

2008

# Interior Optima and the Inada Conditions

C. D. Aliprantis  
*Purdue University*

Gabriele Camera  
*Chapman University, camera@chapman.edu*

F. Ruscitti  
*University of Parma*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/economics\\_articles](http://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/economics_articles)

 Part of the [Economics Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Aliprantis, C.D., G. Camera and F. Ruscitti (2008). Interior optima and the Inada conditions. *Economics Letters* 99(2), 293-297. doi: 10.1016/j.econlet.2007.07.008

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Economics at Chapman University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Economics Faculty Articles and Research by an authorized administrator of Chapman University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [laughtin@chapman.edu](mailto:laughtin@chapman.edu).

---

# Interior Optima and the Inada Conditions

## Comments

NOTICE: this is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in *Economics Letters*. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in *Economics Letters*, volume 99, issue 2 (2008). DOI: [10.1016/j.econlet.2007.07.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2007.07.008)

The Creative Commons license below applies only to this version of the article.

## Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

## Copyright

Elsevier

# INTERIOR OPTIMA AND THE INADA CONDITIONS★

C. D. ALIPRANTIS, G. CAMERA, AND F. RUSCITTI

† Department of Economics, Krannert School of Management, Purdue University, 403 West State Street,  
W. Lafayette, IN 47907-2056, USA

ABSTRACT. We present a new proof of the interiority of the policy function based on the Inada conditions. It is based on supporting properties of concave functions.

*JEL classification:* E00, C61

*Keywords:* growth model, Inada conditions, policy function

## 1. INTRODUCTION: A TYPICAL GROWTH MODEL

The standard formulation of a typical one-sector growth model is as follows.<sup>1</sup> There is a single commodity which is used as capital, along with labor, to produce output. In the simplest formulation, there is a representative infinitely-lived agent who supplies labor in fixed amounts. We concentrate on the associated planning problem and focus on a deterministic setting where time is discrete. In each period  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  a part  $c_t$  of the output is consumed and a part  $x_{t+1}$  is saved as capital for next period, which fully depreciates after its use. This process repeats *ad infinitum*. The quantities  $c_t$  and  $x_{t+1}$  satisfy the resource constraint

$$c_t + x_{t+1} = f(x_t),$$

where  $f: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is the production function and  $x_0$ , the initial capital stock, is given. The function  $f$  is assumed to satisfy the **Inada conditions** [5, p. 120]:

- (1)  $f$  is twice differentiable on  $(0, \infty)$ ,
- (2)  $f'(x) > 0$  and  $f''(x) < 0$  for each  $0 < x < \infty$ ,
- (3)  $f'(0) = \infty$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f'(x) = 0$ .<sup>2</sup>

---

*Date:* July 27, 2007.

★ This research is supported in part by the NSF Grants SES-0128039, DMS-0437210, and ACI-0325846. We thank Erik Balder for pointing out reference [9] to us.

<sup>1</sup> For more details see [4, Chapters 2 and 3] or [8, Chapter 5].

<sup>2</sup> As usual, we define  $f'(0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x) - f(0)}{x - 0}$ .

Replacing  $f$  by  $f - f(0)$ , we can assume without loss of generality that the production function satisfies  $f(0) = 0$  (and still satisfies the Inada conditions). Clearly, the functions  $f(x) = x^\alpha$ , where  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , are all production functions satisfying the Inada conditions. The key point is that every production function satisfying the Inada conditions is strictly increasing and strictly concave.

The following lemma will be used later.

**Lemma 1.1.** *Assume that a function  $f: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  satisfies:*

- (1)  $f(0) = 0$ ,
- (2) *is twice differentiable on  $(0, \infty)$ ,*
- (3)  $f'(x) > 0$  and  $f''(x) < 0$  for each  $0 < x < \infty$ .

*Then we have  $f'(0) = \infty$  if and only if  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} f'(x) = \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Assume first that  $f'(0) = \infty$ . Since  $f''(x) < 0$  holds for all  $x > 0$ , it follows that  $f'$  is a (strictly) decreasing function on  $(0, \infty)$ . This easily implies that  $\ell = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} f'(x)$  exists in  $(0, \infty]$ . Now for each  $x > 0$  there exists (by the Mean Value Theorem) some  $0 < c_x < x$  such that  $\frac{f(x) - f(0)}{x - 0} = f'(c_x)$ . Clearly,  $c_x \rightarrow 0^+$  as  $x \rightarrow 0^+$ , and so

$$\ell = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} f'(c_x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x) - f(0)}{x - 0} = f'(0) = \infty.$$

For the converse, assume that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} f'(x) = \infty$ . Using the L'Hôpital's classical rule appropriately (see, for instance [2, Theorem 7.9, p. 292]), we see that

$$f'(0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x) - f(0)}{x - 0} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x)}{x} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f'(x)}{(x)'} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} f'(x) = \infty,$$

and the proof is finished. ■

Any sequence  $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots)$  satisfying  $0 \leq x_{t+1} \leq f(x_t)$  for all  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  is called a feasible plan or simply a **plan**. The collection of all plans starting with  $x_0$  is denoted  $\Pi(x_0)$ . With each plan  $\mathbf{x} \in \Pi(x_0)$  we associate the consumption plan  $\mathbf{c}_\mathbf{x} = (c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots)$  defined for each  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  by

$$c_t = f(x_t) - x_{t+1}.$$

Clearly,  $0 \leq c_t \leq f(x_t)$  for each  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ .

The objective is to find a plan  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \Pi(x_0)$  that maximizes the lifetime utility function defined by

$$U(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(f(x_t) - x_{t+1}), \quad (1.1)$$

where  $0 < \beta < 1$  is a constant discount factor and  $u: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a bounded function satisfying the Inada conditions and normalized so that  $u(0) = 0$ .<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The boundedness of  $u$  together with property (2) of the Inada conditions, guarantee that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} u'(x) = 0$ . To see this, note first that since  $u'$  is a decreasing function over  $(0, \infty)$ , the limit  $\lambda = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} u'(x)$  exists in  $[0, \infty)$ .

Since  $u$  is bounded, notice that  $U$  as given by (1.1) is a well-defined function. As a matter of fact, if  $0 \leq u(x) \leq M$  holds true for all  $x \geq 0$ , then for every plan  $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, x_1, \dots) \in \Pi(x_0)$  we have  $0 \leq U(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{M}{1-\beta}$ .

Let  $X = [0, \infty)$ , define the constraint correspondence  $\Gamma: X \rightarrow X$  by  $\Gamma(x) = [0, f(x)]$ , and introduce the return function  $F: G_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by  $F(x, y) = u(f(x) - y)$ , and assumed to be bounded, continuous, and strictly concave. Here,  $G_\Gamma$  is the graph of the constraint correspondence  $\Gamma$  defined by  $G_\Gamma = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : 0 \leq y \leq f(x)\}$ , which is a convex set.

Given this notation, we have

$$U(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t F(x_t, x_{t+1}).$$

The function  $U$  may be interpreted either as a social welfare function of a central planner or as the lifetime utility function of a representative agent who owns the “backyard” production technology  $f$ . Given this, we wish to solve the following planning problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize: } U(\mathbf{x}) \\ & \text{Subject to: } \mathbf{x} \in \Pi(x_0). \end{aligned}$$

This optimization problem gives rise to a function  $v: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined for each  $x_0 \geq 0$  by

$$v(x_0) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \Pi(x_0)} U(\mathbf{x}).$$

This function  $v$  is called the value function and it has been studied extensively (e.g., see [8]). Here, we simply state two well-known properties of the value function:

- (1)  $v$  is strictly increasing, concave and continuous,<sup>4</sup> and
- (2) it satisfies the Bellman equation, i.e., for each  $x \geq 0$  we have

$$v(x) = \sup_{y \in \Gamma(x)} [F(x, y) + \beta v(y)] = \max_{0 \leq y \leq f(x)} [F(x, y) + \beta v(y)].$$

For a fixed  $x > 0$ , we consider the function  $\phi: [0, f(x)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined for each  $0 \leq y \leq f(x)$  by

$$\phi(y) = u(f(x) - y) + \beta v(y). \tag{1.2}$$

---

By virtue of the Mean Value Theorem, for each  $x > 0$  there exists some  $x < c_x < 2x$  such that  $\frac{u(2x) - u(x)}{2x - x} = u'(c_x)$ . Clearly,  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} c_x = \infty$ , and from this it follows that  $\lambda = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} u'(c_x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{u(2x) - u(x)}{x} = 0$ .

<sup>4</sup> Clearly, the concavity of  $v$  implies its continuity over  $(0, \infty)$ , the interior of  $X$ . For the point 0 notice first that  $v(0) = 0$ . Put  $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} v(x) = \ell \geq 0$  and let  $x_n \downarrow 0$ . This implies  $f(x_n) \downarrow 0$ . From  $v(x_n) \leq u(f(x_n)) + \beta v(f(x_n))$ , taking limits, we get  $\ell \leq 0 + \beta \ell$  or  $0 \leq (1 - \beta)\ell \leq 0$ . This implies  $\ell = 0$ , so that the value function  $v$  is also continuous at 0. For a different proof of the continuity of  $v$  at zero see [6, Proposition 3.1, p. 49].

Using the continuity and strict concavity of  $u$ , the continuity of  $f$ , and the concavity and continuity of  $v$ , it is not difficult to see that  $\phi$  is continuous and strictly concave. In particular, it follows that there exists a unique maximizer of  $\phi$  over the interval  $[0, f(x)]$ . We denote this unique maximizer by  $g(x)$ . This implies that a function  $g: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  can be defined via the identity

$$v(x) = u(f(x) - g(x)) + \beta v(g(x)).$$

This new function  $g: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is known as the **policy function**.

For many classes of models (including the typical growth model) it is helpful to set conditions in place so that the policy function lies in the interior of the constraint correspondence. Broadly speaking, this property ensures that the representative agent would always want to split the output into two components, consumption and savings, so the economy can grow. The reason why the Inada conditions are extensively used in the literature is that they guarantee this property holds along the equilibrium path. The available proofs of this interiority property of the policy function are, to our knowledge, based on the existence of an optimal plan (see for instance [8, Exercise 6.1, p. 134], [3, Lemma 1, p. 158] or [10]). Ideally, however, one would want to prove that the interiority property holds even if one is not given an optimal plan. We accomplish this task in the next section.

## 2. THE MAIN RESULT

In this section we demonstrate that for each  $x > 0$  the value of the policy function  $g(x)$  lies in the interior of the constraint correspondence  $\Gamma(x)$ . Our contribution is to present a proof that does not require the existence of an optimal plan. The proof uses results that, for convenience, are collected in the Appendix.

**Theorem 2.1.** *For each  $x > 0$  the value  $g(x)$  is an interior point of  $\Gamma(x)$ . That is, for each  $x > 0$  we have  $0 < g(x) < f(x)$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $x > 0$ . We establish first that  $g(x) > 0$ . To see this, assume by way of contradiction that  $g(x) = 0$ . This implies that

$$v(x) = \max_{0 \leq y \leq f(x)} [u(f(x) - y) + \beta v(y)] = u(f(x)).$$

Now consider the continuous function  $\psi: [0, f(x)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined for each  $0 \leq y \leq f(x)$  by

$$\psi(y) = u(f(x) - y) + \beta u(f(y)) = U(x, y, 0, 0, 0, \dots).$$

We claim that this function is maximized when  $y = 0$ . To see this, assume that 0 is not a maximizer of  $\psi$  over  $[0, f(x)]$ . This means that there exists some  $0 < y^* \leq f(x)$  satisfying

$$\psi(y^*) = u(f(x) - y^*) + \beta u(f(y^*)) > u(f(x)).$$

In this case, the plan  $\mathbf{x} = (x, y^*, 0, 0, 0, \dots) \in \Pi(x)$  must satisfy

$$v(x) \geq U(\mathbf{x}) = u(f(x) - y^*) + \beta u(f(y^*)) = \psi(y^*) > u(f(x)) = v(x),$$

which is impossible. This contradiction shows that 0 maximizes  $\psi$  over  $[0, f(x)]$ .

Next, notice that for each  $0 < y < f(x)$  we have

$$\psi'(y) = -u'(f(x) - y) + \beta u'(f(y))f'(y).$$

Using that both  $f$  and  $u$  satisfy the Inada conditions and  $f(0) = 0$ , we get  $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0^+} \psi'(y) = \infty$ . In particular, there is some  $0 < y_0 < f(x)$  such that  $\psi'(y) > 0$  holds for all  $0 < y \leq y_0$ . This and the continuity of  $\psi$  at 0 easily imply that  $\psi$  is strictly increasing in the interval  $[0, y_0]$ . But then 0 is not the maximizer of  $\psi$  over  $[0, f(x)]$ , a contradiction. Hence  $g(x) > 0$  must be the case.

Next, we establish that  $g(x) < f(x)$ . So, assume by way of contradiction that  $g(x) = f(x)$ . That is, for each  $0 \leq y < f(x)$  we have

$$\phi(y) < \phi(f(x)).$$

In this case, we claim that the function  $\phi$ , as defined in (1.2), is also a strictly increasing function. To see this, let  $0 \leq x_1 < x_2 < f(x)$ . Choose  $0 < \lambda < 1$  such that  $x_2 = \lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)f(x)$  and note that by the strict concavity of  $\phi$  we have

$$\phi(x_2) > \lambda \phi(x_1) + (1 - \lambda)\phi(f(x)) > \lambda \phi(x_1) + (1 - \lambda)\phi(x_1) = \phi(x_1).$$

Now pick a sequence  $\{y_n\} \subseteq (0, f(x))$  such that  $y_n \rightarrow f(x)$ . Let  $\hat{v}: [0, f(x)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denote the restriction of  $v$  to the closed interval  $[0, f(x)]$ , and also let  $G: [0, f(x)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the function defined by  $G(y) = u(f(x) - y)$ . Clearly, both  $\hat{v}$  and  $G$  are concave functions and  $\phi = G + \beta \hat{v}$ .

According to Lemma 3.3 (in the Appendix), the superdifferential of  $\phi$  is nonempty at each  $y_n$ . If  $\tau_n \in \partial\phi(y_n)$ , then by Theorem 3.6, there exist  $t_n \in \partial G(y_n)$  and  $s_n \in \partial\hat{v}(y_n)$  such that

$$\tau_n = t_n + \beta s_n. \tag{2.1}$$

Because  $\phi$  is increasing, we obtain that  $\tau_n \geq 0$  (see Part 2 of Lemma 3.2). Since  $y_n$  is an interior point of  $[0, f(x)]$ , it follows that  $t_n$  is the derivative of  $G$  at  $y_n$ . That is, we have  $t_n = -u'(f(x) - y_n)$ , and from (2.1) we get

$$u'(f(x) - y_n) \leq \beta s_n. \tag{2.2}$$

Now consider the value function  $v: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and notice that  $s_n$  is a supergradient of  $v$  at  $y_n$  when restricted to  $[0, f(x)]$ . Since  $y_n$  is an interior point of  $[0, f(x)]$ , it follows from Lemma 3.4 that  $s_n$  is a supergradient of  $v$  over  $[0, \infty)$ , i.e.,  $s_n \in \partial v(y_n)$ . Also, since  $f(x)$  is an interior point of  $[0, \infty)$ , it follows from Theorem 3.5 that the supergradient correspondence  $x \mapsto \partial v(x)$  is upper hemicontinuous at  $f(x)$ . Taking into account that  $\partial v(f(x))$  is a compact set (see Lemma 3.3) and  $y_n \rightarrow f(x)$ , we infer (see [1, Theorem 17.20, p. 565]) that  $\{s_n\}$  has a subsequence that

converges to some point in  $\partial v(f(x))$ . By relabeling, we can assume without loss of generality that  $s_n \rightarrow s \in \partial v(f(x))$ .

Now using the Inada conditions, Lemma 1.1 and (2.2), we see that

$$\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u'(f(x) - y_n) \leq \beta \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n = \beta s \in \mathbb{R},$$

which is impossible. This contradiction establishes that  $g(x) < f(x)$  is also true. ■

### 3. APPENDIX: CONCAVE FUNCTIONS

In this section we discuss a few basic properties of concave functions that are used in this note. Recall that a function  $f: C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $C$  is a nonempty convex subset of a vector space, is said to be **concave** if for each  $x, y \in C$  and each  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$  we have

$$f(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) \geq \alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y).$$

A function  $f: C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called **strictly concave** if  $x, y \in C$  with  $x \neq y$  and  $0 < \alpha < 1$  imply  $f(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) > \alpha f(x) + (1 - \alpha)f(y)$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *For a concave function  $f: C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we have the following.*

- (1) *The (possibly empty) set of maximizers of  $f$  is a convex set.*
- (2) *If  $f$  is also strictly concave, then the (possibly empty) set of maximizers of  $f$  is at most a singleton.*

Next we discuss some basic supporting properties of concave functions. Let  $f: D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function, where  $D$  is a subset of a vector space  $X$ . Let  $X^*$  denote the algebraic dual of  $X$ , i.e., the vector space of all linear functionals on  $X$ . We say that a linear functional  $x^* \in X^*$  is a **supergradient** of the function at a point  $c \in D$ , if for all  $x \in D$  we have

$$f(x) \leq f(c) + x^*(x - c).$$

The collection of all supergradients linear functionals of  $f$  at  $c$  is denoted  $\partial f(c)$  and is called the **superdifferential** of  $f$  at  $c$ . That is,

$$\partial f(c) = \{x^* \in X^*: f(x) \leq f(c) + x^*(x - c) \text{ for all } x \in D\}.$$

It is easy to see that when the function is differentiable at an interior point  $c$  of some subset of a Euclidean space, then the only possible supergradient of  $f$  at  $c$  is the gradient of  $f$  at  $c$ . If  $f$  is defined on a subset of the real numbers, then the superdifferential of  $f$  consists of real numbers; this can be thought of as capturing the notion of derivative.

The proof of the next lemma is straightforward and is omitted.

**Lemma 3.2.** *For a function  $f: D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $D$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , we have the following.*



- (1) If  $c \in D$  and  $\alpha > 0$ , then  $\partial[\alpha f](c) = \alpha[\partial f(c)]$ .
- (2) If  $f$  is a non-decreasing (resp. non-increasing) function, then at point  $c$  in the interior of  $D$  we have  $\partial f(c) \subseteq [0, \infty)$  (resp.  $\partial f(c) \subseteq (-\infty, 0]$ ).

For the proof of the following result see [1, Theorem 7.22, p. 272].

**Lemma 3.3.** *For a concave function  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined on an interval of  $\mathbb{R}$  we have the following.*

- (1) *The left- and right-derivatives  $f_\ell$  and  $f_r$  of  $f$  exist at each interior point of  $I$ .*
- (2) *Both functions  $f_r$  and  $f_\ell$  (defined on the interior of  $I$ ) are decreasing functions.*
- (3) *If  $a, b$  are in the interior of  $I$  and satisfy  $a < b$ , then*

$$f_\ell(a) \geq f_r(a) \geq f_\ell(b) \geq f_r(b).$$

*Moreover, at each interior point  $c$  of  $I$  the superdifferential of  $f$  at  $c$  is nonempty and*

$$\partial f(c) = [f_r(c), f_\ell(c)].$$

*In particular, if  $f$  is differentiable at an interior point  $c$  of  $I$ , then  $\partial f(c) = \{f'(c)\}$ .*

For concave functions, local supportability implies global supportability.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a concave function, where  $I$  is an interval of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Assume that at some interior point  $c$  of  $I$  there is a neighborhood  $V$  of  $c$  such that the real number  $m$  is a supergradient of  $f$  at  $c$  for the restriction of  $f$  to  $V$ . Then,  $m$  is a supergradient of  $f$  at  $c$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $c \in V = (a, b) \subseteq I$  and assume that for each  $x \in (a, b)$  we have

$$f(x) \leq f(c) + m(x - c).$$

It follows that  $m_r \leq m \leq m_\ell$ , where  $m_r = f_r(c)$  and  $m_\ell = f_\ell(c)$ . In particular, for  $x \in I$  with  $x \geq c$  we have

$$f(x) \leq f(c) + m_r(x - c) \leq f(c) + m(x - c).$$

Similarly, for  $x \in I$  with  $x < c$  we have

$$f(x) \leq f(c) + m_\ell(x - c) \leq f(c) + m(x - c).$$

From the above conclusions, we easily infer that  $m \in \partial f(c)$ . ■

The superdifferential correspondence is upper hemicontinuous.

**Theorem 3.5.** *If  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a concave function, where  $I$  is an interval of  $\mathbb{R}$ , then the superdifferential correspondence  $\partial f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is upper hemicontinuous at every interior point of  $I$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $c$  be an interior point of  $I$ . Now assume that a sequence  $\{x_n\}$  of  $I$  satisfies  $x_n \rightarrow c$  and a sequence  $\{m_n\}$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $m_n \in \partial f(x_n)$  for each  $n$ . We must show that the sequence  $\{m_n\}$  has a subsequence that converges to some point of  $\partial f(c)$ ; see [1, Theorem 17.20, p. 565].

Since  $c$  is an interior point of  $I$ , we can assume without loss of generality that there exist two points  $s, t \in I$  and some  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $s + \epsilon \leq x_n \leq t - \epsilon$  holds true for all  $n$ . From  $m_n \in \partial f(x_n)$  we get

$$f(x) \leq f(x_n) + m_n(x - x_n) \quad (3.1)$$

for all  $x \in I$ . In particular, letting  $x = s$  and  $x = t$  consecutively, it follows from (3.1) that

$$\frac{f(t) - f(x_n)}{t - x_n} \leq m_n \leq \frac{f(s) - f(x_n)}{s - x_n} \quad (3.2)$$

holds for each  $n$ . Now recalling that (since  $c$  is an interior point of  $I$ ) the function  $f$  is continuous at  $c$ , we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(x_n) = f(c)$  and so

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(s) - f(x_n)}{s - x_n} = \frac{f(s) - f(c)}{s - c} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(t) - f(x_n)}{t - x_n} = \frac{f(t) - f(c)}{t - c}.$$

In particular, it follows that the two sequences  $\{\frac{f(s) - f(x_n)}{s - x_n}\}$  and  $\{\frac{f(t) - f(x_n)}{t - x_n}\}$  are bounded. But then, a glance at (3.2) shows that the sequence  $\{m_n\}$  is bounded and so it has a convergent subsequence. By passing to a subsequence and relabeling, we can assume without loss of generality  $m_n \rightarrow m$ . Now letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (3.1) we get  $f(x) \leq f(c) + m(x - c)$  for all  $x \in I$ . This shows that  $m \in \partial f(c)$ , and the proof is finished. ■

For a proof of the next result see [7, Theorem 23.8, p. 223] or [9, Theorem 5.38, p. 77].

**Theorem 3.6** (Moreau–Rockafellar). *If  $I$  is a non-trivial interval of  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $f, g: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are two concave functions, then for each  $c \in I$  and all  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$  we have*

$$[\partial(\alpha f + \beta g)](c) = \alpha[\partial f(c)] + \beta[\partial g(c)].$$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] C. D. Aliprantis and K. C. Border, *Infinite Dimensional Analysis*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Springer–Verlag, New York & London, 2006.
- [2] T. M. Apostol, *Calculus*, Vol. I, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Blaisdel, Waltham, MA, 1967.
- [3] R. A. Becker and J. H. Boyd III, *Capital Theory, Equilibrium Analysis and Recursive Utility*, Blackwell Publishers, Malden, MA, 1997.
- [4] M. Harris, *Dynamic Economic Analysis*, Oxford University Press, London and New York, 1987.
- [5] K.-I. Inada, On a two-sector model of economic growth: comments and a generalization, *The Review of Economic Studies* **30** (1963), 119–127.

- [6] M. Majumdar, T. Mitra, and K. Nishimura, Eds., *Optimization and Chaos*, Studies in Economic Theory, Vol. 11, Springer-Verlag, Berlin & Heidelberg, 2000.
- [7] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1970.
- [8] N. Stokey, R. E. Lucas, Jr., and E. C. Prescott, *Recursive Methods in Economic Dynamics*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1989.
- [9] J. van Tiel, *Convex Analysis: An Introductory Text*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1984.
- [10] I. Zilcha and M. Majumdar, Optimal growth in a stochastic environment: some sensitivity and turnpike results, *Journal of Economic Theory* **43** (1987), 116–133.