

Producer Decision and Input Demand Theory

A Modern Approach

Yasuhiro Sakai

Shiga University / Professor Emeritus

I The Firm's Expansion Effect versus the Consumer's Income Effect

The purpose of this paper is to rigorously analyze producer decision and production possibility sets, thus exploring the *axiomatic foundations* of production theory. In older days, Hicks (1946, 1953), Samuelson (1947), Morishima (1953a, 1953b), and others, elaborated upon the well-established analysis of profit-maximizing firm's demand for inputs. Their main mathematical tools were *classical differential calculus*.

In more recent times, however, there have emerged a series of papers which bravely study the *axiomatic foundations of production theory* on the basis of *more modern topological tools*. For this point, see Scott (1962), Bear (1965), Ferguson (1966, 1968, 1969), Friedman (1972), Rader (1968), Basett and Borchering (1969), Hirota & Sakai (1969), Syrquin (1970), Shephard (1970), Arrow & Hahn (1971), Sakai (1973, 1974, 1975), and Malinvaud (1985). After the 1990s until the present day, unifying the axiomatic foundations of both consumption and production theories, brand new approaches named *duality approaches to microeconomic theory* have emerged and widely flourished, with Diewert (1982, 2018), Varian (1999, 2009), and McKenzie (2002) being eminent accomplishments.

A number of those economists above mentioned have bravely attempted to clear up a matter of long-standing confusion concerning the analogy between *consumer's income effect* and *producer's expansion effect*. While consumer demand theory and input demand theory

This paper is a drastically abridged version of Sakai (2023), with many equations and figures shortened and even omitted. I am grateful to Dr. Masashi Tajima for technical assistance.

1) In the 1960s and the 1970s, I myself was a graduate student at the University of Rochester. And completing my Ph.D. thesis, I became an assistant professor at the University of Pittsburgh. In hindsight, I was so fortunate to be surrounded by many outstanding professors such as Lionel McKenzie, Edward Zabel, Ronald Jones, Hugh Rose, James Friedman, Walter Oi, and Akira

appear to be analogous, they are not the same at all. Even a small difference at start may produce a big distinction at goal. The question how and to what extent they are really different is our main concern here.¹⁾

As was independently shown by Hirota & Sakai (1969) and also by Syrquin (1970), the effect of a change in the price of a certain input on the demand for another input can be divided into the following two separate effects. They are *a substitution effect along the old isoquant* and *an expansion effect along the new expansion path*. Unfortunately, the mathematical tool they employed was simple calculus, thus lacking mathematical rigor and fineness. The main purpose of this paper is to make our input demand theory mathematically more sophisticated than the previous attempts, yet developing it in many possible applications to economic reality.

we obtain a sort of decomposition equation in input demand theory which appears to correspond well to the famous Slutsky equation in consumer demand theory. The correspondence between the two decomposition equations, however, is not quite exact: indeed, they look similar but are not identical. We must pay special attention to the critical difference between the word "similar" and the word "identical."²⁾

In this paper, we widely apply the powerful method of McKenzie (1957), which was originally used for the development of consumption theory, to the new area of input demand theory. Then, we can successfully derive various kinds of decomposition equations. And in so doing, we develop the *new idea of a compensated change in output price when a certain input price varies*. This idea is analogous to, but not

exactly the same as, the familiar concept of a compensated change in income when a certain commodity price varies in the traditional consumption theory à la Hicks (1946).

So far, input demand theory has been developed in connection with the problem of *inferior inputs*. An input is called *normal* (or *inferior*) if a rise in output price causes an increase (or a decrease) in the demand in that input. We can obtain the following results. (i) While it is possible that all inputs are normal, it is not possible that they are all inferior. (ii) In case a certain input is inferior, it is not possible that all other inputs are gross complements with it although it is possible that they are all gross substitute for it.

The contents of this paper are as follows. Section II is addressed to a system or a production technology. In Section III, the definition of cost and profit functions will be given, with a careful discussion of their properties. The topological approach of Shephard (1970) to the duality principle between cost and production is developed in these two sections. The total effect of a change in the price of a certain input on the demand for another input is decomposed into substitution and scale effects. In Section IV, we are first concerned with the properties of substitution and total effects, and examine the question how and to what extent they are similar to, or different from, those of substitution and total effects in consumption theory. The problems of inferior inputs and of net and gross substitutability are also discussed. Section V is devoted to various types of decomposition equations in input demand theory — one finite increment and two differential versions. It is rigorously shown that the demand curve of an input is not positively

Takayama, and by many brilliant students including Jerry Green, Jose Sheinkman, Masayoshi Hirota, and Michihiro Ohyama. Though perhaps too late, I would like to say my sincere thanks to all of them.

2) Historically speaking, the fundamental difference between consumer demand theory and input demand theory was first noticed by Hicks (1946), Chapter 7, and mathematically sophisticated by Samuelson (1947), Chapter 4. It seems, however, that the *similarity* between them was not fully developed by these authors, resulting in later development of input demand theory.

sloping, and the substitution and expansion effects always go in the same direction. In Section VI, we will apply our analysis to show the validity of the Le Chatelier-Samuelson principle in input demand theory.

II Production Possibility Sets

We are concerned with a firm that is faced with the problem of producing a single output from a combination of a finite number of inputs subject to a production technology. Let us suppose that there are n inputs and that input-output prices are competitively determined in the market, being independent of the firm's individual behavior.

In what follows, we will make full use of a powerful topological method. For this method, see McFadden (1966), Malinvaud (1985), Mas-Colell & Whinston & Green (1995), McKenzie (2002), and Mitra & Nishimura (2009).

Let us denote an input bundle by $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$. The set of all conceivable input bundles is denoted by X . X is the set of all non-negative n -vectors :

$$X = \{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) : x \geq 0\}. \quad (1)$$

Let us assume that for any $x \in X$, the largest output is conceivable and conveniently denoted by a *production function* $f(x)$. Let Y be the range of the production function :

$$Y = \{y : y \geq 0 \text{ and } y = f(x) \text{ for some } x \in X\}. \quad (2)$$

We assume that Y is nonempty, convex, and open above. Y need not be the nonnegative real line. It may be any subset of Y .

We now let define the following sets.

$$W = \{w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n) : w > 0\}. \quad (3)$$

$$P = \{p : p > 0\}. \quad (4)$$

Evidently, W is the input price space or the set of all input vectors, and P is the output price space or the set of all conceivable output prices.

There is an alternative useful description of the production function $f(x)$. To show this, let us define the following production possibility sets .

$$\bar{A}(y) = \{x : x \in X \text{ and } f(x) \geq y\}. \quad (5)$$

$$\underline{A}(y) = \{x : x \in X \text{ and } f(x) \leq y\}. \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} I(y) &= \bar{A}(y) \cap \underline{A}(y) \\ &= \{x : x \in X \text{ and } f(x) = y\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

It is noted that the *upper possibility set* $\bar{A}(y)$ is the set of all input vectors which are capable of producing *at least* the output y , whereas the *lower possibility set* $\underline{A}(y)$ is the set of all input vectors which are capable of producing *at most* the output y . The set $I(y)$, which is the intersection of $\bar{A}(y)$ and $\underline{A}(y)$, is clearly the familiar *isoquant frontier* corresponding to y .³⁾

We are ready to define a *production technology* as a family of those production possibility sets satisfying the following four assumptions.

Assumption (A1) If $0 \in I(y)$, then $y = 0$.

Assumption (A2) For each $y \in Y$, $\bar{A}(y)$ and $\underline{A}(y)$ are nonempty and closed in X .

³⁾ For a topological and convex approach to production theory, see Uzawa (1964), Nikaido (1968), Shephard (1970), and others.

Assumption (A3) Let us take $x^0 \in \bar{A}(y^0)$ and $x^1 \in \bar{A}(y^1)$ where $x^0 \neq x^1$. For any $t \in (0, 1)$, if we put $x^t = (1-t)x^0 + tx^1$ and $y^t = (1-t)y^0 + ty^1$, then we must find $x^t \in \text{Int } \bar{A}(y^t)$ or the interior of the set $\bar{A}(y^t)$.

Assumption (A4) If $x^1 \geq x^0 \in$ and $x^0 \in \bar{A}(y)$, then $x^1 \in \bar{A}(y)$.

These assumptions require detailed explanations. (A1) states that a positive output cannot be obtained from a null input bundle. In short, nothing comes from nothing. (A2) asserts that any output level y is attainable for some input bundle x , and that the production function $f(x)$ is continuous. Therefore, there should exist neither gaps nor jumps on the production curve.

Remarkably, (A3) together with (A2) clearly implies that the set $\bar{A}(y)$ is a "strictly convex set," meaning that for any x^0 and x^1 , namely two points of $\bar{A}(y)$, if $x^t = (1-t)x^0 + tx^1$, then x^t must belong to the interior of the set $\bar{A}(y)$, not to the boundary $I(y)$.

And finally, (A4) insures that free disposal of inputs is possible. In other words, the producer can dispose of any extra inputs with no costs. Although this may not necessarily reflect the reality, it is theoretically a very convenient assumption.

III The Cost and Profit Functions: Definitions and Properties

In what follows, we assume that Assumptions (A1)–(A4) are met for the production technology. In this section, the definition of

cost and profit functions will be given and their properties will carefully be investigated.

First of all, for any $(w, y) \in W \times Y$, we define a cost function as follows:

$$c(w, y) = \text{Min} \{wx : x \in \bar{A}(y)\}. \quad (8)$$

To see that the cost function $c(w, y)$ is well-defined, we take any arbitrary $x^* \in \bar{A}(y)$ and let $H(w) = \{x : x \in X \text{ and } wx \leq wx^*\}$. Since $\bar{A}(y)$ is closed by (A2) and $H(w)$ is clearly compact, it follows that $\bar{A}(y) \cap H(w)$ is compact as well. Therefore, the continuous function wx takes on a minimum on $\bar{A}(y) \cap H(w)$. Note that for any $x \in \bar{A}(y) - H(w)$, we have $wx > wx^*$. Hence, the function wx attains a minimum on $\bar{A}(y)$.

In connection with the cost function $c(w, y)$, we define a compensated input function as follows:

$$u(w, y) = \{x : x \in \bar{A}(y) \text{ and } wx = c(w, y)\}. \quad (9)$$

The newly-defined function $u(w, y)$ indicates the input bundle demanded by the firm when input prices are w and output is to be y . Under Assumptions (A1)–(A4), $u(w, y)$ is the unique element of X minimizing wx subject to $x \in \bar{A}(y)$. Consequently, we should have the following equation:

$$c(w, y) = w \cdot u(w, y). \quad (10)$$

We are now in a position to establish the following useful lemma:

LEMMA 1 (Properties of $c(w, y)$ and $u(w, y)$)

For all $(w, y) \in W \times Y$, we have the following properties:

- (1) $c(w, y)$ is continuous in (w, y) .
- (2) $c(w, y)$ is differentiable in w , and $\partial c(w, y) / \partial w_i = u_i(w, y)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.
- (3) $c(w, y)$ is homogeneous of degree one in w .
- (4) $c(w, y)$ is concave in w .
- (5) $c(w, y)$ is strictly convex in y .
- (6) If $y^0 > y^1$, $y^0, y^1 \in Y$, then $c(w, y^0) > c(w, y^1)$.
- (7) $u(w, y)$ is continuous in (w, y) .
- (8) $u(w, y)$ is homogeneous of degree zero in w .

The proof of this lemma is rather simple yet considerably lengthy. Because of space constraint, it is omitted here. For details, see Sakai (2023).

At first glance, the contents of Lemma 1 appear to be rather technical and even too mathematical. It should be noticed, however, that it discusses many important properties of the cost and compensated input functions which play critical roles in the theory of cost and production. According to Property (1), the cost function $c(w, y)$ is continuous in (w, y) , so that the *cost curve* as a graphical expression of the cost function is overall smooth and has neither gaps nor jumps throughout. Property (2) tells us that focusing on w only, $c(w, y)$ is extremely smooth, having no kinks at all. Moreover, it also indicates a very nice bridge between the two functions, namely the cost function $c(w, y)$ and the compensated input function $u(w, y)$. Exactly speaking, for any i , we should have $\partial c(w, y) / \partial w_i = u_i(w, y)$, demonstrating that the rate of change of total cost when the price of an input changes is equal to

the amount of compensated demand for that input.

According to Properties (3), (4), (5) and (6), while the cost function $c(w, y)$ is homogeneous one and concave in w , it is strictly convex in y and also strictly increasing. Such concave and convex relations should be worthy of attention. Finally, in the light of Properties (7) and (8), whereas the compensated input demand function $u(w, y)$ is continuous in (w, y) , it is homogeneous of degree zero in w only. This teaches us that $u(w, y)$ reflects the nice properties of $u(w, y)$.

In addition to Assumptions (A1)–(A4), we are now ready to postulate the following assumption.

Assumption (A5) Y is bounded from above.⁴⁾

As will be seen later, the purpose of Assumption (A5) is to force the profit function to be defined later for any $(w, p) \in W \times P$. The newly added Assumption (A5) together with the previous assumptions on Y implies that $Y = [0, y^*]$ for some $y^* < +\infty$. Let $E(w, p) = \{x : x \in X \text{ and } pf(x) - wx \geq 0\}$. Then, under Assumptions (A1)–(A5), the newly defined set $E(w, p)$ is clearly bounded and closed; therefore, the continuous function $pf(x) - wx$ takes on maximum on $E(w, p)$.

Note that by Assumption (A1), $pf(x) - wx = 0$ for $x = 0$; $pf(x) - wx < 0$ for any $x \in X - E(w, p)$. Thus, the maximum attained on $E(w, p)$ is actually the maximum on the whole X .

Now, for any $(w, p) \in W \times P$, let us define a *profit function* $\pi(w, p)$ as follows.

$$\pi(w, p) = \mathbf{Max} \{ pf(x) - wx : x \in X \}. \quad (11)$$

⁴⁾ The purpose of Assumption (A5) is to force the profit function $\pi(w, p) = \{ pf(x) - wx : x \in X \}$ to be defined for any $(w, p) \in W \times P$.

Clearly, for any given price vector (w, p) , $\pi(w, p)$ stands for the maximum profit which can be obtained from the production technology. Since $f(x)$ is strictly concave by Assumption (A3), it is clear that $\pi(w, p)$ is positive for some $(w, p) \in W \times P$. Thus, an *optimum input function* and $x(w, p)$ and an *optimum output function* $y(w, p) \in W \times P$ are defined for all (w, p) . Evidently, $x(w, p)$ and $y(w, p)$ respectively indicate the input bundle as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} x(w, p) &= \{x : x \in X \text{ and } \pi(w, p) \\ &= pf(x) - wx\}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$y(w, p) = f(x(w, p)). \quad (13)$$

Evidently, $x(w, p)$ and $y(w, p)$ respectively indicate the input bundle demanded by the firm, and the output bundle supplied by the firm. It is noted that the input-output vector $(x(w, p), y(w, p))$ is uniquely determined for each price vector $(w, p) \in W \times P$ since the profit $\pi(w, p)$ is strictly concave in x .

The properties of the profit function along with those of the optimum input-output function will be seen in the following lemma.

LEMMA 2 (Properties of $\pi(w, p)$)

For all $(w, p) \in W \times P$, we have following properties .

- (1) $\pi(w, p)$ is differentiable in (w, p) , and $\partial\pi(w, p)/\partial w_i = -x_i(w, p)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $\partial\pi(w, p)/\partial p = y(w, p)$.
- (2) $\pi(w, p)$ is homogeneous of degree one in (w, p) .
- (3) $\pi(w, p)$ is convex in (w, p) .

- (4) If $w^0 \geq w^1 > 0$, then $\pi(w^0, p) \leq \pi(w^1, p)$, with strict inequality if $x(w^0, p) > 0$.
- (5) If $p^0 > p^1 > 0$, then $\pi(w, p^0) > \pi(w, p^1)$, with strict inequality if $y(w^0, p^1) > 0$.
- (6) $x(w, p)$ and $y(w, p)$ are continuous in (w, p) .
- (7) $x(w, p)$ and $y(w, p)$ are homogeneous of degree zero in (w, p) .

The proof of Lemma 2 is omitted here. For details, see Sakai (2023). It is interesting in making a bridge between the profit and optimum input-output functions. The essence of Property (1) is expressed by the two equations; $\partial\pi/\partial w_i = -x_i(w, p)$ and $\partial\pi/\partial p = y(w, p)$. Graphically, it can easily be seen in Fig. 1.

In plain English, on the one hand, the rate of change of total profit when the price of an input price changes is equal to the amount of the input demanded by the firm, multiplied by (-1) . On the other hand, the rate of change of total profit when the price of an output changes is equal to the amount of the output supplied by the firm.

According to Property (1), the profit function $\pi(w, p)$ is not only continuous but also differentiable in (w, p) , so that the *profit curve* as a graphical expression of the profit function is overall very smooth, with no kinks, having neither gaps nor jumps throughout. Property (2) implies that when (w, p) doubles, π also doubles. It follows from Property (3) that for any $(w, p) \in W \times P$, and for any fraction $t \in (0, 1)$, the following inequality holds.

$$\begin{aligned} (1-t)\pi(w^0, p^0) + t\pi(w^1, p^1) \\ > \pi((1-t)w^0 + tw^1, (1-t)p^0 + tp^1). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$




Fig. 1 Nice relationship between profit and input-output : $\partial\pi/\partial w_i = -x_i$ and $\partial\pi/\partial p = y$.

According to Properties (3) and (4), while π tends to decrease as w rises, but it tends to increase as p rises, thus agreeing with common sense.

Finally, by help of Property (6), inputs and outputs continuously change in response to a small change in (w, p) . And Property (7) shows us that when all input prices and all output prices change in the same proportion, all inputs and all output are expected to remain unaffected, agreeing with our common sense.

Now, we are ready to establish the following interesting lemma.

LEMMA 3 (Marginal cost and output price)

For all $(w, p) \in W \times P$, we obtain $\partial c(w, y(w, p)) / \partial y = p$, almost everywhere .

Proof. By the definition of $c(w, y(w, p))$, we note that the following inequality must hold:

$$p \cdot y(w, p) - c(w, y(w, p)) \geq py - c(w, y) \quad (15)$$

for all $(w, y) \in W \times Y$.

Since $c(w, y)$ is concave in y by Lemma 1 (4), it must be almost everywhere differentiable in y .⁵⁾

Further, Eq. (15) asserts that the function $py - c(w, y)$ is maximized at $y = y(w, p)$. Therefore, the first-order characterization for the maximum yields the following.

$$\partial(py - c(w, y)) / \partial y = 0, \text{ almost everywhere.}$$

This implies that $p - \partial c(w, y) / \partial y = 0$ at $y = y(w, p)$ almost everywhere, from which immediately $\partial c(w, y(w, p)) / \partial y = p$ almost everywhere. Q.E.D.

Lemma 3 is an important lemma, saying that the marginal cost of an output is equal to output price. Surely, it demonstrates profit-maximizing behavior of the firm from a different angle. The essence of Lemma 3 is graphically illustrated in Fig. 2 .

We are now in a position to discuss how the optimum and compensated input functions are related with each other.

⁵⁾ For the properties of convex and concave functions, see Fenchel (1953), Rockafellar (1970), Shephard (1970) and Varian (1999, 2009).




Fig. 2 At equilibrium, the following relation holds almost everywhere:
 $\partial c(w, y) / \partial y = p$ at $y = y(w, p)$.

LEMMA 4 (Properties of $x(w, p)$ and $y(w, p)$)

For all $(w, p) \in W \times P$, we obtain the following equations .

- (1) $x(w, p) = u(w, y(w, p))$.
- (2) $c(w, y(w, p)) = w \cdot x(w, p)$.
- (3) $\pi(w, p) = p \cdot y(w, p) - c(w, y(w, p))$.

Proof. To see Property (1), we first note $x(w, p) \in \bar{A}(y(w, p))$. Let us next take $x^s \in \bar{A}(y(w, p))$, and $x^s \neq x(w, p)$. This is possible by Assumptions (A2) and (A4). Now, let a "middle point" $x^t = (1-t)x(w, p) + tx^s$, $t \in (0, 1)$. Then, by means of Assumptions (A2) and (A3), we obtain $x^t \in \text{Int } \bar{A}(y(w, p))$, so that $w x^t > w \cdot x(w, p)$.

Letting $t \rightarrow 0$ yields $x^t \rightarrow x(w, p)$, and $w x \geq w \cdot x(w, p)$. Since $x(w, p) \in \bar{A}(y(w, p))$, and $u(w, y(w, p))$ is uniquely determined for each (w, p) , it must follow that $u(w, y(w, p)) = x(w, p)$. This proves Property (1).

From (1), we find $c(w, y(w, p)) = w \cdot x(w, p) = u(w, y(w, p))$, and $\pi(w, p) = p \cdot y(w, p) - c(w, y(w, p))$, assuring Properties (2) and (3).
 Q.E.D.

From this lemma, the economic significance of $u(w, y(w, p))$ is quite clear. For an arbitrary price vector (w, p) , the optimum input-output combination $(x(w, p))$ is uniquely determined from the production technology. Then, $c(w, y(w, p))$ denotes the cost level which governs the output level $y(w, p)$, and $u(w, y(w, p))$ is the corresponding input bundle. It is also seen that the profit gained by the firm is equal to the difference between $p \cdot y(w, p)$ and $c(w, y(w, p))$.

IV Properties of the Substitution and Total Effects

In the last section, we sought the information about conditions governing inputs demanded by the firm at given input-output prices. In this section, we are now ready to use it to discover how the inputs will change when these prices change.

Now, let us consider a change in w_j . Then, we will see that its impact on x_i can be divided into the following two effects: a *substitution ef-*

fect along the old isoquant and an *expansion effect* (or a *scale effect*) along the new expansion path (or scale path). Although the naming of the first effect is fairly traditional, that of the second effect might be quite new. The composition of the total effect into the substitution and the expansion (or scale) effect in production theory was first noticed by Hirota and Sakai (1969), and later developed by Sakai (1973), Sakai (1974), and others. Such composition in production seems to be similar to, yet not as the same as the composition into the substitution and income effects in consumption theory. How and to what extent the expansion effect differs from the income effect is a very important question, thus composing the main theme of this paper. A detailed discussion on this point will be made in the next section. Although "the expansion effect" has been frequently used in the previous literature and also in present paper, we would like to say that "the scale effect" may be an equally appealing name because it deals with "expansion" (or larger scale) as well as "contraction" (or smaller scale).

The properties of the substitution effect can be summarized in the following theorem.

THEOREM 5 (Differential properties of $u(w, y)$)

For all $(w, y) \in W \times Y$, we have the following properties almost everywhere.

- (1) $(\partial u_i / \partial w_1) w_1 + \dots + (\partial u_i / \partial w_n) w_n = 0$ for any i .
- (2) $w_1(\partial u_1 / \partial w_j) + \dots + w_n(\partial u_n / \partial w_j) = 0$ for any j .
- (3) $\partial u_i / \partial w_j = \partial u_j / \partial w_i$ for any i, j .
- (4) The following matrix is negative semi-definite :

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial u_1 / \partial w_1 & \dots & \partial u_1 / \partial w_n \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \partial u_n / \partial w_1 & \dots & \partial u_n / \partial w_n \end{pmatrix}$$

Proof. Recalling that $c(w, y)$ is concave in w by Lemma 1 (4), it should be almost everywhere twice differentiable in w . Note that by Lemma 1 (2), we find that $\partial c(w, y) / \partial w_i = u_i(w, y)$ for all i . Therefore, it follows that for any $i, u_i(w, y)$ is almost everywhere differentiable in w .⁶⁾

With those preparations in mind, we also recall that $u(w, y)$ is homogeneous of degree zero in w by Lemma 1 (8). Here, if we apply the famous Euler theorem on homogeneous equations, we immediately find the following equation.

$$(\partial u_i / \partial w_1) w_1 + \dots + (\partial u_i / \partial w_n) w_n = 0 \text{ for any } i, \text{ almost everywhere,}$$

assuring Property (1).

To prove Property (2), it is noted that by definition of the compensated function u , the following inequality holds.

$$w \cdot u(w^s, y) \geq w \cdot u(w, y) \text{ for all } w^s \in W. \tag{16}$$

Eq. (16) tells us that the function $w \cdot u(w, y)$ attains minimum among all the functions of the form $w \cdot u(w^s, y)$ at $w^s = w$. Hence, the first order characterization for the minimum yields the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \partial(w \cdot u(w^s, y)) / \partial w_j^s &= 0 \text{ at } w^s = w, j \\ &= 1, \dots, n, \text{ almost everywhere,} \end{aligned}$$

⁶⁾ Note that any concave or convex function is almost everywhere twice differentiable. See Alexandroff (1939).

from which Property (2) follows.

To see Property (3), we recall the well-known Young theorem on differential calculus, which says that whenever a function is twice differentiable, the order of differentiation is not important.⁷⁾

Therefore, by Lemma 1 (2), for any i, j , we obtain $\partial u_i / \partial w_j = \partial^2 c / \partial w_j \partial w_i = \partial^2 c / \partial w_i \partial w_j = \partial u_j / \partial w_i$, almost everywhere, which proves Property (3).

Finally, since the Hessian matrix of the concave function $c(w, y)$ with respect to w is almost everywhere negative semi-definite, Property (4) is easily derived from Lemma 1 (2). Q.E.D.

We are in a position to discuss a new concept of *net substitution and net complementarity* in contrast to a more traditional concept of *gross substitution and gross complementarity*. We say that the input i is a *net substitute for the input j* if $\partial u_i / \partial w_j > 0$, and a *net complement for it* if $\partial u_i / \partial w_j < 0$. Possibly as a rare case, we could have the special situation in which $\partial u_i / \partial w_j \leq 0$ for all i . Generally speaking, when the price of a certain input price rises, the demand for that input tends to decrease if output is to be constant. In other words, the compensated demand curve tends to be negatively sloping. Coupled with this result, Property (1) of Theorem 5 implies that whereas it is possible that all other inputs are net substitutes for an input, it is not possible that they are net complements for it. In short, although net substitutability can be seen everywhere, net complementarity is a rare phenomenon. Property (2) also shows further limits on the possibility of net complementarity. Property (3) asserts that the substitution effect should be symmetrical be-

tween two inputs. Naturally, this agrees with common sense.

The properties of the total effect will be summarized in the following theorem.

THEOREM 6 (Differential properties of $x(w, p)$ and $y(w, p)$)

For all $(w, p) \in W \times P$, we have the following properties, almost everywhere.

- (1) $(\partial x_i / \partial w_1) w_1 + \dots + (\partial x_i / \partial w_n) w_n + (\partial x_i / \partial p) p = 0$ for any i .
- (2) $(\partial y / \partial w_1) w_1 + \dots + (\partial y / \partial w_n) w_n + (\partial y / \partial p) p = 0$.
- (3) $\partial x_i / \partial w_j = \partial x_j / \partial w_i$ for all i, j .
- (4) $\partial x_i / \partial p + \partial y / \partial w_i = 0$ for all i .
- (5) The following matrix is positive semi-definite :

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\partial x_1 / \partial w_1 & \cdots & -\partial x_1 / \partial w_n & \partial x_1 / \partial p \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ -\partial x_n / \partial w_1 & \cdots & -\partial x_n / \partial w_n & \partial x_n / \partial p \\ -\partial y / \partial w_1 & \cdots & -\partial y / \partial w_n & \partial y / \partial p \end{pmatrix}$$

Proof. We first note that the profit function $\pi(w, p)$ is almost everywhere twice differentiable since it is convex by Lemma 2 (3). Since $\partial \pi / \partial w_i = -x_i$ for any i , and $\partial \pi / \partial p = y$, this obviously implies that both input function $x(w, p)$ and the output function $y(w, p)$ are almost everywhere differentiable. Such differential properties are quite important for further derivations.

From Lemma 2 (7), we see that $x(w, p)$ and $y(w, p)$ are homogeneous of degree one. Therefore, by applying the famous Euler theorem on homogenous functions here, we can immediately obtain Properties (1) and (2).

Next, Let us recall the famous Young theorem, which says that if a function is twice

7) See Takagi (1961), pp. 57-58.

differentiable, the order of differentiation does not matter, leading to the same result. So, if we apply the Young theorem to the profit function $\pi(w, p)$ which is convex by Lemma 2 (7), then we can obtain the following equations almost everywhere:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial x_i / \partial w_j &= -\partial^2 \pi / \partial w_j \partial w_i = -\partial^2 \pi / \partial w_i \partial w_j \\ &= \partial x_j / \partial w_i \text{ for all } i, j, \\ \partial x_i / \partial p + \partial y / \partial w_i &= -\partial^2 \pi / \partial p \partial w_i + \partial^2 \pi / \partial w_i \partial p \\ &= -\partial^2 \pi / \partial w_i \partial p + \partial^2 \pi / \partial w_i \partial p = 0 \text{ for all } i. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Properties (3) and (4) are surely assured.

Finally, since the risk function $\pi(w, p)$ is convex, its Hessian matrix must be positive semi-definite, almost everywhere. We note that the following set of equations hold.

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^2 \pi / \partial w_j \partial w_i &= \partial x_i / \partial w_j, \partial^2 \pi / \partial p \partial w_i = \partial x_i / \partial p. \\ \partial^2 \pi / \partial w_j \partial p &= \partial y / \partial w_j, \partial^2 \pi / \partial p^2 = \partial y / \partial p. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, Property (5) is definitely assured.
Q.E.D.

To see the economic significance of Theorem 6, let us introduce several useful concepts here. We say that the input i is a *gross substitute for the input j* if $\partial x_i / \partial w_j > 0$; a *gross complement for it* if $\partial x_i / \partial w_j < 0$. We also say that the input i is a *normal input* if $\partial x_i / \partial p > 0$; an *inferior input* if $\partial x_i / \partial p < 0$. If we employ these concepts, we can give new light on the relationship between inputs and outputs on the one hand and input prices and output prices on the other hand.

First of all, Property (4) of Theorem 6 tells us that the "supposedly normal situation" under which $\partial x_i / \partial w_i \leq 0$ for any i and $\partial y / \partial p \geq 0$ is certainly plausible but not inevitable. As can easily be expected, while the input demand curve tends to be negatively sloping, the output supply curve tends to be positively sloping. Property (4) means that $\partial x_i / \partial p > 0$ (or < 0) if and only if $\partial y / \partial w_i < 0$ (or > 0). In plain English, this means that the input i is a normal input (or an inferior input) if and only if a fall in the price of the input leads to an increase (or a decrease) in output.

In the light of Property (5), we find $\partial y / \partial p \geq 0$. So, Property (2) implies that although it is likely that all of inputs are normal, it is a mission impossible that they are all inferior. Now suppose that a certain input, say x_i is an inferior input, so that $\partial x_i / \partial p > 0$. It follows from Property (1) that, in such a case, it is not possible at all that all other inputs are gross complements for the input i although it is truly possible that they are all gross substitutes for it. Because of Property (3), the *total* effect is symmetrical between two inputs. However, we already know from Theorem 5 (3) above that the *substitution* effect is symmetrical between them. Therefore, the *expansion* effect, as the difference of the total and substitution effects, must be symmetrical as well.⁸⁾

Finally, in the light of Properties (3) and (5), we obtain the following inequalities for all $i \neq j$.

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial x_i / \partial w_i) (\partial x_j / \partial w_j) &\geq (\partial x_i / \partial w_j)^2, \\ (-\partial x_i / \partial w_i) (\partial y / \partial p) &\geq (\partial x_i / \partial p) (-\partial y / \partial w_1). \end{aligned}$$

⁸⁾ This markedly contrasts with the income effect in consumption theory since the latter may be non-symmetrical.

Clearly, these inequalities indicate dominance of the *own effects* over the *cross effects*. Summing up, the differential properties of $x(w, p)$ and $y(w, p)$ are so important that they will be utilized for further discussions on input demand theory.

V Decomposition Equations in Input Demand Theory

As stated above, the *total effect* of a change in the price of an input on the demand for another input can be split up into the two separate effects, namely the *substitution and scale effects*. The purpose of this section is to use the previous results to derive various types of *decomposition equations in input demand theory*. Our attention will be mainly devoted to seeing how and to what extent they are analogous to, or distinct from, the famous Slutsky equations in consumer demand theory (see Slutsky (1915) and McKenzie (1957)).

Let us attempt to decompose the change of the demand for the input i responding to a change in the price of the input j . For that purpose, let us consider the following increment.

$$\Delta x_i(w, p) = x_i(w + \Delta_j w, p) - x_i(w, p), \text{ with } \Delta_j w = (0, \dots, 0, \Delta w_j, 0, \dots, 0).$$

Then, by 4 (1) above, we obtain the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta x_i(w, p) &= u_i(w + \Delta_j w, y(w + \Delta_j w, p)) - u_i(w, y(w, p)) \\ &= u_i(w + \Delta_j w, y(w, p)) - u_i(w, y(w, p)) \\ &\quad + u_i(w + \Delta_j w, y(w + \Delta_j w, p)) - u_i(w + \Delta_j w, y(w, p)). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Now, let us newly define the quantities SE_{ij} and EE_{ij} as follows.

$$SE_{ij} = \frac{u_i(w + \Delta_j w, y(w, p)) - u_i(w, y(w, p))}{\Delta w_j} \quad (18)$$

$$EE_{ij} = \frac{u_i(w + \Delta_j w, y(w + \Delta_j w, p)) - u_i(w + \Delta_j w, y(w, p))}{\Delta w_j} \quad (19)$$

Then, it is easily seen from Eq. (17) that the following equation holds.

$$\Delta x_i / \Delta w_j = SE_{ij} + EE_{ij}. \quad (20)$$

In our opinion, Eq. (20) has very important implications. It is noted that SE_{ij} and EE_{ij} respectively show the *substitution effect and the expansion effect*. At first appearance, it seems to be the *finite increment version* of the famous Slutsky equation in consumer demand theory. In fact, a change Δw_j in the price of the input j affects the behavior of the firm in two different ways. While it causes a change in input price ratios which induces technical substitution among inputs *along the old isoquant*, it entails a change in the profit maximizing output *along the new scale path*.

On the one hand, the first substitution effect stands for the *variation in the optimum combination of inputs within the isoquant class to which the original $x(w, p)$ belongs*. Then, $c(w + \Delta_j w, y(w, p))$ represents the corresponding level of cost which *keeps the firm within the same isoquant class as before the input price change, even in the new input price situation $w + \Delta_j w$* . On the other hand, the scale effect represents the *shift of the optimum input combination in the new input price situation $w + \Delta_j w$, responding to the change of output level from the old level $w + \Delta_j w$ to the new level $y(w + \Delta_j w, p)$* .

Note that Eqs. (18)-(19) stand for the *difference versions of the decomposition equations*. We are now ready to derive the *differential versions*, which are perhaps more interesting than the *difference versions*. To this end, it is necessary to make an additional assumption as follows.

Assumption (A6) For all $(w, p) \in W \times P$, $x(w, p)$ and $y(w, p)$ are differentiable in (w, p) .

This newly added assumption (A6) is not so far from the previous assumptions (A1)–(A5). In fact, as was seen above, the latter ones already assure *almost everywhere differentiability* of $x(w, p)$ and $y(w, p)$. The only difference between the previous assumptions and the newly added assumption comes down to the difference between "almost everywhere" and "everywhere." Moreover, when (A6) is assumed, it is not hard to see from Lemma 4 that $u(w, y)$ and $c(w, y)$ are also differentiable.

Now, we are in a position to establish and prove one of the most important theorems in this paper.

THEOREM 7 (The first kind of decomposition equations)

For all $(w, p) \in W \times P$, we have the following equations.

- (1) $\partial x_i / \partial w_j = \partial u_i / \partial w_j + (\partial u_i / \partial y) (\partial y / \partial w_j)$ for all i, j .
- (2) $\partial x_i / \partial p = (\partial u_i / \partial y) (\partial y / \partial p)$ for all i .

Proof. In the light of Lemma 4 (1), the proof of (1) and (2) is easy and straightforward. Indeed, we know that the following important equation holds.

$$x(w, p) = u(w, y(w, p)).$$

If we apply the well-known rule on the differentiation of a composite function, then we can immediately obtain the desired Properties (1) and (2). Q.E.D.

Property (1) indicates the *first version* of decomposition equation in input demand theory in *differential terms*. Exactly speaking, we find that $\partial x_i / \partial w_j = \partial u_i / \partial w_j + (\partial u_i / \partial y) (\partial y / \partial w_j)$. The first term $(\partial u_i / \partial w_j)$ on the right-hand side tells us to what extent a change in w_j influences u_i . The second term $(\partial u_i / \partial y) (\partial y / \partial w_j)$ on the right-hand side, representing the remarkable scale effect term, shows the *composite effect* containing the following two partial derivative terms :

- (i) The partial derivative term $(\partial y / \partial w_j)$, representing the change in the optimum output corresponding to the change in the price of the input j ,
- (ii) The partial derivative term $(\partial u_i / \partial y)$, showing the change in the optimum input responding to the variation in the output above mentioned.⁹⁾

Property (2) demonstrates that the total effect of a change in input price on the input i can be decomposed into the following two partial derivative terms :

- (i) The partial derivative term $(\partial y / \partial p)$, representing the change in the optimum output as a result of the change in output price,
- (ii) The partial derivative term $(\partial u_i / \partial y)$, showing that the change in the optimum input corresponding to the variation in output above mentioned.

At first appearance, the combination of the firm's substitution and expansion effects seems

⁹⁾ The *first version* of decomposition equation was merely referred to by Basett & Borcharding (1969) without any proof, and later was given a formal proof by Hirota & Sakai (1969) and Syrquin (1970) by using simple calculus. It is noted that the most exact form of decomposition equations in input demand theory is given here in terms of the compensated input functions.

to be analogous to that of the consumer's well-known substitution and income effects. We must say, however, that *they are not exactly the same*.

Whereas in consumption theory we have simply to consider the relations between those commodities which can be regarded as being essentially similar, in production theory we have *two different kinds of commodities to consider — inputs and outputs*. Therefore, their mutual relations and their cross-relations take a little more disentangling. We remind readers that, to obtain a decomposition equation in consumption theory, it is necessary to imagine a compensated change in consumer's income so as to keep the same preference level as before, in spite of a change in the price of a certain commodity. In contrast to such a compensated change in income in consumption theory, in production theory we have to introduce the idea of *a compensated change in output price*, which was first introduced by Hirota & Sakai (1969) and later developed by Sakai (1973), Otani (1982), Diewert (1982, 2018), and others. More exactly speaking, when the price of a certain input price varies, we imagine such a compensated change in output price as would induce the firm to maintain the output level as before the input price change.

By making use of the above-mentioned idea peculiar to production theory, we can now derive the *second version of decomposition equation*. Compared with the first version, this second one will turn out to be more analogous to the decomposition equation in consumption theory. For that purpose, Assumption (A6) needs to be a bit strengthened to the following assumption.

Assumption (A6') For all $(w, p) \in W \times P$, $x(w, p)$ and $y(w, p)$ are *twice differentiable* in (w, p) .

When Assumption (A6') is made, it is obvious by Lemma 4 that $u(w, p)$ and $c(w, y)$ are also twice differentiable. We are now ready to derive the following theorem.

THEOREM 8 (The second kind of decomposition equations)

For all $(w, p) \in W \times P$, we have the following equations.

$$\partial x_i / \partial w_j = \partial u_i / \partial w_j - (\partial x_i / \partial p) (\partial p / \partial w_j)$$

for all i, j ,

$$\text{where } \partial p / \partial w_j \equiv [dp / dw_j] dw_j = 0_{(i \neq j), dy} = 0.$$

The proof of this theorem is similar to that of THEOREM 7, thus being omitted. For details, see Sakai (2023)

Theorem 8 gives us the *second version of decomposition equations in input demand theory*. The scale effect here is meant to represent the composite effect of the following two terms:

- (i) The change in output price so as to maintain the same output level as before, in spite of the change in the price of the input j .
- (ii) The change in the input i corresponding to the variation in output price above mentioned.¹⁰⁾

This second version of decomposition equations are as important as the first version, presumably being even more comparable to the famous Slutsky equations in consumption theory (see Slutsky (1915)). As an immediate result of this theorem, we can finally derive the following.

may look a small step, but surely a giant jump indeed.

10) By relying on the traditional calculus method, Hirota & Sakai (1969) succeeded in deriving the *second* version of decomposition equations. To our regret, however, their proof was rather sketchy and based on the Hessian matrix of the production function per se. We believe that a topological approach taken here is more general, and more elegant, than the previous method. This

THEOREM 9 (Property of the expansion effect)

For all $(w, p) \in W \times P$, we have the following property.

$$EE_{ii} \equiv -(\partial x_i / \partial p)(\partial p / \partial w_i) \leq 0, i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Proof. By making use of Theorem 8, Theorem 7 (2), and Lemma 1 (2), we can obtain the following sequence of equations.

$$\begin{aligned} -(\partial x_i / \partial p)(\partial p / \partial w_i) &= -(\partial x_i / \partial p)(\partial^2 c / \partial y \partial w_i) \\ &= -(\partial u_i / \partial y)(\partial y / \partial p)(\partial u_i / \partial y) = -(\partial y / \partial p)(\partial u_i / \partial y)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, it should be non-positive by Theorem 6 (5). Q.E.D.

The economic significance of this theorem is quite clear. It is recalled by Theorem 5 (4) that $SE_{ii} \equiv \partial u_i / \partial w_i \leq 0$.

In the light of the previous discussions, it is clear that the substitution effect SE_{ij} and the scale effect EE_{ii} should always go in the same direction. Surely, this is also a remarkable contrast to consumption theory à la Hicks (1946), in which the substitution and income effects may go in opposite directions.

In short, input demand theory is input demand theory, thus being distinct from consumer demand theory. Although those two theories look somewhat similar, they are definitely different. We have to understand exactly how and to what extent they are analogous or distinct.

VI Final Remarks on the Le Chatelier - Samuelson Principle

In the above, we have been mainly concerned with the axiomatic foundations of input demand theory. While the approach taken here looks mathematical and rigorous, it has useful economic implications. In particular, it is noted that the total effect of a change in an input can be decomposed into the substitution and expansion effect. How and to what extent such decomposition in input demand is comparable to that in consumer demand is certainly a very important question to ask. To our surprise, such comparison has been rather neglected for long time in the economics literature. We do believe, however, that as the saying goes, it is better late than never.

We are ready here to do some economic applications and make final remarks. First, we note that our decomposition in input demand is closely related to the famous *Le Chatelier - Samuelson principle*. Although this connection was pointed out by our friend Yoshihiko Otani (1982), we are going our own way to confirm it below.

Henri Louis Le Chatelier (1850-1936) was a noted French scientist. He was best known for his work on his chemical equilibrium, which was to be called Le Chatelier principle in the academia. In his classical work contained in Samuelson (1947, enlarged edition 1983), Samuelson boldly applied the principle to economic equilibrium, so that naming of the *Le Chatelier - Samuelson principle* has been so popular in the academic world, especially in the economic profession (see Stiglitz (1966)).¹¹⁾

In our setting of input demand theory discussed so far, we have only to compare

the case with no isoquant constraint and the one with a single constraint, namely the constraint that output y remains constant regardless of a change in w_i . So, in terms of the input demand setting, we must have $(dx_i / dw_i) 0 \leq (dx_i / dw_i) 1 \leq 0$.

If we rather want to follow the decomposition equation formula above mentioned, then, we must find $\partial x_i / \partial w_i = \partial u_i / \partial w_i - (\partial x_i / \partial p) (\partial p / \partial w_i)$, or in short, $TE_{ii} = SE_{ii} + EE_{ii}$

Since the terms TE_{ii} , SE_{ii} , and EE_{ii} are all non-positive, we must have the following: $TE_{ii} \leq SE_{ii} (\leq 0)$. Needless to say, this inequality clearly demonstrates the validity of the famous *Le Chatelier - Samuelson principle* in input demand equilibrium. For this point, also refer to Rader (1968).

In conclusion, the name of Chemist Le Chatelier is brilliantly shining not only in the chemical world but also in the economic world as well. Life may be short, but science is long and spreading indeed!

References

- ⊙ Alexandroff AD (1939) Almost everywhere existence of the second differential of a convex function and some properties of convex surfaces connected with it. *Lenin-grad State University Annals*, Leningrad, Vol. 6 : 3-35.
- ⊙ Alexandrov A, Bedre-Defolie Ö (2017) Le Chatelier-Samuelson principle in games and pass-through of shocks. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 168 : 44-54.
- ⊙ Arrow KJ, Hahn FH (1971) *General competitive analysis*. Holden-Day, San Francisco.
- ⊙ Basett LR, Borcheding TE (1969) 'Inferior factors' and theories of production and input demand: comment. *Economica*, New Series, 38 : 321-322.
- ⊙ Bear DVT (1965) Inferior inputs and the theory of the firm. *Journal of Political Economy*, 73 : 287-289.
- ⊙ Dietzenbacher E (1992) The Le Chatelier-Samuelson principle revisited. *Journal of Economics*, 55 : 277-296.
- ⊙ Diewert WE (1982) Duality approaches to microeconomic theory. Contained in Arrow KJ, Intriligator MD (eds.) (1982) *Handbook of Mathematical Economics*, Vol. II, North-Holland: 105-176.
- ⊙ Diewert WE (2018) Duality in production. Vancouver School of Economics, Microeconomics working papers, No. 201.
- ⊙ Fenchel W (1953) *Convex cones, sets, and functions*. Princeton University Press.
- ⊙ Ferguson CE (1966) Production, prices, and the theory of jointly-derived input demand functions. *Economica*, New Series, 33: 454-461.
- ⊙ Ferguson CE (1968) 'Inferior factors' and the theories of production and input demand. *Economica*, New Series, Vol. 35, 140-150.
- ⊙ Ferguson CE (1969) *The neoclassical theory of production and distribution*. Cambridge University Press.
- ⊙ Friedman JM (1972) Duality principles in the theory of cost and production — revisited. *International Economic Review*, 13, 167-170.
- ⊙ Hicks JR (1946) *Value and capital*, 2nd edition. Oxford University Press.
- ⊙ Hicks JR (1953-1954) A reply to Morshima. *Review of Economic Studies*. 21: 218-221.
- ⊙ Hirota M, Sakai Y (1969) A note on net substitution and scale effects in production theory. Discussion Paper, University of Rochester.
- ⊙ Malinvaud E (1985) *Lectures on microeconomic theory*, Revised edition. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- ⊙ Mas-Colell A, Whinston MD, Green JR (1995) *Microeconomic theory*. Oxford University Press.
- ⊙ McFadden D (1966) Cost, revenue, and profit functions: a cursory review. University of California, Berkeley, Working paper No. 86.
- ⊙ Malinvaud E (1985) *Lectures on microeconomic theory*, second edition. North-Holland.
- ⊙ McKenzie LW (1957) Demand theory without a utility index. *Review of Economic Studies*, 24, 185-189.
- ⊙ McKenzie LW (2002) *Classical general economic theory*. MIT Press.
- ⊙ Mitra T, Nishimura K (eds.) (2009) *Equilibrium, trade, and growth: selected papers of Lionel W. McKenzie*. MIT Press.
- ⊙ Morishima M (1953a) A note on a point in *Value and Capital*. *Review of Economic Studies*, 21: 214-217.
- ⊙ Morishima M (1953a) A rejoinder to Hicks. *Review of Economic Studies*, 21: 222.

11 According to Samuelson (1972), the Le Chatelier Principle was discovered more than one hundred years ago by Le Chatelier, French chemist. Samuelson found, however, that it was a rather vaguely stated principle. So, he decided to make it more perfect, and boldly applied to economic theory. This is the reason why this principle is now called the Le Chatelier-Samuelson

principle. Also see Dietzenbacher (1992) and Alexandrov & Bedre-Defolie (2017).

- ⊙ Nikaido H (1968) Convex structures and economic theory. Academic Press, London.
- ⊙ Okuguchi K, Sakai Y, Ichioka O, Nagatani O (1989) Microeconomics (in Japanese). Yuhikaku Publishers, Tokyo.
- ⊙ Otani Y (1982) A simple proof of the LeChatelier-Samuelson principle and the theory of cost and production. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 27: 430-438.
- ⊙ Rader T (1968) Normally, inputs are never gross substitutes. *Journal of Political Economy*, 76, 38-43.
- ⊙ Rockafellar RT (1970) Convex Analysis. Princeton University Press.
- ⊙ Sakai Y (1973) An axiomatic approach to input demand theory. *International Economic Review*, 14, 733-750.
- ⊙ Sakai Y (1974) Substitution and expansion effects in production theory: the case of joint production. *Journal of Economic Theory*, Vol. 9, 255-274.
- ⊙ Sakai Y (1975) Substitution and expansion effects in the theory of the firm : new results in an old framework. *Seikei Ronso, Hiroshima University*, 25-3: 95-118
- ⊙ Sakai Y (2023) Producer decision and input demand theory: an axiomatic approach. Shiga University, Discussion Paper No. E-25.
- ⊙ Samuelson PA (1972) Maximum principles in analytical economics. *American Economic Review*, 62, 249-262.
- ⊙ Samuelson PA (1947, enlarged ed. 1983) The foundations of economic analysis. Harvard University Press.
- ⊙ Scott RH (1962) ' Inferior ' factors of production. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 76 : 86-97.
- ⊙ Shephard RW (1970) Theory of cost and production functions. Princeton University Press.
- ⊙ Slutsky E (1915) Sulla teoria del bilancio del consumatore. *Gionale degli Economisti e Rivista di Statistica*, 51: 1-26. Translated and contained in Stigler GJ, Boulding KE (eds.) (1952) *Readings in price theory*, 27-56. Irwin, Illinois Press.
- ⊙ Stiglitz J (ed.) (1966) The collected scientific papers of Paul A. Samuelson, volume one. MIT Press.
- ⊙ Syrquin M (1970) A note on inferior inputs. *Review of Economic Studies*, 37: 591-598.
- ⊙ Takagi T (1961) Principles of Mathematical Analysis, 3rd revised edition (in Japanese). Iwanami publishers, Tokyo.
- ⊙ Uzawa H (1964) Duality principles in the theories of cost and production. *International Economic Review*, 5 : 216-229.
- ⊙ Varian HR (1999) Intermediate microeconomics: a modern approach. Norton.
- ⊙ Varian HR (2009) Microeconomic Analysis. Norton.

Producer Decision and Input Demand Theory

A Modern Approach

Yasuhiro Sakai

This paper is concerned with an axiomatic approach to input demand theory. By help of general production possibility sets, we intend to derive decomposition equations in input demand theory, which have been rather neglected so far in the economics literature. Special attention is paid to important comparison between the firm's expansion effect and the consumer's income effect. We discuss the question how and to what extent the expansion effect is distinct from the income effect. In this connection, the Le Chatelier -Samuelson principle is also discussed,

Keywords: producer decision, comparative static analysis, expansion effect, inferior input, Le Chatelier-Samuelson principle