Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
ScienceDirect
Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science 202 (2008) 19–25
Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science
www.elsevier.com/locate/entcs

Continuity Properties of Preference Relations

Marian Baroni[1]

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Canterbury
Christchurch, New Zealand

Douglas Bridges[2]

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Canterbury
Christchurch, New Zealand

Abstract

Various types of continuity for preference relations on a metric space are examined constructively. In particular, necessary and sufficient conditions are given for an order-dense, strongly extensional preference relation on a complete metric space to be continuous. It is also shown, in the spirit of constructive reverse mathematics, that the continuity of sequentially continuous, order-dense preference relations on complete, separable metric spaces is connected to Ishihara's principle **BD**-$\mathbb{N}$, and therefore is not provable within Bishop-style constructive mathematics alone.

Keywords: constructive reverse mathematics, Heine-Borel property, anti-Specker property, uniform continuity theorem

1 Preferences and Continuity

The notions of preference and utility play a fundamental role in traditional microeconomic theory . Each consumer is assumed to have a *consumption set* X—typically, but not essentially, a compact, convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$—whose elements are the *consumption bundles*. Each component of the consumption bundle $\mathbf{x}$ is the amount of a corresponding good or service that the consumer may wish to purchase. It is assumed that there is a binary relation $\succ$ of *preference* on X, where "$\mathbf{x} \succ \mathbf{y}$" means that the consumer strictly prefers bundle $\mathbf{x}$ to bundle $\mathbf{y}$. The early developments of the theory went so far as to assume that the preferences were represented by a *utility function* $u : X \to \mathbb{R}$, whereby $\mathbf{x} \succ \mathbf{y}$ if and only if $u(\mathbf{x}) > u(\mathbf{y})$. It was later

[1] Email:marianbaroni@yahoo.com
[2] Email:d.bridges@math.canterbury.ac.nz

doi:10.1016/j.entcs.2008.03.004

realised that the existence of a utility function representing a given preference relation required justification; furthermore, one could not automatically assume that the utility function, if it existed, was continuous. This led to the study of necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of continuous utility functions, a topic which has been explored in depth since the appearance of the pioneering work of Debreu in the 1950s [11,12].

Early in the constructive analysis of preference relations it became clear that straightforward constructivisation of the classical proofs of the existence and continuity of utility functions was not possible. In fact, Debreu's famous theorem on this subject is false in recursive constructive mathematics [6]. Since the smoothest constructive path to an existence theorem for utility functions uses a very strong continuity condition on the preference relation [4], it would be interesting (maybe useful?) to have an existence theorem under weaker continuity conditions on preferences. To that end, it makes sense to examine the constructive connections between various types of continuity of preferences, analogous to ones for continuity of functions. We begin such an examination in this paper.

Let X be a set that is **inhabited** in the sense that we can construct an element of it. A binary relation $\succ$ on X is called a **preference relation** if it satisfies these two axioms:

$\mathbf{P}_1$ $\forall_{x,y\in X}\,(x \succ y \Rightarrow \neg\,(y \succ x))$;

$\mathbf{P}_2$ $\forall_{x,y\in X}\,(x \succ y \Rightarrow \forall_{z\in X}\,(x \succ z \vee z \succ y))$.

The corresponding **preference-indifference relation** $\succcurlyeq$ is then defined by

$$\forall_{x,y\in X}\,(x \succcurlyeq y \Leftrightarrow \neg\,(y \succ x))\,.$$

(Of course, we write $y \prec x$ and $y \preccurlyeq x$ as equivalents of $x \succ y$ and $x \succcurlyeq y$, respectively.) The corresponding **reverse preference relation** $\succ_{\mathrm{rev}}$ is defined on X by

$$\forall_{x,y\in X}\,(x \succ_{\mathrm{rev}} y \Leftrightarrow y \succ x)\,.$$

With each preference relation and each point a of X we associate

- the **upper contour set**

$$[a,\rightarrow) = \{x \in X : x \succcurlyeq a\}\,,$$

- the **strict upper contour set**

$$(a,\rightarrow) = \{x \in X : x \succ a\}\,,$$

- the **lower contour set**

$$(\leftarrow,a] = \{x \in X : a \succcurlyeq x\}\,,$$

- and the **strict lower contour set**

$$(\leftarrow,a) = \{x \in X : a \succ x\}\,.$$

In this paper we are particularly interested in the case where (X, ρ) is a metric space. The standard inequality on X is then defined by

$$\forall_{x,y\in X} \, (x \neq y \Leftrightarrow \rho(x, y) > 0) \, .$$

Corresponding to various types of continuity of functions between metric spaces there are types of continuity for a preference relation $\succ$ on X. We say that $\succ$ is

- ▷ **pointwise continuous** at a if both the sets $(\leftarrow, a)$ and $(a, \rightarrow)$ are open in X;
- ▷ **sequentially continuous** at a if for each $x \in X$ and each sequence $(x_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ of points of X converging to x,

$$x \succ a \Rightarrow \exists_N \forall_{n\geqslant N} \, (x_n \succ a)$$

and

$$a \succ x \Rightarrow \exists_N \forall_{n\geqslant N} \, (a \succ x_n) \, ;$$

- ▷ **nearly continuous** at a if for each $S \subset X$ and each x in the closure $\overline{S}$ of S,

$$x \succ a \Rightarrow \exists_{s\in S} (s \succ a)$$

and

$$a \succ x \Rightarrow \exists_{s\in S} \, (a \succ s) \, ;$$

- ▷ **nondiscontinuous** at a if both the sets $(\leftarrow, a]$ and $[a, \rightarrow)$ are closed in X.

We say that $\succ$ is, for example, **sequentially continuous on** X if it is sequentially continuous at each point of X. It is straightforward to show that if $\succ$ is represented by a pointwise, sequential, or nearly continuous [3] utility function, then $\succ$ itself has the corresponding continuity property on X.

Our aim is to investigate, within the framework of Bishop-style constructive mathematics (**BISH**), [4] connections between these notions of continuity.

Proposition 1.1 *For preference relations on a metric space, pointwise continuity at a point implies sequential continuity, which implies near continuity, which implies nondiscontinuity.*

Proof. Let $\succ$ be a preference relation on the metric space X, and let $a \in X$. Suppose that $\succ$ is pointwise continuous at a. If $x \succ a$, then there exists $r > 0$ such that $y \succ a$ whenever $\rho(x, y) < r$. It follows that for every sequence $(x_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ of elements of X converging to x, we have $x_n \succ a$ for all sufficiently large n. The case $a \succ x$ is similarly handled. Hence $\succ$ is sequentially continuous at a.

Next suppose that $\succ$ is sequentially continuous at a. Let S be a subset of X, and let x be a point of $\overline{S}$ with $x \succ a$. Then there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ of elements of S converging to x. Since $x \succ a$, it follows from sequential continuity that $x_n \succ a$

[3] More on near continuity for functions is found in [7].

[4] Mathematics that uses only intuitionistic logic and an appropriate set-theory such as that presented in [1]. For more on constructive analysis see [3,8]. For background in the constructive theory of preference and utility, see [2,4,5].

for all sufficiently large n. The case $a \succ x$ is similarly handled. Thus $\succ$ is nearly continuous at a.

To prove that near continuity implies nondiscontinuity, suppose that $\succ$ is nearly continuous at a, and consider a sequence $(x_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ in X that converges to x and satisfies $x_n \succcurlyeq a$ for all n. Assume that $a \succ x$. Clearly, x belongs to the closure of $[a, \rightarrow)$. Since $\succ$ is nearly continuous at a, it follows that $a \succ s$ for some $s \in [a, \rightarrow)$, a contradiction. Consequently, $\neg(a \succ x)$ and therefore $x \succcurlyeq a$—that is, $x \in [a, \rightarrow)$. We prove similarly that the lower contour set at a is closed; so the preference relation $\succ$ is nondiscontinuous at a. □

An irreflexive binary relation R on a set X with an inequality $\neq$ is said to be **strongly extensional** if

$$\forall_{x,y \in X} \left(xRy \Rightarrow x \neq y \right).$$

Proposition 1.2 *A nearly continuous preference relation on a metric space is strongly extensional.*

Proof. Omitted. □

Our next task is to produce necessary and sufficient conditions for the sequential continuity of a certain type of preference relation on a complete metric space (Proposition 1.5 below). We require the following two lemmas, which are reminiscent of Ishihara's tricks [13,9].

Lemma 1.3 *Let $\succ$ be a strongly extensional preference relation on a complete metric space X. Let $a, b, x \in X$ satisfy $x \succ a \succ b$, and let $(x_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ be a sequence in X that converges to x. Then either $x_n \succ b$ for all n or else there exists n such that $a \succ x_n$.*

Proof. Construct an increasing binary sequence $(\lambda_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ such that

$$\lambda_n = 0 \Rightarrow \forall_{k \leqslant n} \left(x_k \succ b \right),$$
$$\lambda_n = 1 - \lambda_{n-1} \Rightarrow a \succ x_n.$$

We may assume that $\lambda_1 = 0$. If $\lambda_n = 0$, set $y_n = x$; if $\lambda_n = 1 - \lambda_{n-1}$, set $y_k = x_n$ for all $k \geqslant n$. Then $(y_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence in X and so converges to a limit $y \in X$. Either $y \succ a$ or $x \succ y$. In the first case, if there exists n such that $\lambda_n = 1 - \lambda_{n-1}$, then $y = x_n \prec a$, a contradiction; hence $\lambda_n = 0$, and therefore $x_n \succ b$, for all n. In the case $x \succ y$, the strong extensionality of $\succ$ yields $x \neq y$; so there exists N such that $x \neq y_N$. Then $\lambda_n = 1 - \lambda_{n-1}$, and therefore $x \succ a \succ x_n$, for some $n \leqslant N$. □

Lemma 1.4 *Under the hypotheses of* Lemma 1.3, *either $x_n \succ b$ for all sufficiently large n, or else $a \succ x_n$ for infinitely many n.*

Proof. The proof uses inductive application of Lemma 1.3 and is omitted. □

A preference relation $\succ$ on a set X is said to be **order dense** if for all $x, z \in X$ with $x \succ z$, there exists $y \in X$ such that $x \succ y \succ z$.

Proposition 1.5 *An order-dense, strongly extensional preference relation $\succ$ on a complete metric space X is sequentially continuous if and only if it is both nondiscontinuous and strongly extensional.*

Proof. If $\succ$ is sequentially continuous, then by Propositions 1.1 and 1.2, it is both nondiscontinuous and strongly extensional.

Suppose, conversely, that $\succ$ has both these last two properties. Let the sequence $(x_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ converge to x in X, and, to begin with, let $x \succ b$. Pick $a \in X$ such that $x \succ a \succ b$. By Lemma 1.4, either $x_n \succ b$ for all sufficiently large n, or else, as we suppose in order to obtain a contradiction, there exists a strictly increasing sequence $(n_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ of positive integers such that $a \succ x_{n_k}$ for each k. Since (this is our nondiscontinuity assumption) the set $(\leftarrow, a]$ is closed, it follows that $x \in (\leftarrow, a]$; that is, $a \nsucc x$, a contradiction. Hence, in fact, $x_n \succ b$ for all sufficiently large n.

Finally supposing that $a \succ x$, we apply the foregoing argument to the reverse preference relation $\succ_{\text{rev}}$, to show that $x_n \succ_{\text{rev}} a$, and therefore $a \succ x_n$, for all sufficiently large n. This completes the proof that $\succ$ is sequentially continuous. $\square$

In the case where the preference relation is represented by a utility function, Proposition 1.5 reduces to Theorem 1 of [13].

2 Sequential and Pointwise Continuity

With classical logic we can prove that, for a preference relation $\succ$ on the metric space X, sequential continuity at each point of X implies, and hence is equivalent to, pointwise continuity throughout X. To see this, suppose that $\succ$ is sequentially continuous at each point of X but is not pointwise continuous at $x \in X$. Then either $(\leftarrow, x)$ or $(x, \rightarrow)$ is not open in X. Assuming, for example, that the latter set is not open, we see that there exist a point $y \in X$ and a sequence $(y_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ converging to y in X, such that $y \succ x \nsucc y_n$ for each n. Since $\succ$ is sequentially continuous at y, we must have $y_n \succ x$ for all sufficiently large n, a contradiction.

Clearly, this proof provides no indication of conditions that might ensure that sequential continuity constructively implies pointwise continuity. In seeking such conditions, and bearing in mind those preference relations that are represented by utility functions [4], we are guided by Ishihara's work [14] relating sequential and pointwise continuity of functions on a complete metric space.

A set S of positive integers is called **pseudobounded** if $\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1}s_n = 0$ for each sequence $(s_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ in S. The following principle, introduced by Ishihara, holds classically and in both the intuitionistic and recursive models of constructive mathematics, is unprovable in a natural formalisation of BISH [17], and has proved extremely significant in constructive reverse mathematics:

BD-$\mathbb{N}$ *Every countable pseudobounded set of positive integers is bounded.*

In particular, as Ishihara showed in [14] (Theorem 4), **BD**-$\mathbb{N}$ is equivalent to the proposition

> Every sequentially continuous mapping of a complete, separable metric space into a metric space is pointwise continuous.

For more on the role of **BD**-$\mathbb{N}$ in constructive reverse mathematics, see [10,15,16].

Theorem 2.1 *If **BD**-$\mathbb{N}$ holds, then every sequentially continuous, order-dense preference relation on a separable metric space is pointwise continuous.*

Proof. Omitted. □

We end with a partial converse to Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.2 *Suppose that every sequentially continuous preference relation on a complete, separable metric space is pointwise continuous. Then **BD**-$\mathbb{N}$ holds.*

Proof. Let S be a countable pseudobounded subset of $\mathbb{N}$, and without loss of generality assume that $0 \in S$. We first invoke Proposition 1 of [14] to produce a complete, separable subset X of $\mathbb{R}$ and a sequentially continuous mapping $u : X \to \{0, 1\}$ such that

$$0 \in X \wedge u(0) = 0 \wedge \forall_m \left(m \in S \Rightarrow 2^{-m} \in X \wedge u(2^{-m})) = 1\right).$$

Note that $1 \in S$. Now,

$$x \succ y \Leftrightarrow u(x) > u(y)$$

defines a sequentially continuous preference relation $\succ$ on X. Suppose that this preference relation is pointwise continuous on X. Then

$$(\leftarrow, 1) = \{x \in X : u(x) = 0\}$$

is an open subset of X that contains 0. Choose a positive integer N such that if $x \in X$ and $|x| < 2^{-N}$, then $u(x) = 0$. If $m \in S$ and $m > N$, then $2^{-m} \in X$, so $u(2^{-m}) = 0$, by our choice of N; but $u(2^{-m}) = 1$, by definition of u. This contradiction shows that $m \leqslant N$ for all $m \in S$. Hence S is bounded. □

The preference relation $\succ$ used in the proof of Theorem 2.2 is not order dense. We do not know whether **BD**-$\mathbb{N}$ is a consequence of the proposition "Every sequentially continuous, order-dense preference relation on a complete, separable metric space is uniformly continuous".

Acknowledgement

The authors thank the Department of Mathematics & Statistics at the University of Canterbury for supporting Marian Baroni as a doctoral student while this paper was begun. They also thank the referee for pointing out several errors in the original version, and for pointing out a major simplification in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

References

[1] Aczel, P., and M. Rathjen, "Notes on Constructive Set Theory", Report No. 40, Institut Mittag–Leffler, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, 2001.

[2] Baroni, M.A., "The Constructive Theory of Riesz Spaces and Applications in Mathematical Economics", Ph.D. Thesis, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand, 2004.

[3] Bishop, E.A., and D.S. Bridges, "Constructive Analysis", Grundlehren der Math. Wiss. **279** (1985), Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg.

[4] Bridges, D.S., *The constructive theory of preference relations on a locally compact space*, Proc. Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie can Wetenschappen, Ser. A, **92 2** (1989), 141–165.

[5] Bridges, D.S., *Constructive methods in mathematical economics*, Mathematical Utility Theory, J. Econ. (Zeitschrift für Nationalökonomie), Suppl. **8** (1999), 1–21.

[6] Bridges, D.S., and F. Richman, *A recursive counterexample to Debreu's theorem on the existence of a utility function*, Math. Soc. Sciences **21** (1991), 179–182.

[7] Bridges, D.S., and L.S. Vîţă, *Apartness spaces as a framework for constructive topology*, Ann. Pure and Applied Logic **119** (2003), 61–83.

[8] Bridges, D.S., and L.S. Vîţă, "Techniques of Constructive Analysis", Universitext, Springer-New-York, 2006.

[9] Bridges, D.S., D. van Dalen and H. Ishihara, *Ishihara's proof technique in constructive analysis*, Proc. Koninklijke Nederlandse Akad. Wetenschappen (Indag. Math.) N.S., **14 2** (2003), 163–168.

[10] Bridges,D.S., H. Ishihara, P.M. Schuster and L.S.Vîţă, *Strong continuity implies uniform sequential continuity*, Arch. Math. Logic **44** (2006), 887–895.

[11] Debreu, G., *Representation of a preference ordering by a numerical function*, Decision Processes (R. Thrall, C. Coombs, and R. Davies, eds), John Wiley, New York, 1954.

[12] Debreu, G., "Theory of Value", John Wiley, New York, 1959.

[13] Ishihara, H., *Continuity and discontinuity in constructive mathematics*, J. Symbolic Logic **56 4** (1991), 1349–1354.

[14] Ishihara, H., *Continuity properties in constructive mathematics*, J. Symbolic Logic **57 2** (1992), 557–565.

[15] Ishihara, H., *Sequential continuity in constructive mathematics*, Combinatorics, Computability and Logic (C.S. Calude, M.J. Dinneen and S. Sburlan, eds), Springer-Verlag, London, 2001, 5–12.

[16] Ishihara, H., and S. Yoshida, *A constructive look at the completeness of* $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R})$, J. Symb. Logic **67** (2002), 1511–1519.

[17] Lietz, P., "From Constructive Mathematics to Computable Analysis via the Realizability Interpretation", Ph.D. Thesis, Technische Universität, Darmstadt, Germany, 2004.