Car following behavioral stochasticity analysis and modelling
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This paper analyzes the car following behavioral stochasticity based on the experimental trajectory data by measuring the wave travel time $T_n(t)$ of vehicle $n$. The analysis shows that the $T_n(t)$ does not follow a consistent pattern. In particular, we found that (i) No matter the speed of leading vehicle oscillates significantly or slightly, $T_n(t)$ might change significantly; (ii) Even if the leader is asked to move with the same speed, the oscillation pattern of $T_n(t)$ might be different from run to run; (iii) Sometimes, even if the speed of leader severely fluctuates, $T_n(t)$ can keep a nearly constant value. Further investigations show that the time series of the increment $\xi_n(t) = T_n(t) - T_n(t-dt)$ follows a mean reversion process, based on which a simple stochastic Newell model is proposed to reproduce the realistic wave travel time. Simulation results show that not only the concave growth pattern of oscillations but also the empirical congested traffic states can be successfully simulated by the new model, including the stable congested traffic states that cannot be simulated by recent stochastic car following models.

Keywords: car following; traffic oscillation; stochasticity; concave growth of oscillations
1 Introduction

Traffic congestion is a nuisance to motorists since it causes more oscillations and discomfort, and results in more fuel consumption and more accidents. Due to the complicated driving behaviors, traffic flow exhibits many fascinating phenomena such as traffic breakdown and capacity drop (Chen et al., 2012a), hysteresis (Ahn, et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2012b), spontaneous formation of jams (Treiterer and Myers, 1974; Zheng et al., 2011), wide scattering of flow density data in congested flow (Treiber et al., 2003). To understand the mechanism of these phenomena is an essential issue for better controlling traffic flow and managing traffic congestion. However, up to now our understanding of traffic flow is limited due to human behavior involved. Actually, there are controversies (Kerner, 2004; Treiber et al., 2010; Schönhof and Helbing, 2009) in the field.

To simulate and understand the car-following behavior, many car-following models have been proposed. The earliest one might be traced back to the Pipes model (Pipes, 1953), which is based on the assumption that drivers maintain a constant space headway. Since then, many classical models have been developed, to name a few, General Motor models (Gazis et al., 1961), Gipps models (Gipps, 1981), Optimal Velocity model (Bando et al, 1995), Full Velocity Difference model (Jiang et al, 2001), Intelligent Driver model (IDM, Treiber et al, 2000). Some models have been successfully used in commercial software, such as Wiedemann model in VISSIM (Wiedemann, 1974), Fritzsche model in PARAMICS (Fritzsche, 1994), and Gipps model in AIMSUN.

In 2002, Newell proposed a simple model, in which it is assumed that a follower’s trajectory overlaps its leader’s shifted by a time \( \tau \) and spacing \( \delta \). In Newell model, traffic oscillations neither amplify nor dampen, which is not consistent with observations. To overcome the deficiency of Newell model, Laval and Leclercq (2010) (LL) proposed that vehicle trajectories accord well with Newell’s car-following model before they experience traffic oscillations. However, the trajectories can deviate
from Newell trajectories when experiencing traffic oscillations. As a result, the LL model is shown to
be able to reproduce traffic oscillations observed in NGSIM data. Later, Chen et al. (2012a) further
considered the timid and aggressive driving behaviors in LL model.

The above-mentioned models are deterministic ones. In the models, the growth of traffic
oscillations is due to instability of the models themselves. However, recently, more and more studies
indicate that stochasticity plays a nontrivial role in traffic flow. Wagner (2012) introduced the strong
fluctuation of preferred headway to simulate the macroscopically observable randomness in traffic flow.
Laval et al. (2014) introduced white noise into the Newell model, which then enables the model to
reproduce the formation of oscillations. Later, Yuan et al. (2018) and Xu and Laval (2019) further
improve the model by Laval et al. (2014).

Apart from above theoretical efforts, empirical and experimental attempts were also made. The
Next-Generation Simulation project (NGSIM, 2006) acquired the vehicle trajectories dataset, see
Figure 1 for an example. There are two kinds of congested patterns shown in Figure 1. Figure 1 (a)
illustrates that jams firstly emerged from the congested traffic flow in the bottleneck region and then
propagated upstream along the road, thus this congested traffic flow is unstable. In contrast, in Figure 1
(b), no jam was generated from the congested traffic flow, indicating that the congested traffic flow is
stable. Moreover, Sugiyama et al. (2008), Nakayama et al. (2009), Tadaki et al. (2013), and Stern et al.
(2018) performed traffic experiments on a circuit, which show that jams can spontaneously form in
high density traffic flow without bottlenecks.
Figure 1. Empirical spatiotemporal patterns of the velocity on the Lane 1 (a) and Lane 5 (b) lane from the NGSIM trajectory dataset collected on a 640 m-segment on southbound US 101. The color bar indicates speed (unit: m/s).

Recently, we also organized the experimental study of car following behaviors on an open road section (Jiang et al., 2014, 2015, 2018; Huang et al., 2018). The concave growth pattern of traffic oscillations was discovered, i.e. the standard deviation of vehicle speed grows along the vehicle platoon in a concave way. However, the oscillations initially grow in a convex way in the classical deterministic car-following models mentioned above, which contradicts with the experimental finding. Besides, we proposed two different kinds of car-following models taking the stochastic factors into account. It was shown that the two kinds of models can reproduce the concave growth of oscillations. Furthermore, the acceleration noise IDM (ANIDM), action point IDM (APIDM), and Two-Regime Stochastic car-following Model (TRSM) have been proposed that also reproduce the concave growth of traffic oscillations with the consideration of stochasticity, see Treiber and Kesting (2018), Xu and
Laval (2019) and the appendix for the details. All of them can simulate the spontaneously jam formation, see Figure A1 in the Appendix, which further demonstrates the importance of stochasticity on traffic flow evolution. Unfortunately, we have tried various bottleneck strength and parameter values of these models, and found that none of them is able to reproduce the stable congested patterns (shown in Figure 1 (b)).

On the other hand, although various forms of driving stochasticity have been incorporated into classical car following models, such as the acceleration noise (Treiber and Kesting, 2018; Xu and Laval, 2019), no empirical analysis based on the vehicle trajectories has been reported. We believe the analysis is important, since it not only reveals the strength and the form of driving stochasticity, but also sheds light on the modelling of stochasticity.

In this paper, following the framework of Laval and Leclercq (2010), we measure the wave travel time from the leader to the follower. By analyzing the experimental data, we found that the driving stochasticity, reflected by the wave travel time increment, follows a mean reversion process. Based on this finding, a new stochastic Newell type model is proposed. Simulations show that it is able to reproduce both the stable and the unstable congested traffic flow and the concave growth pattern of traffic oscillations.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, previous models are reviewed. The experimental data are analyzed in Section 3, then the time series of the wave travel time increment are investigated and modelled in Section 4. Section 5 proposes a new car following model and conducts the simulations. Conclusions are given in Section 6.

2 The framework

Newell’s car following model (abbreviated as NCM, see Newell, 2002) assumes that the following vehicle’s trajectory is the trajectory of the leading vehicle with a translation in time and space. Let $n-1$
denote the vehicle ahead of vehicle $n$, and their location and speed are $x_{n-1}$ and $x_n$, $v_{n-1}$ and $v_n$, respectively. When vehicle $n-1$ changes its speed from $v_{n-1} = v$ to $v_{n-1} = v'$, vehicle $n$ will adjust its speed in the same way after a space displacement of $s_0$ and an adjusting time of $\tau$ to reach the preferred spacing for the new speed $v'$. Under the car-following context, NCM is described by

$$x_n(t + \tau) = x_n(t) + \min\left(x_n^\text{free}(t), x_n^\text{cong}(t)\right)$$

(1)

where the free moving and congested moving terms are defined as

$$x_n^\text{free}(t) = v_{\text{max}} \tau$$

(2)

$$x_n^\text{cong}(t) = x_{n-1}(t) - x_n(t) - \delta$$

(3)

where $v_{\text{max}}$ is the maximum speed. NCM adopts a single wave speed $-w = -\delta/\tau = -(L_{\text{veh}} + s_0)/\tau$ independent of traffic states. Here $L_{\text{veh}}$ is vehicle length. Traffic information, such as speeds, flows, spacing, etc., propagate unchanged along characteristic travelling wave with speed either $v_{\text{max}}$ or $-w$.

However, disturbances will never grow or decay in NCM. Laval and Leclerq (2010) reported that vehicle trajectories will deviate from the Newell trajectories (which are generated by the NCM) when the vehicles go through the traffic oscillations. To capture these deviations, the congested moving term is revised as (Chen et al., 2012a),

$$x_n^\text{cong}(t) = x_{n-1}(t - \eta_n(t)) - x_n(t) - \delta \eta_n(t)$$

(4)

$$\eta_n(t) = T_n(t)/\tau$$

(5)

The term $T_n(t)$ is the actual wave travel time, see Figure 2.
Laval and Leclerq (2010) assume that: (i) $\eta_n(t) = 1$ under the equilibrium driving states; (ii) there are three kinds of variation patterns of $\eta_n(t)$ when the vehicles are under the nonequilibrium driving states, i.e. the concave triangle, the convex triangle and constant patterns, see Figure 3, where $\eta_n^0 = \eta_n^1 = 1$ and $\varepsilon_n^0 = \varepsilon_n^1$.

Later, Chen et al. (2012a) have examined the traffic oscillations in the NGSIM US101 trajectory data to verify above assumptions of Laval and Leclerq (2010) and found that: (1) $\eta_n^0 (\varepsilon_n^0)$ may be different from $\eta_n^1 (\varepsilon_n^1)$; (2) $\eta_n^0$ and $\eta_n^1$ do not necessarily equal 1, and they do not necessarily equal each other. Before entering into the oscillation, the vehicle is in the state with $\eta_n (t) = \eta_n^0$. After exiting the oscillation, the vehicle changes into another state with $\eta_n (t) = \eta_n^1$. 

Figure 2. The measurement of $T_n(t)$. 

![Figure 2](image-url)
However, the NGSIM US101 trajectory data is very short, about 40s for each trajectory, thus their information is pretty limited. In the following section, longer car following trajectories data will be investigated by analyzing the $T_n(t)$ time series. Since $T_n(t) = \eta_n(t) \tau$, the variation of $T_n(t)$ should also exhibit the same pattern as that of $\eta_n(t)$.

3 Experimental data analysis

3.1. Data description

In this paper, the stationary states of the 25-car-platoon experiments (Jiang et al., 2014, 2015) will be extracted and analyzed. The experiments were carried out on a 3.2 km road in Hefei, China. In the experiment, the leading vehicle is required to drive at certain pre-determined constant values, see Figure 4 for some examples. Other drivers are required to drive as normally as they can. Overtaking and lane-changing is prohibited during the experiment. The speed and location data are collected by the high-precision GPS devices every 0.1s.
3.2 Some observed features of $T_n(t)$ time series

To calculate the $T_n(t)$ time series, firstly $\tau$ and $w$ are calibrated. The Genetic algorithm is adopted to minimize the difference between the simulated distance gap and experimental one of the concerned vehicle. Figure 5 shows the distributions of $\tau$ and $w$. Table 1 is the statistics results. Their mean values are 1.68 s and 11.19 km/h, respectively.

![Figure 5. The distributions of $\tau$ and $w$.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple size</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w$</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>10.029</td>
<td>11.194</td>
<td>5.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We examined the time series of $T_n(t)$ for all trajectories, and the most significant discoveries are that:

(i) No matter the speed of leading vehicle oscillates significantly (Figure 6) or slightly (Figure 7), $T_n(t)$ might change significantly.

(ii) Even if the leader is asked to move with the same speed, the oscillation pattern of $T_n(t)$ might be different from run to run, see Figure 7.

(iii) Sometimes, even if the speed of leader severely fluctuates, $T_n(t)$ can keep a nearly constant value (see Figure 8)

![Figure 6. $T_n(t)$, $v_n(t)$ and $v_{n-1}(t)$ time series of the leader-follower pairs, in which speed of the leader remarkably fluctuates. The standard deviations (STD) and coefficient of variations (CV) of the leader’s speed are (a) STD($v_{n-1}$) = 1.96 m/s, CV($v_{n-1}$) = 0.215; (b) STD($v_{n-1}$) = 1.70 m/s, CV($v_{n-1}$) = 0.253. The standard deviations (STD) and coefficient of variations (CV) of the follower’s $T_n$ are (a) STD($T_n$) = 0.59 s, CV($T_n$) = 0.28; (b) STD($T_n$) = 0.48 s, CV($T_n$) = 0.25.](image-url)
Figure 7. $T_n(t)$, $v_n(t)$ and $v_{n-1}(t)$ time series of the successive leader-follower pairs, in which speed of the leader only slightly fluctuates. The leader of the platoon is asked to move with 50 km/h in (a) and (b), 45 km/h in (c) and (d), 30 km/h in (e) and (f). The standard deviations (STD) and coefficient of variations (CV) of the leader’s speed and the follower’s $T_n$ are given in Table 2.

Table 2. The standard deviations (STD) and coefficient of variations (CV) of the leader’s speed and follower’s $T_n$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STD($v_{n-1}$)</td>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV($v_{n-1}$)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD($T_n$)</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV($T_n$)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. $T_n(t)$, $v_n(t)$ and $v_{n-1}(t)$ time series of the successive leader-follower pairs. The standard deviations (STD) and coefficient of variations (CV) of the leaders’ speed and follower’s $T_n$ are: (a) STD($v_{n-1}$) = 1.03 m/s, CV($v_{n-1}$) = 0.15, STD($T_n$) = 0.12 s, CV($T_n$) = 0.09; (b) STD($v_{n-1}$) = 1.43 m/s, CV($v_{n-1}$) = 0.37, STD($T_n$) = 0.07 s, CV($T_n$) = 0.07.

4 The analysis and modelling of $\zeta(t)$ time series

Now we study the time series of the wave travel time increment $\zeta_n(t) = T_n(t) - T_n(t-dt)$. Here $dt$ is the time step and is set to 0.1s, since GPS devices collected the speed and location data every 0.1s. Figure 9 shows three examples of time series of $\zeta_n(t)$, which oscillates around zero.
To study feature of the time series of $\xi_n(t)$, we have conducted the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test. The results show that 99.04% (618 trajectories of total 624 trajectories) $\xi_n(t)$ time series follows the mean reversion process (Chaudhuri and Wu, 2003).

We would like to mention that in our previous study (Tian et al., 2019), it has been found that the time series of $a_n(t) - \lambda \Delta v_n(t-\tau)$ also follows the mean reversion process. Here $\lambda$ is the sensitivity and $\Delta v_n(t-\tau)$ is the speed difference between the leader and follower with delay $\tau$. This indicates that the stochastic factors might exhibit common feature from different perspective. Further investigations are needed to explore this issue.

Therefore, we can use the mean reversion model to simulate $\xi(t)$. To this end, the Vasicek model was applied, which was originally used to describe the evolution of the instantaneous interest rate (Vasicek, 1977).

$$d\xi_n = \alpha(\mu - \xi_n)dt + \sigma dW_t$$

where $W_t$ is a standard Wiener process; the trajectories of $\xi(t)$ will evolve around the mean level $\mu$ in the long run; $\alpha$ is the mean reversion speed, which characterizes the speed at which such trajectories of $\xi(t)$ will regroup around $\mu$ in time; $\sigma$ is the volatility rate that measures instant by instant the amplitude of randomness entering the system. Higher $\sigma$ implies more randomness. Thus, the time series of $T_n(t)$ can be acquired by the following
\[ T_n(t) = T_n(t-dt) + \xi_n(t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where \( dt \) is the time step. It should be noted that, the boundary conditions should be considered to simulated \( T_n(t) \), i.e. \( T_n(t) \) is bounded by \( T_{\text{min}} \) and \( T_{\text{max}} \).

To calibrate Equation (6), the discrete form is adopted and the least square method is applied.

\[ \xi_n(t) = (1-\alpha dt)\xi_n(t-dt) + \alpha dt + \sigma dW_n \]  \hspace{1cm} (8)

The statistical results are shown in Figure 10 and Table 3.

![Figure 10. The distributions of \( \mu \), \( \alpha \) and \( \sigma \).](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple size</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu )</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the mean value of \( \mu \) is zero. Actually, all values of \( \mu \), each corresponding to one of the 624 trajectories, are close to zero. Thus, we assume \( \mu = 0 \) and Equation (9) is applied to model \( \xi_n(t) \).

\[ d\xi_n = -\alpha \xi_n dt + \sigma dW_n \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

Figure 11 shows 6 examples, which compare one realization of simulation result according to Equation (7) and (9) with the experimental result. One can see that the simulated \( T_n(t) \) time series are similar to
the corresponding experimental $T_n(t)$ time series. It should be noted that since Equation (9) is a stochastic model, a different $T_n(t)$ time series will be acquired at another realization. It is consistent with the reality: in the experimental data, see Figure 7, even if the speeds of the leader are the same, $T_n(t)$ are different in two experiments. Figure 12 is the Root Mean Square Percentage Error (RMPSE) of the simulated $T_n(t)$ and real $T_n(t)$. To calculate the RMPSE, we have conducted 1000 times of simulations. Then the smallest RMPSE is chosen to measure the model performance. The mean of the RMPSE is 0.143, which demonstrates that the real $T_n(t)$ can simulate the by Equation (7) and (8) very well.

Figure 11. The simulations of the $T_n(t)$ time series for three different vehicles.
5. The new car following model and simulation results

Based on above analysis, a simple car following model is proposed.

\begin{align}
\nu_n^{\text{free}} (t+\tau) &= \min(\nu_{\text{max}} , \nu_n (t) + a_n (t) \tau) \\
x_n (t+\tau) &= x_n (t) + \min(\nu_n^{\text{free}} (t+\tau) \tau , x_{n-1} (t) - x_n (t) - wT_n (t))
\end{align}

Here \( T_n(t) \) is updated according to Equation (7) and \( a_n (t) \) is the acceleration of vehicle \( n \) defined as follows.

\begin{align}
a_n (t) &= a \left( 1 - \frac{\nu_n (t)}{\nu_{\text{max}}} \right)
\end{align}

5.1 Concave growth of platoon oscillations simulation

Here we show that the new model can quantitatively reproduce the concave growth of platoon oscillations. To this end, the model parameter values are calibrated by the Genetic Algorithm to minimize the Root Mean Square Percentage Error (RMPSE) of the simulated and real speed standard deviations of vehicles and along the platoon. The results are as follows: \( \nu_{\text{max}}= 80 \text{ km/h}, a = 1.0 \text{ m/s}^2, \tau \)
\[ t_0 = 1.0 \text{ s}, \sigma = 0.0045 \text{ s}, s_0 = 2 \text{ m}, T_{\text{min}} = 0.5 \text{ s}, T_{\text{max}} = 2.5 \text{ s}, \text{ and } \alpha = 0.1 \text{ s}^{-1}. \] During the simulation, the vehicle length is set as 5 m.

The simulation results and the corresponding experimental ones are shown in Figure 13. It can be seen that: (1) the simulated speed standard deviation increases in a concave way along the platoon and agrees with the experimental results quite well; (2) the simulated spatiotemporal patterns reproduce the stripe structures as appearing in the experimental ones; (3) the platoon length also agrees with the experimental results very well.

Figure 13. The standard deviations (STD) of speed (a1)-(c1), the simulated spatiotemporal diagrams (a2)-(c2) and the platoon length (a3)-(c3) of the car following platoons. The car number 1 is the leading car. From (a1)-(c1), (a2)-(c2), (a3)-(c3) the leading car moves with \( v_{\text{leading}} = 50, 40 \) and 30 km/h, respectively.
Moreover, we perform sensitivity analysis via investigating the amplitude of platoon oscillation, which is described by the speed standard deviation of the last vehicle in the platoon. From Figure 14, it can be seen that (1) with the increase of mean reversion speed $\alpha$, the amplitude of platoon oscillation firstly increases and then decreases; (2) the volatility rate $\sigma$ and the upper bound $T_{\text{max}}$ are positively correlated with the amplitude of platoon oscillation; (3) the lower bound $T_{\text{min}}$ are almost independent of the amplitude of platoon oscillation.

![Figure 14. Relationship between parameter values and the standard deviation of speed. STD($v_{25}$) is the speed standard deviation of the last vehicle in the platoon.](image-url)
5.2. Empirical congested pattern simulation

There are two kinds of congested patterns shown by the empirical spatiotemporal traffic flow patterns in NGSIM data, which was collected on a 640m-segment on southbound US 101 in Los Angeles, CA, on June 15th, 2005 between 7:50 a.m. and 8:35 a.m., see Figure 1 (a) and (b). Figure 1 (a) shows that the jams firstly were generated from the congested traffic flow in the bottleneck region and then propagated upstream along the road, thus the congested traffic flow is unstable. While in Figure 1 (b), no jams were generated from the congested traffic flow, i.e. the traffic flow is stable. Chen et al. (2012a) have discovered that the rubbernecking caused by the clean-up work on Lane 1 between 7:50 a.m. and 8:05 a.m. is the most likely cause for these congested traffic flow in this segment. The rubbernecking zone is located at [320, 420] m, where the road length $L_{\text{road}} = 640$ m.

To simulate the rubbernecking bottleneck, the following rule is adopted. When vehicles enter the rubbernecking zone, they have a probability $p_{rub}$ to rubberneck which will lead them to decelerate with deceleration $d_{rub}$ for $h_{rub}$ second. Rubbernecking occurs at most once for the vehicle in the bottleneck region. During the simulation, the bottleneck is set to be located at $[0.8L_{\text{road}}, 0.8L_{\text{road}}+L_{\text{bottleneck}}]$ with the length $L_{\text{bottleneck}}=100$ m. The road is initially assumed to be filled with cars that are uniformly distributed with the density $k$ and speed $v_{\text{max}}$. For the leading car going beyond $L_{\text{road}}$, it will be removed from the simulation.

Figure 15 shows the simulation results of the new model. Comparing Figure 1 and Figure 15, it can be seen that the stable and unstable congested patterns can be successfully simulated by the new model. We also have conducted simulation for some other new stochastic car following models, such as the acceleration noise IDM (ANIDM), action point IDM (APIDM), and Two-Regime Stochastic Model (TRSM) (Treiber and Kesting (2018), Xu and Laval (2019)), however, none of them is able to reproduce the stable congested pattern (see Appendix).
Figure 15. The simulation of congested traffic flow on an open road with a rubberneck bottleneck with (a) $p_{rub} = 0.06$, $d_{rub} = 2.0 \text{ m/s}^2$, $h_{rub} = 6.0 \text{ s}$ and (b) $p_{rub} = 0.4$, $d_{rub} = 0.5 \text{ m/s}^2$, $h_{rub} = 2.0 \text{ s}$. The color bar indicates speed (unit: m/s).

6 Conclusions

Recent studies (Wagner, 2012; Jiang et al., 2014; Laval et al., 2014; Tian, et al., 2015; Treiber and Kesting, 2018) show that the driving stochasticity of car following behaviors plays a significant role in traffic flow evolution. There are already various kinds of stochasticity that have been introduced into the deterministic models, such as the acceleration noise or the fluctuation of the preferred time headway, but no empirical analysis based on the vehicle trajectories has been reported.

This paper conducted a detailed analysis on the driving stochasticity following the framework of Laval and Leclercq (2010) by measuring the wave travel time from leader to the follower. To this end, a set of vehicle platoon data are analyzed. The most significant findings are: (i) the wave travel time of
a given driver does not follow a consistent pattern no matter the speed of the leading vehicle significantly fluctuates or is nearly constant; (ii) the wave travel time increment follows a mean reversion process. Based on these findings, a new stochastic Newell type model is proposed. Simulations show that the new model is able to reproduce the concave growth pattern of traffic oscillations and the congested traffic flow patterns detected by the NGSIM US101 dataset. It worth to be noted that the stable congested traffic flow patterns (see Figure 1 (b)) cannot be reproduced by recent new car following models.

However, in this paper, the leader of the platoon always keeps a constant speed. In the future, car following experiments can be conducted by letting the leaders’ speed oscillate so that to examine the impact of external disturbances on traffic flow.

Appendix: Simulation Results of some recent models

A1. The acceleration noise IDM (ANIDM)

In ANIDM (Treiber and Kesting, 2018), the acceleration and velocity of vehicle \( n \) are given by

\[
a_n(t) = a_1 \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{v_n(t)}{v_{\text{max}}} \right)^4 - \left( \frac{v_n(t)T + s_0 - \frac{v_n(t)\Delta v_n(t)}{2\sqrt{ab}}}{d_n(t)} \right)^2 \right]
\]

\[v_n(t + dt) = \max \left( \min \left( v_n(t) + a_n(t)dt + \xi(t), v_{\text{max}} \right), 0 \right)\]

Here, \( \xi(t) \sim N \left( 0, \sqrt{\sigma dt} \right) \) is a normally distributed random number. \( \sigma \) denotes the noise strength and \( dt \) is the timestep.
Table A1. Parameter values of ANIDM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>$a$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$s_0$</th>
<th>$v_{\text{max}}$</th>
<th>$\delta$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>m/s$^2$</td>
<td>m/s$^2$</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>km/h</td>
<td>m/s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A2. The action point IDM (APIDM)

The APIDM (Treiber and Kesting, 2018) considers that there exists a maximum value of action point $\Delta a_{\text{max}}$, and $\Delta a_n$ is a uniformly distributed random number, $\Delta a_n \sim U[0, \Delta a_{\text{max}}]$. In APIDM, the acceleration changes to $a_n(t)$ only when

$$|a_n(t) - a_n(t')| > \Delta a_n$$

is satisfied, otherwise the acceleration equals to $a_n(t')$, $a_n(t)$ is IDM defined in Equation (A1), and $t'$ is the time of last change. When the acceleration changes, a new random number $\Delta a_n$ will be generated from the uniform distribution.

Table A2. Parameter values of APIDM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>$a$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$s_0$</th>
<th>$v_{\text{max}}$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$\Delta a_{\text{max}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>m/s$^2$</td>
<td>m/s$^2$</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>km/h</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>m/s$^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3. The Two-Regime Stochastic car-following Model (TRSM)

Xu and Laval (2019) have proposed the Two-Regime Stochastic car-following Model (TRSM), which incorporate the models of their previous works (Laval et al. 2014 and Yuan et al. 2018). They have shown that the TRSM can reproduce the concave growth of traffic oscillations. The model is
given as follows

\[ x_n^{\text{free}}(t) = x_n(t - \tau) + \max\left(\min\left(v_{\text{max}} \tau, \xi \right), 0\right) \]  
(A4)

\[ x_n^{\text{cong}}(t) = \max\left(x_n(t - \tau), x_{n+1}(t - \mu) - \mu - \max\left(v, 0\right)\right) \]  
(A5)

\[ x_n(t) = \min\left(x_n^{\text{cong}}(t), x_n^{\text{free}}(t)\right) \]  
(A6)

where \(\xi\) is generated by the Normal distribution with the mean \(E_\xi\) and variance \(V_\xi^2\) as follows:

\[ E_\xi = v_{\text{max}} \tau - \left(1 - e^{-\beta \tau}\right)\left(v_{\text{max}} - v_n(t - \tau)\right)/\beta \]  
(A7)

where \(\beta\) is the inverse of the relaxation time. Denoting \(v_0 = v_n(t - \tau)\) and \(v_c = v_{\text{max}}\), then the variance is given by

\[
V_\xi^2(v_0, v_c) = \frac{1}{\beta^2 \left(2\beta^2 - 3\beta\sigma^2 + \sigma^4\right)} e^{-\tau(\beta + \sigma^2)} \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\sigma^2 \left(\beta - \sigma^2\right)^2 \\
2 \beta \left(v_0^2 + 2(1 - 2m)v_0 v_c + v_c^2 \left(-6 + 10m - 3m^2\right) + 2(-1 + m)^2 \tau \beta\right) \\
\left(-v_0^2 + 2(1 - 2m)v_0 v_c + v_c^2 \left(-5 + 8m - 2m^2\right) + 2(-1 + m)^2 \tau \beta\right) \sigma^2 \\
\left(-2\beta \sigma + \sigma^2\right)^2 - e^{\tau(-\beta + \sigma^2)} (v_0 - v_c)^2 \left(2\beta^2 - 3\beta\sigma^2 + \sigma^4\right)^2 + \\
2e^{\tau(-\beta + 2\sigma^2)} \beta^2 \left(2(v_0 - v_c)^2 \beta^2 - (v_0 - mv_c) \beta \sigma^2 + (v_0 - mv_c)^2 \sigma^4\right) \end{array} \right\}
\]  
(A8)
\( \varepsilon \) is also generated by the Normal distribution with the mean \( E_c \) and variance \( V_c^2 \) as follows:

\[
E_c = a_{n+1} (t - \mu_c) \sigma_r^2 / 2
\]

(A9)

\[
V_c^2 = v_{n+1} \left( t - \mu_c \right) \sigma_r^2 + \sigma_z^2 + 2 \rho v_{n+1} \left( t - \mu_r \right) \sigma_z \sigma_r
\]

(A10)

Table A3. Parameter values of TRSM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>( v_{\text{max}} )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( \tau )</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
<th>( \mu_r )</th>
<th>( \mu_\delta )</th>
<th>( \sigma_z )</th>
<th>( \sigma_\delta )</th>
<th>( \rho )</th>
<th>( m )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>km/h</td>
<td>s(^{-1})</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s(^{-1/2})</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure A1. The spatiotemporal diagram of traffic breakdown from free flow to congested flow on an open road with a rubberneck bottleneck with (a) ANIDM: $p_{rub} = 0.2$, $d_{rub} = 2.3 \text{ m/s}^2$ and $h_{rub} = 3 \text{ s}$; (b) APIDM: $p_{rub} = 0.2$, $d_{rub} = 2.7 \text{ m/s}^2$ and $h_{rub} = 3.0 \text{ s}$; (c) $p_{rub} = 0.1$, $d_{rub} = 1.5 \text{ m/s}^2$ and $h_{rub} = 3.6 \text{ s}$. The color bar indicates speed (unit: m/s).

Figure A1 shows the simulation results of above three models. We have tried various bottleneck strength for these models, but all simulation results reproduce the unstable congested patterns. None of them can depict the stable congested pattern shown in Figure 1 (b).
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