

Proof of Lemma 1. The result follows since Q is i) nonempty, ii) bounded above, and iii) closed.

i) Choose any $\bar{K} > 0$. If $s(t) = F(\bar{K}, t, \alpha)/2$, for $t = 1, \dots, T$, then $p(t) > 0$, for all $t = 0, \dots, T$, and, whereas $y(0) < 0$, $y(t) > 0$, for $t = 1, \dots, T$. If $r \in (-\infty, \infty)$ is sufficiently small, it follows

that $\sum_{t=0}^T p(t)y(t)e^{-rt} \geq 0$, so that $r \in Q$.

ii) The assumptions on C and F in the first two paragraphs of ‘The Set Up’ imply that there exist constants $B > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that $C(K) \geq BK + C$, for all $K \geq 0$, and a function $A(t) > 0$ such that $F(K, t, \alpha) \leq A(t)K$ for all $K \geq 0$, $\alpha \in A$, and $t = 1, \dots, T$. Consider any $r \in Q$, so that

$\sum_{t=0}^T p(t)y(t)e^{-rt} \geq 0$, for some $(p, y) = (p(s), y(K, s)) \in M$. Since $p(t) \leq 1$ and

$y(t) = F(K, t, \alpha) - s(t) \leq A(t)K$, for $t = 1, \dots, T$, it follows that $K \left(-B + \sum_{t=1}^T A(t)e^{-rt} \right) - C \geq 0$.

Hence $r < \bar{r}$ where \bar{r} is the unique solution of $-B + \sum_{t=1}^T A(t)e^{-\bar{r}t} = 0$, and \bar{r} is an upper bound for Q , as required.

iii) Consider any sequence $r_n \rightarrow \bar{r}$ where $r_n \in Q$ for all n . It must be shown that $\bar{r} \in Q$.

Suppose the sequences K_n and s_n generate r_n . Take N such that $n > N$ implies $r_n \geq \bar{r} - \Delta$, for

any fixed $\Delta > 0$. Since $-C(K_n) + \sum_{t=1}^T F(K_n, t, \alpha)e^{-(\bar{r}-\Delta)t} \geq 0$, there can be no subsequence of

$K_n \rightarrow \infty$, given the conditions on C and F . Hence there is a convergent subsequence of

$K_n \rightarrow \bar{K} \in [0, \infty)$, say. Now define N such that $n > N$ implies $r_n \in (\bar{r} - \Delta, \bar{r} + \Delta)$ and

$K_n \in (\bar{K} - \Delta, \bar{K} + \Delta)$, for some $\Delta > 0$. Since

$-B(\bar{K} - \Delta) - C + \sum_{t=1}^T (A(t)(\bar{K} + \Delta)e^{-(\bar{r}-\Delta)t} - s_n(t)e^{-(\bar{r}+\Delta)t}) \geq 0$, there can be no subsequence of the

$s_n(t) \rightarrow \infty$, for any $t = 1, \dots, T$. Hence there is a convergent subsequence $s_n \rightarrow \bar{s} \in [0, \infty)^T$, say.

It follows from continuity of the functions $p(s)$ and $y(K, s)$ that \bar{K} and \bar{s} generate \bar{r} , so that $\bar{r} \in Q$, as required.

Proof of Lemma 2. Consider backwards induction on t for the results in the first sentence. These results clearly hold at $t = T$. Suppose then, as the induction hypothesis, that they hold at $t + 1$. It follows that $V(K, t, \alpha) \geq 0$ is continuous in $K \geq 0$, since $V(K, t + 1, \alpha) \geq 0$ and $F(K, t, \alpha) \geq 0$ are continuous, and $V(K, t, \alpha) = \max_{s(t)} \{F(K, t, \alpha) - s(t) + e^{-r} \sigma(s(t))V(K, t + 1, \alpha)\}$. Indeed, the implicit function theorem implies the optimal $s(t)$ satisfying $\sigma'(s(t))V(K, t + 1, \alpha)e^{-r} = 1$ is a continuously differentiable function of $K > 0$, for any $\alpha \in A$. Using the ‘envelope theorem,’ it follows that $V_K(K, t, \alpha) = F_K(K, t, \alpha) + e^{-r} \sigma(s(t))V_K(K, t + 1, \alpha)$, $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$. That is, although $s(t)$ is a function of K , this does not affect this expression because $s(t)$ is chosen optimally. Clearly, $V_K(K, t, \alpha) > 0$ since $F_K(K, t, \alpha) > 0$ and $V_K(K, t + 1, \alpha) > 0$. Further, $V_K(K, t, \alpha)$ can be differentiated to yield $V_{KK}(K, t, \alpha)$ as a continuous function of $K > 0$, completing the induction argument.

Consider now choice of K to maximize $\bar{p}V(K, 1, \alpha)e^{-r} - C(K)$. The assumptions on F and C imply that $\bar{p}V_K(K, 1, \alpha)e^{-r} - C'(K) > 0$, for all small enough $K > 0$, and that $\bar{p}V_K(K, 1, \alpha)e^{-r} - C'(K) < 0$ for all large enough K . Hence there must exist an optimal $K > 0$ satisfying the first-order and second-order necessary conditions as stated.

Proof of Proposition 2. The dependence of variables on r is noted. For any $K > 0$, the envelope theorem implies $V_r(K, t, \alpha, r) = -e^{-r} \sigma(s(t))V(K, t + 1, \alpha, r) + e^{-r} \sigma(s(t))V_r(K, t + 1, \alpha, r)$, $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$. Since $V_r(K, T, \alpha, r) = 0$, it follows that $V_r(K, t, \alpha, r) < 0$, for $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$. Given $\bar{p}V(K^*(r^*), 1, \alpha, r^*)e^{-r^*} = C(K^*(r^*))$ and $\bar{p}V_K(K^*(r), 1, \alpha, r)e^{-r} = C'(K^*(r))$, it follows that $\frac{d}{dr}(\bar{p}V(K^*(r), 1, \alpha, r)e^{-r} - C(K^*(r))) = \bar{p}V_r(K^*(r), 1, \alpha, r) < 0$, so that $\bar{p}V(K^*(r), 1, \alpha, r)e^{-r} < C(K^*(r))$, for all $r > r^*$. That is, $L(r^*, p^*, y^*) = 0$, so that the growth rate r^* is feasible, but $\max_{p, y} L(r, p, y) < 0$, for all $r > r^*$, so no growth rate strictly greater than r^* is feasible.

Proof of Lemma 3. The optimal K^* and s^* solve the following problem

$$\max_{K, s(1), \dots, s(T-1)} \left[-C(K) + \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{p} \left(\prod_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \sigma(s(\tau)) \right) (F(K, t, \alpha) - s(t)) e^{-r^* t} \right].$$

The dynamic programming approach in Lemma 2 can be extended to prove that such $K^* > 0$ and $s^* > 0$ are continuously differentiable functions of r^* and α . Since, in addition,

$$\left[-C(K^*) + \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{p} \left(\prod_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \sigma(s^*(\tau)) \right) (F(K^*, t, \alpha) - s^*(t)) e^{-r^* t} \right] = 0,$$

the implicit function theorem then implies that the maximum growth rate, $r^*(\alpha)$, say, is a continuously differentiable function of $\alpha \in A$. However, as another example of the envelope theorem, the derivatives of K^* and s^*

play no direct role here. That is,
$$\frac{dr^*(\bar{\alpha})}{d\alpha} = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T p^*(t) F_{\alpha}(K^*, 1, \bar{\alpha})}{\sum_{t=1}^T t p^*(t) (F(K^*, t, \bar{\alpha}) - s^*(t))} = 0,$$
 as required,

given also that
$$\sum_{t=1}^T t p^*(t) (F(K^*, t, \bar{\alpha}) - s^*(t)) = \sum_{t=1}^T p^*(t) V(K^*, t, \bar{\alpha}) > 0,$$
 by Lemma 2.

Proof of Theorem 1. Note that $r^*(\bar{\alpha}) = 0$ and $\frac{dr^*(\bar{\alpha})}{d\alpha} = 0$ throughout. Consider first:

Lemma A. (i) $V_{\alpha}(K, t, \bar{\alpha}) > 0$, for all $K > 0$, and $t = 2, \dots, T$. (ii) $V_{K\alpha}(K, 1, \bar{\alpha}) > 0$, for all $K > 0$.

Proof of Lemma A. (i) By the envelope theorem,

$$V_{\alpha}(K, t, \bar{\alpha}) = F_{\alpha}(K, t, \bar{\alpha}) + \sigma(s(t)) V_{\alpha}(K, t+1, \bar{\alpha}),$$

for all $K > 0$, $t = 1, \dots, T-1$. Recall that $F_{\alpha}(K, t, \bar{\alpha}) < 0$, for all $t < \bar{t}$, but $F_{\alpha}(K, t, \bar{\alpha}) > 0$, for all $t \geq \bar{t}$. Hence backwards recursion from T implies that $V_{\alpha}(K, t, \bar{\alpha}) > 0$, for $t = \bar{t}, \dots, T$. Moreover, if $V_{\alpha}(K, t, \bar{\alpha}) \leq 0$, for some $t < \bar{t}$,

then $V_{\alpha}(K, t-1, \bar{\alpha}) < 0$. But, since $V_{\alpha}(K, 1, \bar{\alpha}) = \sum_{t=1}^T p^*(t) F_{\alpha}(K, t, \bar{\alpha}) / \bar{p} = 0$, it must then be that

$$V_{\alpha}(K, t, \bar{\alpha}) > 0, \text{ for any } K > 0, \text{ and } t = 2, \dots, T.$$

(ii) Differentiating $\sigma'(s(t)) V(K, t+1, \alpha) e^{-r^*} = 1$ with respect to α , at $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}$, holding

$K > 0$ constant, yields $\frac{\partial s(t)}{\partial \alpha} = -\frac{\sigma'(s(t))V_\alpha(K, t+1, \bar{\alpha})}{\sigma''(s(t))V(K, t+1, \bar{\alpha})} > 0$, for $t = 1, \dots, T-1$. The envelope

theorem implies that $V_K(K, 1, \alpha) = \sum_{t=1}^T e^{-r^*(t-1)} \sigma(s(1)) \dots \sigma(s(t-1)) F_K(K, t, \alpha) > 0$, for all $K \geq 0$.

Since $F_{K\alpha}(K, t, \alpha) \geq 0$, differentiation of $V_K(K, 1, \alpha)$ with respect to α , at $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}$, with $K > 0$ constant, then yields $V_{K\alpha}(K, 1, \bar{\alpha}) > 0$.

Now Lemmas 2 and A imply the results of Theorem 1:

(I) Since $\bar{p}V_{KK}(K^*, 1, \alpha) - C''(K^*) < 0$, it follows from differentiating

$\bar{p}V_K(K^*, 1, \alpha)e^{-r^*} = C'(K^*)$ with respect to α , at $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}$, that

$$\frac{dK^*}{d\alpha} = \frac{\bar{p}V_{K\alpha}(K^*, 1, \bar{\alpha})}{C''(K^*) - \bar{p}V_{KK}(K^*, 1, \bar{\alpha})} > 0.$$

(II) Differentiating $\sigma'(s^*(t))V(K^*, t+1, \alpha)e^{-r^*} = 1$ with respect to α , at $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}$, where K

can vary, finally yields $\frac{ds^*(t)}{d\alpha} = -\frac{\sigma'(s^*(t)) \left[V_\alpha(K^*, t+1, \bar{\alpha}) + V_K(K^*, t+1, \bar{\alpha}) \frac{dK^*}{d\alpha} \right]}{\sigma''(s^*(t))V(K^*, t+1, \bar{\alpha})} > 0$, for

$t = 1, \dots, T-1$.