

# An Observation-Driven State-Space Model for Claims Size Modeling

Jae Youn Ahn<sup>1,\*</sup>, Himchan Jeong<sup>2,\*</sup>, Mario V. Wüthrich<sup>3,\*</sup>

---

## Abstract

State-space models are popular models in econometrics. Recently, these models have gained some popularity in the actuarial literature. The best known state-space models are of Kalman-filter type. These models are so-called parameter-driven because the observations do not impact the state-space dynamics. A second less well-known class of state-space models are so-called observation-driven state-space models where the state-space dynamics is also impacted by the actual observations. A typical example is the Poisson-Gamma observation-driven state-space model for counts data. This Poisson-Gamma model is fully analytically tractable. The goal of this paper is to develop a Gamma-Gamma observation-driven state-space model for claim size modeling. We provide fully tractable versions of Gamma-Gamma observation-driven state-space models, and these versions extend the work of [Smith and Miller \(1986\)](#) by allowing for a fully flexible variance behavior. Additionally, we demonstrate that the proposed model aligns with evolutionary credibility, a methodology in insurance that dynamically adjusts premium rates over time using evolving data.

---

**Keywords:** observation-driven state-space model, evolutionary credibility, claim size

JEL Classification: C300

---

\*Corresponding authors/equal contribution

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, Ewha Womans University, Seoul, Republic of Korea. Email: [jaeyahn@ewha.ac.kr](mailto:jaeyahn@ewha.ac.kr)

<sup>2</sup>Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, Simon Fraser University, BC, Canada. Email: [himchan\\_jeong@sfu.ca](mailto:himchan_jeong@sfu.ca)

<sup>3</sup>RiskLab, Department of Mathematics, ETH Zurich, Switzerland. Email: [mario.wuethrich@math.ethz.ch](mailto:mario.wuethrich@math.ethz.ch)

## 1. Introduction and motivation

Static random effect models (Laird and Ware, 1982; Lee and Nelder, 1996) have a long tradition in insurance ratemaking to account for heterogeneity among insurance policyholders (Bichsel, 1964). These models assume that the individual claim behavior is influenced by an unobserved latent variable, which remains constant over time for a given policyholder. By estimating this latent variable from past observations, static random effect models provide a systematic way to predict future claims based on past claims experience. This approach has proven effective in contexts where temporal dynamics are less critical, as it simplifies the modeling process and it requires fewer assumptions about the evolution of risk factors.

However, many in real-world applications it is crucial to capture temporal dynamics and evolving risks, necessitating an extension from static random effect models to dynamic frameworks. State-space models (Kalman, 1960; Anderson and Moore, 2005) naturally comply with this need by introducing latent processes that evolve over time, allowing for the modeling of longitudinal data with temporal dependencies. These models are particularly suited for applications in insurance, where the evolution of risk factors plays a critical role (Pinquet et al., 2001; Bolancé et al., 2003). Parameter-driven state-space models, which rely on stochastic latent processes, provide a robust framework for such settings. However, these models often lack analytical tractability, as closed-form expressions for filtering and likelihood evaluations are generally unavailable except in limited cases, such as under Gaussian assumptions. As a result, numerical methods are often employed, which increase computational complexity, require significant processing time and which may restrict explainability because sensitivity analyses may not easily be available. This makes practical implementation challenging in large-scale or real-time applications (Doucet et al., 2000; Arulampalam et al., 2002).

Alternatively, credibility methods (Whitney, 1918; Bühlmann, 1967; Bühlmann and Straub, 1970) can be used as a simpler (approximative) approach to predict claims, and parameter-driven state-space versions were studied in (Pinquet, 2020a,b; Ahn et al., 2021). However, credibility methods typically only focus on providing the predictive mean, and they do not yield the full predictive distribution. Of course, this is a significant limitation of credibility methods, e.g., in risk management the full predictive distributions needs to be studied.

To address these challenges, observation-driven state-space models (Smith and Miller, 1986; Harvey and Fernandes, 1989) have proven to be a practical and effective alternative. These models maintain the dynamic structure of state-space frameworks while allowing for analytical solutions through the use of conjugate prior relationships. Smith and Miller (1986) introduced an observation-driven state-space model for exponentially distributed responses, which was later applied to insurance ratemaking (Bolancé et al., 2007). This model was subsequently extended to Gamma-distributed responses using the Bayesian Gamma-Gamma conjugacy (Ahn et al., 2023a), increasing its relevance and applicability in insurance modeling. Similarly, Harvey and Fernandes

(1989) introduced an observation-driven state-space model tailored for count data.

Despite their advantages, existing observation-driven state-space models (Smith and Miller, 1986; Harvey and Fernandes, 1989) are limited in their ability to capture diverse variance behaviors. Specifically, these models typically assume an increasing variance process that asymptotically goes to infinity. This restricts their flexibility in applications where the variance dynamics may vary, may be uniformly bounded or may even be decreasing. The limitations of the model of Harvey and Fernandes (1989) were formally analyzed in Ahn et al. (2023b), where flexible variance extensions were proposed to address these constraints. The model of Smith and Miller (1986) has not yet been evaluated in this regard, leaving its ability to handle diverse variance behaviors unexplored. In this article, we address this gap by examining the limitations of the model of Smith and Miller (1986) and providing a generalized framework that overcomes these issues.

To this end, we extend the model introduced in Smith and Miller (1986) to develop a flexible observation-driven state-space framework specifically designed for continuous positive data, based on Gamma distributions. These generalized models are able to accommodate a full range of variance behaviors, including stationary, increasing, and decreasing patterns, thereby addressing the constraints of the original framework. By retaining the analytical tractability of the original observation-driven approach, the proposed models ensure closed-form solutions for filtering, estimation and predictive distributions, while significantly enhancing the flexibility in modeling the variance dynamics. These features make these models particularly well-suited for applications involving continuous positive data, such as insurance claim sizes. Furthermore, we show that the proposed model is consistent with evolutionary credibility, dynamically adjusting to evolving data for application in insurance pricing strategies.

This manuscript is structured as follows. We first revisit the Smith–Miller Model, paying particular attention to the variance behavior of its state-space process. To achieve full flexibility in variance behavior, we introduce the Generalized Smith–Miller Model in Section 3 and analyze its variance dynamics in Section 4. Section 5 covers model fitting, forecasting, and the evolutionary credibility formula within the Generalized Smith–Miller framework. Sections 6 and 7 present a simulation study and a real data analysis, respectively. Finally, concluding remarks are provided in Section 8.

## 2. Revisiting the Smith–Miller Model

We start by revisiting the *Smith–Miller Model* (Smith and Miller, 1986) which originally utilized the exponential distribution to characterize the observation distribution. This framework was later extended (Ahn et al., 2023a) to include the more general Gamma distribution, allowing additionally for over-dispersion. We emphasize the need to generalize this latter model by demonstrating that it can accommodate only a very limited variance behavior of the state-space dynamics.

We begin by introducing the notation. For finite sequences, let  $Y_{1:t} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_t)$ , and interpret  $Y_{1:0}$  as the empty sequence, which generates the trivial  $\sigma$ -field  $\sigma(Y_{1:0}) = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$  on the underlying probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ .

We denote by  $\Gamma(\alpha, \beta)$  the Gamma distribution with shape parameter  $\alpha > 0$  and scale parameter  $\beta > 0$ . It is positively supported and has probability density function on  $\mathbb{R}_+$

$$f(x; \alpha, \beta) = \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} x^{\alpha-1} \exp(-\beta x) \quad \text{for } x > 0.$$

The mean and variance are given by  $\alpha/\beta$  and  $\alpha/\beta^2$ , respectively.

### 2.1. Review of the Smith–Miller Model

The Smith–Miller Model involves two stochastic processes: a latent state-space process  $(\Theta_t)_{t \geq 1}$ , which acts as a hidden driver of the dynamics, and an observable process of response variables  $(Y_t)_{t \geq 1}$ , which depends on the latent state-space process. A key feature of the model is the incorporation of a feedback loop from the responses to the state-spaces, impacting the state-space updates, as see (2.4), below. This feedback mechanism distinguishes observation-driven state-space models from their parameter-driven counterparts of Kalman (1960) type. Specifically, following the classification in Cox (1981), parameter-driven state-space models are defined by specifying the state-space updates

$$\text{from } \Theta_t |_{\Theta_{1:t}} \quad \text{to} \quad \Theta_{t+1} |_{\Theta_{1:t}}.$$

In contrast, in observation-driven models, the state-space update is defined by specifying the state-space transitions

$$\text{from } \Theta_t |_{Y_{1:t}} \quad \text{to} \quad \Theta_{t+1} |_{Y_{1:t}}.$$

This incorporates the observed responses into the state-space update.

**Smith–Miller Model** (Smith and Miller (1986); Ahn et al. (2023a)). *Consider a fixed dispersion parameter  $\psi > 0$ , initialization  $a_{1|0} > 1$ , and two exogenous sequences  $(v_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $(\mu_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ . The processes of the responses  $(Y_t)_{t \geq 1}$  and of the state-spaces  $(\Theta_t)_{t \geq 1}$  are defined as follows:*

(0) **Initialization at  $t = 1$ :** Initialize the state-space process  $(\Theta_t)_{t \geq 1}$  by

$$\Theta_1 |_{Y_{1:0}} \sim \Gamma(1 + a_{1|0}, b_{1|0}), \tag{2.1}$$

with  $a_{1|0} = b_{1|0}$  giving unit mean of the inverse initial state-space,  $\mathbb{E}[\Theta_1^{-1}] = 1$ .

(1) **Observation equation for  $t \geq 1$ :** For given  $Y_{1:t-1}$  and  $\Theta_{1:t}$ , the response  $Y_t$  satisfies

$$Y_t |_{Y_{1:t-1}, \Theta_{1:t}} \sim \Gamma\left(\frac{v_t}{\psi}, \frac{\Theta_t}{\mu_t \psi}\right), \quad \text{if } v_t > 0, \tag{2.2}$$

and  $Y_t|Y_{1:t-1}, \Theta_{1:t} = 0$ , almost surely, if  $v_t = 0$ .

(2) **State-space update from  $t$  to  $t+1$ :** Assume the filtering distribution at time  $t \geq 1$  is given by

$$\Theta_t|Y_{1:t} \sim \Gamma(1 + a_t, b_t), \quad (2.3)$$

then, the predictive distribution for  $\Theta_{t+1}$  is assumed to satisfy

$$\Theta_{t+1}|Y_{1:t} \sim \Gamma(1 + a_{t+1|t}, b_{t+1|t}), \quad (2.4)$$

where  $a_{t+1|t}$  and  $b_{t+1|t}$  follow the updating rule

$$a_{t+1|t} = q_t a_t > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad b_{t+1|t} = q_t b_t > 0,$$

with  $q_t$  being defined by

$$q_t = \frac{\gamma(a_t - 1) + 1}{a_t}, \quad (2.5)$$

for a constant parameter  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ .

- Remarks 2.1.**
- We show in (3.4), below, that (2.3) is a straightforward implication of Bayes' rule. Together with (2.5) and the initial condition  $a_{1|0} > 1$ , this implies that  $a_t > 1$  as well as  $a_{t|t-1} > 1$ , for all  $t \geq 1$ , so that the conditional variances of the inverse state-spaces are well-defined for all  $t \geq 1$ .
  - We discuss the observation equation (2.2) and its application to insurance. For  $v_t \geq 1$ , it provides us with the first two conditional moments

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_t|Y_{1:t-1}, \Theta_{1:t}] = \frac{v_t \mu_t}{\Theta_t} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{V}(Y_t|Y_{1:t-1}, \Theta_{1:t}) = v_t \psi \frac{\mu_t^2}{\Theta_t^2}. \quad (2.6)$$

This Gamma response  $Y_t$  is in its additive form; see [Jorgensen \(1997\)](#) for the difference between reproductive and additive forms. For a non-unit exposure<sup>4</sup>  $v_t \geq 2$ , it can be interpreted as the sum of  $v_t$  conditionally i.i.d. gamma distributed individual claims, that is,

$$Z_{t,1}, \dots, Z_{t,v_t}|_{\Theta_t} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \Gamma(1/\psi, \Theta_t/(\mu_t \psi)),$$

---

<sup>4</sup>The models in [Smith and Miller \(1986\)](#) and [Ahn et al. \(2023a\)](#) do not include the exposure  $v_t$  in the observation equation (2.2), but for insurance modeling this is very convenient.

since we have the distributional identity

$$Y_t | Y_{1:t-1}, \Theta_{1:t} \stackrel{(d)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{v_t} Z_{t,j} | \Theta_t \sim \Gamma \left( \frac{v_t}{\psi}, \frac{\Theta_t}{\mu_t \psi} \right). \quad (2.7)$$

That is,  $Y_t$  can be interpreted as the aggregate claim amount in the given (time) period  $t$  of i.i.d. individual Gamma distributed claims  $(Z_{t,1}, \dots, Z_{t,v_t})$ , and it is sufficient to know the aggregate (or average) claim amount  $Y_t$  for each time period  $t$ , because it forms a sufficient statistics for parameter estimation in this problem.

The state-space update under Smith–Miller Model gives is a mean-stationary dynamics of the inverse state-space process  $(\Theta_t^{-1})_{t \geq 1}$  when passing from filtering to predictive distribution, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E} [\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}] = \mathbb{E} [\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]. \quad (2.8)$$

This in turn implies unconditional mean stationarity of the inverse state-spaces. On the other hand, the conditional variances of the inverse state-spaces are proportionally increasing

$$\mathbb{V} (\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}) = \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathbb{V} (\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}). \quad (2.9)$$

Remark, that in dealing with the “stationarity of the state-spaces”, we are mainly interested in the mean and variance stationarity of the inverse state-space process  $(\Theta_t^{-1})_{t \geq 1}$  rather than the process  $(\Theta_t)_{t \geq 1}$  itself. This distinction is motivated by the conditional mean and variance in (2.6), which highlights the primary interest in the mean and variance behavior of  $(\Theta_t^{-1})_{t \geq 1}$ .

The popularity of the Smith–Miller Model is explained by the fact that it allows for explicit formulations of the predictive means  $\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1}|Y_{1:t}]$  and the probability density functions of the response variables  $Y_{1:t}$  in a recursive form (Ahn et al., 2023a).

## 2.2. Variance behavior of the inverse state-space dynamics

The Smith–Miller Model is widely used in applications, including insurance, due to its intuitive interpretation of the state-space updates, see (2.8) and (2.9), and its property of a closed-form expression of the likelihood function. However, the Smith–Miller Model is not fully flexible, as the variance behavior of the inverse state-spaces is increasing, as the following result shows.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Consider the setting in the Smith–Miller Model. Then, we have*

$$\mathbb{V} (\Theta_t^{-1}) \leq \mathbb{V} (\mathbb{E} [\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{V} (\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t})] = \mathbb{V} (\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}) < \infty, \quad t \geq 1$$

with a strict inequality for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ .

*Proof of Proposition 2.2.* For  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ , the tower property for conditional expectations gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}) &= \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t})] \\ &\leq \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) + \frac{1}{\gamma} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t})] \\ &= \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) + \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}(\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t})] = \mathbb{V}(\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (2.8) and (2.9). Furthermore, since  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t})] > 0$ , the equality becomes strict for  $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3. Generalized Smith–Miller Model

Proposition 2.2 demonstrates that the state-space updates (2.4) cannot lead to a decreasing or stationary variance behavior of the inverse state-space dynamics. We introduce a generalized version of the Smith–Miller Model. Modifying the state-space update (2.4) appropriately will allow for flexible variance behaviors, and their detailed analysis is provided in Section 4, below. The following describes the generalized version of the Smith–Miller Model.

**Generalized Smith–Miller Model.** Consider a fixed dispersion parameter  $\psi > 0$ , initialization  $a_{1|0} > 0$ , and three exogenous sequences

$$(\xi_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \Xi, \quad (v_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0, \quad \text{and} \quad (\mu_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where  $\Xi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$  is a convex parameter space for a positive integer  $K$ . The processes of the responses  $(Y_t)_{t \geq 1}$  and the state-spaces  $(\Theta_t)_{t \geq 1}$  are assumed to have the same initialization (2.1),  $t = 1$ , and the same observation equation (2.2),  $t \geq 1$ , as the Smith–Miller Model. The state-space update from time  $t$  to time  $t + 1$  is defined as follows:

(2) **State-space update from  $t$  to  $t + 1$ :** Assume the filtering distribution at time  $t \geq 1$  is given by

$$\Theta_t | Y_{1:t} \sim \Gamma(1 + a_t, b_t), \quad (3.1)$$

then, the predictive distribution for  $\Theta_{t+1}$  is assumed to satisfy

$$\Theta_{t+1} | Y_{1:t} \sim \Gamma(1 + a_{t+1|t}, b_{t+1|t}), \quad (3.2)$$

where  $a_{t+1|t}$  and  $b_{t+1|t}$  follow the recursion

$$a_{t+1|t} = A(a_t, b_t; \xi_t) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_{t+1|t} = B(a_t, b_t; \xi_t) > 0, \quad (3.3)$$

for given measurable functions  $A : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $B : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  specified below.

With suitable choices for the update functions  $A$  and  $B$  in (3.3), the model results in fully tractable models with mean stationary state-space processes. This is detailed in the next subsection. Before proceeding to this, we briefly address the well-definedness of the Generalized Smith–Miller Model. Although we introduced formula (3.1) as an assumption, it is, in fact, a direct consequence of the conditional response distribution (2.2) and the latent distribution (3.2). This result is obtained by applying a Bayesian inference step, often referred to as *filtering* in the time series literature, within a Gamma-Gamma conjugate prior framework. To clarify this, we briefly explain the process, generically denoting a density by  $f$ . By applying Bayes’ formula

$$f(\Theta_t | Y_{1:t}) \propto f(Y_t | Y_{1:t-1}, \Theta_t) f(\Theta_t | Y_{1:t-1}),$$

and substituting the explicit forms of the Gamma densities, the filtering distribution becomes a Gamma distribution with the following parameter updates

$$a_t := a_{t|t-1} + \frac{v_t}{\psi} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_t := b_{t|t-1} + \frac{Y_t}{\mu_t \psi} > 0. \quad (3.4)$$

In this sense, formula (3.1) is not a model assumption but rather a (mathematical) consequence of the state-space update in (3.2), the conditional response distribution (2.2), and the initial condition (2.1). As a result, the Generalized Smith–Miller Model is well-defined.

We discuss the state-space update (3.2), and we specify explicit functional forms of  $A$  and  $B$  in (3.3) that result in linearly tractable models with a *mean stationary* inverse state-space dynamics. Among various possible choices of the update functions  $A$  and  $B$ , we consider the following positive affine functions for  $\xi_t = (\xi_{1,t}, \dots, \xi_{6,t})^\top \in \Xi$

$$a_{t+1|t} = A(a_t, b_t; \xi_t) = \xi_{1,t} + \xi_{2,t}a_t + \xi_{3,t}b_t > 0,$$

and

$$b_{t+1|t} = B(a_t, b_t; \xi_t) = \xi_{4,t} + \xi_{5,t}a_t + \xi_{6,t}b_t > 0.$$

If, for some  $\Delta_t \in (0, 1]$ , we furthermore require the following thinning property

$$\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}] = \Delta_t \mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}] + (1 - \Delta_t), \quad \text{for all } a_t, b_t > 0, \quad (3.5)$$

then this implies the restriction for  $t \geq 1$

$$\xi_{1,t} = \xi_{3,t} = \xi_{4,t} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_{6,t} = \Delta_t \xi_{2,t}.$$

The thinning in (3.5) is motivated by the intuition that we would like to carry forward some past information  $Y_{1:t}$ , reflected by the first term in (3.5), but we also want to add some new noise to the



state-space process reflected by the second term  $(1 - \Delta_t) \cdot 1$ , where this can be interpreted as the prior mean part  $\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1}] = 1$ . The validity of this prior mean is implied by mean stationarity, which still needs to be established, see Proposition 3.3, below. After appropriate reparametrization, we present the following linear evolutionary model as a specific instance of the Generalized Smith–Miller Model.

**Model 3.1.** Consider a fixed dispersion parameter  $\psi > 0$ , initialization  $a_{1|0} > 0$ , and four exogenous sequences

$$(p_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq [0, 1], \quad (q_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (v_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad (\mu_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Consider the processes of the responses  $(Y_t)_{t \geq 1}$  and the state-spaces  $(\Theta_t)_{t \geq 1}$  as in the Generalized Smith–Miller Model, where the general recursions (3.3) are replaced by, for  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$a_{t+1|t} = (p_t + q_t)a_t \quad \text{and} \quad b_{t+1|t} = p_t a_t + q_t b_t. \quad (3.6)$$

Model 3.1 is well-defined if  $a_{t+1|t} > 0$  and  $b_{t+1|t} > 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , which is an immediate consequence of recursions (3.4) and (3.6) as well as the initialization  $a_{1|0} = b_{1|0} > 0$ . Simple algebraic computations show that  $\Delta_t$  in (3.5) can be represented as

$$\Delta_t = q_t / (p_t + q_t) \in (0, 1]. \quad (3.7)$$

In view of (3.4) along with the updates in (3.6), the observations  $(Y_t)_{t \geq 1}$  only enter the sequence  $(b_{t+1|t})_{t \geq 1}$ , and, henceforth,  $(a_{t+1|t})_{t \geq 1}$  is deterministic.

**Remark 3.2.** Parametric representations of the state-space updates, such as the one from (3.1) to (3.2), have been highlighted as key steps in the related literature (Smith and Miller, 1986; Harvey and Fernandes, 1989; Ahn et al., 2023a,b). These representations are often presented as tools for simulating the state-space process and providing intuitive interpretations of the model dynamics. We could present similar parametric representations for Model 3.1, however, it is important to realize that such parametric representations are not unique. This non-uniqueness diminishes the interpretive value of these constructions, as different parametrizations can result in the same underlying dynamics.

**Proposition 3.3.** Under the setting of Model 3.1, we have mean stationarity  $\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1}] = 1$ ,  $t \geq 1$ .

*Proof of Proposition 3.3.* We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}] &= \frac{b_{t+1|t}}{a_{t+1|t}} = \frac{q_t b_t + p_t a_t}{(p_t + q_t) a_t} = \frac{q_t}{p_t + q_t} \frac{b_t}{a_t} + \frac{p_t}{p_t + q_t} \\ &= \Delta_t \mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}] + (1 - \Delta_t). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

Using the tower property of conditional expectations, this implies

$$\mathbb{E} [\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t-1}] = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}] | Y_{1:t-1}] = \Delta_t \mathbb{E} [\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t-1}] + (1 - \Delta_t).$$

By induction we receive the claim using initialization  $b_{1|0} = a_{1|0} > 0$ .  $\square$

#### 4. Variance behavior of the state-space process

In Proposition 3.3, we proved that the inverse state-space process  $(\Theta_t^{-1})_{t \geq 1}$  is mean stationary under Model 3.1. The goal of this section is to analyze its long-term variance behavior under different specifications of the exogenous sequences  $(p_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq [0, 1]$  and  $(q_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ .

We start with a general result, Lemma 4.1, which is the basic tool to analyze the variance behaviors in the subsequent models and subsections: in Section 4.2, we give parameter sequences that lead to a variance stationary inverse state-space process; in Section 4.3, we provide an example with an increasing variance behavior that can asymptotically explode (diverge); and in Section 4.4, we provide an example that has a decreasing variance behavior, in the extreme case converging to zero. That is, asymptotically there is no randomness coming from the state-space process.

##### 4.1. A general result on the variance of the inverse state-space process

We start by a general recursive formula for the variance of the inverse state-space process.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Consider the setting of Model 3.1, and assume that the following variances are finite*

$$\mathbb{V} (\Theta_t^{-1}) < \infty, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 1.$$

The variances of the inverse state-space process satisfy the following recursion

$$\mathbb{V} (\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}) = \frac{q_t^2}{p_t + q_t} \frac{a_t - 1}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1} \mathbb{V} (\Theta_t^{-1}) + \left(1 - \frac{q_t^2}{p_t + q_t}\right) \frac{1}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1}. \quad (4.1)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* We start by proving the following three results

$$\mathbb{V} (\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}) = \frac{a_{t+1|t}}{a_{t+1|t} - 1} \mathbb{V} (\mathbb{E} [\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) + \frac{1}{a_{t+1|t} - 1}, \quad (4.2)$$

$$\mathbb{V} (\Theta_t^{-1}) = \frac{a_t}{a_t - 1} \mathbb{V} (\mathbb{E} [\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) + \frac{1}{a_t - 1}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\mathbb{V} (\mathbb{E} [\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) = \Delta_t^2 \mathbb{V} (\mathbb{E} [\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]). \quad (4.4)$$

We use the tower property and mean stationarity, see Proposition 3.3, to receive the first claim

(4.2) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{V}(\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}(\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t})] + \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{b_{t+1|t}^2}{a_{t+1|t}^2(a_{t+1|t} - 1)}\right] + \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) \\
&= \frac{1}{a_{t+1|t} - 1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]^2] + \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) \\
&= \frac{a_{t+1|t}}{a_{t+1|t} - 1} \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) + \frac{1}{a_{t+1|t} - 1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have we have for the second claim (4.3)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t})] + \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{b_t^2}{a_t^2(a_t - 1)}\right] + \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) \\
&= \frac{1}{a_t - 1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]^2] + \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) \\
&= \frac{a_t}{a_t - 1} \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) + \frac{1}{a_t - 1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have for the third claim (4.4)

$$\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) = \mathbb{V}(\Delta_t \mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}] + (1 - \Delta_t)) = \Delta_t^2 \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]).$$

The lemma is now proved by merging (4.2)-(4.4) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{V}(\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}) &= \frac{(p_t + q_t)a_t}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1} \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) + \frac{1}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1} \\
&= \Delta_t^2 \frac{(p_t + q_t)a_t}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1} \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) + \frac{1}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1} \\
&= \Delta_t^2 \frac{(p_t + q_t)a_t}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1} \left( \frac{a_t - 1}{a_t} \mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}) - \frac{1}{a_t} \right) + \frac{1}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1} \\
&= \Delta_t^2 \frac{(p_t + q_t)(a_t - 1)}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1} \mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}) + \frac{1 - \Delta_t^2(p_t + q_t)}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1}. \\
&= \frac{q_t^2}{p_t + q_t} \frac{a_t - 1}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1} \mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}) + \left( 1 - \frac{q_t^2}{p_t + q_t} \right) \frac{1}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4.2. Model with a stationary variance process

We start with the stationary variance process case under Model 3.1. Recall the weights  $\Delta_t = q_t/(p_t + q_t) \in (0, 1]$ . Moreover, the sequence  $(a_t)_{t \geq 1}$  is deterministic, i.e., does not depend on the

responses  $(Y_t)_{t \geq 1}$ , these only enter the sequence  $(b_t)_{t \geq 1}$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Consider the setting of Model 3.1 with the further condition  $a_{1|0} > 1$ , and assume that the variances of the inverse state-space process are finite*

$$\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}) < \infty, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 1.$$

For a constant variance process  $(\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}))_{t \geq 1}$ , the sequences  $(p_t)_{t \geq 1}$  and  $(q_t)_{t \geq 1}$  need to satisfy for all  $t \geq 1$

$$q_t = \frac{\Delta_t a_{1|0}}{a_t - \Delta_t^2 a_t + \Delta_t^2 a_{1|0}}. \quad (4.5)$$

*Proof of Lemma 4.2.* Lemma 4.1 implies that for a constant variance process  $(\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}))_{t \geq 1}$  we need to have for all  $t \geq 1$  the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{a_{1|0} - 1} &= \frac{q_t^2}{p_t + q_t} \frac{a_t - 1}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1} \left( \frac{1}{a_{1|0} - 1} \right) + \left( 1 - \frac{q_t^2}{p_t + q_t} \right) \frac{1}{(p_t + q_t)a_t - 1} \\ &= q_t \Delta_t \frac{a_t - 1}{q_t a_t / \Delta_t - 1} \left( \frac{1}{a_{1|0} - 1} \right) + (1 - q_t \Delta_t) \frac{1}{q_t a_t / \Delta_t - 1}, \end{aligned}$$

this uses initialization  $\mathbb{V}(\Theta_1^{-1}) = 1/(a_{1|0} - 1)$ ,  $a_{1|0} > 1$ . The above identity is equivalent to

$$q_t a_t / \Delta_t - 1 = q_t \Delta_t (a_t - 1) + (1 - q_t \Delta_t) (a_{1|0} - 1) = q_t \Delta_t (a_t - a_{1|0}) + a_{1|0} - 1 > 0.$$

Solving this for  $q_t$  gives the result.  $\square$

Lemma 4.2 is void unless there exists a Model 3.1 where the corresponding variance process  $(\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}))_{t \geq 1}$  is constant over time  $t \geq 1$ . Motivated by Lemma 4.2, we present the following model as an example of Model 3.1 possessing the constant variance process property. The subsequent result demonstrates that this model exhibits the variance stationarity property.

**Model 4.3.** *With the additional exogenous sequence*

$$(\Delta_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq (0, 1],$$

consider the setting in Model 3.1 with further conditions  $a_{1|0} > 1$ , and where the sequence  $(q_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$  is defined by (4.5).

For Model 4.3 to be well-defined, we need to show  $(q_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ . For this, we show recursively  $q_t > 0$  and  $a_t > 0$ , supposed that  $q_{t-1} > 0$  and  $a_{t-1} > 0$ . The second sequence is initialized by  $a_1 \geq a_{1|0} > 1$ , and the first one by

$$q_1 = \frac{\Delta_1 a_{1|0}}{a_1 (1 - \Delta_1^2) + \Delta_1^2 a_{1|0}} > 0.$$

The recursive step for  $a_t$  follows from

$$a_t \geq a_{t|t-1} = (p_{t-1} + q_{t-1})a_{t-1} = q_{t-1}\Delta_{t-1}^{-1}a_{t-1} > 0,$$

for  $\Delta_{t-1} \in (0, 1]$ . The recursive step for  $q_t$  is given by

$$q_t = \frac{\Delta_t a_{1|0}}{a_t(1 - \Delta_t^2) + \Delta_t^2 a_{1|0}} > 0,$$

for  $\Delta_t \in (0, 1]$ . This proves that  $(q_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $(a_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** *Under the framework of Model 4.3, the inverse state-space process  $(\Theta_t^{-1})_{t \geq 1}$  is stationary in both its mean and variance.*

*Proof of Theorem 4.4.* By Proposition 3.3, we have the mean stationarity of  $(\Theta_t^{-1})_{t \geq 1}$ . There remains to prove that this model has a finite variance process. For this we require that  $a_t > 1$  and  $a_{t|t-1} > 1$  for all  $t \geq 1$ . The former follows from the latter because  $a_t \geq a_{t|t-1}$ . So there remains to prove the latter. We initialize  $a_{1|0} > 1$ . This implies  $a_1 \geq a_{1|0} > 1$ . From this we can see that for  $t = 2$

$$a_{2|1} = q_1 \Delta_1^{-1} a_1 = \frac{a_{1|0}}{a_1 - \Delta_1^2 a_1 + \Delta_1^2 a_{1|0}} a_1 = \frac{a_{1|0}}{a_1 - \Delta_1^2 (a_1 - a_{1|0})} a_1 > a_{1|0} > 1.$$

This implies  $a_2 \geq a_{2|1} > a_{1|0} > 1$ . Recursive iteration for  $t \geq 3$  proves the claim.  $\square$

#### 4.3. Model with an increasing variance process

Proposition 2.2 proves that the Smith–Miller Model exhibits an increasing variance behavior in the inverse state-space dynamics. Consequently, Model 3.1 is capable of accommodating such a behavior, as the Smith–Miller Model is a special case of Model 3.1. That is, the Smith–Miller Model corresponds to Model 3.1 under the following parameter settings, for  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$q_t = \frac{\gamma(a_t - 1) + 1}{a_t} \quad \text{and} \quad p_t = 0.$$

We extend this result by showing that appropriate exogenous sequences in Model 3.1, the variance not only increases but, even diverges.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Consider Model 3.1 with further conditions  $p_t = 0$  and  $v_t = 1$  for all  $t \geq 1$ , and dispersion parameter  $\psi = 1$ . Moreover, assume  $0 < q_t < \delta < 1$  for all  $t \geq 1$ . Then, we have*

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}) = \infty. \tag{4.6}$$

*Proof of Theorem 4.5.* Assume that there exists  $N > 0$  such that  $a_t > 1$  for all  $t \geq N$ , otherwise (4.6) holds because the variance can only be finite if  $a_t > 1$ . That is, in this case we have  $\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}) <$

$\infty$  for all  $t \geq N$ . Then, we come back to Lemma 4.1. Setting  $p_t = 0$ ,  $t \geq 1$ , we have from (4.1)

$$\mathbb{V}(\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}) = \frac{q_t a_t - q_t}{q_t a_t - 1} \mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}) + (1 - q_t) \frac{1}{q_t a_t - 1}, \quad (4.7)$$

for all  $t \geq N$ . Consider the sequence  $(a_t)_{t \geq 1}$

$$a_{t+1} = a_{t+1|t} + v_{t+1}/\psi = q_t a_t + 1 \leq \delta a_t + 1 \leq \delta^t a_{1|0} + \sum_{k=0}^t \delta^k \leq a_{1|0} + \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} < \infty,$$

for all  $t \geq N$ . This implies that the second term on the right-hand side of (4.7) is bounded uniformly from below by a strictly positive constant. Moreover, the first ratio on the right-hand side of (4.7) is bounded from below by 1, therefore, (4.7) implies that a sequence  $(\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}))_{t \geq 1}$  is diverging for  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4.4. Model with a decreasing variance process

Next, we present a setting of Model 3.1 that has decreasing variances of the inverse state-space process. In the extreme case, these variances converge to zero, see Corollary 4.7, below. For this, we consider Model 3.1 under the choice

$$p_t + q_t = 1 \quad \text{for all } t \geq 1, \quad (4.8)$$

with  $(p_t)_{t \geq 1} \subset [0, 1)$ .

**Theorem 4.6.** *Consider Model 3.1 with initialization  $a_{1|0} > 1$  and with constraint (4.8). Then,*

$$\mathbb{V}(\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}) \leq \mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1}), \quad \text{for } t \geq 1,$$

where the equality holds if and only if  $p_t = 0$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.6.* First we note that  $\Delta_t \in (0, 1]$  is deterministic, and  $a_t, a_{t|t-1} > 0$  for all  $t \geq 1$ . Formula (3.8) then implies

$$\mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) = \Delta_t^2 \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]) \leq \mathbb{V}(\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]),$$

and we have an equality if and only if  $\Delta_t = 1$  which is equivalent to  $p_t = 0$ . Next, observe

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}(\Theta_{t+1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t})] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{b_{t|t-1}^2}{a_{t|t-1}^2(a_{t|t-1} - 1)}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{(p_t a_t + q_t b_t)^2}{((p_t + q_t)a_t)^2((p_t + q_t)a_t - 1)}\right] \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[(1 - q_t)a_t + q_t b_t]^2}{a_t^2(a_t - 1)} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[b_t^2]}{a_t^2(a_t - 1)} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}(\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t})]. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality follows from mean stationarity

$$a_t = a_t \mathbb{E} [\Theta_t^{-1}] = a_t \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]] = a_t \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{b_t}{a_t} \right] = \mathbb{E}[b_t],$$

which together with Jensen's inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((1 - q_t)a_t + q_t b_t)^2 \right] &= (1 - q_t)^2 a_t^2 + 2q_t(1 - q_t)a_t^2 + \mathbb{E} [q_t^2 b_t^2] \\ &= (1 - q_t)^2 \mathbb{E}[b_t]^2 + 2q_t(1 - q_t)\mathbb{E}[b_t]^2 + \mathbb{E} [q_t^2 b_t^2] \\ &\leq (1 - q_t)^2 \mathbb{E} [b_t^2] + 2q_t(1 - q_t)\mathbb{E} [b_t^2] + \mathbb{E} [q_t^2 b_t^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [b_t^2], \end{aligned}$$

and we have a strict inequality whenever  $q_t < 1$ , which is equivalent to  $p_t > 0$  under  $p_t + q_t = 1$ . This proves the claim.  $\square$

In the next result we prove that if, under the assumptions of Theorem 4.6, the sequence  $(q_t)_{t \geq 1} \subseteq (0, 1)$  is bounded away from zero and one, the inverse state-space process has an asymptotically vanishing variance, i.e., asymptotically the randomness from the state-spaces is zero.

**Corollary 4.7.** *Consider Model 3.1 with initialization  $a_{1|0} > 1$  and with constraint (4.8). Moreover, assume  $\delta < q_t^2 < 1 - \delta$  for some  $\delta > 0$  and all  $t \geq 1$ , and  $\sum_{t \geq 1} v_t = \infty$ . Then, we have*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{V} (\Theta_t^{-1}) = 0.$$

*Proof of Corollary 4.7.* From Lemma 4.1 and under choice (4.8) we have

$$\mathbb{V} (\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}) = q_t^2 \mathbb{V} (\Theta_t^{-1}) + (1 - q_t^2) \frac{1}{a_t - 1} \leq (1 - \delta) \mathbb{V} (\Theta_t^{-1}) + (1 - \delta) \frac{1}{a_t - 1},$$

for  $t \geq 1$ . Choose  $t + s > t \geq 1$ , then we have using the monotonicity of Theorem 4.6

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V} (\Theta_{t+s}^{-1}) &\leq (1 - \delta)^s \mathbb{V} (\Theta_t^{-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^s (1 - \delta)^k \frac{1}{a_{t+s-k} - 1} \\ &\leq (1 - \delta)^s \mathbb{V} (\Theta_1^{-1}) + \left( \frac{1 - \delta}{\delta} \right) \max_{1 \leq k \leq s} \frac{1}{a_{t+s-k} - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.4) and (3.6) we have for  $t \geq 2$

$$a_t = a_{t|t-1} + v_t/\psi = (p_{t-1} + q_{t-1})a_{t-1} + v_t/\psi = a_{t-1} + v_t/\psi = a_{1|0} + \psi^{-1} \sum_{s=1}^t v_s.$$

Under our assumptions, this implies monotonicity of  $(a_t)_{t \geq 1}$  with  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} a_t = \infty$ . Plugging this

into the previous inequality we obtain upper bound

$$\mathbb{V}(\Theta_{t+s}^{-1}) \leq (1-\delta)^s \frac{1}{a_{1|0}-1} + \left(\frac{1-\delta}{\delta}\right) \frac{1}{a_t-1}.$$

Using  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} a_t = \infty$ , we can find for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  an index  $t \geq 1$  such that the second term is

$$\left(\frac{1-\delta}{\delta}\right) \frac{1}{a_t-1} < \varepsilon/2.$$

Moreover, there exists  $s_0 > 0$  such that for all  $s \geq s_0$

$$(1-\delta)^s \frac{1}{a_{1|0}-1} < \varepsilon/2.$$

But this implies that for all  $u \geq s_0 + t$  we have

$$\mathbb{V}(\Theta_u^{-1}) < \varepsilon.$$

Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  was arbitrary, the claim follows.  $\square$

**Remark 4.8.** For  $p_t \equiv 0$  and  $q_t \equiv 1$ , there is no state-space update from  $t$  to  $t+1$  meaning that

$$\Theta_t|_{Y_{1:t}} \stackrel{d}{=} \Theta_{t+1}|_{Y_{1:t}}.$$

In this case, Model 3.1 becomes a static-random effects model, which complies with the [Bühlmann and Straub \(1970\)](#) assumptions, in particular, it has one static latent factor  $\Theta_t \equiv \Theta \sim \Gamma(a_{1|0}, a_{1|0})$  ([Bühlmann and Gisler, 2006](#), page 44).

From the previous results, we conclude that Model 3.1 allows for a wide range of variance behaviors for the inverse state-space dynamics  $(\Theta_t^{-1})_{t \geq 1}$ . The specific variance behavior should be determined by the data through model fitting and selection. This is discussed next.

## 5. Model Fitting, forecasting, and evolutionary credibility

### 5.1. Evolutionary credibility and credibility formulas

For experience rating, one is mainly interested in forecasting the claim in the next period  $Y_{t+1}$ , given past information  $Y_{1:t}$ . Under Model 3.1, we can compute the conditional expectation of the future claim, given the past observations, by applying the tower property for conditional expectations. That is,

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1}|Y_{1:t}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1}|Y_{1:t}, \Theta_{1:t+1}]|Y_{1:t}] = v_{t+1}\mu_{t+1} \mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}|Y_{1:t}].$$



Using (3.5) and mean stationarity we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1} | Y_{1:t}] = v_{t+1}\mu_{t+1} \left( \Delta_t \mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}] + (1 - \Delta_t) \mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}] \right). \quad (5.1)$$

Thus, the posterior prediction is a credibility weighted average between the observation-driven estimate  $\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}]$  and the prior estimate  $\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}] = \mathbb{E}[\Theta_1^{-1}] = 1$ , with credibility weight, see (3.7),

$$\Delta_t = \frac{q_t}{q_t + p_t} \in (0, 1].$$

This recursive formula (5.1), along with Bayesian filtering in (3.4), provides a basis for deriving the evolutionary credibility structure (Bühlmann and Gisler, 2006, Chapter 9). Specifically, starting from (3.1), we obtain posterior mean

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}] &= \frac{b_t}{a_t} = \frac{b_{t|t-1} + Y_t/(\mu_t\psi)}{a_{t|t-1} + v_t/\psi} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{v_t/\psi}{a_{t|t-1} + v_t/\psi} \frac{1}{\mu_t} \frac{Y_t}{v_t} + \frac{a_{t|t-1}}{a_{t|t-1} + v_t/\psi} \frac{b_{t|t-1}}{a_{t|t-1}}, & \text{for } v_t > 0; \\ \frac{b_{t|t-1}}{a_{t|t-1}}, & \text{for } v_t = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

To simplify notation, for  $Y_t = 0$  and  $v_t = 0$ , we define

$$\frac{Y_t}{v_t} = 0,$$

almost surely, which implies

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_t | Y_{1:t-1}]}{v_t} = 0.$$

With this definition, the recursion can be compactly expressed as

$$\mathbb{E}[\Theta_t^{-1} | Y_{1:t}] = \frac{v_t/\psi}{a_{t|t-1} + v_t/\psi} \frac{1}{\mu_t} \frac{Y_t}{v_t} + \frac{a_{t|t-1}}{a_{t|t-1} + v_t/\psi} \mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t-1}^{-1} | Y_{1:t-1}].$$

Combining this with (3.2) and (5.1), we obtain the evolutionary credibility formula for the normalized observations  $(Y_t/(v_t\mu_t))_{t \geq 1}$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** *Assume Model 3.1 holds. Define the weights  $z_t$  by*

$$z_t = \frac{v_t/\psi}{a_{t|t-1} + v_t/\psi} \in [0, 1).$$

For  $t \geq 1$ , the predictive conditional mean of the future claim is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1}|Y_{1:t}] &= v_{t+1}\mu_{t+1}\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}|Y_{1:t}] \\ &= v_{t+1}\mu_{t+1}\left(\omega_{1,t}\frac{1}{\mu_t} \frac{Y_t}{v_t} + \omega_{2,t}\frac{1}{\mu_t} \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_t|Y_{1:t-1}]}{v_t} + \omega_{3,t}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the credibility weights  $\omega_{1,t}, \omega_{2,t}, \omega_{3,t} \geq 0$  satisfy  $\omega_{1,t} + \omega_{2,t} + \omega_{3,t} = 1$  and are given by

$$\omega_{1,t} = \Delta_t z_t, \quad \omega_{2,t} = \Delta_t(1 - z_t), \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_{3,t} = 1 - \Delta_t.$$

By recursively expanding the previous result we arrive at the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Under Model 3.1, the predictive conditional mean can be represented by*

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1}|Y_{1:t}] = v_{t+1}\mu_{t+1}\left(\sum_{s=1}^t \left[\prod_{k=s+1}^t \omega_{2,k}\right] \left(\omega_{1,s} \left[\frac{1}{\mu_s} \frac{Y_s}{v_s}\right] + \omega_{3,s} \cdot 1\right) + \prod_{s=1}^t \omega_{2,s}\right),$$

for  $t \geq 0$ , where an empty product is set equal to 1 and an empty sum equal to zero.

By setting

$$\Delta_0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\mu_0} \frac{Y_0}{v_0} = 0,$$

the predictive conditional mean in Corollary 5.2 can be simplified as

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{t+1}|Y_{1:t}] = v_{t+1}\mu_{t+1}\left(\sum_{s=0}^t \left[\prod_{k=s+1}^t \omega_{2,k}\right] \left(\omega_{1,s} \left[\frac{1}{\mu_s} \frac{Y_s}{v_s}\right] + \omega_{3,s} \cdot 1\right)\right).$$

Thus, we obtain a credibility weighted average between the observations  $Y_{1:t}$  and the prior mean  $\mathbb{E}[\Theta_{t+1}^{-1}] = 1$ , and depending on the specific choices of the exogenous parameters this may lead to an exponentially decaying seniority weighting in past claims; for seniority weighting see [Pinquet et al. \(2001\)](#).

## 5.2. Likelihood function

The joint density of the observations  $Y_{1:t}$  under Model 3.1 is given by the recursive formula

$$f(y_{1:t}) = f(y_t | y_{1:t-1})f(y_{1:t-1}) = \prod_{s=1}^t f(y_s | y_{1:s-1}),$$

where  $f(y_s | y_{1:s-1})$  for  $2 \leq s \leq t$  represent the conditional density of  $Y_s$  in  $y_s$ , for given  $Y_{1:s-1} = y_{1:s-1}$ , and  $f(y_1) = f(y_1 | y_{1:0})$  represents the density of  $Y_1$  in  $y_1$ . We have the following result.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Under Model 3.1, for  $s \geq 1$ , we have the following holds.*

i. The conditional density of  $Y_s$  in  $y_s > 0$ , given observations  $Y_{1:s-1} = y_{1:s-1}$ , is given by

$$f(y_s | y_{1:s-1}) = \frac{\Gamma(v_s/\psi + a_{s|s-1} + 1)}{\Gamma(v_s/\psi)\Gamma(a_{s|s-1} + 1)} \left( \frac{y_s}{\mu_s\psi} \right)^{v_s/\psi} \left( \frac{b_{s|s-1}}{\frac{y_s}{\mu_s\psi} + b_{s|s-1}} \right)^{a_{s|s-1} + 1} y_s^{-1}.$$

ii. Define the random variable

$$X_s = \frac{Y_s}{\mu_s\psi b_s}.$$

The conditional density of  $X_s$  in  $x_s > 0$ , given observations  $Y_{1:s-1} = y_{1:s-1}$ , is given by

$$f(x_s | y_{1:s-1}) = \frac{\Gamma(v_s/\psi + a_s + 1)}{\Gamma(v_s/\psi)\Gamma(a_s + 1)} x_s^{v_s/\psi - 1} (1 + x_s)^{v_s/\psi + a_s + 1}.$$

This is a Beta-prime distribution with parameters  $v_s/\psi > 0$  and  $a_s + 1 > 0$ , also called as Pearson type VI distribution (Johnson et al., 1995).

*Proof of Lemma 5.3.* Using (2.2) and (3.2), we have for  $s \geq 1$  and  $y_s > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_s | y_{1:s-1}) &= \int_{\theta_s} f(y_s | \theta_s) f(\theta_s | y_{1:s-1}) d\theta_s \\ &= \frac{\left(\frac{1}{\mu_s\psi}\right)^{\frac{v_s}{\psi}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{v_s}{\psi}\right)} y_s^{\frac{v_s}{\psi} - 1} \frac{(b_{s|s-1})^{a_{s|s-1} + 1}}{\Gamma(a_{s|s-1} + 1)} \int_{\theta_s} \theta_s^{\frac{v_s}{\psi} + a_{s|s-1} + 1 - 1} \exp\left\{-\theta_s \left(\frac{y_s}{\mu_s\psi} + b_{s|s-1}\right)\right\} d\theta_s \\ &= \frac{\left(\frac{1}{\mu_s\psi}\right)^{\frac{v_s}{\psi}}}{\Gamma\left(\frac{v_s}{\psi}\right)} y_s^{\frac{v_s}{\psi} - 1} \frac{(b_{s|s-1})^{a_{s|s-1} + 1}}{\Gamma(a_{s|s-1} + 1)} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{v_s}{\psi} + a_{s|s-1} + 1\right)}{\left(\frac{y_s}{\mu_s\psi} + b_{s|s-1}\right)^{\frac{v_s}{\psi} + a_{s|s-1} + 1}} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{v_s}{\psi} + a_{s|s-1} + 1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{v_s}{\psi}\right)\Gamma(a_{s|s-1} + 1)} \left(\frac{y_s}{\mu_s\psi}\right)^{\frac{v_s}{\psi}} \left(\frac{b_{s|s-1}}{\frac{y_s}{\mu_s\psi} + b_{s|s-1}}\right)^{a_{s|s-1} + 1} y_s^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of part i.

The proof of the second part by a change of variables for  $X_s = Y_s/(\mu_s\psi b_s)$ .  $\square$

Note that

$$\lim_{y_s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(y_s | y_{1:s-1})}{y_s^{-(a_{s|s-1} + 2)}} = \frac{\Gamma(v_s/\psi + a_{s|s-1} + 1)}{\Gamma(v_s/\psi)\Gamma(a_{s|s-1} + 1)} (\mu_s\psi b_{s|s-1})^{a_{s|s-1} + 1} \in (0, \infty).$$

This implies that the conditional distribution of  $Y_s$ , given  $Y_{1:s-1}$ , is regularly varying at infinity with tail index  $-(a_{s|s-1} + 2)$ . Applying Karamata's theorem (Embrechts et al., 2013) to the corresponding survival function shows that the conditional survival function of  $Y_s$ , given  $Y_{1:s-1}$ , is regularly varying at infinity with tail index  $-(a_{s|s-1} + 1)$ . These asymptotic properties provide conditions for

the finiteness of the conditional moments. In particular, if  $a_{s|s-1} > 0$ , then  $\mathbb{E}[Y_s | Y_{1:s-1}]$  is finite, and if  $a_{s|s-1} > 1$ , then  $\mathbb{V}(Y_s | Y_{1:s-1})$  is finite, which confirms the earlier conclusions regarding the existence of the conditional variance of the inverse state-space  $\Theta_s^{-1}$ .

In case of a unit exposure  $v_t \equiv 1$  and a unit dispersion  $\psi = 1$ , the Gamma distribution (2.2) turns into the simpler exponential distribution. As a consequence we receive the conditional distribution

$$f(y_s | y_{1:s-1}) = \frac{a_{s|s-1} + 1}{\mu_s b_{s|s-1}} \left( 1 + \frac{y_s}{\mu_s b_{s|s-1}} \right)^{-(a_{s|s-1} + 2)}.$$

This is a Pareto Type II distribution, also called [Lomax \(1954\)](#) distribution, with a shape parameter  $a_{s|s-1} + 1 > 1$  and scale parameter  $\mu_s b_{s|s-1} > 0$ .

## 6. Simulation study

For our simulation study, we use the following data generation schemes. We assume there are  $M$  distinct instances (insurance policies), that are observed for  $T + 1$  years. The records from first  $T$  years are used for the model fitting, and the records of year  $T + 1$  are used for an out-of-sample validation. The exposure at time  $1 \leq t \leq T + 1$  of instance  $1 \leq i \leq M$ ,  $v_{i,t}$ , follows the following distribution

$$v_{i,t} = N_{i,t} + B_{i,t} \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

where  $N_{i,t} \sim \text{Poisson}(0.2 \cdot (t + 1))$ ,  $B_{i,t} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(1.2 - 0.2t)$ , and  $N_{i,t}$  and  $B_{i,t}$  being independent for all  $t$  and  $i$ . The claim severity at time  $t$  for instance  $i$ ,  $\mu_{i,t}$ , is assumed to be known and selected by  $\mu_{i,t} \sim \text{Uniform}(2000, 4000)$ . This gives us the exogenous sequences  $(v_{i,t}, \mu_{i,t})_{t=1}^{T+1}$  for all instances  $1 \leq i \leq M$ . Next,  $(Y_{i,t}, \theta_{i,t})_{t=1}^{T+1}$  is generated under Model 3.1, and assuming (4.5), which implies a variance stationary process. In the construction, we further assume that  $p_{i,t} = \kappa q_{i,t}$  for a constant  $\kappa \geq 0$ , which is equivalent to  $\Delta_{i,t} \equiv \Delta$ . Note that by construction,  $Y_{i,t} = 0$  if and only if  $v_{i,t} = 0$ .

We generated 100 samples under the above data generation scheme with  $M = 5000$  and  $T = 5$ , to estimate  $a_{1|0}$ ,  $\psi$ , and  $\Delta$ . and subsequently predict  $Y_6$  from  $Y_{1:5}$ ,  $v_{1:6}$ , and  $\mu_{1:6}$ . For comparison purpose, we use the following six models:

- **Homogeneous independent:** We assume that  $Y_{i,t} | Y_{i,1:t-1}$  follows a Gamma distribution as in (2.2), with  $\mu_{i,t} = \mu$  and  $\theta_{i,t} = 1$  for  $1 \leq t \leq 6$  and  $1 \leq i \leq 5000$ , where  $\mu$  is estimated as the empirical weighted average of  $(Y_{i,t})_{i,t}$  so that

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{t=1}^T Y_{i,t}}{\sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{t=1}^T v_{i,t}}.$$

- **Homogeneous Bühlmann model:** We assume that  $Y_{i,t} | Y_{i,1:t-1}$  follows a Gamma distribution as in (2.2),  $\mu_{i,t} = \mu$  and  $\theta_{i,t} = \theta_i$  for  $1 \leq t \leq 6$  and  $1 \leq i \leq 5000$ . Note that it is a special case

of the next model (homogeneous SSM) with  $\Delta = 1$ .

- Homogeneous state-space model (SSM): We assume that  $Y_{i,t}|Y_{i,1:t-1}$  follows a Gamma distribution as in (2.2),  $\mu_{i,t} = \mu$  but allow for an evolution of  $\theta_{i,1:6}$  under Model 3.1, assuming (4.5) holds.
- Heterogeneous independent model: We assume that  $Y_{i,t}|Y_{i,1:t-1}$  follows a Gamma distribution as in (2.2),  $\theta_{i,t} = 1$  for  $1 \leq t \leq 6$  and  $1 \leq i \leq 5000$  but use given  $\mu_{i,t}$ 's.
- Heterogeneous Bühlmann model: We assume that  $Y_{i,t}|Y_{i,1:t-1}$  follows a Gamma distribution as in (2.2),  $\theta_{i,t} = \theta_i$  for  $1 \leq t \leq 6$  and  $1 \leq i \leq 5000$  but we use the given  $\mu_{i,t}$ 's. Note that it is a special case of the next model (heterogeneous SSM) with  $\Delta = 1$ .
- Heterogeneous SSM: We assume that  $Y_{i,t}|Y_{i,1:t-1}$  follows a Gamma distribution as in (2.2) while we allow for an evolution of  $\theta_{i,1:6}$  under Model 3.1, assuming (4.5) holds, and we use the given  $\mu_{i,t}$  for  $1 \leq t \leq 6$  and  $1 \leq i \leq 5000$ .

Table 1 summarizes the estimation results of  $a_{1|0}$ ,  $\psi$  and  $\Delta$  over the 100 simulations, both the mean estimates and the standard errors (in the parenthesis) are presented. Note that the homogeneous/heterogeneous independent models are excluded from the comparison as these model do not attempt to estimate  $a_{1|0}$ ,  $\psi$  and  $\Delta$  by assuming  $\theta$  is constantly equal to one. It can be seen that the heterogeneous SSM accurately estimates the values of  $a_{1|0}$ ,  $\psi$  and  $\Delta$ . In the case of the homogeneous SSM, these estimates are a little bit biased as it has a misspecified marginal mean structure.

Table 1: Summary of estimation procedure for true values  $a_{1|0} = 3$  and  $\psi = 1$ .

	$\Delta = 0.5$			$\Delta = 1.0$		
	$\hat{a}_{1 0}$	$\hat{\psi}$	$\hat{\Delta}$	$\hat{a}_{1 0}$	$\hat{\psi}$	$\hat{\Delta}$
Homogeneous	5.5828	1.2222	1.0000	2.9460	1.0415	1.0000
Bühlmann	(0.2704)	(0.0114)	-	(0.1246)	(0.0088)	-
Homogeneous	2.7620	1.0151	0.4659	2.8364	1.0256	0.9750
SSM	(0.1273)	(0.0138)	(0.0238)	(0.1214)	(0.0104)	(0.0106)
Heterogeneous	5.8727	1.1858	1.0000	3.0151	1.0004	1.0000
Bühlmann	(0.2433)	(0.0108)	-	(0.1079)	(0.0083)	-
Heterogeneous	3.0279	1.0017	0.5027	2.9952	0.9977	0.9957
SSM	(0.1228)	(0.0135)	(0.0234)	(0.1077)	(0.0093)	(0.0065)

Tables 2 and 3 display the out-of-sample validation results. The means and standard errors (in parenthesis) are received from the 100 iterations under the different values of  $\Delta$ , which imply

different state-space structures for the evolution of the latent factors  $(\Theta_{i,t})_{t=1}^{T+1}$ . The reported figures are the root-mean squared error (RMSE) and the Gamma deviance (GDEV) defined by

$$\text{RMSE}(\hat{\mu}_{1:M}, Y_{1:M} | v_{1:M}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M (\hat{\mu}_i v_i - Y_i)^2},$$

$$\text{GDEV}(\hat{\mu}_{1:M}, Y_{1:M} | v_{1:M}) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^M \left( -v_i \log \left( \frac{Y_i}{\hat{\mu}_i v_i} \right) + \frac{Y_i - \hat{\mu}_i v_i}{\hat{\mu}_i} \right),$$

where we set  $-v_i \log(Y_i/(\hat{\mu}_i v_i)) = 0$  if  $Y_i = v_i = 0$ , and we dropped the lower time index  $T + 1$ .

Table 2 considers the case  $\Delta = 0.5$ , and it shows that the true model (heterogeneous SSM) outperforms all other models in both measures. This is expected as it is the true model to describe the data generation scheme. In the case of  $\Delta = 1.0$ , Table 3, the heterogeneous Bühlmann model is the true model so it shows the best predictive performance. Meanwhile, it is interesting to observe that the SSMs are capable of estimating the correct value of  $\Delta$  and their predictive performance is almost comparable to the true Bühlmann model (in this case). Therefore, we conclude that the proposed SSMs are flexible enough to find the true model.

Table 2: Summary of out-of-sample validation with simulations ( $a_{1|0} = 3, \psi = 1, \Delta = 0.5$ ).

	RMSE			GDEV		
	Independent	Bühlmann	SSM	Independent	Bühlmann	SSM
Homogeneous	6067.64 (724.26)	6133.54 (690.46)	5981.14 (701.65)	6680.86 (180.72)	6764.54 (189.24)	6499.17 (175.27)
Heterogeneous	5974.26 (727.88)	6025.61 (695.29)	5878.33 (704.12)	6417.36 (176.98)	6473.82 (190.43)	6229.60 (175.06)

Table 3: Summary of out-of-sample validation with simulations ( $a_{1|0} = 3, \psi = 1, \Delta = 1.0$ ).

	RMSE			GDEV		
	Independent	Bühlmann	SSM	Independent	Bühlmann	SSM
Homogeneous	5962.36 (469.85)	5116.05 (355.58)	5118.61 (359.82)	6639.29 (192.44)	5206.91 (119.02)	5212.95 (119.25)
Heterogeneous	5868.95 (471.67)	4939.25 (351.47)	4939.39 (351.82)	6371.98 (186.97)	4901.10 (116.44)	4901.98 (116.38)

## 7. Real data analysis

To assess the applicability of the proposed framework, we analyze a U.S. based longitudinal outpatient visit dataset for the years 2019–2022, which is a part of the database called [Medical Expenditure Panel Survey](#). The original dataset, which contains 30,079 records for 4,928 patients over the years 2019–2022, is a combination of the following four tables in the MEPS database; [HC-213F](#), [HC-220F](#), [HC-229F](#), and [HC-239F](#). As displayed in Table 4, it contains various fields such as the identifier for a patient in the panel (DUPERSID), year and month information for the outpatient visit (OPDATEYR and OPDATEMM), categorical covariates that explain the characteristics of the outpatient visit (for example, SEEDOC\_M18 and LABTEST\_M18; see the [codebook](#) to check the comprehensive list of the covariates and their descriptions), and the total medical expenses charged for the visit (OPTC[YR]X).

Table 4: Sample rows from the original dataset.

DUPERSID	OPDATEYR	OPDATEMM	SEEDOC_M18	LABTEST_M18	...	OPTC[YR]X
2460002101	2021	8	Y	Y	...	6407.5
2460002101	2022	10	Y	Y	...	5344
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
2460004102	2021	3	N	N	...	83.01
2460004102	2021	10	N	N	...	100.01

### 7.1. Data pre-processing with a working model

While the dataset contains rich information with repeated measurements, it requires some steps of pre-processing to be analyzed under the proposed framework. In the Generalized Smith–Miller Model, we implicitly assume that the state-space variables  $(\Theta_t)_{t \geq 1}$  affect each period of the same length (for example, a year or a month) whereas the original dataset is not recorded in that fashion. In other words, the observed value of OPTC[YR]X in each record in the original dataset corresponds to an individual payment  $Z_{t[j]}$ , as described in (2.7), not to  $Y_t$  in (2.2) for a time period.

Therefore, the observed records for a person  $i$  (identified by DUPERSID, here) need to be aggregated within pre-specified periods  $t \geq 1$  to give us  $(Y_{i,t}, v_{i,t}, \mu_{i,t})_{i,t}$ , where  $Y_{i,t}$  is the sum of OPTC[YR]X for person  $i$  in period  $t$ ,  $v_{i,t}$  is the total number of the outpatient visits for person  $i$  in period  $t$ , and  $\mu_{i,t} = \mathbb{E}[Z_{t[j]}]$  is the expectation of OPTC[YR]X per outpatient visit of person  $i$  in period  $t$ . While the aggregations of  $Y_{i,t}$  and  $v_{i,t}$  are straightforward and do not involve any uncertainty,  $\mu_{i,t}$  is unknown at this stage so we need a working model that estimates the marginal mean severity  $\mu_{i,t}$  based on the observed values of the response variables  $Z_{i,t[j]}$  (which is OPTC[YR]X in this case) and the corresponding covariates in the original dataset.

For this purpose, we exploit a preliminary Gamma generalized linear model (GLM) assuming

$$Z_{i,t[j]} \sim \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{\psi}, \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}_{i,t[j]}\psi}\right), \quad \text{with regression mean: } \log(\tilde{\mu}_{i,t[j]}) = \mathbf{x}_{i,t[j]}\boldsymbol{\beta},$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_{i,t[j]}$  are pre-processed covariates from the original dataset as described in Table 5, and GLM parameter  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ . For the covariates pre-processing for the working model, we treated no response or missing values for **Care\_Category**, **Special\_Cond**, **Surgery**, **Prescription** as their proportions were negligible (less than 1%). In the case of **Telehealth**, however, we treated the missing values or no response as a separate category, due to the reasons that for all responses from year 2019 records these are missing (as the telehealth indicator was not collected in the survey in year 2019), and about 25% of records from years 2020–2022 indicate this value as missing.

Table 5: Description of the covariates in the working model.

Variables	Description	Response	Proportions
<b>Doctor_Type</b>	Type of medical professional for the visit	GP	7.00 %
		Specialist	39.27 %
		Non-doctor	53.73 %
<b>Care_Category</b>	Main reason of the outpatient visit	Diagnosis or Treatment	51.67 %
		Others	48.33 %
<b>Special_Cond</b>	Indicator for an existing special condition for the visit	Yes	83.62 %
		No	16.38 %
<b>Surgery</b>	Whether the visit involved a surgery	Yes	8.68 %
		No	91.32 %
<b>Prescription</b>	Whether any medicine prescribed for the visit	Yes	8.33 %
		No	91.67 %
<b>Telehealth</b>	Whether the visit was a telehealth event	Yes	7.61 %
		No	40.35 %
		Unknown	52.04 %

The estimation results of the working model are summarized in Table 6, which also provides some intuitive interpretations. For example, there is expected to incur higher charge if an outpatient visit involved a meeting with a specialist, rather than a general or family doctor. It is also natural to expect that outpatient visits with surgeries could incur higher charges than those without surgeries. Lastly, it is also shown that a telehealth outpatient visit gives less charges than an in-person outpatient visit.

Note that it is possible that  $\mathbf{x}_{i,t[j]}$  may not be identical for all  $j = 1, \dots, v_{i,t}$  as one patient can have multiple outpatient visits in a time period due to different reasons. Therefore, we summarized the estimates from the working model  $\tilde{\mu}_{i,t[j]}$  to obtain a reasonable estimate of  $\mu_{i,t}$  as  $\hat{\mu}_{i,t} = \frac{1}{v_{i,t}} \sum_{j=1}^{v_{i,t}} \tilde{\mu}_{i,t[j]}$ . Sample rows from the resulting dataset in the form of  $(Y_{i,t}, v_{i,t}, \mu_{i,t})_{i,t}$  are displayed



Table 6: Summary of the estimated regression coefficients for the working severity model.

	Estimate	p-value
(Intercept)	7.4351	0.0000
Doctor_Type: Non-doctor	0.1304	0.0338
Doctor_Type: Specialist	0.5515	0.0000
Care_Category: Others	-0.1390	0.0000
Special_Cond: Yes	0.1912	0.0000
Surgery: Yes	1.6888	0.0000
Prescription: Yes	-0.1080	0.0531
Telehealth: Unknown	-0.1501	0.0000
Telehealth: Yes	-0.8352	0.0000

in Table 7. Note that we summarized the observations per half-year intervals so that the pre-processed dataset has  $39,424 = 4928 \times 8$  records, from 4,928 distinct patients and 8 observational periods (from 2019H1 to 2022H2).

Table 7: Sample rows from the pre-processed dataset.

ID	HY	$Y_{i,t}$	$v_{i,t}$	$\hat{\mu}_{i,t}$
2460002101	2019H1	1209.00	1	1750.443
2460002101	2019H2	13712.17	4	2011.496
2460002101	2020H1	0	0	-
2460002101	2020H2	0	0	-
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$

We conclude this subsection with two remarks. Firstly, it is not our primary concern to find either the best working model or the best feature engineering to estimate the marginal severity,  $\text{OPTC}[\text{YR}]X$ . Possibly, one can conduct a more sophisticated analysis to find the best set of engineered features and/or try different predictive models (including but not limited to random forests or neural networks). However, we believe that the current working model is reasonable enough to quantify the underlying impacts of the available covariate information on the response variables, with some intuitive explanations. Note also that our main goal is to evaluate the usefulness of the proposed SSM framework in comparison to the existing models that could describe the serial correlations among the repeated observations, given  $\hat{\mu}_{i,t}$  from some reasonably good working model.

### 7.2. Analysis of the summarized dataset with the proposed model and some benchmarks

For comparison purposes, we applied the six models (Homogeneous independent, Homogeneous Bühlmann, Homogeneous SSM, Heterogeneous independent, Heterogeneous Bühlmann, and Heterogeneous SSM) that were described in Section 6. Recall that all of the aforementioned models

implicitly or explicitly assume a stationary variance for  $(\Theta_{i,t}^{-1})_{t \geq 1}$  by satisfying (4.5). We also assume  $p_{i,t} = \kappa q_{i,t}$  for a constant  $\kappa \geq 0$ . Thus, the dependence structures are parameterized by the following three parameters  $a_{1|0}$ ,  $\psi$  and  $\Delta$ .

Table 8 summarizes the estimation results of  $a_{1|0}$ ,  $\psi$  and  $\Delta$  with the aggregated version of actual data as described above. Again, the homogeneous/heterogeneous independent models are excluded from the comparison as these models do not attempt to estimate  $a_{1|0}$ ,  $\psi$  and  $\Delta$  by assuming  $\theta$  is constantly equal to one. It is shown that the estimated values of  $\Delta$  under the homogeneous/heterogeneous SSMs are around 0.3, which implies a rather fast decay of the impact of the latent factors  $(\Theta_{i,t})_{t \geq 1}$ .

As mentioned in the proof of Proposition 3.3, there is an AR(1) type identity in the relationship between  $\Theta_{i,t}^{-1}$  and  $\Theta_{i,t+1}^{-1}$ , that is,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \Theta_{i,t+1}^{-1} \middle| Y_{i,1:t} \right] = \Delta \mathbb{E} \left[ \Theta_{i,t}^{-1} \middle| Y_{i,1:t} \right] + (1 - \Delta).$$

That being said, if  $\Delta \simeq 0.3$ , then the approximate correlation between  $\Theta_{i,t}^{-1}$  and  $\Theta_{i,t+3}^{-1}$  is only about  $\Delta^3 = 2.7\%$ , which is indeed negligible compared to its full magnitude of 100%. Intuitively, this means that many of the outpatient visits do not occur over a longer time period (possibly for the same reason).

Table 8: Summary of the parameter estimation on the real dataset.

	$\widehat{a}_{1 0}$	$\widehat{\psi}$	$\widehat{\Delta}$
Homogeneous Bühlmann	0.8257	2.0394	1.0000
Homogeneous SSM	0.4166	0.8746	0.3262
Heterogeneous Bühlmann	1.4543	1.7334	1.0000
Heterogeneous SSM	0.7150	0.8257	0.2825

Such an impact from seemingly fast-decaying state-space variables are pronounced in the out-of-sample validation results in Table 9. It is shown that whether we assume a homogeneous or heterogeneous external mean model, the predictive performance of the Bühlmann models (which is analogous to assume  $\Delta = 1$ ) are worse than that of the independent models (which is analogous to assume  $\Delta = 0$ ). On the other hand, the proposed SSMs by far show the best predictive performance by capturing the correct magnitude of the decaying factor of the inverse state-space variables  $\Theta_{i,t}^{-1}$  from the data.

## 8. Summary

Observation-driven state-space models are widely used in time-series modeling due to their analytical tractability in many cases. For claim counts, Harvey and Fernandes (1989) introduced

Table 9: Summary of out-of-sample validation on the real dataset.

	RMSE			GDEV		
	Independent	Bühlmann	SSM	Independent	Bühlmann	SSM
Homogenous	11562.25	12688.83	10715.44	4512.37	4612.77	4185.06
Heterogeneous	10809.82	10940.15	10173.28	3324.28	3532.69	3118.87

a Poisson-Gamma observation-driven state-space model that is fully analytically tractable, and [Ahn et al. \(2023b\)](#) later extended this model to accommodate flexible variance behavior in the latent state-space dynamics.

For claim size modeling or positive continuous random response modeling, the Gamma distribution is a natural and often preferred choice. [Smith and Miller \(1986\)](#) proposed the Gamma-Gamma observation-driven state-space model, offering a fully tractable modeling framework. However, a limitation of the [Smith and Miller \(1986\)](#) model is that its variance behavior is constrained to be increasing. This paper aims to generalize the Gamma-Gamma observation-driven state-space model to allow for flexible variance behavior, addressing this limitation.

Looking ahead, it would be valuable to develop a more rigorous classification of parameter-driven versus observation-driven state-space models. In particular, understanding the conditions under which a given response process  $(Y_t)_{t \geq 1}$  admits both parameter-driven and observation-driven state-space representations would be of great interest. Naturally, this involves addressing the identifiability issues, which are not yet fully resolved.

The Poisson-Gamma and Gamma-Gamma cases are part of the exponential dispersion family (EDF) with conjugate priors. A natural next step would be to investigate whether our results extend to the entire class of EDF models with conjugate priors. Additionally, the Gamma state-space process possesses several desirable properties, as exploited in [Ahn et al. \(2023b\)](#). It would be intriguing to determine the extent to which these properties are necessary to maintain analytical tractability.

## References

- Ahn, J. Y., Jeong, H., and Lu, Y. (2021). On the ordering of credibility factors. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 101:626–638.
- Ahn, J. Y., Jeong, H., and Lu, Y. (2023a). A simple Bayesian state-space approach to the collective risk models. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*, 2023(5):509–529.
- Ahn, J. Y., Jeong, H., Lu, Y., and Wüthrich, M. V. (2023b). A classification of observation-driven state-space count models for panel data. [arXiv:2308.16058](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.16058).

- Anderson, B. D. and Moore, J. B. (2005). Optimal filtering. Courier Corporation.
- Arulampalam, M. S., Maskell, S., Gordon, N., and Clapp, T. (2002). A tutorial on particle filters for online nonlinear/non-Gaussian Bayesian tracking. IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing, 50(2):174–188.
- Bichsel, F. (1964). Erfahrungs-Tarifierung in der Motorfahrzeughaftpflicht-Versicherung. Bulletin of the Swiss Association of Actuaries, 1964:119–130.
- Bolancé, C., Denuit, M., Guillén, M., and Lambert, P. (2007). Greatest accuracy credibility with dynamic heterogeneity: the Harvey-Fernandes model. Belgian Actuarial Bulletin, 7(1):14–18.
- Bolancé, C., Guillén, M., and Pinquet, J. (2003). Time-varying credibility for frequency risk models: estimation and tests for autoregressive specifications on the random effects. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 33(2):273–282.
- Bühlmann, H. (1967). Experience rating and credibility. ASTIN Bulletin - The Journal of the IAA, 4(3):199–207.
- Bühlmann, H. and Gisler, A. (2006). A course in credibility theory and its applications. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bühlmann, H. and Straub, E. (1970). Glaubwürdigkeit für Schadensätze. Bulletin of the Swiss Association of Actuaries, 70(1):111–133.
- Cox, D. R. (1981). Statistical analysis of time series: Some recent developments. Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, 8(2):93–115.
- Doucet, A., Godsill, S., and Andrieu, C. (2000). On sequential Monte Carlo sampling methods for Bayesian filtering. Statistics and Computing, 10:197–208.
- Embrechts, P., Klüppelberg, C., and Mikosch, T. (2013). Modelling extremal events: for insurance and finance, volume 33. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Harvey, A. C. and Fernandes, C. (1989). Time series models for count or qualitative observations. Journal of Business & Economic Statistics, 7(4):407–417.
- Johnson, N. L., Kotz, S., and Balakrishnan, N. (1995). Continuous univariate distributions, volume 2, volume 289. John Wiley & Sons.
- Jorgensen, B. (1997). The theory of dispersion models. CRC Press.
- Kalman, R. E. (1960). A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems. Journal of Basic Engineering, 82(1):35–45.

- Laird, N. M. and Ware, J. H. (1982). Random-effects models for longitudinal data. Biometrics, pages 963–974.
- Lee, Y. and Nelder, J. A. (1996). Hierarchical generalized linear models. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology, 58(4):619–656.
- Lomax, K. S. (1954). Business failures: Another example of the analysis of failure data. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 49(268):847–852.
- Pinquet, J. (2020a). Poisson models with dynamic random effects and nonnegative credibilities per period. ASTIN Bulletin - The Journal of the IAA, 50(2):585–618.
- Pinquet, J. (2020b). Positivity properties of the arfima (0, d, 0) specifications and credibility analysis of frequency risks. Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, 95:159–165.
- Pinquet, J., Guillén, M., and Bolancé, C. (2001). Allowance for the age of claims in bonus-malus systems. ASTIN Bulletin - The Journal of the IAA, 31(2):337–348.
- Smith, R. and Miller, J. (1986). A non-Gaussian state space model and application to prediction of records. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B, 48(1):79–88.
- Whitney, A. W. (1918). The theory of experience rating. Proceedings of the Casualty Actuarial Society, 4:274–292.