

Continuous kinematic wave models of merging traffic flow

Wen-Long Jin*

June 13, 2022

Abstract

Traffic dynamics at a merging junction can be numerically solved with discrete conservation equations and so-called supply-demand methods. In this paper, we first introduce a continuous multi-commodity kinematic wave model of merging traffic and then develop a new framework for constructing the solutions to its Riemann problem with jump initial conditions. In the supply-demand space, the solutions on a link consist of an interior state and a stationary state, subject to admissible conditions such that there are no positive and negative kinematic waves on the upstream and downstream links respectively. In addition, the solutions have to satisfy entropy conditions defined by the supply-demand method in the interior states and a corresponding distribution scheme. For a merging junction with two upstream links, we prove that the stationary states and boundary fluxes exist and are unique for the Riemann problem for both fair and constant distribution schemes. With a numerical example, we demonstrate that the boundary fluxes converge to the analytical solutions at any positive time when we decrease the period of a time interval.

Key words: Kinematic wave models, merging traffic, Riemann problem, supply-demand method, distribution schemes, stationary states, interior states, boundary fluxes

1 INTRODUCTION

Essential to effective and efficient transportation control, management, and planning is a better understanding of the evolution of traffic dynamics on a road network, i.e., the formation, propagation, and dissipation of traffic congestion. The seminal work by (1, 2) (LWR) describes traffic dynamics with kinematic waves, including shock and rarefaction waves, in density (ρ), speed (v), and flux (q). Based on a continuous version of traffic conservation, $\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial q}{\partial x} = 0$, and an assumption of a speed-density relationship, $v = V(\rho)$, the LWR model can be written as

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \rho V(\rho)}{\partial x} = 0, \quad (1)$$

which is for a homogeneous road link with time and location independent traffic characteristics, such as free flow speed, jam density, the number of lanes, capacity, and so on. In general, $V(\rho)$ is a non-increasing function, and $v_f = V(0)$ is the free flow speed. In addition, $q = Q(\rho) \equiv \rho V(\rho)$ is unimodal with capacity $C = Q(\rho_c)$, where ρ_c is the critical density. Traffic states with density higher than ρ_c are congested or over-critical, and those with density lower are free flowing or under-critical. Here we denote the jam density by ρ_j , and $\rho \in [0, \rho_j]$.

In a road network, however, more important and interesting are the formation, propagation, and dissipation of traffic queues caused by bottlenecks around merging, diverging, and other network junctions. For

*Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology, Institute of Transportation Studies, 4038 Anteater Instruction and Research Bldg, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697-3600. Tel: 949-824-1672, Fax: 949-824-8385, Email: wjin@uci.edu

example, congestion can form at a merging junction due to limited capacity of the downstream branch; at a diverging junction, when congestion forms on one downstream branch, the flow to another downstream branch will be reduced due to the First-In-First-Out principle on the upstream link (3). Considering the analytical power and simplicity of the LWR model, many researchers have attempted to study traffic dynamics arising in general transportation networks in the framework of kinematic wave models. In one line, Daganzo (4) and Lebacque (5) extended the Godunov discrete form of the LWR model for computing traffic flows through merging, diverging, and general junctions. In this approach, so-called traffic demand and supply functions are introduced, and boundary fluxes through various types of junctions can be written as functions of upstream demands and downstream supplies. Thus we call this approach as the supply-demand method, which usually applies physically meaningful rules, such as the First-In-First-Out diverging principle (3, 4) and the fair merging principle (6). These discrete models, however, are only suitable for numerical simulations and do not provide any analytical insights on traffic dynamics at a network intersection as the LWR model. In another line, Holden and Risebro (7) and Coclite et al. (8) attempted to solve a Riemann problem of an intersection with m upstream links and n downstream links. In both of these studies, all links are homogeneous and have the same speed-density relations, and traffic dynamics on each link are described by the LWR model. In (7), the Riemann problem with jump initial conditions is solved by introducing an entropy condition that maximizes an objective function of all boundary fluxes. In (8), the Riemann problem is solved to maximize total flux with turning proportions. Both studies were able to describe basic waves arising from a network intersection but also subject to significant shortcomings: (i) All links are assumed to have the same fundamental diagram in both studies; (ii) In (7), vehicles can travel to an arbitrary downstream link, and the entropy conditions used are pragmatic and lack of physical interpretations; and (iii) In (8), results are only valid for restricted turning proportions and junctions with no fewer downstream links; i.e., $n \geq m$. In addition, neither of these studies present a unified continuous model of network vehicular traffic.

As in (7, 8), we attempt to obtain kinematic wave solutions of traffic dynamics arising at a merging junction. However, our study does not bear the same limitations as in these studies: the upstream links can be mainline freeways or on-ramps and can have different characteristics, and our solutions are physically meaningful and consistent with the supply-demand method in (4, 5). In the supply-demand method of merging traffic, the out-flux of an upstream link cannot exceed its demand, and the in-flux of the downstream link cannot exceed its supply. In addition, a so-called distribution scheme has to be used to determine the out-flux of each upstream link (6, 9). For merging traffic, we first present a continuous kinematic wave model of multi-commodity traffic flow based on the conservation of commodity traffic. We present a new framework for solving the Riemann problem for the merging traffic flow model. On each link, there can be a stationary state and an interior state for each branch. Here stationary states are the self-similar states at the boundary, and interior states are flimsy without taking any space in the continuous solution and only show up in the numerical solutions as observed in (10). We introduce a so-called supply-demand diagram and discuss the problem in the supply-demand space, rather than in ρ as in (7, 8). After deriving admissible solutions for upstream and downstream intermediate and interior states, we introduce an entropy condition based on the supply-demand method with different distribution schemes (4, 5). We then prove that stationary states and boundary fluxes are unique for given upstream demand and downstream supply, but interior states may not. Then, kinematic waves on a link is determined by the corresponding LWR model with the stationary state and the initial state as initial states (7). This new framework has been used to solve the Riemann problem for inhomogeneous LWR model at a linear junction (11). In this study, kinematic waves of the Riemann problem can be considered as continuous solutions of the discrete supply-demand method in (4, 5, 6).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce a continuous multi-commodity kinematic wave model of merging traffic. In Section 3, we introduce a new framework for solving the kinematic waves of the Riemann problem with jump initial conditions in the supply-demand space. In particular, we derive traffic conservation conditions, admissible conditions of stationary and initial states, and additional entropy conditions. In Section 4, we solve stationary states and boundary fluxes of a merging junction with two upstream links for two distributions schemes. In Section 5, we show with an example that the numerical solutions indeed converge to the analytical ones. In Section 6, we summarize our findings and present some

discussions.

2 A MULTI-COMMODITY CONTINUOUS KINEMATIC WAVE MODEL OF MERGING TRAFFIC FLOW AND ITS RIEMANN PROBLEM

We consider a merge network with $m \geq 2$ upstream links and one downstream link. In this network, there are m origin-destination pairs and m paths, and we differentiate all vehicles into $P = m$ commodities according to their paths. We denote the link-commodity incidence variable by $\delta_{p,a}$, which equals 1 if commodity p ($p = 1, \dots, m$) uses link a ($a = 1, \dots, m+1$) and 0 otherwise. Thus $P_a = \sum_{p=1}^P \delta_{p,a}$ is the number of commodities on link a .

On a link a , the location is denoted by link coordinate $x_a \in [X_a, Y_a]$, where $x_a = X_a$ and Y_a are the upstream and downstream boundaries respectively, and the length of link a is $L_a = Y_a - X_a$. On the path of a commodity p , the location is denoted by commodity coordinate $x_p \in [X_p, Y_p]$, where $x_p = X_p$ and Y_p are the origin and destination respectively, and the length of path p is $L_p = Y_p - X_p$. If $\delta_{p,a} = 1$, we then denote $L_{p,a}$ as the distance from origin to the upstream boundary of link a . If there is no loop on a path, $L_p = \sum_a \delta_{p,a} L_a$, and the location on a path can be uniquely determined by x_p . That is, if $x_p \in [X_p + L_{p,a}, X_p + L_{p,a} + L_a]$, then x_p is on link a with location $x_a = x_p - L_{p,a} - X_p + X_a$.

For commodity p , we denote density, speed, and flux by $\rho_p(x_p, t)$, $v_p(x_p, t)$, and $q_p(x_p, t) = \rho_p(x_p, t)v_p(x_p, t)$, respectively. From traffic conservation of commodity p , we can have the following continuous conservation equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho_p}{\partial x_p} + \frac{\partial q_p}{\partial t} = 0, \quad (2)$$

whose derivation is the same as that for single commodity (e.g. 12, 13). For link a , we denote density, speed, and flux by $\rho_a(x_a, t)$, $v_a(x_a, t)$, and $q_a(x_a, t) = \rho_a(x_a, t)v_a(x_a, t)$, respectively. Then we have that $\rho_a(x_a, t) = \sum_p \delta_{p,a} \rho_p(x_a, t)$ and $q_a(x_a, t) = \sum_p \delta_{p,a} q_p(x_a, t)$. Note that, $\rho_p(x_a, t)$ exists only when link a is on path p and $\rho_p(x_a, t) = \rho_p(x_p, t)$ with $x_a = x_p - L_{p,a} - X_p + X_a$. It is the same for $v_p(x_a, t)$ and $q_p(x_a, t)$. We assume that traffic streams of different commodities on link a are homogeneous and share the same speed at the same location and time. That is, we have the following speed-density relationships (14, 15)

$$v_p(x_a, t) = v_a(x_a, t) = V(x_a, \rho_a(x_a, t)). \quad (3)$$

Generally, $V_a(x_a, \rho_a)$ is non-increasing in ρ_a , and $Q(x_a, \rho_a) \equiv \rho_a V(x_a, \rho_a)$ is unimodal in ρ_a with its maximum as capacity at x_a . We can see that conservation laws of multi-commodity flows in Equation 2 lead to the following LWR model

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_a} \rho_a(x_a, t) + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_a(x_a, t) V(x_a, \rho_a(x_a, t)) = 0, \quad (4)$$

which can work for inhomogeneous roads (16). Correspondingly, we can have the following traffic conservation equation for commodity p and $x_p \in [X_p + L_{p,a}, X_p + L_{p,a} + L_a]$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_p} \rho_p(x_p, t) + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_{p,a}(x_a, t) V(\rho_a(x_a, t)) = 0, \quad p = 1, \dots, m \quad (5)$$

where $x_a = x_p - X_p - L_{p,a}$. For commodity p , the traffic stream evolves on the corresponding path, and we obtain a one-dimensional hyperbolic conservation law. However, all traffic streams interact with each other on the network, and we have a system of network hyperbolic conservation laws. We hereafter call Equation 5 as a multi-commodity kinematic wave (MCKW) model of merging traffic.

We can see that traffic flow on a road network cannot be modeled by either one-dimensional or two-dimensional conservation laws, since vehicles of different commodities interact with each other on their shared links. In particular, for a merge network with m upstream links, traffic streams of m commodities interact with each other on the downstream link. Traffic dynamics inside each link can be studied by the LWR models in Equation 1 or Equation 4, and the remained task is to study traffic dynamics at the merging junction. Here we consider the Riemann problem for the MCKW model of merging traffic in Equation 5 with jump initial conditions. We assume that all links are homogeneous and infinitely long. For link $a = 1, \dots, m+1$, we assume that its flow-density relation is $q_a = Q_a(\rho_a)$, critical density $\rho_{c,a}$, and its capacity C_a . For upstream link $i = 1, \dots, m$, we denote $x_i = 0$ at the junction and $x_i = -\infty$ at its upstream boundary. Similarly, for downstream link $j = m+1$, we denote $x_j = 0$ at the junction and $x_j = +\infty$ at its downstream boundary. For commodity $p \equiv i \rightarrow j$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = m+1$), we denote $x_p = 0$ at the junction, $x_p = -\infty$ at its origin, and $x_p = +\infty$ at its destination.

For commodity $p = 1, \dots, m$, we have the following jump initial conditions:

$$\rho_p(x_p, 0) = \begin{cases} \rho_{p,L}, & x_p \in (-\infty, 0] \\ \rho_{p,R}, & x_p \in (0, +\infty) \end{cases}. \quad (6)$$

Then upstream link $i = 1, \dots, m$ and downstream link $m+1$ have constant initial conditions:

$$\rho_i(x_i, 0) = \rho_i \equiv \rho_{i,L}, \quad x_i \in (-\infty, 0), \quad i = 1, \dots, m \quad (7)$$

$$\rho_{m+1}(x_{m+1}, 0) = \rho_{m+1} \equiv \sum_p \rho_{p,R}, \quad x_{m+1} \in (0, +\infty). \quad (8)$$

Since the composition of vehicles on downstream links does not affect traffic dynamics at the junction, then solutions to Equation 5 with the initial condition of Equation 6 is equivalent to Equation 7 and Equation 8.

3 A SOLUTION FRAMEWORK

For link $a = 1, \dots, m+1$, we define the following demand and supply functions with all subscript a suppressed (17, 4, 5)

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho) &= Q(\min\{\rho, \rho_c\}) = \begin{cases} Q(\rho), & \text{if } \rho \leq \rho_c \\ C, & \text{if } \rho \geq \rho_c \end{cases}, \\ &= \int_0^\rho \chi(s) Q'(s) ds = \int_0^\rho \max\{Q'(s), 0\} ds \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S(\rho) &= Q(\max\{\rho, \rho_c\}) = \begin{cases} Q(\rho), & \text{if } \rho \geq \rho_c \\ C, & \text{if } \rho \leq \rho_c \end{cases}, \\ &= C + \int_0^\rho (1 - \chi(s)) Q'(s) ds = C + \int_0^\rho \min\{Q'(s), 0\} ds, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\chi(\rho)$ equals 1 iff $Q'(\rho) \geq 0$ and equals 0 otherwise.

Here we represent a traffic state in the supply-demand space as $U = (D, S)$. This is different from many existing studies, in which traffic states are considered on a fundamental diagram as (ρ, q) . For the demand and supply functions in Equation 9 and Equation 10, we can see that D is non-decreasing with ρ and S non-increasing. Thus $D \leq C, S \leq C, \max\{D, S\} = C$, and flux $q(U) = \min\{D, S\}$. In addition, $D = S = C$ iff traffic is critical; $D < S = C$ iff traffic is strictly under-critical (SUC); $S < D = C$ iff traffic is strictly over-critical (SOC). Therefore, state $U = (D, S)$ is under-critical (UC), iff $S = C$, or equivalently $D \leq S$; State $U = (D, S)$ is over-critical (OC), iff $D = C$, or equivalently $S \leq D$.

In Figure 1(b), we draw a supply-demand diagram for the two fundamental diagrams in Figure 1(a). On the dashed branch of the supply-demand diagram, traffic is UC and $U = (D, C)$ with $D \leq C$; on the

solid branch, traffic is OC and $U = (C, S)$ with $S \leq C$. Compared with the fundamental diagram of a road section, the supply-demand diagram only considers its capacity C , but not other detailed characteristics such as critical density, jam density, or shape of the fundamental diagram. That is, different fundamental diagrams can have the same demand-supply diagram, as long as they have the same capacity and are unimodal, and their critical densities, jam densities, or shapes are not relevant. However, given a demand-supply diagram and its corresponding fundamental diagram, the points are one-to-one mapped.




Figure 1: Fundamental diagrams and their corresponding supply-demand diagrams

In the supply-demand space, initial conditions in Equation 7 and Equation 8 are equivalent to

$$U_i(x_i, 0) = (D_i, S_i), x_i \in (-\infty, 0), \quad i = 1, \dots, m \quad (11)$$

$$U_{m+1}(x_{m+1}, 0) = (D_{m+1}, S_{m+1}), x_{m+1} \in (0, +\infty). \quad (12)$$

In the solutions of the Riemann problem for Equation 5 with initial conditions (11-12), a shock wave or a rarefaction wave could initiate on a link from the linear boundary $x = 0$, and traffic states on both links become asymptotically stationary after a long time. At the boundary, there can also exist interior states (10, 18), which take infinitesimal space. We denote the stationary states on upstream link i and downstream link $m + 1$ by U_i^- and U_{m+1}^+ , respectively. We denote the interior states on links i and $m + 1$ by $U_i(0^-, t)$ and $U_{m+1}(0^+, t)$, respectively. The structure of Riemann solutions on upstream and downstream links are shown in Figure 2. Then the kinematic wave on upstream link i is the solution of the corresponding LWR model with initial left and right conditions of U_i and U_i^- , respectively. Similarly, the kinematic wave on downstream link $m + 1$ is the solution of the corresponding LWR model with initial left and right conditions of U_{m+1}^+ and U_{m+1} , respectively.




Figure 2: Structure of Riemann solutions: (a) Upstream link i ; (b) Downstream link $m + 1$

We denote $q_{i \rightarrow m+1}$ as the flux from link i to link $m + 1$ for $t > 0$. Since the fluxes are determined by the stationary states, the out-flux of link i is $q_i = q(U_i^-)$, and the in-flux of link $m + 1$ is $q_{m+1} = q(U_{m+1}^+)$. Further from traffic conservation at a merging junction, we have at stationary states

$$q_{i \rightarrow m+1} = q_i = q(U_i^-), \quad q_{m+1} = q(U_{m+1}^+) = \sum_i q(U_i^-). \quad (13)$$

3.1 Admissible stationary and interior states

As observed in (7, 8), the speed of the kinematic wave on an upstream link cannot be positive, and that on a downstream link cannot be negative. We have the following admissible conditions on stationary states.

Theorem 3.1 (Admissible stationary states) *For initial conditions in Equation 11 and Equation 12, stationary states are admissible if and only if*

$$U_i^- = (D_i, C_i) \text{ or } (C_i, S_i^-), \quad (14)$$

where $S_i^- < D_i$, and

$$U_j^+ = (C_j, S_j) \text{ or } (D_j^+, C_j), \quad (15)$$

where $D_j^+ < S_j$.

The proof is quite straightforward and omitted here. The regions of admissible upstream stationary states in both supply-demand and fundamental diagrams are shown in Figure 3, and the regions of admissible downstream stationary states are shown in Figure 4. From the figures, we can also determine the types and traveling directions of waves with given stationary and initial states on all links. In particular, the types of kinematic waves and the signs of the wave speeds can be determined in the supply-demand diagram, but the absolute values of the wave speeds have to be determined in the fundamental diagram.




Figure 3: Admissible stationary states for upstream link i : marked by black dots

Remark 1. $U_i^- = U_i$ and $U_j^+ = U_j$ are always admissible. In this case, the stationary states are the same as the corresponding initial states, and there are no waves.

Remark 2. Out-flux $q_i = \min\{D_i^-, S_i^-\} \leq D_i$ and in-flux $q_j = \min\{D_j^+, S_j^+\} \leq S_j$. That is, D_i is the maximum sending flow and S_j is the maximum receiving flow in the sense of (19, 4).

Remark 3. In (20), a so-called “invariance principle” is proposed as follows: if $D_i^- = C_i$, then $q(U_i^-) < D_i$; if $S_j^+ = C_j$, then $q(U_j^+) < S_j$. We can see that Theorem 3.1 implies the “invariance principle”.




Figure 4: Admissible stationary states for downstream link $m + 1$: marked by black dots

Corollary 3.2 For upstream link i ($i = 1, \dots, m$), $q_i < D_i$ if and only if $U_i^- = (C_i, q_i)$, and $q_i = D_i$ if and only if $U_i^- = (D_i, C_i)$. For the downstream link $m + 1$, $q_{m+1} < S_{m+1}$ if and only if $U_j^+ = (q_{m+1}, C_{m+1})$, and $q_{m+1} = S_{m+1}$ if and only if $U_j^+ = (C_{m+1}, S_{m+1})$. That is, given out-fluxes and in-fluxes, the stationary states can be uniquely determined.

For interior states, the waves of the Riemann problem on link i with left and right initial conditions of U_i^- and $U_i(0^-, t)$ cannot be negative. Similarly, the Riemann problem on link j with left and right initial conditions of $U_{m+1}(0^+, t)$ and U_{m+1}^+ cannot be positive. Therefore, interior states $U_i(0^-, t)$ and $U_{m+1}(0^+, t)$ should satisfy the following admissible conditions.

Theorem 3.3 (Admissible interior states) For asymptotic stationary states U_i^- and U_{m+1}^+ , interior states $U_i(0^-, t)$ and $U_{m+1}(0^+, t)$ in Equation 18 are admissible if and only if

$$U_i(0^-, t) = \begin{cases} (C_i, S_i^-) = U_i^-, & \text{when } S_i^- < D_i^- = C_i \\ (D_i(0^-, t), S_i(0^-, t)), & \text{when } D_i^- \leq S_i^- = C_i \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where $S_i(0^-, t) \geq D_i^-$, and

$$U_{m+1}(0^+, t) = \begin{cases} (D_{m+1}^+, C_{m+1}) = U_{m+1}^+, & \text{when } D_{m+1}^+ < S_{m+1}^+ = C_{m+1} \\ (D_{m+1}(0^+, t), S_{m+1}(0^+, t)), & \text{when } S_{m+1}^+ \leq D_{m+1}^+ = C_{m+1} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where $D_{m+1}(0^+, t) \geq S_{m+1}^+$.

The proof is quite straightforward and omitted here. The regions of admissible upstream interior states in both supply-demand and fundamental diagrams are shown in Equation 5, and the regions of admissible downstream interior states are shown in Equation 6. From the figures, we can also determine the types and traveling directions of waves with given stationary and interior states on all links, but these waves are suppressed and cannot be observed. But we are able to observe possible interior states in numerical solutions.

Remark 1. Note that $U_i(0^-, t) = U_i^-$ and $U_{m+1}(0^+, t) = U_{m+1}^+$ are always admissible. In this case, the interior states are the same as stationary states.




Figure 5: Admissible interior states for upstream link i : marked by black dots

3.2 Entropy conditions with supply-demand method

With the aforementioned traffic conservation equations and admissible conditions, we cannot uniquely determine the solutions of stationary states. Here we introduce the following local optimization problem (4):

$$\max_{U_i^-, U_{m+1}^+, U_i(0^-, t), U_{m+1}(0^+, t)} \{q_{m+1}\} \quad (18)$$

subject to

$$\begin{aligned} q_i &\leq D_i(0^-, t), \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\ q_{m+1} &\leq S_{m+1}(0^+, t), \\ q_i &= \alpha_i q_{m+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned}$$

where the distribution proportions $\alpha_i \in [0, 1]$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i = 1$. In the literature, there have been different distribution schemes to determine α_i . A number of such schemes have been proposed in literature. In (13), an on-ramp is given total priority and can send its maximum flow. In (4), a priority-based scheme was proposed. In (5), a general scheme was proposed, and it was suggested to distribute out-fluxes according to the number of lanes of upstream links. In (21), an on-ramp is given total priority, but its flow is also restricted by the metering rate. In (6), a fair scheme is proposed to distribute out-fluxes according to local traffic demands of upstream links. In (9), a fair share of the downstream supply is assigned to each upstream proportional to its capacity, and out-fluxes are then determined by comparing the corresponding fair shares and demands.

Therefore, we can introduce the following entropy condition for the Riemann problem for Equation 5 with initial conditions in Equations 11-12:

The boundary fluxes through a merging junction are the solutions of the optimization problem in Equation 18.

To solve the Riemann problem for Equation 5 with initial conditions in Equations 11-12, we will first find stationary and interior states that satisfy the aforementioned entropy condition, admissible conditions,




Figure 6: Admissible interior states for downstream link $m + 1$: marked by black dots

and traffic conservation equations. Then the kinematic wave on each link will be determined by the Riemann problem of the corresponding LWR model with initial and stationary states as initial conditions. Here we will only focus on solving the stationary states on all links, since the kinematic waves of the LWR model have been well studied in the literature. From all the conditions, we can see that the feasible domains of stationary and interior states are independent of the upstream supply, S_i , and the downstream demand, D_j . That is, the same upstream demand and downstream supply will yield the same solutions of stationary and interior states. However, the upstream and downstream wave types and speeds on each can be related to S_i as shown in Figure 3(d) and D_j as shown in Figure 4(d).

4 MERGING JUNCTIONS WITH TWO UPSTREAM LINKS

In this section, we solve stationary states for a merging junctions with two upstream links; i.e., $m = 2$.

4.1 The fair distribution scheme

We consider the fair merging rule proposed in (6), in which

$$\alpha_i = \frac{D_i(0^-, t)}{D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t)}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (19)$$

Obviously, the optimization problem of Equation 18 subject to the fair merging rule yields the following solutions

$$q_i = \min\left\{1, \frac{S_3(0^+, t)}{D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t)}\right\} D_i(0^-, t), \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (20)$$

Thus in the Riemann solutions, stationary and interior states have to satisfy Equation 20, traffic conservation, and the corresponding admissible conditions.




Figure 8: Solutions of stationary states for different initial conditions with the fair merging rule

1. When $D_1 + D_2 \leq S_3$, $q_i = D_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $q_3 = D_1 + D_2$;
2. When $D_i > \frac{C_i}{C_1 + C_2} S_3$ ($i = 1, 2$), $q_i = \frac{C_i}{C_1 + C_2} S_3$ and $q_3 = S_3$;
3. When $D_1 + D_2 > S_3$ and $D_i \leq \frac{C_i}{C_1 + C_2} S_3$ ($i, j = 1$ or 2 and $i \neq j$), $q_i = D_i$, $q_j = S_3 - D_i$, and $q_3 = S_3$.

That is, for $i, j = 1$ or 2 and $i \neq j$,

$$q_i = \min\left\{D_i, \max\left\{S_3 - D_j, \frac{S_3}{C_1 + C_2} C_i\right\}\right\}. \quad (21)$$

The solutions of fluxes in four different regions are shown in Figure 9, in which the big dots represent the initial conditions in (D_1, D_2) , and the end points of the arrows represent the solutions of fluxes (q_1, q_2) . The fluxes in Equation 21 can be considered as the continuous fluxes of a merging junctions and are exactly the same as in (9). In this sense, the distribution scheme in (9) is the continuous version of the fair merging rule. Note that, at $t = 0$, the continuous fluxes may not equal the discrete fluxes by Equation 20, which yields

$$q_i = \min\left\{1, \frac{S_3}{D_1 + D_2}\right\} D_i, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The discrepancy between continuous and discrete fluxes when $D_1 + D_2 > S_3$ and $D_i \leq \frac{C_i}{C_1 + C_2} S_3$ was noticed in (20, 9). However, the results here suggest that, at $t > 0$, the discrete fluxes will converge to the continuous ones, as demonstrated by the numerical example in Section 5.




Figure 9: Solutions of fluxes for a fair merging junction with two upstream links

4.2 The constant distribution scheme

We consider the constant distribution scheme proposed in (5), in which

$$q_i = \min\{D_i(0^-, t), \alpha_i S_3(0^+, t)\}, \quad i = 1, 2 \quad (22)$$

where α_i are constant distribution proportions, $\alpha_i \in [0, 1]$, and $\sum_i \alpha_i = 1$.

Theorem 4.3 *For the Riemann problem of the MCKW model of merging traffic in Equation 5 with initial conditions in Equation 11 and Equation 12, the stationary and interior states satisfying the entropy condition in Equation 22, traffic conservation equations, and the corresponding admissible conditions are in the following:*

1. When $D_1 + D_2 < S_3$ and $D_i \leq \alpha_i C_3$ ($i = 1, 2$), $q_i = D_i$ and $q_3 = D_1 + D_2$;
2. When $D_i > \alpha_i C_3$ and $D_j < S_3 - \alpha_j C_3$ ($i, j = 1$ or 2 and $i \neq j$), $q_i = \alpha_i C_3$, $q_j = D_j$, and $q_3 = \alpha_i C_3 + D_j$.
3. When $D_1 + D_2 \geq S_3$, $S_3 - \alpha_j C_3 \leq D_i \leq \alpha_i S_3$ ($i, j = 1$ or 2 and $i \neq j$), $q_i = D_i$, $q_j = S_3 - D_i$, and $q_3 = S_3$.
4. When $D_i \geq \alpha_i S_3$ ($i = 1, 2$), $q_i = \alpha_i S_3$, and $q_3 = S_3$.

The proof of the theorem is in Appendix B. The solutions of fluxes in four different regions are shown in Figure 10, in which the big dots represent the initial conditions in (D_1, D_2) , and the end points of the arrows represent the solutions of fluxes (q_1, q_2) . With the fluxes, we can easily find all stationary and interior states as in Theorem 4.1. We can see that the discrete fluxes are also different from the continuous fluxes for the constant merging rule. In addition, compared with the fair merging rule, the constant merging rule yield sub-optimal solutions in regions II and VI in Figure 10, in which $q_3 < \min\{D_1 + D_2, S_3\}$.




Figure 11: Solutions of fluxes for an invariant merging junction with two upstream links

where $\rho \in [0, 1]$, the capacity $C_1 = C_2 = C_3 = 0.2$, the free-flow speed $v_f = 1$, and the critical density $\rho_c = \frac{1}{5}$. We also assume that all three links have the same length of 100. Here we split all links into cells with a length of $\Delta x = \frac{1}{n}$ and divide the time duration into time steps with a period of $\Delta t = \frac{0.9}{n}$. Thus, the CFL number is $0.9 < 1$ (23). Here we solve the MCKW model Equation 5 with the fair merging rule (6) with initial conditions: $\rho_1 = 0.12$, $\rho_2 = 0.08$, and $\rho_3 = 0.28$. In the supply-demand space, the initial conditions are $D_1 = 0.12$, $D_2 = 0.08$, and $S_3 = 0.18$. This initial condition is in region IV of Figure 9. From Figure 12(a), initially $q_2 = \frac{D_2}{D_1 + D_2} S_3$, but $q_2 \rightarrow 0.08 = D_2$ when $t \rightarrow \infty$, and it converges to D_2 at any fixed time when $\Delta x \rightarrow 0$. The result is consistent with Corollary 4.2. From Figure 12(b), the density in the last cell of the upstream link 2 at $[100 - \Delta x, 100]$ converges to the interior state when $t \rightarrow \infty$, and it converges to the interior state at any fixed time when $\Delta x \rightarrow 0$. The interior state is the same as suggested by Theorem 4.1 at $(0.16, 0.2)$.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we first introduced a continuous multi-commodity kinematic wave model for a merge network and defined its Riemann problem. Then, we introduced the supply-demand diagram of traffic flow and proposed a solution framework for the Riemann problem. In the Riemann solutions, each link has two new states, an interior state and a stationary state, and the kinematic waves on a link are determined by the initial state and the stationary state. We then derived admissible conditions for interior and stationary states and introduced an entropy condition defined by the supply-demand method in the interior states with a distribution scheme. Then for a merging junction with two upstream links, we proved that the stationary states and boundary fluxes exist and are unique for the Riemann problem for both the fair and constant distribution schemes. With a numerical example, we demonstrated that the fluxes obtained by discrete supply-demand methods converge to the continuous fluxes.

An important observation is that, for both the fair and constant distribution schemes, the fluxes computed by discrete supply-demand methods are different from the continuous fluxes, but the discrete fluxes converge to the continuous ones after a sufficient amount of time or at a given time but with decreasing period of a time




Figure 12: For different cell sizes: (a) out-flux of link 2; (b) density in the last cell of link 2

interval. This is consistent with those in the literature regarding the fair merging rule (20, 9). Actually, the solutions of boundary fluxes proposed in (9) are the continuous fluxes by the fair merging rule in (6). We also show the existence of invariant distribution schemes, in which the discrete fluxes are the same as the continuous ones. Note that the supply-demand method for the LWR model is invariant in this sense (11).

This paper presents a novel framework for solving kinematic waves arising from merging traffic in the supply-demand space. In particular, we expect that boundary fluxes, stationary states, and kinematic waves for other distribution schemes can also be solved in this framework. The analytical approach could be helpful for better understanding the formation and propagation of traffic congestion caused by merging bottlenecks. In the future, we will be interested in studying traffic dynamics at a merging junction with more than two upstream links and calibrating the models with observed data.

References

- [1] M. J. Lighthill and G. B. Whitham. On kinematic waves: II. a theory of traffic flow on long crowded roads. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A*, 229(1178):317–345, 1955.
- [2] P. I. Richards. Shock waves on the highway. *Operations Research*, 4:42–51, 1956.
- [3] M. Papageorgiou. Dynamic modelling, assignment and route guidance in traffic networks. *Transportation Research Part B*, 24(6):471–495, 1990.
- [4] Carlos F. Daganzo. The cell transmission model II: Network traffic. *Transportation Research B*, 29(2): 79–93, 1995.
- [5] J. P. Lebacque. The godunov scheme and what it means for first order traffic flow models. In *The International Symposium on Transportation and Traffic Theory*, Lyon, France, 1996.
- [6] W.-L. Jin and H. Michael Zhang. On the distribution schemes for determining flows through a merge. *Transportation Research Part B*, 37(6):521–540, July 2003.
- [7] H. Holden and N. H. Risebro. A mathematical model of traffic flow on a network of unidirectional roads. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 26(4):999–1017, 1995.

- [8] GM Coclite, M. Garavello, and B. Piccoli. Traffic flow on a road network. *SIAM journal on mathematical analysis*, 36(6):1862–1886, 2005.
- [9] D. Ni and J.D. Leonard. A simplified kinematic wave model at a merge bottleneck. *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 29(11):1054–1072, 2005.
- [10] B. van Leer. On the Relation Between the Upwind-Differencing Schemes of Godunov, Engquist–Osher and Roe. *SIAM Journal on Scientific and Statistical Computing*, 5:1, 1984.
- [11] Wen-Long Jin, Liang Chen, and Elbridge Gerry Puckett. Supply-demand diagrams and a new framework for analyzing the inhomogeneous Lighthill-Whitham-Richards model. 2008. Full paper submitted to the 18th International Symposium on Transportation and Traffic Theory (ISTTT18).
- [12] R. Haberman. *Mathematical models*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1977.
- [13] G. F. Newell. A simplified theory of kinematic waves in highway traffic I: General theory. II: Queuing at freeway bottlenecks. III: Multi-destination flows. *Transportation Research B*, 27:281–313, 1993.
- [14] B. D. Greenshields. A study in highway capacity. *Highway Research Board Proceedings*, 14:448–477, 1935.
- [15] J. M. Del Castillo and F. G. Benitez. On the functional form of the speed-density relationship - II: Empirical investigation. *Transportation Research B*, 29(5):391–406, 1995.
- [16] W. L. Jin and H. M. Zhang. The inhomogeneous kinematic wave traffic flow model as a resonant nonlinear system. *Transportation Science*, 37(3):294–311, August 2003.
- [17] Björn Engquist and Stanley Osher. Stable and entropy satisfying approximations for transonic flow calculations. 34(149):45–75, January 1980. ISSN 0025-5718.
- [18] M. Bultelle, M. Grassin, and D. Serre. Unstable Godunov discrete profiles for steady shock waves. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 35(6):2272–2297, 1998.
- [19] Carlos F. Daganzo. The cell transmission model: a dynamic representation of highway traffic consistent with hydrodynamic theory. *Transportation Research B*, 28(4):269–287, 1994.
- [20] JP Lebacque and M. Khoshyaran. First order macroscopic traffic flow models: Intersection modeling, Network modeling. *Proceedings of the 16th International Symposium on Transportation and Traffic Theory (ISTTT)*, Elsevier, pages 365–386, 2005.
- [21] J.H. Banks. Are Minimization of Delay and Minimization of Freeway Congestion Compatible Ramp Metering Objectives? *Transportation Research Record*, 1727(-1):112–119, 2000.
- [22] Carlos F. Daganzo. The nature of freeway gridlock and how to prevent it. In *The International Symposium on Transportation and Traffic Theory*, Lyon, France, 1996.
- [23] R. Courant, K. Friedrichs, and H. Lewy. ber die partiellen differenzgleichungen der mathematischen physik. *Mathematische Annalen*, 100:32–74, 1928.

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF THEOREM 4.1

Proof. From traffic conservation equations in Equation 13 and admissible conditions of stationary states, we can see that

$$q_3 \leq \min\{D_1 + D_2, S_3\}.$$

We demonstrate that it is not possible that $q_3 < \min\{D_1 + D_2, S_3\} \leq \min\{C_1 + C_2, C_3\}$. Otherwise, we assume that $q_3 = q_0$. Since $q(U_3^+) = q_0 < S_3$, from Equation 15 we have $U_3^+ = (q_0, C_3)$. Further, from Equation 17 we have $U_3(0^+, t) = U_3^+ = (q_0, C_3)$. Hence $S_3(0^+, t) = C_3$. Since $q(U_1^-) + q(U_2^-) = q_0 < D_1 + D_2$, then we have $q(U_i^-) < D_i$ for at least one upstream link. E.g., we assume that

$$q(U_1^-) < D_1.$$

From Equation 14 we have $U_1^- = (C_1, q(U_1^-))$. Further, from Equation 16 we have $U_1(0^-, t) = U_1^-$. Hence $D_1(0^-, t) = C_1$. Then from the entropy condition in Equation 20 we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_3 &= \min\{C_1 + D_2(0^-, t), C_3\}, \\ q_1 &= \min\left\{1, \frac{C_3}{C_1 + D_2(0^-, t)}\right\}C_1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $q_3 < C_3$, $C_1 + D_2(0^-, t) < C_3$, and $q_1 = C_1$, which contradicts $q(U_1^-) < D_1$. Therefore,

$$q_1 + q_2 = q_3 = q(U_1^-) + q(U_2^-) = q(U_3^+) = \min\{D_1 + D_2, S_3\}.$$

When $D_1 + D_2 < S_3$, we have $q(U_3^+) = D_1 + D_2 < S_3$. From Equation 15 and Equation 17 we have $U_3(0^+, t) = U_3^+ = (D_1 + D_2, C_3)$. Since $q(U_1^-) + q(U_2^-) = D_1 + D_2$ and $q(U_i^-) \leq D_i$, we have $q(U_i^-) = D_i$. From Equation 14 we have $U_i^- = (D_i, C_i)$. From Equation 16 we have $U_i(0^-, t) = (D_i(0^-, t), S_i(0^-, t))$ with $S_i(0^-, t) \geq D_i^- = D_i$. From Equation 20 we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_3 &= \min\{D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t), C_3\} = D_1 + D_2 < S_3 \leq C_3, \\ q_i &= \min\left\{1, \frac{C_3}{D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t)}\right\}D_i(0^-, t) = D_i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $D_i(0^-, t) = D_i \leq S_i(0^-, t)$. Then $U_i(0^-, t) = U_i^- = (D_i, C_i)$. In this case, there are no interior states.

When $D_1 + D_2 = S_3$, we have $q(U_3^+) = S_3$. From Equation 15 we have $U_3^+ = (C_3, S_3)$. From Equation 17 we have $U_3(0^+, t) = (D_3(0^+, t), S_3(0^+, t))$ with $D_3(0^+, t) \geq S_3^+ = S_3$. Since $q(U_1^-) + q(U_2^-) = D_1 + D_2$ and $q(U_i^-) \leq D_i$, we have $q(U_i^-) = D_i$. From Equation 14 we have $U_i^- = (D_i, C_i)$. From Equation 16 we have $U_i(0^-, t) = (D_i(0^-, t), S_i(0^-, t))$ with $S_i(0^-, t) \geq D_i^- = D_i$. From Equation 20 we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_3 &= \min\{D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t), S_3(0^+, t)\} = D_1 + D_2 = S_3, \\ q_i &= \min\left\{1, \frac{S_3(0^+, t)}{D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t)}\right\}D_i(0^-, t) = D_i. \end{aligned}$$

We can have the following scenarios. (i) If $D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t) \geq S_3(0^+, t) = D_1 + D_2 = S_3$, then $U_3(0^+, t) = U_3^+$ and there is no interior state on link 3. Moreover, we have $\frac{D_1 + D_2}{D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t)}D_i(0^-, t) = D_i$, which leads to $D_i(0^-, t) \leq D_i$. Thus $D_i(0^-, t) = D_i$, $U_i(0^-, t) = U_i^-$, and there are no interior states on links 1 or 2. (ii) If $S_3(0^+, t) > D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t) = D_1 + D_2 = S_3$, then $U_3^+ = (S_3, C_3)$, and $D_i(0^-, t) = D_i$. Thus $U_i(0^-, t) = U_i^-$, and there are no interior states on links 1 or 2. In this case, there can be a unique interior state on link 3 when $S_3 < C_3$.

When $D_1 + D_2 > S_3$, for upstream links, at least one of the stationary states is strictly over-critical. Otherwise, from Equation 14 we have $U_i^- = (D_i, C_i)$, and $q(U_1^-) + q(U_2^-) = D_1 + D_2 > S_3$, which is impossible.

In addition, we have $q(U_3^+) = S_3 < D_1 + D_2$. From Equation 15 we have $U_3^+ = (C_3, S_3)$. From Equation 17 we have $U_3(0^+, t) = (D_3(0^+, t), S_3(0^+, t))$ with $D_3(0^+, t) \geq S_3^+ = S_3$. From Equation 20 we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_3 &= \min\{D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t), S_3(0^+, t)\} = S_3 < D_1 + D_2, \\ q_i &= \min\left\{1, \frac{S_3(0^+, t)}{D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t)}\right\} D_i(0^-, t). \end{aligned}$$

If $D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t) \leq S_3(0^+, t)$, then $D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t) = S_3 < D_1 + D_2$ and $q_i = D_i(0^-, t)$. This is not possible for the SOC upstream link. Thus $S_3(0^+, t) < D_1(0^-, t) + D_2(0^-, t)$, $S_3(0^+, t) = S_3 < D_1 + D_2$, and $U_3(0^+, t) = U_3^+$.

When $D_i > \frac{C_i}{C_1 + C_2} S_3$ ($i = 1, 2$), stationary states on both links 1 and 2 are strictly over-critical with $U_i^- = U_i(0^-, t) = (C_i, D_i^-)$ with $D_i^- < D_i$. From Equation 20, we have

$$D_i^- = \frac{S_3}{C_1 + C_2} C_i.$$

When $D_1 + D_2 > S_3$ and $D_i \leq \frac{C_i}{C_1 + C_2} S_3$ ($i, j = 1$ or 2 and $i \neq j$), stationary states on links j and i are SOC and UC respectively with $U_j^- = U_j(0^-, t) = (C_j, S_j^-)$, $U_i^- = (D_i, C_i)$, and $S_i(0^-, t) \geq D_i$. From Equation 20, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_i &= \frac{S_3}{C_j + D_i(0^-, t)} D_i(0^-, t), \\ S_j^- &= S_3 - D_i. \end{aligned}$$

■

APPENDIX B: PROOF OF THEOREM 4.3

Proof. When $D_1 + D_2 < S_3$ and $D_i \leq \alpha_i C_3$ ($i = 1, 2$), then $q_3 < S_3$, and $U_3^+ = U_3(0^+, t) = (q_3, C_3)$. Assuming that $q_i < D_i$, then $U_i^- = U_i(0^-, t) = (C_i, q_i)$. From Equation 22, we have $q_i = \min\{C_i, \alpha_i C_3\} = \alpha_i C_3 < D_i$, which contradicts $D_i \leq \alpha_i C_3$. Therefore, $q_i = D_i$ and $q_3 = D_1 + D_2$.

When $D_i > \alpha_i C_3$ and $D_j < S_3 - \alpha_i C_3$ ($i, j = 1$ or 2 and $i \neq j$), assuming that $q_j < D_j$, then $U_j^- = U_j(0^-, t) = (C_j, q_j)$. From Equation 22, we have $q_j = \min\{C_j, \alpha_j S_3(0^+, t)\} = \alpha_j S_3(0^+, t) < D_j < S_3 - \alpha_i C_3 \leq \alpha_j C_3$. Thus $S_3(0^+, t) < C_3$. Also from Equation 22, $q_i \leq \alpha_i S_3(0^+, t) < \alpha_i C_3$, which contradicts $D_i > \alpha_i C_3$. Therefore, $q_j = D_j$. If $q_i = D_i$, then from Equation 22, we have $\alpha_i C_3 < D_i = \min\{D_i(0^-, t), \alpha_i S_3(0^+, t)\} \leq \alpha_i S_3(0^+, t)$, which leads to $C_3 < S_3(0^+, t)$. This contradicts $C_3 \geq S_3(0^+, t)$. Thus, $q_i < D_i$, and $U_i^- = U_i(0^-, t) = (C_i, q_i)$. From Equation 22, we then have $q_i = \alpha_i S_3(0^+, t)$. Thus $q_3 = q_i + q_j < S_3 - \alpha_i C_3 + \alpha_i S_3(0^+, t) \leq S_3$. Then, $U_3^+ = U_3(0^+, t) = (q_3, C_3)$, $q_i = \alpha_i C_3$, $q_3 = \alpha_i C_3 + D_j$.

When $D_1 + D_2 \geq S_3$, $S_3 - \alpha_j C_3 \leq D_i \leq \alpha_i S_3$ ($i, j = 1$ or 2 and $i \neq j$), if $q_3 < S_3$, then $U_3^+ = U_3(0^+, t) = (q_3, C_3)$. At least one upstream stationary state is SOC, since, otherwise, $q_3 = q_1 + q_2 = D_1 + D_2 \geq S_3$, which contradicts $q_3 < S_3$. Assuming that $q_i < D_i$, then $U_i^- = U_i(0^-, t) = (C_i, q_i)$. From Equation 22, we have $q_i = \min\{C_i, \alpha_i C_3\} = \alpha_i C_3 < D_i$. This is not possible, since $D_i \leq \alpha_i S_3$. Thus, $q_i = D_i$. Assuming that $q_j < D_j$, then $U_j^- = U_j(0^-, t) = (C_j, q_j)$. From Equation 22, we have $q_j = \min\{C_j, \alpha_j C_3\} = \alpha_j C_3$. Then $q_i = q_3 - \alpha_j C_3 = D_i < S_3 - \alpha_j C_3$, which is also not possible. Therefore, $q_3 = S_3$. Now assume $q_i < D_i$, then $U_i^- = U_i(0^-, t) = (C_i, q_i)$. From Equation 22, we have $q_i = \min\{C_i, \alpha_i S_3(0^+, t)\} = \alpha_i S_3(0^+, t) < D_i \leq \alpha_i S_3$. Therefore, $q_j \leq \alpha_j S_3(0^+, t) < \alpha_j S_3$, which leads to $q_i + q_j < S_3$. This is not possible, since $q_i + q_j = S_3$. Therefore $q_i = D_i$, and $q_j = q_3 - D_i$.

When $D_i \geq \alpha_i S_3$, if $U_3^+ = U_3(0^+, t) = (q_3, C_3)$ with $q_3 < S_3$, then at least one upstream stationary state is SOC, since, otherwise, $q(U_3^+) = q(U_1^-) + q(U_2^-) = D_1 + D_2 \geq S_3$, which contradicts $q_3 < S_3$. Assuming that $U_1^- = U_1(0^-, t) = (C_1, q_1)$ with $q_1 < D_1$, from Equation 22 we then have $q_1 = \min\{C_1, \alpha_1 C_3\}$. Since $q_1 <$

$D_1 \leq C_1$, then $q_1 = \alpha_1 C_3 < C_1$. Then $q_2 = q_3 - q_1 < S_3 - \alpha_1 C_3 \leq \alpha_2 S_3 \leq D_2$. Thus $U_2^- = U_2(0^-, t) = (C_2, q_2)$, and $q_2 = \min\{C_2, \alpha_2 C_3\} = \alpha_2 C_3$, which contradicts $q_2 < \alpha_2 S_3 \leq \alpha_2 C_3$. Therefore, $U_3^+ = (C_3, S_3)$. If $q_i < \alpha_i S_3 \leq D_i \leq C_i$, then $U_i^- = U_i(0^-, t) = (C_i, q_i)$, from Equation 22, $q_i = \min\{C_i, \alpha_i S_3(0^+, t)\} = \alpha_i S_3(0^+, t) < \alpha_i S_3$. That is, $S_3(0^+, t) < S_3$. Then from Equation 17, $D_3(0^+, t) \geq S_3$. Hence $U_3(0^+, t) = (C_3, q_i/\alpha_i)$. Then $q_j = \min\{D_j(0^-, t), \alpha_j q_i/\alpha_i\} < \alpha_j S_3$, which leads to $q_i + q_j < S_3$. This contradicts $q_i + q_j = q_3 = S_3$. Therefore, $q_i \geq \alpha_i S_3$ for $i = 1, 2$. Since $q_i + q_j = S_3$, we then have $q_i = \alpha_i S_3$.

■