

Econ 420  
Fall, 2022  
Li, Hao  
UBC

## LECTURE 6B. QUASI-CONCAVE PROGRAMMING

### 1. Extension of concave programming

- Consider  $\max_x F(x)$  subject to  $G(x) \leq c$ , where  $F$  is quasi-concave and  $G$  is vector quasi-convex.
  - Kuhn-Tucker conditions are both necessary and sufficient.
  - Will establish extension of concave programming in special cases only.

## 2. Special case of quasi-concave programming

- Consider  $\max_x F(x)$  subject to  $px \leq c$ , where  $F$  is quasi-concave.
  - A single linear constraint function instead of a vector of quasi-convex constraint functions.
  - Economic application: consumer demand problem.

- Kuhn-Tucker conditions for  $\bar{x}$  to be solution: there exists  $\lambda$  such that

- (i')  $F_x(\bar{x}) - \lambda p = 0$ ;

- (ii)  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $p\bar{x} \leq c$ , with complementary slackness.

- Kuhn-Tucker conditions are still necessary.
  - Necessity of (i') and (ii), with no restrictions on  $F$ , follows from general argument of no profitable arbitrage, so long as price vector  $p$  is not 0.
  - (i)  $\bar{x}$  maximizes  $F(x) - \lambda px$  without constraint.
  - Necessity of (i) and (ii) generally fails if  $F$  is quasi-concave rather than concave.

- Question is whether (i') and (ii) are sufficient.
  - (i) and (ii) are always sufficient, with no restrictions on  $F$ .
  - When  $F$  is concave, sufficiency of (i') and (ii) follows from sufficiency of (i) and (ii).
  - With  $F$  quasi-concave, we show sufficiency of (i') and (ii) directly, because (i) and (ii) are generally not necessary.

- We will establish sufficiency of (i') and (ii) for the case of  $\lambda > 0$ .
  - (ii) requires  $p\bar{x} = c$ .
  - Suffices to show that, if for some  $\bar{x}$  satisfying  $p\bar{x} = c$  there exists  $\lambda > 0$  such that  $F_x(\bar{x}) = \lambda p$ , then  $\bar{x}$  solves  $\max_x F(x)$  subject to  $px \leq c$ .

- A characterization of quasi-concave functions.
  - If  $F(\cdot)$  is quasi-concave, then for all  $x^a, x^b$ ,  $F(x^b) \geq F(x^a)$  implies  $F_x(x^a)(x^b - x^a) \geq 0$ .
  - Illustration for  $n = 2$ .
  - Proof.

- Proof of sufficiency of (i') and (ii).
  - Suppose  $F(\tilde{x}) > F(\bar{x})$ .
  - Use characterization to show that  $p\tilde{x} > c$ .