MULTI-DIMENSIONAL TRANSITIONAL DYNAMICS: A SIMPLE NUMERICAL PROCEDURE

TIMO TRIMBORN
KARL-JOSEF KOCH
THOMAS M. STEGER

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 1745
CATEGORY 5: FISCAL POLICY, MACROECONOMICS AND GROWTH
JUNE 2006

CESifo *Working Paper No. 1745*

MULTI-DIMENSIONAL TRANSITIONAL DYNAMICS: A SIMPLE NUMERICAL PROCEDURE

Abstract

We propose the relaxation algorithm as a simple and powerful method for simulating the transition process in growth models. This method has a number of important advantages: (1) It can easily deal with a wide range of dynamic systems including stiff differential equations and systems giving rise to a continuum of stationary equilibria. (2) The application of the procedure is fairly user friendly. The only input required consists of the dynamic system. (3) The variant of the relaxation algorithm we propose exploits in a natural manner the infinite time horizon, which usually underlies optimal control problems in economics. As an illustrative application, we simulate the transition process of the Jones (1995) and the Lucas (1988) model.

JEL Code: C61, C63, O40.

Keywords: transitional dynamics, continuous time growth models, saddle-point problems, multi-dimensional stable manifolds.

Timo Trimborn
University of Hamburg
Department of Economics, IWK
Von-Melle-Park 5
20146 Hamburg
Germany
trimborn@econ.uni-hamburg.de

Karl-Josef Koch
University of Siegen
Department of Economics
Germany
koch@vwl.wiwi.uni-siegen.de

Thomas M. Steger
ETH Zurich
WIF – Institute of Economic Research
ETH Center, ZUE F 13
8092 Zurich
Switzerland
tsteger@ethz.ch

June 2006

1 Introduction

Dynamic macroeconomic theory nowadays relies heavily on infinite horizon optimization models which usually give rise to a system of nonlinear differential equations. This dynamic system is then interpreted to describe the evolution of the economy under consideration. Many studies in the field of growth theory have confined their analysis to the balanced growth path (BGP). A comprehensive understanding of the respective model under study requires, however, that we investigate in addition the transition process. At least two important arguments support this view: First, the positive and normative implications might differ dramatically depending on whether an economy converges towards its BGP or grows along the BGP (e.g. Jones, 1995). Second, dynamic macroeconomic models are often employed to conduct comparative welfare investigations of different policy regimes or instruments. In this context, the transition process needs to be taken into account. Linearizing the dynamic system might be appropriate in many cases but can be potentially misleading especially when the analysis aims at a Pareto-ranking of different policy instruments. This overall perspective is nicely summarized by the following statement due to Jonathan Temple (2003, p. 509): *Ultimately, all that a long-run equilibrium of a model denotes is its final resting point, perhaps very distant in the future. We know very little about this destination, and should be paying more attention to the journey.*

The models employed in growth theory are often multi-dimensional in the sense that there is more than one (predetermined) state variable. Examples comprise R&D-based growth models (e.g. Romer, 1990; Jones, 1995; Eicher and Turnovsky, 1999) as well as human-capital based growth models (e.g. Lucas, 1988; Mulligan and Sala-i-Martin, 1993; Benhabib and Perli, 1994). This class of models frequently exhibits characteristics which make the use of standard procedures fairly inconvenient if not impossible. Here we would like to stress two issues: First, assuming usual stability properties in multi-dimensional models implies that the stable manifold is also multi-dimensional.[1] Moreover, if the dynamic system is characterized by stable eigenvalues which differ substantially in magnitude (i.e. stiff differential equations), then usual procedures are either not applicable or highly inefficient. This characteristic property is not at all a special (or even pathological) case but instead occurs quite frequently; an example is the well-known Jones (1995) model. Second, most standard simulation procedures are not applicable to dynamic systems giving rise to a continuum of saddle-point stable stationary equilibria (i.e. a center manifold). This property arises, for instance, in the popular Lucas (1988) model.

The paper at hand contributes to the literature on dynamic macroeconomic theory by proposing the relaxation algorithm as a powerful method to simulate the transition process in growth models. We show that this procedure is in general well-suited and highly efficient. This will be demonstrated by simulating the transition process of two prominent growth models, i.e. the Jones (1995) model and the Lucas (1988) model. Despite the fact that these models are widely employed in growth theory, their adjustment processes have hardly been investigated. This is probably due to the characteristics mentioned above, which give rise to serious conceptual difficulties when it comes to simulation issues.

In the context of growth theory, the most prominent approaches to simulate the transition process comprise shooting (e.g. Judd, 1998, Chapter 10), time elimination (Mulligan and Sala-i-Martin, 1991), backward integration (Brunner and Strulik, 2002), the projection method (Judd, 1992) as well as the discretization method of Mercenier and Michel (1994). The similarities and differences of the relaxation procedure and the methods mentioned above will be discussed concisely below. The above enumeration shows that

[1] In the case of saddle-point stability, the dimension of the stable manifold equals the dimension of the state space, while indeterminacy implies that the dimension of the stable manifold exceeds the dimension of the state space.

there are already some procedures which have been used in economics to solve dynamic systems. Nonetheless, we think that there are a number of good reasons to include additionally the relaxation procedure into the toolbox of dynamic macroeconomic theory:

First, our experiences with the relaxation algorithm are positive throughout. We have applied the procedure to a wide range of dynamic systems, including stiff differential equations, dynamic systems with saddle-point stable center manifolds as well as highly dimensional computable general equilibrium models. The algorithm performed amazingly well. It is remarkable that an increase in the dimension of the model under study does not cause any conceptual problems. The researcher need not take restrictions with respect to the model dimension into account. In addition, the procedure seems to be efficient with respect to computer time.

Second, the application of the procedure is fairly user friendly. Specifically, the only input which must be provided by the researcher consists in the dynamic system and the set of underlying parameters. No preliminary manipulations of the dynamic system under study must be conducted before the procedure can be applied; this is different from most other procedures as described in Section 3.

Third, the variant of the relaxation algorithm we propose exploits in a natural manner the infinite time horizon which usually underlies standard optimal control problems. This is achieved by a simple transformation of real calendar time into a transformed time scale (as explained in Section 2.1). For most other procedures, this issue must explicitly be dealt with (explained in Section 3).

Overall, it seems that the relaxation algorithm can easily cope with a large number of problems which arise frequently in the context of multidimensional, infinite-time horizon optimal control problems. Finally, it should be noted explicitly that the focus here is on continuous time dynamic models, which have been extensively employed in growth theory. The relaxation procedure has been employed to investigate discrete time dynamic macroeconomic models (Laffargue 1990, Juillard et al. 1998). However, it is well known that discrete time models are conceptually different from continuous time models and hence the application of algorithms designed to investigate discrete time models to continuous time models is very inconvenient.

The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2, the relaxation procedure is described concisely and then evaluated numerically employing the Ramsey-Cass-Koopmans model as a basic example. Section 3 provides a short comparison to alternative methods. In Section 4, we apply the procedure to simulate the transition process of the Jones (1995) model and the Lucas (1988) model. Section 5 summarizes and concludes. The appendix (Section 6) provides a more formal description of the relaxation procedure. Finally, the relaxation algorithm has been programmed in MatLab. This program together with a concise instruction manual is available for free download at: www.rrz.uni-hamburg.de/IWK/trimborn/relaxate.htm.

2 The relaxation procedure

2.1 Description of the relaxation procedure

The principle of relaxation can be applied to various numerical problems. Here we use it to solve a differential equation numerically. Relaxation type algorithms applied to differential equations have two very useful properties. First of all, they can easily cope with boundary conditions, such as initial conditions for state variables and transversality conditions of optimal growth. Second, additional equations, e.g. equilibrium conditions or feasibility constraints, can be incorporated straight away. Beyond, by transformation of the (independent) time variable one can solve infinite horizon problems, as they arise from many dynamic optimization problems in economics.

Suppose we want to compute a numerical solution of a differential equation in terms of a large (finite) sequence of points representing the desired path. To start with, we take an arbitrary trial solution, typically not satisfying the slope conditions implied by the differential equation nor the boundary conditions. We measure the deviation from the true path by a multi-dimensional error function and use the derivative of the error function to improve the trial solution in a Newton type iteration. Hence, at each point of the path the correction is related to the particular inaccuracy in slope and in solving the static equation. The crucial difference to the various shooting methods is the simultaneous adjustment along the path as a whole.

Figure 1 illustrates the adjustment by relaxation of a linear initial guess towards the saddle path in the Ramsey-Cass-Koopmans model. The initial guess starts with a fixed initial value of the state variable k and an arbitrary initial value of the control variable c. It consists of 30 mesh points lined up equidistantly between the starting point and the known steady state of the model. Evaluating the multi-dimensional error function the algorithm realizes that the fit to the differential equation can be improved by an upward shift of the curve without jeopardizing the boundary conditions. After a few steps the error is sufficiently small and the algorithm stops.

The outline of the algorithm proposed in this paper leans on Press, Flannery, Teukolsky and Vetterling (1989, pp. 645-672). We have implemented the algorithm in MatLab. The code is published for free download in the internet[2] and a print version is available on request.[3]

We apply the method to the following kind of problem: Consider a system of $\tilde{N}$ ordinary differential equations together with $N - \tilde{N}$ (static) equations in N real variables. This system describes a vector field on an $\tilde{N}$-dimensional surface in $\mathbb{R}^N$. We impose a list of n_1 boundary conditions at the starting point and n_2 at the end point of a path sufficient to determine a

[2] http://www.rrz.uni-hamburg.de/IWK/trimborn/relaxate.htm

[3] In the appendix we give a detailed description of the algorithm.



Figure 1: Relaxation in the Ramsey-Cass-Koopmans model

particular trajectory. To meet all dimensional requirements n_1 and n_2 must add up to $\tilde{N}$.

For the finite representation of the problem we fix a time mesh of M points in time. In case of an infinite time horizon we choose a transformation to map the interval $[0, \infty]$ to $[0, 1]$. At each point in time an N-dimensional vector has to be determined. We approximate the differential equation by $M-1$ systems of equations of dimension $\tilde{N}$ for the slope between neighboring mesh points. Together with $\tilde{N}$ boundary conditions we have an $M \times \tilde{N}$ dimensional system of equations. After adding the $N - \tilde{N}$ static equations which have to hold at each of the M mesh points we have incorporated all restrictions available. The final system of nonlinear equations is of dimension $M \times N$ and involves the same number of unknowns.

We apply a Gauß-Newton procedure to compute a root of this system. Step by step we adjust the trial solution until the error is sufficiently small. This involves the solution of a linear equation with the Jacobian matrix of the system of nonlinear equations. At first glance, there seems little chance to achieve good solutions because the complexity of the problem is proportional to the size of the Jacobian matrix which is quadratic in M. However, the Jacobian is not an arbitrary matrix of dimension $M \times N$.

The Jacobian matrix inherits a specific structure from the approximation of the differential equation. The boundary conditions and the static equations each depend only on one respective vector, and the interior slope conditions only on neighboring vectors. Hence the Jacobian matrix shows nonzero entries only close to the diagonal. This can be used to solve the linear system by a special version of a Gauß algorithm carried out recursively on N-dimensional blocks along the diagonal. This recursive procedure allows to increase the number M of mesh points without increasing the dimension of the blocks. Only the number of blocks increases in proportion to M. The complexity of the problem is only linear in the number of mesh points and not quadratic. Hence, a fairly good approximation of the continuous path is possible without using too much computer time.

2.2 Implementation of the algorithm

To illustrate, we describe the steps which must be taken when implementing the relaxation algorithm using the Ramsey-Cass-Koopmans model (Ramsey, 1928; Cass, 1965; Koopmans, 1965) as an example. It is important to notice, however, that this description serves as an illustration only. The researcher who intends to simulate a specific model using the program (provided as a supplement to this paper) need not follow these steps.

It is well known that this simple growth model exhibits saddle-point stability and hence the determination of the solution is all but trivial.[4] The

[4] Nonetheless, the model is comparably simple in that the stable manifold is one di-

model gives rise to a system of two differential equations for consumption c and capital per effective labor k (Barro and Sala-i-Martin, 2004, Chapter 2):

$$\dot{c} = \frac{c}{\theta}\left(\alpha k^{\alpha-1} - (\delta + \rho + x\theta)\right) \quad (1)$$

$$\dot{k} = k^{\alpha} - c - (n + x + \delta)k, \quad (2)$$

where α denotes the elasticity of capital in production, n the population growth rate, δ the depreciation rate, x the exogenous growth rate of technology, ρ the parameter for time preference and θ the inverse of the intertemporal elasticity of substitution, respectively. The steady state is $k^* = \left(\frac{\alpha}{\delta+\rho+x\theta}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$ and $c^* = (k^*)^{\alpha} - (n + x + \delta)k^*$ and is saddle point stable.

As a first step, one must choose a time mesh, i.e. a set of points in time at which the solution should be calculated. We select the time mesh to be uniform in the transformed time scale (as explained in section 2.1).

Second, the two differential equations have to be transformed into two non-linear equations which describe the slope between two neighboring mesh points. These equations have to be satisfied between every two mesh points. For M mesh points this leads to $2 \cdot (M - 1)$ nonlinear equations.

Third, two boundary conditions have to be chosen to complete the set of equations to $2 \cdot M$. In this example the relaxation algorithm needs one initial boundary condition and one terminal boundary condition. We set the initial value of the state variable (capital) equal to 10% of its steady state value. For the terminal boundary condition there are several possibilities to formulate an equation. It would be possible to choose each of the two equations (1) or (2) and set the RHS equal to zero. However, here the steady state values for consumption and capital can be computed analytically and, therefore, we can set consumption equal to its steady state value as the terminal boundary condition. It should be noted that only one terminal condition is needed.

mensional. We will turn to a model with a multi-dimensional stable manifold below.

Thus the algorithm does not make use of the knowledge of the steady state value of capital. It is reached automatically.

At last an initial guess for the solution has to be made. For instance, we can choose c and k to be constant at their steady state values $(c_t, k_t) \equiv (c^*, k^*)$.[5] The Newton procedure always converged quickly, indicating a high degree of robustness with respect to the initial guess.

2.3 Evaluation of the procedure

For the special parametrization $\theta = \frac{\delta+\rho}{\alpha(\delta+n+x)-x}$ the representative consumer chooses a constant saving rate $s = \frac{1}{\theta}$ and hence the solution can be expressed analytically (Barro and Sala-i-Martin, 2004, pp. 106-110).[6] This allows us to compare the computed results with the analytical solution, which has a precision close to the machine epsilon. The relative error is computed for every mesh point. Table 1 shows the maximum relative error of consumption and capital per effective labor for different numbers of mesh points. In addition, the quadratic mean error of combined c and k provides information about the distribution of the error.[7] Table 1 reveals that multiplying the number of mesh points by x reduces the maximum error of each solution vector by the factor $\frac{1}{x^2}$, which indicates the order 2 of the difference procedure. Even with a moderate number of mesh points and therefore a short computation time, a sufficiently high degree of accuracy can be achieved. Moreover, the accuracy can be improved to a very high degree by increasing the number of mesh points.[8] The treatment of higher dimensional systems with multi-dimensional stable manifolds is largely analogous to the example described

[5] This is in contrast to Figure 1 where the initial guess is an upward sloping line.

[6] The analytical solution is $k(t) = \left[\frac{1}{(\delta+n+x)\theta} + \left(k_0^{1-\alpha} - \frac{1}{(\delta+n+x)\theta}\right) e^{-(1-\alpha)(\delta+n+x)t}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$ and $c(t) = (1-\frac{1}{\theta})k(t)^{\alpha}$.

[7] It is defined as $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{NM}\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \varepsilon_{c_i}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \varepsilon_{k_i}^2}$ with ε_{c_i} and ε_{k_i} denoting the relative error of k and c at mesh point i, respectively.

[8] It should be mentioned that the allocation of the mesh was chosen exogenously. The accuracy of the algorithm could be improved with a self allocating time mesh.

Table 1: Accuracy of the relaxation algorithm for the Ramsey-Cass-Koopmans model

number of mesh points	max error c	max error k	mean error
10	$< 1.3 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$< 3.4 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$< 3.0 \cdot 10^{-3}$
100	$< 1.1 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$< 8.6 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$< 2.7 \cdot 10^{-6}$
1,000	$< 1.1 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$< 8.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$	$< 8.2 \cdot 10^{-9}$
10,000	$< 1.1 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$< 8.5 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$< 2.6 \cdot 10^{-11}$
100,000	$< 1.1 \cdot 10^{-10}$	$< 8.5 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$< 8.2 \cdot 10^{-14}$

above. This is the reason why the the algorithm performs similarly well for more complicated models.

3 Comparison to other procedures

The relaxation procedure is concisely compared to the most popular alternative solution methods employed in growth theory. These comprise backward integration (Brunner and Strulik, 2002), multiple shooting (e.g. Judd, 1998, Chapter 10), time elimination (Mulligan and Sala-i-Martin, 1991), projection methods (e.g. Judd, 1992; Judd, 1998, Chapter 11) and the method of Mercenier and Michel (1994). This section is kept brief since most of the procedures and their relative advantages are described in Judd (1998) and Brunner and Strulik (2002).

Backward integration as suggested by Brunner and Strulik (2002) exploits the numerical stability of the backward looking system by inverting time. By starting near the steady state of the transformed system, the resulting initial value problem is stable and the solution converges towards the stable manifold of the forward looking system quickly. This method can solve systems with one-dimensional stable manifolds very conveniently. For multi-dimensional manifolds Brunner and Strulik (2002) suggest to generate starting values on an orbit around the steady state. To pass through a pre-specified point (determined by the specific shock under study), it is necessary to iterate until the trajectory hits this point. However, if the real parts of the stable eigenvalues differ substantially, the problem of stiff differential equations occurs. It is well-known that these problems are very hard to handle numerically. For large differences between the stable eigenvalues, it is impossible to meet the pre-specified point, because the backward directed trajectories will be attracted by the submanifold, which is determined by the eigenvalue with the smallest real part. The resulting trajectories hence cannot represent a specified shock and potentially have no economic meaning. Furthermore, if there exists a continuum of steady states represented by a (saddle-point stable) center manifold, then the specific steady state to which the economy converges depends on the initial boundary conditions.[9] If one particular steady state is chosen for backward integration, then only one initial condition can be satisfied. To find a trajectory which fulfills all initial conditions, an iteration process has to be applied. This procedure typically gives rise to problems of convergence.

Mercenier and Michel (1994) propose to transform the continuous time, infinite horizon problem into a finite horizon maximization problem in discrete time with the same steady state. The transformed problem can be solved with a static optimization procedure. This leads to a system of non-linear equations, which is solved by a Newton algorithm. Our approach is to solve the system of differential equations directly. Here the discretization is done at a later stage. To apply the relaxation algorithm the researcher simply has to insert the differential equations into the program code, instead of converting the complete maximization problem. Apart from simplicity, the relaxation algorithm has some further advantages.

First, the relaxation procedure is more general in that the system of differential equations can be attained in different ways. In particular, the

[9] For instance, in the Lucas (1988) model presented below the actual steady state to which the economy converges depends on the initial level of human and physical capital h_0 and k_0.

approach of Mercenier and Michel requires the discount factor to be constant in order to achieve invariance of the steady state. However, if the firm also faces an intertemporal optimization problem, the discount factor is related to the real interest rate which might be time-variant. Second, the proposed version of the relaxation algorithm can deal with a compactification of the time interval. It is not necessary to choose an adequate terminal time where the optimization is truncated. Also, the treatment of a post terminal stationary phase does not apply. Third, the relaxation algorithm leaves room for selecting different discretization rules, also of higher order. This leads to a higher level of accuracy with the same number of mesh points. The discretization rule of the method of Mercenier and Michel is a first order rule, whereas the relaxation procedure uses a second order rule.[10]

Projection methods, introduced in Judd (1992) and Judd (1998, Chapter 11), cover a very wide range of algorithms. For many problems they prove to be fast and accurate, but also require a high programming effort. Moreover, they are usually applied to solve for the policy function. However, if the model exhibits non-monotonic adjustments, the policy function cannot be computed at the turning points. Furthermore, if there exists a continuum of steady states represented by a center manifold, the interval of integration is not known in advance since it depends on the final steady state to which the economy converges. In this case, projection methods appear to be inappropriate. In addition, the polynomial bases and therefore the computation costs grow exponentially when the dimension of the problem increases. To avoid this "curse of dimensionality", a special complete polynomial basis is chosen but still the computation costs grow considerably.

Similar remarks apply to the time elimination method: First, in the case of non-monotonic adjustments, the policy functions cannot be computed at the turning points and, second, if there exists a continuum of steady states,

[10]When multiplying the number of mesh points with x a first order rule leads to a reduction of the global error by $\frac{1}{x}$, whereas a second order rule reduces the error by $\frac{1}{x^2}$.

the interval of integration is unknown.

4 Two illustrative applications

The relaxation procedure is employed to investigate the transition process of two prominent growth models. As a first example, we consider the Jones (1995) model. For usual calibrations this model gives rise to a system of stiff differential equations. The second example, the Lucas (1988) model, implies a saddle-point stable center manifold. Note that the transition process of these popular growth models has hardly been investigated so far, which is probably due to the conceptual problems mentioned above.

4.1 The Jones (1995) model

The technology for final output Y is given by $Y = \alpha_F(\phi L)^{\sigma_L} \int_0^A x(i)^{1-\sigma_L} di$, where ϕ denotes the share of labor allocated to final-output production, $x(i)$ the amount of differentiated capital goods of type i, A the number of differentiated capital goods, α_F a constant overall productivity parameter and σ_L the elasticity of labor in final-output production. Noting the general symmetry among $x(i)$ and using the definition of aggregate capital $K := Ax$, the final-output technology can be written as $Y = \alpha_F(A\phi L)^{\sigma_L} K^{1-\sigma_L}$. The R&D technology is $\dot{A} = J = \alpha_J A^{\eta_A}[(1-\phi)L]^{\eta_L}$ with $\eta_L := \eta_L^p + \eta_L^e$, $\eta_L^p = 1, -1 < \eta_L^e < 0$, where $\dot{A} := dA/dt$, α_J denotes a constant overall productivity parameter, η_A the elasticity of technology in R&D and η_L the elasticity of labor in R&D.

The dynamic system which governs the evolution of the economy under study can be summarized as follows:[11]

$$\dot{k} = y - c - \delta k - \beta_K n k \tag{3}$$

$$\dot{a} = j - \beta_A n k \tag{4}$$

[11]For a detailed derivation of the dynamic system for the general R&D-based non-scale growth model see Steger (2005).

$$\dot{c} = \frac{c}{\theta}[r - \delta - \rho - (1-\gamma)n] - \beta_K nc \tag{5}$$

$$\dot{v}_a = v_a[r - (\beta_K - \beta_A)n] - \pi \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{\sigma_L y}{\phi} = v_a \frac{\eta_L^p j}{1-\phi} \tag{7}$$

where $y = \alpha_F(a\phi)^{\sigma_L} k^{1-\sigma_L}$, $j = \alpha_J a^{\eta_A}(1-\phi)^{\eta_L}$, $r = \frac{(1-\sigma_L)^2 y}{k}$, $\pi = \frac{\sigma_L(1-\sigma_L)y}{a}$, $\beta_K = \frac{1-\eta_A+\eta_L}{1-\eta_A}$, $\beta_A = \frac{\eta_L}{1-\eta_A}$. Note that the dynamic system is expressed in scale-adjusted variables, which are defined by $y := Y/L^{\beta_K}$, $k := K/L^{\beta_K}$, $c := C/L^{\beta_K}$, $a := A/L^{\beta_A}$, $j := J/L^{\beta_A}$ and $v_a := v/L^{\beta_K - \beta_A}$. The (unique) stationary solution of this dynamic system corresponds to the (unique) BGP of the economy expressed in original variables.

Equations (3) and (4) are the equations of motion of (scale-adjusted) capital and technology, (5) is the Keynes-Ramsey rule of optimal consumption c, (6) shows capital market equilibrium with v_a denoting the (scale-adjusted) price of blueprints and (7) determines the privately efficient allocation of labor across final-output production and R&D.

The objective is to solve the four-dimensional system of differential equations (3) - (6), taking into account the static equation (7), which must hold at all points in time. The steady state is a saddle point with a two-dimensional stable manifold. Since the steady state can be determined numerically only, the algorithm computes the steady state of the system first by applying a Newton algorithm. The choice of $k(0) = k_0$ and $a(0) = a_0$ as initial boundary conditions is obvious since k and a are the state variables. Again, there is some freedom when it comes to the determination of boundary conditions. We have set the RHS of equations (5) and (6) equal to zero. Moreover, we choose once more, as an initial guess, all variables to be constant at their steady state values. This always lead to quick convergence, indicating that the procedure is relatively robust with respect to the initial guess.

The transition process considered below results from a combination of two simultaneous shocks. Specifically, it is assumed that the overall productivity parameter in the production function for final output α_F increases from 1.0 to 1.3, while the overall productivity parameter in the production function for new ideas α_J decreases from 1.0 to 0.9. This shock was chosen to demonstrate that the adjustment can be non-monotonic (as can be recognized by inspecting Fig. 2 (vi), for instance) and therefore the policy functions cannot be computed at certain points with conventional methods.[12] Figure 2 gives a summary of the adjustment process. The plots (i)



Figure 2: Summary of the transition of the Jones (1995) model

to (iii) show the time path of the jump variables c, ϕ, v_a, plots (iv) and (v) display the time path of the state variables k and a, while plot (vi) gives the projection of the adjustment trajectory into the (k,a)-plane.

[12]The set of parameters used for simulation is: $\sigma_L = 0.6$, $\sigma_K = 0.4$, $\delta = 0.05$, $n = 0.015$, $\eta_A = 0.6$, $\eta_L = 0.5$, $\eta_L^p = 0.6$, $\rho = 0.04$ and $\gamma = 1$.

4.2 The Lucas (1988) model

Another very interesting example is the model discussed by Mulligan and Sala-I-Martin (1993) and Benhabib and Perli (1994), which is based on the seminal contribution of Lucas (1988). Assume final output is produced from physical and human capital, k and h. The stock of human capital can be split into a share u used for final output production and $1-u$ employed to increase human capital. Due to human capital spill over effects there are increasing returns to scale in the production sector. Intertemporal utility of consumption c with constant elasticity of intertemporal substitution σ^{-1} and discount rate ρ is to be maximized. First order conditions for optimal solutions can be computed in the usual way. In terms of growth rates (denoted by a hat) the system is

$$\hat{k} = APK - c/k \tag{8}$$

$$\hat{h} = \delta(1-u) \tag{9}$$

$$\hat{c} = \sigma^{-1}(\alpha APK - \rho) \tag{10}$$

$$\hat{u} = \frac{(\gamma-\alpha)\delta}{\alpha}(1-u) + \frac{\delta}{\alpha} - \frac{c}{k} \tag{11}$$

where $APK := A\,k^{\alpha-1}h^{1-\alpha+\gamma}u^{1-\alpha}$ denotes the average productivity of capital.

Balanced growth requires that u, c/k as well as APK are constant. The latter requirement in turn demands $(1-\alpha)\hat{k} = (1-\alpha+\gamma)\hat{h}$.

The common balanced growth rate μ of k and c can be computed by solving the system under balanced growth assumptions:

$$\mu = \frac{1-\alpha+\gamma}{(1-\alpha+\gamma)\sigma-\gamma}\,(\delta-\rho)$$

Growth is balanced if the four variables of the system satisfy three equations:

$$1-u = \frac{1-\alpha}{(1-\alpha+\gamma)\sigma-\gamma}(1-\rho/\delta)$$

$$c/k = ((\gamma-\alpha)\psi\mu+\delta)/\alpha$$

$$k^{\alpha-1}h^{1-\alpha+\gamma} \quad = \quad \frac{\sigma\mu+\rho}{\alpha A}\,(u^*)^{\alpha-1}$$

where $\psi := (1-\alpha)/(1-\alpha+\gamma)$. The question arises whether other solutions initially suffering from unbalancedness converge to a BGP. One method to check whether convergence occurs is scale adjustment. Scale adjustment slows down the motion of variables according to their respective balanced growth rates. The transformed variables are

$$ke^{-\mu t}, \quad he^{-\psi\mu t}, \quad ce^{-\mu t} \quad \text{and} \quad u$$

To avoid extra notation we continue to use the old designations of variables. The new, adjusted growth rates are reduced by the constants of adjustment, μ and $\psi\mu$, respectively. The growth rate of u remains unchanged. Due to scale adjustment, the BGP of the original system [shown in Figure 3 (i)] turns into a curve representing a continuum of stationary equilibria, which is labeled CSE [displayed in Figure 3 (ii)] with the same shape. This curve represents a (saddle-point stable) center manifold of the new system.[13] An optimal solution with unbalanced initial state conditions (k_0, h_0) now approaches a particular point on the curve CSE. Yet, there is no way to compute this point analytically.

Numerical computation requires the solution of a differential equation system with two initial conditions and two final conditions. The initial conditions are given by the inital values of state variables $k(0) = k_0$, $h(0) = h_0$. Final conditions which determine the path, and work well with the relaxation algorithm, are stationarity conditions for the state variables, implicitly defined by $\dot{k}(\infty) = 0$ and $\dot{h}(\infty) = 0$.

By numerical simulation of the scale adjusted model we can now answer the following type of question: Consider two economies (1 and 2) differing in their initial states (k_0^1, h_0^1) and (k_0^2, h_0^2) only. Will they converge to the same

[13] The scale adjusted system has one zero eigenvalue, which gives rise to a continuum of stationary equilibria (i.e. a center manifold). For details on the basic concept of center manifolds see, for instance, Tu (1994, pp. 187-191).



Figure 3: Summary of the transition of the Lucas (1988) model

point on the CSE? Or will, alternatively, one economy have a permanent advantage in the sense of exhibiting a higher level of consumption along the BGP? Figure 3 illustrates such a situation, where the solid trajectories display a development implying a higher long run consumption level, as can be recognized by inspecting Figure 3 (iii).

5 Summary

We propose the relaxation algorithm as a powerful and efficient procedure to investigate the transition process of continuous-time growth models. At a very general level, this method has two main advantages: First, it is simpler than most other procedures. Second, and more importantly, the relaxation procedure can easily deal with complex dynamic systems for which conventional algorithms appear to be inappropriate. Specifically, the relaxation procedure can easily handle stiff differential equations as well as dynamic systems giving rise to saddle-point stable center manifolds. It has been demonstrated that these type of systems result from basic workhorse models in growth theory. Finally, it is important to note that the relaxation algorithm can easily deal with highly dimensional dynamic systems, which enables a wide range of potential applications, including computable general equilibrium models as well as dynamic models with heterogeneous agents.

6 Appendix

In this section we go through some details of the algorithm. Consider a system of $\tilde{N}$ differential equations on an open set in $\mathbb{R}^N$, with $\tilde{N} \leq N$. Let $\tilde{x}$ be the vector of those components of the full vector $x \epsilon \mathbb{R}^N$ affected by f.

$$\frac{d\tilde{x}}{dt} = f(t, x) \ , \quad f : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{N}}$$

If $\tilde{N}$ is strictly smaller than N the differential equations are to be supplemented by $N - \tilde{N}$ equations x has to satisfy at any time.

$$0 = g(t, x) \ , \quad g : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N-\tilde{N}}$$

Boundary conditions are supposed to be given in form of n_1 initial conditions and n_2 final conditions. For the solution to be well determined we need $n_1 + n_2$ to equal $\tilde{N}$. Finally, it is convenient to denote the codimension $N - \tilde{N}$ of the manifold given by $g(t, x) = 0$ by n_3. Summing up we have

n_1	initial conditions	
n_2	final conditions	with $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = \tilde{N} + n_3 = N$
n_3	running equations	

For convenience, we rescale the time range $\mathbb{R}_+$ by introducing a new time parameter τ running from 0 to 1

$$\tau = \nu t / (1 + \nu t)$$

In terms of τ we get an equivalent differential-algebraic system

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\tilde{x}}{d\tau} &= \xi(\tau, x) = f(\tfrac{\tau}{\nu(1-\tau)}, x) \,/\, \nu(1-\tau)^2 \\ 0 &= \phi(\tau, x) = g(\tfrac{\tau}{\nu(1-\tau)}, x) \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Define a mesh of M points in (transformed) time τ by $T = \{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_M\}$. Along the mesh, the dependent variable x falls into a list of vectors. To avoid confusion we denote it by $y = \{y_1, \ldots, y_M\}$ where y_k is the value of x at τ_k. We use the midpoint of each interval (τ_k, τ_{k+1}) for the discretization of the differential equation

$$\tilde{y}_{k+1} - \tilde{y}_k = (\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k)\, \xi(\bar{\tau}_k, \bar{y}_k) \quad \text{for } k = 1, \ldots, M-1 \tag{13}$$

where $\bar{\tau}_k = (\tau_k + \tau_{k+1})/2$ and $\bar{y}_k = (y_k + y_{k+1})/2$. An element of this sequence of difference equations yields an $\tilde{N}$-dimensional error function $H : ([0, \ldots, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^N)^2 \to \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{N}}$

$$H(\tau_k, y_k, \tau_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) = \tilde{y}_{k+1} - \tilde{y}_k - (\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k)\xi(\bar{\tau}_k, \bar{y}_k)$$

Note that the matrix of partial derivatives of H with respect to y_k and y_{k+1} differ only in their derivatives of $\tilde{y}_{k+1}$ and $\tilde{y}_k$, respectively, and this is plus or minus the identity matrix of dimension $\tilde{N}$.

Let B denote the initial conditions

$$B : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^{n_1}\,,$$

F denote the final conditions

$$F : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$$

and let C denote the running conditions

$$C : [0, \dots, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^{n_3}$$

All together this defines a system of equations in $y = (y_1, \dots, y_M)\epsilon\mathbb{R}^{N\cdot M}$ given a mesh $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_M)\epsilon\mathbb{R}^M$, and we are looking for a root of this system.

For the description of the algorithm it is convenient to list the equations according to the unknown vectors y_k involved. We start with the initial conditions which only involve y_1 and end with the equations which only involve y_M. Ordered this way the system can be seen as a system of $M+1$ vector equations $E_0(y), \dots, E_M(y)$. The first subsystem $E_0(y)$ depends only on y_1 and consists of n_1 initial conditions. The intermediate subsystems $E_k(y)$ for $k = 1, \dots, M-1$ depend on y_k and y_{k+1} and are of dimension N. Each of these subsystems begins with n_3 running conditions and is completed by $n_1 + n_2$ difference equations. The last subsystem $E_M(y)$ depends on y_M and consists of n_3 interior conditions together with n_2 final conditions. It has dimension $n_2 + n_3$.

$$E(y) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} E_0(y) \\ \vdots \\ E_k(y) \\ \vdots \\ E_M(y) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B(y_1) \end{pmatrix} \\ \vdots \\ \begin{pmatrix} C(y_k) \\ H(y_k, y_{k+1}) \end{pmatrix} \\ \vdots \\ \begin{pmatrix} C(y_M) \\ F(y_M) \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix} \tag{14}$$

Each step of the Newton algorithm applied to $E(y) = 0$ computes a change Δy by solving the linear equation

$$D_y E(y) \cdot \Delta y = -E(y)$$

Due to the ordering of subsystems E this equation is of following form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} S^{0,R} & & & & & \\ S^{1,L} & S^{1,R} & & 0 & & \\ & S^{2,L} & S^{2,R} & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & \\ & 0 & & & S^{M-1,L} & S^{M-1,R} \\ & & & & & S^{M,L} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta y_1 \\ \vdots \\ \Delta y_M \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -E_0(y) \\ \vdots \\ -E_M(y) \end{pmatrix} \tag{15}$$

All $S^{k,L}$ and $S^{k,R}$ are Jacobian matrices defined by

$$S^{k,L} = \frac{\partial E_k(y)}{\partial y_k}\ , \quad \text{and} \quad S^{k,R} = \frac{\partial E_k(y)}{\partial y_{k+1}}$$

The upper left matrix $S^{0,R}$ has n_1 rows and the lower right matrix $S^{M,L}$ only $n_3 + n_2$, whereas all other matrices $S^{k,L}$ and $S^{k,R}$, resp, are $N \times N$. Hence, the system is not overdetermined. The solution Δy can be computed by a specialized Gaussian algorithm. This algorithm starts in the upper left corner of the matrix and works downward block by block to the lower right corner. The result is a system in upper triangular form with a sequence of $N \times (n_2 + n_3)$ non-zero blocks above the diagonal. Finally the vector Δy can computed from bottom to top. To be more precise:

step 0:	Diagonalize the first n_1 columns of $S^{0,R}$.
step k, $k{=}1,\ldots,M{-}1$:	Eliminate the first $N - n_1$ columns of $S^{k,L}$; diagonalize the remainder of $S^{k,L}$ together with the first $N - n_1$ columns of $S^{k,R}$.
step M:	Eliminate the first $N - n_1$ columns of $S^{M,L}$; Diagonalize the remainder of $S^{M,L}$
step $M{+}k$, $k{=}1,\ldots,M$:	Solve for Δy_{M+1-k}.

The Newton algorithm refines the current guess of y by adding Δy or a fraction of this vector to y. The algorithm stops if the error E is sufficiently small according to an appropriate norm.

References

Barro, R. J., and X. Sala-i-Martín (2004): *Economic Growth*. MIT-Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Benhabib, J., and R. Perli (1994): "Uniqueness and Indeterminacy: On the Dynamics of Endogenous Growth," *Journal of Economic Theory*, 63, 113–142.

Brunner, M., and H. Strulik (2002): "Solution of Perfect Foresight Saddlepoint Problems: A Simple Method and Applications," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 26, 737–753.

Cass, D. (1965): "Optimum Growth in an Aggregate Model of Capital Accumulation," *Review of Economic Studies*, 32, 233–240.

Eicher, T. S., and S. J. Turnovsky (1999): "Convergence in a Two-Sector Nonscale Growth Model," *Journal of Economic Growth*, 4, 413–428.

Jones, C. I. (1995): "R&D-Based Models of Economic Growth," *Journal of Political Economy*, 103(3), 759–784.

Judd, K. L. (1992): "Projection Methods for Solving Aggregate Growth Models," *Journal of Economic Theory*, 58, 410–452.

——— (1998): *Numerical Methods in Economics*. MIT Press.

Juillard, M., D. Laxton, P. McAdam, and H. Pioro (1998): "An algorithm competition: First-order iterations versus Newton-based techniques," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 22(8/9), 1291–1319.

Koopmans, T. C. (1965): "On the Concept of Optimal Economic Growth," In: *The Econometric Approach to Development Planning,* Amsterdam: North Holland.

LAFFARGUE, J.-P. (1990): "Résolution d'un modèle économique avec anticipations rationelles," *Annales d'Economie et Statistique*, 17, 97–119.

LUCAS, R. E. JR.. (1988): "On the Mechanics of Economic Development," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 22, 3–42.

MERCENIER, J., AND P. MICHEL (1994): "Discrete-Time Finite Horizon Approximation of Infinite Horizon Optimization Problems with Steady-State Invariance," *Econometrica*, 62(3), 635–656.

MULLIGAN, C., AND X. SALA-I-MARTIN (1991): "A Note on the Time Elimination Method for Solving Recursive Growth Models," *Technical Working Paper No. 116*.

——— (1993): "Transitional Dynamics in Two-Sector Models of Endogenous Growth," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 108(3), 737–773.

PRESS, W., B. FLANNERY, S. TEUKOLSKY, AND W. VETTERLING (1989): *Numerical Recipes in Pascal*. Cambridge University Press.

RAMSEY, F. (1928): "A Mathematical Theory of Saving," *Economic Journal*, 38, 543–559.

ROMER, P. M. (1990): "Endogenous Technological Change," *Journal of Political Economy*, 98, S71–S102.

STEGER, T. M. (2005): "Welfare Implications of Non-Scale R&D-based Growth Models," *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, forthcoming.

TEMPLE, J. (2003): "The Long-Run Implications of Growth Theories," *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 17(3), 497–510.

TU, P. N. (1994): *Dynamical Systems, An Introduction with Applications in Economics and Biology*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

CESifo Working Paper Series

(for full list see www.cesifo-group.de)

1681 Wladimir Raymond, Pierre Mohnen, Franz Palm and Sybrand Schim van der Loeff, Persistence of Innovation in Dutch Manufacturing: Is it Spurious?, March 2006

1682 Andrea Colciago, V. Anton Muscatelli, Tiziano Ropele and Patrizio Tirelli, The Role of Fiscal Policy in a Monetary Union: Are National Automatic Stabilizers Effective?, March 2006

1683 Mario Jametti and Thomas von Ungern-Sternberg, Risk Selection in Natural Disaster Insurance – the Case of France, March 2006

1684 Ken Sennewald and Klaus Waelde, "Itô's Lemma" and the Bellman Equation for Poisson Processes: An Applied View, March 2006

1685 Ernesto Reuben and Frans van Winden, Negative Reciprocity and the Interaction of Emotions and Fairness Norms, March 2006

1686 Françoise Forges, The Ex Ante Incentive Compatible Core in Exchange Economies with and without Indivisibilities, March 2006

1687 Assar Lindbeck, Mårten Palme and Mats Persson, Job Security and Work Absence: Evidence from a Natural Experiment, March 2006

1688 Sebastian Buhai and Coen Teulings, Tenure Profiles and Efficient Separation in a Stochastic Productivity Model, March 2006

1689 Gebhard Kirchgaessner and Silika Prohl, Sustainability of Swiss Fiscal Policy, March 2006

1690 A. Lans Bovenberg and Peter Birch Sørensen, Optimal Taxation and Social Insurance in a Lifetime Perspective, March 2006

1691 Moritz Schularick and Thomas M. Steger, Does Financial Integration Spur Economic Growth? New Evidence from the First Era of Financial Globalization, March 2006

1692 Burkhard Heer and Alfred Maussner, Business Cycle Dynamics of a New Keynesian Overlapping Generations Model with Progressive Income Taxation, March 2006

1693 Jarko Fidrmuc and Iikka Korhonen, Meta-Analysis of the Business Cycle Correlation between the Euro Area and the CEECs, March 2006

1694 Steffen Henzel and Timo Wollmershaeuser, The New Keynesian Phillips Curve and the Role of Expectations: Evidence from the Ifo World Economic Survey, March 2006

1695 Yin-Wong Cheung, An Empirical Model of Daily Highs and Lows, March 2006

1696 Scott Alan Carson, African-American and White Living Standards in the 19th Century American South: A Biological Comparison, March 2006

1697 Helge Berger, Optimal Central Bank Design: Benchmarks for the ECB, March 2006

1698 Vjollca Sadiraj, Jan Tuinstra and Frans van Winden, On the Size of the Winning Set in the Presence of Interest Groups, April 2006

1699 Martin Gassebner, Michael Lamla and Jan-Egbert Sturm, Economic, Demographic and Political Determinants of Pollution Reassessed: A Sensitivity Analysis, April 2006

1700 Louis N. Christofides and Amy Chen Peng, Major Provisions of Labour Contracts and their Theoretical Coherence, April 2006

1701 Christian Groth, Karl-Josef Koch and Thomas M. Steger, Rethinking the Concept of Long-Run Economic Growth, April 2006

1702 Dirk Schindler and Guttorm Schjelderup, Company Tax Reform in Europe and its Effect on Collusive Behavior, April 2006

1703 Françoise Forges and Enrico Minelli, Afriat's Theorem for General Budget Sets, April 2006

1704 M. Hashem Pesaran, Ron P. Smith, Takashi Yamagata and Liudmyla Hvozdyk, Pairwise Tests of Purchasing Power Parity Using Aggregate and Disaggregate Price Measures, April 2006

1705 Piero Gottardi and Felix Kubler, Social Security and Risk Sharing, April 2006

1706 Giacomo Corneo and Christina M. Fong, What's the Monetary Value of Distributive Justice?, April 2006

1707 Andreas Knabe, Ronnie Schoeb and Joachim Weimann, Marginal Employment Subsidization: A New Concept and a Reappraisal, April 2006

1708 Hans-Werner Sinn, The Pathological Export Boom and the Bazaar Effect - How to Solve the German Puzzle, April 2006

1709 Helge Berger and Stephan Danninger, The Employment Effects of Labor and Product Markets Deregulation and their Implications for Structural Reform, May 2006

1710 Michael Ehrmann and Marcel Fratzscher, Global Financial Transmission of Monetary Policy Shocks, May 2006

1711 Carsten Eckel and Hartmut Egger, Wage Bargaining and Multinational Firms in General Equilibrium, May 2006

1712 Mathias Hoffmann, Proprietary Income, Entrepreneurial Risk, and the Predictability of U.S. Stock Returns, May 2006

1713 Marc-Andreas Muendler and Sascha O. Becker, Margins of Multinational Labor Substitution, May 2006

1714 Surajeet Chakravarty and W. Bentley MacLeod, Construction Contracts (or "How to Get the Right Building at the Right Price?"), May 2006

1715 David Encaoua and Yassine Lefouili, Choosing Intellectual Protection: Imitation, Patent Strength and Licensing, May 2006

1716 Chris van Klaveren, Bernard van Praag and Henriette Maassen van den Brink, Empirical Estimation Results of a Collective Household Time Allocation Model, May 2006

1717 Paul De Grauwe and Agnieszka Markiewicz, Learning to Forecast the Exchange Rate: Two Competing Approaches, May 2006

1718 Sijbren Cnossen, Tobacco Taxation in the European Union, May 2006

1719 Marcel Gérard and Fernando Ruiz, Interjurisdictional Competition for Higher Education and Firms, May 2006

1720 Ronald McKinnon and Gunther Schnabl, China's Exchange Rate and International Adjustment in Wages, Prices, and Interest Rates: Japan Déjà Vu?, May 2006

1721 Paolo M. Panteghini, The Capital Structure of Multinational Companies under Tax Competition, May 2006

1722 Johannes Becker, Clemens Fuest and Thomas Hemmelgarn, Corporate Tax Reform and Foreign Direct Investment in Germany – Evidence from Firm-Level Data, May 2006

1723 Christian Kleiber, Martin Sexauer and Klaus Waelde, Bequests, Taxation and the Distribution of Wealth in a General Equilibrium Model, May 2006

1724 Axel Dreher and Jan-Egbert Sturm, Do IMF and World Bank Influence Voting in the UN General Assembly?, May 2006

1725 Swapan K. Bhattacharya and Biswa N. Bhattacharyay, Prospects of Regional Cooperation in Trade, Investment and Finance in Asia: An Empirical Analysis on BIMSTEC Countries and Japan, May 2006

1726 Philippe Choné and Laurent Linnemer, Assessing Horizontal Mergers under Uncertain Efficiency Gains, May 2006

1727 Daniel Houser and Thomas Stratmann, Selling Favors in the Lab: Experiments on Campaign Finance Reform, May 2006

1728 E. Maarten Bosker, Steven Brakman, Harry Garretsen and Marc Schramm, A Century of Shocks: The Evolution of the German City Size Distribution 1925 – 1999, May 2006

1729 Clive Bell and Hans Gersbach, Growth and Enduring Epidemic Diseases, May 2006

1730 W. Bentley MacLeod, Reputations, Relationships and the Enforcement of Incomplete Contracts, May 2006

1731 Jan K. Brueckner and Ricardo Flores-Fillol, Airline Schedule Competition: Product-Quality Choice in a Duopoly Model, May 2006

1732 Kerstin Bernoth and Guntram B. Wolff, Fool the Markets? Creative Accounting, Fiscal Transparency and Sovereign Risk Premia, May 2006

1733 Emmanuelle Auriol and Pierre M. Picard, Government Outsourcing: Public Contracting with Private Monopoly, May 2006

1734 Guglielmo Maria Caporale and Luis A. Gil-Alana, Modelling Structural Breaks in the US, UK and Japanese Unemployment Rates, May 2006

1735 Emily J. Blanchard, Reevaluating the Role of Trade Agreements: Does Investment Globalization Make the WTO Obsolete?, May 2006

1736 Per Engström and Bertil Holmlund, Tax Evasion and Self-Employment in a High-Tax Country: Evidence from Sweden, May 2006

1737 Erkki Koskela and Mikko Puhakka, Cycles and Indeterminacy in Overlapping Generations Economies with Stone-Geary Preferences, May 2006

1738 Saku Aura and Thomas Davidoff, Supply Constraints and Housing Prices, May 2006

1739 Balázs Égert and Ronald MacDonald, Monetary Transmission Mechanism in Transition Economies: Surveying the Surveyable, June 2006

1740 Ben J. Heijdra and Ward E. Romp, Ageing and Growth in the Small Open Economy, June 2006

1741 Robert Fenge and Volker Meier, Subsidies for Wages and Infrastructure: How to Restrain Undesired Immigration, June 2006

1742 Robert S. Chirinko and Debdulal Mallick, The Elasticity of Derived Demand, Factor Substitution and Product Demand: Corrections to Hicks' Formula and Marshall's Four Rules, June 2006

1743 Harry P. Bowen, Haris Munandar and Jean-Marie Viaene, Evidence and Implications of Zipf's Law for Integrated Economies, June 2006

1744 Markku Lanne and Helmut Luetkepohl, Identifying Monetary Policy Shocks via Changes in Volatility, June 2006

1745 Timo Trimborn, Karl-Josef Koch and Thomas M. Steger, Multi-Dimensional Transitional Dynamics: A Simple Numberical Procedure, June 2006