

# BACKGROUND RISK MODEL IN PRESENCE OF HEAVY TAILS UNDER DEPENDENCE

DIMITRIOS G. KONSTANTINIDES, CHARALAMPOS D. PASSALIDIS

**ABSTRACT.** We study the background risk model under a various forms of dependence and some distribution classes of heavy tails. First, we study the asymptotic behavior of tail expectation of a portfolios with unequal heavytailedness, of non-random sums and randomly stopped sums, under some dependence structure which contains the independence as a special case. Further we investigate the asymptotic behavior of a pair of randomly weighted sums, generalizing the dependence structure among random vector components, our results contains the finite ruin probability in bi-dimensional discrete time risk model with unequal heavytailedness. Next, we carry out asymptotic analysis of the tail distortion risk measures in background risk model under various forms of dependence, with multivariate regularly varying risk distributions in each portfolio.

*Keywords:* Multivariate regular variation; Conditional dependence; Breiman's theorem; Tail distortion risk measure; Tail expectation; Strongly asymptotic independence

*Mathematics Subject Classification:* Primary 62P05; Secondary 91G05; 91B05.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We have a  $n$  business lines insurance and we approximated some risk measures, in order to evaluate its efficiency over a fixed time interval. Let us consider a random vector  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , that depicts the losses in the  $n$  lines of insurance business, in this interval. Next, we denote by  $\Theta = (\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_n)$  the vector, describing the systemic risk factors.

Hence, the vector  $\Theta\mathbf{X} = (\Theta_1 X_1, \dots, \Theta_n X_n)$  express the present value of the claims at each business line, while the sum

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i,$$

denotes the total claim. In most papers on such models, consider that the main claims  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are equally weighted, and usually accept as framework the class of regular variation. This means that the portfolios are homogeneous with respect to heavytailedness, see for example [38], [54] and [10].

However, the homogeneity of the tails can be very restrictive, so we consider the asymptotic behavior of a new risk measure, under non-equally weighted portfolios. Furthermore, we take into account that for two portfolios the number of claims is random, and then we show the asymptotic behavior of this new risk measure.

Finally, we study the tail distortion risk measure, on homogeneous portfolios under multivariate regular variation and we find the joint asymptotic behavior of two randomly weighted sums, under a new dependence structure. This form of dependence permits dependencies

among the members of the sequences of the main claims but also between the two sequences. In most of these results the independence is included as special case.

Now we give some preliminaries results and notation. Let denote  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , the scalar product  $c\mathbf{x} = (cx_1, \dots, cx_n)$ ,  $x \wedge y = \min\{x, y\}$ ,  $x \vee y = \max\{x, y\}$ ,  $x_+ = x \vee 0$ ,  $x_- = (-x \vee 0)$  and  $e_i$  represents the vector, whose all the components are 0, except the  $i$ -th, that is 1. For two positive functions  $f$  and  $g$  we write  $f(x) = O(g(x))$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , if

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} < \infty.$$

and  $f(x) = o(g(x))$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , if

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = 0.$$

Let denote by  $F(x) = \mathbf{P}(X \leq x)$  the distribution of the random variable  $X$  and by  $\bar{F}(x) := 1 - F(x) = \mathbf{P}(X > x)$ , its tail. For two-dimensional functions all the convergences holds as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ , unless otherwise stated. Next, we consider the value at risk

$$VaR_p(X) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F(x) \geq p\},$$

for some  $p \in (0, 1)$  and the corresponding conditional tail expectation

$$CTE_p(X) = \mathbf{E}[X | X > VaR_p(X)].$$

Let see now the classes of heavy-tailed distributions and their properties. We assume that all the distributions have infinite right endpoint, that means  $\bar{F}(x) > 0$  for all  $x > 0$ . We say that distribution  $F$  has heavy tail, and write  $\bar{F} \in \mathcal{H}$ , if for any  $\epsilon > 0$  the relation

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\epsilon x} \bar{F}(dx) = \infty,$$

is true.

We say that distribution  $F$  has long tail (symbolically  $F \in \mathcal{L}$ ) if for some (or equivalently for all)  $a \neq 0$  holds

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{F}(x+a)}{\bar{F}(x)} = 1.$$

The class  $\mathcal{L}$  represents a subclass of heavy-tailed distributions  $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{H}$ . If  $\bar{F} \in \mathcal{L}$ , then there exists some function  $a : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that  $a(x) \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $a(x) = o(x)$ , and  $\bar{F}(x \pm a(x)) \sim \bar{F}(x)$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . This  $a(x)$  is called insensitivity function.

We say that distribution  $F$  belongs to the class of subexponential distributions, and write  $\bar{F} \in \mathcal{S}$ , if for some (or equivalently for any)  $n = 2, 3, \dots$  holds

$$\frac{\bar{F}^{n*}(x)}{\bar{F}(x)} \sim n$$

when  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $F^{n*}$  is the  $n$ -fold convolution of distribution  $F$ , introduced in [18].

We say that  $F$  has dominatedly varying tail, and write  $\bar{F} \in \mathcal{D}$ , if holds

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{F}(tx)}{\bar{F}(x)} < \infty$$

for some (or equivalently, for all)  $0 < t < 1$ . Let us make clear, that neither  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{H}$  nor  $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{D}$  are true. However  $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{L}$ . Now, we remind some properties of regular

variation. A random variable  $X$  with distribution  $F$  is regularly varying with index  $\alpha > 0$  and write  $\bar{F} \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$  if

$$\frac{\bar{F}(tx)}{\bar{F}(x)} \rightarrow t^{-\alpha},$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , uniformly for any  $t > 0$ . The class of distributions with regularly varying tails is contained in  $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$

$$\mathcal{R} := \bigcup_{\alpha > 0} \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha} \subset \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{H}$$

Let us now consider the limits

$$\bar{F}_*(t) := \liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{F}(tx)}{\bar{F}(x)}, \quad \bar{F}^*(t) := \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{F}(tx)}{\bar{F}(x)},$$

for all  $t > 0$ .

For some distribution  $F$  the upper and lower Matuszewska indexes are given by

$$\alpha_F := \inf \left\{ -\frac{\ln \bar{F}_*(t)}{\ln t} : t > 1 \right\}, \quad \beta_F := \sup \left\{ -\frac{\ln \bar{F}^*(t)}{\ln t} : t > 1 \right\}.$$

respectively. For these indexes, that appeared in [39], the following relations hold.  $\bar{F} \in \mathcal{D}$  if and only if  $0 \leq \beta_F \leq \alpha_F < \infty$  and  $\bar{F} \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$  if and only if  $\beta_F = \alpha_F = \alpha$ , (see [5]).

The class of regularly varying distributions have many closure properties, see for example [30]. One of these properties is the asymptotic behavior of the tail product convolution, which is the popular Breiman's Theorem. In the [7], and [19] established the following result. If  $X$  and  $\Theta$  two independent random variables with  $X \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$  for some  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\Theta$  is non-negative such that  $\mathbf{E}[\Theta^{\alpha+\epsilon}] < \infty$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$  then  $\mathbf{P}(X\Theta > x) \sim \mathbf{E}(\Theta^\alpha)\mathbf{P}(X > x)$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , which means that  $X\Theta \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$ .

Now we can go to the extension of regular variation in random vectors. Let  $\mathbf{X}$  be a random vector in the space  $[0, \infty]^n$ . We remind that  $\mathbf{X}$  follows the multivariate regularly varying distribution, if there exists a function  $b : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and a non-degenerated Radon measure  $\nu$ , such that holds in the space  $[0, \infty]^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$

$$t\mathbf{P} \left( \frac{\mathbf{X}}{b(t)} \in B \right) \xrightarrow{v} \nu(B), \quad (1.1)$$

where it refers to the vague convergence, as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and for the measure  $\nu : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  it holds  $\nu((x, \infty]) = x^{-\alpha}$ , and we write  $\mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu)$ . This measure  $\nu$  is homogeneous, whence for any Borel set  $B \subseteq [0, \infty]^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  we obtain

$$\nu(tB) = t^{-\alpha}\nu(B),$$

for any  $t \geq 0$ .

For the normalizing function  $b(\cdot)$  we have that  $b(\cdot) \in \mathcal{R}_{1/\alpha}$ , as is indicated in [42]. Another representation of (1.1) is in the following form

$$\frac{1}{\bar{F}(t)}\mathbf{P} \left( \frac{\mathbf{X}}{t} \in B \right) \xrightarrow{v} \nu(B)$$

as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark 1.1.** *The components of the random vector  $\mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu)$  have the same tail convergence speed, in the sense that each component belongs to  $\mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$  with the same  $\alpha > 0$ , however this does not mean that the components have the same distribution, as they eventually differ in the part of the slowly varying functions.*

Now let us remind the strong asymptotic independence (see [34, Assumption A]). Let  $X$  and  $Y$  two real-valued random variables with distributions  $F$  and  $G$  respectively. We say that  $X$  and  $Y$  are strongly asymptotically independent (SAI) if

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(X^- > x, Y > y) &= O[F(-x)\overline{G}(y)], & \mathbf{P}(X > x, Y^- > y) &= O[\overline{F}(x)G(-y)], \\ \mathbf{P}(X > x, Y > y) &\sim C\overline{F}(x)\overline{G}(y), \end{aligned}$$

as  $(x, y) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$ , for some constant  $C > 0$ .

**Remark 1.2.** *It is easy to see that, SAI contains the independence as a special case. In the case where  $X$  and  $Y$  are non-negative (or generally bounded from below) as in our case, then  $X$  and  $Y$  are SAI if holds*

$$\mathbf{P}(X > x, Y > y) \sim C\overline{F}(x)\overline{G}(y)$$

as  $(x, y) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$ . *The SAI covers a wide spectrum of dependence as for example Ali-Mikhail-Haq, Farlie-Gumbel-Morgenstern and Frank copulas.*

The rest of this paper structure is the following. In Section 2 we study one double background risk model, more specifically we study the tail expectation of this model and we give our main result for tail expectation of unequal heavytailedness portfolios under dependence. In section 3 we extend the jointly tail behavior of two weighted random sums, given in [33], in the case of random vectors with generalized tail asymptotically independent components. This dependence structure enables the study of the dependence between two random vectors. Additionally we give the ruin probability in bi-dimensional discrete time risk model under the assumptions of the results of this section. In Section 4, some extensions Breiman's theorem are presented which used to establish asymptotic results of tail distortion risk measure in various background risk models considering the dependence forms between systemic risk factors and losses.

## 2. TAIL EXPECTATION UNDER UNEQUAL HEAVY-TAILEDNESS

**2.1. Non-Random Sums.** In this section we study the tail expectation in the case with portfolios in MRV but with different tail indexes. We denote

$$X_n(\Theta) := \sum_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i, \quad Y_m(\Delta) := \sum_{j=1}^m \Delta_j Y_j.$$

We can consider this model as a double background risk model, which has reason to be studied as well explain below. We give the tail expectation as follows

$$TE[X_n(\Theta), Y_m(\Delta), u] := \mathbf{E} [X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) \mid X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > u],$$

for every  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and for some large enough  $u > 0$ .

The components of the vectors  $(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  and  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_m)$  represent primary, non-degenerated random variables, depicting the main risks. The components of the  $(\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_n)$  and  $(\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_m)$  represent the systemic risk factors.

This subsection focused to the following question: what happens when we want to study  $n$ -independent portfolios, that are asymptotic marginal distributions, with tail  $\overline{F} \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$  and other  $m$ -independent portfolios, that are asymptotic marginal distributions, with tail  $\overline{G} \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha'}$ ?

- (1) If  $\alpha = \alpha'$ , then we can study the merging of the two random vectors into one multivariate regular varying vector with  $m+n$  components, that are arbitrarily dependent, because  $n \wedge m$  random variables are dependent with SAI. There is no reason to use the tail expectation, but we used Corollary 4.2, with  $g(x) = x$ , and for some  $u$  not necessarily equal to VaR, for the only sum of  $m+n$  components.
- (2) But if  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  are dependent with  $\alpha \neq \alpha'$  then things change. So we study the relation of tail expectation, under a certain dependence, called strong asymptotic independence.

The goal of this subsection is the asymptotic double-bound for  $TE(X_n(\Theta), Y_m(\Delta))$  under the assumptions at the beginning of this section. Furthermore this double-bound can be done asymptotic equivalent under one extra condition.

The next result can be found in [33, Corollary 1].

**Proposition 2.1** (Li (2018)). *Let  $(X_i, Y_i)$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  be a sequence of mutually independent random vectors with marginal distributions  $\overline{F}_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha_i}$  and  $\overline{G}_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha'_i}$ , for some  $\alpha_i, \alpha'_i \in [0, \infty)$ . Assume that for every pair  $(X_i, Y_i)$  the components are SAI, with constant  $C_i > 0$ . Let  $S_i, \Delta_i$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  be a sequence of non-negative (and non-degenerated) arbitrarily dependent random variables such that*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \left( \Theta_i^{(\alpha_i - \delta)^+} \vee \Theta_i^{(\alpha_i + \delta)} \right) \left( \Delta_j^{(\alpha'_j - \delta)^+} \vee \Delta_j^{(\alpha'_j + \delta)} \right) \right] < \infty, \quad (2.1)$$

for some  $\delta > 0$  and for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Assume that  $(X_i, Y_i)$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\Theta_i, \Delta_i$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  are independent. Then

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y) \quad (2.2)$$

$$\sim \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{1=j \neq i}^m \mathbf{E} \left[ \Theta_i^{\alpha_i} \Delta_j^{\alpha'_j} \right] \overline{F}_i(x) \overline{G}_j(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{n \wedge m} C_i \mathbf{E} \left[ \Theta_i^{\alpha_i} \Delta_i^{\alpha'_i} \right] \overline{F}_i(x) \overline{G}_i(y),$$

as  $(x, y) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$ .

**Remark 2.1.** *Because we study multivariate regular variation, the marginal distributions have the same tail index, i.e.  $\overline{F}_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$  and  $\overline{G}_j \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha'}$  then (2.1), (2.2) are*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \left( \Theta_i^{(\alpha - \delta)^+} \vee \Theta_i^{(\alpha + \delta)} \right) \left( \Delta_j^{(\alpha' - \delta)^+} \vee \Delta_j^{(\alpha' + \delta)} \right) \right] < \infty, \quad (2.3)$$

for some  $\delta > 0$  and for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$  and

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y) \sim K \overline{F}(x) \overline{G}(y), \quad (2.4)$$

as  $(x, y) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$ , where we denote

$$K := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{1=j \neq i}^m \mathbf{E} \left[ \Theta_i^{\alpha} \Delta_j^{\alpha'} \right] + C \sum_{i=1}^{n \wedge m} \mathbf{E} \left[ \Theta_i^{\alpha} \Delta_i^{\alpha'} \right].$$

In fact, we study one background risk model, with  $n$ -portfolios that are part of some  $n$ -dimensional regular varying vector with independent components (therefore the  $n$ -portfolios

are independent) with tail index " $\alpha$ " and  $m$ -independent portfolios that are part of  $m$ -dimensional multivariate regular varying vector with independent components and with tail index " $\alpha'$ ". The systemic risk factors  $\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_n$  are independent and are independent of the primary components  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  (similarly for  $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_m$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ ). Additionally the  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  are SAI while  $X_i$  and  $Y_j$  are independent for any  $i \neq j$ , and  $\Theta_i, \Delta_i$  are arbitrarily dependent (for the same  $i$ ).

**Theorem 2.1.** *Consider two vectors  $\mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu)$  and  $\mathbf{Y} \in MRV(\alpha', b', \nu')$ , whose components are non-negative and independent. Let us assume that  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  are SAI with marginal distributions  $F$  and  $G$ , respectively, where  $\alpha > 1$  and  $\alpha' > 1$  and  $\Theta$  and  $\Delta$  are non-negative, arbitrarily dependent random vectors, but with independent components. Assume that  $(\Theta, \Delta)$  and  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$  are independent and the  $\Theta, \Delta$  satisfy the relationship (2.3). Then*

$$\begin{aligned} u + K \int_u^\infty \bar{F}(x)\bar{G}(x)dx &\lesssim TE[X_n(\Theta), Y_m(\Delta), u] \\ &\lesssim u + \frac{1}{K\bar{F}(u)\bar{G}(u)} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \mathbf{E}[\Theta_i^\alpha] \int_u^\infty \bar{F}(x)dx + \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{E}[\Delta_j^{\alpha'}] \int_u^\infty \bar{G}(x)dx \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* We denote

$$\bar{F}_\Theta(x, n) := \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x), \quad \bar{G}_\Delta(x, m) := \mathbf{P}(Y_m(\Delta) > x).$$

. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} TE[X_n(\Theta), Y_m(\Delta), u] &= \mathbf{E}[X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) \mid X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > u] \\ &= \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > x \mid X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > u) dx = \\ &\left( \int_0^u + \int_u^\infty \right) \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > x \mid X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > u) dx =: J_1(u) + J_2(u). \end{aligned}$$

For  $J_1(u)$  we have

$$J_1(u) = \int_0^u \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > x \mid X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > u) dx = \int_0^u 1 dx = u. \quad (2.6)$$

Now we estimate the lower bound of  $J_2(u)$

$$J_2(u) = \int_u^\infty \frac{\mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > x)}{\mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > u)} dx. \quad (2.7)$$

For the lower bound of integral, using relation (2.4), and dominated convergence theorem (because  $\alpha, \alpha' > 1$ ) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &\geq \int_u^\infty \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > x) dx \geq \int_u^\infty \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > x) dx \\ &\sim K \int_u^\infty \bar{F}(x)\bar{G}(x) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ , which give the lower bound. For the denominator, taking into account that the random variables are non-negative and further because of the closure property with

respect to product convolution (see [7], because the assumptions of finite moments in (2.3)) and the closure property of the regular variation with respect to convolution (namely from  $X_n(\Theta) \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$  and  $Y_m(\Delta) \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha'}$ ), by non-negative assumption of the components we find out

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > x) &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(X_n(\Theta) > \frac{x}{2}\right) + \mathbf{P}\left(Y_m(\Delta) > \frac{x}{2}\right) \\ &\sim 2^\alpha \bar{F}_\Theta(x, n) + 2^{\alpha'} \bar{G}_\Delta(x, m). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . Using again the expression in (2.7) for  $J_2(u)$ , we can estimate the upper bound as well. Indeed, for the denominator in (2.7), we have the asymptotic estimation

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) + Y_m(\Delta) > u) \geq \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > u, Y_m(\Delta) > u) \sim K \bar{F}(u) \bar{G}(u), \quad (2.10)$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, from (2.9) and (2.10) we find the following upper bound

$$J_2(u) \lesssim \frac{1}{K \bar{F}(u) \bar{G}(u)} \left( \int_u^\infty 2^\alpha \bar{F}_\Theta(x, n) dx + \int_u^\infty 2^{\alpha'} \bar{G}_\Delta(x, m) dx \right), \quad (2.11)$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus from (2.8) and (2.11) we have that :

$$\begin{aligned} K \int_u^\infty \bar{F}(x) \bar{G}(x) dx &\lesssim TE[X_n(\Theta), Y_m(\Delta), u] - u \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{K \bar{F}(u) \bar{G}(u)} \int_u^\infty \left[ 2^\alpha \bar{F}_\Theta(x, n) + 2^{\alpha'} \bar{G}_\Delta(x, m) \right] dx, \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$  For the calculation of  $\bar{F}_\Theta(x, n)$  and  $\bar{G}_\Delta(x, m)$ , because of independence between  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$  and  $(\Theta, \Delta)$  we can use Breiman's theorem. First, we see if  $\mathbf{P}(X_i > u) = \bar{F}(u) \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$ , then we find  $\Theta_i X_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$  and

$$\mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > u) \sim \mathbf{E}[\Theta_i^\alpha] \mathbf{P}(X_i > u) = \mathbf{E}[\Theta_i^\alpha] \bar{F}(u),$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $\Theta$  has independent components, then by Theorem 2.3 of [31], we have:

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i > u\right) \sim \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > u), \quad (2.13)$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ , because of  $\Theta_i X_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha} \subset \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$ . Therefore with similar arguments for  $\Delta_j Y_j$ , and via Breiman's theorem we have:

$$\bar{F}_\Theta(u, n) \sim \bar{F}(u) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}[\Theta_i^\alpha], \quad \bar{G}_\Delta(u, m) \sim \bar{G}(u) \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{E}[\Delta_j^{\alpha'}],$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore under the same assumptions we obtain (2.5).  $\square$

For more details about the asymptotic behavior of

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i > x\right),$$

in a variety of dependence structures and heavy tail classes see [45], [46], [50], [53] among others. We note that the conditions  $\alpha > 1$  and  $\alpha' > 1$  are necessary, because without these assumptions the primary random variables they do not have first moment, as a result the tail expectation does not exist in this case.

**2.2. Randomly stopped sums.** Let study now the tail expectation in two randomly stopped sums of the form

$$X_N(\Theta) := \sum_{i=1}^N \Theta_i X_i, \quad Y_M(\Delta) := \sum_{j=1}^M \Delta_j Y_j. \quad (2.14)$$

where  $N$  and  $M$  represent positive, integer random variables, with finite right endpoint. We can again imagine that we consider two portfolios with main claims  $\{X_i\}$  and  $\{Y_j\}$ , where  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ , while the  $\{\Theta_i\}$  and  $\{\Delta_j\}$ , where  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ , represent the discount factors. Namely, the difference from the set up in the previous subsection is that the number of claim arrivals in each portfolio is a random variable.

In this subsection we study the tail expectation for randomly stopped sums presented in (2.14). The risk measures are usually considered for non-random sums, however the insurance practice needs several times randomly stopped sums, since in non-life risk models is not known in advanced the number of claims in a certain time interval. For recent information on risk measures in renewal risk model see [35]. Motivated by the shortage of these topics in scientific literature, in combination with increasing interest on stopped sums, see for example [6], [41], [49], [29], we examine the tail expectation in two non-equally weighted portfolios. The present set up can not be included in the MRV one when the regular variation indexes  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$  are equal, because of the random variables  $N$  and  $M$ . Thus, this case represent interest, in opposite with the non-random sums, where we mentioned that the case  $\alpha = \alpha'$  is not interesting as special case of previous results.

**Assumption 2.1.** *Let  $\{(X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , is a sequence of independent and identically distributed non-negative random pairs, with the general pair  $(X, Y)$  to be strongly asymptotic independent (SAI) and where their distributions  $F \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$  and  $G \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha'}$  respectively, with  $\alpha, \alpha' > 0$ . The  $\{(\Theta_i, \Delta_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  are non-negative, independent random pairs, non-degenerated to zero, such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E} [\Theta_i^{\alpha+\delta}]^{1/\rho} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E} [\Delta_j^{\alpha'+\delta}]^{1/\rho} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E} [\Theta_i^{\alpha+\delta} \Delta_j^{\alpha'+\delta}] < \infty, \quad (2.15)$$

for some  $\rho = 1+\delta$ . Let  $N$  and  $M$  positive, integer random variables with finite right endpoint. Further we assume that the  $\{N, M\}$ ,  $\{(X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and  $\{(\Theta_i, \Delta_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and mutually independent

Under Assumption 2.1, the dependence between the two randomly stopped sums follows from the following three points

- (1) Each pair of discount factors  $(\Theta_i, \Delta_i)$  is arbitrarily dependent.
- (2) Each pair of main claims  $(X_i, Y_i)$  is strongly asymptotic in dependent (SAI).
- (3) The counting random variables  $\{N, M\}$  are arbitrarily independent.

From the fact that  $N$  and  $M$  have finite right endpoint, we observe that

$$\mathbf{E} [e^{kN}] + \mathbf{E} [e^{kM}] < \infty,$$

for some  $k > 0$ . In the following proposition we provide a restriction of [33, Cor. 3].

**Proposition 2.2.** *[Li (2018)] Under Assumption 2.1 we obtain*

$$\mathbf{P} [X_N(\Theta) > x, Y_M(\Delta) > y] \sim K' \bar{F}(x) \bar{G}(y), \quad (2.16)$$

as  $(x, y) \rightarrow (\infty, \infty)$ , where we denote

$$K' := \mathbf{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{i \neq j=1}^M \mathbf{E} \left[ \Theta_i^\alpha \Delta_j^{\alpha'} \right] + C \sum_{i=1}^{N \wedge M} \mathbf{E} \left[ \Theta_i^\alpha \Delta_i^{\alpha'} \right] \right]. \quad (2.17)$$

The following result provides asymptotics bounds for the tail expectation of randomly stopped sums.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Under Assumption 2.1 we find*

$$K' \int_u^\infty \bar{F}(x) \bar{G}(x) dx \lesssim TE[X_N(\Theta), Y_M(\Delta), u] - u \quad (2.18)$$

$$\lesssim \frac{1}{K' \bar{F}(u) \bar{G}(u)} \int_u^\infty \left[ 2^\alpha \bar{F}_\Theta(x, N) + 2^{\alpha'} \bar{G}_\Delta(x, M) \right] dx.$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\bar{F}_\Theta(x, N) = \mathbf{P}[X_N(\Theta) > x]$  and  $\bar{G}_\Delta(x, M) = \mathbf{P}[Y_M(\Delta) > x]$ .

*Proof.* Initially, as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} TE[X_N(\Theta), Y_M(\Delta), u] &= \mathbf{E}[X_N(\Theta) + Y_M(\Delta) \mid X_N(\Theta) + Y_M(\Delta) > u] \quad (2.19) \\ &= \left( \int_0^u + \int_u^\infty \right) \mathbf{P}[X_N(\Theta) + Y_M(\Delta) > x \mid X_N(\Theta) + Y_M(\Delta) > u] dx =: I_1(u) + I_2(u). \end{aligned}$$

Following the argument in relation (2.6), we get

$$I_1(u) = u. \quad (2.20)$$

For the lower bound of  $I_2(u)$  we find

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(u) &= \int_u^\infty \frac{\mathbf{P}[X_N(\Theta) + Y_M(\Delta) > x]}{\mathbf{P}[X_N(\Theta) + Y_M(\Delta) > u]} dx \geq \int_u^\infty \mathbf{P}[X_N(\Theta) + Y_M(\Delta) > x] dx \\ &\geq \int_u^\infty \mathbf{P}[X_N(\Theta) > x, Y_M(\Delta) > x] dx \sim K' \int_u^\infty \bar{F}(x) \bar{G}(x) dx, \quad (2.21) \end{aligned}$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ , where in the pre-last step we use the fact that  $X_N(\Theta) \geq 0$  and  $Y_M(\Delta) \geq 0$  and the elementary inequality  $\mathbf{P}[A \cap B] \leq \mathbf{P}[A]$ . Thence, from (2.21) we have the lower bound of (2.18).

Now we look for the upper bound of  $I_2(u)$ . At first we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}[X_N(\Theta) + Y_M(\Delta) > u] \geq \mathbf{P}[X_N(\Theta) > u, Y_M(\Delta) > u] \sim K' \bar{F}(u) \bar{G}(u), \quad (2.22)$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ . Further from (2.15) we find

$$\mathbf{E}[\Theta_i^{\alpha+\delta}] < \infty, \quad \mathbf{E}[\Delta_j^{\alpha'+\delta}] < \infty,$$

for some  $\delta > 0$  and for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore applying Breiman's theorem we have  $\Theta_i X_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$  and  $\Delta_j Y_j \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha'}$ , for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . But since  $\Theta_i X_i$  is independent of  $\Theta_k X_k$  for any  $k \neq i$  and  $\Delta_j Y_j$  is independent of  $\Delta_l Y_l$  for any  $l \neq j$  from Assumption 2.1, and the  $N$  and  $M$  have finite right endpoint, by [44, Th. 5] we get that the distributions of  $X_N(\Theta)$  and  $Y_M(\Delta)$  belong to the classes  $\mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{-\alpha'}$  respectively. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}[X_N(\Theta) + Y_M(\Delta) > x] &\leq \mathbf{P}\left[X_N(\Theta) > \frac{x}{2}\right] + \mathbf{P}\left[Y_M(\Delta) > \frac{x}{2}\right] \\ &\sim 2^\alpha \bar{F}_\Theta(x, N) + 2^{\alpha'} \bar{G}_\Delta(x, M), \quad (2.23) \end{aligned}$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . So, from relations (2.22) and (2.23) follows

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(u) &= \int_u^\infty \frac{\mathbf{P}[X_N(\Theta) + Y_M(\Delta) > x]}{\mathbf{P}[X_N(\Theta) + Y_M(\Delta) > u]} dx \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{K' \bar{F}(u) \bar{G}(u)} \int_u^\infty \left[ 2^\alpha \bar{F}_\Theta(x, N) + 2^{\alpha'} \bar{G}_\Delta(x, M) \right] dx, \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . This way, from relations (2.19), (2.20) and (2.24) we conclude also the upper bound of (2.18).  $\square$

**Remark 2.2.** *If we want to proceed in analysis of the distributions  $F_\Theta(x, N)$  and  $G_\Delta(x, M)$ , then by [44, Th. 5] in combination with the last theorem, we obtain the asymptotic behavior of the two tails*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}_\Theta(x, N) &\sim x^{-\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^{\check{N}} \mathbf{P}[N = n] \sum_{k=1}^{\check{N}} L_k(x), \\ \bar{G}_\Delta(x, M) &\sim x^{-\alpha'} \sum_{m=1}^{\check{M}} \mathbf{P}[M = m] \sum_{l=1}^{\check{M}} L'_l(x), \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\check{N}$  and  $\check{M}$  denote the right endpoints of  $N$  and  $M$  respectively and the functions  $L_k$  and  $L'_l$  are slowly varying and stemming from the representations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}[\Theta_k X_k > x] &= x^{-\alpha} L_k(x), \\ \mathbf{P}[\Delta_l Y_l > x] &= x^{-\alpha'} L'_l(x). \end{aligned} \quad (2.26)$$

Thence, relation (2.18) through (2.25) renders

$$\begin{aligned} K' \int_u^\infty \bar{F}(x) \bar{G}(x) dx &\lesssim TE[X_N(\Theta), Y_M(\Delta), u] - u \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{K' \bar{F}(u) \bar{G}(u)} \left[ \left( 2^\alpha \sum_{n=1}^{\check{N}} \mathbf{P}[N = n] \right) \int_u^\infty x^{-\alpha} \sum_{k=1}^{\check{N}} L_k(x) dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( 2^{\alpha'} \sum_{m=1}^{\check{M}} \mathbf{P}[M = m] \right) \int_u^\infty x^{-\alpha'} \sum_{l=1}^{\check{M}} L'_l(x) dx \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

as  $u \rightarrow \infty$ .

### 3. GENERALIZED TAIL ASYMPTOTIC INDEPENDENCE

Next we establish the following relation

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y) \sim \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y), \quad (3.1)$$

as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $\Theta_i, \Delta_j, i \in \mathbb{N}$  arbitrarily dependent non-negative random variables and the primary risk components  $\{(X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  independent random vectors, while  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  are SAI (but  $X_i$  and  $Y_j$  are independent for any  $i \neq j$ ),  $\mathbf{P}(X_i > x) = \bar{F}_i(x) \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$  and

$\mathbf{P}(Y_j > x) = \overline{G}_j(x) \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$ . With joint behavior of two randomly weighted sums see also [12], [43].

Although several dependence structures on finite sequences of random variables have been studied in recent years (see [13], [25], [37]), the case of two sequences appears rarely. The dependence structure between different sequences has good reason to be studied. In the next definition we examine triples of random variables, where probably there exist different dependence structure in each pair. For example in the triple  $(X_i, X_k, Y_j)$ , the pair  $(X_i, X_j)$  are arbitrarily dependent and the  $(X_i, Y_j)$  are SAI.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$  real valued random variables. Then we say that  $X_1, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m$  are generalized tail asymptotic independent, symbolically GTAI, if hold the following relations*

$$\lim_{\min(x_i, x_k, y_j) \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(|X_i| > x_i \mid X_k > x_k, Y_j > y_j) = 0, \quad (3.2)$$

for all  $1 \leq k \notin \{i, j\} \leq n$  and

$$\lim_{\min(x_i, y_j, y_k) \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(|Y_j| > y_j \mid X_i > x_i, Y_k > y_k) = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

for all  $1 \leq k \notin \{i, j\} \leq m$ .

**Remark 3.1.** *This dependence structure allows dependence between  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and dependence between  $X_i$  and  $Y_j$  (not only for  $i = j$ ) and similarly for  $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ . In this paper we restrict ourselves in the case with  $X_i, Y_i$  to be SAI dependent for the same  $i$ , and  $X_i, Y_j$  independent for any  $i \neq j$ .*

Notice that if  $X_i$  and  $Y_j$  are independent for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$  (i.e. the two sequences are independent) then the relationships (3.2), (3.3) can be written as follows

$$\lim_{x_i \wedge x_k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(|X_i| > x_i \mid X_k > x_k) = 0 \quad (3.4)$$

holds for all  $1 \leq i \neq k \leq n$  and

$$\lim_{y_j \wedge y_k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(|Y_j| > y_j \mid Y_k > y_k) = 0 \quad (3.5)$$

for all  $1 \leq j \neq k \leq m$  Through (3.4), (3.5) we get the definition of tail asymptotic independence of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$  respectively, introduced in [25].

**Assumption 3.1.** *We assume that the following random variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ , are GTAI, and the random discount factors*

$$\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_n, \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_m,$$

*are non-negative and non-degenerated to zero random variables, that are upper bounded random variables and independent of  $X_1, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ .*

**Lemma 3.1.** *Under the Assumption 3.1, we have that the products*

$$\Theta_1 X_1, \dots, \Theta_n X_n, \Delta_1 Y_1, \dots, \Delta_m Y_m,$$

*are GTAI.*

*Proof.* By definition of *GTAI*, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exist some constant  $\kappa_0 > 0$  such that for any  $x_i, x_k, y_j > \kappa_0$  the relation:

$$\mathbf{P}(|X_i| > x_i \mid X_k > x_k, Y_j > y_j) < \epsilon$$

holds for all  $1 \leq k \notin \{i, j\} \leq n$ . Let

$$\mathbf{P}(\Theta_i \leq b_i) = 1, \quad \mathbf{P}(\Delta_j \leq d_j) = 1,$$

where  $b_i, d_j > 0$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Then for  $x_i, x_k, y_j$  sufficiently large, namely

$$\frac{x_i}{b_i} > \kappa_0, \quad \frac{x_k}{b_k} > \kappa_0, \quad \frac{y_j}{\lambda_j} > \kappa_0,$$

we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}(|\Theta_i X_i| > x_i, \Theta_k X_k > x_k, \Delta_j Y_j > y_j) \\ &= \int_0^{b_i} \int_0^{b_k} \int_0^{d_j} \mathbf{P}\left(|X_i| > \frac{x_i}{c_i}, X_k > \frac{x_k}{c_k}, Y_j > \frac{y_j}{\lambda_j}\right) \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i \in dc_i, \Theta_k \in dc_k, \Delta_j \in d\lambda_j) \\ &= \int_0^{b_i} \int_0^{b_k} \int_0^{d_j} \mathbf{P}\left(|X_i| > \frac{x_i}{c_i} \mid X_k > \frac{x_k}{c_k}, Y_j > \frac{y_j}{\lambda_j}\right) \mathbf{P}\left(X_k > \frac{x_k}{c_k}, Y_j > \frac{y_j}{\lambda_j}\right) \\ & \quad \times \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i \in dc_i, \Theta_k \in dc_k, \Delta_j \in d\lambda_j) \leq \epsilon \mathbf{P}(\Theta_k X_k > x_k, \Delta_j Y_j > y_j) \end{aligned}$$

by arbitrariness of  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have the first relation. The symmetrical relation, namely:

$$\mathbf{P}(|\Delta_j Y_j| > y_j, \Theta_i X_i > x_i, \Delta_k Y_k > y_k) \leq \epsilon \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x_i, \Delta_k Y_k > y_k)$$

for some  $1 \leq k \notin \{i, j\} \leq m$ , can be obtain easily with similar arguments. And this complete the proof.  $\square$

**Assumption 3.2.** Let  $\{(X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be some sequence of random vectors with marginal distributions  $F_i \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$  and  $G_i \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Assume that  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  are SAI for the same  $i$  and  $X_i, Y_j$  are independent for  $i \neq j$ .

Let  $\{(\Theta_i, \Delta_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be some sequence of arbitrarily dependent, non-negative, non-degenerated and upper bounded random vectors, such that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \left( \Theta_i^{(\beta_{F_i} - \delta)^+} \vee \Theta_i^{\alpha_{F_i} + \delta} \right) \left( \Delta_j^{(\beta_{G_j} - \delta)^+} \vee \Delta_j^{\alpha_{G_j} + \delta} \right) \right] < \infty$$

for some  $\delta > 0$  and for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Assume also that  $\{(X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and  $\{(\Theta_i, \Delta_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  are independent.

Next, we need two lemmas for the proof of Theorem 3.1 below.

**Lemma 3.2.** Under Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2, we find

$$\mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y, \Theta_k |X_k| > a(x)) = o(\mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y)),$$

as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ , for any  $i, j, k$  with  $i \neq k$ , with  $a(x) > 0$  and  $a(x) \rightarrow \infty$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $a(x) < x/2$  and  $a \in \mathcal{R}_0$ .

*Proof.* We can see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y, \Theta_k |X_k| > a(x)) \\ &= \mathbf{P}(\Theta_k |X_k| > a(x) \mid \Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y) \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y) \\ &= o[\mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y)] , \end{aligned}$$

as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ , where in the last step we used Assumption 3.1.  $\square$

Before presenting next lemma, we need some comments. Let suppose that  $X$  follows distribution  $F$  and  $Y$  follows distribution  $G$ , such that

$$\mathbf{P}(X > x, Y > y) = O(\bar{F}(x)\bar{G}(y)) , \quad (3.6)$$

as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ , whence we can see that there exists some constant  $\Lambda > 1$ , such that

$$\mathbf{P}(X > x, Y > y) \leq \Lambda \bar{F}(x)\bar{G}(y) ,$$

for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ . By (3.6) we have that, there exist some  $x_0 > 0$  and  $\Lambda_1 > 1$  such that

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}(X > x, Y > y)}{\bar{F}(x)\bar{G}(y)} \leq \Lambda_1 ,$$

holds for any  $x \geq x_0$  and for any  $y \geq x_0$ .

We consider two independent random variables  $X^*, Y^*$  with respectively tails

$$\bar{F}^*(x) = 1 \wedge \left( \sqrt{\Lambda} \bar{F}(x) \right) , \quad \bar{G}^*(y) = 1 \wedge \left( \sqrt{\Lambda} \bar{G}(y) \right) ,$$

thence we see

$$\bar{F}^*(x) \sim \sqrt{\Lambda} \bar{F}(x) , \quad \bar{G}^*(y) \sim \sqrt{\Lambda} \bar{G}(y) , \quad (3.7)$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  and  $y \rightarrow \infty$  respectively. Thus for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\bar{F}(x) \leq \bar{F}^*(x) , \quad \bar{G}(y) \leq \bar{G}^*(y) ,$$

$$\mathbf{P}[X > x, Y > y] \leq \mathbf{P}[X^* > x, Y^* > y] ,$$

Now we introduce sequences  $\{X_i^\circ, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  and  $\{Y_i^\circ, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . These sequences have i.i.d. components and are independent each other. Their distribution tails are

$$\bar{F}^\circ(x) = 1 \wedge \left( \sqrt{\Lambda} \bar{F}^*(x) \right) , \quad \bar{G}^\circ(y) = 1 \wedge \left( \sqrt{\Lambda} \bar{G}^*(y) \right) .$$

Therefore

$$\bar{F}^\circ(x) \sim \sqrt{\Lambda} \bar{F}^*(x) , \quad \bar{F}^\circ \sim \Lambda \bar{F}(x) , \quad (3.8)$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  and

$$\bar{G}^\circ(y) \sim \sqrt{\Lambda} \bar{G}^*(y) \sim \Lambda \bar{G}(y) , \quad (3.9)$$

as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ . Further, for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  and for any  $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$

$$\bar{F}_i(x) \leq \bar{F}_i^*(x) \leq \bar{F}_i^\circ(x) ,$$

$$\bar{G}_j(y) \leq \bar{G}_j^*(y) \leq \bar{G}_j^\circ(y)$$

$$\mathbf{P}(X_i > x, Y_j > y) \leq \mathbf{P}(X_i^* > x, Y_j^* > y) \leq \mathbf{P}(X_i^\circ > x, Y_j^\circ > y) .$$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\{(X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a sequence of identically distributed random vectors with corresponding marginal distributions  $F$  and  $G$  such that*

$$\overline{F} \in \mathcal{D}, \quad \overline{G} \in \mathcal{D},$$

and (3.6) holds. Let  $\{\Theta_i, \Delta_i, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a sequence of non-negative and non-degenerated random variables such that

$$E_{ij} := \mathbf{E}[(\Theta_i^{(\beta_F - \delta)^+} \vee \Theta_i^{\alpha_F + \delta}) (\Delta_j^{(\beta_G - \delta)^+} \vee \Delta_j^{\alpha_G + \delta})] < \infty, \quad (3.10)$$

for some  $\delta > 0$  and for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Assume that

$$\{(X_i, Y_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\}, \quad \{(\Theta_i, \Delta_i), i \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

are independent. Then

(i) *There exist some  $x_0 > 0$  and some  $\Lambda > 1$  such that for any  $x > x_0$  and for any  $y > x_0$  holds*

$$\sup_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2} \frac{\mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y)}{E_{ij} \overline{F}(x) \overline{G}(y)} \leq \Lambda \quad (3.11)$$

(ii) *If (3.10) holds with both  $\Theta_i^{(\beta_F - \delta)^+}$ ,  $\Delta_j^{(\beta_G - \delta)^+}$ , replaced by 1, then (3.11) holds for any  $x > 0$  and any  $y > 0$ .*

*Proof.* For the relations (3.7) and (3.8) we find

$$\overline{F}(x) \leq \overline{F^*}(x) \leq \sqrt{\Lambda_1} \overline{F}(x), \quad \overline{F^*}(x) \leq \overline{F^\circ}(x) \leq \sqrt{\Lambda_1} \overline{F^*}(x),$$

therefore we obtain

$$\overline{F}(x) \leq \overline{F^\circ}(x) \leq \Lambda_1 \overline{F}(x), \quad \overline{G}(x) \leq \overline{G^\circ}(x) \leq \Lambda_1 \overline{G}(x),$$

for some  $\Lambda_1 > 1$  and for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . For the relations (3.8) and (3.9) we have

$$\overline{F^\circ} \in \mathcal{D}, \quad \overline{G^\circ} \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Next, for the proof of (i), (ii) we follow [33, Lemma 2 (i), (ii)], with  $X^*$  and  $Y^*$  replaced by  $X^\circ$  and  $Y^\circ$  respectively.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Under Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2, for every pair  $(n, m) \in \mathbb{N}^2$  we obtain (3.1).*

*Proof.* We consider the events

$$H_x^\pm := \left\{ \bigvee_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i > x \pm a(x) \right\}, \quad H_y^\pm := \left\{ \bigvee_{j=1}^m \Delta_j Y_j > y \pm a(y) \right\}.$$

with  $a(x)$  defined in Lemma 3.2. Now, let us define the probabilities

$$I_1(x, y) := \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y, H_x^-, H_y^-),$$

$$I_2(x, y) := \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y, (H_x^-)^c),$$

$$I_3(x, y) := \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y, (H_y^-)^c),$$

whence we can see that

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y) \leq I_1(x, y) + I_2(x, y) + I_3(x, y), \quad (3.12)$$

so we have to estimate the  $I_1(x, y)$ ,  $I_2(x, y)$ ,  $I_3(x, y)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1(x, y) &\leq \mathbf{P}(H_x^-, H_y^-) = \mathbf{P}\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i > x - a(x), \bigvee_{j=1}^m \Delta_j Y_j > y - a(y)\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x - a(x), \Delta_j Y_j > y - a(y)) \\
&\sim \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y),
\end{aligned}$$

as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ , where in the last step we used [33, Lemma 3(ii)] (as far as  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  are SAI). Next

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2(x, y) &= \mathbf{P}\left(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y, \bigvee_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i > \frac{x}{n}, \bigvee_{j=1}^m \Delta_j Y_j > \frac{y}{m}, (H_x^-)^c\right) \\
&= \mathbf{P}\left(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y, \bigvee_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i > \frac{x}{n}, \bigvee_{j=1}^m \Delta_j Y_j > \frac{y}{m}, \bigvee_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i < x - a(x)\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{1=k \neq i}^n \mathbf{P}\left(\Theta_i X_i > \frac{x}{m}, \Delta_j Y_j > \frac{y}{m}, \Theta_k X_k > \frac{a(x)}{n}\right) \\
&= o\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ , where in the last step we used Lemma 3.2 and [33, Lemma 3(i)]. Symmetrically we find

$$I_3(x, y) = o\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y)\right),$$

as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ . So from (3.12) we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y) \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y),$$

as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ .

For the lower bound of

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y),$$

we get the inequality

$$\mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y) \geq \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y, H_x^+, H_y^+).$$

Applying Bonferroni inequality twice we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y, H_x^+, H_y^+) \tag{3.13} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y, \Theta_i X_i > x + a(x), \Delta_j Y_j > y + a(y)) \\
&\quad - \sum_{1 \leq i < k \leq n} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x + a(x), \Theta_k X_k > x + a(x), \Delta_j Y_j > y + a(y)) \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq m} \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x + a(x), \Delta_j Y_j > y + a(y), \Delta_k Y_k > y + a(y)),
\end{aligned}$$

and by [33, Lemma 2 (iii) and Lemma 3 (i)] the last two terms in (3.13) are asymptotically negligible with respect to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y).$$

For the first term of right hand side in (3.13) we find a lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x + a(x), \Delta_j Y_j > y + a(y)) \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{1=k \neq i}^n \mathbf{P}\left(\Theta_i X_i > x + a(x), \Delta_j Y_j > y + a(y), \Theta_k X_k < -\frac{a(x)}{n}\right) \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{1=k \neq i}^m \mathbf{P}\left(\Theta_i X_i > x + a(x), \Delta_j Y_j > y + a(y), \Delta_k Y_k < -\frac{a(x)}{n}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which by Lemma 3.2 is asymptotically greater than

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y),$$

as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ , and thus we have the asymptotic relation (3.1).  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** We proved asymptotic estimation (3.1), when  $X_1, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m$  are GTAI, as it comes by Definition 3.1, the  $X_i, Y_i$  are SAI and the  $\Theta_i, \Delta_i$  are upper bounded and non-negative random variables. This restriction is relatively small compared to the extension made in terms of dependence and at the same time reasonable in these models, since  $\Theta_i$  and  $\Delta_j$  depicts the systemic risk factors.

**Remark 3.3.** We see that [33, Lemma 1, Lemma 2(iii), Lemma 3] continue to apply under the generalization of conditions in Theorem 3.1 (with the help of Lemma 3.3).

Now applying [33, Lemma 3 (iii)] in (3.1) and we have the following consequence.

**Corollary 3.1.** Under Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2 and if  $F_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha_i}$ , for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $G_j \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha'_j}$ , for any  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , with  $\alpha_i, \alpha'_j \in [0, \infty)$  and if  $X_i, Y_i$  are SAI dependent, with some constant  $C_i > 0$ , then we obtain (2.2).

In the next corollary we show the asymptotic behavior for the tail expectation, under conditions of Theorem 3.1, and specifically under conditions of Corollary 3.1. We have now one extension of Theorem 2.1 in the case when  $X_1, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m$  are GTAI, in the case when  $X_i, Y_i$  are SAI and in the case when  $X_i, Y_j$  are independent for any  $i \neq j$ , but the systemic risk factors  $\Theta_i, \Delta_i$  are positive and upper bounded, for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Furthermore, because of the grouping into two categories of regular variation, from relation (2.2) we pass to relation (2.4).

**Remark 3.4.** *We write*

$$X_n^\pm(\Theta) := \sum_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i^\pm, \quad Y_m^\pm(\Delta) := \sum_{j=1}^m \Delta_j Y_j^\pm.$$

*We see that, the corresponding maximums for  $X_n^\pm(\Theta)$  and  $Y_m^\pm(\Delta)$ , namely  $\bigvee_{i=1}^n X_i(\Theta)$  and  $\bigvee_{j=1}^m Y_j(\Delta)$ , satisfy the inequalities*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_m(\Delta) > y) &\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n X_i(\Theta) > x, \bigvee_{j=1}^m Y_j(\Delta) > y\right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}(X_n^+(\Theta) > x, Y_m^+(\Delta) > y), \end{aligned}$$

*Therefore Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.1 are also satisfied after replacement with*

$$\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n X_i(\Theta), \bigvee_{j=1}^m Y_j(\Delta)\right).$$

Finally, we present one bi-dimensional discrete time risk model, in two (or four) sub-models with the same stochastic process of surplus.

Recently, the discrete time one-dimensional models have attracted attention by researchers, see [36], [49], [51]. On the other hand more researchers study the multivariate risk models, because it is rarely for an insurance company to operate with one line of business, see [14], [15], [16], [27] among others.

We limit us in only two portfolios and discrete time, where  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  depicts the net loss in  $i$ -th period, in the first and second portfolio respectively,  $\Theta_i$  and  $\Delta_j$  they continue to be systemic risk factors (or discount factors).

Therefore the stochastic discounted value of aggregate insurance losses to time  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  describe

$$\mathbf{S}_n := (S_{1n}, S_{2n}) = \left(x - \sum_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i, y - \sum_{j=1}^n \Delta_j Y_j\right),$$

thence one type of ruin probability is given as

$$\psi(x, y, n) := \mathbf{P}\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n X_i(\Theta) > x, \bigvee_{j=1}^n Y_j(\Delta) > y\right),$$

for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $x, y$  are initial capitals in each portfolio. This ruin probability depicts the probability that both portfolios have been with negative surplus, but not necessarily simultaneously.

**Corollary 3.2.** (i) If Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2 are true, then we obtain

$$\psi(x, y, n) \sim \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{P}(\Theta_i X_i > x, \Delta_j Y_j > y), \quad (3.14)$$

as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ .

(ii) Under the conditions of Corollary 3.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x, y, n) &\sim \mathbf{P}(X_n(\Theta) > x, Y_n(\Delta) > y) \\ &\sim \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{1=j \neq i}^n \mathbf{E} \left[ \Theta_i^{\alpha_i} \Delta_j^{\alpha'_j} \right] \bar{F}_i(x) \bar{G}_j(y) + \sum_{i=1}^n C_i \mathbf{E} \left[ \Theta_i^{\alpha_i} \Delta_i^{\alpha'_i} \right] \bar{F}_i(x) \bar{G}_i(y), \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

as  $x \wedge y \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* Directly from Remark 3.4, the definition of ruin probability, Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 3.1.  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** It is obvious that the net losses of each portfolio do not necessarily have the same distribution in each period, but must be to the same class (i.e  $\mathbf{P}(X_i > x) \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$  or  $\mathbf{P}(X_i > x) \in \mathcal{R}$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) and similarly for  $Y_j$ . Additionally, relations (3.14) and (3.15) hold under the assumptions of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 in [33] respectively.

#### 4. TAIL DISTORTION RISK MEASURES

Let us define function  $\Pi : \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^n$ , as follows  $\Pi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}) := \mathbf{r} \mathbf{u} = (r_1 u_1, \dots, r_d u_n)$ . Then the vector  $\Pi(\Theta, \mathbf{X}) = \Theta \mathbf{X} = (\Theta_1 X_1, \dots, \Theta_n X_n)$ , represents the real loss of the portfolio over the given time interval.

Here limit our study in simple background risk model (without unequal heavytailedness) and for this reason we have a general class of risk measures and various forms of dependence between systemic risk factors and losses. In order to make the model more realistic, we allocate the initial capital into  $d$  lines of business, in general of different amounts. Thus we need non-random, positive weights  $w_1, \dots, w_n$ , with

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1. \quad (4.1)$$

Then the loss portfolio is presented as

$$\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) := \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \Theta_i X_i.$$

This model called background risk model and is a special case of systemic risk model. For more details about Background risk model see [3], [20] and [47].

The class of regular variation although represents a small class of heavy-tailed distributions, has been studied much deeper than any other class of heavy-tailed distributions. It comes by the mathematical convenience of its properties, its frequent appearance in real data in the form of Pareto distribution, and its easy extension in higher dimensions.

However the most significant feature of MRV is the fact that its components can be arbitrarily dependent, and have some very good properties. For example, if  $\mathbf{X} \in MRV$ , with index  $\alpha$  then every (non-degenerated to zero) linear combination of the components of  $\mathbf{X}$  belongs to the class  $\mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$ , see section 7.3 in [42]. As a result, for  $w_i > 0$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,

satisfying a normalization condition (4.1) we find that the weighted sum has distribution with regularly varying tail

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n w_i X_i > x \right) \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}, \quad (4.2)$$

with the same parameter  $\alpha > 0$ .

In [11] was examined the distortion tail risk measure in a similar background risk model. In [11] are developed asymptotic results for the tail risk measure of the quantity  $\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})$ , where  $\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})_i = \Theta X_i$  and the weights  $w_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  are defined as above, with  $\Theta$  to be one-dimensional, and therefore is common for all business lines, and independent of  $\mathbf{X}$ , and also we have continuous distortion function.

In the last section we develop the background risk model, in case of a systemic risk factor  $\Theta$ , which represents a random vector, that means the risk factor is not necessary the same in all the businesses, and then we study several cases, where the  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  are not independent.

In our methodology we use the closure property of MRV under the product convolution, or under the scalar product. Next we remind the extension of Breiman's theorem in case of two independent random vectors, one of them multivariate regularly varying, established in [4].

**Proposition 4.1** (Basrak-Davis-Mikosch (2002)). *Let two non-negative random vectors  $\mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu)$  and  $\Theta$  with arbitrarily dependent components and*

$$\mathbf{E} (\Theta_i^{\alpha+\varepsilon}) < \infty, \quad (4.3)$$

for any  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . If the  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  are independent, then  $\Theta \mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu_\Theta)$  where

$$\nu_\Theta(B) = \mathbf{E} [\nu(\Theta^{-1}B)] = \int_{[0, \infty]^d} \nu(\mathbf{s}^{-1}B) \mathbf{P}_\Theta(d\mathbf{u}),$$

with  $\mathbf{P}_\Theta(\cdot)$  a probability measure, corresponding to distribution of  $\Theta$ .

In this result the independence assumption between the  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\Theta$  is definitely restrictive. Therefore in [24] are found the following three extensions of this result. We present two of them, restricted only on the positive quadrant. The first assumes from one side  $\mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu)$  and from the other side that the vectors  $\Theta, \mathbf{X}$  are asymptotically independent (wich contains the independence assumption as a special case). The asymptotic independence was introduced in [40].

**Proposition 4.2** (Fougeres-Mercadier (2012)). *Let  $\mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu)$  and  $\Theta$  be two non-negative random vectors and the  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  be asymptotically independent, in the sense*

$$t \mathbf{P} \left( \left( \frac{\mathbf{X}}{b(t)}, \Theta \right) \in B \right) \xrightarrow{v} (\nu \times L)(B), \quad (4.4)$$

as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , on the Borel sets  $B \subseteq [0, \infty]^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \times [0, \infty]^n$ ,  $\nu$  is a Radon measure in  $[0, \infty]^n \setminus \mathbf{0}$  and  $L$  as probability measure on  $[0, \infty]^n$ , corresponds to the distribution of  $\mathbf{S}$ . If for some

$\delta > 0$  and for any  $i = 1, \dots, n$  hold

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} t \mathbf{E} \left[ \left( \frac{\|\mathbf{X}\| |\Theta_i|}{b(t)} \right)^\delta \mathbf{1}_{\{\|\mathbf{X}\|/b(t) < \epsilon\}} \right] = 0, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\int_{[0, \infty]^n} \|\mathbf{u}\|^\alpha L(d\mathbf{u}) < \infty, \quad (4.6)$$

with  $\|\cdot\|$  any norm in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\nu_L$  is a measure of the form

$$\nu_L(A) := (\nu \times L)\{(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{u}^{-1}A\} = \int_{[0, \infty]^n} \nu(\mathbf{u}^{-1}A) L(d\mathbf{u}),$$

for any  $A \subset [0, \infty]^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , then  $\Theta \mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu_L)$ .

The next result comes from [24] considers the case of  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  jointly multivariate regularly varying, and at least one couple of components are asymptotically dependent, namely there exist normalizing functions  $b(\cdot)$ ,  $c(\cdot)$ , such that holds

$$t \mathbf{P} \left( \left( \frac{X_i}{b(t)}, \frac{\Theta_i}{c(t)} \right)_{i=1}^n \in B \right) \xrightarrow{v} \nu_{\Theta, \mathbf{X}}(B), \quad (4.7)$$

as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , in some non-zero Radon measure on the space  $[0, \infty]^{2n} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . We assume that the measure  $\nu_{\Theta, \mathbf{X}} \circ \Pi^\leftarrow(\cdot)$  is not degenerated to zero. Hence, there exists an  $i$ , such that the couple  $(X_i, \Theta_i)$  is dependent, namely there exists  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that

$$\nu_{\Theta, \mathbf{X}}^{(i)}((0, \infty]^2) > 0, \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\nu_{\Theta, \mathbf{X}}^{(i)}(\cdot)$  is the restriction of  $\nu$  to its  $i$ -th components of  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$ . The normalizing functions  $b$ ,  $c$  are regularly varying with parameters  $1/\kappa$  and  $1/\lambda$  respectively, with  $\kappa, \lambda > 0$ .

**Proposition 4.3** (Fougeres-Mercadier (2012)). *Let hold the relations (4.7) and (4.8), then*

$$\Theta \mathbf{X} \in MRV \left( \frac{\kappa \lambda}{\kappa + \lambda}, b c, \nu_{\Theta, \mathbf{X}} \circ \Pi^\leftarrow \right)$$

Now in the classic one-dimensional Background risk model we study the asymptotic behavior of tail distortion risk measure which is more general than conditional tail expectation. The following class of measures was introduced in [48]. For a given non-decreasing function  $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , such that  $g(0) = 0$ ,  $g(1) = 1$ , and for any non-negative random variable  $X$ , with distribution  $F$ , the measure

$$\rho_g[X] = \int_0^\infty g[\overline{F}(x)] dx$$

is called distorted risk measure and the function  $g$  is called distortion function. It is well-known that the  $VaR$  and  $CTE$  are distortion risk measures (see for example [55]).

**Definition 4.1** (Zhu-Li (2012)). *Let  $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be non-decreasing, such that  $g(0) = 0$  and  $g(1) = 1$ , then the tail distortion risk measure of a non-negative random variable  $X$  with distribution  $F$  is given by*

$$\rho_g[X \mid X > VaR_p(X)] = \int_0^\infty g[\overline{F}_{X \mid X > VaR_p(X)}(x)] dx$$

where  $\overline{F}_{X \mid X > y}(x) = \mathbf{P}(X > x \mid X > y)$ .

Obviously, the tail distortion risk measure is a distortion risk measure. Furthermore, if the distortion function is the identical function  $g(x) = x$ , then the tail distortion risk measure coincides with the conditional tail expectation.

From [55] we find that if  $X \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$ , with  $\alpha > 0$  and additionally

$$\int_1^\infty g\left(\frac{1}{y^{\alpha-k}}\right) dy < \infty,$$

for some  $0 < k < \alpha$ , then  $\rho_g[X|X > VaR_p(X)] \sim C_\alpha(g) VaR_p(X)$ , as  $p \rightarrow 1$ , where

$$C_\alpha(g) := \int_0^1 y^{-1/\alpha} g(dy) = 1 + \int_1^\infty g\left(\frac{1}{y^\alpha}\right) dy.$$

This last result was shown for any distortion function, without continuity requirement.

From [22] we find for the function  $B_X$ , defined as quantile of  $1/\bar{F}$ ,

$$B_X(s) := \left(\frac{1}{\bar{F}}\right)^\leftarrow(s) = F^\leftarrow\left(1 - \frac{1}{s}\right), \quad (4.9)$$

for any  $s \geq 1$ , and for some continuous distortion function  $g$  the representation

$$\rho_g[X | X > VaR_p(X)] = \int_0^1 B_X\left(\frac{1}{y(1-p)}\right) dg(y) \quad (4.10)$$

for any non-negative random variable  $X$  with distribution  $F$ .

It is clear that the previous asymptotic expressions in section 4 depend on the distortion function only though the constant  $C_\alpha(g)$ , and therefore the quantiles of random variables remain clear of distortion. This helps in practical applications, since the only we need for the application of the model, when the distortion function is varying for the same risks, is the calculation of the integral.

Next, we study a first sub-model of background risk, where  $\mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu)$ , with its components to be eventually dependent and the systemic risk factor  $\Theta$  to be asymptotically independent of  $\mathbf{X}$ . So, in this model we permit dependence among the risks of the  $d$ -business and dependence among the systemic risk factors with the risks, but if some of the risks becomes too large, practically if it cross some high enough threshold, then this dependence between  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  get eliminated.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Consider the product  $\Theta \mathbf{X}$ , with  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  two non-negative random vectors. Under the conditions of Proposition 4.2 if (4.3) holds and*

$$\int_1^\infty g\left(\frac{1}{y^{\alpha/(1+\zeta)}}\right) dy < \infty, \quad (4.11)$$

for some  $\zeta > 0$  hold, then

$$\rho_g[\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) | \Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) > VaR_p(\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}))] \sim C_\alpha(g) \frac{\gamma_{\mathbf{w}}^{1/\alpha}}{\Gamma_\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^n VaR_p(\Theta_i X_i), \quad (4.12)$$

as  $p \rightarrow 1$ , with

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{w}} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) > t)}{\mathbf{P}(\sum_{i=1}^n \Theta_i X_i > t)}, \quad \Gamma_\alpha := \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{e_i}^{1/\alpha}. \quad (4.13)$$

*Proof.* From Proposition 4.2, since relations (4.4), (4.5) and (4.6) are satisfied, we obtain that  $\Theta \mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu_L)$ , therefore  $\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$ , see for example (4.2). From relation (4.10) and the fact that

$$VaR_p(\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})) = B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{1-p} \right), \quad (4.14)$$

we can show

$$\frac{1}{B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{1-p} \right)} \int_0^1 B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{y(1-p)} \right) dg(y) \sim C_\alpha(g), \quad (4.15)$$

as  $p \rightarrow 1$ . Indeed, from the [23], [21, Th. B.2.18] we get that there exists a  $0 < \tilde{p} < 1$ , which depends on  $\zeta > 0$ , such that for  $\tilde{p} \leq p < 1$  and  $0 < y < 1$  holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{y(1-p)} \right) - B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{1-p} \right)}{\frac{1}{\alpha} B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{1-p} \right)} - \frac{y^{-1/\alpha} - 1}{1/\alpha} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{y(1-p)} \right)}{\frac{1}{\alpha} B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{1-p} \right)} - \frac{y^{-1/\alpha}}{1/\alpha} \right| \leq y^{-(1+\zeta)/\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

Further we have

$$\left| \frac{B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{y(1-p)} \right)}{\frac{1}{\alpha} B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{1-p} \right)} - \frac{y^{-1/\alpha}}{1/\alpha} \right| \leq \left| \frac{B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{y(1-p)} \right)}{\frac{1}{\alpha} B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{1-p} \right)} - \frac{y^{-1/\alpha}}{1/\alpha} \right|, \quad (4.17)$$

Hence from relations (4.16) and (4.17) we obtain

$$\left| \frac{B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{y(1-p)} \right)}{B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{1-p} \right)} \right| \leq y^{-1/\alpha} + \frac{y^{-(1+\zeta)/\alpha}}{\alpha}. \quad (4.18)$$

Since the integral in (4.11) converges for some  $\zeta > 0$ , it follows

$$\int_0^1 y^{-1/\alpha} g(dy) \leq \int_0^1 y^{-(1+\zeta)/\alpha} g(dy) < \infty,$$

whence we obtain

$$\int_0^1 \left( y^{-1/\alpha} + \frac{y^{-(1+\zeta)/\alpha}}{\alpha} \right) g(dy) < \infty.$$

Therefore from (4.18) and by dominated convergence theorem, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \int_0^1 \frac{B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{y(1-p)} \right)}{B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{1-p} \right)} g(dy) &= \int_0^1 \lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{y(1-p)} \right)}{B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{1-p} \right)} g(dy) \\ &= \int_0^1 y^{-1/\alpha} g(dy) = C_\alpha(g), \end{aligned}$$

where the pre-last equality follows from  $B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{R}_{1/\alpha}$ , see (4.9) and [42, sec. 2.4]. Therefore, relation (4.15) is true.

Furthermore, taking into account relation (4.13) we obtain

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{VaR}_p(\Theta_i X_i)}{\text{VaR}_p(\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}))} = \frac{\Gamma_\alpha}{\gamma_{\mathbf{w}}^{1/\alpha}}. \quad (4.19)$$

However we also obtain

$$\rho_g [\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) \mid \Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) > \text{VaR}_p(\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}))] = \int_0^1 B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{y(1-p)} \right) g(dy),$$

while by (4.14) and (4.15) we find

$$\int_0^1 B_{\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})} \left( \frac{1}{y(1-p)} \right) g(dy) \sim C_\alpha(g) \text{VaR}_p(\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w})),$$

as  $p \rightarrow 1$  and consequently from relation (4.19) and the last two expressions we find relation (4.12).  $\square$

In the following background risk model, we have  $\Theta, \mathbf{X}$  with both dependence and asymptotic dependence, as well as the jointly multivariate regular variation.

**Corollary 4.1.** *If the assumptions of Proposition 4.3 are true, where  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  are non-negative random vectors with property (4.3) and the integral in (4.11) converges for some  $\zeta > 0$ , then we obtain (4.12) with*

$$a := \frac{\kappa \lambda}{\kappa + \lambda}, \quad (4.20)$$

instead of  $\alpha$ .

*Proof.* From Proposition 4.3 we get

$$\mathbf{X} \in \text{MRV} \left( \frac{\kappa \lambda}{\kappa + \lambda}, bc, \nu_{\Theta, \mathbf{X}} \circ \Pi^{\leftarrow} \right).$$

Hence, since  $\mathbf{P}(X_i \leq x) = F(x)$  with  $\bar{F} \in \mathcal{R}_{-a}$  with  $a$  given in (4.20), we obtain  $\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) \in \mathcal{R}_{-a}$  and further the proof follows the proof of Theorem 4.1.  $\square$

Next we provide a simple corollary, which is an extension of the result from [11, Theorem 3.1] in case when the systemic risk factor is independent of the risk vector  $\mathbf{X} \in \text{MRV}$ .

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let assume that the assumptions of Proposition 4.1 hold, with  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  non-negative random vectors, that are mutually independent. If the integral in (4.11) converges for some  $\zeta > 0$ , then we obtain*

$$\rho_g [\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) \mid \Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) > VaR_p(\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}))] \sim C_\alpha(g) \frac{\gamma_{\mathbf{w}}^{1/\alpha}}{\Gamma_\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^n [\mathbf{E}(\Theta_i^\alpha)]^{1/\alpha} VaR_p(X_i), \quad (4.21)$$

as  $p \rightarrow 1$ .

*Proof.* Firstly we have  $\Theta \mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu_\Theta)$ . Hence, we find that  $\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$ , from the assumptions of Proposition 4.1, as a result we obtain (4.12), because  $\Theta_i$  and  $X_i$  are independent (namely a special case of asymptotic independence). From [9] we find

$$VaR_p(X_i) = VaR_p(\Theta_i X_i) \sim [\mathbf{E}(\Theta_i^\alpha)]^{1/\alpha} VaR_p(X_i), \quad (4.22)$$

as  $p \rightarrow 1$ . Hence from relation (4.22) and relation (4.12) we obtain (4.21).  $\square$

In our effort to enrich the models, we study a slightly different dependence structure between  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  which is called conditional dependence. This last result in tail distortion risk measure goes back to the case when the systemic risk factor  $\Theta$  is one-dimensional, that means it is common of all  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ .

We consider  $\Theta$  to be one-dimensional, namely common for all components, and take the restriction to one concrete dependence model, the conditional dependence model, that covers a wide spectrum of dependence, as for example the Farlie-Gumbel-Morgenstern copulas or the Ali-Mikhail-Haq copulas.

Let check this form of dependence for  $n = 1$ , in the form of  $X$ , with  $\mathbf{P}(X \leq x) = F_1(x)$ , whence we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}(X > x \mid \Theta = t) \sim h_1(t) \bar{F}_1(x), \quad (4.23)$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $h_1(\cdot) : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  measurable function. This dependence model was suggested in [2]. The first application of conditional dependence in risk models was done in [1]. This dependence structure has the property to begin independence asymptotically (as the Asymptotic independence).

In [32] there exists an important extension of this dependence structure. Especially it was considered a  $n$ -variate function  $V : [0, \infty]^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  and a uni-variate function  $h_2 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ , that satisfies the inequalities

$$0 < \inf_{t \in (0, \infty)} h_2(t) \leq \sup_{t \in (0, \infty)} h_2(t) < \infty,$$

and let  $F_2$  be a distribution defined on the interval  $(0, \infty)$  with infinite upper bound, then for any  $\mathbf{y} \in [0, \infty]^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  holds

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{X} > \mathbf{y}x \mid \Theta = t) \sim V(\mathbf{y}) h_2(t) \bar{F}_2(x) \quad (4.24)$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $\bar{F}_2 \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$ , for some  $\alpha > 0$  then  $\mathbf{X} \in MRV$ , with the same index  $\alpha$  as it appears from [32, remark 2.1].

In [17] was shown that under dependence structure (4.24) between  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$ , the probability of joint excess of the product  $\Theta \mathbf{X}$  comes in the form

$$\mathbf{P}[\Theta \mathbf{X} > \mathbf{y}x] = \mathbf{P}[\Theta X_1 > y_1 x, \dots, \Theta X_n > y_n x] \sim \mathbf{E}[h_2(\Theta)] V(\mathbf{y}) \mathbf{E}[(\Theta^*)^\alpha] \bar{F}_2(x), \quad (4.25)$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , for any  $\mathbf{y} \in [0, \infty]^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , under the condition

$$\mathbf{E}[\Theta^{\alpha+\varepsilon}] < \infty, \quad (4.26)$$

for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , where by  $\Theta^*$  we denote a random variable independent of random vector  $\mathbf{X}$ , with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}[\Theta^* \in d\theta] = \frac{1}{\mathbf{E}[h_2(\Theta)]} h_2(\theta) \mathbf{P}[\Theta \in d\theta], \quad (4.27)$$

Thence, from relation (4.25), it follows that the vector  $\Theta \mathbf{X} \in MRV$  with the same variation index  $\alpha$ . So we find the next result, appearing in vague form in [17].

**Proposition 4.4** (Cheng-Konstantinides-Wang (2024)). *If  $\mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu)$  and  $\Theta$  is a non-degenerated to zero random variable, such that (4.26) is true for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then  $\Theta \mathbf{X} \in MRV$ , with the same index  $\alpha$ .*

**Remark 4.1.** *It worth to observe that*

- (1) *From the dependence structure in relation (4.24), we obtain*

$$\mathbf{P}[X_i > x \mid \Theta = \theta] \sim \frac{1}{\mathbf{E}[h_2(\Theta)]} h_2(\theta) \overline{F}_i(x), \quad (4.28)$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , for any  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , see for example in [32, Rem. 2.1]. Relation (4.28), in fact renders the conditional dependence in (4.23) for any pair  $(X_i, \Theta)$ .

- (2) *In [28, Rem. 5.3] can be found a comment about the conditions under which the dependence structure (4.24) contains the independence, as a special case. Next, we examine the asymptotic independence case between  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$ , to show that Proposition 4.4 does not represent a special case of [24, Prop. 4.2]. If  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  are asymptotically independent, then by relation (4.24) we find*

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}[\Theta X_1 > y_1 x, \dots, \Theta X_n > y_n x, \Theta = \theta]}{\mathbf{P}[\Theta = \theta]} \sim V(\mathbf{y}) h_2(\theta) \overline{F}_2(x),$$

from where follows

$$\mathbf{P}[X_1 > y_1 x, \dots, X_n > y_n x] \sim V(\mathbf{y}) h_2(\theta) \overline{F}_2(x), \quad (4.29)$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , where in the second step we use that  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  are asymptotically independent.

Now, for the random vector  $\mathbf{X}$ , we say that it has asymptotically dependent components if

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}[X_1 > y_1 x, \dots, X_n > y_n x]}{\overline{F}(x)} > 0, \quad (4.30)$$

while in opposite case we say that it has asymptotically independent components.

Thus, in case (4.30) is true, there exists some number  $\varepsilon > 0$ , which represents the limit of the ratio. Therefore by (4.29) we obtain

$$\varepsilon \overline{F}_2(x) \sim V(\mathbf{y}) h_2(\theta) \overline{F}_2(x),$$

that means

$$V(\mathbf{y}) h_2(\theta) = \varepsilon > 0, \quad (4.31)$$

hence the dependence (4.24) represents a sub-case of asymptotic independence for  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$ . However, if the vector  $\mathbf{X}$  has asymptotically independent components then  $\varepsilon = 0$ . So from (4.31) we conclude either  $V(\mathbf{y}) = 0$  or  $h_2(\theta) = 0$ , which is not true by definition. Namely, the asymptotic independence for  $\Theta$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  fails.

**Corollary 4.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu)$  be a non-negative random vector and  $\Theta$  be a non-negative random variable. Under the assumptions of Theorem proposition 4.4 and if the integral in (4.11) converges for some  $\zeta > 0$ , then for  $\Theta \mathbf{X}$  we obtain (4.12).*

*Proof.* As the conditions of proposition 4.4 hold, it follows  $\Theta \mathbf{X} \in MRV(\alpha, b, \nu)$ , and consequently  $\Theta \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{w}) \in \mathcal{R}_{-\alpha}$ , for some  $\alpha > 0$ . Further the proof follows the route of Theorem 4.1.  $\square$

## 5. CONCLUSION

The asymptotic analysis of the tail distortion risk measures in background risk model can bring better understanding of the role of the dependence structures. In fact we intent to approach the real situations, where several kind of dependencies interact simultaneously.

In fact, the first models with interdependence among  $\Theta_i$  and  $X_i$ , namely the main claims  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  to be dependent, the discount factors  $\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_n$  to be also dependent and the two sequences  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  and  $\{\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_n\}$  to be mutually dependent, are restricted to the case of multivariate regular variation of main claims. The GTAI dependence structure in two dimensional models provides a form of interdependence among  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and  $\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_n$ .

Finally, in actuarial practice the randomly stopped sums gain more popularity, which is plausible with respect to applications.

## REFERENCES

- [1] ASIMIT, A.V., BADESCU, A.L. (2010) Extremes on the discounted aggregate claims in a time dependent risk model. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* 2, 93–104.
- [2] ASIMIT, A.V., JONES, B.L. (2008) Dependence and the asymptotic behavior of large claims reinsurance. *Insurance Math. Econom.* 43, no. 3, 407–411.
- [3] ASIMIT, V.A., VERNIC, R., ZITIKIS, R. (2016) Background risk models and stepwise portfolio contribution. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability* 18, 805–827.
- [4] BASRAK, B., DAVIS, R.A., MIKOSCH, T. (2002) Regular variation of GARCH processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 99, no. 1, 95–115.
- [5] BINGHAM, N.H., GOLDIE, C.M., TEUGELS, J.L. (1987) *Regular Variation* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [6] BOROVKOV, A.A., BOROVKOV, K.A. (2008) *Asymptotic Analysis of Random Walks: Heavy-Tailed distributions* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [7] BREIMAN L. (1965) On some limit theorems similar to arc-sin law. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 10, 323–331.
- [8] CADENA, M., OMEY, E., VESILO, R. (2022) Revisiting the product of random variables. *J.of Math. Sciences* 267, no. 2, 180–195.
- [9] CHEN, Y., GAO, Y., GAO, W.X., ZHANG, W.P. (2018) Second order asymptotics of risk concentration of a portfolio with deflated risks. *Math. Probability Eng.*, 4689497, 1–12.
- [10] CHEN, Y., LIU J. (2024) Asymptotic capital allocation based on highr momment risk measure. *Eur. Actuar. J.*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13385-024-00378-4>.
- [11] CHEN, Y., WANG, J., ZHANG, W. (2022) Tail distortion risk measure for portfolio with multivariate regular variation. *Commun. Math. Stat.*, 10, 263–285.
- [12] CHEN, Y., YANG, Y. (2019) Bivariate regular variation among randomly weighted sums in general insurance. *European Actuarial Journal*, 9, 301–322
- [13] CHEN, Y., YUEN, K.C. (2009) Sums of pairwise quasi-asymptotic independent random variables with consistent variation. *Stochastic Models*, 25, 76–89.
- [14] CHENG, D., YU, C. (2019) Uniform asymptotics for the ruin probabilities in a bidimensional risk model with strongly subexponential claims. *Stochastics*, 91, no.5, 643–656.
- [15] CHENG, D., YU, C. (2020) Asymptotic ruin probabilities of a two dimensional renewal risk model with dependent inter-arrival times. *Communication in Statistics and Mathematics*, 49, no.7, 1742–1760.

- [16] CHENG, M., KONSTANTINIDES, D.G., WANG, D (2022) Uniform asymptotic estimates in a time-dependent risk model with general investment returns and multivariate regularly varying claims. *Appl. Math. and Comput.*, 434, 1–28.
- [17] CHENG, M., KONSTANTINIDES, D.G., WANG, D (2024) Multivariate regularly varying insurance and financial risks in multi-dimensional risk models. *J. Appl. Prob.*, to appear
- [18] CHISTYAKOV, V.P. (1964) A theorem on sums of independent positive random variables and its applications to branching random processes. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 9, 640–648.
- [19] CLINE, D.B.H., SAMORODNITSKY, G. (1994) Subexponentiality of the product of independent random variables. *Stoch. Process. Appl.*, **49**, 75–98.
- [20] CÔTÉ, M.P, GENEST, C. (2019) Dependence in a background risk model. *J Multivariate Anal.*, 172, 28–46.
- [21] DE HAAN, L., FERREIRA, A. (2006) *Extreme Value Theory: An Introduction*. Springer Verlag, New York.
- [22] DHAENE, J., VANDUFFEL, S., GOOVAERTS, M., KAAS, R., TANG, Q.H. (2006) Risk measures and comonotonicity. *Stochastic Models* 22, no. 4, 573–606.
- [23] DREES, H. (1998) On smooth statistical tail functionals. *Scand. J. Statist.* 25, 187–210.
- [24] FOUGERES, A., MERCADIER, C. (2012) Risk measures and multivariate extensions of Breiman’s theorem. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 49, no. 2, 364–384.
- [25] GELUK, J., TANG, Q. (2009) Asymptotic tail probabilities of sums of dependent subexponential random variables. *J. Theoret. Prob.*, 22, 871–882.
- [26] HULT, H., SAMORODNITSKY, G. (2008) Tail probabilities for infinite series of regularly varying vectors. *Bernoulli*, 14, no. 3, 838–864.
- [27] KONSTANTINIDES, D.G., LI, J. (2016) Asymptotic ruin probabilities for a multidimensional renewal risk model with multivariate regularly varying claims. *Insurance Mathematics and Economics*, 69, 38–44.
- [28] KONSTANTINIDES, D.G., PASSALIDIS, C.D. (2024) Closure properties and heavy tails: random vectors in the presence of dependence *Preprint, arXiv:2402.09041*.
- [29] LEIPUS, R., ŠIAULYS, J. (2024) A note on randomly stopped sums with zero mean increments. *Modern Stochastics: Theory and Applications*, **11**, no.1, 31–42.
- [30] LEIPUS, R., ŠIAULYS, J., KONSTANTINIDES, D.G. (2023) *Closure Properties for Heavy-Tailed and Related Distributions: An Overview*. Springer Nature, Cham.
- [31] LI, J. (2013) On pairwise quasi-asymptotically independent random variables and their applications. *Stat. Prob. Lett.*, **83**, 2081–2087.
- [32] LI, J. (2016) Uniform asymptotics for a multi-dimensional time-dependent risk model with multivariate regularly varying claims and stochastic return. *Insurance Math. Econom.*, 71, 195–204.
- [33] LI, J. (2018) On the joint tail behavior of randomly weighted sums of heavy-tailed random variables. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 164, 40–53.
- [34] LI, J. (2018(b)) A revisit to asymptotic ruin probabilities of a two-dimensional renewal risk model. *Stat. Probab. Lett.*, **140**, 23–32.
- [35] LI, J. (2022) Asymptotic Analysis of a Dynamic Systemic Risk Measure in a Renewal Risk Model. *Insur. Math. Econom.*, **107**, 38–56.
- [36] LI, J., TANG, Q. (2015) Interplay of insurance and financial risks in a discrete time model with strongly regular variation. *Bernoulli* 21, no.3, 1800–1823
- [37] LIU, L. (2009) Precise large deviations for dependent random variables with heavy tails. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 79, 1290–1298.
- [38] LIU, J., YANG, Y. (2021) Asymptotics for systemic risk with dependent heavy-tailed losses. *ASTIN Bulletin*, 51, no.2, 571–605.
- [39] MATUSZEWSKA, W. (1964) On generalization of regularly increasing functions. *Studia Mathematica*, 24, 271–279.
- [40] MAULIK, K., RESNICK, S.I., ROOTZEN, H. (2002) Asymptotic independence and a network traffic model. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 39, no.4, 671–699.
- [41] OLVERA-CRAVIOTO, M. (2012) Asymptotic independence and a network traffic model. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 44, 1142–1172.
- [42] RESNICK, S. (2007) *Heavy-Tail Phenomena. Probabilistic and Statistical Modeling*. Springer, New York.

- [43] SHEN, X., DU, K. (2023) Uniform Approximation for the tail behavior of bidimensional randomly weighted sums. *Method. Comp. Appl. Prob.*, no.25
- [44] SPINDYS, J., ŠIAULYS, J. (2020) Regularly distributed randomly stopped sum, minimum and maximum. *Non. Anal. Mod. Contr.*, **25**, no.3, 509-522
- [45] TANG, Q., TSITSIASHVILI, G. (2003) Randomly weighted sums with application to ruin theory. *Extremes*, 6, 171–188
- [46] TANG, Q., YUAN, Z. (2014) Randomly weighted sums of subexponential random variables with application to capital allocation. *Extremes*, 17, 467–493
- [47] TSANAKAS A. (2004) Dynamic capital allocation with distortion risk measures. *Insurance Mathematics and Economics*, 35, no.2, 223–243.
- [48] WANG, S. (1996) Premium calculation by transforming the layer premium density. *ASTIN Bulletin*, 26, 71–92.
- [49] YANG, Y., KONSTANTINIDES D.G. (2015) Asymptotics for ruin probabilities in a discrete-time risk model with dependent financial and insurance risks. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* (8), 641–659.
- [50] YANG, Y., LEIPUS, R., ŠIAULYS, J. (2012(a)) Tail probability of randomly weighted sums of subexponential random variables under a dependence structure. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 82, 1727–1736.
- [51] YANG, Y., LEIPUS, R., ŠIAULYS, J. (2012(b)) On the ruin probability in a dependent discrete time risk model with insurance and financial risks. *J. Comput. Appl. Mat.*, 236, 3286–3295.
- [52] YANG, Y., LEIPUS, R., ŠIAULYS, J. (2016) Asymptotics for randomly weighted and stopped dependent sums. *Stochastics*, 88, no.2, 1–20.
- [53] YANG, Y., WANG, K., LEIPUS, R., ŠIAULYS, J. (2013) A note on the max-sum equivalence of randomly weighted sums of heavy-tailed random variables. *Non. Anal. Mod. Contr.*, **18**, no.4, 519–525.
- [54] ZHOU C. (2010) Are banks too big to fail? Measuring systemic importance of financial institutions. *International Journal of central banking*, 6, 205–250.
- [55] ZHU, L., LI, H. (2012) Tail distortion risk and its asymptotic analysis. *Insurance Math. Econom.*, 51, no. 1, 115–132.

DEPT. OF STATISTICS AND ACTUARIAL-FINANCIAL MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF THE AEGEAN, KARLOVASSI, GR-83 200 SAMOS, GREECE

*Email address:* `konstant@aegean.gr`, `sas19165@sas.aegean.gr`.