### **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: alexei@nodeslinks.com

### **Abstract**

In 1969 Bromilow observed that the time *T* to execute a construction project follows a power law scaling with the project cost *C*,  $T \sim C^B$  [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*~*N*<sup>1-α</sup> 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

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

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

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

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  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$  is an exponent that depends on the level of parallelism of the project activity network. For projects close to a linear chain of activities  $\alpha \approx 0$  and  $L \sim N$  as expected. As projects get parallelized  $\alpha$  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

$$
(4) \tT \approx K C^B,
$$

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≤α<1 then 0<*B*≤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 https://www.projectmanagement.ugent.be/, downloaded on 2024-08-25. The project cards contain the Sector, reported Budget at Completion  $\epsilon$ , 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),  $\alpha$  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  $\alpha$  solving equation (3) for  $\alpha$  and taking the limit of large critical path size  $\ln L$  >> $\ln A$ , resulting in

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

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  $\alpha$ . 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  $\alpha^*$  and the key result in equation (5), resulting in

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

The figure below shows that  $\alpha^*$  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  $\epsilon$ ).



**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  $0 \leq B \leq 1$ , 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  $C<sup>B</sup>$  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).