

# BGP Model

## Some Derivations

Marco Brianti

Vito Cormun

Spring 2019

## 1 Model

Consider the following model with two states variables. The first equation describes the law of motion of investment  $I_t$ ,

$$I_t = \alpha_{1,1}I_{t-1} + \alpha_{1,2}K_t + s_t^I \quad (1)$$

while the second equation describes the law of motion of capital  $K_t$

$$K_t = I_{t-1} + \alpha_{2,2}K_{t-1} + s_t^K. \quad (2)$$

Notice that  $s_t^I$  and  $s_t^K$  are two disturbances such that  $s_t^I \perp s_\tau^K$  for all  $t$  and  $\tau$ . In addition, we also assume that  $s_t^j \perp s_\tau^j$  for all  $t$  and  $\tau$  for  $j \in \{I, K\}$ .<sup>1</sup>

The system is linear and it can be written in a more compactly as

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_t \\ K_t \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{t-1} \\ K_{t-1} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} s_t^I \\ s_t^K \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

which is

$$X_t = AX_{t-1} + s_t \quad (4)$$

For the rest of the document, we will assume that both  $\alpha_{1,1}$  and  $\alpha_{2,2}$  are positive.<sup>2</sup>

## 2 Stability Conditions

In order to study the stability conditions, we parametrically evaluate the eigenvalues  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  of matrix  $A$ . In other words, we need to solve the following problem,

$$\det(A - \lambda I) = 0$$

which can be rewritten as,

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} - \lambda & \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} - \lambda \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

---

<sup>1</sup>It can be easily derived that in steady state, both investment and capital are equal to  $I_{ss} = K_{ss} = 0$ . Without loss of generality, this result simplifies the analysis because levels outside of steady state are also deviations from steady state.

<sup>2</sup>The economic interpretation of this assumption is straightforward. A positive value of  $\alpha_{2,2}$  means that a part of capital in the previous period is not fully depreciated and survived as an endowment in the subsequent period. Instead,  $\alpha_{1,1}$  positive suggests that Equation 1 is the reduced form of a setting with dynamic strategic complementary of investment. If investment has been positive in the past then it is convenient to invest more also today.

which is,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= (\alpha_{1,1} - \lambda)(\alpha_{2,2} - \lambda) - \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} \\
&= \alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{2,2} + \lambda^2 - (\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2})\lambda - \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} \\
&= \lambda^2 - (\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2})\lambda + \alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{2,2} - \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1}
\end{aligned}$$

Solving over  $\lambda$  yields,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{1,2} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2}) \pm \sqrt{(\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2})^2 - 4(\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{2,2} - \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1})} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2}) \pm \sqrt{(\alpha_{1,1} - \alpha_{2,2})^2 + 4\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1}} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

**Proposition 1** *Sufficient condition to have complex eigenvalues is to have  $\alpha_{1,2}$  and  $\alpha_{2,1}$  with a different sign.*

**Proof** Proof follows from Equation 5. In particular,  $(\alpha_{1,1} - \alpha_{2,2})^2 + 4\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1}$  might be negative if and only if the sign of  $\alpha_{1,2}$  is different than the sign of  $\alpha_{2,1}$ .

**Proposition 2** *Sufficient condition to have real eigenvalues is to have  $\alpha_{1,2}$  and  $\alpha_{2,1}$  with the same sign.*

**Proof** Proof straightforwardly follows from Proposition 1.

**Proposition 3** *If  $\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} = 0$ , then the system is stable (both  $|\lambda_{1,2}| < 1$ ) if and only if both  $\alpha_{1,1}$  and  $\alpha_{2,2}$  are smaller than one.<sup>3</sup>*

**Proof** Since  $\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{1}{2}[\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2} \pm (\alpha_{1,1} - \alpha_{2,2})]$  then we have that  $\lambda_1 = \alpha_{1,1}$  and  $\lambda_2 = \alpha_{2,2}$ . If both  $\alpha_{1,1}$  and  $\alpha_{2,2}$  are smaller than one then the system is automatically stable. On the other hand, if the system is stable -  $|\lambda_{1,2}| < 1$  - then it must be the case that both  $\alpha_{1,1}$  and  $\alpha_{2,2}$  are smaller than one.

### 3 Shock Dependent Cyclical responses

From now on we will assume that  $\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} < 0$ ,  $\lambda_{1,2}$  are real and their module is smaller than one. In particular, I will assume that  $\alpha_{1,2} < 0$  and  $\alpha_{2,1} > 0$ .

#### 3.1 Investment-Specific Shock

Assume in period  $t$ , when the system is in steady state, that  $s_t^I = 1$ . Impact responses at  $t$  of both variables are,

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_t \\ K_t \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{6}$$

At time  $t + 1$ , dynamic responses are,

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_{t+1} \\ K_{t+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} \\ \alpha_{2,1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{7}$$

At time  $t + 2$ , dynamic responses are,

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_{t+2} \\ K_{t+2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1}^2 + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} \\ \alpha_{2,1}\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2}\alpha_{2,1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} \\ \alpha_{2,1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{8}$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Notice that we assumed both  $\alpha_{1,1}$  and  $\alpha_{2,2}$  to be non negative in Section 1.

At time  $t + 3$ , dynamic responses are,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} I_{t+3} \\ K_{t+3} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1}(\alpha_{1,1}^2 + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1}) + \alpha_{1,2}(\alpha_{2,1}\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2}\alpha_{2,1}) \\ \alpha_{2,1}(\alpha_{1,1}^2 + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1}) + \alpha_{2,2}(\alpha_{2,1}\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2}\alpha_{2,1}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1}^2 + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} \\ \alpha_{2,1}\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2}\alpha_{2,1} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

### 3.2 Capital-Specific Shock

Assume in period  $t$ , when the system is in steady state, that  $s_t^K = 1$ . Impact responses at  $t$  of both variables are,

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_t \\ K_t \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

At time  $t + 1$ , dynamic responses are,

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_{t+1} \\ K_{t+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

At time  $t + 2$ , dynamic responses are,

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_{t+2} \\ K_{t+2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2} \\ \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} + \alpha_{2,2}^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

At time  $t + 3$ , dynamic responses are,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} I_{t+3} \\ K_{t+3} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1}(\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2}) + \alpha_{1,2}(\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} + \alpha_{2,2}^2) \\ \alpha_{2,1}(\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2}) + \alpha_{2,2}(\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} + \alpha_{2,2}^2) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2} \\ \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} + \alpha_{2,2}^2 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

At time  $t + 4$ , dynamic responses are,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} I_{t+4} \\ K_{t+4} \end{pmatrix} &= \\ &\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1}[\alpha_{1,1}(\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2}) + \alpha_{1,2}(\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} + \alpha_{2,2}^2)] + \alpha_{1,2}[\alpha_{2,1}(\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2}) + \alpha_{2,2}(\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} + \alpha_{2,2}^2)] \\ \alpha_{2,1}[\alpha_{1,1}(\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2}) + \alpha_{1,2}(\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} + \alpha_{2,2}^2)] + \alpha_{2,2}[\alpha_{2,1}(\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2}) + \alpha_{2,2}(\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} + \alpha_{2,2}^2)] \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1}(\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2}) + \alpha_{1,2}(\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} + \alpha_{2,2}^2) \\ \alpha_{2,1}(\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2}) + \alpha_{2,2}(\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} + \alpha_{2,2}^2) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

**Proposition 4** *Investment  $I_t$  displays a shock-dependent cyclical dynamics if*

$$1. \alpha_{1,1}^2 < |\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1}|$$

$$2. \alpha_{2,2}^2 > |\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1}|$$

**Proof** Notice that after an investment-specific shock  $s_t^I$ , responses of  $I_t$  are,

$$\begin{aligned} I_t &= 1 \\ I_{t+1} &= \alpha_{1,1} \\ I_{t+2} &= \alpha_{1,1}^2 + \alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{2,1} \\ I_{t+3} &= \alpha_{1,1}(\alpha_{1,1}^2 + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1}) + \alpha_{1,2}(\alpha_{2,1}\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2}\alpha_{2,1}) \end{aligned}$$

which implies that both  $I_t$  and  $I_{t+1}$  are positive by construction. However,  $I_{t+2}$  and  $I_{t+3}$  are negative. In particular,  $I_{t+2}$  is negative because  $\alpha_{1,1}^2 < |\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1}|$ . Moreover,  $I_{t+3}$  is negative because both  $\alpha_{1,1}(\alpha_{1,1}^2 + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1})$  and  $\alpha_{1,2}(\alpha_{2,1}\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{2,2}\alpha_{2,1})$  are negative. This is already sufficient to show that investment  $I_t$  displays a cyclical dynamics after an investment-specific shock,  $s_t^I$ .

Conversely, after a capital-specific shock  $s_t^K$ , responses of  $I_t$  are,

$$\begin{aligned} I_t &= 0 \\ I_{t+1} &= \alpha_{1,2} \\ I_{t+2} &= \alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2} \\ I_{t+3} &= \alpha_{1,1}(\alpha_{1,1}^2 + \alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,2}) + \alpha_{1,2}(\alpha_{1,2}\alpha_{2,1} + \alpha_{2,2}^2) \end{aligned}$$