

# On geometric-type approximations with applications to risk and related processes

Fraser Daly\* and Claude Lefèvre†

September 15, 2023

## Abstract

We explore two aspects of geometric approximation via a coupling approach to Stein’s method. Firstly, we refine precision and increase scope for applications by convoluting the approximating geometric distribution with a simple translation selected based on the problem at hand. Secondly, we apply our geometric and geometric-type approximations to risk processes and related areas, including the approximation of Poisson processes with a random time horizon and Markov chain hitting times. Particular attention is given to geometric approximation of random sums, for which explicit bounds are established. These are applied to give simple approximations, including error bounds, for the infinite-horizon ruin probability in the compound binomial risk process.

**Key words and phrases:** Stein’s method; geometric approximation; coupling; random sum; compound binomial risk process; ruin probability; Poisson process; Markov chain hitting time

**MSC 2020 subject classification:** 62E17; 60F05; 91G05

## 1 Introduction and motivation

Approximation by the geometric distribution and its generalisations have continued to receive particular attention in recent years, especially in conjunction with Stein’s method, a powerful technique for probability approximation that has been used successfully for a variety of theoretical and applied topics. Stein’s method was first introduced in [17]; see also [13] for a more recent introduction to the area. Stein’s method for geometric approximation was developed by Barbour and Grübel [4] and Peköz [9]. We refer the reader to [11] and references therein for more recent developments.

Our goal in this note is twofold. Our first aim is to consider how we can improve upon geometric approximation by incorporating a convolution with another random variable. Though a geometric approximation can yield effective error bounds in some applications, extra precision can

---

\*Corresponding author. Heriot–Watt University, School of Mathematical and Computer Sciences, Edinburgh EH14 4AS, UK. Email [f.daly@hw.ac.uk](mailto:f.daly@hw.ac.uk)

†Université Libre de Bruxelles, Département de Mathématique, Campus de la Plaine C. P. 210, B-1050 Bruxelles, Belgium. Email [claude.lefevre@ulb.be](mailto:claude.lefevre@ulb.be)

be gained, and the range of useful applications increased, by using an approximating distribution that incorporates some additional parameters. Examples of this approach include negative binomial approximation (see [14, 19] and references therein) and approximation by a geometric sum [5–7]. Such approaches naturally lead to additional technical complexity in the evaluation of the approximating distribution or the corresponding error bounds. Our approach of convoluting the approximating geometric distribution with an independent translation is an alternative to these ideas. The mass function of this convolution must be kept simple to use, otherwise the benefits are lost. We are motivated here by the work of Röllin [12] on translated Poisson approximation, where better error bounds are obtained than using a traditional Poisson approximation. Our translation will allow us to introduce additional parameters in the approximating distribution which can then be chosen to gain precision, at the cost of some additional complexity in the approximation. Unlike the usual approach to translated Poisson approximation where the translation is by a constant, we will here allow translation by an independent random variable.

Our second goal is to consider approximations related to risk processes, and in particular geometric approximation of random sums, that is, of sums of a random number of random variables. The case in which the number of terms in the sum is itself geometrically distributed has previously been treated by [11]; here we consider the more general case. Our results are applied to give a simple approximation, with explicit error bounds, of the infinite-horizon ruin probability in the compound binomial risk process [8]. We will also give explicit error bounds in the approximation of the number of points in a Poisson process over a random time horizon, and of Markov chain hitting times.

Recall that  $Y \sim \text{Geom}(p)$  has a geometric distribution if  $\mathbb{P}(Y = k) = p(1 - p)^k$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ = \{0, 1, \dots\}$ . In evaluating the approximation error in the work that follows, we will employ the total variation distance between two non-negative, integer-valued random variables  $W$  and  $Y$ , which can be defined in any of the following equivalent ways:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{L}(Y)) &= \sup_{A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+} |\mathbb{P}(W \in A) - \mathbb{P}(Y \in A)| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^+} |\mathbb{P}(W = j) - \mathbb{P}(Y = j)| = \inf \mathbb{P}(W \neq Y), \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}(W)$  denotes the law of  $W$ , and the infimum is taken over all couplings of  $W$  and  $Y$  with the required marginals.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we introduce Stein’s method for geometric approximation, and use these techniques to derive approximation results in the setting where we approximate by the convolution of a geometric distribution and an independent translation. This is illustrated by applications to Poisson processes and Markov chain hitting times. We then consider geometric approximation of random sums in Section 3, and apply these results to derive simple approximations for the ruin probability in the compound binomial risk process.

## 2 Translated geometric approximation

Following Stein’s method for geometric approximation [4, 9], for each  $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+$  we let  $g_A : \mathbb{Z}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be such that  $g_A(k) = 0$  for  $k \leq 0$  and

$$I(k \in A) - \mathbb{P}(Y \in A) = (1 - p)g_A(k + 1) - g_A(k), \quad (2.1)$$

for some  $p \in (0, 1]$ , where  $Y \sim \text{Geom}(p)$ . Recall that Stein's method proceeds by replacing  $k$  in (2.1) by the random variable  $W$  to be approximated, taking expectations, and bounding the expression thus obtained from the right-hand side of (2.1). Essential ingredients in the final part of this procedure include bounds on the behaviour of the functions  $g_A$ . For example,

$$\sup_{A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+} \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^+} |g_A(j+1) - g_A(j)| \leq 1, \text{ and} \quad (2.2)$$

$$\sup_{A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+} \sup_{j, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+} |g_A(j) - g_A(k)| \leq \frac{1}{p}, \quad (2.3)$$

by Lemma 4.2 of [6] and Lemma 1 of [9], respectively.

In the work that follows, we let  $W$  denote the non-negative, integer-valued random variable we wish to approximate. We consider the approximation of  $W$  by  $Y + T$ , where  $Y \sim \text{Geom}(p)$  for some  $p$ , and  $T$  is our random translation independent of  $W$  and  $Y$ . Our results will employ a coupling construction based on that used by [9] and [5]. To that end, we define the random variable  $V$  to be such that

$$\mathcal{L}(V + T + 1) = \mathcal{L}(W | W > T), \quad (2.4)$$

emphasizing that  $V$  will depend on both  $T$  and  $W$ .

With this setup, we may obtain the following

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $W$  and  $T$  be independent integer-valued random variables with  $W \geq 0$  almost surely. Suppose  $V$  is as defined by (2.4) and let  $Y \sim \text{Geom}(p)$  be independent of  $T$ , where  $p = \mathbb{P}(W \leq T)$ . Then*

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{L}(Y + T)) \leq \mathbb{P}(W < T) + (1 - p)\mathbb{E}|W - T - V|, \quad (2.5)$$

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{L}(Y + T)) \leq \mathbb{P}(W < T) + \frac{1 - p}{p} d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W - T), \mathcal{L}(V)). \quad (2.6)$$

*Proof.* Since  $T$  is independent of  $W$  and  $Y$ ,

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{L}(Y + T)) = d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W - T), \mathcal{L}(Y)).$$

Motivated by the argument of (3.11) of [12], we now write

$$\begin{aligned} d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W - T), \mathcal{L}(Y)) &= \sup_{A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}} |\mathbb{P}(W - T \in A) - \mathbb{P}(Y \in A)| \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(W < T) + \sup_{A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+} |\mathbb{E}[(1 - p)g_A(W - T + 1) - g_A(W - T)]|, \end{aligned}$$

using (2.1) for the final expression. Now, conditioning on the value of  $W$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[g_A(W - T)] = (1 - p)\mathbb{E}[g_A(W - T) | W > T] + p\mathbb{E}[g_A(W - T) | W \leq T] = (1 - p)\mathbb{E}[g_A(V + 1)],$$

using the definitions of  $g_A$  and  $V$ . Our bound (2.5) then follows from (2.2) when writing

$$|\mathbb{E}[g_A(W - T + 1) - g_A(V + 1)]| \leq \mathbb{E}|W - T - V|.$$

Similarly, for (2.6) we write

$$|\mathbb{E}[g_A(W - T + 1) - g_A(V + 1)]| \leq \frac{1}{p} d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W - T), \mathcal{L}(V)),$$

using the definition (1.1) of total variation distance and the bound (2.3).  $\square$

*Remark 2.2.* Depending on the situation, it is sometimes more natural to define a geometric random variable on  $\{1, 2, \dots\}$  rather than  $\{0, 1, \dots\}$ . In our framework it is straightforward to switch between the two definitions by simply altering the definition of  $T$ .

In the remainder of this section we consider two applications of Theorem 2.1, to approximation of the number of points observed in a Poisson process over a random time horizon and of Markov chain hitting times. For later use, we recall that a random variable  $U$  is said to be stochastically larger than a random variable  $V$  if  $\mathbb{P}(U > t) \geq \mathbb{P}(V > t)$  for all  $t$ , and that this is equivalent to the existence of a probability space on which we may construct the pair  $(U', V')$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(U') = \mathcal{L}(U)$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(V') = \mathcal{L}(V)$ , and  $U' \geq V'$  almost surely; see Theorem 1.A.1 of [16]. We denote this by  $U \geq_{st} V$ .

## 2.1 Application: Poisson processes with random time horizon

Let  $\{N(t) : t \geq 0\}$  be a homogeneous Poisson process of rate  $\lambda$ , and  $\tau$  be a non-negative random variable independent of this process. We consider the approximation of  $W = N(\tau)$  by  $Y + T$ , where  $Y$  has a geometric distribution and  $T$  is a non-negative, integer-valued random variable independent of  $W$  and  $Y$ .

In this we are motivated by approximation of random sums of the form  $\sum_{i=1}^{N(\tau)} X_i$  which arise, for example, in models for aggregate insurance claims and ruin processes over a random time horizon. Such random time horizons have been considered by [1–3], among others. If  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  are independent of  $N(\tau)$  and  $Y + T$ , Lemma 3.1 of [18] gives us that

$$d_{TV} \left( \mathcal{L} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N(\tau)} X_i \right), \mathcal{L} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{Y+T} X_i \right) \right) \leq d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(N(\tau)), \mathcal{L}(Y + T)),$$

so the approximation of  $N(\tau)$  is important here. We expect a geometric-type approximation to be relevant in cases of practical importance, since if  $\tau$  has an exponential distribution then  $N(\tau)$  is precisely geometrically distributed.

Let  $\xi_0 = 0$  and, for  $i \geq 1$ , let  $\xi_i$  be the time of the  $i$ th event in our Poisson process, so that  $N(t) = \max\{i : \xi_i \leq t\}$ . We define  $V = N(\sigma_T)$ , where

$$\mathcal{L}(\sigma_T) = \mathcal{L}(\tau - \xi_{T+1} | \tau > \xi_{T+1}).$$

This  $V$  satisfies (2.4). To see this, note that conditioning on  $N(\tau) > T$  is equivalent to conditioning on the  $(T + 1)$ th event occurring before time  $\tau$ , i.e., that  $\xi_{T+1} \leq \tau$ . Conditioning on this, the number of events we have seen up to time  $\tau$  is then  $T + 1 + V$ .

We thus obtain from (2.5) that

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(N(\tau)), \mathcal{L}(Y + T)) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tau < \xi_T) + (1 - p)\mathbb{E}|N(\tau) - T - N(\sigma_T)|, \quad (2.7)$$

where  $Y \sim \text{Geom}(p)$  and  $p = \mathbb{P}(\tau < \xi_{T+1})$ .

Consider, for simplicity, the case where  $T = 0$  almost surely, and write  $\sigma = \sigma_0$ . Note that

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma > u) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\tau > u + \xi_1)}{\mathbb{P}(\tau > \xi_1)}, \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\sigma] &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\sigma > u) \, du = \frac{1}{1-p} \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\tau > \xi_1 + u | \xi_1) \, du \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\tau]}{1-p} - \frac{1}{1-p} \int_0^\infty \int_0^x \mathbb{P}(\tau > u) \lambda e^{-\lambda x} \, du \, dx \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\tau]}{1-p} - \frac{1}{\lambda},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $p = \mathbb{P}(\tau < \xi_1) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda\tau}]$ .

In the case where  $\sigma \geq_{st} \tau$  the bound (2.7) simplifies considerably, since we then have

$$\mathbb{E}|N(\tau) - N(\sigma)| = \mathbb{E}N(\sigma - \tau) = \lambda \mathbb{E}[\sigma - \tau] = \frac{\lambda p \mathbb{E}[\tau] - (1-p)}{1-p}.$$

Similarly, if  $\tau \geq_{st} \sigma$  we have  $\mathbb{E}|N(\tau) - N(\sigma)| = \frac{(1-p) - \lambda p \mathbb{E}[\tau]}{1-p}$ .

Observe that if  $\tau$  satisfies the new worse than used (NWU) property that  $\mathbb{P}(\tau > u)\mathbb{P}(\tau > v) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tau > u+v)$  for all  $u, v \geq 0$ , the independence of  $\tau$  and  $\xi_1$  combined with (2.8) implies that  $\sigma \geq_{st} \tau$ . Similarly, if  $\tau$  satisfies the new better than used (NBU) property that  $\mathbb{P}(\tau > u)\mathbb{P}(\tau > v) \geq \mathbb{P}(\tau > u+v)$  for all  $u, v \geq 0$ , we have that  $\tau \geq_{st} \sigma$ . By (2.5) we thus have the following

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $\{N(t) : t \geq 0\}$  be a homogeneous Poisson process of rate  $\lambda$ . Let  $\tau$  be a non-negative random variable independent of this process.*

(a) *If  $\tau$  is NBU,*

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(N(\tau)), \text{Geom}(\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda\tau}])) \leq 1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda\tau}](1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}[\tau]).$$

(b) *If  $\tau$  is NWU,*

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(N(\tau)), \text{Geom}(\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda\tau}])) \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda\tau}](1 + \lambda \mathbb{E}[\tau]) - 1.$$

If  $\tau$  is exponentially distributed (which is trivially both NBU and NWU) then  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  have the same distribution, and the upper bounds of Theorem 2.3 are each zero, reflecting the fact that  $N(\tau)$  has a geometric distribution.

The upper bound of Theorem 2.3(a) was previously established in Section 2.2 of [6], but only under the stronger condition that  $\tau$  have increasing failure rate.

We conclude this section with two examples illustrating Theorem 2.3.

*Example 2.4.* Let  $\tau$  have a gamma distribution, and note that  $N(\tau)$  is thus negative binomial. For simplicity of presentation we normalise  $\tau$  to have unit mean, with density function  $x \mapsto \frac{\beta^\beta}{\Gamma(\beta)} x^{\beta-1} e^{-\beta x}$  for  $x > 0$ , where  $\beta > 0$  is a parameter and  $\Gamma(\cdot)$  is the usual gamma function. We have that  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda\tau}] = \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{\beta}\right)^{-\beta}$  in this case. Note that  $\tau$  has decreasing failure rate when  $\beta < 1$  (and is thus NWU), constant failure rate when  $\beta = 1$  (the exponential case), and increasing failure rate when  $\beta > 1$  (and is thus NBU). Applying both parts of Theorem 2.3 we have

$$d_{TV} \left( \mathcal{L}(N(\tau)), \text{Geom} \left( \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{\beta}\right)^{-\beta} \right) \right) \leq \left| 1 - (1 + \lambda) \left(1 + \frac{\lambda}{\beta}\right)^{-\beta} \right|.$$

As expected, this upper bound is zero when  $\beta = 1$ , and is small when  $\beta$  is close to 1.

*Example 2.5.* Let  $\tau$  be uniformly distributed on the interval  $[a, b]$  for some  $0 \leq a < b$ , so that  $\tau$  has increasing failure rate (and is thus NBU) and satisfies  $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\lambda\tau}] = \frac{e^{-\lambda a} - e^{-\lambda b}}{\lambda(b-a)}$  for all  $\lambda > 0$ . Hence, by Theorem 2.3(a),

$$d_{TV} \left( \mathcal{L}(N(\tau)), \text{Geom} \left( \frac{e^{-\lambda a} - e^{-\lambda b}}{\lambda(b-a)} \right) \right) \leq 1 - \frac{e^{-\lambda a} - e^{-\lambda b}}{b-a} \left( \lambda + \frac{a+b}{2} \right).$$

If  $\lambda a$  and  $\lambda b$  are small, writing  $e^{-\lambda a} \approx 1 - \lambda a$  and  $e^{-\lambda b} \approx 1 - \lambda b$  we see that this upper bound is small when  $a + b \approx \frac{2(1-\lambda^2)}{\lambda}$ .

## 2.2 Application: Markov chain hitting times

We now let  $W$  be the hitting time of an ergodic Markov chain to a set of states  $A$ . That is, we let  $(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots)$  be a Markov chain and  $W = \min\{i \geq 0 : \xi_i \in A\}$  for some fixed subset  $A$  of the state space. We will write  $P_{ij}^{(n)} = \mathbb{P}(\xi_n = j | \xi_0 = i)$  for the  $n$ -step transition probabilities and  $\pi$  for the stationary distribution of our Markov chain, with  $\pi(A)$  denoting the measure of a set  $A$  according to  $\pi$ ; abusing notation, we will write  $\pi_i$  for  $\pi(\{i\})$ .

For some distribution  $F$  on this state space, we let  $\xi_0 \sim F$ , and define  $T = T(F)$  to be a stationary time for this initial distribution, independent of  $W$ . That is,  $T$  is such that  $\mathcal{L}(\xi_T | \xi_0 \sim F)$  is  $\pi$ . In line with Theorem 2.1, we consider the approximation of  $W$  by  $Y + T$ , where  $Y \sim \text{Geom}(p)$  is a geometric random variable with parameter  $p = \mathbb{P}(W \leq T)$  which is independent of  $T$ . We will use (2.6) to give a bound. To that end, we construct the random variables  $W - T$  and  $V$  as follows: Consider the Markov chain  $(X, \xi'_0, \xi'_1, \dots)$ , where the initial state  $X$  is sampled according to  $\pi$ . Since  $T$  is a stationary time, we may construct  $W - T$  as the number of time steps required to hit  $A$  from an initial stationary distribution. That is, we write  $W - T = \min\{i \geq 0 : \xi'_i \in A\}$ . Now consider another Markov chain  $(Y, \xi''_0, \xi''_1, \dots)$  whose initial state  $Y$  is sampled according to  $\pi$  restricted to  $A^c$ , the complement of  $A$ . We may then write  $V = \min\{i \geq 0 : \xi''_i \in A\}$  since, in conditioning on the event that  $W > T$ , we consider the number of steps from such an initial state until we hit  $A$  in addition to the  $T + 1$  steps already taken to reach the state  $\xi''_0$ .

With these random variables, the maximal coupling argument of Theorem 2 of [9] gives

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W - T), \mathcal{L}(V)) \leq \frac{1}{\pi(A^c)} \sum_{i,j \in A} \pi_i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |P_{ij}^{(n)} - \pi_j|.$$

The following bound is then immediate from (2.6).

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots)$  be the Markov chain above,  $W = \min\{i \geq 0 : \xi_i \in A\}$ , and  $T$  be a stationary time as above. With  $Y \sim \text{Geom}(p)$  for  $p = \mathbb{P}(W \leq T)$ ,*

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{L}(Y + T)) \leq \mathbb{P}(W < T) + \frac{1-p}{p\pi(A^c)} \sum_{i,j \in A} \pi_i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |P_{ij}^{(n)} - \pi_j|.$$

This result generalises Theorem 2 of [9], where the hitting time from an initial stationary distribution only is considered, in which case our  $T$  is equal to zero almost surely and  $p = \pi(A)$ .

### 3 Geometric approximation of random sums and the compound binomial risk process

Throughout this section we let  $W = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$ , where  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  are independent and identically distributed, positive integer-valued random variables with  $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = \mu \geq 1$ . We let  $N$  be a non-negative, integer-valued random variable independent of the  $X_i$ . For simplicity we restrict ourselves to the case where the  $X_i$  are identically distributed, but this condition can easily be relaxed.

We will consider the approximation of  $W$  by a geometric random variable  $Y$  in Section 3.1, and then apply our results in Section 3.2 to derive simple and explicit bounds for the infinite-horizon ruin probability in the compound binomial risk process.

In this section we focus on geometric approximation (i.e.,  $T = 0$  almost surely in the setting of Theorem 2.1), since construction of the random variable  $V$  defined in (2.4) seems to be natural here only when  $T = 0$ . This case is also sufficient to give simple and explicit bounds on our ruin probability of interest, which is the principal goal of this section.

#### 3.1 Geometric approximation of random sums

With  $W$  the random sum defined above, we now derive geometric approximation bounds for  $W$ . For later use, we define  $N^{(0)}$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(N^{(0)}) = \mathcal{L}(N|N > 0)$ .

We consider the approximation of  $W$  by  $Y \sim \text{Geom}(p)$ . In line with the discussion in Section 2 in the case where  $T = 0$  almost surely, we choose the parameter  $p$  to be

$$p = \mathbb{P}(W = 0) = \mathbb{P}(N = 0), \quad (3.1)$$

and  $V$  to be such that

$$\mathcal{L}(V + 1) = \mathcal{L}(W|N > 0) = \mathcal{L}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N^{(0)}} X_j\right),$$

so that we may choose  $V = \sum_{j=1}^{N^{(0)}} X_j - 1$ . With this choice we have that

$$\mathbb{E}|W - V| = \mathbb{E}\left|\sum_{i=1}^N X_i - \sum_{j=1}^{N^{(0)}} X_j + 1\right| = \mathbb{E}\left|\sum_{i=N+1}^{N^{(0)}} X_i - 1\right|,$$

since  $N^{(0)} \geq_{st} N$ , and so we may construct these on the same probability space in such a way that  $N^{(0)} \geq N$  almost surely.

Furthermore, if  $N^{(0)} \geq_{st} N + 1$  then we may construct our random variables such that  $\sum_{i=N+1}^{N^{(0)}} X_i$  is almost surely greater than 1, since each  $X_i$  is at least 1 almost surely. In this case we thus have that

$$\mathbb{E}|W - V| = \mu \mathbb{E}[N^{(0)} - N] - 1 = \frac{\mu \mathbb{P}(N = 0) \mathbb{E}[N]}{\mathbb{P}(N > 0)} - 1 = \frac{\mu p \mathbb{E}[N]}{1 - p} - 1.$$

From the definition, we note that  $N^{(0)} \geq_{st} N + 1$  if

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(N = j)}{\mathbb{P}(N > j)} \leq \frac{p}{1 - p}, \quad (3.2)$$

for all  $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . That is,  $N^{(0)} \geq_{st} N + 1$  if  $N$  is larger than  $Y$  in the hazard rate ordering; see Section 1.B of [16].

Combining all these ingredients, we may apply (2.5) with  $T = 0$  to give

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $W = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$  be as above and  $p$  be given by (3.1). Then*

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Geom}(p)) \leq (1-p) \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=N+1}^{N^{(0)}} X_i - 1 \right|.$$

Moreover, if (3.2) holds for all  $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ , then

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Geom}(p)) \leq p(\mu \mathbb{E}[N] + 1) - 1. \quad (3.3)$$

One case which has received particular attention in the literature is that in which  $N \sim \text{Geom}(r)$  has a geometric distribution, so that  $W$  is a geometric sum. Note that in this case  $\mathcal{L}(N^{(0)}) = \mathcal{L}(N + 1)$ , so that the bound (3.3) applies. Geometric approximation for geometric sums has also been considered by [11], who show in their Theorem 3.2 that

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Geom}(p')) \leq \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ 1, r \left[ 1 + \sqrt{\frac{-2}{u \log(1-r)}} \right] \right\} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_1^2]}{\mu} - 1 \right), \quad (3.4)$$

where  $p' = \frac{r}{r + \mu(1-r)}$  and  $u$  is such that  $d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(X_1), \mathcal{L}(X_1 + 1)) \leq 1 - u$ . Note that this parameter  $p'$  is chosen such that the mean of the approximating geometric distribution matches that of  $W$ ; on the other hand our choice is made such that each have the same probability of taking the value zero. In the setting where we have no information on the smoothness of the  $X_i$  in the form of a bound on  $u$ , our geometric approximation bound improves upon this for sufficiently large  $\mathbb{E}[X_1^2]$ , and also applies in the case where  $N$  is not geometric. We note also that both geometric approximation results have the desirable property that the upper bound is zero whenever  $\mu = 1$ . Finally, we refer to [10] for related results on the exponential approximation of random sums in the case where the  $X_i$  are no longer assumed to be integer-valued.

### 3.2 Application to the compound binomial risk process

We now consider how our Theorem 3.1 may be applied to the compound binomial risk process in discrete time [8], defined as follows: Let  $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  and let  $\eta, \eta_1, \eta_2, \dots$  be independent and identically distributed random variables supported on  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ . The risk process  $\{U_t : t = 0, 1, \dots\}$  is defined by

$$U_t = m + t - \sum_{i=1}^t \eta_i,$$

where we write  $q = \mathbb{E}[\eta]$  and make the assumption that  $q < 1$  to ensure a positive drift of this process. We will also assume the existence of second and third moments of  $\eta$  as required. Letting  $\tau = \min\{t \geq 1 : U_t \leq 0\}$ , our interest is in the infinite-horizon ruin probability  $\psi(m)$  defined by

$$\psi(m) = \mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty | U_0 = m). \quad (3.5)$$

This ruin probability is given by a discrete Pollaczek–Khinchine formula: We have  $\psi(0) = q$  and

$$\psi(m) = \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{i=1}^M Y_i \geq m \right) \quad (3.6)$$



for  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , where  $M \sim \text{Geom}(1 - q)$  and  $Y, Y_1, Y_2, \dots$  are independent and identically distributed with  $\mathbb{P}(Y = j) = q^{-1}\mathbb{P}(\eta > j)$  for  $j = 0, 1, \dots$ ; see Proposition 2.6 of [15]. We note that [15] gives some numerical approximations for  $\psi(m)$ , but without any explicit error bounds.

The geometric sum in (3.6) does not quite fit into the framework of Theorem 3.1, since here the summands are allowed to take the value zero with positive probability. We therefore rewrite this by letting  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots$  be independent and identically distributed with

$$\mathbb{P}(X = j) = \mathbb{P}(Y = j | Y > 0) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\eta > j)}{q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)}$$

for  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , and letting  $N \sim \text{Geom}(r)$  with

$$r = \frac{1 - q}{\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0)}. \quad (3.7)$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Letting  $W = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$ , with  $N$  and the  $X_i$  as above, we have  $\mathcal{L}(W) = \mathcal{L}\left(\sum_{i=1}^M Y_i\right)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $K_1, K_2, \dots$  be independent and identically distributed, with  $K_j \sim \text{Bin}(j, \mathbb{P}(Y > 0))$  having a binomial distribution for each  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ . For  $m \geq 0$  we write

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^M Y_i > m\right) = (1 - q) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} q^j \mathbb{P}(Y_1 + \dots + Y_j > m).$$

Of the  $j$  summands within the latter probability, we have  $K_j$  that are non-zero, with the remaining  $j - K_j$  taking the value zero. Conditioning on these  $K_j$  and noting that those  $Y_i$  that are conditioned to be non-zero have the same distribution as  $X$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^M Y_i > m\right) &= (1 - q) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} q^j \sum_{k=0}^j \binom{j}{k} \mathbb{P}(Y > 0)^k \mathbb{P}(Y = 0)^{j-k} \mathbb{P}(X_1 + \dots + X_k > m) \\ &= (1 - q) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \binom{j}{k} [q\mathbb{P}(Y = 0)]^j \right) \left( \frac{\mathbb{P}(Y > 0)}{\mathbb{P}(Y = 0)} \right)^k \mathbb{P}(X_1 + \dots + X_k > m) \\ &= \frac{(1 - q)}{1 - q\mathbb{P}(Y = 0)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{q\mathbb{P}(Y > 0)}{1 - q\mathbb{P}(Y = 0)} \right)^k \mathbb{P}(X_1 + \dots + X_k > m) \\ &= r \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - r)^k \mathbb{P}(X_1 + \dots + X_k > m) = \mathbb{P}(W > m), \end{aligned}$$

as required. □

In order to state a bound on  $\psi(m)$  we will need some further properties of the random variable  $X$ , which we collect in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3.** *With  $X$  as above,*

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\eta(\eta - 1)]}{2(q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0))}, \quad \mathbb{E}[X^2] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\eta(\eta - 1)(2\eta - 1)]}{6(q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0))},$$

and

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(X), \mathcal{L}(X + 1)) = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)}{2(q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0))}.$$

*Proof.* For  $l = 1, 2$  we write

$$\mathbb{E}[X^l] = \frac{1}{q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^l \mathbb{P}(\eta > j) = \frac{1}{q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\eta = i) \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} j^l,$$

from which the first two expressions in the lemma follow. For the total variation distance, the definition (1.1) gives

$$d_{TV}(\mathcal{L}(X), \mathcal{L}(X + 1)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\mathbb{P}(\eta > j - 1) - \mathbb{P}(\eta > j)| = \frac{1}{2(q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0))} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\eta = j),$$

as required.  $\square$

We are now in a position to state the main result of this section.

**Theorem 3.4.** *With  $\psi(m)$  the ruin probability defined in (3.5) above,*

$$\left( \frac{q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)}{\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0)} \right)^m \leq \psi(m) \leq \left( \frac{q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)}{\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0)} \right)^m + \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0)} \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\eta(\eta - 1)] - q + \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0) \right), \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\left| \psi(m) - \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}[\eta(\eta - 1)]}{2(1 - q) + \mathbb{E}[\eta(\eta - 1)]} \right)^m \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{(1 - q)(1 + v)}{\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0)} \right\} \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}[\eta(\eta - 1)(2\eta - 1)]}{3\mathbb{E}[\eta(\eta - 1)]} - 1 \right), \quad (3.9)$$

for  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , where

$$v = \sqrt{\frac{-4(q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0))}{(2q - 3\mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)) \log \left( \frac{q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)}{\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0)} \right)}}.$$

*Proof.* From Lemma 3.2 and the Pollaczec–Khinchine formula (3.6) we may write that  $\psi(m) = \mathbb{P}(W \geq m)$  for  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ . With this representation, we employ the bound (3.3) of Theorem 3.1 in conjunction with the formula for  $\mathbb{E}[X]$  in Lemma 3.3 to obtain that

$$\left| \psi(m) - \left( \frac{q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)}{\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0)} \right)^m \right| \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0)} \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\eta(\eta - 1)] - q + \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0) \right).$$

The proof of (3.8) is completed by noting that  $W$  is stochastically larger than our approximating geometric random variable, and so  $\mathbb{P}(W \geq m) \geq \left( \frac{q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)}{\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0)} \right)^m$ .

For (3.9) we will use (3.4). In line with the notation there, and using the total variation distance given in Lemma 3.3, we write  $1 - u = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)}{2(q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0))}$ , so that

$$u = \frac{2q - 3\mathbb{P}(\eta > 0)}{2(q - \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0))},$$

and so, with  $r$  given by (3.7),

$$v = \sqrt{\frac{-2}{u \log(1 - r)}}.$$

The result then follows from (3.4) and Lemma 3.3.  $\square$

Note that, since they are based on geometric approximation of a geometric sum, we would expect the bounds in Theorem 3.4 to perform well when the summands  $X$  are typically not much larger than one, that is, when  $\mathbb{P}(\eta > 2)$  is small. To conclude this section, we illustrate this point and the bounds of Theorem 3.4 with three examples.

*Example 3.5.* Suppose that  $\eta$  is supported on  $\{0, 1, 2\}$ , with  $\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0) = \alpha_0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\eta = 2) = \alpha_2$ , and  $\mathbb{P}(\eta = 1) = 1 - \alpha_0 - \alpha_2$ . We will assume that  $\alpha_2 < \alpha_0$  to ensure that  $q < 1$ . In this case, both the bounds of Theorem 3.4 identify that  $\psi(m) = (\alpha_2/\alpha_0)^m$ . We note, though, that (3.8) applies for all  $\alpha_2 \in [0, \alpha_0)$ , while the upper bound of (3.9) requires  $\alpha_2 > 0$  to be well-defined.

*Example 3.6.* In the setting where  $\eta \sim \text{Geom}(\alpha)$  has a geometric distribution, with  $\alpha > 1/2$  to ensure that  $q < 1$ , it is known that

$$\psi(m) = \left( \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha} \right)^{m+1}.$$

See Section 2 of [15]. Neither of the estimates in Theorem 3.4 yield exactly this value; the approximations given by (3.8) and (3.9) are

$$\psi(m) \approx \left( \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha} \right)^{2m}, \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(m) \approx \left( \frac{(1 - \alpha)^2}{3\alpha^2 - 3\alpha + 1} \right)^m,$$

respectively. The first of these gives the correct value for  $m = 1$ , but the second is a better approximation for larger  $m$ .

*Example 3.7.* Suppose  $\eta$  has a mixed Poisson distribution. That is, given some non-negative random variable  $\xi$ , suppose that  $\eta|\xi \sim \text{Pois}(\xi)$  has a Poisson distribution. We will illustrate our bound (3.8) in this case; the bound (3.9) may be evaluated similarly, but we omit that to keep the discussion concise. We have that  $q = \mathbb{E}[\xi]$ , which we assume is less than 1. We also have  $\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\xi}]$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[\eta(\eta - 1)] = \mathbb{E}[\xi^2]$ . Hence, the approximation error in (3.8), i.e., the final term on the right-hand side, is

$$\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0)} \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\eta(\eta - 1)] - q + \mathbb{P}(\eta > 0) \right) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[e^{-\xi}]} \left( \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\xi^2] - \mathbb{E}[\xi] + 1 - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\xi}] \right).$$

For example, if  $\eta \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$  has a Poisson distribution for some small  $\lambda > 0$ , writing  $e^{\pm\lambda} \approx 1 \pm \lambda$ , this error is approximately  $\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2(1 + \lambda)$ .

As a second example, suppose instead that  $\xi$  has a gamma distribution with density  $x \mapsto \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{\alpha-1} e^{-\beta x}$  for  $x > 0$ , where  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$  are parameters, so that  $\eta$  has a negative binomial distribution. Then our approximation error is  $\left(1 + \frac{1}{\beta}\right)^\alpha \left(\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2\beta^2} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta} + 1\right) - 1$ . This converges to zero as  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  for fixed  $\beta$ , or as  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$  for fixed  $\alpha$ , for example.

**Acknowledgements:** F. Daly thanks the Belgian FNRS for financial support for a visit to the Université Libre de Bruxelles where this work started. C. Lefèvre has received support from the *DIA*Log Research Chair under the aegis of the Risk Foundation, an initiative of CNP Assurances.

## References

- [1] Albrecher, H. and Thonhauser, S. (2012). On optimal dividend strategies in insurance with a random time horizon. In *Stochastic Processes, Finance and Control: A Festschrift in Honor of Robert J. Elliott*, **157–179**. World Scientific, Singapore.

- [2] Albrecher, H., Finger, D. and Goffard, P.-O. (2022). Blockchain mining in pools: Analyzing the trade-off between profitability and ruin. *Insurance Math. Econom.* **105**, 313–335.
- [3] Asmussen, S., Avram, F. and Usabel, M. (2002). Erlangian approximations for finite-horizon ruin probabilities. *Astin Bull.* **32**, 267–281.
- [4] Barbour, A. D. and Grübel, R. (1995). The first divisible sum. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **8**, 39–47.
- [5] Daly, F. (2010). Stein’s method for compound geometric approximation. *J. Appl. Probab.* **47**, 146–156.
- [6] Daly, F. (2016). Compound geometric approximation under a failure rate constraint. *J. Appl. Probab.* **53**, 700–714.
- [7] Daly, F. (2019). On strong stationary times and approximation of Markov chain hitting times by geometric sums. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **150**, 74–80.
- [8] Gerber, H. U. (1988). Mathematical fun with the compound binomial process. *Astin Bull.* **18**, 161–168.
- [9] Peköz, E. A. (1996). Stein’s method for geometric approximation. *J. Appl. Probab.* **33**, 707–713.
- [10] Peköz, E. A. and Röllin, A. (2011). New rates for exponential approximation and the theorems of Rényi and Yaglom. *Ann. Probab.* **39**, 587–608.
- [11] Peköz, E. A., Röllin, A. R. and Ross, N. (2013). Total variation error bounds for geometric approximation. *Bernoulli* **19**, 610–632.
- [12] Röllin, A. R. (2007). Translated Poisson approximation using exchangeable pair couplings. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **17**, 1596–1614.
- [13] Ross, N. (2011). Fundamentals of Stein’s method. *Probab. Surv.* **8**, 210–293.
- [14] Ross, N. (2013). Power laws in preferential attachment graphs and Stein’s method for the negative binomial distribution. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **45**, 876–893.
- [15] Santana, D. J. and Rincón, L. (2020). Approximations of the ruin probability in a discrete time risk model. *Mod. Stoch. Theory Appl.* **7**, 221–243.
- [16] Shaked, M. and Shanthikumar, J. G. (2007). *Stochastic Orders*. Springer, New York.
- [17] Stein, C. (1972). A bound for the error in the normal approximation to the distribution of a sum of dependent random variables. In *Proc. Sixth Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Prob.* vol. 2, Univ. California Press, Berkeley, 583–602.
- [18] Vellaisamy, P. and Chaudhuri, B. (1996). Poisson and compound Poisson approximations for random sums of random variables. *J. Appl. Probab.* **33**, 127–137.
- [19] Yu, L., Daly, F. and Johnson, O. (2023). A negative binomial approximation in group testing. *Probab. Engrg. Inform. Sci.* **37**, 973–996.