International Journal of Management and Business Development (IJMBD)
eISSN: 3087-4084
Volume03 Issue09 | Page No: - 01-06

Received: 30 Jun 2026, Revised: 19 Jul 2026, Accepted: 25 Aug 2026, Published: 09 Sep 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmbd-v03i09-01

A Quantitative Framework for Measuring Investor Delay Costs and Improving Private Capital Allocation Efficiency

Minh Anh Nguyen[1], Linh Thi Tran[2]

[1] Faculty of Economics and Management Sciences, Vietnam Institute of Economic and Business Studies, Hanoi, Vietnam

[2] Department of Management Sciences, Hanoi School of Economics and Management, Hanoi, Vietnam

ABSTRACT: Temporary delays in private capital allocation can impose economic costs that extend beyond the nominal duration of an investment decision. When capital remains uncommitted, investors may experience opportunity losses, reduced portfolio responsiveness, delayed project initiation, and diminished capacity to exploit emerging investment opportunities. This paper develops a quantitative framework for measuring investor delay costs and evaluating their implications for private capital allocation efficiency. The proposed framework integrates delay duration, committed capital, expected return, opportunity cost, probability of investment realization, and operational decision efficiency into a measurable delay-cost function. The methodology conceptualizes investor delay as a time-dependent capital allocation inefficiency and distinguishes direct financial opportunity costs from indirect efficiency losses. The framework is theoretically positioned within broader evidence concerning artificial intelligence, automation, fraud reduction, and operational performance. Existing literature indicates that AI-enabled systems can improve analytical capacity, automate decision processes, reduce fraud exposure, and enhance organizational performance, while technological infrastructure determines the scalability of such capabilities (Agrawal et al., 2019; Manyika & Sneader, 2018; Mohsen, 2023; Walter, 2023). Building on these insights, the paper proposes a Delay Cost Index and an Allocation Efficiency Ratio for evaluating the financial and operational consequences of temporary investment delays. Analytical findings demonstrate that delay costs increase with capital exposure, expected return differentials, and delay duration, while decision-support automation can reduce the effective delay burden. The framework provides investors and private capital managers with a structured mechanism for prioritizing high-cost delays and assessing process improvements.

KEYWORDS: Investor Delay Cost; Private Capital Allocation; Investment Efficiency; Opportunity Cost; Capital Management; Decision Latency; Artificial Intelligence; Quantitative Framework; Investment Decision-Making.

1. Introduction

Private capital allocation requires investors and capital managers to continuously evaluate opportunities, assess risk, verify information, and determine the timing of financial commitments. The efficiency of this process is not determined exclusively by the quality of the final investment decision. The time required to reach that decision is also economically relevant because capital that remains unallocated during an extended decision process may be unable to generate returns elsewhere. Consequently, temporary investor delay represents an important but comparatively underdeveloped dimension of private capital management.

Mikhail (2024) specifically identifies temporary investor delay as a factor affecting the efficiency of private capital management processes. This perspective is important because conventional investment evaluation frequently concentrates on expected return, risk, liquidity, and portfolio composition while treating decision time as an administrative variable. In practice, however, delay can alter the economic value of an opportunity. A delayed investment decision may cause an investor to miss a favorable entry point, postpone project execution, or maintain capital in a lower-yield position.

Technological development further changes the relationship between decision time and capital efficiency. Artificial intelligence can increase the scale and speed of information processing, while automation can restructure work processes and reduce the time required for repetitive analytical activities (Agrawal et al., 2019; Manyika & Sneader, 2018). Applications of AI to fraud prevention demonstrate that computational systems can

also strengthen financial monitoring and risk identification (Larcelet-Prost, 2023; West, 2021). These developments suggest that investment delay should be analyzed not only as a financial phenomenon but also as an operational performance variable.

The central problem addressed by this paper is therefore the absence of a simple quantitative mechanism for translating temporary investment delay into an economically interpretable cost. The objective is to develop such a framework by connecting capital exposure, expected return, delay duration, opportunity cost, and process efficiency. The paper also examines how AI-enabled decision support may reduce the measurable burden of investor delay.

The scope is limited to private capital allocation and temporary decision delays. The framework is not intended to predict market returns or replace professional investment judgment. Instead, it provides a measurement structure through which managers can identify the economic significance of decision latency and evaluate process improvements.

2. Literature Review

The economics of AI provides a theoretical basis for understanding why information-processing capacity can influence economic decision-making. Agrawal et al. (2019) conceptualize AI primarily in terms of its implications for prediction and decision processes. For private capital management, this distinction is relevant because investment analysis involves repeated prediction, comparison, and evaluation. If analytical tasks can be performed more rapidly without proportionally reducing decision quality, the economic cost associated with waiting may decline.

Manyika and Sneader (2018) similarly emphasize the transformation of work through AI and automation. Their analysis supports the proposition that technological systems can change the structure and efficiency of knowledge-intensive processes. Applied to capital allocation, automation can potentially reduce manual processing time, improve workflow coordination, and allow investment professionals to concentrate on higher-value judgment.

Evidence concerning operational and supply-chain performance provides additional support for linking technology with organizational efficiency. Mohsen (2023) examines the impact of AI on supply-chain management performance, while Walter (2023) considers AI impacts on supply-chain performance through a manufacturing use case. Although these studies are not specifically concerned with investment decisions, their relevance lies in demonstrating that AI can influence organizational performance through improved information processing and operational coordination.

The financial-control dimension is represented by Larcelet-Prost (2023) and West (2021), both of whom discuss AI and machine learning as mechanisms for reducing fraud. Fraud detection is particularly relevant to private capital allocation because verification and risk screening contribute to the time required before capital can be committed. Faster identification of anomalous or suspicious activity can reduce unnecessary delays while maintaining appropriate control mechanisms.

Technological scale is also relevant. Epoch's discussion of parameter, compute, and data trends demonstrates the expanding computational resources available to machine-learning systems. NYU IT's description of the Hudson HPC/AI Cluster illustrates the infrastructure required to support computationally intensive workloads. These sources collectively suggest that improvements in computational capability can facilitate increasingly complex analytical processes.

Webb (2023), through an account of the evolution from GPT-1 to GPT-4, provides an example of rapid advancement in generative AI capabilities. Such developments are potentially relevant to investment workflows involving document analysis, information extraction, summarization, and preliminary evaluation. Nevertheless, technological capability does not automatically imply economically superior investment decisions. Whitehouse (2022) and Manyika and Sneader (2018) indicate the broader workforce and organizational implications of AI adoption, emphasizing that technology changes processes rather than eliminating the need for organizational governance.

The central literature gap is therefore not simply technological. The supplied literature discusses AI capability, automation, fraud reduction, computational infrastructure, and organizational performance, but it does not establish a unified quantitative measure of the economic cost of temporary investor delay. Mikhail (2024) provides the closest conceptual foundation by explicitly treating temporary investor delay as a factor in improving private capital management efficiency. The present study extends that perspective by converting delay into measurable financial and operational indicators.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study uses a quantitative conceptual modeling approach. Rather than estimating parameters from a new investment dataset, the methodology constructs measurable relationships between investment capital, delay duration, expected return, and allocation efficiency. This approach is appropriate because the

supplied literature establishes conceptual relationships but does not provide a standardized dataset capable of direct cross-study statistical estimation.

Investor delay is defined as the additional time between the point at which an investment opportunity becomes sufficiently actionable and the point at which the investor makes the relevant allocation decision. The model assumes that the economic consequence of delay is proportional to the productive use that could otherwise have been obtained from the capital.

3.2 Basic Delay Cost Function

Let:

- CC = capital under consideration;
- rr = expected annual return associated with the relevant alternative;
- dd = delay duration in days;
- rar_a = annual return available from the capital while unallocated;
- PP = probability that the investment opportunity remains available after the delay.

The basic opportunity-cost component can be represented as:

DCbase=C(r−ra)d365DC_{base}=C(r-r_a)\frac{d}{365}

where DCbaseDC_{base} represents the financial cost associated with the temporary delay.

However, investment opportunities are not always preserved during the delay. Therefore, the probability-adjusted delay cost can be represented as:

DCadj=C(r−ra)d365PDC_{adj}=C(r-r_a)\frac{d}{365}P

This formulation recognizes that a delay can have two different consequences. First, the investor may simply postpone the earning period. Second, the opportunity itself may deteriorate or disappear. The probability term captures this second dimension without assuming that every delayed opportunity is permanently lost.

3.3 Process Efficiency Component

Financial opportunity cost alone does not capture the operational consequences of delay. A capital-management process may involve document collection, due diligence, compliance review, fraud screening, investment committee approval, and transaction execution. Each stage can create decision latency.

Let TpT_p represent the planned decision time and TaT_a represent actual decision time. The Delay Ratio can therefore be defined as:

DR=Ta−TpTpDR=\frac{T_a-T_p}{T_p}

A value of zero indicates that the process was completed within the planned period, whereas positive values indicate delay.

To connect operational delay with financial exposure, the Delay Cost Index (DCI) can be formulated as:

DCI=DCadjC×100DCI=\frac{DC_{adj}}{C}\times100

The DCI expresses delay cost as a percentage of the capital under consideration, allowing comparisons across investment opportunities of different sizes.

3.4 Allocation Efficiency Ratio

A complementary measure is the Allocation Efficiency Ratio (AER):

AER=TvTv+TdAER=\frac{T_v}{T_v+T_d}

where TvT_v is the time during which capital is productively positioned or allocated and TdT_d represents economically relevant delay time.

An increase in AERAER indicates that a greater proportion of the relevant decision period is associated with productive capital deployment. Importantly, the ratio does not imply that every delay should be eliminated. Some delays are necessary for due diligence, risk verification, and governance. The objective is therefore to distinguish productive delay from avoidable delay.

3.5 AI-Enabled Process Adjustment

AI can influence the model primarily by reducing processing time rather than by guaranteeing better investment outcomes. Suppose a decision workflow consists of nn activities, with each activity requiring tit_i units of time. Total processing time is:

T=∑i=1ntiT=\sum_{i=1}^{n}t_i

If AI or automation reduces each automatable activity by an efficiency factor aia_i, the revised processing time becomes:

TAI=∑i=1nti(1−ai)T_{AI}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}t_i(1-a_i)

where 0≤ai≤10\leq a_i\leq1.

The resulting time saving is:

ΔT=T−TAI\Delta T=T-T_{AI}

The financial value of this improvement can then be approximated through:

Vtime=C(r−ra)ΔT365PV_{time}=C(r-r_a)\frac{\Delta T}{365}P

This model provides a direct connection between technological process improvement and capital-allocation economics.

3.6 Hypothetical Application

Consider a private investor evaluating an investment of $10 million with an expected annual return differential of 8% compared with the investor's current alternative. If an avoidable delay of 30 days occurs, the basic opportunity cost is:

10,000,000(0.08)3036510,000,000(0.08)\frac{30}{365}

which equals approximately $65,753 before probability adjustment.

If process automation reduces the delay from 30 to 10 days, the remaining delay cost falls to approximately $21,918. The difference, approximately $43,835, represents the potential financial value of reducing the decision delay under the assumed parameters.

This example demonstrates why delay should be evaluated relative to capital exposure rather than measured solely in days. Ten days may be immaterial for a small investment but financially significant for a large allocation with a substantial return differential.

3.7 Model Limitations

The framework depends on estimated returns and probabilities, which may themselves contain substantial uncertainty. Expected return is not guaranteed return, and probability estimates may be subjective. Additionally, reducing decision time can increase error risk if automation is implemented without adequate controls. AI systems may accelerate information processing while simultaneously introducing model bias, data-quality problems, or inappropriate recommendations. Therefore, process speed should not be treated as an independent objective. The relevant objective is risk-adjusted allocation efficiency.

4. Results

The quantitative framework produces five principal findings concerning the relationship between temporary delay and private capital allocation efficiency.

First, delay cost is directly related to the amount of capital exposed to the delayed decision. Holding all other variables constant, doubling capital approximately doubles the financial opportunity cost. This means that a uniform organizational target such as “reduce all investment decisions by five days” is economically inefficient because it assigns equal process importance to opportunities with dramatically different capital exposures. The DCI addresses this weakness by normalizing delay cost against capital.

Second, delay duration has a linear effect in the basic model. When the annual return differential and probability of opportunity preservation remain constant, extending delay from 10 to 20 days approximately doubles the calculated opportunity cost. The implication is that delay becomes increasingly material when investment committees, verification teams, or administrative processes create repeated extensions rather than a single isolated delay. This finding supports the argument that temporary delay should be incorporated into capital-management performance measurement rather than treated solely as an operational inconvenience (Mikhail, 2024).

Third, the return differential between the proposed investment and the alternative use of capital is a critical determinant of delay cost. Capital waiting to enter an opportunity with a relatively small return advantage produces a lower measured cost than capital waiting to enter an opportunity with a substantially higher expected return. Consequently, prioritization systems should rank pending decisions according to economic exposure rather than chronological order alone.

Fourth, probability adjustment materially changes the interpretation of delay. A delayed transaction that has a high probability of remaining available produces a relatively predictable opportunity cost. In contrast, a delay involving a time-sensitive opportunity may generate a substantially larger economic effect because the investment opportunity itself can deteriorate. This distinction enables the framework to separate ordinary time-value losses from opportunity-loss risk.

Fifth, AI-enabled workflow improvements can reduce the economic burden of delay when they shorten genuinely avoidable processing activities. The framework does not claim that AI automatically improves investment performance. Instead, its measurable contribution occurs when analytical, verification, or administrative tasks can be completed faster without compromising investment quality. This interpretation is consistent with the broader literature associating AI and automation with enhanced operational capacity (Agrawal et al., 2019; Manyika & Sneader, 2018).

The model therefore indicates that private capital allocation efficiency is multidimensional. A process may achieve high decision accuracy while remaining economically inefficient because decisions occur too slowly. Conversely, an extremely fast process may be inefficient if reduced verification increases investment errors or fraud exposure. AI applications in fraud prevention suggest that technology should therefore be evaluated according to its ability to increase speed while preserving control quality (Larcelet-Prost, 2023; West, 2021).

Overall, the proposed DCI and AER provide complementary measurements. DCI captures the economic significance of delay, while AER evaluates the efficiency of capital deployment time. Together they offer a more complete perspective than a simple measurement of processing duration.

5. Discussion

The findings indicate that temporary investor delay should be treated as an economic variable within private capital management rather than solely as an administrative performance indicator. Mikhail (2024) establishes the importance of investor temporary delay in private capital management, and the present framework extends that proposition by specifying measurable variables through which delay can be evaluated. The central theoretical contribution is therefore the transformation of decision latency into an economically interpretable quantity.

The first implication concerns managerial prioritization. Traditional workflow systems often process investment opportunities according to arrival time, organizational hierarchy, or committee schedules. The proposed framework suggests that priority should instead incorporate capital exposure, return differential, and opportunity persistence. A relatively small investment requiring extensive administrative attention may generate less economic loss from delay than a large, time-sensitive allocation. Thus, capital managers can use DCI to identify where process acceleration is likely to generate the greatest economic benefit.

The second implication concerns AI adoption. The literature indicates that AI can increase analytical and operational capabilities, but the framework clarifies the mechanism through which these improvements may influence capital allocation. AI generates economic value from speed only when reduced processing time corresponds to lower delay costs. Consequently, organizations should not evaluate AI investment exclusively through generic productivity measures. They should estimate the reduction in economically relevant decision latency and translate that reduction into potential capital value.

The third implication is that automation should not eliminate governance controls. Fraud-prevention applications demonstrate the value of AI in identifying financial anomalies, while broader AI research highlights the importance of organizational adaptation (Larcelet-Prost, 2023; Manyika & Sneader, 2018). A process that becomes faster but less reliable may reduce nominal delay while increasing expected investment losses. Therefore, the optimal system minimizes risk-adjusted delay, not simply elapsed time.

The framework also reveals a trade-off between speed and verification quality. Investment decisions frequently involve uncertainty, incomplete information, compliance requirements, and fraud risk. Reducing every delay could therefore be counterproductive. The distinction between productive and avoidable delay is essential: due diligence that prevents a major investment error may create substantial value even though it increases processing time.

The technological infrastructure literature also provides an important boundary condition. AI-enabled capital management depends on computational resources capable of supporting increasingly sophisticated analytical workloads. Epoch's observations regarding compute and data trends, together with NYU IT's description of HPC/AI infrastructure, indicate that computational capacity can support larger and more complex workloads. However, infrastructure availability does not guarantee economically meaningful improvements unless systems are integrated into investment workflows.

A further limitation concerns estimation risk. Expected return differentials and opportunity probabilities are uncertain and may change during the delay itself. The framework should therefore be implemented with scenario analysis rather than a single deterministic estimate. Sensitivity analysis can test how DCI changes under alternative return, probability, and delay assumptions.

Finally, the framework is best interpreted as a decision-support mechanism rather than an autonomous investment model. Webb's discussion of the evolution of GPT systems illustrates the rapid development of AI capabilities, but capability growth does not remove the need for human governance. Whitehouse (2022) similarly highlights broader workforce implications associated with AI transformation. Private capital managers should therefore use AI to augment analytical capacity while retaining accountability for capital-allocation decisions.

6. Conclusion

This paper developed a quantitative framework for measuring investor delay costs and improving private capital allocation efficiency. The framework treats temporary decision latency as an economic variable determined by capital exposure, return differential, delay duration, and the probability that an opportunity remains available. The proposed Delay Cost Index quantifies the financial burden of delay, while the Allocation Efficiency Ratio evaluates the proportion of relevant decision time associated with productive capital deployment.

The analysis demonstrates that delay costs can become economically significant even when the delay itself appears operationally small. Capital size, expected

return differential, and opportunity sensitivity determine whether a particular delay deserves managerial intervention. Consequently, investment-process optimization should prioritize economically consequential delays rather than simply minimizing average processing time.

The framework also establishes a practical mechanism for evaluating AI and automation. Their value can be assessed through the amount of economically relevant decision time they save, provided that speed improvements do not compromise due diligence, fraud controls, or decision quality. This perspective connects the broader literature on AI, automation, computational infrastructure, fraud prevention, and operational performance with the specific problem of private capital allocation.

The principal contribution is therefore a measurable bridge between decision latency and capital efficiency. Future empirical research should validate the proposed indicators using transaction-level investment data, estimate the relationship between delay and realized investment outcomes, and test whether AI-enabled workflow interventions produce statistically significant improvements in risk-adjusted allocation efficiency. Such research would allow the conceptual framework to evolve into an empirically calibrated model for private capital management.

References

1. Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2019). The Economics of Artificial Intelligence. University of Chicago Press.

2. Epoch, "Parameter, Compute and Data Trends in Machine Learning". Published online at epochai.org. Retrieved 2023, from https://epochai.org/mlinputs/visualization

3. Larcelet-Prost, J. R. (2023). 5 Ways AI Prevents Fraud in Banking and Fintech. ReadSpeaker. https://www.readspeaker.com/blog/anti-fraud-ai/

4. Manyika, J., & Sneader, K. (2018). AI, automation, and the future of work: Ten things to solve for. McKinsey & Company. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/ai-automation-and-the-future-of-work-ten-things-to-solve-for

5. Mohsen, B. M. (2023). Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Supply Chain Management Performance. Journal of Service Science and Management, 16(01), 44-58.

6. NYU IT. (n.d.). Hudson HPC/AI Cluster. New York University. Retrieved 2023, from https://www.nyu.edu/life/information-technology/research-computing-services/high-performance-computing/high-performance-computing-nyu-it/hpc-supercomputer-clusters/hudson.html#:~:text=The%20cluster%20can%20perform%20one,computing%20data%20center%

7. Walter, S. (2023). AI impacts on supply chain performance : a manufacturing use case study. Discover Artificial Intelligence, 3(1), 18.

8. Webb, M. (2023). Insights: Breaking Down the Transformative Journey of GPT Models in AI, from GPT-1 to GPT-4. Techopedia. Retrieved from https://www.techopedia.com/gpt-series-evolution-insights#:~:text=GPT%2D4%20was%20trained%20using%2021%20billion%20petaFLOPs

9. West, D. (2021). Using AI and machine learning to reduce government fraud. The Brookings Institution. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu/articles/using-ai-and-machine-learning-to-reduce-government-fraud/

10. Whitehouse. (2022). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Future of Workforces in the European Union and the United States of America. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/TTC-EC-CEA-AI-Report-12052022-1.pd

11. Mikhail, S. (2024). Estimating the cost of investor's temporary delay as a factor in improving the efficiency of private capital management processes. European journal of Economics and Management Sciences, (3), 34-39.