

A vicious cycle along busy bus corridors and how to abate it

Minyu Shen^{a,b}, Weihua Gu^{*b}, Michael J. Cassidy^c, Yongjie Lin^d and Wei Ni^c

^aSchool of Management Science and Engineering, Southwestern University of Finance and Economics, China

^bDepartment of Electrical Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

^cDepartment of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California, Berkeley

^dSchool of Civil Engineering and Transportation, South China University of Technology

Abstract

We unveil that a previously-unreported vicious cycle can be created when bus queues form at curbside stops along a corridor. Buses caught in this cycle exhibit growing variation in headways as they travel from stop to stop. Bus (and patron) delays accumulate in like fashion and can grow large on long, busy corridors. We show that this damaging cycle can be abated in simple ways. Present solutions entail holding buses at a corridor entrance and releasing them as per various strategies proposed in the literature. We introduce a modest variant to the simplest of these strategies. It releases buses at headways that are slightly less than, or equal to, the scheduled values. It turns out that periodically releasing buses at slightly smaller headways can substantially reduce bus delays caused by holding so that benefits can more readily outweigh costs in corridors that contain a sufficient number of serial bus stops. The simple variant is shown to perform about as well as, or better than, other bus-holding strategies in terms of saving delays, and is more effective than other strategies in regularizing bus headways. We also show that grouping buses from across multiple lines and holding them by group can be effective when patrons have the flexibility to choose buses from across

*Corresponding author, Email address: weihua.gu@polyu.edu.hk

all lines in a group. Findings come by formulating select models of bus-corridor dynamics and using these to simulate part of the Bus Rapid Transit corridor in Guangzhou, China.

Keywords: bus corridor; bus queues; bus holding; common-line patrons

1 Introduction

Busy bus corridors are found the world over. Examples include: the Santo Amaro-Nove de Julho-Centro corridor in Sao Paulo, Brazil, which serves patron flows as high as 98,000/h/direction during peak hours; and the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor in Guangzhou, China, accommodating patron flows of 27,000/h/direction during the rush (Global BRT Data, n.d.). Bus queues that form at stops in corridors such as these create irregular headways. Buses with longer headways can confront larger numbers of boarding patrons at downstream stops. These buses are further delayed as a result, which causes other buses to catch-up from behind, a phenomenon called bunching (Newell and Potts, 1964).

Bunching is known to become more pronounced as buses progress along their routes (Newell, 1974; Daganzo, 2009). One might therefore expect attendant variations in bus headways to worsen in this same fashion. And because large variations in headways engender long queues (see Gu et al., 2011), one might further expect to see steadily longer bus queues when moving from stop to stop along a corridor. This would mean that schedule-keeping erodes, and delays to buses and patrons increase, as buses traverse the corridor. This vicious cycle, triggered by bus queues at stops could also worsen over the course of a rush.

The plausibility of the cycle described above seems to have escaped notice in the literature. Perhaps this is because studies of bus queueing often focus on a single stop, rather than on multi-stop corridors (Gibson et al., 1989; Fernández and Planzer, 2002; Fernández and Tyler, 2005; Fernández, 2010; Gu et al., 2011, 2015; Gu and Cassidy, 2013; Tan et al., 2014; Bian et al., 2019; Shen et al., 2019, 2023). And those works to have examined corridor-wide operations commonly assumed that stops were free of bus queues (Hernández et al., 2015; Schmöcker et al., 2016; Laskaris et al., 2018).

The literature also reports on several forms of control that were examined for idealized

(unqueued) corridor-wide conditions. These forms include adaptive signal control (Anderson and Daganzo, 2020); stop-skipping (Fu et al., 2003; Sun and Hickman, 2005); and the imposition of boarding limits (Delgado et al., 2009). The most widely-studied control form is bus holding (Osuna and Newell, 1972; Vandebona and Richardson, 1986; Hickman, 2001; Daganzo, 2009; Xuan et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2017; Berrebi et al., 2018). The latter form regularizes headways by holding buses at select stops, termed control points, along a corridor. Some of the earliest efforts in this realm entailed adding fixed slack times to bus schedules and prohibiting buses from departing control points ahead of the new schedule (Osuna and Newell, 1972; Newell, 1974; Zhao et al., 2006). Work in Daganzo (2009) proposed a dynamic strategy in which holding times are determined at multiple control points along a line based upon bus headways measured in real time. The work was extended in numerous follow-up studies (Daganzo and Pilachowski, 2011; Xuan et al., 2011; Bartholdi and Eisenstein, 2012; He, 2015; Andres and Nair, 2017; Zhang and Lo, 2018; Dai et al., 2019) to formulate more sophisticated holding strategies that achieve better performance. Finally, work in Berrebi et al. (2015) found bus-holding times that minimize headway variations based upon predictions of bus arrival times in the future.

All the above holding strategies enhance schedule-keeping. However, in a corridor free of bus queues (as assumed in the above works), these strategies can only slow buses down and thus worsen delay for both buses and patrons, as compared against doing nothing. The strategies can reduce delays, but only when buses queue-up at stops, and these cases were not considered in the above works.

We found three works that considered bus queues in multi-stop corridors, though none of these are aligned with our present interest. The first of these studies examined patron behavior in choosing among multiple lines that serve their trips (Sun and Schmöcker, 2018). Another focused on reducing patron wait times by controlling bus speeds (Bian et al., 2020). The third work sought to mitigate bus-stop queues by coordinating the cruising speeds of buses across different lines to distribute bus arrivals at stops more evenly over time (Bian et al., 2023). None of these studies mentioned the vicious cycle described earlier in this section, much less strategies to mitigate it.

The present paper formulates models of corridor dynamics and uses them in simulation

to: (i) verify that the vicious cycle can occur in commonplace settings; (ii) illustrate its damaging effects; and (iii) show that the cycle can be abated by holding buses at a single control point at the corridor’s entrance, to reduce their headway variations and as a result, their delays. Holding strategies to be tested include small variations in the simple headway-based strategy studied in both Abkowitz and Lepofsky (1990) and Berrebi et al. (2018). In our simple variants, buses are released from the control point at regular headways that can be slightly shorter than scheduled values and that can be for bus groupings across distinct lines. The variant is shown to be effective, often more so than more complex holding strategies found in the literature.

The idealized features of a bus corridor, its control point, and the ideas behind the simple headway-based holding strategy are described in the following section. Models of corridor operations and what these say about how the simple headway-based holding strategy might be favorably altered are presented in Section 3. The pulling-together of these models into a simulation platform and the real-world site that provided input data to our analysis are described in Section 4. Section 5 provides outcomes from numerical tests on the simple strategy, where buses are released when their headways meet the scheduled value, and on its variant that employs a reduced headway threshold for releasing buses onto the corridor. A second variant of the simple strategy that holds buses by line group, along with its benefits, are presented in Section 6. Implications of outcomes and their extensions are discussed in Section 7.

2 Corridor Representation and Holding

Consider a corridor serving L bus lines, as shown in Figure 1. Lines may originate at distinct locations upstream and merge onto the corridor. The lines run through each of N multi-berth stops that reside curbside along the corridor, and diverge downstream. Denote c^s as the number of berths at stop $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, and assume that buses are not allowed to overtake one another when they enter and exit these berths at any stop.¹ Denote as f_l the

¹Other queue disciplines, such as limited- and free-overtaking (Gu and Cassidy, 2013; Bian et al., 2019; ?), can be incorporated into our models and would not likely alter present findings as regards the existence of a vicious cycle and the effectiveness of bus holding as a mitigation measure.

bus flow (i.e., service frequency) on line $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$. The bus headway scheduled for line l , H_l , is therefore $\frac{1}{f_l}$.




Figure 1: Corridor layout.

Buses are held and released at the control point located at the corridor's upstream end, again as shown in Figure 1. Figure 2 illustrates how this control point might be designed for a case of $L = 3$, where L dedicated bus lanes are used, each serving one of L bus lines. (A similar design is offered in Szász et al., 1978.) Buses arriving on line l might first queue in the lane assigned to that line. A bus is released from the control point at a time H_l following the release of the bus ahead. A line- l bus arriving at an empty lane is released into the corridor immediately, if the elapsed time since the line's previous release has reached or exceeded H_l . Bus releases might be controlled by signals (meters) installed at the downstream ends of reserved lanes; see again Figure 2.




Figure 2: An example layout of a control point ($L = 3$).

Where space is at a premium, bus queues from distinct lanes can be arranged in tandem fashion in a single reserved lane. If real-time bus-to-bus communication is available as described in Argote-Cabanero et al. (2015), then control can be executed by regulating bus speeds, rather than by holding buses, thus eliminating need for a control point.

Where holding is the means of control, a bus j on line l encounters a holding delay,

denoted $w_{l,j}^0$. The control method therefore reduces bus delay on the corridor only if holding delays are outsized by the accumulated bus delays that holding saves at downstream stops. (This can only be the case when stops are queued with buses sans holding.)

We will show that properties of holding delays can in some circumstances motivate modifications to the simple headway-based holding strategy described above. In one modification, buses on line l are released from the control point at intervals that are slightly less than H_l . A second modification entails grouping buses from across lines and holding them at the control point by group. These matters are discussed in the following sections.

3 Models

Models of bus dynamics and of patron boardings and alightings are presented in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, respectively. Bus-delay equations for assessing corridor performance are in Section 3.3.

3.1 Bus dynamics

Assume for simplicity that bus travel time between the control point and first stop downstream (i.e., stop 1 in Figure 1) is zero. Hence, the arrival time at that stop by bus j on line l , $a_{l,j}^1$, is calculated as:

$$a_{l,j}^1 = a_{l,j}^0 + w_{l,j}^0, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}, j \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}, \quad (1)$$

where $a_{l,j}^0$ is bus j 's arrival time at the control point, and recall that $w_{l,j}^0$ is the bus's holding delay. Assume that $a_{l,j}^0$ is a Gaussian random variable with mean jH_l and standard deviation $C_{H,l}H_l$, i.e., $a_{l,j}^0 \sim \mathcal{N}(jH_l, C_{H,l}^2H_l^2)$, where $C_{H,l}$ is a specified coefficient.² In cases in which bus overtaking occurs between stops, such that $a_{l,j}^0 > a_{l,j+1}^0$, the indices of the two buses are swapped.

The expected holding delay for bus j on line l can be approximated as:

²The coefficient of variation of headways is $\sqrt{2}C_{H,l}$ if the bus arrival times are independent (Ross, 2020). Furthermore, our simulation tests found that other distributions for $a_{l,j}^0$ produced similar outcomes.

$$E[w_{l,j}^0|j] \approx C_{H,l}H_l \cdot \Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{j - \frac{\pi}{8}}{j - \frac{\pi}{4} + 1}\right), \quad (2)$$

where $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse cumulative distribution function for the standard normal distribution. Derivation of (2) is relegated to Appendix B.

In light of (2), average holding delay across the first m buses on line l is:

$$E_{1 \leq j \leq m}[w_{l,j}^0] \approx C_{H,l}H_l \cdot \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{j - \frac{\pi}{8}}{j - \frac{\pi}{4} + 1}\right). \quad (3)$$

Equations (2) and (3) unveil the following two properties regarding holding delays.

Property 1. Expected holding delay is proportional to the standard deviation of bus arrival time, $C_{H,l}H_l$.

Property 2. The expected delay for bus j , $E[w_{l,j}^0|j]$, grows to infinity as j increases, since $\frac{j - \frac{\pi}{8}}{j - \frac{\pi}{4} + 1}$ increases to 1 as j approaches infinity. In addition, since $\{E[w_{l,j}^0|j]\}$ is a divergent increasing sequence, the sequence of its cumulative means, $\{E_{1 \leq j \leq m}[w_{l,j}^0]\}$, is also a divergent increasing sequence. (Proof of this mathematical result is provided in Appendix C.) Thus, average holding delay (3) also approaches infinity as m grows. Fortunately, these growths toward infinity are slow.³

Property 2 means that under a simple headway-based control scheme where buses are released from the control point at scheduled headways, those buses will fall further and further behind schedule as the rush wears on. Both to combat this tendency and to reduce holding delay, we propose the following modification of the simple headway-based strategy studied in Abkowitz and Lepofsky (1990) and Berrebi et al. (2018). With our modification, buses on each line $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ are held at the control point until a minimum headway of ηH_l elapses between consecutive departures from the same line, where $\eta \in [0, 1]$.

Previous studies (e.g., Daganzo, 2009) often model the uncertainties in bus motion as exogenous random terms. However, the stochastic delay incurred by a queued bus at a busy

³Numerical analysis shows that the coefficient in (2), $\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{j - \frac{\pi}{8}}{j - \frac{\pi}{4} + 1}\right)$, moderately increases from 0.60 to 2.87 as j increases from 2 to 300. The coefficient in (3), $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{j - \frac{\pi}{8}}{j - \frac{\pi}{4} + 1}\right)$, grows even slower. Since the number of buses entering a corridor during a peak period is in the hundreds or less, the holding delay will not grow exceedingly large.

stop is affected by downstream buses in the queue, and thus should be treated endogenously. This bus-queueing dynamic is modeled as described below.

Since bus overtaking maneuvers are prohibited inside the multi-berth stops, an arriving bus must enter a queue if the stop's upstream-most berth is occupied. The delay imposed by the queue at stop s is denoted $q_{l,j}^s$. Assume that these queues are not affected by queues from other bottlenecks nearby. When a bus finishes loading and unloading its patrons, it may be blocked by another bus dwelling in a downstream berth in the same stop, and thus incurs an in-berth delay, $b_{l,j}^s$. The bus's departure time from the stop is therefore:

$$d_{l,j}^s = a_{l,j}^s + q_{l,j}^s + S_{l,j}^s + b_{l,j}^s, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}, j \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}, s \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}, \quad (4)$$

where $d_{l,j}^s$ and $a_{l,j}^s$ denote the bus's departure and arrival times from and to the stop, respectively; $S_{l,j}^s$ the bus's dwell time in loading and unloading patrons at the stop; and delay terms $q_{l,j}^s$ and $b_{l,j}^s$ will be determined dynamically through simulation.

A bus's arrival time at downstream stop $s + 1$, denoted $a_{l,j}^{s+1}$, is determined as:

$$a_{l,j}^{s+1} = d_{l,j}^s + t_{l,j}^s, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}, j \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}, s \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}, \quad (5)$$

where $t_{l,j}^s$ is the bus's inter-stop travel time from stop s to stop $s + 1$. The $t_{l,j}^s$ is assumed to follow a lognormal distribution with mean μ_T^s and standard deviation σ_T^s ; i.e., $t_{l,j}^s \sim \mathcal{LN}(\mu_T^s, (\sigma_T^s)^2)$, as per empirical findings in Kieu et al. (2014).⁴ The σ_T^s reflects the extent to which buses are disturbed while traveling between stops. A lower σ_T^s may occur when a dedicated bus lane or signal priority is provided.

3.2 Bus dwell time model and common-line patrons

Assume that bus dwell time, $S_{l,j}^s$, is dictated by a linear function of the numbers of boarding and alighting patrons, $p_{l,j}^s$ and $h_{l,j}^s$, such that

$$S_{l,j}^s = \tau + \delta_b^s p_{l,j}^s + \delta_a^s h_{l,j}^s, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}, j \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}, s \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}, \quad (6)$$

⁴This implies that buses can overtake each other when traveling between stops, which may not be allowed, particularly among buses on the same line. Yet, our simulation tests show that use of the lognormal distribution provides good approximations even when inter-stop overtaking maneuvers are prohibited.

where τ is the time lost due to bus deceleration and acceleration at a stop, and δ_b^s and δ_a^s are the boarding and alighting times per patron at stop s , respectively.

In estimating $p_{l,j}^s$, we note that some patrons may be able to choose buses from among multiple lines (Cominetti and Correa, 2001; Schmöcker et al., 2016; Laskaris et al., 2018). Common-line trips of this sort are modeled by dividing the L bus lines into $K \leq L$ line groups. We assume that patrons can also be divided into K mutually-exclusive groups, so that patrons in one group will not board buses from other groups.⁵ Common-line patrons within the k -th line group ($k \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$) are assumed to arrive at stop s at rate $\lambda_{k,C}^s$. Those patrons can board buses on any line in that group. Non-common-line patrons on line l arrive at stop s at rate λ_l^s , and can only ride buses on that line.

Buses are assumed to have sufficient onboard capacity to admit all patrons wishing to board, including those who arrive while the bus is dwelling (Osuna and Newell, 1972; Schmöcker et al., 2016).⁶ When multiple buses from the same line group are dwelling at a same stop, each common-line patron chooses the bus with the shortest boarding queue. The number of alighting patrons, $h_{l,j}^s$, can be estimated via simulation, knowing patron OD demand along all bus lines; see e.g., He et al. (2019).

3.3 Performance metrics

Average bus delay at stop s , w^s , is given by:

$$w^s = E_{l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}, j \in \{1, 2, \dots\}} [d_{l,j}^s - a_{l,j}^s - S_{l,j}^s], s \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}. \quad (7)$$

⁵In practice, a suitable grouping can be determined knowing: the OD pairs of all patrons, and the set of lines that can serve each OD pair. Lines that share common-line trip-making can be grouped together.

⁶This assumption may overestimate bus bunching and queueing since in reality, delayed and crowded buses may admit few patrons and therefore incur shorter dwell times at downstream stops (Estrada et al., 2016). In contrast, the counterpart may underestimate bunching and queueing due to the following two reasons. First, dwell times are more varied when crowded buses take few boarding patrons due to limited capacity. This will lead to larger queueing delays (Gu et al., 2011, 2015). Second, as the number of onboard patrons approaches a bus's patron-carrying capacity, boarding time per patron becomes longer (Schmöcker et al., 2016), producing more severe queueing and bunching. We have performed simulations where buses have a finite patron-carrying capacity, and results show that the major findings presented in this paper still hold.

Average cumulative delay per bus upon departing from stop s is:

$$W^s = E_{l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}, j \in \{1, 2, \dots\}}[w_{l,j}^0] + \sum_{i=1}^s w^s, s \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}. \quad (8)$$

4 Simulation Models and Inputs

A bus corridor with multiple stops in series is a queueing network (Shortle et al., 2018). If stops have multiple berths, as presently assumed, then each stop is a polling system that is itself difficult to solve (e.g., Takagi, 1988). The complex queueing dynamics described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 render exact analytical solutions to our bus-queueing problem even more difficult to formulate. Moreover, even if analytical models could be developed, they would be too complicated to be computationally efficient, and hence lose their advantage over simulation. The benefits of analytical models would therefore be small. In contrast, simulation is simpler, can emulate complex, real-world dynamics and can readily adapt to variations in the scenarios to be examined here. These features make simulation a better choice for the problem of present interest.

Simulation models presently available for bus operations were either developed for a single bus stop (Gibson et al., 1989; Fernández, 2010); failed to account for bus queues at stops (Wu et al., 2017); or required calibration of numerous parameters (Cortés et al., 2005, 2007). The latter concern can make it difficult to evaluate wide-ranging input conditions, and can obscure factors that contribute most to the effectiveness of a control strategy. To its credit, a simulation logic offered in Bian et al. (2020) modeled a single bus line to a level of detail sufficient for the present effort. But that logic assumed that bus arrival patterns and dwell times could be expressed exogenously, and did not consider common-line patrons.

A parsimonious, discrete-time model of multi-line bus operations was therefore developed in-house and used for the present analysis. The model was coded in Python to emulate bus operations in four modules: (1) at a control point; (2) at multi-berth stops; (3) as patrons board and alight; and (4) on links between stops. At each time step, the four modules are executed in sequence. Program logic is illustrated in Figure 3. A visualization tool of bus motion was also developed. It uses simulation outputs as its inputs, and was used to check for programming errors. The code can be downloaded at: <https://github.com/Minyu->




Figure 3: Flowchart of simulation program.

Shen/corridor-simulation.

4.1 Experimental procedures

Each simulation started with a 1-hour warm-up time to mimic an off-peak period when bus queues might occur at some stops, but only sporadically. During this time, patron arrival rates at bus stops were set to only 30% of the values specified for the rush to follow, and buses were not held at any control point. A 5-hour rush followed each warm-up period, during which time buses were held at the upstream end of the corridor and patron arrival rates at bus stops were based on observations described in Section 4.3.

Simulations were repeated sufficient numbers of times to ensure that the performance metrics of Section 3.3 converged. The number of repetitions was selected as per Ross (2014) for each set of inputs, so that the estimated variance of w^s did not exceed $5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ min}^2$. All simulation tests were performed on a Mac mini 2020 with M1 processor and 16 GB DDR4 memory. Each simulation required 1.5 s, on average, to complete.

4.2 Study site

Simulations were performed for a portion of the Guangzhou Bus Rapid Transit (GBRT) corridor in China. In its entirety, the corridor consists of 26 stops spanning approximately 22.5 kms. We evaluated westbound travel (toward the city center) during the morning rush at ten consecutive, 3-berth stops shown as pins in Figure 4, which constitute the busiest 6.8-km stretch in the system; and did so for eight of its bus lines. Four of the lines span the entirety of the ten-stop stretch; two diverge just before reaching the western-most station labeled 10 in Figure 4; one spans stops 4 through 10; and the last line diverges from the corridor after visiting stop 1. Buses on the final two of these lines were the only ones not held at a simulated control point that was inserted immediately upstream of the stop labeled 1.

4.3 Data collection and parameter estimation

Data were collected from the corridor's ten-stop stretch during the hours of 7-9 AM, and over the five weekdays spanning October 12-16, 2020. At each of the ten stops, patron boardings and alightings were counted for each bus by human observers. Boarding and alighting flows



West ← travel direction East

Figure 4: Layout of the 10-stop stretch of the GBRT corridor.

are shown in Figure 6 for each stop.⁷ Specific boarding and alighting flows for each bus line at each stop are shown in Fig. 6.




Figure 5: Boardings and alightings at each stop.

Our rough calculation shows that these rates are less than 2/3 of those reported prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (Global BRT Data, n.d.). We will return to this matter in later sub-sections. Still, the observed rates serve our purposes, and this too will become clear in

⁷Since we did not have OD data for patrons, the simulation model could not generate patron alighting flows accurately. To compensate, we factored the measured boarding flows upward by suitable amounts, to reflect the influence of alighting on bus dwell times.

sub-sections to follow.




Figure 6: Boardings and alightings at each stop.

Bus arrival- and dwell-times at each stop were measured by the observers as well. Inter-stop travel times were collected via the buses' onboard GPS. The average headway between bus arrivals on line l as they entered the corridor was used as the H_l . The $C_{H,l}$ was taken to be the root-mean-square deviation of the buses' arrival times on line l from their scheduled times, divided by H_l .

Bus arrival- and dwell-times at each stop were measured by the observers as well. The average headway between bus arrivals on line l as they enter the corridor was used as the H_l . The $C_{H,l}$ was taken to be the root-mean-square deviation of the buses' arrival times on line l from their scheduled times, divided by H_l . Results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Bus arrival time distribution parameters.

Line	B2	B2A	B3	B5/B5K	B16	B20	B21	B19
H_l (sec)	200	200	300	300	300	218.2	218.2	480
$C_{H,l}$	1.10	0.88	0.98	0.25	0.64	0.94	1.08	1.0
Line group	1	1	2	2	3	3	NA	NA

The unavailability of patron OD counts made it impossible to estimate the arrival rates of common-line patrons. It was therefore assumed that the six lines spanning most or all of the ten stops are divided into $K = 3$ line groups. Each group consisted of two lines that share a certain proportion of common-line patrons, γ . Hence, $\gamma = \frac{\lambda_{k,C}^s}{\lambda_{k,C}^s + \sum_{l \in \text{group } k} \lambda_l^s}$, for line group $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and $s = 1, 2, \dots, 10$. We assumed $\gamma = 0.5$ for our experiments, except where specified otherwise. We reckon this a conservative assumption, since the six lines share 9 or

more stops.

Finally, the inter-stop bus travel times were collected from onboard GPS data and fitted by lognormal distributions (which exhibited higher goodness-of-fit than other distribution forms we tested). Means and standard deviations of the fitted distributions for each inter-stop link are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Inter-stop bus travel time distribution parameters (sec).

Link	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Mean	53.1	58.1	24.2	32.5	102.3	35.5	69.6	90.6	87.5
Standard deviation	11.3	22.5	9.5	8.5	34.7	8.5	24.0	25.5	41.5

5 Numerical Analysis

Simulation outcomes in Section 5.1 confirm that the vicious cycle described in Section 1 can occur, and that its effects can be abated via bus holding. Outcomes in Section 5.2 reveal how holding can reduce bus delays corridor-wide in corridors with sufficient numbers of tandem stops and sufficiently high patron demands. Outcomes in Section 5.3 reveal the substantial advantages of reducing the minimum headway threshold for bus holding. Finally, Section 5.4 shows the advantage of our modified holding strategy compared against those in the literature.

5.1 Vicious cycle unveiled and abated

The curves in Figure 7a show average bus delay at each stop, w^s , for the patron demands revealed via our boarding and alighting counts. The bold, upper curve displays simulated outcomes in the absence of holding. It shows that abrupt drops in w^s occur at stops 3, 8, and 10. Those stops are the ones characterized by lower boardings and alightings, as can be confirmed from Figure 6. Despite this occasional relief, the bold curve in Figure 7a trends upward: note, for example, the larger w^s at downstream-most stop 10 compared against those

at stops 1 and 2 upstream.⁸ Also note that patron boarding and alighting flows remained fairly constant across stops 4-7, as evident in Figure 6. Yet, the bold curve in Figure 7a trends upward as buses move forward, traversing these stops.

These trends unveil the vicious cycle previously described. Not surprisingly, simulations also reveal that variations in bus arrival headways at stops consistently increase with s .⁹




Figure 7: w^s with and without holding ($\eta = 0.9$).

The lighter-drawn, lower curve in Figure 7a presents the w^s from simulations in which the proposed holding strategy was put in place, and buses in each of six lines were held at the control point until a minimum headway of $\eta \cdot H_l$ elapsed between consecutive departures from the same line, where η is the holding time adjustment factor described in Section 3.1. (More will be said momentarily as regards selection of η , which was 0.9 in the present case.) Visual inspection of both curves in the figure confirms that holding can substantially retard the vicious cycle by regularizing bus headways at the corridor’s entry. (Headway variations in all the downstream stops were diminished as well.) Note how greater delay savings are achieved at downstream stops, where bus queueing is more severe and the reduced headway variations thus bring more benefits.

The curves in Figure 7b were constructed by increasing observed patron demand by

⁸Queueing delay is positively correlated with dimensionless “traffic intensity”, defined in our case as the product of bus flow and average dwell time (Almeida and Cruz, 2018; Shen et al., 2023). However, the traffic intensity of stop 10 (0.71) is substantially lower than those of stops 1 and 2 (0.78 and 0.81, respectively). This indicates that the larger delay at stop 10 is due to the highly-varied headways, and not to excessive boardings or alightings there.

⁹Simulation tests were also conducted for homogeneous corridors where each stop had the same patron demand. Results under these idealized conditions demonstrate more emphatically that both bus delay and headway variation increase monotonically with s .

50%, to bring demand closer to the rate reported for the site prior to the pandemic. Visual inspection of Figures 7a and b reveals how both the vicious cycle, and its retardation through holding grow with demand for bus travel.

5.2 Benefits for long, busy corridors

Findings of the last section indicate that bus holding might save the bus delay accumulated over the entire corridor,¹⁰ where corridors are long and hold sufficient stops. We examine this matter using cumulative bus delay, W^s , as the metric.

Curves for present-day patron demands are shown in Figure 8a. Holding delay is the intercept at $s = 0$ for the lighter-drawn curve (approximately 2.2 mins/bus). Note how that curve consistently lies above its bold counterpart despite the diminishing vertical displacements between the two curves; i.e., the holding strategy results in larger W^s for all $s \leq 10$. The light curve might have fallen below the bold one, but only for long corridors with $s > 10$.




Figure 8: W^s with and without holding ($\eta = 0.9$).

The curves in Figure 8b tell a different story, however. They were constructed from simulations in which patron demands were increased by 50% to approach pre-pandemic levels. Note how holding now produces net delay savings for corridors with $s > 8$.

Not surprisingly, simulated outcomes under yet higher patron demands (not shown for brevity) revealed that holding can save bus delays on even shorter corridors. Hence we see the twofold value of holding when patron demands are sufficiently large and corridors

¹⁰Even if only part of the holding delay is offset by the delay savings at downstream stops, holding is still beneficial due to its headway-regularizing effect.

contain sufficient numbers of stops: the strategy can reduce not only headway variations, but bus delays as well.

5.3 Shortening the headway threshold for holding

We next demonstrate benefits of diminishing bus holding times by using an $\eta < 1$. We do so by once again increasing observed patron demands by 50% to bring them to pre-pandemic levels.

The lowest, solid curve in Figure 9 displays the savings in W^s (measured relative to the do-nothing case) when $\eta = 1$. Note how holding in this case is inferior to the do-nothing option, at least for the ten-stop corridor stretch examined here.

In contrast, the middle, dashed curve in Figure 9 shows that considerable benefits occur by reducing the minimum headway threshold, such that $\eta = 0.9$. Note from the curve's intercept how a 10% reduction in η produces a 58% reduction in holding time.




Figure 9: Effect of η .

Benefits dwindle as η takes smaller values, as evident from the figure's upper-most, dotted curve corresponding to $\eta = 0.8$. Despite a moderate additional reduction in the holding delay, savings in bus queueing delays at downstream stops also decrease. The latter occurs because holding becomes less effective in regularizing headways as η diminishes.

5.4 Comparisons with other holding strategies

We compare our simple, modified strategy against six previously-formulated ones, including the conventional schedule-based holding strategy in Boyle (2009), and those proposed in Da-

ganzo (2009), Xuan et al. (2011), Daganzo and Pilachowski (2011)¹¹, Bartholdi and Eisenstein (2012), and Berrebi et al. (2015). All of the six existing strategies and our own are applied to the GBRT corridor under pre-pandemic demands. A single control point is used (like in Berrebi et al., 2018). For strategies in Daganzo (2009), Xuan et al. (2011), and Daganzo and Pilachowski (2011), this control point is located at the corridor's first stop since these strategies require the use of the demand rates at the stop where holding is applied. For the other strategies (including ours), the control point is located upstream of the corridor's first stop. Similar to Berrebi et al. (2018), slack is ignored in our comparisons. Holding time formulas for the j -th bus on line l under the six existing strategies are presented in Table 3. When these formulas yielded non-positive values, holding was not applied.

Table 3: Holding methods

Holding method	Holding time
Conventional schedule-based method (Boyle, 2009)	$\bar{a}_{l,j}^0 - a_{l,j}^0$
Daganzo (2009)	$(\alpha + \hat{\beta}_l^{s=1}) \left(H_l - (d_{l,j}^{s=1} - d_{l,j-1}^{s=1}) \right)$
The simple control law in Xuan et al. (2011)	$\hat{\beta}_l^{s=1} \left(H_l - (d_{l,j}^{s=1} - d_{l,j-1}^{s=1}) \right) + \alpha \left(\bar{d}_{l,j}^{s=1} - d_{l,j}^{s=1} \right)$
Daganzo and Pilachowski (2011)	$(\alpha + \hat{\beta}_l^{s=1}) \left(H_l - (d_{l,j}^{s=1} - d_{l,j-1}^{s=1}) \right) - \alpha \left(H - (\hat{d}_{l,j+1}^{s=1} - d_{l,j}^{s=1}) \right)$
Bartholdi and Eisenstein (2012)	$\max \left\{ H_l - (a_{l,j}^0 - a_{l,j-1}^0), \alpha \left(\hat{a}_{l,j+1}^0 - a_{l,j}^0 \right) \right\}$
Berrebi et al. (2015)	$\frac{\max_{r \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \left\{ \frac{\hat{a}_{l,j+r}^0 - a_{l,j}^0}{r} \right\} - (a_{l,j}^0 - a_{l,j-1}^0)}{1 + \left(\arg \max_{r \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \left\{ \frac{\hat{a}_{l,j+r}^0 - a_{l,j}^0}{r} \right\} \right)^{-1}}$

The notations used in Table 3 are defined as follows: $\bar{a}_{l,j}^0$ is the scheduled arrival time of bus j on line l at the control point; $\hat{\beta}_l^{s=1}$ is the product of the estimated patron arrival rate and boarding time per patron at the first stop on line l ; α is the control parameter; $\bar{d}_{l,j}^{s=1}$ is the scheduled departure time of bus j from the first stop on line l ; $\hat{d}_{l,j+1}^{s=1}$ is the predicted departure time of the next bus from the first stop on line l ; $\hat{a}_{l,j+r}^0$ is the predicted arrival time of the next r -th bus at the control point on line l ; and M is the number of buses to follow, whose arrival times will be predicted in ways to be described.

Figure 10 plots the coefficient of variation (CV) in departure headways on its y-axis. These are averaged across all the lines and stops. The average cumulative bus delay in the

¹¹Daganzo and Pilachowski (2011) introduced a two-way-looking speed control strategy that relies on bus spacings instead of headways. For simplicity, here we employ the Eulerian version of this strategy, with holding as the control method in place of speed adjustments. The same modification was also adopted by the comparative analyses in Xuan et al. (2011) and Berrebi et al. (2018).

corridor is shown on the figure's x-axis. The data are shown for all the strategies, along with the attendant control parameters. The two metrics are the most commonly used in the literature (e.g., Estrada et al., 2016 and Berrebi et al., 2018). For strategies in Daganzo (2009), Xuan et al. (2011), and Daganzo and Pilachowski (2011), the estimated demand parameter, $\hat{\beta}_l^s$, is assumed to equal the actual demand. Strategies in Daganzo and Pilachowski (2011), Bartholdi and Eisenstein (2012), and Berrebi et al. (2015) rely on predicted arrival times of following buses at the control point. Two kinds of predictions are used: (i) perfect prediction, assuming that buses' future arrival times can be perfectly forecasted; and (ii) bus arrival times are predicted to follow their schedules. Note that (i) represents a best-case scenario while (ii) a worst-case scenario since scheduled arrival times reflect the mean values.

First note that most points in Figure 10 lie in the lightly-shaded region, below and to the left of the do-nothing case, shown with an X. This means that all the said holding strategies can retard the vicious cycle and save bus delays in a congested corridor.




Figure 10: Performance of different holding strategies in terms of headway variations and cumulative bus delays.

Further inspection of Figure 10 shows that our simple modified strategy produces the lowest variation in bus headway. Our method also performs well in terms of reducing bus delay. Note in this context the value of choosing $\eta < 1$.

There are other strategies that can do as well, or better, in this regard, however. Included

in this list are the conventional schedule-based method and Xuan et al. (2011). The strategies in Daganzo and Pilachowski (2011) and Berrebi et al. (2015) can also save more delay than can our strategy, but only when they benefit from perfect predictions of bus arrival times. Even with advanced technology, perfect prediction can be elusive when corridors congest and impede bus movements. In contrast, recall that our simple strategy requires only real-time measurements of bus arrival times.

6 Common-line patrons and holding by group

Common-line patrons are known to trigger greater variations in bus headway and exacerbate bunching (Schmöcker et al., 2016). To mitigate this adverse effect, buses can be held and released by line group instead of by individual line. Thus, we propose the following modification of the simple headway-based strategy: Arriving buses that belong to the same line group k will queue in a same lane at the control point (see Figure 2), and be released with a minimum headway of $1/\sum_{l \in \text{group } k} f_l$, i.e., the joint headway in line group k .

The above modification can produce favorable results when corridors serve common-line patrons in high numbers. To illustrate, the two solid curves in Figure 11 display the W^s that would be saved through holding if the corridor had a large percentage of these patrons, such that $\gamma = 0.9$. The lighter-drawn of these curves plots outcomes when buses are held by group. Its bolder counterpart displays what happens when holding occurs by line.




Figure 11: Effect of γ on holding strategy.

Note that for the large γ , either form of holding can save bus delays. This is not surprising:

with large γ , some buses are likely to serve greater numbers of patrons, leading to more varied dwell times across buses. This, in turn, further triggers larger bus delays (Gu et al., 2011, 2015) and more bunching (Schmöcker et al., 2016). Holding is thus especially valuable.

The solid curves in Figure 11 also make clear that holding buses by line group is the preferred option. This is because holding by group produces lower holding delays (thanks to the smaller bus arrival headways within each line group), and with large γ , the regularized bus headways within each line group also engender more delay savings at stops 1-6. On the downside, holding buses by group produces less delay savings at downstream stops 7-10. This is due to the larger line-specific headway variations created by that strategy.¹²

Things are different if the corridor serves low numbers of common-line patrons. To see this, the dotted curves in Figure 11 display the W^s saved if the corridor had no common-line patrons, such that the ratio of common-line patrons shared by bus lines in a line group, $\gamma = 0$. The lighter of the dotted curves shows that holding buses by group in this case is worse than doing nothing. This is because holding by group would now be inefficient in regularizing headways.

Holding by line alone offers some improvement in this case, as evident from the figure's boldly-drawn, dotted curve. Yet, the benefits of holding clearly degrade when common-line patrons are few.

7 Conclusions

Physically-realistic models were formulated and used to simulate bus movements along part of the BRT corridor in Guangzhou, China. Five findings of interest were unveiled. First, the simulations confirmed that queueing at curbside stops can trigger a vicious cycle, whereby buses encounter worsening conditions as they proceed along a corridor. Second, this cycle can be mitigated by temporarily holding buses at the corridor's upstream end. Third, savings in bus delay can outweigh the delay due to holding when long corridors contain a sufficient

¹²One may be concerned that holding by line group might increase the variations in line-specific headways and thus exacerbate bunching once buses are traveling on line portions that have diverged from the corridor. However, our simulations confirm that holding by line group still reduces headway variation over the entirety of each line, although not as much as holding by line alone.

number of stops. For example, by using our simple modified method of holding according to headway, more than 20% of the overall bus delay can be saved on our Guangzhou site. Even greater savings are expected for busier corridors, such as the Santo Amaro-Nove de Julho-Centro corridor mentioned in the introduction, which accommodates a significantly higher patron flow compared to the studied GBRT corridor. Note that these three findings are unique to congested bus corridors, since holding will only increase bus delays in corridors that are free of bus queues. These findings also indicate that bus commercial speed would improve under our strategy, so that fleet size can be reduced. In addition, holding can reduce patrons' delays in two ways: (i) by reducing in-vehicle delays as bus delays diminish; and (ii) by reducing waiting times as bus headways become less varied (Newell and Potts, 1964). Fourth, our simple strategy outperforms other strategies in the literature in regularizing headways, and thus in reducing bus delays in a congested corridor. Our strategy becomes the best in this regard when future bus arrival times cannot be accurately predicted. Fifth and last, simulations also showed that grouping buses and holding them by group can be effective when large proportions of patrons can choose buses from among multiple lines.

Though the present case study features only a single control point, our models can be readily extended to accommodate multiple such points that might be suitably placed along longer and busier corridors. The best control point locations for a given corridor can be determined by comparing the simulation outcomes under different location plans. Simulation can also be used to determine the best grouping plan of bus lines when buses are held by line group.

Further note (in Section 5.4) that more sophisticated adaptive holding strategies often performed worse than did both the conventional schedule-based method (Boyle, 2009) and our modification to the simple headway-based holding method. This outcome suggests need for further research, to determine if novel, more effective control strategies might be developed by leveraging advanced technologies. These new strategies might adaptively control bus speeds in ways akin to He et al. (2019) or prioritize buses at signalized intersections as described in Estrada et al. (2016) and Anderson and Daganzo (2020). Our models presented in this paper could be used to evaluate these new control schemes.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Project No. 72201214), the General Research Funds (No. 15217415, 15224317) provided by the Research Grants Council of Hong Kong, the Sichuan Science and Technology Program (Project No. 2023NSFSC1035) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities under Grant JBK23YJ01. The authors thank the nine students from South China University of Technology who helped collect data at the Guangzhou BRT and extracted bus trajectories from GPS data.

Appendix A Table of Notations

Table A.1: List of notations

Notation	Description
$a_{l,j}^0$	Arrival time of the j -th bus on line l to the corridor's upstream end
$\bar{a}_{l,j}^0$	Scheduled arrival time of the j -th bus on line l to the corridor's upstream end
$\hat{a}_{l,j+r}^0$	Predicted arrival time of the next r -th bus to the corridor's upstream end when the j -th bus on line l arrives
$a_{l,j}^s$	Arrival time of the j -th bus on line l to stop s
α	Control parameter in Daganzo (2009), Xuan et al. (2011), Daganzo and Pila-chowski (2011) and Bartholdi and Eisenstein (2012).
β_l^s	A dimensionless parameter accounting for the marginal bus dwell time result-ing from a unit increase in headway on line l at stop s
$b_{l,j}^s$	In-berth delay of the j -th bus on line l at stop s
c^s	Number of berths at stop s
$C_{H,l}$	Coefficient of bus arrival time deviation at the corridor's upstream end for line l .
δ_a^s	Boarding time per patron at stop s
δ_b^s	Alighting time per patron at stop s
$d_{l,j}^s$	Departure time of the j -th bus on line l from stop s
$\bar{d}_{l,j}^s$	Scheduled departure time of the j -th bus on line l from stop s
$\hat{d}_{l,j+1}^s$	Predicted departure time of the next bus from stop s when the j -th bus on line l departs
η	Holding time adjustment factor
f_l	Bus flow of line l
γ	Ratio of common-line patrons shared by bus lines in a line group
$h_{l,j}^s$	Number of alighting patrons for the j -th bus on line l at stop s
H_l	Scheduled headway of line l
$\lambda_{k,C}^s$	Common-line patron arrival rate for line group k at stop s
λ_l^s	None-common-line patron arrival rate for line l at stop s
L	Number of bus lines
μ_T^s	Mean bus travel time from stop s to stop $s + 1$
M	Number of following buses to be predicted in Berrebi et al. (2015).
K	Number of line groups
N	Number of stops in the corridor
$p_{l,j}^s$	Number of boarding patrons for the j -th bus on line l at stop s
$q_{l,j}^s$	Queueing delay of the j -th bus on line l at stop s
σ_T^s	Standard deviation of bus travel time from stop s to stop $s + 1$
$S_{l,j}^s$	Dwell time of the j -th bus on line l at stop s
τ	Time lost due to bus deceleration and acceleration, and door opening and closing at a stop
$t_{l,j}^s$	Inter-stop travel time of the j -th bus on line l from stop s to stop $s + 1$
$w_{l,j}^0$	Holding delay of the j -th bus on line l at the control point
w^s	Average bus delay at stop s
W^s	Average cumulative delay per bus from the corridor's upstream end to stop s

Appendix B Derivation of Equation (2)

To derive the approximation, assume first that buses on line $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ are released from the control point in the same order as they are scheduled; i.e., bus $j+1$ is always released later than bus j , even if the Gaussian arrival times, are generated such that $a_{l,j}^0 > a_{l,j+1}^0$. This approximation is conservative since it slightly exaggerates holding delays.

Under this assumption, the release time of bus j from the control point, $a_{l,j}^1$, is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} a_{l,j}^1 &= \max\{a_{l,j}^0, a_{l,j-1}^1 + H_l\} = \max\{a_{l,j}^0, \max\{a_{l,j-1}^0, a_{l,j-2}^1 + H_l\} + H_l\} \\ &= \max\{a_{l,j}^0, a_{l,j-1}^0 + H_l, a_{l,j-2}^1 + 2H_l\} = \dots \\ &= \max\{a_{l,j}^0, a_{l,j-1}^0 + H_l, a_{l,j-2}^0 + 2H_l, \dots, a_{l,1}^0 + (j-1)H_l\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $a_{l,j}^0, a_{l,j-1}^0 + H_l, a_{l,j-2}^0 + 2H_l, \dots, a_{l,1}^0 + (j-1)H_l$ are j independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables following a Gaussian distribution, with mean jH_l and standard deviation $C_{H,l}H_l$. Thus, $a_{l,j}^1$ is the last (largest) order statistic of j i.i.d. Gaussian random variables. A very good approximation to the mean of this order statistic, as per Elfving (1947), is:

$$E[a_{l,j}^1|j] \approx jH_l + C_{H,l}H_l\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{j - \frac{\pi}{8}}{j - \frac{\pi}{4} + 1}\right), \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse function of the standard normal CDF.

Hence, from (1) we have:

$$E[w_{l,j}^0|j] = E[a_{l,j}^1|j] - E[a_{l,j}^0|j] \approx C_{H,l}H_l\Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{j - \frac{\pi}{8}}{j - \frac{\pi}{4} + 1}\right), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

which is (2).

Simulation tests show that both (2) and (3) are very accurate in predicting holding delays.

Appendix C Proof of the divergence of cumulative means of a divergent increasing sequence

For simplicity, assume a non-negative, divergent, and increasing sequence, $0 \leq a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots$, where $a_n \rightarrow \infty$ if $n \rightarrow \infty$. (We add the non-negativity condition because the delay terms in Section 3.1 are non negative. If this condition were to be removed, the claim is still true but the proof would be longer.) Define the cumulative mean sequence $b_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$. Apparently, $\{b_n\}$ is also non-negative and increasing.

Proof. We prove $\{b_n\}$'s divergence by contradiction. Suppose $\exists M > 0$, such that $b_n \leq M, \forall n$. Due to $\{a_n\}$'s divergence, $\exists N$ such that $a_N > 2M$. Then $b_{2N} = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^{2N} a_i = \frac{1}{2}(b_N + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=N+1}^{2N} a_i) > \frac{1}{2}(0 + \frac{1}{N} \cdot N \cdot 2M) = M$, which contradicts what was assumed. \square

References

- Abkowitz, M. D., Lepofsky, M., 1990. Implementing headway-based reliability control on transit routes. *Journal of Transportation Engineering* 116 (1), 49–63.
- Almeida, M. A., Cruz, F. R., 2018. A note on bayesian estimation of traffic intensity in single-server markovian queues. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation* 47 (9), 2577–2586.
- Anderson, P., Daganzo, C. F., 2020. Effect of transit signal priority on bus service reliability. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 132, 2–14.
- Andres, M., Nair, R., 2017. A predictive-control framework to address bus bunching. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 104, 123–148.
- Argote-Cabanero, J., Daganzo, C. F., Lynn, J. W., 2015. Dynamic control of complex transit systems. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 81, 146–160.
- Bartholdi, J. J., Eisenstein, D. D., 2012. A self-coordinating bus route to resist bus bunching. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 46 (4), 481–491.
- Berrebi, S. J., Hans, E., Chiabaut, N., Laval, J. A., Leclercq, L., Watkins, K. E., 2018. Comparing bus holding methods with and without real-time predictions. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 87, 197–211.
- Berrebi, S. J., Watkins, K. E., Laval, J. A., 2015. A real-time bus dispatching policy to minimize passenger wait on a high frequency route. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 81, 377–389.
- Bian, B., Pinedo, M., Zhu, N., Ma, S., 2019. Performance analysis of overtaking maneuvers at bus stops with tandem berths. *Transportation Science* 53 (2), 597–618.
- Bian, B., Zhu, N., Meng, Q., 2023. Real-time cruising speed design approach for multiline bus systems. *Transportation research part B: methodological* 170, 1–24.
- Bian, B., Zhu, N., Pinedo, M., Ma, S., Yu, Q., 2020. An optimization-based speed-control method for high frequency buses serving curbside stops. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 121, 102860.
- Boyle, D. K., 2009. *Controlling System Costs: Basic and Advanced Scheduling Manuals and Contemporary Issues in Transit Scheduling*. Transit Cooperative Research Program Report 135, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., USA.
- Cominetti, R., Correa, J., 2001. Common-lines and passenger assignment in congested transit networks. *Transportation Science* 35 (3), 250–267.

- Cortés, C., Fernández, R., Burgos, V., 2007. Modeling passengers, buses and stops in traffic microsimulators. The MISTRANSIT approach on the PARAMICS platform. In: 86th TRB Annual Meeting, Transportation Research Board.
- Cortés, C. E., Pagès, L., Jayakrishnan, R., 2005. Microsimulation of flexible transit system designs in realistic urban networks. *Transportation Research Record* 1923 (1), 153–163.
- Daganzo, C. F., 2009. A headway-based approach to eliminate bus bunching: Systematic analysis and comparisons. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 43 (10), 913–921.
- Daganzo, C. F., Pilachowski, J., 2011. Reducing bunching with bus-to-bus cooperation. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 45 (1), 267–277.
- Dai, Z., Liu, X. C., Chen, Z., Guo, R., Ma, X., 2019. A predictive headway-based bus-holding strategy with dynamic control point selection: A cooperative game theory approach. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 125, 29–51.
- Delgado, F., Munoz, J. C., Giesen, R., Cipriano, A., 2009. Real-time control of buses in a transit corridor based on vehicle holding and boarding limits. *Transportation Research Record* 2090 (1), 59–67.
- Elfving, G., 1947. The asymptotical distribution of range in samples from a normal population. *Biometrika* 34 (1/2), 111–119.
- Estrada, M., Mensión, J., Aymamí, J. M., Torres, L., 2016. Bus control strategies in corridors with signalized intersections. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 71, 500–520.
- Fernández, R., 2010. Modelling public transport stops by microscopic simulation. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 18 (6), 856–868.
- Fernández, R., Planzer, R., 2002. On the capacity of bus transit systems. *Transport Reviews* 22 (3), 267–293.
- Fernández, R., Tyler, N., 2005. Effect of passenger–bus–traffic interactions on bus stop operations. *Transportation Planning and Technology* 28 (4), 273–292.
- Fu, L., Liu, Q., Calamai, P., 2003. Real-time optimization model for dynamic scheduling of transit operations. *Transportation research record* 1857 (1), 48–55.
- Gibson, J., Baeza, I., Willumsen, L., 1989. Bus-stops, congestion and congested bus-stops. *Traffic Engineering and Control* 30 (6), 291–302.
- Global BRT Data, n.d. [Online]. Available at: <http://brtdata.org>. (Accessed on Aug 19, 2022).
- Gu, W., Cassidy, M. J., 2013. Maximizing bus discharge flows from multi-berth stops by regulating exit maneuvers. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 56, 254–264.

- Gu, W., Cassidy, M. J., Li, Y., 2015. Models of bus queueing at curbside stops. *Transportation Science* 49 (2), 204–212.
- Gu, W., Li, Y., Cassidy, M. J., Griswold, J. B., 2011. On the capacity of isolated, curbside bus stops. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 45 (4), 714–723.
- He, S., 2015. An anti-bunching strategy to improve bus schedule and headway reliability by making use of the available accurate information. *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 85, 17–32.
- He, S., Dong, J., Liang, S., Yuan, P., 2019. An approach to improve the operational stability of a bus line by adjusting bus speeds on the dedicated bus lanes. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 107, 54–69.
- Hernández, D., Muñoz, J. C., Giesen, R., Delgado, F., 2015. Analysis of real-time control strategies in a corridor with multiple bus services. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 78, 83–105.
- Hickman, M. D., 2001. An analytic stochastic model for the transit vehicle holding problem. *Transportation Science* 35 (3), 215–237.
- Kieu, L. M., Bhaskar, A., Chung, E., 2014. Establishing definitions and modeling public transport travel time variability. In: 93rd TRB Annual Meeting, Transportation Research Board.
- Laskaris, G., Cats, O., Jenelius, E., Rinaldi, M., Viti, F., 2018. Multiline holding based control for lines merging to a shared transit corridor. *Transportmetrica B: Transport Dynamics*, 1–34.
- Newell, G. F., 1974. Control of pairing of vehicles on a public transportation route, two vehicles, one control point. *Transportation Science* 8 (3), 248–264.
- Newell, G. F., Potts, R. B., 1964. Maintaining a bus schedule. In: 2nd Australian Road Research Board (ARRB) Conference, Melbourne.
- Osuna, E., Newell, G., 1972. Control strategies for an idealized public transportation system. *Transportation Science* 6 (1), 52–72.
- Ross, S. M., 2014. Introduction to probability models, Section 11.7, Eleventh Edition. Academic Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- Ross, S. M., 2020. Introduction to probability and statistics for engineers and scientists. Academic press.
- Schmöcker, J.-D., Sun, W., Fonzone, A., Liu, R., 2016. Bus bunching along a corridor served by two lines. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 93, 300–317.
- Shen, M., Gu, W., Hu, S., Cheng, H., 2019. Capacity approximations for near-and far-side bus stops in dedicated bus lanes. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 125, 94–120.

- Shen, M., Gu, W., Hu, S., Xiao, F., 2023. Efficient heuristic methods for berth allocation at multi-line, multi-berth curbside bus stops. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 154, 104269.
- Shortle, J. F., Thompson, J. M., Gross, D., Harris, C. M., 2018. *Fundamentals of queueing theory*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sun, A., Hickman, M., 2005. The real-time stop-skipping problem. *Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems* 9 (2), 91–109.
- Sun, W., Schmöcker, J.-D., 2018. Considering passenger choices and overtaking in the bus bunching problem. *Transportmetrica B: Transport Dynamics* 6 (2), 151–168.
- Szász, P. A., Montans, L. C., Ferreira, E. O., 1978. COMONOR: ordinated bus convoy. Technical Paper 9, Companhia de Engenharia de Tráfego.
- Takagi, H., 1988. Queuing analysis of polling models. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 20 (1), 5–28.
- Tan, J., Li, Z., Li, L., Zhang, Y., Lu, L., 2014. Berth assignment planning for multi-line bus stops. *Journal of Advanced Transportation* 48 (7), 750–765.
- Vandebona, U., Richardson, A. J., 1986. Effect of checkpoint control strategies in a simulated transit operation. *Transportation Research Part A: General* 20 (6), 429–436.
- Wu, W., Liu, R., Jin, W., 2017. Modelling bus bunching and holding control with vehicle overtaking and distributed passenger boarding behaviour. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 104, 175–197.
- Xuan, Y., Argote, J., Daganzo, C. F., 2011. Dynamic bus holding strategies for schedule reliability: Optimal linear control and performance analysis. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 45 (10), 1831–1845.
- Zhang, S., Lo, H. K., 2018. Two-way-looking self-equalizing headway control for bus operations. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 110, 280–301.
- Zhao, J., Dessouky, M., Bukkapatnam, S., 2006. Optimal slack time for schedule-based transit operations. *Transportation Science* 40 (4), 529–539.