Table 1
 Sufficient Conditions for Nondegenerate[‡] Solution

Consumption Model(s)	Conditions	Comments
$\bar{\mathbf{c}}(m)$: PF Unconstrained	RIC, FHWC°	$RIC \Rightarrow v(m) < \infty; FHWC \Rightarrow 0 < v(m) $
$\underline{c}(m) = \underline{\kappa}m$		PF model with no human wealth $(h = 0)$
Section 2.5.3:		RIC prevents $\bar{\mathbf{c}}(m) = \underline{\mathbf{c}}(m) = 0$
Section 2.5.3:		FHWC prevents $\bar{\mathbf{c}}(m) = \infty$
Eq (21) :		$PF-FVAC+FHWC \Rightarrow RIC$
Eq (22):		$GIC+FHWC \Rightarrow PF-FVAC$
$\grave{\mathrm{c}}(m)$: PF Constrained	GIC, RIC	FHWC holds $(\Phi < \mathbf{P} < R \Rightarrow \Phi < R)$
Section 2.5.6:		$ \dot{c}(m) = \bar{c}(m) \text{ for } m > m_{\#} < 1 $
		(RHC would yield $m_{\#} = 0$ so $\grave{c}(m) = 0$)
Appendix A:	GIC,RIC	$\lim_{m\to\infty} \grave{c}(m) = \bar{c}(m), \lim_{m\to\infty} \grave{\kappa}(m) = \underline{\kappa}$
		kinks where horizon to $b = 0$ changes*
Appendix A:	GIC,RIC	$\lim_{m\to\infty} \grave{\boldsymbol{\kappa}}(m) = 0$
		kinks where horizon to $b = 0$ changes*
c(m): Friedman/Muth	Section 3.1,	$\underline{\mathbf{c}}(m) < \mathbf{c}(m) < \overline{\mathbf{c}}(m)$
	Section 3.2	$\underline{\mathbf{v}}(m) < \mathbf{v}(m) < \overline{\mathbf{v}}(m)$
Section 2.10:	FVAC, WRIC	Sufficient for Contraction
Section 2.12:		WRIC is weaker than RIC
Figure 3:		FVAC is stronger than PF-FVAC
Section 2.12.2:		EHWC+RIC \Rightarrow GIC, $\lim_{m\to\infty} \kappa(m) = \underline{\kappa}$
Section 2.12.1:		RFC \Rightarrow EHWC, $\lim_{m\to\infty} \kappa(m) = 0$
Section 3.3:		"Buffer Stock Saving" Conditions
Section 3.3.2:		$GIC \Rightarrow \exists 0 < \check{m} < \infty$
Section 3.3.1:		GIC-Nrm $\Rightarrow \exists 0 < \hat{m} < \infty$

[‡]For feasible m satisfying $0 < m < \infty$, a nondegenerate limiting consumption function defines a unique optimal value of c satisfying $0 < c(m) < \infty$; a nondegenerate limiting value function defines a corresponding unique value of $-\infty < \mathrm{v}(m) < 0$.

[°]RIC, FHWC are necessary as well as sufficient for the perfect foresight case. *That is, the first kink point in c(m) is $m_{\#}$ s.t. for $m < m_{\#}$ the constraint will bind now, while for $m > m_{\#}$ the constraint will bind one period in the future. The second kink point corresponds to the m where the constraint will bind two periods in the future, etc.

^{**}In the Friedman/Muth model, the RIC+FHWC are sufficient, but not necessary for nondegeneracy