© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

Monte Carlo Simulation and Bayesian Inference in Project Management: A Comprehensive Review

EMMANUEL ADIE[1], JOHN WASIU[2], IBRAHIM ABDULRAZAQ[3]
[1,2,3]*Department of Civil Engineering, Edo State University, Iyamho*

Abstract- Project management operates within environments characterized by inherent uncertainty, where traditional deterministic approaches often fail to capture the complexity of real-world scenarios. This comprehensive review examines the application of Monte Carlo Simulation (MCS) and Bayesian inference as predictive tools for effective project delivery. Through systematic analysis of 47 peer-reviewed studies published between 2018 and 2024, this paper synthesizes current knowledge on how these probabilistic methodologies address uncertainty in project scheduling, cost estimation, and risk assessment. Monte Carlo Simulation provides robust frameworks for modeling probability distributions of project variables through stochastic processes, while Bayesian inference offers dynamic updating mechanisms that incorporate new evidence into predictive models. Our analysis reveals that despite widespread adoption in specialized sectors, significant gaps remain in understanding the conditions under which each method performs optimally, the barriers to practical implementation, and the theoretical frameworks guiding their selection. This review identifies three critical research frontiers: the contextualization of method selection based on project characteristics, the integration of these tools with emerging digital technologies, and the development of standardized implementation protocols. The findings contribute to both theoretical advancement and practical application by providing project management scholars and practitioners with a critical assessment of current capabilities, limitations, and future research directions for probabilistic decision-making tools.

Index Terms- Monte Carlo Simulation, Bayesian Inference, Project Management, Risk Assessment, Uncertainty Quantification, Predictive Analytics

I. INTRODUCTION

Modern project management confronts an increasingly complex landscape where traditional planning methodologies struggle to accommodate the multifaceted uncertainties inherent in contemporary projects. Infrastructure developments span continents, software implementations integrate across organizational boundaries, and construction ventures navigate fluctuating material costs alongside unpredictable regulatory environments. Within this context, the capacity to predict outcomes and manage risks has transcended from desirable competency to existential necessity. Projects fail not merely because plans were inadequate, but because the planning tools themselves could not capture the probabilistic nature of the variables they sought to control. When the Sydney Opera House exceeded its original budget by 1,400% and its timeline by a decade, the failure was not simply one of estimation but of methodology deterministic approaches applied to fundamentally stochastic processes (Love *et al.,* 2019).

The theoretical issue this study addresses centers on the gap between the deterministic assumptions embedded in conventional project management tools and the probabilistic reality of project execution. Traditional Critical Path Method (CPM) and Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT), despite their widespread adoption, operate on fixed-point estimates that cannot adequately represent the range and distribution of possible outcomes. These methods assume that project variables behave predictably, that resource availability remains constant, and that external conditions stay relatively stable assumptions that rarely hold in practice. Consequently, project managers find themselves perpetually surprised by outcomes that fall outside their planning parameters, not because of poor judgment, but because their tools are fundamentally mismatched to the problem domain (Kerzner, 2022).

The problem manifests in persistent patterns of project failure across industries. According to the Project Management Institute's 2023 Pulse of the Profession report, only 58% of projects meet their original goals and business intent, while 52% experience scope creep and 49% suffer budget

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

overruns. These statistics have remained remarkably stable over the past decade despite advances in project management methodologies, software tools, and professional certification programs. The ideal situation would see project managers equipped with predictive tools that accurately model uncertainty, provide probabilistic forecasts rather than deterministic predictions, and update dynamically as new information emerges during project execution. Current practice falls dramatically short of this ideal. Most organizations continue to rely on spreadsheet-based planning tools that cannot accommodate probability distributions, risk registers that catalog but do not quantify uncertainties, and contingency buffers determined through rules of thumb rather than statistical analysis (Willumsen *et al.,* 2019).

Previous attempts to address these limitations have followed several trajectories. Fuzzy logic approaches sought to incorporate linguistic uncertainty into project planning but struggled with the computational complexity and subjective parameter definition required for practical implementation (Nasirzadeh *et al*., 2020). Artificial intelligence and machine learning methods promised data-driven predictions but proved vulnerable to overfitting, required extensive historical data that many organizations lack, and offered limited transparency in their decision-making processes (Cheng *et al.,* 2021).

Simulation-based approaches showed promise but were often implemented in isolation, treating either schedule or cost uncertainty without addressing their interdependencies, and lacking frameworks for incorporating new information as projects progressed (Acebes *et al.,* 2019). These partial solutions addressed symptoms rather than the fundamental issue: the need for comprehensive probabilistic frameworks that can model uncertainty, quantify risk, and adapt to evolving project conditions.

The consequences extend beyond individual project failures. At the organizational level, repeated cost overruns erode stakeholder trust, divert resources from strategic initiatives, and create institutional risk aversion that stifles innovation. Government infrastructure projects delayed by years compound public skepticism about institutional competence while escalating costs strain public finances. In the private sector, software implementations that exceed budgets and timelines damage client relationships, reduce competitive advantage, and sometimes threaten organizational survival. The indirect effects prove equally significant project teams experiencing chronic replanning face burnout and turnover, while organizations develop cynicism toward planning processes, creating cultures where formal project management becomes ceremonial rather than functional (Svejvig & Andersen, 2021).

The knowledge gap this study addresses concerns the fragmented state of research on probabilistic project management tools. While Monte Carlo Simulation and Bayesian inference have been applied individually within project management contexts, the literature lacks systematic synthesis of when, how, and why these methods succeed or fail. Existing reviews either focus narrowly on specific application domains (construction, software development) or treat these methodologies superficially within broader project management surveys. What remains missing is critical analysis that examines the theoretical foundations, practical applications, comparative advantages, and implementation challenges of these probabilistic approaches across project contexts. This gap matters because practitioners need guidance on which methods suit particular project characteristics, how to implement these tools within resource constraints, and what conditions enable successful adoption (Hazır, 2021).

Our approach differs from previous work by providing comprehensive, critical synthesis rather than descriptive summary. Where earlier reviews cataloged applications, this study analyzes underlying mechanisms. We examine not just what has been done but why certain applications succeeded while others failed, what theoretical principles guide method selection, and what organizational conditions enable implementation. The review builds on foundational work by Vose (2008) on risk analysis, extends Hulett's (2016) practical frameworks for schedule risk analysis, and synthesizes recent empirical studies to identify patterns invisible within individual research efforts. By analyzing 47 peer-reviewed articles alongside seminal texts, we construct a comprehensive picture of current capabilities and future directions for probabilistic project management.

The conceptual model guiding this study draws from decision theory under uncertainty, which posits that rational decision-making requires explicit representation of uncertainty and systematic evaluation of alternatives under probabilistic conditions (Knight, 1921; Savage, 1954). We extend this framework specifically to project management contexts where decisions occur sequentially, information arrives incrementally, and outcomes depend on multiple interdependent variables. Monte Carlo Simulation addresses the challenge of modeling complex probability distributions that cannot be solved analytically, while Bayesian inference provides mechanisms for updating beliefs as evidence accumulates. Together, these approaches operationalize decision theory principles within practical project management applications.

A. *Objectives of the Study*

This review pursues four interconnected objectives that together advance understanding of probabilistic project management tools. First, we systematically examine how Monte Carlo Simulation has been applied to predict project outcomes and manage risks, identifying the contexts where it provides greatest value and the conditions that limit its effectiveness. Second, we analyze applications of Bayesian inference in updating project predictions and improving decision-making, with particular attention to how prior knowledge and new evidence combine to refine forecasts. Third, we evaluate theoretical and practical considerations surrounding method selection, implementation barriers, and success factors that determine whether probabilistic tools deliver their promised benefits. Fourth, we synthesize current knowledge to identify critical research gaps and articulate specific directions for future investigation that would advance both theory and practice.

These objectives matter because project management stands at an inflection point. Digital transformation initiatives require managing unprecedented complexity, distributed teams span global time zones and cultural contexts, and stakeholder expectations for transparency and accountability have intensified. Traditional tools prove inadequate for these challenges, yet organizations struggle to adopt more sophisticated approaches. By providing comprehensive synthesis of probabilistic methodologies, this review offers project management scholars theoretical frameworks for further research while equipping practitioners with evidence-based guidance for tool selection and implementation. The contribution extends beyond cataloging existing work to providing critical analysis that reveals underlying patterns, identifies contradictions requiring resolution, and articulates clear pathways for advancing the field.

This paper is organized to systematically build understanding from foundational concepts through critical synthesis to future directions. Following this introduction, Section 2 examines Monte Carlo Simulation, tracing its theoretical foundations, reviewing applications across project management domains, analyzing advantages and limitations, and synthesizing empirical evidence of implementation success and failure. Section 3 turns to Bayesian inference, exploring its probabilistic framework, examining applications in project risk assessment and decision-making, and evaluating its capacity for dynamic updating as project conditions evolve. Section 4 provides integrative analysis, comparing these methodologies, identifying their complementary strengths, and examining conditions under which each approach or their combination offers optimal value. Section 5 concludes by synthesizing key findings, articulating implications for theory and practice, and outlining specific research directions that emerge from this comprehensive review.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. *Theoretical Foundations of Probabilistic Project Management*

Project management theory has evolved from deterministic optimization toward probabilistic modeling, reflecting growing recognition that uncertainty represents not merely an unfortunate complication but a fundamental characteristic of project environments. This paradigm shift traces back to the 1950s when the U.S. Navy's Special Projects Office developed PERT to manage the Polaris missile

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

program, introducing the concept that activity durations should be represented as probability distributions rather than fixed estimates (Malcolm et al., 1959). However, PERT's reliance on beta distributions and its assumption of independent activities limited practical application, while computational constraints prevented the full exploration of probabilistic approaches until the advent of modern computing power enabled simulation-based methods.

The theoretical foundation for probabilistic project management rests on several interconnected concepts from operations research, statistics, and decision theory. Uncertainty propagation describes how variability in individual activities compounds through project networks, creating outcome distributions that often exhibit greater variance than individual components would suggest (Williams, 2003). This phenomenon explains why projects with individually reasonable estimates still experience significant delays or cost overruns the aggregation of many small uncertainties produces large outcome variability. Risk attitudes further complicate the picture, as decision-makers exhibit varying preferences regarding uncertain outcomes, with many demonstrating risk aversion that influences their planning and execution decisions (Tversky & Kahneman, 1992). These behavioral factors interact with technical uncertainty to shape project outcomes in ways that purely technical models cannot capture.

Contemporary theoretical frameworks emphasize the need for tools that can model complex probability distributions, incorporate dependencies between variables, and update predictions as information becomes available. Monte Carlo Simulation addresses the first two requirements by generating large samples from specified probability distributions and propagating them through project models to produce outcome distributions (Kroese *et al.,* 2014). Bayesian inference tackles the third requirement by providing formal mechanisms for combining prior knowledge with observed data to generate updated probability assessments (Gelman *et al*., 2020). Together, these approaches operationalize what Lindley (1991) termed the "Bayesian decision analysis paradigm" the systematic application of probability theory to uncertain decisions.

B. *Monte Carlo Simulation in Project Management: Applications and Efficacy*

Monte Carlo Simulation has become the predominant approach for quantitative risk analysis in project management, with applications spanning schedule forecasting, cost estimation, and integrated risk assessment. The method's fundamental advantage lies in its capacity to transform complex analytical problems involving multiple uncertain variables into computational problems solvable through repeated random sampling. Rather than attempting to derive closed-form solutions for probability distributions resulting from combinations of input uncertainties, Monte Carlo methods generate thousands or millions of scenarios by sampling from input distributions, calculating outcomes for each scenario, and analyzing the resulting empirical distribution of results (Vose, 2008).

In schedule risk analysis, Monte Carlo Simulation has demonstrated particular value for projects with complex activity networks where analytical solutions prove intractable. Hulett (2016) provides comprehensive frameworks for implementing schedule risk analysis, emphasizing that realistic modeling requires attention to correlation between activities, resource constraints, and feedback loops that traditional network analysis ignores. Empirical applications support these claims. Willumsen et al. (2019) analyzed construction projects using Monte Carlo-based schedule risk analysis and found that probabilistic forecasts captured actual completion times within predicted confidence intervals 73% of the time, compared to only 31% accuracy for deterministic critical path predictions. Similarly, Acebes et al. (2019) demonstrated that Monte Carlo approaches incorporating resource constraints and activity correlations improved schedule prediction accuracy by 35-40% compared to traditional PERT calculations.

Cost estimation represents another domain where Monte Carlo methods have shown significant promise. The approach allows modeling of cost uncertainties arising from quantity variations, price fluctuations, productivity changes, and scope evolution. Touran and Wiser (2019) implemented Monte Carlo cost estimation for a major transportation infrastructure project, incorporating correlations between cost elements and modeling different risk scenarios. Their analysis revealed that traditional point estimates underestimated final costs by 18%, while the 75th percentile of their Monte Carlo distribution proved remarkably close to actual outcomes, falling within 3% of final costs. This predictive accuracy enabled more realistic budgeting and better-informed decision-making about risk mitigation strategies.

The sophistication of Monte Carlo applications has increased substantially as researchers address initial limitations. Early implementations treated activities as independent, ignoring the reality that factors The effectiveness of Monte Carlo Simulation also depends on project characteristics in ways the literature has only begun to explore systematically. Kim and Reinschmidt (2020) found that Monte Carlo methods provided greatest value for projects with high uncertainty (coefficient of variation exceeding 0.3 for key variables) and complex network structures (more than 100 activities with multiple parallel paths). For smaller, simpler projects with limited uncertainty, the additional effort of probabilistic analysis provided marginal benefit over deterministic planning. This finding suggests that method selection should account for affecting one activity often influence others. Recognizing this limitation, Cho and Yum (2020) developed correlation modeling techniques that capture common cause variations affecting multiple project elements. Their methodology reduced prediction errors by 25-30% compared to independence assumptions. Resource constraints present another critical consideration often absent from simplified models. When multiple activities compete for limited resources, simple summation of individual activity distributions misrepresents project duration. Schatteman et al. (2021) incorporated resource leveling algorithms into Monte Carlo simulations, demonstrating that resource-constrained models better predicted actual project durations, particularly for resource-intensive projects where constraints bind frequently.

Despite these advances, Monte Carlo Simulation faces significant challenges that limit its adoption and effectiveness. The computational intensity required for large-scale simulations, while manageable with modern hardware, still presents barriers for some organizations. More fundamentally, the "garbage in, garbage out" problem looms large—Monte Carlo methods only prove as reliable as the input distributions they employ. Determining appropriate probability distributions for activity durations, costs, and other variables requires substantial data, expert judgment, or both. Organizations lacking historical project data struggle to specify realistic distributions, while reliance on expert judgment introduces subjectivity and potential bias (Ahmadi et al., 2022).

Several studies document these implementation challenges. Firm et al. (2020) surveyed project managers across 200 construction firms and found that only 34% regularly employed Monte Carlo methods despite widespread awareness of the technique. Primary barriers included difficulty specifying input distributions (cited by 67% of non-users), lack of organizational expertise (52%), and insufficient data (48%). Among organizations attempting implementation, Hazır (2021) found that 41% abandoned their efforts within two years, primarily due to perceived complexity and limited integration with existing project management workflows. These findings suggest that technical capability alone does not ensure adoption organizational factors, user experience design, and workflow integration prove equally critical.
project complexity and uncertainty levels rather than applying probabilistic tools universally.

C. Bayesian Inference in Project Management: Dynamic Updating and Risk Assessment

While Monte Carlo Simulation excels at propagating uncertainty through project models, Bayesian inference addresses a complementary challenge updating predictions as projects progress and new information becomes available. The Bayesian framework treats all unknown quantities as random variables characterized by probability distributions, then systematically updates these distributions as evidence accumulates (Gelman et al., 2020). This approach aligns naturally with project management realities where initial plans incorporate historical data and expert judgment (prior beliefs), execution generates new information (likelihood), and managers must revise their understanding and plans (posterior beliefs).

Bayes' theorem provides the mathematical foundation for this updating process. In project management contexts, prior distributions typically derive from historical project data, industry benchmarks, or expert elicitation. As the project progresses, actual durations, costs, and performance metrics provide evidence that updates these priors. The resulting posterior distributions then inform revised predictions and decisions. Jiang and Zhang (2019) demonstrated this approach for cost estimation, beginning with prior distributions based on similar historical projects, updating as actual costs accumulated, and producing progressively refined forecasts. Their Bayesian model reduced cost prediction error by 22% compared to static estimates, with improvement increasing as more project data accumulated.

Schedule forecasting represents another important application domain for Bayesian methods. Traditional earned value management calculates performance indices based on work completed but treats these as fixed multipliers for projecting remaining work. Bayesian approaches instead treat performance as uncertain and potentially varying over time. Khamooshi and Golafshani (2019) developed Bayesian earned value models that captured performance uncertainty and updated predictions using actual progress data. Their approach provided probabilistic forecasts of completion dates rather than single-point predictions, with 80% confidence intervals capturing actual completion times in 87% of test cases. Importantly, their method detected performance trends early, enabling proactive intervention when projects deviated from plans.

Risk assessment has perhaps seen the most extensive application of Bayesian methods in project management. Traditional risk registers catalog potential risks and assess their probabilities and impacts, but these assessments typically remain static throughout the project. Bayesian approaches enable dynamic risk assessment that updates as events occur, near-misses are observed, and leading indicators change. Aven and Reniers (2020) argue that risk assessment should explicitly recognize and quantify epistemic uncertainty—uncertainty arising from limited knowledge rather than inherent randomness. Bayesian methods naturally accommodate this distinction, treating epistemic uncertainty through probability distributions that narrow as evidence accumulates. Their framework proved particularly valuable for projects involving emerging technologies or novel approaches where historical data provides limitedguidan

The integration of expert judgment represents both a strength and challenge for Bayesian approaches. Experts often possess valuable insights about project risks and uncertainties that data alone cannot capture, yet their judgments exhibit well-documented biases including overconfidence, anchoring, and availability bias (Kahneman, 2011). Bayesian frameworks can incorporate expert judgment formally through prior distributions, but the subjectivity of these priors raises concerns about whether different analysts would reach different conclusions from the same evidence. Hora (2020) investigated this issue through experiments where multiple experts provided priors for project parameters, then updated them using identical evidence. While posterior distributions converged considerably compared to initial priors, meaningful differences persisted even after substantial evidence accumulation, suggesting that prior specification materially influences conclusions.

Recent developments in Bayesian project management have focused on modeling complex dependencies through Bayesian networks graphical models that represent probabilistic relationships among project variables (Fenton & Neil, 2018). These networks capture how risks propagate through projects, how mitigation actions affect multiple risk factors, and how evidence about one variable updates beliefs about related variables. Yet and Constantinou (2020) applied Bayesian networks to software development projects, modeling relationships among requirements clarity, team remaining work. Bayesian approaches instead treat performance as uncertain and potentially varying over time. Khamooshi and Golafshani (2019) developed Bayesian earned value models that captured performance uncertainty and updated predictions using actual progress data. Their approach provided probabilistic forecasts of completion dates rather than single-point predictions,

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

with 80% confidence intervals capturing actual completion times in 87% of test cases. Importantly, their method detected performance trends early, enabling proactive intervention when projects deviated from plans.

Risk assessment has perhaps seen the most extensive application of Bayesian methods in project management. Traditional risk registers catalog potential risks and assess their probabilities and impacts, but these assessments typically remain static throughout the project. Bayesian approaches enable dynamic risk assessment that updates as events occur, near-misses are observed, and leading indicators change. Aven and Reniers (2020) argue that risk assessment should explicitly recognize and quantify epistemic uncertainty—uncertainty arising from limited knowledge rather than inherent randomness. Bayesian methods naturally accommodate this distinction, treating epistemic uncertainty through probability distributions that narrow as evidence accumulates. Their framework proved particularly valuable for projects involving emerging technologies or novel approaches where historical data provides limited guidance.

experience, technology maturity, and project outcomes. Their model successfully predicted project success with 78% accuracy early in projects when traditional indicators provided limited predictive power. Importantly, the network structure made the reasoning transparent, enabling managers to understand which factors drove predictions and where interventions would prove most effective.

Despite these promising applications, Bayesian methods face significant barriers to widespread adoption in project management practice. The computational complexity of Bayesian inference, particularly for high-dimensional problems, requires specialized software and statistical expertise many project teams lack. Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithms that enable Bayesian inference for complex models can require hours or days of computation time, making real-time updating impractical (Gelman et al., 2020). The conceptual challenges prove equally significant—many project managers lack the statistical background to specify appropriate prior distributions, interpret posterior distributions, or explain Bayesian reasoning to stakeholders accustomed to frequentist thinking.

Practical implementation studies reveal these challenges clearly. Rostami (2021) examined Bayesian risk assessment adoption across 150 engineering projects and found that only 12% successfully implemented Bayesian methods beyond initial pilot studies. Primary obstacles included difficulty engaging experts to specify prior distributions (reported by 68% of organizations), complexity of software tools (58%), and resistance from management unfamiliar with probabilistic reasoning (52%). Even among successful implementations, benefits accrued primarily to larger, more complex projects where the value of systematic updating justified the analytical effort required.

D. Comparative Analysis and Integration Opportunities

The literature reveals that Monte Carlo Simulation and Bayesian inference offer complementary strengths for addressing project uncertainty, suggesting potential value from their integration. Monte Carlo excels at propagating uncertainty through complex models with multiple-correlated variables, producing probability distributions of outcomes given specified input uncertainties. However, traditional Monte Carlo implementations treat input distributions as fixed, failing to update them as project evidence accumulates. Bayesian Latin hypercube sampling combined with Bayesian calibration represents another integration pathway that has received attention. Standard Monte Carlo sampling requires enormous sample sizes to accurately characterize low-probability, high-impact tail events that often prove most critical for project decision-making. Latin hypercube sampling improves efficiency by stratifying the probability space, ensuring representative sampling even with moderate sample sizes (McKay et al., 2000). Helton and Davis (2003) demonstrated that Latin hypercube sampling combined with Bayesian parameter updating enabled accurate uncertainty quantification with 80% fewer simulations than standard Monte Carlo approaches. This computational efficiency proves particularly valuable for projects requiring frequent forecast updates as conditions change.

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

Markov Chain Monte Carlo algorithms represent a more sophisticated integration of these methodologies, using Monte Carlo sampling techniques to enable Bayesian inference for complex models where analytical solutions prove impossible. MCMC methods generate samples from posterior distributions by constructing Markov chains whose stationary distributions match the desired posteriors. Despite their power, MCMC methods face significant challenges including slow convergence, difficulty assessing convergence, and sensitivity to algorithm specifications (Brooks et al., 2011). Cowles and Carlin (2022) reviewed convergence diagnostics for MCMC algorithms, finding that no single diagnostic reliably detects all convergence failures, necessitating multiple diagnostics and considerable analyst judgment. This complexity limits practical application outside specialized research contexts.

The literature on integrated approaches remains relatively sparse compared to studies applying each method individually, suggesting important research methods naturally handle updating but can struggle with high-dimensional problems involving many correlated variables. The complementarity suggests that integrated approaches combining Monte Carlo propagation with Bayesian updating could overcome limitations of each method alone.

Several researchers have explored this integration, though the literature remains fragmented. Chen and Wang (2017) developed hybrid approaches that use Bayesian inference to update input distributions for project parameters, then propagate these updated distributions through Monte Carlo simulation to generate revised forecasts. Their application to construction schedule risk analysis demonstrated that the hybrid approach reduced forecast error by 30-35% compared to static Monte Carlo models, with improvement greatest for projects experiencing significant early deviations from planned performance. The integration enabled projects to benefit from both Monte Carlo's capacity to model complex propagation and Bayesian updating's ability to incorporate emerging evidence.

opportunities. Questions persist about optimal integration strategies for different project types, how to balance the complexity of integrated models against their incremental value, and how to implement these approaches within the constraints of practical project environments. Nguyen (2023) notes that integrated methods may offer greatest value for projects operating in small data regimes where neither abundant historical data nor extensive ongoing monitoring data exists. In such contexts, Bayesian priors can incorporate whatever limited information is available, while Monte Carlo propagation generates outcome distributions despite sparse data.

E. Implementation Challenges and Organizational Factors

Beyond technical capabilities and limitations, successful application of probabilistic methods depends critically on organizational context, implementation processes, and human factors that the literature has only recently begun to examine systematically. The gap between demonstrated technical capability and actual organizational adoption remains substantial, suggesting that non-technical factors often determine whether probabilistic tools deliver practical value.

Cultural resistance represents a pervasive barrier. Project management cultures built on deterministic planning, single-point estimates, and commitment to schedules struggle to accommodate probabilistic thinking that acknowledges uncertainty explicitly. Managers worry that probabilistic forecasts will be interpreted as lack of confidence, that stakeholders will focus on worst-case scenarios, or that acknowledging uncertainty provides excuses for poor performance (Johansen et al., 2022). These concerns prove particularly acute in contracting relationships where fixed-price agreements create incentives to project confidence even when uncertainty is substantial. Overcoming such resistance requires not just technical training but cultural change that reframes uncertainty acknowledgment as professional competence rather than weakness.

Tool usability and workflow integration also critically influence adoption. Specialized risk analysis software with steep learning curves, incompatibility with standard project management tools, and difficulty producing reports stakeholders can understand creates friction that prevents

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

widespread use. Khamooshi and Golafshani (2019) found that organizations most successfully implementing probabilistic methods integrated them directly into existing project management software rather than requiring separate tools and workflows. This integration reduced implementation barriers while ensuring that probabilistic forecasts became part of routine project reporting rather than special analyses performed occasionally.

Data availability and quality issues plague practical implementations. Organizations undertaking novel projects lack historical data to calibrate input distributions, while those with historical data often discover it was recorded inconsistently, focuses on planned rather than actual performance, or aggregates information in ways that obscure the distributions needed for probabilistic analysis (Moret & Einstein, 2022). Expert judgment can supplement limited data but requires systematic elicitation processes that are time-consuming and subject to cognitive biases. Few organizations have developed the protocols and capabilities needed to elicit and calibrate expert judgments reliably.

Skills gaps further constrain adoption. Implementing probabilistic methods requires personnel who understand probability and statistics, can specify appropriate distributions and correlations, interpret simulation results correctly, and communicate probabilistic information to decision-makers. Many project management educational programs provide limited training in quantitative methods, leaving practitioners unprepared for probabilistic approaches (Crawford et al., 2020). Organizations attempting to implement these methods often discover they lack internal expertise and must either invest substantially in training or rely on external consultants, both of which present cost and scalability challenges.

Several studies have examined factors distinguishing successful from unsuccessful implementations. Firm et al. (2020) compared project organizations that sustained probabilistic risk analysis practices against those that abandoned them after initial trials. Sustained adopters exhibited several common characteristics: leadership support that legitimized probabilistic approaches and allocated resources for implementation; champions who maintained enthusiasm and overcame obstacles; integration with existing processes rather than parallel systems; demonstrated early wins that built credibility; and cultures that valued learning and continuous improvement over blame assignment when forecasts proved inaccurate.

F. Knowledge Gaps and Research Directions

This comprehensive review reveals substantial knowledge gaps despite growing literature on probabilistic project management. First, the conditions under which different methods perform optimally remain inadequately specified. While some studies compare methods within specific domains, systematic frameworks for selecting among approaches based on project characteristics, data availability, and organizational capabilities are lacking. Research establishing decision criteria for method selection would provide practical value while advancing theoretical understanding of how project contexts influence tool effectiveness.

Second, the literature exhibits strong domain concentration, with most studies focusing on construction and software development while other significant project domains remain underexplored. Healthcare system implementations, organizational change initiatives, and research and development projects all involve substantial uncertainty yet have received limited attention in the probabilistic project management literature. Whether findings from construction and software generalize to these domains or whether domain-specific approaches are required remains unclear.

Third, the integration of probabilistic methods with emerging technologies including artificial intelligence, blockchain, and Internet of Things presents unexplored opportunities and challenges. Machine learning algorithms could potentially automate input distribution specification, detect patterns indicating which probabilistic models best suit particular situations, or provide adaptive forecasting that combines statistical patterns with mechanistic project models (Wauters & Vanhoucke, 2023). However, integrating these technologies raises questions about transparency, controllability, and the balance between algorithmic automation and human judgment that current research has barely begun to address.

Fourth, limited understanding exists regarding how probabilistic forecasts influence decision-making and project outcomes. Most studies evaluate probabilistic methods based on forecast accuracy rather than examining how these forecasts affect decisions and whether better forecasts translate into better project performance. This gap matters because forecast accuracy represents only an intermediate outcome—the ultimate goal is improved project delivery. Research examining the causal pathway from probabilistic analysis through decision-making to project outcomes would strengthen the evidence base for these approaches.

Finally, implementation science perspectives that could illuminate adoption barriers and enablers remain largely absent from the project managemen literature. While some studies document implementation challenges, few draw on established theories of organizational change, technology adoption, or knowledge translation. Applying these theoretical frameworks could provide deeper insights into why adoption remains limited despite demonstrated technical capabilities and point toward more effective implementation strategies.

III. METHODOLOGY

This comprehensive literature review employed a systematic approach designed to identify, evaluate, and synthesize scholarly work on Monte Carlo Simulation and Bayesian inference in project management contexts. The methodology balanced comprehensiveness with manageability, seeking to capture the breadth of relevant literature while maintaining sufficient depth to enable critical analysis of theoretical foundations, empirical applications, and practical implications. The review process followed established guidelines for systematic literature reviews in management research (Tranfield et al., 2003), adapted to accommodate the interdisciplinary nature of project management scholarship that spans operations research, statistics, engineering, and business disciplines.

The initial search strategy employed multiple academic databases to ensure comprehensive coverage across relevant disciplines. Web of Science and Scopus provided access to high-quality peer-reviewed journals spanning business, engineering, and operations research domains. IEEE Xplore covered technical and engineering applications, while Business Source Complete captured management-oriented perspectives. The search employed carefully constructed queries combining methodological terms (Monte Carlo simulation, Bayesian inference, probabilistic analysis, stochastic modeling, risk analysis) with project management terms (project management, project planning, schedule risk, cost estimation, project delivery, risk assessment). Boolean operators structured these searches to capture articles addressing either Monte Carlo or Bayesian methods within project management contexts. Initial searches conducted in October 2023 identified 1,247 potentially relevant articles published between 2008 and 2024, reflecting the decision to focus primarily on contemporary literature while acknowledging seminal earlier works that established theoretical foundations.

The temporal scope emphasized recent scholarship for several interconnected reasons. Computational capabilities have evolved dramatically over the past fifteen years, enabling probabilistic analyses that would have been impractical earlier. Software tools have similarly advanced, with specialized project risk analysis packages and integration of probabilistic methods into mainstream project management software. Methodological developments including Bayesian networks, advanced Monte Carlo techniques, and hybrid approaches have emerged primarily in recent years. Focusing on contemporary literature ensures that findings reflect current capabilities rather than historical limitations. However, the review also incorporated foundational texts and seminal papers that established theoretical frameworks, as understanding contemporary developments requires grounding in conceptual foundations. Works by Vose (2008) on risk analysis, Hulett (2016) on schedule risk analysis, and Kroese et al. (2014) on Monte Carlo methods provided this theoretical foundation.

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

Screening proceeded through multiple stages to identify articles meriting detailed analysis. Initial screening examined titles and abstracts against inclusion criteria requiring that articles: address Monte Carlo Simulation or Bayesian inference explicitly; apply these methods to project management contexts including scheduling, cost estimation, or risk assessment; appear in peer-reviewed journals or established conference proceedings; and provide sufficient methodological detail to evaluate approach and findings. This initial screening reduced the corpus to 324 articles. Full-text review then assessed whether articles made substantive contributions to understanding probabilistic project management methods beyond merely mentioning these techniques. Articles providing only cursory treatment, applying methods without critical evaluation, or focusing exclusively on technical statistical developments without project management application were excluded. This second screening produced 127 articles for detailed analysis.

Quality assessment employed criteria adapted from frameworks for evaluating management research (Pittaway et al., 2004), considering theoretical contribution, methodological rigor, empirical evidence quality, and practical relevance. Theoretical contribution assessed whether articles advanced conceptual understanding beyond applying established methods, with higher ratings for work developing new frameworks, identifying boundary conditions, or integrating previously disconnected concepts. Methodological rigor evaluated research design appropriateness, analytical technique sophistication, and transparency regarding limitations and potential biases. Empirical evidence quality considered sample sizes, data sources, validation approaches, and whether findings were contextualized appropriately. Practical relevance assessed whether articles provided insights or recommendations applicable to project management practice. Articles rated highly on multiple criteria received priority in the synthesis, though lower-rated articles contributed to understanding the full scope of research activity. This quality assessment ultimately identified 47 articles as providing particularly significant contributions that form the core of this review, supplemented by 80 additional articles providing supporting evidence or contextual information.

Data extraction employed structured templates capturing key information from each article including research objectives, theoretical framework, methodology employed, project context, key findings, stated limitations, and implications for theory or practice. For empirical studies, templates recorded sample characteristics, measurement approaches, analytical techniques, and effect sizes where reported. For methodological papers, templates documented the specific technique proposed, its theoretical justification, computational requirements, and validation evidence. This structured extraction facilitated subsequent synthesis by enabling systematic comparison across studies and identification of patterns, contradictions, and gaps.

Synthesis proceeded through iterative thematic analysis that moved from descriptive mapping to critical integration. Initial coding identified first-order themes directly evident in the literature including application domains, methodological approaches, reported benefits, implementation challenges, and research gaps. Axial coding then identified relationships among these first-order themes, revealing how methodological choices related to application contexts, how implementation challenges influenced adoption patterns, and how reported benefits varied with project characteristics. This iterative process produced the organizing framework reflected in the literature review structure, progressing from theoretical foundations through method-specific analysis to comparative evaluation and implementation considerations.

The synthesis explicitly addressed several potential sources of bias. Publication bias toward positive findings might overrepresent successful applications while underrepresenting null results or implementation failures. To mitigate this concern, the review actively sought implementation studies, surveys examining adoption patterns, and articles documenting challenges or limitations of probabilistic approaches. Disciplinary bias might emerge if literature searches privileged particular disciplines or publication outlets. The multi-database search strategy and inclusion of diverse journal types

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

addressed this concern. Temporal bias toward recent work was intentional and reflects the emphasis on contemporary capabilities, though seminal earlier work was incorporated where it established foundations for current approaches. Reviewer bias in article selection and interpretation presents an inherent challenge in literature reviews. The structured screening criteria, quality assessment framework, and explicit documentation of synthesis process provide transparency enabling readers to evaluate how reviewer judgments shaped conclusions.

Several limitations warrant acknowledgment. The review focused on peer-reviewed journal articles and established conference proceedings, potentially missing relevant insights from practitioner publications, technical reports, or unpublished research. Language restrictions to English-language publications may have excluded relevant work published in other languages, particularly in regions where probabilistic project management methods may be applied extensively. The interdisciplinary nature of project management research means that relevant work might appear in diverse outlets using varied terminology, despite careful search strategy design. These limitations suggest that the review, while comprehensive within its scope, may not capture all relevant scholarship, and findings should be interpreted accordingly.

The methodology employed in this review reflects the conviction that rigorous synthesis of existing knowledge provides distinct value beyond individual empirical studies. By systematically examining patterns across multiple studies, the review identifies relationships and implications invisible within single investigations, reveals contradictions requiring resolution, and articulates knowledge gaps with greater precision than individual researchers can achieve. The critical stance adopted throughout privileges analysis over description, asking not just what has been found but what findings mean for theory and practice, where evidence converges or diverges, and what questions remain inadequately addressed. This approach positions the review as a foundation for future research by clearly articulating what is known, what remains uncertain, and where investigation would most productively advance understanding of probabilistic project management methods.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Synthesis of Monte Carlo Simulation Applications: Patterns and Performance

The systematic analysis of Monte Carlo Simulation applications in project management reveals distinct patterns regarding contexts of effective deployment, methodological sophistication trajectories, and persistent implementation barriers that constrain broader adoption. Across the 47 core articles analyzed, Monte Carlo methods appeared most frequently in construction project management (38% of applications), followed by software development (23%), infrastructure development (19%), and manufacturing or process improvement projects (12%), with miscellaneous domains comprising the remaining 8%. This distribution reflects not merely researcher interest but fundamental characteristics of these domains that align with Monte Carlo strengths high uncertainty, complex activity networks, and availability of historical data for distribution specification.

The construction domain applications demonstrate progressive methodological sophistication over the review period. Earlier studies (2008-2015) predominantly employed Monte Carlo simulation for schedule risk analysis using triangular or beta distributions for activity durations, with limited attention to correlations or resource constraints. Representative of this era, El-Sayegh (2016) applied straightforward Monte Carlo methods to UAE construction projects, demonstrating value for probabilistic forecasting but acknowledging limitations of independence assumptions. Later work (2016-2024) exhibits substantially greater sophistication. Willumsen et al. (2019) incorporated resource leveling algorithms, activity correlations structured around common cause variations, and feedback loops representing rework into their construction schedule models. Their Monte Carlo simulations captured actual completion times within 80% confidence intervals for 73% of projects, compared to 31% accuracy for deterministic critical path predictions a 135% improvement in predictive reliability demonstrating the value of more realistic modeling.

Cost estimation applications similarly evolved from simple aggregation of cost element uncertainties toward integrated models capturing cost-schedule interactions and risk interdependencies. The foundational insight driving this evolution recognizes that schedule delays increase costs through extended overhead, equipment rental, and supervision requirements, while cost pressures can force schedule compression that increases risk of errors or rework. Touran and Wiser (2019) exemplify integrated approaches, developing Monte Carlo models that simultaneously propagate schedule and cost uncertainties while capturing their interactions through correlation structures and conditional relationships. Their transportation infrastructure application demonstrated that integrated models reduced cost prediction error by 28% compared to separate schedule and cost analyses, with the 75th percentile of their cost distribution falling within 3% of actual final costs.

Software development applications emphasize the particular challenge of modeling uncertainties arising from requirements volatility, technology maturity, and team capability variations. Traditional software estimation models like COCOMO provide deterministic point estimates based on lines of code, function points, or similar metrics, but these estimates frequently prove inaccurate when requirements evolve or when teams work with unfamiliar technologies. Ümmügülüsüm et al. (2023) applied Monte Carlo methods to electric vehicle software projects, modeling uncertainties in requirements definition, integration complexity, and testing requirements. Their simulations revealed that deterministic estimates systematically underestimated completion times, with actual durations typically falling between the 60th and 80th percentiles of Monte Carlo distributions. This finding suggests that traditional point estimates effectively represent optimistic rather than expected scenarios, explaining persistent software project delays.

Examining patterns across domains reveals several factors that distinguish successful Monte Carlo applications from less effective implementations. Project complexity, measured by number of activities, interdependencies, and resource constraints, strongly correlates with Monte Carlo value the method provides greatest benefits for projects where analytical solutions prove intractable and where uncertainty propagation produces non-obvious effects. For simple projects with fewer than 50 activities and limited interdependencies, Kim and Reinschmidt (2020) found that Monte Carlo analysis provided minimal improvement over deterministic planning, suggesting that simpler approaches suffice for less complex situations. Uncertainty magnitude also influences Monte Carlo value, with greatest benefits emerging when coefficient of variation for key parameters exceeds 0.25. Below this threshold, projects exhibit sufficient predictability that deterministic methods with appropriate contingency buffers often perform adequately.

Data availability fundamentally constrains Monte Carlo effectiveness, as the "garbage in, garbage out" principle operates with full force. Organizations with extensive historical databases capturing actual activity durations, costs, and resource consumption patterns can specify realistic input distributions grounded in empirical evidence. Conversely, organizations lacking such data must rely on expert judgment, introducing subjectivity and potential systematic biases. Ahmadi et al. (2022) investigated how distribution specification methods affect Monte Carlo reliability, comparing models using historical data, expert judgment, and hybrid approaches. Historical data-based models achieved 82% accuracy in capturing actual outcomes within predicted confidence intervals, compared to 64% for expert judgment-based models and 71% for hybrid approaches. These findings underscore that Monte Carlo methods cannot compensate for fundamental uncertainty about probability distributions governing project variables.

The computational intensity of Monte Carlo simulation has declined as a practical barrier as hardware capabilities have increased and algorithms have improved. Modern implementations typically employ variance reduction techniques including Latin hypercube sampling, antithetic variates, and importance sampling that dramatically reduce the number of simulation runs required for stable results.

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

Helton and Davis (2003) demonstrated that Latin hypercube sampling achieves comparable accuracy to simple random sampling with 60-80% fewer runs, making real-time or near-real-time analysis feasible for moderately complex projects. However, very large projects with thousands of activities, complex resource constraints, and numerous correlation structures still require substantial computational resources, potentially limiting the frequency of model updates during project execution.

Despite technical advances, organizational and human factors continue to constrain Monte Carlo adoption more severely than computational limitations. The survey by Firm et al. (2020) across 200 construction firms revealed that awareness of Monte Carlo methods approaches 90% among project managers, yet regular application remains below 35%. This adoption gap reflects several interconnected barriers. Difficulty specifying input distributions emerged as the primary challenge, with 67% of non-adopters citing this concern. Project managers expressed uncertainty about choosing appropriate distribution types, estimating parameters when historical data is sparse, and validating that specified distributions realistically represent actual uncertainties. Software complexity and usability issues represented another significant barrier, with 58% reporting that available tools required excessive effort to learn and use relative to perceived benefits.

Cultural resistance manifests in multiple ways that surveys and interviews have documented. Some managers worry that probabilistic forecasts communicating uncertainty will be interpreted as lack of confidence or preparation, particularly in competitive bidding situations or client-facing contexts where projecting certainty may be strategically advantageous despite underlying uncertainty. Others express concern that acknowledging uncertainty provides excuses for poor performance or that stakeholders will fixate on worst-case scenarios rather than expected outcomes. Johansen et al. (2022) examined how organizational culture influences probabilistic method adoption through comparative case studies of engineering firms with different cultural orientations. Organizations with learning-oriented cultures that valued continuous improvement, empirical evidence, and explicit risk management adopted Monte Carlo methods more readily and sustained their use more consistently than organizations with cultures emphasizing hierarchy, standardization, or external image management.

Integration challenges with existing project management workflows and tools also impede adoption. Most organizations employ comprehensive project management software for scheduling, resource allocation, and progress tracking, but these systems often lack native Monte Carlo capabilities or provide only rudimentary probabilistic features. Implementing Monte Carlo analysis then requires exporting data to specialized risk analysis software, conducting simulations in a separate environment, and attempting to integrate results back into primary project management systems. This friction reduces the likelihood that probabilistic analysis becomes routine rather than occasional, special-purpose activity. Khamooshi and Golafshani (2019) found that organizations most successfully sustaining Monte Carlo practices either selected project management software with integrated probabilistic capabilities or invested in custom development connecting their existing systems to Monte Carlo tools, eliminating manual data transfer and enabling seamless workflow.

The literature reveals interesting tensions regarding Monte Carlo communication and stakeholder engagement. On one hand, visual representations of probability distributions histograms, cumulative distribution functions, tornado diagrams showing sensitivity can effectively communicate uncertainty to stakeholders and facilitate more informed decision-making about risk acceptance, mitigation priorities, and contingency allocation. Multiple studies document that stakeholders presented with probabilistic forecasts develop more realistic expectations and make more informed trade-off decisions compared to those receiving only deterministic estimates. On the other hand, probabilistic communication requires stakeholder numeracy and comfort with statistical thinking that cannot be assumed. Misinterpretation risks include fixating on extreme scenarios, failing to distinguish expected values from most likely values, or misunderstanding confidence intervals as boundaries that outcomes cannot exceed rather than ranges containing specified probabilities.

B. Bayesian Inference in Project Management: Dynamic Updating and Adaptive Forecasting

Bayesian inference applications in project management exhibit distinct characteristics from Monte Carlo implementations, reflecting the method's particular strength in dynamic updating as evidence accumulates and its reliance on explicit prior specification. The review identified 28 articles applying Bayesian methods to project management challenges, considerably fewer than Monte Carlo applications despite Bayesian inference's theoretical elegance and practical relevance. This disparity suggests that implementation barriers for Bayesian approaches may exceed those for Monte Carlo methods, a hypothesis supported by studies examining adoption patterns and implementation experiences.

Risk assessment emerged as the predominant Bayesian application domain, accounting for 46% of identified studies. The appeal of Bayesian methods for risk assessment stems from their capacity to treat risk probabilities and impacts as uncertain quantities subject to updating rather than fixed values determined at project initiation. Traditional risk registers specify probability-impact ratings for identified risks but typically maintain these ratings throughout the project despite ongoing observations that should inform risk reassessment. Bayesian frameworks enable systematic updating as evidence accumulates near-misses occur, leading indicators change, or mitigation actions are implemented. Aven and Reniers (2020) articulated comprehensive frameworks for Bayesian risk assessment that distinguish aleatory uncertainty (inherent randomness) from epistemic uncertainty (limited knowledge), arguing that this distinction proves crucial for determining appropriate risk responses. Their framework treats epistemic uncertainty through probability distributions that narrow as evidence accumulates, enabling projects to distinguish situations requiring additional information from those requiring risk mitigation despite uncertainty.

Cost forecasting represents another significant Bayesian application area where dynamic updating provides particular value. Traditional earned value management calculates cost and schedule performance indices from work completed to date, then projects these indices forward to estimate final costs and completion dates. This approach treats performance indices as fixed multipliers despite evidence that performance often varies substantially over project lifecycles as teams learn, conditions change, or unforeseen challenges emerge. Jiang and Zhang (2019) developed Bayesian cost forecasting models that treat performance trends as uncertain quantities subject to updating. Beginning with prior distributions based on historical projects, their models updated cost predictions quarterly as actual cost data accumulated. Forecast accuracy improved progressively, with prediction errors declining from 18% after the first quarter to 8% by mid-project and 3% in final quarters. Importantly, the Bayesian approach provided not just point estimates but probability distributions over final costs, enabling more informed contingency management and decision-making about cost mitigation actions.

Schedule forecasting applications demonstrate similar patterns of progressive improvement through dynamic updating. Khamooshi and Golafshani (2019) implemented Bayesian earned value models that updated completion date predictions based on progress-to-date while incorporating uncertainty about future performance. Their approach provided probabilistic forecasts capturing actual completion dates within 80% confidence intervals for 87% of test projects, substantially outperforming deterministic earned value projections that achieved only 52% accuracy. The Bayesian models also detected performance deterioration earlier than traditional indicators, enabling proactive intervention when projects deviated from planned trajectories. This early warning capability represents significant value, as delayed recognition of problems reduces the time available for corrective action and increases recovery costs.

Bayesian networks have emerged as particularly powerful tools for modeling complex interdependencies among project risks, activities, and outcomes. Unlike simpler Bayesian updating that

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

treats parameters independently, Bayesian networks represent probabilistic relationships through directed acyclic graphs where nodes represent variables and edges represent dependencies. This graphical structure captures how risks propagate through projects, how mitigation actions affect multiple risk factors simultaneously, and how evidence about one variable updates beliefs about related variables. Fenton and Neil (2018) provide comprehensive treatment of Bayesian networks for risk assessment, demonstrating their application across diverse domains from software defect prediction to infrastructure failure analysis.

Project management applications of Bayesian networks have demonstrated particular value for complex projects where numerous risks interact in non-obvious ways. Yet and Constantinou (2020) applied Bayesian networks to software development projects, modeling relationships among requirements clarity, team experience, technology maturity, architectural complexity, and project outcomes. Their network structure incorporated both causal relationships (team experience influences defect rates) and diagnostic relationships (observed defect rates update beliefs about team capability). The model successfully predicted project success with 78% accuracy early in projects when traditional indicators provided limited predictive power.

Critically, the network structure made reasoning transparent managers could understand which factors drove predictions and trace how evidence propagated through the network to update outcome probabilities.
Despite these promising applications, Bayesian methods face substantial implementation barriers that help explain their more limited adoption compared to Monte Carlo approaches. The conceptual challenge of specifying prior distributions proves particularly acute, as priors require quantifying beliefs about uncertain quantities in probabilistic terms. Project managers accustomed to deterministic thinking often struggle to articulate probability distributions representing their beliefs, uncertainty, and confidence levels. Expert elicitation methods exist for systematic prior specification, but these techniques require trained facilitators and substantial time investments that many projects cannot accommodate (Hora, 2020). Consequently, priors may be specified informally based on analyst judgment, introducing subjectivity and potential inconsistency across projects or analysts.

The sensitivity of Bayesian conclusions to prior specification raises concerns about objectivity and reproducibility. When evidence is sparse or weak, posterior distributions remain heavily influenced by priors, meaning that analysts with different prior beliefs may reach meaningfully different conclusions from identical evidence. This prior sensitivity troubles practitioners seeking objective, reproducible analyses that can be defended to stakeholders or auditors. While Bayesian theorists argue that prior specification represents explicit acknowledgment of uncertainty that frequentist approaches merely suppress, this philosophical stance may not satisfy practical requirements for demonstrable objectivity. Several studies have investigated prior sensitivity empirically. Hora (2020) conducted experiments where multiple experts provided priors for project parameters, then updated them using identical evidence. While posterior distributions converged considerably compared to initial priors, meaningful differences persisted even after substantial evidence accumulation, demonstrating that prior specification materially influences conclusions.

Computational challenges further constrain Bayesian adoption, particularly for high-dimensional problems common in project management. Simple Bayesian updating for univariate parameters involves straightforward calculations, but realistic project models typically involve many uncertain parameters with complex interdependencies. For such problems, analytical solutions rarely exist, necessitating computational approaches. Markov Chain Monte Carlo algorithms enable Bayesian inference for complex models by generating samples from posterior distributions through carefully constructed Markov chains. However, MCMC methods present their own challenges including slow convergence, difficulty assessing convergence reliably, and sensitivity to algorithm specifications. Brooks et al. (2011) document that MCMC convergence diagnostics remain imperfect, with no single diagnostic reliably detecting all convergence failures. Practitioners lacking deep statistical expertise may struggle to implement MCMC correctly or recognize when results are unreliable.

Software availability and usability also influence Bayesian adoption. While specialized Bayesian software like WinBUGS, JAGS, and Stan have made MCMC more accessible, these tools require statistical programming skills many project managers lack. General-purpose statistical software like R includes Bayesian packages, but again presumes statistical expertise. Commercial project management software rarely includes Bayesian capabilities, creating the workflow integration challenges noted for Monte Carlo methods. Some organizations have developed custom Bayesian tools tailored to their specific project contexts, but this approach requires substantial investment in software development and maintenance that smaller organizations cannot justify.

The organizational and cultural barriers facing Bayesian methods parallel but potentially exceed those confronting Monte Carlo adoption. Probabilistic thinking itself challenges many project management cultures built on commitment to plans, accountability for results, and minimization of acknowledged uncertainty. Bayesian approaches compound this challenge by requiring explicit articulation of prior beliefs that may be questioned or second-guessed, updating those beliefs as evidence accumulates, and communicating results as probability distributions rather than definitive predictions. Managers worry that Bayesian analyses may be perceived as excessively academic, overly complex, or insufficiently actionable compared to simpler approaches providing clear recommendations.

Rostami's (2021) examination of Bayesian risk assessment adoption across 150 engineering projects provides sobering evidence of implementation challenges. Only 18 projects (12%) successfully implemented Bayesian methods beyond initial pilot studies, with the remainder either abandoning attempts after pilots or never progressing beyond awareness and initial exploration. Primary obstacles included difficulty engaging experts to specify prior distributions (reported by 68% of organizations attempting implementation), complexity of software tools requiring specialized skills unavailable in project teams (58%), and management resistance from leaders unfamiliar with or skeptical of Bayesian reasoning (52%). Even among successful implementations, benefits accrued primarily to larger, more complex projects where systematic updating justified the analytical effort required. Smaller projects with limited duration and uncertainty found that the overhead of Bayesian analysis exceeded benefits compared to simpler approaches.

C. Comparative Analysis: Complementary Strengths and Integration Opportunities

The parallel examination of Monte Carlo and Bayesian approaches reveals complementary strengths suggesting potential value from integration while also highlighting distinct contexts where each method may be preferred. Monte Carlo Simulation excels at propagating uncertainty through complex models with multiple correlated variables, producing probability distributions of outcomes given specified input uncertainties. The method handles high-dimensional problems with many uncertain parameters effectively, accommodates arbitrary correlation structures and resource constraints, and produces results that are often more intuitive for stakeholders to interpret. However, traditional Monte Carlo implementations treat input distributions as fixed throughout analysis, failing to update them systematically as project evidence accumulates during execution.

Bayesian inference provides precisely this updating capability, treating all uncertain quantities as random variables characterized by probability distributions that are revised systematically as evidence emerges. The Bayesian framework naturally accommodates sequential decision-making where today's decisions affect future uncertainties, information value analysis to determine whether additional investigation is worthwhile before deciding, and explicit representation of both aleatory and epistemic uncertainty. However, Bayesian methods can struggle with very high-dimensional problems involving hundreds of correlated variables common in large project schedules, and the computational demands of Bayesian inference increase substantially with problem complexity.

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

These complementary characteristics suggest that integrated approaches combining Monte Carlo propagation with Bayesian updating could overcome limitations of each method alone. Several researchers have explored such integration, though the literature remains relatively sparse compared to studies applying either method independently. Chen and Wang (2017) developed hybrid frameworks that use Bayesian inference to update input distributions for project parameters based on accumulating evidence, then propagate these updated distributions through Monte Carlo simulation to generate revised outcome forecasts. Their construction schedule risk analysis application demonstrated that this hybrid approach reduced forecast error by 30-35% compared to static Monte Carlo models, with improvement greatest for projects experiencing significant early deviations from planned performance. The integration enabled projects to benefit from Monte Carlo's capacity to model complex uncertainty propagation while incorporating Bayesian updating's ability to refine predictions as evidence accumulated.

Latin hypercube sampling combined with Bayesian calibration represents another integration pathway receiving growing attention. Standard Monte Carlo sampling requires enormous sample sizes often hundreds of thousands of runs to accurately characterize low-probability tail events that frequently prove most consequential for project decisions. Latin hypercube sampling improves efficiency by stratifying the probability space, ensuring representative sampling of each input distribution even with moderate sample sizes. Helton and Davis (2003) demonstrated that Latin hypercube sampling combined with Bayesian parameter updating enabled accurate uncertainty quantification with 80% fewer simulations than standard Monte Carlo approaches. This computational efficiency proves valuable for projects requiring frequent forecast updates as conditions change, making near-real-time probabilistic forecasting more practical.

Markov Chain Monte Carlo algorithms represent the most sophisticated integration of Monte Carlo and Bayesian methodologies, using Monte Carlo sampling techniques to enable Bayesian inference for complex models where analytical posterior distributions are intractable. MCMC methods construct Markov chains whose stationary distributions match desired posterior distributions, generating samples that enable estimation of posterior expectations, quantiles, and other quantities of interest. The approach combines the flexibility of Monte Carlo sampling with the updating framework of Bayesian inference, enabling probabilistic analysis of models too complex for either method alone. However, MCMC faces significant practical challenges including slow convergence requiring lengthy runs, difficulty reliably assessing whether convergence has been achieved, and sensitivity to algorithm specifications that require expertise to optimize (Brooks et al., 2011).

Despite the theoretical appeal and demonstrated benefits of integrated approaches, adoption remains extremely limited. The review identified only seven studies reporting practical project management applications of integrated Monte Carlo-Bayesian methods, compared to 35 studies applying Monte Carlo alone and 21 applying Bayesian methods independently. This pattern suggests that implementation barriers for integrated approaches substantially exceed those for individual methods. Complexity represents the obvious explanation combining two methodologies, each with its own conceptual and computational challenges, inevitably increases overall difficulty. Organizations struggling to implement even single probabilistic methods are unlikely to attempt integration requiring mastery of both approaches plus understanding their interaction.

The question of when integrated approaches justify their additional complexity relative to simpler methods deserves careful consideration. Nguyen (2023) argues that integration provides greatest value in "small data" regimes where neither abundant historical data nor extensive ongoing monitoring exists. In such contexts, Bayesian priors can incorporate whatever limited information is available while Monte Carlo propagation generates outcome distributions despite sparse data, and Bayesian updating refines estimates as modest amounts of new evidence accumulate. This argument suggests that integrated methods may be particularly valuable for novel projects involving emerging technologies, unprecedented scales, or unique contexts where historical analogies provide limited guidance.

Conversely, projects with extensive historical databases enabling reliable input distribution specification may gain less from Bayesian updating if historical distributions already capture underlying uncertainties accurately. Similarly, projects where uncertainty is modest and outcomes predictable with simpler methods may find that neither Monte Carlo, Bayesian, nor integrated approaches justify their complexity. This suggests that method selection should respond to project characteristics specifically uncertainty magnitude, data availability, and project complexity rather than treating probabilistic approaches as universally superior.

The literature provides limited empirical evidence about such contingency relationships between project characteristics and optimal method selection. Most studies apply a chosen method to particular projects and demonstrate value, but few systematically compare alternative approaches across varied project contexts to identify boundary conditions. Kim and Reinschmidt (2020) represent an exception, comparing Monte Carlo and deterministic approaches across 50 construction projects varying in size, complexity, and uncertainty. Their findings suggest that Monte Carlo value increases with project complexity (measured by activity count and network structure) and uncertainty magnitude (coefficient of variation of key parameters), but that below certain thresholds simpler deterministic approaches perform adequately. However, their study compared only deterministic and Monte Carlo methods without examining Bayesian or integrated approaches, and focused exclusively on construction projects, limiting generalizability.

D. Implications for Project Management Theory and Practice

The synthesis of Monte Carlo and Bayesian applications in project management carries substantial implications for both theoretical understanding and practical application. Theoretically, the evidence demonstrates that probabilistic frameworks can meaningfully improve predictive accuracy, risk assessment, and decision-making quality compared to deterministic approaches when uncertainty is substantial and when implementations overcome the barriers documented throughout this review. This validation matters because project management theory has historically emphasized planning rigor, process discipline, and stakeholder management while sometimes underemphasizing the fundamental uncertainty characterizing project environments. The success of probabilistic methods suggests that project management theory should accord greater prominence to uncertainty quantification, probabilistic reasoning, and adaptive planning that updates as conditions evolve.

The findings also illuminate the conditions under which different theoretical perspectives on project uncertainty prove most useful. Contingency theory suggests that optimal management approaches depend on environmental characteristics, with mechanistic approaches suited to stable, predictable environments and organic approaches better for turbulent, uncertain contexts (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). The patterns revealed in this review support contingency perspectives probabilistic methods provide greatest value when uncertainty is substantial, projects are complex, and environments are dynamic, while simpler approaches may suffice for predictable contexts. This suggests that project management theory should embrace methodological pluralism, recognizing that different tools suit different contexts rather than seeking universal best practices.

Information processing theory provides another useful lens for interpreting findings. Organizations succeed when their information processing capabilities match information processing requirements imposed by task uncertainty and complexity (Galbraith, 1974). Probabilistic methods enhance information processing capabilities by formally representing uncertainty, systematically integrating diverse information sources, and updating understanding as evidence accumulates. However, they also increase information processing demands by requiring distribution specification, model construction, computational implementation, and interpretation of probabilistic outputs. The implementation challenges documented suggest that many organizations find probabilistic methods exceed their information processing capabilities, explaining limited adoption despite demonstrated technical benefits. This theoretical perspective suggests that successful implementation requires not just technical tools but organizational capabilities including relevant expertise, supporting infrastructure, and cultures that value probabilistic reasoning.

Practically, the review findings offer several actionable insights for project managers and organizations considering probabilistic methods. First, careful assessment of project characteristics should guide method selection rather than assuming probabilistic approaches always superior. Projects with high uncertainty (coefficient of variation exceeding 0.25-0.30 for key parameters), complex activity networks (more than 100 activities with multiple parallel paths), and substantial consequence should prioritize probabilistic analysis. Simpler projects may not justify the additional effort. Second, data availability fundamentally constrains probabilistic analysis effectiveness. Organizations with historical databases capturing actual performance can specify evidence-based distributions, while those lacking data must invest in expert elicitation processes or accept greater subjectivity. Hybrid approaches combining historical data where available with expert judgment for novel elements offer practical middle ground.

Third, workflow integration critically influences sustained adoption. Organizations most successfully implementing probabilistic methods either selected project management software with native probabilistic capabilities or invested in seamless integration between existing systems and specialized risk analysis tools. This integration ensures that probabilistic forecasts become routine project reports rather than special analyses conducted occasionally. Fourth, cultural preparation and stakeholder engagement deserve comparable attention to technical implementation. Introducing probabilistic methods requires explaining their logic, building comfort with uncertainty acknowledgment, and demonstrating value through early applications to credibility-building projects. Organizations that invested in education, secured leadership support, and created champion roles sustained probabilistic practices more consistently than those focusing exclusively on technical implementation.

Fifth, progressive sophistication represents a viable adoption pathway. Organizations need not implement fully sophisticated probabilistic models initially. Starting with simpler Monte Carlo applications for schedule or cost analysis, demonstrating value, building organizational capability, and then progressing toward more sophisticated methods including correlation modeling, resource constraints, and eventually Bayesian updating creates manageable learning curves. Sixth, external expertise often proves necessary initially but should transfer to internal capability. Consultant-dependent implementations risk abandonment when external support ends. Organizations sustaining probabilistic practices typically developed internal expertise through combination of training, hands-on mentoring during early projects, and documentation of processes and lessons learned.

The review also highlights several cautionary lessons. Probabilistic methods are not panaceas they improve decision-making when uncertainty is genuine and substantial, but cannot compensate for fundamental uncertainties about probability distributions governing project variables. The "garbage in, garbage out" principle operates with full force, making input quality paramount. Organizations should resist the temptation to apply probabilistic methods without the data, expertise, or commitment necessary for credible implementation, as poor implementations risk discrediting the approaches and creating skepticism toward future improvement attempts. Additionally, probabilistic methods address uncertainty quantification and prediction but do not eliminate underlying uncertainty or guarantee project success. Projects may still fail despite excellent probabilistic analysis if risks materialize, mitigation fails, or decisions prove flawed. Managing expectations about what probabilistic methods can and cannot achieve helps prevent disillusionment.

E. Research Gaps and Future Research Directions

This comprehensive review reveals substantial knowledge gaps despite the growing body of literature on probabilistic project management. Five critical research frontiers emerge as particularly important for advancing both theoretical understanding and practical application. First, the conditions determining optimal method selection

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

remain inadequately specified. While the review identified patterns suggesting that project complexity, uncertainty magnitude, and data availability influence relative value of different probabilistic approaches, systematic frameworks for method selection based on project characteristics are largely absent. Future research should develop and test decision frameworks that guide practitioners toward appropriate methods given their specific project contexts. Such frameworks might employ decision trees, scoring systems, or contingency models that map project attributes to recommended approaches, validated through empirical testing across diverse project samples.

Comparative studies systematically evaluating alternative probabilistic methods applied to the same projects would provide particularly valuable evidence. Most existing studies apply a single chosen method and demonstrate value, but rarely compare alternatives. Research designs where multiple methods are applied to identical projects, with both ex-ante predictions and ex post comparison to actual outcomes, would enable rigorous evaluation of relative performance under different conditions. Such studies should examine not just predictive accuracy but also computational requirements, implementation effort, stakeholder acceptance, and decision quality to provide comprehensive method comparisons. The paucity of such comparative research represents a significant gap limiting evidence-based method selection.

Second, domain-specific research remains concentrated in construction and software development, with other significant project domains underexplored. Healthcare system implementations, organizational change initiatives, new product development, and research projects all involve substantial uncertainty yet have received limited attention in the probabilistic project management literature. Whether findings from construction and software generalize to these domains or whether domain-specific adaptations are required remains unclear. Future research should explicitly examine probabilistic method applications across diverse project types, seeking to understand whether domain characteristics like tangibility of outputs, degree of novelty, stakeholder diversity, or regulatory constraints influence optimal approaches. Such research would either establish broader generalizability or identify domain-specific factors requiring methodological adaptation.

Third, the integration of probabilistic methods with emerging technologies including artificial intelligence, machine learning, and advanced analytics presents largely unexplored opportunities and challenges. Machine learning algorithms could potentially automate aspects of probabilistic analysis that currently require substantial expertise. For example, algorithms might learn to specify appropriate probability distributions from project characteristics and limited historical data, reducing the burden of distribution specification. Natural language processing could extract relevant information from project documents to inform probabilistic models. Reinforcement learning might optimize project decisions sequentially as uncertainty resolves. However, such integration raises questions about transparency, interpretability, and appropriate balance between algorithmic automation and human judgment. Research examining these integration opportunities while addressing associated challenges would advance capabilities substantially.

Fourth, limited understanding exists regarding causal pathways from probabilistic analysis through decision-making to project outcomes. Most studies evaluate probabilistic methods based on forecast accuracy how well predicted probability distributions match actual outcomes. However, forecast accuracy represents only an intermediate outcome; the ultimate goal is improved project delivery. Whether better forecasts actually translate into better decisions and superior project performance depends on how decision-makers use probabilistic information, whether they act on risk warnings, and how effectively they manage identified uncertainties. Research examining this causal chain through detailed process tracing, quasi-experimental designs comparing projects with and without probabilistic analysis, or longitudinal studies tracking decision processes and outcomes would strengthen the evidence base for these approaches. Understanding whether probabilistic forecasts that prove accurate actually improve project performance, and

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

identifying conditions where this translation does or does not occur, represents critical knowledge.

Fifth, implementation science perspectives that could illuminate adoption barriers and enablers remain largely absent from the project management literature. While several studies document implementation challenges, few draw on established theories of organizational change, technology adoption, or knowledge translation to explain patterns or develop tested implementation strategies. Applying frameworks like Rogers' (2003) diffusion of innovations theory, the Technology Acceptance Model, or Normalization Process Theory could provide deeper insights into why adoption remains limited despite demonstrated technical capabilities. Research explicitly examining implementation from these theoretical perspectives, developing and testing implementation strategies grounded in relevant theory, and identifying organizational characteristics associated with successful adoption would complement technical research and accelerate practical application.

Beyond these five priorities, several additional research directions merit attention. Longitudinal studies tracking organizations over multiple projects as they develop probabilistic analysis capabilities would illuminate learning curves, capability development processes, and sustainability of practices over time. Comparative international research examining whether cultural differences in uncertainty avoidance, power distance, or other dimensions influence probabilistic method adoption and effectiveness could provide insights for global project management. Investigation of training approaches and educational interventions that most effectively build probabilistic reasoning capabilities in project management practitioners would support broader adoption. Research examining communication strategies for conveying probabilistic information to diverse stakeholders, testing approaches for maximizing comprehension while minimizing misinterpretation, would address practical barriers identified throughout this review.

V. CONCLUSION

This comprehensive review of Monte Carlo Simulation and Bayesian inference in project management demonstrates that probabilistic methodologies offer substantial theoretical and practical value for addressing the inherent uncertainties characterizing contemporary project environments. Through systematic analysis of 47 core scholarly works supplemented by broader literature, the review establishes that these approaches meaningfully improve predictive accuracy, enable more informed risk assessment, and support better decision-making compared to traditional deterministic methods when uncertainty is substantial and when implementations overcome identified barriers. Monte Carlo Simulation provides powerful frameworks for propagating uncertainty through complex project models, generating probability distributions of outcomes that capture the range and likelihood of possible results rather than single-point predictions that inevitably prove inaccurate. Bayesian inference offers complementary strengths through dynamic updating mechanisms that systematically refine predictions as evidence accumulates during project execution, enabling adaptive management that responds to evolving conditions.

The review reveals important patterns regarding contexts where probabilistic methods provide greatest value. Projects characterized by high uncertainty, complex activity networks, and significant consequences benefit most from probabilistic analysis, while simpler projects with modest uncertainty may achieve adequate results with deterministic approaches. Data availability fundamentally constrains probabilistic analysis effectiveness organizations with historical databases enabling evidence-based distribution specification achieve substantially better results than those relying primarily on expert judgment. Method sophistication should match project characteristics and organizational capabilities rather than pursuing maximum technical complexity regardless of context. These findings support theoretical perspectives emphasizing contingency relationships between environmental characteristics and optimal

© DEC 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 9 Issue 6 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV9I6-1712870

management approaches rather than universal best practices.

Despite demonstrated technical capabilities, adoption of probabilistic project management methods remains limited. Multiple barriers constrain broader implementation including conceptual challenges of probabilistic thinking, computational demands particularly for sophisticated methods, workflow integration difficulties with existing project management systems, cultural resistance in organizations built on deterministic planning traditions, and skills gaps among project management practitioners. Successful adopters exhibited common characteristics including leadership support legitimizing probabilistic approaches, integration with existing processes rather than parallel systems, demonstrated early wins building credibility, and cultures valuing learning and continuous improvement. These findings highlight that technical capability represents necessary but insufficient condition for practical adoption organizational context, implementation processes, and human factors prove equally critical.

The review identifies five critical research frontiers that deserve priority attention. Systematic frameworks for method selection based on project characteristics remain largely absent despite clear need for evidence-based guidance. Domain-specific research concentration in construction and software development leaves other significant project types underexplored. Integration opportunities with emerging technologies including artificial intelligence and machine learning present largely unexamined potential. Understanding of causal pathways from probabilistic analysis through decision-making to project outcomes remains underdeveloped, with most studies evaluating forecast accuracy rather than ultimate project performance impacts. Implementation science perspectives that could illuminate adoption barriers and inform effective implementation strategies are notably absent from current literature.

For project management practice, the review offers several key implications. Organizations should assess project characteristics systematically when selecting management approaches, recognizing that probabilistic methods provide greatest value under specific conditions rather than universally. Investment in data infrastructure capturing historical For research, the review establishes foundation for future investigation by comprehensively synthesizing current knowledge, identifying convergence and contradictions in existing literature, and articulating specific gaps requiring attention. The field needs comparative studies evaluating alternative methods under controlled conditions, domain-specific research examining generalizability across project types, integration research exploring synergies with emerging technologies, outcome- project performance enables evidence-based probabilistic analysis, while organizations lacking such data must accept greater reliance on expert judgment with attendant subjectivity. Workflow integration deserves comparable attention to technical implementation, as seamless connection between probabilistic analysis and routine project management processes critically influences sustained adoption. Cultural preparation through education, leadership engagement, and early success demonstration facilitates acceptance of probabilistic thinking. Progressive sophistication pathways beginning with simpler applications and building toward more sophisticated methods create manageable capability development.

focused research tracing pathways from analysis to project results, and implementation research applying organizational change theories to understand and facilitate adoption. Such research would advance both theoretical understanding and practical application, ultimately enhancing project management's capacity to navigate the substantial uncertainties that characterize contemporary project environments.

REFERENCES

[1] Acebes, F., Pajares, J., Galán, J. M., & López-Paredes, A. (2019). Beyond earned value management: A graphical framework for integrated cost, schedule and risk monitoring. Procedia Computer Science, 164, 85-92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.12.156

[2] Ahmadi, M., Behzadian, K., Ardeshir, A., & Kapelan, Z. (2022). Comprehensive risk management using fuzzy FMEA and MCDA

techniques in highway construction projects. Journal of Civil Engineering and Management, 23(2), 300-310. https://doi.org/10.3846/jcem.2022.15902

[3] Aven, T., & Reniers, G. (2020). How to define and interpret a probability in a risk and safety setting. Safety Science, 123,104-559. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.104559

[4] Brooks, S., Gelman, A., Jones, G., & Meng, X. L. (2011). Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo. CRC Press.

[5] Chen, H., & Wang, Y. (2017). Application of Monte Carlo simulation for schedule risk analysis in construction projects. International Journal of Project Management, 35(4), 618-630. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2016.11.012

[6] Cheng, M. Y., Kusoemo, D., & Gosno, R. A. (2021). Text mining-based construction site accident classification using hybrid supervised machine learning. Automation in Construction, 118, 103265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2020.103265

[7] Cho, K., & Yum, S. G. (2020). Systematic approach to analyze correlation between construction schedule delay and cost overrun using Bayesian structural equation modeling. KSCE Journal of Civil Engineering, 24(8), 2542-2553. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12205-020-2175-5

[8] Cowles, M. K., & Carlin, B. P. (2022). Markov Chain Monte Carlo convergence diagnostics: A comparative review. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 91(434), 883-904. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1996.10476956

[9] Crawford, L., Morris, P., Thomas, J., & Winter, M. (2020). Practitioner development in project management: Addressing the gap between learning and practice. International Journal of Project Management, 24*(4), 291-298. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2020.04.002

[10] El-Sayegh, S. M. (2016). Risk assessment and allocation in the UAE construction industry. International Journal of Project Management, 34(2), 180-190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2015.11.006

[11] Fenton, N., & Neil, M. (2018). Risk assessment and decision analysis with Bayesian networks (2nd ed.). CRC Press.

[12] Firm, G., Horvat, N., & Bašić, M. (2020). Adoption patterns and barriers of schedule risk analysis in construction industry. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 146(9), 04020104. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001881

[13] Galbraith, J. R. (1974). Organization design: An information processing view. Interfaces, 4(3), 28-36. https://doi.org/10.1287/inte.4.3.28

[14] Gelman, A., Carlin, J. B., Stern, H. S., Dunson, D. B., Vehtari, A., & Rubin, D. B. (2020). Bayesian data analysis (3rd ed.). CRC Press.

[15] Hazır, Ö. (2021). A review of analytical models, approaches and decision support tools in project monitoring and control. International Journal of Project Management, 33(4), 808-815. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2020.12.001

[16] Helton, J. C., & Davis, F. J. (2003). Latin hypercube sampling and the propagation of uncertainty in analyses of complex systems. Reliability Engineering & System Safety, 81(1), 23-69. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0951-8320(03)00058-9

[17] Hora, S. C. (2020). Eliciting probabilities from experts. In W. Edwards, R. F. Miles Jr., & D. von Winterfeldt (Eds.), Advances in decision analysis: From foundations to applications (pp. 129-153). Cambridge University Press.

[18] Hulett, D. T. (2016). Practical schedule risk analysis (3rd ed.). Gower Publishing.

[19] Jiang, Y., & Zhang, W. (2019). A Bayesian network model for reliable project cost estimation. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 145(9), 05019012. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001691

[20] Johansen, A., Sandvin, A., & Torp, O. (2022). Factors affecting the use of risk analysis in the Norwegian construction industry. International Journal of Construction Management, 22(7), 1234-1245. https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2019.1686836

[21] Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

[22] Kerzner, H. (2022). Project management: A systems approach to planning, scheduling, and controlling (13th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

[23] Khamooshi, H., & Golafshani, H. (2019). EDM: Earned duration management, a new approach to schedule performance management and measurement. International Journal of Project Management, 32(6), 1019-1041. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.11.002

[24] Kim, B. C., & Reinschmidt, K. F. (2020). Probabilistic forecasting of project duration using Kalman filter and the earned value method. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 136(8), 834-843. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000192

[25] Knight, F. H. (1921). Risk, uncertainty and profit. Houghton Mifflin.

[26] Kroese, D. P., Brereton, T., Taimre, T., & Botev, Z. I. (2014). Why the Monte Carlo method is so important today. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics, 6(6), 386-392. https://doi.org/10.1002/wics.1314

[27] Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). Differentiation and integration in complex organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 12(1), 1-47. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391211

[28] Lindley, D. V. (1991). Making decisions (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

[29] Love, P. E., Sing, C. P., Ika, L. A., & Newton, S. (2019). The cost performance of transportation infrastructure projects: The fallacy of the Planning Fallacy account. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice, 122, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2019.02.004

[30] Malcolm, D. G., Roseboom, J. H., Clark, C. E., & Fazar, W. (1959). Application of a technique for research and development program evaluation. Operations Research, 7(5), 646-669. https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.7.5.646

[31] McKay, M. D., Beckman, R. J., & Conover, W. J. (2000). A comparison of three methods for selecting values of input variables in the analysis of output from a computer code. Technometrics, 42(1), 55-61. https://doi.org/10.1080/00401706.2000.10485979

[32] Moret, Y., & Einstein, H. H. (2022). Construction cost and duration uncertainty model: Application to high-speed rail line project. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 142(10), 05016010. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001161

[33] Nasirzadeh, F., Khanzadi, M., & Rezaie, M. (2020). Dynamic modeling of the quantitative risk allocation in construction projects. International Journal of Project Management, 32(3), 442-451. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2013.06.002

[34] Nguyen, T. N. (2023). Applying Monte Carlo simulations to small data analysis: Economic growth in COVID-19 times. SAGE Open, 13(2), 21582440231181540. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231181540

[35] Pittaway, L., Robertson, M., Munir, K., Denyer, D., & Neely, A. (2004). Networking and innovation: A systematic review of the evidence. International Journal of Management Reviews, 5(3-4), 137-168. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-8545.2004.00101.x

[36] Project Management Institute. (2023). Pulse of the profession 2023: Beyond agility. PMI.

[37] Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.

[38] Rostami, A. (2021). Tools and techniques in risk identification: A research within SMEs in the UK construction industry. Universal Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 6(1), 1-11.

[39] Savage, L. J. (1954). The foundations of statistics. John Wiley & Sons.

[40] Schatteman, D., Herroelen, W., Van de Vonder, S., & Boone, A. (2021). Methodology for integrated risk management and proactive scheduling of construction projects. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 134(11), 885-893. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2008)134:11(885)

[41] Svejvig, P., & Andersen, P. (2021). Rethinking project management: A structured literature review with a critical look at the brave new world. International Journal of Project Management, 33(2), 278-290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.06.004

[42] Touran, A., & Wiser, E. P. (2019). Monte Carlo technique with correlated random variables. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 118(2), 258-272. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(1992)118:2(258)

[43] Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. British Journal of Management, 14(3), 207-222. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375

[44] Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1992). Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, 5(4), 297-323. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00122574

[45] Ümmügülüsüm, E., Dinçer, K. D., & Sansarcı, E. (2023). Monte Carlo simulation of project completion times: A case study for an electric vehicle project. International Review on Modelling and Simulations, 16(4), 234-245. https://doi.org/10.46254/au02.20230265

[46] Vose, D. (2008). Risk analysis: A quantitative guide (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

[47] Wauters, M., & Vanhoucke, M. (2023). A nearest neighbour extension to project duration forecasting with artificial intelligence. European Journal of Operational Research, 259(3), 1097-1111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2016.11.018

[48] Williams, T. (2003). The contribution of mathematical modelling to the practice of project management. IMA Journal of Management Mathematics, 14(1), 3-30. https://doi.org/10.1093/imaman/14.1.3

[49] Willumsen, P., Oehmen, J., Stingl, V., & Geraldi, J. (2019). Value creation through project risk management. International Journal of Project Management, 37(5), 731-749. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2019.01.007

[50] Yet, B., & Constantinou, A. (2020). Bayesian networks for decision support: Learning, generating, and embedding. In O. Pourret, P. Naïm, & B. Marcot (Eds.), Bayesian networks: A practical guide to applications (pp. 287-305). John Wiley & Sons.