

# Math Final Wei Te

## Question #1

**Question 2.** Consider the following maximization problem:

Maximize  $f(x, y) = xy$

subject to  $x + y^2 \leq 2$ ,  $x \geq 0$ ,  $y \geq 0$ .

A.) Formulate the Lagrangian.

B.) Write out the Kuhn-Tucker conditions (marginal, complementary slackness, and non-negativity conditions).

C.) Find the maximizer for this problem.

A) For Lagrangian: we set up a Lagrangian Eqn:

$$\mathcal{L} = xy + \lambda(2 - x - y^2)$$

B) For Kuhn-Tucker Conditions:

<u>Marginal condition</u>	<u>Complementary slackness</u>	<u>Non-negativity</u>
$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} = y - \lambda \leq 0$	$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x} \cdot x = 0 \Rightarrow x(y - \lambda) = 0$ ①	$x \geq 0$
$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial y} = x - 2\lambda y \leq 0$	$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial y} \cdot y = 0 \Rightarrow y(x - 2\lambda y) = 0$ ②	$y \geq 0$
$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda} = 2 - x - y^2 \geq 0$	$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda} \cdot \lambda = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda(2 - x - y^2) = 0$ ③	$\lambda \geq 0$

C) i) if  $x=0$  then from ①,  $xy=0$

Thus,  $x=0$ , or,  $y=0$ , or both  $x$  and  $y=0$

a) if  $x=0$ ,  $y \neq 0$

$$f(x, y) = 0, y=0$$

b) if  $y=0$ ,  $x \neq 0$

$$f(x, y) = 0$$

c) if  $x=0$ ,  $y=0$

$$f(x, y) = 0$$

ii) if  $\lambda \neq 0$ , from ③,  $2 - x - y^2 = 0$

a.) if  $x = 0$ ,  $\Rightarrow y = \pm\sqrt{2}$  as  $y > 0 \Rightarrow y = \sqrt{2}$

$$f(x, y) = 0 \cdot \sqrt{2} = 0$$

b.) if  $y = 0$ ,  $\Rightarrow x = 2$ ,

$$f(x, y) = 0$$

c.) if  $x \neq 0$ , and  $y \neq 0$

$$\text{by ①, } x \neq 0 \Rightarrow y = x \quad \text{④}$$

$$\text{by ②, } y \neq 0 \Rightarrow x = 2\lambda y \quad \text{⑤}$$

plug ④ into ⑤

$$x = 2y^2 \quad \text{⑥}$$

plug ⑥ into  $2 - x - y^2 = 0$

$$\Rightarrow 2 - 2y^2 - y^2 = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow y^2 = \frac{2}{3}$$

$$y = \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3}$$

[  $y = -\frac{\sqrt{6}}{3}$  is eliminated by non negativity ]

$$\Rightarrow x = 2y^2 = 2 \cdot \frac{2}{3} = \frac{4}{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Rightarrow f(x, y) &= x y \\ &= \frac{4}{3} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3} \\ &= \frac{4\sqrt{6}}{9}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, based on the analysis above,

at  $(\frac{4}{3}, \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3})$ ,  $f(x, y)$  can obtain the maximum, which is  $\frac{4\sqrt{6}}{9}$ .

## Question #2

**Question 3.** Consider the following stochastic version of the optimal growth problem. The social planner seeks to

$$\text{Maximize } E_t \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \beta^i U(c_{t+i}), \text{ where } 0 < \beta < 1, \quad (1)$$

subject to the capital accumulation constraint,

$$k_{t+1} = (1-\delta)k_t + y_{t+1} - c_{t+1}, \text{ where } 0 \leq \delta \leq 1. \quad (2)$$

The production function is  $y_{t+1} = F(A_{t+1}, k_{t+1})$  where  $\ln A_{t+1}$  is i.i.d.  $N(0, \sigma^2)$ . The initial capital stock,  $k_t$ , is given. The appropriate side conditions apply but need not be discussed in your answer to this question. All variables have their usual definition.

Derive the Euler equation using the method discussed in class. (Do not use Lagrange methods.) Be careful to write out Bellman's equation and explain the value function. Also, be explicit about how the Envelope Theorem is used in the derivation of the Euler equation.

Since the social planner wants to maximize total utility,

$$\Rightarrow \max_{\{c_t\}_{t=0}^{\infty}} E_t \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \beta^i U(c_{t+i})$$

$$\text{s.t. } k_{t+1} = (1-\delta)k_t + y_{t+1} - c_{t+1}$$

Since  $y_{t+1}$  is a function of  $A_t$  and  $k_t$ .

in this question:

The state variable is  $k_t$ , b/c from the constraint eqn,

$$k_t = (1-\delta)k_{t-1} + F(A_{t-1}, k_{t-1}) - c_{t-1}$$

So it's predetermined before  $t$ . Actually,  $A_t$  can also be state var, b/c  $A_t$  is exogenous, but  $\ln A_t$  is i.i.d.

So, it's convenient to only consider  $k_t$  as our state variable.

the control variable is  $c_t$

As for the transition equation, it's

$$k_{t+1} = (1-\delta)k_t + F(A_t, k_t) - c_t$$

i.e., Current period's capital, tech, and consumption can determine

next period's Capital.

Now, it's time to write down our Bellman Eqn:

Assume the value function in Bellman Eqn is  $V(k_t)$ ,  
i.e., Max attainable value of PDU of utility given the info at current period.

So:

$$V(k_t) = \max_{C_t} E_t \left\{ u(C_t) + \beta V(k_{t+1}) \right\} \quad (1)$$

$$k_{t+1} = (1-\delta)k_t + F(A_t, k_t) - C_t \quad (2)$$

Thus (1) can be written as:

$$V(k_t) = \max_{C_t} E_t \left\{ u(C_t) + \beta V[(1-\delta)k_t + F(A_t, k_t) - C_t] \right\} \quad (3)$$

We take the first order derivative of (3) w/ respect to our control variable  $C_t$ .

$$E_t \left[ u'(C_t) + \beta V_k(k_{t+1}) (-1) \right] = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow u'(C_t) = E_t \left[ \beta V_k(k_{t+1}) \right] \quad (4)$$

On our next step, we need to use Envelope Theorem:

Before stepping into Envelope Theorem, first elaborate about Envelope Theorem.

① If we want to evaluate  $V_k(k_t)$ , the value of  $C_t$  on the RHS of our Bellman Eqn, in order to maximize  $C_t$ ,

taken  $k_t$  as given

$$C_t^* = C^*(k_t)$$

By Envelope Theorem in ③

$$V_k(k_t) = E_t \left[ \underbrace{\frac{\partial u(C_t)}{\partial C_t} \frac{\partial C_t^*}{\partial k_t}}_{\text{part A}} + \underbrace{\beta V_k(k_{t+1}) \frac{\partial k_{t+1}}{\partial C_t} \frac{\partial C_t^*}{\partial k_t}}_{\text{part B}} + \underbrace{\beta V_k(k_{t+1}) \frac{\partial k_{t+1}}{\partial k_t}}_{\text{part B}} \Big|_{\text{keep } C_t \text{ is fixed}} \right] \quad \textcircled{5}$$

Part A:

$$E_t \left[ \frac{\partial C_t^*}{\partial k_t} \left[ u'(C_t) + \beta V_k(k_{t+1}) \cdot (-1) \right] \right]$$

By ④ = 0

So part A = 0

Part B:

can be derived as

$$E_t \left[ \beta V_k(k_{t+1}) [(1-\delta) + F_A(A_t, k_t) \frac{\partial A_t}{\partial k_t}] + F_k(A_t, k_t) \frac{\partial k_t}{\partial k_t} + 0 \right] = 0 \text{ as } A_t \text{ is ind.}$$

$$= E_t \left[ \beta V_K(k_{t+1}) (1-\delta + F_K(A_t, k_t)) \right] \quad (6)$$

plug (6) into (5)

$$V_K(k_t) = \beta E_t \left[ V_K(k_{t+1}) (1-\delta + F_K(A_t, k_t)) \right] \quad (7)$$

By (4),

(7) becomes

$$V_K(k_t) = U'(G_t) \left[ (1-\delta) + F_K(A_t, k_t) \right] \quad (8)$$

$$\Rightarrow V_K(k_{t+1}) = U'(G_{t+1}) \left[ (1-\delta) + F_K(A_{t+1}, k_{t+1}) \right] \quad (9)$$

plug ⑤, ⑥ into ⑦

$$u'(C_t) [1 - \delta + F_K(A_t, K_t)] = \beta E_t [u'(C_{t+1}) [1 - \delta + F_K(A_{t+1}, K_{t+1})]]$$

$$\Rightarrow u'(C_t) = \beta E_t [u'(C_{t+1}) (1 - \delta + F_K(A_{t+1}, K_{t+1}))]$$

⑩

Thus ⑩ is the intertemporal Euler Eqn.



### Question #3 :

#### Question 4.

A.) Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^1$ . Prove the following two inequalities:

$$|x+y| \leq |x|+|y| \quad (1)$$

$$||x|-|y|| \leq |x-y| \quad (2)$$

B.) Given the two inequalities proven in Part A, prove the following proposition:

Proposition 1: Every Cauchy Sequence in  $\mathbb{R}^1$  is bounded.

C.) Prove the following Proposition.

Proposition 2: A sequence of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^M$  converges if all  $M$  sequences of its components converge in  $\mathbb{R}^1$

proof: [ Note: st in this problem represents such that ]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{A(1): } |x+y|^2 &= (x+y)^2 \\ &= x^2 + 2xy + y^2 \\ &= |x|^2 + 2xy + |y|^2 \\ &\leq |x|^2 + 2|x||y| + |y|^2 \\ &\leq (|x|+|y|)^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow |x+y| \leq |x|+|y| \quad \square$$

A(2):

$$\textcircled{1} \text{ if } |x| \geq |y|$$

$$\Rightarrow ||x|-|y|| = |x|-|y|$$

$\Rightarrow$  we need to prove:

$$\underline{|x|-|y| \leq |x-y|}$$

B/c

$$|x| = |x+y-y| = |x-y+y| \leq |x-y|+|y|$$

$$\Rightarrow |x| \leq |x-y|+|y|$$

$$\Rightarrow |x|-|y| \leq |x-y|$$

③ if  $|x| < |y|$ .

$$\Rightarrow |x| - |y| = |y| - |x|$$

$$|y| = |y + x - x| = |y - x + x| \leq |y - x| + |x|$$

$$\Rightarrow |y| - |x| \leq |y - x|$$

$$\text{As } |y - x| = |x - y|$$

$$\Rightarrow |y| - |x| \leq |x - y|$$

Combined w/ ① and ②,

we can get.

$$||x| - |y|| \leq |x - y|$$

□

B) Prove Every Cauchy seq in  $\mathbb{R}^1$  is bdd:

proof: We first define a Cauchy seq  $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^1$ .

Take some sequence in  $x_n$ , denote  $x_1$ , and  $x_j$ , as  $x_j$ ,  $x_i \in$  Cauchy Seq.

thus,  $\exists$  an integer  $N$ , st  $|x_i - x_j| \leq \varepsilon$  for  $i, j \geq N$ , and

$\varepsilon$  is small enough, but  $\varepsilon > 0$ . In this seq, we can also get  $x_N$

st  $|x_i - x_N| \leq \varepsilon$ , then by (2) [Here, we take  $x_i$  as an example, but it can be any seq, iff  $i \geq N$ ]

$$|x_i| - |x_N| \leq |x_i - x_N| \leq \varepsilon$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow |x_i| &\leq |x_N| + |x_i - x_N| = |x_N| + |x_N - x_i| \\ &\leq |x_N| + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Because  $|x_N|t_\varepsilon$  is bdd for the firs  $(N-1)$  terms of the sequences,

thus, we can take a value  $k$ , s.t.

$$k = \max\{|x_1|, |x_2|, \dots, |x_{N-1}|, |x_N|\}$$

$$\Rightarrow |x_i| \leq k t_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \text{it's bdd.} \Rightarrow \text{Every Cauchy seq in } \mathbb{R}^1 \text{ is bdd.} \quad \square$$

C)

C.) Prove the following Proposition.  
Proposition 2: A sequence of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^M$  converges if all  $M$  sequences of its components converge in  $\mathbb{R}^1$

Denote a seq  $\{x_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  in  $\mathbb{R}^M$ .

And denote the components of  $\{x_m\}$  as

$$x_m = \{x_{1m}, x_{2m}, \dots, x_{mm}\}$$

If we assume all the  $\{x_{im}\}_{m=1}^\infty$  converges in  $\mathbb{R}^1$  to limit  $x_i^*$

i.e.,  $x_{1m}$  converges to  $x_1^*$ ,  $x_{2m}$  to  $x_2^*$ , ....

$$x^* = \{x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_M^*\}$$

For each in  $\{x_{im}\}_{i=1}^M$ ,  $\exists |x_{im} - x_i^*| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{M}$ .

when  $m > N_i$ ,  $N_i$  is large enough and  $\varepsilon$  is small enough

but  $\varepsilon > 0$

If we pick a number  $N$ , s.t.  $N = \max\{N_1, \dots, N_M\}$

then if  $m > N$ ,  $\exists$

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_m - x^*\| &= \sqrt{(x_{1m} - x_1^*)^2 + (x_{2m} - x_2^*)^2 + \dots + (x_{(m-1)m} - x_{(m-1)}^*)^2 + (x_{mm} - x_m^*)^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon^2}{M} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{M} + \dots + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{M} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{M}} \\ &= \sqrt{\varepsilon^2} = \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow \|x_m - x^*\| \leq \varepsilon$$

$\Rightarrow$  A seq of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^M$  converges.