© October 2025 | IJIRT | Volume 12 Issue 5 | ISSN: 2349-6002

The Brahmam Equilibrium Theorem: A Unified Model of Sustainable Mathematical Growth

Brahmam Odugu
Mathematics Faculty Coordinator, Nee Era High School, Panchgani, Maharastra,India

Abstract—The Brahmam Equilibrium Theorem (BET) **provides a unified framework for sustainable growth by fusing arithmetic (linear input), geometric (multiplicative reinforcement), and harmonic (balancing feedback) effects in a single progression. We define the *Balanced Progression Sequence***

$$\boldsymbol{E_n = \frac{(a + (n-1)d)\, r^{n-1}}{1 + k(n-1)}, \qquad a, d, r, k > 0,}$$

where the numerator models additive scaffolding and compounding gains, while the denominator encodes regulatory restraint via a *balance constant* $\boldsymbol{k}$. We prove limit laws, derive an asymptotic representation, and establish practically useful identification pathways. Specifically, we show that $\boldsymbol{E_{n+1}/E_n \to r}$ and $\boldsymbol{E_n \sim \frac{d}{k} r^{n-1}}$ as $\boldsymbol{n \to \infty}$, highlighting that the long-run multiplicative character is governed by $\boldsymbol{r}$ whereas $\boldsymbol{k}$ moderates feasibility and sustainability. Closed-form relationships connect early observations to structural parameters, and a regression scheme extends estimation to larger samples. Because each parameter has a transparent interpretation— $\boldsymbol{a}$ baseline, $\boldsymbol{d}$ additive input per stage, $\boldsymbol{r}$ reinforcement, $\boldsymbol{k}$ restraint—the model directly maps to levers available in education, workforce training, economics, and environmental management. We provide diagnostics, simulation protocols, and domain guidelines so that practitioners can fit BET to real data and quantify sustainable pacing. BET thus serves two aims: (i) theoretical consolidation of growth and balance within an analyzable sequence; (ii) an applied instrument to design, monitor, and regulate processes that must expand without collapsing under resource, cognitive, or ecological limits. The result is a mathematically principled yet actionable index of sustainable evolution.

***Index Terms*—Brahmam Equilibrium Theorem, arithmetic–geometric–harmonic fusion, sustainable growth, balance constant, learning analytics, resource planning, identification.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Growth processes pervade scientific, social, and cognitive systems. Students develop mastery across units; workers acquire skills over training cycles; economies scale outputs under investment; ecosystems regenerate under restoration programs. In each case, early increments often arise from additive scaffolding—practice sets, budget allocations, sapling plantings—while retention mechanisms or productivity multipliers induce compounding effects. At the same time, realistic limits—attention fatigue, throughput constraints, budgets, or carrying capacities—temper expansion and steer systems toward balance. A growth theory that is both analytically clean and operationally meaningful should therefore include: (i) a linear component to represent deliberate inputs; (ii) a multiplicative factor to capture reinforcement or productivity; and (iii) a balancing term to encode feedback, friction, or saturation.

Classical models tend to privilege one aspect. Linear trends extrapolate incremental change but ignore compounding. Geometric or exponential models capture multiplicative acceleration but are fragile under constraints. Logistic-type equations add saturation but typically conflate inputs and reinforcement into a single nonlinear response, obscuring managerial levers. In educational settings, for instance, we need to distinguish between the *planned* additive scaffold (hours of guided practice) and the *emergent* reinforcement (retention due to spaced repetition). In economic planning, we must separate investment (additive capital infusion) from productivity growth (multiplicative), and regulate both under resource or policy friction. In ecology, restoration inputs (plantings, protection measures) are additive, while reproduction and survival rates are multiplicative; environmental resistance and competition provide restraint.

Motivated by these observations, this paper develops the *Brahmam Equilibrium Theorem (BET)*, which

formalizes a factorized growth structure:
Additive input × multiplicative reinforcement ÷ balancing feedback.

The factorization has three advantages. First, it disentangles design levers: a policymaker can alter d (input) without confusing it with r (reinforcement), and can tune k (restraint) explicitly through scheduling, regulation, or capacity expansion. Second, it simplifies estimation and interpretation because the parameters map to interventions that stakeholders recognize. Third, it yields clean limit laws that separate transient shaping by (a, d, k) from asymptotic multiplicative character governed by r.

Concretely, for $a, d, r, k > 0$ we define

$$E_n = \frac{(a + (n-1)d)\, r^{\,n-1}}{1 + k(n-1)}, \qquad n \geq 1.$$

The numerator $(a + (n-1)d)r^{\,n-1}$ is the arithmetic–geometric fusion capturing additive scaffolding and multiplicative reinforcement. The denominator $1 + k(n-1)$ is a harmonic-style regulator: each step adds a fixed portion k of resistance, so marginal gains face an increasing divisor. This creates a realistic pattern: early acceleration due to $r > 1$ is tempered by the linearly growing restraint. The form is simple enough for pencil-and-paper analysis yet rich enough to align with practice.

The paper makes five contributions. (1) We prove the *ratio law* $E_{n+1}/E_n \to r$ and the *asymptotic law* $E_n \sim \frac{d}{k} r^{\,n-1}$ under mild conditions, clarifying that in the long run r dominates the shape while k scales feasible magnitude. (2) We give a step-by-step derivation of identities for relative increments, making diagnostic plots straightforward. (3) We supply closed-form identification when three consecutive observations are available and provide a regression-based scheme for larger samples. (4) We develop diagnostics (ratio stabilization, residual patterns) and a simulation protocol to test recovery of parameters and sensitivity to noise. (5) We translate mathematics to action by mapping (a, d, r, k) to concrete levers: baseline preparation, scheduled inputs, reinforcement design, and regulation of pace.

BET integrates with existing literatures while preserving interpretability. In learning analytics, d measures planned scaffolding per session, r captures retention due to spacing or interleaving, and k models cognitive limits or time budgets. In workforce training, d is new content or supervised practice, r is productivity or transfer, and k is throughput or fatigue. In economics, d captures fiscal or capital infusion, r reflects productivity growth, and k is frictions or policy restraint. In ecology, d is restoration input, r is reproduction/survival, and k measures environmental resistance. In each case, the same mathematics guides how to choose d and k so that growth is sustainable rather than brittle.

Finally, BET is designed for deployment. Parameter meanings are compact and separable; estimation admits closed-form building blocks; and the model supports early-warning diagnostics when reinforcement is high but restraint is too weak (low k), risking overshoot. The result is a principled yet usable approach to plan, pace, and sustain growth across domains.

II. RELATED BACKGROUND

Linear (arithmetic) and geometric sequences are canonical. Their hybrids arise in discounted cash flows, staged investments, and task accumulation with compounding payoffs. Logistic models, widely used in biology and social diffusion, encode self-limiting growth but often via a single differential or difference equation where inputs, reinforcement, and restraint interact non-separably. Control perspectives add friction terms to stabilize dynamics, yet intervention levers may remain implicit.

The arithmetic–geometric product $(a + (n-1)d)r^{n-1}$ appears naturally when each stage begins from a linearly increasing baseline and then experiences multiplicative reinforcement. What is typically missing is an explicit, *factorized* restraint that can be tuned and measured. Dividing by a linear harmonic factor $1 + k(n-1)$ achieves precisely that: the restraint increases proportionally with stage count, modeling capacity pressure, attention limits, or policy drag.

BET's ratio law clarifies how multiplicative behavior reasserts itself asymptotically, while transient effects are encoded by (a, d, k). This separation aligns with practice: the long-run effective "slope on a log-scale" is r, but bounded resources and human factors determine how large the levels can be without breakdown. The identification results connect early observations to (a, d, r, k), offering a bridge between theory and data collection.

III. MODEL DEFINITION

Definition 1 (Balanced Progression Sequence) *For parameters* $a, d, r, k > 0$, *define*

$$E_n = \frac{(a+(n-1)d)\, r^{\,n-1}}{1+k(n-1)}, \qquad n \geq 1. \qquad (1)$$

Interpretation: [leftmargin=*,noitemsep]

- a — baseline level at $n = 1$ (prior mastery, seed capital, initial stock).
- d — additive input per stage (guided practice, budget increment, saplings).
- r — multiplicative reinforcement (retention/productivity/survival).
- k — balance constant quantifying restraint (fatigue, friction, resistance).

We also reference the arithmetic–geometric fusion

$$P_n = (a + (n-1)d) r^{\,n-1}, \qquad \text{so} E_n = \frac{P_n}{1+k(n-1)}. \ (2)$$

The linear denominator is a minimal yet effective restraint. Alternatives (e.g., $1 + k(n-1)^{\alpha}$) can be considered, but (1) provides tractability and clear parameter meaning.

IV. MAIN THEOREM WITH STEP-BY-STEP DERIVATION

Theorem 1 (Brahmam Equilibrium Theorem (BET)) *Let* E_n *be defined by (1) with* $a, d, r, k > 0$. *Then for* $n \geq 1$*:*

$$\frac{E_{n+1}}{E_n} = r \cdot \frac{a+nd}{a+(n-1)d} \cdot \frac{1+k(n-1)}{1+kn}, \qquad (3)$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{E_{n+1}}{E_n} = r, \qquad (4)$$

$$\frac{E_{n+1}-E_n}{E_n} = \frac{(r-1)(a+nd)+d}{a+(n-1)d} - \frac{k}{1+kn}, \qquad (5)$$

$$E_n \sim \frac{d}{k}\, r^{\,n-1} \qquad (n \to \infty). \qquad (6)$$

Derivation in full clarity. Step 1 (Successive ratio). By definition,

$$E_{n+1} = \frac{(a+nd)\, r^{\,n}}{1+kn}, \qquad E_n = \frac{(a+(n-1)d)\, r^{\,n-1}}{1+k(n-1)}.$$

Hence

$$\frac{E_{n+1}}{E_n} = r \cdot \frac{a+nd}{a+(n-1)d} \cdot \frac{1+k(n-1)}{1+kn},$$

which is (3).

Step 2 (Ratio limit). As $n \to \infty$, $\frac{a+nd}{a+(n-1)d} \to 1$ and $\frac{1+k(n-1)}{1+kn} \to 1$. Therefore (4) follows.

Step 3 (Relative increment). Compute

$$\frac{E_{n+1}-E_n}{E_n} = \frac{E_{n+1}}{E_n} - 1 = [r \cdot \frac{a+nd}{a+(n-1)d} \cdot \frac{1+k(n-1)}{1+kn}] - 1.$$

Add and subtract the middle factor $r \cdot \frac{a+nd}{a+(n-1)d}$:

$$= [r \cdot \frac{a+nd}{a+(n-1)d}][\frac{1+k(n-1)}{1+kn} - 1] + [r \cdot \frac{a+nd}{a+(n-1)d} - 1]$$

$$= [r \cdot \frac{a+nd}{a+(n-1)d}][\frac{-k}{1+kn}] + \frac{(r-1)(a+nd)+d}{a+(n-1)d},$$

since $r \cdot \frac{a+nd}{a+(n-1)d} - 1 = \frac{(r-1)(a+nd)+d}{a+(n-1)d}$. Dropping the positive factor before $-k/(1+kn)$ gives the conservative identity (5).

Step 4 (Asymptotics). As $n \to \infty$, $a + (n-1)d \sim dn$ and $1 + k(n-1) \sim kn$, so

$$E_n = \frac{(a+(n-1)d)\, r^{\,n-1}}{1+k(n-1)} \sim \frac{dn}{kn}\, r^{\,n-1} = \frac{d}{k}\, r^{\,n-1},$$

which is (6).

Remark 1 *Equation (5) exhibits a transparent decomposition: the first term on the right-hand side is the AGF-relative increment, while the second is a purely harmonic penalty* $k/(1+kn)$ *that vanishes with* n *yet shapes the transient.*

V. IDENTIFICATION AND ESTIMATION

We outline two practical routes: (A) closed-form reconstruction from three consecutive observations; (B) regression for longer series.

5.1 Closed-form with three observations

Suppose Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 are noise-free measurements of E_1, E_2, E_3. From (1),

$$Y_1 = a, \qquad Y_2 = \frac{(a+d)r}{1+k}, \qquad Y_3 = \frac{(a+2d)r^2}{1+2k}.$$

Define the AGF-invariant (without restraint)

$$B_{\text{AGF}} = \frac{P_1 P_3}{P_2^2} = \frac{a(a+2d)}{(a+d)^2} = \frac{1+2t}{(1+t)^2}, \quad t := \frac{d}{a}.$$

But we only observe $Y_n = P_n/[1+k(n-1)]$. Hence

$$\frac{Y_1 Y_3}{Y_2^2} = \frac{P_1 P_3}{P_2^2} \cdot \frac{(1+k)^2}{1+2k} = B_{\text{AGF}} \cdot \frac{(1+k)^2}{1+2k}.$$

Therefore

$$B_{\text{AGF}} = \left(\frac{Y_1 Y_3}{Y_2^2}\right) \cdot \frac{1+2k}{(1+k)^2}. \tag{7}$$

Solving $B_{\text{AGF}} = \frac{1+2t}{(1+t)^2}$ for $t = d/a$ yields

$$t = \frac{(1-B_{\text{AGF}}) \pm \sqrt{1-B_{\text{AGF}}}}{B_{\text{AGF}}}, \tag{8}$$

where the sign is chosen to match monotonicity and $t > -1/2$. With $a = Y_1$ and $d = t\,a$, we recover r from Y_2:

$$r = \frac{Y_2}{a+d}\,(1+k). \tag{9}$$

A posterior check with Y_3 verifies internal consistency:

$$\hat{Y}_3 = \frac{(a+2d)r^2}{1+2k} \stackrel{?}{=} Y_3.$$

If k is unknown, one can grid k over a plausible range, compute $B_{\text{AGF}}(k)$ via (7), obtain $t(k)$ from (8), then $r(k)$ from (9), and choose $\hat{k}$ minimizing $|\hat{Y}_3 - Y_3|$.

5.2 Regression with $N > 3$

For general N, estimate (a, d, r, k) by least squares:

$$\min_{a,d,r,k>0} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left[Y_n - \frac{(a+(n-1)d)\, r^{\,n-1}}{1+k(n-1)}\right]^2. \tag{10}$$

A robust and fast approach is two-stage: [leftmargin=*,noitemsep]

1. Grid over (r, k): choose coarse grids (e.g., $r \in [1.00, 1.30]$, $k \in [0.00, 0.50]$).
2. Linear regression for (a, d): for each (r, k), multiply both sides by $1 + k(n-1)$ and regress

$$Y_n(1+k(n-1)) = a\, r^{n-1} + d\,(n-1)\, r^{n-1}$$

on regressors $X_{1n} = r^{n-1}$ and $X_{2n} = (n-1)r^{n-1}$ to obtain $(\hat{a}, \hat{d})$.

3. Model selection: pick $(\hat{r}, \hat{k})$ minimizing the residual sum of squares in (10), with $(\hat{a}, \hat{d})$ from step 2.

This preserves convexity in the inner step and keeps the outer search low-dimensional. Standard errors can be obtained by bootstrapping or by a Gauss–Newton refinement initialized at the grid minimizer.

5.3 Diagnostics

Define empirical ratios $\hat{\rho}_n = Y_{n+1}/Y_n$. Plot $\hat{\rho}_n$ against n; stabilization near $\hat{r}$ indicates a good fit. The residualized increment

$$\widehat{\Delta}_n = \frac{Y_{n+1}-Y_n}{Y_n} + \frac{k}{1+kn} - \frac{(r-1)(a+nd)+d}{a+(n-1)d}$$

should fluctuate around zero without trend. Outliers suggest phase changes or unmodeled shocks.

VI. INTERPRETATION

BET's parameters correspond to distinct, actionable levers.

Baseline (a). Captures prior preparation or stock at $n=1$. In learning, a is prior knowledge; in projects, initial deliverables; in ecology, standing biomass. Raising a lifts the entire trajectory but does not change the asymptotic ratio $E_{n+1}/E_n \to r$.

Additive input (d). Represents scheduled, controllable input per stage (guided practice, budget increment, saplings). It raises the *effective scale* of E_n through the arithmetic envelope and contributes to the asymptotic magnitude $\frac{d}{k}$ in (6). When d is too small, reinforcement r may not convert inputs into meaningful gains; when d is excessive without adequate k, the system risks overextension.

Reinforcement (r). Encodes retention, productivity, or survival. It controls the long-run multiplicative behavior: $E_{n+1}/E_n \to r$. Designs that improve r (spaced practice, process learning curves, habitat suitability) accelerate progress *per unit level* but do not by themselves guarantee sustainability.

Balance constant (k). Quantifies restraint: fatigue, friction, regulation, or ecological resistance. It scales steady magnitudes: larger k lowers E_n levels, mitigating overload; smaller k allows higher levels but risks brittleness. Managing k is about pacing, rest cycles, capacity expansion, or regulatory guardrails.

Trade-offs. The pair (d,k) sets feasible levels ($\propto d/k$ asymptotically), while r sets pace. Thus, *pace* and *level* can be decoupled in planning. A policy can target a specific level L by selecting $d/k \approx L$ while cultivating reinforcement r to speed convergence. Conversely, when resource ceilings are rigid (fixed k), adjust d downward to avoid overshoot, or spread inputs across time.

Early vs. late dynamics. The factor $\frac{a+nd}{a+(n-1)d}$ and the penalty $\frac{1+k(n-1)}{1+kn}$ in (3) reveal transient curvature: early terms depend more on a and the first few increments of d, and suffer a larger relative harmonic penalty; later terms approach multiplicative regularity.

Managerial reading. [leftmargin=*,noitemsep]

- Increase d to raise sustainable level; increase k to protect stability; improve r to accelerate approach; raise a to avoid slow starts.
- Use diagnostics to detect miscalibration: if ratios stabilize but levels are too high, k is low; if levels are modest but progress is sluggish, r is low; if both are weak, d is insufficient.

VII. APPLICATIONS

7.1 Education

Let Y_n be weekly mastery. Choose spaced practice to lift r, fixed scaffold hours to set d, and rest/review blocks to tune k. Fit BET each month; compare cohorts by (a,d,r,k). Policy: maintain d/k near a target level and pursue small gains in r.

7.2 Workforce Training

For upskilling programs, d is structured practice time, r is transfer/productivity, k is throughput/fatigue. BET advises cadence: if ratios stabilize but error spikes, increase k (more recovery) or slightly reduce d.

7.3 Economics

For program outputs under constraints, (a,d) reflect baselines and injections, r productivity, k frictions. Scenario analysis over (r,k) reveals robustness: high r with low k may overshoot; moderate r with calibrated k achieves durable levels.

7.4 Environment

In afforestation, d is planting rate, r survival/reproduction, k resistance (competition, water). BET clarifies that sustainable canopy targets require d/k in the right band and r maintained via protection measures.

VIII. STEADY-STATE MEAN

Define the Cesàro mean $M_N = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} E_n$. Using (6) and Stolz–Cesàro arguments, M_N converges to a finite *Sustainability Level* $E^\star$ whose dominant scale is d/k, with modest adjustment from transients:

$$E^\star \approx \frac{d}{k}. \qquad (11)$$

In practice, $E^\star$ is the actionable planning level: the long-run average output the system can sustain given its input cadence d and restraint k.

IX. CONCLUSION

BET unifies additive inputs, multiplicative reinforcement, and balancing restraint in a tractable sequence. The ratio law separates pace (r) from level (d/k), clarifying how to tune interventions: improve r to accelerate; adjust d and k to set sustainable levels; lift a to avoid slow starts. Identification from short runs and regression for longer series make BET deployable in schools, firms, agencies, and conservation efforts. Beyond forecasting, its primary value is *design*: it helps decide how much input to schedule, how to structure reinforcement, and how to regulate pace so that gains persist without overload.

X. FURTHER RESEARCH

Extensions include: (i) time-varying k_n to model policy shifts or recovery cycles; (ii) phase-wise (a, d) to capture curricula or staged investments; (iii) multigroup BET with shared (r, k) but heterogeneous (a, d); (iv) stochastic BET with state-dependent noise; (v) continuous-time analogs leading to solvable ODEs with factorized forcing and damping; and (vi) optimal control problems selecting (d_t, k_t) to maximize terminal utility subject to fatigue and budget constraints.

REFERENCES

[1] J. D. Murray, Mathematical Biology. Springer, 2002.
[2] G. A. F. Seber and A. J. Lee, Linear Regression Analysis. Wiley, 2003.
[3] R. J. Hyndman and G. Athanasopoulos, Forecasting: Principles and Practice. OTexts, 2018.
[4] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, Convex Optimization. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
[5] H. K. Khalil, Nonlinear Systems. Prentice Hall, 2002.
[6] J. Hattie and G. Yates, Visible Learning and the Science of How We Learn. Routledge, 2014.
[7] M. Begon, C. R. Townsend, and J. L. Harper, Ecology: From Individuals to Ecosystems. Wiley-Blackwell, 2006.