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ABSTRACT

Cities across the world vary in terms of their urban forms, transportation networks, and travel demand patterns with the variation affecting the viability of different shared mobility modes ranging from mass transit to ridesharing. This study proposes a modeling framework to quantify the shareability of person flows in any city as a function of two inputs—the underlying transportation (street) network and origin-destination (OD) travel demand in the network—as a first step toward a deeper understanding of the joint influence of these factors on the viability of shared mobility modes. This study conceptualizes flow overlap to denote, for a person trip traversing a given path, the weighted (by link distance) average number of other travelers sharing the links along the person’s path. The study extends this concept and formulates the Maximum Network Flow Overlap Problem (MNFLOP) to assign all O-D person flows to the network paths that maximize flow overlap in the region. The study also proposes an MNFLOP variant with a second objective function term, OD flow detours, to capture the trade-off between minimizing travel distance/time and increasing shareability. The study utilizes the MNFLOP output to calculate measures of shareability at various levels of aggregation: single location, single and multiple ODs, individual links, and network level. The study applies the MNFLOP to networks in Sioux Falls and Chicago. Results show that with minor increases in traveler detour, it is possible to significantly increase flow overlap relative to assigning all OD flows to their shortest paths. Origin level measures of flow overlap indicate potential to share trips even from locations with low demand, as long as the trips can be concentrated onto a few paths, showing that critical demand assessment for operating shared mobility modes is guided by both magnitude and directionality of demand.

Keywords: Shareability, Network Modeling, Network Properties, Quadratic Programming, Shared Mobility, Overlap, Demand Patterns
1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Cities are engines of growth and opportunity world-wide, as they connect individuals of all income levels with opportunities, most notably employment opportunities but also healthcare, social/recreational, and religious opportunities. As a result of the opportunities provided by cities, today an estimated 56% of the global population live in cities, with an additional 2.5 billion people estimated to move to cities by 2050 (WorldBank, 2019). The high and increasing density of humans in cities have wide-ranging implications on cities themselves and their infrastructure systems, including urban transportation systems.

In many developed countries around the world, most notably in the United States, the personal vehicle is the predominant mode of travel even within large cities. Unfortunately, personal vehicles take up considerable space when they are either parked or driven in dense urban areas. Hence, as cities grow, there is no possible means to prevent heavy congestion and gridlock if travelers continue to rely extensively on their personal vehicles to travel. Already, the average auto commuter in the US loses nearly 54 hours in congestion, wasting nearly $1,100 annually in time and fuel (Schrank et al., 2019).

In order to provide the large and growing number of urban residents with the mobility that underlies access to opportunities, cities will need to offer, and travelers will need to use, significantly more space-efficient modes of travel than the personal vehicle. Many large cities currently have rail-based public transit offerings and nearly all cities have bus-based public transit offerings. Moreover, many cities have recently permitted private-sector mobility service providers (e.g., Uber, Lyft, Didi, etc.) to offer services. These mobility services include app-based ridesourcing services such as UberX and conventional Lyft services; ride-splitting or shared-ride services such as Uber Pool and Lyft Shared; and other forms of flexible transit services such as those provided by Via. Figure 1.1 displays these private sector transportation services, along with conventional fixed route transit modes and flexible bus transit variations such as route-deviation transit and point deviation transit, along two overlapping dimensions -- flexibility in route and schedule as well as capacity or space efficiency. Figure 1.1 provides a portfolio of different shared mobility modes that cities can utilize to provide people in and around cities with the mobility and accessibility they desire.
Planning and designing rail systems, bus systems, and shared mobility services individually represent challenging problems, as does designing these share mobility modes jointly. The planning and design of these systems has significant implications on mobility and accessibility in urban areas. Hence, providing insightful quantitative information to support the planning and design of shared multi-modal mobility networks is an important research area.

1.2 Research Goal, Objectives, and Contributions

Given the role of cities in providing humans unparalleled access to opportunities, rising population growth in cities, the spatial constraints in cities preventing efficient and sustainable use of personal vehicles, and the importance of intelligently planning and designing space-efficient modes in cities, the overarching goal of this study is to develop conceptual and analytical frameworks, including a mathematical programming formulation, to characterize and quantify sharing potential (i.e., shareability) in and around urban networks. As cities across the world (and regions within a city) vary in terms of their land use, density, street networks, and travel patterns, the study aims to develop a framework that captures a novel fundamental network property, shareability, that directly captures the structure of street networks and travel demand patterns as well as indirectly captures land-use and density.

The analysis framework and associated shareability metrics should provide considerable value to a wide range of stakeholders, including researchers; modelers, analysts, and planners at transportation agencies and consulting agencies; city officials; urban planners; etc. Among other potential uses, the authors
believe the analytical framework and shareability measures proposed in this study will provide significant value in terms of the planning and design of shared mobility systems.

Given the study’s overarching goal, this aims to address five specific objectives. First the study proposes, defines, and mathematically formulates the concept of ‘flow overlap’ as a fundamental unit of shareability between OD flows (person trips) in a transportation network. Second, the study formulates the Maximum Network Flow Overlap Problem (MNFLOP) to assign person flows to paths in a network in order to maximize total network-wide flow overlap—this study’s measure of shareability. Third, the study introduces a second objective function term in the MNFLOP formulation that captures detour costs associated with non-shortest paths. Fourth, the study defines and formulates shareability metrics, stemming from the MNFLOP output, at different levels of aggregation in a transportation network, such as location (i.e., node) level, link level, trip level, and aggregate network level. Finally, the study applies the MNFLOP model to different transportation networks and analyzes the shareability in these networks.

This study makes several contributions to the existing literature. First, to the best of the authors’ knowledge, this study is the first to define and characterize sharing/shareability in a network in a mode- and vehicle-independent manner by jointly considering individual person flows and the underlying network structure. Prior research by Santi et al. (2014) measures shareability, but in the context of a specific mobility service that requires assigning persons to capacitated vehicles. Second, this study defines and formulates the MNFLOP—a novel mathematical formulation able to characterize and quantify the shareability of a network and set of (person/demand) flows between origin nodes and destination nodes. The formulation extends the conventional path-based traffic assignment problem (Chen et al., 2002; Dial, 1971, 2006; Jayakrishnan et al., 1994). Moreover, the formulation of the MNFLOP with two objectives—minimizing detour and maximizing overlap—should allow researchers, modelers, analysts, and planners to evaluate the trade-offs between maximizing shareability (i.e., flow overlaps) and minimizing detours, when planning or designing multi-modal shared mobility networks. Third, this study introduces a metric for demand that captures the directionality and magnitude of demand in a transportation network stemming from a single location or network subregion, termed demand dispersion (or Overlap %). Much of the existing literature
only considers the magnitude of demand emanating from a single location or network subregion, e.g., Li & Quadrifoglio (2010); Nourbakhsh & Ouyang (2012) and Quadrifoglio & Li (2009). This study characterizes the degree of dispersion associated with trips stemming from an origin location, i.e., the extent of commonality or the lack thereof, between the paths of trips from an origin location to all destination locations.

Finally, another valuable feature of the MNFLOP model is that applies to any network with a set of flows, not just transportation networks. Traditionally, constraints and objective functions in network flow models try to avoid, either explicitly or implicitly, condensing flows onto fewer and fewer links, because most network flow applications involve link or node capacity constraints as well as flow-based link or node congestion penalty functions. However, as indicated in this study, there are potential network flow applications where condensing flows onto fewer and fewer links is actually a reasonable objective.

1.3 Paper Structure

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 summarizes the relevant literature and explains the gaps this paper attempts to fill. Section 3 introduces a conceptual framework that defines and connects flow overlaps in a network to the notion of shareability. Section 4 employs the definition of flow overlap and the conceptual framework to state and formulate the MNFLOP. Section 5 uses the output of the MNFLOP to formulate various flow overlap measures at different levels of aggregation. Section 6 provides a summary of the input data for the two case studies including the urban region, its network properties, and the scenario analysis parameters. Section 7 applies the MNFLOP model to the Sioux Falls and Chicago networks. Section 8 discusses the potential uses of the shareability measure and MNFLOP model. Section 9 concludes the paper by summarizing the study and discussing limitations and future research.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Characterizing Urban Form, Transportation Networks, and Mobility Patterns

Several studies in the literature explore different ways to characterize urban form/structure and transportation networks. Srinivasan (2002) developed quantifiable neighborhood level characteristics using
Geographic Information Systems (GIS) that account for land use, network, and accessibility for the Boston metro area in order to model mode choice for work and non-work tours. The specific metrics include population density, distance to transportation facilities like transit stations, nearest freeway ramps, street density, residential entropy, commercial-residential homogeneity, transport entropy, cul-de-sac density, presence of sidewalks, and width of the sidewalk. The model results indicate that land-use and spatial characteristics of the network and neighborhood significantly impact mode choice. Although Srinivasan (2002) does not characterize the shareability for a neighborhood using overlaps in network paths, the study establishes that land-use and the transportation network do affect the usage of shared modes.

Tsai (2005) presents several metropolitan level measures to characterize different urban forms and distinguish compactness from sprawl. The study uses four distinguishable dimensions of a metropolitan area—namely size, density, degree of equal distribution, and degree of clustering to define a metropolitan area. The metrics include population, population density, the Gini coefficient, and Moran coefficient, respectively. The Gini coefficient describes the evenness of the distribution of employment or residential areas in a metropolitan area. On the other hand, Moran’s coefficient measures the degree of clustering based on employment or residential areas. These metrics provide valuable insights into the general characteristics of an urban area that is crucial for the design of shared mobility modes. For example, research finds that high capacity, high frequency fixed transit are more effective in highly clustered cities compared to a sprawled out city (Cervero & Seskin, 1995; Dill et al., 2013; Guerra et al., 2018; McIntosh et al., 2014; Stead & Marshall, 2001). Even though the structure of a transportation network is highly correlated with urban form, the measures in Tsai (2005) may not be sufficient to calculate shareability or provide detailed insights into the design of shared mobility networks like the metrics in the current paper.

Understanding the relationship between urban form, specifically the built environment, and travel behavior is an important and continuing area of research. Ewing & Cervero (2010) present a meta-analysis that analyzes the effects of network and built environment variables on travel behavior; they highlight the variables that are strongly associated with modes such as personal car, walking, and transit. Oke et al. (2019) present a novel urban typology that spans over 300 cities from across more than 120 countries around
the world. The authors use clustering and factor analysis to identify 9 factors and 12 different urban typologies based on the nature of travel behavior and the characteristics of the transportation system. Oke et al. (2019) provide an extensive analysis at an aggregate level in a city to plan sustainable transportation policies based on the urban typology of the city.

Further studies characterize the mobility patterns of a city using real trip data and/or transportation networks. Yang et al. (2016) characterize urban spatial-temporal dynamics using cell phone location data for the city of Shenzhen, China. The study identifies ‘hotspots’ of human convergence and divergence in a city from cell phone data that the authors propose could be used for traffic management and infrastructure planning. Schieber et al. (2017) evaluate the topography of a network and develop an algorithm to characterize and compare different network structures; however, they do not account for differences between two networks with the same structure but different flow patterns. The current study jointly characterizes the network structure as well as the flow or travel patterns in the network. Batty (2012) states that “to understand cities and their design, they need to be assessed as systems composed of flows and networks, and not as artifacts.”

Saberi et al. (2017) present seminal work combining mobility patterns along with the underlying transportation network structure of cities to develop aggregate network level statistical properties. Some of their measures include node degree, coefficient of variation of node degree, network diameter, node flux and its coefficient of variation, node clustering coefficient, and network clustering coefficient. A crucial takeaway from Saberi et al. (2017) is that cities with different urban structures and topographies, such as Chicago and Melbourne, may still exhibit similar OD travel patterns. Therefore, Saberi et al. (2017) highlight that urban form alone is not sufficient to understand and predict mobility patterns and subsequently plan for shared mobility systems.

2.2 Shared Mobility

Despite the potential and initial promise of app-based shared mobility services in terms of making efficient use of space in urban areas, the actual results have been quite mixed or mostly negative thus far.
Recent studies have shown that ride-sourcing services—services where each vehicle serves a single request at a time—account for a significant proportion of trips operated by TNCs (Schaller, 2018). These services have been found to be partially responsible for increasing congestion in cities (Erhardt et al., 2019), with 70% of all ridesourcing trips occurring in the 9 most densely populated metropolitan areas in USA (Schaller, 2018). Even shared-ride and ride-splitting services such as Uber Pool, Uber Express Pool, and Lyft Shared Rides have been found to increase net driving on city streets by as much as 160%, since most of the trips are ‘new’ automobile trips that replaced transit trips or active transportation modes such as walking and biking (Schaller, 2018). Moreover, flexible transit services such as Bridj and Chariot have shut down operations due to low ridership despite offering potential to reshape transit in cities and suburban areas.

TNCs have also been found to have an adverse impact on transit ridership even in dense urban centers (Diao et al., 2021; Graehler et al., 2019; Schaller, 2018). Graehler et al. (2019) observes that except for a few years in certain cities, bus transit ridership has declined more steeply compared to rail modes over the past 10 years. The reason is likely that fixed route transit services operating in suburban areas (and even some urban areas) are unable to provide automobile competitive travel times.

These findings suggest that, if app-based mobility services are to improve mobility and accessibility in a sustainable and space-efficient manner, cities are going to need to regulate these services more effectively (Dandl et al., 2021) as well as reconfigure transit systems and design them jointly with emerging app-based mobility services in mind (Liu et al., 2019; Pinto et al., 2019). The authors hypothesize that the models and shareability metrics proposed in the current study can support these efforts. Several studies have explored the behavioral parameters contributing towards willingness to share trips and use shared mobility services across different markets and socio-economic groups (Alonso-González et al., 2020; Kang et al., 2021; Shaheen & Caicedo, 2021). Even though travel behavior can have a major influence on shareability potential in a region, incorporating the behavioral component of demand is beyond the scope of this study.
2.3 Measuring Shareability in Transportation Networks

Tsao et al. (1999) develop a methodology to analyze a form of sharing potential for carpooling, called the Carpool Demand Reduction (CDR), using the gravity model for a hypothetical area with trips and jobs uniformly distributed throughout the plane. The model assumes a maximum of two passengers involved in a carpool, and that carpooling passengers need to be either from the same origin zone or heading to the same destination zone. The study finds that there is limited potential to reduce demand through carpooling for a region with uniformly dispersed trips and jobs. However, this study does not include an actual road network and serves as a generic model to estimate sharing potential.

Cici et al. (2013) measure sharing potential as the potential reduction in single vehicle trips when travelers are willing to share rides, using Call Description Records (CDRs) to infer home and work locations of travelers in the city of Madrid, Spain. Using the same sharing potential metric as Cici et al. (2013), Gurumurthy & Kockelman (2018) use cell phone traces to infer OD locations and find the potential for dynamic ride sharing in Orlando, Florida. Gurumurthy & Kockelman (2018) employ a dynamic ride-sharing algorithm within an agent-based dynamic simulation model to serve the trips in the cell phone data.

Santi et al. (2014) developed the notion of ‘shareability networks’ to model trip sharing in a deterministic setting and apply classical methods from graph theory to solve the taxi trip sharing problem on the New York City taxi data. Their model includes two parameters—the shareability parameter that determines the number of trips that can be shared by a single vehicle, and the quality of service or detour parameter that defines the total willingness of passengers to detour from their preferred paths. Naturally, as the shareability parameter and the total willingness of passengers to detour increases, the amount of sharing increases and the required vehicles to serve the trips decreases. The main difference between the current study and Santi et al. (2014) is that the latter study focuses on a specific mode with specific vehicle capacities, whereas the current study is mode- and vehicle- agnostic.

Alonso-Mora et al. (2017) extend the shareability network concept developed by Santi et al. (2014) and used it in a dynamic rideshare setting with a capacity of up to 10 passengers per vehicle. The study
showed that a significant reduction in single passenger taxi trips in New York City is possible if passengers are willing to take a small detour and share rides with strangers. Tachet et al. (2017) also extend the shareability network notion developed by Santi et al. (2014) and use it to plot shareability curves for 4 cities, namely New York, Vienna, Singapore and San Francisco. The study plots the probability of sharing trips against the trip density, in terms of trips/hour/sq. km. The results show that the curves follow a similar pattern in all the cities, rising steadily at lower densities and quickly reaching saturation.

A report by FHWA defines a ‘Shared TNC Overlap Rate’ parameter to capture the percentage of a shared trip in which two travelers are in the vehicle together (Middleton et al., 2021). However, this is used only as an input parameter for running different scenarios and not as a measure of shareability for a given network and travel flows.

2.4 Research Gaps Addressed

Based on the relevant literature reviewed, the current study aims to address the following gaps in the research literature. First, this study aims to jointly characterize the transportation network and the demand that flows through the network to measure the shareability of the region. Studies in section 2.1 either quantify the urban form and land use alone (Srinivasan, 2002; Tsai, 2005); the transportation network alone (Schieber et al., 2017) or the travel patterns alone without considering the underlying transportation network (Yang et al., 2016). Even though Saberi et al. (2017) partly addresses the limitation by jointly characterizing transportation network and the travel flows in it, it does not aim to characterize the potential for shareability given the network and demand flows.

Second, the demand input used in the existing literature to explore shareability (Alonso-Mora et al., 2017; Santi et al., 2014; Tachet et al., 2017) are specific to a single mode—taxi trips in nearly all cases. Taxi data does not capture shareability across all person trip flows in the network, which is crucial to design a future integrated multi-modal shared mobility network. Moreover, most existing studies focus exclusively on dense regions with well-developed fixed transit systems. The current study attempts to address this
shortcoming by considering all individual person flows in any network, irrespective of mode, to capture the shareability of the transportation network.

Finally, the current study formulates a mathematical program to measure shareability agnostic of mode and independent of vehicle type/capacity/fleet-size/routing algorithm, from a strategic planning perspective. The math program’s objective is to maximize network overlaps by determining paths for OD flows. Current studies such as Alonso-Mora et al. (2017); Santi et al. (2014) and Tachet et al. (2017) use optimization strategies from an operational or operational planning perspective that are specific to the operation of a limited set of low capacity shared ride vehicles such as taxis or low capacity cars and vans.

3 Conceptual Framework

3.1 Unit Flow Overlaps

This study introduces the notion of flow overlap as a fundamental unit to measure shareability in a network. Broadly defined, flow overlap (or trip overlap) is the extent of spatial, and temporal in some cases, commonality between the paths of trips in a (transportation) network. Flow overlaps are measured considering all person flows in the network simultaneously (i.e., total travel demand in the network, irrespective of mode choice) in order to characterize the commonalities between the paths of all individual person flows.

This study specifically defines the flow overlap for a unit flow (i.e., a trip) from an origin O to a destination D as the link-length-weighted average number of other trips/flows—traveling between all O-D pairs including the unit flow’s OD—with whom the unit flow overlaps during its journey/path. The mathematical formulation of this overlap for a unit flow is shown in Eqn. 1.

\[ Z_{od}^k = \sum_{e \in A} \frac{f_{od}^k c_e \delta_{od}^k}{\sum_{e \in A} (c_e \delta_{od}^k)} + (F_{od} - 1) \] (1)

where, \( A \) is the set of links in the network, indexed by \( e \in A \); \( O, D \) are the set of all origins and destinations in the network, indexed by \( o \in O \) and \( d \in D \), respectively; \( K_{od} \) represents the finite set of acyclic paths for OD pair \( o - d \), indexed by \( k \in K_{od} \); \( c_e \) gives the length of link \( e \); \( \delta_{od}^k \) is a binary parameter that denotes
the link-path incidence of link $a$ on path $k$ from $o$-$d$; $f_{a}^{odk}$ provides the number of other travelers (with ODs distinct from $o - d$) with whom the trip is shared on link $a$ that belongs to path $k$; $F_{od}$ represents the number of travelers heading from $o$ to $d$; and $Z_{od}^{k}$ represents the trip overlap for a single trip leaving from origin $o$ and terminating at destination $d$ through path $k$.

In Eqn.1, the first term represents the link-length-weighted average of the number of travelers along the links the unit flow from O-D pair $(o, d)$ traverses from O-D pairs other than $(o, d)$, with whom the unit flow shares a path. The denominator of the first term denotes the total length of path $k$ from $o$ to $d$. The numerator weights the number of all other travelers not coming from $(o, d)$ that are on link $a$ by the length of link $a$. The second term in Eqn. 1 denotes the number of other travelers from O-D pair $(o, d)$. $F_{od}$ is the total demand from $(o, d)$; the minus one in the second term represents the unit flow from origin $o$ to destination $d$ for which the overlap measure is being calculated.

Eqn. 1 can be extended to include time dimension $t$ to capture spatio-temporal overlaps during a specific time period in the transportation network. Including the temporal component captures the differences in travel patterns and therefore shareability between peak and non-peak hours, or even between AM and PM peak periods. Eqn. 2 displays the spatial-temporal overlap for a unit flow between origin $o$ and destination $d$.

$$Z_{od}^{kt} = \sum_{\forall a \in A} \frac{f_{a}^{0dkt} c_{a}^{t} \delta_{a}^{odkt}}{\sum_{\forall a \in A} (c_{a}^{t} \delta_{a}^{odkt})} + (F_{od}^{t} - 1) \quad (2)$$

where $t$ represents the time period for which overlap is measured.

Eqn. 1 shows the trip overlap for a single trip between an O-D pair in a transportation network, wherein $f_{a}^{odk}$ is given. However, ultimately, $f_{a}^{odk}$ is determined by the network path assignment of flows between every other O-D pair in the network. As the paths between O-D pairs change, so too does $f_{a}^{odk}$. Hence, to determine the maximum overlap or shareability in the network, it is necessary to control all flows from all O-D pairs.
Naturally, there is a trade-off between maximizing overlaps and minimizing detours when assigning OD flows to paths. After presenting an illustrative example in the next subsection, the following subsection discusses the need for a mathematical formulation for determining optimal paths between O-D pairs that maximizes overlaps while considering detours.

### 3.2 Illustrative Example

In this study, the base scenario is the case where all OD flows travel along their shortest paths. Using the formula in Eqn.1, it is straightforward to calculate the flow overlap for every unit flow in the network and then sum all of these unit flow overlaps to obtain a shareability measure. However, in most cases, the shortest path assignment of flows is unlikely to maximize overlap and shareability. Hence, shifting some OD flows from their shortest paths to slightly longer paths should increase flow overlaps in the network.

Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2 illustrate the notion of overlaps in a simple network and how changes in path assignment can lead to higher flow overlaps. Consider the undirected network with three origin nodes A, B and C and one destination node D, with link costs as shown in Figure 3.1. Consider the case where three travelers, X, Y, and Z start their trips from origin nodes A, B, and C, respectively, and all have destination node D.

The shortest paths between each O-D pair are distinct and do not share any common links. Hence, assigning each of these travelers (or the flow from each O-D pair) to their shortest paths produces zero trip overlap for each of the individual trips as well as at an aggregate level for the network.
In the second scenario depicted in Figure 3.2, travelers X and Z detour from their shortest paths and instead travel to destination D via node B and link B-D. Traveler Y continues to take their shortest path to D. This path assignment of travelers produces flow overlap on link B-D. Person Y shares their trip with 2 others on the entirety of their trip from B to D. Person X and Z do not have any overlap on link AB and CB respectively, which corresponds to 3/7th of their total trip length. However, from B to D (4/7th of the trip length), X and Z share with two other trips.

Using Eqn. 1, the cumulative value of flow overlap across the three travelers in Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2, are 0 and 1.43, respectively. Moreover, while the detour in Figure 3.1 is 0 units, the average travel time detour per traveler in Figure 3.2 is 1.33 units. Hence, by adjusting the paths of travelers in this simple case away from shortest paths, it is possible to increase overlaps in the network considerably with only minor increases in detours.

Although beyond the scope of this study, the path choice depicted in Figure 3.2 makes it possible for the 3 travelers to potentially share the same shared mobility mode for a section of the journey. If all 3 travelers share the same vehicle on link B-D, it may be possible to substitute 3 single occupancy vehicle trips on the link with a single vehicle trip. In this case, the total VMT in the network is 10 miles, a reduction of 4 miles from the scenario in Figure 3.1. Thus, it is evident that path choices that increase the flow overlaps in the network enable greater shareability, which could be used as a basis to design single- or multi-mode shared mobility systems. However, it is important to emphasize that the networks paths that flows (aka person trips) are assigned to, do not represent a specific mode in Eqn. 1, Figure 3.1, Figure 3.2, nor anywhere in the paper.

3.3 Extending Unit Flow Overlaps to Network Flow Overlap

While it is straightforward to determine the paths between each O-D pair that maximize network flow overlap in the illustrative example, the problem is considerably more complex for larger networks, more OD demand pairs, and more paths between each O-D pair. Hence, this study proposes a mathematical
programming formulation, called the MNFLOP, to determine the optimal path between each O-D pair in the network that maximizes cumulative network flow overlap.

Section 4 formulates the MNFLOP as a flow- and path-based quadratic integer program. The proposed model for the MNFLOP characterizes and quantifies the shareability in a transportation network or subnetwork, given two inputs: a road network, and origin-destination (OD) person demand flows. The MNFLOP direct model outputs, or decision variables, include the flow on each network link and the single path assigned to each O-D pair flow. Moreover, given the assigned path for each OD flow, it is possible to calculate a large number of other shareability measures in addition to the MNFLOP objective function term(s). The MNFLOP objective function term derived from the unit flow measure in Eqn. 1, is the primary measure for characterizing the shareability of an urban area. However, Section 5 provides a plethora of other shareability measures obtainable from the output of the MNFLOP model.

4 Mathematical Formulation

4.1 Problem Statement

For a given network and OD flow demand data, the objective of the MNFLOP is to maximize total flow overlap in the network via assigning demand between every O-D pair to a network path \( k \). Since the MNFLOP involves assigning trips to non-shortest paths, a bi-criteria objective function is defined to account for tradeoffs between overlaps and detours. Equation (3) provides a formulation of the objective function considering the flows between all O-D pairs in the network.

\[
Objective = \text{Max } Z = \sum_{o \in O} \sum_{d \in D} F_{od} \sum_{k \in K_{od}} X_{od}^k \left(Z_{od}^k - w \Delta_{od}^k \right)
\]  

(3)

All variables in Eqn. 3 are the same as defined previously. The new parameters, indices, and decision variables are as follows: \( X_{od}^k \) is a binary decision variable equal to 1 if the flow for \( o - d \) is assigned to path \( k \); \( \Delta_{od}^k \) represents total detour on path \( k \) from \( o \) to \( d \) compared to the shortest/most preferred path; and \( w \) is a weight parameter that effectively converts units of detour time into units of overlap.
The solution to the MNFLOP is highly sensitive to the choice of the detour weight parameter \( w \). A higher value for detour parameter \( w \) favors the assignment of trips on their shortest/preferred paths.

### 4.2 Problem Formulation

Equation 3 displays an abstraction of the objective function considering the assignment of all flows in the network. Combining Eqn. 1 and Eqn. 3, Eqn. 4 displays the objective of the MNFLOP:

\[
\text{Max } Z = \sum_{o \in O} \sum_{d \in D} F_{od} \left[ \sum_{k \in K_{od}} X_{od}^k \left( \sum_{a \in A} \frac{f_{a}^{odk} c_{a} \delta_{a}^{odk}}{\sum_{a \in A} (c_{a} \delta_{a}^{odk})} + (F_{od} - 1) - w \Delta_{od}^k \right) \right]
\]  

(4)

All the indices, parameters, and decision variables in Eqn. 4 are as defined above. However, Eqn. 4 also introduces a set of auxiliary decision variables, \( f_{a}^{odk} \), denoting the number of overlapping trips on link \( a \) on path \( k \) for trips from \( o \) to \( d \) from O-D pairs other than \( o - d \). This auxiliary decision variable is formulated in Eqn. 5.

\[
f_{a}^{odk} = \sum_{(o',d') \in (O \times D - \{(o,d)\})} F_{o'd'} \sum_{k' \in K_{o'd'}} X_{o'd'}^{k'} \delta_{a}^{o'd'k'} \forall a \in A, \forall o \in O, \forall d \in D, \forall k \in K_{od}
\]  

(5)

where, \( (o',d') \) denotes any Origin-Destination pair that is different from \( (o,d) \); \( F_{o'd'} \) denotes the demand between the other O-D pair \( o' \) and \( d' \); \( k' \) denotes any acyclic path between \( o' \) and \( d' \); \( X_{o'd'}^{k'} \) denotes the binary path choice decision variable for trips between \( o' \) and \( d' \) on path \( k' \); and \( \delta_{a}^{o'd'k'} \) denotes a binary link-path incidence term equal to 1 if link \( a \) is a part of path \( k' \) from \( o' \) to \( d' \).

The auxiliary decision variable \( f_{a}^{odk} \) is computed for all links \( a \) that belong to any path \( k \) from all OD pairs in the network. The dependence of the path choice for maximum trip overlap of an O-D pair on the path assignment of other O-D pairs implies that the MNFLOP is a Quadratic Integer Programming Problem.

The MNFLOP is subject to the constraint that all trips between an O-D pair are assigned to one and only one path. The decision variables are also required to take on binary values.

\[
\sum_{o \in O} \sum_{d \in D} \sum_{k \in K_{od}} X_{od}^k = 1 \quad \forall (o, d) \in O \times D
\]  

(6)

\[
X_{od}^k \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall o \in O, d \in D, k \in K_{od}
\]
4.3 Computational Complexity Considerations

The section provides a brief overview of the computational complexity associated with the MNFLOP. If a network has |O| origins, |D| destinations, and |K| paths between each O-D pair, then the number of path choice decision variables in the optimization problem is |O| × |D| × |K|. The number of path choice decision variables is independent of the number of links in the network and is affected only by the number of O-D pairs and the paths between them. However, the quadratic nature of the objective function in Eqn. 4 means that an optimal path choice for an O-D pair is strongly influenced by the optimal path choice for all other O-D pairs with which there is an overlapping link on their paths. The number of quadratic terms in the objective function increases as the O-D pairs increase in spatial closeness, as this results in more overlapping links between paths from multiple O-D pairs. Naturally, the number of quadratic terms also increases with network size, as larger networks have more links on which different O-D pairs are likely to have overlapping paths.

For a network with |O| origins, |D| destinations and |K| paths between each O-D pair, the MNFLOP could have up to a maximum of \((\frac{|O| \times |D| \times |K|}{2}) - (|K| - 1) \times |O| \times |D|\) quadratic terms where the first term computes the number of different combinations of overlapping paths and the second term subtracts the number of other paths between the same O-D pair. More quadratic terms results in slower convergence while trying to find an exact optimal solution.

4.4 Solution Methodology

The MNFLOP is solved as a constrained Mixed Integer Quadratic Problem (MIQP) using the Gurobi optimization package in Python programming language. The Networkx package is used to create the network and perform other network related operations. As an input to the MNFLOP a finite set of k acyclic shortest paths are pre-computed for each O-D pair: \(K_{od} = 0,1,2,\ldots k\) where \(k = 0\) denotes the shortest path between \(o\) and \(d\), \(k = 1\) denotes the 2\textsuperscript{nd} shortest path and so on. Yen’s algorithm finds the \(k\) shortest paths (Yen, 1971), where \(k\) is set to 5 in this study. In practice, there are many possible ways to determine \(K_{od}\)
and the size of $K_{od}$, such as including all paths between $o$ and $d$ with a detour less than 5 minutes or 10% longer than the shortest path.

5 Measures of Shareability

The output of the MNFLOP model and the ‘extent of commonality’ associated with flow overlaps can be conceptualized and measured from different levels of aggregation, such as at a node level (origin or destination), link level, or at an individual trip level between an O-D pair. At the link level, shareability measures include the link flows themselves, as well as the link flows on a particular link, excluding flow from a specific O-D pair. Table 5.1 provides a comprehensive list of shareability measures.

At a node level, trip overlap can characterize the extent of ‘dispersion’ or ‘concentration’ of trips originating from or destined to a given node. Trips originating from a node exhibit a high degree of dispersion when their trip ends are scattered to multiple destinations in the network and the paths to these destinations have limited overlaps. Conversely, when trips from a node are bound to a limited number of destinations or the paths to the destinations are highly overlapping, the trips from the node exhibit high trip concentration.

The node level measure of shareability presented in this paper considers both the magnitude and the direction of demand emanating from a location, rather than just measuring demand in terms of demand densities (trips per sq. mile per hour). Figure 5.1 illustrates the concept of demand dispersion for trips originating from an origin node by comparing 3 scenarios that vary network and demand patterns, but where the demand density originating from node A is the same: 90 trips per hour per square mile. Figure 5.1 indicates clear differences in flow overlap and dispersion and therefore shareability across the three scenarios. In Scenario 1, all trips are bound to a single destination; hence, all flows share the same path making the demand emanating from node A highly concentrated. Moreover, even though in both Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 trips are equally split between 3 destinations, Scenario 2 has significantly more overlap than Scenario 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Aggregation Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trip Overlap</td>
<td>Person trips</td>
<td>O-D</td>
<td>Average number of other flows with which a unit trip from O to D shares path with (Eqn. 1)</td>
<td>$Z_{od}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Overlap Percentage</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>O-D</td>
<td>The % of other flows with which a unit trip from O to D shares path with</td>
<td>$Z_{od}^% = \frac{Z_{od}}{F} * 100$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detour</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>O-D</td>
<td>The difference in cost of the optimal path from the Shortest Path for flows between an O-D pair</td>
<td>$\Delta_{od}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Overlap</td>
<td>Person trips/mile</td>
<td>O-D</td>
<td>The marginal change in number of overlapping flows for every unit detour away from the Shortest Path between O-D</td>
<td>$M_{Z_{od}} = \frac{Z_{od} - Z_{od}^{SP}}{\Delta_{od}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node Overlap</td>
<td>Person trips</td>
<td>Origin Node</td>
<td>Average number of other flows from an origin that a unit flow originating from the same node shares paths with.</td>
<td>$Z_0 = \sum_{\forall d \in D} Z_{od} F_{od} / F_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node Overlap Percentage</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Origin Node</td>
<td>The percentage of demand that originates from a node which share paths in whole or in part.</td>
<td>$Z_0^% = \sum_{\forall d \in D} Z_{od} F_{od}^% / F_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Network Overlap</td>
<td>Person trips</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>The average number of other flows a unit trip in the network shares path with.</td>
<td>$Z = \sum_{\forall o \in O} \sum_{\forall d \in D} Z_{od} F_{od} / F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Network Overlap Percentage</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>The percentage of total demand in the network that shares paths</td>
<td>$Z_{0}^% = \sum_{\forall o \in O} \sum_{\forall d \in D} Z_{od} F_{od}^% / F$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Network Detour (Cost)</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>The aggregate weighted average of detour cost for all flows in the network</td>
<td>$\Delta = \sum_{\forall o \in O} \sum_{\forall d \in D} \frac{\Delta_{od} F_{od}}{F}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Network Detour Ratio</td>
<td>no unit</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>Ratio of average trip cost in MNFLOP assignment to the average cost of trips in Shortest Path assignment</td>
<td>$\Delta_r = \frac{Avg Trip Cost_{MNFLOP}}{Avg Trip Cost_{SP}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Network Overlap</td>
<td>Person trips/mile</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>Total increase in overlap in the network using MNFLOP assignment for a unit detour from Shortest Path</td>
<td>$M_z = \frac{Z_{MNFLOP} - Z_{SP}}{\Delta}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Network Overlap Percentage</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>Total increase in % of overlapping flows in the network using MNFLOP assignment for a unit detour from Shortest Path</td>
<td>$M_{z^%} = \frac{Z_{MNFLOP}^% - Z_{SP}^%}{\Delta}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Link Flows</td>
<td>Person Flows</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>The average number of person flows on links in the network that have some flows assigned to it.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Links Used</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>The number of links on which flows have been assigned to.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current studies such as Li & Quadrifoglio (2010); Nourbakhsh & Ouyang (2012) and Quadrifoglio & Li (2009) connect design decisions of shared mobility service with demand density only considering the magnitude of demand. Other studies that model mode choice behavior for dynamic shared ride services also just use magnitude of density in the region as one of their input parameters (Alemi et al., 2018; Dias et al., 2017; Middleton et al., 2021). Similarly, studies that analyze the operational efficiency and effectiveness of shared mobility services such as Tachet et al. (2017) and Yan et al. (2020) only use magnitude of demand densities as a parameter. Ronald et al. (2013) consider different spatial distributions for the same magnitude of demand in their study of operational effectiveness of dynamic shared mobility services, however they stop short of quantifying the spatial/directional component of demand.

The demand dispersion measure should provide significantly more value in the design of shared mobility systems than demand density alone because even if the demand density at a location is low, there could still be high potential to share trips based on the structure of the underlying transportation network and the directionality of demand.

At an O-D level, trip overlap can be conceptualized as (i) the proportion of the path between a given O-D pair that is common with other trips in the network, or (ii) the average number of travelers from other O-D pairs that a traveler is likely to overlap with as they make their trip. This research focuses on the latter trip overlap conceptualization in a transportation network.
6  Case Studies

6.1  Study Networks

This study analyzes the shareability in two different networks: the Sioux Falls network and a sub-network of the Chicago region (Stabler, 2019). The Sioux Falls network is a small network with 24 demand nodes and 76 directional links (Figure 6.1a). The Chicago sub-network in Figure 6.1b covers an area of about 60 square miles, and includes nearly 1,000 nodes, including 104 zone centroids, and 2,977 directional links. The Loop or Central Business District (CBD) is in the South-East corner of the Chicago subnetwork. The study employs Gurobi’s MIQP solver to solve the MNFLOP model. The solver is run on a system with 64 GB RAM and Intel i9 processor with a clock speed of 3.60 GHz.

![Figure 6.1a Sioux Falls](image1)

![Figure 6.1b Chicago Subnetwork](image2)

6.2  Scenarios for Analysis

Based on the objective functions in Eqn. 3 and Eqn. 4, the MNFLOP can be formulated in three different ways, by adjusting the $w$ parameter:

1. **Pure Maximum Network Flow Overlap (P-MNFLOP) Assignment**: Trips between O-D pairs are assigned to paths such as to maximize the total trip overlap in the network. This is achieved by setting $w$ to a small non-zero value in the objective function, such as $w = 0.0001$. A very small non-zero
value is used instead of zero in order to prevent the solver from returning inferior or pareto-inefficient solutions in terms of overlap and detour.

2. **Shortest Path (SP) Assignment:** All trips between an O-D pair are assigned to the shortest path between their O-D pair. This is achieved by setting \( w \) to a very high value, close to infinity.

3. **Bi-criterion Maximum Network Flow Overlap (Bi-MNFLOP) Assignment:** This option assigns trips to paths by considering both terms in the objective function. This is achieved by varying the value of \( w \) between a small number and a finite large number.

Table 6.1 provides a summary of the various scenarios analyzed in this study that vary in terms of networks, demand, and assignment method. Due to computational constraints, each scenario only includes demand from a subset of O-D pairs, unless specified otherwise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>P-MNFLOP</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Bi-MNFLOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td>6 Origin Nodes in the North, 6 Destination Nodes in the South (Total Demand = 6,000 person trips)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>Origin Node Analysis for all 24 Demand nodes</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td>10 Destination Zones in CBD in SE, 11 Origin Zones from other quadrants. (Total Demand = 1,730 person trips)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>Origin Node Analysis for a single Demand node</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7 Results

#### 7.1 Sioux Falls

##### 7.1.1 Scenario 1

In this scenario, trips between 6 origin nodes in the North and 6 destination nodes in the South of the Sioux Falls network are assigned using the 3 methods listed in Section 6.2. A detour weight \( w \) value of 1800 trips per minute was used for the Bi-MNFLOP assignment.

Figure 7.1 and Figure 7.2 compare the O-D level frequency distributions (number of O-D pairs) of trip overlap percentage and trip overlap, respectively, across the 3 assignment methods. The overlap and overlap percentage plots show that the histogram for SP assignment skews leftward compared to the other 2
assignment methods. Assigning trips based on P-MNFLOP pushes the distribution rightwards, meaning that the overlap and overlap percentage of most O-D pairs increase relative to SP. Trip overlap increases by as much as 200% for O-D pairs in P-MNFLOP compared to SP. For the chosen value of w, the results of the Bi-MNFLOP are closer to P-MNFLOP than the SP.

Figure 7.3, Figure 7.4, and Figure 7.5 show the link flows on the Sioux Falls network for the P-MNFLOP, SP, and Bi-MNFLOP assignments, respectively. Link thickness is proportional to the number of trips assigned on each the link. The plots make it evident that P-MNFLOP (Figure 7.3) concentrates trips between O-D pairs onto fewer links compared to SP (Figure 7.4) and Bi-MNFLOP (Figure 7.5). Hence, P-MNFLOP concentrates higher link flows onto corridors compared to SP. This concentration of flows is ideal for running high-capacity, -frequency fixed-route transit services, as is discussed later in the paper.

Table 7.1 provides the network level measures of overlap for Scenario 1. The average trip overlap in the network increases by nearly 70% (from 1725 to 2967) for a mere 7% increase in average trip cost (from 15.6 minutes to 16.7 minutes). This shows that when travelers are willing to take a small detour from their preferred paths, shareability can significantly increase. The results of Bi-MNFLOP provide a higher marginal benefit for improving overlap, with a 60% increase in overlap for 4% increase in detour.

The marginal overlap values for P-MNFLOP and Bi-MNFLOP assignment provide a way to characterize the shareability of a network by quantifying the marginal gain in shareable trips if trips are assigned away from their shortest paths. The results show that marginal overlap is higher for Bi-MNFLOP
than P-MNFLOP. Additionally, Table 7.1 shows the marginal overlap value for the Bi-MNFLOP assignment (1806 trips per minute) is greater than the detour weight \( w = 1800 \). The Bi-MNFLOP method ensures that there is a net improvement in overlap of at least 1800 trips per unit time of detour.

### Table 7.1 Network Level Overlap Measures, Sioux Falls Scenario-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>P-MNFLOP</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Bi-MNFLOP (w=1800)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg Overlap Z (Person Trips)</td>
<td>2967.4</td>
<td>1725.2</td>
<td>2809.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Overlap Z% (%)</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Trip Cost (mins)</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Detour ( \Delta ) (mins)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Detour ( \Delta_p ) (ratio)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Overlap ( M_Z ) (Trips/Detour minute)</td>
<td>1129.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1806.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Overlap % ( M_{k_{\text{Detour}}} ) (Overlap %/Detour minute)</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Link Flow (Person trips)</td>
<td>340.8</td>
<td>318.5</td>
<td>329.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Bi-MNFLOP are highly sensitive to the value of \( w \). Figure 7.6 displays results for Bi-MNFLOP as \( w \) ranges between 0.1 and 6,000, approximating the Pareto Frontier. A low value of \( w \) of 0.1 or near 0.1 yields a higher average trip overlap and higher average detour in the network. As the value of \( w \) increases, the average trip overlap starts to decrease and reduces the average detour in the network because the assignment method is moving away from the maximize overlap objective towards minimizing detour. At a \( w \) value of close to 2800, the average detour becomes 0, which means that the Bi-MNFLOP objective has collapsed into a SP assignment method.

As is clear from the plot, changes in \( w \) do not cause a smooth change in overlap and detour. Values remain the same or close to each other for high values of \( w \) before declining sharply at various breakpoints. For example, when \( w \) ranges from 1800 to 1950 the average detour reduces by 66% (D = 0.6 minutes to 0.2 minutes), with a similarly large drop in average overlap (25% drop) for a small change in \( w \). The lack of smoothness stems from the Boolean nature of the path choice decision variable in the optimization problem and the relatively small number of O-D pairs.

Appendix A includes further results for Sioux Falls Scenario 1, including Table A-1 that displays overlap/shareability measures for each OD pair as a function of the flow assignment method. Moreover, Figure A.1 shows the change in overlap percentage at the network level for different values of \( w \).
Figure 7.3 Link Flows for P-MNFLOP, Sioux Falls Scenario 1

Figure 7.4 Link Flows for SP Assignment, Sioux Falls Scenario 1

Figure 7.5 Link Flows for Bicriterion Assignment, Sioux Falls Scenario 1

Figure 7.6 Pareto Optimal Solutions for Scenario-1 Sioux Falls
7.1.2 Scenario 2

Scenario 2 analyzes the extent of overlaps between trips originating from each node of the Sioux Falls network by solving the P-MNFLOP, as well as the SP assignment problem, for each origin separately, just considering the trips that originate from a specific node. This analysis gives insights into the relative dispersion and concentration of trips originating from a single location. These insights should provide valuable information to design location-based mobility services such as transit station feeder services.

Figure 7.7 and Figure 7.8 display the magnitude of demand along with the overlap percentage for all 24 origin demand nodes in the Sioux Falls network using P-MNFLOP and SP, respectively. The plots show that assigning trips using P-MNFLOP increases the overlap percentage for trips originating from each origin node when compared to SP assignment. The plots also show that trips originating from node 2 in the Sioux Falls network exhibit the highest overlap percentage (i.e., the lowest dispersion) under both P-MNFLOP or SP assignment. Node 2 has a flow overlap percentage of over 60% for P-MNFLOP. On the other hand, trips originating from node 16 have the lowest overlap percentage, of slightly less than 30% for P-MNFLOP.

The difference in overlap patterns for nodes 2 and 16 is more evident when examining the P-MNFLOP person link flows for demand from these nodes, as illustrated in Figure 7.9 and Figure 7.10. Flows in Figure 7.9 represent a tree structure with demand emanating from node-2 with trips heading to all destination nodes in few links/branches, indicating a high overlap between the paths to multiple destinations from the origin node. On the other hand, Figure 7.10 shows a tree structure with flows emanating from node-16 branching out across many links on the way to the destination nodes.

Figure 7.7, Figure 7.9, and Figure 7.10 also show that both the magnitude as well as the percentage of overlap provide a strong indication of the extent of shareability of trips from an origin node. Node 2 has a higher overlap percentage value of 62%, with an overlap magnitude of approximately 2500 person trips (62% of total demand from Node-2). Node 16 has a lower overlap percentage value of 28%, however, the magnitude of overlap is much higher compared to node 16 (approximately 7250 person flows, which is 28% of total demand from node 16). This means that even though trips from node 16 are more dispersed, a
unit flow from node 16 is still likely to share a path in part or whole with nearly three times as many other person flows compared to a unit person flow starting from node 2.

Figure 7.9 and Figure 7.10 reinforce the study’s assertion that a lower magnitude of demand from a location (measured in terms of trips per hour or trips per unit area per hour) does not necessarily mean that the shareability of trips from the region is less viable. Even though the number of trips originating from node 2 are relatively few, nearly 62% of all trips originating from node 2 share a path in whole or part under P-MNFLOP assignment (and 50% using SP assignment), suggesting high shareability. Hence, the shareability of demand measured in terms of trip overlap percentage also represents a valuable parameter for making design and operational decisions for shared mobility modes.

**Figure 7.7 Magnitude of Demand and Overlap Percentage for Origin Nodes in Sioux Falls - P-MNFLOP**

**Figure 7.8 Magnitude of Demand and Overlap Percentage for Origin Nodes in Sioux Falls – SP**
7.2 Chicago Sub-Network

7.2.1 Scenario 1

In this scenario, trips are assigned between a selected sample of O-D pairs in a Chicago sub-network. The sub-network is first divided into 4 quadrants with destinations in the South-East region, which contains the Chicago CBD, and origins from the other three quadrants. 10 destination nodes from the S quadrant and 11 origin nodes from the remaining quadrants (4 from NE, 5 from NW and 2 from SW) are randomly chosen but weighted by the number of person flows ending/starting from these nodes respectively. Sampling of O-D pairs was done in this manner to select flows that are heading toward the CBD.

Figure 7.11 shows the regions and a randomly drawn sample of O-D pairs in the network using the proposed method. These 110 O-D pairs account for 1730 person flows, which represent 2.5% of the total demand in the sub-network. Trips are assigned using P-MNFLOP and SP assignment methods. Despite sampling only a few O-D pairs, the quadratic nature of the objective function, along with the large network size, makes solving the optimization problem computationally time consuming. For the purpose of this paper, the solution algorithms terminate after 3600 seconds, when solving the P-MNFLOP. This time period
was chosen because the solution value (lower bound of the P-MNFLOP objective function) tends to not decrease after a few minutes despite the gap in lower and upper bound being quite large. The Gurobi solver chose the shortest path for all O-D pairs \((k = 0)\) as the initial lower bound heuristic solution for the problem. The optimality gap remained at 170\% in this experiment; however, despite this gap, the P-MNFLOP performed significantly better than the conventional SP approach.

Figure 7.12 and Figure 7.13 show the person flows on links in the Chicago sub-network for Scenario 1 using P-MNFLOP and SP assignment respectively. Only links that have person flows assigned to them are symbolized in the plots. A comparison of link flows in Figure 7.12 and Figure 7.13 shows that P-MNFLOP assigns person flows onto fewer links than the SP assignment, unsurprisingly. Scenario-1 in Table 7.2 further indicates the higher flow overlap in the P-MNFLOP assignment compared to SP. Figure 7.13 also shows clear continuous corridors of links with high person flows in the East as well as in the central region of the network, indicating possibilities for high-capacity transit along these corridors. Figure 7.14 shows the change in person flows on links between the P-MNFLOP and SP assignment methods as an alternative method to visualize the difference between the two assignment methods.

Table 7.2 outlines various overlap measures calculated at the network level for Chicago Scenario-1. Average overlap increased by nearly 15\% for a mere 2\% increase in average trip cost between P-MNFLOP and SP. Even though the average overlap percentage for P-MNFLOP seems to be low (10.34\%), it could be due to the sample of O-D pairs chosen, some of which are not close to each other (meaning not much scope of paths overlapping), and due to the high optimality gap at termination. Nevertheless, the overlap and overlap percentage values for P-MNFLOP are higher than that for SP assignment. Moreover, a high value for marginal overlap (nearly 140 additional overlapping person flows for every minute of detour) and a high value of time elasticity of overlap (7\% increase in overlapping person flows for a 1\% increase in travel time), indicate that shareability of a trip can be increased by a significant factor for a small detour from the SP.
Figure 7.11 Sample O-D Flows,

Figure 7.12 P-MNFLOP Link Flows

Figure 7.13 Shortest Path Assignment Link Flows

Figure 7.14 Change in Link Flows (P-MNFLOP - SP)
Table 7.2 Network Level Overlap Measures, Chicago Scenario-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>P-MNFLOP</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg Overlap $Z$ (Person Trips)</td>
<td>178.9</td>
<td>155.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Overlap $Z$ % (%)</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Trip Cost (mins)</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Detour $\Delta$ (mins)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Detour $\Delta_r$ (ratio)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Overlap $M_Z$ (Trips/Detour minute)</td>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Overlap % $M_{Zs}$ (Overlap %/Detour minute)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Elasticity of Overlap</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Link Flow (Person Trips)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.2 Scenario 2

In this scenario, origin node level overlap analysis is performed for all person flows starting from a single origin zone in the Chicago sub-network to all other destination zones. Person flows starting from zone centroid 50 (located in the SE quadrant of the region) to all other 103 destination zones in the network are assigned using both P-MNFLOP as well as SP assignment. Due to the high computational intensity and similar reasons stated for Scenario-1 run of Chicago network, the solution algorithm was terminated after 3600s.

Figure 7.15 and Figure 7.16 show the person flows on links for P-MNFLOP and SP assignment methods respectively. The tree structure in Figure 7.15 shows less ‘branching’ compared to the tree in Figure 7.16. This is because P-MNFLOP assigns person flows originating from Zone 50 to fewer links by pooling together overlapping flows heading to different destinations.

Table 7.3 shows the origin-level overlap measures for node 50 using P-MNFLOP and SP assignment methods. A maximum overlap percentage of 19% is obtained when flows are assigned using P-MNFLOP. This implies that on average, 19% of all flows share paths in whole or part when flows are assigned using P-MNFLOP. The number of overlapping flows increases by nearly 50% for a mere 3% increase in average trip travel time. The high value of marginal overlap as well as marginal overlap percentage suggests that shareability can be increased by assigning flows between some O-D pairs on to slightly longer paths. The results obtained for this problem do not represent the global optimal solution, since execution was
terminated at 3600 seconds (optimality gap of 141%) due to high computational complexity. Nevertheless, even a local optimal solution suggests a significant improvement in shareability when compared to SP assignment.

Figure 7.15 P-MNFLOP Results for Origin Zone 50

Figure 7.16 Shortest Path Results for Origin Zone 50

Table 7.3 Overlap Measures for Origin Zone 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin Level Metrics</th>
<th>P-MNFLOP</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avg Overlap $Z_o$ (Trips)</td>
<td>430.5</td>
<td>297.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Overlap $Z_o^S$ (%)</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>13.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Trip Cost (mins)</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Detour $\Delta$ (mins)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Detour $\Delta_r$ (ratio)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Overlap (Trips/Detour minute)</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Overlap % (Overlap %/Detour minute)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Elasticity of Overlap</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Link Flow (Person Trips)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


8 Discussion

This section discusses the research in the context of the descriptive, predictive, and prescriptive analytics paradigm where descriptive analytics explain what happened in the past, predictive analytics provide insights into what is likely to happen in the future, and prescriptive analytics recommend actions for the future. The MNFLOP and shareability measures in the current study do not fit neatly into any of these three categories, yet the authors believe they can provide significant value in all three areas.

The shareability measures are closest to the descriptive analytics category as the two MNFLOP model inputs—OD demand and transportation network structure—represent the current system. However, the MNFLOP model output and shareability measures do not describe the world as it is or was, as is necessary in descriptive analytics. Rather these measures provide a more fundamental characterization of the transportation system—it’s shareability as a function of the demand and the network—that should provide valuable insights in terms of explaining, predicting, and prescribing components of transportation systems.

8.1 Shareability Measures as Predictors of Transit Ridership

Transit ridership and transit mode share vary considerably across cities in the United States the world. Moreover, demand for transit varies considerably across spatial areas within cities. Similarly, the demand for ridesourcing and shared-ride mobility-on-demand services vary across and within cities. Transit operators, mobility service providers, and transportation planners are quite interested in understanding the factors that cause these variations in transit usage across and within cities. The authors believe that the shareability measures presented in this study can be used, along with various other factors, to explain and forecast the usage of shared mobility modes like public transit and shared-ride services. After controlling for socio-demographic attributes of urban areas as well as transit expenditures, cities with higher shareability should have higher transit ridership. Future research can test this hypothesis.

8.2 Shareability as Input for Shared Mobility System Design

The original impetus for this study was that the existing literature did not effectively characterize demand dispersion alongside demand density in a region while considering the region’s underlying
transportation network. The authors first sought to determine the optimal shared mobility mode (i.e., fixed-route transit, flexible transit, ridesharing, or ridesourcing) for each area of a city given the properties of the area (e.g., demand density and dispersion and underlying transportation network). Although this study does not test the hypothesis that the MNFLOP model and the shareability measures can provide valuable insights for planning a network of multiple shared mobility modes ranging for heavy rail to ridesourcing, ongoing research does aim to test this hypothesis. In the authors review of the literature, prior research had only differentiated between demand density (mostly in continuous space or simplified networks) when determining the optimal shared mobility mode for different regions of a city.

In light of the study’s background, the authors believe the MNFLOP and associated shareability measures can provide valuable insights for planning multi-modal shared mobility networks and even act as an input to planning and design models for multi-modal shared mobility networks. While the broad generalization that high-capacity, high-frequency fixed-route transit services work well in dense areas, while flexible, demand-adaptive door-to-door services work better in lower density areas is generally accepted, real-world urban areas and networks do not fit neatly into these two extremes. Hence, determining (i) where to operate specific shared mobility modes ranging from heavy rail to ridesourcing and (ii) the optimal combination of shared mobility modes in a city, are ongoing challenges.

The authors specifically believe that the MNFLOP and associated shareability measures can provide insights into (i) the viability of specific shared mobility modes ranging from heavy rail to ridesourcing in specific subregions of an urban network, (ii) the street segments and corridors wherein high-capacity, high-frequency transit lines are most viable. The link level shareability measures should have particular value in identifying streets and corridors to locate high-frequency, high-capacity transit infrastructure and services. Moreover, the authors believe the bi-criteria MNFLOP can have particular value for multi-modal system design as it captures trade-offs between overlapping paths and required traveler detours.

Finally, the origin level analysis and overlap % measure proposed in this study capture the magnitude and the extent of directional overlap of demand starting from an origin. Having a high percentage of flow overlap from a node, notwithstanding low magnitude, indicates that it is possible to operate shared modes
even in low density areas when there is high spatial and temporal overlap of flows starting from the location. These origin-level shareability measures should provide considerable value when planning first- and last-mile feeder services around transit stations.

9 Conclusion

9.1 Summary

This paper contains a novel approach to quantify shareability of person trips in a region, given OD travel demand and the underlying transportation network (street network). The study conceptualizes and defines mathematically the notion of ‘flow overlaps’ within a transportation network that underlies the shareability measure. The paper employs the flow overlap concept to formulate the MNFLOP, a path- and flow-based Quadratic Integer Program, to find the shareability for a given network and demand input. A solution to the MNFLOP includes the optimal paths between each O-D pair that maximize shareability in the network. The model output is then used to calculate several shareability measures at various levels of aggregation: OD, origin, link, and network level. The study uses the MNFLOP model to analyze shareability in two networks, Sioux Falls and Chicago, under multiple demand scenarios.

The results illustrate the generalizability of the model to any city or region given the two necessary inputs—a transportation network and O-D demand flows. In addition to validating the problem formulation and mathematical model, the computational results illustrate that compared to SP assignment, the MNFLOP assignment can significantly increase flow overlap in the network with only minor increases in traveler detours. As the MNFLOP is formulated as a bi-criteria optimization problem, analysts can vary the weights on the flow overlap term and the detour terms in order to examine trade-offs between detour time and flow overlaps.

The additionally shareability measures can provide valuable insights to inform planning, design, and operation of various shared mobility systems. For example, the origin/location level measures of flow overlaps indicate that there is potential to share trips even from locations with a low magnitude of demand if the percentage of total demand that share overlapping paths in part or whole is high.
9.2 Limitations and Future Research

Section 8.1 and Section 8.2 detail the potential use of the MNFLOP and associated shareability measures in relation to predicting transit and shared mobility ridership as well as designing a system of multiple shared mobility modes, respectively. Please refer to these two subsections for further details.

One shortcoming of the existing study is the reliance on a commercial solver for the quadratic integer programming model. For moderate size networks, the optimality gap remains quite high (over 100%) even after 24-48 hours. Future research should work to develop alternative exact and heuristic solution algorithms to solve the problem, as well as consideration of alternative formulations and approximations of the original model. Possible approximations include reducing the problem size by clustering trip origin and destination locations or restricting the flows from other O-D pairs when calculating overlap for a specific OD pair to reduce the number of quadratic terms. In terms of heuristic solution approaches, genetic algorithms are potentially appealing as they can likely explore the solution space effectively and efficiently. Tailored heuristics that efficiently estimate, rather than fully evaluate, the objective function in sub-iterations may also be effective. The results of the MNFLOP model may also be influenced by the method used to generate the set of $k$ paths between O-D pairs. Future extensions could explore running the MNFLOP model using other methods to generate $k$ paths, which could in turn be modified based on whether all demand flows or only the demand flows for a specific mode is being analyzed.
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Appendix – A: Additional Results for Sioux Falls Scenario – 1

Table A-1 displays each OD pair, the demand for each OD pair, as well as the optimal path, trip overlap, overlap %, detour distance, and marginal overlap for three separate assignment methods—P-MNFLOP, SP, and Bi-MNFLOP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O-D Pair</th>
<th>Demand ($F_{od}$)</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>Optimal Path</th>
<th>Trip Overlap ($Z_{od}$)</th>
<th>Overlap % ($Z_{od}'$)</th>
<th>D (Min)</th>
<th>Marginal Overlap ($M_{xod}$) (Trips/Min)</th>
<th>Trip Overlap ($Z_{od}$)</th>
<th>Overlap % ($Z_{od}'$)</th>
<th>Trip Overlap ($Z_{od}$)</th>
<th>Overlap % ($Z_{od}'$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-13</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-3-12-13</td>
<td>3799</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2781</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3845</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1-3-12-13-24-21-22-20</td>
<td>2539</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>514.8</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2537</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-3-12-13-24-21-22</td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2166</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-22</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-3-12-13-24-21-22</td>
<td>3099</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3044</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-23</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-3-12-13-24-23</td>
<td>3317</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2199</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3311</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-3-12-13-24-23</td>
<td>3612</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2439</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3619</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2-6-5-4-3-12-13</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>114.3</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2593</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-6-8-7-18-20-21-22</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-6-8-7-18-20-21-22</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-19.2</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3-12-13</td>
<td>4999</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3399</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4899</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3-12-13-24-21-22</td>
<td>3449</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3-12-13-24-23</td>
<td>3814</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3714</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-13</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4-3-12-13</td>
<td>4272</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2672</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4063</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4-5-6-8-7-18-20</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-21</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4-3-12-13-24-21-22</td>
<td>3566</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2099</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3416</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-22</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4-3-12-13-24-21-22</td>
<td>3359</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1260.6</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3164</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-23</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4-3-12-13-24-23</td>
<td>3623</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>879.3</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3452</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-24</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4-3-12-13-24-23</td>
<td>3959</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2359</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3779</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-13</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5-4-3-12-13</td>
<td>3784</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2353</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3545</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5-6-8-7-18-20</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5-4-3-12-13-24-21-22</td>
<td>3319</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2977.9</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3144</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-22</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-6-8-7-18-20-22</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>189.8</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5-4-3-12-13-24-23</td>
<td>3357</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>806.8</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3162</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-13</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6-5-4-3-12-13-24-23</td>
<td>3058</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2781</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6-8-7-18-20</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6-8-7-18-20-21-22</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-22</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6-8-7-18-20-21-22</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6-5-4-3-12-13-24-23</td>
<td>2895</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>695.2</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6-5-4-3-12-13-24-23</td>
<td>3066</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2111.7</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A.1 shows the change in overlap percentage at the network level for different values of $w$. The plot indicates that for lower values of $w$, the average overlap percentage in the network is the high, with the results of P-MNFLOP yielding the highest value of overlap percentage ($w = 0.1$). As the value of $w$ increases, the Bi-MNFLOP objective moves closer to a SP assignment resulting in lower overlap percentage with reducing detours. The plot indicates that the average overlap percentage in a network is a monotonically decreasing function of detour parameter $w$. Similar to the trend observed in Figure 7.6, the plot is not a smooth function, it includes sharp drops in overlap percentage over a small variation in $w$. This plot also indicates that a significant gain in shareability in a network can be achieved if travelers in the network are incentivized to take even a slight detour from their SP.

![Figure A.1 Overlap% vs Detour weight w for Bi-MNFLOP assignment](image-url)