

Computing User Equilibria for Schedule-Based Transit Networks with Hard Vehicle Capacities

Tobias Harks¹, Sven Jäger², Michael Markl¹, and Philine Schiewe³

¹University of Passau, Germany

²RPTU Kaiserslautern-Landau, Germany

³Aalto University, Finland

June 26, 2024

Modelling passenger assignments in public transport networks is a fundamental task for city planners, especially when deliberating network infrastructure decisions. A key aspect of a realistic model for passenger assignments is to integrate selfish routing behaviour of passengers on the one hand, and the limited vehicle capacities on the other hand. We formulate a side-constrained user equilibrium model in a schedule-based time-expanded transit network, where passengers are modelled via a continuum of non-atomic agents that want to travel with a fixed start time from a user-specific origin to a destination. An agent's route may comprise several rides along given lines, each using vehicles with hard loading capacities. We give a characterization of (side-constrained) user equilibria via a quasi-variational inequality and prove their existence by generalizing a well-known existence result of Bernstein and Smith (Transp. Sci., 1994). We further derive a polynomial time algorithm for single-commodity instances and an exact finite time algorithm for the multi-commodity case. Based on our quasi-variational characterization, we finally devise a fast heuristic computing user equilibria, which is tested on real-world instances based on data gained from the Hamburg S-Bahn system and the Swiss long-distance train network. It turns out that w.r.t. the total travel time, the computed user-equilibria are quite efficient compared to a system optimum, which neglects equilibrium constraints and only minimizes total travel time.

1. Introduction

In the domain of public transport, models describing the assignment of passengers over a transit network are crucial for infrastructure planners to understand congestion phenomena and possible investments into the infrastructure. The existing approaches can roughly be categorized into *frequency-based* and *schedule-based* models, see [13, 12] for a survey. The former model class operates with line frequencies and implicitly defines resulting travel times and capacities of lines and vehicles, cf. [39, 11, 42, 3, 6, 5, 23]. With variations in the demand profile during peak hours, the frequency-based approach only leads to approximate vehicle loads, with the error increasing as variability grows. In contrast, schedule-based approaches are more fine-grained and capable of explicitly modelling irregular timetables of lines. They are usually based on a *time-expanded transit network* derived from the physical transit network and additionally includes (artificial) edges such as waiting, boarding, alighting, dwelling, and driving edges to connect different stations. This construct, also known as diachronic graph [29] or space-time network [4], is illustrated in Figure 1.

An assignment of passengers to paths in this network encompasses their entire travel strategies, including line changes, waiting times, etc. It corresponds to a path-based multi-commodity network flow satisfying all demand and supply. One key obstacle in the analysis of such a schedule-based model is the integration of *strategic behaviour* of passengers, opting for shortest routes, and the *limited vehicle capacity*, which bounds the number of passengers able to use a vehicle at any point in time. If a vehicle is already at capacity, further passengers might not be able to enter this vehicle at the next boarding stop, which can make their (shortest) route infeasible. On the other hand, the passengers already in the vehicle are not affected by the passengers wishing to board.

A key issue of such a capacitated model is to choose the right equilibrium concept. Consider for instance the simple example in Figure 1, and suppose that the vehicles operating the violet and the green line have a capacity of 1 unit each. A demand volume of 2 units start their trip at node a at time 1^{00} , and all particles want to travel as fast as possible to the destination node c . The violet line arrives at 4^{30} , while the green line




Figure 1: Two scheduled vehicle trips in the physical network (left) and their representation in the time-expanded transit network (right).

arrives at 6^{00} . Then there exists no capacity-feasible *Wardrop equilibrium* [40, 8], i.e., a flow only using quickest paths.

Most works in the literature deal with this non-existence by either assuming soft vehicle capacities (cf. [9, 30, 27]) or by considering more general travel strategies and a probabilistic loading mechanism (cf. [25, 22, 26, 18]). An alternative approach that inherently supports capacities are so-called *side-constrained user equilibria*. These are feasible flows such that for any used path there is no *available alternative path* with lower cost (cp. [10]). The precise definition of what is an available lower-cost alternative has spurred a whole series of works. Larsson and Patriksson [33, 24] consider only paths with available residual capacity as available alternative paths. This excludes the change from a used path p to another path q that shares some saturated edges with p . For a path p , Smith [38] considers all paths q to which a part of the flow on p can change over so that the resulting flow is feasible. This concept has the drawback that it allows for coordinated deviations of bundles of users, which is unrealistic and, as shown by Smith, leads to non-existence of such side-constrained equilibria for monotonic, continuous, but non-separable cost functions. In response to Smith’s equilibrium concept, Bernstein and Smith [2] propose an alternative equilibrium concept addressing the issue of possible coordinated deviations of bundles of users. This is characterized by the property that “no arbitrarily small bundle of drivers on a common path can strictly decrease its cost by switching to another path” [7]. In their formal definition of this equilibrium notion (see Definition 3 of a *BS-equilibrium* below), the capacity constraints are modelled as discontinuities in the edge cost functions. In this paper, we consider side-constrained user equilibria for schedule-based time-expanded networks, where available alternatives are defined via flow variations in the sense of Bernstein and Smith [2]. Here, whether a path is an available alternative depends only on the available capacity of the vehicle when the passenger boards it, but not on whether capacity is exceeded on a later edge of the vehicle trip. Hence, a path can be an available alternative for some user even if arbitrarily small deviations to that path make the resulting flow infeasible (for some other users). Similar to Nguyen, Pallottino, and Malucelli [27], the priority of passengers in the vehicle can be modelled by expressing the capacity limitations using discontinuous costs on the boarding edges in the time-expanded transit network. The resulting cost map is not separable, and it turns out that it does not satisfy the regularity conditions imposed by Bernstein and Smith [2] to prove existence of equilibria. Our approach works for elastic demands where a user only travels if the travel cost does not exceed the user’s willingness to travel (i.e., cancelling the trip or travelling on another travel mode, e.g., private car). This elastic demand model is quite standard in the transportation science literature, see Wu and Lam [43] and references therein.

1.1. Our Contribution

We define a user equilibrium for schedule-based time-expanded networks using the notion of admissible deviations. For a given flow, an *admissible ε -deviation* corresponds to shifting an ε -amount of flow from a path p to another path q without exceeding the capacity of any boarding edge along q . A feasible flow is a *side-constrained user equi-*

librium if there are no improving admissible ε -deviations for arbitrarily small ε . We summarize our contribution as follows.

1. We prove that for schedule-based time-expanded networks, side-constrained user equilibria can be characterized by a quasi-variational inequality defined over the set of admissible deviations (Theorem 2). Moreover, by moving the side-constraints into discontinuous cost functions that jump to infinity whenever capacities are exceeded, we can express side-constrained user equilibria as BS-equilibria (Theorem 4).
2. We study the central question of the existence of BS-equilibria. We first give an example showing that our cost map does not fall into the category of *regular* cost maps, defined by Bernstein and Smith [2], for which they showed the existence of equilibria. Instead, we introduce a more general condition for cost maps, which we term *weakly regular*. As our main theoretical result, we prove in Theorem 8 that BS-equilibria do exist for weakly regular cost maps. We further show (Theorem 12) that the cost maps in schedule-based time-expanded networks are weakly regular, hence Theorem 8 applies. However, the generalization of Bernstein and Smith’s result might also be of interest for other traffic models.
3. We then turn to the computation of BS-equilibria. For single-commodity time-expanded networks, we present an algorithm that computes a BS-equilibrium in quadratic time relative to the number of edges of the input graph (Theorem 17). For multi-commodity networks, we give an exact finite-time algorithm. As this algorithm is too slow for practical computations, we further develop a heuristic based on our quasi-variational inequality formulation. It starts with an arbitrary feasible flow and updates this flow along elementary admissible deviations in the sense of Theorem 2.
4. Finally, we test our heuristic on realistic instances drawn from the Hamburg S-Bahn network and the Swiss long-distance train network. It turns out that user-equilibria can be computed with our heuristic and that they are quite efficient compared to a system optimum, which neglects equilibrium constraints and minimizes total travel time. More specifically, for the computed instances the total travel times in the user equilibria are less than 8% higher compared to the system optimum.

1.2. Related Work

A large body of research deals with schedule-based transit assignment, see for example the two proceedings volumes [41, 31]. We limit ourselves in the following literature review to schedule-based models that incorporate congestion; for frequency-based and uncongested models, see [12, 13, 14]. Most work uses the schedule-based time-expanded network as a modelling basis, which can be traced back to Nuzzolo and Russo [29] and Carraresi et al. [4].

Carraresi et al. [4] consider a model with hard capacity constraints. They are interested in finding a transit assignment where the cost of every passenger is only a factor of $1 + \varepsilon$

worse than the optimal cost in an uncongested network. Such a routing is only possible when the delays due to congestion are not too large. In heavily congested networks, passengers are satisfied with a route that is best possible under the given congestion conditions. This is approximated in several papers [9, 27, 30] by incorporating the vehicle capacities as continuous penalties representing the discomfort experienced by everyone using an overcrowded edge.

Marcotte and Nguyen [25] deal with hard capacities by defining the *strategy* of an agent as preference orderings of outgoing edges at each node and by assuming a random loading mechanism for congested edges, where the probability of being able to enter an edge is proportional to the capacity and decreases with the number of agents desiring to traverse it as well. Every passenger wants to minimize the *expected* travel cost resulting from their strategy. Marcotte, Nguyen, and Schoeb [26] investigate the model further, including some computational experiments.

The above approaches do not take into account the priority of passengers dwelling in a vehicle over those wishing to board it. Instead of a stochastic loading mechanism, Nguyen et al. [27] introduce a model in which the incoming edges of every departure node are ordered, and the outgoing driving edge is filled with passengers in the order of the edge through which they arrived. This allows to model *FIFO queues* of passengers aiming to board a vehicle. Their model is closest to the one considered in this paper. However, they do not compute equilibria for this model, but switch to an approximate model with continuous penalty terms for the computation.

Hamdouch, Marcotte, and Nguyen [18] combine this priority-based approach with the random loading from above, by assuming that the passengers already in the vehicle can always stay there, while the others take part in the random loading mechanism, introduced by Marcotte and Nguyen. In this way, they model passengers mingling at stations. Again, an agent's cost function is defined as the expected travel time for their chosen strategy, for which an according variational inequality has a solution due to the Ky Fan Inequality. This model has been extended in multiple ways: In [17], the expected strategy costs are generalized by allowing early departure and late/early arrival penalties as well as a crowding discomfort. The work [16] differentiates between seated and standing passengers, which again affects the discomfort (and thus, the expected strategy cost) as well as the priority mechanism. Finally, Rochau, Nökel, and Bell [34] account for risk-aversion, and Hamdouch, Szeto, and Jiang [19] incorporate a stochastic link travel times (besides the fail-to-board randomness) that model variation due to weather effects, incidents, etc. Nuzzolo, Crisalli, and Rosati [28] study the computation of strategy profiles through learning in an iterative heuristic.

Another approach without time-expanded graphs is pursued by Papola, Filippi, Gentile, and Meschini [32] who consider a network combining scheduled public-transport edges and continuous pedestrian edges. They define dynamic flows that traverse the public-transport edges in discrete chunks. To find approximate equilibria, they employ the method of successive averages (MSA). Graf and Harks [15] study side-constrained equilibria for dynamic flows. They consider a dynamic variant of BS user equilibria but give no existence result for them.

2. Side-Constrained Equilibria for Schedule-Based Transit Networks

We first describe a schedule-based time-expanded network (cf. [29, 4]) and then formally define the side-constrained user equilibrium concept.

2.1. The Schedule-Based Time-Expanded Network

Consider a set of geographical stations S (e.g., metro stations or bus stops) and a set of vehicle trips Z (e.g., trips of metro trains or buses), specified by their sequence of served stations and adhering to a fixed, reliable timetable. This timetable specifies the arrival and departure times at all stations of the trip, where the arrival time at a station is always strictly later than the departure time of the previous station. Each vehicle trip $z \in Z$ also has an associated capacity ν_z which represents the maximum number of users the corresponding vehicle may hold at any time. Throughout this work, we use the term *vehicle* synonymously with *vehicle trip*.

To represent the passengers' routes through the network, we construct a time-expanded, directed, acyclic graph $G = (V, E)$ with a time $\theta(v) \in \mathbb{R}$ assigned to each node $v \in V$.

There are three categories of nodes:

- an *on-platform node* for each station $s \in S$ and each time θ at which at least one vehicle departs or arrives in s starts,
- a *departure node* for each vehicle $z \in Z$ and each time θ at which z departs from a station s ,
- an *arrival node* for each vehicle $z \in Z$ and each time θ at which z arrives at a station s .

There are five categories of edges connecting these nodes:

- a *waiting edge* connects two on-platform nodes v, w of the same station s with consecutive times $\theta(v) < \theta(w)$,
- a *boarding edge* connects an on-platform node with a departure node of a vehicle z of common time θ and station s ,
- a *driving edge* connects a departure node with the next stop's arrival node of the shared vehicle z ,
- an *alighting edge* connects an arrival node of a vehicle z with the on-platform node of common time θ and station s ,
- a *dwelling edge* connects an arrival node of a vehicle z with the corresponding departure node at the same station s .

For ease of notation, let E_B and E_D denote the set of all boarding and driving edges, respectively. We denote the time delay of an edge $e = vw$ by $\tau_e := \theta(w) - \theta(v)$, the delay of a v - w -path $p = (e_1, \dots, e_k)$ by $\tau_p := \sum_{e \in p} \tau_e = \theta(w) - \theta(v)$. For a driving edge $e \in E_D$ belonging to a vehicle $z \in Z$, we write $\nu_e := \nu_z$. Waiting and driving edges are always time-consuming, dwelling edges may be time-consuming, and boarding and alighting edges are instantaneous. For a boarding edge $e \in E_B$, we denote the succeeding driving edge by e^+ .

Figure 1 shows a possible generated graph for two vehicles, a green one and a violet one, and four stations a, b, c , and d . The nodes on the grey rectangles represent the on-platform nodes, the other nodes are the departure and arrival nodes.

The non-atomic users of the network are partitioned into several groups: First, they are grouped into finitely many origin-destination and departure-time triplets $(s_j, t_j, \theta_j) \in \mathcal{T} \subseteq S \times S \times \mathbb{R}$. For simplicity, we assume that for each such triplet, there exists an on-platform node at station s_j and time θ_j . To model the elastic demand, there is a non-increasing function $Q_j: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for each triplet that given some travel time τ assigns the volume of particles of triplet j that are willing to travel at cost τ . We assume $Q_j(\tau) = 0$ for all $\tau \geq T$ for some $T \in \mathbb{R}$. Let \mathcal{P}_j° denote the set of paths from the on-platform node at time θ_j and station s_j to any on-platform node of station t_j .

As the travel times of the paths are fixed, we can subdivide all triplets into a finite number of *commodities* I of common willingness to travel and introduce an outside option for each commodity: Let $\{\tau_{j,1}, \dots, \tau_{j,k_j}\} = \{\tau_p \mid p \in \mathcal{P}_j^\circ\}$ be the set of travel times of all paths $p \in \mathcal{P}_j^\circ$ ordered by $\tau_{j,1} < \dots < \tau_{j,k_j}$. For each $j' \in \{1, \dots, k_j + 1\}$, we introduce a commodity $i_{j,j'}$ consisting of all particles of triplet j whose willingness to travel is contained in the interval $[\tau_{j,j'-1}, \tau_{j,j'})$ with $\tau_{j,0} := 0$ and $\tau_{j,k_j+1} := T$. Thus, commodity $i := i_{j,j'}$ has a demand volume of

$$Q_i := Q_j(\tau_{j,j'-1}) - Q_j(\tau_{j,j'}),$$

and we assign it an outside option p_i^{out} with some constant cost $\tau_{p_i^{\text{out}}}$ chosen from $(\tau_{j,j'-1}, \tau_{j,j'})$. Finally, we write $\mathcal{P}_i := \mathcal{P}_j^\circ \cup \{p_i^{\text{out}}\}$, and denote the set of all commodity-path pairs by $\mathcal{P} := \{(i, p) \mid p \in \mathcal{P}_i\}$. Figure 5 demonstrates this classification of the particles into commodities.

2.2. Side-Constrained User Equilibrium

A (*path-based*) flow f is a vector $(f_{i,p})_{(i,p) \in \mathcal{P}}$ with $f_{i,p} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We call the flow f

- *demand-feasible*, if $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i} f_{i,p} = Q_i$ holds for all $i \in I$,
- *capacity-feasible*, if $f_e := \sum_{i,p: e \in p} f_{i,p} \leq \nu_e$ holds for all driving edges $e \in E_D$,
- *feasible*, if f is both demand- and capacity-feasible.

Let $\mathcal{F}_Q, \mathcal{F}^\nu, \mathcal{F}_Q^\nu$ denote the sets of all demand-feasible, capacity-feasible, and feasible flows, respectively. For a given demand-feasible flow f and two paths $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_i$ with $f_{i,p} \geq \varepsilon$, we define the ε -*deviation* from p to q

$$f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon) := f + \varepsilon \cdot (\mathbf{1}_{i,q} - \mathbf{1}_{i,p})$$

as the resulting flow when shifting an ε -amount of flow of commodity i from p to q . We call $f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)$ an *admissible deviation*, if $f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)_{e^+} \leq \nu_{e^+}$ holds for all boarding edges e of q . We say, q is an *available alternative* to p for i with respect to f , if there is some positive ε such that $f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)$ is an admissible deviation. In other words, q is an available alternative, if after switching some arbitrarily small amount of flow from p to q , the path q does not involve boarding overcrowded vehicles. Equivalently, all boarding edges $e \in q$ fulfil $f_{e^+} < \nu_{e^+}$, if $e^+ \notin p$, and $f_{e^+} \leq \nu_{e^+}$, if $e^+ \in p$. We denote the set of available alternatives to p for i with respect to f by $A_{i,p}(f)$.

Definition 1. A feasible flow f is a (*side-constrained*) *user equilibrium* if for all $i \in I$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ the following implication holds:

$$f_{i,p} > 0 \implies \forall q \in A_{i,p}(f) : \tau_p \leq \tau_q.$$

For the rest of this work, we use the shorthand *user equilibrium*.

This means, a feasible flow is a side-constrained user equilibrium if and only if a path is only used if all its faster alternative routes are unavailable due to the boarding capacity constraints.

3. Characterization and Existence

We characterize user equilibria as defined above in two different ways: as solutions to a quasi-variational inequality and as BS-equilibria by defining appropriate, discontinuous cost functions. By generalizing the existence result of Bernstein and Smith [2] for BS-equilibria, we show that user equilibria exist.

3.1. Quasi-Variational Inequalities

Traditional types of user equilibria without hard capacity constraints can be equivalently formulated as a solution to a variational inequality of the form

$$\text{Find } f^* \in D \text{ such that: } \quad \langle c(f^*), f - f^* \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } f \in D, \quad (\text{VI}(c, D))$$

where D is a closed, convex set, and c is a continuous cost function.

With the introduction of hard capacity constraints together with boarding priorities, an admissible ε -deviation might lead to capacity violations. Therefore, such deviations may leave the feasible set $D = \mathcal{F}_Q^\nu$ and, thus, are not representable in this variational inequality, leading us to the concept of quasi-variational inequalities. We define the set-valued function

$$M : \mathcal{F}_Q^\nu \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{P}}, \quad f \mapsto \{f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon) \mid f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon) \text{ is an admissible } \varepsilon\text{-deviation, } \varepsilon > 0\}$$

that returns for any given flow f the set of all possible flows obtained by any admissible ε -deviation with respect to f . We now consider the following quasi-variational inequality:

$$\text{Find } f^* \in \mathcal{F}_Q^\nu \text{ such that: } \quad \langle (\tau_p)_{i,p}, f - f^* \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } f \in M(f^*). \quad (\text{QVI})$$

Theorem 2. *A feasible flow f^* is a user equilibrium if and only if it is a solution to the quasi-variational inequality (QVI).*

Proof. Assume f^* is a user equilibrium, and let $f := f_{i,p \rightarrow q}^*(\varepsilon) \in M(f^*)$ be arbitrary. This means $q \in A_{i,p}(f^*)$ and $\langle \tau, f - f^* \rangle = \varepsilon \cdot (\tau_q - \tau_p) \geq 0$ by the equilibrium condition. Thus, f^* solves (QVI).

Similarly, if f^* is a solution to (QVI), we know for all $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ and $q \in A_{i,p}(f)$ that there is some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $f := f_{i,p \rightarrow q}^*(\varepsilon) \in M(f^*)$. Therefore, $\tau_q - \tau_p = \langle \tau, f - f^* \rangle / \varepsilon \geq 0$, and thus, f^* is a user equilibrium. \square

While the existence of solutions to customary variational inequalities in the form of (VI(c, D)) can be shown using Brouwer's fixed point theorem, the existence of solutions to quasi-variational inequalities is not clear upfront. To establish an existence result, we therefore introduce an alternative characterization of our problem in the next section.

3.2. Bernstein-Smith Equilibrium

In this section, we will reformulate the user equilibrium as a Bernstein-Smith equilibrium for suitably chosen edge cost functions $c_e: \mathcal{F}_Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. This way we dispense with the explicit side-constraints and instead incorporate them as discontinuities into the cost functions, so that any equilibrium must correspond to a feasible flow.

Definition 3 ([2, Definition 2]). We are given a directed graph $G = (V, E)$ and a set of commodities I , each equipped with a demand $Q_i \geq 0$, a finite, non-empty set of paths \mathcal{P}_i , and a cost function $c_{i,p}: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$. A demand-feasible flow $f \in \mathcal{F}_Q$ is a *Bernstein-Smith equilibrium (BS-equilibrium)* if for all $i \in I$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ the following implication holds:

$$f_{i,p} > 0 \implies c_{i,p}(f) \leq \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_i} \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_{i,q}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)).$$

The cost of a non-boarding edge e is given by the time it takes to traverse the edge, i.e., $c_e(f) := \tau_e \geq 0$. Passing a boarding edge takes no time, however, it is only possible to board until the capacity of the vehicle is reached. We realize this by raising the cost of the boarding edge when the capacity is exceeded to a sufficiently large constant M , which is guaranteed to be higher than the cost of any available path, e.g., $M := \max_{i \in I, p \in \mathcal{P}_i} \tau_p + 1$. This means, for a boarding edge $e \in E_B$, the experienced cost is

$$c_e(f) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } f_{e^+} \leq \nu_{e^+}, \\ M, & \text{if } f_{e^+} > \nu_{e^+}. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

For a v - w -path p in our time-expanded graph, we assign the cost

$$c_{i,p}(f) := \sum_{e \in p} c_e(f) = \theta(w) - \theta(v) + \sum_{e \in p \cap E_B} c_e(f). \quad (2)$$

For the outside options p_i^{out} , we assume that they are virtual paths consisting of a single edge in E , which is exclusively used by the path p_i^{out} , and we set the cost of this edge to $c_{i,p_i^{\text{out}}}(f) := \tau_{p_i^{\text{out}}}$.

Theorem 4. *A demand-feasible flow f is a user equilibrium if and only if it is a BS-equilibrium with respect to the cost functions $c_{i,p}$ defined above.*

Proof. For any $f \in \mathcal{F}_Q^\nu$ and $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_i$ with $f_{i,p} > 0$, it holds that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_{i,q}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)) \begin{cases} = \tau_q, & \text{if } \forall e \in E_B \cap q : e^+ \in p \text{ or } f_{e^+} < \nu_{e^+}, \\ \geq M, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that the condition in the case distinction is equivalent to $q \in A_{i,p}(f)$.

If f is a BS-equilibrium, then $c_{i,p}(f) \leq \tau_{p_i^{\text{out}}} < M$ holds by the BS-equilibrium condition and, thus, we must have $c_{i,p}(f) = \tau_p$. The same holds true, if we instead assume f to be a user equilibrium. Therefore, the following equivalence holds:

$$\forall q \in A_{i,p}(f) : \tau_p \leq \tau_q \iff \forall q \in \mathcal{P}_i : c_{i,p}(f) \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_{i,q}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)).$$

Hence, f is a BS-equilibrium if and only if it is a user equilibrium. \square

3.3. Existence

Bernstein and Smith [2, Theorem 2] proved the existence of BS-equilibria in the case that each path cost function has the form $c_{i,p} = \sum_{e \in p} c_e$, where $c_e : \mathcal{F}_Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $e \in E$, are lower-semicontinuous, bounded functions that satisfy the following regularity condition.

Definition 5 ([2]). A cost structure $c : \mathcal{F}_Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^E$ is *regular* if it satisfies

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_{i,q}(f_{p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)) = \sum_{e \in p \cap q} c_e(f) + \sum_{e \in q \setminus p} \bar{c}_e(f)$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_Q$, $i \in I$, and paths $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_i$ with $f_{i,p} > 0$, where \bar{c}_e is the upper hull of c_e defined as

$$\bar{c}_e(f) := \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \{c_e(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{F}_Q, \|x - f\| < \varepsilon\}.$$

Unfortunately, the cost functions in our case as defined in (1) do not fulfil this condition, as the network in Figure 1 illustrates: Assume that both vehicles have a capacity of one, let p be the a - d -path using only the green vehicle, and let q be the a - d -path using both vehicles. Let f be the flow sending one unit along p . Then

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_q(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)) = \tau_q < M \leq \sum_{e \in p \cap q} c_e(f) + \sum_{e \in q \setminus p} \bar{c}_e(f).$$

This irregularity comes from the boarding edge at station c . On the left-hand side it is noticed that the flow on the last driving edge is unchanged and boarding remains possible, whereas the right-hand side is oblivious to the flow reduction along p .

Therefore, we introduce a weaker condition that is satisfied in our time-expanded networks but still guarantees the existence of equilibria.

Definition 6. A cost structure $c: \mathcal{F}_Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^E$ is called *weakly regular* if the following implication holds for all demand-feasible flows $f \in \mathcal{F}_Q$, $i \in I$, and $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ with $f_{i,p} > 0$:

$$c_{i,p}(f) \leq \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_i} \sum_{e \in p \cap q} c_e(f) + \sum_{e \in q \setminus p} \bar{c}_e(f) \implies c_{i,p}(f) \leq \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_i} \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_{i,q}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon))$$

Proposition 7. A regular cost structure $(c_e)_e$ is also weakly regular.

Proof. Assume, the left side of the implication in the definition of weak regularity holds true for some $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$, $f \in \mathcal{F}_Q$, and let $q \in \mathcal{P}_i$. Then, it also holds

$$c_{i,p}(f) \leq \sum_{e \in p \cap q} c_e(f) + \sum_{p \setminus q} \bar{c}_e(f) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_{i,q}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)),$$

where we apply regularity for the last equation. Taking the minimum over all $q \in \mathcal{P}_i$ yields weak regularity. \square

Theorem 8. If $c: \mathcal{F}_Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^E$ is a lower-semicontinuous, bounded, and weakly regular cost structure, a BS-equilibrium exists.

The proof uses a similar approach to that in [2, Theorem 2], but we show that it applies to the broader class of weakly regular cost structures.

Proof. Let M be an upper bound for all functions c_e . There exists, for each $e \in E$, a sequence of continuous functions $c_e^{(n)}: \mathcal{F}_Q \rightarrow [0, M]$ such that $c_e^{(n)}(f) \uparrow c_e(f)$ holds for all $f \in \mathcal{F}_Q$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a Wardrop equilibrium $f^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}_Q$ w.r.t. the path cost function $(c_{i,p}^{(n)})_{(i,p) \in \mathcal{P}}$ defined by $c_{i,p}^{(n)}(f) := \sum_{e \in p} c_e^{(n)}(f)$, i.e.,

$$f_{i,p}^{(n)} > 0 \implies c_{i,p}^{(n)}(f^{(n)}) \leq c_{i,q}^{(n)}(f^{(n)})$$

holds for all $i \in I$ and paths $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_i$ [37]. Equivalently, we have

$$f_{i,p}^{(n)} > 0 \implies \sum_{e \in p \setminus q} c_e^{(n)}(f^{(n)}) \leq \sum_{e \in q \setminus p} c_e^{(n)}(f^{(n)}). \quad (3)$$

The sequence $(f^{(n)}, c^{(n)}(f^{(n)}))$ is contained in the compact set $\mathcal{F}_Q \times [0, M]^E$, and therefore has a convergent sub-sequence with some limit (f, x) ; we pass to this sub-sequence.

By the upper-semicontinuity of the upper hull and the monotonicity of the sequence of cost functions, we have for all $e \in E$

$$\bar{c}_e(f) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{c}_e(f^{(n)}) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_e(f^{(n)}) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_e^{(n)}(f^{(n)}) = x_e. \quad (4)$$

Let $\alpha > 0$. First, since $(c_e^{(n)})_n$ converges pointwise to c_e , there exist $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c_e^{(n_0)}(f) \geq c_e(f) - \alpha/2$. Second, since $c_e^{(n_0)}$ is continuous, there is $\delta > 0$ such that for all $g \in \mathcal{F}_Q$ with $\|f - g\| < \delta$ we have $c_e^{(n_0)}(g) \geq c_e^{(n_0)}(f) - \alpha/2$. As $(c_e^{(n)})_n$ is a pointwise increasing sequence, we then have for all $n \geq n_0$ that $c_e^{(n)}(g) \geq c_e(f) - \alpha$. Third, since

$(f^{(n)})_n$ converges to f , there is n_1 such that $\|f - f^{(n)}\| < \delta$ holds for all $n \geq n_1$. In conclusion, $c_e^{(n)}(f^{(n)}) \geq c_e(f) - \alpha$ holds for $n \geq \max\{n_0, n_1\}$. Since $\alpha > 0$ was arbitrary, we deduce

$$x_e = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_e^{(n)}(f^{(n)}) \geq c_e(f). \quad (5)$$

Let $i \in I$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ with $f_{i,p} > 0$. There exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $f_{i,p}^{(n)} > 0$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Let $q \in \mathcal{P}_i$ be an arbitrary other path. Taking the limit of (3) yields $\sum_{e \in p \setminus q} x_e \leq \sum_{e \in q \setminus p} x_e$, and applying the inequalities (4) and (5) we get

$$\sum_{e \in p \setminus q} c_e(f) \leq \sum_{e \in q \setminus p} \bar{c}_e(f).$$

Adding $c_e(f)$ for each $e \in p \cap q$ to both sides and taking the minimum over all $q \in \mathcal{P}_i$, this shows

$$c_p(f) \leq \min_{q \in \mathcal{P}_i} \sum_{e \in p \cap q} c_e(f) + \sum_{e \in q \setminus p} \bar{c}_e(f).$$

Thus, we can apply weak regularity. \square

In the remainder of this section, we show that the cost structure defined in Section 3.2 is weakly regular, so that there is always a user equilibrium.

Proposition 9. *Let f be a flow, let $i \in I$, let $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_i$, let $e \in p \cap q \cap E_B$, and let $\varepsilon \in [0, f_{i,p}]$. Then $c_e(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)) = c_e(f)$.*

Proof. The function c_e depends only on the flow value on e^+ . Since e^+ also lies in $p \cap q$, this flow value is the same in f and in $f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)$. \square

Notation 10. For a path p and a node v occurring in p , we denote the prefix of p up to this node by $p_{\leq v}$ and the suffix of p starting from v by $p_{\geq v}$.

Lemma 11. *Let f be a flow, let $i \in I$, and let $p, q \in \mathcal{P}_i$ with $c_{i,p}(f) < M$. Let v be the last common node of p and q and let q' be the concatenation of $p_{\leq v}$ and $q_{\geq v}$. Then it holds*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_{i,q'}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q'}(\varepsilon)) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_{i,q}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)).$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. By (2), the expressions $c_{i,q}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon))$ and $c_{i,q'}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q'}(\varepsilon))$ differ only in the cost of their corresponding boarding edges. Applying Proposition 9 to the flow $f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)$ and paths q and q' , we see that the costs of the edges in q and q' after node v are equal. Moreover, by applying the proposition to f and the paths p and q' , we conclude that $c_e(f_{i,p \rightarrow q'}(\varepsilon)) = c_e(f)$ for all $e \in p_{\leq v} = q'_{\leq v}$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{i,q}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)) - c_{i,q'}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q'}(\varepsilon)) &= \sum_{e \in q_{\leq v} \cap E_B} c_e(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)) - \sum_{e \in p_{\leq v} \cap E_B} c_e(f) \\ &= \sum_{e \in q_{\leq v} \cap E_B} c_e(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equation holds because of the assumption $c_{i,p}(f) < M$. \square

Theorem 12. *In the context of schedule-based transit networks, a user equilibrium always exists.*

Proof. We show that the cost structure c defined in Section 3.2 fulfils the conditions of Theorem 8. This implies the existence of a BS equilibrium, which is a user equilibrium by Theorem 4.

Clearly, c_e is bounded and lower semi-continuous for every $e \in E$. To show that $(c_e)_e$ is also weakly regular, let $f \in \mathcal{F}_Q$, $i \in I$, and $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ with $f_{i,p} > 0$ fulfil

$$c_{i,p}(f) \leq \min_{q' \in \mathcal{P}_i} \sum_{e \in p \cap q'} c_e(f) + \sum_{e \in q' \setminus p} \bar{c}_e(f).$$

Applying the above equation for the outside option $q' = p_i^{\text{out}}$, the above statement results in $c_{i,p}(f) \leq \tau_{p_i^{\text{out}}} < M$.

Let q be an arbitrary path in \mathcal{P}_i , let v be the last common node of p and q , and let q' be the concatenation of $p_{\leq v}$ and $q_{\geq v}$. By Lemma 11, we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_{i,q'}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q'}(\varepsilon)) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_{i,q}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q}(\varepsilon)),$$

and it suffices to show

$$\sum_{e \in p \cap q'} c_e(f) + \sum_{e \in q' \setminus p} \bar{c}_e(f) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_{i,q'}(f_{i,p \rightarrow q'}(\varepsilon)) = \sum_{e \in q'} \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_e(f_{i,p \rightarrow q'}(\varepsilon)).$$

As the cost of non-boardings edges is constant, we can restrict our analysis to boarding edges. Note that there is no boarding edge $e \in E_B$ on the path $q_{\geq v}$ for which e^+ is also on p ; otherwise p and q would not be disjoint after v . This means, for any boarding edge e on the path $q_{\geq v}$, we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_e(f_{i,p \rightarrow q'}(\varepsilon)) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_e(f + \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{1}_{q'}) = \begin{cases} M, & \text{if } f_{e^+} \geq \nu_{e^+}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} = \bar{c}_e(f).$$

For a boarding edge e on the subpath $p_{\leq v}$, Proposition 9 implies $\liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} c_e(f_{i,p \rightarrow q'}(\varepsilon)) = c_e(f)$, which concludes the proof. \square

Remark 13. *Even for single-commodity networks, the price of stability, i.e., the ratio of the total travel times in a best user equilibrium and in a system optimum, is unbounded. However, Section 5 shows that this ratio is well-behaved in experiments on real-world networks.*

4. Computation of Equilibria

We continue by discussing the computation of user equilibria. After describing an $\mathcal{O}(|E|^2)$ time algorithm for single-commodity networks, we consider the multi-commodity case, for which we outline a finite algorithm. To compute multi-commodity equilibria in practice, we propose a heuristic based on insights gained by the characterization with the quasi-variational inequality.

4.1. An Efficient Algorithm for Single-Commodity Networks

We begin with the description of an efficient algorithm for single-commodity networks. To reduce notational noise, we omit the index i where applicable, i.e., we write \mathcal{P} instead of \mathcal{P}_i , etc.

Definition 14. Let $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$. We say that a driving edge $e \in p \cap q$ is a *conflicting edge* of p and q if its corresponding boarding edge e_B lies either on p or on q (but not on both).

Assume p and q have a conflicting edge, and let $e \in E$ be the first conflicting edge. We say p has *priority over* q if the boarding edge e_B preceding e lies on q (and not on p). Let $\prec \subseteq \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P}$ denote this relation.

Proposition 15. Let p be a \prec -minimal path, i.e., there exists no $q \in \mathcal{P}$ with $q \prec p$. Then for any $q \in \mathcal{P}$, there is no conflicting edge e of p and q for which the corresponding boarding edge e_B lies on p .

Proof. Let $q \in \mathcal{P}$ be any path, and let e be a conflicting edge of p and q . As $q \not\prec p$, we know that e is either not the first conflicting edge or the corresponding boarding edge does not lie on p . If e is not the first conflicting edge, then let e' denote the previous conflicting edge, and let q' be the concatenation of the prefix of p up to e' and the suffix of q starting from e' . Then e is the first conflicting edge of q' and p , and by $q' \not\prec p$ we know that the boarding edge of e cannot lie on p . \square

We first describe an efficient way to compute a \prec -minimal path ending in a given reachable node w . In fact, this can be done by a simple backward-search on the subgraph of reachable nodes prioritizing non-boarding edges over other edges:

Algorithm 1: Computes a \prec -minimal path

Data: Time-expanded graph $G = (V, E)$, a source node v^* , an end node w of some path in \mathcal{P}

Result: A \prec -minimal path ending in w

$V' \leftarrow$ set of nodes reachable from v^* via directed edges in G ;

$P \leftarrow$ empty path;

$v \leftarrow w$;

while $v \neq v^*$ **do**

if $\exists e = u'v \in E \setminus E_B$ with $u' \in V'$ **then** $u \leftarrow u'$;

else $u \leftarrow$ any $u \in V'$ with $e = uv \in E$;

$P \leftarrow (uv) \circ P$;

$v \leftarrow u$;

return P

Lemma 16. For the end node w of any path in \mathcal{P} , Algorithm 1 computes a \prec -minimal path ending in w in $\mathcal{O}(|E|)$ time.

Proof. To acknowledge that the algorithm is well posed, note that in line 1, the node $v \neq v^*$ is always reachable from v^* and thus, there is some preceding node u which is also reachable from v^* .

As the graph is acyclic, an edge can only be added once to the path P . Hence, the algorithm terminates after $\mathcal{O}(|E|)$ time.

It remains to show that the algorithm is correct. Let p be the returned path, and let $q \in \mathcal{P}$ be any path. Let $e = vw$ be the first conflicting edge of p and q – if none exists, $q \not\prec p$ holds trivially. Clearly, the corresponding boarding edge of e must lie on q : Otherwise, q is evidence that there exists a non-boarding edge $e' = u'v$ with $u' \in V'$ and Algorithm 1 would have chosen e' for p as well (contradicting that e is a conflicting edge). Hence, also in this case, it holds $q \not\prec p$. \square

To compute single-commodity equilibrium flows, the idea is to successively send flow along \prec -minimal and τ -optimal paths. In every iteration, the flow on this path is increased until an edge becomes fully saturated. Then, we reduce the capacity on the edges of p by the added flow, remove zero-capacity edges, and repeat until the demand is met. An explicit description is given in Algorithm 2 where we use the notation $|f| := \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} f_p$.

Algorithm 2: Computes user-equilibrium for single-commodity instances

Data: Time-expanded graph $G = (V, E)$, capacities $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{E_D}$, demand $Q \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, source node v , and a destination station t

Result: A user equilibrium f with demand Q

$f \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$; $G' \leftarrow G$; $\nu' \leftarrow \nu$;

while $|f| < Q$ **do**

$\theta' \leftarrow$ minimum time of all on-platform nodes of t reachable from v in G'
 (and $\theta(v) + \tau_{p^{\text{out}}}$);

$p \leftarrow$ \prec -minimal path w.r.t. G' arriving at t at time θ' ;

$\delta \leftarrow \min(\{\nu'_e \mid e \in p\} \cup \{Q - |f|\})$;

$f \leftarrow f + \delta \cdot \mathbf{1}_p$;

$\nu' \leftarrow \nu' - \delta \cdot (\mathbf{1}_{e \in p})_{e \in E_D}$;

for $e \in p \cap E_D$ with $\nu'_e = 0$ **do**

 | Remove e and its incident edges from G' ;

return f

Theorem 17. For single-commodity networks, Algorithm 2 computes a user equilibrium in $\mathcal{O}(|E|^2)$ time. The resulting user equilibrium uses at most $|E|$ paths.

Proof. To acknowledge that the algorithm terminates, note, that in each round after which the algorithm does not terminate, at least one edge is removed from the graph. Thus, there can be at most $|E_D|$ many rounds. By Lemma 16, each round takes $\mathcal{O}(E)$ time.

Let f be the flow returned by the algorithm. Then f is of the form $f = \delta_1 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{P_1} + \dots + \delta_k \cdot \mathbf{1}_{P_k}$ where k is the number of rounds, and $\delta_j > 0$, $P_j \in \mathcal{P}$ are the values produced in

round $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. By construction, we have $\tau_{P_j} \leq \tau_{P_l}$ and $P_j \neq P_l$ whenever $j < l$. We show by induction over l that $f^l := \sum_{j=1}^l \delta_j \cdot 1_{P_j}$ is a user equilibrium with demand $|f^l|$. The base case $l = 0$ is trivial. Assume f^l is a user equilibrium with demand $|f^l|$. Clearly, f^{l+1} is capacity-feasible w.r.t. ν . Let p be a path with $f_p^{l+1} > 0$, and let $q \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\tau_q < \tau_p$.

If $p = P_j$ for some $j < l + 1$, then $f_p^l > 0$, and by induction hypothesis we have $q \notin A_p(f^l)$. As $A_p(f^{l+1})$ is a subset of $A_p(f^l)$, this implies $q \notin A_p(f^{l+1})$. Otherwise we have $p = P_{l+1}$. Let l^* be the last round of the algorithm before which every edge of q was still present in the graph G' . Clearly, $\tau_q \geq \tau_{P_{l^*}}$ as otherwise P_{l^*} would not have been chosen in iteration l^* . There is a driving edge e on q for which $f_e^{l^*} = \nu_e$. Let e be the first such edge on q . As e is removed from G' at round l^* , it cannot be contained in P_{l+1} . Therefore, if the boarding edge of e lies on q , we have $q \notin A_{P_{l+1}}(f^{l^*}) \supseteq A_{P_{l+1}}(f^{l+1})$. Assume the boarding edge does not lie on q , i.e., q uses the dwelling edge e' before traversing e . As q was contained in G' at rounds l^j , $j \in \{1, \dots, l^*\}$, we know by Proposition 15 that e is not a conflicting edge of q and P^j , and thus, if P_j uses e , it must also use the same dwelling edge e' and the previous driving edge e'' of the vehicle. Hence, $f_{e''}^{l^*} = f_e^{l^*} = \nu_e = \nu_{e''}$. This contradicts the minimality of the position of e in q . \square

For general (aperiodic) schedules our algorithm is strongly polynomial in the input. For compactly describable periodic schedules it is only pseudo-polynomial as it depends on the size of the time-expanded network. The actual blow-up of the network depends on the ratio of the time horizon and the period length.

Remark 18. *The more general single-destination scenario, where we allow multiple commodities sharing a common destination station, can be reduced to the single-commodity case by introducing a so-called super-source node: For each original commodity we add a connection to the node of the commodity's station and start time, which is capacitated by the commodity's demand.*

4.2. The General Multi-Commodity Case

The approach of the previous section fails for the general multi-commodity case as the set of paths $\bigcup_i \mathcal{P}_i$ may not necessarily have a \prec -minimal element if there are commodities that do not share the same destination station (see Figure 8 for an example). Hence, we now describe a finite-time algorithm and a heuristic for computing multi-commodity equilibria in practice.

4.2.1. A finite-time algorithm

In the following, we describe a finite-time algorithm for computing exact multi-commodity user equilibria. As we know that an equilibrium f exists, the idea is now to guess the subset E_O of driving edges that are at capacity, i.e., $E_O = \{e \in E_D \mid f_e = \nu_e\}$, as well as a positive, lower bound ε on the available capacity on all other edges, i.e., $\min_{e \in E_D \setminus E_O} \nu_e - f_e \geq \varepsilon$. Then, we check the following set defined by linear constraints

for feasibility:

$$\mathcal{F}(E_O, \varepsilon) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{F}_Q \mid \begin{array}{ll} f_e = \nu_e, & \text{for } e \in E_O, \\ f_e \leq \nu_e - \varepsilon, & \text{for } e \in E_D \setminus E_O, \\ f_{i,p} = 0, & \text{for } i \in I, p \in \mathcal{P}_i(E_O) \end{array} \right\}, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_i(E_O)$ is the set of paths $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ for which there exists a $q \in \mathcal{P}_i$ with $\tau_q < \tau_p$ such that $e^+ \notin E_O$ holds for all edges $e \in E_B \cap q$ with $e^+ \notin p$.

Lemma 19. *The set of user equilibria coincides with the union of $\mathcal{F}(E_O, \varepsilon)$ over $E_O \subseteq E_D$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. Note that for any feasible flow f and path $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$, there exists some $q \in A_{i,p}(f)$ with $\tau_q < \tau_p$ if and only if $p \in \mathcal{P}_i(E_O)$ with $E_O = \{e \in E_D \mid f_e = \nu_e\}$. Thus, f is a user equilibrium if and only if f is feasible and $f_{i,p} = 0$ holds for all $p \in \mathcal{P}_i(E_O)$. If f is a user equilibrium, it is clearly contained in $\mathcal{F}(E_O, \varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon := \min_{e \in E_D \setminus E_O} \nu_e - f_e$. Conversely, for all $f \in \mathcal{F}(E_O, \varepsilon)$, E_O is automatically of said shape and the condition above is fulfilled. \square

As the set $\mathcal{F}(E_O, \varepsilon)$ only grows when reducing ε , a finite-time algorithm can iteratively decrease ε and then check the feasibility of $\mathcal{F}(E_O, \varepsilon)$ for every subset E_O of E_D . As a user equilibrium must exist, an equilibrium will be found for small enough ε .

Corollary 20. *The procedure described above computes a user equilibrium in finite time.*

4.2.2. Heuristic for computing multi-commodity equilibria

In the following, we describe a heuristic for computing multi-commodity equilibria. Start with some initial feasible flow $f \in \mathcal{F}_Q^V$, e.g., by sending all flow along their outside option. Then, iteratively, find a direction $d \in \mathbb{R}^P$ and change the flow along this direction while preserving feasibility, until an equilibrium is found. More specifically, we replace f with $f' = f + \alpha \cdot d$ where α is maximal such that f' is feasible.

Definition 21. Let f be a feasible flow. A *direction* $d \in \mathbb{R}^P$ is called

- *balanced* if $\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_i} d_{i,p} = 0$ for $i \in I$, and
- *feasible for f* if the flow $f + \alpha \cdot d$ is feasible for small enough $\alpha > 0$.

Clearly, the choice of the direction is essential for this heuristic to approach an equilibrium. The characterization in Theorem 2 indicates using a direction d such that $f + \alpha \cdot d$ is a deviation violating the quasi-variational inequality, i.e., $d := 1_{i,q} - 1_{i,p}$ for some path $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ with $f_{i,p} > 0$ for which q is a better available alternative, i.e., $q \in A_{i,p}(f)$ and $\tau_q < \tau_p$. However, not all such directions are feasible; even worse, sometimes no feasible direction is of this form. Therefore, our approach is to start with such a direction d and, if necessary, transform it to make it feasible. See Algorithm 3 for a sketch of the method described so far.

If this heuristic terminates, it provides an equilibrium, but termination is not always guaranteed, as we will see later. We first describe how we achieve feasibility of the direction.

Algorithm 3: Heuristic for computing multi-commodity equilibria

Data: Time-expanded graph $G = (V, E)$, finite set of commodities I

Result: A user equilibrium

Initialize f by sending all flow along outside options;

while $\exists i \in I, p \in \mathcal{P}_i, q \in A_{i,p}(f)$ with $\tau_q < \tau_p$ **do**

$d \leftarrow 1_{i,q} - 1_{i,p}$;

 (Potentially) transform d to a feasible direction of f ;

$f \leftarrow f + \alpha \cdot d$ with $\alpha > 0$ maximal such that $f + \alpha \cdot d$ is feasible;

return f

Proposition 22. *Let f be a feasible flow and d a balanced direction that fulfils $f_{i,p} > 0$ whenever $d_{i,p} < 0$. Then, d is a feasible direction for f if and only if there exists no boarding edge e such that $f_{e^+} = \nu_{e^+}$, $d_{e^+} > 0$ and $(f_e > 0$ or $d_e > 0)$ hold.*

Proof. Assume d is a feasible direction for f , and let e be any driving edge with $f_{e^+} = \nu_{e^+}$. Then, by the feasibility of $f + \alpha \cdot d$ for small enough α , we must have $d_{e^+} \leq 0$.

Assume now, that d is not a feasible direction for f . Then, there is some i and a path p such that $f_{i,p} + \alpha \cdot d_{i,p} < 0$ for all $\alpha > 0$, which is impossible due to our assumption on d , or there is a driving edge e^+ of some boarding edge e such that $f_{e^+} + \alpha \cdot d_{e^+} > \nu_{e^+}$ for all $\alpha > 0$. Let e^+ be the first such driving edge in its corresponding vehicle. As f is feasible, we must have $f_{e^+} = \nu_{e^+}$ and $d_{e^+} > 0$. If both $f_e \leq 0$ and $d_e \leq 0$ held, the driving edge \tilde{e}^+ of the previous stop of the same vehicle would fulfil $\nu_{e^+} \geq f_{\tilde{e}^+} \geq f_{e^+} = \nu_{e^+}$ and $d_{\tilde{e}^+} \geq d_{e^+} > 0$, a contradiction to the minimality of e^+ . \square

In the case that $d = 1_{i,q} - 1_{i,p}$ is an infeasible direction, we apply the following transformation: As long as d is infeasible, there exists a boarding edge such that $f_{e^+} = \nu_{e^+}$, $d_{e^+} > 0$, and $f_e > 0 \vee d_e > 0$, and we repeat the following procedure: Let (i, p') be such that p' is a path containing e with positive flow $f_{i,p'} > 0$ or whose entry in the direction vector is positive, i.e., $d_{i,p'} > 0$. We decrease $d_{i,p'}$ by $\delta := d_e$, if $f_{i,p'} > 0$, or by $\delta := \min(d_e, d_{i,p'})$, otherwise. Next, we determine a best path $q' \in \mathcal{P}_i$ that does not use full driving edges, i.e., driving edges \tilde{e} with $f_{\tilde{e}} = \nu_{\tilde{e}}$ and $d_{\tilde{e}} \geq 0$. We increase $d_{i,q'}$ by $\min(\{\delta\} \cup \{-d_e \mid e \in q', f_e = \nu_e\})$, and afterwards, decrease δ by the same amount. We repeat this until δ equals zero. A detailed description can be found in Algorithm 4.

Proposition 23. *Algorithm 4 is correct and terminates.*

Proof. Proposition 22 implies correctness. For termination, note that the inner loop always terminates as every path q can be selected at most once. For edges $e' \in E_D$ with $f_{e'} = \nu_{e'}$, while $d_{e'}$ is positive, it is monotonically decreasing (with progression of the algorithm), and once it is non-positive it will never become positive again. In the main loop, every pair (e, p) is considered at most once: Clearly, this is the case if δ is set to d_{e^+} in line 4 as then the edge e will never be considered again because the direction d_{e^+} will never become positive again. Otherwise, δ is set to $d_{i,p}$ and, subsequently, $d_{i,p}$ is set to 0. After that, $d_{i,p}$ will not become positive unless d_{e^+} is non-positive. \square

Algorithm 4: Establishing feasible directions

Data: Time-expanded graph with outside options, feasible flow f , balanced direction $d \in \mathbb{Z}^P$ s.t. $\forall(i, p) : d_{i,p} < 0 \implies f_{i,p} > 0$

Result: A feasible direction

while $\exists e \in E_B$ with $f_{e^+} = \nu_{e^+} \wedge d_{e^+} > 0 \wedge (f_e > 0 \vee d_e > 0)$ **do**

$(i, p) \leftarrow$ any commodity i and path p containing e with $f_{i,p} > 0$ or $d_{i,p} > 0$;

$\delta \leftarrow \begin{cases} d_{e^+}, & \text{if } f_{i,p} > 0, \\ \min(d_{e^+}, d_{i,p}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$;

Decrease $d_{i,p}$ by δ ;

while $\delta > 0$ **do**

$q \leftarrow$ best alternative to p not containing any $e' \in E_D$ with

$f_{e'} = \nu_{e'} \wedge d_{e'} \geq 0$;

$\delta' \leftarrow \min(\{\delta\} \cup \{-d_{e'} \mid e' \in q, f_{e'} = \nu_{e'}\})$;

Increase $d_{i,q}$ by δ' ;

Decrease δ by δ' ;

return d

Undesirable behaviour In some situations, the heuristic might apply changes along directions d_1, \dots, d_k in a cyclic behaviour. We distinguish between *terminating* cycles, for which the heuristic breaks out of the cyclic behaviour after some finite but potentially very large number of iterations, and *non-terminating* cycles (see Appendix C for examples). In practice, most terminating cycles can be detected and prohibited by changing the flow along the common direction $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i$ thereby skipping a potentially large number of iterations. Non-terminating cycles, however, constitute a more serious problem. We can detect these cycles, as their common direction $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i$ vanishes. Randomizing the path selection in the main loop of the heuristic might help in breaking out of the cycle. However, in some cases even this is not possible, in which case we can only restart the heuristic with a randomized path selection rule.

Reducing the instance complexity We employ a technique to reduce the initial complexity of a given instance: There is a class of paths for which the procedure will never remove flow from. Thus, we first fill these paths directly when initializing the heuristic (see Appendix C). In our experiments, this has shown to handle between 10% and 25% of the total demand before entering the heuristic.

5. Computational Study

To gain insights into the applicability of the proposed heuristic, we conduct a computational study on real world train networks. We analyse the performance of the heuristic and compare the computed equilibrium solutions with system optima.

5.1. Experiment Setup

For each network in our dataset, we use a dynamic demand profile. As our dataset only provides aggregate, static demand data, we generate a dynamic profile using a uniform distribution of the demand over time horizon of a typical work day. This means, for every origin-destination (OD) pair, we generate commodities c_i with varying start time.

Since the performance of our heuristic varies with the utilization of network capacities, we also apply it to rescaled demands. A demand scale factor of 1 reflects the real-world demand.

The system optima are computed using a linear-programming based approach with delayed column generation. A system optimum is an optimal solution to the linear program

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_Q^v} \sum_{(i,p) \in \mathcal{P}} \tau_p \cdot f_{i,p}.$$

As it is infeasible to precompute and materialize all possible paths for solving this linear program, the generation of these variables is delayed. The linear program is initialized with some feasible solution, e.g., by sending all particles along their outside option. Then, after every iteration, paths that reduce the objective function are added to the so-called Master-LP, and if any path was added, the Master-LP is solved again. Once no more paths get added, an optimal solution is found. For this, we used software developed by [20, 21].

The heuristic was implemented using the Rust programming language, and all experiments were conducted on an AMD Ryzen 9 5950X CPU.

5.2. Data

A pool of periodic timetables of real-world public transportation networks is provided in the publicly available TimPassLib [36]. In our computational study, we unroll these periodic timetables to match an observation period of a day (18 hours) and feed our heuristic the resulting schedule. Table 1 describes the considered networks and schedules in more detail.

We present results for the Hamburg S-Bahn network (Figure 2) and the Swiss long-distance train network. The nominal demand of 750.000 passengers per day in the Hamburg S-Bahn network was taken from [35]. Due to a lack of real-world data, we set the capacity of all vehicles to 1000 passengers, a number closely aligned to real-world train systems. For example, a 2-unit train system of the DBAG Class 490 can hold up to 1028 passengers. The average number of stops per vehicle is 19.14 in the Hamburg network and 8.25 in the Swiss network. We equip all commodities in our experiments with an outside option of 180 minutes.

5.3. Results

For real-world demands, the heuristic computes user equilibria in both networks in less than 30 seconds. Starting with a demand factor of 0.5 for the Hamburg S-Bahn network



Figure 2: Map of the considered S-Bahn Hamburg as operated until 2023 [1]

Table 1: Details of the considered networks

| Name | # stations | # vehicles | nominal demand | # commodities |
|---------------------|------------|------------|----------------|---------------|
| Hamburg S-Bahn | 68 | 1,512 | 750,000 | 219,240 |
| Swiss Long Distance | 140 | 2,772 | 1,347,686 | 2,609,712 |

and 0.55 for the Swiss network, capacity conflicts occur; for demand factors below these values, any system-optimal flow is also an equilibrium flow as all agents can be assigned to a path p minimizing τ_p over all paths $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$. With an increase in demand, the number of iterations of the heuristic increases heavily. For example in the Hamburg instance, when initializing the heuristic by filling optimal paths until all of them have a full driving edge, only 1,015 iterations are necessary for the nominal demand while 10,280,576 iterations were necessary for a demand factor of 2.5. For the Swiss long-distance train network, the computation time increased similarly dramatically already when doubling the demand.

The average travel time in the computed equilibria is up to 3.3% higher, in the Hamburg instance, and up to 7.4% higher, in the Swiss instance, compared to a system optimum. For the nominal demand, these numbers are below 1%. Figure 3 shows the computation time of the heuristic, and the mean travel times in the equilibrium and in

the system optimum.




Figure 3: Comparison of the mean travel time of the user equilibrium and system optimum, and the computation time of the heuristic in the Hamburg S-Bahn network (left) and the Swiss long-distance train network (right).

6. Conclusion

We presented a side-constrained user equilibrium model for a schedule-based transit network incorporating hard vehicle capacities. As our main results, we proved that equilibria exist and can be computed efficiently for single-commodity instances. The existence result generalizes a classical result of Bernstein and Smith [2]; its proof is based on a new condition (weak regularity) implying existence of BS-equilibria for a class of discontinuous and non-separable cost maps. For general multi-commodity instances we devised a heuristic, which was implemented and tested on several realistic networks based on data of the Hamburg S-Bahn and the Swiss railway.

Limitations of the Model. Our model assumes that passengers are associated with fixed start times for their travel. For flexible departure time choices, however, a side-constrained user equilibrium need not exist. Non-existence also applies for a model with transfer penalties. Examples for non-existence are presented in Appendix D.

Open Problems. First of all, a side-constrained user equilibrium is not unique and, hence, the issue of equilibrium selection or determining which equilibrium is likely to be observed in practice remains unclear and deserves further study. From an algorithmic point of view, the hardness of the equilibrium computation problem for multi-commodity networks is open. The computational complexity for single-commodity networks and periodic timetables (which leads to a compactly representable time-expanded graph) is also open.

References

- [1] Arbalete. Liniennetzplan der S-Bahn Hamburg, 2016. Licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0. Accessed 19-Dec-2023.
- [2] David Bernstein and Tony E. Smith. Equilibria for networks with lower semicontinuous costs: With an application to congestion pricing. *Transp. Sci.*, 28(3):221–235, August 1994.
- [3] Belgacem Bouzaïene-Ayari, Michel Gendreau, and Sang Nguyen. Passenger assignment in congested transit networks: A historical perspective. In Patrice Marcotte and Sang Nguyen, editors, *Equilibrium and Advanced Transportation Modelling*, pages 47–71. Springer, 1998.
- [4] Paolo Carraresi, Federico Malucelli, and Stefano Pallottino. Regional mass transit assignment with resource constraints. *Transp. Res. B: Methodol.*, 30(2):81–98, April 1996.
- [5] M. Cepeda, R. Cominetti, and M. Florian. A frequency-based assignment model for congested transit networks with strict capacity constraints: characterization and computation of equilibria. *Transp. Res. B: Methodol.*, 40(6):437–459, July 2006.
- [6] Roberto Cominetti and José R. Correa. Common-lines and passenger assignment in congested transit networks. *Transp. Sci.*, 35(3):250–267, 2001.
- [7] José R. Correa, Andreas S. Schulz, and Nicolás E. Stier-Moses. Selfish routing in capacitated networks. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 29(4):961–976, November 2004.
- [8] José R. Correa and Nicolás E. Stier-Moses. Wardrop equilibria. In James J. Cochran, Louis A. Cox, Jr, Pinar Keskinocak, Jeffrey P. Kharoufeh, and J. Cole Smith, editors, *Wiley Encyclopedia of Operations Research and Management Science*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2011.
- [9] Umberto Crisalli. Dynamic transit assignment algorithms for urban congested networks. *WIT Trans. Built Environ.*, 44, 1999.
- [10] Stella C. Dafermos and Frederick T. Sparrow. The traffic assignment problem for a general network. *J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stand.*, 73B(2):91–118, April 1969.

- [11] Joaquín de Cea and Enrique Fernández. Transit assignment for congested public transport systems: An equilibrium model. *Transp. Sci.*, 27(2):133–147, 1993.
- [12] Qian Fu, Ronghui Liu, and Stephane Hess. A review on transit assignment modelling approaches to congested networks: a new perspective. *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 54:1145–1155, October 2012.
- [13] Guido Gentile, Michael Florian, Younes Hamdouch, Oded Cats, and Agostino Nuzzolo. The theory of transit assignment: Basic modelling frameworks. In Guido Gentile and Klaus Noekel, editors, *Modelling Public Transport Passenger Flows in the Era of Intelligent Transport Systems*, STTT, pages 287–386. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016.
- [14] Guido Gentile, Klaus Noekel, Jan-Dirk Schmöcker, Valentina Trozzi, and Ektoras Chandakas. The theory of transit assignment: Demand and supply phenomena. In Guido Gentile and Klaus Noekel, editors, *Modelling Public Transport Passenger Flows in the Era of Intelligent Transport Systems*, STTT, pages 287–386. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016.
- [15] Lukas Graf and Tobias Harks. Side-constrained dynamic traffic equilibria. In Kevin Leyton-Brown, Jason D. Hartline, and Larry Samuelson, editors, *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, page 814. ACM, 2023.
- [16] Younes Hamdouch, H.W. Ho, Agachai Sumalee, and Guodong Wang. Schedule-based transit assignment model with vehicle capacity and seat availability. *Transp. Res. B: Methodol.*, 45(10):1805–1830, December 2011.
- [17] Younes Hamdouch and Siriphong Lawphongpanich. Schedule-based transit assignment model with travel strategies and capacity constraints. *Transp. Res. B: Methodol.*, 42(7-8):663–684, August 2008.
- [18] Younes Hamdouch, Patrice Marcotte, and Sang Nguyen. Capacitated transit assignment with loading priorities. *Math. Program.*, 101(1):205–230, 2004.
- [19] Younes Hamdouch, W. Y. Szeto, and Y. Jiang. A new schedule-based transit assignment model with travel strategies and supply uncertainties. *Transp. Res. B: Methodol.*, 67:35–67, September 2014.
- [20] Tobias Harks, Ingo Kleinert, Max Klimm, and Rolf H. Möhring. Computing network tolls with support constraints. *Networks*, 65(3):262–285, March 2015.
- [21] Olaf Jahn, Rolf H. Möhring, Andreas S. Schulz, and Nicolás E. Stier-Moses. System-optimal routing of traffic flows with user constraints in networks with congestion. *Oper. Res.*, 53(4):600–616, August 2005.
- [22] Fumitaka Kurauchi, Michael G. H. Bell, and Jan-Dirk Schmöcker. Capacity constrained transit assignment with common lines. *Journal of Mathematical Modelling and Algorithms*, 2(4):309–327, December 2003.

- [23] Homero Larrain, Hemant K. Suman, and Juan Carlos Muñoz. Route based equilibrium assignment in congested transit networks. *Transp. Res. C: Emerg. Technol.*, 127:103125, June 2021.
- [24] Torbjörn Larsson and Michael Patriksson. An augmented lagrangean dual algorithm for link capacity side constrained traffic assignment problems. *Transp. Res. B: Methodol.*, 29(6):433–455, December 1995.
- [25] Patrice Marcotte and Sang Nguyen. Hyperpath formulations of traffic assignment problems. In Patrice Marcotte and Sang Nguyen, editors, *Equilibrium and Advanced Transportation Modelling*, pages 175–200. Springer US, 1998.
- [26] Patrice Marcotte, Sang Nguyen, and Alexandre Schoeb. A strategic flow model of traffic assignment in static capacitated networks. *Oper. Res.*, 52(2):191–212, April 2004.
- [27] Sang Nguyen, Stefano Pallottino, and Federico Malucelli. A modeling framework for passenger assignment on a transport network with timetables. *Transp. Sci.*, 35(3):238–249, August 2001.
- [28] Agostino Nuzzolo, Umberto Crisalli, and Luca Rosati. A schedule-based assignment model with explicit capacity constraints for congested transit networks. *Transp. Res. C: Emerg. Technol.*, 20(1):16–33, February 2012.
- [29] Agostino Nuzzolo and Francesco Russo. Stochastic assignment models for transit low frequency services: Some theoretical and operative aspects. In Lucio Bianco and Paolo Toth, editors, *Advanced Methods in Transportation Analysis*, pages 321–339, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1996. Springer.
- [30] Agostino Nuzzolo, Francesco Russo, and Umberto Crisalli. A doubly dynamic schedule-based assignment model for transit networks. *Transp. Sci.*, 35(3):268–285, August 2001.
- [31] Agostino Nuzzolo and Nigel H. M. Wilson, editors. *Schedule-Based Modeling of Transportation Networks*, number 46 in ORCS. Springer US, 2009.
- [32] Natale Papola, Francesco Filippi, Guido Gentile, and Lorenzo Meschini. Schedule-based transit assignment: new dynamic equilibrium model with vehicle capacity constraints. In Nuzzolo and Wilson [31], pages 1–26.
- [33] Michael Patriksson. *The traffic assignment problem: models and methods*. VSP, 1994.
- [34] Normen Rochau, Klaus Nökel, and Michael G. H. Bell. Cost functions for strategies in schedule-based transit networks with limited vehicle capacities. *Transp. Res. Rec.*, 2284(1):62–69, January 2012.
- [35] S-Bahn Hamburg GmbH. Zahlen, Daten, Fakten rund um die S-Bahn Hamburg, 2023.

- [36] Philine Schiewe, Marc Goerigk, and Niels Lindner. Introducing TimPassLib – A library for integrated periodic timetabling and passenger routing. *Oper. Res. Forum*, 4, August 2023.
- [37] Mike J. Smith. The existence, uniqueness and stability of traffic equilibria. *Transp. Res. B: Methodol.*, 13(4):295–304, December 1979.
- [38] Mike J. Smith. Two alternative definitions of traffic equilibrium. *Transp. Res. B: Methodol.*, 18(1):63–65, February 1984.
- [39] Heinz Spiess and Michael Florian. Optimal strategies: A new assignment model for transit networks. *Transp. Res. B: Methodol.*, 23(2):83–102, April 1989.
- [40] John Glen Wardrop. Some theoretical aspects of road traffic research. *Proc. Inst. Civ. Eng.*, 1(3):325–378, May 1952.
- [41] Nigel H. M. Wilson and Agostino Nuzzolo, editors. *Schedule-Based Dynamic Transit Modeling: theory and applications*, number 28 in ORCS. Springer US, 2004.
- [42] Jia Hao Wu, Michael Florian, and Patrice Marcotte. Transit equilibrium assignment: A model and solution algorithms. *Transp. Sci.*, 28(3):193–203, August 1994.
- [43] Z. X. Wu and William H. K. Lam. Network equilibrium for congested multi-mode networks with elastic demand. *J. Adv. Transp.*, 37(3):295–318, 2003.

A. Additional Figures

Figure 4 shows a compact representation of the network illustrated in Figure 1. This representation is used in the remaining appendix. Figure 5 illustrates the elastic demand model introduced in Section 2.




Figure 4: Compact representation of the time-expanded transit network from Figure 1




Figure 5: $Q_j(\tau)$ is the volume of particles of triplet (s_j, t_j, θ_j) that are willing to travel at cost τ

B. Price of Stability

Well-studied measures of quality of user equilibria include the price of anarchy as well as the price of stability. For a given problem instance I consisting of a network and a set of commodities, the *price of anarchy* is the social-cost ratio of the worst user equilibrium compared to the system-optimal solution, i.e.,

$$\text{PoA}(I) := \frac{\sup_{f \in \text{EQ}(I)} \sum_{(i,p) \in \mathcal{P}} f_{i,p} \cdot \tau_p}{\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_Q^\nu(I)} \sum_{(i,p) \in \mathcal{P}} f_{i,p} \cdot \tau_p},$$

where $\text{EQ}(I)$ is the set of user equilibria for I and $\mathcal{F}_Q^\nu(I)$ is the set of feasible flows for I . A lower bound of the price of anarchy is the so-called *price of stability*, the social-cost ratio of the best user equilibrium and the system-optimum, i.e.,

$$\text{PoS}(I) := \frac{\inf_{f \in \text{EQ}(I)} \sum_{(i,p) \in \mathcal{P}} f_{i,p} \cdot \tau_p}{\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_Q^\nu(I)} \sum_{(i,p) \in \mathcal{P}} f_{i,p} \cdot \tau_p}.$$

The following statement shows that both of these quality measures are unbounded even if we restrict ourselves to single-commodity instances.

Proposition 24. *There is a single-commodity instance for which the price of stability is unbounded.*

Proof. We consider the network displayed in Figure 6 with three vehicles, all of which have a capacity of 1, and a single commodity with a demand of 2 and assume all particles have a higher willingness to travel than the travel time of the green vehicle's path.

The (in this instance) unique system-optimal flow sends one unit of particles along the violet path from s to t and one unit along the second pink edge. The total travel time of this flow is $1 \cdot 4 + 1 \cdot 5 = 9$.

In this instance, also the user equilibrium is unique: It sends one unit of flow along the violet-pink s - v - s - t path, and the remaining unit onto the green path. If we denote the arrival time of the green path by arr_r , the price of stability equals $(4 + \text{arr}_r)/9$. Increasing arr_r allows us to achieve an arbitrarily large price of stability. \square




Figure 6: A network illustrating unboundedness of the price of stability.

C. Heuristic

Reducing the instance complexity

We preroute some demand to paths for which we can show that our heuristic will not remove flow from. For that we define so-called fixed initial solutions, which represent the prerouted part of the flow.

Definition 25. Let $f = f^{\text{in}} + f^{\text{out}}$ be a feasible flow such that f^{in} vanishes on the outside options and f^{out} vanishes on the “inside” options. Let $f^{(k)}$ denote the flow after iteration k of the procedure given the initial flow $f^{(0)} = f$. We call f^{in} a *fixed initial solution*, if $f^{\text{in}} \leq f^{(k)}$ holds component-wise for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (for any implementation of the heuristic).

Definition 26. Let f^{in} be a fixed initial solution. A path $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ is called *uninterruptible* for f^{in} if it never boards a vehicle with a preceding driving edge \tilde{e} (of the same vehicle as e) which is not yet at capacity, i.e., $f_{\tilde{e}} < \nu_{\tilde{e}}$.

In other words, p is uninterruptible for f^{in} , if whenever p boards a vehicle at some departure node v and there is a preceding dwelling edge (with tail v) and a driving edge \tilde{e} preceding this dwelling edge, then we must have $f_{\tilde{e}} = \nu_{\tilde{e}}$.

Proposition 27. Let f^{in} be a fixed initial solution with corresponding feasible flow $f = f^{\text{in}} + f^{\text{out}}$, and let $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ be an uninterruptible path of a commodity i with $\sum_{q \in \mathcal{P}_i} f_q^{\text{in}} < Q_i$. If p minimizes τ_p on $\{q \in \mathcal{P}_i \mid \forall e \in E_B \cap q : f_{e^+} < \nu_{e^+}\}$ and $\tau_p < \tau_{\text{out}_i}$, then $f^{\text{in}} + \alpha \cdot 1_{i,p}$ is a fixed initial solution for $\alpha = \min\{\nu_{e^+} - f_{e^+} \mid e \in E_B \cap p\} \cup \{Q_i - \sum_{q \in \mathcal{P}_i} f_q^{\text{in}}\}$.

Proof. Let $f^{\text{out},*}$ be the flow that sends the remaining particles of $f^{\text{in}} + \alpha 1_{i,p}$ onto the outside options, i.e., $f_{i,\text{out}_i}^{\text{out},*} := Q_i - \sum_{q \in \mathcal{P}_i} (f^{\text{in}} + \alpha 1_{i,p})_q$. Then, $f^* := (f^{\text{in}} + \alpha 1_{i,p}) + f^{\text{out},*}$ is clearly a feasible flow.

The vector $1_{i,p} - 1_{i,\text{out}_i}$ is a possible choice for the direction in the first iteration of the procedure given the initial flow f because $f_{i,\text{out}_i} > 0$ and $p \in U_{\text{out}_i}(f)$ hold. This direction is also feasible due to Proposition 22. This means, $f + \alpha(1_{i,p} - 1_{i,\text{out}_i})$ might be the flow after the first iteration, and thus, $f^{\text{in}} \leq f^{(k)}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ where $f^{(k)}$ denotes the flow after k iterations given the initial flow $f + \alpha(1_{i,p} - 1_{i,\text{out}_i})$. Assume that there is some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f_{i,p}^{\text{in}} + \alpha > f_{i,p}^{(k)}$, and let k be minimal with this property. Then, in iteration k , some positive amount of flow was removed from entry (i, p) . This can have two reasons:

The first reason could be that there is some shorter path $q \in \mathcal{P}_i$ with $p \in U_q(f^{(k-1)})$, i.e., for any boarding edge e on q for which e^+ is not on p we have $f_{e^+}^{(k-1)} < \nu_{e^+}$. This, however, implies that for all $e \in E_B \cap q$ we have $f_{e^+}^{\text{in}} < \nu_{e^+}$ and thus $\tau_q < \tau_p$ contradicts the minimality of p .

The second reason could be that p is removed when establishing feasibility of the direction in Algorithm 4. This can only happen if there is a boarding edge of p for which $f_{e^+}^{(k-1)} = \nu_{e^+}$ and $d_{e^+} > 0$ hold. This, however, can only happen, if the initially chosen direction $1_{i,q'} - 1_{i,p'}$ fulfils $e^+ \in q' \setminus p'$. As the boarding edge e is already at capacity




Figure 7: A network illustrating the occurrence of small step sizes in the heuristic

after iteration $(k-1)$, q' must have used the previous driving edge of the same vehicle as e . However, as p is uninterruptible for f^{in} (and $f^{\text{in}} \leq f^{(k-1)}$), this edge is also already fully occupied, and thus p' must be a path for which $f_{i,p'}^{\text{in}} > 0$. This would imply, that $\alpha' \cdot (1_{i,q'} - 1_{i,p'})$ is a possible choice for the first iteration given initial flow f (for some $\alpha > 0$) and therefore contradicts that f^{in} is a fixed initial solution. \square

In our implementation of the heuristic, after initializing the flow by sending all particles along their outside option, we swap the particles from their outside option to so-called uninterruptible paths until no more uninterruptible paths exist.

A terminating cycle

Consider the network with four commodities in Figure 7: Commodity $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ has source s_i and sink t_i , and it has exactly one “good” path and an outside-option not displayed in the figure. There are three vehicles: the violet, the pink, and the green vehicle. Each commodity has a demand of 1. The violet and the green vehicles have a capacity of 1 while the pink vehicle has a capacity of $1 - \varepsilon$ for some small $\varepsilon > 0$.

We force the selection of the first two feasible directions in the heuristic. In the initial flow, all particles are sent along their outside option. In the first iteration, we choose to move particles of commodity 3 from their outside option to their shorter path. We can change our initial flow by $\alpha^{(1)} = 1 - \varepsilon$ along this direction. Secondly, we choose to move particles of commodity 2 from their outside option to their shorter path, and change the flow along this direction by $\alpha^{(2)} = 1$.

In iteration 3, the only commodity that can move to their shorter path is commodity 1. The corresponding direction is, however, not feasible as commodity 2 would use an overfilled boarding edge. Thus, applying Algorithm 4 removes particles from the shorter path of commodity 2 at a rate of 1. Because the violet edge has a remaining capacity of ε , the flow can only be changed along this resulting direction by $\alpha^{(3)} = \varepsilon$.

In iteration 4, the only commodity that can move to their shorter path now is commodity 4: By removing ε flow from commodity 2 in the previous iteration, the green $v-t_{2,4}$ -edge has a remaining capacity of ε . Again, the direction of moving particles of commodity 4 to their shorter direction is not feasible, and hence by Algorithm 4, particles of commodity 3 are removed as well. The flow is changed along this direction by

again $\alpha^{(4)} = \varepsilon$.

Note that after that, we are faced with the same scenario as before iteration 3; the only difference is that the ε of flow was shifted away from the good paths of commodities 2 and 3, and to the good paths of commodities 1 and 4. Thus, the same directions of iterations 3 and 4 are applied repeatedly until all flow has been removed from the good path of commodity 2 or 3. Hence, the heuristic needs at least $\lceil (1 - \varepsilon)/\varepsilon \rceil$ iterations before termination.

A non-terminating cycle

The heuristic might also run into cycles from which it does not recover. A simple network demonstrating this behaviour is shown in Figure 8. All three vehicles have a capacity of 1, and all three commodities have a demand of 1. The (non outside-option) paths are displayed to the right. Note that the flow that sends one unit along p_2 and all other particles along their outside option is a user equilibrium.




Figure 8: An example for infinite cyclic behaviour of the heuristic

If, however, the heuristic first chooses to fill p_1 , it ends up in a cycle: After changing along this direction, only path p_4 is not blocked. Thus, the heuristic chooses to fill path p_4 and inevitably remove the flow from p_1 again. Once p_4 is filled, the only non-blocked path is p_3 , and thus p_3 is filled and p_4 is emptied again. Finally, p_1 is again the only non-blocked path and after filling p_1 (and thus removing the flow from p_3), we end up in the same situation as after the first extension.

D. Departure Time Choice and Transfer Penalties

In this section, we show that equilibria fail to exist in some natural extensions of the model. Note that non-existence of user equilibria for departure time choice has already been discovered by Nguyen et al. [27].

Departure Time Choice

When traffic users choose their departure time, their objective is often to minimize their travel time, and usually they desire to arrive not too late and not too early with respect to some target arrival time. We model this by grouping users of the same preferences into

classes of travellers which we consider as commodities in the following: Each commodity i has a source station s_i , a target station t_i , and we define \mathcal{P}_i as the set of paths starting from (any on-platform node of) station s_i and ending in (any wait node of) t_i excluding paths that start or end with waiting edges on s_i or t_i , respectively. Furthermore, each commodity has penalty factors $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i \geq 0$ and a target arrival time T_i such that the uncongested cost of a path $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ equals

$$\tilde{\tau}_{i,p} := \alpha_i \cdot \tau_p + \beta_i \cdot \max\{0, \text{arr}_p - T_p\} + \gamma_i \cdot \max\{0, T_p - \text{arr}_p\}.$$

Here, arr_p denotes the arrival time of the path p , and α_i , β_i , and γ_i denote the penalty factors of the travel time, of late arrival, and of early arrival, respectively. We now consider the cost structure

$$\tilde{c}_{i,p}(f) := \begin{cases} \tilde{\tau}_{i,p}, & \text{if } f_{e^+} \leq \nu_{e^+} \text{ for all } e \in E_B \cap p, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$




Figure 9: An example for non-existence when considering departure time choice or transfer penalties.

If we allow $\alpha_i > 0$, we cannot guarantee existence. Here, this can be verified using the network shown in Figure 9: All vehicles have capacity 1, there are two commodities both with a demand of 1, and we have $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 1$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0$. Assume there is a user equilibrium f . Then, particles of commodity 1 can decide between starting early and taking the pink-violet path and starting late and taking the single violet edge (the pink-violet-green path is always worse than the pink-violet path). This means, that the s_1 - $t_{1,2}$ -edge is completely filled with particles of commodity 1. Therefore, all flow of commodity 2 must use the green path. For commodity 2, the travel time of the green path is higher than the violet path, and therefore boarding the violet path must be blocked by commodity 1 implying that all particles of commodity 1 use the pink-violet path. However, in this flow, particles of commodity 1 would switch to the later violet path as its travel time is shorter, and it is not blocked, contradicting the equilibrium condition.

Transfer Penalties

In reality users might perceive transfers as inconveniences. This can be modelled by introducing a penalty term for the number of transfers, i.e., for a path $p \in \mathcal{P}_i$ the uncongested cost becomes

$$\tilde{\tau}_{i,p} := \tau_p + \alpha_i \cdot n_p,$$

where n_p is the number of transfers on the path p and α_i is a penalty factor.

If we permit $\alpha > 0$, then Figure 9 illustrates again a counter-example for existence of equilibria (with respect to the according cost structure): Assume, α_i is a small, but positive value. Then, as in the discussion for departure time choice above, in an equilibrium flow only the pink-violet path and the green path are used. Again, particles of commodity 1 would switch to the violet path that departs later given the absence of transfers, thus contradicting the equilibrium property.