

Modelling Widely Scattered States in ‘Synchronized’ Traffic Flow and Possible Relevance for Stock Market Dynamics

Dirk Helbing,^a Davide Batic,^a Martin Schönhof,^a
and Martin Treiber^a

^a*Institute for Economics and Traffic, Dresden University of Technology, D-01062
Dresden, Germany*

Abstract

Traffic flow at low densities (free traffic) is characterized by a quasi-one-dimensional relation between traffic flow and vehicle density, while no such fundamental diagram exists for ‘synchronized’ congested traffic flow. Instead, a two-dimensional area of widely scattered flow-density data is observed as a consequence of a complex traffic dynamics. For an explanation of this phenomenon and transitions between the different traffic phases, we propose a new class of molecular-dynamics-like, microscopic traffic models based on times to collisions and discuss the properties by means of analytical arguments. Similar models may help to understand the laminar and turbulent phases in the dynamics of stock markets as well as the transitions among them.

Key words: Traffic dynamics, synchronized congested flow, fluctuations, volatility, stock market

1 Introduction

The dynamics of vehicle traffic has challenged researchers for more than five decades now. Some major breakthroughs have been made only recently thanks to physicists who applied methods from statistical physics and non-linear dynamics. In the meantime, empirical observations indicate that there are different phases of traffic. According to Kerner [1–8], these are (see Fig. 1):

1. free traffic (FT) characterized by a unique flow-density relation $Q_e(\rho)$ up to some maximum flow Q_{\max} ,

2. wide moving clusters (traffic jams) characterized by a jam line $J(\rho)$ and ‘natural constants’ such as the propagation velocity $C < 0$ and the outflow $Q_{\text{out}} < Q_{\text{max}}$ of wide clusters, and
3. ‘synchronized’ congested flow, characterized by a synchronization of average vehicle speeds among neighboring lanes and a wide scattering of flow-density data.

Synchronized flow has three subtypes: (i) stationary and homogeneous states, (ii) oscillatory states, and (iii) homogeneous-in-speed states, where the velocity is constant, i.e. the flow is proportional to the density. While the transitions among these subtypes are continuous, the transitions between free traffic, wide moving jams, and synchronized flow are hysteretic in nature [4–8].




Fig. 1. Schematic illustration of measurements of flow-density data (one-minute averages) after Kerner.

Most simulation models show different traffic states as well [9–14]. Usually, one finds free and stable traffic at low densities. At higher densities, traffic is unstable in most models, which can give rise to emergent traffic jams due to the slow relaxation to some density-dependent equilibrium velocity $V_e(\rho)$. The delayed adaptation leads to overbraking and chain reactions of the following drivers, finally resulting in a standstill of cars. In addition to traffic jams, these models can reproduce congested traffic states of homogeneous and oscillatory type behind bottlenecks reminding of ‘synchronized’ congested traffic of types (i) and (ii) [15,16]. The resulting state depends on the flow on the freeway and on the bottleneck strength, but it is also history-dependent, as traffic flow can be multi-stable. Despite of this success, some people believe that the observation of the wide scattering of congested flow-density data has not yet been fully understood. Many researchers in the field of traffic physics have, therefore, published their own theories of ‘synchronized’ flow, but none of them is generally accepted, and the on-going debate on this hot topic is still very

controversial. The proposed explanations include mixtures of different vehicle types (cars and trucks) [17], a heterogeneity in the time headways [18], changes in the behavior of “frustrated” drivers [19], anticipation effects [20–22], non-unique equilibrium solutions [23,24], and multiple metastable oscillating states [25]. Only the hypotheses of mixed vehicle types and heterogeneous time headways have been empirically supported. Here, we will suggest another approach to the subject, which is empirically motivated. Although we presently do not share some of Kerner’s interpretations of empirical observations and his criticism of the existing traffic models, this paper aims at developing a new class of models consistent with his interpretation of observed traffic data.

2 The Times-to-Collision Model

In the following, we will restrict to identical driver-vehicle units, but distinguish between two different driver behaviors corresponding to different traffic states:

1. In free traffic, a vehicle i located at place $x_i(t)$ at time t will try to adapt its actual velocity $v_i = dx_i/dt$ to the so-called optimal velocity $v_e(\Delta x_i) = V_e(1/\Delta x_i)$ within a certain relaxation time:

$$\frac{dv_i}{dt} = \frac{v_e(\Delta x_i) - v_i}{\tau} \quad (1)$$

$v_e(\Delta x)$ is a function of the headway (gross/brutto distance) $\Delta x_i = (x_{i-1} - x_i)$ to the vehicle in front and can be empirically determined. Alternatively, we may use the simple relation

$$v_e(\Delta x) = \max[v_0, (\Delta x - l)/T], \quad (2)$$

where v_0 is the desired (maximum) velocity in free traffic, l is the minimum vehicle distance (effective vehicle length) and T the safe time clearance (net/netto time gap). This corresponds to the idea that a vehicle tries to keep a velocity-dependent safe distance $(l + Tv)$ and to drive at maximum speed v_0 when there is enough free space in front.

2. In ‘synchronized’ congested traffic, vehicles cannot move freely anymore. Their main concern is to avoid accidents. That is, the time to collision (TTC) given by $T_i = (\Delta x_i - l)/\Delta v_i$, where $\Delta v_i = (v_i - v_{i-1})$ is the relative velocity, should not drop below a certain desired value T_0 , in accordance with observed driver behavior. In other words: Vehicles tolerate a small (netto) clearance $(\Delta x_i - l)$ to the vehicle in front, if the relative velocity Δv_i is small. Moreover, the headway to the leading vehicle is history-dependent. It may suddenly shrink due to a lane-changing vehicle, but usually this does not cause panic braking in order to restore the safe distance $(l + Tv)$.

Let us first discuss the implications of the empirically justified observation that drivers try to maintain a constant inverse time to collision $1/T_i = \Delta v_i / (\Delta x_i - l)$ during their following behavior. This implies the equation $d(1/T_i)/dt = 0$, which finally results in

$$\frac{dv_i}{dt} = \frac{dv_{i-1}}{dt} - c \frac{\Delta v_i^2}{\Delta x_i - l} \quad (3)$$

with $c = \Theta(\Delta v_i)$. The Heaviside step function $\Theta(\Delta v_i)$ is 1 when $\Delta v_i > 0$ and otherwise 0, thereby reflecting that a vehicle would not brake, when the relative velocity Δv_i is zero or negative (given this is not recommended by a deceleration $dv_{i-1}/dt < 0$ by the leader).

We will find that, similar to some other traffic models [10,26–30], the Δv_i -dependent term guarantees safe driving. Introducing the new variable $z_i = (\Delta x_i - l)$ and considering $\Delta v_i = -d\Delta x_i/dt = -dz_i/dt$, we obtain the equation

$$\frac{d^2 z_i}{dt^2} = -\frac{d\Delta v_i}{dt} = \frac{c}{z_i} \left(\frac{dz_i}{dt} \right)^2 = -c \frac{\Delta v_i}{z_i} \frac{dz_i}{dt} \quad (4)$$

or

$$\frac{d \ln(\Delta v_i / v_*)}{dt} = \frac{d\Delta v_i/dt}{\Delta v_i} = c \frac{dz_i/dt}{z_i} = c \frac{d \ln(z_i / z_*)}{dt}, \quad (5)$$

which is analytically solved by

$$\frac{\Delta v_i(t)}{\Delta v_i(0)} = \left[\frac{z_i(t)}{z_i(0)} \right]^c. \quad (6)$$

We can immediately see that for any $c > 0$, the relative velocity Δv_i will become zero when $z_i = 0$, i.e. accidents can be avoided for sure. For $c = 1$, we find

$$\frac{d\Delta v_i}{dt} = -\frac{\Delta v_i(0)}{\Delta x_i(0) - l} \Delta v_i, \quad (7)$$

while the case of kinematic braking with constant deceleration

$$\frac{d\Delta v_i}{dt} = -b = -\frac{[\Delta v_i(0)]^2}{2[\Delta x_i(0) - l]} < 0 \quad (8)$$

corresponds to $c = 1/2$, as usual. Moreover, *the equilibrium solution of equation (3) is $\Delta v_i = 0$, but the distances Δx_i between the vehicles in that*

state are history-dependent and can be very different. That is, maintaining a certain time to collision results in driving at some constant velocity as in homogeneous-in-speed states, but the local density $\rho = 1/\Delta x_i$ may vary considerably.

For $c = 1$, equation (4) is solved by

$$z_i(t) = z_i(0) \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta v_i(0)}{z_i(0)}t\right), \quad (9)$$

which confirms the history-dependent relaxation behavior. If $\Delta v_i > 0$, the headway exponentially approaches the minimal distance $\Delta x_i = l$. Therefore, we expect platoon formation of fast cars behind slow ones with $\Delta v_i < 0$. In contrast, the headways in front of slow vehicles will usually become so high that they will eventually switch to free driving (see Sec. 4). Therefore, our model assumes driver reactions to the acceleration dv_{i-1}/dt of the leading vehicle only during following behavior, when the headways are small. As it is hard for drivers to measure accelerations, it would be reasonable to replace the acceleration of the leading vehicle by some step function of dv_{i-1}/dt .

3 Variants of the Model

We will now introduce an extension of our model of following behavior in ‘synchronized’ congested traffic. Let us assume that vehicles slowly tend to adapt their time to collision $T_i = (\Delta x_i - l)/\Delta v_i$ to some preferred value T_0 . We may describe this by the equation

$$\frac{dv_i}{dt} = \frac{dv_{i-1}}{dt} - c \frac{\Delta v_i^2}{\Delta x_i - l} + \omega^2(\Delta x_i - l - T_0 \Delta v_i) \quad (10)$$

with a small ‘oscillation frequency’ ω . This equation is equivalent to

$$\frac{d^2 z_i}{dt^2} + \omega^2 T_0 \frac{dz_i}{dt} + \omega^2 z_i = \frac{c}{z_i} \left(\frac{dz_i}{dt}\right)^2, \quad (11)$$

which can be analytically solved. We can distinguish the following cases:

1. For $c \neq 1$, we can apply the transformation $z_i = y_i^{1/(1-c)}$, which results in the equation of a damped oscillator:

$$\frac{d^2 y_i}{dt^2} + \omega^2 T_0 \frac{dy_i}{dt} + (1-c)\omega^2 y_i = 0. \quad (12)$$

The general solution is, therefore, of the form

$$z_i(t) = \left(A_1 e^{a_1 t} - A_2 e^{-a_2 t} \right)^{1/(1-c)}, \quad (13)$$

where $A_1 \geq A_2$ are given by the initial conditions and $a_1 = (\alpha - \omega^2 T_0/2)$, $a_2 = (\omega^2 T_0/2 + \alpha)$ with $\alpha^2 = [(\omega^2 T_0/2)^2 - \gamma \omega^2]$. When α^2 is negative, the solution describes a damped oscillation, otherwise the relaxation to $z_i = 0$ is overdamped. In the case $\alpha = 0$, the solution is

$$z_i(t) = B_1 \exp\left(-\frac{\omega^2 T_0}{2\gamma} t\right) (t - B_2)^{1/(1-c)} \quad (14)$$

with parameters B_1 and B_2 given by the initial conditions.

2. For $c = 1$, the solution reads instead

$$z_i(t) = C_1 \exp\left[-\frac{1}{\omega^2 T_0} \left(\omega^2 t + C_2 e^{-\omega^2 T_0 t}\right)\right]. \quad (15)$$

The parameters C_1 and $C_2 > 0$ are again given by the initial conditions.

In conclusion, we find damped or overdamped non-linear oscillations. The system oscillates around and/or converges to $\Delta v_i = 0$ and $z_i = 0$, i.e. $\Delta x_i = l$. Not only would this imply the possibility of accidents, it also means that the resulting state is characterized by one or several dense vehicle platoon(s). Instead of this, we would prefer oscillations around the safe distance $(l + T v_i)$ and $\Delta v_i = 0$. Therefore, we modify equation (10) a little:

$$\frac{dv_i}{dt} = \frac{dv_{i-1}}{dt} - c \frac{\Delta v_i^2}{\Delta x_i - l} + \omega^2 (\Delta x_i - l - T v_i - T_0 \Delta v_i). \quad (16)$$

Between Eqs. (10) and (16) lies a major difference. While *there is no stationary solution of equation (10)* (Δv_i always tends to be non-zero corresponding to a pushy driver behavior), Eq. (16) has the stationary solution $v_i = (\Delta x_i - l)/T$. A linear stability analysis indicates that, in the presence of small perturbations, we can expect damped or overdamped oscillations. Instead, we would prefer an unstable solution leading to permanent oscillations in the system due to vehicle interactions (see Fig. 2). In that case we could expect to find a wide scattering of flow-density data in the congested regime based on a complex dynamics.

We can reach this by generalizing equation (11) according to

$$\frac{d^2 z_i}{dt^2} + \mu(z_i) \frac{dz_i}{dt} + \omega^2 (z_i - T v_i) = \frac{c}{z_i} \left(\frac{dz_i}{dt} \right)^2 \quad (17)$$




Fig. 2. Measured oscillations of the clearance $z = (\Delta x - l)$ and of the relative velocity Δv around $\Delta v = 0$ (cf. Hoefs, 1972) indicate an instability in car-following behavior (after Helbing and Tilch, 1998).

with the a friction function assuming negative values in the neighborhood of $(\Delta x_i - l) = v_i T$, e.g.

$$\mu(z_i) = \omega^2 T_0 + \omega \left[\beta \left(\frac{T v_i}{z_i} + \frac{z_i}{T v_i} \right) - \gamma \right]. \quad (18)$$

The term in the square brackets is new and causes a negative friction effect, i.e. a driving effect, if $\mu < 0$. Such negative friction effects are rather common in models of traffic and self-driven many-particle systems [14]. By construction, the driving effect can appear in the neighborhood of $z_i = v_i T$ only if $(\omega T_0 + 2\beta - \gamma) < 0$. The larger $(\gamma - 2\beta - \omega T_0)$ is, the larger will the emerging oscillations be. Because of the scaling of z_i by $v_i T$, they will also grow with increasing v_i , i.e. with local decreasing density $\rho \approx 1/(l + T v_i)$. A similar result can be found for related approaches for the friction function or for ω^2 itself.

Under the above assumptions, the oscillations are limited in size, as the friction coefficient becomes positive, when the deviation from $z_i = v_i T$ becomes significant. Moreover, the oscillations are non-linear and influenced by the relative velocity $\Delta v_i = -dz_i/dt$ as well. The corresponding equation describing the following behavior of driver i reads

$$\frac{dv_i}{dt} = \frac{dv_{i-1}}{dt} - c \frac{\Delta v_i^2 + \eta^2}{\Delta x_i - l} - \mu(\Delta x_i - l) \Delta v_i + \omega^2 (\Delta x_i - l - T v_i) \quad (19)$$

with $\eta = 0$. Setting $\eta \neq 0$ allows to take into account errors in the estimation of Δv_i or unexpected variations of the relative velocity due to lane changes. Moreover, it would certainly be realistic to add some random noise $\xi_i(t)$ to the acceleration equations, which will be treated in a forthcoming paper. Another reasonable model variant would result by using the acceleration $a = \omega^2 (\Delta x_i - l)$ as a model parameter rather than ω . However, the above model shows

interesting behavior also in the special cases given by $c = 1$, $\omega = 0$, $\omega = 1/(\tau T)$, $\beta = \gamma = 0$, or $\eta = 0$. The other parameters are known from empirical investigations.

4 Transitions Between the Different Traffic States

It is well-known that the model (1) for the driver behavior in free traffic produces linearly unstable traffic flow and jam formation when the condition

$$\frac{dv_e(\Delta x)}{d\Delta x} > \frac{1}{2\tau} \quad (20)$$

is fulfilled. We denote the lowest density $\rho = 1/\Delta x$, for which this condition is fulfilled, by ρ_{cr} (critical density). At this density, the flow $Q_e(\rho) = \rho v_e(1/\rho)$ reaches its maximum Q_{max} .

With some didactically justified simplifications, one can say the following: Once jams are formed, they are characterized by a jam line

$$J(\rho) = \frac{1 - \rho l}{T} \quad (21)$$

related to $v = v_e(\Delta x) = (\Delta x - l)/T$, where $C = -l/T$ corresponds to the backward propagation velocity of the traffic jam. The lowest density at which the jam line $J(\rho)$ cuts the function $Q_e(\rho)$ defines the characteristic outflow Q_{out} from a traffic jam and the density ρ_{out} of free flow downstream of it (see Fig. 1). Between the densities ρ_{out} and ρ_{cr} , traffic is metastable, i.e. a perturbation will grow, if its amplitude exceeds a certain critical amplitude $A(\rho)$, otherwise it will fade away. The critical amplitude $A(\rho)$ decreases with growing density and becomes zero at $\rho = \rho_{\text{cr}}$. At this density, the probability of a breakdown of traffic is 100%.

Transitions from free to ‘synchronized’ congested flow occur more frequently than transitions from free traffic to wide moving clusters. We will assume that a driver-vehicle unit switches between free driving and following behavior with probability 1, when the local flow $Q = v_i/\Delta x_i$ reaches the line

$$K(\rho) = Q_{\text{max}} \left(1 - \frac{\rho - \rho_{\text{cr}}}{1/l - \rho_{\text{cr}}} \right), \quad (22)$$

i.e. when the time clearance $(\Delta x_i - l)/v_i$ becomes smaller than

$$T' = \frac{1 - \rho_{\text{cr}} l}{Q_{\text{max}}}. \quad (23)$$

The transition probability shall be zero below the jam line $J(\rho)$, i.e. when the time clearance is larger than T . Between the lines $J(\rho)$ and $K(\rho)$, we may assume that the transition probability P is approximately given by

$$P(\rho, Q) = \left(\frac{Q - J(\rho)}{K(\rho) - J(\rho)} \right)^\epsilon \quad (24)$$

with some parameter $\epsilon > 1$. This transition is of hystertic nature.

Finally, we mention that we have checked out deterministic transition rules as well, e.g. a switching from free to following behavior for $\Delta x_i < (l + T'v_i + T'_0\Delta v_i)$ and back to free driving for $\Delta x_i > (l + Tv_i + T_0\Delta v_i)$, where the parameter T'_0 may agree with T_0 . The results will be discussed in another paper.

5 Summary and Outlook

We have proposed novel microscopic traffic models assuming that the following behavior in ‘synchronized’ congested flow is different in nature than free driving. The main assumption is that drivers try to maintain a certain time to collision to guarantee accident-free driving. The basic model variant had no unique solution, i.e. no fundamental diagram, and the finally evolving traffic flow was history-dependent. An extended model variant had a stationary solution, but an unstable one, if the parameters were appropriately specified. In that case, the vehicle velocities were non-linearly oscillating with medium-sized amplitudes around the stationary solution. The conditions for transitions between free driving and following behavior were specified in a way inspired by the hypotheses on congested traffic by Kerner [4–8]. In particular, we should have hysteretic transitions between free traffic, wide moving clusters, and ‘synchronized’ flow. Transitions to traffic jams should be rare and require a triggering by sufficiently large perturbations.

Based on our present results, all of this appears to be reproducible with the proposed models. Corresponding simulation results will be presented in a forth-coming paper. Free traffic is characterized by a one-dimensional flow-density relation of positive slope, wide moving clusters by a linear jam line of negative slope, and ‘synchronized’ congested flow by a two-dimensional variation of flow-density data.

We believe that the transition between laminar regimes (free traffic) and strongly varying regimes ('synchronized' flow) may have some analogies with the dynamics of stock markets, where one observes time periods of low and of high volatility [31,32]. The models suggested above may, therefore, also help to gain a better understanding of stock markets.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Boris Kerner and Andrzej Krawiecki for inspiring discussions, and Torsten Werner for preparing illustration 1. They are also grateful for financial support by the DFG (He 2789/2-1) and floating car data by the Bosch GmbH.

References

- [1] B. S. Kerner and H. Rehborn, Experimental features and characteristics of traffic jams, *Phys. Rev. E* **53**, R1297–R1300 (1996).
- [2] B. S. Kerner and H. Rehborn, Experimental properties of complexity in traffic flow, *Phys. Rev. E* **53**, R4275–R4278 (1996).
- [3] B. S. Kerner and H. Rehborn, Experimental properties of phase transitions in traffic flow, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 4030–4033 (1997).
- [4] B. S. Kerner, Experimental characteristics of traffic flow for evaluation of traffic modelling, in *Transportation Systems 1997*, edited by M. Papageorgiou and A. Pouliezios, (Elsevier, London), pp. 765–770 (1997).
- [5] B. S. Kerner, A theory of congested traffic flow, in Rysgaard (1998), Vol. 2, pp. 621–642 (1998).
- [6] B. S. Kerner, Congested traffic flow. Observations and theory, *Transpn. Res. Rec.* **1678**, 160–167 (1999).
- [7] B. S. Kerner, Theory of congested traffic flow: Self organization without bottlenecks, in Ceder (1999), pp. 147–171 (1999).
- [8] B. S. Kerner, Theory of breakdown phenomenon at highway bottlenecks, *Transpn. Res. Rec.* **1710**, 136–144 (2000).
- [9] D. E. Wolf, M. Schreckenberg, and A. Bachem (Eds.), *Traffic and Granular Flow* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1996).
- [10] D. Helbing, *Verkehrsdynamik* (Springer, Berlin, 1997).
- [11] M. Schreckenberg and D. E. Wolf (Eds.), *Traffic and Granular Flow '97* (Springer, Singapore, 1998).

- [12] D. Helbing, H. J. Herrmann, M. Schreckenberg, and D. E. Wolf (Eds.), *Traffic and Granular Flow '99: Social, Traffic, and Granular Dynamics* (Springer, Berlin, 2000).
- [13] D. Chowdhury, L. Santen, and A. Schadschneider, Statistical physics of vehicular traffic and some related systems, *Phys. Rep.* **329**, 199–329 (2000).
- [14] D. Helbing, Traffic and related self-driven many-particle systems, e-print arXiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0012229, to appear in *Reviews of Modern Physics* (Oct./Nov. 2001).
- [15] D. Helbing, A. Hennecke, and M. Treiber, Phase diagram of traffic states in the presence of inhomogeneities, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 4360–4363 (1999).
- [16] M. Treiber, A. Hennecke, and D. Helbing, Congested traffic states in empirical observations and microscopic simulations, *Phys. Rev. E* **62**, 1805–1824 (2000).
- [17] M. Treiber and D. Helbing, Macroscopic simulation of widely scattered synchronized traffic states, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **32**, L17–L23 (1999).
- [18] J. H. Banks, An investigation of some characteristics of congested flow, *Transpn. Res. Rec.* **1678**, 128–134 (1999).
- [19] S. Krauß, *Microscopic Modeling of Traffic Flow: Investigation of Collision Free Vehicle Dynamics* (DLR—Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt e.V., Cologne, 1998), Report No. 98-08.
- [20] C. Wagner, Asymptotic solutions for a multi-anticipative car-following model, *Physica A* **260**, 218–224 (1998).
- [21] W. Knospe, L. Santen, A. Schadschneider, and M. Schreckenberg, CA models for traffic flow: Comparison with empirical single-vehicle data, in [12], pp. 431–436 (2000).
- [22] W. Knospe, L. Santen, A. Schadschneider, and M. Schreckenberg, Towards a realistic microscopic description of highway traffic, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **33**, L477–L485 (2000).
- [23] P. Nelson and A. Sopasakis, The Prigogine-Herman kinetic model predicts widely scattered traffic flow data at high concentrations, *Transpn. Res. B* **32**, 589–604 (1998).
- [24] P. Nelson, Synchronized traffic flow from a modified Lighthill-Whitman model, *Phys. Rev. E* **61**, R6052–R6055 (2000).
- [25] E. Tomer, L. Safonov, and S. Havlin, Presence of many stable nonhomogeneous states in an inertial car-following model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 382–385 (2000).
- [26] A. D. May, Jr., and H. E. M. Keller, Non-integer car-following models, *Highway Res. Rec.* **199**, 19–32 (1967).
- [27] P. G. Gipps, A behavioural car following model for computer simulation, *Transpn. Res. B* **15**, 105–111 (1981).

- [28] S. Krauß, P. Wagner, and C. Gawron, Metastable states in a microscopic model of traffic flow, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 5597–5602 (1997)
- [29] D. Helbing and B. Tilch, Generalized force model of traffic dynamics, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 133–138 (1998).
- [30] G. Sauer mann and H. J. Herrmann, A 1d traffic model with threshold parameters, in [11], pp. 481–486 (1998).
- [31] S. Ghashghaie, W. Breymann, J. Peinke, P. Talkner, and Y. Dodge, Turbulent cascades in foreign exchange markets, *Nature* **381**, 767–770 (1996).
- [32] T. Lux and M. Marchesi, Scaling and criticality in a stochastic multi-agent model of a financial market, *Nature* **397**, 498–500 (1999).