

# Effects of Prediction Feedback on Multi-Route Intelligent Traffic Systems\*

Dong Chuan-Fei<sup>a,b,†</sup>, Ma Xu<sup>a,c</sup>, Wang Bing-Hong<sup>a,d,‡</sup>,  
and Sun Xiao-Yan<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Modern Physics and Nonlinear Science Center, University of Science and Technology of China (USTC), Hefei, Anhui 230026, P.R.China

<sup>b</sup>School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332, U.S.A.

<sup>c</sup>Department of Physics, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244, U.S.A.

<sup>d</sup>The Research Center for Complex System Science, University of Shanghai for Science and Technology, Shanghai 200093, P.R.China

## Abstract

We first study dynamics of traffic flow with real-time information provided and the influence of an efficient feedback strategy named prediction feedback strategy(PFS) on a multi-route scenario in which dynamic information can be generated and displayed on the board to guide road users to make a choice. In multi-route scenario, our model incorporates the effects of adaptability into the cellular automaton models of traffic flow and simulation results adopting prediction feedback strategy have demonstrated high efficiency in controlling spatial distribution of traffic patterns compared with the other three information feedback strategies, i.e., vehicle number and flux. At the end of this paper, we also discuss when PFS will become invalid applying on multi-route systems.

**PACS: 12.38.Bx, 12.15.Lk, 14.70.Hp, 14.65.Ha**

*Keywords:* Prediction Feedback, Multi-Route, Intelligent Traffic Systems, Cellular Automaton Model

---

\*Supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China.

<sup>†</sup>dcfy@gatech.edu, dcfy@mail.ustc.edu.cn

<sup>‡</sup>bhwang@ustc.edu.cn, bhwangustc@hotmail.com

# I. Introduction

Vehicular traffic flow and related problems have triggered great interests of a community of physicists in recent years because of its various complex behaviors. [1–3] and also a lot of theories have been proposed such as car-following theory [4], kinetic theory [5–11] and particle-hopping theory [12, 13]. These theories have the advantage of alleviating the traffic congestion and enhance the capacity of existing infrastructure. And also dynamics of traffic flow with real-time traffic information have been extensively investigated [14–19]. Recently, some real-time feedback strategies have been put forward, such as Travel Time Feedback Strategy (TTFS) [14, 20], Mean Velocity Feedback Strategy (MVFS) [14, 21], Congestion Coefficient Feedback Strategy (CCFS) [14, 22] and Prediction Feedback Strategy (PFS) [14, 23]. It has been proved that MVFS is more efficient than that of TTFS which brings a lag effect to make it impossible to provide the road users with the real situation of each route [21] and CCFS is more efficient than that of MVFS because of the fact that the random brake mechanism of the Nagel-Schreckenberg (NS) model [12] brings fragile stability of velocity [22]. However, CCFS is still not the best one due to the fact that its feedback is not in time, so it cannot reflect the road situation immediately. Compared with CCFS, PFS can provide road users with better guidance because it can predict the future condition of the road. However, we never see these advanced feedback strategies applying on multi-route system except two-route system in the former work. In this paper, we first investigate the effects of all four strategies above applying on three-route model and report the simulation results adopting four different feedback strategies on a three-route scenario with single route following the NS mechanism. And we will discuss the situation of the multi-route system at the end of this paper.

The paper is arranged as following: In Sec. II the NS model and three-route scenario are briefly introduce, together with four feedback strategies of TTFS, MVFS, CCFS and

PFS all depicted in more detail. In Sec. III some simulation results will be presented and discussed based on the comparison of four different feedback strategies. The last section will make some conclusions.

## II. THE MODEL AND FEEDBACK STRATEGIES

### A. NS mechanism

The Nagel-Schreckenberg (NS) model is so far the most popular and simplest cellular automaton model in analyzing the traffic flow [1–3, 12, 24], where the one-dimension CA with periodic boundary conditions is used to investigate highway and urban traffic. This model can reproduce the basic features of real traffic like stop-and-go wave, phantom jams, and the phase transition on a fundamental diagram. In this section, the NS mechanism will be briefly introduced as a base of analysis.

The road is subdivided into cells with a length of  $\Delta x=7.5$  m. Let  $N$  be the total number of vehicles on a single route of length  $L$ , then the vehicle density is  $\rho=N/L$ .  $g_n(t)$  is defined to be the number of empty sites in front of the  $n$ th vehicle at time  $t$ , and  $v_n(t)$  to be the speed of the  $n$ th vehicle, i.e., the number of sites that the  $n$ th vehicle moves during the time step  $t$ . In the NS model, the maximum speed is fixed to be  $v_{max}=M$ . In the present paper, we set  $M=3$  for simplicity.

The NS mechanism can be decomposed to the following four rules (parallel dynamics):

Rule 1. Acceleration:  $v_i \leftarrow \min(v_i + 1, M)$ ;

Rule 2. Deceleration:  $v'_i \leftarrow \min(v_i, g_i)$ ;

Rule 3. Random brake: with a certain brake probability  $P$  do  $v''_i \leftarrow \max(v'_i - 1, 0)$ ; and

Rule 4. Movement:  $x_i \leftarrow x_i + v''_i$ ;

The fundamental diagram characterizes the basic properties of the NS model which has two regimes called "free-flow" phase and "jammed" phase. The critical density, basically

depending on the random brake probability  $p$ , divides the fundamental diagram to these two phases.

### **B. Three-route scenario**

The three-route model are similar with the two-route model in which road users choose one of the three routes according to the real-time information feedback. However, the rules at the exit of the three-route system are more complex than which in two-route system which we will explain in Part C. In the three-route scenario, it is supposed that there are three routes A, B and C of the same length  $L$ . At every time step, a new vehicle is generated at the entrance of three routes and will choose one route. If a vehicle enters one of three routes, the motion of it will follow the dynamics of the NS model. As a remark, if a new vehicle is not able to enter the desired route, it will be deleted. The vehicle will be removed after it reaches the end point.

Additionally, two types of vehicles are introduced: dynamic and static vehicles. If a driver is a so-called dynamic one, he will make a choice on the basis of the information feedback [20], while a static one just enters a route at random ignoring any advice. The density of dynamic and static travelers are  $S_{dyn}$  and  $1 - S_{dyn}$ , respectively.

The simulations are performed by the following steps: first, set the routes and board empty; then, after the vehicles enter the routes, according to four different feedback strategies, information will be generated, transmitted, and displayed on the board at every time step. Then the dynamic road users will choose the route with better condition according to the dynamic information at the entrance of three routes.

### **C. Related definitions**

The road conditions can be characterized by flux of three routes, and flux is defined as follows:

$$F = V_{mean}\rho = V_{mean}\frac{N}{L} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $V_{mean}$  represents the mean velocity of all the vehicles on one of the roads,  $N$  denotes

the vehicle number on each road, and  $L$  is the length of three routes. Then we describe four different feedback strategies, respectively.

TTFS: At the beginning, all routes are empty and the information of travel time on the board is set to be the same. Each driver will record the time when he enters one of the routes. Once a vehicle leaves the three-route system, it will transmit its travel time on the board and at that time a new dynamic driver will choose the road with shorter time.

MVFS: Every time step, each vehicle on the routes transmits its velocity to the traffic control center which will deal with the information and display the mean velocity of vehicles on each route on the board. Road users at the entrance will choose one road with larger mean velocity.

CCFS: Every time step, each vehicle transmits its signal to satellite, then the navigation system (GPS) will handle that information and calculate the position of each vehicle which will be transmitted to the traffic control center. The work of the traffic control center is to compute the congestion coefficient of each road and display it on the board. Road users at the entrance will choose one road with smaller congestion coefficient.

The congestion coefficient is defined as

$$C = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i^w. \quad (2.2)$$

Here,  $n_i$  stands for vehicle number of the  $i$ th congestion cluster in which cars are close to each other without a gap between any two of them. Every cluster is evaluated a weight  $w$ , here  $w=2$  [22].

PFS: Every time step, the traffic control center will receive data from the navigation system (GPS) like CCFS, and the work of the center is to compute the congestion coefficient of each road and simulate the road situation in the future making use of the current road situation by using CCFS. Then display it on the board. Road users at the entrance will choose one road with smaller congestion coefficient. For example, if the prediction time( $T_p$ )

is 50 seconds the road user at the entrance at 100th second will choose one route with small congestion coefficient at 150th second predicted by this strategy like explained above.

In this paper, we set the three-route system has only one entrance and one exit instead of one entrance and three exit as it shows in the Fig.1. So in this paper, the road condition is more close to the reality. The rules at the exit of the three-route system are as follows:




Figure 1: The three-route system only has one entrance and one exit.

- (a) At the end of three routes, the car that is the nearest one to the exit goes first.
- (b) If the cars at the end of three routes have the same distance to the exit, which one drives fastest, which one goes out first.
- (c) If the cars at the end of three routes have the same distance to the exit and speed, the car in the route which has most cars goes first.
- (d) If the rule (a), (b) and (c) are satisfied at the same time, then the cars go out randomly.

Though the rules in three-route system seems to be the same as which in two-route system, if you think it over, you may find they are much more complex than the rules in two-route system. For example, among the cars in route A, B and C, the car in route A is the nearest one to the exit but the cars in route B and C have the same distance to the exit which will never happen in two-route system. In the following section, performance by using four different feedback strategies will be shown and discussed in more detail.




Figure 2: Average flux by performing different prediction time( $T_p$ ). The parameters are  $L=2000$ ,  $p=0.25$ , and  $S_{dyn}=0.5$ .

### III. SIMULATION RESULTS

All simulation results shown here are obtained by 90000 iterations excluding the initial 5000 time steps. From the data shown above, we can find that the time step needed to reach stable state in three-route systems is much longer than which in two-route system. In two-route system, it only needs 25000 time step to reach stable state [23], so it brings about a lot of difficulties in our work. Figure 2 shows the dependence of average flux and prediction time( $T_p$ ) by using prediction feedback strategy. As to the routes' processing capacity, we can see that in Fig.2 there is a positive peak structure at the vicinity of  $T_p \sim 260$  which is much longer than before [23]. So we will use  $T_p=260$  in the following paragraphs.

In contrast with PFS, the flux of three routes adopting CCFS, MVFS and TTFS shows oscillation obviously (see Fig.3) due to the information lag effect [22]. This lag effect can be understood as that the other three strategies cannot reflect the road current situation.

Another reason for the oscillation is that three-route system only has one exit, therefore, only one car can go out at one time step which may result in the traffic jam to happen at the end of the routes and the new strategy can predict the effects to the route situation caused by the traffic jam at the end of the route, therefore, the new strategy may improve the road situation. Compared to CCFS, the performance adopting PFS is remarkably improved, not only on the value but also the stability of the flux. Therefore as to the flux of the three-route system, PFS is the best one.

In Fig.4, vehicle number versus time step shows almost the same tendency as Fig.3, the routes' accommodating capacity is greatly enhanced with an increase in average vehicle number from 230 to 870, so perhaps the high flux of three routes with PFS are mainly due to the increase of vehicle number.

In Fig.5, speed versus time step shows that although the speed is stablest by using prediction feedback strategy, it is the lowest among the four different strategies. The reason is that the routes' accommodating capacity is best by using PFS and as mentioned above the road has only one exit and only one car can go out at one time step, therefore, the more cars, the lower speed. Fortunately, flux consists of two parts, mean velocity and vehicle density, therefore, as long as the vehicle number (because the vehicle density is  $\rho=N/L$ , and the  $L$  is fixed to be 2000, so  $\rho \propto$  vehicle number ( $N$ )) is large enough, the flux can also be the largest.

Fig.6 shows that the average flux fluctuates feebly with a persisting increase of dynamic travelers by using the new strategy. As to the routes' processing capacity, the prediction feedback strategy is proved to be the most proper one because the flux is always the largest at each  $S_{dyn}$  value and even increases with a persisting increase of dynamic travelers. Maybe someone will ask why the average flux in Fig.6 using four different strategies is smaller than the figures shown in the former work [23]. The reason is that the road situation is different from the work before. The three-route system in this paper still permit one car to enter the






Figure 3: (Color online)(a) Flux of each route with travel time feedback strategy. (b) Flux of each route with mean velocity feedback strategy. (c) Flux of each route with congestion coefficient feedback strategy. (d) Flux of each route with prediction feedback strategy. The parameters are  $L=2000$ ,  $p=0.25$ ,  $S_{dyn}=0.5$ , and  $T_p=260$ .




Figure 4: (Color online)(a) Vehicle number of each route with travel time feedback strategy. (b) Vehicle number of each route with mean velocity feedback strategy. (c) Vehicle number of each route with congestion coefficient feedback strategy. (d) Vehicle number of each route with prediction feedback strategy. The parameters are set the same as in Figure 3.




Figure 5: (Color online)(a) Average speed of each route with travel time feedback strategy. (b) Average speed of each route with mean velocity feedback strategy. (c) Average speed of each route with congestion coefficient feedback strategy. (d) Average speed of each route with prediction feedback strategy. The parameters are set the same as in Figure 3.




Figure 6: (Color online) Average flux by performing different strategy vs  $S_{dyn}$ ;  $L$  is fixed to be 2000, and  $T_p$  is fixed to be 260.

system at every time step, therefore, the more routes, the lower flux.

## IV. CONCLUSION

We obtain the simulation results of applying four different feedback strategies, i.e., TTFS, MVFS, CCFS and PFS on a three-route scenario all with respect to flux, number of cars, speed, average flux versus  $T_p$  and average flux versus  $S_{dyn}$ . The results indicates that the PFS strategy has more advantages than the three former ones in the three-route system which has only one entrance and one exit. We also find that in three-route system, it will take much more time to reach the stable state than two-route system. In contrast with the three other strategies, the PFS strategy can bring a significant improvement to the

road conditions, including increasing vehicle number and flux, reducing oscillation, and that average flux increases with increase of  $S_{dyn}$ . And it can be understood because PFS strategy can eliminate the lag effect. The numerical simulations demonstrate that the prediction time( $T_p$ ) play a very important role in improving the road situation.

We also do the simulation result about the average flux versus  $T_p$  on four-route model(see Fig.3) which is obtained by 90000 iterations excluding the initial 5000 time steps. And we can find there also exit a positive peak structure at the vicinity of  $T_p \sim 1020$  which is also much longer than before. We can make a reasonable assumption here that one car pass the route with average speed  $v_{mean} \sim 2$ , then the time it pass the route  $T_{pass} \sim 1000$  because the total length of one route  $L=2000$ . If  $T_{pass} \sim T_p$ , then the prediction feedback strategy will become invalid because the car first at the entrance of the route will leave the road system after this period of time. So we can get the conclusion that the prediction feedback strategy is appropriate on multi-route system when the length of the route become longer enough to ensure the  $T_{pass} > T_p$ .

**Acknowledgments:** This work has been partially supported by the National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program No. 2006CB705500), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 60744003, 10635040,10532060), the Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education of China (Grant No. 20060358065) and National Science Fund for Fostering Talents in Basic Science (J0630319).

## References

- [1] D. Chowdhury, L. Santen and A. Schadschneider, Phys. Rep. **329**, 199 (2000).
- [2] D. Helbing, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 1067 (2001).




Figure 7: Average flux by performing different prediction time( $T_p$ ) on a four-route model. The parameters are  $L=2000$ ,  $p=0.25$ , and  $S_{dyn}=0.5$ .

- [3] T. Nagatani, Rep. Prog. Phys. **65**, 1331 (2002).
- [4] R. W. Rothery, in Traffic Flow Theory, edited by N. Gartner, C. J. Messner, and A. J. Rathi, *Transportation Research Board Special Report*, Vol. 165 (Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1992), Chap. 4.
- [5] I. Prigogine and F. C. Andrews, Oper. Res. **8**, 789 (1960).
- [6] S. L. Paveri-Fontana, Transp. Res. **9**, 225 (1975).
- [7] H. Lehmann, Phys. Rev. E **54**, 6058 (1996).
- [8] C. Wagner, C. Hoffmann, R. Sollacher, J. Wagenhuber, and B. Schrmann, Phys. Rev. E **54**, 5073 (1996).
- [9] D. Helbing, Phys. Rev. E **53**, 2366 (1996).

- [10] D. Helbing, Phys. Rev. E **57**, 6176 (1997).
- [11] D. Helbing and M. Treiber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**,3042(1998).
- [12] K. Nagel and M. Schreckenberg, J. Phys. I **2**, 2221 (1992).
- [13] O. Biham, A. A. Middleton, and D. Levine, Phys. Rev. A **46**, R6124 (1992).
- [14] Y. Yokoya, Phys. Rev. E **69**, 016121 (2004).
- [15] T. L. Friesz, J. Luque, R. L. Tobin, and B.-W. Wie, Oper. Res. **37**, 893 (1989).
- [16] M. Ben-Akiva, A. de Palma, and I. Kaysi, Transp. Res., PartA **25A**, 251 (1991).
- [17] H. S. Mahmassani and R. Jayakrishnan, Transp. Res., Part A **25A**, 293 (1991).
- [18] R. Arnott, A. de Palma, and R. Lindsey, Transp. Res., Part A **25A**, 309 (1991).
- [19] P. Kachroo and K. Ozbay, Transp. Res. Rec. **1556**, 137 (1996).
- [20] J. Wahle, A. L. C. Bazzan, F. Klgl, and M. Schreckenberg, Physica A **287**, 669 (2000).
- [21] K. Lee, P.-M. Hui, B.-H. Wang, and N. F. Johnson, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **70**, 3507 (2001).
- [22] W.-X. Wang, B.-H. Wang, W.-C. Zheng, C.-Y. Yin and T. Zhou, Phys. Rev. E **72**, 066702 (2005).
- [23] C.-F Dong, X. Ma, G.-W. Wang, X.-Y. Sun, B.-H. Wang, Physica A **388**, 4651 (2009).
- [24] B.-H. Wang, D. Mao, and P.-M. Hui, *Proceedings of The Second International Symposium on Complexity Science, Shanghai, August 6C7*, 2002, p. 204.