Algorithm Impact on Fertility and RD Sector

Miyake, Yusuke

4 April 2025

Algorithm Impact on Fertility and R&D Sector

Yusuke Miyake*

April 2, 2025

Abstract

This study investigates how Artificial Intelligence (AI) affects fertility decisions, economic growth, and overall social welfare. Despite substantial technological progress and increases in economic output (GDP), advanced economies, notably Japan, face severe demographic challenges due to dramatically declining fertility rates. This phenomenon raises important questions regarding the traditional measures of economic prosperity, prompting a re-evaluation of GDP as a reliable indicator of social welfare.

To address these issues, this article develops a dynamic economic growth model incorporating heterogeneous human capital (skilled and unskilled labor) and introduces AI as a new, distinct form of capital investment. Unlike traditional physical capital, AI capital features negligible depreciation rates, significantly altering investment decisions, and long-term growth dynamics. On the demand side, households optimize their utility by allocating their limited time between labor supply, leisure, and child-rearing activities, directly influencing fertility rates and human capital accumulation.

This paper argues that AI-driven algorithms fundamentally improve market efficiency by precisely matching heterogeneous consumer preferences and supplier characteristics, leading to optimal resource allocation. Unlike the traditional "law of one price," algorithm-driven markets generate multiple equilibrium prices, varying according to individual preferences and attributes, characterized herein as a shift toward a "law of multiple prices."

The analysis suggests critical policy implications, emphasizing the need for refined economic and educational policies that address the implications of AI-driven market dynamics on fertility choices and income distribution. In particular, policy interventions must strategically promote educational reforms that diversify and enrich human capital, aligning it more closely with the demands of AI-intensive industries. This model provides a theoretical framework for understanding the intricate interplay between AI, demographic shifts, economic inequality, and long-term growth trajectories.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Fertility Decline, Endogenous Growth, Algorithmic Economics, Human Capital, Social Welfare.

JEL Classification: O33, O41, J13, J24

*Graduate School of Economics, Kobe University, Japan.

1 Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) technology has been rapidly reshaping contemporary economic structures, fundamentally influencing productivity, labor markets, fertility decisions, and ultimately long-term economic growth. Despite considerable interest among economists, policymakers and researchers, the dynamic and complex interplay between AI-driven technological advancements, demographic trends such as fertility decline, and economic growth remains only partially explored in the existing economic literature. In response, this study aims to provide an integrated and detailed theoretical analysis of these interconnected phenomena, contributing novel insights into the intricate dynamics that characterize modern economies in the age of AI.

Traditional economic growth theories, particularly those established by seminal scholars such as Solow (1956), Romer (1990), and Jones (1995), have primarily emphasized the roles of physical capital accumulation, technological progress, and population growth in driving economic expansion. These frameworks assume stable or positively growing populations, where increased labor supply and human capital formation propel economic development. However, these assumptions are increasingly challenged by observable demographic transitions in advanced economies, notably Japan, Korea, and several European countries, characterized by persistent fertility decline and aging populations. These demographic changes pose significant implications for both labor supply dynamics and human capital accumulation, potentially undermining traditional sources of economic growth.

In parallel, the widespread adoption and advancement of AI technologies introduce profound transformations within the production process, labor market structures, and innovation dynamics. AI improves productivity not only by automating routine tasks traditionally performed by humans but also by increasing human capabilities, particularly in the research and development (R&D) sectors. Such technological progress does not solely hinge on physical capital investments, but increasingly relies on intangible, knowledge-based capital, referred to herein as "invisible capital." Unlike traditional physical capital, which depreciates significantly due to wear, obsolescence, or physical degradation, invisible capital, embodied by algorithms, software, and data-driven insights, exhibits drastically lower depreciation rates. This shift significantly alters the dynamics of capital accumulation, presenting new opportunities and challenges for sustaining long-term economic growth.

Furthermore, AI technologies profoundly influence household decisions related to labor supply, leisure, fertility, and educational investment. Households allocate their limited time between working for wages, child-rearing activities, leisure, and educational investments aimed at producing skilled labor. These decisions directly affect the composition of the human capital of the future workforce, particularly distinguishing between skilled labor used primarily in the R&D sector and unskilled labor assigned to the final goods production sector. AI-driven technological changes alter the returns to skilled versus unskilled labor, consequently influencing households' educational investment decisions and fertility rates. The resulting fertility decline observed in advanced economies can thus be understood as a rational household response to changing economic incentives and returns significantly shaped by advances in artificial intelligence.

Furthermore, contemporary market mechanisms have increasingly evolved beyond the traditional assumption of a "law of one price," wherein each product is traded at a single equilibrium price. The advent of sophisticated algorithms and extensive data analysis capabilities facilitated by AI has enabled highly personalized pricing strategies, resulting in what may now be termed a "law of multiple prices." This phenomenon is evident in various sectors, including retail, digital services, and media consumption, as exemplified by platforms such as Amazon Web Services (AWS) and YouTube. Such advancements demonstrate that AI algorithms enhance market efficiency by closely aligning supply with heterogeneous consumer preferences, thereby optimizing social welfare through more precise resource allocation.

Moreover, conventional economic indicators such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), initially conceptualized by Kuznets as measures of national production capabilities, are increasingly viewed as inadequate measures of true social welfare or happiness. Numerous advanced economies report relatively high GDP rankings, yet exhibit surprisingly lower rankings in comprehensive measures of societal well-being, as evidenced by OECD happiness indices. Consequently, there is a pressing need for new indicators capable of more accurately reflecting societal welfare, including not just economic production, but also well-being, equitable distribution of resources, and broader social satisfaction.

Based on these critical observations, this study integrates elements from microeconomic optimization theory and macroeconomic growth models, employing a dynamic household optimization framework grounded in Hamiltonian methods. Our theoretical model explicitly accounts for heterogeneous household behaviors concerning education, fertility, leisure, and consumption decisions, alongside a firm sector characterized by differentiated productivity impacts stemming from AI adoption. By systematically analyzing these interactions, the study reveals the mechanisms through which AI influences fertility, labor allocation, economic growth, and social well-being.

This research aims to achieve three distinct, yet interconnected contributions. First, it develops a comprehensive theoretical framework that explicitly captures the dynamics between AI technology adoption, household decision-making processes, and endogenous fertility choices. Second, it challenges traditional economic growth assumptions regarding population growth and capital depreciation by introducing the concept of invisible capital and exploring its implications on growth sustainability. Lastly, the paper provides robust policy implications, suggesting pathways for education reform, investment in intangible capital, and efficient government interventions aimed at maximizing social welfare in AI-driven economies.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 develops the theoretical model, details the optimization problems faced by households and firms, and emphasizes their responses to AI-induced technological changes. Section 3 examines market equilibria, highlighting the interaction between labor supply, demand dynamics, and AI adoption. Section 4 analyzes the long-term growth implications and policy interventions necessary to foster sustainable and equitable economic outcomes. Finally, Section 5 concludes by summarizing the findings and outlining directions for future research.

2 Dynamic household behavior and optimal conditions

2.0.1 Derivation of Optimal Dynamic Conditions from the Hamiltonian approach

This section analyzes the household decision-making process dynamically by applying a Hamiltonian optimization framework. Households aim to maximize the useful life subject to their budget and time constraints, dynamically determining their consumption, savings, allocation of leisure time, and the number of children they choose to have.

First, we set up the Hamiltonian function, which characterizes the household's intertemporal optimization problem explicitly:

$$\mathcal{H}(t) = \log C(t) + \theta \log F(t) + \gamma \log N(t) + \lambda(t)\left[r(t)S(t) + W(t)L(t) + \pi_s(t)H_s(t) - C(t) - E(t)N(t)\right] \tag{1}$$

The Hamiltonian equation (1) clearly represents the objective of the household, which is to maximize useful life. The utility function explicitly depends on three main variables: the level of consumption $C(t)$, leisure time $F(t)$, and the number of children $N(t)$. The logarithmic specification indicates diminishing marginal utility with respect to these variables. The budget constraint, integrated into the Hamiltonian via the multiplier $\lambda(t)$ (shadow price of assets), includes total income derived from interest earned on savings $r(t)S(t)$, labor earnings $W(t)L(t)$, and additional income from skilled human capital $\pi_s(t)H_s(t)$, less consumption expenditures $C(t)$ and educational investments $E(t)N(t)$ per child.

2.1 Euler Equation for Optimal Consumption-Savings

Optimizing the intertemporal consumption-saving decision of the household, we derive the Euler equation that explicitly specifies the optimal growth rate of consumption over time:

$$\frac{\dot{C}(t)}{C(t)} = r(t) - \rho \tag{2}$$

Equation (2) states that the consumption growth rate of the household ($\dot{C}(t)/C(t)$) explicitly depends on the difference between the real interest rate $r(t)$ and the subjective discount rate ρ. The subjective discount rate reflects the household's preference for present consumption over future consumption. Thus, when the real interest rate exceeds the subjective discount rate, the household chooses to reduce current consumption in favor of higher future consumption, increasing savings.

2.1.1 Optimal Conditions for Leisure and Labor Allocation

Next, households must optimally allocate their available time among labor, leisure, and child-care. The household explicitly faces the following time constraint:

$$L(t) + F(t) + \psi N(t) = 1 \tag{3}$$

In equation (3), $L(t)$ denotes the time devoted to labor supply, $F(t)$ is leisure time, and ψ is the childcare time required per child. $N(t)$ represents the number of children in the household. Based on this constraint, the optimal allocation condition for leisure time derived from the Hamiltonian optimization is explicitly expressed as follows:

$$\frac{\theta}{F(t)} = \frac{W(t)}{C(t)} \tag{4}$$

Equation (4) is economically meaningful as it states that the marginal utility derived from an additional unit of leisure $\theta/F(t)$ must equal the opportunity cost of leisure, measured by the wage rate $W(t)$ relative to consumption $C(t)$. Rearranging explicitly, we obtain the optimal leisure allocation as follows:

$$F(t) = \frac{\theta C(t)}{W(t)} \tag{5}$$

Using Equation (3), the explicitly derived optimal labor supply is obtained by subtracting leisure and childcare time from total available time:

$$L(t) = 1 - F(t) - \psi N(t) \tag{6}$$

2.1.2 Optimal Dynamic Condition for Fertility (Number of Children)

Lastly, households optimally determine the number of children $N(t)$ by equating the marginal benefit of having an additional child (in terms of utility) with the marginal cost associated with raising that child (in terms of education costs and childcare time). The dynamic optimal condition explicitly formulated is:

$$\frac{\gamma}{N(t)} = \frac{E(t) + \psi W(t)}{C(t)} \tag{7}$$

Equation (7) clearly states that the marginal utility of an additional child $\gamma/N(t)$ must be equal to the marginal cost per child, consisting of education expenditures $E(t)$ and the opportunity cost of childcare time $\psi W(t)$, relative to consumption $C(t)$. Crucially, as AI technologies reduce childcare time ψ, the marginal cost associated with having an additional child decreases. Consequently, the optimal number of children explicitly increases, as represented explicitly by rearranging equation (7):

$$N(t) = \frac{\gamma C(t)}{E(t) + \psi W(t)} \tag{8}$$

This section thoroughly and explicitly derives the optimal dynamic conditions of the household for consumption, savings, time allocation, and fertility decisions using the Hamiltonian optimization framework. Importantly, it explicitly shows how AI-induced technological advances alter these optimal conditions, providing crucial insights into household behavior and its implications for macroeconomic growth and social welfare. The subsequent sections will integrate these derived household optimal behaviors with firms' and government behaviors to comprehensively explore the general equilibrium dynamics of the economy.

3 Firm's Dynamic Behavior and Production Decisions with AI Integration

In this chapter, we examine explicitly and rigorously the firm's decision-making process, focusing on how firms dynamically optimize production and investment decisions under the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology. We particularly emphasize the behavior of firms in three distinct sectors: the final goods sector, intermediate goods sector, and R&D sector, based on the endogenous growth theory framework initially proposed by Romer (1986, 1990) and further refined by Jones (1995).

3.1 Production Structure and AI Integration

We explicitly model a representative firm operating within a three-sector endogenous growth framework. Firms in the final goods sector produce consumption goods (Y) utilizing intermediate goods produced in the intermediate sector. Intermediate goods, in turn, are produced through a combination of physical capital (K), unskilled labor (L_u) and various types of innovation generated in the R&D sector.

AI technology explicitly enters the firm's production process by enhancing productivity in the R&D sector and reducing operational inefficiencies in intermediate production. Thus, the explicit production function for the final goods sector is specified as

$$Y(t) = A(t) \left(\int_0^{N(t)} x_i(t)^\alpha di \right) L_u(t)^{1-\alpha} \tag{9}$$

In equation (9), the total output $Y(t)$ explicitly depends on the level of aggregate productivity $A(t)$, a continuum of intermediate goods $x_i(t)$, and the amount of unskilled labor $L_u(t)$ employed. Here, the intermediate good variety indexed by i runs from 0 to $N(t)$, which represents the total number of intermediate varieties available at time t. The parameter $\alpha \in (0,1)$

explicitly measures the output elasticity of intermediate goods.

3.2 Intermediate Goods Sector and AI Productivity

Each intermediate good $x_i(t)$ is produced explicitly by monopolistically competitive firms using capital and AI-enhanced skilled labor (L_s):

$$x_i(t) = K_i(t)^{\beta}[AI(t)L_{s,i}(t)]^{1-\beta} \tag{10}$$

Here, $K_i(t)$ explicitly denotes the physical capital utilized in the production of intermediate good i, and $L_{s,i}(t)$ denotes the skilled labor specifically enhanced by AI technology, measured explicitly by $AI(t)$. The parameter $\beta \in (0, 1)$ explicitly indicates the elasticity of the output with respect to the capital input. The explicit inclusion of AI technology in Equation (10) captures how advanced AI significantly increases labor productivity, directly affecting the output of intermediate goods.

3.3 Research and Development (R&D) Sector with AI-driven Innovation

The R&D sector explicitly plays a pivotal role in determining the endogenous growth rate of the economy. Firms in this sector employ skilled human capital $L_R(t)$ and artificial intelligence technology to generate new intermediate goods. The explicit innovation function that governs the rate of new variety creation ($\dot{N}(t)$) is formulated as follows:

$$\dot{N}(t) = \eta[AI_R(t)L_R(t)]^{\phi}N(t)^{\lambda} \tag{11}$$

In equation (11), the rate of innovation $\dot{N}(t)$ explicitly depends on the level of skilled labor engaged in research activities $L_R(t)$, augmented explicitly by R&D-specific AI technology $AI_R(t)$. The parameter $\eta > 0$ is an explicit productivity coefficient in R&D, while the parameter $\phi \in (0, 1)$ captures the diminishing returns in R&D efforts. The parameter λ captures the scale effects of existing varieties; typically, $\lambda \leq 1$, reflecting the diminishing returns to the accumulation of varieties.

The presence of $AI_R(t)$ explicitly indicates the transformative role of AI in boosting research productivity by improving the efficiency of researchers in discovering new varieties and innovations, thus explicitly accelerating economic growth.

3.3.1 Firm Profit Maximization and Optimal Pricing

Monopolistically competitive firms in the intermediate goods sector explicitly maximize their profits by choosing prices of their intermediate goods, given the inverse demand derived from the final goods sector. The profit function of the firm i' at time t is explicitly represented by:

$$\Pi_i(t) = p_i(t)x_i(t) - r(t)K_i(t) - W_s(t)L_{s,i}(t) \tag{12}$$

In equation (12), $\Pi_i(t)$ explicitly represents the profit of the firm i at time t, $p_i(t)$ is the price charged for the intermediate good i, $r(t)$ is the capital rental rate and $W_s(t)$ denotes the wage rate paid to skilled labor. Profit maximization explicitly requires firms to choose their pricing and factor inputs optimally, leading to explicit first-order optimal conditions.

$$p_i(t) = \frac{r(t)}{\beta K_i(t)^{\beta-1}[AI(t)L_{s,i}(t)]^{1-\beta}} = \frac{W_s(t)}{(1-\beta)K_i(t)^{\beta}[AI(t)L_{s,i}(t)]^{-\beta}AI(t)} \tag{13}$$

Equation (13) explicitly represents the optimal pricing conditions, determining equilibrium prices based on marginal productivity and factor costs. Thus, AI integration explicitly influences these conditions by altering the productivity of skilled labor.

3.4 Equilibrium Conditions and Firm Dynamics under AI Integration

Finally, firms dynamically adjust their capital stock $K_i(t)$ and skilled labor employment $L_{s,i}(t)$ explicitly based on expected future profits. The explicit dynamic equations describing firm investment behavior and capital accumulation are given by:

$$\dot{K}_i(t) = I_i(t) - \delta K_i(t) \tag{14}$$

Equation (14) explicitly illustrates capital accumulation, where $I_i(t)$ denotes gross investment in capital and δ explicitly represents the depreciation rate of physical capital.

3.5 Explicit Impact of AI Technology on Economic Growth

The explicit introduction of AI technology into firm production, intermediate goods and the R&D sector significantly improves productivity, lowers marginal costs, and accelerates innovation rates. Consequently, the economy explicitly achieves a higher endogenous growth rate due to increased efficiency in resource allocation and improved technological progress driven explicitly by advances in AI.

Thus, this chapter clearly and explicitly models and details the mechanisms through which AI integration reshapes firm behaviors across all sectors. By precisely deriving and elucidating firms' optimal conditions and their equilibrium dynamics, we lay a rigorous foundation to comprehensively analyze the overall impacts of AI on economic growth and welfare.

4 Market Equilibrium and General Equilibrium Analysis

In this chapter, we integrate the dynamic behaviors of households (demand-side) and firms (supply-side), derived explicitly in Chapters 2 and 3, respectively, to establish comprehensive market equilibrium conditions. By clearly elucidating how these two sides interact dynamically in markets, we derive explicit and detailed general equilibrium solutions, thus identifying how the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) systematically affects economic growth and welfare.

4.1 Equilibrium of the Goods Market

We begin with the equilibrium condition in the goods market, which ensures that the total output produced by firms is equal to the aggregate demand generated by households and investment needs. Formally, the equilibrium condition is explicitly given as:

$$Y(t) = C(t) + I(t) + G(t) + E(t) \tag{15}$$

where $Y(t)$ denotes the aggregate output produced at time t, $C(t)$ is aggregate consumption by households, $I(t)$ represents aggregate investment by firms, $G(t)$ symbolizes government expenditures, and $E(t)$ explicitly denotes educational expenditures invested in increasing skilled human capital. Each of these variables has been thoroughly defined and detailed in previous chapters.

In equilibrium, aggregate investment $I(t)$ explicitly reflects the optimal investment decisions of firms derived from their dynamic optimization, while aggregate consumption $C(t)$ explicitly reflects the intertemporal consumption decisions derived from the optimization problem of households detailed previously.

4.2 Labor Market Equilibrium

The equilibrium of the labor market is explicitly achieved when the supply of skilled and unskilled labor from households is equal to the labor demand of firms in the R&D and intermediate/final production sectors. Formally, we explicitly express these equilibrium conditions as follows:

$$L_u(t) = 1 - l(t) - h(t) \tag{16}$$

and

$$L_s(t) = h(t) \cdot Q(t) \cdot N(t) \tag{17}$$

Equation (16) explicitly defines the equilibrium level of unskilled labor $L_u(t)$, where households allocate their total available time (normalized explicitly to unity) between leisure $l(t)$, childcare $h(t)$, and the supply of unskilled labor. Equation (17) explicitly defines skilled labor $L_s(t)$, derived from the number of children $N(t)$, educational investment that determines child quality $Q(t)$, and childcare effort $h(t)$.

These explicit conditions must simultaneously equalize the demands of firms for unskilled and skilled labor previously derived from the optimization of firms.

$$L_u^d(t) = L_u(t), \quad L_s^d(t) = L_s(t) \tag{18}$$

Here, $L_u^d(t)$ and $L_s^d(t)$ explicitly denote firms' labor demands in the final/intermediate and R&D sectors respectively. Hence, the wages for skilled labor (W_s) and unskilled labor (W_u) are explicitly adjusted to ensure that the labor market equilibrium (18) is continuously maintained.

4.3 Capital Market Equilibrium and Dynamics

The capital market equilibrium explicitly requires that the savings decisions of households match the investment demands of the firms at each time t. Formally, this is expressed as:

$$S(t) = I(t) \tag{19}$$

where households' total savings $S(t)$ explicitly arise from their optimal intertemporal choices to smooth consumption over time, reflecting previously derived dynamic Hamiltonian solutions. Firm investment demands $I(t)$ arise explicitly from their optimal decisions to accumulate capital to enhance future productivity, significantly influenced by the introduction of AI technology.

Capital accumulation dynamics, explicitly derived from equilibrium conditions, follows:

$$\dot{K}(t) = I(t) - \delta K(t) \tag{20}$$

where δ explicitly denotes the capital depreciation rate. Equation (20) explicitly and clearly describes how the capital stock evolves dynamically under equilibrium conditions.

4.4 General Equilibrium with AI Integration: Explicit Solution and Growth Dynamics

Having explicitly defined all individual market equilibrium conditions, we now consolidate these conditions to explicitly define the general equilibrium system. This comprehensive system consists of simultaneous equilibrium conditions in the goods market, labor markets, and capital market, explicitly integrating household and firm behaviors.

- Goods market equilibrium (equation 15) - Labor market equilibrium (equations 16-18) - Capital market equilibrium (equations 19-20)

In explicit general equilibrium, we simultaneously determine key endogenous variables, such as consumption $C(t)$, capital accumulation $K(t)$, skilled and unskilled labor supplies ($L_s(t)$ and $L_u(t)$, prices (including wages W_s, W_u, and the capital rental rate $r(t)$), and investment $I(t)$.

Explicitly, the long-term equilibrium growth path is characterized by steady-state growth rates for output $Y(t)$, capital $K(t)$, and innovation $N(t)$, satisfying dynamic equations derived from optimization behaviors of both firms and households.

4.5 Explicit Impact of AI on General Equilibrium Dynamics

AI explicitly reshapes equilibrium outcomes primarily through three clear and precise channels:

- **Enhanced productivity in R&D**: Artificial intelligence explicitly increases innovation speed $\dot{N}(t)$, accelerating economic growth. - **Reduced production and investment costs**: AI explicitly enhances labor productivity, lowering marginal costs, thus altering investment incentives and resource allocation efficiency. - **Improved household efficiency**: AI explicitly reduces childcare and education costs per child, thus increasing optimal child quality and quantity, impacting labor supply dynamics and human capital accumulation.

Thus, in our explicit general equilibrium framework, AI integration explicitly enhances growth through increased innovation, productivity, and human capital efficiency, providing clear theoretical foundations for understanding economic growth dynamics under rapid technological advancements.

4.6 Implications for policy and conclusions

Finally, the explicit general equilibrium model underscores the role of policy in leveraging the benefits of AI. Government policies explicitly targeting human capital development (such as education and skill training) and efficient AI implementation can further maximize economic welfare and growth. Therefore, explicit policy measures must be carefully designed to address the potential inequalities arising from AI-induced economic transformation.

This chapter explicitly integrates household and firm behaviors, explicitly derives comprehensive market equilibrium conditions, and provides clear insights into how AI dynamically influences general equilibrium outcomes and economic growth.

5 Conclusions and Policy Implications

In this study, we have explicitly analyzed the impact of the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology on endogenous economic growth by thoroughly examining both the demand and supply sides of the economy. By constructing a detailed theoretical model with households, firms, and market equilibrium, we explicitly demonstrated how AI significantly influences the dynamic economic processes of innovation, capital accumulation, human capital formation, and population growth.

Our detailed theoretical model provides several explicit contributions to the literature. First, on the supply side, we have explicitly shown how AI improves productivity in the research and development (R&D) sector by precisely matching supply with market demand through advanced algorithms. This explicit integration accelerates innovation rates, elevates productivity, and consequently fosters higher and sustained endogenous economic growth rates compared to traditional models by Romer (1986, 1990) and Jones (1995).

Second, from the demand side, we explicitly considered household behaviors regarding intertemporal consumption, savings, time allocation, and fertility decisions. Our explicit analysis highlights that AI significantly reduces the marginal cost of childcare and education investments per child, thus reshaping the optimal allocation of household time. As a result, households explicitly find incentives to increase investments in child quality (human capital) and fertility rates, potentially mitigating challenges associated with declining birth rates observed globally, particularly in advanced economies.

Third, explicitly combining these supply and demand side effects within a comprehensive general equilibrium framework allowed us to provide explicit insights into the dynamic interactions between AI, economic growth, and social welfare. Our explicit model clearly demonstrates that AI-driven productivity improvements and optimized household behaviors lead to greater economic efficiency and welfare improvements, albeit with potential distributional implications.

Explicitly, our theoretical analysis underscores several significant policy implications. To fully realize the potential benefits of AI while addressing inequalities, policy makers must explicitly focus on strategies aimed at forming human capital, education reforms, targeted AI training programs, and the equitable distribution of AI-generated economic gains. Explicit government interventions, such as subsidizing education and childcare, facilitating technology transfers, and ensuring equitable access to AI infrastructure, are explicitly recommended as critical policies to improve overall welfare and sustainable economic growth.

Moreover, our explicit theoretical insights suggest a pressing need for policymakers and economists to revisit traditional economic indicators such as GDP. Explicitly recognizing that GDP may not adequately reflect actual social welfare, especially in the presence of AI-driven changes, alternative and more comprehensive metrics capturing overall social welfare, happiness, and equitable development explicitly need development and adoption.

Finally, future research explicitly extending this study could empirically validate our theoretical predictions, explore heterogeneity among households and firms, and explicitly examine the potential global implications of AI technology integration across different economic regions and systems. Explicit empirical investigations using advanced econometric algorithms and randomized controlled trials (RCTs) would further reinforce the robustness of our theoretical insights.

In conclusion, this research explicitly highlights that AI technology has profound implications for economic growth and social welfare. Explicit integration of AI into economic frameworks offers promising solutions to contemporary economic challenges, such as declining fertility rates, stagnation in productivity, and market mismatches. Explicit and informed policy making will thus be essential in harnessing the full potential of AI to create more sustainable, equitable, and prosperous economies.

—

References

- Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2019). Artificial Intelligence, Automation, and Work (NBER Working Paper No. 24196). National Bureau of Economic Research.

- Aghion, P., & Howitt, P. (1992). A Model of Growth Through Creative Destruction. *Econometrica*, 60(2), 323-351.

- Diamond, P. A. (1965). National Debt in a Neoclassical Growth Model. *The American Economic Review*, 55(5), 1126-1150.

- Jones, C. I. (1995). R&D-Based Models of Economic Growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 103(4), 759-784.

Jones, C. I. & Romer, P. M. (2010). The New Kaldor Facts: Ideas, Institutions, Population, and Human Capital. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 2(1), 224-245.

- Kuznets, S. (1934). National Income, 1929-1932. *Senate Document No. 124*, 73rd US Congress.

- Narita, Y. (2021). Algorithmic Matching and Market Design. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 35(2), 87-106.

- Romer, P. M. (1986). Increasing returns and long-term growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 94(5), 1002-1037.

- Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous Technological Change. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), S71-S102.

- Solow, R. M. (1956). A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 70(1), 65-94.

- Narita, Y. (2023). Randomized Controlled Trials in Economics and Beyond *Econometrica*, 91(1), 273-302.

- Narita, Y. (2023). Welfare implications of Algorithmic Pricing. *American Economic Review: Insights*, 5(1), 21-38.

- Miyake, Y. (2024). Artificial Intelligence, Fertility, and Economic Growth: Theoretical and Policy Implications. MPRA Discussion Paper Series, University of Munich.

- OECD (2022). OECD Economic Surveys: Japan 2022. OECD Publishing, Paris.