

Should the Timing of Inspections be Predictable?*

Ian Ball[†] Jan Knoepfle[‡]

4 September 2024

Abstract

A principal hires an agent to work on a long-term project that culminates in a breakthrough or a breakdown. At each time, the agent privately chooses to work or shirk. Working increases the arrival rate of breakthroughs and decreases the arrival rate of breakdowns. To motivate the agent to work, the principal conducts costly inspections. She fires the agent if shirking is detected. We characterize the principal's optimal inspection policy. Predictable inspections are optimal if work primarily generates breakthroughs. Random inspections are optimal if work primarily prevents breakdowns. Crucially, the agent's actions determine his risk attitude over the timing of punishments.

Keywords: inspections, audits, dynamic contracting, moral hazard

JEL: D82, D86, M42

*We thank Yifan Dai for excellent research assistance. For comments, we thank Nageeb Ali, Dirk Bergemann, Olivier Compte, Brett Green, Deniz Kattwinkel, Nicolas Lambert, Lucas Maestri, Stephen Morris, Teemu Pekkari, Jacopo Peregò, João Ramos, Ron Siegel, Ludvig Sinander, Curtis Taylor, and Alex Wolitzky. For helpful feedback, we thank audiences at VSET, Stanford, SMYE Orleans, ESEM, Aalto, ESSET Gerzensee, UT Austin, Georgetown, BFI Economic Theory Conference, Penn State, Columbia Economic Theory Conference, Emory, Boston University, City University of Hong Kong, Carnegie–Mellon/Pittsburgh, UCL, USC, Essex, Paris, LSE, Oxford, Queen Mary, EC, SAET, Warwick, Boston College, Tel Aviv, Ben Gurion, Hebrew University, and Bonn. Knoepfle acknowledges financial support for the Academy of Finland (Project 325218).

[†]Department of Economics, MIT, ianball@mit.edu.

[‡]School of Economics and Finance, Queen Mary University of London, j.knoepfle@qmul.ac.uk.

1 Introduction

Inspections are widely used to reveal information about agents’ otherwise unobserved actions.¹ Venture capital investors conduct financial audits to ensure that entrepreneurs do not divert funds for private gain. Research grants are extended only after researchers pass intermediate reviews. Firms and workers are inspected to ensure their compliance with health, safety, and environmental regulations.

Some inspections occur at pre-announced times; others are surprises. In this paper, we study the optimal timing of costly inspections in a dynamic moral hazard setting. We show how the nature of the task induced by the inspections determines whether predictable or random inspections are optimal. If the agent’s main task is *innovation*—think of an entrepreneur in a start-up working towards a technological breakthrough—then predictable inspections are optimal. If the agent’s main task is *maintenance*—think of a worker following safety guidelines to prevent an accident (breakdown)—then random inspections are optimal. While “maintenance lacks the glamour of innovation,” economies tend to spend more on “fighting decay” than on research and development ([The Economist, 2018a](#)).

We analyze the following continuous-time model. A principal hires an agent to work on a long-term project that culminates in a breakthrough or a breakdown. The principal commits to the timing of costly inspections. At each time, the agent privately works or shirks.² Work increases the arrival rate of breakthroughs and decreases the arrival rate of breakdowns. In the absence of inspections, the agent strictly prefers shirking to working. Each inspection yields a binary result—pass or fail—that (partially) reveals the agent’s past actions, as described in detail below. If the agent fails an inspection, the principal terminates the project. We solve for the cheapest inspection policy that induces the agent to work continuously.

If the principal inspects more often, then the agent has stronger incentives to work: shirking will be detected sooner, and the project will be terminated before the agent can enjoy shirking for very long. Of course, inspecting more often is more costly for the principal, so it is optimal for the principal to inspect just often enough so that the agent is willing to work. The question remains whether the timing of

¹In 2017, the four accounting firms Deloitte, EY, KPMG, and PwC earned over 47 billion dollars from auditing alone ([The Economist, 2018b](#)).

²In some applications, shirking represents an unproductive (or even fraudulent) activity, such as diverting funds.

these inspections should be predictable or random.

The form of the optimal inspection policy is driven by the agent’s endogenous risk attitude over the timing of punishments. The agent’s actions affect the probability that the project ends (in a breakthrough or breakdown) before a planned inspection is carried out. If the agent expects the project to end sooner, then he is effectively more impatient, making his discount factor more convex as a function of time.

First, we derive the optimal policy in the case that the inspection technology is *perfect*. That is, each inspection perfectly reveals whether the agent has previously shirked.

If the agent’s main task is innovation—work speeds up breakthroughs by more than it delays breakdowns—then it is optimal for the principal to inspect *periodically*. That is, the time between consecutive inspections is constant (Theorem 1). Consistent with this result, venture capital financing of start-ups is generally conducted in stages, with each stage contingent on passing a predictable audit.³ In the innovation regime, shirking prolongs the project by delaying breakthroughs. If the agent plans to shirk, then he is effectively more patient, making his discount factor *less convex* as a function of time. In this case, conducting each inspection at a nonrandom time is the most cost-effective way for the principal to punish the agent for shirking.

Conversely, if the agent’s main task is maintenance—work delays breakdowns by more than it speeds up breakthroughs—then it is optimal for the principal to conduct inspections randomly. Under the optimal policy, inspections are conducted with a constant hazard rate (Theorem 2). Consistent with this result, workplace safety inspections, which aim to prevent accidents, are generally conducted without advance notice.⁴ In the maintenance regime, shirking shortens the project by generating breakdowns. If the agent plans to shirk, then he is effectively more impatient, making his discount factor *more convex* as a function of time. In this case, conducting inspections at random times is the most cost-effective way for the principal to punish the agent for shirking.

Next, we derive the optimal inspection policy in the case that the inspection technology is *imperfect*. That is, shirking by the agent does not always leave a paper trail. The longer the agent has shirked, the more likely he is to fail an inspection. If the agent passes one inspection, then he is likely to pass another inspection conducted

³For further discussion of periodic inspections in practice, see Section 5.1, p. 14.

⁴For further discussion of random inspections in practice, see Section 5.2, p. 17.

soon after, even if he shirks in between. As a result, it is wasteful for the principal to conduct imperfect inspections in short succession. Thus, the imperfect inspection technology creates a new motive for the principal to space apart inspections.

If the agent’s main task is innovation, then it is optimal for the principal to inspect periodically (Theorem 3.i), as was the case with the perfect inspection technology. Indeed, periodic inspections are already spaced apart, so the imperfect inspection technology creates an additional force toward periodicity. If the agent’s main task is maintenance but the rate at which work delays breakdowns is not too large, then this spacing-apart motive dominates and periodic inspections are still optimal.

Conversely, if the agent’s main task is maintenance and the rate at which work delays breakdowns is sufficiently large, then randomization is optimal (Theorem 3.ii). The optimal policy leverages the benefits of randomization while also spacing apart inspections. After each inspection, there is a fixed period during which inspections are not conducted. The next inspection is conducted with positive probability at the end of this period. If the agent is not inspected at that time, then the next inspection is conducted with a constant hazard rate thereafter. Once the inspection is conducted, the cycle repeats, beginning with an inspection-free period. An inspection policy of this form is used in an anti-corruption program in Brazil. Municipalities are randomly chosen for audit, but only after a fixed time has passed since their last audit (Avis, Ferraz, and Finan, 2018).

Finally, we consider an alternative inspection technology that allows the agent to recover from past shirking by working before an inspection. If the recovery rate is small, then the optimal inspection policy is unchanged from the main specification. If the recovery rate is sufficiently large, then it is optimal for the principal to conduct inspections randomly in order to deter window-dressing by the agent (Theorem 4).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 1.1 discusses related literature. Section 2 presents the model. Section 3 studies the agent’s behavior without inspections. Section 4 formulates the principal’s problem recursively. Next, we solve for the optimal inspection policy with perfect inspections (Section 5) and imperfect inspections (Section 6). In Section 7, we consider the alternative inspection technology that allows for recovery. The conclusion is in Section 8. The main proofs are in Appendix A. Additional results and proofs are in Appendix B.

1.1 Related literature

Previous work on the optimal allocation of monitoring resources has observed that randomization can provide uniform incentives over time. [Lazear \(2006\)](#) studies a model in which monitoring reveals the agent’s *current* (binary) action.⁵ The agent is punished if he is shirking at the moment in which he is monitored. At each time, the agent works if and only if the likelihood of monitoring at that moment is sufficiently high. Therefore, the cheapest way for the principal to motivate the agent to follow a given action path is to uniformly randomize monitoring over the times at which working is induced.⁶

[Varas, Marinovic, and Skrzypacz \(2020\)](#) and [Achim and Knoepfle \(2024a,b\)](#) study regulatory inspections in a model of firm reputation. The underlying technology is of the form introduced by [Board and Meyer-ter-Vehn \(2013\)](#). In these papers, inspections reveal information about the agent’s *past* actions, but under this special technology, the agent’s incentives are *separable* across time. At each instant, the agent works if and only if the expected discounted time until the next inspection is sufficiently low.⁷ Therefore, the cheapest way for the principal to motivate full effort is to conduct inspections with a constant hazard rate.⁸ Under this policy, the agent has identical work incentives at each time, just as in the corresponding optimal policy

⁵Most subsequent work on dynamic contracts analyzes monitoring of current actions; see [Antinolfi and Carli \(2015\)](#), [Piskorski and Westerfield \(2016\)](#), [Chen, Sun, and Xiao \(2020\)](#), [Li and Yang \(2020\)](#), [Dai, Wang, and Yang \(2022\)](#), [Rodivilov \(2022\)](#), and [Wong \(2022\)](#). In [Halac and Prat \(2016\)](#) and [Dilmé and Garrett \(2019\)](#), the principal’s investment has a persistent effect on her monitoring capabilities, but monitoring still reveals information about current actions only. In dynamic adverse selection problems, the monitored state is distributed independently across periods in [Chang \(1990\)](#), [Monnet and Quintin \(2005\)](#), [Wang \(2005\)](#), [Popov \(2016\)](#), [Malenko \(2019\)](#), and [Li and Libgober \(2023\)](#); the state is serially correlated in [Ravikumar and Zhang \(2012\)](#) and [Kim \(2015\)](#).

⁶[Eeckhout, Persico, and Todd \(2010\)](#) extend this insight to a setting with unobservable heterogeneity in agent payoffs. They test the theory using data on police crackdowns.

⁷The discount factor reflects standard exponential discounting and also the Poisson transitions of the binary state. In Section 7, we consider a more general inspection technology that nests the technology in [Varas et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Achim and Knoepfle \(2024a,b\)](#). There, we compare our results with [Varas et al.’s \(2020\)](#).

⁸While random inspections are optimal for incentives, these papers find that predictable inspections can have other benefits. [Varas et al. \(2020\)](#) show that periodic inspections can be optimal if the principal directly values the information revealed by each inspection. [Achim and Knoepfle \(2024a\)](#) show that a principal without commitment power cannot benefit from randomization, but the best deterministic inspection schedule can be implemented through coordinated continuation play. [Achim and Knoepfle \(2024b\)](#) rule out coordinated continuation play. They show that in Markov perfect equilibria, inspections are random (deterministic) at beliefs at which the agent’s effort decreases (increases) uncertainty.

in [Lazear \(2006\)](#).

We depart from previous work on inspections by considering breakthroughs and breakdowns, and by analyzing a different inspection technology. Together, these modeling choices allow us to show how the optimal timing of inspections depends on whether the inspections are intended to motivate innovation or maintenance.

Our results show that the inspection technology can fundamentally change the optimal inspection policy. Under the technology in [Varas et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Achim and Knoepfle \(2024a,b\)](#), local incentives are sufficient and exponentially distributed inspection times are optimal. By contrast, our perfect inspection technology is neutral in the sense that both deterministic and exponential inspections are optimal when there are no breakthroughs or breakdowns. Under our inspection technology, the agent’s optimal action at each time depends on his actions at other times (and hence on the entire distribution of time until the next inspection). As a result, we must consider global deviations. In many applications, deterring extended deviations is important. An employee who expects to fail his next review because he has shirked in the past may find it optimal to shirk continuously until the review. The practical importance of such deviations is highlighted by the recent trend of “quiet quitting.”⁹ Analyzing these extended deviations allows us to uncover a new economic force. When there are breakthroughs and breakdowns, the curvature of the agent’s discount factor changes when the agent plans to shirk for *positive* duration. This change in curvature drives the form of the optimal policy.

We contribute to the dynamic contracting literature by identifying which kinds of tasks are best incentivized through predictable inspections and which are best incentivized through random inspections.¹⁰ A number of papers study the dynamic incentives of agents working toward breakthroughs, without inspections: [Bergemann and Hege \(1998, 2005\)](#), [Hörner and Samuelson \(2013\)](#), [Green and Taylor \(2016\)](#), and [Halac, Kartik, and Liu \(2016, 2017\)](#).¹¹ A consistent finding in these papers is that the principal should com-

⁹A 2022 Gallup poll found that half of US workers are “quiet quitters” ([Harter, 2022](#)). A partner at McKinsey describes the mindset of a quiet quitter as follows: “My boss doesn’t check in on me. HR takes six months to do a write-up. I bet I can stay in this gig for two years and not do much.” ([McKinsey, 2022](#)).

¹⁰[Eilat, Neeman, and Solan \(2023\)](#) consider predictable and random inspections in a different context. They study a game between two agents who choose when to pay a cost to check whether an opportunity has arrived. Depending on the payoff parameters, equilibrium may feature predictable or random inspections.

¹¹In [Manso \(2011\)](#) and [Klein \(2016\)](#), the agent chooses between an unknown technology and a safe technology, which generates successes at a lower but certain rate. To encourage use of the

mit to a deterministic deadline.¹² The deadline punishes the agent for not achieving a breakthrough soon enough, thus motivating the agent to work. We show that *inspections* should be deterministic if the agent’s task is innovation. Despite the similarity of these conclusions, the reasons are quite different. The agent’s continuation value upon reaching an inspection depends on his action history; the agent’s value upon reaching a deadline does not. For a detailed comparison of deadlines and inspections, see Appendix B.1. In particular, a deadline does not help to motivate maintenance.

Finally, an important force in our paper is the relationship between time- and risk-preferences. [Ortoleva, Safonov, and Yariv \(2022\)](#) exploit this relationship in an adverse selection problem. In their model, the agent’s discount rate is his private information. They show how the agent’s induced risk preferences can be used to screen the agent in an allocation problem. In our moral hazard setting, the agent’s hidden actions determine his *effective* risk preferences.¹³

2 Model

2.1 Setting

Environment Time is continuous and the horizon is infinite. There are two players: a principal (she) and an agent (he). The principal hires the agent to work on a project. During the project, the agent privately chooses at each time t in $[0, \infty)$ whether to work ($a_t = 1$) or shirk ($a_t = 0$). The principal commits to the timing of costly inspections. Each inspection reveals information about the agent’s past actions, as described below.

The project culminates in a public breakthrough or a public breakdown, which

unknown technology, it is optimal to reward later success and, potentially, early failures. For an analysis of incentives in the presence of breakdowns, without inspections, see [Keller and Rady \(2015\)](#), [Bonatti and Hörner \(2017\)](#), [Hörner, Klein, and Rady \(2021\)](#), and [Wagner and Klein \(2022\)](#).

¹²In [Green and Taylor \(2016\)](#), the agent has to complete two breakthroughs, and the deadline for the second breakthrough is deterministic. The deadline for the first breakthrough, however, is random. This randomness encourages the agent to immediately report a breakthrough, which is privately observed by the agent. In our model, breakthroughs and breakdowns are public.

¹³See [DeJarnette, Dillenberger, Gottlieb, and Ortoleva \(2020\)](#) for an axiomatic analysis of the connection between impatience and risk-preferences over time-lotteries. To be sure, our results are not driven by primitive time preferences, but by effective time preferences determined endogenously by the agent’s actions.

arrive independently at Poisson rates

$$a_t \lambda_G \quad \text{and} \quad (1 - a_t) \lambda_B,$$

where λ_G and λ_B are nonnegative parameters. The subscripts abbreviate *good* (for a breakthrough) and *bad* (for a breakdown). A breakthrough can arrive only when the agent is working, and a breakdown can arrive only when the agent is shirking.¹⁴ The principal can terminate the project at any time prior to a breakthrough or a breakdown. The game ends when the project ends—in a breakthrough, in a breakdown, or by termination.

Inspection technology There is an evolving *detectability state* $\theta_t \in \{0, 1\}$ that is hidden to both players. The current state is publicly revealed whenever the principal conducts an inspection. Initially, $\theta_0 = 0$. While in state 0, transitions to state 1 occur at Poisson rate $\delta(1 - a_t)$, independently of breakthroughs and breakdowns. State 1 is absorbing. One interpretation is that the state θ_t indicates whether the agent's past shirking has left behind evidence. This evidence is uncovered only at an inspection. Since state 1 is absorbing, evidence does not disappear.¹⁵ The detectability parameter δ measures the rate at which evidence is left behind when the agent shirks.

Each inspection has two possible results. Say that the agent *passes* (respectively, *fails*) an inspection if the state is revealed to be 0 (respectively, 1). If the agent follows an action path $a = (a_s)_{s \geq 0}$, then it is straightforward to compute the probability $p_t(a)$ that the agent passes an inspection conducted at time t :

$$p_t(a) = \exp \left\{ -\delta \int_0^t (1 - a_s) \, ds \right\}.$$

The passage probability p_t is a decreasing, convex function of the duration of shirking prior to time t . If the agent fails one inspection, then he will fail all subsequent inspections. Therefore, the agent's conditional probability of passing an inspection

¹⁴This assumption can be relaxed. If the breakthrough and breakdown rates were instead $\lambda_G + \lambda_G a_t$ and $\lambda_B + \lambda_B(1 - a_t)$, then we could incorporate the baseline arrival rates into the discount rate by defining $r' = r + \lambda_G + \lambda_B$.

¹⁵In Section 7 we allow for transitions from state 1 to state 0.

at time t , given that he passed an inspection at an earlier time t' , is

$$\frac{p_t(a)}{p_{t'}(a)} = \exp \left\{ -\delta \int_{t'}^t (1 - a_s) ds \right\}.$$

This conditional probability depends only on the duration of shirking between times t' and t .

Payoffs The principal and the agent both discount future payoffs using the exponential discount factor e^{-rt} , where $r > 0$. While the project continues, the agent's flow utility, as a function of his action a_t in $\{0, 1\}$, is given by

$$u(a_t) = a_t u_1 + (1 - a_t) u_0,$$

where $u_1, u_0 > 0$. When the project ends, the agent gets his outside option payoff, which is normalized to 0. In particular, the agent does not receive a lump sum benefit or cost from a breakthrough or a breakdown. In some applications, it is natural for the agent to receive a lump sum reward from a breakthrough or a lump sum cost from a breakdown. We can accommodate this in our framework by annuitizing these lump sums into the agent's flow payoff. Our results go through; see Appendix A.7 for the details.

Each time the principal inspects the agent, she pays a lump sum cost, normalized to 1. The setting is described by six parameters: $\lambda_G, \lambda_B, \delta, r, u_1, u_0$. We study the principal's cost-minimization problem: What is the cheapest inspection policy that induces the agent to work on the project at all times until achieving a breakthrough?

This stylized model admits various interpretations. In an employment setting, the principal is a manager and the agent is a worker. During the project, the worker receives a flow wage and experiences a flow effort cost from working. In an investment setting, the principal is an investor and the agent is an entrepreneur running a start-up. While the relationship is ongoing, the investor funds the start-up at a constant flow rate and pays the entrepreneur a flow wage. At each time t , the entrepreneur chooses whether to invest the current flow of funds ($a_t = 1$) or divert the current flow of funds ($a_t = 0$) for his own private benefit.

2.2 Principal's problem

The principal commits to a dynamic, stochastic inspection policy. Formally, an inspection policy is a sequence $\mathbf{T} = (T_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of random variables satisfying $0 < T_1 < T_2 < \dots$. The n -th inspection is conducted at (random) time T_n if and only if the project has not already ended by time T_n .

The principal also commits to the timing of project termination, but the optimal termination policy is clear. In order to induce work until a breakthrough, the principal cannot terminate the project on path. In the off-path event that the agent fails an inspection, it is optimal for the principal to immediately terminate the project, thus imposing the maximal punishment on the agent. Hereafter, we refer to the inspection policy only, with the understanding that each inspection policy is combined with this optimal termination policy.

Given an inspection policy \mathbf{T} , the agent chooses an action process $A = (A_t)_{t \geq 0}$ adapted to \mathbf{T} with right-continuous paths.¹⁶ At time t , the agent takes action A_t , provided that the project has not yet ended. The principal chooses an inspection policy \mathbf{T} to minimize the expected inspection cost, subject to the constraint that it is a best response for the agent to work until a breakthrough, i.e., to choose $A_t = 1$ for all t . Denote this action process by $A = \mathbf{1}$.

To state the problem formally, define the effective discount factor

$$D_t(a) = \exp \left\{ -rt - \lambda_G \int_0^t a_s ds - \lambda_B \int_0^t (1 - a_s) ds \right\}. \quad (1)$$

This discount factor is the product of the standard exponential discount factor e^{-rt} and the conditional probability that the project has not yet ended in a breakthrough or a breakdown by time t , given action path $(a_s)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$. To simplify notation, set $T_0 = 0$ and $p_0(a) = 1$ for all action paths a . Given an inspection policy \mathbf{T} , the agent's expected payoff from an action process A adapted to \mathbf{T} is given by

$$U(A, \mathbf{T}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p_{T_{n-1}}(A) \int_{T_{n-1}}^{T_n} D_t(A) u(A_t) dt \right]. \quad (2)$$

The expectation is over the inspection policy \mathbf{T} and the action process A . For each

¹⁶Formally, A is adapted to the natural filtration generated by the counting process $N_t = |\{n : T_n \leq t\}|$ associated with \mathbf{T} .

realization of (A, \mathbf{T}) , the expression inside brackets sums the agent’s conditional expected utility over each inter-inspection interval.¹⁷ The term $p_{T_{n-1}}(A)$ appears because the agent passes the $(n-1)$ -th inspection if and only if he passes all inspections up to and including the $(n-1)$ -th.

The principal chooses an inspection policy \mathbf{T} to minimize the expected discounted inspection cost

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} p_{T_{n-1}}(\mathbf{1}) D_{T_n}(\mathbf{1}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T_n} \right],$$

subject to the constraint that $U(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{T}) \geq U(A, \mathbf{T})$ for all right-continuous actions processes A adapted to \mathbf{T} .

3 Warm-up: No inspections

If the principal does not conduct inspections, then the agent’s expected payoff from an action process A is

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\infty} D_t(A) u(A_t) dt \right]. \quad (3)$$

Working until the project ends ($A = \mathbf{1}$) and shirking until the project ends ($A = \mathbf{0}$) respectively yield expected payoffs

$$U_1 := \frac{u_1}{\lambda_G + r} \quad \text{and} \quad U_0 := \frac{u_0}{\lambda_B + r}.$$

In each expression, the denominator reflects the rate at which the project ends under the specified action path. Without inspections, the agent’s problem is stationary. We show that the agent has a stationary best response—either always working or always shirking is optimal.

Lemma 1 (No inspections)

Without inspections, working until the project ends is a best response for the agent if and only if $U_1 \geq U_0$.

Myopically, the agent weakly prefers working to shirking if $u_1 \geq u_0$. Dynamically, the agent also considers the effect of his actions on the probability that the project

¹⁷We use the conditional independence of inspection results and breakthroughs and breakdowns to factor the expectation into the product of the passage probability and the effective discount factor.

continues. He weakly prefers always working to always shirking if $U_1 \geq U_0$. If $\lambda_G = \lambda_B$, then the agent's actions do not affect the length of the project, so the dynamic and myopic conditions coincide. In the innovation regime ($\lambda_G > \lambda_B$), working shortens the project, so the dynamic condition for working is more demanding than the myopic condition. Conversely, in the maintenance regime ($\lambda_B > \lambda_G$), working lengthens the project, so the dynamic condition for working is less demanding than the myopic condition.

We make the following standing assumption.

Assumption 1. $U_0 > U_1$.

By Lemma 1, the inequality $U_0 > U_1$ means that inspections are needed to induce the agent to work; otherwise, it is optimal for the principal to never inspect the agent.

4 Recursive formulation

We analyze the principal's problem recursively. Consider the principal's continuation problem after the agent passes an inspection at time t . In this case, $\theta_t = 0$, so the time- t continuation problem is identical to the time-0 problem, as we argue below.¹⁸ In the off-path event that the agent fails an inspection, terminating the project is optimal, as discussed in Section 2.2.

In the recursive formulation, after each passed inspection, the principal chooses the random time T until the next inspection, and the agent chooses the action path $a = (a_t)_{t \geq 0}$ that he will follow until the next inspection.¹⁹ Let \mathcal{A} denote the set of right-continuous action paths. The principal's infimal cost, denoted K^* , satisfies the Bellman equation

$$K^* = \inf_T \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-(\lambda_G + r)T} (1 + K^*) \right], \quad (4)$$

where the infimum is taken over all random times T satisfying

$$\mathbf{1} \in \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T D_t(a) u(a_t) dt + p_T(a) D_T(a) U_1 \right]. \quad (5)$$

¹⁸One implication is that the principal would use the same dynamic policy if she could commit only to the timing of the next inspection and the associated termination decision.

¹⁹Time is measured relative to the last inspection. The agent plans to take action a_t at time t , provided that the principal does not inspect first. The planned action a_t is executed only if $T > t$.

First consider the recursive obedience constraint (5). If the agent passes the next inspection, then his optimal value in the continuation problem is U_1 since this is his payoff from always working (no matter the inspection policy), and always working must be optimal in the continuation problem. If the agent fails the next inspection, then the project is terminated. The associated term $(1 - p_T(a))D_T(a)0$ vanishes. Condition (5) requires that if the agent behaves optimally *after* the next inspection, then *until* the next inspection the agent weakly prefers working to any other action path.

In the principal's Bellman equation (4), the expected cost is computed assuming that the agent chooses the action path $a = \mathbf{1}$. The next inspection is conducted at time T , provided that the project has not already ended. Thus, the principal uses the discount factor $D_T(\mathbf{1}) = e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T}$. The principal pays cost 1 to conduct the inspection. On path, the agent passes the inspection, so the principal's cost in the continuation problem is K^* .

The principal's problem in (4)–(5) can be expressed in the following more convenient form. The principal chooses a positive random time T to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T D_t(a)u(a_t) dt + p_T(a)D_T(a)U_1 \right] \leq U_1, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The constraint here is equivalent to (5) since putting $a = \mathbf{1}$ into the right side of (5) gives U_1 . We have divided the objective in (4) by $1 + K^*$, so the value of (6) is $K^*/(1 + K^*)$. An inspection policy \mathbf{T} is optimal if and only if, conditional on almost every inspection history (T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}) , the increment $T_n - T_{n-1}$ follows a distribution that solves (6).

In (6), the principal minimizes the expected cost of the next inspection subject to the constraint that the agent cannot profit by deviating before the next inspection. This problem is still complex because the set \mathcal{A} of action paths is large. For a given random time T , the agent's best deviation could involve many alternating periods of working and shirking. To solve (6), we set up various relaxed problems, each of which imposes the inequality only for action paths a in some subset \mathcal{A}' of \mathcal{A} . The suitable set \mathcal{A}' of binding deviations depends on the parameter values. We solve each relaxed problem by constructing Lagrange multipliers. Then we check that our relaxed solution is feasible in the original problem (6). To do so, we consider

the dynamic optimization problem for the agent that is induced by the candidate inspection policy. We solve the associated HJB equation to confirm that always working is a best response for the agent.

5 Optimal timing of perfect inspections

To highlight the main force in the model, we first solve the principal's problem in the special case of *perfect* inspections. The passage probability is given by

$$p_t(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \int_0^t (1 - a_s) ds = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \int_0^t (1 - a_s) ds > 0. \end{cases}$$

That is, the agent passes the time- t inspection if and only if he has not shirked for a positive duration before time t . This passage probability is the limit of the passage probability in the main model as the detectability parameter δ tends to ∞ .

We separate the analysis into two regimes—innovation and maintenance—according to the relative sensitivities of breakthroughs and breakdowns to the agent's action.

5.1 Innovation: $\lambda_G > \lambda_B$

If $\lambda_G > \lambda_B$, then working increases the arrival rate of breakthroughs by more than it decreases the arrival rate of breakdowns. Consequently, working shortens the project. In particular, this case obtains if there are breakthroughs but no breakdowns ($\lambda_B = 0$).

Theorem 1 (Periodic perfect inspections)

Suppose that inspections are perfect and $\lambda_G > \lambda_B$. Then it is optimal to inspect periodically with some period τ^ , i.e., $T_n = n\tau^*$ for all n . If $u_0 \geq u_1$, then this policy is uniquely optimal and the period τ^* is given by*

$$e^{-(\lambda_B+r)\tau^*} = \frac{U_0 - U_1}{U_0}. \quad (7)$$

If the agent's primary task is innovation—think of a start-up entrepreneur or a researcher working toward a new discovery—then it is optimal to conduct inspections at regular intervals. If the agent plans to shirk, then he expects the project to last longer, making him effectively more patient. Thus, shirking makes the agent's

discount factor less convex (i.e., more concave). As a result, conducting the next inspection at a deterministic time is the most cost-effective way to punish shirking.

Consistent with Theorem 1, periodic inspections are standard in venture capital financing and research funding. Gompers and Lerner (2004) observe that “venture capitalists use staged investment to periodically evaluate” firms they invest in, and they “discontinue funding the project if they learn negative information” (p. 141–142). In a sample of 794 firms backed by venture capital, Gompers and Lerner (2004) find that firms subject to greater agency costs (as proxied by the industry ratio of tangible to non-tangible assets or R&D intensity) have shorter financing rounds and thus greater monitoring frequency. For research grants, the European Research Council (ERC) periodically reviews recipients’ spending, according to a pre-announced schedule.²⁰

We illustrate the proof of Theorem 1 in the case $u_0 \geq u_1$. That is, shirking yields a weakly higher flow payoff than working, which is natural in our motivating applications. In this case, the binding deviation is for the agent to shirk immediately and continue shirking until the next inspection, as we check below. We consider the relaxation of (6) that requires this particular deviation ($a = \mathbf{0}$) to be unprofitable for the agent. After some algebra, this relaxed problem can be expressed as follows. The principal chooses a positive random time T to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E} U_0 e^{-(\lambda_B+r)T} \geq U_0 - U_1. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The original constraint in (6) requires that the payoff from any deviation is less than the payoff from working forever. Here, we have restated the inequality for the shirk-always deviation in terms of losses relative to U_0 : the agent’s loss (relative to U_0) from the shirking deviation is weakly greater than his loss (relative to U_0) from working forever.

Crucially, λ_B appears in the exponent in the constraint but λ_G appears in the exponent in the objective. Under the shirking deviation, the agent’s effective discount factor is $D_T(\mathbf{0}) = e^{-(\lambda_B+r)t}$ because breakdowns arrive at Poisson rate λ_B while the agent is shirking. On the other hand, the principal considers the cost of the next inspection on path. When the agent works, breakthroughs arrive at Poisson rate λ_G ,

²⁰See <https://erc.europa.eu/manage-your-project/financial-reporting>.




Figure 1. Shirking agent's loss (orange) from a perfect inspection with $\lambda_G > \lambda_B$. In this example, $\lambda_G + r = 2$; $\lambda_B + r = 1$; $U_1 = 1.25$; and $U_0 = 2$.

so the principal's objective uses the effective discount factor $D_T(\mathbf{1}) = e^{-(\lambda_G+r)t}$.

The solution of (8) becomes clear once we change variables. Instead of choosing the random time T of the next inspection, the principal can equivalently choose the random variable $X = e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T}$, which is the on-path cost of conducting an inspection at time T . In terms of X , (8) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} X \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E} U_0 X^{(\lambda_B+r)/(\lambda_G+r)} \geq U_0 - U_1. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Figure 1 depicts the principal's problem before (left) and after (right) the change of variables, in an example with $\lambda_G > \lambda_B$. The left panel plots, as a function of the inspection time t , the principal's on-path inspection cost (black) and the agent's loss from the inspection under the shirking deviation (orange). The principal chooses a distribution over the horizontal axis to minimize her expected on-path inspection cost, subject to the constraint that the agent's expected loss from the inspection under the shirking deviation is at least $U_0 - U_1$. As a function of the inspection time, the agent's shirking loss is *less convex* than the principal's on-path cost because $\lambda_B < \lambda_G$.

The right panel of Figure 1 puts the principal's on-path inspection cost X on the horizontal axis $[0, 1]$, which is reversed so that time still moves from left to right. The principal chooses a distribution whose expectation is minimal (i.e., furthest right), subject to the constraint that the agent's expected loss from the inspection under the shirking deviation is at least $U_0 - U_1$. This loss is a concave function of X , so replacing any random variable X with the constant $\mathbb{E} X$ slackens the constraint,

without changing the principal’s objective. Therefore, the unique solution is the constant $x^* = e^{-(\lambda_G+r)\tau^*}$ for which the constraint holds with equality. The point x^* is labeled on the right panel of Figure 1. The associated time τ^* is given by (7).

We have argued that conducting the next inspection at the nonrandom time τ^* is the cheapest way to deter the agent from shirking immediately and continuing to shirk until the next inspection. It remains to check that if the next inspection is conducted at time τ^* , then no other deviations are profitable for the agent. If the agent shirks at all before time τ^* , then he is certain to fail the inspection. Given that he will fail the inspection, the agent’s payoff is highest if he shirks continuously over the interval $[0, \tau^*]$ —shirking prolongs the project (because $\lambda_G > \lambda_B$) and yields a weakly higher flow payoff (because $u_0 \geq u_1$).

The argument above assumes that $u_0 \geq u_1$. Suppose instead that $u_0 < u_1$. In this case, periodic inspections are still optimal, but the argument is more subtle. If the agent has already shirked, then he knows that he will fail the next inspection. As the next inspection (and hence the end of the game) nears, the agent becomes increasingly myopic. Since $u_0 < u_1$, the agent will find it optimal to work once the next inspection is sufficiently close. In the proof, we identify the binding shirk-before-work deviation and we give an explicit formula for the optimal period τ^* .²¹ We analyze such shirk-before-work deviations in more detail in the case of imperfect inspections (Section 6.1).

5.2 Maintenance: $\lambda_B > \lambda_G$

If $\lambda_B > \lambda_G$, then working decreases the arrival rate of breakdowns by more than it increases the arrival rate of breakthroughs. Consequently, working lengthens the project. In particular, this case obtains if there are breakdowns but no breakthroughs ($\lambda_G = 0$).

Theorem 2 (Random perfect inspections)

Suppose that inspections are perfect and $\lambda_B > \lambda_G$. Then the following policy is uniquely optimal. The gaps $(T_n - T_{n-1})_{n \geq 1}$ are independently and identically dis-

²¹If $u_0 < u_1$, then the periodic policy is not the unique solution. There are other optimal policies in which the time between consecutive inspections follows a distribution that concentrates near τ^* . In the proof, we identify a time $\bar{t} > 0$ such that in every optimal policy, the time between any consecutive inspections is at least \bar{t} .




Figure 2. Shirking agent’s loss (orange) from a perfect inspection with $\lambda_B > \lambda_G$. In this example, $\lambda_G + r = 1$; $\lambda_B + r = 2$; $U_1 = 1.25$; and $U_0 = 2$.

tributed according to an exponential distribution with hazard rate γ^* , where

$$\frac{\gamma^*}{\lambda_B + r} = \frac{U_0 - U_1}{U_1}. \quad (10)$$

If the agent’s primary task is maintenance—think of a worker following safety protocols to prevent an accident—then it is optimal to conduct inspections at random times. If the agent plans to shirk, then he expects the project to end sooner, making him effectively more impatient. Thus, shirking makes the agent’s discount factor more convex. As a result, conducting the next inspection at a random time is the most cost-effective way to deter shirking.

Consistent with Theorem 2, safety inspections are generally conducted randomly. In fact, the US Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) explicitly prohibits advance notice of workplace inspections, outside of certain special circumstances (OSHA, 1971).²² Johnson, Levine, and Toffel (2023) suggest an improved targeting approach for OSHA inspections. They acknowledge, however, that such targeting would make inspections more predictable, potentially reducing their general deterrence effect (Johnson et al., 2023, p. 33). In politics, elected representatives understand that shirking (e.g., engaging in corruption) tends to shorten their time in office, by increasing their chances of being ousted. Brazil has a federal anti-corruption initiative that randomly audits the finances of municipal governments. Municipalities

²²For example, advance notice is allowed if workplaces must make special preparations for an inspection.

are selected for audit by public lotteries (Avis et al., 2018).²³

To build intuition for Theorem 2, first consider the same relaxed problem (8) as in the innovation regime. This problem requires only that it is unprofitable for the agent to shirk immediately and continue shirking until the next inspection. As before, we can change variables to get (9). Figure 2 plots the same functions as Figure 1, before and after the change of variables, in an example with $\lambda_B > \lambda_G$. As a function of the inspection time, the agent's loss from the inspection under the shirking deviation is *more convex* than the principal's on-path inspection cost. In the right panel, we express this loss as a convex function of the principal's on-path inspection cost $X = e^{-(\lambda_G+r)t}$. In the relaxed problem, the principal would like to spread out the distribution of time until the next inspection by inspecting either very early or very late. But such a policy is infeasible in the original problem. If the agent is not inspected early on, then he can infer that he will not be inspected for a very long time. Instead of working continuously, the agent strictly prefers to work briefly and then, once the risk of an early inspection has passed, shirk until the next inspection. Deviations of this form will indeed bind.

In the maintenance regime, the binding deviations take the following form: work until time s , and then shirk until the next inspection, for each time $s \geq 0$. We consider the relaxation of (6) requiring that none of these work-before-shirk deviations is profitable. After some algebra, this relaxed problem can be expressed as follows. Let $\mathbb{E}_s = \mathbb{E}[\cdot | T > s]$. The principal chooses a positive random time T to solve²⁴

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E}_s U_0 e^{-(\lambda_B+r)(T-s)} \geq U_0 - U_1, \quad s \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

For each fixed s , suppose that time s has passed since the last inspection. The inequality requires that if the agent has worked continuously since the last inspection, then it is unprofitable for the agent to begin shirking now and continue shirking until the next inspection.

Since $\lambda_B > \lambda_G$, the loss function in the constraint is more convex than the objective, as illustrated in Figure 2. Therefore, the solution of the relaxed problem (11) is to

²³The details of the randomization resemble our solution with the imperfect inspection technology, as we discuss in Section 6.

²⁴If $\mathbf{P}(T > s) = 0$, then the agent does not actually shirk under the specified deviation, so we consider the inequality to be satisfied, even though the conditional expectation is not well-defined.

conduct the next inspection at a constant hazard rate; see Lemma 2 (Appendix A.1). This policy is memoryless—the conditional distribution of time until the next inspection is the same, no matter how much time has passed since the last inspection. With the hazard rate γ^* in (10), each constraint in (11) holds with equality.

We have argued that inspecting with the constant hazard rate γ^* is the cheapest way to deter all work-before-shirk deviations. It remains to check that if the next inspection is conducted with hazard rate γ^* , then no other deviations are profitable for the agent. In the proof, we show that under this policy, once the agent begins shirking, he finds it optimal to continue shirking until the next inspection. At any time, if the agent has not previously shirked, then he is indifferent between working continuously and shirking continuously until the next inspection. If the agent has previously shirked, then he is certain to fail the next inspection, so his incentives to work are weaker. Hence, he *strictly* prefers to shirk until the next inspection.

6 Optimal timing of imperfect inspections

In this section, we consider the imperfect inspection technology (with finite detectability parameter δ) from the main model (p. 7). To ensure that the principal’s problem is feasible, we impose the additional standing assumption that the inspection technology is sufficiently precise.

Assumption 2. $\delta > (\lambda_B + r)(U_0 - U_1)/U_1$.

There exists an inspection policy that motivates the agent to work continuously if and only if Assumption 2 holds.

The imperfect inspection technology creates a new motive for the principal to space apart inspections. If two inspections are conducted in quick succession, then the agent is unlikely to leave behind new evidence of shirking in between the inspections, even if he shirks continuously. The optimal policy reflects this new motive to space apart inspections. Periodic inspections are still optimal in the innovation regime ($\lambda_G > \lambda_B$), but they are also optimal for some other parameters, provided that λ_B is not much larger than λ_G .

On the other hand, if λ_B is sufficiently larger than λ_G , then the optimal policy leverages the benefits of randomization while also spacing apart inspections. After each inspection, there is an inspection-free period. The next inspection is conducted

at the end of this period with positive probability. With complementary probability, the next inspection is conducted with constant hazard rate thereafter. Once the inspection is conducted, the cycle repeats, beginning with an inspection-free period. This inspection format is observed in practice. Under the Brazilian anti-corruption initiative discussed in Section 5.2, municipalities are selected for audit in regular lotteries, but “once audited, the municipality can be audited again only after several lotteries have elapsed” (Avis et al., 2018, p. 1920). This rule is a convenient way to (approximately) implement an inspection-free period followed by inspections at a constant hazard rate.

To formally state the optimal inspection policy, let $\text{Exp}(\gamma)$ denote an (independent) exponentially distributed random variable with hazard rate γ .

Theorem 3 (Imperfect inspections)

Assume $\delta > 2\lambda_G - \lambda_B + r$. There exists a threshold $\bar{\lambda}_B = \bar{\lambda}_B(\lambda_G, \delta, r, u_0, u_1)$, with $\bar{\lambda}_B > \lambda_G$, such that the following hold.

- (i) If $\lambda_B \leq \bar{\lambda}_B$, then it is optimal to inspect periodically with some period τ^* , i.e., $T_n = n\tau^*$ for all n . Moreover, there exists a time $\bar{t} = \bar{t}(\lambda_B, \lambda_G, \delta, r, u_0, u_1) > 0$ such that under every optimal policy, $T_n - T_{n-1} \geq \bar{t}$ for each n .
- (ii) If $\lambda_B > \bar{\lambda}_B$, then the following policy is uniquely optimal. The gaps $(T_n - T_{n-1})_{n \geq 1}$ are independently and identically distributed. For each n , the gap $T_n - T_{n-1}$ equals $\hat{\tau}$ with some probability π^* in $(0, 1)$. With probability $1 - \pi^*$, the gap $T_n - T_{n-1}$ has the distribution of $\hat{\tau} + \text{Exp}(\gamma^*)$, where

$$e^{-\delta\hat{\tau}} = \frac{\lambda_B - \lambda_G}{\lambda_B - \lambda_G + \delta}, \quad \gamma^* = \frac{(U_0 - U_1)(\lambda_B + r)(\lambda_B + r + \delta)}{U_1(\lambda_B + r + \delta) - U_0(\lambda_B + r)}. \quad (12)$$

We separately discuss the two cases of Theorem 3 below. Here we make two remarks.²⁵

Remark 1 (Threshold $\bar{\lambda}_B$). If $\lambda_B > \lambda_G$, then the condition $\lambda_B > \bar{\lambda}_B$ holds if and only if conducting deterministic inspections with period $\hat{\tau}$ strictly induces the agent to work. The condition $\lambda_B > \bar{\lambda}_B$ can be expressed as

$$\frac{\lambda_B + r}{\lambda_G + r} > 1 + g\left(\frac{\delta}{\lambda_G + r}, \frac{u_0}{u_1}\right),$$

²⁵These remarks are verified within the main proof of Theorem 3 (Appendix A.5).

for some strictly positive function g that is strictly decreasing in its first argument and strictly increasing in its second argument. Note that this condition is invariant to rescaling the units of time and of flow utility. For any fixed ratio $u_0/u_1 > 1$, we have $g(d, u_0/u_1) \downarrow 0$ as $d \uparrow \infty$, which is in line with the perfect-inspection limit.

Remark 2 (Relaxing the condition on the precision δ). Theorem 3 assumes that $\delta > 2\lambda_G - \lambda_B + r$. Under this condition, the passage rate is sufficiently convex (as a function of the duration of shirking) that the binding deviations are not local.²⁶ Some of the conclusions still hold if this condition is relaxed. A weaker version of part i holds without additional assumptions on δ . If $\lambda_B \leq \bar{\lambda}_B$, then it is optimal to inspect periodically, but not every optimal policy satisfies the lower bound \bar{t} on the time between consecutive inspections. Part ii holds under a strictly weaker (but more complicated) condition on δ , which is stated in the proof. Numerical calculations suggest that the weaker condition is violated only for a narrow range of parameter values.

6.1 Periodic imperfect inspections

Within the case $\lambda_B \leq \bar{\lambda}_B$, different deviations can bind, depending on the parameter values. First consider the relaxation of (6) requiring that it is unprofitable for the agent to shirk immediately and continue shirking until the next inspection. This relaxed problem can be expressed as follows. The principal chooses a positive random time T to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E} L_S(T) \geq U_0 - U_1, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $L_S(t) = e^{-(\lambda_B+r)t}(U_0 - U_1 e^{-\delta t})$.

The function L_S is plotted in the left panel of Figure 3. As a function of the time t until the next inspection, L_S represents the agent's loss (relative to U_0) from shirking immediately and continuing to shirk until the next inspection. Naturally, this loss is smaller than in the case of perfect inspections. Here, the agent passes the time- t inspection with probability $e^{-\delta t}$, in which case he gets his continuation payoff U_1 . As t tends to 0, this passage probability converges to 1, so the loss $L_S(t)$ converges to $U_0 - U_1$.

²⁶In Section 7, we analyze a setting in which local deviations bind.




Figure 3. Agent’s loss from an imperfect inspection (orange for shirk-always deviation, green for shirk-work deviation) with $\lambda_B \leq \bar{\lambda}_B$. In this example, $\lambda_G + r = 2$; $\lambda_B + r = 1$; $U_1 = 1.25$; $U_0 = 2$; and $\delta = 3.5$. Here, \bar{L}_S is globally concave because $\delta + \lambda_B \geq \lambda_G \geq \lambda_B$.

As before, we change variables. In terms of the principal’s on-path inspection cost $X = e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T}$, problem (13) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} X \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E} \bar{L}_S(X) \geq U_0 - U_1, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $\bar{L}_S(x) = x^{(\lambda_B+r)/(\lambda_G+r)}(U_0 - U_1 x^{\delta/(\lambda_G+r)})$.

The right panel of Figure 3 plots the loss \bar{L}_S as a function of the principal’s on-path inspection cost, in an example with $\lambda_B \leq \bar{\lambda}_B$. For some parameter values, shirking all the way until the next inspection is the binding deviation. In this case, we show that the loss function \bar{L}_S is suitably concave (Claim 1 in Appendix A.5). Therefore, the unique solution of this relaxed problem is the constant at which \bar{L}_S intersects the horizontal line $U_0 - U_1$. In the proof, we verify that this solution is feasible in the original problem.

For other parameter values, the binding deviation takes the following form: shirk until time \bar{t} and then work until the next inspection, for some fixed time $\bar{t} > 0$.²⁷ In this case, we consider a variant of (14) requiring that the loss from this deviation (relative to U_0) is at least $U_0 - U_1$. This loss, as a function of the principal’s on-path inspection cost, is denoted by \bar{L} and is plotted in the right panel of Figure 3. We label

²⁷In the proof, we must consider a third case. For λ_B sufficiently close to (but below) $\bar{\lambda}_B$, the binding deviations are the same as in the case $\lambda_B > \bar{\lambda}_B$ discussed below. We show that inspecting periodically is then the unique solution.

the point $\bar{x} = e^{-(\lambda_G+r)\bar{t}}$. If the next inspection is conducted before time \bar{t} , then the agent does not begin working before the inspection. So, to the left of \bar{x} , the agent's loss \bar{L} coincides with \bar{L}_S . At time \bar{t} , the agent begins working, and thereafter the project ends at the same rate as it does on path. So, to the right of \bar{x} , the agent's loss \bar{L} is affine in the principal's on-path inspection cost.

Let $x^* = e^{-(\lambda_G+r)\tau^*}$ be the point at which the function \bar{L} intersects the horizontal line $U_0 - U_1$, as shown on the plot. We show that \bar{L} is suitably concave (Claim 2 in Appendix A.5). Therefore, the solutions of this relaxed problem are precisely the distributions with expectation x^* that concentrate on $[0, \bar{x}]$, the affine segment of \bar{L} . It follows that every optimal inspection policy has a no-inspection period of length at least \bar{t} . Not all of the relaxed solutions are feasible in the original problem, however. In the proof, we show that inspecting with period τ^* is one solution. There is also a range of almost-periodic policies that are optimal. Under each of these policies, the time between consecutive inspections follows a distribution that concentrates near τ^* .

6.2 Random imperfect inspections

Suppose $\lambda_B > \bar{\lambda}_B$. To build intuition for part ii of Theorem 3, first consider the same relaxed problem (13) as in the case $\lambda_B \leq \bar{\lambda}_B$. Figure 4 plots the same loss functions as in Figure 3 in an example with $\lambda_B > \bar{\lambda}_B$. In particular, $\lambda_B > \lambda_G$, so the loss function \bar{L}_S , as a function of the on-path inspection cost, is first concave and then convex. In the relaxed problem (13), the principal would like to approximate the concavification of \bar{L}_S by inspecting either at an intermediate time or else very far into the future. But in response to such a policy, the agent could profitably deviate by working until the intermediate time and then, if he is not inspected, shirking thereafter. Thus, additional deviations must bind.

The binding deviations are of the same form as in the maintenance regime with perfect inspections: work until time s , then shirk until the next inspection. But now these constraints bind only for $s = 0$ and for $s \geq \hat{\tau}$, where $\hat{\tau}$ is given in (12). The point $\hat{x} = e^{-(\lambda_G+r)\hat{\tau}}$ is shown in the right panel of Figure 4.²⁸ The optimal inspection policy proceeds as follows. First, there is an inspection-free period of length $\hat{\tau}$. With positive probability, the agent is inspected exactly at time $\hat{\tau}$. If the agent is not inspected at time $\hat{\tau}$, then the next inspection is conducted with a constant hazard

²⁸It can be checked that \hat{x} lies before (left of) the point of inflection of \bar{L}_S , but after (right of) the point where the concavification of \bar{L}_S becomes affine.




Figure 4. Shirking agent’s loss (orange) from an imperfect inspection with $\lambda_B > \bar{\lambda}_B$. In this example, $\lambda_G + r = 1$; $\lambda_B + r = 2$; $U_0 = 2$; $U_1 = 1.25$; and $\delta = 5$.

rate thereafter. Once the inspection is conducted, the cycle repeats, beginning with a fresh period without inspections.²⁹

As the ratio $(\lambda_B + r)/(\lambda_G + r)$ increases, there is a stronger force towards randomization due to the relative convexity of the shirking agent’s discount factor $e^{-(\lambda_B+r)T}$. We show in the proof (Claim 4 in Appendix A.5) that the normalized inspection-free period $(\lambda_G + r)\hat{\tau}$ is decreasing in the ratio $(\lambda_B + r)/(\lambda_G + r)$ and in the normalized inspection precision $\delta/(\lambda_G + r)$. As δ tends to ∞ , the optimal policy in Theorem 3.ii converges to the exponential policy from Theorem 2. In particular, the inspection-free period $\hat{\tau}$ and the probability π^* of inspecting at time $\hat{\tau}$ both tend to 0, and the threshold $\bar{\lambda}_B$ converges to λ_G .

7 Inspection technology with recovery

In the main model, we assume that once the agent’s shirking leaves behind evidence, the agent fails the next inspection with certainty. We now consider an alternative inspection technology that allows the agent to recover from past shirking. Formally,

²⁹The structure of this policy is similar to the optimal policy in Varas et al. (2020) in the case in which the principal directly values the information revealed by an inspection. There, the principal’s flow payoff is convex in her belief about the state, and there is uncertainty about the state even when the agent works continuously. In our model, the detectability state is not payoff-relevant, and on path there is no uncertainty about the detectability state. Moreover, the binding deviations are quite different. In Varas et al. (2020), the most profitable deviations are always local, even when the principal directly values information. Under our main inspection technology, the binding deviations are always non-local.

the detectability state θ_t evolves as follows. Transitions from state 0 to state 1 occur at Poisson rate $\delta(1 - a_t)$, as before. Now transitions from state 1 to state 0 occur at Poisson rate ρa_t .³⁰ We call ρ the recovery rate. The main model corresponds to $\rho = 0$.

In the leading case $u_0 > u_1$, the policies in Theorem 3 remain optimal if ρ is locally perturbed above 0, as long as the detectability parameter δ is large enough; for a formal statement, see Theorem 5 in Appendix B.2. Perturbing ρ affects the agent's passage probability only when he works after having previously shirked. Under certain conditions, the constraints involving shirk-before-work deviations are slack.

If the recovery rate ρ is sufficiently large, then the form of the optimal policy can fundamentally change. To illustrate why, we first show that different periods of work contribute to the passage probability as complements if $\rho \leq \delta$ and as substitutes if $\rho \geq \delta$. If ρ is sufficiently large, then the binding deviations are local and the optimal inspection policy is exponential (see Theorem 4 below). Varas et al. (2020) consider an inspection technology with the special recovery rate $\rho = \delta$. At the end of this section, we contrast our results with theirs.

7.1 Role of the inspection technology

Consider the inspection technology with recovery rate $\rho \geq 0$. Fix $t > s > 0$. In state θ_s (which is hidden), the marginal effect of action a_s on the probability of passing an inspection at time t (i.e. $\theta_t = 0$) can be shown to equal

$$[\delta(1 - \theta_s) + \rho\theta_s] \exp \left\{ -\delta \int_s^t (1 - a_\tau) d\tau - \rho \int_s^t a_\tau d\tau \right\}. \quad (15)$$

The expression in (15) is the product of two terms. The first term, in brackets, captures the effect of action a_s on time- s state transitions. In state 0, working prevents transitions to state 1 at rate δ . In state 1, working generates transitions to state 0 at rate ρ . The exponential term in (15) captures the effect of θ_s on θ_t . Formally, this term is the difference in conditional probabilities, $\mathbf{P}(\theta_t = 0 | \theta_s = 0) - \mathbf{P}(\theta_t = 0 | \theta_s = 1)$, for a given action path $(a_\tau)_{s \leq \tau < t}$.

³⁰Let $p_{t|t'}(a)$ denote the conditional probability of passing an inspection at time t , given that the agent passed an inspection at time t' . If $\rho = 0$, then $p_{t|t'}(a) = p_t(a)/p_{t'}(a)$. If $\rho > 0$, this equality no longer holds. In this case, the term $p_{T_{n-1}}(A)$ in (2) must be replaced with the full expression $\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} p_{T_j|T_{j-1}}(A)$.

From (15), we see that the relative values of ρ and δ determine whether the passage probability p_t is a supermodular or submodular function of the action history $(a_s)_{0 \leq s < t}$. If $\rho < \delta$, then the marginal effect of action a_s in (15) is greatest if the agent works before time s (making $\theta_s = 0$ most likely) and after time s (making the exponential term largest). Thus, the passage probability is a *supermodular* function of the action path—different periods of work are complements. Therefore, working today has the smallest effect on the agent’s probability of passing the next inspection if the agent shirks at all other times. Intuitively, the agent does not expect working today to make up for other periods of shirking. This creates a force toward *global* incentive constraints binding.

If $\rho > \delta$, then the marginal effect of action a_s in (15) is greatest if the agent shirks before time s (making $\theta_s = 1$ most likely) and after time s (making the exponential term largest). Thus, the passage probability is a *submodular* function of the action path—different periods of work are substitutes. Therefore, working today has the smallest effect on the agent’s probability of passing the next inspection if the agent works at all other times. Intuitively, the agent expects other periods of work to make up for shirking today. This creates a force toward *local* incentive constraints binding.

In the special case $\rho = \delta$, the expression in (15) simplifies to $\delta e^{-\delta(t-s)}$. The marginal effect of action a_s on the passage probability is independent of all other action choices; this is the case studied in Varas et al. (2020).

7.2 Optimal inspection policy with high recovery rate

Under the inspection technology without recovery, the binding deviations are global. By contrast, with a sufficiently high recovery rate, the binding deviations are local, as we now show. Consider the relaxed problem requiring only that locally shirking at each time s is unprofitable. The relaxed problem can be expressed as follows. As above, let $\mathbb{E}_s = \mathbb{E}[\cdot | T > s]$. The principal chooses a positive random time T to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E}_s \delta e^{-(\lambda_G+r+\rho)(T-s)} U_1 \geq (u_0 - u_1) - (\lambda_B - \lambda_G) U_1, \quad s \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The right side of the inequality captures the marginal benefit, in the absence of inspections, from locally shirking at time s . This benefit reflects the effect of shirking on the flow payoff and on the rate at which the project ends (in a breakthrough or a

breakdown). The left side captures the marginal loss, due to the upcoming inspection, from locally shirking at time s . From (15), the marginal effect of locally shirking at time s on the probability of passing a time- T inspection is $\delta e^{-\rho(T-s)}$. This effect decays in the time $T - s$ until the inspection. At time s , the state transitions from 0 to 1 at rate δ , and working thereafter generates transitions back to state 0 at rate ρ . The term $\delta e^{-\rho(T-s)}$ is multiplied by the discounted utility $e^{-(\lambda_G+r)(T-s)}U_1$. Here, λ_G appears in the exponent because the agent works after locally deviating.

Whenever $\rho > 0$, the loss function in the local constraint is more convex, as a function of T , than the objective. Therefore, the unique solution of the relaxed problem (16) is to conduct the next inspection at a constant hazard rate; see Lemma 2 (Appendix A.1). For $\rho > 0$, inspecting with a constant hazard rate is the cheapest way to deter *local* deviations, regardless of the values of δ , λ_G , and λ_B . These other parameters determine whether deterring local deviations is sufficient. If ρ is small enough, then local incentives are not sufficient. Indeed, in our main model ($\rho = 0$), the binding deviations are global, and the form of the solution depends on the relative values of λ_G and λ_B .

We next identify a range of parameter values for which local incentives are sufficient. In this case, it is optimal to inspect with a constant hazard rate.

Theorem 4 (Random inspections with recovery)

Consider the inspection technology with recovery rate $\rho > 0$. If $\rho + \lambda_G \geq \delta + \lambda_B$, then the following policy is uniquely optimal. The gaps $(T_n - T_{n-1})_{n \geq 1}$ are independently and identically distributed according to an exponential distribution with hazard rate

$$\gamma^* = \frac{(U_0 - U_1)(\lambda_B + r)(\lambda_G + r + \rho)}{U_1(\lambda_B + r + \delta) - U_0(\lambda_B + r)}. \quad (17)$$

The condition $\rho + \lambda_G \geq \delta + \lambda_B$ ensures that the binding constraints are local. If $\lambda_G = \lambda_B$, then this inequality reduces to $\rho \geq \delta$. This is precisely the condition under which the passage probability is submodular in the action path.³¹ If $\rho + \lambda_G > \delta + \lambda_B$, then the hazard rate γ^* in Theorem 4 is strictly higher than the hazard rate in Theorem 3.ii.³² Recovery makes local deviations strictly more attractive to the agent,

³¹If $\lambda_G \neq \lambda_B$, then there is an additional effect. When the agent shirks, his continuation value decreases. If shirking lengthens the project ($\lambda_G > \lambda_B$), then a lower continuation value makes working more attractive, which encourages local deviations. If shirking shortens the project ($\lambda_G < \lambda_B$), then a lower continuation value makes shirking more attractive, which encourages global deviations.

³²In the limit as ρ tends to 0, the condition $\rho + \lambda_G \geq \delta + \lambda_B$ reduces to $\delta \leq \lambda_G - \lambda_B$, which

so when these local deviations bind, more frequent inspections are required.

7.3 Comparison with Varas et al. (2020)

In a setting without breakthroughs or breakdowns, Varas et al. (2020) consider an inspection technology which corresponds to the special recovery rate $\rho = \delta$ in our setup. They show that conducting inspections with a constant hazard rate is the cheapest way to induce full effort (Proposition 4, p. 2913). This result is essentially a special case of Theorem 4 with $\lambda_G = \lambda_B = 0$ and $\rho = \delta$.³³

Varas et al. (2020, p. 2894) explain that randomly inspecting the agent (firm) is optimal because:

deterministic inspections may induce “window dressing” by the firm: the firm has strong incentives to put in effort toward the inspection date, merely to pass the test, and weak incentives right after the inspection, since the firm knows that it will not be inspected in the near future.

Our paper shows that this conclusion depends on the inspection technology. Without breakthroughs or breakdowns ($\lambda_G = \lambda_B = 0$), our Theorem 4 implies that random inspections are optimal if $\rho \geq \delta$, i.e., if the passage probability is submodular. In this case, surprise inspections are effective at deterring window-dressing.³⁴ With a low recovery rate, however, periodic inspections are optimal (by Theorem 3.i and Theorem 5 in Appendix B.2). In this case, the agent is tempted to shirk for an extended period, so there is no reason to surprise the agent. Since the failure probability $1 - p_t$ is concave in the duration of shirking, periodic inspections are a more cost-effective way to catch prolonged shirking.

Relative to Varas et al. (2020), our paper identifies a new economic force that arises when (a) shirking affects the arrival rate of breakthroughs or breakdowns, and (b) the agent’s binding deviations involve shirking for an extended period, rather than an instant. In many applications, such extended deviations are a primary concern, as

can be satisfied only in the innovation regime ($\lambda_G > \lambda_B$). If $\delta \leq \lambda_G - \lambda_B$, then we conclude from Theorem 4 and Remark 2 that periodic and exponential inspections are both optimal. Note that the inequality $\delta \leq \lambda_G - \lambda_B$ is inconsistent with the condition $\delta \geq 2\lambda_G - \lambda_B + r$ imposed in Theorem 3.

³³Their result is not exactly a special case of ours because their payoff structure is different and they restrict the agent’s (continuous) action to an interval $[0, \bar{a}]$, where $\bar{a} < 1$. So even under maximal effort, there are random state transitions.

³⁴In an education setting, window-dressing corresponds to “cramming” for a test. Surprise “pop quizzes” are often used to motivate students to work continuously.

evidenced by the recent trend of “quiet quitting” (see Footnote 9). By (a), the agent’s effective discount factor changes when he plans to shirk for positive duration. By (b), such extended shirking deviations are relevant. The optimal inspection policy exploits the relative curvature of the agent’s effective discount factor under such deviations.

8 Conclusion

We study the design of inspection policies in a dynamic moral hazard setting. We show that different forms of inspection are optimal for encouraging different kinds of tasks. Predictable inspections are better for motivating an agent to work towards a breakthrough, such as a technological innovation. Random inspections are better for motivating an agent to work to prevent a breakdown, such as a workplace accident. This dichotomy is driven by the agent’s effective risk attitude over time lotteries, which is determined endogenously by the agent’s actions.

Our paper highlights the important role of the inspection technology in determining the optimal inspection policy. For tractability, previous work has focused on particular inspection technologies which ensure that local incentives are sufficient. By contrast, we work in a setting in which global deviations bind. This allows us to uncover important differences between motivating innovation and maintenance.

A Main proofs

A.1 Preliminaries

Notation Throughout the proofs we use the notation $\lambda_0 := \lambda_B + r$ and $\lambda_1 := \lambda_G + r$. With this notation, $U_i = u_i/\lambda_i$ for $i = 0, 1$. We express the solutions in terms of the five (strictly positive) parameters $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \delta, U_0, U_1$. To be sure, we only independently vary the primitive parameters $\lambda_B, \lambda_G, \delta, r, u_0, u_1$.

Constrained optimization In the proofs below, we solve two constrained optimization problems of the following general form. Given parameters A, α , and β , choose a distribution F over $(0, \infty)$ to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\beta t} dF(t) \\ & \text{subject to} && \int_{(s, \infty)} (e^{-\alpha(t-s)} - A) dF(t) \geq 0, \quad s \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The next lemma states the solution for a range of parameter values.

Lemma 2 (Exponential solution)

Given $0 < A < 1$ and $\alpha > \beta > 0$, the unique solution of (18) is the exponential distribution with hazard rate $\gamma^ = \alpha A / (1 - A)$.*

The proof of Lemma 2 is in Appendix A.8.

Deviations We introduce notation for the agent's utility from deviations. For $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tau \geq 0$, let

$$U(a; \tau) = \int_0^\tau D_t(a) u(a_t) dt + p_\tau(a) D_\tau(a) U_1. \tag{19}$$

With this notation, the constraints in (6) take the form $\mathbb{E}U(a; T) \leq U_1$, for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$. We consider a few special action paths: always shirk, shirk-before-work, and work-before-shirk. For $s, \tau \geq 0$, let

$$U_S(\tau) = U(\mathbf{0}; \tau), \quad U_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau) = U(1_{[s, \infty)}; \tau), \quad U_{\text{WS}}(s; \tau) = U(1_{[0, s)}; \tau). \tag{20}$$

For $s \leq \tau$, evaluating these integrals and simplifying gives

$$\begin{aligned} U_S(\tau) &= U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0\tau}) + U_1e^{-(\delta+\lambda_0)\tau}, \\ U_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau) &= U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0s}) + U_1e^{-\lambda_0s} [1 - e^{-\lambda_1(\tau-s)}(1 - e^{-\delta s})], \\ U_{\text{WS}}(s; \tau) &= U_1 + e^{-\lambda_1s} [U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0(\tau-s)}) - U_1(1 - e^{-(\delta+\lambda_0)(\tau-s)})]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

For $s > \tau$, we have $U_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau) = U_{\text{SW}}(\tau; \tau)$ and $U_{\text{WS}}(s; \tau) = U_{\text{WS}}(\tau; \tau) = U_1$. Note that $U_S(\tau) = U_{\text{SW}}(\tau; \tau) = U_{\text{WS}}(0; \tau)$.

We often work with losses rather than gains. Setting $L(a; \tau) = U_0 - U(a; \tau)$, the constraints in (6) can be expressed as $\mathbb{E}L(a; T) \geq U_0 - U_1$, for a in \mathcal{A} .

Bounding number of zeros In the proofs below, we use the following bound on the number of zeros of certain sums of exponentials.

Lemma 3 (Zeros)

Define $g: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by $g(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i e^{-\alpha_i t}$, for some integer $n \geq 1$, distinct real exponents $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$, and nonzero coefficients A_1, \dots, A_n . The function g has at most $n - 1$ zeros.

Through a change of variables $x = e^{-t}$, we can equivalently bound the number of zeros of the function $\bar{g}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i x^{\alpha_i}$ on the domain $(0, \infty)$. This bound can be proven by induction, using the following observations. If $\alpha_i \neq 0$, then the function $\bar{h}(x) = x^{-\alpha_i} \bar{g}(x)$ has the same strictly positive zeros as \bar{g} . The function \bar{h} has a constant term, so its derivative \bar{h}' has only $n - 1$ terms. The function \bar{h}' has a zero between any two zeros of \bar{h} , so \bar{h} has at most one more strictly positive zero than \bar{h}' .

A.2 Proof of Lemma 1

We discretize the agent's problem. Fix $\Delta > 0$. In the Δ -discretized problem, the agent can change his action only at times $k\Delta$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots$. Let V_Δ denote the agent's suprenal utility in the Δ -discretized problem. The Bellman equation reads

$$V_\Delta = \max_{i=0,1} \{U_i(1 - e^{-\lambda_i\Delta}) + e^{-\lambda_i\Delta} V_\Delta\}.$$

The unique solution is $V_\Delta = \max\{U_0, U_1\}$. By a limiting argument,³⁵ it follows that the agent's value in the continuous-time problem is also $\max\{U_0, U_1\}$. Thus, working forever is optimal if and only if $U_1 \geq U_0$.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 1

We separate into two cases.

Case 1 Suppose $u_0 \geq u_1$. The period τ^* in (7) is well-defined because $0 < (U_0 - U_1)/U_0 < 1$.

First we check that the constant $x^* := e^{-\lambda_1 \tau^*}$ is the unique solution of the relaxed problem (9). Define $\bar{L}_S: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by $\bar{L}_S(x) = U_0 x^{\lambda_0/\lambda_1}$. Since $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$, the function \bar{L}_S is strictly concave and strictly increasing. From (7), we have $\bar{L}_S(x^*) = U_0 - U_1$. If a $(0, 1)$ -valued random variable X satisfies $\mathbb{E} X \leq x^*$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \bar{L}_S(X) \leq \bar{L}_S(\mathbb{E} X) \leq \bar{L}_S(x^*) = U_0 - U_1,$$

and equality holds in both inequalities if and only if X is the constant x^* . Thus, the constant x^* is the unique solution of (9). In terms of the original variables, the constant τ^* is the unique solution of (8).

It remains to check that τ^* is feasible in the original problem (6). Recall the notation in (19). From the definition of τ^* in (7), we have $U(\mathbf{0}; \tau^*) = U_1$. Consider an arbitrary action path a in \mathcal{A} . If $\int_0^{\tau^*} a_t = \tau^*$, then $U(a; \tau^*) = U_1$. If $\int_0^{\tau^*} a_t < \tau^*$, then $p_{\tau^*}(a) = 0$, so

$$U(a; \tau^*) = \int_0^{\tau^*} D_t(a)u(a_t) dt \leq \int_0^{\tau^*} D_t(\mathbf{0})u_0 dt = U(\mathbf{0}; \tau^*),$$

where the inequality holds because for each time t , we have $D_t(a) \leq D_t(\mathbf{0})$ (because $\lambda_G > \lambda_B$) and $u(a_t) \leq u_0$ (because $u_1 \leq u_0$).

³⁵Any right-continuous function $a: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ can be expressed as the pointwise limit of a sequence of step functions $a_n: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ defined by $a_n(t) = a(k/2^n)$ if $(k-1)/2^n \leq t < k/2^n$, for $k = 1, 2, \dots$. By dominated convergence, as n tends to ∞ , the agent's expected utility from a_n converges to the agent's expected utility from a .

Case 2 Suppose $u_1 > u_0$. In this case, we consider shirk-before-work deviations. Recall the notation from (20). With perfect inspections, for $0 < s < t$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\text{SW}}(s; t) &= U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0 s}) + U_1 e^{-\lambda_0 s} (1 - e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)}), \\ U'_{\text{SW}}(s; t) &= e^{-\lambda_0 s} [(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0 - U_1(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0)e^{-\lambda_1(t-s)}], \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where U'_{SW} denotes the derivative of U_{SW} with respect to its *first* argument. By assumption, $\lambda_G > \lambda_B$, so $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$. Therefore, for each fixed $t > 0$, the derivative $U'_{\text{SW}}(\cdot; t)$ is strictly single-crossing from above over $(0, t)$.

We identify the binding shirk-before-work deviation. Define \bar{s} and τ^* by

$$e^{-\lambda_0 \bar{s}} = \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_0}{\lambda_1}, \quad e^{-\lambda_0 \tau^*} = \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_0}{\lambda_1} \left(\frac{(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0}{U_1(\lambda_1 - \lambda_0)} \right)^{\lambda_0/\lambda_1}. \quad (23)$$

Since $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$ and $\lambda_1 U_1 = u_1 > u_0 = \lambda_0 U_0$, these values \bar{s} and τ^* are well-defined and satisfy $0 < \bar{s} < \tau^*$. It can be checked that $U'_{\text{SW}}(\bar{s}; \tau^*) = 0$ and $U_{\text{SW}}(\bar{s}; \tau^*) = U_1$.

Consider the relaxed problem of choosing a $(0, \infty)$ -valued random variable T to solve

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} e^{-\lambda_1 T} \\ &\text{subject to} && U_{\text{SW}}(\bar{s}; T) \leq U_1. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

We change variables. Let $\bar{x} = e^{-\lambda_1 \bar{s}}$ and $x^* = e^{-\lambda_1 \tau^*}$. Note that $\bar{x} > x^*$. Upon setting $X = e^{-\lambda_1 T}$, we obtain the equivalent problem of choosing a $(0, 1)$ -valued random variable X to solve

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} X \\ &\text{subject to} && \mathbb{E} \bar{L}(X) \geq U_0 - U_1, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $\bar{L}: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is defined by

$$\bar{L}(x) = \begin{cases} U_0 x^{\lambda_0/\lambda_1} & \text{if } x \geq \bar{x}, \\ U_0 \bar{x}^{\lambda_0/\lambda_1} - U_1 \bar{x}^{\lambda_0/\lambda_1} (1 - x/\bar{x}) & \text{if } x < \bar{x}. \end{cases}$$

Since $\lambda_1 > \lambda_0$, the function \bar{L} is concave and strictly increasing.³⁶ Moreover, \bar{L} is

³⁶To see that the kink preserves concavity, note that the derivative of \bar{L} jumps at \bar{x} by

$$(\lambda_0/\lambda_1)U_0 \bar{x}^{(\lambda_0-\lambda_1)/\lambda_1} - U_1 \bar{x}^{(\lambda_0-\lambda_1)/\lambda_1} = \bar{x}^{(\lambda_0-\lambda_1)/\lambda_1} (U_0 \lambda_0 - U_1 \lambda_1)/\lambda_1,$$

which is strictly negative because $u_1 > u_0$.

strictly concave over $[\bar{x}, 1]$. From the definition of τ^* in (23), we have $\bar{L}(x^*) = U_0 - U_1$. If a $(0, 1)$ -valued random variable X satisfies $\mathbb{E} X \leq x^*$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \bar{L}(X) \leq \bar{L}(\mathbb{E} X) \leq \bar{L}(x^*) = U_0 - U_1,$$

and equality holds in both inequalities if and only if $\mathbb{E} X = x^*$ and X concentrates on $(0, \bar{x}]$, the affine segment of \bar{L} . Therefore, the constant x^* solves (25), and all solutions of (25) must concentrate on $(0, \bar{x}]$. In terms of the original variables, the constant τ^* solves (24), and all solutions of (24) must concentrate on $[\bar{s}, \infty)$.

It remains to check that τ^* is feasible in the original problem (6). We claim that over any inspection-free interval, the agent strictly prefers shirking for length s and then working for length w to working for length w and then shirking for length s :

$$U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0 s}) + e^{-\lambda_0 s} U_1(1 - e^{-\lambda_1 w}) > U_1(1 - e^{-\lambda_1 w}) + e^{-\lambda_1 w} U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0 s}). \quad (26)$$

To see that this inequality holds, note that each side is a weighted average of U_0 and U_1 with total weight $1 - e^{-\lambda_0 s - \lambda_1 w}$, but the left side puts strictly more weight on U_0 , and we have $U_0 > U_1$.

We conclude that for any a in \mathcal{A} ,

$$U(a; \tau^*) \leq \sup_{0 \leq s \leq \tau^*} U_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau^*) = U_{\text{SW}}(\bar{s}; \tau^*) = U_1.$$

A.4 Proof of Theorem 2

The relaxed problem (11), expressed in terms of the distribution F over $(0, \infty)$ of the random variable T , takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-(\lambda_G + r)t} dF(t) \\ & \text{subject to} && \int_{(s, \infty)} [U_0 e^{-(\lambda_B + r)(t-s)} - (U_0 - U_1)] dF(t) \geq 0, \quad s \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This problem can be expressed in the form of (18) with $A = (U_0 - U_1)/U_0$; $\alpha = \lambda_0$; and $\beta = \lambda_1$. Since $0 < (U_0 - U_1)/U_0 < 1$ and $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1 > 0$, we can apply Lemma 2 to conclude that the unique solution of (11) is the exponential distribution with hazard rate $\gamma^* = \lambda_0(U_0 - U_1)/U_1$.

It remains to check that this exponential distribution is feasible in the original problem (6). Suppose that the time until the next inspection is exponentially distributed with hazard rate γ^* . By construction, no work-before-shirk deviation is profitable. To show that no other deviations are profitable, it suffices to show that once the agent has shirked (for positive duration), he finds it optimal to shirk until the next inspection. Once the agent has shirked, he is certain to fail the next inspection, so his continuation problem is equivalent to the no-inspection problem with discount rate $r + \gamma^*$. By the proof of Lemma 1 (Appendix A.2), shirking is optimal if

$$\frac{U_1 \lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + \gamma^*} \leq \frac{U_0 \lambda_0}{\lambda_0 + \gamma^*},$$

which holds (strictly) because $U_1 < U_0$ and $\lambda_1 < \lambda_0$.

A.5 Proof of Theorem 3

We separate into cases and solve a different relaxed problem in each case. Then we use these relaxed solutions to prove the result. Recall the expressions in (21) for the agent's payoffs from the shirk-before-work and work-before-shirk deviations. In particular, for $s \leq \tau$, we have

$$U_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau) = U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0 s}) + U_1 e^{-\lambda_0 s} [1 - e^{-\lambda_1(\tau-s)}(1 - e^{-\delta s})].$$

Define the period τ^* to be the largest time t such that

$$\max_{s \in [0, t]} U_{\text{SW}}(s; t) \leq U_1. \tag{27}$$

It can be checked that τ^* is well-defined and strictly positive; moreover, (27) holds with equality at $t = \tau^*$.³⁷ For all s in $[0, \tau^*]$, we have

$$U_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau^*) \leq U_1 = U_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*),$$

so $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) \leq 0$. Here and below, we add a prime to denote the derivative of a

³⁷For $0 \leq s < t$, as (s, t) tends to $(0, 0)$, the derivative $U'_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau)$ tends to $\lambda_0(U_0 - U_1) - \delta U_1$, which is strictly negative by Assumption 2. So, for t sufficiently small, the maximum on the left side of (27) is achieved at $t = 0$ and hence (27) holds. On the other hand, $U_{\text{SW}}(t; t) \rightarrow U_0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, so (27) is violated for t sufficiently large. By Berge's theorem, the left side of (27) is continuous in t , so equality must hold at $t = \tau^*$.

function with respect to its *first* argument.

We separate into cases according to the condition

$$U_1(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1)e^{-\delta\tau^*} \geq U_0(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1). \quad (28)$$

If $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_0$, then (28) holds.³⁸

The rest of the proof proceeds as follows. We consider three different relaxed problems. We use the solutions of these relaxed problems to establish the two forms of the optimal inspection policy. Then we characterize the threshold $\bar{\lambda}_B$, as discussed in Remark 1. Next we prove four claims used in the proof. Lastly, we relax the assumption on δ , as discussed in Remark 2.

Relaxed problem: shirk Suppose that (28) holds and $U_S(\tau^*) = U_1$. We check that the constant $x^* := e^{-\lambda_1\tau^*}$ is the unique solution of the relaxed problem (14). Recall the loss function $\bar{L}_S: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ given by

$$\bar{L}_S(x) = x^{\lambda_0/\lambda_1}(U_0 - U_1x^{\delta/\lambda_1}).$$

If $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$, define x_c by $U_1(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1)x_c^{\delta/\lambda_1} = U_0(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1)$. In the case $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$, the condition (28) holds if and only if $x^* \geq x_c$.

Claim 1. The function \bar{L}_S is strictly quasiconcave and has an interior maximizer, denoted $x_{0,S}$. If $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_0$, then \bar{L}_S is strictly concave over $[0, x_{0,S}]$. If $\lambda_1 < \lambda_0$, then over the interval $[x_c, 1]$, the function \bar{L}_S is strictly concave and coincides with its concavification $\text{cav } \bar{L}_S$.

Using Claim 1, we show that the constant x^* is the unique solution of (14). By assumption, $U_S(\tau^*) = U_1$, so $\bar{L}_S(x^*) = U_0 - U_1$. Since $\bar{L}_S(1) = U_0 - U_1$, it follows that $x^* < x_{0,S}$. There are two cases.

1. $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_0$. Suppose that a $(0, 1)$ -valued random variable X satisfies $\mathbb{E} X \leq x^*$. Let $X' = \min\{X, x_{0,S}\}$. By Claim 1,

$$\mathbb{E} \bar{L}_S(X) \leq \mathbb{E} \bar{L}_S(X') \leq \bar{L}_S(\mathbb{E} X') \leq \bar{L}_S(x^*) = U_0 - U_1,$$

³⁸Suppose $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_0$. If $\delta + \lambda_0 \geq \lambda_1$, then (28) is immediate by checking signs. If $\lambda_0 + \delta < \lambda_1$, then (28) holds because $0 < U_1e^{-\delta\tau^*} < U_0$ and $0 > \delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 > \lambda_0 - \lambda_1$.

with equality only if X equals the constant x^* .

2. $\lambda_1 < \lambda_0$. Suppose that a $(0, 1)$ -valued random variable X satisfies $\mathbb{E} X \leq x^*$. By the definition of concavification and Claim 1,

$$\mathbb{E} \bar{L}_S(X) \leq \text{cav } \bar{L}_S(\mathbb{E} X) \leq \text{cav } \bar{L}_S(x^*) = \bar{L}_S(x^*) = U_0 - U_1, \quad (29)$$

where the second inequality holds because $\text{cav } \bar{L}_S$ is strictly increasing³⁹ over $[0, x_{0,S}]$ and $\mathbb{E} X \leq x^* < x_{0,S}$; the first equality holds because $x^* \geq x_c$ by (28). Moreover, since $x^* \geq x_c$, both inequalities in (29) hold with equality only if X equals the constant x^* .

Relaxed problem: shirk-before-work Suppose that (28) holds and $U_S(\tau^*) < U_1$. Suppose further that $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) < 0$.⁴⁰ Let \bar{s} be the largest maximizer of $U_{\text{SW}}(\cdot; \tau^*)$ over $[0, \tau^*]$. Since $U_S(\tau^*) < U_1$, we have $\bar{s} < \tau^*$. Since $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) < 0$, it can be checked that $\bar{s} > 0$.⁴¹

Consider the relaxed problem of choosing a $(0, \infty)$ -valued random variable T to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} e^{-\lambda_1 T} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E} U_{\text{SW}}(\bar{s}; T) \leq U_1. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

We change variables. Let $\bar{x} = e^{-\lambda_1 \bar{s}}$ and $x^* = e^{-\lambda_1 \tau^*}$. Note that $\bar{x} > x^*$. Define $\bar{L}: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by⁴²

$$\bar{L}(x) = U_0 - U_{\text{SW}}(\bar{s}; -\lambda_1^{-1} \log x).$$

Consider the equivalent relaxed problem of choosing a $(0, 1)$ -valued random variable $X = e^{-\lambda_1 T}$ to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} X \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E} \bar{L}(X) \geq U_0 - U_1. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Claim 2. The function \bar{L} is strictly quasiconcave, and its unique maximizer, x_0 , satisfies $x_0 \geq \bar{x}$. The function \bar{L} is concave over $[0, x_0]$ and affine over $[0, \bar{x}]$. If

³⁹This holds because $\text{cav } L_S$ is concave and is uniquely maximized at the point $x_{0,S}$.

⁴⁰Recall that the definition of τ^* implies only the *weak* inequality $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) \leq 0$.

⁴¹Suppose for a contradiction that $\bar{s} = 0$. Then $U_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau^*) < U_1$ for all s in $(0, \tau^*]$. Since $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) < 0$, it follows that (27) holds for some t strictly greater than τ^* , contrary to the definition of τ^* . (We must consider the derivative because $U_{\text{SW}}(\cdot; \tau^*)$ is not bounded away from U_1 over $(0, \tau^*]$.)

⁴²We extend the function \bar{L} to the point 0 by continuity.

$x_0 > \bar{x}$, then \bar{L} is strictly concave over $[\bar{x}, x_0]$.

Using Claim 2, we show that the constant x^* solves (31). From the definition of τ^* in (27), we have $\bar{L}(x^*) = U_0 - U_1$. Suppose that a $(0, 1)$ -valued random variable X satisfies $\mathbb{E}X \leq x^*$. Let $X' = \min\{X, x_0\}$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}\bar{L}(X) \leq \mathbb{E}\bar{L}(X') \leq \bar{L}(\mathbb{E}X') \leq \bar{L}(x^*) = U_0 - U_1, \quad (32)$$

where the first inequality uses the definition of X' ; the second inequality holds because \bar{L} is concave over $[0, x_0]$; and the third inequality holds because \bar{L} is strictly increasing over $[0, x_0]$, and $\mathbb{E}X' \leq \mathbb{E}X \leq x^* < \bar{x} \leq x_0$. Moreover, equality holds in all three inequalities in (32) if and only if $\mathbb{E}X = x^*$ and X concentrates on $(0, \bar{x}]$. Therefore, the constant x^* solves (31), and all solutions of (31) must concentrate on $(0, \bar{x}]$. In terms of the original variables, the constant τ^* solves (30), and all solutions of (30) must concentrate on $[\bar{s}, \infty)$.

Relaxed problem: work-before-shirk Suppose that (28) is violated. It follows that $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$. Consider the relaxed problem of choosing a $(0, \infty)$ -valued random variable T to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E}e^{-\lambda_1 T} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E}U_{\text{WS}}(s; T) \leq U_1, \quad s \in \{0\} \cup [\tau, \infty), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where the value of τ will be specified below. From (21), we have

$$U_{\text{WS}}(s; T) = U_1 + e^{-\lambda_1(s \wedge T)} h(s \wedge T; T),$$

where the function h is defined by

$$h(s; t) = U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0(t-s)}) - U_1(1 - e^{-(\delta+\lambda_0)(t-s)}).$$

Therefore, problem (33) is equivalent to the problem of choosing a distribution F on $(0, \infty)$ to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\lambda_1 t} dF(t) \\ & \text{subject to} && \int_{(s, \infty)} h(s; t) dF(t) \leq 0, \quad s \in \{0\} \cup [\tau, \infty). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

To solve (34), we construct Lagrange multipliers. The constraints are indexed by s in $\{0\} \cup [\tau, \infty)$. Attach a nonnegative mass multiplier η_0 to the $s = 0$ constraint and a nonnegative, integrable density multiplier $\eta(s)$ to the time- s constraint, for all $s \geq \tau$. The Lagrangian becomes

$$\begin{aligned} L(F; \eta_0, \eta) = & \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\lambda_1 t} dF(t) + \eta_0 \int_{(0, \infty)} h(0; t) dF(t) \\ & + \int_{\tau}^{\infty} \left[\int_{(s, \infty)} h(s; t) dF(t) \right] \eta(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Change the order of integration in the double integral to get

$$L(F; \eta_0, \eta) = \int_{(0, \infty)} I(t) dF(t),$$

where

$$I(t) = e^{-\lambda_1 t} + \eta_0 h(0; t) + \int_{\tau \wedge t}^t \eta(s) h(s; t) ds. \quad (35)$$

Now we define the multipliers. For some $\bar{\eta} \geq 0$, let $\eta(s) = \bar{\eta} e^{-\lambda_1 s}$ for all $s \geq \tau$. Plug in this expression, integrate, and group like terms. For $t \geq \tau$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(t) = & e^{-\lambda_1 t} \left[1 - \frac{\bar{\eta}}{\lambda_1} \left(\frac{U_0 \lambda_0}{\lambda_0 - \lambda_1} - \frac{U_1 (\delta + \lambda_0)}{\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1} \right) \right] \\ & + e^{-\lambda_0 t} U_0 \left[-\eta_0 + \frac{\bar{\eta}}{\lambda_0 - \lambda_1} e^{(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1) \tau} \right] \\ & + e^{-(\delta + \lambda_0) t} U_1 \left[\eta_0 - \frac{\bar{\eta}}{\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1} e^{(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1) \tau} \right] \\ & + (U_0 - U_1) \left[\eta_0 + \frac{\bar{\eta}}{\lambda_1} e^{-\lambda_1 \tau} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

By assumption, (28) is violated, so $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$. Therefore, $\hat{\tau}$ is well-defined by (12):

$e^{-\delta\hat{\tau}} = (\lambda_0 - \lambda_1)/(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1)$. Let $\tau = \tau^* \wedge \hat{\tau}$. Define $\bar{\eta}$ and η_0 by

$$\bar{\eta} = \lambda_1 \left(\frac{U_0\lambda_0}{\lambda_0 - \lambda_1} - \frac{U_1(\delta + \lambda_0)}{\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1} \right)^{-1}, \quad \eta_0 = \frac{\lambda_1 e^{(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1)\tau}}{U_0\lambda_0 - e^{-\delta\tau}U_1(\delta + \lambda_0)}. \quad (37)$$

The multiplier $\bar{\eta}$ is well-defined and positive because $U_0 > U_1$ and $\lambda_0(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1) > (\delta + \lambda_0)(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1)$. The multiplier η_0 is well-defined and positive because

$$e^{-\delta\tau} < \frac{U_0(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1)}{U_1(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1)} < \frac{U_0\lambda_0 - U_1\lambda_1}{U_1(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1)} < \frac{U_0\lambda_0}{U_1(\delta + \lambda_0)}, \quad (38)$$

as we now check. The first inequality can be checked by cases: if $\tau = \hat{\tau}$, use the inequality $U_0 > U_1$; if $\tau = \tau^*$, use the fact that (28) is violated. The second inequality uses $U_0 > U_1$, and the third inequality uses Assumption 2.

Hereafter, we consider the function $I: (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ defined in (35), with the multipliers defined in (37).

Claim 3. If $\tau^* < \hat{\tau}$, then $\operatorname{argmin}_{t>0} I(t) = \{\tau^*\}$. If $\tau^* \geq \hat{\tau}$, then $\operatorname{argmin}_{t>0} I(t) = [\hat{\tau}, \infty)$.

We apply Claim 3 to solve (34). There are two cases.

First suppose $\tau^* \leq \hat{\tau}$. Assume that $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) < 0$. Thus, $\bar{s} > 0$. We claim that a point mass on τ^* is the unique solution of (34). First we check that the point mass δ_{τ^*} is a solution of (34). By Claim 3, the point mass δ_{τ^*} minimizes the Lagrangian. We check that δ_{τ^*} satisfies all the constraints in (34) with equality. Clearly, $U_{\text{WS}}(s; \tau^*) = U_1$ for all $s \geq \tau^* = \tau$. It remains to check that $U_{\text{WS}}(0; \tau^*) = U_1$, or equivalently, $U_{\text{SW}}(\tau^*; \tau^*) = U_1$. Let $U'_{\text{SW}}(\tau^*; \tau^*)$ denote the *left* derivative of the function $U_{\text{SW}}(\cdot; \tau^*)$ at τ^* . Since (28) is violated, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U'_{\text{SW}}(\tau^*; \tau^*) &= e^{-\lambda_0\tau^*} [U_0\lambda_0 - U_1\lambda_1 - e^{-\delta\tau^*}U_1(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1)] \\ &\geq e^{-\lambda_0\tau^*} \lambda_1(U_0 - U_1) \\ &> 0. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Over $(0, \tau^*)$, the function $s \mapsto U'_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau^*)$ is a sum of at most three exponentials, so it has at most two zeros by Lemma 3. Since $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) < 0$ and $U'_{\text{SW}}(\tau^*; \tau^*) > 0$, it follows that $U'_{\text{SW}}(\cdot; \tau^*)$ cannot cross zero from above over $(0, \tau^*)$, and hence $U_{\text{SW}}(\cdot; \tau^*)$ cannot have an interior maximizer over $[0, \tau^*]$. Since $\bar{s} > 0$, we must have $\bar{s} = \tau^*$. Thus, $U_{\text{SW}}(\tau^*; \tau^*) = U_1$.

Now we check that there is no other solution of (34). If $\tau^* < \hat{\tau}$, then by Claim 3, the point mass δ_{τ^*} is the unique minimizer of the Lagrangian. If $\tau^* = \hat{\tau}$, then by Claim 3 all minimizers of the Lagrangian concentrate on $[\tau^*, \infty)$. For any such distribution other than δ_{τ^*} , the constraint with $s = 0$ is violated.

Next, suppose $\tau^* > \hat{\tau}$. By Claim 3, the Lagrangian is minimized by any distribution concentrating on $[\hat{\tau}, \infty)$. We claim that there is a unique distribution F on $[\hat{\tau}, \infty)$ that satisfies the complementary slackness condition

$$\int_{(s, \infty)} [U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0(t-s)}) - U_1(1 - e^{-(\delta+\lambda_0)(t-s)})] dF(t) = 0, \quad (40)$$

for all s in $\{0\} \cup [\hat{\tau}, \infty)$.⁴³ By Assumption 2, we have $U_1(\delta + \lambda_0) > U_0\lambda_0$, so we can apply Lemma 5 in Appendix B.4 to conclude that the distributions on $[\hat{\tau}, \infty)$ that satisfy (40) for every $s \geq \hat{\tau}$ are precisely the distributions F_π , for π in $[0, 1]$, given by

$$F_\pi(t) = \pi + (1 - \pi)(1 - e^{-\gamma^*(t-\hat{\tau})}), \quad t \geq \hat{\tau}, \quad (41)$$

where γ^* is defined in (12). Plug this distribution F_π into condition (40) with $s = 0$. This equation is linear in π . Solving gives

$$\pi^* = \frac{(U_0 - U_1)(e^{\lambda_0\hat{\tau}}(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1) - (\delta + 2\lambda_0 - \lambda_1))}{U_1(\delta + \lambda_0) - U_0\lambda_0}. \quad (42)$$

It can be shown that π^* is in $(0, 1)$.⁴⁴ We conclude that F_{π^*} is the unique solution of (34).

Periodic solution Suppose that (a) $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_0$ or (b) $\lambda_1 < \lambda_0$ and $\tau^* \leq \hat{\tau}$. Suppose further that $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) < 0$. We have shown that the constant τ^* solves some relaxation of (6) and, furthermore, that all solutions of the relaxation concentrate on $[\bar{t}, \infty)$ for some $\bar{t} = \bar{t}(\lambda_B, \lambda_G, \delta, r, u_0, u_1) > 0$.⁴⁵ Use the inequality (26) to conclude,

⁴³Technically, complementary slackness only implies equality for $s = 0$ and for almost every $s \geq \hat{\tau}$, but it can be shown that this implies equality for every $s \geq \hat{\tau}$.

⁴⁴Consider (40) at $s = 0$ with the distribution F_π . We claim that the left side is strictly negative if $\pi = 1$ and strictly positive if $\pi = 0$. For a proof, see Appendix B.3.

⁴⁵Recall the three different relaxations: shirk; shirk-before-work; and work-before-shirk. None of these cases is ruled out by the assumption that (a) or (b) holds.

as above, that τ^* is feasible in the original problem (6).⁴⁶ Finally, we prove that $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) < 0$ if $\delta > 2\lambda_1 - \lambda_0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) &= (U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0 - e^{-\lambda_1\tau^*} U_1\delta, \\ U''_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) &= -(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0^2 + e^{-\lambda_1\tau^*} U_1\delta(\delta + 2\lambda_0 - 2\lambda_1). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) \leq 0$, by the definition of τ^* . Suppose for a contradiction that $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} U''_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) &= U''_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) + U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*)(\delta + 2\lambda_0 - 2\lambda_1) \\ &= (U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0(\delta + \lambda_0 - 2\lambda_1) \\ &> 0. \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Thus, $U_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau^*) > U_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) = U_1$ for s sufficiently small, contrary to the definition of τ^* .

Periodic–exponential solution Suppose that $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$ and $\tau^* > \hat{\tau}$. It follows that (28) is violated,⁴⁷ so we consider the work-before-shirk relaxed problem. We have shown that the distribution F_{π^*} from (41) is the unique solution of the relaxed problem (34). Here we give a necessary and sufficient condition for F_{π^*} to be feasible in the original problem (6). Then we check that our condition is satisfied if $\delta > 2\lambda_1 - \lambda_0$.

Suppose that the time T until next inspection follows the distribution F_{π^*} . First we check that the agent finds it weakly optimal to shirk over $[\hat{\tau}, \infty)$, no matter his action history. Over $(\hat{\tau}, \infty)$, the distribution of T is memoryless, so the only state variable is the agent's belief q_t that $\theta_t = 0$. The agent's belief evolves according to the differential equation $\dot{q}_t = -q_t\delta(1 - a_t)$. Therefore, the HJB equation reads

$$0 = \max_{a=0,1} \{ au_1 + (1-a)u_0 - q\delta(1-a)V'(q) - \lambda_a V(q) + \gamma^*(qU_1 - V(q)) \}.$$

⁴⁶With imperfect inspections, the argument is unchanged because the agent's passage probability depends only on the total duration of shirking, not its allocation over time.

⁴⁷If $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$ and $\tau^* > \hat{\tau}$, then

$$e^{-\delta\tau^*} < e^{-\delta\hat{\tau}} = \frac{\lambda_0 - \lambda_1}{\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1} < \frac{U_0(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1)}{U_1(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1)}.$$

We verify that this HJB equation is solved by the value function

$$V(q) = U_1 + (q - 1)(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0/\delta. \quad (44)$$

Plug in this value function, write $\lambda_a = \lambda_1 a + \lambda_0(1 - a)$, and substitute in the expression for γ^* from (12). Simplify to get

$$0 = \max_{a=0,1} a(q - 1)(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1)/\delta.$$

Since $\delta + \lambda_0 > \lambda_0 > \lambda_1$, this equation is satisfied. At every belief q , the agent weakly prefers shirking to working (strictly so if $q < 1$).

Now we consider the remaining deviations. In particular, we must consider shirk-work-shirk deviations. For $s \leq \hat{\tau}$, let

$$U_{\text{SWS}}(s; F_{\pi^*}) = \int_0^\infty U(1_{[s, \hat{\tau})}; t) dF_{\pi^*}(t).$$

Define $U(a; F_{\pi^*})$ analogously for each $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Use the inequality (26), as in previous cases, and the HJB argument above to conclude that

$$\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} U(a; F_{\pi^*}) = \max_{0 \leq s \leq \hat{\tau}} U_{\text{SWS}}(s; F_{\pi^*}). \quad (45)$$

In terms of the value function V from (44), we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\text{SWS}}(s; F_{\pi^*}) &= U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0 s}) + e^{-\lambda_0 s} U_1(1 - e^{-\lambda_1(\hat{\tau} - s)}) \\ &\quad + e^{-\lambda_0 s - \lambda_1(\hat{\tau} - s)} [\pi^* U_1 e^{-\delta s} + (1 - \pi^*) V(e^{-\delta s})]. \end{aligned}$$

As a function of s , this expression is a sum of a constant and three exponential terms. Differentiate U_{SWS} with respect to s and evaluate at $s = \hat{\tau}$.⁴⁸ The definition of $\hat{\tau}$ makes some terms vanish, and we obtain

$$U'_{\text{SWS}}(\hat{\tau}; F_{\pi^*}) = (U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0 e^{-\lambda_0 \hat{\tau}} > 0. \quad (46)$$

We claim that the right side of (45) is at most U_1 if and only if $U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) \leq 0$. If $U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) > 0$, then the right side of (45) is strictly greater than U_1 : for s

⁴⁸Technically we are considering the left derivative at $s = \hat{\tau}$.

sufficiently small, we have

$$U_{\text{SWS}}(s; F_{\pi^*}) > U_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) = U_1,$$

where the equality holds because over $[\hat{\tau}, \infty)$, the agent is indifferent between working and shirking if $q = 1$. Conversely, suppose $U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) \leq 0$. By (46), we have $U'_{\text{SWS}}(\hat{\tau}; F_{\pi^*}) > 0$, so it follows from Lemma 3 that over the domain $(0, \hat{\tau})$, the derivative $U'_{\text{SWS}}(s; F_{\pi^*})$ cannot cross zero from above, hence $U_{\text{SWS}}(s; F_{\pi^*})$ cannot have an interior maximizer. The definition of F_{π^*} ensures that

$$U_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) = U_{\text{SWS}}(\hat{\tau}; F_{\pi^*}) = U_1.$$

Therefore, the right side of (45) is U_1 .

We now show that $U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) < 0$ if $\delta > 2\lambda_1 - \lambda_0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) &= (U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0 - e^{-\lambda_1 \hat{\tau}} [\pi^* U_1 \delta + (1 - \pi^*)(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0], \\ U''_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) &= -(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0^2 + e^{-\lambda_1 \tau^*} [\pi^* U_1 \delta + (1 - \pi^*)(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0] (\delta + 2\lambda_0 - 2\lambda_1). \end{aligned}$$

Apply the argument in (43), with $\pi^* U_1 \delta + (1 - \pi^*)(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0$ in place of $U_1 \delta$.

Threshold $\bar{\lambda}_B$ We check that there exists a threshold $\bar{\lambda}_B = \bar{\lambda}_B(\lambda_G, \delta, r, u_0, u_1)$, with $\bar{\lambda}_B > \lambda_G$, such that the inequality $\lambda_B > \bar{\lambda}_B$ holds if and only if $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$ and $\tau^* > \hat{\tau}$. In order to state the next claim, define the following domains:

$$D^* = \{(\ell_0, d, y_0) \in (0, \infty)^3 : d > y_0 - \ell_0 > 0\}, \quad \hat{D} = \{(\ell_0, d) \in (0, \infty)^2 : \ell_0 > 1\}.$$

Claim 4 (Thresholds).

1. There exists a continuous function $g^*: D^* \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\lambda_1 \tau^* = g^*(\lambda_0/\lambda_1, \delta/\lambda_1, u_0/u_1),$$

whenever $(\lambda_0/\lambda_1, \delta/\lambda_1, u_0/u_1)$ is in D^* . Moreover, g^* is strictly increasing in its first two arguments and strictly decreasing in its third argument. For fixed $d, y_0 > 0$, we have $\lim_{\ell_0 \uparrow y_0} g^*(\ell_0, d, y_0) = \infty$ and, if $y_0 > d$, we have $\lim_{\ell_0 \downarrow (y_0 - d)} g^*(\ell_0, d, y_0) = 0$.

2. There exists a continuous function $\hat{g}: \hat{D} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\lambda_1 \hat{\tau} = \hat{g}(\lambda_0/\lambda_1, \delta/\lambda_1),$$

whenever $(\lambda_0/\lambda_1, \delta/\lambda_1)$ is in \hat{D} . Moreover, \hat{g} is strictly decreasing in both arguments. For any fixed $d > 0$, we have $\lim_{\ell_0 \downarrow 1} \hat{g}(\ell_0, d) = \infty$. For any fixed $\ell_0 > 1$, we have $\lim_{d \uparrow \infty} \hat{g}(\ell_0, d) = 0$.

For fixed (d, y_0) with $d > 0$ and $y_0 > 1$, Claim 4 implies that over the interval $(\max\{1, y_0 - d\}, y_0)$, the map $\ell_0 \mapsto g^*(\ell_0, d, y_0) - \hat{g}(\ell_0, d)$ is strictly increasing and crosses 0 exactly once. Denote the unique zero by $\bar{\ell}_0 = \bar{\ell}_0(d, y_0)$. By Claim 4, the function $\bar{\ell}_0$ is strictly decreasing in d and strictly increasing in y_0 . Moreover, for each $y_0 > 1$, we have $\lim_{d \uparrow \infty} \bar{\ell}_0(d, y_0) = 1$. Thus, we have proven Remark 1 (where $g := \bar{\ell}_0 - 1$).

Now we return to the original variables. For fixed $(\lambda_G, r, \delta, u_0, u_1)$ with $u_0/u_1 > 1$, define $\bar{\lambda}_B = \bar{\lambda}_B(\lambda_G, r, \delta, u_0, u_1)$ by

$$\frac{\bar{\lambda}_B + r}{\lambda_G + r} = \bar{\ell}_0 \left(\frac{\delta}{\lambda_G + r}, \frac{u_0}{u_1} \right).$$

By construction, $\bar{\lambda}_B \geq \lambda_G$.

Proof of Claim 1 Differentiating \bar{L}_S gives

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{L}'_S(x) &= \lambda_1^{-1} x^{(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1)/\lambda_1} [U_0 \lambda_0 - U_1 (\delta + \lambda_0) x^{\delta/\lambda_1}], \\ \bar{L}''_S(x) &= \lambda_1^{-2} x^{(\lambda_0 - 2\lambda_1)/\lambda_1} [U_0 \lambda_0 (\lambda_0 - \lambda_1) - U_1 (\delta + \lambda_0) (\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1) x^{\delta/\lambda_1}]. \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Over $[0, 1]$, the derivative \bar{L}'_S is strictly single-crossing from above.⁴⁹ Therefore, \bar{L}_S is strictly quasiconcave. Its unique maximizer, $x_{0,S}$, is given by

$$x_{0,S}^{\delta/\lambda_1} = \frac{U_0 \lambda_0}{U_1 (\delta + \lambda_0)}.$$

By Assumption 2, we have $0 < x_{0,S} < 1$. We separate into two cases.

First suppose $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_0$. If $\lambda_1 < \delta + \lambda_0$, then by (47), the function \bar{L}_S is strictly concave over $[0, 1]$. If $\lambda_1 \geq \delta + \lambda_0$, then $0 \leq \lambda_1 - \lambda_0 - \delta < \lambda_1 - \lambda_0$. For $x \leq x_{0,S}$, we

⁴⁹In the main text, we reversed the direction of the horizontal axis $[0, 1]$ when plotting \bar{L}_S and \bar{L} . In the proofs, we assume that the interval $[0, 1]$ has its standard orientation.

have $U_1(\delta + \lambda_0)x^{\delta/\lambda_1} \leq U_0\lambda_0$, so it follows from (47) that $\bar{L}_S''(x) < 0$.

Next suppose $\lambda_1 < \lambda_0$. From (47), the second derivative \bar{L}_S'' is single-crossing from above. For $x \geq x_c$, we have

$$U_1(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1)x^{\delta/\lambda_1} \geq U_0(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1) > 0,$$

so (47) implies that $\bar{L}_S''(x) < 0$. From (47), it is straightforward to show that

$$x_c \bar{L}_S'(x_c) = \bar{L}_S(x_c) = \bar{L}_S(x_c) - \bar{L}_S(0).$$

Therefore, $\text{cav } \bar{L}_S$ is affine over $[0, x_c]$ and agrees with \bar{L}_S over $[x_c, 1]$.

Proof of Claim 2 We have

$$\bar{L}(x) = \begin{cases} \bar{L}_S(x) & \text{if } x \geq \bar{x}, \\ \bar{L}_S(\bar{x}) - U_1 \bar{x}^{\lambda_0/\lambda_1} (1 - x/\bar{x})(1 - \bar{x}^{\delta/\lambda_1}) & \text{if } x < \bar{x}. \end{cases}$$

By Claim 1, the function \bar{L}_S is strictly quasiconcave and has interior maximizer $x_{0,S}$. There are two cases.

First suppose $\bar{x} \geq x_{0,S}$. In this case, Claim 2 holds with $x_0 = \bar{x}$ since \bar{L} is affine and strictly increasing over $[0, \bar{x}]$, and \bar{L}_S is strictly decreasing over $[\bar{x}, 1]$.

Next suppose $\bar{x} < x_{0,S}$. In this case, Claim 2 holds with $x_0 = x_{0,S}$. Clearly, \bar{L} is affine over $[0, \bar{x}]$. Over the interval $[x^*, x_0]$, the function \bar{L}_S is strictly concave by Claim 1.⁵⁰ Over $[\bar{x}, x_0]$, the function \bar{L} coincides with \bar{L}_S , so if $\bar{x} < x_0$, then \bar{L}_S is strictly concave over $[\bar{x}, x_0]$. Finally, to show that \bar{L} is concave over $[0, x_0]$, we check that concavity is preserved at the kink. Suppose not. Then the left and right derivatives of \bar{L} at \bar{x} satisfy $\bar{L}'(\bar{x}-) < \bar{L}'(\bar{x}+) = \bar{L}'_S(\bar{x})$. Over $[x^*, \bar{x}]$, the function \bar{L} is affine and \bar{L}_S is strictly concave, so $\bar{L}(x^*) > \bar{L}_S(x^*)$, hence $U_{\text{SW}}(\bar{s}; \tau^*) < U_S(\tau^*)$, contrary to the definitions of \bar{s} and τ^* .

Proof of Claim 3 The definition of $\bar{\eta}$ eliminates the first line in (36). If $\tau^* \geq \hat{\tau}$, then $\tau = \hat{\tau}$, so the second and third lines of (36) vanish as well. If $\tau^* < \hat{\tau}$, then $\tau = \tau^*$. In this case, it can be checked that the derivative of (36) is zero at $t = \tau$

⁵⁰In particular, if $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$, then $x^* \geq x_c$ by (28).

and is strictly positive over (τ, ∞) .⁵¹ In both cases, it can be shown that I is strictly decreasing over $[0, \tau]$. Since $h(t; t) = 0$ for all t , the integrand I is differentiable at $t = \tau$, and we have $I'(\tau) = 0$. To prove that $I'(t) < 0$ for $t < \tau$, we equivalently show that $e^{\lambda_1 t} I'(t) < 0$ for $t < \tau$. Since $I'(\tau) = 0$, it suffices to prove that $e^{\lambda_1 t} I'(t)$ is strictly increasing over $[0, \tau]$. For $t < \tau$ we have

$$(e^{\lambda_1 t} I'(t))' = e^{-(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1)t} \eta_0 [U_1(\delta + \lambda_0)e^{-\delta t}(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1) - U_0 \lambda_0(\lambda_0 - \lambda_1)] > 0,$$

where the inequality holds because $U_1(\delta + \lambda_0) > U_0 \lambda_0$ (by Assumption 2) and $e^{-\delta t}(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1) > \lambda_0 - \lambda_1$ (since $t < \tau \leq \hat{\tau}$).

Proof of Claim 4 Define new variables: $\ell_0 = \lambda_0/\lambda_1$; $d = \delta/\lambda_1$; and $y_0 = u_0/u_1$. In terms of these variables, Assumptions 1–2 are jointly equivalent to the inequality $d > y_0 - \ell_0 > 0$. This inequality defines the domain D^* .

First consider τ^* . In (27), set $s' = \lambda_1 s$ and $t' = \lambda_1 t$. Then $\lambda_1 \tau^*$ is the largest time t' such that

$$\max_{s' \in [0, t']} U_{\text{SW}}(s'/\lambda_1; t'/\lambda_1) \leq U_1. \quad (48)$$

After some algebra, the inequality (48) can equivalently be expressed in terms of (ℓ_0, d, y_0) as

$$\max_{s' \in [0, t']} \left\{ \frac{y_0}{\ell_0} (1 - e^{-\ell_0 s'}) + e^{-\ell_0 s'} \left(1 - e^{-(t' - s')} (1 - e^{-d s'}) \right) \right\} \leq 1.$$

For fixed $t' > 0$ and s' in $(0, t']$ the term in brackets is strictly decreasing in ℓ_0 and d and strictly increasing in y_0 .⁵² Moreover, the derivative of the term in brackets in s , evaluated at $s = 0$, is $y_0 - \ell_0 - d e^{-t'}$, which is also strictly decreasing in ℓ_0 and d and strictly increasing in y_0 . We conclude that $\lambda_1 \tau^*$ is strictly increasing in ℓ_0 and d , and strictly decreasing in y_0 .⁵³

⁵¹In (36), since $\tau < \hat{\tau}$, the coefficient on $e^{-\lambda_0 t}$ is negative and the coefficient on $e^{-(\delta + \lambda_0)t}$ is positive. After differentiating, these signs flip, so the derivative becomes positive for $t > \tau$.

⁵²For the dependence on ℓ_0 , observe that $(1 - e^{-\ell_0 s})/\ell_0$ is the slope of the secant line to the convex function \exp over the interval $[-\ell_0 s', 0]$.

⁵³We must analyze the derivative in order to establish that these comparative statics are strict; see the argument in Footnote 41.

Now consider $\hat{\tau}$. For $\ell_0 > 1$, the definition of $\hat{\tau}$ in (12) can be expressed as

$$\lambda_1 \hat{\tau} = \frac{1}{d} \log \left(1 + \frac{d}{\ell_0 - 1} \right). \quad (49)$$

The right side is strictly decreasing in ℓ_0 and d , and satisfies the claimed limits.⁵⁴

Condition on δ The theorem statement assumes that $\delta > 2\lambda_1 - \lambda_0$. Here we analyze how this assumption can be relaxed, as discussed in Remark 1.

If $\lambda_B \leq \bar{\lambda}_B$, then the periodic policy is still optimal even without the assumption $\delta > 2\lambda_1 - \lambda_0$.⁵⁵ In the proof, we use the assumption $\delta > 2\lambda_1 - \lambda_0$ only to show that $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) < 0$. If $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) = 0$, then the constant τ^* solves the local relaxed problem of choosing a $(0, \infty)$ -valued random variable T to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} e^{-\lambda_1 T} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E} U'_{\text{SW}}(0; T) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, since

$$U'_{\text{SW}}(0; t) = (U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0 - U_1\delta e^{-\lambda_1 t},$$

the solution set consists of all random variables T with $\mathbb{E} U'_{\text{SW}}(0; T) = 0 = U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*)$. In particular, the constant τ^* is feasible in the original problem (6), as shown in the proof.

If $\lambda_B \geq \bar{\lambda}_B$, then the condition on δ can be relaxed. The assumption $\delta > 2\lambda_1 - \lambda_0$ is used in the proof only to show that $U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) \leq 0$. We can instead compute this derivative directly. Substituting the expression for π^* from (42), we obtain

$$U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) = (U_0 - U_1)e^{-\lambda_1 \hat{\tau}} \left[e^{\lambda_1 \hat{\tau}} \lambda_0 - (e^{\lambda_0 \hat{\tau}} - 1)(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1) \right],$$

where $\hat{\tau}$ is defined by (12). Thus, the condition $U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) \leq 0$ holds if and only if

$$e^{\lambda_1 \hat{\tau}} \lambda_0 - (e^{\lambda_0 \hat{\tau}} - 1)(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1) \leq 0. \quad (50)$$

Numerical simulations (available upon request) suggest that there is a very narrow

⁵⁴For the dependence on d , observe that $(\ell_0 - 1)\lambda_1 \hat{\tau}$ is the slope of the secant line to the log function over the interval $[1, 1 + d/(\ell_0 - 1)]$.

⁵⁵We no longer have the bound on the support for all optimal solutions, however.

range of parameter values for which $\lambda_B \geq \bar{\lambda}_B$ holds but (50) is violated.

A.6 Proof of Theorem 4

We solve the relaxed problem that requires that all local deviations are unprofitable. Then we verify that the solution of this relaxed problem is feasible in the original problem.

Local deviations For $s, h, t \geq 0$, let $U_s(h; t)$ denote the agent's expected payoff if the principal inspects at time t and the agent plans to shirk over $[s, s + h)$ and work otherwise. Using the notation from (19), we have $U_s(h; t) = U(1_{[0, s] \cup [s+h, \infty)}; t)$. For $s + h \leq t$, the agent's probability of failing the inspection is $(1 - e^{-\delta h})e^{-\rho(t-s-h)}$, so

$$U_s(h; t) = U_1(1 - e^{-\lambda_1 s}) + e^{-\lambda_1 s} U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0 h}) + e^{-\lambda_1 s - \lambda_0 h} U_1(1 - e^{-\lambda_1(t-s-h)}) \\ + e^{-\lambda_1(t-h) - \lambda_0 h} U_1 [1 - (1 - e^{-\delta h})e^{-\rho(t-s-h)}].$$

For $s < t$, differentiate with respect to h and evaluate at $h = 0$. After simplifying, we have

$$U'_s(0; t) = e^{-\lambda_1 s} [(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0 - e^{-(\lambda_1 + \rho)(t-s)} U_1 \delta]. \quad (51)$$

For $s \geq t$, we have $U_s(h; t) = U_1$ for all $h \geq 0$, so $U'_s(0; t) = 0$.

Relaxed problem: local deviations Consider the relaxed problem of choosing a positive random variable T to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mathbb{E} e^{-\lambda_1 T} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbb{E} U'_s(0; T) \leq 0, \quad s \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

To see that this constraint is necessary, recall that for all times $s, h \geq 0$, we must have $\mathbb{E} U_s(h; T) \leq U_1 = \mathbb{E} U_s(0; T)$. Now differentiate under the integral sign, using the dominated convergence theorem.

After substituting in the expression for U'_s above, we see that this problem is

equivalent to choosing a distribution F on $(0, \infty)$ to solve

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\lambda_1 t} dF(t) \\ & \text{subject to} && \int_{(s, \infty)} [U_1 \delta e^{-(\lambda_1 + \rho)(t-s)} - (U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0] dF(t) \geq 0, \quad s \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Note that this is an alternative formulation of problem (16) in the main text. This problem (52) takes the form of (18) with

$$A = \frac{(U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0}{U_1 \delta}, \quad \alpha = \lambda_1 + \rho, \quad \beta = \lambda_1.$$

By Assumptions 1–2, we have $0 < A < 1$. We have assumed $\rho > 0$, so $\alpha > \beta > 0$. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 2 to conclude that the unique solution is the exponential distribution with hazard rate $\gamma^* = \alpha A / (1 - A)$, which reduces to the expression in the theorem statement.

Remaining deviations It remains to check that if the principal uses the exponential policy with hazard rate γ^* , then it is optimal for the agent to work until the inspection. Since the distribution of time until the next inspection is memoryless, the only state variable is the agent’s belief q_t that $\theta_t = 0$. The agent’s belief evolves according to the differential equation

$$\dot{q}_t = (1 - q_t) \rho a_t - q_t \delta (1 - a_t).$$

The HJB equation reads

$$0 = \max_{a=0,1} \left\{ a u_1 + (1 - a) u_0 + [(1 - q) \rho a - q \delta (1 - a)] V'(q) - \lambda_a V(q) + \gamma^* (q U_1 - V(q)) \right\}. \tag{53}$$

We verify that this HJB equation is solved by the function

$$V(q) = U_1 + (q - 1)(U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0 / \delta.$$

Plug in this value function, write $\lambda_a = \lambda_1 a + \lambda_0(1-a)$, and substitute in the expression for γ^* from Theorem 4. Simplify to get

$$0 = \max_{a=0,1} (a-1)(q-1)(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \rho)/\delta.$$

If $\lambda_1 + \rho \geq \delta + \lambda_0$, then this equation is satisfied. In this case, at every belief q , the agent weakly prefers working to shirking (strictly so if $q < 1$).

A.7 Annuitizing lump sum payoffs

Suppose that the agent gets a reward $R > 0$ from a breakthrough and a cost $C > 0$ from a breakdown. In this case, we redefine the flow payoffs as

$$\hat{u}_1 = u_1 + \lambda_G R, \quad \hat{u}_0 = u_0 - \lambda_B C, \quad (54)$$

where $\hat{u}_1, \hat{u}_0 > 0$. For any right-continuous action path a and time τ , the agent's expected utility over $[0, \tau]$ from following a can be expressed as the sum of the agent's expected accumulated flow payoffs and expected lump sum payoffs:

$$\int_0^\tau D_t(a)u(a_t) dt + \int_0^\tau [a_t \lambda_G R - (1 - a_t) \lambda_B C] D_t(a) dt.$$

Rearranging, we get

$$\int_0^\tau D_t(a)\hat{u}(a_t) dt, \quad \text{where } \hat{u}(a_t) = a_t \hat{u}_1 + (1 - a_t) \hat{u}_0.$$

Therefore, annuitizing the lump sum payoffs into the flow payoffs preserves the agent's *expected* utility from any action path over any time interval. This transformation does not preserve the agent's ex post utility, for a given breakthrough or breakdown time realization, but this difference does not affect incentives.

We check that a modified version of Theorem 3 goes through, under a more general flow payoff specification. Suppose that for some payoff parameter μ , the flow payoffs can be expressed as $\hat{u}_i(\lambda_G, \lambda_B; \mu)$ for $i = 0, 1$, where \hat{u}_i is continuous in (λ_G, λ_B) . In view of Remark 1, the condition

$$\lambda_B > \bar{\lambda}_B(\lambda_G, \delta, r, \hat{u}_0(\lambda_G, \lambda_B; \mu), \hat{u}_1(\lambda_G, \lambda_B; \mu))$$

in Theorem 3 can be expressed as

$$\frac{\lambda_B + r}{\lambda_G + r} > 1 + g \left(\frac{\delta}{\lambda_G + r}, \frac{\hat{u}_0(\lambda_G, \lambda_B; \mu)}{\hat{u}_1(\lambda_G, \lambda_B; \mu)} \right), \quad (55)$$

for some $(0, \infty)$ -valued function g that is strictly increasing in its second argument. As long as the ratio $\hat{u}_0(\lambda_G, \lambda_B; \mu)/\hat{u}_1(\lambda_G, \lambda_B; \mu)$ is weakly decreasing in λ_B for each fixed λ_G and μ , we can equivalently express condition (55) as

$$\lambda_B > \hat{\lambda}_B(\lambda_G, \delta, r; \mu),$$

for some function $\hat{\lambda}_B$ with $\hat{\lambda}_B > \lambda_G$.

We can apply this result to the specification in (54). With $\mu = (u_0, u_1, R, C)$, we have

$$\frac{\hat{u}_0(\lambda_G, \lambda_B; \mu)}{\hat{u}_1(\lambda_G, \lambda_B; \mu)} = \frac{u_0 - \lambda_B C}{u_1 + \lambda_G R}.$$

This ratio is decreasing in λ_B .

A.8 Proof of Lemma 2

Attach a nonnegative multiplier η_0 to the time-0 constraint and a nonnegative, integrable density multiplier $\eta(s)$ to the time- s constraint, for $s > 0$. The Lagrangian becomes

$$\begin{aligned} L(F; \eta_0, \eta) = & \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-\beta t} dF(t) - \eta_0 \int_{(0, \infty)} (e^{-\alpha t} - A) dF(t) \\ & - \int_0^\infty \left[\int_{(s, \infty)} (e^{-\alpha(t-s)} - A) dF(t) \right] \eta(s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Change the order of integration in the double integral to get

$$L(F; \eta_0, \eta) = \int_{(0, \infty)} I(t) dF(t),$$

where

$$I(t) = e^{-\beta t} - \eta_0(e^{-\alpha t} - A) - \int_0^t \eta(s)(e^{-\alpha(t-s)} - A) ds.$$

Let $\eta(s) = \bar{\eta}e^{-\beta s}$ for some nonnegative coefficient $\bar{\eta}$ to be determined below. Substitute in this expression, integrate, and group like terms to get

$$I(t) = e^{-\beta t} \left[1 - \bar{\eta} \left(\frac{A}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\alpha - \beta} \right) \right] + e^{-\alpha t} \left[-\eta_0 + \frac{\bar{\eta}}{\alpha - \beta} \right] + \left(\eta_0 + \frac{\bar{\eta}}{\beta} \right) A.$$

To make the bracketed terms vanish, take

$$\bar{\eta} = \left(\frac{A}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\alpha - \beta} \right)^{-1}, \quad \eta_0 = \frac{1}{\alpha - \beta} \left(\frac{A}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\alpha - \beta} \right)^{-1}.$$

These multipliers are nonnegative since $\alpha > \beta > 0$ and $A > 0$. With these multipliers, the Lagrangian reduces to a constant. Therefore, a distribution F over $(0, \infty)$ solves (18) if and only if F satisfies every inequality constraint in (18) with equality.⁵⁶ Since $0 < A < 1$, we can apply Lemma 4 from Appendix B.4 to conclude that the unique solution is the exponential distribution with hazard rate $\gamma^* = \alpha A / (1 - A)$.

⁵⁶Technically, complementary slackness implies equality only for almost every $s \geq 0$, but it can be shown that this implies equality at every $s \geq 0$.

References

- ACHIM, P. AND J. KNOEPFLE (2024a): “Relational Enforcement,” *Theoretical Economics*, 19, 823–863. [4, 5]
- (2024b): “The Tension between Trust and Oversight in Long-term Relationships,” Working paper. [4, 5]
- ANTINOLFI, G. AND F. CARLI (2015): “Costly Monitoring, Dynamic Incentives, and Default,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 159, 105–119. [4]
- AVIS, E., C. FERRAZ, AND F. FINAN (2018): “Do Government Audits Reduce Corruption? Estimating the Impacts of Exposing Corrupt Politicians,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 126, 1912–1964. [3, 18, 20]
- BERGEMANN, D. AND U. HEGE (1998): “Venture Capital Financing, Moral Hazard, and Learning,” *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 22, 703–735. [5]
- (2005): “The Financing of Innovation: Learning and Stopping,” *RAND Journal of Economics*, 719–752. [5]
- BOARD, S. AND M. MEYER-TER-VEHN (2013): “Reputation for Quality,” *Econometrica*, 81, 2381–2462. [4]
- BONATTI, A. AND J. HÖRNER (2017): “Learning to Disagree in a Game of Experimentation,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 169, 234–269. [6]
- CHANG, C. (1990): “The Dynamic Structure of Optimal Debt Contracts,” *Journal of Economic theory*, 52, 68–86. [4]
- CHEN, M., P. SUN, AND Y. XIAO (2020): “Optimal Monitoring Schedule in Dynamic Contracts,” *Operations Research*, 68, 1285–1314. [4]
- DAI, L., Y. WANG, AND M. YANG (2022): “Dynamic Contracting with Flexible Monitoring,” *Available at SSRN 3496785*. [4]
- DEJARNETTE, P., D. DILLENBERGER, D. GOTTLIEB, AND P. ORTOLEVA (2020): “Time Lotteries and Stochastic Impatience,” *Econometrica*, 88, 619–656. [6]

- DILMÉ, F. AND D. F. GARRETT (2019): “Residual Deterrence,” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 17, 1654–1686. [4]
- ECKHOUT, J., N. PERSICO, AND P. E. TODD (2010): “A Theory of Optimal Random Crackdowns,” *American Economic Review*, 100, 1104–35. [4]
- EILAT, R., Z. NEEMAN, AND E. SOLAN (2023): “Opportunity Hunters,” Working paper. [5]
- GOMPERS, P. A. AND J. LERNER (2004): *The Venture Capital Cycle*, MIT Press. [14]
- GREEN, B. AND C. R. TAYLOR (2016): “Breakthroughs, Deadlines, and Self-Reported Progress: Contracting for Multistage Projects,” *American Economic Review*, 106, 3660–3699. [5, 6, 59, 60]
- HALAC, M., N. KARTIK, AND Q. LIU (2016): “Optimal Contracts for Experimentation,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 83, 1040–1091. [5]
- (2017): “Contests for Experimentation,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 125, 1523–1569. [5]
- HALAC, M. AND A. PRAT (2016): “Managerial Attention and Worker Performance,” *American Economic Review*, 106, 3104–3132. [4]
- HARTER, J. (2022): “Is Quiet Quitting Real?” *Gallop*, September 6, 2022. [5]
- HÖRNER, J., N. KLEIN, AND S. RADY (2021): “Overcoming Free-Riding in Bandit Games,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 89, 1948–1992. [6]
- HÖRNER, J. AND L. SAMUELSON (2013): “Incentives for Experimenting Agents,” *RAND Journal of Economics*, 44, 632–663. [5]
- JOHNSON, M. S., D. I. LEVINE, AND M. W. TOFFEL (2023): “Improving Regulatory Effectiveness through Better Targeting: Evidence from OSHA,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 15, 30–67. [17]
- KELLER, G. AND S. RADY (2015): “Breakdowns,” *Theoretical Economics*, 10, 175–202. [6]

- KIM, S.-H. (2015): “Time to Come Clean? Disclosure and Inspection Policies for Green Production,” *Operations Research*, 63, 1–20. [4]
- KLEIN, N. (2016): “The Importance of Being Honest,” *Theoretical Economics*, 11, 773–811. [5]
- LAZEAR, E. P. (2006): “Speeding, Terrorism, and Teaching to the Test,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121, 1029–1061. [4, 5]
- LI, A. AND M. YANG (2020): “Optimal Incentive Contract with Endogenous Monitoring Technology,” *Theoretical Economics*, 15, 1135–1173. [4]
- LI, Z. AND J. LIBGOBER (2023): “The Dynamics of Verification when Searching for Quality,” Working Paper. [4]
- MALENKO, A. (2019): “Optimal Dynamic Capital Budgeting,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 86, 1747–1778. [4]
- MANSO, G. (2011): “Motivating innovation,” *The journal of finance*, 66, 1823–1860. [5]
- MCKINSEY (2022): “Quiet Quitting and Performance Management,” *McKinsey & Company*, <https://mckinsey.com/capabilities/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/quiet-quitting> October 26, 2022. [5]
- MONNET, C. AND E. QUINTIN (2005): “Optimal Contracts in a Dynamic Costly State Verification Model,” *Economic Theory*, 26, 867–885. [4]
- OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION (1971): “29 CFR Part 1903 – Inspections, Citations and Proposed Penalties,” Electronic Code of Federal Regulations. [17]
- ORTOLEVA, P., E. SAFONOV, AND L. YARIV (2022): “Who Cares More? Allocation with Diverse Preference Intensities,” Working paper. [6]
- PISKORSKI, T. AND M. M. WESTERFIELD (2016): “Optimal Dynamic Contracts with Moral Hazard and Costly Monitoring,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 166, 242–281. [4]

- POPOV, L. (2016): “Stochastic Costly State Verification and Dynamic Contracts,” *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 64, 1–22. [4]
- RAVIKUMAR, B. AND Y. ZHANG (2012): “Optimal Auditing and Insurance in a Dynamic Model of Tax Compliance,” *Theoretical Economics*, 7, 241–282. [4]
- RODIVILOV, A. (2022): “Monitoring Innovation,” *Games and Economic Behavior*, 135, 297–326. [4]
- THE ECONOMIST (2018a): “Repair is as Important as Innovation,” *The Economist*, October 20, 2018. [1]
- (2018b): “What is an Audit For?” *The Economist*, May 26, 2018. [1]
- VARAS, F., I. MARINOVIC, AND A. SKRZYPACZ (2020): “Random Inspections and Periodic Reviews: Optimal Dynamic Monitoring,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 87, 2893–2937. [4, 5, 24, 25, 26, 28]
- WAGNER, P. A. AND N. KLEIN (2022): “Strategic Investment and Learning with Private Information,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 204, 105523. [6]
- WANG, C. (2005): “Dynamic Costly State Verification,” *Economic Theory*, 25, 887–916. [4]
- WONG, Y. F. (2022): “Dynamic Monitoring Design,” Working paper. [4]

B Online appendix

B.1 Deadlines versus inspections

In innovation environments ($\lambda_G > \lambda_B$) with monetary incentives (and no inspections), a general finding is that deterministic deadlines are optimal; see the literature review (Section 1.1). In this section, we compare this finding with our results, and we discuss the differences between deadlines and inspections.

When an inspection is conducted, the agent's continuation value depends on the probability that he passes the inspection. This probability depends on the agent's past actions. By contrast, when the deadline is reached, the project ends with certainty and the agent's continuation value is zero, independent of the agent's past actions. Mathematically, a deadline can be thought of as an inspection with a degenerate passage probability: $p_t(a) = 0$ for all times t and action paths a .

To highlight the differences between deadlines and inspections, we solve for the optimal timing of a deadline in an environment that is otherwise as close as possible to our main model. The agent's flow payoffs u_0 and u_1 , the common discount rate r , and the breakthrough and breakdown rates λ_G and λ_B are as in the main model. Suppose that the principal gets a lump sum payoff of 1 from a breakthrough. The principal designs the time of the deadline to maximize her expected payoff. At the deadline, the project is terminated (if it has not already ended in a breakthrough or breakdown). To make the problem nontrivial, assume $\lambda_G > \lambda_B$; $u_1 > u_0$; and $U_0 > U_1$.⁵⁷

It can be shown that it is optimal for the principal to induce the agent to work continuously until the deadline. Thus, the principal chooses a positive random deadline T to solve

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize} \quad & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T e^{-rt} \lambda_G e^{-\lambda_G t} dt \right] \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T D_t(a) u(a_t) dt \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T e^{-(\lambda_G+r)t} u_1 dt \right], \quad a \in \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

The objective reduces to $(1 - \mathbb{E} e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T}) \lambda_G / (\lambda_G + r)$, so the principal equivalently

⁵⁷A deadline encourages work only if $\lambda_G > \lambda_B$. The condition $u_1 > u_0$ is reasonable if the agent gets a lump sum reward from a breakthrough, which has been annuitized into the flow payoff as described in Appendix A.7.

minimizes $\mathbb{E} e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T}$, as in (6) in the main text. The key difference here is that the agent's continuation value at time T is zero, independent of his previous actions.

In (56), the binding constraints are local. Let $\mathbb{E}_s = \mathbb{E}[\cdot|T > s]$. For each time s , the local constraint takes a form similar to (16):

$$0 \geq (u_0 - u_1) - (\lambda_B - \lambda_G) \mathbb{E}_s \left[\int_s^T e^{-(\lambda_G+r)(t-s)} u_1 dt \right], \quad s \geq 0. \quad (57)$$

Recall that $u_1 > u_0$ and $\lambda_G > \lambda_B$. This local constraint requires that the flow benefit from working outweighs the loss from shortening the project. Compare (57) with (16). There are two important differences. First, the agent's action at time s has no effect on his continuation value at the deadline T , so the left side of (57) vanishes. In (16), the left side reflects the marginal effect of the agent's time- s action on the passage probability p_T . Second, the agent's expected payoff, at time s , from working until the end of the project depends on the time until the deadline. In (16), this time- s continuation payoff from working is U_1 , no matter the timing of the subsequent inspections.

Consider the relaxed problem that imposes only the time-0 local constraint. The solution set of this relaxed problem consists of all random variables T satisfying

$$\mathbb{E} e^{-(\lambda_G+r)T} = 1 - \frac{u_1 - u_0}{(\lambda_G - \lambda_B)U_1}.$$

There is a range of relaxed solutions because the agent's effective discount factor is the same under a local deviation as on path. It can be checked that the deterministic and exponential solutions of this relaxed problem are feasible in (56), and hence are optimal.

By contrast, in our main inspection problem, *global* constraints bind because the passage probability p_t is strictly supermodular in the action path. In the innovation regime ($\lambda_G > \lambda_B$), the agent's discount factor becomes less convex when he plans to shirk for positive duration. This creates a strict force toward periodic inspections. By Theorem 3.i, an exponential policy is strictly suboptimal because it does not maintain a gap between consecutive inspections.

Green and Taylor (2016) consider a problem similar to (56) in their single-stage benchmark. There are breakthroughs, but no breakdowns or discounting. The principal also designs time-varying bonuses. Mathematically, we can think of the principal

as designing the flow payoffs $u_1(t)$, but paying an associated cost to increase them. [Green and Taylor \(2016\)](#) find that a deterministic deadline is uniquely optimal. To get intuition for this result, consider the deterministic and exponential solutions of (56). Under the exponential solution, all the local constraints hold with equality. Under the deterministic solution, only the local constraint at $s = 0$ holds with equality. When the principal designs bonus payments, she can take advantage of the slack in the subsequent local constraints in order to reduce subsequent bonus payments. This force is specific to the innovation setting ($\lambda_G > \lambda_B$). Indeed, a deadline discourages work in the maintenance regime ($\lambda_B > \lambda_G$).

B.2 Robustness to small recovery rate

Here we formalize the claimed robustness to perturbing ρ . Recall that if $u_0 > u_1$, then with the perfect inspection technology with no recovery, the agent never works after having shirked in any binding deviation. We check that the binding deviations remain unchanged as long as δ is sufficiently large and ρ is sufficiently small.

Theorem 5 (Robustness to recovery)

*Assume $u_0 > u_1$. There exist thresholds $\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}(\lambda_G, \lambda_B, r, u_0, u_1) > 2\lambda_G - \lambda_B + r$ and $\bar{\rho}(\lambda_G, \lambda_B, r, u_0, u_1) > 0$ such that under the inspection technology with recovery, if $\delta > \bar{\delta}$ and $\rho < \bar{\rho}$, then parts *i* and *ii* of Theorem 3 hold, with the same threshold functions $\bar{\lambda}_G$ and \bar{t} , and the same period τ^* .*

Proof. We follow the proof of Theorem 3 (Appendix A.5), indicating the appropriate modifications to accommodate a positive recovery rate ρ . In particular, with a positive recovery rate ρ , the agent's payoffs from shirk-before-work deviations take a different form. For $s \leq \tau$, the agent's probability of failing the inspection is $(1 - e^{-\delta s})e^{-\rho(\tau-s)}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau) &= U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0 s}) + e^{-\lambda_0 s} U_1(1 - e^{-\lambda_1(\tau-s)}) + e^{-\lambda_0 s - \lambda_1(\tau-s)} U_1 [1 - (1 - e^{-\delta s})e^{-\rho(\tau-s)}] \\ &= U_0 - (U_0 - U_1)e^{-\lambda_0 s} - U_1 e^{-\lambda_0 s - \lambda_1(\tau-s)} (1 - e^{-\delta s})e^{-\rho(\tau-s)}. \end{aligned}$$

Define τ^* as in the proof of Theorem 3, with this new expression for U_{SW} . As before (see footnote 37), it can be shown that τ^* is well-defined. Also define the period τ_S^* to be the largest time t such that $U_S(t) = U_1$. The period τ_S^* does not depend on

ρ because the function U_S does not depend on ρ . By construction, $\tau^* \leq \tau_S^*$. In the argument below, we will reference the following conditions:

$$\delta + \lambda_0 - 2\lambda_1 - 2\rho > 0, \quad (58)$$

$$\rho U_1 + e^{-\delta\tau^*} (\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \rho) U_1 < u_0 - u_1, \quad (59)$$

$$\rho U_1 < (U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0. \quad (60)$$

Period τ_S^* We claim that if (58) and (59) both hold, then $\tau^* = \tau_S^*$. It suffices to show that $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) < 0$ and $U'_{\text{SW}}(\tau^*; \tau^*) > 0$, for then the conclusion follows from Lemma 3.⁵⁸ We have

$$\begin{aligned} U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) &= (U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0 - e^{-(\lambda_1 + \rho)\tau^*} U_1 \delta, \\ U''_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) &= -(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0^2 + e^{-(\lambda_1 + \rho)\tau^*} U_1 \delta (\delta + 2\lambda_0 - 2\lambda_1 - 2\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) \leq 0$, by the definition of τ^* . Suppose for a contradiction that $U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} U''_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) &= U''_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) + U'_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) (\delta + 2\lambda_0 - 2\lambda_1 - 2\rho) \\ &= (U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0 (\delta + \lambda_0 - 2\lambda_1 - 2\rho) \\ &> 0, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

by (58). Thus, $U_{\text{SW}}(s; \tau^*) > U_{\text{SW}}(0; \tau^*) = U_1$ for s sufficiently small, contrary to the definition of τ^* .

Second, we have

$$U'_{\text{SW}}(\tau^*; \tau^*) = e^{-\lambda_0\tau^*} (U_0\lambda_0 - (\lambda_1 + \rho)U_1 - e^{-\delta\tau^*} (\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \rho)U_1),$$

which is strictly positive by (59).

Periodic solution Assume (58) and (59) both hold. As argued above, we have $\tau^* = \tau_S^*$. Suppose that (a) $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_0$ or (b) $\lambda_1 < \lambda_0$ and $\tau^* \leq \hat{\tau}$. Use the inequality (26) to conclude, as above, that τ^* is feasible in the original problem (6).⁵⁹

⁵⁸Here about below, derivatives evaluated at $s = 0$ are *right* derivatives and derivatives evaluated at $s = \tau^*$ (or $\hat{\tau}$) are *left* derivatives.

⁵⁹In fact, with recovery, frontloading shirking has the additional benefit of increasing the agent's passage probability. If the state is 0 with probability q , then after shirking for duration Δ and then

Periodic–exponential solution Assume (58)–(60) hold. In particular, we have $\tau^* = \tau_S^*$. Suppose that $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$ and $\tau^* > \hat{\tau}$. As in the proof of Theorem 3, the distribution F_{π^*} from (41) is the unique solution of the relaxed problem (34). Note that the definition of π^* does not depend on ρ . Here we give a sufficient condition for F_{π^*} to be feasible in the original problem, now with recovery rate ρ .

Suppose that the time T until the next inspection follows the distribution F_{π^*} . First we check that the agent finds it weakly optimal to shirk over $[\hat{\tau}, \infty)$, no matter his action history. As before, over $(\hat{\tau}, \infty)$, the distribution of T is memoryless, so the only state variable is the agent’s belief q_t that $\theta_t = 0$. With recovery rate ρ , the agent’s belief evolves according to the differential equation

$$\dot{q}_t = (1 - q_t)\rho a_t - q_t\delta(1 - a_t).$$

The HJB equation reads

$$0 = \max_{a=0,1} \left\{ (1 - a)u_0 + au_1 + [(1 - q)\rho a - q\delta(1 - a)] V'(q) - \lambda_a V(q) + \gamma^*(qU_1 - V(q)) \right\}.$$

We verify that this HJB equation is solved by the value function

$$V(q) = U_1 + (q - 1)(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0/\delta.$$

Note this expression is the same as in (44). Plug in this value function, write $\lambda_a = \lambda_1 a + \lambda_0(1 - a)$, and substitute in the expression for γ^* from Theorem 3. Simplify to get

$$0 = \max_{a=0,1} a(q - 1)(U_0 - U_1)\lambda_0(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 - \rho)/\delta.$$

By (58), this equation is satisfied. At every belief q , the agent weakly prefers shirking to working (strictly so if $q < 1$).

Now we consider the remaining deviations. In particular, we must consider shirk-work-shirk deviations. With a positive recovery rate ρ , the agent’s shirk-work-shirk

working for duration Δ , the state is 0 with probability $q_{\text{SW}} = 1 - (1 - qe^{-\delta\Delta})e^{-\rho\Delta}$. If instead the agent works for duration Δ and then shirking for duration Δ , then the state is 0 with probability $q_{\text{WS}} = (1 - (1 - q)e^{-\rho\Delta})e^{-\delta\Delta}$. With δ and ρ both strictly positive, it can be checked that $q_{\text{SW}} > q_{\text{WS}}$, no matter the value of q .

payoff now takes a different form. We have

$$U_{\text{SWS}}(s; F_{\pi^*}) = U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0 s}) + e^{-\lambda_0 s} U_1(1 - e^{-\lambda_1(\hat{\tau}-s)}) \\ + e^{-\lambda_0 s - \lambda_1(\hat{\tau}-s)} [\pi^* q(s) U_1 + (1 - \pi^*) V(q(s))],$$

where $q(s) = 1 - (1 - e^{-\delta s})e^{-\rho(\hat{\tau}-s)}$.

To complete the proof, it suffices to check that with this new expression for U_{SWS} , we still have $U'_{\text{SWS}}(\hat{\tau}; F_{\pi^*}) > 0$ and $U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) < 0$. Directly computing the derivative gives

$$U'_{\text{SWS}}(\hat{\tau}; F_{\pi^*}) = e^{-\lambda_0 \hat{\tau}} \left[(U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0 - \frac{\rho(\pi^* U_1 \delta + (\pi^* - 1)(U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0)}{\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1} \right] \\ > e^{-\lambda_0 \hat{\tau}} \left[(U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0 - \frac{\rho U_1 \delta}{\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1} \right],$$

by Assumption 2. Since $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$, this expression is strictly positive by (60).

To prove the inequality $U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) < 0$, note that

$$U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) = (U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0 - e^{-(\lambda_1 + \rho)\hat{\tau}} [\pi^* U_1 \delta + (1 - \pi^*)(U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0], \\ U''_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) = -(U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0^2 \\ + e^{-(\lambda_1 + \rho)\hat{\tau}} [\pi^* U_1 \delta + (1 - \pi^*)(U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0] (\delta + 2\lambda_0 - 2\lambda_1 - 2\rho).$$

If (58) holds, then we can apply the same argument following (61), with $\pi^* U_1 \delta + (1 - \pi^*)(U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0$ in place of $U_1 \delta$, to conclude that $U'_{\text{SWS}}(0; F_{\pi^*}) < 0$.

Solving for the thresholds Now we find threshold functions $\bar{\delta}$ and $\bar{\rho}$ such that (58)–(60) hold if $\delta > \hat{\delta}$ and $\rho < \hat{\rho}$. We choose thresholds that are parameterized by $\varepsilon > 0$.

Write $\tau^* = \tau^*(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, u_0, u_1; \delta, \rho)$. Since τ^* is weakly increasing in δ and weakly decreasing in ρ , for $u_0 < u_1$ there exists a threshold $\hat{\delta}(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, u_0, u_1; \rho)$ that is weakly increasing in ρ such that $e^{-\delta \tau^*} (\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1) U_1 \leq (u_0 - u_1)/2$ whenever $\delta \geq \hat{\delta}(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, u_0, u_1; \rho)$.

Let

$$\bar{\delta}(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, u_0, u_1) = \max \left\{ \hat{\delta}(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, u_0, u_1; \varepsilon/2), 2\lambda_1 - \lambda_0 + \varepsilon/2 \right\},$$

and

$$\bar{\rho}(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, u_0, u_1) = \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{(U_0 - U_1) \lambda_0}{U_1}, \frac{u_0 - u_1}{2U_1} \right\}.$$

It can be checked that (58)–(60) hold if $\delta > \bar{\delta}$ and $\rho < \bar{\rho}$. The thresholds $\bar{\delta}$ and $\bar{\rho}$ are increasing in ε . So as ε increases, the constraint on δ becomes more restrictive and the constraint on ρ becomes more permissive. \square

B.3 Verification for the point mass in Theorem 3

Consider (40) at $s = 0$. Plug in the distribution F_π from (41) and rearrange to get

$$\pi h(\hat{\tau}) + (1 - \pi) \int_{(\hat{\tau}, \infty)} h(t) \gamma^* e^{-\gamma^*(t-\hat{\tau})} dt = 0, \quad (62)$$

where the function h is defined by $h(t) = U_0(1 - e^{-\lambda_0 t}) - U_1(1 - e^{-(\delta + \lambda_0)t})$.

First, we claim that the left side of (62) is strictly negative at $\pi = 1$. At $\pi = 1$, the left side equals $h(\hat{\tau})$. Note that

$$h'(t) = e^{-\lambda_0 t} [U_0 \lambda_0 - U_1(\delta + \lambda_0)e^{-\delta t}].$$

By (38), we have $h'(t) > 0$ for $t \geq \hat{\tau}$. By assumption, $\hat{\tau} < \tau^*$, so $h(\hat{\tau}) < h(\tau^*) \leq 0$, where the last inequality holds because τ^* is feasible in (34).

Next, we claim that the left side of (62) is strictly positive at $\pi = 0$. Take $\pi = 0$ and substitute in the expressions for $\hat{\tau}$ and γ^* . After some algebra, the left side of (62) becomes

$$\frac{(U_0 - U_1)(\delta + 2\lambda_0 - \lambda_1)}{\delta(\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1)} \left[\frac{\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1}{\delta + 2\lambda_0 - \lambda_1} - \left(\frac{\lambda_0 - \lambda_1}{\delta + \lambda_0 - \lambda_1} \right)^{\lambda_0/\delta} \right].$$

Since $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1$, it suffices to prove that the expression in brackets is strictly positive. Let $a = \lambda_0/\delta$ and $b = (\lambda_0 - \lambda_1)/\delta$. With this substitution, the expression in brackets reduces to

$$\frac{1 + b}{1 + a + b} - \left(\frac{b}{1 + b} \right)^a.$$

To show that this expression is strictly positive, we prove that

$$(1 + b)^{1+a} > (1 + a + b)b^a,$$

which is equivalent to

$$1 + b > (1 + a + b)^{1/(1+a)} b^{a/(1+a)}.$$

This inequality follows from the weighted AM-GM inequality (strictness is guaranteed because $1 + a + b \neq b$).

B.4 Uniqueness

The proofs of uniqueness rely on the following lemmas.

Lemma 4 (Unique fixed point—single exponential)

Fix $A > 1$ and $\alpha > 0$. For each π in $[0, 1)$, there exists exactly one distribution F on $[0, \infty)$ with $F(0) = \pi$ satisfying

$$\int_{(s, \infty)} A e^{-\alpha(t-s)} dF(t) = 1 - F(s), \quad (63)$$

for all $s \geq 0$. Namely, $F(t) = \pi + (1 - \pi)(1 - e^{-\gamma t})$, for all $t \geq 0$, where $\gamma = \alpha/(A - 1)$. Moreover, this distribution function F satisfies (63) for every $t \geq 0$.

Proof. Let F be a cumulative distribution function on $[0, \infty)$ that satisfies this system. Put $t = 0$ in (63) to get

$$\int_{(0, \infty)} A e^{-\alpha s} dF(s) = 1 - F(0) = 1 - \pi.$$

For each $t \geq 0$, we have

$$\int_{(t, \infty)} A e^{-\alpha(s-t)} dF(s) = e^{\alpha t} \left[1 - \pi - \int_{(0, t]} A e^{-\alpha s} dF(s) \right].$$

Use the layer-cake representation and then change variables to get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{(0, t]} A e^{-\alpha s} dF(s) &= A e^{-\alpha t} [F(t) - F(0)] + A \int_{e^{-\alpha t}}^1 [F(-\alpha^{-1} \log x) - F(0)] dx \\ &= A e^{-\alpha t} F(t) + \int_0^t A \alpha e^{-\alpha s} F(s) ds - A \pi. \end{aligned}$$

Substitute these equalities into (63) to get

$$(1 - \pi)e^{\alpha t} - AF(t) - \int_0^t A\alpha e^{-\alpha(s-t)} F(s) ds + A\pi e^{\alpha t} = 1 - F(t).$$

Solve for $F(t)$ to get

$$F(t) = \pi e^{\alpha t} + \frac{1}{A-1} \left[e^{\alpha t} - 1 - \int_0^t A\alpha e^{-\alpha(s-t)} F(s) ds \right].$$

That is, F is a fixed point of an operator defined by the expression on the right side. Define this operator on the space of bounded functions on an interval $[0, t_1]$ with the supremum norm. For $t_1 < A\alpha/(A-1)$, this operator is a contraction, and hence has a unique fixed point, denoted F_1 . For some t_2 larger than t_1 , define the operator on the space of bounded functions on $[0, t_2]$, by replacing $F(t)$ with $F_1(t)$ on the right side for $t \leq t_1$. If $t_2 < t_1 + \alpha A/(A-1)$, then this operator is a contraction and hence has a unique fixed point F_2 on $[0, t_2]$ that extends F_1 . Continuing in this way, each operator is a contraction provided that $t_{i+1} - t_i < A\alpha/(A-1)$. Construct a sequence (t_i) satisfying these inequalities with $t_i \uparrow \infty$. We get a sequence of fixed points F_i over $[0, t_i]$. For each fixed t , we must have $F(t) = F_i(t)$ for all i such that $t_i \geq t$. Therefore, F is unique.

It remains to check that this F is actually a cumulative distribution function. Guess that $F(t) = \pi + (1 - \pi)(1 - e^{-\gamma t})$ for $t \geq 0$. We have $F(0) = \pi$, and (63) is satisfied for all t if $A\alpha/(\alpha + \gamma) = 1$, hence $\gamma = \alpha/(A-1)$. This cumulative distribution function is therefore the unique solution. \square

Lemma 5 (Unique fixed point—sum of exponentials)

Fix positive numbers A, B, α, β with $A - B = 1$ and $\beta B > \alpha A$.⁶⁰ For each π in $[0, 1]$, there exists exactly one distribution F on $[0, \infty)$ with $F(0) = \pi$ that satisfies

$$\int_{(s, \infty)} [A(1 - e^{-\alpha(t-s)}) - B(1 - e^{-\beta(t-s)})] dF(t) = 0, \quad (64)$$

for all $s \geq 0$. Namely, $F(t) = \pi + (1 - \pi)(1 - e^{-\gamma t})$, for all $t \geq 0$, where $\gamma = \alpha\beta/(\beta B - \alpha A)$. Moreover, this distribution function F satisfies (64) for every $t \geq 0$.

⁶⁰Provided that $A > B$, the condition $A - B = 1$ is a normalization. This normalization simplifies the expression for γ .

Proof. Let F be a cumulative distribution function on $[0, \infty)$ that satisfies this system. The integrand is continuous in (s, t) and vanishes when $s = t$. Therefore, we can calculate the total derivative of the left side with respect to t by differentiating under the integral (by dominated convergence) and ignoring the change in the left endpoint. Thus,

$$\int_{(t, \infty)} [-\alpha A e^{-\alpha(s-t)} + \beta B e^{-\beta(s-t)}] dF(s) = 0, \quad (65)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Multiply (64) by β and subtract (65). Simplify using the equality $A - B = 1$ to conclude that

$$\int_{(t, \infty)} \frac{(\beta - \alpha)A}{\beta} e^{-\alpha(s-t)} dF(s) = 1 - F(t),$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Since $A = B + 1$ and $\beta B > \alpha A$, it follows that $\beta A > \alpha A + \beta$. Therefore, $(\beta - \alpha)A/\beta > 1$, so we can apply Lemma 4 to complete the proof, noting that

$$\gamma = \frac{\alpha}{(\beta - \alpha)A/\beta - 1} = \frac{\alpha\beta}{\beta A - \alpha A - \beta} = \frac{\alpha\beta}{\beta B - \alpha A}. \quad \square$$