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Abstract—With the emergence of autonomous vehicles, it is important to understand their impact on the transportation system. However, conventional traffic simulations are time-consuming. In this paper, we introduce an analytical traffic model for unmanaged intersections accounting for microscopic vehicle interactions. The macroscopic property, i.e., delay at the intersection, is modeled as an event-driven stochastic dynamic process, whose dynamics encode the microscopic vehicle behaviors. The distribution of macroscopic properties can be obtained through either direct analysis or event-driven simulation. They are more efficient than conventional (time-driven) traffic simulation, and capture more microscopic details compared to conventional macroscopic flow models. We illustrate the efficiency of this method by delay analyses under two different policies at a two-lane intersection. The proposed model allows for 1) efficient and effective comparison among different policies, 2) policy optimization, 3) traffic prediction, and 4) system optimization (e.g., infrastructure and protocol).

I. INTRODUCTION

With the emergence of autonomous vehicles, it is important to understand how the microscopic interactions of those autonomous vehicles affect the delay and throughput of the macroscopic traffic flow, especially at unmanaged intersections.

The literature contains many traffic models that can support the analysis of delay and congestion [1]. There are two major types of traffic models: 1) microscopic simulation models where every car is tracked and 2) macroscopic flow models where traffic is described by relations among aggregated values such as flow speed and density, without distinguishing its constituent parts. The major advantage of microscopic simulation models is the precise description of inter-vehicle interactions. Such models have been widely adopted in evaluating the performance of autonomous vehicles [2]. Various evaluation platforms have been developed based on this concept such as AIMSUN [3], VISSIM [4], and others [5]. However, it can be time-consuming to obtain the micro-macro relationships by simulation. Only “point-wise” evaluation can be performed in the sense that a single parametric change in vehicle behavior requires new simulations. To gain a deeper understanding of the micro-macro relationships, an analytical model is desirable.

Macroscopic flow models provide a tractable mathematical structure with few parameters to describe interactions among vehicles. Those models usually come in the form of partial differential equations. However, it remains challenging to model intersections. Existing methods introduce boundary constraints to represent intersections [6], [7]. However, these models can only tolerate simple first-in-first-out (FIFO) policies at intersections. To consider other kinds of policies, the vehicles need to be treated as particles that interact among one another, which has not been captured by existing flow models.

This paper introduces an analytical stochastic continuous-time, discrete-event traffic model. We use it to describe delays at unmanaged intersections under different microscopic vehicle behaviors. The model considers microscopic interactions and is analytical, which absorbs the advantages of both the microscopic simulation models and macroscopic flow models. With this model, we can better understand how the microscopic behavior design of a single vehicle affects the macroscopic transportation system. In addition to direct analysis, we can perform event-driven simulation under this model, which is more efficient than conventional time-driven traffic simulation. The policies under consideration are not required to have closed-form solutions.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section II formulates the traffic model as an event-driven stochastic process, and illustrates how vehicle behaviors
are encoded in the traffic model. Section III illustrates the effectiveness of the model through case studies. Section IV discusses applications and potential extensions of the method. Section V concludes the paper.

II. TRAFFIC MODEL

This section introduces the traffic model. The traffic delay at an intersection is modeled as an event-driven stochastic process. An event is defined as the introduction of a new vehicle. This section then describes how the microscopic vehicle interactions affect the macroscopic dynamics.

A. Traffic Model at Intersections

Consider an intersection with \( K \) incoming lanes. A conflict is identified if two incoming lanes intersect with each other. These relationships can be described in a conflict graph \( G \) with the nodes being the incoming lanes and the links representing conflicts. For example, Fig. 1a illustrates one possible road configuration with four incoming lanes; and Fig. 1b shows the consequent conflict graph. \( T^k \) is the delay at lane \( k \) which will be introduced in (1).

When there are conflicts, vehicles from the corresponding lanes cannot occupy the intersection at the same time. Let \( t^*_i \) be the desired time for vehicle \( i \) to pass the center of the intersection. The vehicles are numbered such that \( t^*_i < t^*_i+1 \). Fig. 2a illustrates the desired time of occupancy (centered at \( t^*_i \)) for vehicles coming in the four lanes in Fig. 1a. According to the conflict graph in Fig. 1b, the scenario in Fig. 2a is infeasible as vehicles 1, 2, 3, and 4 cannot occupy the intersection at the same time. Let \( \tilde{t}_i \) be the actual time for vehicle \( i \) to pass the center of the intersection. Fig. 2b shows the actual time of occupancy when all vehicles adopt the FIFO policy. The actual time of occupancy may change when the policy changes, resulting in different amount of traffic delay. For example, Fig. 2c corresponds to another policy which will be introduced in Section III.

For quantitative analysis, the traffic at the intersection is modeled as an event-driven stochastic system with the state being the traffic delay and the input being the incoming traffic. It is assumed that the desired passing time for incoming vehicles from lane \( k \) follows a Poisson distribution with parameter \( \lambda_k \). The traffic flows from different lanes are independent of each other. Since the combination of multiple Poisson processes is still a Poisson distribution [8], the incoming traffic from all lanes can be described as one Poisson process \( \{t^*_1, t^*_2, \ldots \} \) with parameter \( \lambda = \sum_k \lambda_k \). The input to the traffic model is chosen to be the random arrival interval between vehicle \( i + 1 \) and vehicle \( i \), i.e., \( x_i = t^*_i+1 - t^*_i \), and the lane number \( s_{i+1} \) for vehicle \( i + 1 \). For all \( i \), the probability density for \( x_i = x \) is \( p_x(x) = \lambda e^{-\lambda x} \), and the probability of \( s_{i+1} = k \) is \( P_s(k) = \frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda} \). The delay for lane \( k \) considering \( i \) vehicles is denoted \( T^k_i \), which captures the difference between the actual passing time and the traffic-free passing time of those vehicles, i.e.,

\[
T^k_i = \max_{s_j = k, j \leq i} \tilde{t}^{(i)}_j - t^*_j,
\]

where \( \tilde{t}^{(i)}_j \) denotes the actual passing time for vehicle \( j \) when only the first \( i \) vehicles are considered. \( \tilde{t}^{(i)}_j \) corresponds to an equilibrium in microscopic vehicle interactions which will be introduced in (3). It may differ from \( t^*_j \) for \( k \neq i \).

Define \( T_i := [T^1_i, \ldots, T^K_i]^T \). The dynamics of the traffic delay at the intersection is determined by

\[
T_{i+1} = F(T_i, x_i, s_{i+1}),
\]

where the function \( F \) depends on the policies adopted by the vehicles and the road topology defined by the conflict graph \( G \). Given (9), the conditional probability density of \( T_{i+1} \) given \( T_i, x_t \) and \( s_{i+1} \) is

\[
p_{T_{i+1}}(t \mid T_i, x_i, s_{i+1}) = \delta(t = F(T_i, x_i, s_{i+1})),
\]

where \( \delta(\cdot) \) is the delta function. The probability density is

\[
p_{T_{i+1}}(t) = \sum_k P_k(k) \int p_{T_{i+1}}(t \mid T_i, x_i, k)p_T(T_i)d\tau p_x(x)dx
\]

\[
= \sum_k P_k(k) \int \delta(0)p_T(T_i)p_x(x)d\tau dx,
\]

which involves integration over a manifold. The cumulative probability of \( T_i \) is denoted as \( P_T(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t \ldots \int_{-\infty}^{t^k} p_T(\tau^1, \ldots, \tau^k)d\tau^1 \ldots d\tau^k \) where \( t \in [t^1, \ldots, t^K] \). The problems of interest are:

- Does the sequence \( \{p_T\} \) converge in \( L_1 \)-norm?
- Divergence corresponds to the formation of congestion, i.e., the case that the expected delay keeps growing.

If converged, what is the steady state distribution of \( p_T := \lim_{i \to \infty} p_{T_i} \)? From the steady state distribution, we may compute the expected delay.

These two problems will be considered in the case studies in Section III. Moreover, from the distribution of the lane delays, we can compute the scalar delay introduced by the \((i + 1)\)th vehicle as

\[
d_{i+1} = \sum_{j \leq i} \left( \tilde{t}^{(i+1)}_j - \tilde{t}^{(i)}_j \right) + \tilde{t}^{(i+1)}_{i+1} - t^*_i+1.
\]

In the case that the introduction of a new vehicle only affects the last vehicle in other lanes (which is usually the case),

\[
d_{i+1} = T_{i+1}^{s_{i+1}} + \sum_{k \neq s_{i+1}} (T^k_{i+1} - T^k_i + x_t).
\]

B. Microscopic Interactions

It is assumed that the vehicles at intersections have fixed paths. When interacting with other vehicles, they only change their speed profiles to adjust the time to pass the intersection. Such simplification is widely adopted [9], [10]. In this paper, we further reduce the high dimensional speed profile for vehicle \( i \) to a single state \( t_i \) which denotes the time for vehicle \( i \) to pass the center of the intersection. Since the mapping from \( t_i \) to a speed profile is surjective, interactions can be analyzed using \( t_i \)’s.
The policy of vehicle $i$ is denoted
\[ t_i(k) = f(t_i^*, t_{-i}(k - 1)), \]
where $k$ denotes time step. The subscript $-i$ denotes all other indices except $i$. The one step delay is due to reaction time. An equilibrium is achieved if the vehicles do not have incentives to adjust the passing time $t_i$'s. Such equilibrium may be broken by the introduction of a new vehicle. Nonetheless, it is assumed that the time for the vehicles to achieve a new equilibrium is negligible regarding the time interval between two events. Every event then leads to one equilibrium. The actual passing time $\bar{t}_j(i)$ when $i$ vehicles are considered lies at the $i$th equilibrium such that
\[ \bar{t}_j(i) = f(t_j^*, t_{-j}^{(i)}), \forall j \leq i. \]

The average delay of the vehicles satisfies
\[ \bar{d} = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum t_i^{(N)} - t_i^* = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum d_i, \]
where the second equality is due to (5). According to the central limit theorem, the system is ergodic such that the average delay of all vehicles equals the expected delay introduced by any event in the steady state,
\[ E(\bar{d}) = \lim_{i \to \infty} E(d_i). \]

III. Case Studies

To illustrate the effectiveness of the model, this section derives traffic properties under two frequently used policies by analysis, event-driven simulation (EDS) as well as conventional time-driven traffic simulation. The two policies are first-in-first-out (FIFO) policy and flexible order (FO) policy. For simplicity, we only consider a two-lane intersection (which is equivalent to lane merging).

A policy specifies 1) the passing order, and 2) the temporal gap between two consecutive vehicles. Denote $\Delta_d$ and $\Delta_s$ to be the temporal gap between vehicles from different lanes and the temporal gap between vehicles from the same lane respectively. The gap may be affected by vehicle speed, uncertainties in perception, and etc. When the traffic density is low, we assume $\Delta_d = 0$ for simplicity.

![Fig. 3: Illustration of the mapping (2) under FIFO for $s_{i+1} = 1$.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$T^2_1 &lt; x_i - \Delta_s$</td>
<td>$T^2_{i+1} = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$T^2_2 &lt; x_i - \Delta_d$</td>
<td>$T^2_{i+1} = -\Delta_d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$T^2_1 \geq x_i - \Delta_s$</td>
<td>$T^2_{i+1} = T^2_1 + \Delta_s - x_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$T^2_2 &lt; x_i - \Delta_d$</td>
<td>$T^2_{i+1} = -\Delta_d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$T^2_1 \geq x_i - \Delta_d$</td>
<td>$T^2_{i+1} = T^2_1 + \Delta_d - x_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$T^2_2 &lt; T^2_1$</td>
<td>$T^2_{i+1} = T^2_1 - x_i$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Case 1: Lane Merging with FIFO

Under FIFO, the passing order is determined by the desired arrival times $\{t_i^*\}_i$ such that the actual passing time for vehicle $i$ should be after the actual passing times for all conflicting vehicles $j$ such that $j < i$. As the passing order is fixed, the actual passing time will not be affected by later vehicles, i.e., $\bar{t}_j(i) = \bar{t}_j(j)$ for all $j < i$. For vehicle $i$,
\[ \bar{t}_i(i) := \max\{t_i^*, D_i, S_i\}, \]
where
\[ D_i = \max_j (\bar{t}_j(i) + \Delta_d) \text{ s.t. } j < i, (s_j, s_i) \in I, \]
\[ S_i = \max_j (\bar{t}_j(i) + \Delta_s) \text{ s.t. } j < i, s_j = s_i. \]

The effect of FIFO is illustrated in Fig. 2b. Following from (11) and (12), the dynamic equation (2) for FIFO can be computed, which is listed in Table 1 and illustrated in Fig. 3. Only the case for $s_{i+1} = 1$ is shown. The case for $s_{i+1} = 2$ can be obtained by switching the superscripts 1 and 2. To bound the domain from below, let $T^2_0 = \max\{T^2_1, -\Delta_d\}$ for all $i$ and $j \in \{1, 2\}$. The mapping is piece-wise smooth with four smooth components. Region 1 corresponds to the case when there is a sufficient gap in both lanes for the $(i + 1)$th vehicle to pass without any delay. Regions 2 and 3 correspond to the case where the last vehicle is from the ego lane and it causes delay for the $(i + 1)$th vehicle. Region 4 corresponds to the case where the last vehicle is from the other lane and it causes delay for the $(i + 1)$th vehicle.

Given the dynamic equation, the distribution of traffic delay in (11) can be computed. The propagation of $P_i$, for $\lambda_1 = 0.1s^{-1}, \lambda_2 = 0.5s^{-1}, \Delta_d = 2s, \Delta_s = 1s$ is shown in Fig. 4a by an event-driven simulation of (2) with 10,000 particles. At iteration 1, $P_i(1)$ percent of particles are at $(0, -\Delta_d)$, while the others are at $(-\Delta_d, 0)$. Every particle corresponds to a traffic scenario. For conventional time-driven traffic simulation, it is computationally expensive to obtain distributions with 10,000 traffic scenarios. However, with the event-driven simulation under the proposed model, the

1Some authors define the FIFO strategy to be such that vehicle $i$ should yield to vehicle $j$ for all $j < i$ no matter whether there is a conflict. The FIFO strategy presented in this paper is similar to the Maximum Progression Intersection Protocol (MP-IP) [11]. Nonetheless, there is no difference between the two in the two-lane case.
distributions can be obtained in real time. The distribution approached steady state at iteration 8 with a unique pattern. This pattern will be verified through theoretical analysis as future work.

**B. Case 2: Lane Merging with FO**

FO allows high priority vehicles to yield to low priority vehicles if low priority vehicles can arrive earlier. The passing order may change over time. At step \( i \), let \( t^{i-1} \) be the earliest desired time for vehicle \( i \) to pass considering its front vehicles in the same lane. Sort the list \( \{ t^{i-1}_1, \ldots, t^{i-1}_j \} \) in ascending order and record the ranking in an injection \( Q : N \rightarrow N \). If there is a tie, then the vehicle with smaller index has smaller \( Q \) value. For the first vehicle in \( Q \), i.e., vehicle \( k = Q^{-1}(1) \), \( t^{(i-1)}_k \) is the desired time. By induction, assuming that \( t^{(i)}_k \) for \( Q(j) < Q(k) \) has been computed, then

\[
\tilde{t}^{(i)}_k = \max \{ t^{(i-1)}_k, D^{(i)}_k, S^{(i)}_k \},
\]

where

\[
D^{(i)}_k = \max \{ \tilde{t}^{(i)}_k + \Delta_d \} \text{ s.t. } Q(j) < Q(k), (s_j, s_k) \in \mathcal{G}
\]

\[
S^{(i)}_k = \max \{ \tilde{t}^{(i)}_k + \Delta_s \} \text{ s.t. } Q(j) < Q(k), s_j = s_k.
\]

Under FO, the actual passing time may change at every time step. There is a distributed algorithm [12] to implement this policy where the vehicles do not necessarily need to compute the global passing order. The effect of FO is illustrated in Fig. 2c. Vehicles in the same direction tend to form groups and pass together.

Following from (1) and (14), the dynamic equation (2) for FO can be computed, which is listed in Table II and illustrated in Fig. 5 for \( s_{i+1} = 1 \). There are eight smooth components in the mapping. Regions 1 to 4 are the same as in the FIFO case such that vehicle \( i + 1 \) passes the intersection after all other vehicles. Regions 5 to 8 correspond to the case that vehicle \( i + 1 \) passes the intersection before the last vehicle in the other lane. In regions 5 and 7, vehicle \( i + 1 \) does not experience any delay as there is sufficient gap in the ego lane. The last vehicle in the other lane is delayed by the last vehicle in the ego lane but can still go before the last vehicle in the other lane. Delay is caused in the other lane in region 6.

Given the dynamic equation, the distribution of traffic delay in Fig. 4 can be computed. The event-driven simulation with the same conditions in the FIFO case is shown in Fig. 4b. FO generates less delay than FIFO. However, the distribution under FO no longer has the “zebra” pattern shown in FIFO. In this paper, we investigate the steady state distribution of delay for \( \Delta_s > 0 \) and leave the case that \( \Delta_s > 0 \) for future work. Indeed, when \( \Delta_s = 0 \), the mapping \( p_T \rightarrow p_{T_{i+1}} \) is a contraction as illustrated in Fig. 8. Proposition 1 provides a closed-form solution of \( p_T \) in the case where \( \Delta_s = 0 \) and \( \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 \). As the problem is symmetric, define \( g(t) := p_T(t, t - \Delta_d) = p_T(t - \Delta_d, t) \). Let the finite part of the function be \( \tilde{g}(t) \), and the delta component be \( \lambda_g(t) \) which is nonzero only at 0 and \( \Delta_d \).

**Proposition 1 (Steady State Distribution for \( \Delta_s = 0 \) under FO).** If \( \Delta_s = 0 \) and \( \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 \), we have

\[
\tilde{g}(t) = Ce^{\frac{t}{\lambda}}, \quad \tilde{g}(0) = \frac{2}{\lambda} C, \quad \tilde{g}(\Delta_d) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{2e^{-\frac{\Delta_d}{\lambda}}}{\lambda} C.
\]

where \( C = \frac{\lambda_1(1-e^{-\frac{\Delta_d}{\lambda}})}{2 \left( e^{\frac{\Delta_d}{\lambda}} + e^{-\frac{\Delta_d}{\lambda}} \right)} \).

**Proof.** For \( t \in (0, \Delta_d) \), using the mapping in regions 3, 4, and 8, we get the following steady state relationship

\[
\tilde{g}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \int_{\Delta_d}^{\Delta_d} g(t + x - \Delta_d)p_x dx + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Delta_d}^{\infty} g(t + x)p_x dx \right].
\]

Multiply both sides by \( e^{-\lambda t} \), and then differentiate with respect to \( t \) to get

\[
\tilde{g}' - \lambda \tilde{g} = -\frac{\lambda}{2} \tilde{g}
\]

Hence, \( \tilde{g} = Ce^{\frac{t}{\lambda}} \) for some constant \( C \). Now we solve for the constant \( C \). Due to symmetry, \( \int_{\Delta_d}^{\infty} g(t) dt = \frac{1}{2} \). Using the fact that \( g = \tilde{g} + \lambda \tilde{g} \) and \( \tilde{g} = Ce^{\frac{t}{\lambda}} \), we get

\[
\tilde{g}(0) + \frac{2C(e^{-\frac{\Delta_d}{\lambda}} - 1)}{\lambda} + \tilde{g}(\Delta_d) = \frac{1}{2} \quad (19)
\]

Consider region 1. The point mass at 0 is

\[
\tilde{g}(0) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\Delta_d}^{0} g(r) dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Delta_d}^{\infty} g(r) dr.
\]

By choosing the order of integration, we get

\[
\tilde{g}(0) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\Delta_d} g(r) dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Delta_d}^{\infty} g(r) dr = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\Delta_d} e^{-\lambda(t+\Delta_d)} g(r) dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Delta_d}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} g(r) dr.
\]

Hence,

\[
\tilde{g}(0) = e^{-\lambda \Delta_d} \frac{1}{2} I,
\]

where \( I = \int_{0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda t} g(r) dr \). Plugging in the expression of
Then, \( g(\tau) \), we have

\[ I = \hat{g}(0) + e^{-\lambda \Delta_d} \hat{g}(\Delta_d) + \frac{2C(1 - e^{-\lambda \Delta_d})}{\lambda}. \]  

(21)

Considering region 5. The point mass at \( \Delta_d \) is \( \hat{g}(\Delta_d) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\Delta_d} \int_{x_i}^{x_i + \Delta_d} g(\tau) d\tau p_i(x) dx \). By changing the order of integration, \( \hat{g}(\Delta_d) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\Delta_d} p_i dx g(\tau) d\tau = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\Delta_d} (1 - e^{-\lambda \tau}) g(\tau) d\tau. \) Then,

\[ \hat{g}(\Delta_d) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{2} - I \right]. \]  

(22)

We combine (19) to (22) to verify the claim in Proposition 1.

According to (17), the probability of zero-delay (\( \hat{g}(0) \)) and the probability of \( \Delta_d \)-delay (\( \hat{g}(\Delta_d) \)) only depend on \( \lambda \Delta_d \), i.e., the ratio between the temporal gap and the arrival interval. Fig. 7 illustrates those relationships. When the ratio between the temporal gap and the arrival interval increases, the probability of zero-delay decreases while the probability of \( \Delta_d \)-delay increases. Fig. 7 also illustrates the result from EDS, which verifies Proposition 1.

In the following discussion, we validate the event-driven model against the time-driven traffic simulation. By ergodicity (10), the mean delay of all vehicles in the time-driven traffic simulation should equal the expectation of the delay induced by any event in the steady state. The statistical mean delay under each scenario is obtained through the time-driven traffic simulation for 10min. The details of the simulation is provided in an earlier journal [12]. The expected steady state delay is computed using the result from Proposition 1. Given (9), the steady state probability density of delay for \( t \in [0, \Delta_d) \) satisfies

\[ p_d(t) = \int_0^{\Delta_d} [g(t + x) + g(t + x - \Delta_d) + g(x - t + \Delta_d)] p_i(x) dx. \]  

(23)

Applying (17) in (23), the distribution of steady state delay becomes

\[ P_d(t) = \frac{4C}{\lambda} \left[ e^{\frac{t}{\lambda} - e^{\frac{x}{\lambda} - \Delta_d}} + e^{\frac{t}{\lambda} - e^{\frac{x}{\lambda} - \Delta_d - \lambda t}} \right] + \frac{1 - e^{-\lambda t}}{2}. \]  

(24)

The distributions under different \( \Delta_d \) are shown in Fig. 8. The shaded area is the distribution obtained through EDS with 10,000 particles which validates the expression in (24).

The expected delay can be computed as:

\[ E(d) = \int_0^{\Delta_d} t dP_d(t) = \frac{\Delta_d}{2} + \frac{e^{-\lambda \Delta_d} - 1}{2\lambda(e^{\frac{t}{\lambda} \Delta_d} + e^{\frac{t}{\lambda} \Delta_d - \lambda t})}. \]  

(25)
When the traffic density is low, the delays obtained through the four methods approximated using the event-driven simulation are shown in Fig. 9. When the traffic density is low, the delays obtained through the four methods approximate the expected delay (25), the analytical expected delay (24) for $\Delta_d = 1s$, the expected delay obtained through EDS, and the statistical mean delay in the time-driven traffic simulation are shown in Fig. 9. When the traffic density is low, the delays obtained through the four methods align very well. As the traffic density increases, the model underestimates the real traffic delay due to the fact that the assumption $\Delta_s = 0$ is only valid for small $\lambda$.

**IV. DISCUSSION**

The analytical model helps us understand the consequences of the microscopic behaviors on the macroscopic system. The potential applications of the analytical model are very broad. When $\lambda \to 0$, i.e., the traffic density is low, $E(d) \to \frac{\Delta d}{2} + -\frac{\lambda \Delta d + (\lambda \Delta d)^2}{24} = \frac{\lambda \Delta d^2}{4}$.

When $\Delta_d = 1.5s$, the analytical expected delay, the approximation function $\frac{\lambda \Delta_d^2}{4}$, the expected delay obtained through EDS, and the statistical mean delay in the time-driven traffic simulation are shown in Fig. 9. When the traffic density is low, the delays obtained through the four methods align very well. As the traffic density increases, the model underestimates the real traffic delay due to the fact that the assumption $\Delta_s = 0$ is only valid for small $\lambda$.

1) **Efficiently verifying and comparing the policies:** With the analytical model, we can avoid extensive time-consuming traffic simulations when verifying a policy or comparing a group of policies. Even in the case that explicit analytical solution is difficult to obtain (e.g. in the case of a neural-network policy), more efficient verification and comparison can be performed using the event-driven simulation.

2) **Optimizing the policies:** The model can help determine the parameters in the vehicle policies, for example, $\Delta_d$.

3) **Deriving necessary conditions on the policies:** Indeed, we can obtain the condition on function $F$ such that the probability distributions in (4) will always converge. We can then enforce such condition during policy design.

4) **Predicting real-time traffic:** For a fixed vehicle policy, the expected delay is a function of the density of the incoming traffic flow in the model. Hence, the properties of the outgoing traffic flow can be predicted given the incoming traffic flow. The expected delay is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
E(d) = & \frac{\Delta d}{2} + -\frac{\lambda \Delta d + (\lambda \Delta d)^2}{24} = \frac{\lambda \Delta d^2}{4} \\
\end{align*}
\]

When $\Delta_d = 1.5s$, the analytical expected delay, the approximation function $\frac{\lambda \Delta_d^2}{4}$, the expected delay obtained through EDS, and the statistical mean delay in the time-driven traffic simulation are shown in Fig. 9. When the traffic density is low, the delays obtained through the four methods align very well. As the traffic density increases, the model underestimates the real traffic delay due to the fact that the assumption $\Delta_s = 0$ is only valid for small $\lambda$.

4) **Predicting real-time traffic:** For a fixed vehicle policy, the expected delay is a function of the density of the incoming traffic flow in the model. Hence, the properties of the outgoing traffic flow can be predicted given the incoming traffic flow. The expected delay is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
E(d) = & \frac{\Delta d}{2} + -\frac{\lambda \Delta d + (\lambda \Delta d)^2}{24} = \frac{\lambda \Delta d^2}{4} \\
\end{align*}
\]

When $\Delta_d = 1.5s$, the analytical expected delay, the approximation function $\frac{\lambda \Delta_d^2}{4}$, the expected delay obtained through EDS, and the statistical mean delay in the time-driven traffic simulation are shown in Fig. 9. When the traffic density is low, the delays obtained through the four methods align very well. As the traffic density increases, the model underestimates the real traffic delay due to the fact that the assumption $\Delta_s = 0$ is only valid for small $\lambda$.

**V. CONCLUSION**

This paper introduced an analytical traffic model for unmanaged intersections considering various vehicle behaviors.
The macroscopic property, i.e., delay at the intersection, was modeled as an event-driven stochastic dynamic process. The macroscopic dynamics encoded the equilibrium resulted from microscopic vehicle interactions. Both the vehicle policies and the road topology could affect the macroscopic dynamics. With the model, the distribution of traffic delay can be obtained through either direct analysis or event-driven simulation. They were more efficient than conventional time-driven traffic simulation, and captured more microscopic details than conventional macroscopic flow models. The steady state traffic properties under two different vehicle polices in a two-lane case were studied in detail. The accuracy of the model was verified against traffic simulation.
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