

Technical appendix of “Debt contracts with *ex-ante* and *ex-post* asymmetric information: an example.”

G. Carlier * L. Renou †

1st September 2004

Computation and properties of the density g_μ

In the sequel for $x := (x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ we shall simply write $x := (x_1, x')$. Taking a test-function $\varphi \in C^0([\alpha_1, 0], \mathbb{R})$, using the change of variables $p = (p_1, p') \mapsto (\alpha \cdot p, p')$ and Fubini’s formula we get:

$$\int_{\Sigma_{N-1}} \varphi(\alpha \cdot p) \rho(p) dp = - \int_{\alpha_1}^0 \frac{\varphi(t)}{\alpha_1} \left(\int_{\Sigma_t} \rho\left(\frac{t}{\alpha_1} - \sum_{n=2}^{N-1} \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_1} p_n, p'\right) dp' \right) dt,$$

where:

$$\Sigma_t := \left\{ p' \in \Sigma_{N-2} : \left(\frac{t}{\alpha_1} - \sum_{n=2}^{N-1} \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_1} p_n, p' \right) \in \Sigma_{N-1} \right\}.$$

This proves that μ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue’s measure on $[\alpha_1, 0]$ and admits the density:

$$g_\mu(t) = -\frac{1}{\alpha_1} \int_{\Sigma_t} \rho\left(\frac{t}{\alpha_1} - \sum_{n=2}^{N-1} \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_1} p_n, p'\right) dp'.$$

g_μ is trivially positive since α_1 is negative. We shall write g_μ in a more compact way as:

$$g_\mu(t) = \int_{\Sigma_t} \sigma(t, p') dp' \text{ with } \sigma(t, p') = -\frac{1}{\alpha_1} \rho\left(\frac{t}{\alpha_1} - \sum_{n=2}^{N-1} \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_1} p_n, p'\right).$$

*Université Paris IX-Dauphine, CEREMADE, Place du Maréchal De Lattre De Tassigny, 75775 Paris CEDEX 16, France, carlier@ceremade.dauphine.fr.

†School of Economics, Room G52, Napier Building, University of Adelaide, 5005 Australia, ludovic.renou@adelaide.edu.au.

If ρ is continuous so is g_μ (use Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem and the fact that, if t_n converge to t , the indicator function of Σ_{t_n} converges to that of Σ_t a.e. with respect to the $N - 2$ dimensional Lebesgue's measure). Since $\Sigma_0 = \Sigma_{\alpha_1} = 0_{\mathbb{R}^{N-2}}$, we have $g_\mu(0) = g_\mu(\alpha_1) = 0$. Moreover, if ρ is strictly positive on the interior of Σ_{N-1} , so is g_μ on $(\alpha_1, 0)$.

Lemma 1 *If $\rho \in C^1(\Sigma_{N-1}, \mathbb{R})$ and ρ is strictly positive on Σ_{N-1} , then there exists a neighborhood of 0 on which g_μ is nonincreasing.*

Proof. First, note that Σ_t can be written as

$$\Sigma_t = \left\{ p' \in \Sigma_{N-2} : \sum_{n=2}^{N-1} \alpha_n p_n \geq t \text{ and } \sum_{n=2}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_1}\right) p_n \leq 1 - \frac{t}{\alpha_1} \right\}.$$

For t sufficiently close to 0, the requirements $p' \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N-2}$ and $\sum \alpha_n p_n \geq t$ imply $\sum_{n=2}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_n}{\alpha_1}\right) p_n \leq 1 - \frac{t}{\alpha_1}$ and $\sum_{n=2}^{N-1} p_n \leq 1$ so that there exists t_0 such that for $t_0 \leq t < 0$

$$\Sigma_t = \left\{ p' \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N-2} : \sum_{n=2}^{N-1} \alpha_n p_n \geq t \right\} = -tA_0, \quad (1)$$

where A_0 is the (fixed) set

$$A_0 := \left\{ p' \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N-2} : \sum_{n=2}^{N-1} \alpha_n p_n \geq -1 \right\}.$$

Hence, for $t \in (t_0, 0)$, $g_\mu(t)$ can be computed as

$$g_\mu(t) = (-t)^{N-2} \int_{A_0} \sigma(t, -tq) dq.$$

Differentiating this expression yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{g}_\mu(t) &= -(N-2)(-t)^{N-3} \int_{A_0} \sigma(t, -tq) dq \\ &\quad + (-t)^{N-2} \int_{A_0} (\partial_t \sigma(t, -tq) - \partial_q \sigma(t, -tq) \cdot q) dq \end{aligned}$$

so that $\dot{g}_\mu(t) < 0$ for sufficiently close to 0. □

The case of observable lender's type

As a benchmark, let us consider the optimal (type-dependent) contract when the lender's type $p \in \Sigma_{N-1}$ is observable by the borrower. If p is observable, for each p , the borrower determines $\bar{\omega}$ and C by maximizing the profit:

$$\pi(\bar{\omega}, C) := \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{q_n}{2\varepsilon} \int_{\bar{\omega}}^{\theta_n + \varepsilon} (\omega - \bar{\omega}) d\omega - C \quad (2)$$

subject to $\bar{\omega} \in [\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]$ and the participation constraint:

$$U(p, \bar{\omega}, C) = (\alpha \cdot p)\bar{\omega} + \beta \cdot p + z(\bar{\omega}) + C \geq r \quad (3)$$

Since clearly (3) is binding, one gets:

$$C = r - (\alpha \cdot p)\bar{\omega} - \beta \cdot p - z(\bar{\omega}).$$

Replacing in (2) and defining the reduced type $t := \alpha \cdot p$, elementary calculus yields:

$$\pi(p, \bar{\omega}, C) = \bar{\omega}(t - \tau) + k'$$

where k' is some constant and:

$$\tau = -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left(\theta_N - \sum_{n=1}^N \theta_n q_n - \gamma \right).$$

Hence, when p is observable, the borrower offers the contract $\underline{\delta}$ to lenders with types $t \in [\alpha_1, 0]$ with $t \leq \tau$ and contract $\bar{\delta}$ to lenders with type $t \geq \tau$. It is easy to check that $\tau \geq \alpha_1$ and that pooling occurs ($\underline{\delta}$ offered to all the lenders) exactly when $\tau \geq 0$ which is the same condition as in the adverse selection case.