

A multistate approach to disability insurance reserving with information delays

Oliver Lunding Sandqvist^{1,2,*}

¹PFA Pension, Sundkrogsgade 4, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark.

²Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 5, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: oliver.s@math.ku.dk.

Disability insurance claims are often affected by lengthy reporting delays and adjudication processes. The classic multistate life insurance modeling framework is ill-suited to handle such information delays since the cash flow and available information can no longer be based on the biometric multistate process determining the contractual payments. We propose a new individual reserving model for disability insurance schemes which describes the claim evolution in real-time. Under suitable independence assumptions between the available information and the underlying biometric multistate process, we show that these new reserves may be calculated as natural modifications of the classic reserves. For estimation of the model constituents, we employ the procedure proposed in Buchardt et al. (2025). A real data application shows the practical relevance of our concepts and results.

Keywords: Multistate life insurance; Claims reserving; Incurred-but-not-reported; Reported-but-not-settled.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 91G05; 60G57; 62N02; 62P05; 91G60.

JEL Classification: G22; C51; C02.

1. Introduction

Reserves are fundamental to the insurance industry, and recently, reserving for disability insurance schemes has become a topic of considerable interest for Danish insurers due to new regulation, worsening risks, and heightened price competition. Disability insurance and similar insurance schemes such as workers' compensation insurance generally work by covering disabilities of an insured that occur in a prespecified *coverage period* in exchange for a premium. Disabilities are covered in the sense that benefits are paid out if the insured becomes disabled with a disability that qualifies for a payout per the criteria specified in the insurance contract. The most prominent schemes pay benefits as long as the insured is disabled and is below the retirement age to compensate for lost wages. Usually, disability benefits will not be paid starting from disablement, but only once the disability has lasted a period of time called the *qualifying period* or *waiting period*. In fact,

many disabilities will start payout even later due to reporting and adjudication delays. Reporting delays are defined as the time between the occurrence and reporting of an event. For Danish insurance companies, disabilities generally have long reporting delays compared to other insurance events such as deaths. The adjudication delay is defined as the time between when a claim is reported and when it is adjudicated. During the adjudication process, the insurance company evaluates whether the insured is eligible for disability benefits or not. This can be a lengthy process when there is a need to obtain further clinical assessments of the claimed disability.

These characteristics situate disability insurance somewhere between traditional life and non-life insurance schemes: the long cash flows associated with the possibility of paying benefits from disablement until retirement are similar to the characteristics of other life insurance schemes, while information delays are features that have so far primarily been explored in the non-life part of the insurance reserving literature. In this paper, we propose a model that is tailored to accommodate both of these features.

Our proposed model can in many ways be seen as an extension of the classic semi-Markov models that have dominated the actuarial literature on disability insurance, see for example Janssen (1966), Hoem (1972), Haberman and Pitacco (1998), Helwich (2008), Christiansen (2012), and Buchardt et al. (2015). Such models have also been used extensively in the biostatistical literature, see for example Lagakos et al. (1978), Andersen et al. (1993), Dabrowska (1995), Hougaard (2000), and Spitoni et al. (2012) as well as the references therein. The semi-Markov models have been popular in the disability insurance literature for several reasons. First and foremost, they allow the intensity of mortality and reactivation from a disability to depend on the duration since disablement, which is crucial in practice. In addition, the contractual payments in some cases depend on the duration since the last jump, for example due to a qualifying period, which can be handled in a semi-Markov setup. Finally, semi-Markov models, and multistate models more generally, provide a natural and parsimonious way to represent the information contained in an insurance contract and to capture the intertemporal dependencies of the cash flow. We seek to retain these attractive properties while accommodating the effects of reporting and adjudication delays.

As noted in Buchardt et al. (2023), the fundamental challenge in this endeavor is that contractual payments refer to when events occur (e.g. the time of death or the time of disablement) without any regard to when this information is observed by the insurer. On the other hand, the usual multistate life insurance modeling literature assumes that one can observe the process driving the contractual payments fully and in real-time. Therefore, when the information needed to determine the contractual payments at a given time is not available to the insurer at that time due to information delays, the problem falls outside the usual multistate life insurance modeling framework.

The paper Buchardt et al. (2023) has established a framework intended to deal with these complications, distinguishing between and linking the so-called valid time model, which models when events occur, and the so-called transaction time model, which models what is observed by the insurer. While some relations between the models stay simple in all cases, the relation between the reserves can be almost arbitrarily complicated and hence has to be investigated in specific models. In their Example 5.8, they derive an explicit relation in a simple example, but remark: *“To capture the full picture of IBNR and RBNS reserving, one would need to explore more intricate transaction time models with both reporting delays and claim adjudications”*. Here, IBNR stands for incurred-but-not-reported while RBNS stands for reported-but-not-settled. In this paper, we do exactly this, applying the framework to derive explicit and tractable expressions for the reserves of fairly general disability insurance schemes under suitable assumptions. We also give detailed discussions on the reasonableness of the assumptions and the practical relevance of the results.

The reserves are operationalized by employing the estimation procedure from Buchardt et al. (2025) who has studied parametric estimation of multistate models subject to reporting delays and adjudications. In addition to providing operational expressions for disability insurance reserves, a main contribution of the paper is to provide intuition for how transaction time information may affect the reserves in a realistic setting, allowing one to adjust the models when certain assumptions are not met, and serving as a basis for future work in this area.

The way reporting delays and adjudication processes are incorporated in our model shares some similarities with parts of the non-life insurance literature on individual reserving models, especially those formulated in the recent string of papers Crevecoeur et al. (2019), Verbelen et al. (2022), Crevecoeur et al. (2022a), and Crevecoeur et al. (2022b). The first two papers explore estimation of the claim frequency subject to IBNR claims. Both assume an underlying Poisson process driving the claim frequency and form a thinned version by deleting claims that are unreported by the time of analysis. In the first paper, the maximum likelihood estimator is obtained by assuming piecewise constant rates, while in the second paper, one treats the deleted claims as missing under an EM-algorithm. The third paper explores reserving and estimation of RBNS claims by modeling the conditional distribution of the full claim development, consisting of all payments and auxiliary characteristics of the claim, given the historical development. The model is calibrated using (weighted) maximum likelihood estimation. The last paper explores reserving and estimation of both IBNR and RBNS, using much of the framework that had been developed in the previous papers. Their reserves do not have closed-form solutions so Monte-Carlo simulation is used. All the models are formulated in discrete time.

Comparing with our approach, a formal difference is that we formulate the models in continuous time. The effect of IBNR on claim frequency is treated in a similar manner, but additional survival probabilities appear in our multistate approach compared to the Poisson model. The primary difference regarding IBNR however stems from how the payments are treated. In the non-life insurance models, the conditional expectation of the ultimate payment given the reporting delay is computed using Monte-Carlo simulation of the full real-time development of the claim while we instead are able to use the known form of the contractual payments. For RBNS modeling, Crevecoeur et al. (2022a) and Crevecoeur et al. (2022b) similarly propose to model the full real-time development of a claim conditional on historical developments. Having to model the full development of a claim results in a larger number of model elements, and thus a greater risk of misspecification. This risk of bias accumulation is acknowledged in Crevecoeur et al. (2022a) where it is suggested to re-scale each time layer of the model to ensure that the sum of the predictions equals the sum of the observed values in the training data.

Our approach requires additional conditional independence assumptions between the observed information and the underlying biometric state process driving the contractual payments, but in return, one only needs two extra model elements in addition to what is usually modeled in the multistate approach, namely the reporting delay distribution and the adjudication probabilities. Furthermore, one obtains relatively simple closed-form expressions for the reserves, eliminating the need for Monte-Carlo simulation. The derivation of the reserves is based on stochastic analysis that falls outside of existing results and techniques, because we are led to analyze the biometric state process stopped at a random time that is not a stopping time with respect to the filtration of interest, namely the filtration generated by the biometric state process. Such complications did not arise in the simple model from Example 5.8 of Buchardt et al. (2023), and the treatment of the resulting mathematical complexities is another main contribution of the paper.

It is also relevant to consider whether the reserves could be based on aggregate models (e.g., chain ladder Mack (1993, 1999)) rather than individual reserving models given their popularity with practitioners, see e.g. Lopez et al. (2018) and the references therein. For aggregate models to be

applicable, steady-state assumptions have to hold on an aggregate level. Steady-state assumptions at a portfolio level are unsuitable for disability insurance since disability claims frequently lead to several decades of benefit payments causing the proportion of long-lasting disabilities in the portfolio to rise for many decades. Assuming that an aggregate reserving model was available, it would likely still suffer from certain robustness issues. For example, a model based on chain ladder would be slow to capture trends such as the sharp rise in mental health-related disabilities that has been observed in recent years, while it is straightforward to include a calendar time effect in the proposed reserving models. As another example, consider an IBNR reserve that arises as some transformation of the classic semi-Markov reserves for the policies that are currently in the portfolio. Then an influx of new policies would lead to an unwarranted increase in reserves; the aggregate IBNR reserve should initially remain unchanged since disabilities that occurred before entering the portfolio do not lead to disability benefits. Covariate shifts in the portfolio would also violate steady-state assumptions, while individual reserving models are robust to such shifts whenever the covariate is included in the model.

A general disadvantage of individual models is that they often lead to higher estimation risk since more elements have to be estimated. They may also lead to higher model risk since more assumptions are needed to construct the models. In this paper, we seek to accommodate the former by deriving models that do not require many new model elements. To accommodate the latter, we provide detailed discussions on how to adjust the models when central assumptions of the setup are violated. Methods for detecting deviations between the models and the realized outcomes are given in Remark B.1 and Theorem 5.10 of Buchardt et al. (2023), making it possible to monitor the estimation and model risk. The proposed models thus possess many properties that could make them attractive for practitioners.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes our valid time and transaction time model for disability insurance schemes. Section 3 concerns reserving and contains the main results. Estimation is discussed in Section 4. Section 5 contains a real data application. Section 6 concludes. Lengthy proofs are deferred to Appendix A and the straightforward extension to stochastic interest rates is given in Appendix B.

2. Setup

2.1. Disability insurance in valid time

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$ be a filtered background probability space. The biometric state of the insured is governed by a non-explosive pure jump process $Y : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathcal{J}$ on a finite state space $\mathcal{J} = \{1, 2, \dots, J\}$ for $J \in \mathbb{N}$ with deterministic initial state y_0 . Denote by N the corresponding multivariate counting process with components $N_{jk} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{N}_0$ ($j, k \in \mathcal{J}, k \neq j$) given by

$$N_{jk}(t) = \#\{s \in (0, t] : Y_{s-} = j, Y_s = k\}.$$

For $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{J}$, let $\tau_{\mathcal{A}} : \Omega \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}_+$ be the first hitting time of \mathcal{A} such that $\tau_{\mathcal{A}} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y_t \in \mathcal{A}\}$. The information generated by Y is represented by the filtration $\mathcal{F}_t^Y = \sigma(Y_s, s \leq t)$. We shall also need the future information $\mathcal{F}^{t,Y} = \sigma(Y_s, s \geq t)$. Let $U : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ be the duration in the current state,

$$U_t = t - \sup\{s \in (0, t] : Y_s \neq Y_t\}.$$

A life insurance contract between the insured and the insurer is stipulated by the specification of the accumulated cash flow $B : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ representing the accumulated benefits less premiums.

We refer to this as the valid time cash flow or the contractual payments, and assume it is on the usual semi-Markov form,

$$B(dt) = \sum_{j=1}^J 1_{(Y_{t-}=j)} B_{j,t-U_{t-}}(dt) + \sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j \neq k}}^J b_{jk}(t, U_{t-}) N_{jk}(dt), \quad B(0) \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $B_{j,w} : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}, w \geq 0$) are measurable, càdlàg and of finite variation, and $b_{jk}(t, u)$ ($j, k \in \mathcal{J}, j \neq k$) are measurable and bounded. Since $t - U_{t-}$ is piecewise constant, the above expression is well-defined. We bundle all the processes that determine the payments into $X_t = (t, Y_t, U_t)$. Note that $\mathcal{F}_t^X = \mathcal{F}_t^Y$ since U is constructed from the history of Y . Like Buchardt et al. (2023), we name the model for X and B the *valid time model*. In this paper, we assume that the biometric state process Y takes values in the state space \mathcal{J} depicted in Figure 2.1.




Figure 2.1: The state process Y takes values in $\mathcal{J} = \{a, i_1, \dots, i_m, r, d\}$, being an illness-death model with m disabled states $\mathcal{I} = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ and a separate reactivated state. To reduce clutter, all transitions to and from \mathcal{I} are illustrated as single dotted arrows. Transition between the disabled states is not possible.

Note that we have here labeled the states with letters instead of integers to stay consistent with the actuarial literature. This should cause no confusion in what follows. We assume $y_0 = a$ since only non-disabled are offered the insurance. We assume that Y is a semi-Markov process with measurable transition hazards $\mu_{jk} : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ ($j, k \in \mathcal{J}, j \neq k$) which are Lebesgue-integrable on compact subsets of \mathbb{R}_+^2 so that the intensity process for N_{jk} is given by $\lambda_{jk}(t) = 1_{(Y_{t-}=j)} \mu_{jk}(t, U_{t-})$. That Y is semi-Markov implies that X is Markov. The assumption regarding the existence of transition hazards (as opposed to cumulative transition hazards) could be removed using the techniques of Jacobsen (2006) or Helwich (2008) and it would similarly not be difficult to allow for an uncountable number of disabled states e.g. $\mathcal{I} = (0, 1]$ representing the degree of lost earning capacity. The choice and implications of the chosen state space are discussed in Remark 2.1.

Remark 2.1. (Valid time state space for disability insurance contract.)

In the multistate modeling literature, one usually allows for a general finite state space. We restrict our attention to the particular state space depicted in Figure 2.1 because, as was noted in the introduction, the relation between the valid time and transaction time reserves can be highly model-specific. The state space is intended to be general enough to capture most common disability insurance schemes. The hierarchical structure is imposed to simplify the transaction time model construction by making it so that there is only one disability and reactivation time to keep track of, as well as making the implementation in Section 5 easier since one can avoid

implementing the semi-Markov Kolmogorov forward differential equations known from Buchardt et al. (2015) and instead use Thiele's differential equations successively.

Modeling disability insurance contracts using the model from Figure 2.1 implies that at most one disability can occur, that the disability type does not change after disablement, and that a reactivation of this disability is permanent. For contracts where it is important to model temporary reactivations, one might instead prefer to use a non-hierarchical illness-death model where reactivations are modeled as jumps back into state a instead of into the separate reactivated state r , see e.g. Figure 3 in Helwich (2008) or Example 2.1 in Christiansen (2012).

When coverage periods are short, as is usually the case for disability insurance schemes, and the disability hazard is small, ignoring the possibility of several disabilities can be reasonable. Even if one uses the non-hierarchical model, it can be complicated to allow for several distinct disabilities if the insurance contract includes a coverage period. To see this, consider the situation where the insured becomes disabled within the coverage period of a disability annuity, reactivates, and becomes disabled again outside of the coverage period. Whether the insured is qualified for disability payments for the second disability depends on whether or not it was caused by the disability event in the coverage period.

The most natural way to capture this is to choose the disability event times to be those that lead to payout when estimating the disability hazard or to extend X such that it contains information about which disability event is causing the current disablement. An alternative would be to let the payment rate in the disabled state be the average payment rate conditional on the historical development of X , see Remark 3.11 for more details. These approaches would all lead to models with an intricate dependence on the past coverage periods and the historical development of X . In Remark 3.11 we propose ways to obtain consistent reserves in situations where there may be several disabilities and/or transition between the disability types without having to use the non-hierarchical state space. ∇

In order to formulate the transaction time model in the next section, it is convenient to introduce some marked point process notation. In general, all our processes are assumed to be constructed according to the canonical approach of Jacobsen (2006), which among other things implies a specific regular conditional distribution used in the conditional distributions and conditional expectations. We note that X takes values in a Borel-space which we denote (E, \mathcal{E}) . Write ∇ for the irrelevant mark and $\bar{E} = E \cup \{\nabla\}$. Let

$$K = \{((t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) \in \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+^{\mathbb{N}} \times \bar{E}^{\mathbb{N}} : t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \uparrow \infty, t_n < t_{n+1} \text{ if } t_n < \infty, \\ \text{and } x_n \in E \text{ iff } t_n < \infty\}$$

denote the space of sequences of jump times and jump marks and let this be equipped with the σ -algebra \mathcal{K} generated by the coordinate projections

$$T_n^\circ((t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, (x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}) = t_n, \quad X_n^\circ((t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, (x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}) = x_n$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let the stochastic process $H : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto K$ be the marked point process history of X . The value H_t consists of the ordered sequences of jump times $(\tau_{\{j\}} \times 1_{(\tau_{\{j\}} \leq t)})_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ and corresponding jump marks $(X_{\tau_{\{j\}}} \times 1_{(\tau_{\{j\}} \leq t)})_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ followed by a sequence of ∞ and ∇ respectively. Note that this representation of the jump times and jump marks only holds when the model is hierarchical. Since X is a piecewise deterministic process, there exists a measurable function $f : K \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto E$ with the property that $X_t = f_{H_t}(t)$.

2.2. Disability insurance in transaction time

As was pointed out in Buchardt et al. (2023), it may sometimes be unreasonable to assume that the insurer has observed \mathcal{F}_t^X at time t , since there can be reporting and processing delays for disability claims. In this case, we also cannot assume that $B(t)$ has been paid out at time t . Consequently, we introduce a stochastic process $\mathcal{Z} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto S$, where (S, \mathcal{S}) is a Borel-space, which generates the insurer's available information $\mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}$. We furthermore introduce the stochastic process $\mathcal{B} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ modeling the accumulated observed payments which by construction will be $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ -adapted, measurable, càdlàg and of finite variation. We refer to it as the transaction time cash flow. The model for \mathcal{Z} and \mathcal{B} , which we now specify, is called the *transaction time model*.

Information

As a first coordinate of \mathcal{Z} we define the right-continuous pure jump process $Z^{(1)} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathcal{J}^{(1)}$ taking values in the state space $\mathcal{J}^{(1)} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ depicted in Figure 2.2.




Figure 2.2: State space $\mathcal{J}^{(1)}$ for the process $Z^{(1)}$.

The process $Z^{(1)}$ represents the state of the claim settlement and it holds that $Z_0^{(1)} = 1$. We introduce another coordinate of \mathcal{Z} denoted $Z^{(2)} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ which represents the time of the disability event as reported by the insured in connection with a claim. We require $t \mapsto Z_t^{(2)}$ to be increasing and piecewise constant, and that its value can only increase upon a jump of $Z^{(1)}$ into state 2. Furthermore, we require $Z_t^{(2)} \leq t$ and that $Z_t^{(2)}$ stays constant after a nonzero amount of disability benefits have been awarded. How disability benefits are awarded is formalized later in this section. The interpretation is that when a disability claim is reported, the insurer also reports at which past time the disability occurred. Furthermore, different disability claims are allowed, but only until one of the claims is awarded, and the claims must furthermore always be reported in the same order as their chronological ordering. We let $Z_0^{(2)} = 0$ as a convention. We also introduce a coordinate $Z^{(3)} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathcal{I}$ which represents the disability type that is reported in connection with a claim, assume that it only changes when $Z^{(2)}$ changes, and set $Z_0^{(3)} = i_1$ as a convention. Finally, denote the counting processes related to $Z^{(1)}$ by $N_{jk}^{(1)} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{N}_0$ ($j, k \in \mathcal{J}^{(1)}, j \neq k$) and denote by $T_{\{j\}} = \inf\{s \in [0, \infty) : Z_s^{(1)} = j\}$ the first hitting time of state j by $Z^{(1)}$.

In addition to observing $Z = (Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)}, Z^{(3)})$, the insurer observes what is being awarded to the insured; for example, whether a jump from state 2 to state 3 of $Z^{(1)}$ was accompanied by a payout of disability benefits in the form of *backpay* or not. The term backpay refers to a payout of overdue payments that have been delayed by reporting and processing delays, and such payments

appear in the transaction time cash flow \mathcal{B} constructed later in this section.

Knowing what is awarded to the insured however contains more information than simply knowing the realized payments since awarding disability benefits may not immediately lead to the commencement of payments if the adjudication is completed before the qualifying period ends. What is awarded to the insured is encoded in the bi-temporal stochastic process $H : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mapsto \mathbb{K}$, where H_s^t is interpreted as the value of H_s based on the information available at time t . We sometimes refer to t as the observational time and s as the historical time. We also introduce $X : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mapsto E$ given by $X_s^t = (s, Y_s^t, U_s^t) = f_{H_s^t}(s)$, which is interpreted as the value of X_s based on the available information at time t . Similarly, introduce the bi-temporal counting processes $N_{jk} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mapsto \mathbb{N}_0$ which we denote $N_{jk}^t(s)$ with analogous interpretation. In total, we let $\mathcal{Z}_t = (Z_t, H_t^t)$.

To specify a model for H_s^t , we introduce an auxiliary stochastic process $G : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, where G_t marks the beginning of the period where the insured would be eligible for additional disability when standing at time t , and which is given by

$$dG_t = dZ_t^{(2)} + 1_{(Z_t^{(1)}=4)} dt + \sum_{k \in \{3,4,5\}} \delta_t^{2k} dN_{2k}^{(1)}(t), \quad G_0 = 0,$$

for stochastic processes $\delta^{2k} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ with $k \in \{3, 4, 5\}$ satisfying $\delta_t^{24} = t - G_{t-}$ and $\delta_t^{2k} \in [0, t - G_{t-})$ when $k \in \{3, 5\}$. The fact that $Z_t^{(2)}$ was required to be constant after a non-zero amount of disability claims have been awarded corresponds to saying that it stays constant after time t if $G_t > Z_t^{(2)}$. The interpretation of the specification of G is that the insured is disabled if they have an ongoing disability payout (in other words: the insurance company is not able to retract disability benefits that have been paid out), which is captured by G increasing with a rate of 1 in state 4 as well as G jumping to the value t if a jump from state 2 to state 4 occurs at time t . If the insured was eligible for additional disability benefits but is no longer disabled at the time of payout, this is captured by an increase in G upon a jump from state 2 to state 3 or to state 5.

From G , we can create other processes of interest such as $W : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, being the number of time units the insured has been eligible for disability benefits using the current information, which is given by

$$W_t = G_t - Z_t^{(2)}.$$

We use W instead of writing expressions in terms of G whenever it eases interpretation. Some immediate properties are that G_t and W_t are increasing and $W_t \leq G_t \leq t$.

We now specify H_s^t . The bi-temporal process H_s^t contains $(T_{\{5\}}, d)$ on $(T_{\{5\}} \leq s, T_{\{5\}} \leq t)$, $(Z_t^{(2)}, Z_t^{(3)})$ on $(Z_t^{(2)} \leq s, 0 < W_t)$, and (G_t, r) on $(G_t \leq s, 0 < W_t, Z_t^{(1)} \neq 4, G_t \neq T_{\{5\}})$. Thus, events enter H_s^t when the corresponding jump time exceeds s and some t -related criterion is satisfied: Death has to have occurred before time t for the death event to be included, the insured has to have been deemed eligible for disability benefits for a nonzero amount of time by time t for the disability event to be included, and if it additionally holds that the payout of disability benefits has been stopped at time t and this wasn't due to death then the reactivation event is also included. As detailed later in this section, the transaction time cash flow \mathcal{B} is constructed such that it is always in accordance with H_s^t . Therefore, H_s^t determines the payments and its specification is consequently essential to how the proposed transaction time model works.

To complete the modeling setup for the observations, we need to specify how \mathcal{Z} is related to X . Note that $t \mapsto H_s^t$ is constant between jumps of $Z^{(1)}$, and assume $T_{\{5\}}$ is finite almost surely and that $H_s^t = H_s$ for $t \geq T_{\{5\}}$. In other words, $Z^{(1)}$ is the driver of new information arriving and the valid time process X_s is the limit of the transaction time process X_s^t when the observation time t

tends to infinity. It follows that the *basic bi-temporal structure assumptions* introduced in Buchardt et al. (2023) are satisfied, and we may hence use their results. Note that with this specification of the transaction time model, once a disability claim has triggered some benefits, everything that happens afterward relates to this disability and no other disabilities can be reported. This is similar in spirit to how it was assumed that at most one disability could occur in the valid time model depicted in Figure 2.1.

Remark 2.2. (Granularity of the information.)

The above transaction time model presumes that the actuary has access to relatively granular information. It might be that the actuary does not receive information about reported claims, but is only notified about payouts. In that case, one may work with alternative transaction time models such as the $Z^{(1)}$ model depicted in Figure 2.3.




Figure 2.3: Coarser state space for the process $Z^{(1)}$.

Here the different events could represent starting running payments, stopping running payments, or awarding backpay. It would be natural to let $Z^{(2)} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \{0, 1\}$ be an indicator of whether there is running payments in the current state, and allow for a stochastic amount (including zero) of disability benefits to be awarded when jumping from one state to the next. The methods presented in this paper for the granular case can be adapted to handle this coarser case as well. Our methods do not apply if individual data is not available. ∇

Payments

We now specify how the transaction time cash flow \mathcal{B} is related to the valid time cash flow B . We first introduce the time value of money. A detailed treatment may be found in Norberg (1990). Let $\kappa : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ be some deterministic strictly positive càdlàg *accumulation function* with initial value $\kappa(0) = 1$. A common choice is $\kappa(t) = \exp\left(\int_{(0,t]} r(v) dv\right)$ for some deterministic integrable function $r : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ called the force of interest. The corresponding *discount function* is $t \mapsto 1/\kappa(t)$. Introduce the auxiliary stochastic process $\mathcal{B}' : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{B}'(t) = \sum_{j=1}^J \int_{[0,t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} 1_{(Y_{s-}^t=j)} B_{j,s-U_{s-}^t}(ds) + \sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j \neq k}}^J \int_{[0,t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} b_{jk}(s, U_{s-}^t) N_{jk}^t(ds)$$

which is the time t value of the payments generated by $(X_s^t)_{s \leq t}$. We then specify the transaction time cash flow $\mathcal{B} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\int_{[0,t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} \mathcal{B}(ds) = \mathcal{B}'(t). \quad (2.1)$$

The payments \mathcal{B} are constructed such that the accumulated payments in real-time are always congruent with the most recent marked point process history. The way discounting is incorporated

is closely connected to the notion of no arbitrage; the insurance company should not be able to keep the additional interest that they would earn by delaying the payout of benefits, so payments are accumulated with interest from the relevant historical time to the current observational time.

An explicit construction of a \mathcal{B} satisfying Equation (2.1) and further discussions are given in Buchardt et al. (2023). That their definition of \mathcal{B} satisfies Equation (2.1) follows by using their Proposition 5.3 upon dividing with $\kappa(t)$ on both sides and taking the difference between evaluating in 0 and t to see

$$\int_{(0,t]} \frac{1}{\kappa(s)} \mathcal{B}(ds) = \frac{1}{\kappa(t)} \mathcal{B}'(t) - \mathcal{B}(0)$$

and then isolating $\mathcal{B}'(t)$.

In Appendix B, we extend the results of Section 3 to stochastic interest rates that are independent of the valid and transaction time models and furthermore provide a way to validate the non-financial parts of the model. While these results are important for practical applications, they are relatively straightforward to derive and are somewhat orthogonal to the rest of the paper. Consequently, they have been deferred to the appendix.

3. Reserving

We now introduce the valid time and transaction time reserves, which are the focal point of the remainder of the paper. The present value in the valid time model $P : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and the present value in the transaction time model $\mathcal{P} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ are defined as

$$P(t) = \int_{(t,\infty)} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} \mathcal{B}(ds), \quad \mathcal{P}(t) = \int_{(t,\infty)} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} \mathcal{B}(ds),$$

respectively. We assume $P(t)$ and $\mathcal{P}(t)$ are integrable for any t . The corresponding valid time reserve $V : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and transaction time reserve $\mathcal{V} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ are then defined as

$$V(t) = \mathbb{E}[P(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^X], \quad \mathcal{V}(t) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^Z].$$

Since $P(t)$ is $\mathcal{F}^{t,X}$ -measurable and X is Markov, we get $V(t) = \mathbb{E}[P(t) \mid X_t]$ almost surely. We also introduce the state-wise reserves $V_j : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ given by $V_j(t, u) = \mathbb{E}[P(t) \mid X_t = (t, j, u)]$ ($t \geq 0, j \in \mathcal{J}, u \geq 0$), which are measurable functions satisfying $V_{Y_t}(t, U_t) = V(t)$ almost surely. The choice of $V_j(t, u)$ is not unique, but we follow the convention from the literature, which is to choose the version where the transition probabilities satisfy the Chapman-Kolmogorov equations surely, confer with Jacobsen (2006) p. 158-159 for the construction of such a version. In most applications, the specific choice of the state-wise reserves will not matter, since they will always be evaluated in X_t . This is not the case in our application, so we make this choice explicit. The choice is also important if one is interested in path properties of $V(t)$, see e.g. Christiansen and Furrer (2021). Our choice of state-wise reserves agrees with that of Christiansen and Furrer (2021), confer with the proof of Theorem 5.10 in Buchardt et al. (2023).

For $K \in \mathcal{A}$ we write

$$V_j(t, u; K) = \mathbb{E}[P(t) \mid X_t = (t, j, u), K]$$

for the reserve when we additionally condition on the event K . It is defined as $V_j(t, u; K) = \mathbb{E}[1_K P(t) \mid X_t = (t, j, u)] / \mathbb{P}(K \mid X_t = (t, j, u))$ with the convention $0/0 = 0$. This equals $\mathbb{E}[P(t) \mid X_t = (t, j, u), 1_K]$ on the event K .

Categorization

Using the setup introduced in Section 2.2, we can categorize the reserve at different points in time according to the usual claims reserving terminology known from e.g. Norberg (1993).

- On $(\text{Settled}_t) = (Z_t^{(1)} = 5)$, the claim and reserve are classified as *settled*, because even if some payments may remain in the dead state, the total claim size is known exactly.
- On $(\text{RBNS}_t) = (Z_t^{(1)} \in \{2, 3, 4\})$, the claim and reserve are *reported-but-not-settled*.
- On $(\text{CBNR}_t) = (Z_t^{(1)} = 1)$, the claim and reserve are *covered-but-not-reported*.

In the latter case, we will have an IBNR contribution for policies where the disability has already occurred, and a *covered-but-not-incurred* (CBNI) contribution for policies where no disability has occurred yet. We therefore also introduce the events $(\text{IBNR}_t) = (\text{CBNR}_t, \tau_{\mathcal{I}} \leq t)$ and $(\text{CBNI}_t) = (\text{CBNR}_t, \tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t)$ which are however not known from the information available at time t . We also define $(\text{RBNSr}_t) = (\text{RBNS}_t, W_t > 0)$ and $(\text{RBNSi}_t) = (\text{RBNS}_t, W_t = 0)$, being RBNS where benefits have and have not been awarded respectively. In the former case, the time of disability is known and the time of reactivation is not fully determined, while in the latter case, both are not fully determined. The latter case is sometimes referred to as reported-but-not-paid in the literature, see e.g. Bettonville et al. (2021), and the former could consequently be called paid-but-not-settled, but these terms are not used in the current paper.

Independence

For the reserves to be tractable, we need some restriction on the conditional distribution of X given $\mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}$. Conditional independence criteria provide a natural way to impose such restrictions. We find it desirable to assume that the transaction time information only affects the distribution of future values X by affecting the probability that a certain valid time outcome was the true realization, and thus provides no additional information if the true valid time outcome was known. This leads to tractable reserves and is often a reasonable assumption, and even if it is not, the violation can often be remedied by extending the valid time model, see the discussion in Remark 3.10. When the insured is dead all is known and so no independence assumption is needed. Formally, we thus assume:

Assumption 3.1. (Influence of transaction time information.)

On (CBNR_t)

$$\sigma((X_s)_{s \geq G_t}) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}} \mid 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}, X_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} 1_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} \leq t)}.$$

On (RBNS_t)

$$\sigma((X_s)_{s \geq G_t}) \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}} \mid 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}, X_{G_t}. \quad \diamond$$

Here X_{G_t} is understood as the composite stochastic variable $\omega \mapsto (X_{G_t(\omega)})(\omega)$. Note that on both events, it holds that $\tau_{\{d\}} > t$ and one could thus have replaced $1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}$ by the event $(\tau_{\{d\}} > t)$ in the conditioning. This assumption states that the distribution of the valid time behavior of two subjects after time G_t is exchangeable whenever the values of the variables in the conditioning agree for these subjects no matter the rest of the transaction time information. The effect of this assumption is that the transaction time information $\mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}$ only affects the distribution of the variables entering in the conditioning and not the rest of the valid time process.

As Assumption 3.1 stands, there is still some transaction time information remaining via X_{G_t} in the second case; for example $(X_{G_t} = (G_t, i, 0))$ for $i \in \mathcal{I}$ implies that the disability starting at time G_t is not awarded at time t . What is needed to remove this final piece of transaction time information is a strong Markov-type property at the random time G_t . This situation is non-standard since the random time where the process is stopped is not a stopping time, see however Yackel (1968) where a random time change with a non-stopping time is used to obtain a Markov process from a semi-Markov process. The phenomenon is nevertheless similar to how left-truncated processes are usually studied conditional on some event having occurred prior, where the event is measurable with respect to an enlarged filtration stopped at the left-truncation time, but might not be measurable with respect to the self-exciting filtration, see for example Section III.3 of Andersen et al. (1993). To obtain the strong Markov property at G_t , we impose Assumption 3.2.

Assumption 3.2. (Conditional independence of stopped valid time process.)

$\forall v, t \geq 0$:

$$\mathcal{F}^{v, X} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{F}_v^X \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \mid \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}, X_v$$

on $(G_t \leq v, \text{RBNS}_t)$. ◇

This is analogous to how the Markov property allows one to discard $(X_u)_{u \leq v}$ in the conditional distribution of $(X_s)_{s \geq v}$ when also conditioning on X_v . Here we however need to keep the knowledge that death has not occurred. Under this assumption, we get the following strong Markov property.

Lemma 3.3. (Strong Markov property at G_t .)

Under Assumption 3.2,

$$\mathbb{P}((X_s)_{s \geq G_t} \in \cdot \mid (X_s)_{s \leq G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}) = \mathbb{P}((X_s)_{s \geq x_1} \in \cdot \mid X_{x_1} = x, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}) \Big|_{x=X_{G_t}}$$

on (RBNS_t) where $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$.

The proof of Lemma 3.3 is long and is hence deferred to the appendix. Lemma 3.3 states that there is no extra knowledge gained about the distribution of X knowing that a path $(X_s)_{s \leq x_1}$ came from a transaction time realization with $x = X_{G_t}$ compared with just conditioning on $(X_s)_{s \leq x_1}$ when knowledge about survival until time t is retained.

3.1. CBNR reserve

We first consider being on (CBNR_t) and calculate the transaction time reserve. This is only of interest if $\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t) > 0$, so we assume that this is the case. Introduce the *IBNR-factor* $I : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times \mathcal{I} \mapsto [0, 1]$ defined as

$$I_i(s, t) = \mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = s, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = i).$$

Note that this probability can also be expressed as the probability that the delay between the disability event and the first disability claim is larger than $t - s$. Introduce also the transition probabilities

$$p_{jk}(s, t, u, z) = \mathbb{P}(Y_t = k, U_t \leq z \mid Y_s = j, U_s = u).$$

The reserve for the CBNR case is given in Theorem 3.4.

Theorem 3.4. (*CBNR reserve.*)

On (CBNR_t) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(t) &= V_a(t, t) \times \mathbb{P}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t \mid \text{CBNR}_t) \\ &+ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \int_{(0, t]} \left(\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} V_i(s, 0; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t)) + \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} b_{ai}(s, s) - \int_{(s, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(v)} B_{a,0}(dv) \right) \\ &\quad \times \frac{p_{aa}(0, s, 0, \infty)}{\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t)} I_i(s, t) \mu_{ai}(s, s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t \mid \text{CBNR}_t) = 1 - \int_{(0, t] \times \mathcal{I}} \frac{I_i(s, t)}{\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t)} (\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}})(\mathbb{P})(ds, di)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t) = \frac{\int_{(t, \infty) \times \mathcal{I}} I_i(s, t) (\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}})(\mathbb{P})(ds, di)}{1 - \mathbb{P}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} = \infty \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t, \tau_{\{d\}} > t)} + \int_{(0, t] \times \mathcal{I}} I_i(s, t) (\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}})(\mathbb{P})(ds, di).$$

Inserting $(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}})(\mathbb{P})(ds, di) = p_{aa}(0, s, 0, \infty) \mu_{ai}(s, s) ds$ for $s \in (0, \infty)$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}$ as well as substituting

$$1 - \mathbb{P}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} = \infty \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t, \tau_{\{d\}} > t) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \int_{(t, \infty)} p_{aa}(t, s, t, \infty) \mu_{ai}(s, s) ds,$$

and using Remark 3.6 to calculate $V_i(s, 0; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t))$, one sees that the reserve in Theorem 3.4 is computable using only the usual valid time hazards and the new model element $I_i(s, t)$ for $s < \infty$.

Proof. Write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(t) &= \mathbb{E}[1_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t)} \mathcal{P}(t) + 1_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} \leq t)} \mathcal{P}(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}, \tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t] \mathbb{P}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}) + \mathbb{E}[1_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} \leq t)} \mathcal{P}(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}]. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is the CBNI reserve and the second term is the IBNR reserve.

We start by treating the CBNI reserve. Note that on $(\text{CBNR}_t, \tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t)$, it holds that $\mathcal{P}(t) = P(t)$ by Theorem 5.4 of Buchardt et al. (2023), since it then holds that $(X_s)_{0 \leq s \leq t} = (X_s^t)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$. This leads to

$$1_{(\text{CBNR}_t)} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}, \tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t] = 1_{(\text{CBNR}_t)} \mathbb{E}[P(t) \mid \tau_{\{d\}} > t, \tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t] = 1_{(\text{CBNR}_t)} V_a(t, t),$$

by the first part of Assumption 3.1 and using that $P(t)$ is $\sigma((X_s)_{s \geq G_t})$ -measurable since $G_t \leq t$.

For the IBNR reserve, we find by Theorem 5.4 of Buchardt et al. (2023) that on $(\text{CBNR}_t, \tau_{\mathcal{I}} \leq t)$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(t) &= P(t) + \int_{[0, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} (B - \mathcal{B})(ds) \\ &= \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}^-)} P(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}^-) - \int_{[\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{a,0}(ds) \\ &= \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(\tau_{\mathcal{I}})} P(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}) + \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(\tau_{\mathcal{I}})} b_{aY_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}}}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, \tau_{\mathcal{I}}) - \int_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{a,0}(ds) \end{aligned}$$

since the payments are at least equal until $\tau_{\mathcal{I}}$ on this event. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & 1_{(\text{CBNR}_t)} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(t) 1_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} \leq t)} \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}] \\ &= 1_{(\text{CBNR}_t)} \mathbb{E} \left[1_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} \leq t)} \left(\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(\tau_{\mathcal{I}})} P(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}) + \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(\tau_{\mathcal{I}})} b_{aY_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, \tau_{\mathcal{I}})} - \int_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{a,0}(ds) \right) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}} \right] \\ &= 1_{(\text{CBNR}_t)} \mathbb{E} \left[1_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} \leq t)} \left(\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(\tau_{\mathcal{I}})} \mathbb{E}[P(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}) \mid X_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} \vee \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}] \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(\tau_{\mathcal{I}})} b_{aY_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, \tau_{\mathcal{I}})} - \int_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{a,0}(ds) \right) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

by the tower property. Now note that on $(\text{CBNR}_t, \tau_{\mathcal{I}} \leq t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[P(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}) \mid X_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} \vee \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}] &= \mathbb{E}[P(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}) \mid X_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}}, \tau_{\{d\}} > t] \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[P(s) 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} > t)} \mid X_s = (s, i, 0)]}{\mathbb{P}(\tau_{\{d\}} > t \mid X_s = (s, i, 0))} \Big|_{s=\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, i=Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}}} \\ &= V_{Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, 0; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t))} \end{aligned}$$

by the first part of Assumption 3.1 and the usual strong Markov property, see Theorem 7.5.1 of Jacobsen (2006), using $(\tau_{\{d\}} > t) \in \sigma(X_t)$. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(t) 1_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} \leq t)} \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}] \\ &= \int_{(0, t] \times \mathcal{I}} \left(\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} V_i(s, 0; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t)) + \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} b_{ai}(s, s) - \int_{(s, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(v)} B_{a,0}(dv) \right) (\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}})(\mathbb{P})(ds, di) \end{aligned}$$

on (CBNR_t) . Note that on (CBNR_t) , we have $(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}})(\mathbb{P})(ds, di) = (\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} \mid \text{CBNR}_t)(\mathbb{P})(ds, di)$. Using Bayes' theorem, see for example Theorem 1.31 in Schervish (1995), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} (\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} \mid \text{CBNR}_t)(\mathbb{P})(ds, di) &= \mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = s, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = i) \frac{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}})(\mathbb{P})(ds, di)}{\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t)} \\ &= I_i(s, t) \mu_{ai}(s, s) \frac{p_{aa}(0, s, 0, \infty)}{\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t)} ds \end{aligned}$$

for $s \in [0, \infty)$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}$. This also implies

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t \mid \text{CBNR}_t) = 1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \int_{(0, t]} I_i(s, t) \mu_{ai}(s, s) \frac{p_{aa}(0, s, 0, \infty)}{\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t)} ds.$$

For the final part, note

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}})] = \int_{(0, \infty) \times \mathcal{I}} I_i(s, t) (\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}})(\mathbb{P})(ds, di) + \mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t, \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = \infty).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t, \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = \infty) &= \mathbb{P}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} = \infty \mid \text{CBNR}_t) \mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} = \infty \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t, \tau_{\{d\}} > t) \mathbb{P}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t \mid \text{CBNR}_t) \mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t) \end{aligned}$$

using the first part of Assumption 3.1 in the second equality. Inserting these expressions, isolating for $\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t)$, and simplifying gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t) = \frac{\int_{(t, \infty) \times \mathcal{I}} I_i(s, t) (\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}})(\mathbb{P})(ds, di)}{1 - \mathbb{P}(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} = \infty \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t, \tau_{\{d\}} > t)} + \int_{(0, t] \times \mathcal{I}} I_i(s, t) (\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}})(\mathbb{P})(ds, di).$$

Collecting the results, we obtain the statement of the theorem. \square

Remark 3.5. (Relation to non-life insurance Poisson models.)

For the IBNR term, the time s disability rate $\mu_{ai}(s, s)$ has to be multiplied by the IBNR-factor $\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = s, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = i)$ similarly to the Poisson process model in Norberg (1999). Heuristically, one has to hold a disability reserve for the expected number of disabilities $\mu_{ai}(s, s) ds$ at a prior time s times the proportion of insured that have yet to report their claim by time t , which is $\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = s, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = i)$. The extra factor $p_{aa}(0, s, 0, \infty)/\mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t)$ adjusts for the fact that there can be at most one disability occurrence in this model as opposed to a Poisson process model where there can be several occurrences. ∇

Remark 3.6. (Conditional semi-Markov model.)

In Section 6 of Hoem (1972), the author obtains an expression for the transition probabilities and hazards of a semi-Markov process conditional on not having entered a specific absorbing part of the state space before a given time. For our purposes, choose the transient states to be $\mathcal{J} \setminus \{d\}$. Calculating the transition probabilities that appear in $V_i(\cdot, \cdot; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t))$ can then be done as usual upon switching to the hazards $\mu_{\ell_j}(s, u; t)$, where

$$\mu_{\ell_j}(s, u; t) = \mu_{\ell_j}(s, u) \frac{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{d\}} p_{jk}(s, t, 0, \infty)}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{d\}} p_{\ell k}(s, t, u, \infty)}$$

for $s < t$ and

$$\mu_{\ell_j}(s, u; t) = \mu_{\ell_j}(s, u)$$

for $s \geq t$. Consequently, the hazard of jumping to states where there is a higher probability of remaining in $\mathcal{J} \setminus \{d\}$ is increased and the hazard is decreased when there is a lower probability of remaining in $\mathcal{J} \setminus \{d\}$. After time t , the conditioning provides no additional information, and the hazards are equal to the hazards in the unconditional model. ∇

Remark 3.7. (Benefits of modeling reporting delays stochastically.)

One could also have considered a simpler model where reporting delays were deterministic. In the data application, the numerical value of such simple reserves are compared with those obtained with the proposed methods, see also Remark 5.1. A disadvantage of such an approach is that reporting delays are stochastic in reality, so the validity of the model would be less clear. Similarly, one might overlook the fact that the classic disability reserve is only the relevant "claim size" in the IBNR reserve if independence assumptions like Assumption 3.1 and 3.2 hold, see also the discussion in Remark 3.10.

There are also some disadvantages related to the size and timing of the reserve that might result from using a model with a deterministic reporting delay. A first-order error is, as discussed at the end of the introduction and in Remark 5.1, if the size of the portfolio increases by $x\%$ then the simple IBNR reserve becomes $x\%$ too high and vice versa. Changes to the size of the portfolio are relatively common for disability insurance due to the short coverage periods, leading the insured to have frequent opportunities to change their insurance provider. Second-order errors arise since the timing of the disability and the covariate dependence are handled slightly more imprecisely in the simple model. ∇

3.2. RBNS reserve

We now consider being on (RBNS_t) . The reserve for the RBNSi case is given in Theorem 3.8.

Theorem 3.8. (*RBNSi reserve.*)

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(t) &= \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} V_a(G_t, G_t; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t)) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, i, 0) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}})) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} V_i(G_t, 0; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t)) + \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} b_{ai}(G_t, G_t) \right) \times \mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, i, 0) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}) \\ &\quad - \int_{(G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{a,0}(ds) \end{aligned}$$

on (RBNSi_t) with $i = Z_t^{(3)}$.

Utilizing Remark 3.6 to calculate $V_i(G_t, 0; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t))$, and analogously $V_a(G_t, G_t; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t))$, we see that the RBNSi reserve may be calculated using the usual valid time model and the new model element $\mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, 0) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}})$ which we name the *adjudication probability*. This gives the probability that the reported disability claim will ultimately be awarded.

Proof. By similar calculations to the IBNR-case, we find

$$\mathcal{P}(t) = \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_{t-})} P(G_{t-}) - \int_{[G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} \mathcal{B}(ds).$$

The latter term is $\mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}$ -measurable and on (RBNSi_t) satisfies

$$\int_{[G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} \mathcal{B}(ds) = \int_{[G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{a,0}(ds)$$

so the interesting part is $\kappa(t)/\kappa(G_{t-}) \times P(G_{t-})$. On (RBNSi_t) we have

$$\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_{t-})} P(G_{t-}) = \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} P(G_t) + 1_{(X_{G_t}=(G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, 0))} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} b_{aZ_t^{(3)}}(G_t, G_t) + \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} B_{a,0}(\{G_t\}),$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(t) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} P(G_t) + 1_{(X_{G_t}=(G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, 0))} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} b_{aZ_t^{(3)}}(G_t, G_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}} \right] - \int_{(G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{a,0}(ds) \\ &= \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} \mathbb{E}[P(G_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}, X_{G_t} = (G_t, a, G_t)] \mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, a, G_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} \mathbb{E}[P(G_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}, X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, 0)] \mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, 0) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} b_{aZ_t^{(3)}}(G_t, G_t) \mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, 0) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}) - \int_{(G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{a,0}(ds) \end{aligned}$$

on (RBNSi_t) . By the second part of Assumption 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, we get on (RBNSi_t) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[P(G_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}, X_{G_t} = (G_t, a, G_t)] &= \mathbb{E}[P(G_t) \mid \tau_{\{d\}} > t, X_{G_t} = (G_t, a, G_t)] \\ &= V_a(G_t, G_t; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[P(G_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}, X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, 0)] &= \mathbb{E}[P(G_t) \mid \tau_{\{d\}} > t, X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, 0)] \\ &= V_{Z_t^{(3)}}(G_t, 0; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t)) \end{aligned}$$

using that all of $(X_s)_{s \leq G_t}$ is known in the conditioning for both cases. Collecting the results, we arrive at the desired expression. \square

The reserve for the RBNSr case is given in Theorem 3.9.

Theorem 3.9. (*RBNSr reserve.*)

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(t) &= V_r(t, t - G_t) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, i, W_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}})) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} V_i(G_t, W_t; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t)) - 1_{(Z_t^{(1)} \neq 4)} \left(\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} b_{ir}(G_t, W_t) + \int_{(G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{r, G_t}(ds) \right) \right) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, i, W_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}) \end{aligned}$$

on (RBNSr_t) with $i = Z_t^{(3)}$.

Similarly to Theorem 3.8, one can use Remark 3.6 and the adjudication probability $\mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, W_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}})$ to calculate the RBNSr transaction time reserve. Note also that if $Z_t^{(1)} = 4$ then $\mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, W_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}) = 1$ and furthermore $G_t = t$, $Z_t^{(3)} = Y_t$, and $W_t = U_t$. Thus, the expression collapses to $\mathcal{V}(t) = V_{Y_t}(t, U_t)$ which is the classic valid time disability reserve.

Proof. As in the RBNSi-case, we find

$$\mathcal{P}(t) = \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t-)} P(G_t-) - \int_{[G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} \mathcal{B}(ds).$$

The latter term is $\mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}$ -measurable and on (RBNSr_t) satisfies

$$\int_{[G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} \mathcal{B}(ds) = \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} B_{Z_t^{(3)}, G_t - W_t}(\{G_t\}) + 1_{(Z_t^{(1)} \neq 4)} \left(\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} b_{Z_t^{(3)}r}(G_t, W_t) + \int_{(G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{r, G_t}(ds) \right)$$

so the interesting part is $\kappa(t)/\kappa(G_t-) \times P(G_t-)$. Proceeding in a similar manner as before, we see on (RBNSr_t) that

$$\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t-)} P(G_t-) = \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} P(G_t) + 1_{(X_{G_t} = (G_t, r, 0))} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} b_{Z_t^{(3)}r}(G_t, W_t) + \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} B_{Z_t^{(3)}, G_t - W_t}(\{G_t\}).$$

Now on (RBNSr_t) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(t) &= \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} \mathbb{E} \left[P(G_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}, X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, W_t) \right] \mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, W_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} \mathbb{E} \left[P(G_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}, X_{G_t} = (G_t, r, 0) \right] \mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, r, 0) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}) \\ &\quad - 1_{(Z_t^{(1)} \neq 4)} \left(\frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(G_t)} b_{Z_t^{(3)}r}(G_t, W_t) \mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, W_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}) + \int_{(G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{r, G_t}(ds) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the second part of Assumption 3.1 and Lemma 3.3, we see on (RBNSr_t) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[P(G_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}, X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, W_t) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[P(G_t) \mid \tau_{\{d\}} > t, X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, W_t) \right] \\ &= V_{Z_t^{(3)}}(G_t, W_t; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[P(G_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}}, X_{G_t} = (G_t, r, 0) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[P(G_t) \mid \tau_{\{d\}} > t, X_{G_t} = (G_t, r, 0) \right] \\ &= V_r(G_t, 0; (\tau_{\{d\}} > t)) \\ &= \frac{\kappa(G_t)}{\kappa(t)} V_r(t, t - G_t) + \int_{(G_t, t]} \frac{\kappa(G_t)}{\kappa(s)} B_{r, G_t}(ds) \end{aligned}$$

using that $(X_s)_{s \leq G_t}$ is known in the former case, and towering on $(X_s)_{s < G_t}$ in the latter case, observing that the expectation given $(X_s)_{s \leq G_t}$ only depends on X_{G_t} and not $(X_s)_{s < G_t}$. Putting everything together, we arrive at the claimed result. \square

Remark 3.10. (Weakening the independence assumptions.)

In the absence of Assumption 3.1 and 3.2, the valid time hazards and reserves could be influenced by additional transaction time information such as the disability reporting delay $U_{\mathcal{I}}$. This could be relevant if e.g. longer reporting delays were indicative of a more serious disability such that the intensity of N_{ir} with respect to the filtration $t \mapsto \mathcal{F}_t^X \vee \sigma(U_{\mathcal{I}})$ was $\lambda_{ir}(t) = 1_{(Y_{t-}=i)}\mu_{ir}(t, U_{t-}, U_{\mathcal{I}})$ with μ_{ir} being decreasing as a function of the last argument. Imposing an assumption like Assumption 3.1 when also conditioning on $U_{\mathcal{I}}$ would then for example lead to the award-term of the RBNSi reserve becoming

$$\mathbb{E}[P(G_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^Z, X_{G_t} = (G_t, i, 0)] = V_i(G_t, 0, U_{\mathcal{I}}; (\tau^d > t))$$

with obvious notation. We briefly note that it is not a priori clear whether one would expect long reporting delays to be indicative of more or less severe disabilities. One could hypothesize that people with severe disabilities would find it more demanding to submit insurance claims. On the other hand, they might not need as much time to collect medical evidence if it is self-evident that they will be approved for disability benefits.

An alternative way to weaken Assumption 3.1 would be to incorporate more of the transaction time information in the valid time model e.g. by using different disabled states for different disability severities instead of a single disabled state. If the reporting delays only affect our estimate of the future trajectory of the valid time process X through the information they give us about the severity of the disability, Assumption 3.1 would be satisfied in the larger valid time model that incorporates information about severity of the disability. ∇

Remark 3.11. (On the simplifying assumptions.)

Some notable simplifications that have been made in order to arrive at tractable transaction time reserves are the independence assumptions (which were discussed in Remark 3.10), that there can be at most one disability event in the coverage period which reaches the payout stage, that the time and type of the disability event is completely known once benefits have started, and that the insurer cannot retract disability benefits. While it is true that none of these assumptions fully hold in practice, we believe that they are not seriously violated, and they only contribute with second-order effects compared to the main effects that have been included.

For example, the probability of experiencing q disabilities with independent causes is roughly equal to the disability hazard raised to the q 'th power, so while more than one disability may occur in reality it is very uncommon. Similarly, there might be situations where the insurer and insured do not agree on the time of disablement leading to the time of disablement being changed to an earlier date after the insurer has started paying benefits. There may also be situations where retraction of disability benefits occurs if the insured willfully withheld information about their reactivation. However, the changes to the event times are probably sufficiently small and infrequent that the effect is negligible compared to other sources of error stemming from modeling, estimation, and forecasting error related to the biometric and financial model constituents. Accommodating transitions between the disabled states could be important depending on what the disability types represent. For example, they could represent different severities. If the severity of a disability changes often and different severities lead to substantially different payouts then this would be important to include in the model. We hence discuss possible remedies in the next paragraph.

If the aforementioned effects are sufficiently large to warrant explicit modeling, our models may still serve as a starting point. To accommodate the possibility of the time of disability changing

after benefits have been awarded, one could for example add a term to the award-part of the RBNSi reserve equal to the the probability that the insured will be awarded benefits from an earlier time than G_t multiplied with the average additionally awarded amount for such cases. To accommodate multiple disabilities, a pragmatic approach could be to place the disability periods end-to-end in the estimation phase, such that an additional disability was treated as an annulment of a reactivation. This skews the time value of the cash flow but otherwise results in consistent reserves. It will however likely make the individual predictions less precise since the duration dependence will stem from a more heterogeneous population. For example, a long disability duration could stem from a single disability from which the insured has not reactivated, or it could be that they have reactivated from a long disability but then recently become disabled again.

If transitions between the disabled states were possible in the valid time state space one could formulate a transaction time model similar to the one specified towards the end of Example 5.8 in Buchardt et al. (2023). This would however result in a substantially more complicated model. We instead propose to let disability type i_k represent disabilities that start out as type i_k and estimate the reactivation, disabled mortality, and reactivated mortality hazards consistently with this. If the valid time disability payments also depend on the disability type, we propose to model these payments conditional on the initial disability type and the disability duration. By the tower property, this leads to the same reserves but in practice requires that one also estimates these conditional payments which brings the approach closer to the non-life insurance literature where the benefit sizes also have to be modeled. This approach may also be useful in other situations where the benefit size depends on more than the state and duration process; it could for example depend on whether the insured is receiving benefits from the government or other insurance companies. Taking the conditional expectation of the payments given the state and duration brings the problem back into something that can be represented in the usual semi-Markov framework.

As illustrated here, a benefit of having interpretable closed-form expressions for the reserves is that it is possible to reason about how to adjust the model when the underlying assumptions change. ∇

4. Estimation

To compute the transaction time reserves, one needs to estimate the valid time transition hazards, the IBNR-factor, and the adjudication probabilities. The IBNR-factor and adjudication probabilities are new model elements, and one hence needs to find a suitable way to estimate these. In addition, standard estimation procedures also do not apply for the valid time transition hazards since the data is contaminated by reporting delays and incomplete event adjudication.

For simplicity, we limit the discussion to the situation where there is at most one reported disability claim in the sense that $Z^{(2)}$ can increase only once. In this case, the delay between the disability time $\tau_{\mathcal{I}}$ and the time of the first reported disability $T_{\{2\}}$ equals the reporting delay of the disability event, the latter being the difference between $\tau_{\mathcal{I}}$ and the last time where a disability is reported. This is sufficient for the application in Section 5 and makes the statistical problem a special case of the one studied in Buchardt et al. (2025). The methods however easily generalize to the case where several distinct disabilities may be reported, in which case both the IBNR-factor and disability reporting delay distribution would need to be estimated in order to compute the IBNR reserve and estimate the disability hazard, respectively.

The data structure in Buchardt et al. (2025) consists of events that are reported with a delay and which may be confirmed or annulled upon adjudication. Their proposed estimation algorithm is a two-step procedure, where the first step is to estimate the adjudication probabilities and the

reporting delay distribution, and the second step uses these to estimate the valid time hazards while correcting for contamination. Due to the assumed model for \mathcal{Z} , the adjudication probability $\mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, W_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}})$ can be calculated as an absorption probability for a suitable multistate model as in Buchardt et al. (2025). We henceforth refer to the transition hazards in the adjudication multistate model as adjudication hazards. Furthermore, estimating the IBNR-factor is equivalent to estimating the disability reporting delay distribution since

$$I_i(s, t) = \mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = s, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = i) = \mathbb{P}(T_{\{2\}} - \tau_{\mathcal{I}} > t - s \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = s, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = i).$$

Imposing a parametric model for all three model elements hence results in an estimation problem that can be handled using Buchardt et al. (2025). More details are given in Appendix C.

The estimator of the valid time hazards described in Appendix C and employed in the data application outlined in Section 5 corresponds to the *Poisson approximation* from Buchardt et al. (2025) rather than the full estimator described in Section 3.3 of that paper. The approximation has the advantage of being simpler to implement and allowing one to estimate the different valid time hazards separately. Because the data employed in Section 5 only contains deaths recorded during the adjudication period, it is not possible to run the full estimation procedure of Buchardt et al. (2025). The mortality rates are nevertheless needed in order to calculate the reserves in the data application, so in Section 5 we employ the hazards given in Table 1 which are inspired by those published by the Danish Financial Supervisory Authority (FSA).

Remark 4.1. (Restricting the information used for adjudications.)

Note that Buchardt et al. (2025) allows one to reduce the information that the adjudication hazards depend on e.g. such that the reactivation adjudication hazards are not conditional on the disability reporting delay. In this paper, the adjudication probabilities are however defined conditional on the full transaction time filtration $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{Z}}$, so to compute these, the adjudication hazards must also depend on all of $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{Z}}$. One can of course still impose structural assumptions on the adjudication hazards such that they only depend on parts of $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{Z}}$. ∇

Remark 4.2. (Estimation and independence assumptions.)

The independence imposed via Assumption 3.1 and 3.2 is not used in the estimation procedure of Buchardt et al. (2025), and one hence still obtains consistent and asymptotically normal estimators if these assumptions do not hold. We conjecture that one could derive estimators that are more efficient than the ones suggested here by exploiting these independence assumptions. ∇

5. Data application

To illustrate our methods, we calculate transaction time reserves at time η for a subset of the LEC-DK19 (Loss of Earning Capacity – Denmark 2019) data set which was introduced in Buchardt et al. (2025). The data includes information on disability exposure and occurrences, reactivation exposure and occurrences, reporting delays for disabilities, and adjudication exposure and occurrences related to both disabilities and reactivations. The data window $[0, \eta]$ is $[31/01/2015, 01/09/2019]$. Available covariates are gender and age.

We note that the biometric data conforms with the valid time state space from Figure 2.1 with a single disabled state i_1 which we henceforth refer to as i for notational convenience. Furthermore, the adjudication data conforms with the adjudication multistate model described in Appendix C. In the following we estimate the relevant model elements using the method proposed in Section 4 and subsequently calculate the reserves using the results from Section 3.

The implementation is written in R (R Development Core Team, 2023) and is available on GitHub (<https://github.com/oliversandqvist/Web-appendix-disability-reserving>).

For estimation of the hazards, we let all the covariates enter in a linear predictor with log link and assume that all hazards are variationally independent such that there is no overlap in parameters between different hazards. The disability hazard is regressed on age, gender, and calendar time, while the reactivation hazard is regressed on the same covariates but also the duration as disabled. As noted in Section C.5, the data does not permit a reasonable estimate of the death hazards, and we thus simply employ the death hazards from Table 1 when calculating reserves.

The adjudication hazards for an RBNSi claim are regressed on age, gender, duration since the disability event, duration since the disability event was reported, and whether or not the claim has been (temporarily) rejected previously. The adjudication hazards for an RBNSr claim are regressed on age, gender, duration since the disability event, and duration since the reactivation event. As noted in Remark 4.1, these hazards should depend on all of \mathcal{F}^Z , so the fact that we for example do not regress the reactivation adjudication hazards on the disability reporting delay should be understood as the implicit assumption that the true value of that regressor is known to be zero.

For the disability reporting delay, we impose a Weibull proportional reverse time hazard distribution which has the distribution function $t \mapsto (1 - \exp(-(\lambda t)^k))^{\exp(W^T \beta)}$ for covariates W and parameters (λ, k, β) . For covariates, we use age at disability onset and gender. The data does not contain observations of reactivation reporting delays, but we take this to be an artifact of the data rather than a violation of Assumption 3.2 and hence proceed as if this had not been the case, recalling that the reactivation reporting delay distribution is only needed for estimation and not for reserving.

With these specifications, we note that the estimation procedure becomes identical to the one in Section 6 of Buchardt et al. (2025) and we may hence use their estimates; confer with Section 6 and Section G of the supplementary material in Buchardt et al. (2025) for the parameter values. We however keep the calendar time effect fixed at its value at η so as to not overextrapolate the observed calendar time trend when calculating the prospective reserves.

	Age	Male	Female	min{Duration, 5}
μ_{ad}, μ_{rd}	0.09	-9.50	-9.80	-
μ_{id}	0.09	-6.40	-6.80	-0.25

Table 1: Death hazards based on estimates published by the Danish FSA.

For reserving, we sample 100 random insured at time η and compute reserves for each of the categories CBNR, RBNSi, and RBNSr. The data contains around 250,000 insured that are in the portfolio at time η , but it would take a long time to compute the reserve for everyone using our proof-of-concept R implementation. The terms that take the longest to compute are valid time active reserves and IBNR reserves which for a single insured take a couple of seconds to evaluate on a regular laptop. Insurance companies have access to optimized calculation kernels and greater computing power with some presently relying on semi-Markov models for their reserves, so this is not a limitation of our proposed approach but rather of this specific implementation. Furthermore, it is possible to speed up computations by finding suitable approximations of, for example, the IBNR reserve given in Theorem 3.4. For CBNR and RBNSr, we sample the 100 insured without replacement, but since there are only 59 insured in the RBNSi category at time η , we sample these with replacement.

The transaction time reserves are compared with a naive approach where X_η^η is plugged into the valid time reserves. The naive approach thus leads to reserves that are sufficient to cover disabilities that have an ongoing payout at time η and disabilities that occur after time η but ignores IBNR-claims, claims that are under adjudication, and possible reapplications.

The transaction time reserves are further compared with a simple approach where ad-hoc adjustments of the valid time reserves are made to adjust for IBNR and incomplete adjudication. The simple approach takes the CBNR reserve to be a valid time active reserve where the coverage period is extended with the average disability reporting delay. The average delay d is found to be around 0.53 years when the average is based on disabilities that occurred at least two years before time η to limit the effect of right-truncation. The heuristic is that the insurance company should cover disabilities that arrive up to d years after the end of the coverage period since these disabilities occurred within the coverage period if the reporting delay was deterministically equal to d . The RBNSi reserve is chosen to be a valid time disability reserve with duration 0 since most claims get awarded. For the RBNSr reserve, a valid time disability reserve is used if there are ongoing disability payments and a valid time active reserve is used otherwise to accommodate those who will apply for additional benefits in the future.

The same hazards are used in all of the approaches so the differences between the results only reflect the reserving methodologies and not the estimation. Since the data does not contain information about benefit type or size we set $B(dt) = \mathbf{1}_{(Y_{t-}=i)} \mathbf{1}_{(t-U_{t-} \leq \eta+3)} \mathbf{1}_{(a+t \leq 67)} dt$, where a is the age at time 0, corresponding to a unit disability annuity until retirement at age 67 with a coverage period of 3 years. Note that this specification of the cash flow also implies that the insured are covered for disabilities occurring before time η . We finally assume a constant force of interest $r \equiv 0.02$. The reserves are calculated by plugging in the estimated model elements into Theorem 3.4, 3.8, and 3.9. The state-wise valid time reserves entering into these expressions are calculated by solving Thiele's differential equation iteratively over the states by exploiting the hierarchical structure of \mathcal{J} .

Remark 5.1. (Alternative simple CBNR reserves.)

An alternative but similar simple approach for the CBNR category would be to reserve $V_a(\eta, \eta) + V_i(\eta - d, 0) \times \mu_{ai}(\eta - d, \eta - d) \times d$. Heuristically, with a constant reporting delay d , the probability of having an unreported disability is the probability of having a disability occur in $(\eta - d, \eta]$ which is roughly $\mu_{ai}(\eta - d, \eta - d) \times d$, and for each of these one reserves $V_i(\eta - d, 0)$. This can also be motivated by applying relevant approximations to the expression in Theorem 3.4. The resulting reserve is 9.22, which brings the difference between the proposed and simple method down by a factor of 2/3. Another alternative simple reserve could be $\exp(r \times d) \times V_a(\eta - d, \eta - d)$ which results in a reserve of 9.21.

The remaining difference can generally be attributed to the timing of the disability and the covariate dependence being incorporated slightly more imprecisely in the simple model. Since most disability claims are short, the backpay may constitute a considerable part of the payment, making it important to correctly assess the timing of the disability. Note that the performance of the simple methods would likely deteriorate in more complicated situations with inflow/outflow of insured, non-constant interest, and calendar time effects, confer with Remark 3.7. ∇

The results are given in Table 2. The settled category is not depicted since the reserve is zero in all cases. The largest relative difference arises for the RBNSi reserve. The naive method under-reserves since it ignores the reported disability and reserves as if the insured was active because no disability benefits have been awarded yet. Surprisingly, the proposed method also leads to larger reserves than the simple method which always reserves the valid time disability reserve. This happens because the adjudication probabilities are close to one (they have an average of

around 0.9) and there are many older insured where the effect of conditioning on not having died and reserving from time G_t instead of t leads to moderately larger reserves.

The second largest relative difference is seen for the CBNR reserve. Here, the probability weighting of the active reserve is observed to be very close to one, so the main difference between the proposed and naive method is the IBNR contribution. Thus, the naive method under-reserves as it neglects this term. The simple method much closer to the proposed method as expected, but there is still a sizeable relative difference.

The smallest relative difference for the non-settled cases is seen for the RBNSr reserve. This is because, in the data set, there are considerably more insured receiving running benefits than are reactivated. In fact, only four reactivated insured were sampled and none of them had applied for additional benefits. As the population mix shifts toward a higher proportion of reactivated subjects, the difference between the proposed and naive method is likely to grow.

	(CBNR $_{\eta}$)	(RBNSi $_{\eta}$)	(RBNSr $_{\eta}$)
Proposed method	9.29	502.44	961.68
Simple method	8.98	481.20	945.66
Naive method	7.73	6.23	945.35
Simple method difference	0.32 (3.53%)	21.23 (4.41%)	16.02 (1.69%)
Naive method difference	1.56 (20.19%)	496.21 (7961.48%)	16.33 (1.73%)

Table 2: Reserves for 100 randomly sampled insured from each of the claims settlement categories except the settled category where the reserve is identically zero.

To explore the practical implications of our results for a full insurance portfolio, we approximate the average reserve in each of the categories for the wider insurance portfolio by the average reserve of the 100 sampled insured. Multiplying the average reserve in a given category with the total number of insured in that category, we obtain the results depicted in Figure 5.1. Comparing with Table 2, we see that despite the RBNSi category having the largest absolute and relative differences for the 100 sampled insured, the difference on the portfolio level is comparable with that of the RBNSr category, which had the smallest relative difference for the 100 sampled insured. This is because there are considerably more insured in the RBNSr category at time η . Similarly, the CBNR category, which showed the smallest absolute difference in Table 2, leads to the largest difference on the portfolio level due to this category being by far the largest. In total, the naive and simple method leads to portfolio reserves that are around 11.1% and 2.7% smaller than the proposed method, respectively.

To gain further insight into the financial implications, consider that in 2019, the annual reports of two large Danish insurers showed portfolio reserves for health and disability insurance obligations amounting to 9,351 and 17,606 million DKK respectively. Therefore, a 2.7% increase in these reserves would equate to approximately 250 million DKK for the former and 470 million DKK for the latter.




Figure 5.1: The approximated portfolio level reserve decomposed by category.

It would be highly relevant to compare the different reserves with observed claim developments to see which best describe the data. This is however not possible with the current data since the disability and reactivation occurrences and exposures are available for a single valuation date only, and their values at different valuation dates also cannot be inferred from the adjudication data since the same id does not refer to the same insured across the individual data tables. This is therefore left as a topic for future research.

6. Conclusion

This paper develops an individual reserving model for disability insurance in the presence of information delays caused by reporting delays and adjudication processes. We have introduced suitable conditional independence assumptions that lead to tractable and interpretable reserves, which may be calculated using the usual valid time hazards, the IBNR-factor, and the adjudication probabilities. The reserves are tailored to the features of disability insurance schemes by accommodating reporting delays and adjudication processing while preserving the advantages offered by valid time multistate models, namely that contractual payments are an a priori known function of a multistate process whose intertemporal distribution is well-understood. It is argued that the estimation procedure from Buchardt et al. (2025) may be used to estimate the model constituents of the reserves. Finally, the practical potential of our models is illustrated through an application to a real insurance data set.

Acknowledgments and declarations of interest

This research has partly been funded by the Innovation Fund Denmark (IFD) under File No. 1044-00144B. The author declares no conflicts of interest. I would like to thank Kristian Buchardt and my supervisor Christian Furrer for many fruitful discussions. I would also like to thank them both for their helpful comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. I am also very grateful to an anonymous referee for comments and suggestions that improved the paper significantly.

Appendix A: Proof of Lemma 3.3

To state and prove Proposition A.1, which immediately implies Lemma 3.3, we first introduce some marked point process notation. Let $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{H}, (\mathcal{H}_t)_{t \geq 0})$ be the canonical space of counting measures, see Section 2 and 4.2 in Jacobsen (2006). Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ be the underlying random counting measure for X . Write (T_n, X_n) for the jump times and marks of μ . For a given random counting measure m , we let $\tau_n(m)$ and $\eta_n(m)$ be the n 'th jump time and jump mark respectively implying $T_n = \tau_n(\mu)$ and $X_n = \eta_n(\mu)$. For any measurable random time R , define the truncated measure $\theta_R \mu : (R < \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ by

$$\theta_R \mu(\omega) = \sum_{n: R(\omega) < T_n(\omega) < \infty} \varepsilon_{(T_n(\omega), X_n(\omega))}$$

where $\varepsilon_{(t,x)}$ is the Dirac measure in (t, x) . We write $T_{R,n} = \tau_n(\theta_R \mu)$ and $X_{R,n} = \eta_n(\theta_R \mu)$ for the jump times and jump marks determining $\theta_R \mu$. Thus, if $R(\omega) < \infty$,

$$\theta_R \mu(\omega) = \sum_{n: T_{R,n}(\omega) < \infty} \varepsilon_{(T_{R,n}(\omega), X_{R,n}(\omega))}$$

with $R(\omega) < T_{R,1}(\omega) \leq T_{R,2}(\omega) \leq \dots$. Also let $T_{R,0} = R$ and $X_{R,0} = X_R$. We denote by Q^x the distribution of $\theta_{x_1} \mu$ given $X_{x_1} = x$ constructed as the time-inhomogeneous case in Jacobsen (2006) p. 157-158. Note that this actually corresponds to $Q^{x_1, x}$ in the notation of Jacobsen (2006). Even though X is time-homogeneous, this is usually not the case when we condition on $1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}$ which is why we employ the time-inhomogeneous construction. The function governing the behavior of X between jumps is denoted ϕ_{vs} , meaning that if $v \leq s$ and no jumps occurred in $(v, s]$, one has $X_s = \phi_{vs}(X_v)$. The jump time and jump mark Markov-kernels for Q^x are denoted $F_{t_n, y_n}(v)$ and $r_t(\phi_{t_n t}(y_n), C)$ respectively. The interpretation is that $F_{t_n, y_n}(v)$ gives the probability that the next jump has occurred by time v given that the previous jump happened at time t_n with mark y_n , while $r_t(y, C)$ gives the probability that an event occurring at time t from state y ends up in the set C . Note $F_{\infty, \nabla}(v) = 0$ for any $v \in [0, \infty)$ and $r_\infty(y, C) = 1_{(\nabla \in C)}$.

We let t be fixed but arbitrary. Let \tilde{Q}^x be constructed as Q^x but according to the modified Markov kernels where one additionally conditions on $1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}$, hence now being stochastic. One could, of course, have removed this additional stochasticity by replacing the indicator with the event $(\tau_{\{d\}} > t)$ in the conditioning on the relevant event (RBNS_t) . We however stick with this construction since it more easily generalizes to other cases where one wants to keep additional information that is not deterministically known on the relevant event. It holds that $\tilde{Q}^x(H) = \mathbb{P}(\theta_{x_1} \mu \in H \mid X_{x_1} = x, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$ almost surely for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Note that for every possible outcome of the conditioning information, the transition kernels of \tilde{Q}^x stay on the Markov form: either the conditioning is superfluous because it relates to an event that occurred before the previous jump time, or it is future-measurable and one can hence use the formula for conditional probabilities in the jump time and jump mark kernels, use the Markov property, and then use the formula for conditional probabilities in reverse. This shows that the transition kernels indeed only depend on (t_n, y_n) and not on t_1, \dots, t_{n-1} and y_1, \dots, y_{n-1} . They will be denoted $\tilde{r}_t(y, C)$ and $\tilde{F}_{t_n, y_n}(v)$. For notational convenience, we write $\mathbf{1}(t) = 1_{(\text{RBNS}_t)}$. We now state and prove Proposition A.1, which immediately implies the statement in Lemma 3.3.

Proposition A.1. *(Strong Markov type property at G_t .)*

Under Assumption 3.2, one has

$$\mathbf{1}(t) \mathbb{P}(\theta_{G_t} \mu \in \cdot \mid (X_s)_{s \leq G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}) = \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{Q}^{X_{G_t}}(\cdot) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

\mathbb{P} -a.s.

This is an almost sure equality between probability measures on $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{H})$. We note that the proof does not use many properties of our model for X and G_t , and similar arguments may thus be used to show strong Markov properties for other Markov processes and random times provided that an independence assumption similar to Assumption 3.2 is imposed.

Proof. The proof is inspired by the proof of Theorem 7.5.1 in Jacobsen (2006) with the necessary changes to adjust for the fact that Assumption 3.2 is different than the usual Markov independence assumption.

As in Jacobsen (2006), we note that showing Equation (A.1) is equivalent to showing for $n \geq 1$ and all measurable and bounded function $f_i : (0, \infty] \times \bar{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that the following holds:

$$\mathbf{1}(t)\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(T_{G_t,i}, X_{G_t,i}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)} \right] = \mathbf{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_{G_t}} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(\tau_i, \eta_i) \right] \quad (\text{A.2})$$

which we will prove by induction on n . The proof consists of four steps:

- (i) For a discretization of G_t to $G_t(M)$ with $M \in \mathbb{N}$, show the result (A.1) for X stopped at $T_{G_t(M),n-1}$ for any $n \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} & 1_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t)\mathbb{P}(\theta_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}} \mu \in \cdot \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t(M),n-1}}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}) \\ &= 1_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t)\tilde{Q}^{X_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}}}(\cdot). \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) Show convergence for $M \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} 1_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}}} [f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \\ &= 1_{(T_{G_t,n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t,n-1}}} [f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)]. \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) Discretize G_t to $G_t(M)$ and use dominated convergence with (i) and (ii) to conclude:

$$\mathbf{1}(t)\mathbb{E}[f_n(T_{G_t,n}, X_{G_t,n}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t,n-1}}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}] = \mathbf{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t,n-1}}} [f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)].$$

- (iv) Use (iii) and induction over n to finish the proof.

(i) : Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$ be given. Define

$$G_t(M) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} t_{Mm} 1_{(t_{M(m-1)} \leq G_t < t_{Mm})}$$

for $t_{Mm} = m2^{-M}$. Had we not known that $G_t < \infty$ almost surely, one would have to add $\infty 1_{(G_t = \infty)}$ here and show the result on $(G_t < \infty)$.

Take an F on the form

$$F = ((X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t(M),n-1}} \in B) \cap (X_{G_t} \in C) \cap (1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)} \in D)$$

and note that the collection of such sets constitutes an intersection-stable generator for

$$\sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t(M),n-1}}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$$

containing Ω . Write $F_{M,m} = F \cap (G_t(M) = t_{Mm})$ and note that

$$F_{M,m} \in \sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T_{t_{Mm},n-1}}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(\mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}).$$

Here we used that $G_t(M)$ is G_t -measurable and that X_{G_t} contains G_t as a coordinate. Now we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{F_{M,m}} \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{Q}^{X_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}}}(H) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_{F_{M,m}} \mathbf{1}_{(T_{t_{Mm},n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{Q}^{X_{T_{t_{Mm},n-1}}}(H) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_{F_{M,m}} \mathbf{1}_{(T_{t_{Mm},n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \mathbb{P}(\theta_{T_{t_{Mm},n-1}} \mu \in H \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{t_{Mm},n-1}}, X_{G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \int_{F_{M,m}} \mathbf{1}_{(T_{t_{Mm},n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \mathbf{1}_{(\theta_{T_{t_{Mm},n-1}} \mu \in H)} d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(F_{M,m} \cap (T_{t_{Mm},n-1} < \infty) \cap (\text{RBNS}_t) \cap (\theta_{T_{t_{Mm},n-1}} \mu \in H)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(F_{M,m} \cap (T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty) \cap (\text{RBNS}_t) \cap (\theta_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}} \mu \in H)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is Lemma A.2 with $T = T_{t_{Mm},n-1}$. The third equality uses $F_{M,m} \cap (T_{t_{Mm},n-1} < \infty) \cap (\text{RBNS}_t) \in \sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T_{t_{Mm},n-1}}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(\mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$; recall in particular that $(\text{RBNS}_t) = (T_{\{2\}} \leq t, T_{\{5\}} > t)$ and $(T_{\{2\}} \leq t)$ is known from $\sigma(X_{G_t})$ since $(T_{\{2\}} \leq t) = (G_t > 0)$. Summing over $m \geq 1$ and using $(G_t < \infty)$ almost surely gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_F \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{Q}^{X_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}}}(H) d\mathbb{P} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(F \cap (T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty) \cap (\text{RBNS}_t) \cap (\theta_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}} \mu \in H)\right). \end{aligned}$$

As the left- and right-hand side are finite measures, uniqueness of finite measures on intersection stable classes containing Ω gives that the equation holds for any $F \in \sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t(M),n-1}}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(\mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$. As $\mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{Q}^{X_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}}}(H)$ is also $\sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t(M),n-1}}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(\mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$ -measurable, it satisfies the defining properties of

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}_{(\text{RBNS}_t)} \mathbf{1}_{(\theta_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}} \mu \in H)} \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t(M),n-1}}, X_{G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}],$$

so we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \mathbb{P}(\theta_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}} \mu \in H \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t(M),n-1}}, X_{G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}_{(\text{RBNS}_t)} \mathbf{1}_{(\theta_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}} \mu \in H)} \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t(M),n-1}}, X_{G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}] \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{Q}^{X_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}}}(H). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) : Note that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t,n-1} < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t,n-1}}} [f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t,n-1} < \infty)} \int_{(T_{G_t,n-1}, \infty]} \int_{\bar{E}} f_n(v, y) \tilde{r}_v(\phi_{T_{G_t,n-1}v}(X_{T_{G_t,n-1}}), dy) \tilde{F}_{X_{T_{G_t,n-1}}}(dv) \end{aligned}$$

with a similar expression for $\mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}}} [f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)]$.

On $(\bar{N}_{T_{G_t, n-1}} = \bar{N}_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}})$ and $(T_{G_t(M), n-1} < \infty)$, it holds for $v \geq T_{G_t(M), n-1}$, since $T_{G_t(M), n-1} \geq T_{G_t, n-1}$, that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{T_{G_t, n-1}v}(X_{T_{G_t, n-1}}) &= \phi_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}v}(\phi_{T_{G_t, n-1}T_{G_t(M), n-1}}(X_{T_{G_t, n-1}})) \\ &= \phi_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}v}(X_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}})\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\bar{F}_{X_{T_{G_t, n-1}}}(v) = \bar{F}_{X_{T_{G_t, n-1}}}(T_{G_t(M), n-1})\bar{F}_{X_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}}}(v).$$

Therefore, it holds on $(\bar{N}_{T_{G_t, n-1}} = \bar{N}_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}})$ that

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M), n-1} < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M), n-1} < \infty)} \times \\ & \quad \int_{(T_{G_t(M), n-1}, \infty]} \int_{\bar{E}} f_n(v, y) \tilde{r}_v(\phi_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}v}(X_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}}), dy) \tilde{F}_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}}(dv) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M), n-1} < \infty)} \times \frac{1}{\bar{F}_{X_{T_{G_t, n-1}}}(T_{G_t(M), n-1})} \times \\ & \quad \int_{(T_{G_t(M), n-1}, \infty]} \int_{\bar{E}} f_n(v, y) \tilde{r}_v(\phi_{T_{G_t, n-1}v}(X_{T_{G_t, n-1}}), dy) \tilde{F}_{T_{G_t, n-1}}(dv) \\ & \xrightarrow{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t, n-1} < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t, n-1}}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)].\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\mathbf{1}_{(\bar{N}_{T_{G_t, n-1}} = \bar{N}_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}})} \xrightarrow{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1},$$

since \bar{N} is right-continuous and $T_{G_t(M), n-1} \downarrow T_{G_t, n-1}$. We thus get

$$\begin{aligned}& \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M), n-1} < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \\ &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1}_{(\bar{N}_{T_{G_t, n-1}} = \bar{N}_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}})} \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t(M), n-1} < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \\ &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1}_{(\bar{N}_{T_{G_t, n-1}} = \bar{N}_{T_{G_t(M), n-1}})} \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t, n-1} < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t, n-1}}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{(T_{G_t, n-1} < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t, n-1}}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)].\end{aligned}$$

We are now in a position to show the result using dominated convergence.

(iii) : Take F on the form

$$F = ((X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t, n-1}} \in B) \cap (X_{G_t} \in C) \cap (\mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)} \in D).$$

Such sets constitute an intersection stable generator of $\sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t, n-1}}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(\mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$ containing Ω . Now let

$$F_M = ((X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t(M), n-1}} \in B) \cap (X_{G_t} \in C) \cap (\mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)} \in D)$$

as then

$$F_M \in \sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t(M), n-1}}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(\mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$$

and $1_{F_M} \xrightarrow{M \rightarrow \infty} 1_F$ by using that X is right-continuous, that $T_{G_t(M),n-1} \geq T_{G_t,n-1}$, and that $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} T_{G_t(M),n-1} = T_{G_t,n-1}$. We now see using dominated convergence and the results of (i) and (ii):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_F 1_{(T_{G_t,n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t,n-1}}} [f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] d\mathbb{P} \\
& \stackrel{(ii)}{=} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{F_M} 1_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t(M),n-1}}} [f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] d\mathbb{P} \\
& \stackrel{(i)}{=} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{F_M} 1_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \\
& \quad \times \mathbb{E}[f_n(T_{G_t(M),n}, X_{G_t(M),n}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t(M),n-1}}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}] d\mathbb{P} \\
& = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{F_M} 1_{(T_{G_t(M),n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) f_n(T_{G_t(M),n}, X_{G_t(M),n}) d\mathbb{P} \\
& = \int_F 1_{(T_{G_t,n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) f_n(T_{G_t,n}, X_{G_t,n}) d\mathbb{P}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the last equality, we used that $(T_{G_t(M),n}, X_{G_t(M),n})(\omega) = (T_{G_t,n}, X_{G_t,n})(\omega)$ for $M = M(\omega)$ sufficiently large. Now since the left-hand side and right-hand side are finite measures, when seen as a function of F , that are equal on an intersection stable generator including Ω , we can conclude that they are equal on all of $\sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t,n-1}}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$. Since it also holds that $1_{(T_{G_t,n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t,n-1}}} [f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)]$ is $\sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t,n-1}}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$ -measurable, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
& 1_{(T_{G_t,n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \mathbb{E}[f_n(T_{G_t,n}, X_{G_t,n}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t,n-1}}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}] \\
& = \mathbb{E}[1_{(T_{G_t,n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) f_n(T_{G_t,n}, X_{G_t,n}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t,n-1}}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}] \\
& = 1_{(T_{G_t,n-1} < \infty)} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t,n-1}}} [f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)].
\end{aligned}$$

We can further strengthen this to

$$\mathbf{1}(t) \mathbb{E}[f_n(T_{G_t,n}, X_{G_t,n}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t,n-1}}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}] = \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t,n-1}}} [f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \quad (\text{A.3})$$

since also

$$\begin{aligned}
& 1_{(T_{G_t,n-1} = \infty)} \mathbb{E}[f_n(T_{G_t,n}, X_{G_t,n}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t,n-1}}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}] \\
& = 1_{(T_{G_t,n-1} = \infty)} f_n(\infty, \nabla) \\
& = 1_{(T_{G_t,n-1} = \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t,n-1}}} [f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)].
\end{aligned}$$

Now we are in a position to use induction over n in Equation (A.2).

(iv) : Using Equation (A.3) with $n = 1$ gives the result from Equation (A.2) for $n = 1$. For $n \geq 2$,

assume the result holds for $n - 1$ and observe

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{1}(t)\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(T_{G_t,i}, X_{G_t,i}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}\right] \\
&= \mathbf{1}(t)\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[f_n(T_{G_t,n}, X_{G_t,n}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{G_t,n-1}}, X_{G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}] \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i(T_{G_t,i}, X_{G_t,i}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}\right] \\
&\stackrel{\text{(iii)}}{=} \mathbf{1}(t)\mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{E}^{X_{T_{G_t,n-1}}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \times \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i(T_{G_t,i}, X_{G_t,i}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}\right] \\
&= \mathbf{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_{G_t}}\left[\tilde{E}^{\eta_{n-1}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \times \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i(\tau_i, \eta_i)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows by the induction hypothesis. Continuing the calculations, we see

$$\mathbf{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_{G_t}}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i(\tau_i, \eta_i) \times \tilde{E}^{\eta_{n-1}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)]\right] = \mathbf{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_{G_t}}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(\tau_i, \eta_i)\right],$$

by writing out the expectations using the Markov kernels. Hence we have shown

$$\mathbf{1}(t)\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(T_{G_t,i}, X_{G_t,i}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}\right] = \mathbf{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_{G_t}}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(\tau_i, \eta_i)\right]$$

so Equation (A.2) hold for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by induction, which proves the desired result. \square

For the proof of Proposition A.1, we needed Lemma A.2, which corresponds to Proposition A.1 if the random time G_t was replaced by a \mathcal{F}^X -stopping time in some of the terms.

Lemma A.2. *(Strong Markov type property at stopping time.)*

Under Assumption 3.2 it holds that

$$\mathbf{1}_{(T < \infty)}\mathbf{1}_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbf{1}(t)\mathbb{P}(\theta_T \mu \in \cdot \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T}, X_{G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}) = \mathbf{1}_{(T < \infty)}\mathbf{1}_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbf{1}(t)\tilde{Q}^{X_T}(\cdot) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for any \mathcal{F}^X -stopping time T .

The proof is very similar to the proof of Proposition A.1.

Proof. This is equivalent to showing for all $n \geq 1$ and all measurable bounded functions f_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{1}_{(T < \infty)}\mathbf{1}_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbf{1}(t)\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(T_{T,i}, X_{T,i}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T}, X_{G_t}, \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}\right] \\
&= \mathbf{1}_{(T < \infty)}\mathbf{1}_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbf{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_T}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(\tau_i, \eta_i)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$T(M) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} t_{Mm}\mathbf{1}_{(t_{M(m-1)} \leq T < t_{Mm})} + \infty\mathbf{1}_{(T = \infty)}$$

with $t_{Mm} = m2^{-M}$. Note that $(T(M) < \infty) = (T < \infty)$. We partition the proof into four parts corresponding to the four parts of the proof of Proposition A.1.

(i) : First we show the result (A.4) with the discrete random time $T(M)$ in place of T , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{1}_{(T < \infty)} \mathbb{1}_{(G_t \leq T(M))} \mathbb{1}(t) \mathbb{P}(\theta_{T(M)} \mu \in \cdot \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T(M)}, X_{G_t}, \mathbb{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}) \\ & = \mathbb{1}_{(T < \infty)} \mathbb{1}_{(G_t \leq T(M))} \mathbb{1}(t) \tilde{Q}^{X_{T(M)}}(\cdot). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Take $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and F on the form

$$F = ((X_s)_{s \leq T(M)} \in B) \cap (X_{G_t} \in C) \cap (\mathbb{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)} \in D).$$

Note that the collection of such sets constitutes an intersection-stable generator for $\sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T(M)}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(\mathbb{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$ containing Ω . Write $F_{M,m} = F \cap (T(M) = t_{Mm})$, and note that $F_{M,m} \in \mathcal{F}_{t_{Mm}}^X \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(\mathbb{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$ and also $(\text{RBNS}_t) \cap (G_t \leq t_{Mm}) \in \mathcal{F}_{t_{Mm}}^X \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(\mathbb{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{F_{M,m}} \mathbb{1}_{(G_t \leq T(M))} \mathbb{1}(t) \tilde{Q}^{X_{T(M)}}(H) d\mathbb{P} \\ & = \int_{F_{M,m}} \mathbb{1}_{(G_t \leq t_{Mm})} \mathbb{1}(t) \tilde{Q}^{X_{t_{Mm}}}(H) d\mathbb{P} \\ & = \int_{F_{M,m}} \mathbb{1}_{(G_t \leq t_{Mm})} \mathbb{1}(t) \mathbb{P}(\theta_{t_{Mm}} \mu \in H \mid X_{t_{Mm}}, \mathbb{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}) d\mathbb{P} \\ & = \int_{F_{M,m}} \mathbb{1}_{(G_t \leq t_{Mm})} \mathbb{1}(t) \mathbb{P}(\theta_{t_{Mm}} \mu \in H \mid \mathcal{F}_{t_{Mm}}^X \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(\mathbb{1}_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})) d\mathbb{P} \\ & = \int_{F_{M,m}} \mathbb{1}_{(G_t \leq t_{Mm})} \mathbb{1}(t) \mathbb{1}_{(\theta_{t_{Mm}} \mu \in H)} d\mathbb{P} \\ & = \mathbb{P}(F_{M,m} \cap (G_t \leq T(M)) \cap (\text{RBNS}_t) \cap (\theta_{T(M)} \mu \in H)). \end{aligned}$$

The third equality is Assumption 3.2 with $v = t_{Mm}$. Summing over $m \geq 1$ and using uniqueness of finite measures on intersection-stable generators gives the result for $T(M)$ on $(T(M) < \infty) = (T < \infty)$. This now gives Equation (A.5).

(ii) : Note that for any bounded measurable function f , we have

$$\tilde{E}^{X_T}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)] = \int_{(T, \infty]} \int_{\bar{E}} f(v, y) \tilde{r}_v(\phi_{Tv}(X_T), dy) \tilde{F}_{X_T}(dv)$$

with a similar expression for $\tilde{E}^{X_{T(M)}}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)]$. On $(\bar{N}_T = \bar{N}_{T(M)})$, it holds for $v \geq T(M)$, since also $T(M) \geq T$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{Tv}(X_T) & = \phi_{T(M)v}(\phi_{TT(M)}(X_T)) \\ & = \phi_{T(M)v}(X_{T(M)}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{F}_{X_T}(v) = \tilde{F}_{X_T}(T(M)) \tilde{F}_{X_{T(M)}}(v).$$

Hence, we have on $(\bar{N}_T = \bar{N}_{T(M)}) \cap (T < \infty)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{E}^{X_{T(M)}}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)] &= \int_{(T(M), \infty]} \int_{\bar{E}} f(v, y) \tilde{r}_v(\phi_{T(M)v}(X_{T(M)}), dy) \tilde{F}_{X_{T(M)}}(dv) \\
&= \frac{1}{\tilde{F}_{X_T}(T(M))} \int_{(T(M), \infty]} \int_{\bar{E}} f(v, y) \tilde{r}_v(\phi_{Tv}(X_T), dy) \tilde{F}_{X_T}(dv) \\
&\xrightarrow{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{(T, \infty]} \int_{\bar{E}} f(v, y) \tilde{r}_v(\phi_{Tv}(X_T), dy) \tilde{F}_{X_T}(dv) \\
&= \tilde{E}^{X_T}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)].
\end{aligned}$$

Since also $1_{(\bar{N}_{T(M)} = \bar{N}_T)} \rightarrow 1$ for $M \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} 1_{(T < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_{T(M)}}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)] &= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} 1_{(\bar{N}_{T(M)} = \bar{N}_T)} 1_{(T < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_{T(M)}}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \\
&= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} 1_{(\bar{N}_{T(M)} = \bar{N}_T)} 1_{(T < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_T}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \\
&= 1_{(T < \infty)} \tilde{E}^{X_T}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)].
\end{aligned}$$

We are now in a position to use dominated convergence.

(iii) : Take F on the form $F = ((X_s)_{s \leq T} \in B) \cap (X_{G_t} \in C) \cap (1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)} \in D)$ and write

$$F_M = ((X_s)_{s \leq T(M)} \in B) \cap (X_{G_t} \in C) \cap (1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)} \in D).$$

Note that $F_M \in \sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T(M)}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$ and $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} 1_{F_M} = 1_F$ since X is right-continuous and $T(M) \downarrow T$. Similarly, $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} 1_{(G_t \leq T(M))} = 1_{(G_t \leq T)}$ since the indicator $s \mapsto 1_{(G_t \leq s)}$ is right-continuous and $T(M) \downarrow T$. By dominated convergence and the results from (i) and (ii), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_F 1_{(T < \infty)} 1_{(G_t \leq T)} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{E}^{X_T}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)] d\mathbb{P} \\
&\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{F_M} 1_{(T < \infty)} 1_{(G_t \leq T(M))} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{E}^{X_{T(M)}}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)] d\mathbb{P} \\
&\stackrel{(i)}{=} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{F_M} 1_{(T < \infty)} 1_{(G_t \leq T(M))} \mathbf{1}(t) \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{E}[f(T_{T(M), 1}, X_{T(M), 1}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T(M)}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}] d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_{F_M} 1_{(T < \infty)} 1_{(G_t \leq T(M))} \mathbf{1}(t) f(T_{T(M), 1}, X_{T(M), 1}) d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \int_F 1_{(T < \infty)} 1_{(G_t \leq T)} \mathbf{1}(t) f(T_{T, 1}, X_{T, 1}) d\mathbb{P},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows by

$$F_M \cap (T < \infty) \cap (G_t \leq T(M)) \cap (\text{RBNS}_t) \in \sigma((X_s)_{s \leq T(M)}) \vee \sigma(X_{G_t}) \vee \sigma(1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)})$$

and the last equality follows since $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} 1_{F_M} = 1_F$. By uniqueness of finite measures on intersection stable generators, this shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&1_{(T < \infty)} 1_{(G_t \leq T)} \mathbf{1}(t) \tilde{E}^{X_T}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[1_{(T < \infty)} 1_{(G_t \leq T)} \mathbf{1}(t) f(T_{T, 1}, X_{T, 1}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}] \\
&= 1_{(T < \infty)} 1_{(G_t \leq T)} \mathbf{1}(t) \mathbb{E}[f(T_{T, 1}, X_{T, 1}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}].
\end{aligned}$$

The result also holds when removing the indicator $1_{(T<\infty)}$ since

$$\begin{aligned} & 1_{(T=\infty)}1_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbb{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_T}[f(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \\ &= 1_{(T=\infty)}1_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbb{1}(t)f(\infty, \nabla) \\ &= 1_{(T=\infty)}1_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbb{1}(t)\mathbb{E}[f(T_{T,1}, X_{T,1}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}]. \end{aligned}$$

(iv) : Using the result of (iii) with $f = f_1$ gives the base case of the induction. For $n \geq 2$, assume that the result hold for $n - 1$. Observe then

$$\begin{aligned} & 1_{(T<\infty)}1_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbb{1}(t)\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(T_{T,i}, X_{T,i}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[1_{(T<\infty)}1_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbb{1}(t)\mathbb{E}[f_n(T_{T,n}, X_{T,n}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T_{T,n-1}}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}] \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i(T_{T,i}, X_{T,i}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}\right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{(iii)}}{=} \mathbb{E}\left[1_{(T<\infty)}1_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbb{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_{T_{T,n-1}}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i(T_{T,i}, X_{T,i}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}\right] \\ &= 1_{(T<\infty)}1_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbb{1}(t)\mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{E}^{X_{T_{T,n-1}}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)] \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i(T_{T,i}, X_{T,i}) \mid (X_s)_{s \leq T}, X_{G_t}, 1_{(\tau_{\{d\}} \leq t)}\right] \\ &= 1_{(T<\infty)}1_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbb{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_T}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i(\tau_i, \eta_i)\tilde{E}^{\eta_{n-1}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)]\right] \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows by the tower property and the second follows by (iii) with $f = f_n$ and the \mathcal{F}^X -stopping time $T_{T,n-1}$ using also that $(G_t \leq T) \subseteq (G_t \leq T_{T,n-1})$. The last equality follows by the induction hypothesis. We finally see,

$$\begin{aligned} & 1_{(T<\infty)}1_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbb{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_T}\left[\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i(\tau_i, \eta_i)\tilde{E}^{\eta_{n-1}}[f_n(\tau_1, \eta_1)]\right] \\ &= 1_{(T<\infty)}1_{(G_t \leq T)}\mathbb{1}(t)\tilde{E}^{X_T}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n f_i(\tau_i, \eta_i)\right] \end{aligned}$$

by writing out the expectations using the Markov kernels. This concludes the induction and the proof. \square

Appendix B: Stochastic interest rate

We consider the extension of the results to models with stochastic interest rates. Assume that $\kappa(t) = \exp\left(\int_{(0,t]} r(v) dv\right)$ with $r : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ being a stochastic process. We assume that there exists an equivalent martingale measure for the financial market which we denote \mathbb{Q} . Define the time- t forward interest rate as

$$f(t, s) = -\frac{\partial \log P(t, s)}{\partial s}$$

where for $0 \leq t \leq s$ we have $P(t, s) = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\kappa(t)/\kappa(s) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^r]$ is the price at time t of a zero-coupon bond paying one unit at time s . Then $P(t, s) = \exp\left(\int_{(t,s]} f(t, v) dv\right)$. We introduce

$$\kappa_u(t) = \exp\left(\int_{(0,t]} r(u, v) dv\right)$$

for

$$r(u, v) := \begin{cases} r(v), & v \leq u \\ f(u, v), & v > u \end{cases}$$

being the realized interest rate before time u and the forward interest rate after time u . Note for $t \leq u \leq s$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\frac{\kappa(s)}{\kappa(t)} \mid \mathcal{F}_u^r\right] &= \frac{\kappa(u)}{\kappa(t)} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\frac{\kappa(s)}{\kappa(u)} \mid \mathcal{F}_u^r\right] \\ &= \exp\left(\int_{(t,u]} r(v) dv\right) \exp\left(\int_{(u,s]} f(u, v) dv\right) \\ &= \frac{\kappa_u(s)}{\kappa_u(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

The extension of our results to a stochastic interest rate is simple if there is no dependence or conditional dependence between the filtrations \mathcal{F}^r and \mathcal{F}^Z . Redefine the transaction time reserve as

$$\mathcal{V}(t) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^Z \vee \mathcal{F}_t^r]$$

where now $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{Q}}$. By Theorem 5.4 of Buchardt et al. (2023), we see

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(t) &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{[0,\infty)} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} B(ds) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^Z \vee \mathcal{F}_t^r\right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^J \int_{[0,t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} 1_{(Y_{s^-}^t=j)} B_{j,s-U_{s^-}^t}(ds) + \sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j \neq k}}^J \int_{[0,t]} \frac{\kappa(t)}{\kappa(s)} b_{jk}(s, U_{s^-}^t) N_{jk}^t(ds) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^Z \vee \mathcal{F}_t^r\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the independence between \mathcal{F}^r and \mathcal{F}^Z , standard arguments now give

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(t) &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{[0,\infty)} \frac{\kappa_t(t)}{\kappa_t(s)} B(ds) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^Z \vee \mathcal{F}_t^r\right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^J \int_{[0,t]} \frac{\kappa_t(t)}{\kappa_t(s)} 1_{(Y_{s^-}^t=j)} B_{j,s-U_{s^-}^t}(ds) + \sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j \neq k}}^J \int_{[0,t]} \frac{\kappa_t(t)}{\kappa_t(s)} b_{jk}(s, U_{s^-}^t) N_{jk}^t(ds) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^Z \vee \mathcal{F}_t^r\right]. \end{aligned}$$

This expression is identical to the expression for \mathcal{V} in the case of a deterministic interest rate, but where κ is replaced with κ_t . Now since \mathcal{F}^r is completely exogenous to \mathcal{F}^Z , all the calculations in Section 3 remain valid with κ replaced by κ_t , and hence we conclude that the results presented in Theorem 3.4, 3.8, and 3.9 still hold true if one substitutes κ_t for κ in all terms.

Remark B.1. (Run-off plots.)

Run-off plots are a common graphical tool used to validate the reserves. The intuition is that if

the reserves are correctly specified, the reserve should be converted to payments such that the sum of the two stays constant over time, see Figure B.1 for an illustration. We show that if interest is handled appropriately, this approach is justified.




Figure B.1: Illustration of a run-off plot with origin at the end of the coverage period, where reserves consist of only IBNR and RBNS contributions.

Assume that reserves are calculated with a fixed frequency (e.g. monthly) which we take to be the unit of the time scale. Let $\mathcal{V}^{\text{pc}}(t) = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}} \vee \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^r]$ be the reserve calculated with the previous interest rate curve. Since increasing the number of policies does not diversify the market risk, we focus on validating the non-financial model elements. For one policy, straightforward calculations give

$$\frac{\kappa_{t-1}(t-1)}{\kappa_{t-1}(t)} \mathcal{V}^{\text{pc}}(t) - \mathcal{V}(t-1) = - \int_{(t-1, t]} \frac{\kappa_{t-1}(t-1)}{\kappa_{t-1}(s)} \mathcal{B}(ds) + \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{P}(t-1) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}} \vee \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^r] - \mathcal{V}(t-1). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Hence, the change in the reserves where the interest rate curve is kept fixed at the previous interest rate curve and discounted one time unit is equal to the realized payments discounted to the previous time unit plus a term which has mean zero conditional on $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}^{\mathcal{Z}} \vee \mathcal{F}_{t-1}^r$. In other words, the latter term has mean zero if the non-financial part of the model is correctly specified no matter the prior financial and non-financial developments. Since this non-financial risk can be diversified away by increasing the size of the portfolio, it becomes negligible when summing Equation (B.1) over many policies. Hence, the height of the stacked curves of $t \mapsto \mathcal{V}(0) + \sum_{m=1}^t \kappa_{m-1}(m-1)/\kappa_{m-1}(m) \times \mathcal{V}^{\text{pc}}(m) - \mathcal{V}(m-1)$ and $t \mapsto \mathcal{B}(0) + \sum_{m=1}^t \int_{(m-1, m]} \kappa_{m-1}(m-1)/\kappa_{m-1}(s) \mathcal{B}(ds)$ summed over the policies is expected to stay constant throughout when the number of policies used in the sample is sufficiently large. ∇

Appendix C: Estimation

This section details how to embed the statistical problem of this paper into the one from Buchardt et al. (2025) and provides a more accessible exposition of their estimation procedure applied to the current setting.

C.1: Statistical model

The disability and reactivation events may both be affected by reporting delays, but the death event is not. The disability reporting delay is $U_{\mathcal{I}} : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ with $U_{\mathcal{I}} = 1_{(\tau_{\mathcal{I}} < \infty)}(T_{\{2\}} - \tau_{\mathcal{I}})$. Estimating

the IBNR-factor $I_i(s, t)$ when $s < \infty$ is equivalent to estimating the disability reporting delay distribution since

$$I_i(s, t) = \mathbb{P}(\text{CBNR}_t \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = s, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = i) = \mathbb{P}(U_{\mathcal{I}} > t - s \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = s, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = i).$$

Let $R : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ with $R = \inf\{s \geq 0 : G_s = G_\infty\}$ be the final time where payments are stopped. The reactivation reporting delay $U_r : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is $U_r = 1_{(\tau_{\{r\}} < \infty)}(R - \tau_{\{r\}})$. Note that there is no reporting delay when the insurer terminates the running payments, but a jump of $Z^{(1)}$ from state 2 to state 3 or state 5 which triggers backpay may lead to a reactivation reporting delay. Estimation of the reactivation reporting delay distribution is not needed for reserve calculation but is needed for our proposed estimator of the valid time hazards.

Both the disability and reactivation events also have non-trivial adjudications while death events do not. One can calculate the adjudication probability $\mathbb{P}(X_{G_t} = (G_t, Z_t^{(3)}, W_t) \mid \mathcal{F}_t^{\mathcal{Z}})$ as an absorption probability on the state space $\mathcal{J}^\omega = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ depicted in Figure C.1 with a set of $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ -predictable transition intensities $\omega_{jk} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ ($j, k \in \mathcal{J}^\omega, j \neq k$). Disability benefits are awarded if and only if the process is absorbed in state 3 or 5. The multistate model of Figure C.1 starts each time a disability or reactivation event is reported. A disability adjudication starts in state 1, while a reactivation adjudication starts in state 2. Note that since the adjudication hazards are $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ -predictable, they can and will be different when the adjudication pertains to a disability or a reactivation event. The shared notation for the adjudication hazards and the state space is chosen for parsimony.

Let $\sigma(t) = \inf\{v \geq 0 : W_v > W_t\}$ be the next time where disability benefits are awarded after time t . The multistate model of Figure C.1 corresponds to modeling $s \mapsto \mathcal{Z}_s$ on the interval $(t, \sigma(t)]$ using the self-exciting filtration $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ except that the mark at time $\sigma(t)$ is the reduced mark $(Z_{\sigma(t)}, 1_{(W_{\sigma(t)} > W_t)})$ as opposed to the full mark $\mathcal{Z}_{\sigma(t)}$. When the object of interest is the adjudication probability, there is no need to model the full mark, which would entail modeling how much backpay was awarded, and as a consequence also whether the insured receives running benefits after the award or not.




Figure C.1: Multistate model for adjudications. Active report is 1, inactive report is 2, awarded is 3, dead without award is 4, and dead with award is 5.

Let the observation window be $[0, \eta]$ and let the valid time process X be subject to independent left-truncation and right-censoring, hence being observed on a random interval $(V, C] \subseteq [0, \eta]$ even in the absence of reporting delays and adjudication processes. Events that occurred in $(V, C]$ can be reported and adjudicated up until time η . Baseline covariates, meaning covariates that are known at time 0 in the valid time and transaction time filtrations, can easily be incorporated here and in the rest of the paper by conditioning on them throughout. Define the parameter spaces \mathbb{G} , \mathbb{F} , and Θ being subsets of Euclidean spaces. The statistical model is denoted $\mathcal{P} = \{P_{(g, f, \theta)} : (g, f, \theta) \in \mathbb{G} \times \mathbb{F} \times \Theta\}$. The adjudication intensities under $P_{(g, f, \theta)}$ only depend on (g, f, θ) through g and are denoted $t \mapsto \omega_{jk}(t; g)$. The reporting delay distributions under $P_{(g, f, \theta)}$ only depend on (g, f, θ)

through f and are denoted $t \mapsto \mathbb{P}(U_{\mathcal{I}} \leq t \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}}, f)$ and $t \mapsto \mathbb{P}(U_r \leq t \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}}, \tau_{\{r\}}, f)$. The valid time hazards under $P_{(g,f,\theta)}$ only depend on (g, f, θ) through θ and are denoted $(t, u) \mapsto \mu_{jk}(t, u; \theta)$. We now describe the proposed estimators.

C.2: Adjudication probabilities

Let $N_{jk}^{\omega} : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{N}_0$ denote the counting processes on \mathcal{J}^{ω} where jumps due to starting a new adjudication are excluded. The objective function is the log-likelihood, which for one insured is

$$\ell_{\omega}(g) = \sum_{\substack{j,k \in \mathcal{J}^{\omega} \\ j \neq k}} \int_{(0,\eta]} \log\{\omega_{jk}(t; g)\} N_{jk}^{\omega}(dt) - \int_{(0,\eta]} \omega_{jk}(t; g) dt.$$

For n i.i.d. insured, the log-likelihood which we denote $\ell_{\omega}^{(n)}(g)$ is a sum over n such terms. The estimator is the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{g}_n = \arg \max_{g \in \mathbb{G}} \ell_{\omega}^{(n)}(g)$. The argmax can be found using existing `glm` software packages, see Section D in the supplementary material of Buchardt et al. (2025) for details.

C.3: Reporting delay distribution

The reporting delays are right-truncated since only jumps reported before η are part of the sample. We first discuss disability reporting delays and subsequently reactivation reporting delays. Since we for disability reporting delays condition on $\tau_{\mathcal{I}}$, only disability claims that will be awarded should be included in the estimation of the reporting delay distribution for disability events. We accommodate this by weighting the relevant objective function with the adjudication probability. Assume that $U_{\mathcal{I}}$ given $(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}})$ has density with respect to a common reference measure across \mathcal{P} . We informally denote this density evaluated at a point u by $\frac{d}{du} \mathbb{P}(U_{\mathcal{I}} \leq u \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}}, f)$. For one subject, the objective function for an observed disability reporting delay u is

$$\ell_{U_{\mathcal{I}}}(f; \hat{g}_n) = \mathbb{P}(X_{Z_{\eta}^{(2)}} = (Z_{\eta}^{(2)}, Z_{\eta}^{(3)}, 0) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{\mathcal{Z}}, \hat{g}_n) \times \log \left\{ \frac{\frac{d}{du} \mathbb{P}(U_{\mathcal{I}} \leq u \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = Z_{\eta}^{(2)}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = Z_{\eta}^{(3)}, f)}{\mathbb{P}(U_{\mathcal{I}} \leq \eta - \tau_{\mathcal{I}} \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = Z_{\eta}^{(2)}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = Z_{\eta}^{(3)}, f)} \right\}.$$

Here the first term is the adjudication probability $\mathbb{P}(X_{G_{\eta}} = (G_{\eta}, Z_{\eta}^{(3)}, 0) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{\mathcal{Z}}, \hat{g}_n)$ on (RBNSi_{η}) and is 1 if the disability has been awarded. The objective function for n i.i.d. subjects is a sum of n such terms and we denote this by $\ell_{U_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(n)}(f; \hat{g}_n)$.

Similarly, assume U_r given $(\tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}}, \tau_{\{r\}})$ has density with respect to a common reference measure across \mathcal{P} which we informally denote $\frac{d}{dw} \mathbb{P}(U_r \leq w \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}}, \tau_{\{r\}}, f)$. For one subject, the objective function for an observed reactivation reporting delay w is

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{U_r}(f; \hat{g}_n) &= (1 - \mathbb{P}(X_{G_{\eta}} = (G_{\eta}, Z_{\eta}^{(3)}, W_{\eta}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{\eta}^{\mathcal{Z}}, \hat{g}_n)) \\ &\times \log \left\{ \frac{\frac{d}{dw} \mathbb{P}(U_r \leq w \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = Z_{\eta}^{(2)}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = Z_{\eta}^{(3)}, \tau_{\{r\}} = G_{\eta}, f)}{\mathbb{P}(U_r \leq \eta - \tau_{\{r\}} \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = Z_{\eta}^{(2)}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = Z_{\eta}^{(3)}, \tau_{\{r\}} = G_{\eta}, f)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let the objective function for n i.i.d. subjects be denoted $\ell_{U_r}^{(n)}(f; \hat{g}_n)$. The estimator is then $\hat{f}_n = \arg \max_{f \in \mathbb{F}} \ell_{U_{\mathcal{I}}}^{(n)}(f; \hat{g}_n) + \ell_{U_r}^{(n)}(f; \hat{g}_n)$.

Remark C.1. (Chain ladder estimator.)

The reporting delay distribution can alternatively be estimated using chain ladder, see for example

Section 5 in Bücher and Rosenstock (2024), but the large-sample properties are then not a special case of Buchardt et al. (2025) since they consider parametric estimators. Note that chain ladder in this case does not estimate a reserve but rather an element of the individual reserve, namely the IBNR-factor. As seen in Section 3, an assumption like Assumption 3.1 is needed for the IBNR reserve to approximately decompose into an IBNR-factor-adjusted frequency multiplied with a classic valid time disability reserve as the associated claim size. ∇

C.4: Valid time hazards

Make a partition of the observation window $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_L = \eta$ and let $O_{jk}(\ell) = N_{jk}^\eta(t_{\ell+1}) - N_{jk}^\eta(t_\ell)$ and $E_j(\ell) = \int_{(t_\ell, t_{\ell+1}]} 1_{(Y_s^\eta=j)} ds$ ($\ell = 0, \dots, L-1$) be the occurrences and exposures based on H^η for a single insured. To describe how the duration process is affected by accepting or rejecting a disability claim, we introduce the auxiliary durations $U_j(\ell) = U_{t_\ell}^\eta$ for $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Note that there is initially no dependence on j .

If there is an unadjudicated disability at time η , the occurrences, exposures, and durations are modified:

$$\begin{aligned} O_{ai}(\ell) &\leftarrow \mathbb{P}(X_{G_\eta} = (G_\eta, i, 0) \mid \mathcal{F}_\eta^Z, \hat{g}_n), & G_\eta \in (t_\ell, t_{\ell+1}], \\ E_a(\ell) &\leftarrow (t_{\ell+1} - t_\ell) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(X_{G_\eta} = (G_\eta, i, 0) \mid \mathcal{F}_\eta^Z, \hat{g}_n)), & G_\eta \in (0, t_\ell], \\ E_i(\ell) &\leftarrow (t_{\ell+1} - t_\ell) \times \mathbb{P}(X_{G_\eta} = (G_\eta, i, 0) \mid \mathcal{F}_\eta^Z, \hat{g}_n), & G_\eta \in (0, t_\ell], \\ U_i(\ell) &\leftarrow t_\ell - G_\eta, & G_\eta \in (0, t_\ell], \end{aligned}$$

for $i = Z_\eta^{(3)}$. If there is an unadjudicated reactivation at time η , the occurrences, exposures, and durations are modified:

$$\begin{aligned} O_{ir}(\ell) &\leftarrow (1 - \mathbb{P}(X_{G_\eta} = (G_\eta, i, W_\eta) \mid \mathcal{F}_\eta^Z, \hat{g}_n)), & G_\eta \in (t_\ell, t_{\ell+1}], \\ E_i(\ell) &\leftarrow (t_{\ell+1} - t_\ell) \times \mathbb{P}(X_{G_\eta} = (G_\eta, i, W_\eta) \mid \mathcal{F}_\eta^Z, \hat{g}_n), & G_\eta \in (0, t_\ell], \\ E_r(\ell) &\leftarrow (t_{\ell+1} - t_\ell) \times (1 - \mathbb{P}(X_{G_\eta} = (G_\eta, i, W_\eta) \mid \mathcal{F}_\eta^Z, \hat{g}_n)), & G_\eta \in (0, t_\ell], \\ U_i(\ell) &\leftarrow t_\ell - Z_\eta^{(2)}, & G_\eta \in (0, t_\ell], \end{aligned}$$

for $i = Z_\eta^{(3)}$. Finally, in all cases, the exposures are modified with the reporting delay distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{ai}(\ell) &\leftarrow E_a(\ell) \times \mathbb{P}(U_{\mathcal{I}} \leq \eta - \tau_{\mathcal{I}} \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = t_\ell, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = i, \hat{f}_n), \\ E_{ir}(\ell) &\leftarrow E_i(\ell) \times \mathbb{P}(U_r \leq \eta - \tau_{\{r\}} \mid \tau_{\mathcal{I}} = Z_\eta^{(2)}, Y_{\tau_{\mathcal{I}}} = i, \tau_{\{r\}} = t_\ell, \hat{f}_n), \end{aligned}$$

for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. For the remaining transitions set $E_{jk}(\ell) \leftarrow E_j(\ell)$.

The objective function $\ell(\theta; \hat{g}_n, \hat{f}_n)$ is the log-likelihood resulting from assuming that $(O_{jk}(\ell))_{j,k,\ell}$ are independent Poisson distributed random variables with mean values $(\mu_{jk}(t_\ell, U_j(\ell); \theta) E_{jk}(\ell))_{j,k,\ell}$. Let the objective function for n i.i.d. subjects be denoted $\ell^{(n)}(\theta; \hat{g}_n, \hat{f}_n)$. The estimator is $\hat{\theta}_n = \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \ell^{(n)}(\theta; \hat{g}_n, \hat{f}_n)$, which corresponds to the Poisson approximation from Buchardt et al. (2025). The argmax can be found using existing `glm` software packages when the modified occurrences, exposures, and durations have been constructed. Note that if two occurrences have the same mean value, these occurrences and their corresponding exposures can be summed without changing the objective function. This aggregation may save memory and speed up computations.

C.5: Asymptotic properties

The Poisson approximation introduces bias that does not vanish asymptotically, but which is small when the hazards and reporting delays are small, see Section 3.3 of Buchardt et al. (2025) or Section B.2 of their supplementary material. The approximation error for the disability hazard is expected to be negligible since the hazard appears to be smaller than 10^{-2} by some margin. There is also a small approximation bias coming from implementing the Poisson approximation via occurrences and exposures, see Section D in the supplementary material of Buchardt et al. (2025) for details. Denote by $B_n = \hat{\theta}_n - \hat{\theta}_n^{\text{full}}$ the approximation bias, where $\hat{\theta}_n^{\text{full}}$ is the estimator based on the full procedure. We use $\overset{\text{a}}{\sim}$ to denote asymptotic distribution. The asymptotic properties of the estimators are given in Proposition C.2.

Proposition C.2. *Under Assumptions 1-3 and 5-8 from Buchardt et al. (2025), which are standard integrability and smoothness conditions,*

$$(\hat{g}_n, \hat{f}_n, \hat{\theta}_n) \overset{\text{a}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}((0, 0, B_n), \Sigma)$$

for a non-singular covariance matrix Σ .

Proof. This follows directly from Theorem 1 of Buchardt et al. (2025). □

References

- ANDERSEN, P. K., BORGAN, O., GILL, R. D. & KEIDING, N. (1993). *Statistical Models Based on Counting Processes*. New York: Springer.
- BETTONVILLE, C., D'OULTREMONT, L., DENUIT, M., TRUFIN, J. & VAN OIRBEEK, R. (2021). Matrix calculation for ultimate and 1-year risk in the Semi-Markov individual loss reserving model. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* **2021**, 380–407.
- BUCHARDT, K., FURRER, C. & SANDQVIST, O. L. (2023). Transaction time models in multi-state life insurance. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* **2023**, 974–999.
- BUCHARDT, K., FURRER, C. & SANDQVIST, O. L. (2025). Estimation for multistate models subject to reporting delays and incomplete event adjudication. Preprint. Available online at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.04318>.
- BUCHARDT, K., MØLLER, T. & SCHMIDT, K. B. (2015). Cash flows and policyholder behaviour in the semi-Markov life insurance setup. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* **2015**, 660–688.
- BÜCHER, A. & ROSENSTOCK, A. (2024). Combined modelling of micro-level outstanding claim counts and individual claim frequencies in non-life insurance. *European Actuarial Journal*, 1–33.
- CHRISTIANSEN, M. (2012). Multistate models in health insurance. *ASTA Advances in Statistical Analysis* **96**, 155–186.
- CHRISTIANSEN, M. C. & FURRER, C. (2021). Dynamics of state-wise prospective reserves in the presence of non-monotone information. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **97**, 81–98.

- CREVECOEUR, J., ANTONIO, K. & VERBELEN, R. (2019). Modeling the number of hidden events subject to observation delay. *European Journal of Operational Research* **277**, 930–944.
- CREVECOEUR, J., ROBBEN, J. & ANTONIO, K. (2022a). A hierarchical reserving model for reported non-life insurance claims. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **104**, 158–184.
- CREVECOEUR, J., ANTONIO, K., DESMEDT, S. & MASQUELEIN, A. (2022b). Bridging the gap between pricing and reserving with an occurrence and development model for non-life insurance claims. *ASTIN Bulletin* **53**, 185–212.
- DABROWSKA, D. (1995). Estimation of transition probabilities and bootstrap in a semiparametric Markov renewal model. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* **5**, 237–259.
- HABERMAN, S. & PITACCO, E. (1998). *Actuarial models for disability insurance*. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall.
- HELWICH, M. (2008). *Durational effects and non-smooth semi-Markov models in life insurance*. PhD thesis, University of Rostock.
- HOEM, J. (1972). Inhomogeneous semi-Markov processes, select actuarial tables, and duration-dependence in demography. In: *Population Dynamics*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 251–296.
- HOUGAARD, P. (2000). *Analysis of multivariate survival data*. New York: Springer.
- JACOBSEN, M. (2006). *Point process theory and applications: Marked point and piecewise deterministic processes*. Boston: Birkhauser.
- JANSSEN, J. (1966). Application des processus semi-markoviens à un problème d’invalidité. *Bulletin de l’Association Royale des Actuaries Belges* **63**, 35–52.
- LAGAKOS, S. W., SOMMER, C. J. & ZELEN, M. (1978). Semi-Markov models for partially censored data. *Biometrika* **65**, 311–317.
- LOPEZ, O., MILHAUD, X. & THÉRON, P. E. (2018). Micro-level VS macro-level reserving in non-life insurance: why and when? Preprint. Available online at <https://hal.science/hal-01868744>.
- MACK, T. (1993). Distribution-free calculation of the standard error of chain ladder reserve estimates. *ASTIN Bulletin: The Journal of the IAA* **23**, 213–225.
- MACK, T. (1999). The standard error of chain ladder reserve estimates: Recursive calculation and inclusion of a tail factor. *ASTIN Bulletin: The Journal of the IAA* **29**, 361–366.
- NORBERG, R. (1990). Payment measures, interest, and discounting: an axiomatic approach with applications to insurance. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* **1990**, 14–33.
- NORBERG, R. (1993). Prediction of Outstanding Liabilities in Non-Life Insurance. *ASTIN Bulletin* **23**, 95–115.

- NORBERG, R. (1999). Prediction of Outstanding Liabilities II. Model Variations and Extensions. *ASTIN Bulletin* **29**, 5–25.
- R DEVELOPMENT CORE TEAM (2023). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, <http://www.R-project.org>.
- SCHERVISH, M. J. (1995). *Theory of statistics*. New York: Springer.
- SPITONI, C., VERDUIJN, M. & PUTTER, H. (2012). Estimation and asymptotic theory for transition probabilities in Markov renewal multi-state models. *The International Journal of Biostatistics* **8**, 23.
- VERBELEN, R., ANTONIO, K., CLAESKENS, G. & CREVECOEUR, J. (2022). Modeling the occurrence of events subject to a reporting delay via an EM algorithm. *Statistical Science* **37**, 394–410.
- YACKEL, J. (1968). A random time change relating semi-Markov and Markov processes. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **39**, 358–364.
- LINDSEY, J. K. (1995). Fitting parametric counting processes by using log-linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C* **44**, 201–212.