

Bus bunching as a synchronisation phenomenon

Vee-Liem Saw,^{1,2} Ning Ning Chung,³ Wei Liang Quek,¹ Yi En Ian Pang,¹ and Lock Yue Chew^{1,2,3,*}

¹*Division of Physics and Applied Physics, School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences,
21 Nanyang Link, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 637371*

²*Data Science and Artificial Intelligence Research Centre, Block N4 #02a-32,
Nanyang Avenue, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 639798*

³*Complexity Institute, 61 Nanyang Drive, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 637335*

(Dated: December 15, 2024)

Bus bunching is a perennial phenomenon that not only diminishes the efficiency of a bus system, but also prevents transit authorities from keeping buses on schedule. We present a physical theory of buses serving a loop of bus stops as a ring of coupled self-oscillators, analogous to the Kuramoto model. Sustained bunching is a repercussion of the process of phase synchronisation whereby the phases of the oscillators are locked to each other. This emerges when demand exceeds a critical threshold. Buses also bunch at low demand, albeit temporarily, due to frequency detuning arising from different human drivers' distinct natural speeds. We calculate the critical transition when *complete phase locking* (full synchronisation) occurs for the bus system, and posit the critical transition to *completely no phase locking* (zero synchronisation). The intermediate regime comprising *chimera states* is the phase where clusters of partially phase locked buses exist. Intriguingly, these theoretical results are in close correspondence to real buses in a university's shuttle bus system.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Yv, 89.40.Bb, 89.65.Lm

A self-oscillator is a unit with an internal source of energy (to overcome dissipation) that continuously and autonomously performs rhythmic motion. It is stable against perturbations on its amplitude but neutrally stable over perturbations on its phase. The latter allows an array of coupled self-oscillators to undergo phase synchronisation, as individual members affect others' phases through their nonlinear interactions [1]. This simple framework has provided a paradigm of immense utility for investigating various synchronisation phenomena, comprising circadian rhythms [2, 3], neurons [4], Josephson junctions [5–7], a raft of other physical, chemical, social systems [8], as well as complex networks [9]. Plenty of research has been devoted to this area with rigorous mathematical treatments [1]. In particular, coupled self-oscillators exhibit phase transition: *synchronisation emerges if coupling exceeds a critical threshold* [1, 10–13].

Dynamics of bus bunching, in contrast, is not as extensively studied by a physics approach. Buses arriving at bus stops in bunches forces commuters to face extended waiting times; and whilst indubitably undesirable, such occurrences are stable [14–31]. Bus bunching is a physical phenomenon of a complex socio-technological system. Hitherto, it is distinct from the concept of oscillator synchrony. Nevertheless, are there correspondences between them? This Letter establishes these connections and reveals the entrainment mechanisms of buses serving a loop of bus stops which underlie major bus routes at the heart of cities across the globe.

Consider a bus system comprising N buses serving M bus stops in a loop. Each bus i , where $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, is a self-oscillator: It has its own engine, fuel, and autonomy to travel along the loop; being human-driven, or driverless in the near future. Motion of bus i is in-

dependent of its position or phase $\theta_i \in [0, 2\pi)$ on the loop; it always moves with its natural (angular) frequency $\omega_i = 2\pi f_i = 2\pi/T_i$. If traffic slows it or if it momentarily accelerates, after that it just continues with ω_i without correcting for that phase perturbation (neutral stability). Without bus stops, bus i loops around with ω_i , oblivious and unaffected by other buses which can overtake. With bus stop j present, where $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, each bus i must spend a stoppage τ_{ij} to board/alight passengers. We consider loading as the dominant process during τ_{ij} , with passengers alighting simultaneously via different doors. So, this stoppage τ_{ij} is due to $P_j :=$ number of people at bus stop j ; and $l :=$ loading rate onto the bus, i.e. $\tau_{ij} = P_j/l$. The loading rate l is the same for each bus i at each bus stop j , and bunched buses share the load. Furthermore, P_j depends on the time headway Δt_{ij} between bus i and the bus immediately ahead (temporal phase difference), together with the average rate of people spawning at bus stop j , denoted by s_j . This time headway Δt_{ij} (Fig. 1) is defined as the time interval between the moment the bus ahead leaves bus stop j (so P_j resets to 0) and the subsequent moment when bus i leaves bus stop j (resetting P_j to 0). Hence $P_j = s_j \Delta t_{ij}$, and overall:

$$\tau_{ij} = k_j \Delta t_{ij} \quad (1)$$

gives the stoppage of bus i at bus stop j as a function of Δt_{ij} . The quantities $k_j := s_j/l < 1$ are couplings amongst buses due to bus stops. The formulation therefore describes a *ring of discrete-local-unidirectionally coupled self-oscillators* for this bus loop system. The coupling is discrete as it only happens at bus stops; local because τ_{ij} only depends on the time headway from the bus immediately ahead; unidirectional due to only the




FIG. 1. Time headway Δt_{ij} (temporal phase difference) with respect to bus stop j between bus i and the bus immediately ahead: the time interval between the moment the latter leaves bus stop j and the moment bus i leaves bus stop j .

leading bus directly affecting the trailing bus.

Note that: 1) Δt_{ij} and τ_{ij} are *directly measurable physical quantities*; 2) τ_{ij} depends on Δt_{ij} and k_j , but not explicitly on ω_i . Point (2) implies that inevitably present stochasticity of ω_i in real systems *do not affect the relationship between Δt_{ij} and τ_{ij}* : If ω_i is slower, then Δt_{ij} and correspondingly τ_{ij} [via Eq. (1)] are increased. In addition, multiple (arbitrarily located) bus stops between bus i and the bus ahead would certainly delay it but *not affect the relationship between Δt_{ij} and τ_{ij}* , i.e. this analytical treatment applies to any $N, M = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Hence, we can employ Eq. (1) to empirically determine k_j by measuring τ_{ij} and Δt_{ij} . Intriguingly, whilst Eq. (1) is linear, the coupling dynamics amongst buses is nonlinear. This is manifested by the average (angular) velocity of bus i over a time interval $\eta + \tau_{ij}$ (where η excludes stoppage) as it traverses bus stop j :

$$\left\langle \frac{d\theta_i}{dt} \right\rangle = \omega_i \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \eta/k_j \Delta t_{ij}} \right), \quad (2)$$

i.e. $\langle d\theta_i/dt \rangle$ has a coupling term $-\omega_i/(1 + \eta/k_j \Delta t_{ij})$ [a function of phase difference]. This is analogous to the Kuramoto model for synchronisation of an array of coupled self-oscillators whereby Eq. (2) has coupling term of the form $K \sum \sin \Delta\theta_{ij}$ [10, 11]. Unlike the *original* Kuramoto model where coupling is a mean field globally contributed by every self-oscillator and is continuous, buses experience discrete coupling at bus stops (pulses), which is local (depending only on the bus immediately ahead) and unidirectional (instead of mutual) [32].

Buses bunch in two ways: 1) frequency detuning; 2) phase locking. Due to frequency detuning, a fast bus catches a slow one, overtakes, then escapes: The system exhibits *periodic bunching*. This is always present due to human drivers' distinct ω_i . In contrast, strong coupling during high demand causes phase synchronisation where some adjacent pair of buses' *spatial phase difference*, $\Delta\theta$, becomes small and *bounded*. Hence, we classify the bus system's dynamics into two phases (note the dual usage of "phase"): (a) *lull*, where periodic bunching occurs due to frequency detuning; and (b) *busy*, where phase locking (sustained bunching) forms at high demand. Frequency detuning is a double-edge sword: It is a source of non-synchrony in an ensemble of oscillators (purportedly

preferable in undoing clustering), but simultaneously prevents stable constant $\Delta\theta$ (which is inappropriate).

Coupled self-oscillators generally experience phase synchronisation, given sufficiently strong coupling. For instance, the Kuramoto model provides an exact analytical treatment for *infinitely* many oscillators with natural frequencies given by a unimodal symmetric distribution $g(\omega)$. By considering the density distribution of these oscillators over the loop, the critical transition for synchronisation occurs at $K_c = 2/\pi g(0)$ [10–13]. For finite $N = 2, 3, \dots$ buses, we derive an analytic expression for the critical coupling k_c where phase transition occurs between *complete* (CPL) and *partial phase locking* (PPL) [derivation in supplemental material (SM)] [33]. Suppose each of the M bus stops has equal spawning rate s (so $k := s/l$) and they are perfectly staggered. This k_c is:

$$k_c(N) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{\omega_N}{\omega_i} \right), \quad (3)$$

where the N buses have natural frequencies $\omega_1 > \dots > \omega_N$. Buses in CPL would bunch as a single unit at each bus stop. After picking up everybody, they leave simultaneously with the faster ones pulling away, but get bunched completely at the next bus stop due to high demand. They are thus in equilibrium, with this sequence of events repeating at every bus stop. Eq. (3) gives a dimensionless quantity, depending on dimensionless ratios $\omega_N/\omega_i = f_N/f_i = T_i/T_N$.

An N -bus system is CPL if $k > k_c(N)$. There is another critical coupling $\bar{k} \leq k_c(N)$ marking the phase transition between PPL and *no phase locking* (NPL). If $k < \bar{k}$, then all buses do not experience phase locking but occasionally bunch due to frequency detuning. PPL is the regime $\bar{k} < k < k_c(N)$. The lull phase refers to NPL where bunching only occurs due to frequency detuning; the busy phase includes both PPL and CPL where at least one sustained bunching is present. The case $N = 2$ is special: $\bar{k} = k_c(2)$ with only NPL (lull) and CPL (busy). In real bus systems, we should never have to encounter CPL where all N buses bunch together, as this would be a highly inefficient system.

We carry out extensive simulations to determine the various degrees of local clustering of sustained bunching. This is done for $N = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7$ buses, respectively, with natural frequencies given in Table I, serving $M = 12$ staggered bus stops in a loop. From Eq. (3), theoretical values of $k_c(N)$ for the transition between PPL and CPL are calculated. Generally, an N -bus system has $N - 1$ independent local phase differences. If there is local clustering between a pair of buses, then its $\Delta\theta_{\max}$ is small ($\sim 0^\circ$); whereas large $\Delta\theta_{\max}$ ($\sim 180^\circ$) signifies no local phase locking since it is able to open up a large phase difference. The number of small $\Delta\theta_{\max}$ represents the degree of local clustering. As shown in Fig. 2, increasing k would increase the degree of local clustering *stepwise*

N	f_i (mHz)	k_c
2	1.39, 0.93	0.028
3	1.39, 1.16, 0.93	0.045
4	1.39, 1.24, 1.08, 0.93	0.061
5	1.39, 1.24, 1.16, 1.08, 0.93	0.077
6	1.39, 1.31, 1.24, 1.08, 1.00, 0.93	0.091
7	1.39, 1.31, 1.24, 1.16, 1.08, 1.00, 0.93	0.108

TABLE I. Table of k_c for various N buses with different $f_i \in [0.93, 1.39]$ mHz, serving $M = 12$ bus stops in a loop.

until $k_c(N)$ where CPL emerges with all $\Delta\theta_{\max} \sim 0^\circ$. Our simulations register slightly higher $k_c(N)$ for the critical transition between PPL and CPL than the analytical results given by Eq. (3). This is because people are *discrete*. If “0.9 person” is spawned, then the bus(es) would leave instead of loading that “0.9 person”. So, slightly stronger coupling is required to keep them bunched. Whilst we do not have the analytical calculation for the critical \bar{k} for $N > 2$ that marks the transition between NPL and PPL (because these are non-equilibria with unbunched buses continually affecting the bunched pair), simulations suggest that this phase transition occurs at $\bar{k} \sim k_c(2) = 0.028$. Thus, $k_c(2) < k < k_c(N)$ is a reasonable indication of PPL. Incidentally, a PPL state is also known as *chimera*, as it is the coexistence of synchronised and unsynchronised buses [34–53]. For our bus system, the coupling is local whereas many reported systems with chimera states have nonlocal coupling. The notion of chimera state was first coined for identical oscillators [36], and subsequently extended to heterogeneous oscillators [37, 41–43, 51]. Note that although $k < \bar{k}$ such that all $\Delta\theta_{\max} = 180^\circ$, simulations reveal transient local clustering periodically appearing.

We can apply our physical theory of buses as a synchronisation phenomenon to our Nanyang Technological University (NTU) Campus Buses [54]. We collect and process positional data for buses on the *Blue* route [55]. There are $M = 12$ bus stops along a loop within our campus, usually served by 3–4 buses (1–2 during off-peak hours), with 7–8 buses over busy periods (week-days 8.30–10.30am). These human-driven buses do not have identical natural frequency, but take an average of 12–18 minutes to complete a loop without stoppages, i.e. $f_i \in [0.93, 1.39]$ mHz. This frequency range forms the basis for the prescribed f_i in Table I.

Data from our NTU buses (see SM for details) turn out to fit well according to our physical theory’s predictions:

1. A 2-bus scenerio on Monday, 16th of April, 2018 (9.32–10.33pm) is in the *lull phase* where they are not phase locked, with measured $k = 0.024 \pm 0.004$ being less than $k_c(2) = 0.028$.
2. The cumulative 3-bus scenerios for an entire working week, 16–20th of April, 2018 (4–5pm, before the evening rush hour) is also in the *lull phase*,




FIG. 2. Simulation results of $N = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7$ buses, respectively, serving $M = 12$ bus stops in a loop: The number of bunched buses increases stepwise as k increases. CPL is the region $k > k_c(N)$, where all $\Delta\theta_{\max} \sim 0^\circ$. NPL is observed to occur when $k < \bar{k} \sim k_c(2) = 0.028$, where all $\Delta\theta_{\max} \sim 180^\circ$. PPL for $N > 2$ lies in between these extremes, as demarcated by the two vertical lines in the graphs.




FIG. 3. Graphs of $\Delta\theta$ between adjacent NTU campus buses versus time elapsed: (i) 2 buses serving at 9.32–10.33pm on the 16th; (ii) 3 buses serving at 4.32–5.07pm on the 20th; (iii) 7 buses serving at 8.56–10.13am on the 19th of April, 2018. The first two are in the *lull phase* with frequency detuning causing a fast bus to chase, overtake, then pull away from a slow bus. The third is in the *busy phase* where clusters of sustained phase-locked buses are visible. In the bottom graph, bunched buses are represented by thick coloured curves where $\Delta\theta$ is small, whilst other buses’ $\Delta\theta$ are large (grayscale thin curves). Videos for these are given as SM.

with measured $k = 0.018 \pm 0.007$ being less than $k_c(3) = 0.045$. This measured value is also less than $\bar{k} = k_c(2) = 0.028$. No clustering is observed.

3. The cumulative 6 to 7-bus scenerios for an entire working week, 16–20th of April, 2018 (9–10am, morning rush hour) is in the *busy phase*, with

measured $k = 0.065 \pm 0.017$. Although less than $k_c(6) = 0.091$ and $k_c(7) = 0.108$ (thankfully, otherwise this would be a ridiculously inefficient system), it is much higher than $\bar{k} = k_c(2) = 0.028$, indicating the presence of clusters of phase-locked buses.

Fig. 3 supports the theoretical deduction of these scenarios based on their measured k , by showing how $\Delta\theta$ between adjacent pairs of NTU buses evolve with time, with the loop isometrically mapped to a circle.

Let us now consider N initially staggered buses with identical $\omega = 2\pi f = 2\pi/T$ serving M bus stops, as we anticipate a future when self-driving buses are programmed. It turns out that although this is an equilibrium where they can remain staggered, stability *bifurcates* from neutrally stable to unstable at a critical $k = k_{c'}$:

$$k_{c'}(N) = \frac{N\tau_{\min}}{T}. \quad (4)$$

To derive Eq. (4), note that a bus must spend at least τ_{\min} to board even one passenger. If $l\tau_{\min}$ is at least P_{\max} := maximum number of people accumulated at each bus stop, then *all buses would only spend the minimum stoppage* τ_{\min} to board them. When the N buses are staggered, $\Delta t_{ij} \sim T/N$. Therefore, $P_{\max} = sT/N$ and the critical transition is given by $l\tau_{\min} = P_{\max} = sT/N$, i.e. Eq. (4). For $k < k_{c'}$, the system is neutrally stable since all stoppages are τ_{\min} even with small perturbations. If $k > k_{c'}$, the staggered configuration is generally unstable and all buses end up bunching. There is no chimera state. Intriguingly, our simulations show that the system can remain in staggered equilibrium for some values of $k > k_{c'}$ due to the *wide-doors effect* allowing multiple passengers boarding simultaneously [24, 25, 30]: If a bus can pick up l people per time step, then picking up $1, 2, \dots, l$ people all require one time step, i.e. tiny perturbations are tolerable. Let us compare the efficacy against bunching for bus systems with identical ω versus non-identical ω_i . With $N = 5$, $T = 15$ minutes ($\omega = 1.11$ mHz) and $\tau_{\min} = 5$ seconds (which includes deceleration and acceleration), then $k_{c'}(5) = 0.028$. This is similar to $k_c(2)$ with frequency detuning (Table I), but requires 5 buses. With $N = 2$, $k_{c'}(2) = 0.011$ implies that a coupling of, say $k = 0.020$, would cause bunching. Unlike with frequency detuning, bunched buses with identical ω stay bunched.

In conclusion, we can model complex real bus systems by a simple physical theory of self-oscillators coupled via Eq. (1), where the latter successfully captures essential underlying features of the former. Perhaps the most significant takeaway from this physical theory is, since *self-oscillators can be entrained*, buses can be kept staggered by a system of periodic driving forces. As lucidly described in Ref. [1], ordinary clocks these days need not be very accurate. A high-precision central clock can send periodic pulses (via radio signals) to entrain those

clocks, safeguarding their accuracy. Similarly, we can design a set of central oscillators for the bus system that dictates the N *ideal phases* for the N buses, whereby signals are sent out periodically to entrain them to remain staggered. In the real world, such central oscillators must continuously adapt to varying demands and traffic conditions. Hence, we are presently developing a smart central system using data science and artificial intelligence feeding on live demand, real-time traffic data, etc. [17, 29], thereby inhibiting bus bunching by driven entrainment.

This work was supported by MOE AcRF Tier 1 (Grant No. RG93/15) and the Joint WASP/NTU Programme (Project No. M4082189).

* lockyue@ntu.edu.sg

- [1] A. Pikovsky, M. Rosenblum, and J. Kurths, *Synchronization: A Universal Concept in Nonlinear Sciences*, Cambridge Nonlinear Science Series (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).
- [2] A. T. Winfree, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **16**, 15 (1967).
- [3] J. F. Aldridge and T. Pavlidis, *Nature* **259**, 343 (1976).
- [4] D. Cumin and C. Unsworth, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **226**, 181 (2007).
- [5] K. Wiesenfeld, P. Colet, and S. H. Strogatz, *Phys. Rev. E* **57**, 1563 (1998).
- [6] B. C. Daniels, S. T. M. Dissanayake, and B. R. Trees, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 026216 (2003).
- [7] G. Filatrella, N. F. Pedersen, and K. Wiesenfeld, *Phys. Rev. E* **75**, 017201 (2007).
- [8] J. A. Acebrón, L. L. Bonilla, C. J. Pérez Vicente, F. Ritort, and R. Spigler, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 137 (2005).
- [9] F. A. Rodrigues, T. K. D. Peron, P. Ji, and J. Kurths, *Physics Reports* **610**, 1 (2016).
- [10] Y. Kuramoto, in *International Symposium on Mathematical Problems in Theoretical Physics*, edited by H. Araki (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1975) pp. 420–422.
- [11] Y. Kuramoto, *Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984).
- [12] S. H. Strogatz and R. E. Mirollo, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **63**, 613 (1991).
- [13] S. H. Strogatz, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **143**, 1 (2000).
- [14] G. Newell and R. Potts, 2nd Australian Road Research Board **2**, 388 (1964).
- [15] R. A. Chapman and J. F. Michel, *Transportation Science* **12**, 165 (1978), <https://doi.org/10.1287/trsc.12.2.165>.
- [16] W. B. Powell and Y. Sheffi, *Transportation Science* **17**, 376 (1983), <https://doi.org/10.1287/trsc.17.4.376>.
- [17] Y. Bin, Y. Zhongzhen, and Y. Baozhen, *Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems* **10**, 151 (2006), <https://doi.org/10.1080/15472450600981009>.
- [18] C. Gershenson and L. A. Pineda, *PLOS ONE* **4**, 1 (2009).
- [19] C. F. Daganzo, *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* **43**, 913 (2009).
- [20] G. Bellei and K. Gkoumas, *Public Transport* **2**, 269 (2010).
- [21] O. Cats, A. N. Larijani, H. N. Koutsopoulos, and

- W. Burghout, *Transportation Research Record* **2216**, 51 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.3141/2216-06>.
- [22] C. Gershenson, *PLOS ONE* **6**, 1 (2011).
- [23] J. J. Bartholdi and D. D. Eisenstein, *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* **46**, 481 (2012).
- [24] S. Jara-Díaz and A. Tirachini, *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy* **47**, 91 (2013).
- [25] C. Stewart and A. El-Geneidy, *Transportation Research Record* **2418**, 39 (2014), <https://doi.org/10.3141/2418-05>.
- [26] L. Sun, A. Tirachini, K. W. Axhausen, A. Erath, and D.-H. Lee, *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* **69**, 447 (2014).
- [27] A. Tirachini, *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* **59**, 37 (2014).
- [28] C. Gershenson and D. Helbing, *Complexity* **21**, 9 (2015).
- [29] L. Moreira-Matias, O. Cats, J. Gama, J. Mendes-Moreira, and J. F. de Sousa, *Applied Soft Computing* **47**, 460 (2016).
- [30] A. El-Geneidy, D. van Lierop, E. Gris, G. Boisjoly, D. Swallow, L. Fordham, and T. Herrmann, *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* **99**, 114 (2017).
- [31] P. Wang, X. Chen, W. Chen, L. Cheng, and D. Lei, *Transportation Research Record* **0**, 0361198118798722 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361198118798722>.
- [32] There are various extensions to myriads of systems involving local coupling, different lattice arrangements of the oscillators, selective directional coupling, weighted and time-varying coupling, etc. carrying the name “Kuramoto” [4–7]. These mainly still have a sine term in the coupling, highlighting the 2π -periodicity with respect to phase difference. The Kuramoto model, however, assumes *weak* coupling with several other approximations/simplifications (see for example, Ref. [1]). There are in fact, more general coupling functions [56, 57]. Our derivation for the bus system here is *exact*.
- [33] We also derive the corresponding exact formula for $N = 2$ *local unidirectional Kuramoto oscillators* (this is equivalent to the original Kuramoto model), viz. $K_c(2) = (\omega_1 - \omega_2)/2$. (See SM.) Although we do not find a close form for $N > 2$, we state the condition for CPL, leading to the problem of minimising K . As K is a function of $N - 1$ independent local phase differences, subjected to $N - 2$ constraints, it can be minimised by the method of Lagrange multipliers.
- [34] Y. Kuramoto and D. Battogtokh, *Nonlinear Phenomena in Complex Systems* **5**, 380 (2002).
- [35] Y. Kuramoto, *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos: Where Do We Go from Here?*, edited by S. Hogan, A. Champneys, B. Krauskopf, M. di Bernardo, R. Wilson, H. Osinga, and M. Homer (Institute of Physics, Bristol, U.K., 2003) p. 209.
- [36] D. M. Abrams and S. H. Strogatz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 174102 (2004).
- [37] E. Montbrió, J. Kurths, and B. Blasius, *Phys. Rev. E* **70**, 056125 (2004).
- [38] D. M. Abrams and S. H. Strogatz, *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos* **16**, 21 (2006), <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218127406014551>.
- [39] D. M. Abrams, R. Mirollo, S. H. Strogatz, and D. A. Wiley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 084103 (2008).
- [40] D. M. Abrams, R. Mirollo, S. H. Strogatz, and D. A. Wiley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 129902 (2008).
- [41] C. R. Laing, *Chaos* **19**, 013113 (2009).
- [42] C. R. Laing, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **238**, 1569 (2009).
- [43] C. R. Laing, *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **22**, 043104 (2012), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4758814>.
- [44] G. C. Sethia and A. Sen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 144101 (2014).
- [45] V. K. Chandrasekar, R. Gopal, A. Venkatesan, and M. Lakshmanan, *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 062913 (2014).
- [46] L. Schmidt and K. Krischer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 034101 (2015).
- [47] F. Böhm, A. Zakharova, E. Schöll, and K. Lüdge, *Phys. Rev. E* **91**, 040901 (2015).
- [48] L. Schmidt and K. Krischer, *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **25**, 064401 (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4921727>.
- [49] C. R. Laing, *Phys. Rev. E* **92**, 050904 (2015).
- [50] A. Mishra, C. Hens, M. Bose, P. K. Roy, and S. K. Dana, *Phys. Rev. E* **92**, 062920 (2015).
- [51] M. J. Panaggio and D. M. Abrams, *Nonlinearity* **28**, R67 (2015).
- [52] T. Kotwal, X. Jiang, and D. M. Abrams, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 264101 (2017).
- [53] S. Kundu, S. Majhi, B. K. Bera, D. Ghosh, and M. Lakshmanan, *Phys. Rev. E* **97**, 022201 (2018).
- [54] S. Begum, 9th of April, *The Nanyang Chronicle* (2018), “Need for higher shuttle bus frequency in the evenings: Survey”.
- [55] Live data: <https://baseride.com/maps/public/ntu/>.
- [56] H. Daido, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 760 (1994).
- [57] J. D. Crawford, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4341 (1995).

Bus bunching as a synchronisation phenomenon: Supplemental material

Vee-Liem Saw,^{1,2} Ning Ning Chung,³ Wei Liang Quek,¹ Yi En Ian Pang,¹ and Lock Yue Chew^{1,2,3}

¹*Division of Physics and Applied Physics,
School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, 21 Nanyang Link,
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 637371*

²*Data Science and Artificial Intelligence Research Centre,
Block N4 #02a-32, Nanyang Avenue,
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 639798*

³*Complexity Institute, 61 Nanyang Drive,
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 637335*

(Dated: December 15, 2024)

Abstract

The supplemental material contains the following:

1. Analytical derivation of the phase transition to complete phase locking of all N buses serving M staggered bus stops in a loop.
2. Analytical derivation of the phase transition to complete phase locking of all N Kuramoto oscillators subjected to local unidirectional coupling.
3. Data analytics on the Nanyang Technological University Campus Buses.

ANALYTICAL DERIVATION OF THE PHASE TRANSITION TO COMPLETE PHASE LOCKING OF ALL N BUSES SERVING M STAGGERED BUS STOPS IN A LOOP

Consider $N = 2$ buses with natural angular frequencies $\omega_1 > \omega_2$ ($\omega_i = 2\pi f_i = 2\pi/T_i$) serving $M = 1$ bus stop in a loop. Suppose that the coupling $k := s/l$ is strong enough such that these two buses are phase locked. (Recall that s and l are the spawning and loading rates, respectively.) In that case, these two buses would always bunch at the bus stop and share the loading of people. Once everybody has been picked up, the two buses leave together, with the faster one pulling away. After one revolution, the faster one returns to the bus stop and begins picking up people. But before finishing, the slower one arrives (because k is strong enough such that there are many people waiting at the bus stop) and the two buses share loading. These two buses are in such an equilibrium which repeats over and over.

In Fig. S1, (a) is the moment when the two buses just leave the bus stop after picking up everybody, (b) is when the fast bus just arrives after one revolution, (c) is when the slow bus just arrives, and (d) is when both buses have finished picking up everybody and leave. The time elapsed from (a) to (b) is T_1 , from (b) to (c) is $T_2 - T_1$, from (c) to (d) is τ_{shared} , where τ_{shared} is the duration when these two buses share loading. The total number of people to be picked up is s times the total time elapsed from (a) to (d), which is $T_2 + \tau_{\text{shared}}$. These people are picked up by:

1. Only the fast bus = $l(T_2 - T_1)$.
2. Shared by the fast and slow buses = $2l\tau_{\text{shared}}$.

The critical transition between no phase locking and phase locking is when $\tau_{\text{shared}} = 0$. In that case,

$$sT_2 = l(T_2 - T_1) \tag{1}$$

$$k_c := \frac{s}{l} \tag{2}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{T_1}{T_2} \tag{3}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{f_2}{f_1} \tag{4}$$




FIG. S1: $N = 2$ buses serving $M = 1$ bus stop in a loop, where k is strong enough such that they are phase locked.

$$= 1 - \frac{\omega_2}{\omega_1}. \quad (5)$$

If there are M staggered bus stops, then these sequence of events repeat at every bus stop. At the critical transition, $\tau_{\text{shared}} = 0$ and the total number of people to pick up is still sT_2 . However, the time interval for the fast bus to pick up all people is only $(T_2 - T_1)/M$ since there are M staggered bus stops in one revolution. Then, we have

$$sT_2 = \frac{l(T_2 - T_1)}{M} \quad (6)$$

$$k_c = \frac{1}{M} \left(1 - \frac{T_1}{T_2} \right) \quad (7)$$

$$= \frac{1}{M} \left(1 - \frac{f_2}{f_1} \right) \quad (8)$$

$$= \frac{1}{M} \left(1 - \frac{\omega_2}{\omega_1} \right). \quad (9)$$

So with M bus stops, each bus stop multiplies the coupling strength. Hence, only one M -th of the coupling strength with one bus stop is required when there are M bus stops.

Let us now consider N buses with angular frequencies $\omega_1 > \dots > \omega_N$ serving $M = 1$ bus stop in a loop, and we know that having M staggered bus stops would be one M -th of k_c for $M = 1$. The total number of people to pick up is $s(T_N + \tau_{\text{shared}})$, since all buses have to wait for the slowest bus to reach the bus stop, and then all buses would share the load over the duration τ_{shared} . These people are picked up by:

1. Only the first bus $= l(T_2 - T_1)$.
2. Shared by only the first and second buses $= 2l(T_3 - T_2)$.
3. Shared by only the first, second and third buses $= 3l(T_4 - T_3)$.

4. ...

5. Shared by only the first $N - 1$ buses = $(N - 1)l(T_N - T_{N-1})$.

6. Shared by all buses = $Nl\tau_{\text{shared}}$.

The critical transition between complete and partial phase locking is when $\tau_{\text{shared}} = 0$. In that case,

$$sT_N = l[T_2 - T_1 + 2T_3 - 2T_2 + 3T_4 - 3T_3 + \dots + (N - 1)T_N - (N - 1)T_{N-1}] \quad (10)$$

$$= l \left[(N - 1)T_N - \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} T_i \right] \quad (11)$$

$$k_c = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{T_i}{T_N} \right). \quad (12)$$

Thus, the critical transition between complete and partial phase locking for the general case of N buses serving M staggered bus stops in a loop is:

$$k_c = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{\omega_N}{\omega_i} \right), \quad (13)$$

where $\omega_N/\omega_i = f_N/f_i = T_i/T_N$.

ANALYTICAL DERIVATION OF THE PHASE TRANSITION TO COMPLETE PHASE LOCKING OF ALL N KURAMOTO OSCILLATORS SUBJECTED TO LOCAL UNIDIRECTIONAL COUPLING

Consider N Kuramoto oscillators with natural angular frequencies $\omega_1 > \dots > \omega_N$, subjected to local unidirectional coupling. This system differs from the original Kuramoto model (with the exception of $N = 2$ which is indeed equivalent), whereby here oscillator i ($i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$) is only directly influenced by the oscillator that is immediately ahead of it. We are interested in this type of Kuramoto oscillators instead of the original model whereby the coupling is globally contributed by every oscillator, because this is the direct analogue to the bus system (a bus is only directly influenced by the bus immediately ahead).

If the coupling is *strong enough*, i.e. $K \geq K_c$, then these N oscillators are *completely phase locked* with faster oscillators being successively ahead of slower ones. The critical coupling K_c is the value of K such that the system is barely able to be completely phase

locked. Hence, the N equations governing the motion of the N oscillators in such a situation are:

$$\frac{d\theta_i}{dt} = \omega_i + K \sin(\theta_{i-1} - \theta_i), \quad (14)$$

where θ_i represents the phase of oscillator i on the unit circle, and $\theta_0 := \theta_N$. The constant K is the coupling strength between the oscillators. Note that we do not divide K by N (which is done in the original Kuramoto model), because there is only one sine term present (instead of $N - 1$ sine terms in the original Kuramoto model). The condition for these oscillators being completely phase locked is:

$$\frac{d\theta_1}{dt} = \dots = \frac{d\theta_N}{dt}, \quad (15)$$

giving $N - 1$ independent equations which are functions of $N - 1$ independent phase differences $\phi_1 = \theta_1 - \theta_2, \dots, \phi_{N-1} = \theta_{N-1} - \theta_N$.

Let us work this out explicitly in the case of $N = 2$. The governing equations are:

$$\frac{d\theta_1}{dt} = \omega_1 + K \sin(\theta_2 - \theta_1) = \omega_1 - K \sin(\theta_1 - \theta_2) \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{d\theta_2}{dt} = \omega_2 + K \sin(\theta_1 - \theta_2). \quad (17)$$

The phase locked condition gives:

$$\frac{d\theta_1}{dt} = \frac{d\theta_2}{dt} \quad (18)$$

$$K = \frac{\omega_1 - \omega_2}{2 \sin(\theta_1 - \theta_2)}. \quad (19)$$

This implies that the two oscillators can be phase locked as long as there is a phase difference $\theta_1 - \theta_2$ which satisfies Eq. (19), given some value of K . If K is not strong enough, i.e. $K < K_c$, then no phase difference $\theta_1 - \theta_2$ can satisfy Eq. (19) and the two oscillators are not phase locked. The sought after critical transition K_c between the unsynchronised and synchronised phases of the system (note the dual usage of the word ‘‘phase’’) occurs when Eq. (18) is satisfied for the smallest K , i.e. we need to minimise Eq. (19). This gives

$$K_c = \frac{1}{2}(\omega_1 - \omega_2), \quad (20)$$

which occurs when the phase difference between the two oscillators is $\theta_1 - \theta_2 = \pi/2$.

For $N = 3$, the governing equations are:

$$\frac{d\theta_1}{dt} = \omega_1 + K \sin(\theta_3 - \theta_1) = \omega_1 - K \sin(\phi_1 + \phi_2) \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{d\theta_2}{dt} = \omega_2 + K \sin(\theta_1 - \theta_2) = \omega_2 + K \sin \phi_1 \quad (22)$$

$$\frac{d\theta_3}{dt} = \omega_3 + K \sin(\theta_2 - \theta_3) = \omega_3 + K \sin \phi_2, \quad (23)$$

where $\phi_1 = \theta_1 - \theta_2$, $\phi_2 = \theta_2 - \theta_3$, $\theta_3 - \theta_1 = -(\theta_1 - \theta_2 + \theta_2 - \theta_3) = -(\phi_1 + \phi_2)$. From the condition for complete phase locking

$$\frac{d\theta_1}{dt} = \frac{d\theta_2}{dt} = \frac{d\theta_3}{dt}, \quad (24)$$

we have two independent equations

$$K = \frac{\omega_1 - \omega_2}{\sin \phi_1 + \sin(\phi_1 + \phi_2)} \quad (25)$$

$$K = \frac{\omega_2 - \omega_3}{\sin \phi_2 - \sin \phi_1}. \quad (26)$$

This implies that the three oscillators can all be phase locked if there are some phase differences ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 between these three oscillators which satisfy the above two equations, given some value of K . The sought after critical transition between completely phase locked and partially phase locked phases of the system occurs when K is minimised. Since K depends on the two variables ϕ_1, ϕ_2 which are subjected to the constraint

$$\frac{\omega_1 - \omega_2}{\sin \phi_1 + \sin(\phi_1 + \phi_2)} = \frac{\omega_2 - \omega_3}{\sin \phi_2 - \sin \phi_1}, \quad (27)$$

the problem of minimising K can be solved by the method of Lagrange multipliers. Unfortunately, there does not appear to be a closed form solution for K_c . This applies to any N oscillators, where K is a function of $N - 1$ independent phase differences which are subjected to $N - 2$ constraint equations. The closed form solution is found for $N = 2$ in Eq. (20), but not for $N > 2$.

Interestingly for $N = 3$, we note that if $\omega_1 - \omega_2 = \omega_2 - \omega_3 = \Omega$, then $\phi_1 = 0$, $\phi_2 = \pi/2$ is the solution that minimises K as can be verified by the method of Lagrange multipliers. In this case,

$$K_c = \Omega. \quad (28)$$

However, the corresponding situations with $\omega_1 - \omega_2 = \dots = \omega_{N-1} - \omega_N$ for $N > 3$ do not seem to admit such a nice closed form solution.

DATA ANALYTICS ON THE NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY CAMPUS BUSES

We collect and process positional data for buses on the *Blue* route of our Nanyang Technological University (NTU) Campus Buses [1]. There are $M = 12$ bus stops along a loop within our campus, usually served by at least 3 buses (1 – 2 during off-peak hours), with 7 – 8 buses over busy periods (weekdays 8.30 – 10.30am). These human-driven buses do not have identical natural frequency, but take an average of 12 – 18 minutes to complete a loop without stoppages, i.e. $f_i \in [0.93, 1.39]$ mHz. As bus stops have heterogeneous spawning rates, a fair global measure is obtained by averaging quantities over all 12 bus stops, i.e. *moving average*. Therefore, we calculate moving averages of Δt_{ij} and τ_{ij} to plot the time series for each bus i , thus deducing the average k via Eq. (1) in the main paper, i.e.

$$k = \tau_{ij} / \Delta t_{ij}. \quad (29)$$

Bus bunching is a highly observed phenomenon, with 4 – 5 buses bunching together being a ubiquitous sight in NTU. This perennial and notorious issue on bus bunching affects students, staff and faculty members who live, work and play in our beautiful campus [2].

Fig. S2 shows the time series of our NTU buses recorded over the entire working week 16 – 20th of April, 2018, clearly depicting the two phases *lull* and *busy*, as described in the main paper. The first is a quintessential example of two initially antipodally-spaced buses, ending up bunching due to frequency detuning. Their average natural frequencies are 0.94 mHz and 1.14 mHz, respectively. These average natural frequencies fluctuate, which effectively contributes towards greater frequency detuning. This event occurred at 9.32 – 10.33pm on the 16th. Next is a collection of time series between 4 – 5pm during those 5 days, where 3 buses were serving during this hour (15 time series in total). Before 4pm and after 5pm, buses are rested/replaced, i.e. the system is tweaked or non-isolated. This 4 – 5pm is an interval where the system is *isolated*. These situations represent real-world examples of the lull phase where bunching occurs periodically with the fast bus pulling off after overtaking. The third is a selection of 10 time series throughout those 5 days from 9 – 10am, served by 6 – 7 buses during the morning rush hour. This is a typical situation of the busy phase where clusters of phase-locked buses are recorded. Here, we make a selection because these 6 – 7 buses often overtake one another constituting a transient state which




FIG. S2: Graphs of τ_{ij} versus Δt_{ij} (moving averages) of our NTU Campus Buses, for the three situations described in the text. Left and middle are in the *lull phase*; right is in the *busy phase*. Each time series starts from ► and ends at ■.

destroys the moving average sequence. Bunched buses share the load, so the loading rate l gets multiplied — which is not k for a single bus. In addition, these are 10 time series with highest demand, to determine a representative value for *peak demand* throughout the week. Demand varies during morning rush hour because lectures in NTU start at the half-hour mark, so students travelling from campus residences to faculty buildings are likely to leave at preferred times. For the first two graphs (lull phase), overtaking is not as frequent and no time series is excluded.

The plots in Fig. S2 signify a *linear relationship* between τ_{ij} and Δt_{ij} [Eq. (29)], with expected real-world stochasticity. A source of deviation from Eq. (29) arises from disembarkation: Buses carrying many passengers may stop longer, although the time headway may be relatively small with few boarding. Also, if bus capacity is reached, excess passengers are ignored. Anyway, we can fit a straight line to obtain the gradient k and the τ_{ij} -intercept. The τ_{ij} -intercept is not quite zero, but of the order of +10 seconds for all τ_{ij} - Δt_{ij} graphs. This systematic shift is because positional data from the source were updated once in approximately 10 seconds, i.e. buses would be reported as being at bus stops although they actually departed. Furthermore, data coarseness causes the measured τ_{ij} to include deceleration/acceleration times over the bus stops, plus oftentimes buses should wait for clear traffic before rejoining the road. From the gradients of the fitted lines, $k = 0.024 \pm 0.004$ for the first graph, $k = 0.018 \pm 0.007$ for the second [breakdowns for the 5 respective days (4 – 5pm) are: 0.021 ± 0.007 , 0.028 ± 0.005 , 0.015 ± 0.006 , 0.011 ± 0.005 , 0.024 ± 0.004], and $k = 0.065 \pm 0.017$ for the third. *Estimate*: Suppose 1 person takes 1 second to board/alight. If 10 people approach a bus stop per minute at busy hours, compared to 1 in 5 minutes

during lull times, these translate to $k \in [0.003, 0.167]$. Our results are within this range.

The data analytics strongly suggest a classification of the bus system into distinct lull and busy phases, as mentioned earlier. Frequency detuning allows a fast bus to pull away after overtaking. Although it gets held up at subsequent bus stops, during lull periods its stoppage is short and its higher speed helps widen the spatial phase difference, $\Delta\theta$. However, when coupling gets beyond a critical value, the bus system transitions from lull to busy where clusters of phase-locked buses appear: whilst the fast bus escapes, it then experiences lengthy stoppage at the next bus stop and gets caught up. This sequence of events repeats at every bus stop. Since frequency detuning causes periodic bunching under weak coupling, they are also periodically staggered: $\Delta\theta_{\max} = 180^\circ$. If coupling gets beyond the critical threshold, phase locking emerges: $\Delta\theta_{\max} \sim 0^\circ$. Periodic bunching and phase locking are the two stable phases of human-driven bus systems, where their natural frequencies are different.

[1] Live data: <https://baseride.com/maps/public/ntu/>.

[2] S. Begum, 9th of April, The Nanyang Chronicle (2018), “*Need for higher shuttle bus frequency in the evenings: Survey*”.