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Abstract

Accurate traffic flow prediction is essential for optimal transport systems operations and management. With the availability of large volumes of traffic data from sensors and new data sources, deep learning has emerged as a powerful approach for traffic forecasting. This paper reviews recent literature on deep neural networks for short-term traffic flow prediction. First, an introduction motivates the importance of accurate prediction in intelligent transportation systems and the potential of deep learning. Next, common deep network architectures including deep belief networks, stacked autoencoders, , and convolutional neural networks are discussed. Key findings from studies are highlighted, followed by a critical analysis of advantages and limitations of current methods. Finally, future research directions including explanatory methods, efficient architectures, and practical deployment are suggested to fully realize the promise of deep learning for traffic prediction.

1. Introduction

Efficient transportation systems are critical for economic growth and social development. A key capability for intelligent transportation management is accurate short-term forecasting of traffic variables like volume and speed. Timely and reliable traffic flow prediction enables optimal coordination of infrastructure and assets to reduce congestion, energy use, and environmental impact [1].

With the widespread deployment of sensors and emergence of new data sources like connected vehicles, transportation agencies now have access to continuously growing volumes of heterogeneous traffic data. However, traditional shallow machine learning models, which have been commonly used in the past, face limitations when it comes to fully exploiting large historical datasets and uncovering the complex nonlinear spatiotemporal relationships inherent in traffic flow [2]. This is particularly challenging due to the stochastic and time-varying nature of traffic patterns, influenced by factors such as demand fluctuations, incidents, weather conditions, and control measures [3]. Consequently, accurate modeling and prediction of traffic flow have been difficult to achieve.

While various methods, including statistical models like ARIMA and Kalman filtering, as well as machine learning models like neural networks and simulation models [2,3], have been employed for traffic forecasting, they often struggle to capture the intricate dependencies and complex traffic patterns that exist in real-world scenarios. However, the advent of big data and the rise of deep learning have opened up new possibilities. Recent advances in deep learning provide new opportunities to overcome limitations of earlier approaches and improve predictive capabilities. Deep neural networks have achieved state-of-the-art performance on myriad problems involving big, high-dimensional data in fields like computer vision, natural language processing, and time series forecasting [4]. By learning hierarchical representations and mappings, deep networks can uncover latent patterns and dependencies beyond the reach of shallow learning techniques and statistical methods [5].

These developments make deep neural networks well-suited for handling the complexities and capturing the spatiotemporal dynamics of traffic flow. With their multiple layers and ability to automatically extract hierarchical features, deep architectures empower models to effectively handle the abundance of data and uncover hidden patterns, enabling more accurate and comprehensive traffic prediction and modeling. By leveraging the representation learning ability and flexible nonlinear modeling capacity of deep neural networks, transportation agencies can make better-informed decisions and optimize traffic management strategies in the face of ever-growing traffic data.

This paper reviews recent literature on deep learning techniques for short-term traffic flow prediction. The potential benefits and key architectures are discussed. Findings from studies are highlighted along with directions for future research. The review aims to summarize progress in this emerging area at the intersection of deep learning and intelligent transportation.

2. Deep Learning Models for Traffic Prediction

A range of deep neural network architectures have been investigated for traffic prediction. Major categories include deep belief networks, stacked autoencoders, recurrent neural networks, and convolutional neural networks. Hybrid models combining recurrent, convolutional, and other specialized layers have also been proposed.

2.1 Deep Belief Networks

Deep belief networks (DBNs) are probabilistic generative models composed of multiple layers of latent variables [6]. DBNs can be pre-trained in an unsupervised manner by greedily stacking and training individual restricted Boltzmann machines. When trained on traffic data, DBNs can discover patterns and correlations in historical measurements from multiple sensor locations [7].

Huang et al. [7] developed a DBN model with a regression output layer for multi-step traffic flow forecasting. The DBN outperformed multivariate linear regression and backpropagation neural networks in predicting flows on a freeway network with varying missing data levels. DBNs have also been applied for travel time prediction [8] and traffic congestion detection [9]. A limitation is that DBNs do not directly model temporal dependencies.

2.2 Stacked Autoencoders

As mentioned previously, deep learning techniques have become increasingly promising for traffic prediction. Stacked autoencoders (SAEs) specifically offer a valuable approach for learning robust features from traffic data in an unsupervised manner, which can later be fine-tuned through supervised methods. By employing SAEs, models are able to acquire generic traffic flow features by traversing multiple layers of feature representation.

The first paper by Lv et al. develops an SAE model with a logistic regression layer on top for supervised prediction. The model takes into account spatial and temporal correlations in traffic flow by using data from multiple road sensor stations as inputs. The SAE is pretrained in a greedy layerwise fashion and then fine-tuned using backpropagation. When tested on California freeway data, the SAE model outperformed baseline methods like SVM and RBF neural networks in accuracy.

The second paper by Yang et al. also builds an SAE model but uses the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm on the top layer for prediction. This SAE-LM model is designed using the Taguchi method to find the optimal model structure. The inputs are traffic speed and headway data from multiple points on a UK freeway. The optimized SAE-LM with 5 hidden layers demonstrated around 90% prediction accuracy, outperforming other methods like particle swarm NN and RBFNNs.

The paper by Lv et al. develops a deep learning model using stacked autoencoders (SAEs) for short-term traffic flow forecasting. The SAE model takes traffic data from multiple adjacent road sensor stations as input to capture spatial and temporal correlations. It is pretrained in an unsupervised manner to learn generic traffic features, then fine-tuned with backpropagation using labeled data for supervised prediction. A logistic regression layer is added on top of the SAE for final output. When evaluated on California highway data, the SAE model demonstrates greater accuracy than shallow methods like SVMs and RBF neural networks. The results highlight the advantages of deep SAE architectures that can learn robust spatial-temporal traffic features in an unsupervised fashion before fine-tuning the model in a supervised manner. This provides an effective deep learning approach to short-term traffic flow prediction.(paper number 3)

2.3 Recurrent Neural Networks

Recurrent neural networks (RNNs) are designed to model sequential data by maintaining history through cyclic connections [14]. This enables capturing long-term temporal dependencies, ideal for traffic forecasting. RNN variants like long short-term memory (LSTM) address issues like exploding/vanishing gradients in training [15].

Tian and Pan (2015) applied LSTM networks for traffic flow prediction, using an input sequence length of 30 minutes. This allowed the LSTM to leverage its long short-term memory to sense temporal dependencies from further back in the time series. Their LSTM approach with long input sequences showed improved prediction accuracy compared to methods like SVR and standard RNNs. The authors note RNNs face difficulty modeling long-term dependencies, which LSTM overcomes through its gated memory cells. Importantly, Tian and Pan also studied LSTM performance with missing data, comparing approaches like mean value imputation versus a temporal smoothness constraint. Their results showed LSTM maintained robust accuracy despite missing data, owed to its ability to retain memory over long sequences. This demonstrates a key advantage of LSTM for prediction with incomplete traffic data.

Rui Fu et al. (2016) compared LSTM and GRU neural network methods for short-term traffic flow prediction. They found both LSTM and GRU outperformed the ARIMA model, demonstrating their ability to capture nonlinear traffic patterns that ARIMA cannot. Between LSTM and GRU, the results showed GRU achieved slightly better accuracy overall and converged faster during training. The authors note this is likely because GRU has a simpler gate structure than LSTM, making its training more efficient. This study provides a useful comparison of LSTM and GRU, two popular recurrent architectures, showing their relative strengths for sequential traffic modeling and prediction.

Yang et al. (2018) proposed an LSTM model with feature enhancement for short-term traffic flow prediction. They introduced an attention mechanism to identify and select relevant long-term historical traffic values as additional features. These long-term values were combined with short-term data as LSTM inputs to compensate for LSTM's limitations in modeling exceedingly long sequences. Experiments showed the feature-enhanced LSTM achieved better accuracy compared to standard LSTM models, demonstrating the benefit of augmenting sequential data with selective long-range inputs. This provides a useful technique for harnessing LSTM's short and long-term modeling abilities.

Cui et al. (2016) proposed an LSTM model to predict short-term traffic flow while considering the impact of rainfall. Rainfall data was incorporated as an additional input to the LSTM model. Modeling the impact of rainfall on traffic patterns can improve the accuracy of flow prediction, as rainfall significantly disrupts normal traffic patterns. Comparative results showed the proposed rainfall-LSTM model outperformed LSTM and ARIMA models that did not account for rainfall data. This demonstrates the importance of incorporating relevant external factors like weather into sequential prediction models. The rainfall-LSTM model also outperformed other methods like SVM and ANN, showing the advantage of LSTM's sequential modeling capabilities over other popular approaches. The authors note LSTM's ability to learn long-term dependencies allows it to relate distantly past rainfall to present traffic conditions, elucidating the value of LSTM's long short-term memory for modeling sequences influenced by distant external factors. Performance was compared on weekday versus weekend data, with weekends showing higher error owed to greater variability in traffic patterns. However, the rainfall-LSTM model maintained robust accuracy despite this variability. In summary, this paper provides an example of using LSTM's long short-term memory and ability to incorporate auxiliary inputs to improve prediction accuracy by modeling the impact of external influencing factors like weather. It also demonstrates LSTM's advantages over other commonly used prediction methods. (paper 2)

2.4 Convolutional Neural Networks

Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) extract localized spatial features via kernel filters and have proven very effective for grid-structured data [19]. For traffic prediction, the spatial topology and correlations can be exploited by CNNs. They have been applied for flow forecasting [20], demand prediction [21], and congestion detection [22]. Limitations include naively treating time as just another dimension.

Hybrid deep networks aim to combine strengths of CNNs and RNNs by using convolutional layers to extract spatial features and recurrent layers to capture temporal dynamics [17, 23]. Attention mechanisms can also help identify relevant inputs. Such deep hybrid models show promise for spatiotemporal traffic prediction.

2.5 Graph Neural Networks

Recent advances in graph neural networks (GNNs) have shown promise for traffic forecasting by modeling road networks as graphs and leveraging spatial and temporal graph convolutions. Both ASTGCN [1] and STFGNN [2] represent the road network as a graph, where nodes are sensors and edges are road connections. This allows capturing complex spatial dependencies between different locations in the traffic network using graph convolutions.

ASTGCN uses the given spatial adjacency matrix to model connections. STFGNN additionally constructs a novel "temporal graph" using dynamic time warping to capture temporal similarities that the spatial graph may miss. It then fuses the spatial graph, temporal graph, and node self-connections into a unified spatial-temporal fusion graph to jointly model spatial and temporal dependencies.

[1] Guo, Shengnan, et al. "Attention based spatial-temporal graph convolutional networks for traffic flow forecasting." Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. Vol. 33. No. 01. 2019.

[2] Li, Mengzhang, and Zhanxing Zhu. "Spatial-Temporal Fusion Graph Neural Networks for Traffic Flow Forecasting." Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence. Vol. 35. No. 5. 2021.

2.5.1 Capturing Spatial and Temporal Patterns

To capture different temporal patterns, ASTGCN uses three components to separately model recent, daily periodic, and weekly periodic dependencies. Each component has a spatial-temporal attention mechanism to dynamically model spatial and temporal correlations.

In contrast, STFGNN captures joint spatial-temporal patterns by stacking together spatial-temporal fusion graph modules and gated CNN modules with dilated convolutions. The graph modules model spatial and temporal correlations, while the CNN modules complement them by capturing long-range dependencies that the graphs may miss locally.

3. Key Findings and Future Outlook

Studies have demonstrated significant improvements in prediction accuracy using deep over shallow learning. Deep networks can uncover latent traffic flow features and relationships that better generalize to new data. In [11], stacked autoencoders reduced error by over 15% compared to shallow neural networks. Hybrid models that leverage spatial and temporal modeling strengths of CNNs and RNNs achieve state-of-the-art performance [23].

However, deep networks are often criticized as black boxes. Important future work is on explainability methods to provide insights into their workings and bridge the gap between data-driven and traditional model-based traffic flow theory [24]. Interactive visualizations can help analysts understand and refine predictions [25].

Another direction is developing more efficient deep architectures that balance model complexity, training time, and generalization. Regularization methods and network pruning can help avoid overfitting on noisy traffic data [26]. Transfer learning can reduce training data requirements [27]. These can aid deployment for real-time operations.

Finally, integration with transportation infrastructure remains challenging. Prediction systems must be robust and adaptive as new data sources and traffic control measures emerge. Deep learning has made significant progress but fully realizing its promise requires translating accuracy gains to real-world impact.

4. Conclusion

This paper reviewed deep learning techniques for short-term traffic flow forecasting. State-of-the-art methodscombining strengths of recurrent, convolutional, and attention-based networks were highlighted. Studies demonstrate the vast potential to improve prediction accuracy by deep learning. Future opportunities include interpretable models, efficient architectures, and integration with transportation operations and planning. As deep learning advances and transportation evolves, this synergy between fields can enable smarter, more dynamic traffic systems.
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