

# Machine-Learned Prediction Equilibrium for Dynamic Traffic Assignment

Lukas Graf<sup>1</sup>, Tobias Harks<sup>1</sup>, Kostas Kollias<sup>2</sup>, and Michael Markl<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Augsburg

<sup>2</sup>Google

{lukas.graf, tobias.harks}@math.uni-augsburg.de, kostaskollias@google.com,  
michael.markl@student.uni-augsburg.de

December 15, 2021

We study a dynamic traffic assignment model, where agents base their instantaneous routing decisions on real-time delay predictions. We formulate a mathematically concise model and derive properties of the predictors that ensure a *dynamic prediction equilibrium* exists. We demonstrate the versatility of our framework by showing that it subsumes the well-known full information and instantaneous information models, in addition to admitting further realistic predictors as special cases. We complement our theoretical analysis by an experimental study, in which we systematically compare the induced average travel times of different predictors, including a machine-learning model trained on data gained from previously computed equilibrium flows, both on a synthetic and a real road network.

## 1. Introduction

Understanding and optimizing traffic networks is a significant effort that impacts billions of people living in urban areas, with key challenges including managing congestion and carbon emissions. These phenomena are heavily impacted by individual driver routing decisions, which are often influenced by ML-based predictions for the delays of road segments (see, for instance, [17] for an overview of convolutional and graph neural network based approaches). One key aspect that is not well understood, is that these routing decisions, in turn, influence the forecasting models by changing the underlying signature of traffic flows.

In this paper, we address this interplay focusing on the popular dynamic traffic assignment (DTA) framework, on which there has been substantial work over the past decades

(see the classical book of Ford and Fulkerson [6] or the more recent surveys of Friesz et al. [8], Peeta and Ziliaskopoulos [30] and Skutella [33]). A fundamental base model describing the dynamic flow propagation process is the so-called *deterministic queuing model* due to Vickrey [36]. Here, a directed graph  $G = (V, E)$  is given, where edges  $e \in E$  are associated with a queue with positive rate capacity  $\nu_e \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and a physical transit time  $\tau_e \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . If the total inflow into an edge  $e = vw \in E$  exceeds the rate capacity  $\nu_e$ , a queue builds up and agents need to wait in the queue before they are forwarded along the edge. The total travel time along  $e$  is thus composed of the waiting time spent in the queue plus the physical transit time  $\tau_e$ . The Vickrey model is arguably one of the most important traffic models (see Li, Huang and Yang [22] for an up to date research overview of the past 50 years), and yet, it is mathematically quite challenging to analyze (see Friesz et al. [14] for a discussion of the inherent complexities).

Given a physical flow propagation model, the routing and traffic prediction algorithms are usually subsumed under a *behavioral model* of agents in order to solve a DTA model. The behavior of agents is modelled based on their informational assumption which in turn defines their respective utility function. Most works in the DTA literature on the Vickrey model can roughly be classified into two main informational categories: the *full information model* and the *instantaneous information model*. In the full information model, an agent is able to exactly forecast future travel times along a chosen path effectively anticipating the whole spatio-temporal flow evolution over the network. This assumption has been justified by letting travelers learn good routes over several trips and a dynamic equilibrium then corresponds to an attractor of an underlying learning dynamic. Existence and computation of dynamic equilibria in the full information model has been studied extensively in the transportation science literature, see [7, 13, 14, 15, 25, 43], whereas the works in [18, 5] allow a direct combinatorial characterization of dynamic equilibria leading to existence and uniqueness results in the realm of the Vickrey bottleneck model. While certainly relevant and key for the entire development of the research in DTA, this concept may not accurately reflect the behavioral changes caused by the wide-spread use of navigation devices and resulting real-time decisions by agents.

In the instantaneous route choice model, agents are informed in real-time about the current traffic situations and, if beneficial, reroute instantaneously no matter how good or bad that route was in hindsight, see Ran and Boyce [31, § VII-IX], Boyce, Ran and LeBlanc [2, 32], Friesz et al. [9]. Indeed it seems more realistic that the information available to a navigation device is rather instantaneous and certainly not complete, that is, congestion information is available only as an aggregate (estimated waiting times for road traversal) but the individual routes and/or source and destination of travelers are usually unknown. For the Vickrey model, Graf, Harks and Sering [11] established the existence of instantaneous dynamic equilibria and derived further structural properties. One key property that differentiates dynamic equilibria (in the full information model) from instantaneous dynamic equilibria is the possibility of *cyclic behavior* of agents in the latter. More specifically, [11] show that there are instances with only two origin-destination pairs and a finite flow volume in which *any* instantaneous dynamic equilibrium cycles forever. This can never happen in the full information model as an agent plays a best-response given the collective decisions of all other agents, thus, any

cycle only increases the travel time.

### 1.1. Our Contribution

We propose a new DTA formulation within the Vickrey model that is based on *predicted* travel times. Since the physical transit times are known a priori, the only unknown is the precise evolution of the queues over time. In our model, every agent is associated with a *queue prediction function* that provides for any future point in time a prediction of queues. This model includes as special cases the full information model and the instantaneous information model but it allows to use predictions based on historical data or the queueing evolution learned en route. Besides these special cases, our model allows other queue prediction functions and even includes the case of finitely many *classes* of agents that may use different predictors.

As our main theoretical contribution, we define this model formally and derive conditions for the queue predictors leading to the existence of dynamic equilibria. The main approach is based on an *extension property* of partial equilibrium flows, that is, we show that any equilibrium flow up to some time  $\theta \geq 0$  can be extended to time  $\theta + \alpha$  for some  $\alpha > 0$  which leads to the existence on the whole  $\mathbb{R}$  using Zorn's lemma. The extension step itself is based on a formulation using infinite dimensional variational inequalities in the edge-flow space and whenever the predictor satisfies a natural continuity condition, only depends on past information and the predicted arrival times are non-decreasing, the extension is possible.

While this approach is in line with previous existence proofs using variational inequalities as put forth in the seminal papers by Friesz et al. [7, 13, 14, 15], there are some remarkable differences. The above works rely on the complete spatio-temporal unfolding of the path-inflows over the network which is known as *network loading*. As shown in [11], already the simple prediction function given by the constant current queues (which leads to the instantaneous route choice model) leads to dynamic equilibria with cycling behavior (forever) and thus puts a path-based formulation over the entire time horizon out of reach. Our extension approach follows the extension-methodology used in [11] for the case of constant prediction functions. The more general model, however, comes with several technical difficulties that we need to address. We demonstrate the applicability of our main result by showing that it applies for instance to a natural linear regularized predictor  $\hat{q}_e^{\text{RL}}$ . The idea here is to predict the queue growth linearly based on previously observed data on the time interval  $[\bar{\theta} - \delta, \bar{\theta}]$ . The regularization is necessary to obtain a continuous predictor since the purely linearized predictor  $\hat{q}_e^{\text{L}}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) := (\theta - \bar{\theta})\partial_- q_e(\bar{\theta})$  may be discontinuous as a function in the variable  $q$ .

On the experimental side, we conduct a simulation on a small synthetic network, on the commonly used Sioux Falls network from [20] and on a larger real road network of Tokyo, Japan, obtained from Open Street Maps [27]. We study how the average travel time of vehicles in the network is impacted by the application of various predictors. For this purpose, we also train a linear regression model, for use as one of our predictors.

## 1.2. Related Work

The idea of using real-time information and traffic predictions en route and subsequently change the route is by no means new and has been proposed under varying names such as ATIS (advanced traveller information systems), see [4, 37, 40] for an overview. Ben-Akiva et al. [1] introduced DynaMIT, a simulation-based approach designed to predict future traffic conditions. Other works that also rely on simulation-based models include [23]. Peeta and Mahmassani [29] introduced a rolling horizon framework addressing the real-time traffic assignment problem. This approach concatenates for fixed consecutive time-intervals static flow assignments and thus does not comply to our definition of dynamic equilibrium in which at any time (also within stages) equilibrium conditions must hold. Huang and Lam [16] allow for different user classes where each class may use a different travel time prediction. Their model is formulated in discrete time and assumes an acyclic path formulation.

A large body of research has been dedicated to the use of deep learning techniques, in particular *graph neural networks* (GNNs), for predicting street segment delays in road networks. It is impossible to list all relevant work in this section, we instead describe some key papers and point the reader to [17] for a complete survey. The work in [21] uses a random walk-based graph diffusion process to create a convolutional operator that captures spatial relations. In [41], the authors propose a spatio-temporal graph convolutional network which model the temporal dependency, whereas [39] models the spatial dependency through an adaptive learnable dependency matrix and the temporal dependency with dilated convolution [26]. Finally, *graph attention networks* (GATs) [35] have also been used in the context of traffic predictions [42]. We note that our work bridges the above areas of dynamic route updates based on real time information and of applying ML models for predicting traffic delay.

Gentile [10] considered a mathematical approach incorporating traffic predictions in a dynamic traffic assignment (DTA) model. He derives the existence of equilibria using a variational inequality approach for the considered DTA model under simplifying assumptions such as an acyclic graph. The VI approach is arc and node-based and for its correctness, the assumption on acyclic (finite) paths is necessary as he uses a telescopic sum of edge travel times in order to arrive at a path-based VI formulation as used in [7]. Note that this approach fails in the general setting we consider in this paper. For further references on adaptive route choice models we refer to [19, 24, 12, 34, 38].

## 2. The Flow Model

In the following, we describe the Vickrey fluid queuing model that we will use throughout this paper. We consider a finite directed graph  $G = (V, E)$  with positive rate capacities  $\nu_e \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and positive transit times  $\tau_e \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  for every edge  $e \in E$ . There is a finite set of commodities  $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$ , each with a commodity-specific source node  $s_i \in V$  and a commodity-specific sink node  $t_i \in V$ . We assume that there is at least one  $s_i$ - $t_i$  path for each  $i \in I$ . The (infinitesimally small) agents of every commodity  $i \in I$  enter the network according to a locally integrable, bounded network inflow rate function  $u_i : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ .

A *flow over time* is a tuple  $f = (f^+, f^-)$ , where  $f^+, f^- : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times E \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  are locally integrable functions modeling the edge inflow rate  $f_{i,e}^+(\theta)$  and edge outflow rate  $f_{i,e}^-(\theta)$  of commodity  $i$  of an edge  $e \in E$  at time  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . The *queue length* of edge  $e$  at time  $\theta$  is given by

$$q_e(\theta) := \sum_{i \in I} F_{i,e}^+(\theta) - \sum_{i \in I} F_{i,e}^-(\theta + \tau_e), \quad (1)$$

for  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , where  $F_{i,e}^+(\theta) := \int_0^\theta f_{i,e}^+(z) dz$  and  $F_{i,e}^-(\theta) := \int_0^\theta f_{i,e}^-(z) dz$  denote the *cumulative (edge) inflow* and *cumulative (edge) outflow*. We implicitly assume  $f_{i,e}^-(\theta) = 0$  for all  $\theta \in [0, \tau_e)$ , which will ensure together with Constraint (4) (see below) that the queue lengths are always non-negative. For the sake of simplicity, we denote the aggregated in- and outflow rates for all commodities by  $f_e^+ := \sum_{i \in I} f_{i,e}^+$  and  $f_e^- := \sum_{i \in I} f_{i,e}^-$ , respectively.

A *feasible flow over time* satisfies the following conditions (2), (3), (4), and (5). The *flow conservation constraints* are modeled for a commodity  $i \in I$  and all nodes  $v \neq t_i$  as

$$\sum_{e \in \delta_v^+} f_{i,e}^+(\theta) - \sum_{e \in \delta_v^-} f_{i,e}^-(\theta) = \begin{cases} u_i(\theta) & \text{if } v = s_i, \\ 0 & \text{if } v \neq s_i, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

for  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  where  $\delta_v^+ := \{vu \in E\}$  and  $\delta_v^- := \{uv \in E\}$  are the sets of outgoing edges from  $v$  and incoming edges into  $v$ , respectively. For the sink node  $t_i$  of commodity  $i$  we require

$$\sum_{e \in \delta_{t_i}^+} f_{i,e}^+(\theta) - \sum_{e \in \delta_{t_i}^-} f_{i,e}^-(\theta) \leq 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \quad (3)$$

We assume that the queue operates at capacity which can be modeled by requiring

$$f_e^-(\theta + \tau_e) = \begin{cases} \nu_e & \text{if } q_e(\theta) > 0, \\ \min \{ f_e^+(\theta), \nu_e \} & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

for all  $e \in E, \theta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ .

Finally, we want the flow to follow a strict FIFO principle on the queues, which can be formalized by

$$f_{i,e}^-(\theta) = \begin{cases} f_e^-(\theta) \cdot \frac{f_{i,e}^+(\vartheta)}{f_e^+(\vartheta)} & \text{if } f_e^+(\vartheta) > 0, \\ 0 & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where  $\vartheta := \min \{ \vartheta \leq \theta \mid \vartheta + \tau_e + \frac{q_e(\vartheta)}{\nu_e} = \theta \}$  is the earliest point in time a particle can enter edge  $e$  and leave at time  $\theta$  and  $\frac{q_e(\vartheta)}{\nu_e}$  is the current waiting time to be spent in the queue of edge  $e$ . Consequently, constraint (5) ensures that the share of commodity  $i$  of the aggregated outflow rate at any time equals the share of commodity  $i$  of the aggregated inflow rate at the time the particles entered the edge.

## 2.1. Instantaneous Dynamic Equilibrium

In an instantaneous dynamic equilibrium (IDE) as defined in [11] we assume that, whenever an agent arrives at an intermediate node  $v$  at time  $\theta$ , she is given the information about the current queue length  $q_e(\theta)$  and transit time  $\tau_e$  of all edges  $e \in E$ , and, based on this information, she computes a shortest  $v$ - $t_i$  path and enters the first edge on this path. We define the *instantaneous travel time* of an edge  $e$  at time  $\theta$  as  $c_e(\theta) := \tau_e + \frac{q_e(\theta)}{\nu_e}$ . With this we can define commodity-specific node labels  $\ell_{i,v}(\theta)$  corresponding to current earliest arrival times when travelling from  $v$  to the sink  $t_i$  at time  $\theta$  by

$$\ell_{i,v}(\theta) := \begin{cases} \theta & \text{for } v = t_i, \\ \min_{e=vw \in E} \ell_{i,w}(\theta) + c_e(\theta) & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

We say that edge  $e = vw$  is *active* for  $i \in I$  at time  $\theta$ , if  $\ell_{i,v}(\theta) = \ell_{i,w}(\theta) + c_e(\theta)$  and we denote the set of active edges for commodity  $i$  by  $E_i(\theta) \subseteq E$ .

**Definition 1.** A feasible flow over time  $f$  is an *instantaneous dynamic equilibrium (IDE)*, if for all  $i \in I, \theta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and  $e \in E$  it satisfies

$$f_{i,e}^+(\theta) > 0 \implies e \in E_i(\theta). \quad (7)$$

## 2.2. Dynamic Nash Equilibrium

In contrast, in the full information model we assume that agents have complete knowledge of the entire (future) evolution of the dynamic flow. If an agent enters an edge  $e = vw$  at time  $\theta$ , the travel time is  $c_e(\theta) := \tau_e + \frac{q_e(\theta)}{\nu_e}$  and the exit time of edge  $e$  is given by  $T_e(\theta) := \theta + c_e(\theta)$ . In this setting it is common (cf. [5]) to define the node labels in such a way as to denote the earliest possible arrival time at each node (starting from the commodity's source node). Here, however, we will instead use an equivalent definition more in line with the node labels for IDEs. So, for any  $i \in I, v \in V$  and  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  we define a node label  $\ell_{i,v}(\theta)$  denoting the earliest possible arrival time at node  $t_i$  for a particle starting at time  $\theta$  at node  $v$  by setting

$$\ell_{i,v}(\theta) := \begin{cases} \theta & \text{for } v = t_i, \\ \min_{e=vw \in \delta_v^+} \ell_{i,w}(T_e(\theta)) & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

We, again, say that an edge  $e = vw$  is *active* for commodity  $i \in I$  at time  $\theta$ , if it holds that  $\ell_{i,v}(\theta) = \ell_{i,w}(T_e(\theta))$  and denote by  $E_i(\theta)$  the set of active edges for commodity  $i$  at time  $\theta$ .

**Definition 2.** A feasible flow over time  $f$  is a *dynamic equilibrium (DE)*, if for all  $e \in E, i \in I$  and  $\theta \geq 0$  it holds that

$$f_{i,e}^+(\theta) > 0 \implies e \in E_i(\theta). \quad (9)$$

### 3. Dynamic Prediction Equilibria

IDE is a short-sighted behavioral concept assuming that agents at time  $\bar{\theta}$  predict the future evolution of queue sizes according to the constant function  $q_e(\theta) = q_e(\bar{\theta})$  for all  $\theta \geq \bar{\theta}$ . In the following we will relax this behavioral assumption by introducing a model wherein every commodity  $i \in I$  maintains a predictor  $\hat{q}_{i,e}$  for every edge  $e \in E$ . For a given flow over time and any two times  $\theta \geq \bar{\theta}$  the value  $\hat{q}_{i,e}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q)$  is then the queue length at time  $\theta$  on edge  $e$  as predicted by commodity  $i$  at time  $\bar{\theta}$ . Formally, a predictor  $\hat{q}_{i,e}$  has the following signature:

$$\hat{q}_{i,e} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$$

In general such a predictor can depend in any arbitrary way on the entire input data including, in particular, the future evolution of the queue lengths after the prediction time  $\bar{\theta}$ . However, for our theoretical results we require the predictors to behave in a slightly more restricted way. First we want the predictors to depend continuously on query time, prediction time and the observed queue lengths.

**Definition 3.** We call a predictor  $\hat{q}_{i,e}$  *continuous*, if the mapping

$$\hat{q}_{i,e} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$$

with respect to the product topology on the left side and the topology induced by the uniform norm on all  $C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})$  is continuous.

The second property, which is also important for implementing the predictors, is that the predictors do not use (and, therefore, do not need) any information on the future evolution of the queues.

**Definition 4.** A predictor  $\hat{q}_{i,e}$  is called *oblivious*, if the following condition holds

$$\forall \theta, \bar{\theta}, q, q' : q_{\leq \bar{\theta}} = q'_{\leq \bar{\theta}} \implies \hat{q}_{i,e}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) = \hat{q}_{i,e}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q'),$$

where  $q_{\leq \bar{\theta}}$  denotes the restriction of the function  $q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  to  $[0, \bar{\theta}] \times E$ .

The final property ensures that at any point in time there are shortest paths with respect to the predicted queue lengths that are cycle free. However, before we can formally define this property, we need some additional notation. If an agent of commodity  $i \in I$  enters an edge  $e = vw$  at time  $\theta$ , the predicted travel time estimated at time  $\bar{\theta}$  is given by  $\hat{c}_{i,e}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) := \tau_e + \frac{\hat{q}_{i,e}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q)}{\nu_e}$  and the predicted exit time of edge  $e$  is given by  $\hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) := \theta + \hat{c}_{i,e}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q)$ . We call these times  $\bar{\theta}$ -*estimated* to emphasize that these values are predictions made at time  $\bar{\theta}$ .

**Definition 5.** A predictor  $\hat{q}_{i,e}$  *respects FIFO* if for any edge  $e$ , queue lengths functions  $q_e$  and prediction time  $\bar{\theta}$  the predicted exit time  $\hat{T}_{i,e}(\cdot; \bar{\theta}; q)$  is a monotonically non-decreasing function.

This now allows us to describe how agents determine routes according to the predicted queues. At time  $\bar{\theta}$  an agent of commodity  $i \in I$  predicts that if she enters a path  $P = (e_1, \dots, e_k)$  at time  $\theta$  she will arrive at the endpoint of  $P$  at time

$$\hat{\ell}_i^P(\cdot; \bar{\theta}; q) := \hat{T}_{i, e_k}(\cdot; \bar{\theta}; q) \circ \dots \circ \hat{T}_{i, e_1}(\cdot; \bar{\theta}; q). \quad (10)$$

Denoting the (finite) set of all simple  $v$ - $t_i$  paths by  $\mathcal{P}_{i,v}$ , the earliest  $\bar{\theta}$ -estimated time at which an agent starting at time  $\theta$  from node  $v$  can reach  $t_i$  is given by

$$\hat{\ell}_{i,v}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) := \min_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{i,v}} \hat{\ell}_i^P(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q), \quad (11)$$

where the minimum over an empty set is infinity. The label functions defined in (11) satisfy the following equations:

$$\hat{\ell}_{i,v}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) = \begin{cases} \theta & \text{if } v = t_i, \\ \min_{vw \in \delta_v^+} \hat{\ell}_{i,w}(\hat{T}_{i,vw}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q); \bar{\theta}; q) & \text{if } v \neq t_i. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

We say that an edge  $e = vw$  is  $\bar{\theta}$ -estimated active for commodity  $i$  at time  $\theta$ , if  $\hat{\ell}_{i,v}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) = \hat{\ell}_{i,w}(\hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q); \bar{\theta}; q)$  holds true. Furthermore, let us denote the set of  $\bar{\theta}$ -estimated active edges for commodity  $i$  at time  $\theta$  by  $\hat{E}_i(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q)$ .

**Definition 6.** A pair  $(\hat{q}, f)$  of a set of predictors  $\hat{q} = (\hat{q}_{i,e})_{i \in I, e \in E}$  and a flow over time  $f$  is a *dynamic prediction equilibrium (DPE)*, if for all  $e \in E, i \in I$  and  $\theta \geq 0$  it holds that

$$f_{i,e}^+(\theta) > 0 \implies e \in \hat{E}_i(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q).$$

We then also call the flow  $f$  a *dynamic prediction flow with respect to the predictor  $\hat{q}$* .

## 4. Existence of Dynamic Prediction Equilibria

In this section we show that for oblivious and continuous predictors that respect FIFO there always exist dynamic prediction equilibria. We will also give several examples of such predictors, including one inducing IDEs as corresponding equilibria.

### 4.1. Existence of DPE Using a Variational Inequality

To show the existence of DPE we make use of a result by Brézis [3, Theorem 24] guaranteeing the existence of solutions to certain variational inequalities.

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $[a, b] \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be some interval,  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $K \subseteq L^2([a, b])^d$  a nonempty, closed, convex and bounded set and  $\mathcal{A} : K \rightarrow L^2([a, b])^d$  a weak-strong-continuous mapping. Then there exists a point  $g^* \in K$  such that*

$$\langle \mathcal{A}(g^*), g - g^* \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } g \in K. \quad (13)$$



This theorem can be used to build up a dynamic predicted flow with respect to a given set of predictors by iteratively extending so-called *partial dynamic prediction flows* which fulfill the equilibrium property up to some time horizon. First, we formally introduce these flows:

**Definition 8.** A *partial flow up to time*  $\phi$  is a tuple  $f = (f^+, f^-)$  of locally integrable functions  $f^+, f^- : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times E \times I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  fulfilling conditions (2), (3) and (4) for  $\theta \leq \phi$ . We call  $f$  a *partial dynamic prediction flow with respect to a set of oblivious predictors*  $\hat{q}$  up to time  $\phi$ , if  $f_{i,e}^+(\theta) > 0$  implies  $e \in \hat{E}_i(\theta; \theta; q)$  for all  $\theta \leq \phi, e \in E, i \in I$ .

We will now show that such a partial dynamic prediction flow can always be extended for some additional time interval. We will employ a similar proof-technique to the one used in [11, Lemma 5.6] for the proof of the extension property of IDEs flows. However, the analysis is more involved as we allow for a more general functional dependence of the predicted queue lengths on the past flow evolution. This stands in contrast to IDEs where each prediction only depends on the queue lengths of one edge at a single point in time.

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $I$  be a finite set of commodities with locally integrable, bounded network inflow functions  $u_i$  and let  $\hat{q} = (\hat{q}_{i,e})_{i \in I, e \in E}$  be a set of continuous and oblivious predictors that respect FIFO. We can extend any partial dynamic prediction flow  $f$  with respect to  $\hat{q}$  up to time  $\phi$  to a dynamic prediction flow up to time  $\phi + \alpha$  for any  $0 < \alpha < \min_{e \in E} \tau_e$ .*

We will only give a brief proof sketch here – the full proof can be found in the appendix. The main idea is to first define a set  $K$  of all possible extensions of the given partial flow. We then define a mapping  $\mathcal{A} : K \rightarrow L^2(D)^{I \times E}$  associating with each possible extension a function which for every commodity  $i$ , edge  $e$  and time  $\theta$  is zero if and only if this edge is active for this commodity at this time. Using the continuity of the predictors we then show that this mapping is weak-strong continuous such that we can apply Theorem 7 to get a solution to the variational inequality (13). Finally, we show that this solution is indeed an extension which also satisfies the properties of a dynamic prediction flow.

With this key-lemma we can now show the existence of dynamic prediction flows for all oblivious and continuous predictors that respect FIFO. Starting with the zero-flow up to time 0 and iteratively applying Lemma 9 gives us a partial dynamic prediction flow up to any finite time horizon. Zorn's lemma then shows the existence of a dynamic prediction flow for all times, thus, proving our main theorem (the detailed proof can again be found in the appendix):

**Theorem 10.** *For any network with finite set of commodities, each associated with a locally integrable, bounded network inflow rate and oblivious and continuous predictors  $\hat{q}_{i,e}$  that respect FIFO, there exists a dynamic prediction flow with respect to  $\hat{q}$ .*

**Example 11.** To see why we require the predictors to be continuous, consider the non-continuous predictor

$$\hat{q}_e(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) := \begin{cases} q_e(\bar{\theta}), & \text{if } q_e(\bar{\theta}) < 1 \\ 2, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$




Figure 1: A network where the use of a non-continuous predictor can result in a situation where no dynamic prediction equilibrium exists. Edges are labeled with  $(\tau_e, \nu_e)$ .

Using this predictor in a network consisting of only a single source-sink pair connected by two parallel edges  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  (see Figure 1) can already lead to a situation where no equilibrium flow exists. Let  $\nu_{e_1} = 1, \tau_{e_1} = 1, \nu_{e_2} = 2, \tau_{e_2} = 2$  and assume a constant inflow rate of 2 at the source. Then, clearly, during the time interval  $[0, 1)$  agents using the above predictor may only enter edge  $e_1$  (as the predicted travel time along edge  $e_1$  is strictly smaller than 2). Beginning with time  $\theta = 1$ , however, every possible flow split will violate the equilibrium condition, since at that time edge  $e_1$  has a queue length of 1 and, thus, a predicted queue length of 2. On the one hand, sending agents into edge  $e_1$  at a rate of less than 1 for any period of time after  $\theta = 1$ , leads to an immediate decrease of its queue lengths and, thus, edge  $e_2$  becomes inactive again. If, on the other hand, agents enter edge  $e_1$  at a rate of 1 or more its queue length will remain at least 1 and, therefore, edge  $e_1$  will be inactive.

## 4.2. Application Predictors

We now discuss several predictors and analyze whether the theorem above can be applied. We begin with simple predictors and make them more sophisticated step-by-step.

The *Zero-Predictor* predicts no queues for all times, i.e.

$$\hat{q}_{i,e}^Z(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) = 0.$$

This predictor is trivially continuous and oblivious and respects FIFO. The resulting dynamic prediction flow is a flow, where particles just always follow physically shortest paths.

The *constant predictor* predicts in a continuous way that all queues will stay constant:

$$\hat{q}_{i,e}^C(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) = q_e(\bar{\theta}).$$

This leads to the mentioned special case of IDE flows. Since the constant predictor clearly is continuous and oblivious and respects FIFO we can apply Theorem 10 and, thus, reprove the existence of IDE flows shown in [11].

The *linear predictor* takes the derivative of the queues and extends them linearly up to some fixed time horizon  $H \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Formally it is defined as

$$\hat{q}_{i,e}^L(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) := (q_e(\bar{\theta}) + \partial_- q_e(\bar{\theta}) \cdot \min\{\theta - \bar{\theta}, H\})^+,$$

where  $(x)^+ := \max\{x, 0\}$  denotes the positive part of  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . The linear predictor is not in general continuous since the partial derivative  $\partial_- q_e(\bar{\theta})$  might be discontinuous.

The *regularized linear predictor* solves this by taking a rolling average of the past gradient (with rolling horizon  $\delta > 0$ ) and extend the prediction queues according to this:

$$\hat{q}_{i,e}^{\text{RL}}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) := \left( q_e(\bar{\theta}) + \frac{q_e(\bar{\theta}) - q_e(\bar{\theta} - \delta)}{\delta} \cdot \min\{\theta - \bar{\theta}, H\} \right)^+$$

**Proposition 12.** *The regularized linear predictor is oblivious and continuous and respects FIFO. It, thus, induces the existence of a dynamic prediction equilibrium.*

The proof is a direct computation (see the appendix for the detailed proof). A different way of understanding the regularized predictor is that it takes two samples from the past queue lengths (at time  $\bar{\theta}$  and  $\bar{\theta} - \delta$ ) and uses this information to predict future queue lengths up to the prediction horizon by a linear function. We can generalize this idea by taking more samples of the past queue (possibly also of queues of neighbouring edges) and use these values to find a piecewise linear prediction of the queue length for the future. More precisely, given some sample number  $k$ , some step size  $\delta$ , and a neighbourhood edge set  $N(e) \subseteq E$  we choose real numbers  $a_{i,j}^{e'}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, H/\delta$  and  $e' \in N(e)$ . Our predictor is then the piecewise linear function interpolating between the points  $(\bar{\theta} + j\delta, (\sum_{e' \in N(e)} \sum_{i=1}^k a_{i,j}^{e'} \cdot q_{e'}(\bar{\theta} - i\delta))^+)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, H/\delta$ .

By the same arguments as for the regularized linear predictor, this always results in an oblivious and continuous predictor and, by choosing the parameters  $a_{i,j}^{e'}$  appropriately, we can also ensure that it respects FIFO. Thus, such a predictor is also guaranteed to induce a dynamic prediction equilibrium. This then immediately raises the question of how to choose the parameters  $a_{i,j}^{e'}$  in order to achieve a good predictor. In our experimental section below, we will use machine learning to learn these parameters by evaluating past data. We will then denote the resulting predictor by  $\hat{q}^{\text{ML}}$  and call it a *linear regression predictor*. We provide more details on the features and data used to train the predictor in the following section.

Finally, the *perfect predictor* predicts the queues exactly as they will evolve, i.e. it satisfies

$$\hat{q}_{i,e}^{\text{P}}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) := q_e(\theta).$$

This predictor clearly is not oblivious and, thus, we can not apply our existence result here. However, dynamic predicted flows with respect to this predictor do exist as those are just dynamic equilibria for which existence has been proven in [5].

## 5. Computational Study

In the following computational study, we want to compare the different predictors that we introduced in the last section with a machine-learning based alternative. To compare the predictors, we introduce an extension based algorithm which builds an approximation of dynamic flow prediction equilibria for a given set of predictors. We also use this algorithm to generate training data for the machine learning system using the constant predictors, which results in an approximation of IDEs.

As a metric for the performance of different predictors, we monitor their average travel times in an extension with multiple predictors used side by side: Let  $i$  be a commodity with net inflow rate  $u_i(\theta) := \bar{u}_i$  for  $\theta \leq h$  and  $u_i(\theta) := 0$  for  $\theta > h$ , where  $\bar{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  is the constant inflow rate up to some time  $h$ . Let  $o_i(\theta) := \sum_{e \in \delta_i^-} f_{i,e}^-(\theta) - \sum_{e \in \delta_i^+} f_{i,e}^+(\theta)$  denote the outflow rate of commodity  $i$  out of the network. Taking the integral of  $u_i(\psi) - o_i(\psi)$  over  $[0, \phi]$  yields the flow of commodity  $i$  that is inside the network at time  $\phi$ . If we integrate the flow inside the network over some time period  $[0, H]$  with  $H \geq h$ , we obtain the *total travel time* of particles of commodity  $i$  up to time  $H$ :

$$T_i^{\text{total}} := \int_0^H \int_0^\phi u_i(\psi) - o_i(\psi) \, d\psi \, d\phi$$

The *average travel time* is defined as  $T_i^{\text{avg}} := T_i^{\text{total}} / (h \cdot \bar{u}_i)$ .

### 5.1. Extension based simulation

As proposed in our model, each infinitesimal agent updates its route each time after traversing an edge. As our flow is continuous, this would imply, that the prediction and therefore also the dynamic shortest paths are updated in a continuous manner. For a computational study, this can only be approximated: In our implementation, we assume that a prediction taken at time  $\bar{\theta}$  stays valid for a certain time interval  $[\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta} + \varepsilon)$ , after which all queue predictions are recalculated and agents choose new routes. More specifically, during our implementation, we maintain piece-wise constant inflow and outflow functions  $f_{i,e}^+$ ,  $f_{i,e}^-$  as well as piece-wise linear queue lengths  $q_e$ . We have a sequence of equidistant prediction times  $\bar{\theta}_k$  at which the predictions are updated in the form of piece-wise linear functions  $\hat{q}_{i,e}(\cdot; \bar{\theta}_k; q)$ . From these predictions, we derive the time-dependent cost functions  $\hat{c}_{i,e}(\cdot; \bar{\theta}_k; q)$  as well as labels  $\hat{l}_{i,v}(\cdot; \bar{\theta}_k; q)$  which are in turn piece-wise linear functions.

For a commodity  $i$  the label functions  $(\hat{l}_{i,v}(\cdot; \bar{\theta}_k; q))_{v \in V}$  describe the time-dependent arrival times at sink  $t_i$  with respect to the dynamic cost functions  $(\hat{c}_{i,e}(\cdot; \bar{\theta}_k; q))_{e \in E}$ . These label functions can be computed using a simple Bellman-Ford based algorithm introduced by [28]. Once, the label functions are available, the set of active edges  $\hat{E}_i(\bar{\theta}_k; \bar{\theta}_k; q)$  can be easily determined. We then send flow along these active edges until the next prediction time  $\bar{\theta}_{k+1}$ . This is done with the following so-called distribution phase: Let us first assume, that the node inflow  $b_{i,v}^-(\theta) := \sum_{e \in \delta_v^-} f_{i,e}^-(\theta)$  is constant on some proper interval  $[\phi, \phi + \varepsilon) \subseteq [\bar{\theta}_k, \bar{\theta}_{k+1})$ . The edge-inflow functions of edges  $e \in \delta_v^+$  are then extended on  $[\phi, \phi + \varepsilon)$  by setting  $f_{i,e}^+(\theta) := b_{i,v}^-(\theta) / \left| \delta_v^+ \cap \hat{E}_i(\bar{\theta}_k; \bar{\theta}_k; q) \right|$  if  $e \in \hat{E}_i(\bar{\theta}_k; \bar{\theta}_k; q)$  and  $f_{i,e}^+(\theta) := 0$  otherwise. The edge outflow rates are then determined using conditions (4) and (5).

To build a feasible dynamic flow, we have to comply with the flow conservation constraints when extending the flow. As the outflow of edges may vary during a single interval  $[\bar{\theta}_k, \bar{\theta}_{k+1})$  we can only extend the flow with the above method until some edge outflow changes, after which we would have to start another distribution phase. By choosing  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\phi + \varepsilon$  is the next time an edge changes its outflow rate (or




Figure 2: A network with constant inflow at source  $s$ . The only sink is node  $t$ . Edges are labeled with  $(\tau_e, \nu_e)$ .

the next prediction time), the flow conservation constraint is satisfied. This implies that there might be a multitude of smaller distribution phases during a single prediction interval. However, these subsequent distribution phases can be sped up by only updating nodes where edge outflow rates of incoming edges have changed.

We include the code of our simulations in the supplementary material.

## 5.2. Data

We conduct our experiments on three graphs. The first is a warm-up synthetic graph with 4 nodes and 5 edges. We present the graph in Figure 2. The second graph is the road map of Sioux Falls as given in [20] which is commonly used in the transport science literature. This public data set comes with edge attributes free-flow travel time  $\tau_e$  and capacity  $\nu_e$ . The third graph is the center of Tokyo, as obtained from Open Street Maps [27]. This graph includes information about the free-flow speed, the length and the numbers of lanes of each road segment  $e$ . We compute the transit time  $\tau_e$  as the product of the free-flow speed and the length of edge  $e$ . The capacity  $\nu_e$  is calculated by multiplying the number of lanes with the free-flow speed.

For the latter two networks, commodities are randomly chosen. Detailed information on these networks are depicted in Table 1.

Network	$ E $	$ V $	$ I $
Sioux Falls	75	24	12
Tokyo	4,803	3,538	35

Table 1: Attributes of the considered networks

## 5.3. The Machine Learned Predictor

To assess the impact of ML-based models in our setting, we train a simple linear regression predictor for each network. To obtain training data for the regression, we run simulations using the extension based framework of Section 5.1 with the simpler constant predictor introduced in Section 4.2. This allows the model to estimate the progression of




Figure 3: Average travel times of competing predictors in the synthetic network in Figure 2.

queues when agents follow our behavioral model. The features used to train the model are 10 observations of the past queue length of the edge and of neighboring edges.

#### 5.4. Comparison of Predictors

We first take a closer look at the synthetic network as shown in Figure 2. Here, we want to analyze how the average travel times of competing predictors evolve while increasing the total network inflow. For each oblivious predictor described in Section 4.2, we add a commodity  $i \in \{\hat{q}^Z, \hat{q}^C, \hat{q}^L, \hat{q}^{RL}, \hat{q}^{ML}\}$ . Each of these commodities has the same source  $s$  and sink  $t$  and the same constant inflow  $\bar{u}_i$  up to time  $h = 25$ . The outcome of running the simulation with time horizon  $H = 100$  for each sampled total inflow in  $(0, 30)$  can be seen in Figure 3. The ML based predictor performed best, while notably the Zero-Predictor, who sends flow along paths  $(s, t)$  and  $(s, v, w, t)$  equally at all times, performs better than the remaining predictors.

For the road-networks of Sioux Falls and Tokyo, we randomly generate inflow rates according to the edge capacities of the network. For each commodity  $i$ , we ran the simulation after adding 5 additional commodities with the same source and sink as  $i$  – one for each predictor – with a very small constant inflow rate. We monitored their average travel time as a measure of the performance of the different predictors. All other commodities in the network were assigned the constant predictor, such that the resulting queues should behave similar to the training data.

Generally, the Zero-Predictor performs the worst in this scenario; the machine learning based predictor performs similarly well as the remaining predictors. We include more

detailed results in the appendix. We believe it is an interesting future direction to explore more complex learning algorithms and how they interface with the dynamic prediction equilibrium concept as well as understand how different graph topologies impact the various predictors.

## References

- [1] Moshe Ben-Akiva, Michel Bierlaire, Haris N. Koutsopoulos, and Rabi Mishalani. *Real Time Simulation of Traffic Demand-Supply Interactions within DynaMIT*, pages 19–36. Springer US, Boston, MA, 2002.
- [2] David E. Boyce, Bin Ran, and Larry J. LeBlanc. Solving an instantaneous dynamic user-optimal route choice model. *Transportation Science*, 29(2):128–142, 1995.
- [3] Haïm Brézis. équations et inéquations non linéaires dans les espaces vectoriels en dualité. *Annales de l’Institut Fourier*, 18(1):115–175, 1968.
- [4] Caspar G. Chorus, Eric J. E. Molin, and Bert Van Wee. Use and Effects of Advanced Traveller Information Services (ATIS): A Review of the Literature. *Transport Reviews*, 26(2):127–149, 2005.
- [5] Roberto Cominetti, José R. Correa, and Omar Larré. Dynamic equilibria in fluid queueing networks. *Oper. Res.*, 63(1):21–34, 2015.
- [6] L. R. Ford and D. R. Fulkerson. *Flows in Networks*. Princeton University Press, 1962.
- [7] Terry L. Friesz, David Bernstein, Tony E. Smith, Roger L. Tobin, and B. W. Wie. A variational inequality formulation of the dynamic network user equilibrium problem. *Oper. Res.*, 41(1):179–191, January 1993.
- [8] Terry L. Friesz and Ke Han. The mathematical foundations of dynamic user equilibrium. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 126:309 – 328, 2019.
- [9] Terry L. Friesz, Javier Luque, Roger L. Tobin, and Byung-Wook Wie. Dynamic network traffic assignment considered as a continuous time optimal control problem. *Operations Research*, 37(6):893–901, 1989.
- [10] Guido Gentile. Solving a dynamic user equilibrium model based on splitting rates with gradient projection algorithms. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 92:120–147, 2016.
- [11] Lukas Graf, Tobias Harks, and Leon Sering. Dynamic flows with adaptive route choice. *Math. Program., Ser. B*, 183(1):309–335, 2020.
- [12] Younes Hamdouch, Patrice Marcotte, and Sang Nguyen. A strategic model for dynamic traffic assignment. *Networks and Spatial Economics*, 4(3):291–315, Sep 2004.

- [13] Ke Han, Terry L. Friesz, and Tao Yao. Existence of simultaneous route and departure choice dynamic user equilibrium. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 53:17 – 30, 2013.
- [14] Ke Han, Terry L. Friesz, and Tao Yao. A partial differential equation formulation of Vickrey’s bottleneck model, part i: Methodology and theoretical analysis. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 49:55 – 74, 2013.
- [15] Ke Han, Terry L. Friesz, and Tao Yao. A partial differential equation formulation of Vickrey’s bottleneck model, part ii: Numerical analysis and computation. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 49:75 – 93, 2013.
- [16] Hai-Jun Huang and William H. K. Lam. A multi-class dynamic user equilibrium model for queuing networks with advanced traveler information systems. *Journal of Mathematical Modelling and Algorithms*, 2(4):349–377, 2003.
- [17] Weiwei Jiang and Jiayun Luo. Graph neural network for traffic forecasting: A survey. *CoRR*, abs/2101.11174, 2021.
- [18] Ronald Koch and Martin Skutella. Nash equilibria and the price of anarchy for flows over time. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 49(1):71–97, 2011.
- [19] Rafał Kucharski and Guido Gentile. Simulation of rerouting phenomena in Dynamic Traffic Assignment with the Information Comply Model. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 126(C):414–441, 2019.
- [20] Larry J. LeBlanc, Edward K. Morlok, and William P. Pierskalla. An efficient approach to solving the road network equilibrium traffic assignment problem. *Transportation Research*, 9(5):309–318, 1975.
- [21] Yaguang Li, Rose Yu, Cyrus Shahabi, and Yan Liu. Diffusion convolutional recurrent neural network: Data-driven traffic forecasting. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR*, 2018.
- [22] Zhi-Chun Li, Hai-Jun Huang, and Hai Yang. Fifty years of the bottleneck model: A bibliometric review and future research directions. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 139:311 – 342, 2020.
- [23] H. Mahmassani. Dynamic network traffic assignment and simulation methodology for advanced system management applications. *Networks and Spatial Economics*, 1:267–292, 2001.
- [24] Patrice Marcotte, Sang Nguyen, and Alexandre Schoeb. A strategic flow model of traffic assignment in static capacitated networks. *Operations Research*, 52(2):191–212, 2004.
- [25] Frédéric Meunier and Nicolas Wagner. Equilibrium results for dynamic congestion games. *Transportation Science*, 44(4):524–536, 2010. An updated version (2014) is available on Arxiv.



- [26] Aaron van den Oord, Sander Dieleman, Heiga Zen, Karen Simonyan, Oriol Vinyals, Alex Graves, Nal Kalchbrenner, Andrew Senior, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Wavenet: A generative model for raw audio. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.03499*, 2016.
- [27] OpenStreetMap contributors. Planet dump retrieved from <https://planet.osm.org>. <https://www.openstreetmap.org>, 2017.
- [28] Ariel Orda and Raphael Rom. Shortest-path and minimum-delay algorithms in networks with time-dependent edge-length. *J. ACM*, 37(3):607–625, July 1990.
- [29] Srinivas Peeta and Hani S. Mahmassani. Multiple user classes real-time traffic assignment for online operations: A rolling horizon solution framework. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 3(2):83–98, 1995.
- [30] Srinivas Peeta and Athanasios Ziliaskopoulos. Foundations of Dynamic Traffic Assignment: The Past, the Present and the Future. *Networks and Spatial Economics*, 1(3):233–265, 2001.
- [31] B. Ran and D. Boyce. *Dynamic urban transportation network models: theory and implications for intelligent vehicle-highway systems*. Lecture notes in economics and mathematical systems. Springer, Berlin, New York, Paris, 1996.
- [32] Bin Ran, David E. Boyce, and Larry J. LeBlanc. A new class of instantaneous dynamic user-optimal traffic assignment models. *Operations Research*, 41(1):192–202, 1993.
- [33] Martin Skutella. An introduction to network flows over time. In *Research Trends in Combinatorial Optimization, Bonn Workshop on Combinatorial Optimization, November 3-7, 2008, Bonn, Germany*, pages 451–482, 2008.
- [34] Avinash Unnikrishnan and Steven Waller. User equilibrium with recourse. *Networks and Spatial Economics*, 9(4):575–593, 2009.
- [35] Petar Velickovic, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. Graph attention networks. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2018.
- [36] William S Vickrey. Congestion theory and transport investment. *American Economic Review*, 59(2):251–60, May 1969.
- [37] David Watling. Urban traffic network models and dynamic driver information systems. *Transport Reviews*, 14(3):219–246, 1994.
- [38] David Watling and Martin L. Hazelton. The dynamics and equilibria of day-to-day assignment models. *Networks and Spatial Economics*, 3:349–370, 2003.

- [39] Zonghan Wu, Shirui Pan, Guodong Long, Jing Jiang, and Chengqi Zhang. Graph wavenet for deep spatial-temporal graph modeling. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*. AAAI Press, 2019.
- [40] Hai Yang. Multiple equilibrium behaviors and advanced traveler information systems with endogenous market penetration. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 32(3):205–218, 1998.
- [41] Bing Yu, Haoteng Yin, and Zhanxing Zhu. Spatio-temporal graph convolutional networks: A deep learning framework for traffic forecasting. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2018, July 13-19, 2018, Stockholm, Sweden.*, pages 3634–3640, 2018.
- [42] Chuanpan Zheng, Xiaoliang Fan, Cheng Wang, and Jianzhong Qi. GMAN: A graph multi-attention network for traffic prediction. In *The Thirty-Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2020, The Thirty-Second Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2020, The Tenth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2020, New York, NY, USA, February 7-12, 2020*, pages 1234–1241, 2020.
- [43] Daoli Zhu and Patrice Marcotte. On the existence of solutions to the dynamic user equilibrium problem. *Transportation Science*, 34(4):402–414, 2000.

## A. Omitted Proof Details

In this section we provide the proofs for our theoretical results which were omitted from the main body of the paper.

### A.1. The Proof of the Extension Lemma

Before we can prove Lemma 9 we first have to recall some definitions from functional analysis. Let  $[a, b] \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  be a closed interval. Then the  $L^2$ -space for this interval is defined as

$$L^2([a, b]) := \left\{ x : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \int_a^b x(\xi)^2 d\xi < \infty \right\}.$$

Together with the scalar product  $\langle x, y \rangle := \int_a^b x(\xi)y(\xi) d\xi$  it forms a Hilbert space with induced norm  $\|f\|_{L^2}$ . For vectors of functions  $f, g \in L^2([a, b])^d$  we define  $\langle f, g \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^d \langle f_i, g_i \rangle$  making  $L^2([a, b])^d$  itself a Hilbert space.

The space of continuous functions  $C([a, b])$  on this interval together with the uniform norm  $\|f\|_{\infty} := \sup \{ |f(x)| \mid x \in [a, b] \}$  forms a Banach space.

**Definition 13.** A sequence  $f^k$  of vectors of functions in  $L^2([a, b])^d$  converges weakly to  $f \in L^2([a, b])^d$ , if  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle f^k, g \rangle = \langle f, g \rangle$  holds for all  $g \in L^2([a, b])^d$ .

A mapping  $\mathcal{A} : K \rightarrow Y$  from some subset  $K \subseteq L^2([a, b])^d$  to a Banach space  $Y$  is *weak-strong-continuous* at  $f \in K$ , if for every sequence  $f^k$  that converges weakly to  $f$ , we have  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{A}(f^k) - \mathcal{A}(f)\|_Y = 0$ . The mapping itself is *weak-strong-continuous* if it is weak-strong-continuous at all  $f \in K$ .

*Proof of Lemma 9.* Let  $f$  be a partial dynamic prediction flow up to time  $\theta$  with respect to a set of oblivious and continuous predictors  $\hat{q}$ . Choose some  $\alpha \in (0, \min_{e \in E} \tau_e)$ , let  $D := [\phi, \phi + \alpha]$  and define the inflow of commodity  $i$  at node  $v$  and time  $\theta$  by  $b_{i,v}^-(\theta) := \sum_{e \in \delta_v^-} f_{i,e}^-(\theta) + \mathbb{1}_{v=s_i} u_i(\theta)$  for all  $\theta \in [\phi, \phi + \alpha]$ , where  $f_{i,e}^-$  is uniquely defined by (4) and (5). Because we chose  $\alpha < \tau_e$ , the outflow rates  $f_{i,e}^-|_D$  and therefore also the balances  $b_{i,v}^-$  do not depend on the yet to be defined inflow rates  $f_{i,e}^+|_D$  during the interval  $D$ .

To apply Theorem 7, we first define the set of all possible extensions of  $f$  on the interval  $D$  in the form of inflow functions  $g_{i,e} \in L^2(D)$  one of which should later become  $f_{i,e}^+|_D$ :

$$K := \left\{ g \in L^2(D)^{I \times E} \mid \begin{array}{l} \forall i \in I, v \in V \setminus \{t_i\} : \sum_{e \in \delta_v^+} g_{i,e} = b_{i,v}^- \text{ a.e.} \\ \forall i \in I : \sum_{e \in \delta_{t_i}^+} g_{i,e} \leq b_{i,t_i}^- \text{ a.e., } \forall i \in I, e \in E : g_{i,e} \geq 0 \end{array} \right\}$$

This set is clearly closed and convex. Boundedness follows from the boundedness of the network inflow rates and the edge outflow rates (cf. (4)). Finally, for non-emptiness, we observe that flow particles of commodity  $i$  start at node  $s_i$ , from which  $t_i$  is reachable, and – in a dynamic prediction flow – can never enter an edge towards a node from which there is no path to  $t_i$ . Thus, flow of commodity  $i$  can only arrive at nodes which have at

least one outgoing edge or are  $t_i$ . So, for every node  $v \neq t_i$  with  $b_{i,v}^- \neq 0$  we can always choose some edge  $e \in \delta_v^-$  and define  $g_{i,e} := b_{i,v}^-$  to obtain some element of  $K$ .

We note that, for any  $g \in K$ , we can extend the flow  $f$  with  $g$  to a partial flow up to time  $\phi + \alpha$  by assigning  $f_{i,e}^+|_D \leftarrow g_{i,e}$  and reassign  $f_{i,e}^-$  using (4) and (5). Then, conditions (2) and (3) are fulfilled almost everywhere due to  $\sum_{e \in \delta_v^+} g_{i,e} = b_{i,v}$  and  $\sum_{e \in \delta_{t_i}^+} g_{i,e} \leq b_{i,t_i}$ , respectively. Changing  $g$  on a null set, we can obtain the required properties for all  $\theta \leq \phi + \alpha$ .

Now, we want to establish a weak-strong-continuous map  $\mathcal{A} : K \rightarrow L^2(D)^{I \times E}$  to which a solution of the variational inequality (13) would give an extension preserving the properties of dynamic prediction equilibria. For this, we choose the map defined by

$$\mathcal{A}(g)_{i,e}(\theta) := \hat{l}_{i,w} \left( \hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta; \theta; q^g); \theta; q^g \right) - \hat{l}_{i,v}(\theta; \theta; q^g) \quad \text{for } \theta \in D, e = (v, w) \in E, i \in I$$

where  $q^g \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^E$  is the queue of the partial flow up to time  $\phi + \alpha$  defined by the extension of  $f$  with  $g$ . We observe that for any time  $\theta \in D$  we have  $\mathcal{A}(g)_{i,e}(\theta) = 0$  if and only if  $e$  is  $\theta$ -predicted active for commodity  $i$ , i.e. particles of commodity  $i$  are allowed to enter this edge at that time.

In order to show that this mapping  $\mathcal{A}$  is indeed weak-strong continuous we decompose it into a concatenation of several simpler maps and then prove continuity of each of those intermediate steps separately.

**Claim 1.** *The mapping  $\mathcal{B} : L^2(D)^{I \times E} \rightarrow C([0, \phi + \alpha])^E, (g_{i,e})_{i \in I, e \in E} \mapsto (q_e^g)_{e \in E}$  is weak-strong continuous, i.e.*

$$\|g^n - g\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0 \implies \|q^{g^n} - q^g\|_{\infty} \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof of Claim 1.* Cominetti, Correa and Larré have shown in [5, Lemma 4 and section 5.5] that for any feasible dynamic flow  $f$ , the map  $(f_{i,e}^+)_{i \in I} \mapsto q_e$  is weak-strong-continuous from  $L^p([0, M])^I$  to  $C([0, M])$  and therefore  $(f_{i,e}^+)_{i \in I, e \in E} \mapsto (q_e)_{e \in E}$  is also weak-strong-continuous from  $L^2([0, M])^{I \times E}$  to  $C([0, M])^E$  for any  $M \geq 0$ . This directly implies that  $\mathcal{B}$  is also weak-strong continuous.  $\square$

**Claim 2.** *Let  $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $(q^n)_n \subseteq C([0, \phi + \alpha])^E$  some sequence of partial queue functions converging uniformly to some set of queue functions  $q \in C([0, \phi + \alpha])^E$  and  $\hat{q}_{i,e}$  some continuous and oblivious predictor. Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exist  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $n \geq N$ ,  $\theta, \theta' \in [0, M]$  and  $\bar{\theta}, \bar{\theta}' \in D$  with  $|\theta - \theta'|, |\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}'| < \delta$  we have*

$$|\hat{q}_{i,e}(\theta'; \bar{\theta}'; q^n) - \hat{q}_{i,e}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q)| \leq \epsilon.$$

*Proof of Claim 2.* This follows directly from the continuity of the predictor  $\hat{q}_{i,e}$  together with the fact that  $[0, M]$  and  $D$  are compact sets.  $\square$

**Claim 3.** *For every  $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  the mapping*

$$C(D)^E \rightarrow C([0, M] \times D)^{I \times V}, (q_e) \mapsto (\hat{l}_{i,v}(\cdot, \cdot, (q_e)))$$

is strong-strong continuous, i.e.

$$\|q^n - q\|_\infty \rightarrow 0 \implies \left\| (\hat{\ell}_{i,v}(\cdot, \cdot, q^n)) - (\hat{\ell}_{i,v}(\cdot, \cdot, q)) \right\|_\infty \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof of Claim 3.* We first show that for every commodity  $i$  and every simple path  $P$  the mapping

$$C(D)^E \rightarrow C([0, M] \times D)^I, q \mapsto \hat{\ell}_i^P(\cdot, \cdot, q)$$

is strong-strong continuous for every  $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . We prove this by induction on the length of  $P$ . The base case, i.e. a path consisting of a single edge  $e$ , follows directly from Claim 2 as in this case we have  $\hat{\ell}_i^P(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) = \theta + \frac{1}{\nu_e} \hat{q}_{i,e}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) + \tau_e$ . For the induction step let  $P$  be a path of length at least two and ending with some edge  $e$ , i.e.  $P = P', e$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{\ell}_i^P(\cdot; \cdot; q^n) - \hat{\ell}_i^P(\cdot; \cdot; q) \right\|_\infty = \sup_{\substack{\theta \in [0, M] \\ \bar{\theta} \in D}} \left| \hat{\ell}_i^P(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q^n) - \hat{\ell}_i^P(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) \right| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{\theta \in [0, M] \\ \bar{\theta} \in D}} \left| \hat{T}_{i,e}(\hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q^n); \bar{\theta}; q^n) - \hat{T}_{i,e}(\hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q); \bar{\theta}; q) \right| \\ &= \sup_{\substack{\theta \in [0, M] \\ \bar{\theta} \in D}} \left| \hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q^n) + \frac{1}{\nu_e} \hat{q}_{i,e}(\hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q^n); \bar{\theta}; q^n) - \hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) - \frac{1}{\nu_e} \hat{q}_{i,e}(\hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q); \bar{\theta}; q) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{\theta \in [0, M] \\ \bar{\theta} \in D}} \left| \hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q^n) - \hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q) \right| \\ &\quad + \sup_{\substack{\theta \in [0, M] \\ \bar{\theta} \in D}} \left| \frac{1}{\nu_e} \hat{q}_{i,e}(\hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q^n); \bar{\theta}; q^n) - \frac{1}{\nu_e} \hat{q}_{i,e}(\hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q); \bar{\theta}; q) \right| \\ &= \left\| \hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\cdot; \cdot; q^n) - \hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\cdot; \cdot; q) \right\|_\infty \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\nu_e} \sup_{\substack{\theta \in [0, M] \\ \bar{\theta} \in D}} \left| \hat{q}_{i,e}(\hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q^n); \bar{\theta}; q^n) - \hat{q}_{i,e}(\hat{\ell}_i^{P'}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q); \bar{\theta}; q) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where the first term converges by induction while the second converges by induction combined with Claim 2. From this the statement of Claim 3 follows immediately as every  $\hat{\ell}_{i,v}$  is a minimum over a finite number of functions  $\hat{\ell}_i^P$ .  $\square$

**Claim 4.** For any set of continuous and oblivious predictors  $(\hat{q}_{i,e}) \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^{I \times E}$  and any set of partial queues  $q \in C([0, \phi + \alpha])^E$  the predicted labels  $\hat{\ell}_{i,v}(\cdot; \cdot; q)$  are continuous in the first two arguments.

*Proof of Claim 4.* This follows directly from the continuity of the predictors and the definition of the predicted labels.  $\square$

We can now proceed to prove that the mapping  $\mathcal{A}$  is weak-strong continuous. Let  $(g_{i,e}^n)$  be a sequence in  $K$  converging weakly to some  $(g_{i,e}) \in K$ . We have to show that  $\mathcal{A}(g_{i,e}^n)$  then converges strongly to  $\mathcal{A}(g_{i,e})$ , i.e.  $\|\mathcal{A}(g_{i,e}^n) - \mathcal{A}(g_{i,e})\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$  or, equivalently, for every  $\epsilon > 0, e = (v, w) \in E$  and  $i \in I$  there exists some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n \geq N$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{A}(g_{i,e}^n)_{i,e} - \mathcal{A}(g_{i,e})_{i,e}\|_\infty \\ &= \sup_{\theta \in D} \left| \hat{l}_{i,w}(\hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta; \theta; q^{g^n}); \theta; q^{g^n}) - \hat{l}_{i,v}(\theta; \theta; q^{g^n}) - \hat{l}_{i,w}(\hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta; \theta; q^g); \theta; q^g) + \hat{l}_{i,v}(\theta; \theta; q^g) \right| \\ &\leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Due to Claim 4 and the fact that  $D$  is compact, there exists some  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $\theta, \bar{\theta} \in D$  and  $\theta' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  with  $|\theta - \theta'| < \delta$  we have  $|\hat{l}_{i,w}(\theta; \bar{\theta}; q^g) - \hat{l}_{i,w}(\theta'; \bar{\theta}; q^g)| < \epsilon/3$ . Now choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $n \geq N$  we have

- $\left\| \hat{T}_{i,e}(\cdot; \cdot; q^{g^n}) - \hat{T}_{i,e}(\cdot; \cdot; q^g) \right\|_\infty = \frac{1}{\nu_e} \left\| \hat{q}_{i,e}(\cdot; \cdot; q^{g^n}) - \hat{q}_{i,e}(\cdot; \cdot; q^g) \right\|_\infty < \delta$  on  $D \times D$  (possible because of Claims 1 and 2),
- $\left\| \hat{l}_{i,v}(\cdot; \cdot; \hat{q}^{g^n}) - \hat{l}_{i,v}(\cdot; \cdot; \hat{q}^g) \right\|_\infty < \epsilon/3$  on  $D \times D$  (possible because of Claims 1 to 3) and
- $\left\| \hat{l}_{i,w}(\cdot; \cdot; \hat{q}^{g^n}) - \hat{l}_{i,w}(\cdot; \cdot; \hat{q}^g) \right\|_\infty < \epsilon/3$  on  $D' \times D$ , where we define a new interval  $D' = [\phi, \phi + \alpha + \max_{\theta \in D} \frac{\hat{q}_{i,e}(\theta, \theta, q^g)}{\nu_e} + \delta]$  (possible because of Claims 1 to 3)

Then, for every  $k \geq K$  and  $\theta \in D$  we have  $\hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta, \theta, q^{g^n}) \leq T_{i,e}(\theta, \theta, q^g) + \delta \in D'$  and, thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \hat{l}_{i,w} \left( \hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta; \theta; q^{g^n}); \theta; q^{g^n} \right) - \hat{l}_{i,v}(\theta; \theta; q^{g^n}) - \hat{l}_{i,w} \left( \hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta; \theta; q^g); \theta; q^g \right) - \hat{l}_{i,v}(\theta; \theta; q^g) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \hat{l}_{i,w} \left( \hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta; \theta; q^{g^n}); \theta; q^{g^n} \right) - \hat{l}_{i,w} \left( \hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta; \theta; q^{g^n}); \theta; q^g \right) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \hat{l}_{i,w} \left( \hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta; \theta; q^{g^n}); \theta; q^g \right) - \hat{l}_{i,w} \left( \hat{T}_{i,e}(\theta; \theta; q^g); \theta; q^g \right) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \hat{l}_{i,v}(\theta; \theta; q^{g^n}) - \hat{l}_{i,v}(\theta; \theta; q^g) \right| \\ &< \epsilon/3 + \epsilon/3 + \epsilon/3 = \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly what we had to prove.

Thus, Theorem 7 implies the existence of a solution  $g^*$  to the variational inequality. It remains to show that the extension  $f^*$  of  $f$  with  $g^*$  is in fact a partial dynamic prediction flow up to time  $\phi + \alpha$ . We already argued that the extension is a partial flow. Hence, we only have to verify that for all  $i \in I$  and  $\theta \in [0, \phi + \alpha)$  the condition

$$f_{i,e}^{*+}(\theta) > 0 \implies e \in \hat{E}_i(\theta; \theta; q^{g^*}). \quad (14)$$

holds. As the predictors  $\hat{q}_{i,e}, i \in I$  are oblivious, they only depend on past queues; therefore, this condition is already fulfilled for  $\theta < \phi$  as  $f$  was already a partial dynamic prediction flow up to time  $\phi$  and the queues of  $f$  and  $f^*$  coincide on  $[0, \phi)$ . Hence, we only have to show this condition for  $\theta \in [\phi, \phi + \alpha)$ .

Suppose that (14) does not hold for almost all  $\theta \in [\phi, \phi + \alpha)$ . Then there is an edge  $e$ , a commodity  $i$ , and a set of times  $\Theta \subseteq [\phi, \phi + \alpha)$  of positive measure, such that  $g_{i,e}^*(\theta) > 0$  and  $e \notin \hat{E}_i(\theta; \theta; q^{f^*})$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{A}(g^*)_{i,e}(\theta) > 0$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Since  $g^*$  and  $\mathcal{A}(g^*)$  are non-negative we have:

$$\langle \mathcal{A}(g^*), g^* \rangle \geq \int_{\Theta} \mathcal{A}(g^*)_{i,e}(\theta) \cdot g_{i,e}^*(\theta) d\theta > 0. \quad (15)$$

We will now define a new solution  $g' \in K$  that fulfils  $\langle \mathcal{A}(g^*), g' \rangle = 0$ . As already mentioned, for any solution – and especially for  $g^*$  – we have the following property: For every commodity  $i$ , every node  $v \neq t_i$  with  $b_{i,v}^- \neq 0$  and every time  $\theta$  there exists an outgoing edge  $e \in \delta_v^+$  that is active, i.e.,  $e \in \hat{E}_i(\theta; \theta; q^{f^*})$ . Furthermore, the sets  $\Theta_{i,e} := \{ \theta \in [\phi, \phi + \alpha) \mid e \in \hat{E}_i(\theta; \theta; q^{f^*}) \}$  are, by their definition and the continuity of the predicted label functions  $\hat{\ell}_{i,v}$ , closed and, therefore, measurable. Thus, we can define  $g' \in K$  as follows. At every node  $v$ , for every commodity  $i$  and at every point in time  $\theta$ , we send all arriving flow at  $v$  of commodity  $i$  into an edge  $e \in \hat{E}_i(\theta; \theta; q^{f^*})$ , where  $\hat{E}_i(\theta; \theta; q^{f^*})$  are the active edges according to  $g^*$ . It is easy to check that this implies  $\langle \mathcal{A}(g^*), g' \rangle = 0$ . Combining this with (15) we get

$$\langle \mathcal{A}(g^*), g' - g^* \rangle = \langle \mathcal{A}(g^*), g' \rangle - \langle \mathcal{A}(g^*), g^* \rangle < 0,$$

which is a contradiction to (13). Thus,  $f^*$  satisfies (14) almost everywhere. Now, let  $\Theta_0$  be the set of points in time where (14) is not satisfied. Then  $\Theta_0$  is a set of measure zero and it is possible to modify the edge inflow rates at every  $\theta \in \Theta_0$ , such that flow conservation and (14) is fulfilled by sending all flow into edges in  $\hat{E}_i(\theta; \theta; q^{f^*})$ . This has no impact on the queues or the shortest path distances, thus, resulting in an extension of  $f$  satisfying (14) everywhere.  $\square$

## A.2. Proof of the Existence Theorem

*Proof of Theorem 10.* We define the set of all partial dynamic prediction flows with respect to the given set of predictors  $\hat{q}$  as

$$\mathcal{F}(\hat{q}) := \{ (f, \theta) \mid f \text{ a partial dynamic prediction flow w.r.t. } \hat{q} \text{ up to time } \theta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{ \infty \} \}.$$

This set is clearly non-empty as the zero-flow is a partial dynamic prediction flow up to time 0. We also define a partial order  $\preceq$  on  $\mathcal{F}(\hat{q})$  by defining

$$(f, \theta) \preceq (f', \theta') :\iff \theta \leq \theta' \wedge f'_{\leq \theta} = f_{\leq \theta}.$$

Then every chain  $(f_1, \theta_1) \preceq (f_2, \theta_2) \preceq \dots$  has an upper bound  $(f, \theta)$ . Namely, we can define  $\theta := \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{ \theta_k \}$  and  $f^+$  by setting  $f_{i,e}^+(\theta) := f_{k,i,e}^+(\theta)$  for any  $k$  with  $\theta < \theta_k$ . Note that, due to the definition of the partial order  $\preceq$  this is well-defined.

Thus, Zorn's lemma guarantees the existence of a maximal element  $(f, \theta) \in \mathcal{F}$ . Now assume for contradiction that  $\theta \neq \infty$ . Then, by Lemma 9, we can extend this flow to a partial dynamic prediction flow  $f'$  up to some time  $\theta + \alpha$ . This, however, means that  $(f, \theta) \preceq (f', \theta + \alpha)$  and  $(f, \theta) \neq (f', \theta + \alpha)$  – contradicting the maximality of  $(f, \theta)$ . So, any maximal element  $f$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  already has to be a dynamic prediction flow with respect to  $\hat{q}$  for all times.  $\square$

### A.3. Continuity of the Regularized Linear Predictor

*Proof of Proposition 12.* We only consider the case without finite time horizon, i.e.  $H = \infty$ . The other case follows completely analogous. Let  $f$  be some feasible flow,  $\theta, \bar{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $(q_e) \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^E$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $e \in E$  some fixed edge. We define

$$\epsilon' := \frac{\epsilon}{4} \cdot \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\delta}{q_e(\bar{\theta}) - q_e(\bar{\theta} - \delta)}, \frac{\delta}{|\theta - \bar{\theta}| + 2} \right\} > 0. \quad (16)$$

Now, due to the continuity of  $q$  there exists some  $\gamma > 0$  such that for all  $e \in E$  and  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  with  $|\bar{\theta} - \zeta| < \gamma$  we have  $|q_e(\bar{\theta}) - q_e(\zeta)|, |q_e(\bar{\theta} - \delta) - q_e(\zeta - \delta)| < \epsilon'/2$ . Then, for all  $\theta', \bar{\theta}' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $(q'_e) \in C(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^E$  with  $|\theta - \theta'|, |\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}'|, \|q - q'\|_\infty < \min \{1, \epsilon'/2, \gamma\}$  we have

- $|q_e(\bar{\theta}) - q'_e(\bar{\theta}')| \leq |q_e(\bar{\theta}) - q_e(\bar{\theta}')| + |q_e(\bar{\theta}') - q'_e(\bar{\theta}')| < \epsilon'$  and
- $|q_e(\bar{\theta} - \delta) - q'_e(\bar{\theta}' - \delta)| \leq |q_e(\bar{\theta} - \delta) - q_e(\bar{\theta}' - \delta)| + |q_e(\bar{\theta}' - \delta) - q'_e(\bar{\theta}' - \delta)| < \epsilon'$ .

Combining these allows us to get the desired bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| q_e(\bar{\theta}) + \frac{q_e(\bar{\theta}) - q_e(\bar{\theta} - \delta)}{\delta} \cdot (\theta - \bar{\theta}) - q'_e(\bar{\theta}') - \frac{q'_e(\bar{\theta}') - q'_e(\bar{\theta}' - \delta)}{\delta} \cdot (\theta' - \bar{\theta}') \right| \\ & \leq |q_e(\bar{\theta}) - q'_e(\bar{\theta}')| + \frac{1}{\delta} |q_e(\bar{\theta}) - q_e(\bar{\theta} - \delta)| \cdot |\theta - \theta' + \bar{\theta}' - \bar{\theta}| \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\delta} |q_e(\bar{\theta}) - q'_e(\bar{\theta}') + q'_e(\bar{\theta}' - \delta) - q_e(\bar{\theta} - \delta)| \cdot |\theta' - \bar{\theta}'| \\ & \leq \epsilon' + \frac{1}{\delta} |q_e(\bar{\theta}) - q_e(\bar{\theta} - \delta)| \cdot \epsilon' + \frac{1}{\delta} \cdot 2\epsilon' \cdot (|\theta - \bar{\theta}| + 2) \stackrel{(16)}{\leq} \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{\epsilon}{4} + \frac{2\epsilon}{4} = \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since taking the maximum of two continuous functions is again a continuous function, this shows that the regularized linear predictor is indeed a continuous predictor.  $\square$

## B. More Results of the Computational Analysis

As mentioned in the main paper, here are a few more results of the computational study alongside some explanations. Here, we focus only on the two larger networks, i.e. the Sioux-Falls and the Tokyo networks. In both cases the training data of the linear regression predictor stems from simulations up to some time horizon  $H$  where all






Figure 4: Average travel times compared to the minimum average travel time in the Sioux Falls network.

commodities use the constant predictor. From these simulations, for all edges  $e \in E$  samples of the form

$$(q_{e'}(\bar{\theta} - i\delta))_{e' \in N(e), i=0, \dots, k}$$

were extracted as input and

$$(q_e(\bar{\theta} + j\delta))_{j=1, \dots, k'}$$

as labels of the model for  $\bar{\theta} \in [0, H]$ .

### B.1. Results on the Sioux Falls Network

As the number of edges is small enough in the Sioux Falls network, we trained a separate model for each edge each with a 90%/10% split for the training data and test data. The coefficient of determination was above 0.9 for all edges except for 6 edges but always higher than 0.5.

Evaluating the average travel time of the different predictors for 12 random commodities as explained in Section 5.4 yields the results depicted in Figure 4. We can see that the linear regression predictor  $\hat{q}^{ML}$  performs similarly well as the regularized linear predictor  $\hat{q}^{RL}$  which is slightly beaten by the constant and the linear predictors. The Zero predictor performs worse than all of the rest many times.

### B.2. Results on the Tokyo Network

Because the Tokyo instance has substantially more edges, we decided to train a single model used for all edges. In order to predict the queue lengths of an edge  $e = vw$  in




Figure 5: Average travel times compared to the minimum average travel time in the Tokyo network.

this model, we use the data of (up to) 5 incoming edges of  $v$  and insert 0s if  $v$  has less than 5 incoming edges. A training and validation split of 90%/10% yields a coefficient of determination of 0.97.

Running the evaluation now on 35 randomly chosen commodities gives the results shown in Figure 5. In this scenario, the linear regression predictor performed similarly well as the linear and the constant predictor. Here, the Zero predictor performs a little bit better than the regularized linear predictor, but worse than the remaining three.