Dynamic Programming Theorems

Prof. Lutz Hendricks

Econ720

July 21, 2020

Dynamic Programming Theorems

Useful theorems to characterize the solution to a DP problem.

There is no reason to remember these results.

But you need to know they exist and can be looked up when you need them.

Generic Sequence Problem (P1)

$$V^*(x(0)) = \max_{\{x(t+1)\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t U(x(t), x(t+1))$$

$$subject \ to$$

$$x(t+1) \in G(x(t))$$

$$x(0) \text{ given}$$

 $x(t) \in X \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is the set of allowed states.

The correspondence $G: X \rightrightarrows X$ defines the constraints.

A solution is a sequence $\{x(t)\}$

Mapping into the growth model

$$\max_{\{k(t+1)\}_{t=0}^\infty}\sum_{t=0}^\infty\beta^t U(f(k(t))-k(t+1))$$
 subject to
$$k(t+1)\in G(k(t))=[0,f(k(t))]$$

$$k(t)\in X=\mathbb{R}^+$$

$$k(0) \text{ given}$$

Recursive Problem (P2)

$$V(x) = \max_{y \in G(x)} U(x, y) + \beta V(y), \ \forall x \in X$$

A solution is a policy function $\pi: X \longrightarrow X$ and a value function V(x) such that

- 1. $V(x) = U(x, \pi(x)) + \beta V(\pi(x)), \forall x \in X$
- 2. When $y = \pi(x)$, now and forever, the max value is attained.

The Main Point

This is the upshot of everything that follows:

If it is possible to write the optimization problem in the format of P1

and if mild conditions hold,
then solving P1 and P2 are equivalent.

Assumptions That Could Be Relaxed

- 1. Stationarity: U and G do not depend on t.
- 2. Utility is additively separable.
 - Time consistency
- 3. The control is x(t+1).
 - ▶ There could be additional controls that don't affect x(t+1).
 - ► They are "max'd out". Ex: 2 consumption goods.

Dynamic Programming Theorems

- ► The payoff of DP: it is easier to prove that solutions exist, are unique, monotone, etc.
- ▶ We state some assumptions and theorems using them.

Assumption 1: Non-emptiness

- ▶ Define the set of feasible paths starting at x(0) by $\Phi(x(0))$.
- ▶ G(x) is nonempty for all $x \in X$.
 - needed to prevent a currently good looking path from running into "dead ends"
- ▶ $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{t=0}^{n} \beta^t U(x(t), x(t+1))$ exists and is **finite**, for all $x(0) \in X$ and feasible paths $\mathbf{x} \in \Phi(x(0))$.
 - cannot have unbounded utility

Assumption 2: Compactness

- ▶ The set X in which x lives is **compact**.
- G is compact valued and continuous.
- *U* is continuous.

Notes:

- Compactness avoids existence issues: without it, there could always be a slightly better **x**
- ► Compact *X* creates trouble with endogenous growth, but can be relaxed.
- ▶ Think of A1 and A2 together as the "existence conditions."

Digression

A correspondence is continuous if it has a closed graph and is lower hemicontinuous.

Closed graph: $\{x_n\} \to x$ and $\{y_n\} \to y \implies y \in G(x)$ where

Lower hemicontinuity:

For every $\{x_n\} \to x \in X$ there is a y_n that satisfies

- 1. $y_n \in G(x_n)$
- $2. \{y_n\} \to y \in G(x)$

Assumption 3: Convexity

- ▶ *U* is strictly concave.
- ▶ G is convex (for all x, G(x) is a convex set).

Typical assumptions to ensure that **first order conditions** are sufficient.

Assumption 4: Monotonicity

- ightharpoonup U(x,y) is strictly increasing in x.
 - more capital is better
- ▶ G is monotone in the sense that $x \le x'$ implies $G(x) \subset G(x')$.

This is needed for **monotonicity** of policy function.

Assumption 5: Differentiability

ightharpoonup U is continuously **differentiable** on the interior of its domain.

So we can work with first-order conditions.

Main Result

Principle of Optimality + Equivalence of values:

A1 and A2 \implies solving P1 and solving P2 yield the same value and policy functions.

You can read about the details...

Theorem 3: Uniqueness of V

- Assumptions: A1 and A2.
- ► Then there exists a unique, continuous, bounded value function that solves P1 or P2 (they are the same).
- ► An optimal plan **x*** exists. But it may not be unique.

Theorem 4: Concavity of V

- Assumptions: A1-A3 (convexity).
- ▶ Then the value function is strictly concave.

Recall: A3 says that U is strictly concave and G(x) is convex.

So we are solving a concave / convex programming problem.

Corollary 1

- Assumptions A1-A3.
- ▶ Then there exists a **unique optimal plan** \mathbf{x}^* for all x(0).
- lt can be written as $x^*(t+1) = \pi(x^*(t))$.
- \triangleright π is continuous.

Reason: The Bellman equation is a concave optimization problem with convex choice set.

Theorem 5: Monotonicity of V

- Assumptions: A1, A2, A4.
- \triangleright Recall A4: U and G are monotone.
- ▶ *V* is strictly increasing in all arguments (states).

Theorem 6: Differentiability of V

- Assumptions A1, A2, A3, A5.
- ► A5: *U* is differentiable.
- ► Then V(x) is continuously differentiable at all interior points x' with $\pi(x') \in IntG(x')$.
- ► The derivative is given by:

$$DV(x') = D_x U(x', \pi(x'))$$
 (1)

This is an envelope condition: we can ignore the response of π when x' changes.

- ▶ How could one show that *V* is increasing? Or concave? Etc.
- ► Thinking of the Bellman equation as a functional equation helps...
- Think of the Bellman equation as mapping V on the RHS into \hat{V} on the LHS:

$$\hat{V}(x) = \max_{y \in G(x)} U(x, y) + \beta V(y)$$
 (2)

- ▶ The RHS is a function of *V*.
- ► The Bellman equation maps the space of functions *V* lives in into itself.

$$\hat{V} = T(V) \tag{3}$$

▶ The solution is the function V that is a fixed point of T:

$$V = T(V) \tag{4}$$

Notation

- ▶ If $T: X \rightarrow X$, we write:

 - 1. Tx instead of the usual T(x)2. $T(\hat{X})$ as the image of the set $\hat{X} \subset X$.

- ▶ The Bellman equation is $\hat{V} = TV$.
- Suppose we could show:
 - 1. If V is increasing, then \hat{V} is increasing.
 - 2. There is a fixed point in the set of increasing functions.
 - 3. The fixed point is unique.
- ▶ Then we would have shown that the solution *V* is increasing.
- The contraction mapping theorem allows us to make arguments like this.

Definition

Let (S,d) be a metric space and $T: S \to S$. T is a contraction mapping with modulus β , if for some $\beta \in (0,1)$,

$$d(Tz_1, Tz_2) \le \beta d(z_1, z_2), \ \forall z_1, z_2 \in S$$
 (5)

A contraction pulls points closer together.

Theorem 7: Let (S,d) be a complete metric space and let T be a contraction mapping. Then T has a unique fixed point in S.

Recall:

- 1. Cauchy sequence: For any ε , $\exists n$ such that $d(x_n, x_m) < \varepsilon$ for m > n.
- 2. Complete metric space: Every Cauchy sequence converges to a point in *S*.

A helpful result for showing properties of V:

```
Theorem 8: Let (S,d) be a complete metric space and let T: S \to S be a contraction mapping with fixed point T\hat{z} = \hat{z}.

If S' is a closed subset of S and T(S') \subset S', then \hat{z} \in S'.

If T(S') \subset S'' \subset S', then \hat{z} \in S''.
```

The point: When looking for the fixed point, one can restrict the search to sub-spaces with nice properties.

Example:

- We try to show that V is strictly concave, but the set of strictly concave functions (S) is not closed.
- ▶ If we can show that *T* maps strictly concave functions into a closed subset *S'* of *S*, then *V* must be strictly concave.

Blackwell's Sufficient Conditions

This is helpful for showing that a Bellman operator is a contraction:

Theorem 9: Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^K$, and $\mathbf{B}(X)$ be the space of bounded functions $f: X \to \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $T: \mathbf{B}(X) \to \mathbf{B}(X)$ satisfies:

- (1) monotonicity: $f(x) \le g(x)$ for all $x \in X$ implies $Tf(x) \le Tg(x)$ for all $x \in X$.
 - (2) discounting: there exists $\beta \in (0,1)$ such that

$$T[f(x)+c] \le Tf(x)+\beta c$$
 for all $f \in \mathbf{B}(X)$ and $c \ge 0$.

Then T is a contraction with modulus β .

Example: Growth Model

$$TV = \max_{k' \in [0, f(k)]} U(f(k) - k') + \beta V(k')$$
 (6)

Metric space:

- ▶ S: set of bounded functions on $(0, \infty)$.
- ightharpoonup d: sup norm: $d(f,g) = \sup |f(k) g(k)|$.

Step 1: $T: S \rightarrow S$

- need tricks if *U* is not bounded (argue that *k* is bounded along any feasible path)
- otherwise TV is the sum of bounded functions

Example: Growth Model

Step 2: Monotonicity

- Assume $W(k) \ge V(k) \forall k$.
- Let g(k) be the optimal policy for V(k).
- ► Then

$$TV(k) = U(f(k) - g(k)) + \beta V(g(k))$$
(7)

$$\leq U(f(k) - g(k)) + \beta W(g(k)) \tag{8}$$

$$\leq TW(k)$$
 (9)

Example: Growth Model

Step 3: Discounting

$$T(V+a(k)) = \max U(f(k) - k') + \beta[V(k') + a]$$

$$= V(k) + \beta a$$
(10)

Therefore: T is a contraction mapping with modulus β .

Summary: Contraction mapping theorem

Suppose you want to show that the value function is increasing.

- 1. Show that the Bellman equation is a contraction mapping using Blackwell.
- 2. Show that it maps increasing functions into increasing functions.

Done.

First order conditions

Consider again Problem P2:

$$V(x) = \max_{y \in G(x)} U(x, y) + \beta V(y), \ \forall x \in X$$

If we make assumptions that ensure:

- V is differentiable and concave.
- ▶ *U* is concave.
- ▶ *G* is convex. [A1-A5 ensure all that.]

Then the RHS is just a standard concave optimization problem.

We can take the usual FOCs to characterize the solution.

First order conditions

 \blacktriangleright For y:

$$D_{y}U(x,\pi(x)) + \beta DV(\pi(x)) = 0$$
 (12)

▶ To find DV(x) differentiate the Bellman equation:

$$DV(x) = D_x U(x, \pi(x)) + D_y U(x, \pi(x)) D\pi(x) + \beta DV(\pi(x)) D\pi(x) =$$
(13)

Apply the FOC to find the Envelope condition:

$$DV(x) = D_x U(x, \pi(x))$$
(14)
$$DV(\pi(x)) = D_x U(\pi(x), \pi(\pi(x)))$$
(15)

Sub back into the FOC:

$$D_{y}U(x,\pi(x)) + \beta D_{x}U(\pi(x),\pi(\pi(x))) = 0$$
 (16)

First order conditions

In the usual prime notation:

$$D_2U(x,x') + \beta D_1U(x',x'') = 0$$
 (17)

- Think about a feasible perturbation:
 - 1. Raise x' a little and gain $D_2U(x,x')$ today.
 - 2. Tomorrow lose the marginal value of the state x': $D_1(x',x'')$.
- Why isn't there a term as in the growth model's resource constraint: $f'(k) + 1 \delta$?
 - ▶ By writing U(x,x'), the resource constraint is built into U.
 - In the growth model: $U(k,k') = u(f(k) + (1-\delta)k k')$.
 - ► $D_1 U = u'(c) [f'(k) + 1 \delta].$

Transversality

- Even though the programming problem is concave, the first-order condition is not sufficient!
- ► A mechanical reason: it is a first-order difference equation it has infinitely many solutions.
- A boundary condition is needed.

Theorem 10: Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^K$ and assume A1-A5. Then a sequence $\{x(t+1)\}$ with $x(t+1) \in IntG(x(t))$ is optimal in P1, if it satisfies the Euler equation and the transversality condition

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \beta^t D_x U(x(t), x(t+1)) \ x(t) = 0$$
 (18)

$$\max \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^{t} \ln(c(t))$$

$$subject \ to$$

$$0 \leq k(t+1) \leq k(t)^{\alpha} - c(t)$$

$$k(0) = k_{0}$$

- Step 1: Show that A1 to A5 hold.
- ▶ Define $U(k,k') = \ln(k^{\alpha} k')$.
- A1 is obvious: G(x) is non-empty. The sum of discounted utilities is bounded for all feasible paths.
- ► A2:
 - X is compact no, but we can restrict k to a compact set w.l.o.g.
 - ▶ *G* is compact valued and continuous: check
 - *U* is continuous: check
- A3: U is strictly concave. G(x) is convex: check.
- \blacktriangleright A4: U is strictly increasing in x. G is monotone: check.
- ► A5: *U* is continuously differentiable: check

- ► Step 2: Theorems 1-6 and 10 apply.
- We can characterize the solution by first-order conditions and TVC.
- ► FOC:

$$\frac{1}{k^{\alpha} - \pi(k)} = \beta V'(\pi(k)) \tag{19}$$

► Envelope:

$$V'(k) = \frac{\alpha k^{\alpha - 1}}{k^{\alpha} - \pi(k)} \tag{20}$$

Combine:

$$\frac{1}{k^{\alpha} - \pi(k)} = \beta \frac{\alpha \pi(k)^{\alpha - 1}}{\pi(k)^{\alpha} - \pi(\pi(k))}$$
(21)

► Or

$$u'(c) = \beta f'(k') u'(c')$$
(22)

Other things we know:

- 1. *V* is continuously differentiable, bounded, unique, strictly concave.
- 2. V'(k) > 0.
- 3. The optimal policy function $c = \phi(k)$ is unique, continuous.

Reading

- ► Acemoglu, Introduction to Modern Economic Growth, ch. 6
- ► Stokey, Lucas, with Prescott, *Recursive Methods*. A book length treatment. The standard reference.
- ► Krusell, "Real Macroeconomic Theory," ch. 4.