

From Single Agent to Multi-Agent: Improving Traffic Signal Control

Tislenko Maksim¹ and Kisilev Dmitrii²

¹ITMO University, Saint-Petersburg, e-mail: makstislenko@gmail.com

²HSE University, Moscow, e-mail: dkiseljov@hse.ru

June 21, 2024

Abstract

Due to accelerating urbanization, the importance of solving the signal control problem increases. This paper analyzes various existing methods and suggests options for increasing the number of agents to reduce the average travel time. Experiments were carried out with 2 datasets. The results show that in some cases, the implementation of multiple agents can improve existing methods. For a fine-tuned large language model approach there's small enhancement on all metrics.

Keywords: traffic signal control, multi-agent systems, large language model, traffic control agent, reinforcement learning.

1 Introduction

The issue of traffic signal control is more relevant than ever. According to the UN report, "The urban population of the world has grown rapidly since 1950, having increased from 751 million to 4.2 billion in 2018. Asia, despite being less urbanized than most other regions today, is home to 54 % of the world's urban population, followed by Europe and Africa (13% each).[9]". In 2014, traffic congestion cost Americans over \$ 160 billion in lost productivity and wasted over 3.1 billion gallons of fuel [4]. Traffic congestion was also attributed to over 56 billion pounds of harmful CO2 emissions in 2011 [12]. In the European Union, the cost of traffic congestion was equivalent to 1 % of the entire GDP [11]. Consequently, efficient TSC offers significant economic and environmental benefits, as well as improvements in societal well-being.

There're lots of different methods how to get less number of traffic congestions, allow people to reach their destination faster on average from reinforcement learning methods to algorithms based on large language models. In lots of these effective algorithms, multi-agent approach was not applied despite the fact that it showed good results as was proved in [8].

In this article, we've created a multi-agent system where agents can utilize different approaches, including those based on Reinforcement Learning (RL) and Large Language Models (LLMs). Our focus is to adapt the method from a [7] to the domain of traffic signal control and then conduct experiments with multiple agents to observe and analyze their performance. Specifically, we hypothesize that the combination of RL or

LLM-based approaches can improve traffic signal control by leveraging the strengths of both methodologies. By using a majority voting mechanism, we aim to aggregate the decisions of diverse agents to achieve a more robust and effective traffic signal control system. That’s why we are attempting to implement the method of majority voting among several agents. The details of these methods and their implementation will be explained further in the article.

The experiments will involve setting up a simulated traffic environment where different agents control traffic signals at various intersections. We’ve conducted experiments on 2 datasets with 1, 5, or 10 agents and compared results for different numbers of agents.

2 Related work

Existing research on Traffic Signal Control (TSC) can be categorized into three main approaches: traditional transportation methods [5, 6, 13], Reinforcement Learning (RL)-based techniques [1, 10, 16, 17], and methods based on transformers [7, 18, 20]

Transportation methods focus on developing efficient heuristic algorithms that adapt traffic signal configurations dynamically based on real-time lane-level traffic conditions. However, these methods require significant manual design and human effort.

The advent of deep neural networks (DNNs) has led to the adoption of deep RL-based techniques, which have shown impressive performance in various traffic scenarios. Despite their success, RL-based methods face several challenges. They often struggle with generalizing to larger road networks or rare high-traffic situations, as their training data covers only a limited range of traffic scenarios. Additionally, RL-based methods lack interpretability due to the black-box nature of DNNs, making it difficult to understand the reasoning behind their control actions in specific traffic conditions.

Our research uses the MPLight algorithm that was introduced in [1]. It leverages the concept of pressure to coordinate multiple intersections. Pressure is defined as the difference between the queue lengths of incoming lanes at an intersection and the queue length of the downstream intersection’s receiving lane. Chen et al. employed pressure as both the state and reward for a DQN agent, which is shared across all intersections, built on top of the FRAP [22] model. The authors reported that this approach resulted in up to a 19.2% improvement in travel times compared to the next best method, PressLight [16].

There are also a few methods based on transformers. For instance, in [21] transformers are used to characterize traffic conditions better. With the shared Transformer-based cooperation mechanism, intersection controllers could adequately exploit spatial-temporal correlations and adaptively capture global traffic dynamics, guiding them to explore collaborative traffic strategies more efficiently.

Also in [7] proposed a new method based on LLMs. In this study, LLMLight was presented, a novel framework that utilizes large language models (LLMs) as traffic signal control agents. Specifically, the framework begins by instructing the LLM with a knowledgeable prompt detailing real-time traffic conditions. By guiding LLMs to perform a human-like, step-by-step analysis of current traffic conditions, the intelligent agent can make optimal control decisions, thereby improving overall traffic efficiency at intersections. Extensive experiments on nine traffic flow datasets demonstrate that the framework equipped with LightGPT, a backbone training procedure for optimizing a traffic signal control-oriented LLM, significantly outperforms traditional methods, showcasing its exceptional effectiveness and generalization ability across various traffic scenarios. Leveraging the advanced generalization capabilities of LLMs, LLMLight engages a reasoning and decision-making process akin to human intuition for effective traffic control. This work showed that LLMs show results better than traditional RL and transportation methods in some cases. Also,

it is worth noticing that LLM-powered traffic signal control not only shows superior performance across diverse traffic scenarios but also provides detailed explanations for each decision, contributing to a more comprehensible and accountable traffic control system. Thus, there is a reason to use LLM for traffic control problems and try to improve the performance of LLM using various methods.

There're lots of different ways to improve the performance of existing large language models. For instance [2] focus on improvement based on a fine-tuning method called Self-Play fine-tuning (SPIN), which starts from a supervised fine-tuned model. At the heart of SPIN lies a self-play mechanism, where the LLM refines its capability by playing against instances of itself. More specifically, the LLM generates its own training data from its previous iterations, refining its policy by discerning these self-generated responses from those obtained from human-annotated data. The method progressively elevates the LLM from a nascent model to a formidable one, unlocking the full potential of human-annotated demonstration data for SFT. Some of the recent studies focus on ensemble methods [14, 15] and multiple LLM-Agents collaboration frameworks [3, 19]. In these works, multiple LLM agents are used to improve the performance of LLMs. For instance, LLM-Debate [3] employs multiple LLM agents in a debate form. The reasoning performance is improved by creating a framework that allows more than one agent to "debate" the final answer to arithmetic tasks. They show performance improvements compared to using one single agent. All in all, these researches use under the hood multiple LLMs to increase the performance.

Our work is based on [8]. In this paper simply via a sampling-and-voting method, the performance of large language models (LLMs) scales with the number of agents instantiated. Also, this method is orthogonal to existing complicated methods to further enhance LLMs, while the degree of enhancement is correlated to the task difficulty. Comprehensive experiments were conducted on a wide range of LLM benchmarks to verify the presence of their finding and to study the properties that can facilitate its occurrence.

3 Method

In this section, we introduce our method and how it is implemented in different algorithms. It is similar to the method described in [8]. Our method consists of a two-phase process: sampling and voting. During the sampling phase, we try to generate N samples from N different agents. After generating these samples, the most popular answer is chosen for each intersection. In the end, as a result, we have an array of actions, each of which was chosen by majority voting.

3.1 Problem Statement

During our experiments, there were 12 (for the Jinan dataset) or 16 (for the Hangzhou dataset) intersections with 4 different phases as mentioned in 3. Below is a picture showing the layout of an intersection.

Lanes with the same colour belong to the same phase. It's worth noting that a right turn on the right lane (green colour on the image) is always allowed that's why there're 4 phases. Our aim in this research is to minimize average queue length (AQL), average travel time (ATT), and average waiting time (AWT). Connectivity between intersections wasn't taken into account because it's hard for LLMs to generalize information from several intersections.

Consider an environment \mathcal{E} with K states $s \in S$ corresponding to each of K intersections and actions $a \in A$. In the context of a traffic signal control problem, the environment can be understood as the simulated or real-world traffic system that the control algorithm interacts with. A state in this context can be described as a comprehensive representation of the current traffic conditions at each intersection within the network,




Fig. 1: Intersection scheme

such as the number of vehicles in each lane, etc. The state should capture all relevant information needed for the traffic control algorithm to make informed decisions.

Let us have K states corresponding to each of K intersections $\{s_1, \dots, s_K\} \in S$. Then at time step t we will have $\{s_{1t}, \dots, s_{Kt}\} \in S_t$. In our implementation, the state at each step contains the current phase and the number of vehicles on each lane. There may be 4 different phases at each intersection: 1. Left-turn from east and west, 2. Left-turn from north and south, 3. Go-through traffic from east and west, or 4. Go-through traffic from north and south.

At every time step, the agent chooses the optimal action. An action refers to a specific signal phase chosen for traffic signal control. Each action corresponds to activating a particular signal phase, such as allowing go-through traffic from specific directions or enabling left-turn movements.

Let us have N agents $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_N\}$, each of which can propose an action a_i at each time step t . Our goal is to choose the optimal action a^* in each state s_t using a voting method based on the proposed actions from all agents.

Let $\pi_i(s_{kt})$ be the policy of the i -th agent, which determines the action a_i in state s_{kt} . The policy is a decision-making strategy employed by the model for traffic signal control. At each time step t , each agent A_i proposes an action $a_i = \pi_i(s_{kt})$. After receiving all N proposals, we choose action a^* as follows:

$$a^* = \operatorname{argmax}_a \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{I}(a_i = a)$$

where \mathbb{I} is an indicator function that equals 1 if $a_i = a$, and 0 otherwise.

3.2 Process Description

Algorithm 1 Sampling Phase

- 1: Initialization of agents: Each of N agents A_i is initialized with its policy π_i .
 - 2: **for** each state s_{kt} $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ **do**
 - 3: **for** each agent A_i **do**
 - 4: Generate a new action $a_i = \pi_i(s_{kt})$
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **end for**
-

Algorithm 2 Voting Phase

- 1: Initialize actions collector a
 - 2: **for** each agent A_i **do**
 - 3: Collect an action a_i proposed by A_i to actions collector a
 - 4: **end for**
 - 5: Choosing an action as illustrated in 3.1: Determine the most popular action a^* from a by majority voting.
 - 6: Executing the action: Execute the chosen action a^* in the environment \mathcal{E} .
-

3.3 Implementation Differences for agents based on LLM and RL Algorithms

There are small differences in implementation for algorithms based on Large Language Models (LLM) and Reinforcement Learning (RL).

3.3.1 LLM-Based Algorithms

In LLM algorithms, sampling and voting can be conducted based on textual input, where each agent generates a textual response, and the most frequent response is chosen for further actions. In detail, every agent gets a prompt where task and scenario description are contained. It's worth mentioning that the prompt contains for large language models some facts based on common sense like "The traffic congestion is primarily dictated by the early queued vehicles, with the MOST significant impact" because LLMs basically are not supposed to solve these kind of tasks. The prompt is taken the same as in [7], the full version of it may be found in appendix A1. The output of the LLM-based agent is primarily textual data in the form of a reasoning trajectory and control action descriptions. For LLM agents multiagent approach can be used because predictions of every agent aren't deterministic, in our work the temperature hyperparameter is set to 0.1. The temperature parameter modifies the probabilities of the next word in the sequence by scaling the logits (the raw predictions from the model) before applying the softmax function. This output is generated by the agent to provide insights into the decision-making process and the selected actions for traffic signal control at intersections.

3.3.2 RL-Based Algorithms

In the realm of Reinforcement Learning (RL), particularly within the multi-agent paradigm, the orchestration of network updates necessitates a meticulously orchestrated preparation of states for each individual agent. This preparatory phase is indispensable, serving as the bedrock upon which subsequent algorithmic operations rest. This was done for each agent in the current paper.

Also in MPLight, unlike the LLM-based approach, training is conducted, learning rate is 0.001. The input state and target value for each agent are prepared during network updates.

Multi-agent approach which is based on the independence of agents can be used because the recommendations of every agent may vary. The reason of varying recommendations is that during the initialization of MPLight agents, the weights are initialized randomly. Also when selecting an action, agents may choose a random action with some probability. When preparing states and target values for each agent, data is randomly selected from memory (storage of previous interactions with the environment).

3.4 Algorithm pipeline

We propose to create a multi-agent system by integrating several (1, 5 or 10) large language models (LLMs) or reinforcement learning (RL) models. This approach aims to leverage the strengths of different models, enhance accuracy, and improve overall system performance by distributing tasks among specialized agents.

To create this system we initialized several identical models which were taken from 3.3. These models generate different actions for each state. From each model, we receive a recommended signal. Using the voting method described in Section 3.1, we determine the final action. Each model's recommendation is considered a vote, and the action with the most votes is selected as the final action. This approach helps to aggregate the diverse recommendations from multiple models, ensuring a more robust decision-making process.

The algorithm below illustrates the whole pipeline of the multi-agent version of the method. It includes initialization, action generation, voting, final action selection and metrics calculation. The multi-agent system is designed to handle various traffic conditions by dynamically adjusting the traffic signals based on real-time data. By doing so, the system can adapt to varying traffic patterns throughout the day, ensuring smooth traffic flow even during peak hours. Moreover, the use of multiple agents for each intersection allows for scalability, enabling the system to manage traffic in large urban areas with numerous intersections effectively.

In the algorithm below there's following variables introduced:

- Q_i is the queue length at intersection i .
- W_i is the waiting time at intersection i .
- T_i is the travel time for vehicle i .
- n is the number of vehicles.

Algorithm 3 Pipeline of the multi-agent version of algorithm

- 1: Initialize the total run count T and minimum action time τ from the configuration .
- 2: Reset the environment and obtain the initial for all intersections state S_0 .
- 3: **for** each time step t in range of T/τ **do**
- 4: Initialize empty lists for action A .
- 5: **for** each s_{kt} , $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ **do**
- 6: Get the information about s_{kt} .
- 7: **end for**
- 8: Initialize an empty list for prompts P .
- 9: **for** each s_{kt} , $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ **do**
- 10: Generate a prompt p_k from the s_{kt} and append the prompt to P .
- 11: **end for**
- 12: Initialize an empty list for responses R
- 13: **for** each s_{kt} , $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ **do**
- 14: Generate response r_k from the LLM agents using p_k by majority voting.
- 15: Decode the response and append to R .
- 16: **end for**
- 17: Initialize an empty action list A
- 18: **for** each r_k $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ **do**
- 19: Get the signal from response
- 20: Append the action code corresponding to the signal to A .
- 21: **end for**
- 22: Step the environment with A and set state S_{t+1} .
- 23: Compute

$$\bar{Q} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K Q_i$$

- 24: Compute

$$\bar{W} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K W_i$$

- 25: **end for**
- 26: Compute

$$T_{\text{total}} = \sum_{i=1}^n T_i$$

- 27: **return** $T_{\text{total}}, \bar{W}, \bar{Q}$
-

4 Experimental setup

4.1 Datasets

In this research, we have performed a comparison using 2 datasets: Jinan and Hangzhou. For the Jinan dataset there's 12 intersections (4x3), for the Hangzhou dataset there's 16 intersections (4x4). The Jinan dataset was collected from the Dongfeng subdistrict, Jinan, China, the Hangzhou dataset was collected in the Gudang subdistrict, Hangzhou, China.

4.2 Metrics

There're 3 metrics that were used to compare methods with a different number of agents: average travel time (ATT) which measures the mean duration that vehicles take to travel from their origins to their respective destinations, average queue length (AQL) which refers to the mean number of vehicles queuing in the road network, average waiting time (AWT) that quantifies the mean time that vehicles spend queuing at intersections within the road network.

4.3 Compared methods

There're 5 methods compared: 2 transportation, 2 based on LLM, and 1 based on reinforcement learning. Below is a short explanation of these methods.

The Fixed Time Algorithm for traffic signal control is one of the simplest and most widely used methods for managing traffic flow. The main idea is that traffic lights switch between phases according to a predetermined schedule, regardless of the current traffic conditions. This algorithm uses fixed schedules to switch traffic light phases. It does not consider current traffic conditions. All traffic lights switch according to the fixed schedule, regardless of the number of vehicles at the intersection. This method is easy to implement and does not require constant monitoring and updating of traffic data, reducing operational costs.

The Max Pressure algorithm is an advanced traffic signal control method designed to optimize traffic flow at intersections by dynamically adjusting signal phases. The core idea is to use real-time information about vehicle queues to make decisions that minimize overall delays and congestion. The algorithm dynamically adjusts the signal phases at each intersection based on real-time traffic conditions, specifically the vehicle queues at each approach. The final decision depends on the calculation of pressure a difference between the incoming and outgoing queues. Unlike some other algorithms, this algorithm does not require prior knowledge of average traffic demands. It operates solely on current traffic data, making it adaptable to real-time conditions.

The MPLight algorithm is an advanced traffic signal control method that combines the principles of the Max Pressure (MP) algorithm with machine learning techniques, specifically reinforcement learning, to improve traffic management. By setting the reward of RL agents to be the same as max pressure control objective, each local agent is maximizing its own cumulative reward, which further maximizes the network throughput under certain constraints. Implementing MPLight may require integration with existing traffic management systems and sensors, which could involve additional costs and technical challenges.

The main idea of the LLMLight algorithm is to use a Light Language Model (LLM) called LLMLight for optimized traffic signal control. It leverages LLMs to make effective control actions based on reasoning trajectories and aligns with long-term traffic flow goals. The algorithm aims to enhance traffic efficiency by prioritizing lanes with congestion and providing detailed rationales for decision-making in a transparent and explainable manner. This algorithm requires lots of computational capabilities but for the enhanced version

of LLM fine-tuned specifically for the TSC problem, LightGPT, results on average are better than for any other method.

5 Experimental results

Below on the table 1 results of performances are introduced. For algorithms based on RL and LLMs to compare their performance with different numbers of agents this number was 1, 5 or 10. The simulation time is 1 hour. For fixed and Max pressure algorithms number of agents is constant and equal to 1 because the larger number of agents doesn't make sense. The best results for each metric and dataset are highlighted in bold.

Method	Jinan			Hangzhou		
	ATT	AQL	AWT	ATT	AQL	AWT
Fixed (1 agent)	481.793	491.033	70.987	616.017	301.325	73.987
Max pressure (1 agent)	282.579	170.708	44.532	325.329	68.992	49.601
MPLight (1 agent)	307.82	215.93	97.88	345.60	84.7	81.97
MPLight (5 agent)	304.987	209.117	99.929	349.054	87.617	98.149
MPLight (10 agent)	298.79	201.20	91.795	353.183	91.342	125.905
Llama 13b (1 agent)	403.67	371.55	135.979	458.95	175.08	199.41
Llama 13b (5 agent)	401.12	371.91	133.524	449.04	161.375	159.192
Llama 13b (10 agent)	404.92	370.575	139.23	441.44	160.901	199.45
LightGPT (1 agent)	277.259	164.275	46.657	312.413	58.433	47.004
LightGPT (5 agent)	277.29	163.5	45.692	312.059	57.65	47.882
LightGPT (10 agent)	274.854	159.775	45.847	311.576	57.53	46.079

Table 1: Performances of models with different number of agents

6 Experimental analysis

As we can see from the table above for some datasets and models multiagent approach shows good results.

For the MPLight algorithm there's a good advance in results for the Jinan dataset. The reason of it is that in the Hangzhou dataset number of intersections is more than in the Jinan dataset. For the Jinan dataset, the number of intersections is one-third less than that of the Hangzhou dataset. In large intersection datasets, the number of interactions and situations increases, which complicates the learning task. With a higher number of agents at a single intersection, the complexity grows exponentially, which can lead to a deterioration in results.

For the LLMLight algorithm based on Llama 13b proposed method doesn't show any enhancement. The reason is that this model was not trained for traffic signal control problem and it is too weak for this kind of task. Because of it during conducting experiments the dispersion of Llama 13b results was bigger than on any other methods. Unlike Llama13b LightGPT model shows some improvement in most of all metrics with an increasing number of agents, it showed stable values of metrics.

In the context of LLMs, it is important to note that their effectiveness in specific management tasks heavily depends on the quality of their pre-training. Models specifically trained on data related to trans-

portation systems and traffic signal control can show significantly better results. Therefore, investing in the training of specialized models can be a strategically justified decision to improve the performance of traffic management systems. This is evident when comparing the results of Llama 13b and LightGPT, which is essentially a fine-tuned version of Llama 13b.

All in all, our results may be summarized using 3 points:

1. The multi-agent approach for RL algorithms shows good results for datasets with a small number of intersections.
2. For "weak" LLMs multiagent approach doesn't show any enhancement because of their instability in results.
3. For fine-tuned LLMs multiagent approach allows to reach small advance in all metrics.

All in all, for cities that have lots of computational capabilities multi-agent approach with a fine-tuned LightGPT model can show the best results among all possible options. If there's not enough computational resources Max pressure algorithm shows good results on all datasets.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we've successfully created multi-agent system and conducted experiments with it for different RL and LLM-based algorithms. Our experiments showed that for some cases especially for fine-tuned LLM models, there's some enhancement when several agents are used. In future works we are going to provide more experiments with different RL-based and LLM-based algorithms. Also, we are going to try this approach with different types of agents and compare it with the results from this paper.

In conclusion, the choice of approach and model for traffic signal control should be based on an analysis of the number of intersections and available computational resources to ensure optimal system performance. Considering the specifics of each city, adapting the approach may include tuning algorithms, improving data quality, and utilizing advanced distributed learning methods. The development of more sophisticated models and algorithms may also involve integrating real-time data, which will allow for more accurate responses to changing traffic conditions and enhance the overall efficiency of the management system.

References

- [1] Chacha Chen, Hua Wei, Nan Xu, Guanjie Zheng, Ming Yang, Yuanhao Xiong, Kai Xu, and Zhenhui Li. Toward a thousand lights: Decentralized deep reinforcement learning for large-scale traffic signal control. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34:3414–3421, April 2020.
- [2] Zixiang Chen, Yihe Deng, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, and Quanquan Gu. Self-play fine-tuning converts weak language models to strong language models, 2024.
- [3] Yilun Du, Shuang Li, Antonio Torralba, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Igor Mordatch. Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multiagent debate, 2023.
- [4] The Economist. The cost of traffic jams. <https://www.economist.com/blogs/economist-explains/2014/11/economist-explains-1>, 2014. November 2014.
- [5] PB Hunt, DI Robertson, RD Bretherton, and M Cr Royle. The scoot on-line traffic signal optimisation technique. *Traffic Engineering & Control*, 23(4), 1982.
- [6] Peter Koonce and Lee Rodegerdts. Traffic signal timing manual. Technical report, United States. Federal Highway Administration, 2008.
- [7] Siqi Lai, Zhao Xu, Weijia Zhang, Hao Liu, and Hui Xiong. Llmilight: Large language models as traffic signal control agents, 2024.
- [8] Junyou Li, Qin Zhang, Yangbin Yu, Qiang Fu, and Deheng Ye. More agents is all you need, 2024.
- [9] Department of Economic and United Nations Social Affairs. *World Urbanization Prospects 2018*. United Nations, New York, 2019.
- [10] Afshin Oroojlooy, MohammadReza Nazari, Davood Hajinezhad, and Jorge Silva. Attendlight: Universal attention-based reinforcement learning model for traffic signal control. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020*, virtual, December 2020.
- [11] David Schrank, Bill Eisele, and Tim Lomax. Tti’s 2012 urban mobility report. Technical Report 4, Texas A&M Transportation Institute, The Texas A&M University System, 2012.
- [12] David Schrank, Bill Eisele, Tim Lomax, and Jim Bak. 2015 urban mobility scorecard, 2015. Published by Texas A&M Transportation Institute.
- [13] Pravin Varaiya. Max pressure control of a network of signalized intersections. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 36:177–195, 2013.
- [14] Fanqi Wan, Xinting Huang, Deng Cai, Xiaojun Quan, Wei Bi, and Shuming Shi. Knowledge fusion of large language models, 2024.
- [15] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Huai hsin Chi, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2203.11171, 2022.

- [16] Hua Wei, Chacha Chen, Guanjie Zheng, Kan Wu, Vikash V. Gayah, Kai Xu, and Zhenhui Li. Presslight: Learning max pressure control to coordinate traffic signals in arterial network. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD 2019*, pages 1290–1298, Anchorage, AK, USA, August 4-8 2019. ACM.
- [17] Hua Wei, Nan Xu, Huichu Zhang, Guanjie Zheng, Xinshi Zang, Chacha Chen, Weinan Zhang, Yanmin Zhu, Kai Xu, and Zhenhui Li. Colight: Learning network-level cooperation for traffic signal control. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM 2019*, pages 1913–1922, Beijing, China, November 3-7 2019. ACM.
- [18] Qiang Wu, Mingyuan Li, Jun Shen, Linyuan Lü, Bo Du, and Ke Zhang. Transformerlight: A novel sequence modeling based traffic signaling mechanism via gated transformer. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD 2023*, pages 2639–2647, Long Beach, CA, USA, August 6-10 2023. ACM.
- [19] Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Shaokun Zhang, Erkang Zhu, Beibin Li, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, and Chi Wang. Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation framework, 08 2023.
- [20] Xue Ye, Shen Fang, Fang Sun, Chunxia Zhang, and Shiming Xiang. Meta graph transformer: A novel framework for spatial-temporal traffic prediction. *Neurocomputing*, 491, 12 2021.
- [21] Chen Zhao, Xingyuan Dai, Xiao Wang, Lingxi Li, Lv Yisheng, and Fei-Yue Wang. Learning transformer-based cooperation for networked traffic signal control. In *2022 IEEE 25th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pages 3133–3138, 10 2022.
- [22] G. Zheng, Y. Xiong, X. Zang, J. Feng, H. Wei, H. Zhang, Y. Li, K. Xu, and Z. Li. Learning phase competition for traffic signal control. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 1963–1972, 2019.

A 1

A traffic light regulates a four-section intersection with northern, southern, eastern, and western sections, each containing two lanes: one for through traffic and one for left-turns. Each lane is further divided into three segments. Segment 1 is the closest to the intersection. Segment 2 is in the middle. Segment 3 is the farthest. In a lane, there may be early queued vehicles and approaching vehicles traveling in different segments. Early queued vehicles have arrived at the intersection and await passage permission. Approaching vehicles will arrive at the intersection in the future. The traffic light has 4 signal phases. Each signal relieves vehicles' flow in the group of two specific lanes. The state of the intersection is listed below. It describes:

- The group of lanes relieving vehicles' flow under each signal phase.
- The number of early queued vehicles of the allowed lanes of each signal.
- The number of approaching vehicles in different segments of the allowed lanes of each signal.

<<There is information about current state>>

Please answer: Which is the most effective traffic signal that will most significantly improve the traffic condition during the next phase? Requirements:

- Let's think step by step.
- You can only choose one of the signals listed above.
- You must follow the following steps to provide your analysis:
Step 1: Provide your analysis for identifying the optimal traffic signal.
Step 2: Answer your chosen signal.
- Your choice can only be given after finishing the analysis.
- Your choice must be identified by the tag: <signal>YOUR_CHOICE</signal>.