The Basket Residue Theory (BRT)

Leonard Karshima Shilgba

Department of Computing Sciences, Faculty of Science, Admiralty University of Nigeria

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.110200015

Received: 12 December 2025; Accepted: 18 December 2025; Published: 26 February 2026

ABSTRACT

This paper introduces the Basket Residue Theory (BRT) as a mathematical framework for assessing the real purchasing power of money, prosperity levels, poverty dynamics, and indirect wealth transfers in an economy. The model builds on variations in the prices of a representative basket of goods and services, offering a quantitative measure of real value erosion or enhancement over time. BRT extends beyond conventional inflation indices by integrating fiscal and monetary interactions into the valuation residue concept.

Keywords: Basket Residue Theory, Purchasing Power, Inflation, Prosperity Index, Poverty Dynamic, National Economic Balance.

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Background. Conventional economic measures of inflation and cost of living, such as the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and Purchasing Power Parity (PPP), evaluate how prices of a representative basket of goods and services evolve over time. However, these indices often fail to directly quantify residual purchasing power—that is, the portion of the consumer's fixed nominal expenditure that loses or gains real value as macroeconomic variables fluctuate.

Related Works

- Fisher (1911) introduced the concept of the real value of money through his equation of exchange $MV = PT$, relating money supply to the price level and transaction volume.
- Keynes (1936) explored how expectations and interest rates affect consumption and investment.
- Samuelson and Nordhaus (2010) refined cost-of-living indices but maintained a focus on aggregate price movements.
- Piketty (2014) examined wealth accumulation and inequality but without a dynamic residue framework.
- Blanchard (2017) and Mishkin (2019) addressed the effects of fiscal and monetary policies on real income and consumption.

Distinction of the Basket Residue Theory (BRT). Unlike existing models, BRT:

(1) Treats residual purchasing capacity (R_t) as a quantifiable function of nominal expenditure (A) and dynamic prices $P_i(t)$.

(2) Integrates monetary and fiscal policy effects into a unified mathematical framework.

(3) Enables computation of prosperity indices, poverty trajectories, and implicit wealth transfers through changes in the basket residue.

Model Formulation And Derived Economic Measures

Let a representative consumer allocate a fixed nominal expenditure A_t each year to purchase from a basket containing n goods and services. The price of each item i at time t is $p_i(t)$, and the quantity purchased is $q_i(t)$.

The total value of purchases in year t is

$$C_t = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i(t)q_i(t) \leq A_t \tag{1}$$

(Note: It is possible to have: $C_t > A_t$, suggesting deficit in wellbeing, which is a motivation of this work).

The Basket Residue (R_t) is defined as

$$R_t = A_t - C_t = A_t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i(t)q_i(t) \tag{2}$$

To express residue relative to base-year basket cost, we define

$$R_t^{(real)} = \frac{A_t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i(t)q_i(t)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i(0)q_i(0)} \tag{3}$$

Subscript 0 denotes the base period.

We will work primarily with the simplified fixed-basket case where $q_i(t) = b_i$ and

$A_t \equiv A$ is constant unless stated otherwise. In that case

$$R_t^{(real)} = (A - C_t)/C_0$$

The rate of real value erosion is

$$E_t = 1 - \frac{R_t^{(real)}}{R_{t-1}^{(real)}} \tag{4}$$

Next, we provide concise mathematical derivations and proofs for four central measures introduced in the Basket Residue Theory (BRT): (i) the Prosperity Index Π_t, (ii) Poverty Dynamics Φ_t, (iii) Indirect Wealth Transfer Ω_t, and (iv) the National Economic Balance B_t. The proofs are based on the basic definitions of the reference basket cost C_t, nominal entitlement A_t, and individual nominal wages W_t^j. We also clarify the meaning and role of the variable m used in aggregation in Equation (11).

Prosperity Index Π_t:

Definition

The Prosperity Index is defined as

$$\Pi_t = \frac{R_t^{(real)}}{A_t} \tag{5}$$

Properties and derivation of Π_t:

If $R_t^{(real)}$ is given by equation (3) and $A_t > 0$, then it is not difficult to see that

$$\Pi_t = \frac{A_t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i(t)q_i(t)}{A_t \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i(0)q_i(0)} \tag{6}$$

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue II February 2026

In the fixed-basket, fixed-A case, this simplifies to

$$\Pi_t = \frac{A - C_t}{A C_0}$$

Remarks

Interpretation: Π_t measures the real residue per unit nominal entitlement; positive values indicate surplus (ability to buy more than base scaled), negative values indicate shortfall relative to base.

Poverty Dynamics Φ_t :

Definition

Define Poverty Dynamics as

$$\Phi_t = 1 - \Pi_t. \tag{7}$$

Algebraic relation and dynamics

Given Π_t as in (5), we have

$$\Phi_t = 1 - \frac{R_t^{(real)}}{A_t} = \frac{A_t \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i(0)q_i(0) - \left(A_t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i(t)q_i(t)\right)}{A_t \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i(0)q_i(0)} \tag{8}$$

In the fixed-basket, fixed-A case, this reduces to

$$\Phi_t = 1 - \frac{A - C_t}{A C_0} = \frac{AC_0 - (A - C_t)}{A C_0}$$

which after simplification shows the direct dependence of Φ_t on C_t.

Indirect Wealth Transfer Ω_t:

We now consider an agent (public employee) with nominal wage $W > 0$ that is not adjusted for inflation within the period.

Definition

The real wage at time t is

$$W_t^{(real)} = \frac{W}{P_t^{(index)}} \tag{9}$$

Where $P_t^{(index)}$ is a price index (for example CPI) normalized such that $P_0^{(index)} = 1$.

Then define the Indirect Wealth Transfer

$$\Omega_t = 1 - \frac{W_t^{(real)}}{W} = 1 - \frac{1}{P_t^{(index)}} \tag{10}$$

Interpretation and derivation

If $P_t^{(index)} > 0$, then Ω_t equals the proportionate loss of real wage relative to nominal wage, and it is clear that it can be written as

$$\Omega_t = \frac{W - W_t^{(real)}}{W}$$

Moreover, if $P_t^{(index)} = C_t / C_0$ (i.e. the CPI constructed from the reference basket), then

$$\Omega_t = 1 - \frac{C_0}{C_t}$$

National Economic Balance B_t and the variable m. Let the economy consist of $m \in$ N economic actors (households, representative agents, or institutional units). Each actor $k = 1, \ldots, m$ has a residue $R_{t,k}$ (nominal or real as specified). The National Economic Balance at time t is

$$B_t = \sum_{k=1}^{m} R_{t,k} \qquad (11)$$

Linearity and aggregation

The National Economic Balance B_t aggregates individual residues linearly. Consequently, for any scalar α and residues $R_{t,k}$,

$B_t(\alpha R) = \alpha B_t(R)$.

If residues are real-valued (i.e. measured in currency units), B_t represents the economy-wide net residue (surplus if positive, deficit if negative).

Remarks

The variable m denotes the number of economic units over which aggregation is performed. In micro-analyses, m could be the number of households in a sample; in macro-aggregates, m could be the total number of households in the economy or partitioned groups (e.g., income deciles). Choosing m depends on the desired aggregation level and data availability.

Additional identities. When all agents share identical nominal entitlement A and identical basket cost C_t, we have $R_{t,k} = A - C_t$ for all k, and $B_t = m(A - C_t) = mR_t$.

If agents have heterogeneous nominal incomes A_k, then

$$B_t = \sum_{k=1}^{m} (A_k - C_{t,k})$$

where $C_{t,k}$ may reflect household-specific baskets.

The above derivations show that the BRT measures are algebraically simple consequences of the definitions of basket cost, nominal entitlements, and price indices. The derivations emphasize linearity, normalization, and clear interpretations: prosperity as real residue per unit nominal income, poverty dynamics as its complement, indirect wealth transfer as proportionate erosion of real wages, and national balance as the aggregate of individual residues.

Policy Implications

BRT provides a dynamic tool for policymakers to quantify real value erosion per income group, assess fiscal policy impacts on purchasing capacity, and identify indirect wealth transfers caused by inflationary finance.

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue II February 2026

The theoretical results of this paper provide a basis for designing and evaluating real-world fiscal and social policy instruments under dynamic macroeconomic uncertainty. The evolution of the aggregate surplus, denoted by Φ_t, and the growth-adjusted productivity index, Ω_t, can both serve as quantitative policy indicators in a managed equilibrium framework.

Targeted Income Support through Φ_t. Since Φ_t reflects the distribution-adjusted residual of aggregate output after consumption and entitlement flows, it can be applied in calibrating income support or conditional cash transfer programs. For instance, in economies experiencing cyclical volatility, policymakers may use threshold values of Φ_t to trigger targeted interventions: when Φ_t falls below a pre-defined stability line, automatic transfers or subsidies could be deployed to stabilize real consumption among lower-income groups. Conversely, positive deviations of Φ_t beyond equilibrium could justify a temporary withdrawal or scaling down of such supports to prevent inflationary pressures. This approach integrates distributive justice directly into the dynamic optimization of fiscal instruments.

Public Wage Indexation via Ω_t. The variable Ω_t, interpreted as a normalized measure of systemic productivity or income elasticity, provides a natural guide for public wage and pension indexation. For example, instead of linking public-sector wage increases purely to nominal inflation, governments can adopt a dynamic wage rule:

$$W_t = W_0 (1 + \delta \, \Omega_t),$$

where δ is a responsiveness coefficient derived from long-run productivity expectations. Under this formulation, wage and pension adjustments follow the real economy's performance rather than purely political cycles, enhancing fiscal discipline and public trust.

Broader Applications. Beyond fiscal transfers and wage policy, Φ_t and Ω_t can also inform monetary stabilization strategies and social insurance design. For instance, central banks may integrate Φ_t into real liquidity targeting, while social insurance schemes could peg benefit ratios to the smoothed trajectory of Ω_t to ensure actuarial sustainability.

Ultimately, the analytical framework developed in this paper offers a unified structure for dynamic equilibrium management bridging the micro-foundations of welfare distribution with the macro-prudential governance of growth.

Furthermore, we now explicitly incorporate fiscal policy into the entitlement dynamics through the formulation

$$A_t = Y_t (1 - \tau_t) + G_t,$$

where Y_t denotes national income (or output), τ_t represents the effective tax rate, and G_t stands for net government transfers or expenditures directed toward households.

This formulation embeds fiscal instruments directly into the evolution of nominal entitlement, thereby linking private sector welfare to public finance mechanisms. Specifically, a rise in taxation (τ_t) contracts disposable entitlement by reducing the proportion of income available for private allocation, while an increase in transfers (G_t) expands entitlement through redistributive injections.

Consequently, the basket residue R_t (the real entitlement residual) becomes endogenously sensitive to fiscal policy choices, reflecting how the government's tax-and-transfer operations alter the time path of welfare-adjusted equilibrium. This improvement ensures that fiscal policy is no longer treated as an exogenous disturbance but as an integral control variable within the systems dynamic structure.

Moreover, this integration allows for simulation of counterfactual fiscal scenarios: policymakers can now test how varying τ_t and G_t influence R_t, the aggregate stability measure Φ_t, and the productivity elasticity index Ω_t. This enhances the practical policy interpretability of the model, particularly for designing stabilizing fiscal interventions or automatic adjustment rules.

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue II February 2026

Basket Residue Theory (BRT) – Worked Numerical Examples

We give concrete numerical examples demonstrating the Basket Residue Theory (BRT) measures: basket cost C_t, basket-units purchasable f_t, prosperity index $\Pi_t = \ln f_t$, poverty indicators (threshold-based), indirect wealth transfer Ω_t, per-worker restore amounts, and the national economic balance B_t. All computations use a small simulated dataset over three periods.

Setup and simulated data. We work with a simple representative basket composed of three items: Food, Energy, and Transport. We choose three time periods $t = 0, 1, 2$ (base period $t = 0$), and three representative agents $k = 1, 2, 3$ (so $m = 3$). The basket expenditures (monetary) in each year are

Table 1. Basket component costs (N) by year

Item	$t = 0$	$t = 1$	$t = 2$
Food	40,000	45,000	50,000
Energy	30,000	35,000	40,000
Transport	30,000	30,000	35,000
Total basket cost C_t	100,000	110,000	125,000

We assume three agents with fixed nominal annual incomes (entitlements):

$A_1 = 100{,}000$, $A_2 = 150{,}000$, $A_3 = 300{,}000$.

(These represent a low, middle, and high nominal income household, respectively.)

BRT basic quantities

Basket-units purchasable: $f_t = \frac{A}{C_t}$

This is the number of reference baskets the nominal income buys. Compute $f_{t,k} = \frac{A_k}{C_t}$. The table below shows values (rounded to 6 decimal places where needed).

Table 2. Basket-units $f_{t,k} = \frac{A_k}{C_t}$

Agent k	$f_{0,k}$	$f_{1,k}$	$f_{2,k}$
1 ($A_1 = 100,000$)	1.000000	0.909091	0.800000
2 ($A_2 = 150,000$)	1.500000	1.363636	1.200000
3 ($A_3 = 300,000$)	3.000000	2.727273	2.400000

Prosperity index (log form): $\Pi_{t,k} = \ln f_{t,k}$. This log-transform is additive over time and interpretable as continuous growth rates.

Table 3. Prosperity index $\Pi_{t,k} = \ln f_{t,k}$

Agent k	$\Pi_{0,k}$	$\Pi_{1,k}$	$\Pi_{2,k}$
1	0.000000	-0.095310	-0.223144
2	0.405465	0.310155	0.182322
3	1.098612	1.003600	0.875469

Interpretation. Agent 1's Π becomes negative as inflation erodes purchasing power (falling below 1 basket). Agents 2 and 3 retain Π > 0 (still buy more than one base basket), but Π declines over time indicating deteriorating real position.

Nominal residue and real residue.

Table 4. Nominal residue $R_{t,k}$ (**N**)

Agent k	$R_{0,k}$	$R_{1,k}$	$R_{2,k}$
1	0	-10,000	-25,000
2	50,000	40,000	25,000
3	200,000	190,000	175,000

Nominal residue (currency units): $R_{t,k} = A_k - C_t$.

Real residue (normalized by base basket C_0):

$$R_{t,k}^{(real)} = \frac{A_k \quad C_t}{C_0}$$

Table 5. Real residue $R_{t,k}^{(real)}$ (units of base basket $C_0 = 100{,}000$)

Agent	$R_{0,k}^{(real)}$	$R_{1,k}^{(real)}$	$R_{2,k}^{(real)}$
1	0.00	-0.10	-0.25
2	0.50	0.40	0.25
3	2.00	1.90	1.75

Poverty measures (threshold-based). Choose a poverty threshold of $\theta = 1$ basket-unit (i.e., can the agent buy at least the reference basket). Define *poverty indicator* by

$$I_{t,k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } f_{t,k} < \theta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and *poverty gap* by

$$G_{t,k} = \max(0, \theta - f_{t,k}).$$

Table 6. Poverty indicator $I_{t,k}$ and poverty gap $G_{t,k}$ (for $t = 0$ and $t = 2$)

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue II February 2026

Agent k	$f_{0,k}$	$I_{0,k}$	$G_{0,k}$	$f_{2,k}$	$I_{2,k}$	$G_{2,k}$
1	1.00	0	0.00	0.80	1	0.20
2	1.50	0	0.00	1.20	0	0.00
3	3.00	0	0.00	2.40	0	0.00

Interpretation. Agent 1 becomes "poor" by this threshold in period 2 (cannot buy one reference basket). Agents 2 and 3 remain above the threshold.

Indirect wealth transfer (workers → government) – Ω_t. Define a price index (CPI) from the reference basket:

$$\mathrm{CPI}_t = \frac{C_t}{C_0}.$$

Thus: $\mathrm{CPI}_0 = 1.00$, $\mathrm{CPI}_1 = 1.10$, $\mathrm{CPI}_2 = 1.25$.

The indirect wealth-transfer fraction is

$$\Omega_t = 1 - \frac{1}{\mathrm{CPI}_t}.$$

Compute:

$$\Omega_1 = 1 - \frac{1}{1.10} \approx 0.090909 = 9.09\% \qquad \Omega_2 = 1 - \frac{1}{1.25} = 0.20 = 20\%$$

This fraction represents the proportionate erosion of real wage values (if wages are held fixed in nominal terms) due to inflation from base period 0 to t.

Per-worker nominal *restore* to keep prior real purchasing power. Given a worker paid nominal wage W at time t, the nominal extra required at t+1 to restore prior purchasing power is

$$\mathrm{Restore}_{t\to t+1} = W\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_t} - 1\right).$$

Example: if $W = 100{,}000$, then between $t = 0$ and $t = 1$,

$$\text{Restore} = 100,000\left(\frac{110,000}{100,000} - 1\right) = 100,000 \times 0.10 = 10,000.$$

Between $t = 1$ and $t = 2$,

$$\text{Restore} = 100,000\left(\frac{125,000}{110,000} - 1\right) = 100,000 \times 0.13636 \approx 13,636.$$

National Economic Balance B_t. Aggregate the nominal residues across the $m = 3$ agents:

$$B_t = \sum_{k=1}^{3} R_{t.k}$$

From the nominal residue table:

$B_0 = 0 + 50{,}000 + 200{,}000 = 250{,}000,$

$B_1 = -10{,}000 + 40{,}000 + 190{,}000 = 220{,}000,$

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue II February 2026

$B_2 = -25{,}000 + 25{,}000 + 175{,}000 = 175{,}000.$

Interpretation. The aggregate residue falls over time from 250,000 to 175,000: even though nominal incomes are unchanged in this example, rising basket costs shrink the economy-wide residue (aggregate leftover after buying the reference basket), indicating a net erosion of aggregate surplus relative to the reference basket.

Short commentary and policy takeaways.

- The basket-units $f_{t,k}$ give an intuitive, direct measure of how many base baskets each nominal income buys; they are immediately interpretable (1 means just one basket).
- The prosperity index $\Pi_t = \ln f_t$ is useful because differences in Π are interpretable as continuous proportional changes.
- Poverty thresholds expressed in basket-units are easy to compute and interpret: they show which agents fall below a living-basket threshold and by how much (poverty gap).
- Ω_t (derived from the CPI) quantifies the fractional real loss from fixed nominal wages— an important summary for policymakers concerned with indexation, pensions, and public pay.
- The national balance B_t aggregates micro residues and gives a macro snapshot of how much "surplus" remains once each household attempts to purchase the reference basket.

Table 7. Key numeric summary (selected values)

	C_t	CPI_t	Ω_t	B_t(N)
$t = 0$	100,000	1.000	0.000	250,000
$t = 1$	110,000	1.100	0.0909	220,000
$t = 2$	125,000	1.250	0.2000	175,000

Differential Specifications For The Basket Residue Theory (BRT)

Next, we derive differential relations for the Basket Residue R_t in continuous time and propose explicit functional forms $\dot{R}_t = f(\cdot)$ (in particular, see Appendix C) that embed money supply growth μ_t and other macro/price drivers. We present a family of linear and nonlinear specifications, give solvable examples (closed form under constant parameters), and discuss alternative independent variables suitable for estimation and policy interpretation.

Preliminaries and Identity

Recall the basic BRT definitions in continuous time. Let a fixed reference basket have physical quantities $b_i > 0$ for $i = 1,\ldots,n$. Let $p_i(t)$ be the nominal price of good i at time t. Define the basket cost

$$C_t = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i p_i(t).$$

Let A_t be the nominal amount available to a representative agent (this may be constant or time-varying). The nominal basket residue is

$R_t = A_t - C_t.$

Differentiate R_t with respect to time t. Because R_t is the difference of two time-dependent quantities, we have the exact identity

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue II February 2026

$$\dot{R}_t = \dot{A}_t - \dot{C}_t = \dot{A}_t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \dot{p}_i(t). \qquad (12)$$

This identity is algebraic and holds for any specification of A_t and $p_i(t)$. The modeling task is to supply economically plausible specifications for $\dot{A}_t$ and $\dot{p}_i(t)$. In particular, we may wish to make these depend on the money supply growth rate μ_t and other macro variables.

A Canonical Modelling Strategy

The identity (12) suggests modelling in two parts:

(1) a specification for nominal entitlement growth $\dot{A}_t$ (wage growth, pension indexation, transfer adjustments);

(2) a specification for price dynamics $\dot{p}_i(t)$ as a function of μ_t and other drivers (supply shocks, exchange rate, taxes, wage costs).

Thus we write the structural form

$$\dot{R}_t = f\big(A_t,\, p_{1,t}, \ldots, p_{n,t},\, \mu_t,\, x_t\big)$$

where x_t is a vector of other possible drivers (exchange rate e_t, interest rate r_t, productivity shocks, taxes τ_t, etc.).

Below we present useful explicit choices for f, starting from linear forms and moving to multiplicative (nonlinear) forms.

Linear Specification (First Step)

A simple and transparent specification is linear in the fundamental primitives. Suppose we specify

$$\dot{A}_t = \alpha_A(t) \text{ (exogenously given nominal entitlement growth)}, \qquad (13)$$

$$\dot{p}_i(t) = \pi_i \mu_t + \gamma_i p_i(t) + \varepsilon_{i,t}, \quad i = 1,\ldots,n, \qquad (14)$$

where π_i measures the sensitivity of price i to money supply growth μ_t, γ_i captures endogenous inertia or auto-regressive drift of the price (e.g. due to menu costs or sticky adjustment), and $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ is a supply shock / idiosyncratic term.

Substituting into (12) yields the linear model

$$\dot{R}_t = \alpha_A(t) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i\big(\pi_i \mu_t + \gamma_i p_i(t) + \varepsilon_{i,t}\big). \qquad (15)$$

Special case: constant parameters and no shocks. If $\alpha_A(t) = \alpha_A$ (constant), $\varepsilon_{i,t} = 0$, and $\mu_t = \mu$ is constant, then

$$\dot{R}_t = \alpha_A - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i\big(\pi_i \mu + \gamma_i p_i(t)\big)$$

If prices themselves follow $\dot{p}_i(t) = \gamma_i p_i(t) + \pi_i \mu$ (an inhomogeneous linear ODE), it has solution

$$p_i(t) = e^{\gamma_i t}\Big(p_i(0) + \int_0^t e^{-\gamma_i s}\pi_i \mu \, ds\Big) = e^{\gamma_i t} p_i(0) + \frac{\pi_i \mu}{\gamma_i}\big(e^{\gamma_i t} - 1\big)$$

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue II February 2026

when $\gamma_i \neq 0$. Substitute into $\dot{R}_t$ to obtain a full expression for $\dot{R}_t$ and integrate if desired to get R_t.

Even simpler tractable case. If we further take $\gamma_i = 0$ (no price inertia) and $\alpha_A = 0$ (fixed nominal entitlement A), then

$$\dot{R}_t = -\mu \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \pi_i$$

This integrates to

$$R_t = R_0 - \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \pi_i\Big) \mu\, t,$$

a linear decline (or increase if the bracket value is negative) of residue in time.

Affine (matrix) form: compact notation. Write $\boldsymbol{p}_t = (p_{1,t}, \ldots, p_{n,t})^{\mathrm{T}}$, $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_n)^{\mathrm{T}}$, $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_n)^{\mathrm{T}}$,

$\boldsymbol{\gamma}$= diag($\gamma_1,\ldots,\gamma_n$), and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t} = (\varepsilon_{1,t}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{n,t})^{\mathrm{T}}$. Then (14) and (15) can be written, respectively, as

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{p}}_t = \boldsymbol{\pi}\mu_t + \boldsymbol{\gamma p_t} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t},$$

and

$$\dot{R}_t = \alpha_A(t) - \mathbf{b}^{\mathrm{T}}(\boldsymbol{\pi}\mu_t + \boldsymbol{\gamma p_t} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon_t}).$$

This succinctly shows that the gradient of R_t with respect to time is the difference between entitlement growth and a linear functional of price dynamics.

Nonlinear / multiplicative specifications. Linear models are simple but may miss saturation, interaction, and multiplicative effects. Here are some useful alternatives.

Proportional (multiplicative) model. Suppose prices respond proportionally to money growth and to current prices:

$$\dot{p}_i(t) = \pi_i \mu_t p_i(t) + \varepsilon_{i,t}.$$

Then

$$\dot{R}_t = \dot{A}_t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \big(\pi_i \mu_t p_i(t) + \varepsilon_{i,t}\big)$$

This specification captures situations where money growth scales the rate of price inflation multiplicatively; it is consistent with models where inflation rate is proportional to money growth.

CobbDouglas style interaction term. A flexible nonlinear form is

$$\dot{p}_i(t) = \kappa_i p_i(t)^{\beta_i} {\mu_t}^{\delta_i} + \varepsilon_{i,t}$$

with $\beta_i, \delta_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\dot{R}_t = \dot{A}_t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \big(\kappa_i p_i(t)^{\beta_i} {\mu_t}^{\delta_i} + \varepsilon i, t\big).$$

This can model, for instance, diminishing returns in price pass-through ($0 < \beta_i < 1$) or nonlinear sensitivity to money growth.

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue II February 2026

Log-linear (useful for estimation). Take logs and model the inflation rate $\pi_{i,t} = \frac{\dot{p}_i}{p_i}$ as $\pi_{i,t} = \tilde{\pi}_i \mu_t + \tilde{\gamma}_i + \tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,t}$.

Then

$\dot{p}_i = p_i(\tilde{\pi}_i \mu_t + \tilde{\gamma}_i) + p_i \tilde{\varepsilon}_{i,t}$,

and $\dot{R}_t$ follows directly via (12).

Alternative independent variables for *f*. Money growth μ_t is natural; other variables we may include:

- e_t: exchange rate (if many goods are imported, $p_{i,t}$ is sensitive to e_t);
- r_t: nominal interest rate (affects exchange, import costs, financing costs);
- g_t: real output growth / productivity shocks (supply side);
- τ_t: taxes/subsidies on specific goods;
- W_t: nominal wage growth (feeds back into costs and hence $p_{i,t}$);
- V_t: velocity of money (in QTM), since $\mu_t \cdot V_t$ enters price pressure;
- $\sigma_{i,t}$: volatility indexes or uncertainty measures (affects risk premia and markups).

A general model could be

$\dot{p}_i(t) = g_i\big(p_{i,t}, \mu_t, e_t, r_t, W_t, V_t, \tau_t, \xi_{i,t}\big)$,

and thus

$$\dot{R}_t = \dot{A}_t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i g_i(\cdot).$$

Example: Linear Dynamic Model With Constant Parameters (Closed Form)

Consider the tractable system:

$\dot{A}_t = \alpha_A, \qquad \dot{p}_i = \gamma_i p_i + \pi_i \mu, \qquad \mu_t \equiv \mu$ (constant), $\qquad \varepsilon_{i,t} = 0.$

Solution for price i (as previously) is

$p_i(t) = e^{\gamma_i t} p_i(0) + \frac{\pi_i \mu}{\gamma_i}\big(e^{\gamma_i t} - 1\big) \quad (\gamma_i \neq 0)$

and therefore

$$C_t = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i p_i(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i e^{\gamma_i t} p_i(0) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \frac{\pi_i \mu}{\gamma_i}\big(e^{\gamma_i t} - 1\big)$$

Furthermore, since

$$\dot{R}_t = \dot{A}_t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \dot{p}_i(t),$$

integrating both sides over the interval $[0, t]$ yields

$$R_t = R_0 + \alpha_A t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i p_i(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i p_i(0).$$

Hence the residue is

$$R_t = R_0 + \alpha_A t - \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \frac{\pi_i \mu}{\gamma_i}(e^{\gamma_i t} - 1) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i p_i(0)(1 - e^{\gamma_i t}).$$

This expression is explicit and can be used to compute asymptotics. If $\gamma_i < 0$ (mean reversion of prices), the exponential terms decay and so residue is asymptotically linear (i.e., the long run residue is linear) in t with slope α_A. If $\gamma_i > 0$ (explosive prices), residue decays rapidly.

Identification and Estimation Notes

- **Interpretation of π_i.** In the linear model $\dot{p}_i = \pi_i \mu_t + \gamma_i p_i(t) + \varepsilon_{i,t}$, $i = 1,...,n$, π_i is the pass-through coefficient of money growth onto the $\dot{p}_i$. Estimate by regressing observed inflation of good i on observed μ_t and lags of p_i.
- **Endogeneity.** Money growth may be endogenous to inflation expectations or output; we may use Implied Volatility (IV) (e.g., monetary policy shocks, or central bank exogenous targets) or structural identification.
- **Data for b_i.** We use CPI basket weights or household survey quantities for b_i. For heterogeneous households, b_i becomes household specific—b_i^j.
- **Model selection.** We start with log-linear inflation regressions, then test for multiplicative effects (interactions), and check robustness to including exchange rate and wage growth.

CONCLUSION

The Basket Residue Theory formalizes the concept of real purchasing capacity as a measurable economic residue, offering a new lens for examining prosperity, poverty, and wealth redistribution. The algebraic identity

$$\dot{R}_t = \dot{A}_t - \sum b_i \dot{p}_i$$

is the anchor: every proposed specification simply models the right-hand ingredients. Linear specifications give transparency and closed forms; multiplicative or CobbDouglas forms capture nonlinear pass-through and saturation. For empirical work, we can begin with log-linear inflation regressions to obtain pass-through coefficients, then simulate residue trajectories under policy scenarios. Additionally, it is noteworthy that a parsimonious form that is both compact and estimable could be used for specification. For instance,

$$\dot{R}_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \dot{A}_t - \beta_1 \mu_t - \beta_2 \Delta e_t - \beta_3 W_t - \varepsilon_t,$$

where Δe_t is change in exchange rate and W_t is wage growth, maps directly to policy variables and is easy to estimate.

Appendix A. Numerical Illustration

This appendix provides a semi-realistic five-year dataset to demonstrate the computational behavior of the Basket Residue Theory (BRT) under varying price and monetary conditions. Here, the annual nominal entitlement is set at $A = 100{,}000$ USD. Setting Average Basket Price Index =ABPI; Real Basket Residue=RBR; Money Supply Growth=MSG; and Prosperity Index=PI, consider the table below.

Table 8. Five-Year Dataset for Basket Residue Computation

Year	ABPI	RBR	MSG (μ_t)	PI (Π_t)
1	1.00	100,000	5 %	1.000
2	1.08	92,593	6 %	0.926
3	1.15	86,957	7 %	0.870
4	1.22	81,967	8 %	0.820
5	1.35	74,074	10 %	0.741

The simulated trend shows a continuous decline in real basket residue, suggesting progressive erosion in the real purchasing power of fixed entitlements under inflationary pressure.

Appendix B. Model Limitations and Future Extensions

The present BRT model assumes a fixed nominal entitlement $A_t = A$, but in practical economies, entitlements may evolve dynamically. A promising extension replaces constant A with a time-dependent exponential growth function:

$$A_t = A_0 e^{kt}, \tag{16}$$

where A_0 is the base entitlement and k is the nominal growth rate in income or expenditure capacity.

Future research could also consider:

(1) Introducing substitution effects among goods when relative prices change.

(2) Integrating fiscal feedbacks, such as progressive taxation and subsidy effects, into A_t.

(3) Applying BRT measures across income deciles to quantify differential welfare impacts.

Appendix C. Analytical Cross-Reference

As established in Section 5 of the main text—Differential Specifications for the Basket Residue Theory—the derivative relationship is given by:

$$\frac{dR_t}{dt} = f(A_t, P_i, \mu_t) = -A_t \frac{dP_t}{dt} + P_t \frac{dA_t}{dt} - g(\mu_t) \tag{17}$$

which links directly to the prosperity and poverty dynamics equations. When $A_t = A_0 e^{kt}$, we obtain the adjusted growth sensitivity:

$$\frac{dR_t}{dt} = A_0 e^{kt} \left(kP_t - \frac{dP_t}{dt} \right) - g(\mu_t) \tag{18}$$

This formulation demonstrates the competing effects of income growth and inflationary dynamics on real economic well-being.

Appendix D. Simulation Summary

To visualize the long-run impact, a simulated projection of R_t over 10 years using the exponential income growth function $A_t = A_0 e^{0.05t}$ reveals that unless nominal entitlements grow faster than the price index, real purchasing

ISSN No. 2454-6194 | DOI: 10.51584/IJRIAS |Volume XI Issue II February 2026

power continues to decline. The outcome reinforces BRTs potential as a diagnostic tool for policy calibration and wage indexation frameworks.

The residue R_t represents unrealized purchasing potential. It is a monetary shadow: in practice, it may be unavailable for consumption because price increases absorb nominal entitlements. Put colloquially, the Basket Residue Theory (BRT) measures the erosion of entitlement by the residue of goods and services in the representative basket that the agent no longer affords. The smaller R_t is, the more the residue of goods and services in the representative basket of goods and services that the agent cannot afford.

REFERENCES

1. Fisher, I. (1911). The Purchasing Power of Money. Macmillan.
2. Keynes, J. M. (1936). The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money. Macmillan.
3. Samuelson, P. A., & Nordhaus, W. D. (2010). Economics. McGraw-Hill.
4. Piketty, T. (2014). Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Harvard University Press.
5. Blanchard, O. (2017). Macroeconomics. Pearson.
6. Mishkin, F. S. (2019). The Economics of Money, Banking, and Financial Markets. Pearson.