∛UTS

Graph modelling approaches for motorway traffic flow prediction

by A.S. Mihaita, Zac Papachatgis, Marian-Andrei Rizoiu

SPEAKER'S NAME:

Adriana-Simona MIHAITA University of Technology Sydney, Australia

September 20 – 23, 2020

Online IEEE ITSC 2020



www.fmlab.org



Summary

1. Introduction

2. Methodology

- 1. Spatial and Graph Structure
- 2. Backtracking Prediction Method (BKTR-P)
- 3. Interpolation Prediction Method (INTR-P)

3. Case Study

- 1. Sydney M7 motorway
- 2. Daily Profile and traffic flow map

4. Experimental setup

- 1. Prediction setup
- 2. Past and future prediction horizon selection
- 3. Other baseline models

5. Results

- 1. BKTR-P and INTR-P results
- 2. Past vs future time horizon analysis
- 3. Comparison with other Deep Learning models

6. Conclusions



Introduction



Challenges for accurate flow prediction:

- a) large amounts of data sets generated every minute across large areas,
- b) the spatial structure and layout of the network can induce high complexity in the localisation of traffic count stations and their utilisation,
- c) stochastic events which can severely disturb regular traffic conditions,
- d) the spatial and temporal distribution of traffic flow can induce direct and indirect congestion propagation patterns and
- e) missing or erroneous data due to varying equipment functioning state, or inconsistent human reporting.

Summary 1. Introduction

2. Methodology

- 1. Spatial and Graph Structure
- 2. Backtracking Prediction Method (BKTR-P)
- 3. Interpolation Prediction Method (INTR-P)
- 3. Case Study
 - 1. Sydney M7 motorway
 - 2. Daily Profile and traffic flow map

4. Experimental setup

- 1. Prediction setup
- 2. Past and future prediction horizon selection
- 3. Other baseline models

5. Results

- 1. BKTR-P and INTR-P results
- 2. Past vs future time horizon analysis
- 3. Comparison with other Deep Learning models

6. Conclusions











Fig. 1: Methodology for the proposed graph-flow prediction along the M7 motorway, as a succession of five steps.



Ť

Some notations:

- F(s; i) the vehicle flow recorded by a station s, during the interval
- Three types of station profiles: E.g. 39A (straight station), 12E (exit station), 15X(exit stations)
- $s_1 \rightarrow s_2$: a car that is recorded by s_1 could be recorded next by s_2 .

Graph structure:

- G(V;E): V is the set of vertexes (or nodes) here the stations. E is the set of edges (or arcs)
- s_1 -> s_2 : a car that is recorded by s_1 could be recorded next by s_2 ; s_1 , s_2 are from G.
- Unidirectional edges with attributes (distance, travel time)
- separate ways for upstream and downstream traffic

1. Backtracking Prediction Method (BKTR-P)



 look upstream for a station u of type a which lies r+p time intervals upstream of station at expected distance (r+p)*d*avg(speed(u,v))

How?

- By building the distance matrix between **u** and **v** during **r+p** time intervals
- We transverse the graph between **u** and **v** and detect all entries/exits

One step prediction
$$\widehat{F}(v;t+1) = F(u;t-1) + \sum_{e \in \mathscr{E}} F(e;t-1) - \sum_{x \in \mathscr{X}} F(x;t-1)$$

p=1, r=1: predict the flow at station v using flow at station u and add/extract flow of entries/exits

1. Backtracking Prediction Method (BKTR-P)

Multiple step prediction



Position of vehicles passing through stations





1. Interpolation Prediction Method (INTR-P)

Similar to BKTR-P but interpolating the recorded flow values in two consecutive time intervals $t_1, t_2: F^*(s; i \rightarrow i+1)$ Where $t_1 + t_2 = d$



a) BKTR-P exemplification b) flow representation between two time intervals

UTS



1. Interpolation Prediction Method (INTR-P)

Similar to BKTR-P but interpolating the recorded flow values in two consecutive time intervals $t_1, t_2: F^*(s; i \rightarrow i+1)$ Where $t_1 + t_2 = d$



a) BKTR-P exemplification

b) flow representation between two time intervals c)

c) INTR-P exemplification.





Summary

1. Introduction

2. Methodology

- 1. Spatial and Graph Structure
- 2. Backtracking Prediction Method (BKTR-P)
- 3. Interpolation Prediction Method (INTR-P)

3. Case Study

- 1. Sydney M7 motorway
- 2. Daily Profile and traffic flow map

4. Experimental setup

- 1. Prediction setup
- 2. Past and future prediction horizon selection
- 3. Other baseline models

5. Results

- 1. BKTR-P and INTR-P results
- 2. Past vs future time horizon analysis
- 3. Comparison with other Deep Learning models

6. Conclusions



Daily profiling and outlier identification

M7 motorway details:

- 2017 data set
- 208 bi-directional "flow counting stations"
- 36.34 million data points
- d = 3min
- d_i the i_{th} interval of a day, i = 1:480.

Outlier and anomaly detection

- Missing records
- All-zero records
- Abnormal long data records

Current work on anomaly detection using Deep Learning Submitted (Mihaita, A.S., Li, H., Rizoiu, M.A., Traffic congestion anomaly detection and prediction using deep learning, Transport Part C, August 2020).

UTS



Fig. 3: a) Daily Profile - Historical data by day of the week, b) Example of traffic outliers and anomaly detection across consecutive traffic flow stations without any entries/exits in between.

Summary

1. Introduction

2. Methodology

- 1. Spatial and Graph Structure
- 2. Backtracking Prediction Method (BKTR-P)
- 3. Interpolation Prediction Method (INTR-P)
- 3. Case Study
 - 1. Sydney M7 motorway
 - 2. Daily Profile and traffic flow map

4. Experimental setup

- 1. Prediction setup
- 2. Past and future prediction horizon selection
- 3. Other baseline models

5. Results

- 1. BKTR-P and INTR-P results
- 2. Past vs future time horizon analysis
- 3. Comparison with other Deep Learning models

ÖUTS

6. Conclusions

1) Prediction setup - 36.34 million data points



Choosing the training/testing and validation periods based on the total number of missing data points.



2) Past and future prediction horizon

By varying *t* on a dataset with n time points, we obtain n-R-P+1 pairs of inputs and outputs.

t-R

... t-2

t-1



Constraints: given by the length of the motorway in km in each direction:

R=1, p=1 – BKTR-P and INTR-P have been applied on ALL stations from 72A->03A R=5,p=5 - - BKTR-P and INTR-P have been applied on limited stations from 26A->03A

Ex1. R=2, P=1



t+1

t+2

...

t+P



3) Other models used for comparison

- 1. Daily Profile Predictor (DPP) using historical average traffic flow from daily patterns
- 2. BPNN Back propagation neuronal networks;
- 3. CNN convolutional neuronal networks
- **4. LSTM** long short term memory models
- 5. CNN-LSTM the hybrid combination model of CNN and LSTM

implemented in previous work published in :

Mihaita, A.S., Li Haowen, He Zongyang, Rizoiu Marian-Andrei, Motorway Traffic Flow Prediction using Advanced Deep Learning, IEEE Intelligent Transport Systems Conference, Auckland, New Zealand, 27-30 October 2019.



4) Performance evaluation:

i) the Root Mean Square Error:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\widehat{F}(v;t) - F(v;t)\right)^2}$$

ii) the R-squared value:

$$R^{2} = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\widehat{F}(v;t) - F(v;t)\right)^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(F(v;t) - \overline{F}(v;t)\right)^{2}}$$

iii) Symmetric Mean Absolute Percentage Error:

$$SMAPE = \frac{100\%}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{|\widehat{F}(v;t) - F(v;t)|}{|\widehat{F}(v;t)| + |F(v;t)|}.$$



Summary

1. Introduction

2. Methodology

- 1. Spatial and Graph Structure
- 2. Backtracking Prediction Method (BKTR-P)
- 3. Interpolation Prediction Method (INTR-P)
- 3. Case Study
 - 1. Sydney M7 motorway
 - 2. Daily Profile and traffic flow map

4. Experimental setup

- 1. Prediction setup
- 2. Past and future prediction horizon selection
- 3. Other baseline models

5. Results

- 1. Anomaly and outlier treatment
- 2. BKTR-P and INTR-P results
- 3. Past vs future time horizon analysis
- 4. Comparison with other Deep Learning models



6. Conclusions

Results – anomaly and outlier treatment





Results – BKTR-P and INTR-P



Ż

Results – BKTR-P and INTR-P



÷

UTS

Footer content here

Results – BKTR-P and INTR-P



Ť

Footer content here

Results – comparison with other DL models



Results – comparison with other DL models





Conclusions

- 1. Backtracking algorithm outperforms for short term predictions (less than 10 minutes) all other models, including daily profile prediction, interpolation model and deep learning models (LSTM, CNN, and hybrid CNN-LSTM).
- 2. The more complex deep learning models do not improve the prediction accuracy for our motorway flow prediction study.

Limitations

- (1) The algorithms assume no branching structure of the motorway, i.e. we only have one main flow, plus entries and exits. If we had two or more motorways, the traffic at a given station, at a given time point could have originated from multiple points in the past, from all motorways;
- (2) the methods need to be tested against more complex network structures such as regular urban traffic networks, when the complexity of the graph increases;
- (3) testing the performance of the current models against GCNNs, a popular version of CNN which embeds the graph structure of the network as well

∛UTS

QUESTIONS?

Adriana-simona.Mihaita@uts.edu.au

2 PhD Opportunities:

- A.I. for traffic management
- Traffic control for connected and autonomous vehicles



UTS CRICOS 00099F