

Contraction Mapping Theorem for the Cartesian Product of Complete Metric Spaces

Alexis Akira Toda*

January 27, 2022

Abstract

This paper extends the classical contraction mapping theorem to the Cartesian product of complete metric spaces. The modulus $\beta < 1$ of a contraction mapping is replaced by the condition $\rho(B) < 1$, where B is an appropriate nonnegative matrix and ρ denotes the spectral radius. Blackwell's sufficient condition is also generalized in this setting. Applications to dynamic programming and asset pricing are discussed.

Keywords: contraction, dynamic programming, spectral radius.

1 Introduction

Let (X, d) be a complete metric space. A self map $T : X \rightarrow X$ is called a contraction mapping with modulus $\beta \in [0, 1)$ if

$$d(Tx, Ty) \leq \beta d(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X. \quad (1.1)$$

The well-known Banach's contraction mapping theorem states that a contraction mapping T has a unique fixed point $x^* \in X$, and starting from any initial value x^0 , the sequence $x^n := T^n x^0$ obtained by iterating T converges to x^* at rate β^n . The contraction mapping theorem as well as Blackwell (1965)'s sufficient conditions play a crucial role in the theory of dynamic programming, which is the foundation of many dynamic economic models (see, for instance, Bertsekas and Shreve (1978), Stokey and Lucas (1989), and Bertsekas (2017) for some textbook treatment).

This paper extends the classical contraction mapping theorem to the Cartesian product of complete metric spaces. Instead of the contraction condition (1.1), we require

$$v(Tx, Ty) \leq Bv(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X, \quad (1.2)$$

where $X = X_1 \times \cdots \times X_I$ is a Cartesian product of complete metric spaces, $v(x, y) = (d_1(x, y), \dots, d_I(x, y))$ is the vector of distances in each space, and $B = (b_{ij})$ is a nonnegative square matrix with spectral radius (largest absolute value of all eigenvalues) less than 1. I show that analogous results to the classical

*Department of Economics, University of California San Diego. Email: atoda@ucsd.edu.

contraction mapping theorem such as existence and uniqueness of a fixed point, convergence, and error analysis hold in this generalized setting.

The motivation behind this generalization comes from the theory of stochastic dynamic programming. Standard dynamic programming problems seek to maximize the expected present discounted value of payoffs

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(x_t, y_t), \quad (1.3)$$

where \mathbb{E} is the expectation operator, $\beta \in [0, 1)$ is the discount factor, u is the flow utility function, and (x_t, y_t) are state and control variables at time t . Many recent works in economics consider dynamic programming problems with state-dependent discounting that seek to maximize

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left(\prod_{s=0}^t \beta_s \right) u(x_t, y_t), \quad (1.4)$$

where $\beta_t \geq 0$ is the discount factor from time $t - 1$ to t that can be stochastic and we normalize $\beta_0 \equiv 1$; see [Krusell and Smith \(1998\)](#), [Toda \(2019\)](#), and [Cao \(2020\)](#) for several examples and [Stachurski and Zhang \(2021\)](#) for a review of such models. Importantly, in this class of models the discount factor β_t is permitted to exceed 1 occasionally, which makes the standard contraction mapping argument inapplicable.¹ In a recent paper, [Stachurski and Zhang \(2021\)](#) develop a general theory of dynamic programming with state-dependent discounting by assuming what they call the “eventually discounting” condition. This condition allows them to show that some iterate of the Bellman operator is a contraction mapping and recover existence and uniqueness results.

The approach presented in this paper significantly simplify their argument. Instead of showing that some iterate of the Bellman operator is a contraction, my approach clarifies under what conditions a self map behaves like a contraction. In addition to generalizing the contraction mapping theorem, I generalize [Blackwell \(1965\)](#)’s sufficient conditions. Furthermore, simple applications to stochastic dynamic programming with state-dependent discounting and asset pricing are discussed.

2 Main results

We aim to generalize the contraction mapping theorem when X is the Cartesian product of complete metric spaces. For each $i = 1, \dots, I$, let (X_i, d_i) be a complete metric space. Define the product space (X, d) by $X = \prod_{i=1}^I X_i$ and $d(x, y) = \max_i d_i(x_i, y_i)$, where $x = (x_1, \dots, x_I)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_I)$. Recall that for a square matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, the *spectral radius*, denoted by $\rho(A)$, is defined by the largest absolute value of all eigenvalues:

$$\rho(A) := \max \{ |\alpha| \mid \alpha \text{ is an eigenvalue of } A \}.$$

We introduce the following definition.

¹Even if the discount factor is constant and strictly less than 1, similar issues arise in some models with “rate of return risk”. See [Ma et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Ma and Toda \(2021\)](#) for some discussions.

Definition 2.1. A self map $T : X \rightarrow X$ is a *generalized contraction* with coefficient matrix $B = (b_{ij})$ if B is nonnegative, $\rho(B) < 1$, and

$$d_i((Tx)_i, (Ty)_i) \leq \sum_{j=1}^I b_{ij} d_j(x_j, y_j) \quad (2.1)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, I$ and $x, y \in X$.

For any $x, y \in X$, define the vector of distances by

$$v(x, y) := (d_i(x_i, y_i))_{i=1}^I \in \mathbb{R}_+^I. \quad (2.2)$$

Then clearly $v(x, y) \geq 0$ and $v(y, x) = v(x, y)$. If $v(x, y) = 0$, then $d_i(x_i, y_i) = 0$ for all i , so $x_i = y_i$ and hence $x = y$. If $x, y, z \in X$, since

$$d_i(x_i, z_i) \leq d_i(x_i, y_i) + d_i(y_i, z_i)$$

for each i because (X_i, d_i) is a metric space, we have

$$v(x, z) \leq v(x, y) + v(y, z), \quad (2.3)$$

where \leq is defined entry-wise. Therefore v satisfies all axioms of a metric except that it is vector-valued. Using v , the generalized contraction condition (2.1) can be compactly written as

$$v(Tx, Ty) \leq Bv(x, y). \quad (2.4)$$

The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2.2 (Generalized Contraction Mapping Theorem). *For each $i = 1, \dots, I$, let (X_i, d_i) be a complete metric space, and define the complete metric space (X, d) by $X = \prod_{i=1}^I X_i$ and $d(x, y) = \max_i d_i(x_i, y_i)$. Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a generalized contraction mapping with coefficient matrix $B = (b_{ij})$ with spectral radius $\rho(B) < 1$. Then*

1. $T : X \rightarrow X$ has a unique fixed point $x^* \in X$,
2. For any $x^0 \in X$, we have $T^n x^0 \rightarrow x^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,
3. For any $\beta \in (\rho(B), 1)$, the approximation error $d(T^n x^0, x^*)$ is $O(\beta^n)$.

Proof. Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the supremum norm in \mathbb{R}^I (so $\|x\| = \max_i |x_i|$ for $x = (x_1, \dots, x_I)$) as well as the operator norm for $I \times I$ matrices induced by $\|\cdot\|$. Note that $\|\cdot\|$ is monotonic in the sense that $0 \leq x \leq y$ implies

$$\|x\| = \max_i |x_i| \leq \max_i |y_i| = \|y\|. \quad (2.5)$$

By the definitions of d and v in (2.2), we have

$$d(x, y) = \max_i d_i(x_i, y_i) = \|v(x, y)\|.$$

Take any $x^0 \in X$ and define $x^n = T^n x^0$. Let us first show that $\{x^n\} \subset X$ is bounded. To see this, iterating (2.4), we obtain

$$v(x^k, x^{k-1}) \leq B^{k-1} v(x^1, x^0).$$

Summing this inequality over $k = 1, \dots, n$ and using the triangle inequality (2.3), we obtain

$$v(x^n, x^0) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n v(x^k, x^{k-1}) \leq (I + B + \dots + B^{n-1})v(x^1, x^0)$$

for all n . Since $B \geq 0$ and $\rho(B) < 1$ by assumption, $\sum_{k=1}^n B^{k-1}$ monotonically converges to the nonnegative matrix $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} B^{k-1} = (I - B)^{-1}$. Therefore

$$v(x^n, x^0) \leq (I - B)^{-1}v(x^1, x^0)$$

for all n . Taking the supremum norm of both sides and using the monotonicity (2.5), we obtain

$$d(x^n, x^0) = \|v(x^n, x^0)\| \leq \|(I - B)^{-1}v(x^1, x^0)\| =: M < \infty,$$

implying that the sequence $\{x^n\}$ is bounded.

Next let us show that $\{x^n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence and hence convergent. If $m \geq n$, iterating (2.4) yields

$$v(x^m, x^n) \leq B^n v(x^{m-n}, x^0).$$

Taking the supremum norm of both sides, using the monotonicity (2.5), and noting that $\{x^n\}$ is bounded, we obtain

$$d(x^m, x^n) = \|v(x^m, x^n)\| \leq \|B^n\| \|v(x^{m-n}, x^0)\| \leq M \|B^n\|.$$

By the Gelfand spectral radius formula (Horn and Johnson, 2013, Theorem 5.7.10), we have $\|B^n\|^{1/n} \rightarrow \rho(B) < 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore for any $\beta \in (\rho(B), 1)$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|B^n\| \leq C\beta^n$ for all n , so $\|B^n\| \rightarrow 0$ and $\{x^n\}$ is Cauchy. Since each (X_i, d_i) is a complete metric space, so is (X, d) , and therefore there exists $x^* \in X$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^n = x^*$.

Let us show that x^* is the unique fixed point of T . By the triangle inequality and (2.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v(Tx^*, x^*) &\leq v(Tx^*, Tx^n) + v(Tx^n, x^*) \\ &\leq Bv(x^*, x^n) + v(x^{n+1}, x^*). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum norm of both sides, we obtain

$$d(Tx^*, x^*) \leq \|B\| d(x^n, x^*) + d(x^{n+1}, x^*) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ because $x^n \rightarrow x^*$. Therefore $d(Tx^*, x^*) = 0$ and hence $Tx^* = x^*$, so x^* is a fixed point of T . If x^*, y^* are two fixed points, then for any n we have

$$v(x^*, y^*) = v(T^n x^*, T^n y^*) \leq B^n v(x^*, y^*).$$

Taking the supremum norm of both sides, we obtain

$$d(x^*, y^*) = \|v(x^*, y^*)\| \leq \|B^n\| \|v(x^*, y^*)\| \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so $d(x^*, y^*) = 0$ and $x^* = y^*$. Therefore the fixed point is unique.

Finally, for any x^0 and $x^n = T^n x^0$, we have

$$v(x^n, x^*) = v(T^n x^0, T^n x^*) \leq B^n v(x^0, x^*).$$

Therefore

$$d(x^n, x^*) = \|v(x^n, x^*)\| \leq \|B^n\| \|v(x^0, x^*)\| \leq C\beta^n \|v(x^0, x^*)\| \rightarrow 0,$$

and the approximation error $d(x^n, x^*)$ is $O(\beta^n)$. \square

Clearly the classical contraction mapping theorem is a special case of Theorem 2.2 by setting $I = 1$ and $B = \beta < 1$.

As in Blackwell (1965), we can derive a simple sufficient condition for the generalized contraction property (2.1). Let Ω be a nonempty set. For each $i = 1, \dots, I$, suppose that $X_i \subset \mathbb{R}^\Omega$ is a subset of all real functions $f_i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is a complete metric space with respect to the sup metric

$$d_i(f_i, g_i) := \sup_{x \in \Omega} |f_i(x) - g_i(x)|.$$

Letting $X = \prod_{i=1}^I X_i$ and $d(f, g) = \max_i d_i(f_i, g_i)$ for $f = (f_1, \dots, f_I) \in X$ and $g = (g_1, \dots, g_I) \in X$, then (X, d) becomes a complete metric space. Furthermore, $X \subset (\mathbb{R}^I)^\Omega$ is partially ordered by letting $f \leq g$ if $f_i(x) \leq g_i(x)$ for all i and $x \in \Omega$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $T : X \rightarrow X$ be a self map with the following properties:*

1. (Monotonicity) *If $f \leq g$, then $Tf \leq Tg$.*
2. (Discounting) *For any $f \in X$ and nonnegative vector $c \in \mathbb{R}_+^I$, we have $f + c \in X$. Furthermore, there exists a nonnegative matrix $B = (b_{ij})$ with $\rho(B) < 1$ such that for any $c \in \mathbb{R}_+^I$, we have*

$$T(f + c) \leq Tf + Bc. \quad (2.6)$$

Then T is a generalized contraction with coefficient matrix B .

Proof. Take any $f, g \in X$. Then for each i and $x \in \Omega$, we have

$$f_i(x) \leq g_i(x) + |f_i(x) - g_i(x)| \leq g_i(x) + d_i(f_i, g_i).$$

Letting $c_i = d_i(f_i, g_i) \in [0, \infty)$ and $c = (c_1, \dots, c_I)$, noting that T is monotone and applying (2.6), we obtain

$$(Tf)_i(x) \leq (T(g + c))_i(x) \leq (Tg)_i(x) + (Bc)_i.$$

Therefore

$$(Tf)_i(x) - (Tg)_i(x) \leq (Bc)_i.$$

Interchanging the roles of f, g , we obtain

$$(Tg)_i(x) - (Tf)_i(x) \leq (Bc)_i.$$

Therefore

$$|(Tf)_i(x) - (Tg)_i(x)| \leq (Bc)_i.$$

Taking the supremum over $x \in \Omega$, we obtain

$$d_i((Tf)_i, (Tg)_i) \leq (Bc)_i = \sum_{j=1}^I b_{ij} d_j(f_j, g_j),$$

which is the generalized contraction condition (2.1). \square

3 Applications

This section discusses several applications of the Generalized Contraction Mapping Theorem 2.2.

3.1 Dynamic programming with stochastic discounting

Here I show that Theorem 2.2 can be applied in a straightforward way to solve dynamic programming problems with state-dependent discounting when the exogenous shocks are driven by a finite state Markov chain, which simplifies some of the arguments in Stachurski and Zhang (2021).²

Let $I = \{1, \dots, I\}$ be a finite set and $\{i_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ be a Markov chain taking values in I with transition probability matrix $P = (p_{ij})$. Consider the following dynamic programming problem in a Markovian environment. Let X, Y be nonempty sets. At each stage $t = 0, 1, \dots$, given the exogenous state $i_t \in I$ and endogenous state variable $x_t \in X$, the decision maker chooses the control variable $y_t \in \Gamma_{i_t}(x_t)$, where $\Gamma_i : X \rightarrow Y$ is a correspondence with $\Gamma_i(x) \neq \emptyset$. Given the exogenous state i_t , endogenous state x_t , and control y_t , the decision maker receives the flow utility $u_{i_t}(x_t, y_t)$ and the next period's state is determined by the law of motion $x_{t+1} = g_{i_t i_{t+1}}(x_t, y_t)$, where $u_i : X \times Y \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$ and $g_{ij} : X \times Y \rightarrow X$. Conditional on transitioning from state $i_t = i$ to $i_{t+1} = j$, the decision maker discounts the next period's flow utility using the discount factor $\beta_{ij} \geq 0$.

Mathematically, the problem is

$$\text{maximize} \quad \mathbb{E}_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left(\prod_{s=0}^t \beta_{i_{s-1} i_s} \right) u_{i_t}(x_t, y_t) \quad (3.1a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad (\forall t) y_t \in \Gamma_{i_t}(x_t), \quad x_{t+1} = g_{i_t i_{t+1}}(x_t, y_t), \quad (3.1b)$$

$$x_0 \in X \text{ and } i_0 \in I \text{ given,} \quad (3.1c)$$

where $\beta_{i_{-1} i_0} \equiv 1$ and $\Pr(i_{t+1} = j \mid i_t = i) = p_{ij}$.

For a function $V : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^I$, define the Bellman operator T by

$$(TV)_i(x) = \sup_{y \in \Gamma_i(x)} \left\{ u_i(x, y) + \sum_{j=1}^I p_{ij} \beta_{ij} V_j(g_{ij}(x, y)) \right\}. \quad (3.2)$$

We say that $V^* : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^I$ satisfies the Bellman equation if V^* is a fixed point of T , so $V^* = TV^*$. Standard results (e.g., Blackwell, 1965) show that if $\beta_{ij} \equiv \beta < 1$ is constant and each u_i is bounded, then T is a contraction mapping (with modulus β) on the space $(bX)^I$ of bounded functions from X to \mathbb{R}^I (and thus has a unique fixed point $V^* \in (bX)^I$), and that $V_{i_0}^*(x_0)$ is the supremum value of the dynamic programming problem (3.1).

The following theorem generalizes the theory of stochastic dynamic programming to the case with state-dependent discounting.

²A similar argument appears earlier in (Ma et al., 2020, Lemma B.5), although it is specialized to an income fluctuation problem with state-dependent discounting and returns, which is solved by Euler equation iteration. Appendix A of Ma and Toda (2021) also exploits a similar idea.

Theorem 3.1. *Let X, Y be nonempty sets, $u_i \in b(X \times Y)$, $\Gamma_i : X \rightarrow Y$ be such that $\Gamma_i(x) \neq \emptyset$ for all $x \in X$, and $g_{ij} : X \times Y \rightarrow X$. Define the matrix $B = (p_{ij}\beta_{ij})$ and assume $\rho(B) < 1$. Then the followings are true.*

1. $T : (bX)^I \rightarrow (bX)^I$ defined by (3.2) is a generalized contraction mapping with coefficient matrix B .
2. Letting $V^* \in (bX)^I$ be the unique fixed point of T , $V_{i_0}^*(x_0)$ is the supremum value of the dynamic programming problem (3.1).

Proof. We only show the first claim as the second is similar to standard results.

Since by assumption each u_i is bounded, if $V \in (bX)^I$, then clearly the right-hand side of (3.2) is bounded. Therefore $T : (bX)^I \rightarrow (bX)^I$. To show that T is a generalized contraction, it suffices to verify the assumptions of Theorem 2.3. Monotonicity of T is trivial. To show the discounting property (2.6), take any $V \in (bX)^I$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}_+^I$. Then $V + c \in (bX)^I$, and it follows from (3.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} (T(V + c))_i(x) &= \sup_{y \in \Gamma_i(x)} \left\{ u_i(x, y) + \sum_{j=1}^I p_{ij}\beta_{ij}(V_j(g_{ij}(x, y)) + c_j) \right\} \\ &= (TV)_i(x) + \sum_{j=1}^I p_{ij}\beta_{ij}c_j = (TV)_i(x) + (Bc)_i. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\rho(B) < 1$ by assumption, by Theorem 2.3 T is a generalized contraction mapping with coefficient matrix B . \square

3.2 Asset pricing

Consider a financial asset that trades at price P_t and pays dividend $D_t > 0$ at time t . Standard results in asset pricing (Harrison and Kreps, 1979) show that the absence of arbitrage implies the existence of a stochastic discount factor M_t such that

$$P_t = \mathbb{E}_t[M_{t+1}(P_{t+1} + D_{t+1})]. \quad (3.3)$$

Consider a simple asset pricing model in which $I = \{1, \dots, I\}$ is the finite set of exogenous states and $\{i_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ is a Markov chain taking values in I with irreducible transition probability matrix $P = (p_{ij})$. Let $m_{ij} > 0$ be the stochastic discount factor conditional on transitioning from state i to j . Let the dividend growth $G_t := D_t/D_{t-1}$ take value $G_{ij} > 0$ conditional on transitioning from state i to j . Then under what condition does the asset has a finite price-dividend ratio?

Let $v_i = P_t/D_t$ be the price-dividend ratio in state i . Dividing both sides of (3.3) by $D_t > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v_i &= \frac{P_t}{D_t} = \mathbb{E}_t \left[M_{t+1} \frac{D_{t+1}}{D_t} \left(\frac{P_{t+1}}{D_{t+1}} + 1 \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J p_{ij} m_{ij} G_{ij} (v_j + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Defining the vector $v = (v_1, \dots, v_I)$ and matrix $B = (p_{ij}m_{ij}G_{ij})$, the above equation can be written as

$$v = Tv := Bv + B1,$$

where $1 = (1, \dots, 1)$ is the vector of ones. We can now characterize the price-dividend ratios as follows.

Proposition 3.2. *The asset has finite price-dividend ratios if and only if $\rho(B) < 1$, in which case*

$$v = (I - B)^{-1}B1. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. Suppose $\rho(B) < 1$. Applying Theorem 2.3, we can see that $T : \mathbb{R}_+^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^I$ is a generalized contraction with the unique fixed point given by (3.4).

Suppose next that $\rho(B) \geq 1$ and the vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_+^I$ of price-dividend ratios is finite. Multiplying the left Perron vector $u > 0$ of B from left to $v = Tv$, it follows from $B1 \gg 0$ that

$$u'v = u'(Bv + B1) = \rho(B)u'v + u'B1 \implies 0 \geq (1 - \rho(B))u'v = u'B1 > 0,$$

which is a contradiction. \square

The asset pricing model is simple enough that Proposition 3.2 can be easily proved without appealing to the generalized contraction mapping theorem. However, using Theorem 2.2 clarifies the argument.

References

- Dimitri P. Bertsekas. *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control*, volume 2. Athena Scientific, fourth edition, 2017.
- Dimitri P. Bertsekas and Steven E. Shreve. *Stochastic Optimal Control: The Discrete Time Case*. Academic Press, 1978.
- David Blackwell. Discounted dynamic programming. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 36(1):226–235, February 1965. doi:[10.1214/aoms/1177700285](https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177700285).
- Dan Cao. Recursive equilibrium in Krusell and Smith (1998). *Journal of Economic Theory*, 186:104978, March 2020. doi:[10.1016/j.jet.2019.104978](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2019.104978).
- J. Michael Harrison and David M. Kreps. Martingales and arbitrage in multi-period securities market. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 20(3):381–408, June 1979. doi:[10.1016/0022-0531\(79\)90043-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0531(79)90043-7).
- Roger A. Horn and Charles R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, New York, second edition, 2013.
- Per Krusell and Anthony A. Smith, Jr. Income and wealth heterogeneity in the macroeconomy. *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(5):867–896, October 1998. doi:[10.1086/250034](https://doi.org/10.1086/250034).
- Qingyin Ma and Alexis Akira Toda. A theory of the saving rate of the rich. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 192:105193, March 2021. doi:[10.1016/j.jet.2021.105193](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2021.105193).

Qingyin Ma, John Stachurski, and Alexis Akira Toda. The income fluctuation problem and the evolution of wealth. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 187: 105003, May 2020. doi:[10.1016/j.jet.2020.105003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2020.105003).

John Stachurski and Junnan Zhang. Dynamic programming with state-dependent discounting. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 192:105190, March 2021. doi:[10.1016/j.jet.2021.105190](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2021.105190).

Nancy L. Stokey and Robert E. Lucas, Jr. *Recursive Methods in Economic Dynamics*. Harvard University Press, 1989.

Alexis Akira Toda. Wealth distribution with random discount factors. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 104:101–113, June 2019. doi:[10.1016/j.jmoneco.2018.09.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmoneco.2018.09.006).