Non life pricing: empirical comparison of classical GLM with tree based Gradient Boosted Models Innovative approach to pure premium estimation

Leonardo Petrini

Paris, 8th June 2017

1 / 12

Methodologies and Tools

- GAM: A better GLM
- Tree Based Gradient Boosted Models

2 Empirical Results

- Adopted Datasets
- Performance Results

- A correct and accurate pricing
- A better understanding of the risk components
- Number of Claims (NB) and Claim Severity (CS)

Key Quantity

BurningCost = NB * CS

Beyond GLM: Generalised Additive Models

$$g(E[y|x]) = \beta_0 + f_1(x_1) + \ldots + f_p(x_p)$$

- Advantages
 - Effective in treating non-linearity
 - Can adapt to a large variety of scenarios
- Disadvantages
 - Can easily lead to overfitting
 - Computationally intensive
- The 'mgcv' package:
 - Define a formula
 - Create a parallel cluster
 - Run the 'mgcv::bam(...)' function



stopCluster(cl)

Gradient Boosted Models: Understanding the Hype

- Decision Tree based models
- Proven to work in Insurance
- XGBoost: The Kaggle "to-go" model
- Actively used by companies as ...





eXtreme Gradient Boosting: The State of Art

- Ensemble of Decision Trees
- Boosting Algorithm
- Active community
- Computationally attractive
- 10x Faster than GBM



```
library(xgboost)
```

```
train <- xgb.DMatrix(data = ..., label = ...)
test <- xgb.DMatrix(data = ..., label = ...)
watchlist <- list(train = ..., test = ...)</pre>
```

- CAS Dataset: 'freMTPL'
- Private Dataset: 'Actuarial Pricing Game'
- Pre-Processing
- Cross-Validation
- Metrics Used:
 - Number of Claims: Poisson Log-Loss
 - Claim Severity: Root Mean Square Error
 - Burning Cost: Normalised Gini Index

CAS Dataset: GAM vs XGBoost



Cumulative share of Insured

Private Dataset: GAM vs XGBoost



Thank You!

leopetrini@mail.com | GitHub: XGBoost-in-Insurance-2017



Leonardo Petrini

Non life pricing: empirical comparison of class

Paris, 8th June 2017

12 / 12