Boris S.K erner 1 and Sergey L.K lenov 2

¹ Daim lerChrysler AG, REI/VF, HPC:G021, 71059 Sindel ngen, Germ any ² Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Department of Physics, 141700 Dolgoprudny, Moscow Region, Russia

PACS num bers: 89.40.+ k, 47.54.+ r, 64.60.C n, 64.60 Lx

Abstract. Two di erent determ inistic m icroscopic tra c ow models, which are in the context of the K emer's there-phase tra c theory, are introduced. In an acceleration time delay model (ATD-model), di erent time delays in driver acceleration associated with driver behaviour in various local driving situations are explicitly incorporated into the model. Vehicle acceleration depends on local tra c situation, i.e., whether a driver is within the free ow, or synchronized ow, or else wide moving jam tra c phase. In a speed adaptation model (SAm odel), vehicle speed adaptation occurs in synchronized ow depending on driving conditions. It is found that the ATD - and SA-models show spatiotem poral congested tra c patterns that are adequate with empirical results. In the ATD and SA-models, the onset of congestion in free ow at a freeway bottleneck is associated with a rst-order phase transition from free ow to synchronized ow; moving jams em erge spontaneously in synchronized ow only. Dierences between the ATD - and SA-m odels are studied. A comparison of the ATD - and SA-m odels with stochastic m odels in the context of three phase tra c theory is made. A critical discussion of earlier trac w theories and models based on the fundam ental diagram approach is presented.

1. Introduction

Theoretical studies of freeway trac ow dynamics is one of the rapid developing elds of statistical and nonlinear physics (see the reviews [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], the book [7], and the conference proceedings [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]). For a mathematical description of freeway trac ow, a huge number of di erent microscopic and macroscopic trac

ow models have been introduced. In macroscopic models, individual dynamic vehicle behaviour is averaged, i.e., these models describe dynamics of average trac ow characteristics like average vehicle speed and density (see e.g., [16, 17, 18, 19, 20])z. Microscopic trac ow models describe individual dynamic vehicle behaviour, which should simulate empirical spatiotem poral features of phase transitions and congested patterns in freeway trac. In this article, we restrict a consideration of microscopic trac ow models only.

There are two types of microscopic trac c ow models: Deterministic models and stochastic models [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. In deterministic models, some dynamic rules of vehicle motion in trac ow are responsible for spatiotem poral features of trac patterns that the models exhibit. Contrastingly, stochastic models, in addition to dynamic rules of vehicle motion, exhibit model uctuations, which play a fundamental role for trac pattern features.

There are at least two classes of determ inistic traction of w models [1, 3, 4, 5, 6]. In the rst class, driver time delays in vehicle acceleration (deceleration) a are explicitly taken into account. An example is the classic model of Herman, Montroll, Potts, and Rothery [23]: If the vehicle speed v, or the speed dimension between the vehicle speed and the speed of the preceding vehicle v, or else the net distance g (space gap) between vehicles changes, then the driver accelerates (decelerates) with a time delay [23]:

$$a(t+) = f(v(t);v(t);g(t)):$$
 (1)

Based on (1), Gazis, Herman, and Rothery [24] have developed a microscopic trac

ow model, which is capable of describing trac beyond of instabilities; steady state solutions of this model lie on a one-dimensional curve in the ow (density plane (the fundamental diagram) (see the review by Nagel et al. [6] for more detail). Recall that steady state solutions are hypothetical model solutions in which all vehicles move at the same time-independent speed and the same space gap between vehicles. One of the mathematical descriptions of this model class rst proposed by Nagatani and Nakanishi [25] and further developed by Lubashevky et al. [26] reads as follow s

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \frac{f(v(t);v(t);g(t)) \quad a(t)}{(t)};$$
(2)

In both m odels [24, 25, 26], steady state m odel solutions in the ow (density plane lie on the fundam ental diagram .

There is also another class of determ inistic m icroscopic m odels in which the vehicle speed satis es the equation [1, 3, 4, 5, 6]:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}v}{\mathrm{d}t} = (v(t); v(t); g(t)): \tag{3}$$

Examples are optimal velocity (OV) models of Newell [27], W hitham [28], Bando, Sugiyama et al. [29], and the intelligent driver model (IDM) of Treiber and

z It should be noted that transferring the information delivered from one vehicle interacting with the neighbour ones requires to deal carefully with a complex averaging process by derivation of a macroscopic trac ow model. The related mathematical theory is developed in Ref. [21, 22].

Helbing [30, 31]. Steady state solutions of this model class that obviously satisfy the conditions $(v;v_{;}g) = 0$ and $v = v_{:}$ lie on the fundamental diagram in the ow (density plane.

If functions and model parameters in the models (2) and (3) are chosen in an appropriated way, then there is a range of vehicle density in which steady state model solutions for free ow are unstable. This instability, which should explain the onset of congestion, leads to wide moving jam emergence in free ow (F! J transition) [2, 3, 4, 5, 6].

However, as explained in the book [7], the above models that are in the context of the fundam ental diagram approach, as well as all other trac own odels reviewed in [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] cannot explain the fundam ental empirical feature of trac breakdown, i.e., that the onset of congestion in free own at a bottleneck is associated with a local rst-order phase transition from free ow to synchronized ow (F! S transition) [32, 33, 34] rather than with an F! J transition. For this reason, K emerintroduced a three-phase tract theory. In this theory, there are three tract phases: (i) free ow, (ii) synchronized ow, and (iii) wide moving fam.

The rst microscopic models in the context of three-phase trac theory introduced in 2002 are stochastic models [35, 36]. As in empirical observations [33, 34], in these models wide moving jams emerge spontaneously only in synchronized ow (S! J transition), i.e., the models exhibit the sequence of F! S! J transitions leading to wide moving jam emergence in free ow; in addition, the models show all types of congested patterns found in empirical observations [35, 36, 37, 38, 7, 39]. Recently, some new microscopic models based on three-phase tract theory have been developed [40, 41, 42]. How ever, there are no deterministic models in the context of three-phase tractheory, which can exhibit the F! S! J transitions found in empirical observations and the diagram of congested patterns of three-phase tractheory [34, 7]. In stochastic models [35, 36, 37, 38, 7], driver time delays in acceleration (deceleration) are simulated mainly through the use of model uctuations. Therefore, a development of deterministic models based on three-phase tract for a more realistic theory of car follow ing behaviour.

In this paper, two determ inistic m icroscopic three-phase tra c m odels are presented. In an acceleration time delay m odel (ATD-m odel for short; Sect. 2), an explicit description of driver time delays in vehicle acceleration (deceleration) is used. In a speed adaptation m odel (SA-m odel for short; Sect. 3), vehicle speed adaptation occurs in synchronized ow depending on driving conditions. In Sects. 4 and 5, we show that these m odels exhibit the F! S! J transitions and congested patterns associated with results of empirical observations. In addition, a stochastic SA-m odel is introduced and com pared with the determ inistic SA-m odel of Sects. 2 and 3 are com pared with earlier determ inistic m odels and a critical discussion of m odels in the context of the fundam ental diagram approach is perform ed.

2. A cceleration T im e D elay M odel

2.1. Driver Behavioural Assumptions and Empirical Basis of ATD-Model

A determ inistic three-phase trace ow model with driver time delays (ATD-model) is based on the following empirical features of phase transitions and congested patterns as well as driver behavioural assumptions of three-phase trace theory (Sects. 2.3, 2.4,

and 8.6 of the book [7]):

(i) In synchronized ow, a driver accepts a range of di erent hypothetical steady states with various space gaps g at the same vehicle speed v, i.e., steady states of synchronized ow cover a two-dimensional region in the ow {density plane.

(ii) To avoid collisions, in the steady states a driver does not accept the vehicle speed that is higher than some safe speed (denoted by $v_s(g; v_1)$) that depends on the speed of the preceding vehicle v_1 . In contrast with earlier models in which a safe speed determ ines a multitude of steady states on the fundam ental diagram [1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 43], in the ATD -m odel the safe speed determ ines the upper boundary of the two-dimensional region for the steady states in the ow {density plane [7].

(iii) If a driver cannot pass the preceding vehicle, then the driver tends to adjust the speed to the preceding vehicle within a synchronization gap G (v; v_{2}), i.e., at

a speed adaptation e ect occurs. The synchronization gap determines the lower boundary of the two-dimensional region for the steady states in the ow (density plane. In the ATD-model, the speed adaptation e ect is modelled through a driver acceleration K (v; v) (v v) adjusting the speed to the preceding vehicle under the conditions (4); K (v; v) is a sensitivity.

(iv) In trac ow with greater space gaps, a driver searches for the opportunity to accelerate and to pass. This leads to driver over-acceleration, which is modelled through a driver acceleration A (V $^{(free)}$ (g) v) adjusting the vehicle speed at

$$g > G(v; v_{1})$$
(5)

to a gap-dependent optimal speed in free ow $V^{(free)}(g)$, where A is a sensitivity of this e ect.

A competition between the speed adaptation e ect and driver over-acceleration simulates a rst-order F! S transition leading to the onset of congestion in real trac ow (see explanations in Sect. 2.4 in [7]).

(v) In empirical observations, due to an F! S transition there is a maximum point of free ow associated with the maximum density $m_{max}^{(free)}$, maximum ow rate $q_{max}^{(free)}$, and maximum speed $v_{min}^{(free)}$ given by the formula $v_{min}^{(free)} = q_{max}^{(free)} = m_{max}^{(free)}$ (Sect. 2.3 in [7]). This maximum point is modelled through F! S transition, which occurs already due to in nitesimal local perturbations in steady states of free ow associated with the optimal speed in free ow V^(free)(g) at the density $m_{max}^{(free)}$.

(vi) In high density ow, a driver decelerates stronger than it is required to avoid collisions if the preceding vehicle begins to decelerate unexpectedly (driver over-deceleration). In the ATD-model, the over-deceleration e ect, which explains and simulates moving jam emergence in synchronized ow, is modelled by a driver time delay in reduction of a current driver deceleration (denoted by $= 1^{(dec)}_{1}(v)$). The longer $1^{(dec)}$, the stronger the over-deceleration e ect. In empirical observations, the low er the synchronized ow speed, the greater the probability for moving jam s emergence (Sect. 2.4 in [7]). For this reason, $1^{(dec)}_{1}(v)$ is chosen to be longer at low er speeds than at higher ones.

(vii) At the downstream front of a wide moving jam or a synchronized ow region, a driver within the jam or the synchronized ow region does not accelerate before the preceding vehicle has begun to accelerate. In the ATD -m odel, this e ect is modelled through the use of a mean driver time delay in acceleration at the downstream front of the synchronized ow region, which depends on a time delay in driver acceleration (denoted by $= {0 \atop 0}^{(acc)}$) and on the sensitivity K (v; v) at v < v. At the downstream front of a wide moving jam, a mean time delay in acceleration from a standstill v = 0 within the jam should be longer than the mean driver time delay in synchronized

ow [7]. To simulate this longer mean time delay in vehicle acceleration, in addition with two mentioned above model e ects, a vehicle within the jam does not accelerate before the condition

$$g \quad q_{h \text{ ax}}^{(jam)} \tag{6}$$

is satis ed, in which $g_{hax}^{(jam)}$ is the maximum space gap within the wide moving jam phase.

(viii) Moving in synchronized ow of lower speeds, a driver comes a closer to the preceding vehicle than the synchronization gap G. In empirical observations, this self-compression of synchronized ow is called the pinch e ect (Sect. 12.2 in [7]). In the ATD-model, the pinch e ect is simulated through the use of two model assumptions. Firstly, a time delay in reduction of a current driver acceleration (denoted by $= \frac{(acc)}{1}$) increases if the speed decreases. Secondly, the sensitivity K (v; v.), which describes the speed adaptation e ect (item (iii)), is chosen at v v di erent from K (v; v) at v < v. (item (vii)). Speci cally, K (v; v) at v v is chosen to be smaller at low speeds than at higher ones. As a result, at lower speeds vehicles choose smaller space gaps than the synchronization gap G.

(ix) At the upstream front of a wide moving jam or a synchronized ow region, a driver begins to decelerate after a time delay denoted by $= 0^{(dec)}$. This delay time should describe realistic velocities of deceleration fronts in congested trac patterns.

2.2. Main Equations

An ATD-m odel reads as follow s:

d- -

$$\frac{\mathrm{dx}}{\mathrm{dt}} = \mathbf{v}; \tag{7}$$

$$\frac{dv}{dt} = a;$$
 (8)

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \begin{cases}
(a^{(\text{free})} & a) = & \text{at } g > G \text{ and } g > g^{(\text{jan})}_{\text{gax}}; \\
(a^{(\text{syn})} & a) = & \text{at } g \quad G \text{ and } g > g^{(\text{jan})}_{\text{gax}}; \\
(a^{(\text{jan})} & a) = & \text{at } g \quad G \text{ and } g > g^{(\text{jan})}_{\text{gax}};
\end{cases}$$
(9)

where x is the vehicle space co-ordinate; g = x, x d; the lower index 'm arks variables related to the preceding vehicle; all vehicles have the same length d, which includes the m inim um space gap between vehicles within a wide m oving jam; a^(free), a^(syn), and a^(jam) are vehicle accelerations (deceleration) in the free ow, synchronized

ow, and wide moving jam phases, respectively. If the condition (5) is satisfied, then a vehicle moves in accordance with the rules for free ow. Within synchronized ow associated with the condition $g_{max}^{(jam)} < g \in G(v; v)$, the vehicle tends to adapt the speed to the preceding vehicle. Within a wide moving jam, the space gap is small, specifically $g_{max}^{(jam)}$, and the vehicle decelerates x

x Since the vehicle speed v cannot be negative, the following condition is also used for Eqs. (8), (9):

$$a(t) \quad 0 at v(t) = 0$$
: (10)

To satisfy this condition in numerical simulation, the acceleration a(t) is replaced by the value m ax(a(t); 0) if v(t) = 0 at time t.

2.3. Driver Acceleration

The accelerations (decelerations) a (free), a (syn), and a (jam) are found from the condition a ^(phase)

$$a^{\text{(priase)}} = \min(\max(a^{\text{(priase)}}; a_{\min}); a_{\max}; a_{s}); \qquad (11)$$

the superscript \phase" in (11) means either \free", or \syn", or else \jam " for the related tra c phase; as is a deceleration related to safety requirem ents; am in and am ax $(a_{m in} < 0, a_{m ax})$ are respectively the minimum and maximum accelerations for cases in which there are no safety restrictions. In (11), functions $a^{(\text{free})}$, $a^{(\text{syn})}$, and $a^{(jam)}$ associated with driver acceleration within the related trace phase { free ow, or synchronized ow, or else wide moving i are determined as follows:

$$a^{\text{(free)}}(g; v; v_{1}) = A(V^{\text{(free)}}(g) v) + K(v; v_{1})(v_{1} v);$$
(12)

$$a^{(syn)}(g; v; v) = A m in (V_{max}^{(syn)}(g) v; 0) +$$

$$K (v; v) (v v);$$
 (13)

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(jam)}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{K}^{(jam)}\mathbf{v}; \tag{14}$$

Here $V_{max}^{(syn)}$ (g) is a gap-dependent maximum vehicle speed in synchronized ow; K $^{(jam)}$ is a sensitivity.

2.4. Safety Conditions

Safety deceleration with a deceleration a_s can be applied, if the vehicle speed becomes higher than the safe speed v_s (g; v_1). We use safety deceleration found from the condition:

$$a_{s}(g; v; v_{1}) = A_{s}(v_{s}(g; v_{1}) v);$$
 (15)

where A_s is the sensitivity related to safety requirem ents.

The speed $v_s(q; v_s)$ in (15) is found based on the safety condition of G ipps [43]:

$$v_s T_s + v_s^2 = (2b_s) \quad g + v_s^2 = (2b_s);$$
 (16)

where T_s is a safety tim e gap, b_s is a constant deceleration.{ We use an approxim ated formula for $v_s(g; v_1)$ derived from (16) in Appendix A, which enables us to write $a_s(q; v; v)$ (15) as follows

$$a_{s}(g; v; v_{v}) = A_{s}^{(g)}(v_{v})(g=T_{s} v) + K_{s}(v_{v})(v_{v} v);$$
(18)

where

$$A_{s}^{(g)}(v_{*}) = A_{s}T_{s}(T_{s} + v_{*} = (2b_{s}))^{-1};$$
(19)

$$K_{s}(v_{1}) = A_{s}(T_{0} + v_{1} = (2b_{s}))(T_{s} + v_{1} = (2b_{s}))^{\perp};$$
(20)

 T_0 is a constant.

k In the article, large enough ow rates on the main road are considered at which congested patterns can occur at a bottleneck. For this reason, in (12) K is chosen to be independent on g in the free ow phase. At considerably smaller ow rates in free ow, speci cally, if g increases, K in (12) should tend towards zero when g G.

{ Note that Eqs. (9) of the ATD -m odel can also be written without the term $a^{(jam)}$ as follows

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \frac{(a^{(\text{free})} \ a) = \ atg > G;}{(a^{(\text{syn})} \ a) = \ atg \ G:}$$
(17)

In (17), the speed $v_s(g; v_1)$ in (15) is found based on the G ipps-condition (16) when $g_{hax}^{(jam)}$ and the speed $v_s(g; v_v) = 0$ when $g < g_{max}^{(jam)}$. In the latter case, the form ula (15) with $v_s(g; v_v) = 0$ plays the role of vehicle deceleration within the wide moving iam phase.

2.5. Physics of Driver T in e Delays

In Eqs. (9), the time delay is chosen as

$$= \underset{\sim}{\text{s at } a_{s} < m \text{ in } (0; m \text{ ax } (a^{(\text{phase})}; a_{m \text{ in}}); a);}$$
(21)

Here, $_{\rm s}$ is a short driver time delay associated with a nite driver reaction time that must be taken into account in the cases when the driver should decelerate unexpectedly to avoid collisions; ~ is a time delay in other tractions, which is chosen dimensioned in the depending on whether the vehicle accelerates or decelerates:

$$\sim = \begin{pmatrix} (acc) & at a > 0; \\ (dec) & at a & 0: \end{pmatrix}$$
(22)

In turn, ^(acc) and ^(dec) in (22) depend on the acceleration a:

The driver time delays $\binom{(acc)}{0}$, $\binom{(dec)}{1}$, $\binom{(dec)}{1}$, and $\binom{(acc)}{1}$ in (23), (24) are associated with hum an expectation of local driving conditions, in particular, with spatial and tem poral anticipation of a driver in accordance with local adaptation to those trac situations in which the driver takes into account both the current and expected future behaviour of many vehicles ahead (see also Sect. 2.1).

 $_{0}^{(acc)}$ is the mean time delay when a driver starts to accelerate or wants to increase the acceleration. This can often occur at the downstream front of a wide moving jam or a synchronized ow region, i.e., when the speed in trac ow downstream of the vehicle is higher than the current vehicle speed. In these cases, after the preceding vehicle has begun to accelerate, the driver also begins to accelerate, how ever, after a time delay to have a desired time gap to the preceding vehicle.

 $_0^{\rm (dec)}$ is the mean time delay when the driver starts to decelerate or wants to decelerate harder in cases in which the driver approaches a region of a lower speed downstream .

 $_{1}^{(acc)}$ corresponds to situations in which the driver accelerates currently but wants either to stop the acceleration or to reduce it. Thus, $_{1}^{(acc)}$ is the m ean driver time delay in interruption or reduction of driver acceleration in cases in which the driver recognizes that current acceleration is greater than a desired acceleration in the current driving situation.

 $_{1}^{(dec)}$ corresponds to situations in which the driver decelerates currently but wants either to stop the deceleration or to reduce it. Thus, $_{1}^{(dec)}$ is the mean time delay in interruption or reduction of driver deceleration in cases in which the driver recognizes that current deceleration is more negative than a desired deceleration in the current driving situation.

2.6. Model of Road with On-Ram p Bottleneck

0 pen" boundary conditions are applied on the main road of the length L_0 . At the beginning of the road free ow conditions are generated for each vehicle one after

another at equal time intervals $_{in} = 1 = q_{in}$ where q_{in} is the ownrate in the incoming boundary ow. To satisfy safety conditions, a new vehicle appears only if the distance from the beginning of the road ($x = x_b$) to the position x = x, of the farthest upstream vehicle in the lane exceeds the distance $v_T_s + d$. The speed v and coordinate x of a new vehicle are $v = v_s$ and $x = x_b$, respectively. After a vehicle has reached the end of the road, it is removed; before this, the farthest downstream vehicle maintains its speed. In the initial state (t = 0), all vehicles have the same initial speed v = V (free) (g) and space gap g, and $q_{in} = v = (g + d)$.

An on-ram p bottleneck on the main road is considered. The on-ram p consists of two parts: (i) The merging region of the length L_m that begins at $x = x_{on}$. W ithin this region, vehicles can merge onto the main road from the on-ram p. (ii) The part of the on-ram p lane of length L_r upstream of the merging region at which vehicles move according to the model equations for a hom ogeneous road with the maximum speed $v_{\rm free; on} = 90$ km/h. At the beginning of the on-ram p lane the ow rate to the on-ram p $q_{\rm pn}$ is given as the ow rate on the main road $q_{\rm h}$.

The following rules are applied for vehicle merging within the merging region. A speed \diamond is calculated corresponding to formula

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{m} \, \mathrm{in} \, (\mathbf{v}^+ \, ; \, \mathbf{v} + \, \mathbf{v}_r^{(1)}) \tag{25}$$

and then it is used in the merging rules

Here superscripts g^+ and g^- are space gaps to the preceding vehicle and the trailing vehicle on the main road, respectively; v^+ and v^- are speeds of the preceding vehicle and the trailing vehicle, respectively; $q_{n \ in}^{(on)}$ and $v_r^{(1)}$ are constants, where $g_{m \ in}^{(on)}$ is the minimum gap at which vehicle merging is possible, $v_r^{(1)}$ describes the maximum possible increase in speed after vehicle merging. Note that the nite increase $\psi^{(1)}$ in the vehicle speed (25) is used to simulate a complex driver behaviour during merging onto the main road, especially in synchronized ow: In some cases, before merging the driver has to accelerate abruptly, to adjust the speed to the speed of the preceding vehicle.

If the conditions (26) are satis ed, then the vehicle m erges onto the m ain road. A fler m erging the vehicle speed v is set to v (25) and the vehicle coordinate does not change. If the conditions (26) are not satis ed, the vehicle does not m erge onto the m ain road. In this case, the vehicle m oves in the on-ram p lane until it com es to a stop at the end of the m erging region.

2.7. M odel Functions and Param eters

M odel functions and parameters are shown in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. As explained in Sect. 2.1, driver time delays ${}_{1}^{(dec)}$ and ${}_{1}^{(acc)}$ are chosen to be functions of the vehicle speed; additionally, the synchronization gap G (v; v.) and sensitivity K (v; v.) are chosen to be asymmetric speed functions depending on whether the vehicle speed v is higher or lower than the speed v. Explanations of the function K (v; v.) have been made in item (vii) and (viii) of Sect. 2.1.

Speed dependence and an asymmetric function for the synchronization gap G (v; v.) are explained by driver behaviour as follows. The synchronization gap is the space gap at which a driver adapts its speed to the speed of the preceding vehicle. Firstly, the synchronization gap is an increasing function of speed: The lower the

Table 1. ATD-model functions
Synchronization gap
$G (v; v_{1}) = vm ax 0; T (syn) (v) + (v; v_{1}) (v v)$ $(v; v_{1}) = (acc) at v < v_{1}$ $(dcc) at v v$ $T (syn) (v) = T_{0} (syn) (1 0:85 (v=V_{0})^{2})$
Sensitivities
$\begin{array}{lll} K & (v; v_{1}) = & \begin{matrix} K & (acc) & at v < v_{1} \\ K & (dec) & at v & v \end{matrix} \\ K & (dec) & (v) = K & (dec) \\ (v) = & (1 + \exp ((v = v_{c} & 1) =)) & 1 \end{matrix} $
C haracteristic speed functions
$ \begin{array}{l} V^{(\rm free)} (g) = V (g) \\ V_{max}^{(\rm syn)} (g) = V (g) \\ V (g) = V_0 \tanh ((g+2) = (V_0 T)) \end{array} $
Speed dependensies of time delays
$ \begin{pmatrix} (dec) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} (v) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 \text{ s at } v & y \\ 0.7 \text{ s otherw ise} \\ \begin{pmatrix} (acc) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} (v) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.57 \text{ s at } v & y \\ 0.57 \text{ s at } v & y \\ 0.87 \text{ s otherw ise} \\ \end{pmatrix} $

Table 2. ATD-m odel param eters

 $\begin{array}{l} V_0 = \ 33.3 \ m/s \ (120 \ km/h), T = \ 0.9 \ s, \\ A = \ 0.5 \ s^{-1}, K^{(acc)} = \ 0.8 \ s^{-1}, K^{(jam)} = \ 1 \ s^{-1}, \\ K^{(dec)}_1 = \ 0.95 \ s^{-1}, K^{(dec)}_2 = \ 0.48 \ s^{-1}, v_c = \ 15 \ m/s, = \ 0.15, \\ T^{(syn)}_0 = \ 2.5 \ s, \ ^{(acc)} = \ 0.5 \ s^2 = m, \\ q^{(jam)}_{m \ ax} = \ 0.95 \ m, \ ^{(dec)}_0 = \ 1 \ s, \ ^{(acc)}_0 = \ 0.75 \ s, \ s = \ 0.4 \ s, \\ a_{m \ ax} = \ 1 \ m = \ s^2, a_{m \ in} = \ 1 \ m = \ s^2, \\ A_s = \ 1.25 \ s^{-1}, b_s = \ 2 \ m = \ s^2, T_s = \ 1 \ s, T_0 = \ 0.42 \ s, \\ L_0 = \ 25 \ km, x_b = \ 5 \ km, x_{on} = \ 16 \ km, \\ L_m = \ 300 \ m, \ L_r = \ 500 \ m, \ = \ 0.22, \ v_r^{(1)} = \ 8 \ m/s, \ g^{(on)}_{m \ in} = \ 0. \end{array}$

speed, the smaller the maximum gap at which the driver can comfortably move in synchronized ow. Secondly, if v < v, the driver accelerates and he/she can start speed adaptation at a smaller space gap than in the opposite case $v > v_{\cdot}$. The function T ^(syn) (v) is used to have a di erence in vehicle space gap in steady states of free ow and synchronized ow at a given ow rate. This space gap di erence, which is used for simulation of a rst-order F! S transition, tends towards zero when the density in free ow approaches the maximum point for free ow $m_{max}^{(free)}$ (gures 1 (a) and (c)); see also item (v) of Sect. 2.1).



Figure 1. Model steady states for the ATD-models: (a) - In the space-gap { speed plane. (b) - In the ow {density plane. (c) { Steady states and the line J (explanation of the line J see in the book [7]). (d) { ATD-model with separated steady states in free ow and synchronized ow.

2.8. Steady States

In steady states, all vehicles have the same speed $v = v_1$ and the same space gap g, and all accelerations and their time derivatives are zero, and the density and the ow rate q are related to the space gap g and to the speed v by the obvious conditions

$$= 1 = (x, x) = 1 = (g + d); \quad q = v = v = (g + d):$$
(27)

A coording to (8) { (15) and form ulae for V $^{(free)}$ (g), $V_{m ax}^{(syn)}$ (g) (Table 1) for steady states, we get

$$v = V(g)$$
 at $g > G(v)$ and $g > g_{max}^{(jam)}$; (28)

v V (g) at g G (v) and
$$g > g_{ax}^{(jam)};$$
 (29)

$$v = 0$$
 at $g \quad q_{hax}^{(jam)}$; (30)

$$v = v_{g}(g; v):$$
 (31)

A coording to (28) { (31), the model steady states consist of the curve v = V (g) (28) at $g_{\text{frin}}^{\text{(free)}}$ (curve F in gure 1 (a)) for free ow, a two-dimensional region in the space-gap {speed plane for synchronized ow determ ined by inequalities in (29), (31), and the line v = 0 at $g_{\text{frian}}^{\text{(jam)}}$ (30) for wide moving jams (gure 1 (a)), $g_{\text{frian}}^{\text{(free)}}$ is the minimum space gap in free ow found as a solution of the set of the equations v = V (g) and q = G(v; v) at $v = v_{1}$.

The two-dimensional region for steady states of synchronized ow is limited by the following boundaries: the boundary U, the curve L, the curve v = V (g) at $g < g_{min}^{(free)}$, and the horizontal line $g = g_{max}^{(jam)}$. The boundary U is associated with the safe speed,

i.e., this is determined by the condition (31) when it is an equality. This leads to the condition for the boundary U

$$g = vT_s:$$
(32)

The boundary L is found from the condition that the vehicle space gap is equal to the synchronization gap

$$g = G(v)$$
: (33)

In the ow {density plane, free ow (curve F in gure 1 (b)) is found from

$$q = V_F ()$$
(34)

at $\binom{(\text{free})}{\max}$ where $V_F() = V(g) \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{d}$, $\binom{(\text{free})}{\max} = (g_{m \text{ in}}^{(\text{free})} + d)^{-1}$. A wide moving jam is associated with the horizontal line q = 0 at $\binom{(\text{jam})}{\min} = (g_{m \text{ ax}}^{(\text{jam})} + d)^{-1}$, $\max = d^{-1}$. The boundaries of a two-dimensional region for steady states of synchronized ow are: the upper line U determ ined by the condition $q = (1 \quad d) = T_{e}$, the low er curve L determ ined by the condition G(q =) = 1 d, the curve (34) at $> \frac{(\text{free})}{\max}$, and the vertical line $= \frac{(jam)}{\min} + \frac{1}{2}$.

3. Speed A daptation M odel

3.1. Empirical F! S! J Transitions as Physical Basis of Speed Adaptation M odel

The fundamental hypothesis of three-phase tract theory, which postulates that hypothetical steady states of synchronized ow cover a two-dimensional region in the

ow (density plane, is also one of the basic hypotheses of the ATD -m odel presented above (gures 1 (a) and (b)). In contrast with the ATD -m odel, in a speed adaptation m odel (speed adaptation m odel, SA -m odel for short) hypothetical steady states of synchronized ow are associated with a curve (curve S in gures 2 (a) and (b)), i.e., they cover a one-dimensional region in the ow (density plane. The curve S is associated with an averaging of an in nite num ber of steady states of synchronized ow to one synchronized ow speed for each vehicle space gap. A gap dependence of the average speed in synchronized ow steady states on the curve S is denoted by $V_{ev}^{(syn)}$ (g). The basis hypothesis of the SA -m odel is associated with the sequence of F! S! J transitions, which determ ine m oving jam em ergence in empirical observations [33, 7].

Note that as in the models and theories in the context of the fundam ental diagram approach [1, 3, 4, 5, 6], in the SA-model steady state model solutions cover a onedimension region (s) in the ow {density plane. However, in the models and theories reviewed [1, 3, 4, 5, 6], which claim to show spontaneous moving jam emergence, the F! J transition governs the onset of congestion. This is inconsequent with empirical results [7]. In contrast, in the SA-model the onset of congestion is associated with an F! S transition, whereas moving jam s occur spontaneously only in synchronized ow, in accordance with empirical results.

The SA-m odel is simpler than the ATD-m odel. How ever, due to this simpli cation the SA-m odel cannot show some features of congested patterns of the ATD-m odel

⁺ We have also studied another version of the ATD -m odel in which there is a separation of steady states in free ow and synchronized ow in the ow {density plane, i.e., the maximum point for free ow $\frac{(free)}{m ax}$ is related to the intersection point of the line U and the curve F (gure 1 (d)). Simulations of this version of the ATD -m odel show qualitatively the same features of phase transitions and congested patterns as those discussed in Sect. 4.



F igure 2. M odel steady states for SA -m odels: (a, b) - In the space-gap{speed (a) and the ow {density plane (b) for the SA -m odel (35){ (41). (c, d) - The SA -m odel (35){ (40), (42). (e, f) - 0 ther possible SA -m odels (see A ppendix B). D ashed parts of curves for m odel steady states in (a{f) are associated with unstable m odel steady states. (g, h) { Steady states and the line J for the SA -m odel (a, b) and the SA -m odel (c, d).

(Sect. 5.2), which are observed in empirical observations. The purpose of the SA-m odel is to simulate an F! S transition and features of the sequence of F! S! J transitions, as observed in empirical observations [33, 7], in a simple way. This con rm s an assumption of three-phase tractheory that if rather than the fundam ental hypothesis the hypothesis about the F! S! J transitions is the basis of a mathematical model, then the model can show and predict some important empirical features of the phase transitions (see footnote 4 of Sect. 4.3.4 in [7]).

In the SA-models, an F! S transition is modelled through two e ects: (i) D iscontinuouty of steady speed solutions (gures 2 (a), (c), and (e)) or their instability (curve FS in gure 2 (f)) in the vicinity of the maximum point of free ow $\frac{(free)}{m_{in}}$, $\frac{(free)}{m_{in}}$. (ii) The speed adaptation e ect is modelled through the term K (v; v) (v v) that adjusts the speed to the preceding vehicle in synchronized ow.

Moving jam emergence is simulated through an instability of some of the synchronized ow model steady states associated with the curve $V_{av}^{(syn)}(g)$. This instability occurs in synchronized ow at lower speeds and greater densities (i.e., smaller space gaps). The associated critical density and speed of the synchronized ow steady states are denoted by $_{cr}^{(SJ)}$ and $v_{cr}^{(SJ)}$, respectively (gure 2). To simulate this instability, as in the ATD-model (item (viii) of Sect. 2.1), in the SA-m odels the sensitivity K (v; v.) at v v is a decreasing speed function. Similarly with the ATD-model, to simulate the mean time delay in acceleration at the downstream jam front in the SA-model, a vehicle within the jam does not accelerate before (6) is satis ed (item (vii) of Sect. 2.1).

3.2. Basic Equations

There can be different possibilities for a separation of steady states of free for a synchronized ow in SA-m odels, which all exhibit qualitatively the same features of the F! S! J transitions. To illustrate this, here we consider two variants of SA-m odels; in Appendix B other possible variants of SA-m odels are discussed. A llthese variants of the SA-m odels exhibit very sim ilar features of phase transitions and spatiotem poral congested transit of the transitions that are associated with the same physics of these SA-m odels.

A form ulation for the SA-m odel reads as follows

$$\frac{\mathrm{dx}}{\mathrm{dt}} = \frac{\mathrm{v}}{\mathrm{s}}$$
(35)

$$\frac{dv}{dt} = \begin{cases} a^{(\text{tree})} & \text{at } v \quad v_{\text{m in}}^{(\text{tree})} \text{ and } g > g_{\text{m ax}}^{(\text{jam})}; \\ a^{(\text{syn})} & \text{at } v < v_{\text{m in}}^{(\text{free})} \text{ and } g > g_{\text{m ax}}^{(\text{jam})}; \\ a^{(\text{jam})} & \text{at } 0 \quad q \quad g_{\text{m ax}}^{(\text{jam})}: \end{cases}$$
(36)

The vehicle acceleration a = dv=dt in (36) is supposed to be limited by the maximum acceleration a_{max} , i.e., in (36)

$$a^{(\text{phase})} = \min \left(a^{(\text{phase})}; a_{\text{max}} \right):$$
(37)

Here and below the associated designations of functions and parameters have the same m eaning as those in the ATD -m odel (Sect. 2).

3.3. Vehicle Acceleration

Functions $a^{(free)}$ (g; v; v,), $a^{(syn)}$ (g; v; v,), and $a^{(jam)}$ (v) in (37) are chosen as follows

$$\begin{aligned} a^{\text{(free)}}(g; v; v_{\cdot}) &= A^{\text{(free)}}(V^{\text{(free)}}(g) \quad v) + \\ K(v; v_{\cdot})(v_{\cdot} \quad v); \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{(\text{syn})}(\mathbf{g}; \mathbf{v}; \mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{A}^{(\text{syn})} \mathbb{V}_{av}^{(\text{syn})}(\mathbf{g}) \quad \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v}$$

$$K(v; v)(v v);$$
 (39)

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(jam)}(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{K}^{(jam)}\mathbf{v}; \tag{40}$$

Two versions of functions $V_{av}^{(syn)}(g)$ in (39) that lead to two di erent versions of the SA-m odels are considered:

$$V_{av}^{(syn)}(g) = g(g) = T_{av}^{(syn)};$$
 (41)

and

$$V_{av}^{(syn)}(g) = V_1 \tanh \frac{g(g)}{T_{av}^{(syn)}V_1} + cg(g);$$
 (42)

where g(g) = g $g_{nax}^{(jam)}$; $T_{av}^{(syn)}$, V_1 and c are constants.

3.4. Steady States and M odel P aram eters

In the SA-m odels, in accordance with (36) there are three isolated curves for steady states of the SA-m odels associated with the three tra cphases: free ow, synchronized ow, and wide m oving jam (gures 2 (a) and (b)).

Steady states of free ow are related to a curve $v = V_F$ () and form ula (34) (the curve F in gures 2 (a) { (d) } associated with the condition

$$v = V$$
 (free) (g) at v $v_{m in}^{(free)}$: (43)

Steady states of synchronized ow are related to a curve S in the space-gap { speed plane (gures 2 (a) and (c)) given by the condition

$$v = V_{av}^{(syn)} (g) \quad \text{at } v < v_{m in}^{(\text{free})} \text{ and } g > g_{m ax}^{(\text{jam})} :$$
(44)

In term s of the ow rate q and density , the form ula (44) reads

$$q = V_{S}() \text{ at } \underset{\min}{\overset{(syn)}{\min}} < < \underset{\min}{\overset{(jam)}{\min}};$$
(45)

where V_s () = $V_{av}^{(syn)}$ (g) $j_{g=1}$ d, $m_{in}^{(syn)}$ = $(g_{max}^{(syn)} + d)^{-1}$, $g_{max}^{(syn)}$ is found from the equation $V_{av}^{(syn)}$ ($g_{max}^{(syn)}$) = $v_{min}^{(free)}$.

In the case of the function $V_{av}^{(syn)}$ (g) given by (41), the formula (45) yields the equation for a curve S with a negative slope in the ow {density plane (gure 2 (b))

$$q = (1 = {}^{(jam)}_{m in}) = T_{av}^{(syn)} at {}^{(syn)}_{m in} < {}^{(jam)}_{m in}:$$
(46)

W hen the function $V_{av}^{(syn)}(g)$ is given by formula (42), the curve S has a maximum in the ow {density plane (gure 2 (d)).

Steady states for a wide moving jam are the same as those in the ATD-model, i.e., they are given by a horizontal line

$$q = 0 \quad \text{at} \quad (jam) \\ m in \qquad m ax \tag{47}$$

in the $ow \{ density p lane (gures 2 (b) and (d)) \}$

Parameters of the SA-models are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. SA -m odel param eters

 $\begin{array}{l} & V^{(\rm free)}\left(g\right)=V\left(g\right), \\ & V\left(g\right)=V_{0}\tanh\left(g\!\!=\!\left(V_{0}T\right)\right), V_{0}=33.3\,\textrm{m}/\textrm{s}\left(120\,\textrm{km}\,/h\right), T=0.85\,\textrm{s}, \\ & a_{m\,ax}=2\,\textrm{m}\,\textrm{s}^{-2}\textrm{;}\,\textrm{A}^{(\rm free)}=0.4\,\textrm{s}^{-1}\textrm{,} \\ & \textrm{A}^{(\rm syn)}=0.1\,\textrm{s}^{-1}\textrm{,}\,\textrm{K}^{(jam)}=2.2\,\textrm{s}^{-1}\textrm{,} \\ & \textrm{K}\left(v\textrm{;}\,v\cdot\right)\textrm{ is given in Table 1,} \\ & \textrm{K}\left(^{(\rm dec)}\left(v\right)\textrm{ is given in Table 1 at }v_{c}=10\,\textrm{m}\,/\textrm{s}\textrm{,}=0.07\textrm{,} \\ & g_{m\,in}^{(on)}=g_{m\,ax}^{(jam)}\textrm{,}=0.25\textrm{.} \\ & \textrm{In the SA modelw ith function}\,V_{av}^{(\rm syn)}\left(g\right)\,(41)\textrm{,}\,\textrm{we use} \\ & v_{m\,in}^{(\rm free)}=22.22\,\textrm{m}\,/\textrm{s}\,(80\,\textrm{km}\,/\textrm{h})\textrm{,}\,\textrm{K}_{1}^{(\mathrm{dec})}=0.95\,\textrm{s}^{-1}\textrm{K}_{2}^{(\mathrm{dec})}=0.64\,\textrm{s}^{-1}\textrm{,} \\ & \textrm{K}^{(\mathrm{acc})}=0.4\,\textrm{s}^{-1}\textrm{;}\,\textrm{T}_{av}^{(\rm syn)}=1.2\,\textrm{s}\,\textrm{g}_{m\,ax}^{(jam)}=0.7\,\textrm{m}\textrm{,}\,v_{r}^{(1)}=3.5\,\textrm{m}\,/\textrm{s}\textrm{.} \\ & \textrm{In the SA modelw ith function}\,V_{av}^{(syn)}\left(g\right)\,(42)\textrm{,}\,\textrm{we use} \\ & v_{m\,in}^{(\rm free)}=23.61\,\textrm{m}\,/\textrm{s}\,(85\,\textrm{km}\,/\textrm{h})\textrm{,}\,\textrm{K}_{1}^{(\mathrm{dec})}=0.95\,\textrm{s}^{-1}\textrm{,}\,\textrm{K}_{2}^{(\mathrm{dec})}=0.75\,\textrm{s}^{-1}\textrm{,} \\ & \textrm{K}^{(\mathrm{accc})}\left(v\right)=0.3+0.4\,\textrm{m}\,\textrm{in}\,(1;v\!\!=\!\!12)\,\textrm{s}^{-1}\textrm{,}\,V_{1}=20\,\textrm{m}\,/\textrm{s}\textrm{,} \\ & c=0.007\,\textrm{m}^{-1}\textrm{,}\,\textrm{T}_{av}^{(\rm syn)}=1\,\textrm{s},\,\textrm{g}_{m\,ax}^{(\textrm{im})}=1\,\textrm{m}\textrm{,}\,v_{r}^{(1)}=2.5\,\textrm{m}\,/\textrm{s}\textrm{.} \end{array} \right$

4. Diagram of Congested Tra c Patterns at On-Ram p Bottleneck in ATD-M odel

Numerical simulations of the ATD-m odel show that congested patterns (gure 3), which appear on the main road upstream of the bottleneck, are qualitatively the same as those for the stochastic models of Ref. [35, 36, 37] reviewed in the book [7]. However, dynamics of phase transitions leading to congested pattern formation and a diagram of these patterns in the ow { ow plane with co-ordinates are $g_{\rm H}$ and $q_{\rm in}$ (gure 3 (a)) exhibit some important peculiarities in comparison with the stochastic models [35, 36, 37]. These peculiarities are associated with a determ inistic character of the ATD-m odel. To understand this, rstly features of an F! S transition at the bottleneck in the determ inistic ATD-m odel should be considered.

4.1. Local Perturbation and F! S Transition in Free Flow at Bottleneck

Vehicle merging results in a abrupt local space gap reduction on the main road. This can lead to abrupt local vehicle deceleration. For this reason, a dynamic decrease in speed (gure 4 (a)) and the associated increase in density in the on-ramp merging region appear. This local disturbance in the speed and density localized at the bottleneck can be considered a time-dependent dynamic perturbation in free ow. The dynamic nature of this perturbation (there are no random uctuations in the determ inistic ATD-m odel) is explained by dynamic rules of vehicle motion and by a spatial non-hom ogeneity localized in the on-ramp merging region within which on-ramp in ow and ow on the main road merge. If the ow rate_{in}g is great enough, then due to dynamic merging rules of Sect. 2.6 vehicles can merge onto the main road at di erent locations within the merging region. This com plex dynamic vehicle merging behaviour causes the associated com plex dynamic spatiation (gure 4 (a)).

If the speed and density within the perturbation are averaged over time with an averaging time interval that is considerably longer than time intervals between merging



Figure 3. Congested patterns in the ATD-m odel: (a) { Diagram of congested patterns. (b) { M axim um capacity in free ow at the bottleneck $q_{max}^{(free B)}$, the discharge ow rate downstream of the congested bottleneck $q_{out}^{(bottle)}$, and the capacity drop q. (c{h} { Congested patterns upstream of the bottleneck related to (a): (c{f} { Synchronized ow patterns (SPs) and (g, h) { general patterns (GPs). (c) { W idening SP (W SP). (d) { Sequence of m oving SPs (M SPs). (e) { Localized SP (LSP). (f) { A Itemating synchronized ow pattern (A SP). (g) { GP. (h) { Dissolving GP (D GP). In (c{h}) the ow rates (q_{on};q_{in}) are: (c) (350, 2140), (d) (60, 2367), (e) (360, 1800), (f) (240, 2026), (g) (510, 2310), (h) (360, 2310) vehicles/h. $q_{max; lim}^{(free B)}$ 2470 vehicles/h. In (b) the discharge ow rate $q_{out}^{(bottle)}$ is changed from 2270 to 1925 vehicles/h, q_{out} 1805 vehicles/h. T_{ob} = 30 m in for the boundary $F_{S}^{(B)}$ and 60 m in for the boundary $S_{J}^{(B)}$. $t_{0} = 7$ m in.



Figure 4. Perculiarities of F! S transitions in the ATD-model: (a{f) { Space dependences of speed and density within local perturbations at on-ram p bottleneck at two di erent param eters of vehicle m erging from on-ram p onto the m ain road v $_{1}^{(1)} = 8 \text{ m/s}$ (a{c) and v $_{1}^{(1)} = 12 \text{ m/s}$ (d{f). $q_{on} = q_{on}^{(1)} = 300$, $q_{on} = q_{on}^{(2)} = 120$, and $q_{in} = 1900$ vehicles/h. In (a, d) curves 1{6 are related to di erent time m om ents. (g) { Boundaries $F_{S}^{(B)}$ of a rst-order F! S transition at the bottleneck associated with (a) and (d), respectively. The boundary $F_{S}^{(B)}$ associated with curve 1 in (g) is taken from gure 3 (a). In (b, c, e, f), 5-m in averaging of tra c variables m easured at virtual detectors at di erent locations are show n. O ther m odel param eters are the same as those in gure 3.

of vehicles, then spatial distributions of the speed and density within the associated average perturbation (gures 4 (b) and (c)) can be considered a \determ inistic" perturbation localized at on-ram p bottleneck. At this time scale the determ inistic perturbation is motionless, the total ow rate (across the main road and on-ram p lane) within the perturbation does not depend on spatial co-ordinate. This total ow rate in free ow is $g_{im} = q_{in} + q_{on}$. In contrast, the average speed and density spatially vary in free ow at the bottleneck. In particular, $g_{im} = v_{free}^{(B)} = v_{free}^{(free)}$, where $v_{free}^{(B)}$ and $f_{free}^{(B)}$ are the minimum speed and maximum density within the determ inistic

perturbation, respectively; $v^{(free)}$, ${}^{(free)}$ are the speed and density downstream of the perturbation, respectively (gures 4 (b) and (c)); $v_{free}^{(B)} < v^{(free)}$, ${}^{(B)}_{free} > {}^{(free)}$.

At a given q_{in} , the greater q_{on} , the low er the speed $v_{\rm free}^{(B)}$ and the greater the density $_{\rm free}^{(B)}$ within the perturbation, i.e., the greater the amplitude of the determ inistic perturbation (gures 4 (b) and (c)). This grow th in the perturbation am plitude has a lim it associated with an F! S transition that occurs spontaneously at the bottleneck when q_{bn} gradually increases. The multitude of the ow rates q_h and q_{bn} , at which the F! S transition occurs, determ ines the boundary $F_{\rm S}^{~(B)}$ in the pattern diagram (gure 3 (a)). At the boundary $F_S^{(B)}$ a rst-order F! S transition (see Sect. 5.1) occurs spontaneously during a chosen time interval Tob that is considerably longer than a time interval $\frac{(\text{grow B})}{\text{determ}}$ (about 60 s) required for the average speed to decrease from the speed within a dynamic perturbation in free ow at the bottleneck to a synchronized ow speed (see explanations in Sect. 5.3.7 of [7]). The necessity of the time interval T_{ob} is associated with a time delay $T_{FS}^{\,(B\,)}$ for an F! S transition found in the ATD-model: A fler the time delay $T_{\rm FS}^{\,\,(B\,\,)}$, a time-dependent (dynamic) perturbation (gure 4 (a)), which can cause a short-time decrease in the speed within the perturbation markedly lower than $v_{\rm free}^{\rm (B)}$, can occur. This perturbation occurrence leads to the F! S transition. The boundary $F_s^{(B)}$ is determined from the condition $T_{FS}^{(B)}$. T_{ob}

In stochastic models [7], the boundary $F_{S}^{(B)}$ is also determ ined by the considition that an F! S transition occurs at given q_{in} and q_{on} after a time delay $T_{FS}^{(B)}$ during a chosen time interval T_{ob} . However, in the stochastic models $T_{FS}^{(B)}$ is a random value: In dimensional entry of the same q_{h} and q_{on} various $T_{FS}^{(B)}$ are found. This stochastic model nature enables us also to calculate the probability for F! S transition occurrence [36, 7].

In contrast with the stochastic models [7], in the determ inistic ATD-model there are no random uctuations. Time-dependent perturbations in free ow localized at the bottleneck (gure 4 (a)) have dynamic nature explained above. For this reason, in the ATD-model $T_{FS}^{(B)}$ is a xed value at given q_h and q_{on} ; consequently, the probability for F! S transition occurrence cannot be found.

In addition, num erical simulations of the ATD-m odel show that a duration of a dynam ic speed decrease within the perturbation below the speed $v_{\rm free}^{(B)}$ is considerably shorter (1{3 s) than ${}_{\rm determ}^{(grow B)}$. As a result, it is found that at a given $q_{\rm in}$ the time delay $T_{\rm FS}^{(B)}$ is a strong decreasing function of $q_{\rm on}$ in a neighborhood of the boundary $F_{\rm S}^{(B)}$. A leady a small increase in $q_{\rm on}$ behind the boundary $F_{\rm S}^{(B)}$ leads to a decrease in $T_{\rm FS}^{(B)}$ down to ${}_{\rm determ}^{(grow B)}$. Thus, we can suggest that in the ATD-m odel the boundary $F_{\rm S}^{(B)}$ is very close to the boundary for the determ inistic F! S transition (see explanation of the determ inistic F! S transition for each of the determ inistic F! S transition for the determ inistic F! S transition (see explanation of the determ inistic F! S transition for the determ inistic F! S transition (see explanation of the determ inistic F! S transition for the determ inistic F! S transition (see explanation of the determ inistic F! S transition for the determ inistic

The dynamic character of perturbations at the bottleneck, which is responsible for the above mentioned physics of the boundary $F_S^{(B)}$ for an F! S transition in the ATD-model, can clear be seen, if smaller disturbances in speed and density occur due to vehicle merging. Smaller disturbances can be simulated by an increase in the parameter $v_r^{(1)}$ of vehicle merging (Sect. 2.6). As a result, at the same q_{in} and q_{bn} as those in gures 4 (a) { (c) both time-dependent (gure 4 (d)) and deterministic perturbations (gures 4 (e) and (f)) become smaller. This leads to a shift of the



Figure 5. Perculiarities of S! J transitions in the ATD-model: (a, b) { Spatiotem poral decay of dynam ic speed waves that emerge in the merging on-ram p region during their upstream propagation through a widening SP (W SP) in space and time (a) and at di erent virtual detectors (b). (c, d) { Spatiotem poral growth of dynam ic speed waves that emerge in the merging on-ram p region during their upstream propagation through an initialW SP in space and time (c) and at di erent virtual detectors (d). $q_{on} = 300$ (a, b), 360 (c, d), and $q_{in} = 2310$ vehicles/h. O ther model param eters are the same as those in gure 3.

boundary $F_{S}^{(B)}$ in the diagram of congested patterns to greater q_{on} (curve 2 in gure 4 (g)):

4.2. Perculiarities of S! J Transitions and Congested Patterns

In the ATD-model, moving jam formation in synchronized ow (S! J transition), which occurs at the boundary $S_J^{(B)}$ in the congested pattern diagram (gure 3 (a)), exhibits also some qualitative di erent features in comparison with the stochastic models [7].

As in the stochastic models [7], in the ATD-model after a synchronized ow pattern (SP) occurs upstream of the bottleneck due to F! S transition at the bottleneck, a further increase in $q_{\rm DN}$ leads to a subsequent decrease in the speed within the SP. This can cause an S! J transition with the following general pattern (GP) form ation. In the stochastic models, a self-grow th of random model uctuations is mostly responsible for the S! J transition. In contrast, in the ATD-model there are no random model uctuations.

In the ATD -m odel, dynam ic merging of vehicles from the on-ram p lane onto the

main road can cause dynamic speed and density waves that propagate upstream in synchronized ow of the SP (gure 5). It turns out that if the ow rate, g is related to a point $(q_{\text{bn}}; q_{\text{in}})$ between the boundaries $F_{\text{S}}^{(B)}$ and $S_{\text{J}}^{(B)}$ (gure 3 (a)), then these dynamic waves decay during their upstream propagation within synchronized ow of the SP (gures 5 (a) and (b)). In contrast, at the boundary $S_{\text{J}}^{(B)}$ the waves begin to self-grow th in their am plitude leading wide moving jam formation, i.e., one of GPs appears upstream of the bottleneck (gures 5 (c) and (d)).

As in the KKW cellular autom ata (CA) model [36, 7], in the ATD-model the maximum ow rate in free ow downstream of the bottleneck $f_{\text{Max}}^{\text{(free B)}}$ is a decreasing function of q_{bn} (gure 3 (b)). Recall, that the ow rate $f_{\text{Max}}^{\text{(free B)}}$ (q_{bn}) is the ow rate in free ow downstream of the bottleneck associated with the boundary $F_{\text{S}}^{(\text{B})}$. After a congested pattern is formed at the bottleneck, the ow rate downstream of the congested bottleneck called discharge ow rate $q_{\text{ut}}^{\text{(bottle)}}$ (gure 3 (b)) is usually smaller than the initial ow rate $q_{\text{max}}^{\text{(free B)}}$. The di erence $q(g_{\text{h}}) = q_{\text{max}}^{\text{(free B)}}(q_{\text{bn}})$ $q_{\text{ut}}^{\text{(bottle)}}(q_{\text{bn}})$ called \capacity drop" is an increasing function of q_{bn} at the boundary $F_{\text{S}}^{(\text{B})}$ in the diagram of congested patterns.

In accordance with empirical results [7], in the ATD -m odel moving jams do not emerge spontaneously in free ow. This is because in all states of free ow critical perturbations required for an F! S transition are considerably sm aller than those for F! J transition. In the model, all synchronized ow states that are above the line J in the ow {density plane (gure 1 (c)) are metastable ones against wide moving jam emergence.

5. Phase Transitions and Congested Patterns in SA-M odels

5.1. Nucleation and M etastability E ects of Pattern Formation

As the ATD-model, the SA-models exhibit a rst-order F! S transition at the bottleneck, which is accompanied by nucleation and metastability e ects, as well as by a hysteresis in SP emergence and dissolution. To illustrate these e ects found for both the ATD- and SA-models, we restrict a consideration to the SA-model (35) { (41) (gures 6 and 7). W hen an initial state at the bottleneck is free ow in which q_{in} is given and q_{on} increases gradually, then, as in the ATD-model (gure 4 (a)), a dynam ic disturbance in free ow localized at the bottleneck appears spontaneously. A tim e averaging of spatial speed and density distributions within the perturbation leads to the associated determ inistic perturbation (gures 6 (a) and (b)). Determ inistic perturbation features are the same as those for the ATD-model (Sect. 4.1).

The speed $v_{free}^{(B)}$ within the determ inistic perturbation decreases when q_{bn} increases (from point 1 to 5 in gure 6 (c)). Consequently, $f_{\text{free}}^{(B)}$ increases. In the ow (density plane, the ow rate on the main road associated with this density increases too (from point 1 to 5 in gure 6 (d)), whereas the ow rate upstream of the perturbation is equal to q_{in} , i.e., it does not change (from point 1 to 5 in gure 6 (e)). This increases in the determ inistic perturbation amplitude with q_{bn} has a lim it $q_{\text{bn}} = q_{\text{on}}^{(\text{determ} ; FS)}$ associated with the determ inistic F! S transition (dotted down-arrow in gure 6 (c)). How ever, non-hom ogeneous free ow dynamics (Sect. 4.1), which is caused by vehicle merging, results in an F! S transition at a smaller q_{bn} (point 5 in gure 6 (c)) related to a point on the boundary $F_{\text{S}}^{(B)}$ in the diagram of congested patterns (gure 8 (a)).



Figure 6. Nucleation and metastability of free ow and synchronized ow: (a, b) { Spatial dependence of the speed (a) and density (b) within the determ inistic perturbation in free ow at the bottleneck for two ow rates $q_{on} = 150$ (curve I) and 240 (curve II) vehicles/h. (c) { Double Z-characteristic in the ow-rate{ speed plane for the sequence of F! S! J transitions. (d, e) { Hysteresis e ects in the ow {density plane due to F! S and reverse S! F transitions within the determ inistic perturbation (d) and on the main road upstream of the bottleneck (e). Dotted curves in (d, e) are related to steady state model solutions. $q_{in} = 2252$ vehicles/h.



Figure 7. Congested pattern excitation in m etastable free ow: (a) { Short-time (2 m in) perturbations in the ow rate q_{on} used for pattern excitation. (b{d}) { W SP (b), GP (c), and M SP (d) induced by the related perturbations (curve 1, 2, and 3 in (a), respectively). $q_{in} = 2252$ vehicles/h. $q_{on} = 220$ vehicles/h in (b, c) and $q_{on} = 140$ vehicles/h in (d). A m plitudes of perturbations in (a) are: 270 for (b, d) and 500 vehicles/h for (c).

The speed decreases and density increases abruptly within the initial perturbation (arrows F! S from point 5 to 5^0 in gures 6 (c) { (e)) and a congested pattern emerges at the bottleneck. In the example, a widening SP (W SP) occurs upstream of the bottleneck due to the F! S transition (gure 8 (c)).

If now q_{on} decreases, the speed within the W SP increases (from point 5^0 to 3^0 in gures 6 (c) { (e) }. This synchronized ow speed increase has a limit: The speed increases and density decreases abruptly within the synchronized ow (arrows S ! F from the point 3^0 to 3 in gures 6 (c) { (e) } and free ow returns at the bottleneck.

Note that q_{in} in gure 6 is chosen to be greater than the threshold ow rate q_i for moving SP (M SP) existence. As a result, the initial motion less downstream front of synchronized ow at the bottleneck begins to move away upstream. Consequently, an M SP emerges (gure 8 (d)) (range of q_n within which M SPs occur is shown by a dashed part of the synchronized ow states $v_{syn}^{(B)}$ in gure 6 (c)). At greater q_n on the dashed part of the synchronized ow states $v_{syn}^{(B)}$ in gure 6 (c) this free ow at the bottleneck can persist for a short time only: A new F! S transition occurs spontaneously and a new M SP emerges at the bottleneck, and so on. D ue to this e ect, a sequence of M SP s appears.

At $q_{in} > q_{th}$ an MSP can also be induced by application a short-time local perturbation in free ow. The speed within this external perturbation should be lower than the critical speed $v_{cr; FS}^{(B)}$ associated with the critical branch on the Z-characteristic for the F! S and reverse S! F transitions at the bottleneck. As in the stochastic models [7], this Z-characteristic consists of the states for free ow associated with



F igure 8.D iagram of congested patterns at the on-ram p bottleneck in SA-m odel (35){(41) (a), the m axim um capacity in free ow $q_{max}^{(free B)}$, the discharge ow rate at the on-ram p $q_{out}^{(bottle)}$ and the capacity drop q (b), and congested patterns (c{h}) related to (a): (c{e}) { SPs and (f{h}) { GPs. (c) { W SP. (d) { M SP. (e) { LSP. (f) { GP at $q_{in} > q_{out}$. (h) -GP at $q_{in} < q_{out}$. In (c{h}) the ow rates (q_{on} ; q_{in}) are: (c) (200, 2353), (d) (140, 2378), (e) (940, 1520), (f) (250, 2353), (g) (400, 2353), and (h) (900, 1770) vehicles/h. q_{max} ; im 2475 vehicles/h.

the determ inistic perturbation at the bottleneck $v_{\rm free}^{(B)}$, the critical branch $v_{\rm cr; FS}^{(B)}$, and synchronized ow states $v_{\rm yn}^{(B)}$ (gure 6 (c)). In accordance with this Z-characteristic, we get the associated hysteresise ects on the fundam ental diagram (arrow sF! S and S! F in gures 6 (d) and (e)).

If in contrast q_{bn} increases, the speed within the W SP decreases (gure 6 (c)). This speed decrease has a limit associated with the ownrate $q_n = q_{bn}^{(cr; SJ)}$ at which an S! J transition must occur (dotted down-arrow S! J in gure 6 (c)). However, because there are speed and density waves of a nite amplitude in synchronized ow, an S! J transition occurs already for $q_{bn} < q_{bn}^{(cr; SJ)}$ (point 6 and solid down-arrow in gure 6 (c)). As a result, an GP emerges. This is because in the SA-models, synchronized ow steady states with the speed $v > v_{cr}^{(SJ)}$, which are above the line J in the ow (density plane, are metastable ones against wide moving jam emergence. This metastability can be seen from another Z-characteristic in the speed (ow plane associated with an S! J transition in synchronized ow . The Z-characteristic consists of the states for synchronized ow $v_{syn}^{(B)}$, the critical branch for critical perturbations in synchronized ow $v_{sr,sJ}^{(B)}$, and the line v = 0 for wide moving jam s (gure 6 (c)).

From the resulting double Z-characteristic (gure 6 (c)), it can concluded that in a metastable free ow at the bottleneck (left of the boundary $F_S^{(B)}$ in the diagram in gure 8 (a)) depending on amplitude of a time-limited perturbation caused, for example, by an increase in q_{bn} (curves 1 and 2 in gure 7 (a)), either an W SP (gure 7 (b)) or an GP (gure 7 (c)) can be induced. At smaller q_n (curve 3 in gure 7 (a)), an M SP (gure 7 (d)) can be excited in free ow. All results presented in gures 6 and 7 for the SA-m odel remain qualitatively equal for the ATD-m odel.

5.2. Comparison of Congested Patterns in ATD - and SA-Models

The SA-m odel (36) { (41) (gure 8) exhibits the following shortcoming in comparison with the ATD-m odel (gure 3):

(i) If the ow rate q_n is within a ow rate range $q_n^{(FSJ)} < q_{on} < q_{on}^{(LSP)}$, then no SP can be form ed at the boundary $F_S^{(B)}$ in the diagram (gure 8 (a)): The sequence of F! S! J transitions occurs spontaneously at this boundary, leading to GP em ergence. For this reason, the related part of the boundary at which GPs em erge spontaneously in free ow at the bottleneck is labelled $F_S^{(B)} \& S_J^{(B)}$.

(ii) If the ow rate q_h at this boundary decreases, another characteristic ow rate $q_{in} = q_{in}^{(LSP)}$ associated with the ow rate $q_n = q_{pn}^{(LSP)}$ at this boundary is reached: At $q_{in} < q_{in}^{(LSP)}$ moving jams do not emerge in synchronized ow upstream of the bottleneck. As a result, at $q_{in} < q_{in}^{(LSP)}$ and right of the boundary $F_s^{(B)}$ only an LSP remains at the bottleneck. W ithin this LSP the speed is very low. This LSP has a qualitative di erent nature in comparison with an LSP of higher synchronized ow speed in the ATD-m odel that occurs at considerably greater q_{in} (gure 3).

In the SA -m odel (35) { (40), (42), the branch for average synchronized ow states $V_{av}^{(syn)}$ has a part with a positive slope (gure 2 (d)). Then LSPs of higher speeds appear in the diagram of congested patterns (gure 9). How ever, these LSPs are not related to LSPs observed in empirical observations. To explain this, note that these m odelLSPs are very narrow ones (gure 9 (e)). They are localized within the merging region of the on-ramp and consist of two narrow fronts only (gure 10 (a)): There is no region of synchronized ow between the fronts within these LSPs. This is regardless

of the ow rates q_h and q_{bn} . Con ictingly, in empirical observations rather than such narrow LSPs, an extended region of synchronized ow is usually observed within an empirical LSP. The LSP width (in the longitudinal direction) changes over time considerably. These empirical features of LSPs shown by the ATD-m odel (gure 10 (b)) are not found in the SA-m odel.

(iii) In the ATD-m odel (gures 10 (e) and (f)) as in empirical observations, both free and synchronized ow s can be formed between wide moving jams within an GP. In contrast, in the SA-m odels only free ow can be formed between wide moving jams within the GP (gures 10 (c) and (d)). The reason for this is as follows. The average branch for synchronized ow lies for speeds $v > v_x^{(SJ)}$ above the line J (gure 2 (g)). F low states in the jam out ow should be related to points on the line J. Thus, there are no synchronized ow states between the jams. This explains why only free ow can be formed between the jams in the SA-m odels.

The mentioned shortcoming of the SA-model result from the averaging of a 2D - region of steady states for synchronized ow in the ow {density plane of the ATD - model (gure 1 (a)) to the branch for average synchronized ow states (curve S in qure 2).

At chosen SA -m odel parameters the condition

$$q_{\text{but}} > q^{(\text{pinch})} \tag{48}$$

is satis ed, where $q^{p \text{ inch})}$ is the ow rate within the pinch region of an GP in which narrow moving jams emerge. Under the condition (48), no DGPs appear in the SA – models (gures 8 and 9). At other parameters of the SA - models, an opposite condition

$$q_{\text{put}} < q^{(\text{pmch})} \tag{49}$$

can be satis ed. Then DGPs appear in the SA-m odels.

The maximum ow rate in free ow downstream of the bottleneck $f_{\text{Max}}^{\text{(free B)}}(q_{\text{bn}})$, the discharge ow rate $q_{\text{ut}}^{\text{(bottle)}}$, and the \capacity drop" q can sometimes exhibit di erent features as those in the ATD-model (gure 3 (b)) when the ow rate $q_{\text{ut}}^{\text{(bottle)}}$, and the \capacity drop" q can sometimes exhibit di erent features as those in the ATD-model (gure 3 (b)) when the ow rate $q_{\text{max}}^{\text{(bottle)}}$, and the \capacity drop" q can sometimes exhibit di erent features as those in the ATD-model (gure 3 (b)) when the ow rate $q_{\text{max}}^{\text{(free B)}}$ does not depend on q_{bn} , whereas in the SA-model (35){ (41) $q_{\text{max}}^{\text{(free B)}}$ does not depend on q_{bn} , whereas in the SA-model (35){ (40), (42) $q_{\text{max}}^{\text{(free B)}}$ depends on q_{bn} but at considerably greater q_{bn} than for the ATD-model.

Simulations show that the SA m odels presented in Appendix B show qualitatively the same features of the phase transitions and spatiotem poral congested patterns as those in the SA -m odel (35) { (41).

5.3. Comparison with Stochastic SA-M odels

It is interesting to compare the determ inistic SA -m odels with possible stochastic SA -m odels. Such models can be derived from the stochastic model of Ref. [35, 37], if

The only exclusion is the SA-model with the average branch for synchronized ow (42), if parameters for the curve S and/or the line J, i.e., for wide moving jam propagation are chosen di erent as those shown in gures 2 (c), (d), and (h): These di erent parameters should lead to an intersection of the line J with the average branch for synchronized ow with a positive slope in the ow {density plane. However, in this speci c case only one state of the synchronized ow, which is associated with the point of the latter intersection, is possible. This model e ect is not agreed with empirical results, in which the ow rate and speed between wide moving jam swithin GPs can change over tim e considerably [7].



Figure 9. Diagram of congested patterns at the on-ram p bottleneck in the SA-m odel (35){ (40), (42) (a), the maximum capacity in free ow $q_{max}^{(free B)}$, the discharge ow rate at the on-ram p $q_{out}^{(bottle)}$ and the capacity drop q (b), and congested patterns (c-f) related to (a): (c-e) - SP and (f) - GP. (c) - W SP. (d) - Subsequence of M SPs. (e) - LSP. (f) - GP arising from W SP. In (c-f), the ow rates (q_{on};q_{in}) are: (c) (200, 2400), (d) (90, 2450), (e) (360, 2115), (f) (300, 2400) vehicles/h. $q_{max}^{(free B)}$ 2475 vehicles/h. In (b), $q_{out}^{(bottle)}$ is changed from 2450 to 2200 vehicles/h. q_{out}

2D region of synchronized ow steady states is averaged to synchronized ow states related to a 1D region in the ow {density plane.

A stochastic SA -m odel can easily be derived from the stochastic m odel of R ef. [37] based on the physics and ideas for the SA -m odel approach discussed in Sect. 3. To reach this goal, in the part of the stochastic m odel of R ef. [37]

$$v_{n+1} = m ax(0; m in(v_{free}; v_{c;n}; v_{s;n}));$$
 (50)

$$x_{n+1} = x_n + v_{n+1}$$
(51)

for a desired speed in synchronized ow v_{in} , rather than the form ula (3) of Ref. [37] leading to a 2D region of synchronized ow steady states in the ow (density plane, the following equations associated with the physics of the SA-m odels of Sect. 3 are



Figure 10. Comparison of LSPs (a, b) and GPs (c(f) in the SA-m odel (35) (40), (42) (a, c, d) and in the ATD-m odel (b, e, f). LSPs and their parameters are the same as those in gures 9 (e) and 3 (e), respectively. In (e, f), $v_r^{(1)} = 7.5 \text{ m/s}$. (q_{pn}; q_{in}) are: (c, d) (380, 2397), (e, f) (660, 2222) vehicles/h.

used:

$$v_{c;n} = v_n + \max(h_i; \min(a_n; n));$$

$$g = A^{(free)}(g_n)(v_{free} v_n) + K^{(free)}(q_n)(v_{free}) + K^{(free)}(q_n) + K^{(free)}(q_n)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free}} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free}} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free}} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} K^{\text{free}} \\ K^{\text{free$$

In (50){ (53), v_n and x_n are the speed and space co-ordinate of a vehicle; the index n corresponds to the discrete time t = n, n = 0;1;2;::: is the time step; v_{free} is the maximum speed in free ow, which is a constant; v_{y_n} is the save speed of Ref. [37]; $a_n = 0$ is acceleration, $b_n = 0$ is deceleration, which are taken as the same stochastic functions used in the model of Ref. [37]; the space gap $g_n = x \cdot_{y_n} - x_n = d$; the average speed in synchronized ow steady states $V_{av}^{(\text{syn})}$ is given by the form ula (41) at $g_{n ax}^{(\text{jam})} = 0$. Of course, other form ulations for the average synchronized ow steady states $V_{av}^{(\text{syn})}$, for example used in the determ inistic SA-models (gures 2 (b), (d), and (f)) can also be applied.

In general, descriptions of random vehicle acceleration and deceleration are the same as those in the stochastic model of Ref. [35, 37]: At the stochas

speed v_{n+1} is set to $v_{n+1} = v_{n+1}$ where the speed v_{n+1} is calculated from the equations (50) { (53). At the second step, a noise component $_n$ is added to the calculated speed v_{n+1} . Then the nal speed is found from the condition [37]

$$v_{n+1} = \max(0; \min(v_{\text{free}}; v_{n+1} + n; v_n + a_{\max}; v_{\text{s};n}));$$
(54)

where a_{m ax} is the maxim um acceleration.

However, in contrast with the stochastic model of Ref. [37], the noise component n in (54) is chosen to be dimensional from zero only if the vehicle decelerates, specially

$$h_{n} = \begin{array}{cc} h_{n \text{ ax}} & (p_{n} \quad r) & \text{if } y_{n+1} < v_{n} \\ 0 & \text{otherw ise;} \end{array}$$
(55)

where r = rand(0;1), (z) = 0 at z < 0 and (z) = 1 at z = 0, $_{m}a_{ax}$, $b_{m}a_{x}$, $p_{b}a_{m}a_{x}$, $p_{b}a_{m}a_{x}$, $b_{m}a_{x}$, $p_{b}a_{m}a_{x}$, $b_{m}a_{x}$, $b_{m}a_{x}$, $p_{b}a_{m}a_{x}$, $b_{m}a_{x}$, $b_{m}a_{$

Simulations show that the stochastic SA-model (50) { (55) exhibits qualitatively similar spatiotem poral congested patterns at the on-ram p bottleneck (gure 11) as those in the associated deterministic SA-models (gure 8). However, there are qualitative di erences in the dynamics of rst-order F! S and S! J transitions leading to pattern form ation explained in Sect. 5.1: In the stochastic SA-model, random model uctuations are important for phase transition nucleation, whereas in the deterministic SA-models the F! S and S! J transitions are nucleated by dynamic perturbations emerging within the on-ram p merging region.

Note that under the chosen model parameters in the stochastic SA-model (50) { (55) the condition (49) can be satisfied at smaller q_n . As a result, there is a region in the diagram of congested patterns in which DGPs occur (region labelled DGP in gure 11 (a)). After the wide moving jam of the DGP is upstream of the bottleneck as well as in the ATD-model, an LSP remains at the bottleneck (gure 11 (h)). In

contrast with the ATD-m odel, this LSP exists for a nite time interval only and free ow returns at the bottleneck.

However, in a small neighbourhood of the boundary labelled D in the diagram, which separates DGPs and GPs, there is a peculiarity in pattern formation under the condition (49): If the ow rate q_n increases in the neighbourhood of the boundary D in the diagram, then the lifetime of an LSP, which occurs within an DGP increases and it tends towards in nity at the boundary D (gure 12 (a)). This quasi-steady LSP is explained by a very long interval between wide moving jam emergence in the synchronized ow at the bottleneck (gure 12 (b)). This interval tends towards the in nity at the boundary D.

6. D iscussion

6.1. C om parison of ATD – and SA – models with OV – models and other D eterm inistic M odels

The rst term in the formula for vehicle acceleration $e^{\text{(free)}}$ (12), A (V (free) (g) v), describes the dynamics of the speed v in the vicinity of the optimal speed V (free) (g) in free ow. At a time scale that is considerably greater than the time delay , this dynamic behaviour is the same as those in di erent OV-m odels [3, 4, 5, 29], which can be written as follows

$$\frac{\mathrm{d} v}{\mathrm{d} t} = A (g; v) (V (g) v);$$
(56)



Figure 11. Diagram of congested patterns at the on-ram p bottleneck in the stochastic SA-m odel (50){(55) (a), the maximum capacity in free ow $q_{max}^{(free B)}$, the discharge ow rate at the on-ram p $q_{out}^{(bottle)}$ and the capacity drop q (b), and congested patterns (c{h} related to (a): (c{f} { SPs and (g, h) { GPs. (c) { W SP. (d) { M SP. (e) { LSP. (f) { ASP. (g) { GP. (h) - D GP. In (c{h}) the ow rates (q_{on};q_{in}) are: (c) (200, 2250), (d) (60, 2250), (e) (720, 1470), (f) (120, 2235), (g) (500, 2220), and (h) (352, 2235) vehicles/h. $q_{max;lim}^{(free B)}$ 2300 vehicles/h. M odel parameters: A ^(free) (g_n) = 0.5m in 1; (g_n $q_{min}^{(free B)}) = 20$, $g_{min}^{(free)} = 36 \text{ m}$, A ^(syn) = 0:1, $T_{av}^{(syn)} = 1:45 \text{ s}$, $g_{max}^{(jam)} = 0$, $p_b = 0.02$. $p_1 = 0.55$, $p_2 (v_n) = 0.5 + 0.48 (v_n 15)$, $a_{hax} = b_{max} = 0.5 \text{ m} = s^2$, K = 1. The other parameters are the same as those in [37]. The on-ramp m odel from [37, 38] is used, in which the synchronization gaps $G_n^+ = G_n = g_{min}^{(free)}$.

q



Figure 12. Transform ation of DGP in gure 11 (h) to GP with a very long time interval between wide moving jam emergence (b) through an DGP with a quasi-steady LSP (a) by a small increase in the ow rate q_{on} in a neighbourhood of the boundary D in the diagram of congested patterns in gure 11 (a). The ow rates $(q_{on}; q_{in})$ are: (a) (357, 2235) and (b) (362, 2235) vehicles/h.

However, in (56) the vehicle acceleration A (g; v) (V (g) v) is valid for the whole possible space gap range [3, 4, 5, 29]

In contrast with the 0V - m odels, in the ATD - m odel this vehicle acceleration is applied for large space gaps (5) associated with free ow only.

The crucial di erence of the ATD -m odel with the OV-m odels and all other determ inistic microscopic trac ow m odels (see references in the reviews [1, 3, 4, 5, 6]) is that the vehicle acceleration behaviour qualitatively changes when the vehicle is within the synchronization gap, i.e., if the condition (4), which is opposite to the condition (5), is satisfied.

The condition (4) is associated with the synchronized ow phase in which there is no optimal speed in the ATD-model. This conclusion follows from (13) and its analysis made in Sect. 2.8 in which it has been shown that for a given steady space gap in synchronized ow there are an in nity of steady vehicle speeds within a nite speed range (gure 1 (a)).

The concept of safe speed $v_s(q; v_s)$ for vehicle collision prevention used in the ATD-model is qualitatively di event from the concept of optimal speed that is the basis of the determ inistic approaches (2) and (3): The optim alspeed is a desired one (this explains the term \optim al" speed) for a driver to be reached (the driver m oves com fortable with the optim al speed during a long tim e), whereas the safe speed is not an optim alone but a lim iting speed that is still perm itted (the driver should not m ove with this speed during a long time because this is strain for the driver and, therefore, non-com fortable). The qualitative di erence of these two concepts is m athem atically re ected in the dynam icm odel behaviour. In the ATD -m odel, when the vehicle speed is higher than the safe speed and safe deceleration is applied, then a driver tim e delay is equal to a sm all driver reaction time: $= \frac{1}{2}$ (21). In all other driving situations, which are not associated with safe speed, driver tim e delays are dierent from s. This is because these driver time delays are associated mostly with qualitatively di erent expected events occurring within di erent tra c phases (Sect. 2.5). As a result, in the ATD -m odel driver deceleration to the safe speed occurs considerably quicker, then in other driving situations. In contrast, in accordance with the concept of optimal speed, in OV-models there is a driver time delay in deceleration that characterizes speed relaxation to the optim al speed [1, 4, 5, 27, 28, 29, 40].

(57)

The crucial di erences between the SA-m odels and all other trac ow models in which steady states covering a one-dimensional region (s) in the ow (density plane (see references in the reviews [1, 3, 4, 5, 6]) are as follows. In contrast with the models of Ref. [1, 3, 4, 5, 6], in the SA-models at each density of free ow states the critical amplitude of a local perturbation required for an F! S transition is considerably smaller than the critical amplitude of a local perturbation required for an F! J transition.

In the SA-m odels, there are two ranges of m odel steady states separated one from another by a m odel discontinuity in vehicle space gap or in speed (gures 2 (a) { (e)) or else due to instability of m odel steady states against in nitesim al non-hom ogeneous

uctuations (gure 2 (f)) This simulates the hypothesis of three-phase trac theory about a competition between over-acceleration and speed adaptation e ect that is responsible for F! S and S! F transitions: The rst range of steady states simulates free ow, whereas the second simulates synchronized ow. To simulate S! J transitions within synchronized ow, steady states associated with synchronized ow of higher speeds are metastable with respect to moving jam emergence, i.e., moving jam sem erge in these synchronized ow states only if large enough amplitude local perturbations appear; synchronized ow states of low er speeds are unstable with respect to moving jam emergence. These requirements to the SA-models lead to F! S! J transitions that are responsible for moving jam emergence found in empirical data [7].

6.2. Critical D iscussion of Theories and M odels based on the Fundam ental D iagram Approach

In the OV model (56), as in other determ inistic (and stochastic) trac ow models in the context of the fundam ental diagram approach reviewed in [1, 3, 4, 5, 6], which claim to show spontaneous jam emergence, there is a range of the density on the fundam ental diagram in which steady states on this diagram are unstable against in nitesimal perturbations.] This instability leads to wide moving jam emergence in these models both on hom ogeneous road and at a bottleneck. We denote the minimum density of this density range, in which in nitesimal uctuations grow, by $_{\rm cr}^{(J)}$ (gures 13 (a) and (b)).

There are two possibilities for the arrangement of the point of this instability $\binom{(J)}{cr}$; $q_{cr}^{(J)}$) on the fundamental diagram in the OV model and other models in the context of the fundamental diagram approach:

(i) The point $\begin{pmatrix} {}^{(J)}_{cr}; q^{(J)}_{cr} \end{pmatrix}$ lies left of the maximum point of the fundamental diagram $(_0; q_0)$, i.e., on the branch of the diagram with a positive slope (gure 13 (a)):

$$= \begin{array}{c} {}^{(J)}_{\rm cr} < \\ 0 \end{array}$$
(58)

(ii) The point $\begin{pmatrix} (J) \\ cr \end{pmatrix}$; $q_{cr}^{(J)}$) lies right of the maximum point of the fundamental diagram $(_{0}; q_{0})$, i.e., on the branch of the diagram with a negative slope (gure 13 (b)):

$$= \frac{(J)}{cr} > _{0}:$$
(59)

] It should be noted that some of the models based on the fundam ental diagram approach are not valid far from equilibrium. It is not simply a matter of a phase transition type that a model exhibits in steady conditions, but of the di culty of closing equations, which should work in unsteady conditions by relations valid only in steady uniform conditions.



F igure 13. Tra c patterns in OV-m odels at an on-ram p bottleneck: (a, b) { Fundam ental diagrams of OV-m odels when the condition (58) (a) and (59) (b) are satisfied, respectively. (c, d) { W idening patterns of dense ow upstream of the bottleneck at two ow rates $q_{on} = 160$ (c) and 400 (d) vehicles/h. (e) { Formation of wide moving jams within the dense ow upstream of the bottleneck at $q_{on} = 700$ vehicles/h. In (c{e) the ow rate $q_{in} = 2676$ vehicles/h. Figures (c{e}) are related to the OV-m odel (b) at V (g) = V_0 tanh ((g g_0)=g_1) + tanh (g_0=g_1) at V_0 = 14 m/s, g_0 = 17 m, g_1 = 7 m, the sensitivity A (g; v) = A (v) in (56) is A (v) = 5 s^{-1} at v 12 m/s and A (v) = 0:9 s^{-1} at v < 12 m/s.

Note that in both cases (i) and (ii) all states on the fundamental diagram, in which the density satis es the condition

$$\min < (0)_{\rm cr}; \tag{60}$$

where m_{in} is the density in the wide moving jam out ow associated with the ow rate q_{but} , are metastable states with respect to moving jam emergence [44]. The case (i) has intensively been considered in the literature [3, 4, 5, 6] and criticized in Sect. 3.3.2 of the book [7].

In the case (ii) (gure 13 (b)), the ow rate in free ow downstream of an on-ram p bottleneck q_{sum} cannot exceed the maximum ow rate on the fundamental diagram q_0 . If q_{in} is a given large enough value and the ow rate q_n begins to increase, then a localized perturbation as that in the ATD - and SA -m odels (Sects. 4.1 and 5.1) appears at the bottleneck (gures 14 (a) and (b)). The minimum speed within the time-



Figure 14. Pattern features in the OV-model in gure 13 (b) at an on-ram p bottleneck: (a, b) { Spatial dependences of the averaged speed (a) and density (b) on the main road within determ in istic perturbations localized at the bottleneck at $q_{on} = 80$ (curve I) and 117 (curve II) vehicles/h. (c, d) { 0 n-ram p ow rate dependencies of the average speed (c), ow rate and density (d) on the main road at locations of the minimum of the average speed. (e) { 0 n-ram p ow rate dependences of the ow rate and density on the main road at the location 200 m upstream of the begin of the on-ram p m erging region. (f, g) { 0 n-ram p ow rate dependences of the ow rate (f) and density (in the ow (density plane) (g) on the main road in free ow downstream of the bottleneck. (h) { Wave of dense ow that starts to propagate upstream with the velocity \boldsymbol{v}_d 0.7 km /h under the condition (62) at a very sm all value q = 3 vehicles/h; $t_1 = 15$, $t_2 = 25$, $t_3 = 55$, t₄ = 90 m in; q_{on} = 120 vehicles/h; the determ inistic perturbation (curve II) is the sam e as those in (a). D otted curves on (d, e, g) show steady m odel states in the ow {density plane. $q_{in} = 2676$ vehicles/h, $q_0 = 2795$ vehicles/h. 5-m in averaged data.

averaged (determ inistic) perturbation on the main road decreases when q_{on} increases (points 1{3 in gure 14 (c)). In the OV-model, when q_n increases, the location of the minimum speed within the determ inistic perturbation on the main road exhibits

rstly a slight shift downstream and then upstream within the merging region of the on-ram p (gure 14 (a, b)). For this reason, the ow rate on the main road at the location of the minimum speed within the deterministic perturbation on the main road rstly slightly increases and then decreases (points 1{3 in gure 14 (d)), whereas the ow rate on the main road upstream of the on-ram p merging region is equal to q_h (points 1{3 in gure 14 (e)). When q_n increases beginning from zero, the ow rate q_{sum} downstream of the bottleneck increases beginning from $q_{sum} = q_{in}$ (points 1{3 in gure 14 (f) and (g)).

At a given large enough ow rate q_n this grow the of the local perturbation in free ow at the bottleneck with q_n has a limit. This limit is reached when the ow rate q_{bn} reaches some critical value $q_{bn} = q_{bn}^{(d)}$ at which the ow rate q_{um} is equal to the maximum ow rate on the fundam ental diagram:

$$q_{sum} = q_{in} + q_{on}^{(d)} = q_0$$
: (61)

W hen the ow rate qn increases further, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}_{\rm in} + \mathbf{q}_{\rm pn} \quad \mathbf{q} > 0; \tag{62}$$

then the upstream front of the initial perturbation, which is motion less at the condition $q_{sum} = q_{in} + q_{on}$ q (curve II in gure 14 (h)), begins to move upstream of the bottleneck, i.e., a wave of lower speed and greater density propagating upstream appears (spatial speed distributions related to the times t_1 { t_4 in gure 14 (h)). As a result, a dense ow associated with the branch of the diagram with a negative slope occurs upstream of the bottleneck (gures 13 (c) and (d) and points 4{6 in gures 14 (c){ (e)}. At the critical point (61), the derivative of the minimum average speed on the main road on the ow rate q_n is discontinuous, whereas this speed is a continuous decreasing function of q_{bn} (gure 14 (c)). The greater the ow rate g_1 , speci cally, the greater q (62), the greater absolute velocity of the wave of dense ow propagation j_{dj} (gures 13 (c) and (d)). In addition, the ow rate downstream of the bottleneck, which is equal to q_0 under the condition (61), remains approximately to be equal to q_0 , when q_{bn} increases (points 4{6 in gures 14 (f) and (g)).

It must be noted that the above mentioned behaviour of the upstream front of the perturbation at the bottleneck in the OV model (56), (59) is qualitatively dienent from those for the upstream front of the perturbation at the bottleneck in the ATD – and SA models. In the latter case, when the ow rate q_n reaches the critical value for an F! S transition, a wave of synchronized ow occurs abruptly and propagates upstream with a nite velocity. This is associated with a rst-order F! S transition. In contrast, in the OV model there is no discontinuous change in the velocity v_d when due to an increase in q_{bn} the condition (62) is satistical ow rate $q_n^{(d)}$ associated with the critical ow rate $q_n^{(d)}$ is associated with the critical ow rate $q_n^{(d)}$. Thus, in the OV model there is no discontinuous from the critical ow rate $q_n^{(d)}$ associated with the condition (61). Specific cally, we not that if q! = 0, then $\frac{1}{2}rj! = 0$. Thus, in the OV model there is no rst-order phase transition from free ow to dense ow .

The widening dense ow upstream of the bottleneck (gures 13 (c) and (d) and 14 (h)) can exist only, when the density $_{\rm d}$ in the dense ow satisfies the condition

$$_{0} < _{d} < _{cr}^{(J)} :$$
 (63)

This is because at the density $_{\rm d} = _{\rm cr}^{(J)}$ the dense ow loses its stability against wide moving jam emergence (point 7 and dotted down-arrow in gure 14 (c)). However, dynamic waves that emerge due to vehicle merging at the bottleneck propagate through the dense ow. For this reason, in numerical simulations this moving jam emergence occurs already at the density $_{\rm d} < _{\rm cr}^{(J)}$ (point 6 and solid down-arrow in qure 14 (c)).

The congested patterns in gures 13 (d) and (e) at the rst glance resemble a widening SP and an GP, respectively. Indeed, in both cases a dense ow occurs upstream of the bottleneck whose downstream front is xed at the bottleneck. Thus, this dense ow should satisfy the macroscopic spatiotem poral objective criteria for the synchronized ow phase (Sect. 1). This conclusion is, how ever, incorrect. To explain this, note that in empirical observations application of the objective criteria, which de ne the tra c phases in congested tra c, leads to clear distinction of the synchronized ow phase. This synchronized ow exhibits the following fundamental empirical feature: An F! S transition leading to synchronized ow emergence is a

rst-order phase transition. In contrast, in a tracon with model an application of the objective criteria does not guarantee that dense ow occurrence in free ow is associated with a rst-order phase transition, which is one of the requirements for the synchronized ow phase.

This conclusion concerns the OV m odel (56), (59) (gure 13 (b)) as well as other m odels in the context of the fundam ental diagram approach under condition (59). W hereas for the SA-m odel there is a Z-shaped speed { ow characteristic associated with a rst-order F! S transition in free ow at the bottleneck (gures 6 (c) { (e) }, for the OV m odel the on-ram p ow rate dependence of the speed at the bottleneck is a monotonous decreasing function (gure 14 (c)): There is no rst-order phase transition, when a dense ow related to the fundam ental diagram with a negative slope is form ed upstream of the bottleneck. Thus, the dense tra c ow in the case of the OV m odel and other m odels in the context of the fundam ental diagram approach under condition (59) does not exhibit the im portant em pirical feature of synchronized ow and, therefore, the dense ow is not associated with the synchronized ow phase.

There are also tra c ow models in the context of the fundam ental diagram approach, in which there is no instability of steady model states on the fundam ental diagram regardless of the vehicle density. Examples of this model class are as follows: (i) An OV model (56) in which the sensitivity A (g; v) is great enough regardless of v and g. (ii) The Nagel-Schreckenberg cellular autom ata m odel in the determ inistic model limit, i.e., when probability of model uctuations in this model is equal zero (p = 0) [46]. (iii) The Lighthill-W hitham -Richards m odel [47] and the associated celltransm ission m odels [48]. In this m odel class, tra c patterns at a freew ay bottleneck are qualitatively similar as those found in the OV model (56), (59) at the density considerably smaller than the critical density $_{\rm cr}^{\rm (J)}$ (the patterns associated with points $1\{5 \text{ in } qures 14 (c) \{(q)\}$. These common model features are as follows: 1) the local perturbation at the bottlenecks at q < 0 (gures 14 (a) and (b)); 2) widening dense ow upstream of the bottleneck at q > 0 (gures 13(c) and (d) and 14 (h)); 3) there is no discontinuous change in speed (no speed breakdown) at the bottleneck when widening dense ow occurs; 4) with an increase in trac dem and at q 0, the upstream front velocity of widening dense ow increases continuously beginning from zero. Thus, in this model class, there is no rst-order F! S transition observed during the onset of congestion at the bottleneck, i.e., this dense ow has no relation to real

freeway tra c.

6.3. Conclusions

(i) Two di erent determ inistic m icroscopic tra c ow model classes in the context of three-phase tra c theory, the ATD – and SA -m odels, have been introduced in the article.

(ii) The ATD - and SA m odels reproduce in portant empirical spatiotem poral features of phase transitions in trac c ow and congested trac patterns.

(iii) In contrast with all other known determ inistic microscopic trac c ow models, in the ATD - and SA-models vehicles moving in free ow and vehicles moving in synchronized ow exhibit qualitatively dierent dynamic behaviour. This is a result of the introduction of two separated regions of steady state model solutions for free

ow and synchronized ow in the ATD - and SA-models as well as di erent dynamic rules of vehicle motion in free ow and synchronized ow implemented in the models.

(iv) As in empirical observations, there is a rst-order phase transition in the ATD - and SA-m odels from free ow to synchronized ow that explained the onset of congestion at bottlenecks in these m odels.

(v) The nature of the onset of congestion as a st-order F! S transition in free ow at the bottleneck, which the ATD - and SA -m odels show, is also associated with m etastability of free ow at the bottleneck against external short-time disturbances in this ow in a neighbourhood of the bottleneck. A s a result, there is multiple congested pattern em ergence in an initial free ow at the bottleneck in the ATD - and SA -m odels: D epending on an amplitude (or duration) of an external disturbance, one of the SP s or else an GP can be induced in free ow at the bottleneck at the same chosen m odel param eters.

(vi) In accordance with empirical results, in the ATD – and SA-models moving jams can emerge spontaneously in synchronized ow only, i.e., as a result of F ! S! J transitions.

(vii) In addition to the above common behaviour of the ATD - and SA-models, these models exhibit also some qualitatively different features. This is because in the ATD-model synchronized ow model steady states are related to a 2D-region in the ow (density plane, whereas synchronized ow model steady states in the SA-models

belong to an 1D -region (a curve) in the ow {density plane. In particular, the following di erences of model features have been found:

(1) The ATD-m odel can show all types of spatiotem poral congested patterns at an on-ram p bottleneck observed in em pirical observations.

(2) In contrast, SA-m odels cannot show LSPs associated with empirical results as well as some of empirical features of synchronized ow between wide moving jams within GPs.

(viii) M odels in the context of the fundam ental diagram approach reviewed in [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] cannot explain the onset of congestion in free ow, which in empirical observations is associated with a rst-order F! S transition. D epending on the m odel type and m odel parameters, in these m odels either wide m oving jam emergence is responsible for the onset of congestion at an on-ramp bottleneck rather than an empirically observed F! S transition or a widening dense trac ow occurs upstream of the bottleneck when the density in free ow at the bottleneck exceeds the density associated with the maximum point on the fundam ental diagram. In the latter case, in contrast with empirical observations there is no rst-order phase transition from an

initial free ow to this dense ow at the bottleneck: The dense ow results from nonhom ogeneity of a freeway in a neighbourhood of the bottleneck. Thus, these models cannot show a rst-order F! S transition observed during the onset of congestion at the bottleneck in real freeway tra c, i.e., this dense ow has no relation to real freeway tra c. Indeed, the rst-order F! S transition is a fundamental empirical feature of the onset of congestion in free ow with the subsequent synchronized ow phase emergence at the bottleneck.

Appendix A.

To derive form ula (18) [45], let us consider a solution of (16) when it is an equality:

$$v_{s}(g; v_{s}) = \frac{2b_{s}g + v_{s}^{2}}{b_{s}T_{s} + \frac{2b_{s}g + v_{s}^{2}}{b_{s}^{2}T_{s}^{2} + 2b_{s}g + v_{s}^{2}}}:$$
 (A.1)

From (16), (A.1), it can be seen that if $g = v \cdot T_s$, then the safe speed $v_s = v \cdot$; if in contrast $g < v \cdot T_s$, then the speed $v_s < v \cdot$. In particular, this ensures collision less vehicle motion. To simplify the formula (A.1), let us replace the space gap g in denominator of (A.1) by the value $v \cdot T_s$. This reduces the safe speed v_s at $g < v \cdot T_s$, therefore, the safety condition (16) remains to be valid. Then from formula (A.1), we get

$$v_{s}(g; v_{s}) = \frac{g + v_{s}^{2} = (2b_{s})}{T_{s} + v_{s} = (2b_{s})};$$
 (A 2)

To provide m one comfortable vehicle deceleration, an anticipated gap $g^{(a)} = g + (v, v)T_0$ is used in formula (A 2) rather than the gap g. As a result, (A 2) takes the form

$$v_{s}(g; v_{s}) = \frac{g + (v_{s} - v_{s})T_{0} + v_{s}^{2} = (2b_{s})}{T_{s} + v_{s} = (2b_{s})}:$$
(A.3)

Substituting (A.3) into (15), we nd formula (18) with coe ciens (19), (20).

Note that we have also tested another form ulation for the safe speed in the ATD - model when the speed $v_s(g; v_{\cdot})$ in (15) is given by form ula (A.1). Simulations of the ATD - model show that both form ulations (18) and (A.1) ensure collision less vehicle motion at an appropriate choice of model parameters and lead to qualitatively the same features of phase transitions and congested patterns.

Appendix B.

In this Appendix, two further variants of the SA-m odels are presented. In the st of these variants, the form ula (36) reads as follows

$$\frac{dv}{dt} = \begin{cases} a^{(\text{free})} & \text{atg } g_{\text{m in}}^{(\text{free})}; \\ a^{(\text{syn})} & \text{atg}_{\text{m ax}}^{(\text{jam})} < g < g_{\text{m in}}^{(\text{free})}; \\ a^{(\text{jam})} & \text{at0 } g \quad g_{\text{m ax}}^{(\text{jam})}; \end{cases}$$
(B.1)

where $a^{(free)}$, $a^{(syn)}$, $a^{(jam)}$ are given by (37){ (41). In this SA-m odel, steady states of free ow (the curve F in gure 2 (e)) correspond to the condition (43), averaged steady states of synchronized ow are related to a line S given by the condition

$$q = (1 = {\binom{(jam)}{m in}} = T_{av}^{(syn)} \text{ at } {\binom{(free)}{m ax}} < {\binom{(jam)}{m in}}; \tag{B 2}$$

steady states for a wide moving jam are associated with the condition (47) (gure 2 (e)).

In another variant of SA-m odel, form ula (36) reads as follows

$$\frac{dv}{dt} = \begin{cases} a^{(\text{free})} & \text{at } g & g_{\text{h in}}^{(\text{free})}; \\ a^{(\text{FS})} & \text{at } g_{\text{max}}^{(\text{syn})} < g < g_{\text{m in}}^{(\text{free})}; \\ a^{(\text{syn})} & \text{at } g_{\text{max}}^{(\text{syn})} < g & g_{\text{h ax}}^{(\text{syn})}; \\ a^{(\text{syn})} & \text{at } g_{\text{max}}^{(\text{jam})} < g & g_{\text{h ax}}^{(\text{syn})}; \\ a^{(\text{jam})} & \text{at } 0 & g & g_{\text{max}}^{(\text{jam})}: \end{cases}$$
(B.3)

In (B 3), $g_{max}^{(syn)}$ is the maximum space gap in synchronized ow; $a^{(jam)}$, $a^{(free)}$, $a^{(syn)}$ are given by (37) in which $a^{(jam)}$ is taken from (40),

$$\begin{aligned} & a^{\text{(Iree)}}(g; v; v_{2}) = A^{\text{(Iree)}}(V^{\text{(Iree)}}(g) \quad v) + \\ & K^{\text{(free)}}(v_{2} \quad v); \end{aligned} \tag{B.4} \\ & a^{\text{(syn)}}(g; v; v_{2}) = A^{\text{(syn)}} V_{av}^{\text{(syn)}}(g) \quad v + \end{aligned}$$

$$K^{(syn)}(v; v_{1})(v, v);$$
 (B.5)

where the sensitivity

$$K^{(syn)}(v; v_{\prime}) = \begin{cases} K^{(acc)} & at v < v_{\prime}; \\ K^{(dec)} & at v & v_{i}; \end{cases}$$
(B.6)

K $^{(\text{free})}$ is a sensitivity, $V_{av}^{(\text{syn})}$ (g) is given by (41). A function $a^{(FS)}$ (g; v; v,) in (B.3) is taken as follows

$$a^{(FS)}(g; v; v) = m in a_{max}; A^{(FS)}(V^{(FS)}(g) v) + K^{(free)}(v, v);$$
(B.7)

where the function V $^{(FS)}(g) = V(g)$ at $g_{max}^{(syn)} < g < g_{min}^{(free)}$, A $^{(FS)}$ is a sensitivity that in a general case can be di erent from the sensitivity A $^{(free)}$ in free ow.

In the SA-m odel (B.3) { (B.7), steady states of free ow (the curve F in gure 2 (f)) are associated with the condition (43), averaged steady states of synchronized ow are related to a line S given by the condition

$$q = (1 = {\binom{(jam)}{m in}} = T_{av}^{(syn)} \text{ at } {\binom{(syn)}{m in}} < {\binom{(jam)}{m in}}; \tag{B.8}$$

where $\frac{(syn)}{m in} = 1 = (g_{m ax}^{(syn)} + d)$, and steady states for a wide moving jam are found from the condition (47) (gure 2 (f)).

In contrast with the other SA-m odels, the SA-m odel (B.3) { (B.7) has a limited density range of steady states between steady states for free ow and synchronized ow, which are found from the condition

$$a^{(FS)} = 0$$
 at $g_{max}^{(syn)} < g < g_{min}^{(free)}$: (B.9)

Eq. (B.9) yields the following condition for these steady states in the $ow \{ \text{density} p \text{lane} (\text{curve F S in } gure 2 (f)) \}$

$$q = V_F () \text{ at } \underset{m \text{ ax}}{^{(\text{free})}} < < \underset{m \text{ in}}{^{(\text{syn})}}; \tag{B 10}$$

where the density $m_{max}^{(free)}$ at the maximum point for free ow is not greater than the density $_0$ associated with the maximum point on the curve FS (gure 2 (f)). To simulate a rst-order F! S transition, the steady state model solutions (B.10) should be unstable against in nitesimal non-hom ogeneous perturbations. This requirement

to the SA-m odel (B.3) { (B.7) is easy satis ed through an appropriated choice of the function V ^(FS) (g) and the sensitivities A ^(FS), K ^(free), K ^(syn). In this case, num erical simulations of the SA-m odel (B.3) { (B.7) m ade show that this model exhibits F! S! J transitions in accordance with empirical results (we used the following parameters for the SA-m odel (B.3) { (B.7): V (g) = V₀ tanh ((g g)=g₁) + tanh (g₀=g₁) with V₀ = 14 m /s, g₀ = 21 m, g₁ = 7 m; g_{max}^(syn) = 24 m; A ^(free) = A ^(FS) = 0:1 s ¹; K ^(free) = 0:6 s ¹; K ^(acc) = 0:4 s ¹; K ^(dec) is taken from Table 1 with K ^(dec) = 1 s ¹, v_c = 9 m /s, = 0.05; other parameters are the same as those in the SA-m odel (35) { (41) }.

 N.H.Gartner, C.J.Messer, A.Rathi (eds.). Special Report 165: Revised M onograph on Tra c Flow Theory (Transportation Research Board, W ashington, D C. 1997)

- [2] D.E.Wolf.Physica A 263,438 (1999)
- [3] D. Chow dhury, L. Santen, A. Schadschneider. Physics Reports 329, 199 (2000)
- [4] D.Helbing.Rev.M od.Phys.73, 1067(1141 (2001)
- [5] T.Nagatani.Rep.Prog.Phys.65, 1331 (1386 (2002)
- [6] K.Nagel, P.Wagner, R.Woesler. Operation Res. 51, 681 (716 (2003)
- [7] B S.Kemer.The Physics of Trasc (Springer, Berlin, New York 2004).
- [8] J.-B. Lesort (editor). Transportation and Tra c Theory, Proceedings of the 13th International Symposium on Transportation and Tra c Theory (Elsevier Science Ltd, Oxford 1996)
- [9] A. Ceder (editor). Transportation and Tra c Theory, Proceedings of the 14th International Sym posium on Transportation and Tra c Theory (Elsevier Science Ltd, Oxford 1999)
- [10] M A P. Taylor (editor). Transportation and Tra c Theory in the 21st Century, Proceedings of the 15th International Sym posium on Transportation and Tra c Theory (Elsevier Science Ltd, Am sterdam 2002)
- [11] D E.W olf, M. Schreckenberg, A.Bachem (editors). Tra c and G ranular Flow, Proceedings of the International W orkshop on Tra c and G ranular Flow, O ctober 1995 (W orld Scientic, Singapore 1995)
- [12] M. Schreckenberg, D.E. Wolf (editors). Trac and Granular Flow' 97, Proceedings of the International Workshop on Trac and Granular Flow, October 1997 (Springer, Singapore 1998)
- [13] D.Helbing, H.J.Hernmann, M.Schreckenberg, D.E.W olf (editors). Trac and Granular Flow, 99, Proceedings of the International W orkshop on Trac and Granular Flow, October 1999, (Springer, Heidelberg 2000)
- [14] M. Fukui, Y. Sugiyama, M. Schreckenberg, D.E. W olf (editors). Trac and Granular Flow, 01, Proceedings of the International W orkshop on Trac and Granular Flow, O ctober 2001, (Springer, Heidelberg 2003)
- [15] S.P.Hoogendoorn, S.Luding, P.H.L.Bovy, M.Schreckenberg, D.E.Wolf (editors). Trac and Granular Flow' 03, Proceedings of the International Workshop on Trac and Granular Flow, October 2003, (Springer, Heidelberg 2005)
- [16] H J.Payne. In: M athem atical M odels of Public System s, edited by G A .Bekey, Vol.1 (Simulation Council, La Jolla 1971); Transportation Research Record 772, 68 (1979)
- [17] R.Kuhne: In: Highway Capacity and Level of Service, edited by U.Brannolte (A A.Balkema, Rotterdam 1991) pp.211
- [18] B.S.Kerner, P.Konhauser. Phys. Rev. E 48 2335{2338 (1993)
- [19] A.Klar, R.Kuhne, R.Wegener Surv.Math.Ind., 6, 215 (239 (1996).
- [20] N.Bellom o, M.Delitala, V.Coscia.Math.ModelsMeth.Appl.Sci.12, 1801{1844 (2002).
- [21] S.Darbha, K.R.Rajagopal. System s and Control Letters 43, 387-401 (2001).
- [22] 4.S.Darbha, K.R.Rajagopal. M athem atical Problem s in Engineering 7, 379-392 (2001).
- [23] R.Herman, E.W. Montroll, R.B.Potts, R.W. Rothery. Operations Res. 7, 86{106 (1959).
- [24] D.C.Gazis, R.Herman, and R.W. Rothery, Operations Res. 9, 545 [567 (1961).
- [25] T.Nagatani and K.Nakanishi, Phys. Rev. E 57, 6415 (1998).
- [26] I.Lubashevsky, P.W agner, R.M ahnke, European Phys.J.B 32, 243 (247 (2003).
- [27] G F.Newell, Operations Res. 9, 209 (1961).
- [28] G.B.W hitham, Proc.R.Soc.London A 428,49 (1990).
- [29] M. Bando, K. Hasebe, A. Nakayama, A. Shibata, Y. Sugiyama, Jpn. J. Appl. M ath. 11, 203 (1994); Phys. Rev. E 51, 1035 (1042 (1995).
- [30] M.Treiber, D.Helbing, e-print, cond-m at/9901239 (1999).
- [31] M. Treiber, A. Hennecke, D. Helbing, Phys. Rev. E 62, 1805 (1824 (2000).
- [32] B.S.Kemer, H.Rehborn. Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 4030 (1997).
- [33] B.S.Kemer, Phys.Rev.Lett. 81, 3797 (1998).

- [34] B.S.Kerner, Phys. Rev. E 65, 046138 (2002).
- [35] B.S.Kemer, S.L.Klenov: J.Phys.A: Math.Gen.35, L31 (2002)
- [36] B.S.Kemer, S.L.Klenov, D.E.Wolf, J.Phys.A: Math.Gen. 35 9971 (10013 (2002).
- [37] B.S.Kemer, S.L.Klenov, Phys. Rev. 68 036130 (2003)
- [38] B.S.Kemer, S.L.Klenov: J.Phys.A: Math.Gen. 37 8753 (8788 (2004).
- [39] B.S. Kerner, S.L. Klenov, H. Hiller: physics/0507094 (2005). E-print in http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0507094.
- [40] L.C. Davis: Phys. Rev. E 69 016108 (2004).
- [41] H.K. Lee, R. Barlovic, M. Schreckenberg, D. Kim: Phys. Rev. Let. 92, 238702 (2004).
- [42] R.Jiang, Q.S.W u: J.Phys.A: Math.Gen. 37, 8197 [8213 (2004).
- [43] P.G.G ipps: Trans.Res.B.15, 105{111 (1981); 20, 403{414 (1986).
- [44] B.S.Kemer, P.Konhauser: Phys.Rev.E 50, 54(83 (1994).
- [45] B.S. Kemer, S.L. Klenov: physics/0507120 (2005), E-print in http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0507120.
- [46] NagelK and Schreckenberg M 1992 J Phys. (France) I 2 2221
- [47] Lighthill M J and W hitham G B 1955 Proc. R. Soc. A 229 317 Richards P I 1956 Operations Res. 4 42
- [48] Daganzo C 1999 In [9] 81-104