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#### Abstract

In this chapter, we present an expanded car-following model studying the collective influence of the driver's sensory memory as well as the velocity differential between the following and leading vehicles in the traffic flow process. The stability conditions are determined by doing a linear stability analysis on three types of traffic flows in the headway-sensitivity space: stable, metastable, and unstable. Furthermore, numerical simulation of the space-time evolution of headways and headway profiles is performed. The numerical simulation results match closely with the theoretical conclusions. The following car driver's sensory buffer time and velocity differential play a crucial influence on traffic flow stability, according to both analytical and simulation data.
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## I.INTRODUCTION

In the last 60 years, the idea of the development of various theories related to traffic flow has come into existence. On the basis of different approaches and mathematical methods, researchers have given very satisfactory consequences in the field of traffic theory. The most common and serious problem with traffic dynamics is traffic jams. Because of the tremendous quantitative increase in vehicles, traffic congestion has become a major transportation issue. To handle these types of challenges, researchers have developed a wide range of traffic flow models and theories. These models are significant for the improvement of precise tools for understanding, simulating, and controlling urban transportation systems. In this chapter, we are concerned with the microscopic approach. As a basic and important component of the microscopic approach, car-following theory has been theoretically studied. The car-following theory represents and illustrates the relationship among leading and
following vehicles. In the last few decades, many car-following models like the "optimal velocity model by Bando et al. [1], full velocity difference model by Jiang et al. [2], generalized force model by Helbing and Tilch [3], GM model [4] etc. have been developed. In addition, many extended car-following models have been proposed to analyze various real factors of traffic flow such as the honk effect [5,6], ITS environment [8, 9], cooperative driving systems [10], driver's anticipation [11] and heterogeneous vehicles [12] etc."

However, the preceding traffic flow models did not study the driver's memory effect. In this direction, Zhang [13] presented a "macro model" in which the driver's memory impact is considered, Peng et al. [14] presented a "driver's memory lattice model," and it is observed that the memory of past information plays a crucial role in the driving process of a driver and derived a car-following model by introducing the driver's memory effect into account. The above-discussed models consider the memory only at earlier time $\mathrm{t}-\tau_{0}$, butavoid the traffic states between $\left[\mathrm{t}-\tau_{0}, t\right]$.

Later,Cao [15] generated a car-following model by assuming the driver's sensory memory (Mean Memory Model) over a period of time $\left[\mathrm{t}-\tau_{0}, t\right]$ and observed that the developed model is more realistic. However, the impact of velocity difference is not considered in this model. Actually, the velocity difference plays a crucial role in the traffic flow. The velocity difference effect, not only improved the traffic flow stability but also resolved the problems of collision and improbable deceleration.

In our study, we extended the main memory model by introducing the effect of velocity difference and presented a new traffic flow model named as "an expanded car-following model studying effect of velocity difference with driver's memory".
The chapter is laid out as follows: in section II, we gave the model equation. In Section III, we examined the suggested model's linear stability. Section IV employs numerical simulation to validate theoretical findings. The conclusion comes in Section V. The findings of the linear stability investigation and numerical simulation reveal that the current model is more realistic than previous models.

## II.NEW MODEL

In this chapter, we proposed a new car-following model by introducing velocity difference term into the mean memory model [15].The new model is given below
$\frac{d v_{j}}{d t}=\alpha\left[\mathrm{V}\left\{\Delta x_{j}\left(\mathrm{t}-\tau_{1}\right)-v_{j}\right\}\right]+\mathrm{k} \Delta v_{j}(\mathrm{t})$
where $v_{j}$ represent the velocity of $j^{\text {th }}$ car at time $\mathrm{t}, \alpha=\frac{1}{\tau}$ is the "sensitivity coefficient" of a driver, $\Delta x_{j}\left(\mathrm{t}-\tau_{1}\right)$ represents the mean headway in the interval $\left[\mathrm{t}-\tau_{0}, \mathrm{t}\right]$ and $\tau_{0}$ is the driver sensory memory time. The term
$\Delta v_{j}(\mathrm{t})=v_{j+1}(\mathrm{t})-v_{j}(\mathrm{t})$
represents the velocitydifference of $j+1^{\text {th }}$ and $j^{\text {th }}$ vehicle at time $\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{k}=\frac{\lambda}{\tau}$ is the reaction coefficient of response for velocity difference $\Delta v_{j}(t)$ and V represents"optimal velocity function".

Equation (1) displays that acceleration of $j^{\text {th }}$ carat time t is calculated by the optimalvelocity, which depends on mean headway, velocity of $j^{\text {th }}$ car and velocity difference of preceding car $j+1^{\text {th }}$ and the following car $j^{\text {th }}$ at time t .
Now, expanding the term $\Delta x_{j}\left(t-\tau_{1}\right)$ in equation (1) by Taylor series about $\tau_{1}$, we obtain
$\Delta x_{j}\left(t-\tau_{1}\right)=\Delta x_{j}(t)-\tau_{1} \frac{d \Delta x_{j}(t)}{d t}+\mathrm{o}\left(\tau_{1}\right)$
where $\mathrm{o}\left(\tau_{1}\right)$ represents the terms containing higher power of $\tau_{1}$. By neglecting the terms containing higher power in equation (2) and then using in equation (1), we get
$\left.\frac{d v_{j}}{d t}=\alpha\left[\mathrm{V}\left\{\Delta x_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}-\tau_{1} \frac{d \Delta x_{j}(t)}{d t}\right\}-v_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right]+\mathrm{k} \Delta v_{j}(\mathrm{t})$
$\left.\frac{d v_{j}}{d t}=\alpha\left[\mathrm{V}\left\{\Delta x_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}-\tau_{1} \Delta v_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}-v_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right]+\mathrm{k}\left[v_{j+1}(\mathrm{t})-v_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right]$
Again by Taylor series expansion of $\left.\mathrm{V}\left\{\Delta x_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}-\tau_{1} \Delta v_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}$ about $\tau_{1} \Delta v_{j}(\mathrm{t})$ and ignoring the non-linear terms, we obtained
$\left.\mathrm{V}\left\{\Delta x_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}-\tau_{1} \Delta v_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}=\mathrm{V}\left\{\Delta x_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}-\tau_{1} \Delta v_{j}(\mathrm{t}) V^{\prime}\left(\left(\Delta x(t)_{j}\right)\right.$
where $V^{\prime}\left(\left(\Delta x(t)_{j}\right)\right.$ denotes the derivative of optimal velocity function w.r.t. headway at time t.

Using equation (4) into (3), we have
$\frac{d v_{j}}{d t}=\alpha\left[\mathrm{V}\left\{\Delta x_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}-\tau_{1} \Delta v_{j}(\mathrm{t}) V^{\prime}\left(\left(\Delta x(t)_{j}\right)-v_{j}(t)\right]+\mathrm{k}\left[v_{j+1}(\mathrm{t})-v_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right]\right.$
If $\tau_{1}=0$ and $\lambda=0$, then given model becomes optimal velocity model.
For model stability analysis, we describe the equation (5) using finite difference method, we have
$v_{j}(t+\tau)=v_{j}(t)+\alpha \tau\left[V\left\{\Delta x_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}-\tau_{1}\left\{v_{j+1}(t)-v_{j}(j)\right\} V^{\prime}\left(\Delta x_{j}(t)\right)-v_{j}(t)\right]+\mathrm{k}\left[v_{j+1}(\mathrm{t})-v_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right]$
$v_{j}(t+\tau)=\left[V\left\{\Delta x_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}-\tau_{1}\left\{v_{j+1}(t)-v_{j}(j)\right\} V^{\prime}\left(\Delta x_{j}(t)\right)\right]+\lambda\left[v_{j+1}(\mathrm{t})-v_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right]$
Again using finite difference method in equation (6), we get
$x_{j}(t+2 \tau)=x_{j}(t+\tau)+\tau V\left\{\Delta x_{j}(\mathrm{t})\right\}-\tau_{1}\left[\Delta x_{j}(t+\tau)-\Delta x_{j}(t)\right] V^{\prime}\left(\Delta x_{j}(t)\right.$
$+\lambda\left[\Delta x_{j}(t+\tau)-\Delta x_{j}(t)\right]$
The following optimal velocity function is used in this model:
$\mathrm{V}\left(\Delta x_{j}\right)=V_{1}+V_{2}\left[\tanh C_{1}\left(\Delta x_{j}-l_{c}\right)-C_{2}\right](8)$
where $l_{c}$ is the car's length. The above formula is used in many car- following models.

## III.LINEAR STABILITY ANALYSIS

The suggested model is not subjected to linear analysis in this part. Firstly, we assume traffic flow stability in terms of uniform flow. This flow is defined as all vehicles travelling with the same headway ' h ', the optimal velocity $\mathrm{V}(\mathrm{h})$, and the relative velocity is set to zero. Clearly, the consistently steady-state solution of equation (5) can be represented as
$x_{j}^{0}=h j+V(h) t$
where h denotes the steady-state headway and $\mathrm{h}=L / N, \mathrm{~L}$ is road length, N is the entire number of vehicles, $\mathrm{V}(\mathrm{h})$ is the optimal velocity in uniform traffic flow and $x_{j}^{0}(t)$ represent the location of the vehicle in steady-state.
Let $y_{j}(t)$ be a small perturbation from the uniform steady state solution $x_{j}^{0}(t)$, i.e.,
$x_{j}(t)=x_{j}^{0}(t)+y_{j}(t)$
and the corresponding headway is
$\Delta x_{j}(t)=h+\Delta y_{j}(t)(11)$
Using equations (10) and (11) into equation (8), we obtain
$y_{j}^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{t})=\alpha\left[V\left\{h+\Delta y_{j}(t)\right\}-\tau_{1} \Delta y_{j}^{\prime}(\mathrm{t}) V^{\prime}\left\{h+\Delta y_{j}(t)\right\}-\left\{V(h)+y_{j}^{\prime}(\mathrm{t})\right\}\right]+\mathrm{k} \Delta y_{j}^{\prime}(\mathrm{t})$
Expanding the terms $V\left\{h+\Delta y_{j}(t)\right\} \& V^{\prime}\left\{h+\Delta y_{j}(t)\right.$ by taylor series and neglecting the higher power of $\Delta y_{j}(t)$, then we get the following linear equation:
$y_{j}^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{t})=\alpha\left[\Delta y_{j}(t) V^{\prime}(\mathrm{h})-\tau_{1} \Delta y_{j}^{\prime}(\mathrm{t}) V^{\prime}(h)-y_{j}^{\prime}(\mathrm{t})\right]+\mathrm{k} \Delta y_{j}^{\prime}(\mathrm{t})$
where $y_{j}^{\prime \prime}(\mathrm{t})$ represents the second order derivative w.r.t. ' t ', $\Delta y_{j}(t)=y_{j+1}(t)-y_{j}(t)$ and $V^{\prime}(h)=\left[\frac{d \Delta V(\Delta x)}{d \Delta x}\right]_{\Delta x=h}$.
Expanding $y_{j}(t)=B e^{(i k j+z t)}$ (Fourier modes) and let $\tau_{1}=p \tau, \mathrm{p}$ is a parameter, we have $z^{2}+\left[\left(e^{i k}-1\right)\left(p V^{\prime}(h)-\mathrm{k}\right)+\alpha\right] \mathrm{z}-\alpha\left(e^{i k}-1\right) V^{\prime}(h)=0$
By expanding $\mathrm{z}=z_{1}(\mathrm{ik})+z_{2}(i k)^{2} \ldots$, substituting this value of z into equation (13) and ignoring the higher order terms, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[z_{1}(i k)+z_{2}(i k)^{2}\right]^{2}+\left[\left\{(i k)+\frac{(i k)^{2}}{2}\right\}\left(p V^{\prime}(h)-\mathrm{k}\right)+\alpha\right]^{*}} \\
& \left(z_{1}(i k)+z_{2}(i k)^{2}\right)-\alpha\left\{(i k)+\frac{(i k)^{2}}{2}\right\} V^{\prime}(h)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Comparing the coefficients of (ik) and $(i k)^{2}$ on both sides, we get

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
z_{1}=\mathrm{V}^{\prime}(\mathrm{h})  \tag{14}\\
\mathrm{z}_{2}=\frac{\mathrm{V}^{\prime}(\mathrm{h})}{2 \alpha}\left[(1+2 \lambda) \alpha-2 p \mathrm{~V}^{\prime}(\mathrm{h})\right]-\frac{\left(\mathrm{V}^{\prime}(\mathrm{h})\right)^{2}}{\alpha}
\end{array}\right.
$$

For small disturbance of long wavelength, the uniform traffic flow is unstable if $z_{2}<0$, while stable if $z_{2}>0$.

Therefore, the neutral stability condition is given by putting $z_{2}=0$. i.e.,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{\mathrm{V}^{\prime}(\mathrm{h})}{2}\left[(1+2 \lambda) \alpha-2 \mathrm{pV}^{\prime}(\mathrm{h})\right]-\left(\mathrm{V}^{\prime}(\mathrm{h})\right)^{2}=0 \\
& \mathrm{~V}^{\prime}(\mathrm{h})=\frac{(1+2 \lambda) \alpha}{2(1+\mathrm{p})} \tag{15}
\end{align*}
$$

Consequently, the uniform traffic flow is stable for long wavelength if,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{V}^{\prime}(\mathrm{h})<\frac{(1+2 \lambda) \alpha}{2(1+p)} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

The neutral stability curves are shown in figures 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 with the help of stability condition (16) in the parameter space $(\Delta x, \alpha)$.

From the figures, it is clear that different critical points $\left(h_{c}, \alpha_{c}\right)$ for distinct sets of $(\lambda, p)$ are obtained for the neutral stability curves. The peaks of each curve show the critical point. If $\alpha>\alpha_{c}$, the uniform steady state is always linearly stable irrespective of vehicle headway and if $\alpha<\alpha_{c}$, the uniform steady state in neighbourhood of $h_{c}$ is unstable.
These stability curves divide the region into two sub-regions (a) stable (b) unstable. Above the neutral stability curves traffic flow is stable while below the curves it is unstable. Therefore, traffic congestion will not appear in the stable region which we will also prove in the simulation result.

It can be easily seen from the fig. 1.1 that the increasing the value of sensory memory coefficient p , the height of stability curves increases i.e., the stable region decreases with increasing the value of p . Similar results hold for $\lambda=0.3$ and $\lambda=0.5$ as shown in fig. 1.2 and fig. 1.3, respectively.

From figures 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, it is found that for a particular value of ' p ' the amplitude as well as critical sensitivity decrease with an increase in the value of $\lambda$ i.e., stable area improves with an increase in the value of $\lambda$. Therefore, we can conclude that velocity difference plays a crucial role in reducing the traffic congestion.


Fig. 1.1: Neutral Stability Curves in the headway-sensitivity Space for $\lambda=0$ and distinct Values of p


Fig. 1.2: Neutral stability curves in the headway-sensitivity space for $\lambda=0.3$ and distinct values of p .


Fig. 1.3: Neutral stability curves in the headway-sensitivity space for $\lambda=0.5$ and distinct values of p .

## IV. NUMERICAL SIMULATION

The suggested study is numerically simulated to investigate the effect of driver memory and velocity difference on "spatial-time evolution of headway" and "headway profile" when a tiny disturbance appears. In order to simulate the current model, we rewrite equation (7) in terms of headway as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta x_{j}(t+2 \tau)= & \Delta x_{j}(t+\tau)+\tau\left[V\left(\Delta x_{j+1}(t)\right)-V\left(\Delta x_{j}(t)\right)\right] \\
& -p \tau\left[\Delta x_{j+2}(t+\tau)-\Delta x_{j+1}(t+\tau)-\Delta x_{j+2}(t)+\Delta x_{j+1}(t)-\Delta x_{j+1}(t+\tau)\right. \\
& \left.+\Delta x_{j}(t+\tau)+\Delta x_{j+1}(t)-\Delta x_{j}(t)\right]\left[V^{\prime}\left(\Delta x_{j+1}(t)\right)-V^{\prime}\left(\Delta x_{j}(t)\right)\right] \\
& +\lambda\left[\Delta x_{j+2}(t+\tau)-\Delta x_{j+1}(t+\tau)-\Delta x_{j+2}(t)+\Delta x_{j+1}(t)-\Delta x_{j+1}(t+\tau)\right. \\
& \left.+\Delta x_{j}(t+\tau)+\Delta x_{j+1}(t)-\Delta x_{j}(t)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Simulation is performed under periodic boundary condition. Initially, assume that there are $J=100$ vehicles are uniformly distributed on a road of length $(L)=1500 \mathrm{~m}$. The initial conditions are chosen as follows:
$\left.\Delta x_{j}(t)\right|_{\mathrm{t}=0}=\left.\Delta x_{j}(t)\right|_{\mathrm{t}=1}=\Delta x_{0}=\frac{L}{J}, \quad \mathrm{j}=1,2,3, \ldots, 100$
$\left.\Delta x_{j}(t)\right|_{t=2}=\Delta x_{0}=\frac{L}{J}, \quad \mathrm{j} \neq 1, j \neq 2$
$\left.\Delta x_{j}(t)\right|_{\mathrm{t}=2}=\Delta x_{0}+0.5, \quad \mathrm{j}=1$
$\left.\Delta x_{j}(t)\right|_{t=2}=\Delta x_{0}-0.5, \quad \mathrm{j}=2$
Other input parameters are as follows:
$\mathrm{V}_{\text {max }}=\mathrm{V}(\mathrm{L} / \mathrm{J}), \alpha=\frac{1}{\tau}=2 s^{-1}$
where $\mathrm{J}=100$ and $\mathrm{L}=1500 \mathrm{~m}$.
Figures 2(a)-2(d) represent the "spatiotemporal evolution of the headway" after $t=10000$ s for distinct values of $p$ when $\lambda=0$. From the figures 2(b)-2(d), it can be easily seen that the initial uniform perturbation converts into "kink-antikink density wave" which are the solution of mKdV equation. These density waves propagate over time in the opposite direction as shown in figure and these observations are same as that happen in real traffic. As we enter into stable region for $\mathrm{p}=0$, these traffic wave evolves straight line.


Fig. 2(a): Headway evolution in space and time after $\mathrm{t}=10000$ s for $\lambda=0$ and $\mathrm{p}=0$


Fig. 2(b): Headway evolution in space and time after $t=10000$ s for $\lambda=0$ and $p=0.1$


Fig. 2(c): Headway evolution in space and time after $t=10000$ s for $\lambda=0$ and $p=0.2$


Fig. 2(d): Headway evolution in space and time after $t=10000$ s for $\lambda=0$ and $p=0.3$

Figures 3(a)-3(d) represent the graph between headway profile after $t=10000$ s for different values of p when $\lambda=0$. Figure 3(a) shows that density wave dies out and the kink- antikink waves convert into a single line which represents that there is no traffic congestion. Further from figures3(b), 3(c) and 3(d), we can observe that the amplitude of density waves rises with an increase in the value of p which shows that the region of traffic congestion growths with increase in the value of p .


Fig. 3 (a): Headway profiles at $\mathrm{t}=10000$ s, for $\lambda=0$ and $\mathrm{p}=0$.


Fig. 3(b): Headway profiles at $t=10000$ s, for $\lambda=0$ and $p=0.1$


Fig. 3(c): Headway profiles at $t=10000$ s, for $\lambda=0$ and $p=0.2$


Fig. 3(d): Headway profiles at $t=10000$ s, for $\lambda=0$ and $p=0.3$.

Figures 4(a)-4(d) represent the "spatiotemporal evolution of the headway" after $t=10000 \mathrm{~s}$ for distinct values of p when $\lambda=0.3$. For $\mathrm{p}=0$, we are in stable region, therefore, the initial perturbation dies out. As we increase the value of $p$ from 0.1 to 0.3 shown in figures 4(b)4(d), the initial uniform disturbance changes into "kink-antikink density wave," which are the solution of mKdV equation. These density waves propagate in backward direction with time as happen in real life traffic.
We can observe that the height of density waves rises with rise in the value of $p$ from figures 5(a)-5(d), which shows that the area of traffic congestion grows with increase in the value of p.

The "spatiotemporal evolution of the headway" and "Headway profile" are shown in figures 6 and 7 , respectively, for distinct values of $p$ when $\lambda=0.5$. Similar kinds of affect have been found for this case also.

From these figures, we observed that the quantity of stop and go wave rises as the value of p increases which implies that the traffic jam rises with increase in the value of $p$.


Fig. 4(a): Headway evolution in space and time after $\mathrm{t}=10000$ s for $\lambda=0.3$ and $\mathrm{p}=0$.


Fig. 4(b): Headway evolution in space and time after $t=10000$ s for $\lambda=0.3$ and $p=0.1$.


Fig. 4(c): Headway evolution in space and time after $t=10000$ s for $\lambda=0.3$ and $p=0.2$


Fig. 4(d): Headway evolution in space and time after $t=10000$ s for $\lambda=0.3$ and $p=0.3$

Again from Figures 3(d), 5(d) and 7(d), it can be easily seen that the number of stop and go wave in Figure 3(d) is more than that of 7(d) which shows that traffic jam is more serious in 3(d) than that of 7(c) due to velocity difference.


Fig. 5(a): Headway profiles at $\mathrm{t}=10000 \mathrm{~s}$, for $\lambda=0.3$ and $\mathrm{p}=0$.


Fig. 5(b): Headway profiles at $t=10000$ s, for $\lambda=0.3$ and $p=0.1$


Fig. 5(c): Headway profiles at $\mathrm{t}=10000$ s, for $\lambda=0.3$ and $\mathrm{p}=0.2$


Fig. 5(d): Headway profiles at $t=10000$ s, for $\lambda=0.3$ and $p=0.3$


Fig. 6(a): Headway evolution in space and time after $\mathrm{t}=10000$ s for $\lambda=0.5$ and $\mathrm{p}=0$.


Fig. 6(b): Headway evolution in space and time after $t=10000$ s for $\lambda=0.5$ and $p=0.1$.


Fig. 6(c): Headway evolution in space and time after $\mathrm{t}=10000$ s for $\lambda=0.5$ and $\mathrm{p}=0.2$.


Fig. 6(d): Headway evolution in space and time after $t=10000$ s for $\lambda=0.5$ and $p=0.3$.


Fig. 7(a): Headway profiles at $\mathrm{t}=10000$ s, for $\lambda=0.5$ and $\mathrm{p}=0$.


Fig. 7(b): Headway profiles at $\mathrm{t}=10000$ s, for $\lambda=0.5$ and $\mathrm{p}=0.1$


Fig. 7(c): Headway profiles at $\mathrm{t}=10000 \mathrm{~s}$, for $\lambda=0.5$ and $\mathrm{p}=0.2$


Fig. 7(d): Headway profiles at $t=10000$ s, for $\lambda=0.5$ and $p=0.3$

## V CONCLUSION

In this chapter, an extended car-following model is presented by assuming collective effect of velocity difference and driver's memory in the traffic flow. The stability criterion of this model is found by linear stability analysis. The outcomes show that the stability of traffic
flow decreases with increase in the value of driver's memory time, also it is found that for a particular value of ' $p$ ', the stable region increase with rise in the value of ' $\lambda$ '.

It should be noted that the traffic jam induced due to driver's memory can be overcome by considering the effect of velocity difference. In other words, we can say that if driver senses the information of leading vehicles in term of acceleration, then upto some level this information will be helpful in reducing the time consumed in congestion as well as in smooth driving. Therefore, it is obvious that both these factors play a crucial role in traffic and these factors should be considered while modeling.
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