Deduction of the Bromilow's time-cost model from the fractal nature of activity networks

Alexei Vazquez* Nodes & Links Ltd, Salisbury House, Station Road, Cambridge, England, CB1 2LA *Email: <u>alexei@nodeslinks.com</u>

Abstract

In 1969 Bromilow observed that the time *T* to execute a construction project follows a power law scaling with the project cost *C*, $T \sim C^{\beta}$ [Bromilow 1969]. While the Bromilow's time-cost model has been extensively tested using data for different countries and project types, there is no theoretical explanation for the algebraic scaling. Here I mathematically deduce the Bromilow's time-cost model from the fractal nature of activity networks. The Bromislow's exponent is $B=1-\alpha$, where $1-\alpha$ is the scaling exponent between the number of activities in the critical path *L* and the number of activities *N*, $L \sim N^{1-\alpha}$ with $0 \le \alpha \le 1$ [Vazquez *et al* 2023]. I provide empirical data showing that projects with low serial/parallel (SP)% have lower *B* values than those with higher SP%. I conclude that the Bromilow's time-cost model is a law of activity networks, the Bromilow's exponent is a network property and forecasting project duration from cost should be limited to projects with high SP%.

1- Assumptions

Let us consider a project with cost C, duration T, number of activities N and critical path size of L activities. The project cost is deduced from the sum of the cost of individual activities and, by the central limit theorem, it is approximated by

(1)
$$C \approx c N$$
,

where c is the average activity cost.

The project duration is deduced from the sum of critical path activities durations and, by the central limit theorem, it is approximated by

(2)
$$T \approx t_c L$$
,

where t_c is the average duration of critical path activities.

In [Vazquez *et al* 2023] it was demonstrated that there is a power law scaling between the critical path size and the number of activities

$$(3) \qquad L \approx A N^{1-\alpha},$$

where A is a constant factor and $0 \le \alpha \le 1$ is an exponent that depends on the level of parallelism of the project activity network. For projects close to a linear chain of activities $\alpha = 0$ and $L \ge N$ as expected. As projects get parallelized α increases approaching the upper bound of $\alpha = 1$ for projects with almost all activities executed in parallel.

2- Key result

From (1) - (3) it follows that

$$(4) T \approx K C^{B},$$

with the Bromilow's exponent given by

$$(5) \qquad B=1-\alpha,$$

and the constant factor

 $(6) K = A t_c / c^B.$

2.1- Implications

- 1. Since $0 \le \alpha \le 1$ then $0 \le B \le 1$.
- 2. There is no unique value of *B* for all projects.
- 3. *B* is closer to 1 for projects with low parallelism, with few activities outside the critical path.
- 4. *B* is closer to 0 for projects with high parallelism, with several sub-critical paths.

3- Empirical support

3.1- Data selection

I have analyzed projects from the DSLIB database maintained by the Operations Research and Scheduling Research group at Ghent University <u>https://www.projectmanagement.ugent.be/</u>, downloaded on 2024-08-25. The project cards contain the Sector, reported Budget at Completion \in , Planned duration Days and the Serial/Parallel (SP) %. The SP% is defined as

(7) SP% = 100% (L-1) / (N-1).

Vanhoucke *et al* 2008]. A total of 39 Construction Sector projects with no missing data and durations larger than 50 days were selected.

3.2- Bromilow's exponent single project estimate

According to equation (3), α should be estimated from the scaling between the critical path size and the number of activities. This can be done for simulated activity networks [Vazquez *et al* 2023], but it is not possible for single real projects. Yet, we can obtain a single-project estimate of α solving equation (3) for α and taking the limit of large critical path size $\ln L >> \ln A$, resulting in

(8)
$$\alpha^* \approx \ln L / \ln N$$
.

In turn, the critical path size can be calculated using equation (7), L = (SP%/100%) (N-1) + 1. That allow us to obtain single-project estimates of α . Bear in mind the resulting values are less precise for networks with a small critical path size.

The Bromilow's exponent *B* should be estimated from the plot of duration vs cost data. Yet, we can obtain a single-project estimate using α^* and the key result in equation (5), resulting in

$$(9) \qquad B^* = 1 - \alpha^*.$$

The figure below shows that α^* decreases with increasing the SP% (Fig. 1A), while B^* increases reaching almost 1 with increasing the SP% (Fig. 1B).



Figure 1. Bromilow's exponent estimation from single project data.

3.3- Bromilow's exponent multi project estimate

To provide further evidence that the Bromilow's exponent depends on the level of parallelism, I have divided the dataset into two quantiles with low and high SP%. Note that we're lumping together projects with different B^* , but that is the best we can do given the available data. Then I obtained an independent estimate of the Bromilow's exponent from the slope of a linear regression of log(Planned Duration Days) vs log(Budget at Completion \in).



Figure 2. Bromilow's exponent estimation from duration vs budget data.

Despite similar budget ranges, projects with less parallelism (SP% (47.0, 95.0], Fig. 2 squares) have a wider range of durations than those with high parallelism (SP% (2.999, 47.0], Fig. 2 circles). In agreement with this observation, the Bromilow's exponent of the high SP% group is two times larger B=0.147, compared to B=0.069 for projects with low SP%. The chance to obtain a difference as large or larger is 0.0028 (100,000 permutations of the quantile labels) and therefore it is significant. This data supports the implications 1-4. The Bromilow's exponent is in the range $0 < B \le 1$, it is not unique for all projects and it is larger for projects with low parallelism (higher SP% quantile) than those with high parallelism (lower SP% quantile).

Conclusions

When deploying the Bromilow's model $T \approx K C^B$ to estimate project duration from cost, we should pay attention to the characteristics of the underlying activity network. The model parameters (*K*, *B*) should have been estimated using as input projects with similar level of parallelism to the target projects.

The prefactor *K* is not an absolute constant (see equation (6)). The underlying assumption is that C^{B} has larger variations across projects than *K*, and therefore the variations in C^{B} determine the variations in project duration *T*. However, the Bromilow's exponent *B* is small for projects with high

level of parallelism (blue circles in Figure 2). In that context, the assumption that C^{B} has larger variations across projects than K does not hold true. Large variations in budget are not translated into high variations in project duration. I discourage the use of the Bromilow's model for projects with a Serial/Parallel below 50%.

References

Bromilow, F. J. Contract time performance expectations and the reality. in *Building forum* vol. 1 70–80 (1969).

Vazquez, A., Pozzana, I., Kalogridis, G. & Ellinas, C. Activity networks determine project performance. *Sci Rep* **13**, 509 (2023).

Vanhoucke, M, Coelho, J., Debels, D., Maenhout, B., and Tavares. An evaluation of the adequacy of project network generators with systematically sampled networks. *European Journal of Operational Research* **187**, 511–524 (2008).