

Group Trip Planning Query Problem with Multimodal Journey

Dildar Ali
Department of CSE
IIT Jammu

Jammu, India
2021rcs2009@iitjammu.ac.in

Suman Banerjee
Department of CSE
IIT Jammu

Jammu, India
suman.banerjee@iitjammu.ac.in

Yamuna Prasad
Department of CSE
IIT Jammu

Jammu, India
yamuna.prasad@iitjammu.ac.in

Abstract—In *Group Trip Planning (GTP) Query Problem*, we are given a city road network where a number of *Point of Interest (PoI)* has been marked with their respective categories (e.g., Cafeteria, Park, Movie Theater, etc.). A group of agents want to visit one PoI from every category from their respective starting location and once finished, they want to reach their respective destinations. This problem asks which PoI from every category should be chosen so that the aggregated travel cost of the group is minimized. This problem has been studied extensively in the last decade, and several solution approaches have been proposed. However, to the best of our knowledge, none of the existing studies have considered the different modalities of the journey, which makes the problem more practical. To bridge this gap, we introduce and study the *GTP Query Problem with Multimodal Journey* in this paper. Along with the other inputs of the *GTP Query Problem*, we are also given the different modalities of the journey that are available and their respective cost. Now, the problem is not only to select the PoIs from respective categories but also to select the modality of the journey. For this problem, we have proposed an efficient solution approach, which has been analyzed to understand their time and space requirements. A large number of experiments have been conducted using real-life datasets, and the results have been reported. From the results, we observe that the PoIs and modality of journey recommended by the proposed solution approach lead to much less time and cost than the baseline methods.

Index Terms—Group Trip Planning Query, PoInt of Interest, Dynamic Programming, Optimization.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent times, due to the advancement of wireless internet and GPS-enabled hand-holding mobile devices, capturing the location of a moving object has become easier. This leads to the generation of a large number of datasets that contain the location information of a group of people over different time stamps. Such datasets are available in public repositories and are useful for solving many real-life problems, including driving behavior prediction [1], route recommendation [2], [3], etc. Storing, managing, and mining such datasets lead to a different domain called *Spatial Databases and Spatial Data Mining* [4], [5]. Many internet giants, including Google, Alibaba, etc., are in the business of this domain and earn significant revenue from it. One well-studied problem in the domain of spatial databases is the *Group Trip Planning Query Problem* [6]–[9]. In this problem, we are given a road network of a city where the vertex set is constituted by the set of PoIs

and the edge set is the road fragments connecting the PoIs. Also, the PoIs are classified into different categories, such as cafeterias, parks, movie theaters, restaurants, etc. A group of friends (referred to as agents in this paper) want to travel from their respective starting location to a destination location in the city, and during their journey, they want to visit one PoI from every category. This problem asks for one PoI from every category so that the aggregated travel cost by the group is minimized. In the literature, this problem has been studied in both variants. One in which the order of categories is fixed and the other where this is not fixed. The first variant is called the *Ordered GTP Query Problem*, and the second variant is called the *UnOrdered GTP Query Problem* [10]. Also, the *GTP Query Problem* has been studied in several other variants as well, such as in indoor locations, PoIs with some utility value [8], with fairness criteria [11], [12] and many more. In the last decade, this problem has been studied extensively.

Typically, in a city, there exists several transport mediums such as metro, ferry, cab, etc. It is natural that even between two PoIs, different journey modalities will incur different costs, comfort, time, etc. Given the starting and destination location, it is important to effectively plan our journey while keeping certain objectives in mind (e.g., maximize comfort, minimize distance, minimize cost, minimize the number of transfers, and so on). Extensive literature exists on journey planning. However, to the best of our knowledge, the *GTP Query Problem* has not been studied in the context of multiple transport mediums. To bridge this gap, in this paper, we study the *GTP Query Problem* in the presence of multiple transport options. Formally, we call our problem *GTP Query Problem with Multiple Transport Medium* (abbreviated as *GTP-MTM Problem*), and we ask the following question: Given a city road network, where the PoIs are marked with their respective categories, the set of agents with their respective source and destination locations, the transport details of the city with their respective fare, the *GTP-MTM Problem* asks to choose one PoI from every category such that the aggregated travel cost of the whole group is minimized. In particular, we make the following contributions in this paper:

- We introduce and study a practical variant of the *GTP Query Problem* considering the presence of multiple

transport mediums. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study in this direction.

- To address this problem, we introduce an optimal journey planning algorithm and analyze it to understand its time and space requirements.
- A large number of experiments have been carried out to establish the effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed solution approach.

The rest of this paper has been organized as follows. Section II describes some relevant studies from the literature. The background concepts and formal problem description have been described in Section III. The proposed solution approach has been stated in Section IV. Section V contains the experiment evaluation of the proposed solution approach. Finally, Section VI concludes our study and gives future research directions.

II. RELATED WORK

The study presented in this paper comes under Multimodal Journey Planning and Group Trip Planning Query Problems. In the following two subsections, we present relevant studies from the literature.

A. Multimodal Journey Planning

Multimodal journey planning involves integrating diverse transport modes to find efficient routes between a source and a destination, considering constraints such as cost, time, and comfort. This problem is especially relevant in urban environments with complex and interconnected transport networks. Existing research in this domain can be broadly categorized into passenger-focused and transport manager-focused studies. The passenger-focused studies aim to optimize travel efficiency and experience by minimizing factors like travel time, cost, and number of transfers while considering comfort and convenience. Potthoff and Sauer [13], [14] introduced the McTB approach, which optimizes three key criteria: arrival time, the number of public transit trips, and unrestricted transfer modes. Building on this, their HyDRA algorithm [15] enhances query execution efficiency, supporting faster computations in multimodal networks. Delling et al. [16]–[18] developed efficient algorithms for multimodal routing and delays, incorporating transfer penalties and mode preferences. RAPTOR, proposed by Delling et al. [19], focuses on minimizing transfer times and ensuring scalability in large public transportation networks. Other studies have emphasized multi-objective optimization in multimodal planning. Chassein et al. [20] proposed bicriteria optimization models balancing travel time and reliability. From a broader perspective, graph-based approaches have also enhanced multimodal journey planning. For instance, Disser et al. [21] proposed techniques to handle multi-criteria shortest path problems in multimodal networks.

The transport manager-focused studies address system-wide efficiency, emphasizing operational optimization. Ceder [22] outlined methods for public transit scheduling and operations essential for integrating multiple transport modes. Van Nes

and Bovy [23] examined strategies for network optimization, focusing on multimodal transport infrastructure development.

B. Group Trip Planning Query Problem

To the best of our knowledge, Li et al. [24] was the first to study the trip planning query problem on metric graphs and proposed several approximate solutions. Subsequently, this problem has been extended to include a group of travelers instead of a single traveler. Here, the context is a group of agents who want to travel from their respective source to the destination location. During their journey, they wish to visit one PoI from every category, and the objective is to minimize the aggregated distance traveled by the whole group. This variant has been introduced by Hashem et al. [6]. They proposed several heuristic solutions for this problem, which have been strengthened by their experimental evaluation. Later, Ahmadi et al. [10] proposed a mixed search (both breadth and depth) strategy, and they used the progressive group neighbor exploration technique. Lee and Park [25] studied the trip planning problem to identify a common meeting PoI such that the ride-sharing mechanism becomes effective. Mahin et al. [9] studied the Activity-aware Ridesharing Group Trip Planning Query Problem with the notion of flexible PoIs. This problem returns an optimal ridesharing group that minimizes the group cost. Recently, the GTP query problem has been studied in relation to the notion of fairness. In this direction, the first contribution came from Banerjee and Singhal [11], who studied the Envyfree GTP Query Problem and proposed a group nearest neighbor search-based approach to solve the problem. Subsequently, this study has been extended by Solanki et al. [12], and they introduced a couple of other fairness notions and provided efficient algorithms that generate solutions where the fairness criteria have been guaranteed.

To the best of our knowledge, the GTP Query Problem has not been studied considering the presence of multiple transport mediums. In this paper, we bridge this gap by studying the GTP Query Problem with multiple transport medium.

III. BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM DEFINITION

In this section, we describe the basic concepts related to our problem and subsequently define it formally.

A. Road Network

In this study, we model a city road network using an undirected, weighted graph $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, W)$, where the vertex set $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ contains the set of PoIs in the city. The edge set \mathcal{E} of \mathcal{G} is constituted by the road segments joining the PoIs. Here, W is the edge weight function that maps each edge to the corresponding travel cost between the two PoIs joined by the corresponding road segment, i.e., $W : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. For any edge $(v_i v_j)$, its weight is denoted by $W(v_i v_j)$. As per our problem context, ‘vertex’ and ‘PoI’ have been used interchangeably. Similarly, ‘road segment’ and ‘edge’ have been used interchangeably. For any vertex $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$, the neighbor of v_i is denoted by $N(v_i)$ and defined as the other PoIs that are directly linked with v_i , i.e., $N(v_i) = \{v_j : (v_i v_j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$.

The cardinality of $N(v_i)$ is called the degree of v_i . A sequence of vertices $P = \langle v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_j \rangle$ is said to be a path in \mathcal{G} if $(v_k, v_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{E}$ for all $i \leq k \leq j - 1$. For any path P in \mathcal{G} , let $\mathcal{V}(P)$ and $\mathcal{E}(P)$ denote the set of vertices and edges that constitute the path. The weight of the path P is defined as the sum of the edge weights of the edges that constitute the path, i.e., $W(P) = \sum_{(v_p, v_q) \in \mathcal{E}(P)} W(v_p, v_q)$. For any two vertices v_i and v_j , the shortest path distance from v_i to v_j is denoted by $dist(v_i, v_j)$. As \mathcal{G} is undirected, $dist(v_i, v_j) = dist(v_j, v_i)$. Many other terminologies related to graph theory have been adopted from [26].

B. Group Trip Planning Query Problem

For any positive integer k , $[k]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. In the GTP Query Problem, a set of ℓ many agents $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_\ell\}$ wants to travel from their respective source to the destination location. The source and destination location of the i -th agent is denoted by v_i^s and v_i^d , respectively. All the PoIs under consideration can be classified into one of k distinct categories. This can be formalized by the function $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow [k]$. For any $i \in [k]$, let \mathcal{V}_i denotes the set of PoIs belongs to i -th category. Also, we assume that there does not exist any i such that $\mathcal{V}_i = \emptyset$. For simplicity, we assume that the source and destination locations of the agents are also part of the city road network, and each one is a PoI in \mathcal{G} . Hence, $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1^s, v_2^s, \dots, v_\ell^s\} \cup \{v_1^d, v_2^d, \dots, v_\ell^d\} \cup \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{V}_k$.

Now, in our problem context, we define *Valid Path* in Definition 1.

Definition 1 (Valid Path). For the agent u_i a path $\langle v_i^s, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k, v_i^d \rangle$ in \mathcal{G} is said to be a valid path if v_i^s and v_i^d are the source and destination location of u_i , and for all $j \in [k]$, $v_j \in \mathcal{V}_j$.



Fig. 1: An example of a valid path for an agent u_i , where the path starts at v_i^s (source), visits one PoI from each category (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) , and ends at v_i^d (destination).

From Figure 1, we observed that in a valid path, every agent visits one PoI from every category in the predetermined sequence. Also, from the first category to the k -th category, all the agents visit together. This implies that the valid paths for different agents will be different. However, it can be observed that from the first to the k -th category, the path will be the same for all the agents. Consider for any $i \in [k]$, $|\mathcal{V}_i| = n_i$. Now, it can be observed that the number of valid paths will be $\prod_{i \in [k]} n_i$. Let \mathcal{P} contain the common portions (i.e., from the first to the k -th category of PoIs) set of all valid paths. Now, for any valid path $p \in \mathcal{P}$, let $D(p)$ denote the aggregated distance for the path. If the common path is $p = \langle v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k \rangle$ then the aggregated distance $D(p)$ can be computed using Equation 1.

$$D(p) = \sum_{i \in [\ell]} dist(v_i^s, v_1) + \sum_{i \in [k-1]} dist(v_i, v_{i+1}) + \sum_{i \in [\ell]} dist(v_k, v_i^d) \quad (1)$$

Next, we formally define the GTP Query Problem, which has been formally stated in Definition 2.

Definition 2 (GTP Query Problem). Given a city road network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, W)$ which contains all the PoIs of interest and classified into different categories, the GTP Query Problem asks to select one PoI from each category such that aggregated travel cost by the group is minimized. This can be expressed using Equation 2.

$$p^* \leftarrow \underset{p \in \mathcal{P}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{C}(p) \quad (2)$$

Here, $p^* = \langle v_1^*, v_2^*, \dots, v_k^* \rangle$ denotes the optimal path.

C. Multi Modal Journey

Typically, in a city, there exist several transport mediums to commute. A traveler may wish to choose an option (e.g., metro, ferry, cab, etc.) depending on cost, time, comfort level, etc. Consider in the city of our consideration, there exists p different modes of transport. In this paper, we use the terminology ‘vehicle’ to refer to any conveyance used in any mode of transport. For any $i \in [p]$, let V_i denote the set of vehicles of i -th transport medium. Next, we state the notion of *route* in Definition 3.

Definition 3 (Route). Given a city road network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, W)$ the route is defined as a path in the network such that there must exists at least one vehicle that covers that path in its journey.

For any route $r = \langle v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_j \rangle$, let $PoI(r)$ denotes the set of PoIs that the route r covers. $PoI_s(r)$ and $PoI_e(r)$ denotes the starting and ending PoI of the route r . For any vehicle x that covers the route r , $t_s^x(r)$ and $t_e^x(r)$ denotes the start time and end time of the vehicle x for the route r , respectively. For any PoI $v \in PoI(r)$, the arriving time and departure time of the vehicle x is denoted by $t_s^x(v, r)$ and $t_e^x(v, r)$, respectively. It is meaningful to consider $t_e^x(v, r) > t_s^x(v, r)$. Also, the difference between these two quantities is denoted by $\Delta_x(v, r)$, i.e., $\Delta_x(v, r) = t_e^x(v, r) - t_s^x(v, r)$ and defined as the stop time of the vehicle x at the PoI v of the route r . We have a cost matrix \mathbb{C} , which is a three-dimensional matrix whose entries are as follows. (a, b, c) -th entry of the matrix \mathbb{C} will contain the cost of moving from the PoI v_a to v_b using the c -th modality of journey. However, it is not necessary that between every pair of PoIs, there will exist transport of all modalities. In that case, the corresponding cell in the matrix will contain \times . This means if $\mathbb{C}(a, b, c)$ contains \times , there does not exist direct communication from v_a to v_b using the c -th type modality. This can be mathematically formalized as a mapping $\mathbb{C} : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \times [p] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\times\}$.

Definition 4 (Journey Planning). Given the city road network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, W)$ with the transport details and cost, two PoIs of \mathcal{G}

v_a and v_b , and a start time t the journey planning is defined as a sequence of routes along with the corresponding vehicles such that the following criteria got satisfied:

- The starting PoI of the first route and the ending PoI of the last route in the journey plan must be the start and destination of the journey.
- For any two consecutive routes, the starting time of the chosen vehicle of the second route should be more than the ending time of the chosen vehicle of the first route.

Consider for the city road network under consideration for the given two PoIs v_a and v_b the following set of routes $\mathcal{R} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_y\}$ will form a journey plan if the following conditions are met:

- There must exist some $i \in [p]$ such that for all $j \in [x]$ $V_i(r_j) \neq \emptyset$.
- The starting PoI of route r_1 and ending PoI of route r_y will be v_a and v_b , respectively. This means $PoI_s(r_1) = v_a$ and $PoI_e(r_y) = v_b$.
- For any two consecutive routes r_i and r_{i+1} where $1 \leq i \leq x-1$, $t_s(r_{i+1}) \geq t_e(r_i)$.

In this study, we consider that for a specific modality (say i) for any two vehicles $x, y \in V_i$, such that both of them cover the route r , the cost of commuting between the PoIs v_a and v_b by either x or y will be the same. Now, we define the cost of a journey planning in Definition 5.

Definition 5 (Cost of a Journey Planning). *Given the transport details, the cost, and journey planning (i.e., the routes and the corresponding vehicles as stated in Definition 4), the cost of journey planning is defined as the sum of the costs of the routes that constitute the whole journey. For the journey planning $\mathcal{R} = \langle r_1, r_2, \dots, r_y \rangle$, and $V = \{i, j, \dots, k\}$ the cost is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{R})$ and can be mathematically expressed as:*

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{R}) = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{C}(a, b, c) \quad (3)$$

Where v_a and v_b are the start and end PoI of the route r , and in the journey planning, it has been decided that this route will be traveled using a vehicle of c -th modality.

Given the information on transport details and its cost, and given two PoIs, it is an important problem to decide how to commute between two given PoIs so that the cost of travel is minimized. This leads to the notion of minimum cost journey planning, which has been stated in Definition 6.

Definition 6 (Minimum Cost Journey Planning). *Given a city road network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{W})$, the transport details (i.e., different modalities of journey with their respective routes and their associated cost) the minimum cost journey planning problem asks to choose a least cost journey planning. Mathematically, this problem can be posed as an optimization problem as follows:*

$$\mathcal{R}^* \leftarrow \underset{\mathcal{R} \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{R}) \quad (4)$$

Here, \mathbb{R} denotes the set of all possible journey planning.

Subsequently, we define the GTP Query Problem under the realm of multi-modal journey and formally define our problem.

D. GTP Query Problem with Multi Modal Journey

As mentioned in Section III-B, the goal of the GTP Query Problem is to find a path that leads to minimum travel costs. In this paper, we introduce a variant of the GTP Query Problem where multiple modes of transportation exist in the city under consideration. Now, it can be observed for every agent, the individual cost may be different, and this is due to the following reasons. Let, $\langle v_1^*, v_2^*, \dots, v_k^* \rangle$ the common path, however, for any i -th agent the path that it covers is $\langle v_i^s, v_1^*, v_2^*, \dots, v_k^*, v_i^d \rangle$. So, to commute from their respective source locations to v_1^* and from v_k^* to their respective destination location incur different costs. As the common portion of the trip, the modality of the journey has to be decided collectively. Now, we define the cost of commuting for the whole group in Definition 7.

Definition 7 (The Cost of the Group). *Given a GTP Query Problem instance, any of the transport details of the city along with the cost, the cost of commuting of the group can be defined as the sum of the following three costs:*

- Sum of the individual costs for reaching the recommended PoI of the first category.
- Sum of the total cost incurred by the group from the first category of PoI to the k -th category of PoI.
- Sum of the individual costs for reaching the recommended PoI of the first category.

Hence, mathematically this can be posed as follows

$$\mathcal{C}_R(\mathcal{U}) = \sum_{i \in [\ell]} \mathbb{C}(v_i^s, v_1^*, d_i) + \ell \cdot \sum_{j \in [k-1]} \mathbb{C}(v_j^*, v_{j+1}^*, d_j) + \sum_{s \in [\ell]} \mathbb{C}(v_k^*, v_i^d, d_s) \quad (5)$$

It can be observed that in Equation 5, a subscript R has been used. This signifies this cost has been defined for a specific journey planning R (for all the agents collectively). Now, based on the group cost as defined in Equation 5, we formally define the GTP Query with Multi-Modal Journey Problem in Definition 8.

Definition 8 (GTP Query with Multi Modal Journey Problem). *Given a GTP Query Problem instance along with the transport details of the city (i.e., details of different transport medium, routes, their corresponding costs, etc.), the GTP Query with Multi-Modal Journey Problem asks to recommend one PoI from every category, and the journey plan for all the agents such that the total travel cost as defined in Equation 5 gets minimized. Mathematically, this problem can be posed as a discrete optimization problem as follows.*

$$\mathcal{R}^* \leftarrow \underset{\mathcal{R} \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathcal{C}_R(\mathcal{U}) \quad (6)$$

Next, we proceed to describe the solution approach. The symbols and notations used in this paper have been mentioned in Table I.

TABLE I: Symbols with their interpretation

Symbol	Interpretation
$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, W)$	The city road network
\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}	The vertex set and edge set of \mathcal{G}
n, m	The number of vertices/edges present in \mathcal{G}
$(v_i v_j)$	An arbitrary edge of \mathcal{G}
$dist(v_i v_j)$	The shortest path between the POIs v_i and v_j
k	The number of categories of POIs
g	The number of transport medium
\mathcal{V}_i	The set of POIs belongs to i -th category
p_i	The number of POIs belongs to i -th category
P	Any arbitrary path in \mathcal{G}
$W(P)$	Total distance traveled in the path \mathcal{G}
\mathcal{U}	The set of agents in the GTP Query Problem
ℓ	The number of agents
v_i^s, v_i^d	The source and destination of the i -th agent
\mathcal{P}	The set of all valid paths
p	Any arbitrary valid path
p^*	Optimal valid path
\mathbb{C}	The cost matrix
$\mathcal{D}(p)$	The aggregated distance traveled in path p
r	Any arbitrary route
$\mathcal{V}_i(r)$	The set of vehicle with modality i covering the route r
$PoI_s(r), PoI_e(r)$	Start and End POI of the route r
$t_s(r), t_e(r)$	Start and End time of the route r
$[k]$	The set $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$
\mathbb{R}^+	The set of positive real number

IV. PROPOSED APPROACH

Given the city road network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, W)$, the transport details, and the set of POIs, we propose a dynamic programming (DP) based algorithm that will return the minimum cost journey plan. The working of Algorithm 1 is split into five different steps. In the first step from Line NO. 1 to 5, we construct the multi-graph using the POIs and initialize the categories of POIs, source, destinations, and the DP dictionary. Next, in the second step, the transition between source POIs to the POIs of the first intermediate category is performed in Line NO. 6 to 19. In the third step, the transition between intermediate categories is performed in Line NO. 20 to 33. Next, in the fourth step, the transitions between the last intermediate category and the destinations are performed in Line No. 34 to 45. Finally, in Line No. 46 to 47, the total minimum cost and the paths of each individual agent are extracted. Here, for finding the shortest path, we consider the Dijkstra shortest path algorithm [27], [28], and in the intermediate paths, all the agents travel together, and for this, the intermediate travel cost is multiplied by the number of agents (ℓ). The representation of POIs in Algorithm 1 is as follows. Consider a set of ℓ many agents $\{v_1^s, v_2^s, \dots, v_\ell^s\}$ are the source vertices and $\{v_1^d, v_2^d, \dots, v_\ell^d\}$ are the destination vertices in the network \mathcal{G} and the POIs are categories into k types and they contains p_1, p_2, \dots , and p_k many POIs, respectively. Now, from source vertices to the first category of POIs, each POI contains $g \times \ell$ many variables to store the transport medium and costs where g is the number of transport mediums. So, the first category contains total $p_1 \times g \times \ell$ many variables. It can be represented as a matrix below.

$$\mathcal{V}_{11} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{V}_{11}^{(1, \mathcal{V}_1^s)} & \mathcal{V}_{11}^{(2, \mathcal{V}_1^s)} & \dots & \mathcal{V}_{11}^{(n, \mathcal{V}_1^s)} \\ \mathcal{V}_{11}^{(1, \mathcal{V}_2^s)} & \mathcal{V}_{11}^{(2, \mathcal{V}_2^s)} & \dots & \mathcal{V}_{11}^{(n, \mathcal{V}_2^s)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{V}_{11}^{(1, \mathcal{V}_\ell^s)} & \mathcal{V}_{11}^{(2, \mathcal{V}_\ell^s)} & \dots & \mathcal{V}_{11}^{(n, \mathcal{V}_\ell^s)} \end{bmatrix}$$

Here, $\mathcal{V}_{11}^{(1, \mathcal{V}_1^s)}$ contains the transport cost from vertex \mathcal{V}_1^s to vertex \mathcal{V}_{11} in the first category of POIs via transport medium 1. Next, from the first category to the second category of POIs, each POI in the second category obtains g many variables, and the second category contains total $p_2 \times g$ variables, and the cost of each transport medium will be multiplied with ℓ as all the agents are traveled by a group. Here, \mathcal{V}_{21} is a POI in the second category. The representation is as follows.

$$\mathcal{V}_{21} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{V}_{21}^{(1, \mathcal{V}_{11})} & \mathcal{V}_{21}^{(2, \mathcal{V}_{11})} & \dots & \mathcal{V}_{21}^{(n, \mathcal{V}_{11})} \\ \mathcal{V}_{21}^{(1, \mathcal{V}_{12})} & \mathcal{V}_{21}^{(2, \mathcal{V}_{12})} & \dots & \mathcal{V}_{21}^{(n, \mathcal{V}_{12})} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{V}_{21}^{(1, \mathcal{V}_{1p_1})} & \mathcal{V}_{21}^{(2, \mathcal{V}_{1p_1})} & \dots & \mathcal{V}_{21}^{(n, \mathcal{V}_{1p_1})} \end{bmatrix}$$

Similarly, for all intermediate categories till the k^{th} category, all POIs contain g many variables. Finally, from the last category to the destination vertices, each obtains g many variables. Here, in this case, the destination vertices cost will not multiplied by the number of agents as their destinations are different. This can be represented as given below.

$$\mathcal{V}_1^d = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{V}_1^{d(1, \mathcal{V}_{k1})} & \mathcal{V}_1^{d(2, \mathcal{V}_{k1})} & \dots & \mathcal{V}_1^{d(n, \mathcal{V}_{k1})} \\ \mathcal{V}_1^{d(1, \mathcal{V}_{k2})} & \mathcal{V}_1^{d(2, \mathcal{V}_{k2})} & \dots & \mathcal{V}_1^{d(n, \mathcal{V}_{k2})} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{V}_1^{d(1, \mathcal{V}_{kp_k})} & \mathcal{V}_1^{d(2, \mathcal{V}_{kp_k})} & \dots & \mathcal{V}_1^{d(n, \mathcal{V}_{kp_k})} \end{bmatrix}$$

a) **Complexity Analysis of Algorithm 1:** Now, we analyze the time and space requirements of Algorithm 1. In-Line No. 1, constructing the multi-graph and ensuring connectivity by adding edges between disconnected components takes $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$, where n and m are the numbers of vertices and edges in the graph. Next, in Line No. 2 to 3 scanning node attributes to classify POIs into k categories takes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ and in Line No. 4 randomly assigning source v_i^s and destination v_i^d will take $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. Initializing the DP dictionary in Line No. 5 will take $\mathcal{O}(n)$, and in Line No. 6, initialization of variables will take $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. So, Line No. 1 to 5 will take $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time. Next, in Line No. 7 to 19 for each POI $j \in \mathcal{P}[C_1]$ and each source $i \in v_i^s$, computing shortest path (using Dijkstra) will take $\mathcal{O}(n \log n + m \log n)$ and the total time requirement will be $\mathcal{O}(\ell \cdot p_1 \cdot n \log n + \ell \cdot p_1 \cdot m \log n)$, where ℓ and p_1 are the number of agents and number of POIs in $\mathcal{P}[C_1]$, respectively. In Line No. 20 to 33, for each POI $j \in \mathcal{P}[C_c]$ and each POI $i \in \mathcal{P}[C_{c-1}]$ computing shortest path will take $\mathcal{O}(n \log n + m \log n)$. Considering p_c is the number of POIs in $\mathcal{P}[C_c]$ and p_{c-1} is the number of POIs in $\mathcal{P}[C_{c-1}]$, the time requirements will be $\mathcal{O}(p_c \cdot p_{c-1} \cdot (n \log n + m \log n))$. Now, summing all the intermediate category ($k - 2$), the total time

Algorithm 1: An Optimal Journey Planning Algorithm

Data: The Road Network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, W)$, ℓ number of agents, transport details, the set of Source and Destination Points of Interest (PoIs) v_i^s and v_i^d , the set of PoI categories \mathcal{C} , and the set of transport mediums \mathcal{M} .

Result: A journey (routes and corresponding vehicles) connecting the PoIs v_i^s and v_i^d with minimum cost.

```

/* Step 1: Graph Construction and Initialization */
1 Construct a multi-graph  $\mathcal{G}$  using transport details, with nodes  $\mathcal{V}$  and edges  $\mathcal{E}$ ;
2 Identify the set of categories  $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$  from node attributes;
3 Categorize PoIs into  $\mathcal{P}[c]$  for each category  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , ensuring intermediate
   categories have a fixed number of PoIs;
4 Randomly assign sources  $v_i^s \in C_1$  and destinations  $v_i^d \in C_k$ ;
5 Initialize a DP dictionary  $DP[c][i] \leftarrow \infty$  for minimum costs to PoIs in
   category  $c$  from source  $v_i^s$ ;
/* Step 2: Base Case (First Category) */
6  $First\_Category\_Cost = \infty$ ,  $Chosen\_PoI = \emptyset$ ,  $Best\_Path = []$ ;
7 for each PoI  $j \in \mathcal{P}[C_1]$  do
8    $total\_cost = 0$ ;  $path = []$ ;
9   for each source  $i$  in  $v_i^s$  do
10    if a path exists from  $i$  to  $j$  then
11      $path \leftarrow ShortestPath(\mathcal{G}, i, j, W)$ ;
12      $path\_cost \leftarrow ShortestPathCost(\mathcal{G}, i, j, W)$ ;
13      $total\_cost \leftarrow total\_cost + path\_cost$ ;
14     update  $path$ ;
15   if  $total\_cost < First\_Category\_Cost$  then
16      $First\_Category\_Cost \leftarrow total\_cost$ ;
17      $Chosen\_PoI \leftarrow j$ ;
18      $Best\_Path \leftarrow path$ ;
19  $DP[C_1][j] \leftarrow \{PoI \leftarrow Chosen\_PoI, cost \leftarrow$ 
    $First\_Category\_Cost, paths \leftarrow Best\_Path\}$ 
/* Step 3: Transition for Intermediate Categories */
20 for each category  $c \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$  do
21    $min\_cost = \infty$ ,  $Chosen\_PoI = \emptyset$ ,  $Best\_Path = []$ ;
22   for each PoI  $j \in \mathcal{P}[C_c]$  do
23     for each PoI  $i \in \mathcal{P}[C_{c-1}]$  do
24       if a path exists from  $i$  to  $j$  then
25         $path \leftarrow ShortestPath(\mathcal{G}, i, j, W)$ ;
26         $path\_cost \leftarrow$ 
27          $DP[c-1][i][cost] + ShortestPathCost(\mathcal{G}, i, j, W)$ ;
28         $total\_cost \leftarrow total\_cost + path\_cost$ ;
29        update  $path$ ;
30       if  $total\_cost < min\_cost$  then
31         $min\_cost \leftarrow total\_cost$ ;
32         $Chosen\_PoI \leftarrow j$ ;
33         $Best\_Path \leftarrow path$ ;
34    $DP[c][j] \leftarrow \{PoI \leftarrow Chosen\_PoI, cost \leftarrow$ 
    $min\_cost, paths \leftarrow Best\_Path\}$ 
/* Step 4: Transition to Destinations */
35  $last\_PoI = DP[k-1][j][PoI]$ ;
36  $optimal\_paths = []$ ;
37  $group\_path \leftarrow DP[k-1][j][path]$ ;
38  $shared\_cost \leftarrow DP[k-1][j][cost]$ ;
39  $group\_trip\_cost \leftarrow shared\_cost \times \ell$ ;
40  $individual\_cost\_sum \leftarrow 0$ ;
41 for each destination  $j \in v_i^d$  do
42   if a path exists from  $last\_PoI$  to  $j$  then
43     $path \leftarrow group\_path + ShortestPath(\mathcal{G}, last\_PoI, j, W)$ ;
44     $individual\_cost \leftarrow ShortestPathCost(\mathcal{G}, last\_PoI, j, W)$ ;
45     $individual\_cost\_sum \leftarrow$ 
46      $individual\_cost\_sum + individual\_cost$ ;
47     $optimal\_paths.append(path)$ ;
/* Step 5: Final Total Cost for Group */
48  $total\_cost\_for\_all\_agents \leftarrow$ 
49  $group\_trip\_cost + individual\_cost\_sum$ ;
50 return  $total\_cost\_for\_all\_agents, optimal\_paths$ ;

```

requirements will be $\mathcal{O}((k-2) \cdot p \cdot p \cdot (n+m) \log n)$ i.e., $\mathcal{O}(k \cdot p^2 \cdot (n+m) \log n)$. Next, in Line No. 34 to 47 time requirements will be $\mathcal{O}(\ell \cdot p_k \cdot (n+m) \log n)$, where p_k is the number of PoIs in the last category. So, the overall time complexity for Algorithm 1 will be $\mathcal{O}(k \cdot p^2 \cdot (n+m) \log n)$.

Now, we analyze the additional space requirements of Algorithm 1. The graph \mathcal{G} uses $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ space, and the DP table stores costs for all PoIs in all categories will be $\mathcal{O}(k \cdot p)$. Next, each path required $\mathcal{O}(p \cdot s)$ space, where s is the average length of the paths. Hence, the overall space requirements will be $\mathcal{O}(n+m+k \cdot p+p \cdot s)$ i.e., $\mathcal{O}(n+m+k \cdot p)$.

Theorem 1. *The time and space requirements of Algorithm 1 will be of $\mathcal{O}(k \cdot p^2 \cdot (n+m) \log n)$ and $\mathcal{O}(n+m+k \cdot p)$, respectively.*

b) An Illustrative Example: We consider the following scenario to demonstrate the working of the Algorithm 1. Let, we have a road network $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, W)$ consists of 10 PoInts of Interest (PoIs) v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{10} . The PoIs are categorized into five categories $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4, C_5\}$, where $C_1 = \{v_1, v_2\}$ (sources), $C_2 = \{v_3, v_4\}$ (first intermediate category), $C_3 = \{v_5, v_6\}$ (second intermediate category), $C_4 = \{v_7, v_8\}$ (third intermediate category), $C_5 = \{v_9, v_{10}\}$ (destinations). The edge weights W represent the travel costs, and each edge is labeled with multiple transport mediums like Bus (B), Car (C), Train (T), and Ferry (F). Figure 2 shows the road network and categories. Each edge has multiple transport mediums and costs, providing flexibility for the journey. The algorithm initializes the graph with nodes v_1 to v_{10} and assigns categories C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 , and C_5 . Next, we initialize $DP[C_1][v_1] = 0$, $DP[C_1][v_2] = 0$ and set all other $DP[c][v_i] = \infty$. In the transition for category C_2 (First Intermediate Category), for each PoI in C_2 , compute the minimum Cost from PoIs in C_1 considering all transport mediums. For example, for v_3 , the Cost from v_1 via Bus is 5, and via Train is 7. The Cost from v_2 via Car is 8, and via Ferry is 12. Next, for v_4 , cost from v_1 via Car is 3, via Bus is 6. The Cost from v_2 via Ferry is 10, and via Train is 9. So, minimum cost if v_1 and v_2 want to select v_3 is $(8+5) = 13$ and if v_4 is chosen then cost will be $(10+3) = 13$. The updated value in DP table will be $DP[C_2][v_3] = 13$ and $DP[C_2][v_4] = 13$. Now, from the second category to the third category, the minimum Cost for v_3 to v_5 is 4 via Train and v_3 to v_6 via Bus is 6. Similarly, the cost for v_4 to v_5 and v_6 are 7 and 5, respectively. So, updated value is $DP[C_3][v_5] = 17$ and $DP[C_3][v_6] = 18$. For the fourth category the updated values are $DP[C_4][v_7] = 20$ and $DP[C_4][v_8] = 21$. Finally in the last category $DP[C_5][v_9] = 25$ and $DP[C_5][v_{10}] = 24$. So, in the intermediate category, two possible minimum cost paths are $v_3 \rightarrow v_5 \rightarrow v_7$ and $v_4 \rightarrow v_6 \rightarrow v_7$. Both the paths take Cost = 20, and these intermediate paths are common for all the agents. Hence, for agent 1 who starts journey from v_1 to v_{10} the possible path is $v_1 \rightarrow v_3 \rightarrow v_5 \rightarrow v_7 \rightarrow v_{10}$ and the cost is 24. Similarly for agent 2, possible path will be $v_2 \rightarrow v_3 \rightarrow v_5 \rightarrow v_7 \rightarrow v_9$ and travel cost is 25. As both share common intermediate paths, the total group trip cost will be $(20 + 4 + 5) = 29$.




Fig. 2: Road network with categories C_1 to C_5 .

Theorem 2. *The Algorithm 1 always terminates within a finite number of steps for any valid input graph \mathcal{G} .*

Proof. Let $|\mathcal{V}|$ be the number of PoIs and $|\mathcal{E}|$ be the number of edges in the input graph \mathcal{G} . Each PoI and edge from the input is processed once to construct \mathcal{G} , which takes $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$. If the graph is disconnected, edges are added between disconnected components. Let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_p denote the p connected components of the graph. At most $p - 1$ edges are added to connect these components, which is a finite operation. For each category $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k\}$, the algorithm iterates through all pairs of PoIs $i \in C_{c-1}, j \in C_c$. Let $|C_c|$ denote the number of PoIs in category C_c . Then the pairwise iterations across all categories take at most $\sum_{c=2}^k |C_{c-1}| \cdot |C_c| \leq |\mathcal{V}|^2$. Next, the shortest path computations are performed using Dijkstra’s algorithm [27] with complexity $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{E}| \cdot \log |\mathcal{V}|)$ for each source-target pair. Since there are $|C_{c-1}| \cdot |C_c|$ such pairs, the total complexity for path computations is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{V}|^2 \cdot |\mathcal{E}| \cdot \log |\mathcal{V}|)$. The dynamic programming (DP) updates for costs and paths iterate over $|C_c|$ PoIs per category, taking $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{V}| \cdot |C_c|)$. Each algorithm stage involves a finite number of operations, and no infinite loops are possible because the graph and categories are finite. Thus, the algorithm terminates. \square

Theorem 3. *If the input graph \mathcal{G} is connected (or made connected by the algorithm), the Algorithm 1 guarantees a feasible journey from sources v_i^s to destinations v_i^d .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, W)$ be the input graph. If \mathcal{G} is not connected, the algorithm identifies connected components C_1, C_2, \dots, C_p , which ensures $\bigcup_{i=1}^p C_i = \mathcal{V}$, $C_i \cap C_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. For each pair of disconnected components, an edge is added between a PoI $v_i \in C_i$ and $v_j \in C_j$. At most $p - 1$ edges are added, ensuring that the graph becomes connected i.e., $\text{diameter}(\mathcal{G}) < \infty$. Next, for each source v_i^s , the algorithm computes the shortest path to every PoI in C_1 using Dijkstra’s algorithm, which guarantees $\exists \text{path}(v_i^s, v_j) \quad \forall v_j \in C_1$. By mathematical induction on the categories, we assume a path exists from v_i^s to any $v_j \in C_{c-1}$. The algorithm computes the shortest path from v_j to all $v_k \in C_c$, ensuring $\exists \text{path}(v_i^s, v_k) \quad \forall v_k \in C_c$. In the final PoI to destinations, the algorithm computes the shortest path from the last PoI in C_k to each destination v_i^d , ensuring $\exists \text{path}(v_i^s, v_i^d) \quad \forall v_i^d \in \mathcal{V}$. Thus, a feasible journey exists for all source-destination pairs. \square

Theorem 4. *The Algorithm 1 computes a journey with the minimum total cost between sources v_i^s and destinations v_i^d .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, W)$ be the input graph and $DP[c][j]$ represent the minimum cost to reach PoI $j \in C_c$ from any source v_i^s . The recurrence relation for DP is $DP[c][j] = \min_{i \in C_{c-1}} (DP[c-1][i] + \text{ShortestPathCost}(i, j))$. For the base case ($c = 1$), $DP[1][j] = \sum_{i \in v_i^s} \text{ShortestPathCost}(i, j)$. Now, applying mathematical induction on categories, we assume $DP[c-1][i]$ stores the minimum cost to reach $i \in C_{c-1}$. The Algorithm 1 computes the cost for $j \in C_c$ by evaluating all transitions $i \rightarrow j$ and taking the minimum, ensuring optimality $DP[c][j] = \min_{i \in C_{c-1}} (DP[c-1][i] + W(i, j))$. By mathematical induction, $DP[c][j]$ stores the minimum cost for all paths ending at $j \in C_c$. Now, for final transitions to the destinations, for each destination v_i^d , the total cost is $\text{TotalCost} = \sum_{j \in C_k} DP[k][j] + \sum_{j \in v_i^d} W(j, v_i^d)$. Since all pairwise costs are minimized in the DP updates, the final cost is also minimized. Thus, the algorithm computes the globally optimal journey. \square

V. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

In this section, we describe the experimental evaluation of the proposed solution approach. Initially, we start by describing the datasets used in our experiments.

A. Dataset Description

We evaluate our proposed approach with two different real-world datasets. First, the networks of Switzerland, which are previously used by Sauer et al. [15], [29], [30], and the second is the road network of Helsinki¹ city of Finland. The public transit network for Switzerland and Finland are collected from GTFS feed². The Switzerland network covers the timetable of two business days, and the road networks were obtained from OpenStreetMap³. The Finland dataset includes travel time and distance between all SYKE (Finnish Environment Institute), calculated for walking, cycling, public transport, and car travel [31]. This data covers two times of day: midday and rush hour. In Switzerland network we merged seven different feeds ‘Bus’, ‘Train’, ‘Ferry’, ‘Funicular’, ‘Gondola’, ‘Subway’ and ‘Tram’ into a single transport network. We categorize the PoIs into ten distinct categories ‘Train Station’, ‘Public Square’, ‘City Center’, ‘Bridge’, ‘School’, ‘Park’, ‘Bus Stop’, ‘Airport’, ‘Healthcare Facility’ and ‘Hotel’. Further, we compute the travel cost for each medium of transport using (Travel Cost = Base Fare + (Cost per minute * Travel Time) + (Cost per meter * Travel Distance)) the information provided in Table II. In the pre-processing steps, we eliminate the PoI pair from the Switzerland network in which the source and destination PoI are the same. In the case of the Finland dataset, there are complete transport road networks for the city of Helsinki. However, in our problem context, we have taken a small portion of the road networks that contain 1100 unique PoIs. One point to be highlighted is the fares given in Table II, III are the approximate fares we assumed for our problem context. An overview of the networks is given in the Table IV.

¹<https://welcome.hel.fi/>

²<https://gtfs.geops.ch/>

³<https://download.geofabrik.de/>

TABLE II: Base Fare, Cost per Meter, and Cost per Minute for Different Transport Modes in Switzerland

Transport Medium	Base Fare (CHF)	Cost per Meter (CHF)	Cost per Minute (CHF)
Bus	2.50 - 4.00	0.01 - 0.03	0.05 - 0.10
Tram	2.50 - 4.00	0.01 - 0.03	0.05 - 0.10
Train	~5.00	0.03 - 0.05	0.10 - 0.15
Ferry	5.00 - 10.00	0.05 - 0.10	0.15 - 0.25
Funicular	1.30 - 5.00	0.02 - 0.04	0.10 - 0.15
Gondola	5.00 - 15.00	0.05 - 0.15	0.20 - 0.50
Subway	2.50 - 4.00	0.01 - 0.03	0.05 - 0.10

TABLE III: Base Fare, Cost per Meter, and Cost per Minute for Different Transport Modes in Helsinki, Finland

Transport Medium	Base Fare (EUR)	Cost per Meter (EUR)	Cost per Minute (EUR)
Bike	0.00 - 5.00	0.00 - 0.10	0.05 - 0.10
Public Transport	3.20	0.03 - 0.05	0.05 - 0.10
Private Car (Taxi)	5.90	0.01 - 0.05	0.74

TABLE IV: Dataset Description

Attributes	Switzerland	Finland
Stops	44557	1100
Routes	168294	4840000
Vertices	1310	1100
Edges	11370	604950

B. Environment and Key Parameter Setup

The proposed and baseline methods are implemented in Python using the Jupyter Notebook Platform. All the experiments are conducted in a Ubuntu-operated desktop system with 64 GB RAM and an Xeon(R) 3.5 GHz processor. Next, we vary the number of agents ($|\mathcal{U}|$) by 5, 10, 20, 50, 100 to show the effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed solution approach. We also vary the number of PoIs in the intermediate category to show the scalability of the proposed and baseline methods. However, we have experimented for a different number of categories, say 5, 10, 20. We present all our experimental results considering the 10 as the default number of the intermediate category. We have experimented with all our codes three times, and the average results are reported.

C. Baseline Methodologies

a) Random PoI and Random Medium (RPRM): In this approach, from source to destination via intermediate categories of PoI, the PoIs are selected randomly, and the transport medium between two PoIs is chosen randomly.

b) Random PoI and Cheapest Medium (RPCM): This approach selects PoIs randomly from source to destination via intermediate categories of PoI; however, consider the cheapest transport medium to visit one PoI to others.

c) Nearest Neighbor PoI and Cheapest Medium (NNCM): This approach considered the nearest PoI in the first category of PoIs from the source using the cheapest transport medium, and from onwards, it selects one PoI from each category, considering the same till the destination.

D. Goals of our Experiments

The following research questions (RQ) are our focus in this study.

- **RQ1:** Varying number of agents, how do the travel cost and computational time change?
- **RQ2:** Varying number of agents, how does the usage of transport medium change?
- **RQ3:** Varying number of PoI in each category, how do the computational time and transport medium change?

E. Experimental Results and Discussions

In this section, we will address the research questions posed in Section V-D and discuss the experimental results.

1) No. of Agents Vs. Travel Cost: In this work, we vary the number of agents by 5, 10, 20, 50, and 100 to evaluate the transport cost via the different mediums of the journey. In Figure 4(a), 4(c), with the increase in the number of agents, the travel costs also increase, and from source to the first category and the last category to the destinations contribute significant costs in total travel while increasing the number of agents. In the Finland dataset, the proposed ‘OJPA’ approach provides less cost than the baseline methods like ‘NNCM’, ‘RPCM’, and ‘RPRM’, and among the baseline methods, the ‘NNCM’ provides less cost and the ‘RPRM’ provides maximum cost. This happens because the ‘NNCM’ always picks the nearest PoI and cheapest medium of journey, and on the other hand, the ‘RPRM’ always picks a PoI and medium of journey randomly. In the case of the Switzerland dataset, similar observations were found as those in Finland, as reported in Figure 4(c). For example, in the Finland dataset, when the number of agents is 5, the travel costs for ‘OJPA,’ ‘NNCM,’ ‘RPCM,’ and ‘RPRM’ are 42.75 €, 160.765€, 237.5 € and 244.6 €, respectively. When the number of agents is 100, the travel costs for ‘OJPA,’ ‘NNCM,’ ‘RPCM,’ and ‘RPRM’ are 745.75 €, 2569.23 €, 4156.25 €, and 4156.25 €, respectively. Now, in the Switzerland datasets, when the number of agents varies from 5 to 100, the travel costs for ‘OJPA,’ ‘NNCM,’ ‘RPCM,’ and ‘RPRM’ are 30701.25 CHF, 68861.25 CHF, 308353.75 CHF, and 204588.75 CHF to 15005950 CHF, 75782150 CHF, 103046875 CHF, and 70440000 CHF, respectively. The reason behind providing a huge cost in the Switzerland dataset is that, in most cases, no direct paths are available in the road network. In most cases, direct paths between two PoIs are available in the Finland dataset. For this reason, the proposed ‘OJPA,’ as well as all the baseline methods, provides fewer costs than the Switzerland dataset.

2) No. of Agents Vs. Time: To determine the computational time required, we vary the number of agents and observe the run time is proportional to a varying number of agents. We have compared our proposed approach with baseline methods like ‘NNCM,’ ‘RPCM,’ and ‘RPRM’ and among them ‘NNCM’ takes more time compared to the baselines like ‘RPCM,’ and ‘RPRM’ as well as the ‘OJPA’ approach. This happens because ‘NNCM’, finds the nearest PoI from one category to the PoIs from another. It is also considered




Fig. 3: Varying $|\mathcal{U}|$ Vs. Usage of transport medium in Switzerland (*a, b, c, d, e*) and in Finland (*f, g, h, i, j*), Varying No. of Poi Vs. Cost (*k*) and Varying No. of Poi Vs. Time (*l*) for Switzerland dataset




Fig. 4: Varying $|\mathcal{U}|$ in Switzerland (*a, b*) and in Finland (*c, d*)

the cheapest medium of the journey, which leads to huge computational time. However, the ‘RPCM’ and ‘RPRM’ both methods use randomization for the selection of PoIs from one category to another, and this leads to very less runtime, and it is negligible compared to the other methods. These observations are consistent with both Switzerland as well as Finland datasets, as shown in Figure 4(b) and 4(d), respectively. For example, in the Switzerland dataset, when we vary agents from 5 to 100, the runtime for ‘OJPA’, ‘NNCM’, ‘RPCM’, and ‘RPRM’ varies from 24, 25, 2, 2 to 546, 605, 58, 53 in seconds, respectively.

3) **No. of Agents Vs. Medium Usage:** The usage of travel medium varies when the number of agents varies. Figure 3(a) to 3(j) shows the varying number of agents, how the usage of different transport mediums varies. In the Switzerland dataset, we have considered different mediums of the journey, i.e., ‘bus (BS)’, ‘ferry (FR)’, ‘gondola (GD)’, ‘subway (SW)’, ‘tram (TM)’, ‘train (TN)’. Now, with the increase in the number of agents, the usage of different mediums increases, and only ‘bus’, ‘ferry’, ‘gondola’, and ‘tram’ are used as the travel medium for all the proposed and baseline methods. In all the cases, ‘Bus’ is the most used medium while ‘gondola’ is the

least used medium of journey. In figure 3(a, b, c, d, e), we have reported the average usage of the travel mediums, and from the figure, it is clear that the Unknown (UN) medium has the highest usage. This happens in the dataset because the road network is not well connected, and to build a connected graph, we used additional edges. During the journey, most of the agents chose the edges in their optimal paths. In the ‘OJPA’ and ‘NNCM’, the usage of different mediums is almost the same, while the ‘RPCM’ and ‘RPRM’ have very far different usage of mediums due to the randomization nature. The Finland dataset consists of three journey modes: public transport (PT), private car (PC), and bike, and they are used very frequently. Public transport and private cars are the most used medium, as reported in Figure 3(f, g, h, i, j). We have observed that with the increase in the number of agents, the usage of private cars as a medium increases and public transport usage decreases. These observations are consistent with the Switzerland dataset.

4) **Additional Discussion:** Additionally, we have experimented with varying numbers of PoIs in each category to check the computational time requirements and usage of different mediums of the journey. We fixed the number of agents as 100 and varied the number of PoIs in each category by 5, 10, 15, and 20, and the experimental results are reported in Figure 3(k, l). We have observed that the computational time increases rapidly with the increased number of agents. Now, in the case of medium usage, minor changes happen in the case of the ‘OJPA’ and ‘NNCM’ approaches. However, major changes in usage occur in the ‘RPCM’, and ‘RPRM’. We have also varied the number of intermediate categories by 5, 10, 20 and observed that with an increasing number of categories, the computational cost increases rapidly. One point needs to be noted in the Switzerland and Finland datasets: we have considered an equal number of PoIs in each category, including the source and destination categories for all our experiments as default settings.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we have studied the GTP query problem in the presence of multiple transport mediums for commuting. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study on GTP Query Problem in this direction. We show that as the number of categories of PoIs increases, the problem becomes intractable. We have proposed a dynamic programming-based approach, and the proposed methodology has been analyzed to understand its time and space requirements. We conduct a large number of experiments with publicly available benchmark datasets. From the experiments, we have observed that the proposed solution approach leads to a much better quality solution compared to many baseline methods. Now, this study can be extended in the following directions. As the objective of our study is to minimize the aggregated cost of the group, it may happen that the individual cost for some agents may be too high compared to others. Hence, tackling the fairness issue in our problem context is an important direction for future research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Q. Xue, K. Wang, J. J. Lu, and Y. Liu, “Rapid driving style recognition in car-following using machine learning and vehicle trajectory data,” *Journal of advanced transportation*, vol. 2019, no. 1, p. 9085238, 2019.
- [2] J. Dai, B. Yang, C. Guo, and Z. Ding, “Personalized route recommendation using big trajectory data,” in *2015 IEEE 31st international conference on data engineering*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 543–554.
- [3] B. Qu, W. Yang, G. Cui, and X. Wang, “Profitable taxi travel route recommendation based on big taxi trajectory data,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 653–668, 2019.
- [4] R. H. Güting, “An introduction to spatial database systems,” *the VLDB Journal*, vol. 3, pp. 357–399, 1994.
- [5] S. Shekhar, *Spatial databases*. Pearson Education India, 2007.
- [6] T. Hashem, T. Hashem, M. E. Ali, and L. Kulik, “Group trip planning queries in spatial databases,” in *Advances in Spatial and Temporal Databases: 13th International Symposium, SSTD 2013, Munich, Germany, August 21–23, 2013. Proceedings 13*. Springer, 2013, pp. 259–276.
- [7] A. Tabassum, S. Barua, T. Hashem, and T. Chowdhury, “Dynamic group trip planning queries in spatial databases,” in *Proceedings of the 29th international conference on scientific and statistical database management*, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [8] S. Barua, R. Jahan, and T. Ahmed, “Weighted optimal sequenced group trip planning queries,” in *2017 18th IEEE International Conference on Mobile Data Management (MDM)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 222–227.
- [9] M. T. Mahin and T. Hashem, “Activity-aware ridesharing group trip planning queries for flexible pois,” *ACM Transactions on Spatial Algorithms and Systems (TSAS)*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1–41, 2019.
- [10] E. Ahmadi and M. A. Nascimento, “A mixed breadth-depth first search strategy for sequenced group trip planning queries,” in *2015 16th IEEE International Conference on Mobile Data Management*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2015, pp. 24–33.
- [11] M. Singhal and S. Banerjee, “Envy-free trip planning in group trip planning query problem,” in *International Conference on Network-Based Information Systems*. Springer, 2022, pp. 212–223.
- [12] N. Solanki, S. Jain, S. Banerjee, and Y. P. Kumar S, “Fairness driven efficient algorithms for sequenced group trip planning query problem,” in *Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, 2023, pp. 86–94.
- [13] M. Pothoff and J. Sauer, “Efficient algorithms for fully multimodal journey planning,” in *22nd Symposium on Algorithmic Approaches for Transportation Modelling, Optimization, and Systems, ATMOS 2022, September 8–9, 2022, Potsdam, Germany, ser. OASICS*, M. D’Emidio and N. Lindner, Eds., vol. 106. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022, pp. 14:1–14:15. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.4230/OASICS.ATMOS.2022.14>
- [14] —, “Fast multimodal journey planning for three criteria,” in *Proceedings of the Symposium on Algorithm Engineering and Experiments, ALENEX 2022, Alexandria, VA, USA, January 9–10, 2022*, C. A. Phillips and B. Speckmann, Eds. SIAM, 2022, pp. 145–157. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611977042.12>
- [15] —, “Efficient algorithms for fully multimodal journey planning,” in *22nd Symposium on Algorithmic Approaches for Transportation Modelling, Optimization, and Systems (ATMOS 2022)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [16] D. Delling, P. Sanders, D. Schultes, and D. Wagner, “Engineering route planning algorithms,” in *Algorithmics of large and complex networks: design, analysis, and simulation*. Springer, 2009, pp. 117–139.
- [17] D. Delling, K. Giannakopoulou, D. Wagner, and C. Zaroliagis, “Timetable information updating in case of delays: Modeling issues,” *Arrival Technical Report*, 2008.
- [18] D. Delling, J. Dibbelt, T. Pajor, and R. F. Werneck, “Public transit labeling,” in *Experimental Algorithms: 14th International Symposium, SEA 2015, Paris, France, June 29–July 1, 2015, Proceedings 14*. Springer, 2015, pp. 273–285.
- [19] D. Delling, T. Pajor, and R. F. Werneck, “Round-based public transit routing,” *Transportation Science*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 591–604, 2015.
- [20] A. Chassein and M. Goerigk, “A bicriteria approach to robust optimization,” *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 66, pp. 181–189, 2016.
- [21] Y. Disser, M. Müller-Hannemann, and M. Schnee, “Multi-criteria shortest paths in time-dependent train networks,” in *Experimental Algorithms: 7th International Workshop, WEA 2008 Provincetown, MA, USA, May 30–June 1, 2008 Proceedings 7*. Springer, 2008, pp. 347–361.

- [22] A. Ceder, *Public transit planning and operation: Modeling, practice and behavior*. CRC press, 2016.
- [23] R. van Nes, "Multilevel network optimization for public transport networks," *Transportation research record*, vol. 1799, no. 1, pp. 50–57, 2002.
- [24] F. Li, D. Cheng, M. Hadjieleftheriou, G. Kollios, and S.-H. Teng, "On trip planning queries in spatial databases," in *International symposium on spatial and temporal databases*. Springer, 2005, pp. 273–290.
- [25] J. Lee and S. Park, "The collective trip planning query processing using g-tree index structure," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Big Data and Smart Computing (BigComp)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 173–180.
- [26] R. Diestel, *Graph theory*. Springer (print edition); Reinhard Diestel (eBooks), 2024.
- [27] E. W. Dijkstra, "A note on two problems in connexion with graphs," in *Edsger Wybe Dijkstra: his life, work, and legacy*, 2022, pp. 287–290.
- [28] F. B. Zhan, "Three fastest shortest path algorithms on real road networks: Data structures and procedures," *Journal of geographic information and decision analysis*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 69–82, 1997.
- [29] J. Sauer, D. Wagner, and T. Zündorf, "An efficient solution for one-to-many multi-modal journey planning," in *20th Symposium on Algorithmic Approaches for Transportation Modelling, Optimization, and Systems (ATMOS 2020)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [30] D. Bez and J. Sauer, "Fast and delay-robust multimodal journey planning," in *2024 Proceedings of the Symposium on Algorithm Engineering and Experiments (ALENEX)*. SIAM, 2024, pp. 105–117.
- [31] H. Tenkanen and T. Toivonen, "Longitudinal spatial dataset on travel times and distances by different travel modes in helsinki region," *Scientific data*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 77, 2020.