

Compressive Origin-Destination Matrix Estimation

Borhan M. Sanandaji and Pravin P. Varaiya

Abstract

The Origin-Destination (OD) Matrix Estimation (ME) is one of the main tasks in transportation planning. Recent approaches for OD ME include estimation based on link traffic counts. In most of the situations, however, the ME is cast as an underdetermined inverse problem with infinitely many solutions as usually the number of available individual link traffic counts is much smaller than the total number of possible paths in a traffic network. As a result, there is no unique solution and one should use other available information in the ME procedure.

In this paper, we aim to perform ME under the assumption that path allocations are suitably *sparse* (i.e., among all alternative paths that exist for a given OD pair, only a few of the paths are taken in a trip). Our work, called Compressive Origin-Destination Matrix Estimation (CODE), is inspired by Compressive Sensing (CS) which is a recent paradigm in signal processing for sparse signal recovery. We show that in cases where the true path allocation is suitably sparse, it is possible to perform the OD ME from a small number of link flow observations.

The main technical novelty of our approach is in casting the OD ME problem as ℓ_1 -recovery of a sparse signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ from measurements $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ with $M < N$, where $\mathbf{y}$ contains link traffic counts, $\mathbf{A}$ is a binary matrix whose structure is dependent on the topology of the network and is assumed to be known, and $\mathbf{x}$ is the path allocation vector with $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq S < N$. The path allocation vector $\mathbf{x}$ contains all OD pair flows and path splits for each OD pair as unknowns. We support CODE with illustrative simulations where we consider noiseless, noisy, and weighted versions of the algorithm. When there is exact recovery, CODE is actually able to recover the path splits for each OD pair in addition to all OD pair flows from link traffic counts. In addition to synthetic examples, we consider applying CODE to real data taken from a region in East Providence.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Origin-Destination (OD) Matrix Estimation (ME) is one of the most essential tasks in transportation planning and analysis. Traditional approaches for obtaining the OD matrix involve using home or roadside interview surveys. However, these methods are usually costly and hard or even impossible to obtain in a timely manner. Therefore, traffic planners and researchers have considered different methods for estimating the OD matrix based on traffic counts of individual links in a traffic network [1]–[9]. For a complete literature survey of different approaches to OD ME using traffic counts, see [6], [8], [9], among others. In more recent approaches to OD ME, tag-based data from Automatic Vehicle Identification (AVI) and Electronic Toll Collection (ETC) are also included in the ME process [10]–[12]. The OD ME methods can be also partitioned into static and dynamic traffic models [8], [13], [14]. In a static model, the traffic flows are assumed to be time-independent and the goal of the ME is to recover average OD flows which is useful for long-term traffic planning. In a dynamic traffic model, however, the OD flows are time-dependent and we have access to link measurements on shorter time frames [1], [4], [15], [16]. In most of these approaches, the OD ME is cast as an inverse problem where one is interested in recovering the path allocations given the link traffic counts and the topology of the traffic network. However, this inverse problem is usually highly underdetermined as usually the total number of possible paths in a network is usually much greater than the number of links. As a result, there exist infinitely many solutions satisfying the inverse problem and one should use other available information and criteria in the ME procedure.

B. M. Sanandaji and P. P. Varaiya are with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720 USA (e-mail: {sanandaji,varaiya}@eecs.berkeley.edu).

Supported in part by EPRI and CERTS under sub-award 09-206; PSERC S-52; NSF under Grants EECS-1129061, CPS-1239178, and CNS-1239274; the Republic of Singapore National Research Foundation through a grant to the Berkeley Education Alliance for Research in Singapore for the SinBerBEST Program; Robert Bosch LLC through its Bosch Energy Research Network funding program.




Fig. 1: Traffic network model with 3 origin and destination zones, 4 links, and 7 possible paths associated with 6 possible OD pairs. In this example, for each OD pair there exists only one path except for OD pair 1-3 (from origin zone 1 to destination zone 3) for which there exist 2 alternative paths: $\ell_2^1\ell_3^2$ and ℓ_3^1 .

A. Sparse Path Allocations and CODE

In this paper, we aim to perform the OD ME under the assumption that among all alternative paths that exist for a given OD pair, only a few of the paths are taken in a trip. In other words, the path allocation vector which contains all OD pair flows and path splits of each OD pair is suitably *sparse*. Our work is inspired by Compressive Sensing (CS) [17]–[19] which is a recent paradigm in signal processing for sparse signal recovery. We show that in cases where the true path allocation is suitably sparse, it is possible to perform the OD ME from a small number of link flow observations. For this reason, we call our approach Compressive Origin-Destination Matrix Estimation (CODE). In our formulation, the path allocation vector $\mathbf{x}$ contains all OD pair flows and path splits for each OD pair as unknown variables.¹ When there is exact recovery, CODE is actually able to recover the path splits for each OD pair as well as OD pair flows from link traffic counts. The main technical novelty of our approach is in casting the OD ME problem as ℓ_1 -recovery of a sparse signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ from measurements $\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ with $M < N$, where $\mathbf{y}$ contains link traffic counts, A is a binary matrix whose structure is dependent on the topology of the network and is assumed to be known, and $\mathbf{x}$ is the path allocation vector with $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \leq S < N$.

B. Paper Organization

In section II, we setup the OD ME problem based on both the static and dynamic traffic models and introduce the sparse path allocation framework. We list some of the basic tools of CS and ℓ_1 -minimization in section III. We then examine CODE in its noiseless and noisy settings on a synthetic illustrative traffic example in section IV. We discuss a weighted version of CODE and its use in the ME problem in section V. Section VI presents a case study based on real data taken from a traffic area in East Providence.

II. PROBLEM SETUP

Let's consider a collection of origins and destinations in a traffic network. Figure 1 shows an example where each node i represents a zone and each link ℓ_j^i represents a link from node (zone) i to node j . Note that the graph is directed so there might be a road from zone i (origin) to zone j (destination) but not in the reverse direction. Each measurement y_j^i is the traffic counts of the vehicles traveling from node i to node j through the link ℓ_j^i . Note that this is a static framework. Between any given pair of ODs, there might exist several alternative paths. For example, from origin 2 to destination 1 there exists one path that starts from zone 2, passes through zone 3, and then reaches to zone 1. Likewise, from origin 1 to destination 3, there exist 2 alternative paths: node 1 to node 3 and node 1 to node 2 to node 3. If we do this path finding for all OD pairs, one can identify all possible paths in this network. Our measurements, however, are the total number of vehicles that pass through each link. For example, the measurement y_2^1 represents the total number of vehicles that pass through link ℓ_2^1 . This traffic can be an aggregation of the

¹In the OD ME literature, the path splits are usually assumed to be given and known while in CODE they are unknown variables.

traffic that is in part associated with 3 paths: the path from node 1 to 2 (called path p_1), the path from node 1 to node 2 to node 3 (called path p_2), and the path from node 3 to node 1 to node 2 (called path p_7). Our goal is to recover the contribution of each path from the measurement y_2^1 . Formally,

$$y_2^1 = x^{\ell_2^1} + x^{\ell_2^1 \ell_3^2} + x^{\ell_1^3 \ell_2^1} := x_1 + x_2 + x_7,$$

where x_i (also shown as x^{p_i}) is the contribution of path p_i to the considered link flow measurement. Observe that in this example, there are a total of 7 possible paths associated with 6 different OD pairs. Traffic counts associated with this example can be represented in a matrix-vector product format as:

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} y_2^1 \\ y_3^1 \\ y_3^2 \\ y_1^3 \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{y}} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}}_A \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \\ x_5 \\ x_6 \\ x_7 \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{x}}. \quad (1)$$

The goal in the OD ME problem is to recover $\mathbf{x}$ from link flow observations $\mathbf{y}$. Apparently, this is an underdetermined set of linear equations which has a non-trivial nullspace. Therefore, there exist infinitely many solutions $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ that satisfy the linear equations, making the unique recovery of the true solution impossible, in general. However, in the following we show that under some conditions we can recover a unique solution. We first explain the traffic model which is based on the *conservation law*.

A. Static Traffic Model and the Conservation Law

Assume there are K OD pairs ($k = 1, 2, \dots, K$) associated with N paths ($n = 1, 2, \dots, N$). The conservation law dictates that for any link ℓ_j^i from node i to node j , we have the following traffic model. Let y_j^i be the count of vehicles on link ℓ_j^i and f_k be the total count of vehicles traveling the k th OD pair. Then, in a static traffic model y_j^i can be written as

$$\text{(measurement model): } y_j^i = \sum_k \left(\sum_n w_{k,n} a_{k,n}^{i \rightarrow j} \right) f_k, \quad (2)$$

where $w_{k,n}$ represents the percentage of vehicles that take the n th path in traveling the k th OD pair, and $a_{k,n}^{i \rightarrow j}$ is a binary variable that equals to 1 if ℓ_j^i belongs to the n th path in traveling the k th OD pair and 0 otherwise [20]. Note that the weights $w_{k,n}$ (also called path splits) should satisfy

$$\text{(weight constraints): } \begin{cases} \sum_n w_{k,n} = 1, \\ 0 \leq w_{k,n} \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad \begin{matrix} k = 1, \dots, K, \\ k = 1, \dots, K \text{ and } n = 1, \dots, N. \end{matrix} \quad (3)$$

For each link flow measurement y_j^i , we can rewrite (2) as

$$y_j^i = [a_{1,1}^{i \rightarrow j} \dots a_{k,n}^{i \rightarrow j} \dots a_{K,N}^{i \rightarrow j}] \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} w_{1,1} f_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_{k,n} f_k \\ \vdots \\ w_{K,N} f_K \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N}. \quad (4)$$

Note that in our formulation (4) the dimension of $\mathbf{x}$ is equal to the total number of paths in a network.

For the network of Fig. 1, let's define $p_1 = \ell_2^1, p_2 = \ell_2^1 \ell_3^2, p_3 = \ell_3^1, p_4 = \ell_3^2 \ell_1^3, p_5 = \ell_3^2, p_6 = \ell_1^3, p_7 = \ell_1^3 \ell_2^1$. Noting that by constraints (3), $w_{1,1} = w_{3,4} = w_{4,5} = w_{5,6} = w_{6,7} = 1$ and $w_{2,2} + w_{2,3} = 1$. We have

$$(\text{static link traffic counts}): \begin{cases} y_2^1 = \underbrace{w_{1,1}f_1}_{x_1} + \underbrace{w_{2,2}f_2}_{x_2} + \underbrace{w_{6,7}f_6}_{x_7} = f_1 + w_{2,2}f_2 + f_6, \\ y_3^1 = \underbrace{w_{2,3}f_2}_{x_3} = w_{2,3}f_2, \\ y_3^2 = \underbrace{w_{2,2}f_2}_{x_2} + \underbrace{w_{3,4}f_3}_{x_4} + \underbrace{w_{4,5}f_4}_{x_5} = w_{2,2}f_2 + f_3 + f_4, \\ y_1^3 = \underbrace{w_{3,4}f_3}_{x_4} + \underbrace{w_{5,6}f_5}_{x_6} + \underbrace{w_{6,7}f_6}_{x_7} = f_3 + f_5 + f_6. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Remark 1: In our formulation, when there is exact recovery one can recover all OD flows f_k and path splits $w_{k,n}$ based on the recovered $\mathbf{x}$. For example, given x_2 and x_3 , we can recover f_2 because $x_2 + x_3 = w_{2,2}f_2 + w_{2,3}f_2 = (w_{2,2} + w_{2,3})f_2 = f_2$. Also, we can recover $w_{2,2} = x_2/f_2$ and $w_{2,3} = x_3/f_2$.

Remark 2: The decomposition (4) is different than the standard way as here we assume the weights $w_{k,n}$ are *unknown* a priori and therefore they are incorporated into $\mathbf{x}$. This is one of the main differences of our approach for OD ME with other works. Apparently, this makes $\mathbf{x}$ live in a higher-dimensional subspace. However, under *sparse path allocation* assumption, we show that how one can recover sparse solutions, even from a highly underdetermined set of linear equations.

B. Dynamic Traffic Model

In section II-A, we presented the conservation law under a static traffic model. In a static model, the traffic flows are assumed to be time-independent and the goal of the ME is to recover average OD flows which is useful for long-term traffic planning. In a dynamic traffic model, however, the OD flows are time-dependent and we have access to link measurements on shorter time frames. This model is more realistic as it can include hour-to-hour (e.g., rush hours vs. normal hours) or day-to-day (e.g., weekdays vs. weekends) link traffic counts and OD pair flows. Apparently, analyzing dynamic traffic models is more complicated than the static case. In particular, in a dynamic model one needs to consider the time delay between the *start time* (the time a vehicle leaves an origin) and the *count time* (the time a vehicle is being detected by the counter device on the considered link). This time delay is assumed to be zero in a static traffic model. As a result, in a dynamic framework the link flow measurements y_j^i and OD flows f_k are time dependent. For simplicity of illustration, we assume a one-sample time delay in passing through each link in the network example of Fig. 1.² Under this assumption, a dynamic version of (5) is

$$(\text{dynamic link traffic counts}): \begin{cases} y_2^1(t) = f_1(t) + w_{2,2}f_2(t) + f_6(t-1), \\ y_3^1(t) = w_{2,3}f_2(t), \\ y_3^2(t) = w_{2,2}f_2(t-1) + f_3(t) + f_4(t), \\ y_1^3(t) = f_3(t-1) + f_5(t) + f_6(t). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The set of equations (6) can be compactly written in a matrix-vector product format as

²This assumption is only for simplifying our illustration and might be the case for small traffic networks. For larger networks, however, a more careful calculation of time delays (based on link lengths, link conditions, network topology, traffic times, etc.) is required.

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} y_2^1(t) \\ y_3^1(t) \\ y_3^2(t) \\ y_1^3(t) \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{y}(t)} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}}_A \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} f_1(t) \\ w_{2,2}f_2(t) \\ w_{2,3}f_2(t) \\ w_{2,2}f_2(t-1) \\ f_3(t) \\ f_3(t-1) \\ f_4(t) \\ f_5(t) \\ f_6(t) \\ f_6(t-1) \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{x}(t)}. \quad (7)$$

Comparing (7) with its static version (1) reveals that considering time delays in the model increases the dimensionality of $\mathbf{x}(t)$, making the OD ME problem even more underdetermined. However, in a dynamic framework we can take measurements over time and consider a stacked version of (7) in the OD ME.

III. COMPRESSIVE SENSING (CS)

CS, introduced by Candès, Romberg and Tao [21] and Donoho [17], is a powerful paradigm in signal processing which enables the recovery of an unknown vector from an underdetermined set of measurements under the assumption of sparsity of the signal and under certain conditions on the measurement matrix. The CS recovery problem can be viewed as recovery of an S -sparse signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ from its observations $\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ is the measurement matrix with $M < N$ (in many cases $M \ll N$). An S -sparse signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is a signal of length N with S non-zero entries where $S \ll N$. The notation $S := \|\mathbf{x}\|_0$ denotes the sparsity level of $\mathbf{x}$. Since the matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ has a non-trivial nullspace when $M < N$, there exist infinitely many solutions to the equation $\mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x}$, given $\mathbf{y}$. However, recovery of $\mathbf{x}$ is indeed possible from CS measurements if the true signal is known to be sparse. Recovery of the true signal can be accomplished by seeking a sparse solution among these candidates.

A. Recovery via ℓ_0 -minimization

Supposing that $\mathbf{x}$ is exactly S -sparse, recovery of $\mathbf{x}$ from $\mathbf{y}$ can be formulated as the ℓ_0 -minimization

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_0} := \arg \min \|\mathbf{x}\|_0 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x}. \quad (8)$$

The recovery problem (8) can be interpreted as finding an S -term approximation to $\mathbf{y}$ given A [17], [22].

B. Recovery via ℓ_1 -minimization

Solving the ℓ_0 -minimization problem (8) is known to be NP-hard. Thanks to the results of CS in regards to sparse signal recovery, however, it has been discovered that it is not always necessary to solve the ℓ_0 -minimization problem (8) to recover $\mathbf{x}$. In fact, a much simpler problem often yields an equivalent solution: we only need to solve for the “ ℓ_1 -sparsest” $\mathbf{x}$ that agrees with the measurements $\mathbf{y}$ by solving

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_1} := \arg \min \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x}. \quad (9)$$

The ℓ_1 -minimization problem (9), also known as Basis Pursuit (BP) [23], is significantly more approachable than the ℓ_0 -minimization problem (8) and can be solved with traditional linear programming techniques whose computational complexities are polynomial in N . A noise-aware version of the ℓ_1 -minimization (9) can be considered by relaxing the equality constraint as

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_1} := \arg \min \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|\mathbf{y} - A\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \delta, \quad (10)$$

where δ is a parameter that depends on the noise content of the measurements.

TABLE I: The 3 plausible OD pairs and their corresponding 14 paths for the network of Fig. 2.

	OD pair 3 – 1		OD pair 3 – 2		OD pair 4 – 2
p_1	ℓ_1^3	p_6	$\ell_1^3 \rightarrow \ell_2^1$	p_{10}	$\ell_1^4 \rightarrow \ell_2^1$
p_2	$\ell_2^3 \rightarrow \ell_1^2$	p_7	ℓ_2^3	p_{11}	$\ell_1^4 \rightarrow \ell_3^1 \rightarrow \ell_2^3$
p_3	$\ell_2^3 \rightarrow \ell_4^2 \rightarrow \ell_1^4$	p_8	$\ell_4^3 \rightarrow \ell_1^4 \rightarrow \ell_2^1$	p_{12}	ℓ_2^4
p_4	$\ell_4^3 \rightarrow \ell_1^4$	p_9	$\ell_4^3 \rightarrow \ell_2^4$	p_{13}	$\ell_3^4 \rightarrow \ell_1^3 \rightarrow \ell_2^1$
p_5	$\ell_4^3 \rightarrow \ell_2^4 \rightarrow \ell_1^2$			p_{14}	$\ell_3^4 \rightarrow \ell_2^3$

C. ℓ_0/ℓ_1 Equivalence and the Restricted Isometry Property

In using the ℓ_1 -minimization problem (9) as a relaxation of the ℓ_0 -minimization problem (8), one should note that $\hat{x}_{\ell_1}$ is not equal to $\hat{x}_{\ell_0}$ unless the measurement matrix A satisfies some conditions. The Restricted Isometry Property (RIP), introduced by Candès and Tao [24], is one of the most fundamental recovery conditions that has been studied in the CS literature [19]. Establishing the RIP for a given matrix A guarantees that the solution to the ℓ_1 -minimization problem is equivalent to the solution to the ℓ_0 -minimization problem. However, the RIP condition is a *sufficient* recovery condition and in many cases the ℓ_1 -minimization recovers the true sparse solution while A does not satisfy the RIP. In particular, when sparse dynamical systems are involved the gap between the RIP and the actual recovery performance increases. Such applications have been recently investigated in system identification [25]–[29], observability and control design of linear systems [30], [31], and identification of interconnected networks [32], [33].

IV. AN ILLUSTRATIVE SYNTHETIC TRAFFIC NETWORK EXAMPLE

In order to better explain the ideas, let's consider a synthetic network example. While our proposed CODE algorithm can be applied to dynamic traffic models as explained in section II-B, for the sake of simplicity and saving space we consider applying CODE to static traffic models. Figure 2 shows the structure of the considered network. There are 4 nodes (OD zones) connected with 10 links. The link from node i to node j is denoted by ℓ_j^i where the vehicle count measurements on this link is denoted by y_j^i . In total, there are 12 possible OD pairs, each can be achieved via alternative paths. In this example, we assume that only 3 of the OD pairs are plausible. Table I lists the considered plausible OD pairs and their corresponding 14 paths. If we have access to all of the 10 link flow measurements, based on (4) and the structure of the network (Fig. 2), we can form a set of linear equations as

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} y_2^1 \\ y_3^1 \\ y_1^2 \\ y_4^2 \\ y_1^3 \\ y_2^3 \\ y_4^3 \\ y_1^4 \\ y_2^4 \\ y_3^4 \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^M} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}}_{A \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} w_{1,1}f_1 \\ w_{1,2}f_1 \\ w_{1,3}f_1 \\ w_{1,4}f_1 \\ w_{1,5}f_1 \\ w_{2,6}f_2 \\ w_{2,7}f_2 \\ w_{2,8}f_2 \\ w_{2,9}f_2 \\ w_{3,10}f_3 \\ w_{3,11}f_3 \\ w_{3,12}f_3 \\ w_{3,13}f_3 \\ w_{3,14}f_3 \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N}. \quad (11)$$




Fig. 2: Traffic network model with 4 nodes (OD zones) and 10 links.

Apparently, even if we have access to all of the 10 possible link flow measurements, the set of linear equations (11) is underdetermined. A conventional way to recover $\mathbf{x}$ is by solving the ℓ_2 -minimization

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_2} := \arg \min \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} \\ x_i \geq 0, \forall i. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Several variants of least-squares techniques have been proposed and studied in the OD ME literature. See [6], [8], [9] for detailed surveys, among others. However, for the sake of this paper we can reasonably categorize them as the ℓ_2 -minimization problem given in (12). We show that under sparse path allocation assumption, we can recover the true solution by solving the ℓ_1 -minimization:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_1} := \arg \min \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} \\ x_i \geq 0, \forall i. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Note that the constraint $x_i \geq 0, \forall i$ is added to account for non-negativeness of the path allocations.

A. Noiseless Recovery of Sparse Path Allocations

In the following, we consider different scenarios where the ℓ_1 -minimization (13) is successful in recovering $\mathbf{x}$. Let's start by considering noiseless recovery and motivating the CODE algorithm.

Example 1 (ℓ_1 -Recovery vs. ℓ_2 -Recovery): Let's consider the network example given in Fig. 2. Let's assume we have access to only 6 link measurements as: $\{y_2^1, y_3^1, y_2^2, y_2^3, y_4^3, y_3^4\}$. The goal is to recover $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{14}$ based on the available link flow measurements. The true path allocation $\mathbf{x}$ in this example is 4-sparse while satisfying conditions (3). In particular, we have assumed that p_2 is the taken path in OD pair 3–1 with $w_{1,2} = 1$, p_8 is the taken path in OD pair 3–2 with $w_{2,8} = 1$, and p_{11} and p_{14} are the taken paths in OD pair 4–2 with $w_{3,11} = 0.25$ and $w_{3,14} = 0.75$, respectively. Note that $w_{3,11} + w_{3,14} = 1$. Fig. 3 depicts the recovery results. As can be seen, the ℓ_1 -minimization succeeds in recovering the true 4-sparse $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{14}$ from 6 link measurements while the ℓ_2 -minimization fails, motivating the CODE algorithm. A keen reader should observe that he recovered solution from ℓ_2 -recovery is not even sparse. $\square$




Fig. 3: (Example 1) Illustration of how the ℓ_1 -minimization succeeds and ℓ_2 -minimization fails in recovery of the true 4-sparse path allocation from 6 link flow measurements of the traffic network of Fig. 2.

Example 2: In this example, we show that how the required number of measurements for exact recovery via ℓ_1 -minimization increases with the sparsity level of $\mathbf{x}$. Let's consider two fixed supports for $\mathbf{x}$: a 3-sparse $\mathbf{x}$ ($\mathcal{S}_1 = \{5, 9, 13\}$) and a 4-sparse $\mathbf{x}$ ($\mathcal{S}_2 = \{2, 8, 11, 14\}$). On each of these supports, we generate several $\mathbf{x}$ while satisfying constraints (3). We repeat this experiment for different number of link flow measurements. For a fixed number of measurements, we randomly choose a subset of links as our available link flow measurements at each iteration. We repeat this experiment for 500 iterations and solve the ℓ_1 -minimization (13). In order to better understand the set of recovered solutions, we consider 3 different recovery scenarios. In its most rigorous case, we consider $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_1}$ to be an exact recovery only if $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_1} = \mathbf{x}$. In other words, exact recovery happens if all of the weights and OD flows are perfectly recovered. However, as mentioned earlier $\mathbf{x}$ contains a particular structure due to constraints (3). For example, one might consider $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_1}$ as a successful recovery if all OD flows are perfectly recovered while the recovered weights do not necessarily match the true weights. In its least rigorous case, one might consider $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_1}$ to be a successful recovery if the sum of all recovered OD flows match the true total flow sum. Based on the application, all of these recovery criteria can be considered and are important in transpiration planning. Fig. 4 shows the recovery results for all of these situations. Fig. 4(a) and 4(b) depict how the recovery performance improves as less rigorous recovery criterion is considered for a 3-sparse and a 4-sparse $\mathbf{x}$, respectively. As expected, one needs more measurements to recover a 4-sparse $\mathbf{x}$ than a 3-sparse $\mathbf{x}$. $\square$

Example 3: In this example, we consider all possible 3-, 4-, and 5-sparse signals and for each, we calculate the recovery rate for different number of measurements over 500 iterations. The results are illustrated in Fig. 5. At each iteration and for a given sparsity level S , we randomly generate a signal $\mathbf{x}$ (with random OD flow values and weights while satisfying (3) and on a random support). We then randomly select the link flow measurements for a given M . For each pair of M and S , we repeat this procedure for 500 iterations and calculate the recovery rate as the percentage of the times that there is an exact recovery (based on element wise recovery criterion) by solving the ℓ_1 -minimization. $\square$

B. Noisy CODE and Compressible Path Allocations

So far we have considered recovery of signals (i.e., path allocations $\mathbf{x}$) in scenarios where $\mathbf{x}$ is exactly S -sparse and in a noiseless framework. However, in practice this might not be the case and often we deal




Fig. 4: (Example 2) Illustration of how the recovery rate changes with measurements. Two fixed supports (3- and 4-sparse) are considered. The recovery rate is calculated as the percentage of the times there is an exact recovery by solving the ℓ_1 -minimization. (a) 3-sparse path allocation. (b) 4-sparse path allocation.




Fig. 5: (Example 3) Illustration of how the recovery rate changes with sparsity and measurements. We perform the following procedure at each iteration. For a given sparsity level and number of measurements, we randomly select the support and generate $\mathbf{x}$, calculate $\mathbf{y}$, and then randomly choose a subset of links as our available measurements. For each pair (S,M), we repeat this procedure for 500 iterations and calculate the recovery rate as the percentage of the times there is an exact recovery by solving the ℓ_1 -minimization.

with the so-called *compressible* signals and noisy measurements, A signal $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is called compressible when it has more than $S < N$ non-zero entries but can be well approximated by its S largest entries. In most of the practical applications of CS, one deal with compressible signals and noisy measurements.

Example 4 (Noisy ℓ_1 -Recovery): In this example, we consider CODE from noisy measurements. Let's consider signals generated on two fixed supports (a 3-sparse and a 4-sparse) as explained in Example 2. Let's assume $M = 10$ link measurements are available. A Gaussian noise level with distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.1^2)$ and a Gaussian noise level with distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.02^2)$ is added to true measurements for the 3-sparse and 4-sparse signals, respectively. We use a noise-aware version of the ℓ_1 -minimization (13) as

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_1} := \arg \min \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases} \|\mathbf{y} - A\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \delta \\ x_i \geq 0, \forall i. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$




Fig. 6: (Example 4) Illustration of how CODE can be applied to noisy measurements. Two fixed supports (a 3-sparse and a 4-sparse) are considered as explained in Example 2. All $M = 10$ link measurements are available. A Gaussian noise level with $\mathcal{N}(0, \nu^2)$ is added to true measurements. We plot the histogram of recovery error $\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2$ over 1000 iterations. (a) 3-sparse with $\nu = 0.1$ (b) 4-sparse with $\nu = 0.02$.

The parameter δ is chosen based on the noise content of measurements. For comparison, we repeat this recovery problem by solving a noise-aware version of the ℓ_2 -minimization (12) as

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell_2} := \arg \min \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases} \|\mathbf{y} - A\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \delta \\ x_i \geq 0, \forall i. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Fig. 6(a) and 6(b) illustrate the noisy recovery results where we plot the histogram of recovery error $\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2$ over 1000 iterations, for 3- and 4-sparse signals, respectively. As can be seen, the ℓ_1 -minimization is stable to noise and yields much smaller recovery error $\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}\|_2$ in both cases. $\square$

V. WEIGHTED ℓ_1 -MINIMIZATION

Expert knowledge, tag-based data captured from AVI and ETC mechanisms, etc., can provide a-priori information about the path allocations. This extra knowledge (even partial and rough) can help recovery of the true path allocation vector $\mathbf{x}$ using CODE. To this end, we propose to use a *weighted* version of the ℓ_1 -minimization problem (13) as follows

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_w = \arg \min \|\Lambda \mathbf{x}\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{y} = A\mathbf{x} \\ x_i \geq 0, \forall i, \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is a given diagonal matrix with positive entries (weights) on the diagonal. This is a convex problem and can be cast as a linear program. Note that $\|\Lambda \mathbf{x}\|_1 = \sum_i \lambda_i |x_i|$ is a weighted sum of the entries of $\mathbf{x}$. An entry of $\mathbf{x}$ assigned with a large weight tends to get more penalized in the minimization problem. Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of all possible paths for all OD-pairs where $|\mathcal{N}| = N$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of taken paths. In designing the weight matrix Λ , *higher* weights will be assigned to a subset $\mathcal{S}'$ of paths, where $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, that are *less likely* to be taken. Similarly, *lower* weights will be assigned to a subset of paths that are *more likely* to be taken. Fig. 7 shows an example where incorporating some extra information in the CODE improves the recovery of a 4-sparse $\mathbf{x}$ from 6 link flow measurements $\{y_2^1, y_3^1, y_2^3, y_4^3, y_2^4, y_3^4\}$ via solving the weighted ℓ_1 -minimization (16). The weights are chosen based on





Fig. 7: Illustration of how weighted ℓ_1 -minimization can help recovery of a 4-sparse path allocation $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{14}$ from 6 link flow measurements of the traffic network example given in Fig. 2. For clarity, the weights associated with the paths of a given OD pair are distinguished by different colors.

our rough understanding of the path allocations. For example, for OD pair 3 – 1, a smaller weight is assigned to the entry associated with the true path (p_2) compared to other alternative paths for this OD pair. Similarly, smaller weights are assigned to entries 8, 11, and 14, forcing the weighted ℓ_1 -minimization to penalize these entries less than other paths. Ideally, one would like to assign smaller weights to the non-zero entries associated with the true solution. However, it might not be always possible to find a consistent weight matrix as often we do not have access to the true support when designing Λ . In such situations, one can consider using reweighted ℓ_1 -minimization techniques as the recovery algorithm [34]. Starting from an inconsistent initial weight matrix, the reweighted ℓ_1 -minimization converges to the true solution after few iterations.³ Note that the weights do not necessarily add to 1 for a given OD pair and they simply represent our understanding of the true path allocation.


VI. CASE STUDY IN EAST PROVIDENCE

We apply CODE to traffic data recorded from an area in East Providence. Figure VI depicts the map and a schematic of the urban area under study. The matrix A associated with the area under study has 10 rows (number of measurements) and 33 columns (total number of paths). For the sake of saving space, we do not provide the path allocation table details and focus on representing the CODE recovery result. Fig. 9 illustrates the recovery results. As can be seen, the solution has only a few non-zero entries. The most significant path (p_{10}) is the path on the Grand Army of the Republic Highway ($\ell_8^1 \rightarrow \ell_9^8$). This result further confirms that there usually exists a sparse path allocation which can be recovered using CODE.

³At each iteration, the reweighted ℓ_1 -minimization updates the weight matrix based on the recovered solution at the previous iteration.



(a)



(b)

Fig. 8: Case study of CODE on real data. (a) Map of the area under study in East Providence (Grand Army of the Republic Hwy and Warren Ave). (b) Schematic of the area under study. There are a total of 33 paths associated with OD pairs while 10 link flow measurements are available.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge Keir Opie and Vassili Alexiadis from Cambridge Systematics, Inc. for providing real data and valuable discussions. The authors gratefully acknowledge Alex Kurzanskiy for his insightful comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. J. Van Zuylen and L. G. Willumsen, "The most likely trip matrix estimated from traffic counts," *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 281–293, 1980.
- [2] M. G. H. Bell, "The estimation of an origin-destination matrix from traffic counts," *Transportation Science*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 198–217, 1983.
- [3] E. Cascetta, "Estimation of trip matrices from traffic counts and survey data: a generalized least squares estimator," *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 289–299, 1984.
- [4] M. G. H. Bell, "The estimation of origin-destination matrices by constrained generalized least squares," *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 13–22, 1991.
- [5] H. Yang, T. Sasaki, Y. Iida, and Y. Asakura, "Estimation of origin-destination matrices from link traffic counts on congested networks," *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 417–434, 1992.
- [6] T. Abrahamsson, "Estimation of origin-destination matrices using traffic counts – A literature survey," *International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis - IIASA*, vol. 27, p. 76, 1998, technical Interim Report IR-98-021.
- [7] M. L. Hazelton, "Some comments on origin-destination matrix estimation," *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 811–822, 2003.
- [8] E. Bert, "Dynamic urban origin-destination matrix estimation methodology," Ph.D. dissertation, EPFL, 2009.




Fig. 9: The recovered path allocation using CODE associated with the considered area in East Providence as shown in Fig. 8(a) and Fig. 8(b). As can be seen, the solution has only a few nonzero entries. The most significant path is the path on the Grand Army of the Republic Highway ($\ell_8^1 \rightarrow \ell_9^8$).

- [9] S. Bera and K. V. Krishna Rao, “Estimation of origin-destination matrix from traffic counts: the state of the art,” *European Transport*, no. 49, pp. 3–23, 2011.
- [10] N. J. Van Der Zijpp, “Dynamic origin-destination matrix estimation from traffic counts and automated vehicle identification data,” *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, vol. 1607, no. 1, pp. 87–94, 1997.
- [11] Y. Asakura, E. Hato, and M. Kashiwadani, “Origin-destination matrices estimation model using automatic vehicle identification data and its application to the han-shin expressway network,” *Transportation*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 419–438, 2000.
- [12] J. Kwon and P. Varaiya, “Real-time estimation of origin-destination matrices with partial trajectories from electronic toll collection tag data,” *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, vol. 1923, no. 1, pp. 119–126, 2005.
- [13] M. Bierlaire, “The total demand scale: a new measure of quality for static and dynamic origin–destination trip tables,” *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 36, no. 9, pp. 837–850, 2002.
- [14] J. Barceló and J. Casas, “Dynamic network simulation with AIMSUN,” in *Simulation approaches in transportation analysis*. Springer, 2005, pp. 57–98.
- [15] I. Okutani and Y. J. Stephanedes, “Dynamic prediction of traffic volume through kalman filtering theory,” *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 1984.
- [16] M. Cremer and H. Keller, “A new class of dynamic methods for the identification of origin-destination flows,” *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 117–132, 1987.
- [17] D. L. Donoho, “Compressed sensing,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 1289–1306, 2006.
- [18] E. J. Candès, “Compressive sampling,” in *Proc. of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, vol. 3, pp. 1433–1452, 2006.
- [19] E. J. Candès and M. Wakin, “An introduction to compressive sampling,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 21–30, 2008.
- [20] E. Castillo, P. Jiménez, J. M. Menéndez, and A. J. Conejo, “The observability problem in traffic network models: Algebraic and topological methods,” *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 208–222, 2008.
- [21] E. J. Candès, J. Romberg, and T. Tao, “Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information,” *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 489–509, 2006.
- [22] M. B. Wakin, “The geometry of low-dimensional signal models,” Ph.D. dissertation, Rice University, 2006.
- [23] S. S. Chen, D. L. Donoho, and M. A. Saunders, “Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit,” *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 33–61, 1999.
- [24] E. J. Candès and T. Tao, “Decoding via linear programming,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 51, no. 12, pp. 4203–4215, 2005.
- [25] H. Ohlsson, L. Ljung, and S. Boyd, “Segmentation of ARX-models using sum-of-norms regularization,” *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 1107–1111, 2010.
- [26] R. Tóth, B. M. Sanandaji, K. Poolla, and T. L. Vincent, “Compressive system identification in the linear time-invariant framework,” in *Proc. 50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference*, pp. 783–790, 2011.
- [27] B. M. Sanandaji, “Compressive system identification (CSI): Theory and applications of exploiting sparsity in the analysis of high-dimensional dynamical systems,” Ph.D. dissertation, Colorado School of Mines, 2012.
- [28] P. Shah, B. N. Bhaskar, G. Tang, and B. Recht, “Linear system identification via atomic norm regularization,” in *Proc. 51th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 6265–6270, 2012.
- [29] B. M. Sanandaji, T. L. Vincent, K. Poolla, and M. B. Wakin, “A tutorial on recovery conditions for compressive system identification of sparse channels,” in *Proc. 51th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 6277–6283, 2012.
- [30] B. M. Sanandaji, M. B. Wakin, and T. L. Vincent, “Observability with random observations,” to appear in *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2013. [Online]. Available: arXiv:1211.4077

- [31] J. Zhao, N. Xi, L. Sun, and B. Song, "Stability analysis of non-vector space control via compressive feedbacks," in *Proc. 51th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 5685–5690, 2012.
- [32] B. M. Sanandaji, T. L. Vincent, and M. B. Wakin, "Compressive topology identification of interconnected dynamic systems via clustered orthogonal matching pursuit," in *Proc. 50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 174–180, 2011.
- [33] W. Pan, Y. Yuan, J. Goncalves, and G. Stan, "Reconstruction of arbitrary biochemical reaction networks: A compressive sensing approach," in *Proc. 51th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 2334–2339, 2012.
- [34] E. J. Candès, M. B. Wakin, and S. P. Boyd, "Enhancing sparsity by reweighted ℓ_1 minimization," *Journal of Fourier analysis and applications*, vol. 14, no. 5-6, pp. 877–905, 2008.