



HAL
open science

Multi-models machine learning methods for traffic flow estimation from Floating Car Data

Jinjian Li, Guillaume Lozenguez, Jacques Boonaert, Arnaud Doniec

► **To cite this version:**

Jinjian Li, Guillaume Lozenguez, Jacques Boonaert, Arnaud Doniec. Multi-models machine learning methods for traffic flow estimation from Floating Car Data. *Transportation research. Part C, Emerging technologies*, 2021, 132, pp.103389. 10.1016/j.trc.2021.103389 . hal-03546002

HAL Id: hal-03546002

<https://hal.science/hal-03546002v1>

Submitted on 16 Oct 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License



Multi-models Machine Learning Methods for Traffic Flow Estimation from Floating Car Data

Jinjian Li, Jacques Boonaert, Arnaud Doniec, Guillaume Lozenguez
IMT Nord Europe, Institut Mines-Télécom, Univ. Lille, Centre for Digital Systems F-59000 Lille, France.
jinjian.li@{imt-lille-douai.fr, qq.com}, {arnaud.donic, jacques.boonaert, guillaume.lozenguez}@imt-nord-europe.fr

Abstract

Traffic flow measurement is very important for traffic management systems. However, the existing traditional measurement approaches are highly time-consuming and expensive to continuously gather the required data and to maintain the corresponding equipment, such as loop detectors and video cameras. On the other hand, many services on the web propose to estimate automobile travel time taking into account traffic conditions thanks to crowd sourced data (Floating Car Data). This work proposes to reconstruct, from estimated travel time, traffic flows using machine learning method. In particular, we evaluate the capacity of Gaussian Process Regressor (GPR) to address this issue. After obtaining estimated travel time on a given route, a clustering process shows that travel duration profiles in each day can be associated to different "types of day". Then, different regressors are trained in order to estimate traffic flows from travel duration. In the "multi-model" variant, we trained a Regressor for each type of day. Conversely, in the "single model" variant, only one Regressor is trained (the type of day is not taken into account). This is an innovative work to estimate and reconstruct the traffic flow in transportation networks with machine learning method from aggregated Floating Car Data (FCD). A series of experiments are conducted to compare the estimated traffic flows, obtained by the proposed single model and multi-model, and the real ones from actual sensors. The obtained results show that both single model and multi-models can capture the tendency of real traffic flows. Furthermore, the performance can be improved by regulating parameters in GPR machine learning model, such as half width of sample window and sample size (a whole week or only weekdays), and multi-models can highly increase the performance compared with the single model. Therefore, the proposed GPR machine learning and FCD based new method can replace those traditional loop detectors for the measurement of traffic flow.

Keywords:

Estimation of traffic flows, simulation and modeling of transportation systems, Gaussian Process Regression (GPR), big data, machine learning, Floating Car Data (FCD)

1. Introduction

With the rapid growth of urban centers during the last decades, the development of efficient urban transportation services has become a central issue to reduce the high wasted time during the daily commute. The resulting increasing demand in terms of transportation flows has to cope with the difficulty to adapt existing or create new transportation networks.

In this context, simulate daily transportation behaviors allows operators to experiment and to visualize decisions about infrastructure and regulation policies. One of the major basics on efficient simulation relies on the ability to produce models representing the way that transportation flows evolve with time, depending on the traffic demands and events that impact the transportation network. The estimation of traffic flow is one of the core requirements in those simulation. One of the costless solution would be to reconstruct the traffic flow from aggregated information (travel duration estimations), available on web services.

37 Previous work validates that machine learning based approach is a promising way to reconstruct "sensor like traffic
38 flow data" from aggregated information like the ones proposed by Google services [1, 2]. Applied such an approach
39 would permit, for instance, to infer on a realistic traffic demand at each entrance of a city (i.e. the flow of incoming
40 vehicles).

41 Machine learning over aggregated information approach is based on accessible databases that can provide infor-
42 mation regarding the transportation condition (travel duration) at a given location and at a given time. In 2007, the
43 Google company has extended Google Maps by adding Google Live Traffic, the visualization of traffic information
44 in real time[3][4]. Here, the notion of real time means the current state and is applied to qualify the service of FCD
45 provided. In more detail, Google exploits users' position data of Android smart-phones, in order to get a significantly
46 fast and accurate mapping of the traffic. This data is called Floating Car Data (FCD), which can also be collected by
47 any localization system embedded in a car and sent to the service provider via a mobile connection. Generally, these
48 raw Floating Car Data are aggregated to provide more intelligible and relevant information regarding traffic condition.
49 For example, in Google Maps, FCD are used to give a real-time traffic information using colored road section¹ which
50 is determined by the navigation system or, as in the case of Google Live Traffic, by the smart phone and is sent to the
51 service provider via a mobile phone connection. Therefore this allows the generation of real-time traffic information,
52 which is visualized by the colors on Google Maps: red road points are related to a traffic jam or stop-and-go traffic,
53 orange indicates heavy traffic and green points correspond to clear roads. However, those platforms generally provide
54 only aggregated data like average travel duration more than the initial raw data.

55 Such an approach would permit operators to provide efficient global information while limiting the effort in contin-
56 uously measuring road traffic flows based on physical sensors (radars, induction loops, etc.). The number of sensors,
57 even in mid-sized cities, can increase very quickly. For example, to measure the input and output flows of a simple
58 4-points roundabout, at least 8 physical sensors are required. Therefore, such an expensive traffic flow measurement
59 method makes the mentioned simulation process out of reach.

60 Preliminary result was published on the 15th World Conference on Transport Research 2019 [1] and on the 6th
61 International Conference on Control Decision and Information Technologies 2019 [2] where traffic flows is estimated
62 according to Floating Car Data (FCD) from Google Maps only on the basis of regressors trained using machine learn-
63 ing techniques instead of using stationary physical equipment (such as loop detectors [5] or video cameras [6]). In this
64 paper, we present an extension of the previous works with an increased experiment setup that permits to automatize
65 the model definition. Firstly, we show experimentally that, among 19 types of regression methods (including Linear
66 Regression Models, Regression Trees, Support Vector Machines and Ensemble of Trees), the Gaussian Process Re-
67 gression (GPR) is the most suitable machine learning method to obtain the best fitting criterion with respect to our
68 dataset. Secondly, a selection of the adequate regressor is computed from a set of regressors (multi-model) to estimate
69 traffic flows from FCD, based on the different types of travel duration profiles. This multi-model approach can greatly
70 reduce the estimation error, by precisely clustering days presenting different types of travel duration profiles. Experi-
71 ments are conducted by comparing estimated flows with real ones provided from induction loop sensors. The results
72 we obtain seem promising enough to say that correct transportation flows models could be obtained with a very light
73 use of real traffic sensors.

74 This paper is organized as follows: the next section describes related works and the different usages of aggregated
75 FCD in the context of transportation networks modeling. The third section focuses on the problem we choose to
76 address that is building sensor like data flow measurements from aggregated data. In this section, we also provide
77 details regarding our problem formulation on the standpoint we took for solving it. The fourth section presents the
78 single and multi-GPR machine learning method for the estimation of traffic volume. The fifth section deals with the
79 experimental site, the results we obtained, the comparison between estimated traffic flow and real observed data prior
80 to the discussion. The last section concludes this paper and presents some perspectives and further works based on it.

81 2. Related Work

82 The successful wide scale deployment of the Advanced Traveler Information Systems (ATIS) and Advanced Traf-
83 fic Management Systems (ATMS) highly relies on the capability to perform accurate estimation of the real traffic

¹4 colors are available: green for normal speed of traffic, orange for slower conditions, red for congestion and dark red for stopped traffic

84 states on road networks. Therefore, the use of real-time Floating Car Data (FCD), based on traces of Global Posi-
 85 tioning System (GPS) positions of vehicles, is emerging as a reliable and cost-effective way to collect accurate traffic
 86 data for a wide area road network. Unlike other traffic data collection techniques (e.g. traffic cameras, induction loops
 87 embedded in the roadway, radar-based sensors), floating cars act as moving sensors traveling in a traffic stream and
 88 do not require additional instrumentation to be set up on the roadway.

89 The main communication architecture for FCD is based on the exchange of information between a fleet of floating
 90 cars traveling on a road network and a central data operation system. The floating cars periodically send their positions
 91 (latitude, longitude and altitude) and instantaneous velocity thanks to GPS receiver and Global System for Mobile
 92 communications (GSM) or General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) transmitter. While the central data operation system
 93 tracks the received FCD along the traveled path by matching the related trajectory data to the corresponding real road
 94 network. The frequency of sending/reporting is generally determined by the required resolution of the data and the
 95 performances of the available communication channels, for example, bandwidth. Therefore, FCD is an effective
 96 approach to determine the real traffic speed on the road network, based on gathering of data such as localization,
 97 speed, direction of travel and time information from the mobile phones of drivers and passengers of the vehicle. That
 98 is to say, every vehicle with an active mobile phone acts as a sensor for the network.

99 Using FCD for estimating travel duration and traffic states has received high attention over the years from the
 100 scientific community. The most common and useful information provided by FCD is travel-duration and speeds along
 101 road links or paths [7, 8, 9]. Works such as [10, 11, 12] calculate or forecast the travel duration on roadside according
 102 to the speed of the floating car on that road. Event detection, such as congestion and accidents has been discussed by
 103 using the trajectories or speed of floating cars [13, 14, 15]. The percentage of floating cars required for the estimation
 104 of travel duration is presented in the works like [16, 17, 18]. Reconstructing the traffic states from FCD has been
 105 previously addressed in papers such as [17, 19, 20, 21].

106 In [19], the authors attempt to estimate and predict the travel speed with the real-time FCD based on traces of GPS
 107 positions. Another work like [22], both spatial and temporal characteristics to the domain of floating car sampling is
 108 introduced. And the analysis of this work can provide an insight for floating car based traffic state system designers
 109 on the transmitting period, sampling interval and penetration of floating car that are desirable in a traffic network
 110 in order to get certain coverage and accuracy in traffic state estimation. An interesting method is proposed in [20],
 111 whose purpose is to obtain a high quality on the reconstruction of travel times in the net with a smaller percentage of
 112 FCD vehicles and number of FCD messages. The most recent research about traffic state reconstruction using FCD
 113 is presented in work [21]. The speed is estimated based on FCD. Then the authors make use of the R^2 Statistic to
 114 build the function between average speed (\bar{V}) and density (ρ). Finally, the traffic flow is calculated according to the
 115 Fundamental diagram ($Q = \rho \cdot \bar{V}$).

116 In summary, the above works mainly deal with the following subjects: 1) strategy to collect FCD, 2) estimation of
 117 traffic state by building traditional function model. However, in this work, on the one hand, it is a pragmatic choice
 118 to apply the aggregated FCD in Google Maps, because it is the most widespread and best-known system from a more
 119 practical and industrial point of view, and it can provide lots of data in a complete transportation network considering
 120 scientific aspects. Other FCD providers (such as Uber) could have been employed, but the quality of the collected
 121 data is very similar while offering a much lower coverage than the Google-based services[23]. Moreover, accessing
 122 the data sources (programming constraints) from the Google API is almost straight straightforward and free of charge
 123 (for a given number of requests per month). On the other hand, traffic flows are estimated according to FCD from
 124 Google Maps only, on the basis of regressors trained using machine learning techniques, instead of using traditional
 125 stationary devices (such as loop detectors [5] or video cameras [6]). To the best of our knowledge, this is an innovative
 126 approach that could help minimize the use of stationary sensors while providing a good enough estimation of traffic
 127 flows.

128 3. Problem Description and Proposed Mathematical Model

129 This section firstly describes the problem addressed in the work. Next step presents the proposed system structure,
 130 where two types of regressors based models are introduced, including single model and multi-model. Then the feature
 131 extraction method is shown. At last, the criteria used to evaluate the proposed system's performance are presented.

132 3.1. Problem description

133 The problem is the estimation of traffic flow on a lane based on travel duration estimated by Google Maps thanks
 134 to FCD, as illustrated in Fig. 1. We consider a road section of a certain length (1.2 km in the example of Fig. 1), we
 135 measure the traffic flow on this section thanks to a physical sensor (in the example of Fig. 1 data were collected using
 136 a Doppler radar (24.165 GHz / 100mw EIRP)) located in the middle of the section and in parallel we estimate the
 137 travel time on this section thanks to Google Maps. The objective is to find the relationship between this travel time
 138 and the vehicle flow measured on the ground.

139 According to the Fundamental diagram of traffic flow theory, travels duration and traffic flows are linked with
 140 each other, and their nonlinear relationship can be traditionally formulated with some special statistical model-based
 141 methods based on many assumptions, with lots of parameters to be tuned[24][25]. Several examples of such method
 142 are Van-Aerde-Function and exponential model [26]. The parameters to be tuned can be mean travel time at zero and
 143 real flow, some other parameters to be estimated from empirical data, etc. However, it would be too complicated with
 144 too many parameters to be tuned to use a general statistical model-based method, with no guarantee of efficiency.
 145 Therefore, this work tries to directly establish such a relationship on the basis of machine learning methods. Because
 146 machine-learning based approach can learn a general black model without the knowledge of a ‘Physique Model’ of
 147 the dynamic system, making it much more convenient to be propagated on all over ‘similar’ road sections.




Figure 1: Estimation of traffic flow based on FCD (travel duration) from Google with machine learning method. It is assumed in this article that traffic flows should be uniform along the chosen road

148 3.2. Proposed system structure

149 The proposed system structure consists of three parts: data collection, machine learning model training and trained
 150 model testing, as illustrated in Fig.2. For data collection, traffic flows are measured by a sensor over a specified and
 151 limited period of time, which is 26 weeks in this work. Over this same period of time, We retrieve directly travels
 152 durations, which are calculated by Google map servers with a complicated algorithm based on the collected floating
 153 car data. In other words, through the Google maps API, the travel duration can be obtained by giving the GPS for
 154 origin and destination of the chosen road segment, and the time-stamp, as shown in the Tab. 1. The GPS for origin
 155 and destination is got manually from the Google Map on the chosen road. The time-stamp is a serial of numbers to
 156 define a certain instantaneous time elapsed since 1970, January 1st, 0 hours, 0 minutes, 0 seconds. The request can
 157 be done either on a Web browser or by Python programming. The travel duration data is captured each ten minutes
 158 from Google-map. In total, 26208 data are retrieved. Then the obtained traffic flows data and their corresponding
 159 travels durations are split into two sets: a training dataset with 50 percent for the machine learning model training,
 160 and a validation dataset with another 50 percent for the trained model testing. For the training of machine learning
 161 model, the estimation of traffic flows from travels durations is treated using regression models. Three types of models
 162 are proposed: single model, manual multi-model, and K-means multi-model (refers to 3.3). The machine learning
 163 algorithm applied is the training of a Gaussian Processes Regressors (GPR) (refers to 4.5). This corresponds to the red
 164 rectangle part in Fig.2, that is presented more detailedly in the next section (refers to 3.3). At the end of the learning
 165 process, trained GPR models are obtained, which can take travels durations as input to estimate traffic flows as output,
 166 without requiring any additional ‘in site’ flow sensors anymore. The estimated traffic flows are compared with the
 167 one measured by real sensors to evaluate the performance of trained GPR models.




Figure 2: Proposed system structure

Table 1: Input and output data structure for requesting FCD with Google Maps API. For example, the 310 seconds in the output column means that it takes average 310 seconds for cars to pass from origin point GPS to the destination point GPS on the road at the given time stamp.

Example	Input			Output
	GPS of origin	GPS of destination	Time-stamp	Traffic duration (s)
1	(50.372329,3.070058)	(50.380205,3.082129)	1520677640	310
	Road name: Boulevard de la Republique,Douai,France		(10/03/2018;10:27:20)	
2	(50.380163,3.079186)	(50.390721,3.081124)	1521306610	370
	Road name: Boulevard Lahure,Douai,France		(17/03/2018;17:10:10)	

3.3. Single model and multi-models proposed for traffic flows estimation

The traffic flows evolve over the days of a week, because of the difference of traffic demand and supply between working day and weekend. Therefore, using days’ specific GPR models (multi-models approach) instead of a ”generic” one (single model approach) may provide better estimations of the traffic flows along the week. In the manual multi-models, three GPR models are trained for weekdays, Saturday and Sunday in training data set.

As a prior step, we also have to verify that days of the week can be clustered on the basis of the travel durations profiles collected by Google Map. Here, the profile associated to a day is simply the sequence of travel durations measurements along this day. To do so, we apply a Principal Components Analysis (PCA), which is a method to reduce the dimension of a feature vector while keeping a significant part of its original information (refers to 4.2). The classical k-means algorithm is further applied to this reduced feature space (refers to 4.3) to build clusters that are interpreted as different types of days. On the one hand, each of these clusters will, in turn, be used to train its own GPR model. On the other hand, the label results from k-means are applied to train a Support Vector Machine (SVM) model, which is used to cluster a new day (testing data sets) to choose the suitable trained GPR model from its corresponding FCD profile. Three provided strategies to build models are illustrated in Figs.3 and 4:

1. Single model: only one GPR model is trained using all the training data (variations of FCD profiles between the days are not taken into account during the GPR’s training process, namely, all the training days are applied to the same regression model)[1].
2. Manual multi-model: three different GPR models are trained (one for days of the week except Saturday and




Figure 3: Flowchart for Single model and manual multi-models (an example for three clusters on training and testing data sets for a week, respectively)

186 Sunday, one for Saturdays and one for Sundays, respectively), to model the fact that, generally speaking, the
 187 traffic flows seem to be similar during "regular" days of the week, and are different during Saturday and during
 188 Sunday. The term "manual selection" stands for the fact this partition is only based on the name of the day,
 189 without statistical analysis[2].

190 3. K-means multi-models: several different GPR models are trained based on the clustering results from k-means,
 191 in order to model the fact that, generally speaking, the FCD profiles clustered by k-means should have similar
 192 traffic flows. This K-means multi-models are new content compared with the above two types of models pub-
 193 lished on two International Conferences. Therefore, performing the clustering process using FCD or using flow
 194 data leads to two compatible partitions of the type of days.

195 3.4. Features extraction method

196 The feature extraction method is illustrated in Fig.5. This paper address a regression problem but not a prediction
 197 problem. Then, for estimating traffic flow at time step k , "past" and "future" travel duration samples can be taken into
 198 account. Consequently, the feature extraction process is based on the assumption that the traffic flow f_k at the given
 199 time step k can be approximated from a samples window with $(2 \cdot n + 1)$ width centered on travel durations d_k at time
 200 step k , where, the notations are defined as follows:




Figure 4: Flowchart for K-means multi-models (an example for three clusters on training and testing data sets for a week)

- 201 1. f_k and d_k : The variable $f(t)$ is defined as the actual traffic flow (in veh/h) measured by a traditional sensor
 202 (such as an inductive loop detector) on a given lane at time t , while $d(t)$ is the corresponding travel durations
 203 (in s) estimated by Google for passing the same given lane at the same instant t . In practice, traffic flow data
 204 $f(t)$ is sampled at a period T_{flow} corresponding to one hour with traditional sensors by the urban terrestrial
 205 transportation network management service of the city of Douai in France. However the travel duration data
 206 $d(t)$ is sampled from Google Maps at a period T_e , which is equal to ten minutes, in order to get more information
 207 about the travel duration. To cope with these different sampling periods, traffic flow data are linearly interpolated
 208 between two conservative values of the traffic flows, as shown in the Fig.5. As a result, both $d(t)$ and $f(t)$ are
 209 considered to be sampled with sample period T_e . Therefore, for the sake of simplicity, in the following, we
 210 denote $d(k \cdot T_e) \equiv d_k$ and $f(k \cdot T_e) \equiv f_k$, which means that the travel duration and travel flow can be represented
 211 as d_k and f_k , respectively, for k^{th} sample at time $k \cdot T_e$.
- 212 2. n : The variable n ($n \in N^*$) refers to the half width of the samples window acquired from $d(t)$, centered at time
 213 step k , as illustrated by the purple rectangle drawn in Fig.5.

214 Therefore, the input vector (or extracted features) X_k of the GPR is $X_k = \{d_{k-n} \dots d_{k-1} d_k d_{k+1} \dots d_{k+n}\}$. The output
 215 value is the traffic flow f_k . Alternatively stated, the traffic flow f_k should be estimated by the GPR model from the
 216 extracted features X_k .




Figure 5: Features extraction model

217 4. Theory of Machine Learning Methods Applied

218 This section firstly presents the total flowchart of proposed traffic flow estimation system. Then the theory is
 219 researched for the Machine Learning related methods applied in this work, as shown in the Figs.3 and 4.

220 4.1. Innovation and main steps of the proposed traffic flow estimation model

221 The innovation of the proposed model is that we apply a Machine Learning based model to rebuild the relationship
 222 between easily accessible travel duration and costly measured traffic flow, instead of applying the traditional formu-
 223 lation with lots of parameters to be tuned. Moreover, the proposed model can automatically classify the training data
 224 set into different types to train several Regression models to improve the performance, compared to single Regression
 225 model, and the testing day can also be classified into the most suitable Regression model because of a trained classifier,
 226 in order to reduce the estimation error percentage. This is the first proposal compared to all the existed literatures for
 227 the problem of traffic flow estimation from FCD. Therefore, the following three subsections present the main steps of
 228 the proposed traffic flow estimation model by combining the proposed system structure in the Fig.2 and the different
 229 models flowchart in the Figs.3 and 4.

230 4.1.1. Main steps for traffic flow estimation with single model

- 231 • Request of FCD from Google Maps API and corresponding traffic flow from transportation management;
- 232 • Construction of input vector X_k based on the selected half width of sample window n , as presented in the
 233 subsection 3.4;
- 234 • Division of all FCD and traffic flow data into training data set and testing data set according to a certain propor-
 235 tion;
- 236 • Application of training data set to train 19 types of Machine Learning methods, as shown in the Fig.6;
- 237 • Application of testing data set on the trained Machine Learning models to get estimated traffic flows;
- 238 • Comparison of the estimated traffic flow and the real one.

239 4.1.2. Main steps for traffic flow estimation with manual multi-models

- 240 • Request of FCD from Google Maps API and corresponding traffic flow from transportation management;

- 241 • Division of all FCD and traffic flow data into three groups of training data set and testing data set according to
- 242 weekdays, Saturday and Sunday;
- 243 • Construction of input vector X_k based on the selected half width of sample window n , as presented in the
- 244 subsection 3.4, for training and testing data set respectively;
- 245 • Application of three groups of training data set to three different GPR models respectively, as shown in Fig.6;
- 246 • Application of three groups of testing data set on the corresponding trained Machine Learning models according
- 247 to weekdays, Saturday and Sunday, in order to get estimated traffic flows;
- 248 • Comparison of the estimated traffic flow and real one.

249 4.1.3. Main steps for traffic flow estimation with K-means multi-models

- 250 • Request of FCD from Google Maps API and corresponding traffic flow from transportation management;
- 251 • Division of all FCD and traffic flow data into training data set and testing data set with day as unit;
- 252 • Combination of all the FCD data within the same day in the training data set as input vector for PCA;
- 253 • Application of K-means methods to groups all days in the training data set into three different groups;
- 254 • Construction of input vector X_k based on the selected half width of sample window n , as presented in the
- 255 subsection 3.4, in the three different groups separately;
- 256 • Application of three groups of training data set to three different GPR models respectively, as shown in Fig.6;
- 257 • Combination of all the FCD data within the same day in the testing data set as input vector for PCA;
- 258 • A classifier SVM trained based on the K-means results in the above step 6, in order to classify the testing data
- 259 into suitable group;
- 260 • Application of corresponding trained Machine Learning models in each group on testing data set to get esti-
- 261 mated traffic flow;
- 262 • Comparison of the estimated traffic flow and real one.

263 4.2. Principal Components Analysis (PCA) for reduction of the selected features space dimension

264 Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is the general name for a technique in multivariate data analysis aimed to
 265 reduce the number of dimensions, while keeping as much as possible of the data's variation [27, 28]. Instead of
 266 researching thousands of original variables, the first few components built from a linear combination of the original
 267 features and containing the majority of the data's variation are explored. The statistical analysis and visualization of
 268 these new variables, named the principal components, can assist to find similarities and differences between samples.
 269 Important original variables that are the major contributors to the first few components can also be discovered. More
 270 precisely, PCA applies a vector space transformation to reduce the dimensionality of large data sets. By using mathe-
 271 matical projections, the original data set, which may have involved a great deal of variables, can often be interpreted
 272 in just a few variables (named the principal components). Therefore, it is often the case that an examination of the
 273 reduced dimensional data set will allow the user to spot trends, patterns and outliers in the data, much more easily than
 274 without performing this principal component analysis. Therefore, in this paper, PCA is applied to reduce the features
 275 dimensions of the FCD profiles in order to facilitate the k-means clustering.

276 4.3. Clustering method K-means to dispatch all tested days into different clusters

277 The k-means is an unsupervised clustering algorithm applied to find groups within the data [29, 30]. Given a set
 278 of observations (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) , where each observation is a d -dimensional vector, k-means clustering algorithm aims
 279 to divide the n observations into a set of k groups ($k \leq n$), such as $G = G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k$, in order to minimize the
 280 within-group sum of distance squares, which is defined as the sum of distance functions of each point in the group to
 281 the corresponding center. The objective function of k-means is the following, where, c_i means the centroid of points
 282 in group G_i . Therefore, the k-means clustering algorithm can be used to cluster the days based on the FCD profiles.
 283 In this work, we choose the value of k based on the daily life's observation of our city in France. Typically, we have
 284 three types of day: working days, Saturdays and Sundays. During classical working days, people need to go to work,
 285 etc. Saturdays are characterized by less work and open shops. Sundays, generally, few people go to work and the
 286 possible activities are more restricted (most of the shops are closed for instance).

$$\operatorname{argmin}_G \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{x \in G_i} \|x_i - c_i\|^2 \tag{1}$$

287 **4.4. Classification method SVM**

288 SVM is a typical machine learning algorithm for classification problem, which was originally introduced by
 289 Vapnik and co-workers [31][32] and successively extended by plenty of other researchers. It can have a remarkably
 290 robust performance with respect to sparse and noisy data, which makes it useful in a good deal of applications from
 291 text categorization to protein function prediction. In particular, for the classification problem, it separates a given
 292 set of binary labeled training data with a hyperplane, which is maximally distant from training data sets (also known
 293 as ‘the maximal margin hyperplane’). If no linear separation is possible, it also can work by combining with the
 294 technique of ‘kernels’ function, which can automatically realize a non-linear mapping to a feature space. In the end,
 295 the hyperplane found by the SVM in feature space corresponds to a non-linear decision boundary in the input space.
 296 For a more detailed presentation about SVM, interested readers can refer to [32] for more information.

297 **4.5. Regression machine learning methods for traffic volume estimation based on the FCD**

298 This section presents the description of regression machine learning methods for the estimation of traffic flow
 299 based on travel duration from Google Maps, as shown in Fig.6.




Figure 6: Machine learning models for regression with different kernel functions tested in this article (in total 19 types)

300 **4.5.1. Linear regression models**

301 These models describe a linear relationship between an output and one or more input. Such model has the follow-
 302 ing characteristics: 1)the response (output) has a normal distribution with mean Y, for a set of predictors or inputs,
 303 which is named as X; 2)a coefficient vector b is defined and linearly combined with the predictors X; 3)the linear re-
 304 gression model is Y = Xb. The classical hyperparameters to tune when using linear regression models are the learning
 305 rate and the number of interactions. We can also choose to perform robust fitting using a set of weighting functions to
 306 cope with outliers or to consider non-Gaussian noise affecting the data.

307 **4.5.2. Regression trees models**

308 These models can give numeric responses based on input data. In order to predict a response, the decisions in
 309 the tree from the root node down to a leaf node should be followed, because each leaf node contains a response.
 310 The trees applied are binary, which means that only one predictor (variable) is checked in each step of prediction.
 311 The hyperparameters for regression trees allow to obtain different trees forms restricting the maximum depth of trees,
 312 defining the minimum data points to split a node, fixing the number of samples required to consider node as a leaf,
 313 etc.

314 4.5.3. Support Vector Machine (SVM) for regression

315 This model is identified by Vladimir Vapnik and his colleagues [33], is a very popular machine learning tool for
 316 regression. The SVM regression is a nonparametric technology, since it relies on kernel functions. In the Matlab
 317 Regression learner APP, the linear epsilon-insensitive SVM (ϵ -SVM) regression is applied. In ϵ -SVM regression,
 318 predictor variables (X) and observed response values (Y) are included in the training data set, and the goal is to find
 319 a function $f(X)$ that deviates from Y (observed response values) by a value no greater than ϵ (error or deviation) for
 320 each training point X, as shown in Eq.(2). And the function $f(X)$ should be as flat as possible.

$$|f(X) - Y| \leq \epsilon \quad (2)$$

321 In addition to the choice of the kernel function (linear, quadratic, cubic, gaussian, etc.) two hyperparameters are
 322 mainly used to improve performance of SVM: ϵ parameter defining the width (margin) of the zone used to fit the
 323 training data and a factor, corresponding to a "box constraint" that tunes the cost of deviations larger than ϵ .

324 4.5.4. An ensemble of trees model

325 This model is a predictive model composed of a weighted combination of multiple regression trees. In general,
 326 combining multiple regression trees increases predictive performance. This means that results from many weak learn-
 327 ers can be melded into one high-quality ensemble predictor. Here we find the same parameters as for the decision
 328 trees (maximum depth of each tree, the minimum data to split a node, etc) and some extra hyperparameters like the
 329 number of trees or the weighted combination of trees.

330 4.5.5. Gaussian Process Regression (GPR)

331 As we can see in the experimental results in the section 5 that Gaussian Process Regression (GPR) can help
 332 us to have good performance for the estimation of traffic flow. Therefore the GPR is introduced more detailedly
 333 as following. Firstly, the background of GPR machine learning method is introduced[34]. Then the algorithm of
 334 applying the GPR for the estimation of traffic flow is explained.

335 The GPR [34][35] is a supervised machine learning method that offers mapping function between input and
 336 (continuous) output data. The Gaussian Process framework is used in different areas extended from classification to
 337 regression problems, including speed estimation [36], travel duration estimation [37], time-varying systems [38] etc.
 338 In this work, a GPR model was adopted to model and to estimate traffic volume from the Google aggregated FCD.
 339 Because the traffic volume is expected to have some complex relationship with the travel duration on the same road,
 340 simple parametric models such as linear or polynomial functions is inappropriate for this task[24][25]. Therefore, in
 341 this subsection, firstly, Gaussian Processes (GPs) formulation is presented. Then, based on the GPs formulation, the
 342 Gaussian Process Regression machine learning method is introduced.

343 Generally, GPs offer a Bayesian paradigm to learn an implicit functional relationship $\hat{y} = \hat{f}(x)$, according to a given
 344 training data set, $D = \{(X_i^d, y_i) | i \in N\}$. The variable N is the size of the data set. The symbol X_i^d represents a vector for
 345 the i^{th} observed input variable (also named predictor, regressor, control, or independent) in a d -dimensional feature
 346 space. And y_i is a one-dimensional observed target value (also named predicted, regresse, response, or dependent),
 347 which is either continuous or discrete. However, unlike most classical Bayesian models [39], GPs directly infer a
 348 prior distribution on the whole function $\hat{f}(X)$. Thus, function $\hat{f}(X)$ is treated as a random field and is assumed to be a
 349 GP a prior, as the Eq.(3) shows.

$$p(\hat{f}(X)|\theta) \propto GP(m(X), k(X, X')) \quad (3)$$

350 where, the prior GP is fully defined by a mean function $m(X)$ and a covariance function $k(X, X')$. The notation θ means
 351 the prior's hyperparameters applied to parameterize the covariance function, as follows:

$$K(X, X') = K(X, X'; \theta) \quad (4)$$

352 Strictly speaking, a GP model can also be treated as a probability distribution, which is defined over the following
 353 functions:

$$E[\hat{f}(X)] = m(X) \quad (5)$$

$$Cov[\hat{f}(X), \hat{f}(X')] = k(X, X') \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{f}(X), \hat{f}(X')$ are random variables that are indexed by any pair of X and X' . Then, a GP prior can be roughly considered as a probability distribution for an infinite number of random variables. Furthermore, a collection of function values, which are indexed by any finite number of $X = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^T$, e.g., $F(X) = [f(x_1), f(x_2), \dots, f(x_n)]$, supposes a multivariate normal distribution in Eq.(7)

$$p(\hat{f}(X)) = N(m(X), K(X, X')) \quad (7)$$

where the average vector $m(X)$ and covariance matrix $K(X, X')$ are determined directly based on $m(\bullet)$ and $k(\bullet, \bullet)$, as following:

$$m(X) = [m(x_1), m(x_2), \dots, m(x_n)]^T \quad (8)$$

$$K_{i,j} = k(x_i, x_j) \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n \quad (9)$$

For the sake of simplicity and without loss of generality, $m(x) = 0$ is assumed, since the data can always be centered by the sample mean.

With the machine learning term, $k(x, x')$ is often named as a **kernel function** or simply a kernel instead of a covariance function. As detailed later, kernel functions generally take certain forms which are parameterized by one or several parameters θ . Therefore, a GP prior can be specified by determining a specific type of kernel function (also named covariance function) and the associated θ values.

Once a GP prior $p(f|\theta)$ and a "noise" model $p(y|f)$ are determined, $p(f|D, \theta)$ the posterior distribution of f can be easily obtained by updating the prior $p(f|\theta)$ based on the Bayes theorem with the training data set D , as shown in Eq.(10)

$$p(f|D, \theta) = \frac{p(y|f)p(f|X, \theta)}{p(D|\theta)} \quad (10)$$

where the input variables X should be made explicit in the prior and term $p(D|\theta)$ is called Marginal Likelihood, since it is a function of variable θ and given data set D . The noise model $p(y|f)$ is also a likelihood, for the reason that it is a function of f for a fixed set of observations y . Here, the $p(y|f)$ is introduced, since y_i is a corrupted version of $f(x_i)$. Therefore, the estimation distribution for a new input x_{new} is achieved by using the Eq.(11) with the posterior $p(f|D, \theta)$

$$p(f_{new}|x_{new}, D, \theta) = \int p(f_{new}, f|D, \theta)df \quad (11)$$

By the combination with Eq.(11) and the noise model, the predictive distribution for y_{new} is achieved in the Eq.(12)

$$p(y_{new}|x_{new}, D, \theta) = \int p(y_{new}, f_{new}|D, \theta)df_{new} \quad (12)$$

From the Eq.(12), not only the estimated average values but also the associated uncertainty (error-bar) could be calculated. In the GP modeling, it is as collection of function values $f(x)$ needed to be Gaussian instead of variables x itself, which are assumed to be distribution-free. Therefore, the GP model theoretically can handle data with any kinds of distributions. For a more detailed presentation, interested readers can refer to [34][40] [41] for more information.

379 Gaussian Process Regression machine learning method is introduced based on the GPs formulation. The GP
 380 model presented in the above subsection can solve non-linear regression problems, if the observed target value y_i is
 381 continuous, and the noise model $p(y|f)$ is assumed as a normal distribution. Then the GPR model can be expressed in
 382 the Eq.(13).

$$y_i = f(x_i) + \theta_i \quad \theta_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2) \quad (13)$$

383 In this case, the inference of GPR model becomes analytically tractable, as a result of the Gaussianity of $p(y|f)$.
 384 Accordingly, for a new input x_{new} , the predictive mean and variance associated with $\hat{f}_{new} = f(x_{new}) = f_{new}$ are defined
 385 in Eq.(14)-(15), respectively[34].

$$\mu(f_{new}) = k(x_{new}, X)[K(X, X') + \sigma^2 I]^{-1}y \quad (14)$$

386 and

$$Var(f_{new}) = k(x_{new}, x_{new}) - K(x_{new}, X)[K(X, X) + \sigma^2 I]^{-1}k(X, x_{new}) \quad (15)$$

387 where X and y mean the observed predictors and observe target value. I is defined as the identity matrix.

388 The main hyperparameter of GPR is σ the initial value for the noise standard deviation of the Gaussian process
 389 model.

390 5. Experiment and validation from the real data for single model

391 In this section, we conduct a series of experiments over two road segments to evaluate the proposed algorithm and
 392 compare the results with real data. Firstly, the performance is compared between estimated traffic flow and real data
 393 in the single model regarding data of a first road segment. Then the results between single model and multi-models
 394 are compared on another road segment.

395 5.1. Single model simulation case

396 The experiments are executed on a 1.2 km long road segment named "Boulevard de la République, Douai, 59500,
 397 France" with GPS of origin (50.372329,3.070058) and destination (50.380205,3.082129) for a duration of 26 weeks.
 398 Firstly, the protocol of our experiments are presented. Then, the comparison of RMSE among different machine
 399 learning regression methods is shown for n (half width of the sample window) from 2 to 24. Next, experimental
 400 performance during a whole week is presented in detail for the kernel function, named rational quadratic in GPR,
 401 because it can help us to achieve the lowest RMSE value, compared with others. Finally, an experiment with only
 402 weekdays, which performs better than the above case, is executed, for the reason that the profile of traffic flow exists
 403 big difference between weekdays and weekends.

404 5.1.1. Protocol and experiments description

405 The data of travel duration and real traffic flow on this road for a whole week from Monday to Sunday is respec-
 406 tively acquired from Google Maps, as shown in Fig.7 and town council of Douai in France, as Fig.8 shows. In total,
 407 19 types of regression models are applied to find the best machine learning regression methods for such problem of
 408 estimating traffic flow from travel duration. The set of all the sample data is divided into two groups: 50 percent of
 409 sample data is used to train and validate the regression model; the remainder is extracted as new data to test the perfor-
 410 mance of the trained regression model. The 5-fold Cross Validation method is applied for the 19 types of regression
 411 machine learning algorithms to avoid overfitting problem. The n (half width of the sample window as shown in the
 412 Fig.5) locates in the zone [2,24]. Specifically, the sample time interval is from 20 to 240 minutes, since the sample
 413 step is 10 minutes. The unit for traffic flow is *veh/h*, travel duration s . Note that all the hyperparameters described in
 414 the presentation of each regression machine learning models have been automatically tuned by Matlab.




Figure 7: Travels durations from Google FCD along a week




Figure 8: Traffic flows from actual sensors measurements along a week

5.1.2. Evaluation criteria

The evaluation criteria, containing Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Root-Mean-Square Deviation (RMSD), are applied to evaluate and to compare the performances of the two proposed strategies (single model and multi-model), because they are the classical criteria and the most used evaluation criteria for the sequences data regression problem while some authors suggest the joint use of the MAE ('Mean absolute Error')[42]. In addition, the estimation error distribution looks near from being Gaussian (refer to histogram in pages 16-17), which is a 'classical' use case for comparing models with MSE. Here, they are defined as follows:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N (f(k) - \hat{f}(k))^2} \quad (16)$$

$$AM = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N (f(k) - \hat{f}(k)) \quad (17)$$

$$RMSD = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^N ((f(k) - \hat{f}(k)) - AM)^2} \quad (18)$$

where $f(k)$ is the observed traffic flow at time step k and $\hat{f}(k)$ is the corresponding estimated traffic flow. AM is the arithmetic mean. N is the total number of samples.

5.1.3. Discussion about Machine Learning methods

This subsection presents the comparison of RMSE for all the 19 machine learning regression models, as shown in Fig.10 and Tab. 2-3, in order to find the best solution, which can estimate the traffic flow from travel duration with lowest RMSE. The 19 regression modules are grouped in the Tab. 2-3 into five families:

A. Linear regression models. These models always get a very high RMSE, because the relationship between travel duration and traffic flow is nonlinear [24][25].

B. Regression trees. These models can achieve better performance than linear regression models with lower RMSE, for the regression trees can deal with nonlinear system. The best result with lowest RMSE 70.206 happens when the n equals 24 under the Fine Tree (number 5 in the Tab. 2).

C. Support vector machines. The lowest RMSE for SVM is 59.811, which is obtained by the Fine Gaussian at $n=24$, and is 14.81 percent lower than that in the Fine Tree.

D. Ensemble of trees. Such models are better than the above regression trees by combining several trees together. The lowest RMSE (57.69) is acquired by the bagged trees when n is 24, and is 17.83 percent lower than that in the Fine Tree.

E. Gaussian process regression models. The global best result is the lowest RMSE with value of 18.938, which is achieved by Rational quadratic kernel function with $n=23$, is 67.17 percent lower than that in the bagged trees.




Figure 9: RMSE profile for regression models under n from 2 to 24

Table 2: RMSE value for types 1-10 of machine learning regression models under n from 2 to 24 (PE is an abbreviation of Percentage Error)

n	A. Linear Regression Models				B. Regression Trees						C. Support Vector Machines									
	1	PE(%)	2	PE(%)	3	PE(%)	4	PE(%)	5	PE(%)	6	PE(%)	7	PE(%)	8	PE(%)	9	PE(%)	10	PE(%)
2	139.34	57.89	139.82	58.09	139.4	57.92	139.2	57.83	121.49	50.48	112.54	46.76	108.56	45.10	140.04	58.18	143.47	59.61	138.91	57.71
3	137.39	57.04	137.86	57.24	137.47	57.07	135.43	56.23	119.27	49.52	108.24	44.94	105.85	43.95	138.75	57.60	141.35	58.68	140.63	58.39
4	134.86	55.97	138.73	57.57	134.96	56.01	132.95	55.18	111.58	46.31	104.88	43.53	100.8	41.83	136.23	56.54	139.48	57.89	136.94	56.83
5	133.35	55.34	137.39	57.01	133.43	55.37	130.33	54.09	103.18	42.82	99.005	41.09	100.81	41.83	134.44	55.79	137.8	57.19	145.42	60.35
6	131.79	54.71	135.9	56.41	131.95	54.77	128.05	53.15	107.71	44.71	104.24	43.27	103.61	43.01	132.83	55.14	134.44	55.81	150.27	62.57
7	129.77	53.90	137.11	56.95	129.87	53.95	126.64	52.60	94.734	39.35	97.147	40.35	101.63	42.21	130.89	54.37	131.83	54.76	152.14	63.20
8	129.05	53.64	135.48	56.31	129.21	53.71	123.79	51.46	98.612	40.99	97.456	40.51	102.91	42.78	130.74	54.34	128.86	53.56	146.37	60.84
9	127.19	52.91	140.3	58.36	127.33	52.97	121.86	50.69	94.104	39.14	100.76	41.91	101.65	42.28	128.64	53.51	126.83	52.76	163.07	67.83
10	126.54	52.68	148.69	61.90	126.85	52.81	121.4	50.54	97.403	40.55	98.407	40.97	97.951	40.78	128.21	53.37	127.45	53.06	162.7	67.73
11	125.7	52.37	178.28	74.28	126.01	52.50	120.84	50.35	86.043	35.85	93.192	38.83	99.77	41.57	127.47	53.11	124.91	52.04	160.55	66.89
12	124.97	52.11	179.63	74.90	125.23	52.22	116.96	48.77	89.94	37.50	91.758	38.26	99.918	41.66	126.58	52.78	124.56	51.94	158.66	66.16
13	124.74	52.06	210.81	87.98	125.12	52.22	116.72	48.71	93.361	38.96	93.12	38.86	97.285	40.60	126.6	52.84	124.37	51.91	160.71	67.07
14	123.77	51.71	241.99	101.1	124.32	51.94	115.76	48.36	91.025	38.03	89.777	37.51	96.699	40.40	126.29	52.76	123.19	51.89	155.8	65.09
15	123.22	51.54	282.11	118.1	123.5	51.66	117.24	49.04	90.555	37.88	92.967	38.89	99.135	41.47	124.93	52.26	123.77	51.77	138.82	58.07
16	124.15	52.00	332.36	139.2	124.35	52.09	114.32	47.89	88.712	37.16	92.762	38.86	99.672	41.75	124.81	52.28	127.62	53.46	139.21	58.31
17	123.24	51.70	582.82	244.5	124.01	52.02	116.72	48.97	87.416	36.67	94.123	39.49	101.81	42.71	129.96	54.52	124.71	52.32	126.29	52.98
18	120.62	50.69	3320.7	1395	121.66	51.12	111.1	46.69	81.363	34.19	85.653	35.99	98.107	41.23	122.39	51.43	122.95	51.67	122.49	51.47
19	122.29	51.48	2766	1164	123.36	51.94	116.61	49.09	83.37	35.10	89.206	37.56	100.93	42.49	123.03	51.80	126.85	53.40	106.17	44.70
20	121.52	51.26	1984.5	837.1	122.8	51.80	114.85	48.44	83.675	35.29	90.415	38.14	99.475	41.96	122.84	51.81	125.48	52.93	99.649	42.03
21	120	50.72	1854.7	783.9	121.99	51.56	116.97	49.44	82.25	34.76	90.11	38.08	102.39	43.27	121.84	51.49	124.07	52.44	84.521	35.72
22	120.22	50.91	1559.9	660.6	122.41	51.84	116.47	49.32	85.913	36.38	92.222	39.05	101.59	43.02	121.54	51.47	122.44	51.85	81.469	34.50
23	118.77	50.40	1748.6	742.1	121.11	51.39	113.25	48.06	89.603	38.02	85.03	36.08	99.911	42.40	120.17	51.00	120.58	51.17	89.94	38.17
24	119.44	50.79	1647.2	700.5	121.98	51.87	113.83	48.41	70.206	29.86	85.831	36.50	98.789	42.01	120.16	51.10	120.2	51.12	72.312	30.75

In summary, the estimation performance can be improved either by changing machine learner regression model or by increasing the value of n . Indeed, for most models, the RMSE decreases when n increases. The performance rank for different types of regression models for the problem of estimating traffic flow from travel duration is as following: Gaussian Process Regression models > Ensemble of Trees > Support Vector Machines > Regression Trees > Linear Regression Models. Therefore, this work chooses Gaussian Process Regression with Rational quadratic kernel function as regression model.

5.1.4. Discussion about half width of sample window n

Globally, for the GPR with kernel functions of rational quadratic, when n increases from 4 to 23, the RMSE value decreases accordingly, and the lowest one achieved at the point ($n=23$) is 18.9 veh/h. Then RMSE value lightly increases when n is 24, for the reason that when the n is too big, some data far away from the center point is not so related and give some extra noise influence to the estimation. However, the rate for reducing the RMSE is extremely different when n is augmented. For n from 4 to 16, the RMSE is reduced rapidly with an improvement of 65.3 veh/h. Then the RMSE is reduced slowly with an improvement of 10.3 veh/h for n from 16 to 24. Therefore, the best choice for n equals to 23 when the RMSE performance is the only criterion. Nevertheless n with 16 is the best choice if the

Table 3: RMSE value for types 11-19 of machine learning regression models under n from 2 to 24 (PE is an abbreviation of Percentage Error)

n	C. Support Vector Machines						D. Ensemble of Trees						E. Gaussian Process Regression Models					
	11	PE(%)	12	PE(%)	13	PE(%)	14	PE(%)	15	PE(%)	16	PE(%)	17	PE(%)	18	PE(%)	19	PE(%)
2	121.47	50.47	121.93	50.66	131.73	54.73	105.24	43.72	103.11	42.84	112.51	46.75	110.33	45.84	117.19	48.69	108.1	44.91
3	117.17	48.65	117.32	48.71	129.65	53.83	100.68	41.80	97.405	40.44	108.85	45.19	106.05	44.03	108.45	45.03	102.96	42.75
4	107.14	44.46	114.3	47.44	126.36	52.44	95.515	39.64	92.91	38.56	103.17	42.82	100.92	41.88	95.616	39.68	94.589	39.26
5	98.045	40.69	110.38	45.81	124.06	51.48	90.612	37.60	87.285	36.22	101.27	42.03	93.715	38.89	85.182	35.35	85.625	35.53
6	87.702	36.41	106.82	44.34	121.99	50.64	86.639	35.96	81.334	33.76	87.001	36.11	75.897	31.51	74.147	30.78	72.321	30.02
7	82.244	34.16	104.93	43.59	120.37	50.00	83.458	34.67	77.281	32.10	74.919	31.12	63.406	26.34	66.032	27.43	61.221	25.43
8	81.351	33.81	102.47	42.59	119.3	49.59	82.659	34.36	75.11	31.22	68.456	28.45	58.613	24.36	62.284	25.89	56.414	23.45
9	74.383	30.94	100.6	41.85	118.62	49.34	81.15	33.76	73.467	30.56	57.456	23.90	50.483	21.00	56.786	23.62	49.325	20.52
10	76.824	31.98	99.243	41.31	117.75	49.02	78.016	32.48	72.134	30.03	50.495	21.02	45.461	18.92	54.807	22.82	44.856	18.67
11	72.479	30.20	97.02	40.42	116.81	48.67	75.379	31.40	69.785	29.07	45.249	18.85	41.7	17.37	51.979	21.66	41.032	17.10
12	66.382	27.68	95.666	39.89	116.29	48.49	75.877	31.64	69.455	28.96	40.445	16.86	38.691	16.13	50.049	20.87	38.394	16.01
13	69.009	28.80	94.385	39.39	115.77	48.32	75.278	31.42	68.36	28.53	37.241	15.54	37.108	15.49	49.13	20.50	36.458	15.22
14	71.017	29.67	93.295	38.98	115.76	48.36	73.077	30.53	66.832	27.92	32.498	13.58	32.696	13.66	44.989	18.80	32.179	13.44
15	66.37	27.76	93.601	39.15	114.85	48.04	74.462	31.15	67.647	28.30	29.112	12.18	30.136	12.61	44.952	18.80	29.272	12.24
16	71.199	29.82	92.992	38.95	115.5	48.38	70.419	29.50	67.434	28.25	30.068	12.59	30.875	12.93	45.374	19.01	29.831	12.50
17	64.483	27.05	93.214	39.10	115.63	48.51	73.546	30.85	67.996	28.53	27.302	11.45	28.789	12.08	43.885	18.41	27.449	11.52
18	68.883	28.95	92.875	39.03	114.56	48.14	69.63	29.26	64.482	27.10	26.534	11.15	27.136	11.40	41.809	17.57	26.221	11.01
19	63.142	26.58	90.304	38.02	114.56	48.23	69.87	29.42	63.823	26.87	24.464	10.30	25.677	10.81	40.669	17.12	24.498	10.31
20	66.065	27.87	90.291	38.09	114.02	48.09	71.631	30.21	63.074	26.61	22.907	9.66	24.535	10.35	40.417	17.05	22.934	9.67
21	66.552	28.13	88.121	37.24	114.11	48.23	69.455	29.35	61.529	26.00	21.019	8.88	22.85	9.66	38.7	16.36	21.198	8.96
22	64.148	27.17	86.628	36.69	114.48	48.48	70.341	29.79	60.342	25.55	20.455	8.66	21.922	9.28	38.134	16.15	20.43	8.65
23	66.24	28.11	84.859	36.01	113.22	48.05	67.567	28.67	60.842	25.82	19.105	8.11	20.202	8.57	35.857	15.22	18.938	8.04
24	59.811	25.44	81.297	34.57	113.2	48.14	68.533	29.14	57.69	24.53	20.198	8.59	21.519	9.15	35.418	15.06	20.18	8.58




Figure 10: RMSE profile for GPR under different n

454 RMSE performance and length of n should be considered together, because the bigger n is, the more data is needed to
 455 estimate the traffic flow, as shown in the Fig. 5.

456 5.1.5. Experimental performance for a whole week

457 The comparison between real and estimated traffic flow and the distribution of errors is shown in detail with n as:
 458 4, 8, 16, 24, as shown in Fig. 11–18. Firstly, with $n=4$, the trained GPR model can only capture the traffic flow
 459 tendency, because the n is too small and more information should be needed, as shown in the Fig. 11. As a result,
 460 for the corresponding distribution of error in the Fig. 12, only 45 percent of errors locates between the zone [-50,
 461 50] (veh/h). The biggest error happens in 300 veh/h and the RMSE is 92 veh/h. However, when n is increased to
 462 24, estimated traffic flow is more similar to the real one than that with $n=4$, as the Fig. 17 shows, which means that
 463 the increase of n can help to model the profile more exactly. Therefore, 86 percent of errors locates in the zone [-50,
 464 50] (veh/h), which is almost twice bigger than that with $n=4$. The RMSE is 20.18 veh/h. Third times lower than the
 465 one with $n=4$. The biggest error is 170 veh/h. However, in Fig. 17, most of the obvious error happens in weekends,
 466 because the profile's shape of traffic flow is very different between workdays and the weekend, which motivates us to
 467 build a GPR model only for weekdays to improve the performance. This subject is discussed in detail in the following
 468 subsection.




Figure 11: Actual VS estimated traffic flow with $n=4$ for a week




Figure 12: Normalized estimation error with $n=4$ for a week




Figure 13: Actual VS estimated traffic flow with $n=8$ for a week




Figure 14: Normalized estimation error with $n=8$ for a week




Figure 15: Actual VS estimated traffic flow with $n=16$ for a week




Figure 16: Normalized estimation error with $n=16$ for a week




Figure 17: Actual VS estimated traffic flow with $n=24$ for a week




Figure 18: Normalized estimation error with $n=24$ for a week




Figure 19: Actual VS estimated traffic flow with n=4 for weekdays only




Figure 20: Normalized estimation error with n=4 for weekdays only




Figure 21: Actual VS estimated traffic flow with n=8 for weekdays only




Figure 22: Normalized estimation error with n=8 for weekdays only




Figure 23: Actual VS estimated traffic flow with n=16 for weekdays only




Figure 24: Normalized estimation error with n=16 for weekdays only




Figure 25: Actual VS estimated traffic flow with n=24 for weekdays only




Figure 26: Normalized estimation error with n=24 for weekdays only

469 5.1.6. Experimental performance for only weekdays

470 The performance is compared between GPR models for whole weeks and only weekdays. For $n=4$, compared
 471 with the GPR model for the whole week (refers to Fig. 11), the GPR model for only weekdays (refers to Fig. 19)
 472 can capture the real data more precisely, and can get a higher percentage of errors (62.8%) locating between the zone
 473 $[-50,50]$. Furthermore, when the n is increased to 24, as shown in the Fig.26, 97 percent of errors in the zone $[-50,50]$
 474 , which is 11% higher than that in the GPR model for the whole week, as Fig. 18 shows. Therefore the performance
 475 can be improved by building a GPR model with smaller time zone, for example, only the weekdays instead of a whole
 476 week.

477 5.2. Multi-models simulation case

478 Firstly, the experiments' parameters are presented. Secondly, FCD profiles on training data sets are clustered into
 479 k (here $k = 4$) clusters by k-means method. At last, the obtained results (estimated traffic flows) are compared with
 480 the real observed data (real traffic flows measured by sensors).

481 Prior to the above clustering process, the dimension of FCD profiles is reduced by PCA (Principal Component
 482 Analysis) algorithm. Having a look at the eigen vectors' coefficients after the PCA has been applied to the initial rep-
 483 resentation shows us that the initial basis is not preserved. Indeed, most of the eigenvectors result from a combination
 484 of a large number of the initial base's vectors. As an illustration, figure 27) represents the eigenvector basis as a 33x33
 485 gray level image. The darker is the pixel, the closer to 0 is the magnitude of the corresponding eigenvector's coeffi-
 486 cient. Rather than observing columns mainly made of dark pixels with a few bright pixels, we see a wide distribution
 487 of gray shaded pixels affecting a large part of the image.




Figure 27: Representation of the eigenvector basis after PCA

488 5.2.1. Experiments' parameter

489 The experiments are executed on the road segment named "Boulevard Lahure, Douai, 59500, France" with GPS
 490 of origin (50.380163,3.079186) and destination (50.390721,3.081124) for the duration of 26 weeks. The FCD are
 491 extracted directly from the Google Map API[43]. The total number of sample data is 20208 ($6*24*7*16$), owing to
 492 the 10 minutes sampling period. The actual traffic flows data are provided by Douai's town council. All the sample
 493 days are divided into two sets: one containing 80 percent of the source data for training the model, and another with
 494 20 percents of the source data for testing the model. The overfitting problem is avoided by applying the 5-folds cross
 495 validation method. The kernel function of the GPR is Rational Quadratic, since this one performed the best along the
 496 experiments. The quadratic kernel function is applied for SVM. The dimension of the feature vector is 33, because
 497 the half width of the samples window (n) is defined as 16. All training days are classified into 4 clusters with k-means
 498 algorithm. The units of parameters are as follows: traffic flow, RMSE and RMSD are expressed in veh/h, while travel
 499 durations are in s .




Figure 28: Training data sets are clustered into four clusters by k-means algorithm, after their dimensions are reduced by PCA method. Each day is expressed as a point, beside which the numbering schemes are defined as follows: 1) the first number represents the day within each week; 2) the last two numbers express the order of week. For example, the number "203" means the Tuesday in the third week.

5.2.2. Labeling results from PCA and k-means for training data

The clustering results are presented in Fig.28 for days with different travel durations profiles. We can observe that PCA leads to a drastic reduction of the dimension of the features space from its original value to 2, significantly decreasing the complexity of the k-means based labeling process. At the end of the clustering, training days are divided into 4 clusters: cluster 1 and 2 include most of weekdays and a small part of weekends; cluster 3 consists of most of Saturday and some weekdays, which proves that the traffic flows during some weekdays are similar to Saturday. This is the main reason explaining the different performances between multi-model from k-means selection and multi-model from manual selection: in multi-model with manual selection, all weekdays belong to the same group (refers to Figs.3 and 4); cluster 4 is mainly made of Sunday. Therefore, PCA associated to k-means can cluster the travel durations profiles into different clusters more reasonably and precisely than the manual way.

5.2.3. Comparison of statistical results

Table 4: Comparison of statistical results (RMSE and RMSD are expressed in veh/h)

Criteria	Single model	Manual multi-models	K-means multi-models
RMSE	37.3434	37.1286	23.827
RMSD	37.0281	36.9523	23.8084

The RMSE and RMSD for single model, manual multi-models and K-means multi-model are compared in the Tab.4. All types of models can estimate traffic flows with low RMSE and RMSD. Furthermore the K-means multi-models can reduce RMSE and RMSD by up to 36.2% and 35.9%, respectively, compared with single model. Because each day in testing data set is firstly input to the trained SVM model to choose the suitable trained GPR model. However, the multi-model with manual selection does not significantly improve the performance compared with single model, because such model cannot group the FCD flows profiles precisely. As we noticed before, all weekdays labeled using manual selection naturally belong to the same group. However, many FCD flows profiles during weekdays are similar to that in Saturday, as shown in Fig. 28.

The differences between the three models tend to narrow if we focus on peak hours. In the figures 29 to 40 we have considered the morning peak hours (6:00 - 9:30 am) and the evening peak hours (4:00 - 7:30 pm). Figures 29, 31, 33, 35, 35, 39 and 39 represent actual and estimated flows over a succession of peak hours. There is no time scale in these graphs, the peak hour periods succeed one another in chronological order. The corresponding error histograms

523 are shown in Figures 30, 32, 36, 36, 36, 40 and 40. In a general way, we can see that by considering only the peak
 524 hours, the interest of the multi-models (manual or learned) is much more reduced. We can also see that the afternoon
 525 peak hours are better estimated than the morning peak hours (16% maximum error versus 24%). This is probably due
 526 to the fact that these peaks are much more variable over the week compared to the rest of the day. This leads to some
 527 noise in the estimation.




Figure 29: Actual (RED) VS estimated traffic flow (BLUE) with single model for morning peak hours




Figure 30: Normalized estimation error with single model for morning peak hours




Figure 31: Actual (RED) VS estimated traffic flow (BLUE) with single model for evening peak hours




Figure 32: Normalized estimation error with single model for evening peak hours

528 **6. Conclusion and future works**

529 This work illustrates that Machine learning techniques based on Agregated Data permit to estimate the Traffic
 530 flows according to Floating Car Data (FCD) only on the basis of trained regressors. Principal Component Analysis
 531 (PCA) coupled with k-means technique allows to differentiate clusters of daily FCD profiles. Models are built for
 532 each cluster tuned by selecting the appropriate multi-model Gaussian Processes Regressors (GPR) using the Support
 533 Vector Machine (SVM) classifier generates coherent traffic flow.

534 The experimental results show that the multi-model with k-means selection can significantly reduce the Root
 535 Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Root-Mean-Square Deviation (RMSD), compared with single model or multi-model
 536 with manual selection. The produced estimation by single or multi-models is promising enough to be used instead
 537 of static sensors based measurements. Practically speaking, this could have very interesting consequences: once the
 538 GPR model has been learned for a given road (on the basis of a relatively brief in site data acquisition process), the
 539 FCD are sufficient for continuously providing a good enough estimation of the vehicles flow along that road, using
 540 our GPR regressor. Thus, as an alternative approach to investing in a costly static sensor systems for each of the
 541 roads requiring a flow estimation, we could rather use movable measurement units to acquire the data for training the
 542 GPR, and then move this system to another place and repeat the process until each model of these "strategic" roads is




Figure 33: Actual (RED) VS estimated traffic flow (GREEN) with manual multi-models for morning peak hours




Figure 34: Normalized estimation error with manual multi-models for morning peak hours




Figure 35: Actual (RED) VS estimated traffic flow (GREEN) with manual multi-models for evening peak hours




Figure 36: Normalized estimation error with manual multi-models for evening peak hours




Figure 37: Actual (RED) VS estimated traffic flow (MAGENTA) with K-means multi-models for morning peak hours




Figure 38: Normalized estimation error with K-means multi-models for morning peak hours




Figure 39: Actual (RED) VS estimated traffic flow (MAGENTA) with K-means multi-models for evening peak hours




Figure 40: Normalized estimation error with K-means multi-models for evening peak hours

543 learned. Finally, a GPR regressor combined with its corresponding FCD stream would act as a kind of virtual sensor,
544 cost effective vehicles flow sensor.

545 These measurements, in turn, are used to build and update urban transportation networks' models, which are
546 necessary components required for future mobility to better manage circulation flows within our cities and increase
547 the safety of the users. In a near future, these users could be "human drivers" as well as autonomous cars. The
548 latter may directly use the provided models while directly feeding them with their FCD for an even better quality of
549 traffic estimation. This is exactly what we are currently developing in the scope of the ORIO project (refers to the
550 Acknowledgment section). In fact, the proposed algorithm can be used for all traffic situation and not only urban
551 traffic. The urban context is chosen in the work because the implementation of physical sensors (radar, induction
552 loops) are more difficult than highway.

553 As a critical reflection, two main drawbacks can be highlighted. A first one concerns the use of non-sparse methods
554 on input data which could be an issue with longer sequences to analyze, leading to obtaining a more complex learned
555 model. A second one, classical in every machine learning solutions, relates to our dependence on the quality of input
556 data. Let's remember that we need two types of input data: the actual flow measured on studied road section and
557 travel time supplied by the FCD provider (e.g. Google in this article).

558 In a simulation perspective, our results are encouraging regarding the capacity of generating traffic flows from
559 punctual real measurements and more global aggregated data. The virtual sensors reproduce flows according to the
560 curve of the day. The aim is for these sensors to be distributed all over the network. The multi-model permits to gain in
561 accuracy and to provide a collection of 'typical days' to use in simulations. Our perspective is first to generate virtual
562 sensors in key road segments that capture the main entrance and way out of a studied area. Beyond the simulation
563 perspective, questions remain on the possibility to take advantage of a model learned in a specific road segment for
564 other 'similar' road segments in the network. The test of the proposed algorithms on other areas of the city and other
565 transportation context will be the subject of our future work. To do so, the model can integrate topological information
566 (dimension of the segment, relative position to the city center...) as well as temporal information in a multi-model
567 learned from several road segments in order to help in producing generalizable models.

568 The input vector of the GPR regressor is a sequence of consecutive FCD values centered at the **sample step** for
569 which the flow estimation has to be produced. To make it clear, the proposed GPR does not directly take into account
570 the "time" (says hours, minutes and seconds), neither does it use the name of the day itself while it produces a rather
571 good estimation of the flows. It is no secret saying that traffic flows evolve with the time of the day and the day of the
572 week (the traffic during the weekend sometimes has nothing to do with what it is on business days!). Then, instead of
573 feeding our GPR learning process with data including a complete week, we plan to build sets of "period of the day"
574 related GPR regressors (for instance: night, morning, midday, afternoon and evening) in replacement of "weekly"
575 GPR regressors computed from several road segment data.

576 Acknowledgment

577 This work was supported by the project ORIO (Observing the peRformances of urban Infrastructures and mobility
578 / preventing collisions with vulnerable people using Opportunistic radar). The project ORIO is done within the
579 framework of ELSAT2020, which is co-financed by the European Union with the European Regional Development
580 Fund, the French state and the Hauts de France Region Council. The real traffic flow data from induction loops on the
581 road "86 Boulevard de la République, Douai, France" was provided by the town hall of Douai (mairie de douai).

582 References

- 583 [1] J. Li, J. Boonaert, A. Doniec, G. Lozenguez, Toward reliable estimations of urban traffic flows from machine learning and floating car data,
584 in: 15th World Conference on Transport Research, Vol. In presse, 2019.
- 585 [2] J. Li, J. Boonaert, A. Doniec, G. Lozenguez, Traffic flow multi-model with machine learning method based on floating car data, in: 6th
586 International Conference on Control Decision and Information Technologies, 2019, pp. 512–517.
- 587 [3] P. van den Haak, T. Bakri, R. Van Katwijk, M. Emde, M. Snelder, et al., Validation of google floating car data for applications in traffic
588 management, in: Transportation Research Board 97th Annual Meeting, no. 18-00609, 2018.
- 589 [4] T. Jeske, Floating car data from smartphones: What google and waze know about you and how hackers can control traffic, Proceeding of the
590 BlackHat Europe (2013) 1–12.
- 591 [5] S. Cheung, S. Coleri, B. Dunder, S. Ganesh, C.-W. Tan, P. Varaiya, Traffic measurement and vehicle classification with single magnetic
592 sensor, Transportation research record: journal of the transportation research board (1917) (2005) 173–181.

- [6] B. Coifman, D. Beymer, P. McLauchlan, J. Malik, A real-time computer vision system for vehicle tracking and traffic surveillance, *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 6 (4) (1998) 271–288.
- [7] T. Miwa, Y. Tawada, T. Yamamoto, T. Morikawa, En-route updating methodology of travel time prediction using accumulated probe-car data.
- [8] S. Turksma, The various uses of floating car data, in: 10th International Conference on Road Transport Information and Control, 2000, pp. 51–55.
- [9] J. Yoon, B. Noble, M. Liu, Surface street traffic estimation, in: Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications and Services, 2007, pp. 220–232.
- [10] C. De Fabritiis, R. Ragona, G. Valenti, Traffic estimation and prediction based on real time floating car data, in: 11th International IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems, 2008.
- [11] C. Nanthawichit, T. Nakatsuji, H. Suzuki, Application of probe-vehicle data for real-time traffic-state estimation and short-term travel-time prediction on a freeway, *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* (1855) (2003) 49–59.
- [12] T. Erdelić, T. Carić, M. Erdelić, L. Tišljarić, A. Turković, N. Jelušić, Estimating congestion zones and travel time indexes based on the floating car data, *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* 87 (2021) 101604.
- [13] Y. Asakura, T. Kusakabe, N. X. Long, T. Ushiki, Incident detection methods using probe vehicles with on-board gps equipment, *Transportation Research Procedia* 6 (2015) 17–27.
- [14] Y. Chen, C. Chen, Q. Wu, J. Ma, G. Zhang, J. Milton, Spatial-temporal traffic congestion identification and correlation extraction using floating car data, *Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems* 25 (3) (2021) 263–280.
- [15] L. Chen, J. Shi, M. Cheng, H. Zhu, L. Sun, Characteristics of urban road non-recurrent traffic congestion based on floating car data, in: Proceedings of 4th International Conference on Electronic Information Technology and Computer Engineering, 2020, p. 120–126.
- [16] X. Dai, M. A. Ferman, R. P. Roesser, A simulation evaluation of a real-time traffic information system using probe vehicles, in: Proceedings of IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems, 2003.
- [17] J. Hong, X. Zhang, Z. Wei, L. Li, Y. Ren, Spatial and temporal analysis of probe vehicle-based sampling for real-time traffic information system, in: IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, 2007.
- [18] J. J. Vázquez, J. Arjona, M. Linares, J. Casanovas-Garcia, A comparison of deep learning methods for urban traffic forecasting using floating car data, *Transportation Research Procedia* 47 (2020) 195–202.
- [19] C. de Fabritiis, R. Ragona, G. Valenti, Traffic estimation and prediction based on real time floating car data, in: 11th IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems, 2008, pp. 197–203.
- [20] B. S. Kerner, C. Demir, R. G. Herrtwich, S. L. Klenov, H. Rehborn, M. Aleksic, A. Haug, Traffic state detection with floating car data in road networks, in: Proceedings of IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems, 2005, pp. 44–49.
- [21] A. Sunderrajan, V. Viswanathan, W. Cai, A. Knoll, Traffic state estimation using floating car data, *Procedia Computer Science* 80 (2016) 2008–2018.
- [22] J. Hong, X. Zhang, Z. Wei, L. Li, Y. Ren, Spatial and temporal analysis of probe vehicle-based sampling for real-time traffic information system, in: IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, 2007, pp. 1234–1239.
- [23] H. Wu, Comparing google maps and uber movement travel time data, *Transport Findings* (2019) 1–5.
- [24] J. H. Wu, M. Florian, S. He, An algorithm for multi-class network equilibrium problem in pce of trucks: application to the scag travel demand model, *Transportmetrica* 2 (1) (2006) 1–9.
- [25] W. H. Lam, H.-J. Huang, Calibration of the combined trip distribution and assignment model for multiple user classes, *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 26 (4) (1992) 289–305.
- [26] W. Brilon, J. Lohoff, Speed-flow models for freeways, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 16 (2011) 26–36.
- [27] D. Groth, S. Hartmann, S. Klie, J. Selbig, Principal components analysis, in: *Computational Toxicology*, Springer, 2013, pp. 527–547.
- [28] S. T. Lim, D. F. W. Yap, N. A. Manap, Medical image compression using block-based pca algorithm, in: International Conference on Computer, Communications, and Control Technology, 2014, pp. 171–175.
- [29] K. P. Sinaga, M.-S. Yang, Unsupervised k-means clustering algorithm, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 80716–80727.
- [30] A. Alsayat, H. El-Sayed, Social media analysis using optimized k-means clustering, in: IEEE 14th International Conference on Software Engineering Research, Management and Applications (SERA), 2016, pp. 61–66.
- [31] T. S. Furey, N. Cristianini, N. Duffy, D. W. Bednarski, M. Schummer, D. Haussler, Support vector machine classification and validation of cancer tissue samples using microarray expression data, *Bioinformatics* 16 (10) (2000) 906–914.
- [32] V. Vapnik, *Statistical learning theory*. 1998, Vol. 3, Wiley, 1998.
- [33] V. Vapnik, *The nature of statistical learning theory*, Springer science & business media, 2013.
- [34] C. E. Rasmussen, Gaussian processes in machine learning, in: *Advanced lectures on machine learning*, Springer, 2004, pp. 63–71.
- [35] Y. Xie, K. Zhao, Y. Sun, D. Chen, Gaussian processes for short-term traffic volume forecasting, *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* (2165) (2010) 69–78.
- [36] J. Hu, J. Wang, Short-term wind speed prediction using empirical wavelet transform and gaussian process regression, *Energy* 93 (2015) 1456–1466.
- [37] T. Idé, S. Kato, Travel-time prediction using gaussian process regression: A trajectory-based approach, in: Proceedings of the SIAM International Conference on Data Mining, 2009.
- [38] J. Hu, X. Li, Y. Ou, Online gaussian process regression for time-varying manufacturing systems, in: 13th IEEE International Conference on Control Automation Robotics & Vision (ICARCV), 2014, pp. 1118–1123.
- [39] F. V. Jensen, *An introduction to Bayesian networks*, Vol. 210, UCL press London, 1996.
- [40] D. J. MacKay, Gaussian processes—a replacement for supervised neural networks?, *Citeseer* (1997) 1–31.
- [41] C. K. Williams, C. E. Rasmussen, *Gaussian processes for machine learning*, the MIT Press 2 (3) (2006) 4.
- [42] T. Chai, R. R. Draxler, Root mean square error (rmse) or mean absolute error (mae)?—arguments against avoiding rmse in the literature, *Geoscientific model development* 7 (3) (2014) 1247–1250.
- [43] Google, Google map api, <https://cloud.google.com/maps-platform>, accessed: 2018-11-20.