} W_t, \sigma B_t)_{t \in [0, T]}. \quad (2.5)$$

By Theorem 4.1 in [15] the addition of two elements in  $D$  is continuous at every  $(x, y)$  where  $x$  and  $y$  are continuous functions. By applying the continuous mapping theorem to the sum of the components in (2.5) we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} S_{tm} \Rightarrow \left( \sigma B_t + \sqrt{\lambda V(\xi_1)} W_t \right)_{t \in [0, T]}.$$

This last limit process is centered, Gaussian and has the same covariance structure as the centered Gaussian process  $\gamma B$ , which ends the proof.  $\square$

We now approximate  $(\tilde{S}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ . Notice that  $E[\frac{N_t}{N_T} \sum_{i=1}^{N_T} \xi_i] = \lambda E(\xi_1)t$ . Hence  $E(\tilde{S}_t) = 0$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *The scaled process  $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\tilde{S}_{tm})_{t \in [0, T]}$  converges in law on  $D[0, T]$  to*

$$\tilde{U}_t := \sigma B_t + (\gamma - \sigma) \frac{t}{T} B_T, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (2.6)$$

as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* First we note that the process  $(\tilde{U}_t)$  is a centered Gaussian process with covariance function given by

$$K(s, t) = (\gamma^2 - \sigma^2) \frac{st}{T} + \sigma^2 (s \wedge t), \quad s, t \in [0, T]. \quad (2.7)$$

Consider the following decomposition

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \tilde{S}_{tm} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \frac{N_{tm}}{N_{Tm}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{Tm}} (\xi_i - E[\xi_1]) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} E[\xi_1] (N_{tm} - \lambda tm). \quad (2.8)$$

Define

$$Z_m(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=1}^{tm} (\xi_j - E[\xi_1]).$$

Now, notice that the decomposition (2.8) can be written as

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \tilde{S}_{tm} = \frac{N_{tm}}{N_{Tm}} Z_m\left(\frac{N_{Tm}}{m}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} E[\xi_1] (N_{tm} - \lambda tm). \quad (2.9)$$

The quantity  $\frac{N_{tm}}{N_{Tm}}$  (resp.  $\frac{N_{Tm}}{m}$ ) converges in distribution on  $D$  to  $t \mapsto \frac{t}{T}$  (resp.  $t \mapsto \lambda T$ ).

Theorem 3.9 of Billingsley [5] implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{N_{Tm}}{m}, \frac{N_{tm}}{N_{Tm}}, Z_m(t), \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} E[\xi_1] (N_{tm} - \lambda tm) \right)_{t \in [0, T]} \\ & \Rightarrow (\lambda T, \frac{t}{T}, \sqrt{V(\xi_1)} W_t, \sigma B_t)_{t \in [0, T]} \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

By Theorem 3.1, 4.2 and 4.1 in [15] the mapping  $h : D \times D_0 \times D^2 \rightarrow D$ ,  $(x', y', z', v') \mapsto x'(z' \circ y') + v'$ , is continuous at every quadruple of continuous functions  $(x, y, z, v)$  with  $y$  being strictly increasing. The continuous mapping theorem, applied to  $h$  and the convergent sequence (2.10), yields

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \tilde{S}_{tm} \Rightarrow \frac{t}{T} \sqrt{\lambda V(\xi_1)} W_T + \sigma B_t =: V_t.$$

$V$  and  $\tilde{U}$  are centered Gaussian processes with the same covariance function given in (2.7), thus they have the same distribution, and the proof is complete.  $\square$



We briefly comment on the method we use for proving Proposition 2.2 and Theorem 2.4. Recall that a more commonly used method for proving convergence in distribution on  $D$  is, first, to prove weak convergence of finite dimensional distributions and, second, to show tightness of the considered sequence of probability measures on  $D$  (see e.g. Section 13 in [5]). A convenient method for verifying tightness is to show that the second moment, or another appropriately chosen moment, of the product of two neighboring process increments can be nicely controlled.

This commonly used approach can also be applied to the two scaled process families of Proposition 2.2 and Theorem 2.4, respectively. A sufficient moment criterion for tightness of the distributions of  $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}S_m)$ ,  $m \geq 1$ , is that there exists a constant  $C \in [0, \infty)$  such that for all  $r, s, t \in [0, T]$  with  $r \leq s \leq t$  we have

$$E[(S_s - S_r)^2(S_t - S_s)^2] \leq C(t - r)^2$$

(see e.g. Section 13 in [5]). The same moment criterion applies to the scaled versions of  $\tilde{S}$ . Notice that the increments of  $(S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  and  $(\tilde{S}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  are not independent. Even in the Poisson case where  $(S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  has independent increments, the increments of  $\tilde{S}$  are not independent. The dependence of increments implies that the moment criterion for verifying tightness requires a stronger integrability condition on the claim sizes  $\xi_i$  than  $L^2$  integrability.

The approach that we follow for proving Proposition 2.2 and Theorem 2.4 requires only  $L^2$  integrability of the claim sizes. The reason is that it falls back on limit theorems for simpler processes and then applies the continuous mapping theorem for the Skorohod topology. This approach relies on results of [15], and it has been used in particular in [7] in the context of diffusion approximations of risk processes.

**Remark 2.5.** Let  $z \in D([0, T])$  be a given path with finite jump activity, i.e. such that  $z$  admits a finite number of jumps in any finite interval (notice that  $S$  and  $\tilde{S}$  have finite jump activity, almost surely). Define then  $n_t(z)$  as the number of jumps of  $z$  during the time interval  $[0, t]$ . The path  $z$  can always be written as

$$z(t) = z_c(t) + \sum_{0 < t \leq T} (z(t) - z(t^-)),$$

where  $z_c$  is a continuous trajectory and  $z(t^-)$  is the left-hand side limit of  $z$  at  $t$ . The transformation suggested by De Vylder and Goovaerts is the following application  $R : D \rightarrow D$ :

$$R(z)(t) := z_c(t) + n_t(z) \left( \frac{1}{n_T(z)} \sum_{0 < t \leq T} (z(t) - z(t^-)) \right),$$

that replaces each jump of  $z$  by the average jump of  $z$  between 0 and  $T$ .

A simple consequence of our results is that the application  $R$  is not continuous for the Skorohod topology. If it was, then Proposition 2.2 would imply that  $R(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}S_m) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\tilde{S}_m$  converges in distribution on  $D$  for the Skorohod topology to  $R(\gamma B) = \gamma B$ , which is not the case, by Theorem 2.4.

## 2.2 Comparison of the ruin probabilities

Let  $X_t := x - U_t$  and  $\tilde{X}_t := x - \tilde{U}_t$ . The ruin probability  $\rho$  can be approximated by  $\chi := P(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} X_t < 0)$  and the ruin probability  $\tilde{\rho}$  by  $\tilde{\chi} := P(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{X}_t < 0)$ . In this section we show that  $\tilde{\chi} \leq \chi$ .

First note that  $X_T = \tilde{X}_T$ . Conditional to  $X_T = y$ , the process  $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a Brownian bridge from  $x$  to  $y$  with diffusion rate  $\gamma$ . We can therefore derive an explicit formula for the conditional probability that  $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  goes below zero at some time before  $T$ .

To make this precise, let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the collection of Borel sets on the space of continuous functions  $\mathcal{C}([0, T])$  endowed with the supremum norm. Moreover, let  $\mathcal{B} \times \mathbb{R} \ni (A, y) \mapsto P(A | X_T = y)$  be a regular conditional distribution of  $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  with respect to  $X_T$ .

**Lemma 2.6.** *For all  $y \geq 0$  we have*

$$P\left(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} X_t < 0 | X_T = y\right) = \exp\left(-2\frac{xy}{T\gamma^2}\right).$$

*Proof.* One can show ([11], Chap I) that the law of  $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  under  $P(\cdot | X_T = y)$  coincides with the law a Brownian bridge from  $x$  to  $y$  with diffusion rate  $\gamma$ . Therefore,

$$P\left(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} X_t < 0 | X_T = y\right) = P\left(\inf_{t \in [0, \gamma^2 T]} B_t < -x | B_{\gamma^2 T} = y - x\right).$$

Well-known results on hitting probabilities for Brownian bridges (see e.g. Proposition 3 in [13]) imply the result.  $\square$

We next derive an explicit formula for the conditional probability that  $(\tilde{X}_t)$  goes below zero at some time before  $T$ . To this end recall that the process

$$Y_t := \left(B_t - \frac{t}{T}B_T\right), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (2.11)$$

is a Brownian bridge on  $[0, T]$  from zero to zero. Observe that

$$\tilde{U}_t = \sigma Y_t + \gamma \frac{t}{T} B_T = \sigma Y_t + \frac{t}{T}(x - X_T).$$

and that  $B_T$  is independent of  $Y_t$ . Conditional to  $X_T = y$ , the process  $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is therefore a Brownian bridge from zero to  $y$  with diffusion rate  $\sigma$ . From well-known results on hitting probabilities of Brownian bridges we arrive at the following result.

**Lemma 2.7.** For all  $y \geq 0$  we have

$$P\left(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{X}_t < 0 \mid X_T = y\right) = \exp\left(-2\frac{xy}{T\sigma^2}\right).$$

Lemma 2.6 and 2.7 imply that the difference of ruin probabilities  $\chi$  and  $\tilde{\chi}$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \chi - \tilde{\chi} &= \int_0^\infty [P(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} X_t < 0 \mid X_T = y) - P(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{X}_t < 0 \mid X_T = y)] P(X_T \in dy) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \left[ \exp\left(-2\frac{xy}{T\gamma^2}\right) - \exp\left(-2\frac{xy}{T\sigma^2}\right) \right] \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\gamma^2 T}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2\gamma^2 T}\right) dy \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the difference is greater than zero if  $\gamma > \sigma$ . Thus we have obtained the following

**Theorem 2.8.**

$$P\left(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{X}_t < 0\right) \leq P\left(\inf_{t \in [0, T]} X_t < 0\right),$$

where we have an equality if and only if the claim sizes  $(\xi_i)_{i \geq 0}$  are deterministic.

**Remark 2.9.** The assumption made on the counting process  $N$  in the formulation of De Vylder and Goovaerts ([14]) differs from our Assumption 2.1. In [14], it is assumed that  $N$  is a *homogeneous risk process*, meaning that conditionally on  $(N_T = n)$ , the vector of jump times  $(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n)$  has the same distribution as the increasing order statistics of  $n$  independent uniform random variables on  $[0, T]$ . In particular, this property is satisfied when  $N$  is a Poisson process. More details and properties of the homogenous process are given in [10]. If we assume that  $(N_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}^+}$  is a homogeneous process, then according to Theorem A2 in [14], it is a mixed Poisson process. This entails, using the same lines of reasoning as in the Chapter 4 of [6] (pages 65-67), that our limit results hold true, with  $\lambda$  replaced by a structure random variable  $\Lambda$ . Then by conditioning on this variable, we can still compare the ruin probabilities in the diffusion limits, as in the previous Theorem.

**Remark 2.10.** All the results presented so far remain true if one omits the assumption that each random variable  $\xi_i$  is non-negative, but simply assumes that  $E(\xi_i) \geq 0$ .

## 2.3 The dynamics of the approximating diffusion

We close this section by characterizing  $(\tilde{U}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ , the diffusion limit of the claim surplus process within the model with equalized claims, as a solution of

a stochastic differential equation (SDE). First observe that the diffusion limit  $(\tilde{U}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a Gaussian process. Recall that the law of a one-dimensional Gaussian process  $(Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is uniquely determined by its expectation function  $m(t) := E(Z_t)$  and covariance function  $K(t, s) := \text{Cov}(Z_t, Z_s)$ . Hence, we can characterize the limiting law of  $\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \tilde{S}_{tm}\right)_{t \in [0, T]}$  as that of a Gaussian process with  $m(t) = 0$  and  $K(s, t) = (\gamma^2 - \sigma^2) \frac{st}{T} + \sigma^2(s \wedge t)$  for  $s, t \in [0, T]$ , where the constants  $\gamma$  and  $\sigma$  are defined in (2.2) and (2.3). This allows further to characterize the limiting law in terms of an SDE.

**Proposition 2.11.** *There exists a Brownian motion  $(\tilde{W}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  such that the process  $(\tilde{U}_t)$  satisfies the SDE*

$$d\tilde{U}_t = \tilde{U}_t \frac{\gamma^2 - \sigma^2}{\sigma^2(T-t) + \gamma^2 t} dt + \sigma d\tilde{W}_t \quad (2.12)$$

on  $[0, T]$ .

*Proof.* We first solve explicitly the SDE (2.12) for a given Brownian motion  $(W_t)$ . To this end let  $f(t) = \frac{\gamma^2 - \sigma^2}{\sigma^2(T-t) + \gamma^2 t}$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Note that the SDE  $dZ_t = Z_t f(t) dt + \sigma dW_t$  with initial condition  $Z_0 = 0$  has a unique solution given by

$$Z_t = \int_0^t \exp\left(\int_s^t f(u) du\right) \sigma dW_s, \quad t \in [0, T].$$

The solution process  $(Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a Gaussian process. The covariance structure of  $(Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  coincides with the one of  $(\tilde{U}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ . Indeed, for any  $s, t \in [0, T]$ , the Itô isometry implies

$$\text{Cov}(Z_s, Z_t) = \int_0^{s \wedge t} \exp\left(\int_r^s f(u) du\right) \exp\left(\int_r^t f(u) du\right) \sigma^2 dr.$$

Notice that  $\exp\left(\int_r^k f(u) du\right) = \frac{\sigma^2 T + (\gamma^2 - \sigma^2)k}{\sigma^2 T + (\gamma^2 - \sigma^2)r}$  for any  $k \in [r, T]$ . Now a straightforward computation shows that

$$\text{Cov}(Z_s, Z_t) = \sigma^2(s \wedge t) + (\gamma^2 - \sigma^2) \frac{st}{T}.$$

As a consequence, the process  $(Z_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  has the same law as the process  $(\tilde{U}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ . Now define  $\tilde{W}_t := \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( \tilde{U}_t - \int_0^t \tilde{U}_s f(s) ds \right)$ . Then the pair  $(\tilde{U}_t, \tilde{W}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  has the same process distribution as  $(Z_t, W_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ . In particular,  $(\tilde{W}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a Brownian motion and  $(\tilde{U}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  satisfies (2.12).  $\square$

**Remark 2.12.** The dynamics (2.12) can be derived from (2.6) via a projection argument. To explain this, let  $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the smallest filtration such that, first, the usual conditions of right-continuity and completeness are satisfied and, second,  $(\tilde{U}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is adapted. Denote by  $\tilde{U}_t = \tilde{M}_t + \tilde{A}_t$  the Doob-Meyer decomposition of  $(\tilde{U}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  with respect to  $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ . Assume that there exists an integrable  $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)$ -predictable process  $\alpha$  such that  $\tilde{A}_t = \int_0^t \alpha_s ds$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ . Since  $\langle \tilde{M}, \tilde{M} \rangle_t = \langle \tilde{U}, \tilde{U} \rangle_t = \sigma^2 t$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , we conclude from Levy's theorem that  $\tilde{M}/\sigma$  is a Brownian motion w.r.t.  $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)$ .

For the Brownian bridge  $Y$ , defined in (2.11), there exists a Brownian motion  $W^Y$  such that

$$dY_t = dW_t^Y - \frac{Y_t}{T-t} dt.$$

Since  $B_T$  is independent of  $Y_t$ , the process  $W^Y$  is also a Brownian motion with respect to the initially enlarged filtration  $(\mathcal{G}_t)$ , where  $\mathcal{G}_t := \cap_{s>t} (\mathcal{F}_s^Y \vee \sigma(B_T))$ . In particular,  $(\tilde{X}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is a  $(\mathcal{G}_t)$ -Itô process with dynamics

$$d\tilde{U}_t = \gamma \frac{1}{T} B_T dt - \frac{\sigma Y_t}{T-t} dt + \sigma dW_t^Y = \frac{\gamma B_T - \tilde{U}_t}{T-t} dt + \sigma dW_t^Y.$$

Notice that  $W_t^Y = \tilde{W}_t - \int_0^t \mu_s ds$ , where

$$\mu_t = -\frac{1}{\sigma} \left( \alpha_t - \frac{\gamma B_T - \tilde{U}_t}{T-t} \right).$$

The process  $\mu$  is the so-called information drift of  $\tilde{W}$  w.r.t. to the enlarged filtration  $(\mathcal{G}_t)$ . It is known that the  $L^2$  projection of  $\mu$  onto the space of square integrable and  $(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)$ -progressively measurable processes vanishes (see e.g. Section 1 in [1]). This entails that  $\alpha_t = \tilde{U}_t \frac{\gamma^2 - \sigma^2}{\sigma^2(T-t) + \gamma^2 t}$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$ , and hence (2.12).

### 3 The conjecture in the heavy traffic approximation

We now assume that  $\eta = c - \lambda E(\xi_1) > 0$ . By scaling time with  $1/\eta^2$  and letting  $\eta \downarrow 0$ , the laws of the diffusion limits of  $(S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  and  $(\tilde{S}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  are given by the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.1.** *The process  $(\eta S_{\frac{t}{\eta^2}})_{t \in [0, T]}$  converges in law on  $D[0, T]$  to*

$$V_t := \gamma B_t - t, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

and the process  $\left(\eta\frac{\tilde{S}_t}{\eta^2}\right)_{t\in[0,T]}$  converges in law on  $D[0,T]$  to

$$\tilde{V}_t := \sigma B_t + (\gamma - \sigma)\frac{t}{T}B_T - t, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

as  $\eta \rightarrow 0$ .

*Proof.* The proof is a straightforward adaptation of [3, Theo. 5.1] using the results from Proposition 2.2 and Theorem 2.4.  $\square$

In the heavy traffic approximation, the ruin probability  $\rho$  can be approximated by  $P(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} V_t > x)$  and the ruin probability  $\tilde{\rho}$  by  $P(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \tilde{V}_t > x)$ . Following similar arguments as in Section 2.2, one has  $V_T = \tilde{V}_T$ , and the conditional non ruin probability is equal to

$$P\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} V_t \leq x | V_T = y\right) = P\left(B_t \leq \frac{x+t}{\gamma}, 0 \leq t \leq T | B_T = \frac{y+T}{\gamma}\right), \quad y < x.$$

In other words, the non ruin probability conditional to  $V_T = y$  is equal to the probability that a Brownian bridge starting from 0 and going to  $\frac{y}{\gamma} + T$  with length equal to  $T$  stays under the line  $t \rightarrow \frac{x+t}{\gamma}$ . Using the results of [13, 4], we obtain

$$P\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} V_t \leq x | V_T = y\right) = 1 - \exp\left(-2\frac{x(x-y)}{T\gamma^2}\right). \quad (3.1)$$

Using arguments similar to the ones of Section 2.2, it follows that

$$P\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \tilde{V}_t \leq x | V_T = y\right) = 1 - \exp\left(-2\frac{x(x-y)}{T\sigma^2}\right), \quad (3.2)$$

and hence we obtain that

$$P\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} V_t \leq x | V_T = y\right) - P\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \tilde{V}_t \leq x | V_T = y\right) \leq 0.$$

This implies that the De Vylder-Goovaert conjecture holds true in the heavy traffic approximation.

## References

- [1] S. Ankirchner, S. Dereich, and P. Imkeller. The Shannon information of filtrations and the additional logarithmic utility of insiders. The Annals of Probability, 34(2):743–778, 2006.
- [2] S. Asmussen. Approximations for the probability of ruin within finite time. Scandinavian Actuarial Journal, 1984(1):31–57, 1984.

- [3] S. Asmussen and H. Albrecher. Ruin probabilities. World Scientific Publishing Co Pte Ltd, 2010.
- [4] M. P. Atkinson and D. I. Singham. Multidimensional hitting time results for Brownian bridges with moving hyperplanar boundaries. Statistics and Probability Letters, 100:85 – 92, 2015.
- [5] P. Billingsley. Convergence of probability measures. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition, 1999. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [6] H. Furrer. Risk theory and heavy-tailed Lévy processes. PhD Thesis, ETH, Zurich, 1997.
- [7] H. Furrer, Z. Michna, and A. Weron. Stable Lévy motion approximation in collective risk theory. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 20(2):97 – 114, 1997.
- [8] J. Grandell. A class of approximations of ruin probabilities. Scandinavian Actuarial Journal, 1977(sup1):37–52, 1977.
- [9] L. D. Iglehart. Diffusion approximations in collective risk theory. Journal of Applied Probability, 6(2):285–292, 1969.
- [10] C. Lefèvre and P. Picard. A new look at the homogeneous risk model. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 49(3):512–519, 2011.
- [11] D. Revuz and M. Yor. Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004.
- [12] C. Y. Robert. On the De Vylder and Goovaerts conjecture about ruin for equalized claims. J. Appl. Probab., 51(3):874–879, 09 2014.
- [13] T. H. Scheike. A boundary-crossing result for Brownian motion. Journal of Applied Probability, 29(2):448–453, 1992.
- [14] F. D. Vylder and M. Goovaerts. Homogeneous risk models with equalized claim amounts. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 26(2):223 – 238, 2000.
- [15] W. Whitt. Some useful functions for functional limit theorems. Mathematics of Operations Research, 5(1):67–85, 1980.