This document is a response to an article published on April 23, 2016 in Barron's regarding AmTrust that was based on false statements and incorrect analysis.

On April 23, 2016, Barron's published an article by Bill Alpert, entitled "Is AmTrust Stock Worth the Premium." This article is asserted to be a follow-up to Mr. Alpert's factually incorrect and misleading story from June 2014 about AmTrust that coincided with a short-attack on the Company. Despite the misguided claims in his 2014 story, AmTrust's stock increased 33% by year-end 2014, and we believe his latest article is equally misinformed and misleading with numerous errors. Unsurprisingly, Mr. Alpert's 2016 article has coincided with short activity in AmTrust stock. This April, a significant number of put options were purchased on AmTrust stock. The purchase of put options can be indicative of a "short and distort attack" on a company's stock.

On April 15, 2016, Mr. Alpert contacted AmTrust and provided a list of questions which he wanted us to answer for his story. While we provided answers to his questions, the resulting story was still filled with inaccuracies and innuendos, which leads us to believe that Mr. Alpert has no genuine interest in fairly reporting on the Company.

The comments below are a response to the article.

1. In the article, Mr. Alpert incorrectly contends that AmTrust's "cost of settling claims for policies issued in the seasoned years 2007-13 have climbed hundreds of millions of dollars above the reserves that AmTrust initially set aside" and that, "[s]ince 2006, adverse development in the reserves of AmTrust's three biggest units has topped $750 million before reinsurance."

   The truth is that, since 2006, AmTrust has experienced, in the aggregate, net reserve development of approximately $113 million or 1.2% of total incurred losses and 0.8% of earned premium, as reported in the company's Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") filings. In addition, as the Company has publicly disclosed in its 2015 10K filing, approximately 53% of total reserves in 2015 were IBNR compared to approximately 49% of total reserves in IBNR in 2014.

2. Mr. Alpert's repeats the maliciously false assertion made by short sellers that losses ceded by AmTrust to the Company's wholly-owned Luxembourg reinsurance companies are not included in the Company's consolidated financials and points to that falsehood as a basis to support his incorrect thesis.

   The truth is that all losses ceded by AmTrust to AmTrust's wholly-owned Luxembourg reinsurance companies are and always have been included in AmTrust's consolidated financial statements. Mr. Alpert's baseless assertion has been reviewed and rejected by AmTrust's regulators and auditors.

3. Mr. Alpert questions AmTrust "other assets", which total $1.4 billion. Although he does not dispute the validity of the "other assets" held by AmTrust, he suggests that the "other assets" constitute too high a percentage of AmTrust's total assets and book value.

   AmTrust's "other assets" are valid and appropriate. **The assets we categorize as "other assets" consist primarily of administration fees receivable generated by AmTrust's fee businesses, life settlement contracts, loans receivable, deferred financing fees and federal income taxes recoverable and deferred tax assets.**

4. Mr. Alpert contends that, in 2015, AmTrust's subsidiary, Technology Insurance Company ("Technology"), is assuming an average workers' compensation settlement cost of $2,600 for known claims and misleadingly compares it to Technology's average workers' compensation claim costs in earlier years, which range from $4,700 to $8,200 per claim.

   The truth is that Technology's average workers' compensation claim costs in 2015 are consistent with prior years. It is actuarially and logically flawed to compare case and paid losses for accident year 2015, which has only one year of seasoning, to more mature accident years.

   Although Mr. Alpert acknowledged that we had advised him that the comparison is inappropriate, he chose not to include the explanation that we provided to him, which we set forth here:

   > Mr. Alpert's comment: Your statutory filings for TIC's workers' comp indicate that the average "case + paid per reported claim" for the 2015 accident year ($2,623) was far below those of earlier accident years (ranging $4,744 to $8,155, not counting the extreme 2011) and the average workers' comp claim of $12,481 shown in your 10-K.
   >
   > **Q8:** Why are TIC's recent accident year case reserve levels so low?
   >
   > **AmTrust Response:** The premise of the question is actuarially and logically flawed. It is not appropriate to compare case and paid losses for accident year 2015, which has only one year of seasoning, to more mature accident years.
   >
   > Accident year 2015's reserves consist primarily of incurred but not reported losses ("IBNR"), which are not included in the above referenced ratio. If IBNR were included in the above calculation for the 2015 accident year, it would fall well within the range presented above.

5. Mr. Alpert compares the amount of capital we raised in 2015 - $900 million – to the cash held at the holding company at year end - $15 million and suggests it is questionable.

During the past 12 months, AmTrust successfully raised over $900 million in capital which has been appropriately allocated to fund acquisitions and to support organic growth in subsidiaries. As of December 31, 2015, the Company had several hundred million dollars in cash and investments outside of its insurance subsidiaries that was in addition to the cash at the holding company.

6. Mr. Alpert states that AmTrust has told analysts that "it has decided to avoid insuring the hospitals in Italy's litigious south."

This is not true. AmTrust is fully committed to the Italian market.