

---

## AN UNBOUNDED BERGE'S MINIMUM THEOREM WITH APPLICATIONS TO DISCOUNTED MARKOV DECISION PROCESSES

RAÚL MONTES - DE - OCA AND ENRIQUE LEMUS - RODRIGO - LESSIEUZ\*

This paper deals with a certain class of unbounded optimization problems. The optimization problems taken into account depend on a parameter  $t$ . Firstly, there is an established condition which permits to guarantee the continuity of the value function  $v_t(x)$  at  $x = 0$  for all  $t > 0$ . This condition is called the minimality condition. It applies to optimization problems under consideration, and it is a sufficient condition for the existence of a unique optimal solution. Some examples of nonconvex optimization problems that satisfy the conditions of the article are given. The theory developed is applied to discounted Markov decision processes. With possibly noncompact action sets in order to obtain a unique optimal policy. The paper is illustrated with two examples of how to control a random walk. One of these examples has nonconstant discount factors.

**Keywords:** Berge's minimum theorem, moment function, discounted Markov decision processes

uniqueness of the optimal policy, convex function, optimal policy

**Classification:** 90C40, 93E20, 90A16

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $X$  and  $A$  be nonempty Borel spaces. For each  $x \in X$  let  $\gamma(x)$  be a nonempty subset of  $A$ . Let  $Gr(\gamma) := \{(x, a) : x \in X, a \in \gamma(x)\}$  and let  $G : Gr(\gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a nonnegative function. Consider the following minimization problem below.

$$\inf_{a \in \gamma(x)} G(xa) \quad x \in X \quad (1)$$

Let  $f^* : X \rightarrow A$ , such that  $f^*(x) \in \gamma(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ , be a minimizer of (1) assuming, of course, that such a minimizer exists, and let  $G^*$  be the corresponding value function, i.e.,

$$G^*(x) = G(x, f^*(x)) = \inf_{a \in \gamma(x)} G(xa) \quad x \in X \quad (2)$$

---

\*Part of the present paper was presented on August 31, 2010 in Prague, Stochastika 2010, Czech Republic.

The first part of this paper is concerned with the establishment of a version of the Berg's Minimum Theorem (see [5] p. 116) which permits one to obtain the continuation of the function  $G^*$ , and thus

upper semicontinuity of the multimap  $t \mapsto \gamma^*(x) := \{a \in \gamma(x) : G(xa) = G^*(x)\}$

The main condition that has been imposed is that the function  $G$  is a moment function, i.e., that  $G$  is a convex function with a bounded domain and the complement of compact sets. Additionally, for the continuity of  $f^*$  it uses inner quenches instead of outer ones.

These conditions permit to deal with unbounded problems with possibly unbounded functions  $G$  and possibly noncompact restriction sets  $\gamma(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ , and they also work for minimization problems for weakly h-cG and / or weakly h-cG<sup>\*</sup> restrictions sets  $\gamma(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ , are nonconvex in some stochastic control problems (see [10, 20, 21, 24] and three-bracketleft 0 ]).

The first antecedent in the study of the continuity of  $G^*$  is the upper semicontinuity of  $x \mapsto \gamma^*(x)$  requiring the compactness of  $\gamma(x)$  to restrict the set  $\gamma(x)$ . It is known that the Minimum Theorem (and related results due to Berge (see [5] p. 115–117)) (In fact Berge in [5] works with maximization problems and in his book he naturally refers to the result related to the continuity of  $G^*$  and the upper semicontinuity of  $x \mapsto \gamma^*(x)$  as the Maximum Theorem).

In Lemmas 6.11.8 and 6.11.9 of [27] the continuity of  $G^*$  is analyzed under the assumption that  $\gamma(x) = A$  for all  $x \in X$  provided that  $A$  is a compact set.

Also in [11] a result concerning the continuity of  $G^*$  and  $f^*$  is presented but the convexity of  $G$  is assumed. Nevertheless, it is important to note that the nonconvex cases as well, regarding not only the economic applications [15, 17] but also its importance

when the action set is finite or discrete and hence concerned on convexity [18].

The major bulk of the research on Berge's Theorem concerns the boundedness of the reward (or cost) function and compactness of  $\gamma(x)$  (see [4], [8], [9], [14], [16], [25], [32], [33], [34]). The importance of the unbounded noncompact cases is apparent in such a work as [15] or [17] in economics, and one-bracketleft 0 where a large bibliography relates to

Markov decision processes (MDPs) can be found on this subject. Hence presenting a version of the Berge's Theorem for the unbounded noncompact cases can considerably extend its usefulness.

On the other hand, correspondences or multimap  $t \mapsto \gamma^*(x)$  is a basic tool in contemporary economic mathematical modeling in such problems as economic game theory, game theoretical modelling of economic in the era of information technology, and the optimal actions of the agents involved, forming the basis of the game model. Berg's Maximum Theorem provides extremely valuable methods for finding the best responses corresponding to the game theory. Further information on the application of Berge's Theorem to MDPs on Borel spaces, which (possibly) noncompact action sets, and weakly h-cG and weakly h-cG<sup>\*</sup> problems mentioned above can be found in two-bracketleft 5 and three-bracketleft 31].

The second part of the paper deals with the application of the result of the first part to MDPs on Borel spaces, which (possibly) unbounded and weakly h-cG<sup>\*</sup> function with (possibly)

noncompact action sets, and weakly h-cG<sup>\*</sup> total cost function (see [10]).

For this type of MDPs the existence of stationary optimal policy a minimizer of the Optimality Equation (OE) is assumed (see [10]). And for such a discounted Markov decision process, denote by  $f^*$  its optimal policy and by  $V^*$  its optimal value function [10].

In this part, the function  $G$  given in (1) is  $h - t_e + r_i - g$  and satisfies the OE and the

main conditions which ensure the continuity of  $f^*$  and  $V^*$  are the uniqueness of  $f$  (see [6] for conditions for the uniqueness of optimal policies of undiscounted MDPs) and the fact that the cost function  $c$  is a moment function [10].

The theory presented in this part of the article applies to the very important model proposed by Lindley [22] that in the paper will be referred to as Lindley's random walk useful in queueing and dam management. It is known that control decisions are random walks (see Lindley's random walk see, for instance, [35]).

When dealing with MDPs in economic applications it is often the case that the optimal policy  $f^*$  greatly simplifies or clarifies the analysis of the corresponding dynamic programming model [16, 17, 23]. However, this is not always the case, or the theoretical research becomes then an important research area. This paper suggests a linear approach to the uniqueness of the optimal policy based on the well-known start-and-stop rule [6].

It is interesting to note that research on discrete-time MDPs is an old one (Bergen's theorem approach), usually analyzes continuous time of the value function and uses for example [12].

The continuity of the optimal policy  $f^*$ 's is established for linear models with

finite horizon, constant multi-valued  $x \rightarrow \gamma(x)$  and convexity assumptions. The nonlinear case, with infinite horizon, a possible non-continuous action space and non-convexity restrictions, is also considered. The general interest of precise  $\gamma$ -motivation [13], and constitutes an important portion of this paper.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the minimization problem. Section 3 gives the version of the Minimum Theorem and some numerical examples. Section 4 applies Section 3 to discrete-time MDPs and Section 5 presents two examples that illustrate the theory developed in the previous section. Section 6 concludes. Section 7 is followed by two appendixes which contain the proofs of the main results of the article.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

For short, throughout the paper, a period is understood to be a semicontinuous interval. A metric space is called lower semicontinuous if it is a closed set in a metric space.

Let  $X$  and  $A$  be nonempty Borel spaces (i.e., measurable and bounded sets of a complete separable metric spaces).

Now, some basics on multifunctions are supplied in this section for more information see [1].

A multifunction  $\gamma$  from  $X$  to  $A$  is a function from  $X$  to  $A$  whose values  $\gamma(x)$  for each  $x \in X$ , is a nonempty subset of  $A$ .

The graph of the multifunction  $\gamma$  is a subspace of  $X \times A$  defined as  $Gr(\gamma) = \{(x, a) \mid x \in X, a \in \gamma(x)\}$ .

$$x \in X, a \in \gamma(x).$$

**Definition 2.1.** A multifunction  $\gamma$  from  $X$  to  $A$  is said to be

Unbounded Berge's minimum theorem 27 (a) Borel - measurable if  $\{x \in X : \gamma(x) \cap O \neq \emptyset\}$  is a Borel set  $O \subset A$

$$\text{set } O \subset A;$$

(b) upper semicontinuous if  $\{x \in X : \gamma(x) \cap F \neq \emptyset\}$  is closed - d  $n - iX$  for every close

$$F \subset A;$$

(c) lower semicontinuous if  $\{x \in X : \gamma(x) \cap O \neq \emptyset\}$  is open - n for every  $r^{e-n}$  see  $O \subset A$

(d) continuous if it is both upper semicontinuous and lower semicontinuous.

The terms correspondence instead (read of multimap to indicate nonempty intersection) are more convenient than original terminology (see [5]), they will not be adopted here.

**Remark 2.1.** It is well-known that Definition 2.1(b) is a special case of a compact-value  $\gamma$ , which is equivalent to: if  $x_n \rightarrow x$  in  $X$  and  $a_n \in \gamma(x_n)$  then there exists a subsequence  $\{a_{n(k)}\}$  of  $\{a_n\}$  and  $a \in \gamma(x)$ , such that  $a_{n(k)} \rightarrow a$  (see Theorem 17.2 p. 56 in [1]).

Besides, Definition 2.1(c) is also equivalent to: for each  $a \in \gamma(x)$  there exists a subsequence  $\{x_{n(k)}\}$  of  $\{x_n\}$  and  $a_k \in \gamma(x_{n(k)})$  for each  $k$  such that  $a_k \rightarrow a$ .

(see Theorem 17.2 p. 565 in [1] bracketright-parenright)

Now, the minimization problem will be established here.

Throughout the remainder of Section 2 and 3 let  $X$  and  $A$  be fixed nonempty Borel spaces and  $\gamma$  denotes a given Borel-measurable multimap from  $X$  to  $A$ . Let  $\mathbb{F}$  denote the set of measurable functions  $f : X \rightarrow A$  such that  $f(x) \in \gamma(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ .  $f - \text{parenleft} \in \mathbb{F}$  is called a *selection* for the multimap  $\gamma$ . For the moment  $G(\gamma) := \text{Gr}(\gamma) \cap \mathbb{F}$  is a give nonnegative (or bounded below) and measurable function on  $X$ .

$$G^*(x) := \inf_{a \in \gamma(x)} f(a) \quad (3)$$

$x \in X$ . If  $G(x, \cdot)$  attains its minimum at some point  $i - n \gamma(x)$  then we will write “min instead of “inf” in (3). **Remark 2.2.** In Rieder [28] it was proved that  $\text{Gr}(\gamma)$  is a Borel subset of  $X \times AG$  if  $\gamma$  is lower semicontinuous, bounded below, and nonempty, and if  $\gamma$  is compact on  $\text{Gr}(\gamma)$  (i.e. for every  $x \in X$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , the set  $\{a \in \gamma(x) : G(x, a) \leq r\}$  is compact). Then there exist a selection  $f^* \in \mathbb{F}$  such that for each  $x \in X$ ,  $G(x, \cdot)$  attains its minimum at  $f^*(x)$ . **Lemma 2.1.** If  $\gamma$  is closed-valued (i.e.  $\gamma(x)$  is closed for each  $x \in X$ ) and nonempty, then  $G^*$  is closed.

**Proof.** This is a consequence of Proposition 2.1 on page 110 [3].  $\square$

**Lemma 2.2.** If  $\gamma$  is lower semicontinuous and  $G$  is upper semicontinuous, then  $G^*$  is upper semicontinuous.

**Proof.** See the proof of Lemma 17.29 in [1].  $\square$

**The Moment Condition ( MC ) .** The r – es – i a s e – q u n – e c  $\{\mathbb{K}_n\}$  o compac set suc

that  $\mathbb{K}_n \uparrow Gr(\gamma)$ , and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} ((x_n - i^f_{comma-a}) element-negationslash \mathbb{K}_n) G(xa) = +\infty \quad (4)$$

**Remark 3 . 1 .** ( a ) In case  $x \rightarrow \gamma(x)$  i – s con s an t h – t@ i  $\gamma(x = A)$  fo al  $x \in X$  wit  $A$  as a compact set , and  $X$  wh i – c h s – iσhyphen – c ompa c s ( i . e ) ther exis a increasin sequence of compact sets  $\{W_n\}$  such that  $W_n \uparrow X)G$  i e triviall a momen t because , if  $\mathbb{K}_n = W_n \times A$ ,  $n = 12$ , . t – hn – e  $\mathbb{K}_n \uparrow Gr(\gamma)$  a n – d ( 4 hold becaus  $Gr(\gamma) \setminus \mathbb{K}_n$  is empty , for each  $n$ , and the minimum o ve th em p t – y se i equa t

$+\infty$ .

( b ) A nonnegative measurable func t i – o n  $H$  on a B ore p – s ac  $Y$  i sa i – d t b a mom en

on  $Y$  ( see , [ 1 0 , 2 0 , 2 1 ] [ 2 4 ] and [ 3 0 ] i – f h – t er – e i an increas n – i g s e – q uenc o compac sets  $Y_n \uparrow Y$  such that

$$li_{\rightarrow_n} m_\infty(yi - nfelement – negationslash Y_n H(y) = +\infty$$

Thus , the MC states that  $G$  i – s a moment on  $Gr(\gamma)$

In many important optimization prob l – e ms co erciv n – e es of th objectiv functio i observed . It is remarkable that th i – s simp e – l and u s – e fu c oncep ei sometime ignored being so natural in the context of the prob l – e ms s u – t d i – ed  $\frac{1}{n-i}$  thi p ape r Se [ 26sfo mor information .

Define , for each  $x \in X$ ,  $\gamma^*(x) := \{a \in \gamma(x) : G(xa) \leq G*(x)\} = \{\in \gamma(x) G(x, a) = G^*(x)\}$ , and for each  $\zeta \subset X$ , whe r – e  $\zeta : i a n o n n e m p y – t$  compac se t  $\Omega_\zeta := \{(x, a) \in Gr(\gamma) : x \in \zeta, a \in \gamma^*(x)\}$ . Obs e – re – v t – h@ fo a – ec – hx  $\in X$   $\gamma^*(x)$  i nonempt and compact if  $G$  is lower semicon t i – n uous and n – i f hyphen – c ompa c on  $Gr(\gamma)$  ( se ) Remar 2 . 2 )

Now the version of the Minimum Theo r – e m wil be pre e – s nte d

**Theorem 3 . 1 .** Suppose that the mu lt i – f unc t o – i n  $\gamma$  i c los e – dv – hyphen alu e – d a d – n cont i – n uou s  $G$  i continuous and inf - compact on  $Gr(\gamma)$ , and t – h e MC hold s T h n – e  $G^*$  i continuou an the multifunction  $x \rightarrow \gamma^*(x)$  i – s u s – period c .

P r o o f . Fix  $\zeta \subset X$ , where  $\zeta$  is a nonempty compac se t Le  $(x_k, ak \in \Omega_\zeta k = 1, 2, ..$  and  $(x, a) \in Gr(\gamma)$ , such that  $(x_k, ak) \rightarrow (x, a)$  No t – e h – t@  $x \in \zeta$  M oreove r  $G(x_k, ak) \leq G^*(x_k)$ , for all  $k$ , and as from Lemma 2period – two  $G^*$  i u . s . c . i result h – t a  $G(x, a) \leq G^*(x)$  ( recall that  $G$  is continuous ) . Then  $a \in \gamma^*(x)$  i . e  $\Omega_\zeta$  i c t lose – d n – is  $Gr(\gamma)$  a n d )<sub>b</sub> yL m – e m 2 . 1 , it is also closed in  $X \times A$ .

Now , suppose that for each  $m = 1, 2, ..$  t – h e e – r i parenleft – w<sub>m</sub> a<sub>m</sub> parenright  $\in \Omega$  n – a d parenleft – w m, am  $\notin$

$\mathbb{K}_m$  ( here  $\mathbb{K}_m, m = 1, 2, ...$ , are the compact set i – n th MC ) Sinc w<sub>m</sub>  $\in \zeta$  fo al  $m = 1, 2, ..., \zeta$  is compact , and  $G^*$  i – s u . s . c . i f ol o – l ws t – h a

$$G(w_m, a_m) \leq G^*(w_m) \leq \sup_{x \in \zeta} G^*(x < +\infty)$$

for all  $m$  ( recall that an  $u$  period  $-s$  c . func t o  $-i_n$  attain it ma x i  $-m$  um ove a compac se t se Theorem 2 . 4 . 3 p . 44 [ 1 ] ) .

Consequently ,

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} G(w_m, a_m) < +\infty \quad (5)$$

Now , as

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{a_{,x}) \notin \mathbb{K}_m} G(x, a) &\leq G(w_m a_m) \\ m = 1, 2, \dots, \text{then} \\ +\infty &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} ((x \inf_{a \notin \mathbb{K}_m} G(x, a)) \text{parenrightBig} \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} pG(\text{parenleft} - w_m a_m) \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to ( 5 ) . Theref o  $-r$  e  $-h - t_e r - e$  e xist a p ositiv intego  $\eta$  suc tha  $\Omega_\zeta \subset \mathbb{K}_\eta$ . As  $\Omega_\zeta$  is closed , it fo lows that i  $-i - s$  compa ct

Since  $\zeta$  is arbitrary , the conclusion i  $-s$  that  $\Omega_\zeta$  i compa c fo ea h  $-c$  nonempt compac

$\Omega_{,\zeta_n}'$  Let  $= \{\{z_n\}\} \cup^{\text{be}} \{za\}$  sequence(noticethatin  $\gamma^*_X$ , and  $i - s$  a compacte ltzbe  $\gamma^*(x)$ ,  $x \in \text{such}$  that  $\gamma^*(x)$   $\text{a} \in \text{ee-lmeand}$  mp ty ssther exis  $a \in \gamma$

$\{(z_n, a_n)\}, (z_{n(k)}, a_{n(k)}) \rightarrow (z, a^*)$ ,  $k \rightarrow \infty$  Now  $s - u$  p - p o s - e  $h - t_a$  fo  $r \geq 0$   $G*(z_n \leq r)$  for all  $n$ . Hence , letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the la s - tn - i equa lity a pply i - n g T r heorm - e 1.1 p . 1 i [ 3 1 ] ( specifically the characteriza ton of lm sup f o - r a s q - e uenc given a n - d th 7 fac tha  $(z, a^*) \in \Omega_\zeta'$ , it results that

$$r \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} G^*(z_n) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} G(z_n a_n) \geq G(\text{parenleft} - za^*) = G^*(z)$$

$$n \rightarrow \infty \quad n \rightarrow \infty$$

i . e . for  $r \geq 0$ ,  $\{x \in X : G^*(x) \leq r\}$  i - s c o - ls - e d n - iX On th othe h a - n d obviousl  $\{x \in X : G^*(x) \leq r\}$  is empty for  $r < 0$  (r - e ca l  $h - t @ G$  i n o - n n g - e ative ) Consequently  $G^*$  is l . s . c . Therefore , as from Lemma 2period - two,  $G^*$  i u . s . c .  $h - t_e$  c - o nt n - i ui t - y o  $G^*$  follow s

Besides , as the multifunction  $x \rightarrow \gamma^*(x)$  i - s compa ct v - hyphen alu e - d a d - n an( $k \rightarrow a^*$  i tfollow

from Remark 2 . 1 that this mul t i - f unc t o - i n i - s u . s . c  $\square$

**Corollary 3 . 1 .** Under the Assump ti - o ns of The o e - r m 3 . 1 i ther exist a uniqu  $f^* \in \mathbb{F}$  such that

$$G^*(x) = G(xf^*(x)) \quad (6)$$

$x \in X$ , then  $f^*$  is continuous .

P r o o f . Note that for each  $x \in X$ ,  $\gamma^*(x) = \{f^*(x)\}$  T he - n fo  $W \subset A$   $\{ \in X \mid \gamma^*(x) \cap W \neq \emptyset \} = \{x \in X : f^*(x) \in W\}$ . Now a t - h e mu lti u - f ncti o - nx  $\rightarrow \gamma^*(x)$   $\xrightarrow{x}$  it results that for each closed  $F \subset A$ ,  $\{x \in X \mid \gamma^*(x) \cap F \neq \emptyset\} = braceleft - x \in X \mid f^*(x) \in F \} is closed in X$ . Consequenl y  $f^*$  i - s con t n - i uous : (s - e e T )heorm 8.3 p . 7 [ 7 ]  $\square$

274 R MONTES hyphen – D E O – hyphen CA AND E LEM US hyphen – R D – O R I – G UE  
 The following examples show that w i – t h h – t e se of a s s – u mp t o – i n a – n d condition i

this article , it is possible to consider minm i – z a t o – i n p r – o blms w i h – t nonconve functio G and / or with nonconvex restriction sets  $\gamma(x)x \in X$  as well

As it has been mentioned in Sec t i – o n 1, h – t e p r – o o f relat d – e t th e – x ample i thi

Section and in Section 5 , wi l – l be given in Appen d x – i A and Ap p e – no<sub>dx-i</sub> B belo w

Let k be a fixed positive integer ,  $k \geq 2$  Define

$$\varphi(x) := bar - x^{1/3} + 1 + 1 \quad (7)$$

$x \in \mathbb{R}$ ( notice that  $\varphi(x) > 0$ , for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ) and

$$P(x, w) := (1/(2(k+1)))w^2 \text{parenleft} - k_+ 1 + \varphi(xw^2 + \varphi(xw - \text{parenright}) + \varphi(x)) \quad (8)$$

$x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $w \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Lemma 3 . 1 .** For each  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , there e x i – ss – t a un i – q ue  $h^*(x) < 0$  su h – c t – h a

$$P(x, h^*(x)) = m_{w \in \mathbb{R}}^{i-n} Px - \text{parenleft} w \text{right}$$

$$\text{Moreover, } P(x, h^*(x)) < P(x, 0) = \varphi(x) x \in \mathbb{R}$$

**Remark 3 . 2 .** The polynomial  $P(x, \cdot)$  ( w i – t h r e p – s e c t – o th sec n – o d v ariable define above will have a degree greater or equal than 6 f o k  $\geq 2$  a n – d henc e th minimize ca not , in general , be explicitly given , becau s – e i s – t d er i – v a t v – i e w il be o a e<sub>degree</sub>  $\geq 5$  an so its roots will not be determined by ra d i – c a s – l i – n m os of th case s f<sub>Fo</sub> a clea genera

exposition on this subject , aimed at non hyphen – s pe cialist s e – s e [ 19 ]

**Example 3 . 1 .** Take  $X = A = \gamma(x) = \mathbb{R}$   $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and

$$G(x, a) = a^1 \text{slash} - three + \varphi(x) \quad (9)$$

$$a > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}$$
 and

$$G(x, a) = P(xa) \quad (10)$$

$$a \leq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

**Lemma 3 . 2 .** Example 3 . 1 sa t i – s fies the Assump t o – i n i – n Co rolla y – r 3.1 a n – dG i noncon

vex . **Example 3 . 2 .** Take  $X = \mathbb{R}, A = \gamma(x) = (-\infty, 0] \cup [1, +\infty) x \in \mathbb{R}$  a n – d

$$G(x, a) = a^1 \text{slash} - three + \varphi(x) \quad (11)$$

$$a \geq 1, x \in \mathbb{R}, \text{and}$$

$$G(x, a) = P(xa) \quad (12)$$

$$a \leq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

**Lemma 3 . 3 .** Example 3 . 2 sa t i – s fies the Assump t o – i n i – n C orolla y – r 3.1 a – n d bot G an the restriction set  $A = (-\infty, 0] \cup [1, +\infty)$  a r – e nonc n – ov – e x

As mentioned before, the continuity of  $h - t_e$  values under function composition in the sense of  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h - t_e^n = h - t_e$  has been established by several authors and it should be stressed that, in fact, the minimization observed in Berge's Theorem immediately grants us the continuity of the optimal measure selector. A similar extension of the unbounded case of Berge's Theorem presented here can be straightforwardly established in important discrete-continuous-time MDPs as, the linear-quadratic

one or in the greatly non hyphen - 1 linear Lin d e - 1 y quoteright - s random wa lk us n - i g th result o [ 6 ]

#### 4 . DISCOUNTED MARKOV DECISION PROCESSES

**Decision Model .** Let  $(X, A, \{A(x) : x \in X\}, Q, c)$  be the usual discrete-time Markov decision model (see [10]), where both the state-space  $X$  and control space  $A$  are Borel spaces. For each  $x \in X$ ,  $A(x) \subset A$  is the measurable set of admissible actions at a state  $x$ . The set  $\mathbb{K} := \{(x, a) : x \in X, a \in A(x)\}$  is a Borel subset of  $X \times A$ .

of  $X \times A$ . Consider the transition probability  $Q(B \mid x, a)$  where  $B \in \mathbb{B}(\text{parenleft} - X)$  ( $\mathbb{B}(X)$

denotes the Borel sigma - algebra of  $X$ ) and  $(xa) \in \mathbb{K}$  i a st o c - h asti e kerne o  $X$  give  $\mathbb{K}$  ( i . e .  $Q(\cdot | x, a)$  is a probabil<sup>i-t</sup> y measure on  $X$  fo e ve y - r  $(x, a \in \mathbb{K}$  a - n d  $Q(B | \cdot)$  i a measurable function on  $\mathbb{K}$  for every  $B \in \mathbb{B}(X)$ ) F i - n ally th cos pe stag c i a nonnegative and measurable func t i - o n on  $\mathbb{K}$

**Remark 4 . 1 .** In many important cases the differential equation of the form

$$x_{t+1} = F(-x_t, a_t, \xi t) \quad (13)$$

with  $t = 0, 1, \dots$ , where  $\{\xi_t\}$  is a sequence of  $n - i$  independent elements drawn from a distribution (i.e.,  $d$ ) random elements with values in some Borel space  $S$ . A  $n - d$  width  $\Delta$  is a common measure of density.  $\Delta F$  is a measurable function from  $\mathbb{K} \times S$  to  $0X$  and  $h - t_e$  is a nonstationary probability distribution  $Q$  given by

$$Q(B \mid x, a) = \int I_B(F\text{parenleft} - xa, s) \Delta(s) ds \quad (14)$$

$B \in \mathbb{B}(X)$  and  $(x, a) \in \mathbb{K}$ , where  $I[\cdot]$  denotes the indicator function of the subset  $\{\cdot\}$ .

**Policies.** A control policy  $\pi$  is a measurable probability distribution rule for choosing actions, and at each time  $t$  ( $t = 0, 1, \dots$ ) the control prescribed by  $\pi$  may depend on both current state as well as on the history of the previous observations and actions. These are called

policies will be denoted by  $\Pi$ . Given the initial state  $x_0 = (x, y, n, p)$ , the unique probability distribution of the state-action pair processes  $\{(x_t, a_t)\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$  will be denoted by  $P_x^\pi$ , where  $E_x^\pi$  stands for the corresponding distribution of expectations.

operator , and the stochastic process  $\{x_t\}$  will be called a Markov decision process (MDP).  $\mathbb{F}$  denotes the set of measurable functions  $f: X \rightarrow A$  such that there exists  $f(x) \in A$  for all  $x \in X$ . A policy  $\pi \in \Pi$  is stationary if there exists  $f \in \mathbb{F}$  such that at time  $t$ ,  $\pi^t$  the action  $f(x_t)$  is applied at each time  $t$ . The class of stationary policies is naturally identified with  $\mathbb{F}$ .

**Optimality Criterion.** Given  $\pi \in \Pi$  and initial state  $x_0 = x \in X$  the

$$V(\pi,x) = E_x^\pi[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty}\alpha^t c(x_t,at)] \tag{15}$$

276 R MONTES hyphen - D E O - hyphen CA AND E LEM US hyphen - R D - O R  $I \leftarrow G$  UE  
be the total expected discounted cost when us i - n g h - t e po li c - y  $\pi$  giv n - e th initia stat x  
The number  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  is called the *discount factor*  $r$

A policy  $\pi^*$  is said to be *discounted optimal*  $i - fVpi - parenleft^*x) = V^*(x)$  fo a l  $x \in X$  wher

$$V^*(x) = i - n_\pi^f Vpi - parenleft^*x) \quad (16)$$

$x \in X$ .  $V^*$  defined in ( 16 ) is called the *optimal value function*  $i - o$   $n$

An MDP with the total expected discounted cost as the optimal criterion will be referred to as *discounted MDP* ( and the probability of the item  $w^t$  be denoted  $d - e b M DPs$  )

**Assumption 4 . 1 .**

( a ) The one - stage cost  $c$  is lower semicontinuous and  $\inf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -c - o mp$  ac

( b ) The transition law  $Q$  is strongly continuous and

2 . 2 ) .

( c ) The transition law  $Q$  is strongly continuous and

$$w(x, a) := \int uparenleft - y) Qd - parenleft_y | xa)$$

is continuous and bounded on  $\mathbb{K}$ , for every me asu r - a bl b u - o n d e - d u - f nctio u o  $X$

( c ) There is a policy  $\pi'$  such that  $V(\pi', x) < \infty$  for each  $x \in X$

**Lemma 4 . 1 .** ( Hernández - Lerma and Santos - Hernandez - bracketleft 0 Theorem 4 . 2 . 3 Lemma 4 . Assumption

hold . Then the optimal value function  $V^*$  defined in ( 16 ) ( pointwise minimum solution of the *Optimality Equation* ( OE ) ) is for all  $x \in X$

$$V^*(x) = \min_{a \in A(x)} [c(x, a) + \alpha \int V^*(y) Qd - parenleft_y | xa)] \quad (17)$$

and , if  $u$  is another solution to the OE , then  $u(\cdot) \geq V^*(\cdot)$  There is also  $f^* \in \mathbb{F}$  such that :

$$V^*(x) = c(x, f^*(x)) + \alpha \int V^*(y) Qd - parenleft_y | xf^*(x)) \quad (18)$$

$x \in X$ , and  $f^*$  is optimal .

The following assumption will be valid for the discounted MDP P for which Assumption

4.1 holds. Take  $\gamma(x) = A(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ .

**Assumption 4 . 2 .**

( a )  $\gamma$  is closed - valued and continuous ; ( b )  $f^*$  is unique ;

- (c)  $c(\cdot, \cdot)$  is a continuous function,  $\int V^*(y)Q(dy|x, a)$  is finite for every  $(x, a) \in \mathbb{K}$  and  $\int V^*(y)Q(dy|\cdot)$  is a continuous function on  $\mathbb{K}$ .  
(d)  $c$  satisfies the MC.

**Remark 4.2.** (a) In [6] conditions which ensure the uniqueness of  $f^*$  in (18) are provided.

- (b) In the next Section two examples for other discounted MDPs are presented.

**Theorem 4.1.** Consider a discounted MDP for which Assumption 4.1 holds. Then  $V^*$  and  $f^*$  are continuous functions.

Proof. Fix a discounted MDP for which Assumption 4.1 holds. Let  $(X, A, \{A(x) | x \in X\}, Q, c)$  be the Markov decision model for this MDP. Let  $f^*$  be the optimal policy whose existence is guaranteed in (18). Let  $V^*$  be the value function defined in

(16), and take  $\gamma(x) = A(x), x \in X$  (note that  $\mathbb{K} = \text{Gr}(G)$ ). Then

$$G(x, a) := c(x, a) + \alpha \int V^*(y)Q(dy|x, a) \quad (19)$$

$(x, a) \in \mathbb{K}$ . (Observe that the minimization in problem (17) is finite due to the OE condition.) Now Assumptions in Corollary 3.1 for these  $G$  and  $f^*$  will be verified. First, note that from Assumptions 4.2(a), 4.2(b), and 4.2(c) it follows that  $f^*$  is continuous, and the uniqueness of  $f^*$  follows easily. Second, observe that

$$A_r(x) := \{a \in A(x) : G(x, a) \leq r\} \subseteq \{a \in A(x) : c(x, a) \leq r\}$$

$x \in X$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . Hence, Assumption 4.1(a) and 4.2 hold. Since  $G$  is inf-compact

on  $\text{Gr}(G)$ .

Thirdly, let  $\mathbb{K}_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$  be the compact sets in the MC for the cost function  $c$  (see Assumption 4.2(d)). Note that since  $c$  is nonnegative and  $\int V^*(y)Q(dy|\cdot)$  are also nonnegative. Hence, since

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{a,x \in \mathbb{K}_n} c(x, a) &\leq (xn - i_{(c,a) \notin \mathbb{K}_n}^f) - c(x, a) + \alpha \int V^*(y)Q(dy|x, a) \\ &= (xn - i_{(c,a) \in \mathbb{K}_n}^f) G(x, a) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in (20), it follows that  $G$  satisfies the MC. Therefore  $V^*$  and  $f^*$  are continuous functions as a consequence of Theorem 3.1.  $\square$

**EXAMPLE 5.1.** Let  $X = A = A(x) = [0, \infty)$  for all  $x \in X$ . The random walk system is given by

$$x_{t+1} = [x + a_t - \xi t^+] \quad (21)$$

278 R MONTES hyphen – D E O – hyphen CA AND E LEM US hyphen – R D – O R I – G UE  
 $t = 0, 1, \dots$ . Here  $z^+ = \max \{0, z\}$ , and  $\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots$  are i.i.d. random variables taking values in  $S = [0, \infty)$  and with a common density  $\Delta$ . Besides,  $i$  is as usual a bounded continuous function. Let  $H$  be the distribution function of  $u - f$  given by  $\xi$  where  $\xi$  is a generic element of the sequence  $\{\xi\}$  (note that  $h = H_i$  is a continuous function). The cost function is given by :

$$c(x, a) = x + (a - 1)^2 \quad (22)$$

$$x, a \in [0, \infty).$$

**Lemma 5 . 1 .** Assumptions 4 . 1 and 4 . 2 hold for Example 5 . 1

With the results developed so far a theoretical interest but nevertheless interesting situations can arise :

**Example 5 . 2 .** Let  $X = A = [0, \infty)$ , and  $A(x) = [x, \infty) x \in X$ . The dynamic system is given by

$$x_{t+1} = [x + g(at - \xi t^+) \quad (23)$$

$t = 0, 1, \dots$ . Here  $\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots$  are i.i.d. random variables taking value in  $S = [0, \infty)$  and with a common density  $\Delta$ . Besides,  $i$  is a bounded and continuous function. The cost function is given by

$$c(x, a) = x^2 + a^2 \quad (24)$$

$$(x, a) \in \mathbb{K}.$$

**Assumption 5.1.**  $g : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is positive and continuous and decreasing

**Lemma 5 . 2 .** Under Assumption 5 . 1 , Example 5 . 1 period – two satisfies Assumption 4 . 1 and 4 . 2

6 . CONCLUSIONS It would seem that theorems like Berge's theorem – see  $h = t$  at a rate  $w$  – is well known in mathematics

economists, should be better known to all researchers interested in MDPs. An efficient such a Theorem can still be a source of new findings here – the optimal policy is unique, suggests that further research on this area is still possible – misusing

APPENDIX A : PROOFS RELATED TO EXAMPLES 3 . AND 3 . Proofs of Lemma 3 . 1 . Let  $x$  be a fixed element of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Consider the first and the second derivatives of  $P$  with respect to  $w$ , denoted by  $P_w$  and  $-nPw - w$  respectively obtained that

$$P_w(x, w) = w^{2k+1} + 2\varphi(xw + \varphi(x)) \quad (25)$$

and

$$P_{ww}(x, w) = (2k+1)w^{2k} - k + 2\varphi'(xw + \varphi(x)) \quad (26)$$

$P_w(x, \cdot)$  has odd degree, hence it has at least one real root. As  $Pw - w(x, \cdot)$  is positive by the well-known Rolle's Theorem, there on  $l$  exist one real root for  $P_w(x, \cdot)$  denote

by  $h^*(x)$ . Furthermore, again, the positive values of  $P_{ww}(x \cdot m - i p \text{ lie } t - h a h * (x \cdot i \text{ th unique minimum for (8)})$ . Finally  $h^*(x) \cdot i - s \text{ nega t v - i e b e c - a us } P_w(x, w) > 0 \text{ fo } w \geq 0$  and, obviously,  $P(x, h^*(x)) < P(x, 0) = \varphi(x)$ . Since  $x$  is arbitrary L m - e ma 3. follows period - square

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Fix  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . If  $a > 0$  then trivially  $G(x, a) > 0$ . Suppose that  $a \leq 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} G(x, a) &= \frac{1}{2(k+1)} a^{2(k+1)} + \varphi(x) \cdot a^2 + \varphi(xa) + \varphi(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2(k+1)} a^{2(k+1)} + \varphi(x) \cdot a^2 + a + 1 \\ &= \frac{1}{2(k+1)} a^{2(k+1)} + \varphi(x) [a + \text{slash-one} \cdot 2^2 + 3/4] > 0 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, as  $x$  is arbitrary  $G$  is nonnegative ( $i - n \text{ fac } G$  is positive). Clearly,  $G$  is continuous (observe that  $G(x0) = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} G(xa) = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} a \rightarrow^+$  (a1/+

$$\varphi(x)) = \varphi(x), \text{ for each } x \in \mathbb{R}).$$

Let  $A_r(x) := \{a \in \mathbb{R} : G(x, a) \leq r\}, x \in \mathbb{R}, r \in \mathbb{R}$ . Observing that  $G$  is positive it follows that  $A_r(x) = \emptyset$  (and hence  $A_r(x)$  is compact if  $r \leq 0$ ). Note that for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow +\infty} G(x, a) = \lim_{a \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{a}{2(k+1)} + \varphi(x) = +\infty \quad (27)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{a \rightarrow -\infty} G(x, a) &= \lim_{a \rightarrow -\infty} P(x, a) \\ &= \lim_{a \rightarrow -\infty} a^{2(k+1)} \left[ \frac{1}{2(k+1)} + \varphi(x) \frac{1}{a^2} + \frac{1}{a^{2k+1}} + a^{2(k+1)} \right] \\ &= +\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Therefore, if for some  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $r > 0, A_r(x)$  is unbounded downwards (27 and (28) it is possible to choose  $a' \in A_r(x)$  such that  $G(xa') > r$  which contradicts (d)). Conclusion  $G$  is inf-compact on  $Gr(\gamma)$ , and therefore exists a selector  $f^* \in \mathbb{F}$  such that for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}, G(x, \cdot)$  attains its minimum  $i - nf^*(x)$  (e - s e Rem a r - k 2.2)

Now, note that from Lemma 3.1

$$G(x, h^*(x)) = P(x, h^*(x)) < G(xa)$$

$x \in \mathbb{R}, a \leq 0, a \neq h^*(x)$ ; and also by Lemma 3.1 for  $x \in \mathbb{R}, a > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} G(x, h^*(x)) &= P(xh^*(x)) \\ &< P(x0) = \varphi(x) \\ &\leq a^1 \text{slash-three} + \varphi(x) = G(x, a) \end{aligned}$$

Then,  $h^*(x)$  is a minimum of  $G(x, \cdot)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and evident  $yh^*(x) = f^*(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Consequently, the uniqueness of  $f^*$  follows

280 R MONTES hyphen – D E O – hyphen CA AND E LEM US hyphen – R D – O R I – G UE  
Now , it is direct to verify that  $G$  sa t i – s fies the MC To p o – r v thi s t – a k  $\mathbb{K} = [-n, n \times$

$$[-n, n], n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Obviously , for each  $n, \mathbb{K}_n$  is compact and  $\mathbb{K}_n \uparrow \mathbb{K} = Gr(\gamma = \mathbb{R}^2)$  Fi a positiv integer  $n$  and take  $(x, a)$  element – negationslash  $\mathbb{K}_n$ . Consider the f o l l – o w n – i g f – o u case s  $n$  – minus  $\leq x \leq n$  an  $a > n; -n \leq x \leq n$  and  $a < -n; |x| > n$  and  $a > 0$  or bar –  $x > n$  a d – na  $\leq 0$

In the first case , it follows from ( 9 ) that

$$G(x, a) = a^{1/3} + \varphi(x) \geq a^{1/3} \geq n^{1/3} \quad (29)$$

If  $-n \leq x \leq n$  and  $a < -n$ , then , from ( 1 0 ) i f ol l – o ws h – t a

$$\begin{aligned} G(x, a) &= \frac{1}{2(k+1)} a^2 \text{parenleft} - k_{+1} \text{+} \varphi(x a - \text{parenright}^2 + \varphi(x \text{parenright} - a + \varphi(x \\ &= \frac{1}{2(k+1)} a^2 \text{parenleft} - k_{+1} \text{+} \varphi(x)[a - \text{parenleft} + \text{one} - \text{slash} 2) + 3/4 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2(k+1)} a^2 \text{parenleft} - k_{+1} \text{+} \frac{1}{2k - \text{parenleft} + 1} n^{2(k+1)} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Similarly , it is possible to obtain tha t f o – r x – bar  $> n$  and  $a > 0$

$$G(xa) \geq n^{1/\text{slash} - \text{three}} \quad (31)$$

and that , for  $|x| > n$  and  $a \leq 0$ ,

$$G(x, a) \geq (3/4)n^{1/3} \quad (32)$$

Hence , ( 30 ) – ( 32 ) imply that for every  $(x, a)$  element – negationslash  $\mathbb{K}_n$

$$G(x, a) \geq \min\{(3/4)n^{1/3}, (1/\text{parenleft} - \text{two}(k+1))n - \text{parenright}2(k+1)\}$$

Since n is arbitrary , it results that

$$\left( \inf_{a, x \in \mathbb{K}_n} G(x, a) \right) \geq \min\{(3/4)n^{1/\text{slash} - \text{three}}, (1/\text{two} - \text{parenleft}\text{parenleft} - k + 1\text{)}n - \text{parenright}2(k+1)\} \quad (33)$$

for every  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  Then , let tng  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  i – n three – parenleft3) i result t – h a  $G(\cdot, \cdot)$  satisfie th MC .

Finally ,  $G(\cdot, \cdot)$  is nonconvex as a con s – e quence of th no nc n – o vext y o  $G(-1, a)$

$$a^{1/\text{R}, (2(k+which_1))a^2 \text{is}_{k+1}^{\text{given } 1), a \leq \text{by}_0} G_{\text{observe}}^{(-1, a)} = a^1 \text{that} G^{1/\text{slash} - \text{three}}(+_{x0}^1) a = \varphi(x_0^0 x^a d - n \in \mathbb{R}^{G(-1)} a) \text{als} = 1 + a + \text{nonconvex}$$

P r o o f o f L e mma 3 . 3 . Simiar to the p r – o of of Lemma 3.2  $\square$  APPENDIX B : PROOFS RELATED TO EXAMPLES 5 . AND 5 .

P r o o f o f L e mm a 5 . 1 . The cost func t i – o n cs – i n o – n n g – e ativ e cont i – n ou s an observ

that  $x \leq$  for  $r \leq$  each  $x_{+1}^x \in [0 \text{and}]_{Ar(x)}^{\infty}, Ar(x) = 1 \text{O}_{+}(r^i - f_-^r < )_x 1 x / 2, A_{f-i}^r(x x_{+1}^{\infty}) \text{bracketleft} - \text{one}_{<} - r (-th_{n-e} x) 1 \text{th}_{\text{inf}}^{1/2} + \text{comp}$   
c follows , concluding that Assump t i – o n 4 . 1 ( a ) ho ld s

The proof of the strong continuity of  $h - t_e$  takes into account a law  $Q$  in due to the fact that  $y$  (21) is a measurable and bounded function  $t - y$  of  $u - f$  net  $i - o$  in the sense from the well-known Change of Variable Theorem  $i - i - s o$  bta  $n - i$  ed  $t - h a$

$$\int u(y)Q(dy | x, a) = u(0)[1 - H(xa) + \int I[0^{comma} - x + a](z)u(z\Delta x - parenleft + a - z)dz$$

$(x, a) \in \mathbb{K}$ , where  $I[\cdot]$  denotes the indicator function of the set  $\{a \leq x + a\}$ . The continuity of  $H$  implies the continuity of  $u$  at  $(0, -H(x, a))$ . A  $u$  is bounded and  $\Delta$  is a bounded continuous function in the result from the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\int I[0^{comma} - x + a](z)u(z)\Delta(x + a - z)dz$$

is a continuous function on  $\mathbb{K}$ . In conclusion  $Q$  is strong  $y - 1$  continuous. Let  $f \in \mathbb{F}$ , given by  $f(x) = 1$ , for all  $x \in X$ . Then for  $a - ec - hx \in X$

$$E_x^f[c(x_0, a_0)] = c(xf(x)) = x \quad (34)$$

Now, for each  $x \in X$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} E_x^f[c(x_1, a_1)] &= \int c(y, f(y)Q(dybar - xf)) = \int yQd - parenleft_y | xf) \\ &= \int I_{[0, \infty)}(s)[x + 1 - s + \Delta(s)ds] \\ &= \int I_{[0, x+1]}(s)(x + 1 - s)\Delta(s)ds \\ &= (x + 1)P[\xi \leq x + 1] - \int I[0, x - plus1](s)\Delta(s)ds \leq x + 1 \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

and by a direct induction argument, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E_x^f[c(xta_t)] &\leq x + t \quad (36) \\ t &= 0, 1, \dots \end{aligned}$$

Now, for each  $x \in X$ , using (34) and (36),

$$V(f, x) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha^t E_x^f[c(x_t, a_t)] \leq x/(1 - \alpha) + \alpha /(-\alpha 2) \quad (37)$$

Therefore, Assumption 4.1 holds for Example 1-e5.1

On the other hand, clearly  $\gamma(x) = A(x) = [0\infty)x \in X$  is closed and value an continuous (in fact  $\gamma$  is constant).

Observe that it is trivial to prove that  $c(\cdot, i)$  strict  $l - y$  or convex  $F(x, a, s) = [+a - s]^+$ ,  $x, a \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $s \in S$ , is convex in  $(x, a)$  for each  $s \in S$  and increasing in  $x$  for each  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $s \in S$ , and the multimap  $f_{unc}(x) \rightarrow A(x = [0\infty))$  is convex that is increasing valid.

282 R MONTES hyphen - D E O - hyphen CA AND E LEM US hyphen - R D - O R I - G UE that  $(1 - \lambda)a + \lambda a' \in A((1 - \lambda)x + \lambda x')$  f o - r a l x  $x' aa \in [0\infty)$  a d - n  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  an  $A$  and  $A(x)$  are convex for each  $x \in X$ . Mo r - e o ve r  $X$  i o - c n v e - x a w el 1 S thi exempl satisfies Condition 1 in [ 6 ] , and the uniquene s - s of h - t<sub>e</sub> o pt i - m al poli y - c follow s

Now the finiteness and the continu i - t<sub>y</sub> of  $\int V^*(yQd - \text{parenleft}_y | \cdot)$  wil be verifie d  
From ( 37 ) ,

$$0 \leq V^*(x) \leq x/(1 - \alpha) + \alpha/(1 - \alpha)^2 \quad (38)$$

$x \in X.$

Then , from ( 38 ) and a computa t i - o n smi a - l r t - o h - t<sub>e</sub> o n - e n - i parenleft - three 5) i follow tha tfo reac

$$\begin{aligned} (x, a) &\in \mathbb{K}, \\ \int V^*(y)Q(dy | x, a) &= \int I_{\text{bracketleft-zero}, \infty}(s)V^*(x - \text{bracketleft} + a - s +)_\Delta(sds \\ &\leq [1/(1 - \alpha)] \int I_{[0\infty)}(s)\text{bracketleft} - x + a - s^+\Delta(s)d + \alpha /(-\alpha) \\ &\leq \frac{x + a}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\alpha}{(1 - \alpha)^2} < +\infty \end{aligned}$$

In [ 6 ] it has been proved that , i - f condit o - i n C 1 h old s t - hn - e th opt i - m a v alu functio  $V$  is an increasing function on  $X = [0, +\infty)$  ( see Lemma 6one - period i - n [6] ) Henc i i obta<sup>n</sup> ine that  $V^*$  is continuous almost everywhere ( a period - e.n - i  $[0 + \infty)$  ( se T heor e - me4.3. <sup>s</sup> [2] an the paragraph j ust next to the end of the p r - o of of thi theorem ) Le  $(x_k, a_k \in \mathbb{K})$  such that  $(x_k, a_k) \rightarrow (x, a) \in \mathbb{K}$ . Let  $T > 0$  s - uh - c t - h a efo ea h - ck = 1, 2, ...

$$0 \leq x_k \leq T \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq a_k \leq T \quad (39)$$

From ( 38 ) , for each  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ , and  $s \in S$ ,

$$0 \leq V^*([x_k + a_k - s +)_\Delta(s \leq h_k(s)$$

where  $h_k(s) = ([x_k + a_k - s]^+/(1 - \alpha) + \alpha/(1 - \alpha) - 2\Delta(s)s) \in S$  O bserv tha tfr o - m (39 and a computation similar to the one in ( 35 ) f o ea c - hk = 1, 2 ...

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int h_k(s)ds \\ &= \int I_{[0, \infty)}(s)(\frac{[x_k + a_k - s^+]}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\alpha}{(1 - \alpha)^2})\Delta(s)ds \\ &\leq \frac{x_k + a_k}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\alpha}{(1 - \alpha)^2} \leq \frac{2T}{1 - \alpha} + \frac{\alpha}{(\text{parenleft} - one - \alpha)^2} < +\infty \quad (40) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover , it is direct to ver i - f<sub>y</sub> that  $\{h_k\}$  conv r - e ge p ointwise l - y t th u - f nctio  $h(s =$

$([x + a - s]^+/(1 - \alpha) + \alpha/(1 - \alpha)^2)\Delta(s)s \in S$  and t - ha |  $hk(s) \leq (T - two /(-\alpha + \alpha/(1 - \alpha)^2)\Delta(s), s \in S, k = 1, 2, \dots$  Now us i - n g h - t<sub>e</sub> s t - a d - n a r - d Dom inat d - e Convergenc

Theorem it follows that  $\int h_k(s)ds \rightarrow \int h(s) ds$

On the other hand , due to the con t i - n u t - i<sub>y</sub> a . e of  $V^*$  i i o b tain e - d a wel tha

$$V^*([x_k + a_k - s +)_{\Delta(s)} \rightarrow V^*(\text{bracketleft} - x + a - s] +^{\Delta-\text{parenright}}(s)$$

Unbounded Berge ' s minimum theorem 28 when  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $s - a \rightarrow 0$ . So , applying Theorem 1 7 p period – nine2n – i bracketleft – two9] i result tha

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int V^*(y) Q(dy | x_k, a_k) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int I_{[0, \infty)}(sV^*([x + a - s] + \Delta(s)) d \\ &= \int I_{[0, \infty)}(sV^*(x + a - s^+) \Delta(s) d \\ &= \int V^*(y) Q(d_y x - b) \end{aligned}$$

i . e .  $\int V^*(y) Q(dy | \cdot, \cdot)$  is a continuous function

Therefore , Assumption 4 . 2 ( c ) holds .

Finally , let  $\mathbb{K}_n = [0, n] \times [0, n], n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Every  $x \in \mathbb{K}_n$  is compact and  $\mathbb{K}_n \uparrow \mathbb{K} = Gr(\gamma) = [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$ . Now , fix a positive integer  $n$  and a  $a \in \mathbb{K}_n$ . There are two cases :  $0 \leq x \leq n$  and  $a > n$  or  $x > n$  and  $a \geq 0$ . In the first case it follows from ( 22 ) that

$$c(x, a) \geq (n - 1)^2 \quad (41)$$

If  $x > n$  and  $a \geq 0$ , then again , from (22) it results that

$$c(xa) \geq n \quad (42)$$

( 41 ) and ( 42 ) imply that for every  $(x, a) \in \mathbb{K}_n$

$$c(x, a) \geq \min\{(n - 1)^2 n\} \quad (43)$$

and since  $n$  is arbitrary , it follows that

$$\left( \inf_{a, x \in \mathbb{K}_n} c(x, a) \geq \min\{(n - 1)^2 n\} \right) \quad (44)$$

for every  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ . Now , let taking  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  it is four – parenleft4 it result that a  $c(\cdot, \cdot)$  satisfies the MC .  $\square$

Proof of Lemma 5 . 2 . Clearly  $X$  and  $A$  are convex sets and nonnegative inf - compact , continuous , and strictly convex on  $\mathbb{K}$  besides  $x \rightarrow A(x)$  is closed - valued

It is direct to verify that  $F(x, a, s) = \max_{x \in \mathbb{K}} g(a) - s + xa \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $s \in S$  is convex

in  $(x, a)$  for each  $s \in S$  and increasing in  $x$  for each  $a \in A(x)$  and  $s \in S$  the multifunction  $x \rightarrow A(x)$  is convex , and  $A(x)$  is convex – valued for each  $x \in X$

Similar to Example 5 . 1 ( see the proof of Lemma 5 . 1 ) it is possible to prove that

- $Q$  induced by ( 23 ) is strongly continuous
- For  $f \in \mathbb{F}$ , given by  $f(x) = x, x \in X$

$$V(f, x) \leq \eta x^2 + \beta x + \theta \quad x \in X \quad (45)$$

$$\text{where } \eta = 2/(1 - \alpha), \beta = (4g(0)\alpha)/(1 - \alpha)^2 \text{ and } \theta = 2[g(0)2[(\alpha(+\alpha)(1 - \alpha)^3) + (\alpha(1 + 4\alpha + \alpha^2)/(1 - \alpha)^4)]$$

284 R MONTES hyphen – D E O – hyphen CA AND E LEM US hyphen – R D – O R I – G  
 UE Hence , Assumption 4 . 1 and 4 . 2 ( b ) hold . In pa rt i – c ula r Con ditio n – o C 1 i – n [6  
 hold s

Again , as in Example 5 . 1 ( see the proof of Lemma 5 . 1 ) i i a ls possibl et oestablis

that :

- Foreach  $(x, a) \in \mathbb{K}$ ,

$$\int V^*(y)Q(dy | x, a) \leq \eta(x + g(0)) + \beta \text{parenleft} - x + g(0) + \theta < +\infty \quad (46)$$

( To verify ( 46 ) it is necessary to use ( 45 ) . •  $V^*$  is continuous almost everywhere i – n zero – bracketleft+  $\infty$  ( thi fol 1 – o w fr m – o C o – n ditio C 1 i

[6]).

- $\int V^*(y)Q(d y | ..)$  is a con ti nuous func t i – o n

Consequently , Assumption 4 . 2 ( c ) holds .

Now the continuity of  $x \rightarrow A(x)$  wil be p r – oe – v d Firstly i w il b p rov e – d tha  $x \rightarrow A(x)$  is l . s . c , and later that  $x \rightarrow A(x)$  i – s u s – periodperiod – c Let  $x_n \rightarrow x$  n – iX a n – da  $\in A(x = [x, \infty)$  If  $x = a$ , then take  $a_n = x_n \in A(x_n)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $a_n \rightarrow a$  I a  $\neq x$  i . e  $x < a$  then take  $a_n = x_n + (a - x)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and o .bserv t – h a a  $a_n \in A(x_n)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $a_n \rightarrow a$ ; hence , Remark 2 . 1 imp l i – e s that  $x \rightarrow A(x)$  i l . s . c Le  $F \subset A$  b a close set , and let  $x_n \in \{x \in X : [x, \infty) \cap F \neq \emptyset\}$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and s – u p pos tha  $x \rightarrow y \in X$  For each  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $b_n \in [x_n, \infty) \cap F$ . I – f h – t e r – e e xis t a p ositiv integre m suc htha  $b_m > y$ , then  $b_m \in [y, \infty) \cap F$ , i . e .  $y \in \{x \in X : [x, \infty) \cap F \neq \emptyset\}$  I  $x_n \leq b \leq y$  for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , then , since  $x_n \rightarrow y$  i – t f ol o – l ws t – h a l m – i<sub>n→∞</sub> b = y As b  $\in F$  for all  $n$ , and  $F$  is closed , it resul t – s that  $y \in F$  i . e  $y \in \{x \in X : [x, \infty) \cap F \neq \emptyset\}$  hence ,  $\{x \in X : [x, \infty) \cap F \neq \emptyset\}$  i – s c o – l sed i – nX T . herefor e D fi – e niti o – n 2.1(b implie that  $x \rightarrow A(x)$  is u . s . c .

Finally , for each  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , let  $\mathbb{K}_n = \{(xa) | x \in [0, n], a \in [x, n]\}$  I i direc t verify that for each  $n$ ,  $\mathbb{K}_n$  is compact , and a l – s o h – t @ $\mathbb{K}_n \uparrow \mathbb{K}$  Le n be a fixe positiv integer , and take  $(x, a) \in \mathbb{K} \setminus \mathbb{K}_n$ . Then  $a > n$  w h i – c h mp lie h – t a c(xa =  $x^2 + a \geq$

$$a^2 > n^2 \text{ So } (xn - \inf_{(x, a) \notin \mathbb{K}_n} c(xa)) > n^2 \quad (47)$$

Since  $n$  is arbitrary , it follows that ( 47 ) holds f o e a – c h n = 1, 2, ... Henc e lettin  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in ( 47 ) , it results that c sa t i – s fies the MC

Therefore , Assumptions 4 . 2 ( a ) and 4period – two( d ) ho l d  $\square$  ( Receive Marc h 4 , 2 0 1 1  
 RE F E RE N C E S

[ 1 ] C . D . Aliprantis and K . C . Borde r Infinit e Dme ns o – i n a An alysis . Thi r – d E ditio n . Springer Verlag , Berlin 2006 .

[ 2 ] R . B . Ash : Real Variables w i – t h Ba s c – i Me tr i – c S a – pc – e T p – o ol o – g y E – I E – E Pres s N w – e Yor 1 993 .

- [ 3 ] J . P . Aubin and I . Ekeland : Applicability of Nonlinear Analysis J . Wiley New York 1984
- [ 4 ] L . M . Ausubel and R . J . Denecker : A generalization of the theorem of maximum Econom Theory 3 ( 1993 ) , 99 – 17 .
- [ 5 ] C . Berge : Topological Spaces Oxford University Press London 196 ( reprint ) by Dover Publications , Inc . Mathematics New York 1997
- [ 6 ] D . Cruz - Suárez , R . Montes - de - Oca , and F . Saá - e m - S i v - l a : Condition of uniqueness of optimal policies of discounted Markov decision processes Mathematics Method Oper . Res 60 ( 2004 ) , 415 – 436 .
- [ 7 ] J . Dugundji : Topology Allyn and Bacon Boston 1966
- [ 8 ] P . K . Dutta , M . K . Majumdar , and R . K . Sundareshwaran : Programming problems . J . Econom Dynam Control 18 ( 1994 ) c 1069 – 1092
- [ 9 ] P . K . Dutta and T . M . i - tra : Maximum value functions for convexity and dynamic programming problems . J . Econom Dynam Control 18 ( 1994 ) c 1069 – 1092
- [ 10 ] O . Hernández - Lerma and J . B . Laš - sr - e re : Discrete time Markov control processes Basic Optimality Criteria . Springer - Verlag , New York 1996
- [ 11 ] O . Hernández - Lerma and W . J . Runggaldie : Monotonic approximation for stochastic control problems . J . Math - h Systems Estimation Control 4 ( 1994 ) 99 – 140
- [ 12 ] K . Hinderer : Lipschitz continuity of value functions in Markovian decisions Processes Math . Methods Oper . Res . 60 ( 2005 ) 3 – 2 – 2
- [ 13 ] K . Hinderer and M . Stiegler : Increasingly continuous minimizers in one dimensional linear - convex systems with constraints z th continuou an th sdiscrete case . Math . Methods Oper . Res 44(1996)189endash – two04
- [ 14 ] A . Horsley , A . J . Wrobel and T . Van Zandt Be - g e ' maxima and minimum theory with topological properties on the action set . Econom Lett 61(1998)287 – 291
- [ 15 ] A . Jasić kiewicz and A . S . Nowak : Discrete - time control dynamical systems with bounded returns Application to economic models . J . Math Anal Appl 378 ( 2011 ) 450 – 462
- [ 16 ] J . S . Jordan : The continuity of optimal dynamics in decision rules Econometric five - four ( 1977 ) 1365 – 1376 .
- [ 17 ] T . Kamiyoshi : Stochastic optimal growth with time - homogeneous bounded or unbounded shocks J . Math - h Econom 43 two - parenleftzero – zero7) seven – four7 – 500
- [ 18 ] T . Kamiyoshi and S . Roy : A nonsmooth nonconvex mode optimal growth J . Math . Theory 32 ( 2007 ) , 435 – 460
- [ 19 ] R . B . King : Beyond quadratic equations Birkhäuser Boston 1996
- [ 20 ] M . Kitayev : Semi - Markov and jump - up model analysis averaging cost criterion Theory Probab . Appl . 30 ( 1985 ) 272 – 288
- [ 21 ] A . Leizarowitz : Optimal control of systems with inputs in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  J . Math Anal Appl 1 nine - four ( 1990 ) 180 – 209 .

- [ 22 ] D . V . Lindley : The theory of queues wi t – h a s n – i g l serve r Proc Ca  
mbridg Philo s So c  
4 8 ( 1 952 ) , 277 – 289 .
- [ 23 ] M . Majumdar and R . Radne <sup>r</sup> Sta t i – o na y – r op t i – m al po licie swi h – t  
discountin gi n astochasti  
activity analysis model . Economie tr i – c a 51 ( 1 983 ) 18 21 – eight – one37
- [ 24 ] S . P . Meyn : Ergodic Theorems f o – r di c – s r e t – e tme sto h – c asti  
system usin a stochasti  
Lyapunov functions . SIAM J Con t – r o Op tm 27 (nine – one89) 1409 – 143 9

- 286 R MONTES hyphen – D E O – hyphen CA AND E LEM US hyphen – R D – O R  $I \dot{G}$  UE  
[ 25 ] E . A . Ok : Real Analys i – s w t – i h Econom i – c App l c – i a t i – o n s Princet n – o U niversit yPress , Prince ton 2007 .
- [ 26 ] A . L . Peressini , F . E . Su lli van , and J J Uh l The Ma thma tic so fNonlinea rProg r a – m ming Springer - Verlag , New York 1 988 .
- [ 27 ] M . L . Puterman : Markov Decis i – o n Proc esse s Discre e – t Sto c – h asti cDynam i cProgr m – a ming John Wiley , New York 1 994 .
- [ 28 ] U . Rieder : Measurable selec t i – o n theo e – r ms f o o ptimizat i – o n p roblems Manuscript aMath 24 ( 1 978 ) , 1 1 5 – 1 3 1 .
- [ 29 ] H . L . Royden : Real Analy s i – s T h r – i d E dit i – o n Mac mil a – l n N e – w Yo k – r 1988 [ 30 ] R . H . Stockbridge : Time - average con t – r o of m art n – i gal problems a linea progra – m min formulation . Ann . Probab . 1 8 ( 1 990 ) 2 9 1 – 3 1 4
- [ 31 ] R . Sundaram : A First Course in Op tm i – z at o – i n T heory C a – m bridg Universit Pres s Cambridge 1 996 .
- [ 32 ] G . Tian and J . Zhou : The maximum t – ho – er – e m a d – n th existenc o Nas equilibri u – m of ( generalized ) games w i – t hout o – l wer sem i – c on t n – i uitie s J Ma th A nal Appl one – six6 ( 1992 ) 35 1 – 3 6 4 .
- [ 33 ] G . Tian and J . Zhou : Transfer con t i – n uit e – i s ge neralizat i – o n of th Weierstras an dmaxi mum theorem : a full characte r i – z at o – i n J Ma th E c – oo – n m 24 ( 1 995 ) 2 8 1 – 3 0 3
- [ 34 ] M . Walker : A general i – z a t i on of the maximum theo e – r m Inte r – n a t . Econom . Rev . 2 0 ( 1 979 ) 267 – 2 7 2 .
- [ 35 ] A . Yushkevich : Blackwe l optima li t – yn – i B orel i – a n o – c nt i – n uous –n – i – actio Marko decisio processes . SIAM J . Control Op ti m 35(1997)2one – five7 – 2 18 2 Ra ú l Montes - de - Oca , Depa<sup>t-r</sup> amento de Matem á tica s Un i – v e rs d – i ad A u t – acute – o o – n ma M etropolitana Iztapalapa , Av . San Rafael Atlixco 1 86 , Col . Vicen t i – n a 9340 M é x i – c o D . F M é xico e - mail : momr @ xanum . uam . mx Enrique Lemus - Rodr í guez , Escuela de Actuar í a Univer s i – d ad An áu – h ac M é xi o – chyphen – Nr – ote Av Uni versidad An á huac 4 6 , Col . Lomas An á hua c 52786 Hu i – x qui u – l ca n Ed o de M é xico M é xico e - mail : elemus @ anahuac . mx