

The association between crashes and safety-critical events:
synthesized evidence from crash reports and naturalistic driving data among
commercial truck drivers

Miao Cai^a, Mohammad Ali Alamdar Yazdi^b, Amir Mehdizadeh^c, Qiong Hu^c, Alexander Vinel^c,
Karen Davis^d, Hong Xian^a, Fadel M. Megahed^e, Steven E. Rigdon^{a,*}

^a*Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis, MO, 63103, United States*

^b*Carey Business School, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, 21218, United States*

^c*Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, 36849, United States*

^d*Department of Computer Science and Software Engineering, Miami University, Oxford, OH, 45056, United States*

^e*Farmer School of Business, Miami University, Oxford, OH, 45056, United States*

Abstract

The past decade has witnessed continuous growth of naturalistic driving studies (NDSs). When analysing NDS data, safety-critical events (SCEs) are commonly used as surrogates for safety, since actual crashes are very rare. However, the association between SCEs and crashes is not consistent in previous studies and has not been verified among commercial truck drivers. Based on routinely collected kinematic data from 31,828 truck drivers in a large commercial trucking company, this paper examines the association between four types of SCEs (headway, hard brake, collision mitigation, and rolling stability) and crashes, as well as injuries and fatalities. Compared to existing studies on the subject, that are based on up to about 2 million miles driven, our study involves an estimated 2.3 billion miles driven. Bayesian negative binomial models were applied to examine the association between three outcomes (crashes, injuries, and fatalities) and the four SCEs. It was found that a unit increase in the number of any type of SCEs per 10,000 miles was associated with 8.4% (95% credible interval (CI): 8.0-8.8%) increase in crashes per mile and 8.7% (95% CI: 4.8-13.6%) increase in the number of injuries per mile. The increase was different in different types of SCEs: 3.3% (95% CI: 2.6-4%) for headways, 8.1% (95% CI: 7.5-8.7%) for hard brakes, 50.4% (95% CI: 41.4-60%) for rolling stability, and 22.2% (95% CI: 19.8-24.5%) for collision mitigation. The results are consistent when stratified by different business units and driver types. This study provides statistically strong and robust evidence that SCEs are positively associated with crashes and injuries among commercial truck drivers. NDS and kinematic data routinely collected by trucking companies provide a promising opportunity for future data analytic research.

Keywords: truck, naturalistic driving studies, safety-critical events, crashes, injuries, fatalities

*Corresponding Author

Email addresses: miao.cai@slu.edu (Miao Cai), yazdi@jhu.edu (Mohammad Ali Alamdar Yazdi), azm0127@auburn.edu (Amir Mehdizadeh), qzh0011@auburn.edu (Qiong Hu), alexander.vinel@auburn.edu (Alexander Vinel), davisk4@miamioh.edu (Karen Davis), hong.xian@slu.edu (Hong Xian), fmegahed@miamioh.edu (Fadel M. Megahed), steve.rigdon@slu.edu (Steven E. Rigdon)

1. Introduction

Truck drivers “form the lifeblood of [the U.S.] economy” (The White House, 2020), moving more than 70% of goods, transporting approximately 10.8 billion tons of freight, and generating annual revenues of over \$700 billion (John, 2019). It is then imperative to reduce the prevalence and severity of crashes involving commercial trucks. Tsai et al. (2018) pointed out three aspects related to this concern: (a) in 2017, 5,005 lives were claimed in 4,455 fatal crashes involving large trucks or buses, and 170,000 persons were injured in 116,000 injury crashes involving trucks and buses (FMCSA, 2019); (b) larger property damage occurred, which can increase the likelihood of injuries and human loss, as well as increase travel-time for other commuters; and (c) indirect losses in efficiency arose from the slowing and damage of essential goods during transit. Despite the significant advances in trucking safety technologies (e.g., deployment of forward-collision mitigation and lane departure warning systems), large truck crash rates have increased over the past decade. In the U.S., the involvement rate per 100 million large-truck miles traveled increased from 1.32 in 2008 to 1.48 in 2016 for fatal crashes, and from 21 in 2008 to 31 in 2015 (most recent data at the time of writing) for injury crashes (NHTSA’s National Center for Statistics and Analysis, 2019).

Traditionally, the literature focusing on analyzing trucking crashes relied on data from police reports. Due to the retrospective nature of these reports, they are subject to four major limitations. First, the post-hoc nature of the reports results in recall and information bias (Stern et al., 2019). The second limitation stems from the fact that crashes constitute rare events when compared to non-crashes, which makes it difficult to make statistically valid conclusions on the risk factors of crashes (Guo et al., 2010; Theofilatos et al., 2019). Third, critical behavioral factors, such as fatigue, distraction and cell-phone use, are under-reported by those involved in crashes in an attempt to avoid penalties, fines and legal actions (Dingus et al., 2011; Stern et al., 2019). Finally, minor crashes, resulting in no injuries and no/minor physical damages, tend to be under-reported (Blower, 2017), which impacts the total reported crashes and hence, the understanding of crash risk.

The emergence of sensor-based monitoring technologies, which generate detailed data related to both the truck and truck driver’s performance, can enhance our understanding of road safety especially when integrated with data analytic techniques (Shi and Abdel-Aty, 2015; Katrakazas et al., 2015; Imprilou and Quddus, 2019; He et al., 2019; Wali and Khattak, 2020; Mehdizadeh et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020). The coupling of these sensors with computational advances, which can harness the resulting big datasets, have allowed for conducting several naturalistic driving studies (NDSs) that can overcome the aforementioned limitations in the retrospective crash analysis literature. For example, the 100-car study (Neale et al., 2005), UDRIVE (Eenink et al., 2014) and SHRP2 (Hankey et al., 2016) NDSs collected acceleration, video

and location data for crashes and non-crashes, thus, providing superior ability to estimate the risk or rate of crashes due to the inclusion of non-crashes, and also to investigate the short period prior to crashes or safety events without being subjected to information/recall bias (Guo et al., 2010).

Despite the massive amounts of data captured in NDSs, the recorded number of crashes, in any given study, remains small. For example, the 100-car study captured around two million vehicle miles, 40,000+ hours of driving, and yet included only 69 crashes (Neale et al., 2005). This is an expected result since crashes are rare events; hence their rates are reported per 100 million miles driven. In view of these limitations, naturalistic driving studies often use surrogate events in place of actual crashes. Such surrogates are usually referred to as safety-critical events (SCEs) and are selected to intuitively represent (more numerous) “near misses”, i.e., special types of accident precursors that have all features of accidents, except that potentially catastrophic outcomes were avoided by last-second evasive maneuvers (Dingus et al., 2011; Saleh et al., 2013). A fundamental question then is whether some specific classes of SCEs (e.g., hard brakes, initiation of collision mitigation systems, rolling stability alerts, etc.) can be used as a surrogate for crashes. Since these less severe events are more frequent than crashes, a strong positive correlation between the two would allow for statistically valid modeling of crash risk even when the number of actual crashes is limited.

1.1. *Research gaps*

The study of the association between surrogate measures and more rare accident events can be first attributed to Heinrich (1931) who attempted to apply the scientific method to the field of industrial accident prevention. In the context of motor vehicle crash analysis, the earlier works focused on estimating the conversion factor between the two types of events (Evans and Wasielewski, 1982, 1983; Cooper, 1984; Risser, 1985; Hydén, 1987). With the advancements in sensor-based technologies and the transition to NDS, we found several research studies (Dingus et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2010; Gordon et al., 2011; Simons-Morton et al., 2012; Wu and Jovanis, 2012; Guo and Fang, 2013; Wu et al., 2014; Pande et al., 2017; Gitelman et al., 2018) that examined the relationship between kinematic-based SCEs and crashes. Table 1 provides an overview of these studies on the relationship between SCEs and crashes, highlighting the sample size, driver types, driving locations, number of observed crash and surrogate events for the participating vehicles/drivers, statistical approach used, and statistically significant effects. While the largest of these involved about 43,000 hours and 2 million miles driven, ours is based on 66 million hours and 2.3 billion miles driven.

Table 1: Differences between existing literature and our study regarding sample size, crash surrogates, statistical models, and conclusion.

Ref.	Data set	Study size	Region	Statistical model	Crash surrogates (effect direction)
Dingus et al. (2006)	100-car	Drivers: 241 commuters Hours driven: 43,000 Miles driven: ~2M Time frame: 1 year Crashes: 69 <u>Surrogates: 761</u>	Northern Virginia & Washington D.C., USA	95% confidence limits modeled using a Poisson distribution	Braking (↑) Steering (↑) Accelerating (↑)
Guo et al. (2010)	100-car	Drivers: 241 commuters Hours driven: 43,000 Miles driven: ~2M Time frame: 1 year Crashes: 69 <u>Surrogates: 761</u>	Northern Virginia & Washington D.C., USA	Sequential factor analysis, Poisson regression	Near crashes (↑)
Gordon et al. (2011)	-	Drivers: 78 commuters Hours driven: NR Miles driven: ~0.08M Time frame: 10 months Crashes: NR <u>Surrogates: NR</u>	Michigan, USA	Seemingly unrelated regression, Poisson regression	Lateral deviation (↓) Lane-departure warning (↑) Time to edge crossing (↑)
Simons-Morton et al. (2012)	-	Drivers: 42 newly licensed teenagers Hours driven: NR Miles driven: NR Time frame: 18 months Crashes: 37 <u>Surrogates: NR</u>	Virginia, USA	Logistic regression using generalized estimating equations	Elevated gravitational-force (↑)
Wu and Jovanis (2012)	100-car	Drivers: 241 commuters Hours driven: 43,000 Miles driven: ~2M Time frame: 1 year Crashes: 13 <u>Surrogates: 38</u>	Northern Virginia & Washington D.C., USA	Logistic regression	Yaw rate (↓) Lateral acceleration (↓)
Guo and Fang (2013)	100-car	Drivers: 102 young and high mileage Hours driven: 43,000 Miles driven: ~2M Time frame: 1 year Crashes: 60 <u>Surrogates: 7,394</u>	Northern Virginia & Washington D.C., USA	Negative binomial regression	Critical-incident events (↑)
Wu et al. (2014)	100-car	Drivers: 90 commuters Hours driven: NR Miles driven: ~1.1M Time frame: 1 year Crashes: 14 <u>Surrogates: 182</u>	Northern Virginia & Washington D.C., USA	Poisson regression	Run-off-road events (↑)

Continued on next page

Table 1 – continued from previous page

Ref.	Data set	Study size	Region	Statistical model	Crash surrogates (effect direction)
Pande et al. (2017)	-	Drivers: 33 commuters Hours driven: NR Miles driven: NR Time frame: 10 days Crashes: NA <u>Surrogates:</u> NA	California, USA	Negative binomial regression	High magnitude jerks while decelerating (\uparrow)
Gitelman et al. (2018)	-	Drivers: 64 commuters Hours driven: NR Miles driven: NR Time frame: 1 year Crashes: NA <u>Surrogates:</u> NA	Israel	Negative binomial regression	Braking (\uparrow) Speed alerts (\downarrow)
This paper	-	Drivers: 31,828 commercial truck drivers Hours driven: ~66M Miles driven: ~2.3B Time frame: 1 year Crashes: 34,884 <u>Surrogates:</u> 450,758	National data, USA	Bayesian negative binomial regression	Headway (\uparrow) Hard brakes (\uparrow) Collision mitigation (\uparrow) Rolling stability (\uparrow)

Abbreviations: NR indicates that the parameter was not reported (or reported in combination with another parameter and hence cannot be inferred). M and B denote that the reported numbers are in millions and billions, respectively.

Although the studies summarized in Table 1 use different types of SCEs, they generally reached similar conclusions indicating that their selected crash surrogates had positive or zero association with crashes (with the exception of speed alert events in Gitelman et al. (2018)). Based on Table 1, we can identify four main gaps in the literature:

- Although two separate NDS datasets, the *Drowsy Driver Warning System Field Operation Test* and the *Naturalistic Truck Driving Study*, have been sponsored by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (Hickman et al., 2018), no studies have examined the association between crashes and surrogates using NDS data sets that specifically target commercial truck drivers. It is unclear whether the associations identified for a general driving population can hold for commercial drivers.
- The number of drivers reported in those studies are limited, with the largest studies (Dingus et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2010) examining 241 drivers. Thus, the number of reported crashes was less than 100. Note this observation specifically pertains to the literature examining the association between crash and SCEs since the number of reported crashes in the overarching NDS study can be larger.
- With more than 30,000 truck drivers and 2 billion mileage driven, we can further explore the correlation between SCEs and crash severity (injuries and fatalities), which no existing studies were able to analyze due to small sample size.

- The studies investigating the association between surrogates and crashes were confined to small geographic areas, which may limit the generalizability of the conclusions to regions having different weather conditions, regulations, and commuting behavior (Tsai et al., 2015).

1.2. Study focus, goals and contributions

Owing to the four identified gaps in the literature, the primary objective of this paper is to investigate the association between crashes and SCEs among commercial truck drivers. This study is performed in collaboration with a leading shipping freight company in the U.S. The collaboration with an industry partner provides the following unique settings:

- At the time of data collection, the company's entire fleet utilized the Bendix® Wingman® AdvancedTM monitoring system. Both the data management and system maintenance operations were performed by the company. Note that this system is also widely used by other U.S. based trucking operators.
- The truck drivers included in this study were all employed by the company at the time of data collection. The data were collected routinely as a part of their job.
- Unlike previous studies, the routes chosen by the drivers are subject to company policies, delivery windows and government regulations, i.e., naturally follow realistic commercial driving patterns.

Consequently, we can capitalize on data generated by 30,000+ trucks, which accumulate over 2 billion total miles per year. The implication of the large sample size is two-fold. First, we can overcome the sample size and driving location restrictions that can affect the inference from the previous studies. Second, the large sample size provides an opportunity for not only studying the relationship between the surrogates and crashes, but to also study the relationship between the surrogates and both injuries and fatalities.

This study investigates whether kinematic events captured from a popular, commercial sensor-based system can be used as surrogates for crash events. If such a relationship can be established, then our insights can be incorporated by other trucking companies employing (similar) systems. The sensor-based monitoring system used by the company captures four different kinematic events:

- Headway, which signals an instance of tailgating for at least 118 seconds at an unsafe gap time (a measure of distance between leading and trailing vehicles) of 2.8 seconds or less (Grove et al., 2015).
- Hard brakes, which are defined as instances of a deceleration rate of 9.5 miles per hour per second or more.
- Activation of the rolling stability system, which intervenes by applying brake pressure (in addition to potentially applying trailer pressure) assisting the driver in aligning the vehicle when the system's critical thresholds are approached (Bendix®, 2007).
- Activation of the forward collision mitigation system.

Our goal is to explain the association between these four SCEs and trucking crashes, injuries and fatalities. To achieve this goal, we examine the following research questions:

- (A) To what extent are the SCEs associated with crashes, injuries, and fatalities among commercial truck drivers?
- (B) Is the association between crashes and SCEs consistent for all four different SCEs (headway alerts, hard brakes detected, collision mitigation activation, and rolling stability activation)?
- (C) Does the association between crashes and SCEs hold for the different business units of our industrial partner (dedicated, intermodal, and final-mile) and driver types (local, regional, and over-the-road)?

Note that the question of what factors affect the likelihood of a crash, or predict crashes is a separate topic, (Shmueli et al., 2010) which we do not address here.

By addressing the research questions above, this paper provides three main contributions to the literature. First, the large sample size provides the statistical power to estimate the correlation between SCEs and crashes. Second, four types of SCEs (headways, hard brakes, collision mitigation, and rolling stability) are examined in this study, and we show that the magnitude of associations between crashes and the four types of SCEs are different. Third, since most of the crashes have no human injuries or fatalities, sample sizes in previous studies are usually too small to infer an association between SCEs and severe crashes. In this data set, we are able to examine the association between injuries, fatalities, and SCEs.

2. Data description

The data used in this study were collected by a U.S.-based trucking company, which provides transportation, delivery, and logistics services to customers and consumers in North America. The data captures three of the logistical services provided by the company: (a) dedicated contract carriage, where trucks and drivers are assigned to a singular customer with familiar routes, task and work duties; (b) intermodal freight services, where the freight is transported in intermodal containers between shipping ports, rail terminals and inland shipping docks; and (c) final mile delivery services, where non-conveyable products are delivered to customers. It is important to note that the purposes of data collection, which covers the company's entire fleet, were routine performance monitoring, drivers' assistance and regulatory compliance. All the data were anonymized prior to the research team's access. The study protocol and data usage for research purposes were approved by the Institutional Review Board of Saint Louis University.

2.1. Drivers' characteristics

The company provided a driver's characteristics table that linked age, gender, business unit and driver type to the anonymized driver ID. Driver types include (a) local drivers who transport freight within a 200-mile radius and return home on the same day, (b) regional drivers moving freights in regional routes

that may include several surrounding states, and (c) over-the-road drivers who specialize in hauling freight long distances, requiring them to be on the road for days/weeks.

The original dataset provided by the company included 34,348 drivers. We have excluded 2,520 drivers (i.e., 7.4% of the original dataset) from our analysis if any of the following criteria is met: (a) driver inactivity, where we required the driver to have at least 100 GPS pings in the data to be included; (b) the unique identification code for the driver is not found in the provided demographics table; and/or (c) the number of SCEs reported were identified as obvious outliers (we only removed drivers who had an unrealistically large number of SCEs). Hereafter, all reported data will correspond to only those generated by the remaining 31,828 drivers, whose characteristics are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: A summary of driver characteristics including their average age \pm SD, number of drivers per gender, business unit and driver types (with their % in parentheses).

Variable	Statistics
Age:	
Range	20 to 82 years
Mean age \pm SD	44.48 \pm 11.72
Gender: (%)	
Male	29,248 (91.9%)
Female	1,583 (5.0%)
Unknown	997 (3.1%)
Business unit: (%)	
Dedicated	16,152 (50.7%)
Final-mile	5,908 (18.6%)
Intermodal	9,768 (30.7%)
Driver type: (%)	
Local	13,381 (42.0%)
Regional	15,707 (49.3%)
Over-the-road	2,740 (8.6%)

2.2. Data acquired from the sensor-based monitoring system

2.2.1. Ping data

Our study is based on data captured from April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016 by the company's sensor-based monitoring system on their entire fleet. Our dataset includes intermittently collected real-time driving *ping* records, which ranges from every couple of seconds to approximately 15 minutes. Over 50% of the time intervals between two pings were less than 5 minutes and over 95% of them were less than 15 minutes. The time intervals varied among drivers, places, and trips, and there were no clear patterns explaining the variations in interval lengths. Each ping is a data point that includes the exact date and time of the record (year, month, day, hour, minute, and second), GPS (latitudes and longitudes with five decimal place recordings), GPS quality, speed, and drivers' anonymized unique identification code.

We must emphasize that these data were collected as part of the company's ongoing monitoring and surveillance plan. The data were not collected specifically as part of a planned NDS. That said, the data

are still measurements on factors that could affect safety and are therefore still valid for the purpose of answering the questions we pose in Section 1.2.

The included 31,828 commercial truck drivers had a total of 1,494,678,173 pings. Based on the GPS quality indicator, 98.7% of these pings were of “good quality”. An overview of the pings’ locations is shown in Figure 1, where the active (speed > 0 MPH) and inactive (speed = 0 MPH) pings are depicted in Figures 1a and 1b, respectively. Note that the plot was created by aggregating the GPS locations to two decimal places in order to ensure the anonymity of the data, and only displaying locations with at least fifty pings. Both Figures 1a and 1b utilize a sequential color scheme, where a darker color indicates a higher number of pings. The background grey lines are the major roads in the United States (United States Geological Survey, 2014) and the solid black lines are state boundaries. The geographical point patterns suggest that most of the trucking transportation closely matches the U.S. population density distribution (i.e., it is more concentrated along the coasts). The active and inactive pings are generally consistent, but active pings are more concentrated in major midwest roads.

2.2.2. Safety critical events


The SCEs were collected independently from the ping data. A SCE is recorded whenever a pre-specified kinematic threshold, defined in Section 1.2, of the Bendix® Wingman® Advanced™ monitoring system was triggered while driving. The collected SCE data include the exact date and time, latitude and longitude (specific to five decimal places), driver, and the type of SCEs. A total of 450,758 SCEs were collected, which were divided into (a) 170,421 headway events, (b) 218,419 hard brakes, (c) 55,243 initiations of the forward-collision mitigation system, and (d) 6,675 initiations of the rolling stability system.

2.3. Crashes


In addition to the sensor-based data, the trucking company provided a crash dataset, which included the anonymized driver ID, state, city, report time, the number fatalities, and the number of injuries. Every row in this dataset corresponded to a unique crash. In total, the 31,828 drivers included in this study were involved in 34,884 crashes, 239 injuries, and 22 fatalities.

2.4. Data aggregation

To draw inferences from the ping data, it should be aggregated to provide insights about trips, routes, and/or any other unit of analysis of interest. In this study, we aggregated the ping data into trips based on the approach of Pande et al. (2017). Specifically, we define a trip as a continuous period of driving, which can contain sub-periods of stopping as long the length of any period is under 30 minutes. In our analysis, we sorted the original ping by driver using the observed timestamp for each driver. Then, if the ping speed



(a) Active pings captured from the 31,828 truck drivers from April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016.



(b) Inactive pings captured from the 31,828 truck drivers from April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016.

Figure 1: Geographical point patterns of active and inactive pings in a large commercial NDS data set.

data showed that the truck was not moving (the speed of the ping equals zero) for more than 30 minutes, the ping data were separated into two different trips.

The aggregation of pings into trips is demonstrated in Figure 2, where the *x*-axis shows the date and time of pings, and the *y*-axis captures the speed (in miles per hour, MPH). Each point represented a ping at that date and time, with different colors indicating the real-time speed category. Whenever the truck stopped (the grey points) for at least 30 minutes, the pings were separated into different trips, indicated by the purple arrows in the bottom (Trip 1, Trip 2, ..., Trip 6). The trip time was then calculated by taking the difference between the trip end time and start time.




Figure 2: Data aggregation from ping data to trips for a sample of a commercial NDS data set.

The traveled distance within a trip was computed using a three sequential-step procedure. First, we sorted the ping data by driver, date, and time. Then, in step 2, we computed the distance between consecutive ping locations for each driver using the haversine method (Sinnott, 1984), which assumes a spherical earth and ignores all ellipsoidal effects. Although this haversine method does not reflect the true driving distance since it calculates the shortest distance between two points, it is the most feasible algorithm we could use for this huge data set. The third step involved summing up all the distances traveled within a trip for each driver. This procedure aggregated the original ping data into 18,740,142 trips, with a total of 2,320,967,467 miles traveled in 65,646,731 hours. The total number of miles recorded is consistent with the estimates provided by the company pertaining to their total annual incurred miles. Furthermore, the median trip time was 2.61 hours and the median number of miles per trip was 77.06 miles. A summary of the total number of events described in Sections 2.1-2.4 is provided in Table 3.

3. Methodology

3.1. Data preparation for statistical modeling

With the modeling objectives in mind, we can categorize the data from Section 2 into three statistical categories. First, our outcome/response variables capture the number of (a) crashes, (b) injuries, and (c)

Table 3: A summary of the trucking data that is analyzed in this study.

Pings		Trips		SCEs		Crashes	
Total pings	1,494,678,173	Total trips	18,740,142	Total SCEs	450,758	Crashes	34,884
Drivers	31,828	Total miles	2,320,967,467	Headway	170,421	Injuries	239
		Total hours	65,646,731	Hard brakes	218,419	Fatalities	22
		Median miles	77.06	Collision mitigation	55,243		
		Median hours	2.61	Rolling stability	6,675		

fatalities reported for a given driver. Thus, the outcome variables capture data that is aggregated/added over the 1-year period of data collection. Note that we hypothesize that these three outcome variables should be positively correlated with the total miles driven, and hence we also record the total miles driven by each driver. The second category includes our primary predictor variables of interest, where the rate of SCE per 10,000 miles is computed for each SCE, i.e., four rates are computed for each driver capturing headway, hard brakes, rolling stability and forward collision mitigation events. We also compute a pooled SCE rate per 10,000 miles for each driver, representing the aggregation of the four SCEs (i.e. the rate if any of the four SCEs were observed). Note that all five SCE predictor variables are also based on the driver's total driving activity over the course of the data collection period. The third, and final category, captures the following driver-specific covariates: (a) age, (b) gender, (c) mean ping speed, (d) business unit, and (e) driver type. With the exception of the computed mean ping speed, the other four covariates are obtained using the company provided demographics table. A summary of the computed variables is provided in Table 4. Note that the distribution of the other covariates was provided in Table 2.

Table 4: A summary of the computed response, predictor variables and covariate.

Variable	Mean \pm SD
Number of crashes per driver	1.10 \pm 1.69
Headways per driver per 10,000 miles	5.35 \pm 27.01
Hard brakes per driver per 10,000 miles	6.86 \pm 22.75
Rolling stability initiations per driver per 10,000 miles	0.21 \pm 1.20
Collision mitigation initiations per driver per 10,000 miles	1.74 \pm 4.66
Ping speed per driver	29.85 \pm 7.23

The final step in preparing the data for modeling was to examine whether the number of predictors and/or covariates can be reduced based on a correlation analysis. Note that the variables included both continuous (primary predictors, age and mean ping speed) and polytomous (gender, business unit, and driver type) variables. To account for the mixed variable types, we adopted the approach of Revelle et al. (2010, 2016) to compute the Pearson, polychoric and polyserial correlation coefficients for the pairwise evaluation of continuous, polytomous and mixed variables, respectively. We present the results in Figure 3.

Based on Figure 3, there are two observations to be highlighted. First, the Pearson correlation coefficient values between any two rates of SCEs were small (< 0.2). Second, none of the correlation coefficients exceeded 0.6 in magnitude. Accordingly, we concluded that the resulting statistical models will not have




Figure 3: A correlation plot of the primary predictor variables and the covariates. Note that multiple correlation coefficients were used to account for the mixed (i.e., categorical and numeric) nature of the variables. The top four variables are the SCEs and the others are the predictor variables.

any serious multicollinearity issues (which will be examined in greater detail during the model assessment stage).

3.2. Modeling strategy and its relation to the examined research questions

Note that the outcome variable (number of crashes, injuries, or fatalities) is a strictly non-negative integer. In the literature, Poisson regression or negative binomial models have been commonly applied for this type of analysis (e.g., see Table 1). By design, the Poisson regression model assumes equal mean and variance of outcome distribution, which can lead to inferior performance in the cases of potential overdispersion or underdispersion issues in the data (Lord and Mannering, 2010). Negative binomial modeling can adjust for the variance independently from its mean. Consequently, we employ the latter approach. We also adopted Bayesian rather than frequentist estimation approach since it provides more flexibility in specifying statistical models when compared to traditional maximum likelihood estimation methods (Dunson, 2001). Furthermore, in the case of rare-events, even relatively flat priors can increase the precision of parameter estimation. Using the Bayesian negative binomial models, we can investigate the three research questions introduced in Section 1.2. Table 5 shows the different combinations of samples and models.

3.3. Statistical models

3.3.1. Model specification

Let Y_i denote an outcome variable (i.e., the number of crashes, injuries or fatalities) over a distance of T_i miles for the i th driver. Each of the three outcomes was modeled in different Bayesian negative binomial models. We assume that Y_i has a negative binomial distribution with mean parameter μ_i and a common

Table 5: An overview of how the data is sampled and modeled to examine the three research questions.

Research question	Samples	Model
Question 1: Are SCEs associated with crashes, injuries, and fatalities?	All data	# Crashes = $f(\text{Pooled SCE rate and all covariates})$ # Crashes = $f(\text{Individual rate for each of the 4 SCEs and all covariates})$ # Injuries = $f(\text{Pooled SCE rate and all covariates})$ # Injuries = $f(\text{Individual rate for each of the 4 SCEs and all covariates})$ # Fatalities = $f(\text{Pooled SCE rate and all covariates})$ # Fatalities = $f(\text{Individual rate for each of the 4 SCEs and all covariates})$
Question 2: Is the association between crashes and SCEs consistent for all four different SCEs?	All data	# Crashes = $f(\text{Headway rate and all covariates})$ # Crashes = $f(\text{Hard brake rate and all covariates})$ # Crashes = $f(\text{Rolling stability initiation rate and all covariates})$ # Crashes = $f(\text{Collision mitigation rate and all covariates})$
Question 3: Does the association between crashes and SCEs hold for the different business units and driver types?	Stratified sampling by: Dedicated \cap Local Dedicated \cap Regional Dedicated \cap Over-the-Road Intermodal \cap Local Intermodal \cap Regional Final Mile \cap Regional Final Mile \cap Over-the-Road	# Crashes = $f(\text{Individual rate for each of the 4 SCEs, mean speed, age and gender})$. Note that the model above is applied to each individual stratified sample.

auxiliary parameter ϕ . The corresponding probability mass function of Y_i is parameterized as

$$P(y_i|\mu, \phi) = \binom{y_i + \phi - 1}{y_i} \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu + \phi} \right)^{y_i} \left(\frac{\phi}{\mu + \phi} \right)^\phi, \quad y_i = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (1)$$

The mean and variance of Y_i are $E[Y_i] = \mu$ and $V(Y_i) = \mu + \frac{\mu^2}{\phi}$. The inverse of ϕ controls the overdispersion, which is scaled by μ^2 . By assuming that the number of SCEs per 10,000 miles has an additive effect on the logarithm of rate of crashes μ_i , we have the following log-linear Bayesian negative binomial regression:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i &\sim \text{Negative Binomial}(T_i \times \mu_i, \phi) \\ \log \mu_i &= \alpha_0 + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \dots + \beta_J x_{iJ} + \theta_1 z_{i1} + \dots + \theta_K z_{iK}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the total miles driven T_i is considered as an offset variable to account for the mileage difference among drivers. Also, α_0 is the intercept and β_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ is the coefficient of the j -th primary predictor x_{ij} . $J = 1$ for pooled SCE rate models (x_{i1} represents the rate of any SCE) and one SCE rate at a time models (x_{i1} represents the rate of headway, hard brakes, rolling stability, or collision mitigation, with only one of them used at a time). Note that the values of J and K depend on the application of the models as shown in Table 5. Specifically, $J = 4$ for four SCEs models ($x_{i1}, x_{i2}, x_{i3}, x_{i4}$ represent the rate of headway, hard brakes, rolling stability, and collision mitigation, respectively, with all four variables used in the same model at a time). The parameter θ_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$, is the coefficient of the k -th covariate z_{ik} , and $K = 4$ (age, mean speed, gender) for models stratified by business units and driver types, while $K = 8$ (age, mean

speed, gender, business unit, and driver types) for non-stratified models. Gender, business units, and driver types were coded using one-hot encoding: (a) gender included female (reference group), male, and unknown; (b) business units included dedicated (reference group), intermodal, and final-mile; and (c) driver types included local (reference group), regional, and over-the-road. We took relatively noninformative priors for β_k and ϕ . Specifically, we assumed $\alpha_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_J, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_K \sim \text{Normal}(0, 10^2)$ and $\phi \sim \text{Exponential}(1)$.

3.3.2. Bayesian estimation and parameter interpretation

We applied the Hamiltonian Monte Carlo procedure to estimate the posterior distributions of all parameters. Compared to its two predecessor Markov chain Monte Carlo samplers (the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm and Gibbs sampling), Hamiltonian Monte Carlo is much more efficient in making valid proposal samples, and there exists a well-developed statistical package implementing this algorithm (McElreath, 2020). To make sure the Hamiltonian Monte Carlo converged to the true posterior distributions, we set 4,000 iterations for each of the four chains, with the first 2,000 being warm-up iterations. The Markov chains were considered as converged when the Gelman-Rubin diagnostic \hat{R} was less than 1.1 for each variable (Gelman et al., 1992).

In the Bayesian setting, parameters are considered as random variables that have probabilistic distributions instead of unknown fixed values, so no p-values can be reported here. The posterior mean and 95% credible intervals (CIs) of the incidence rate ratios ($\exp(\beta)$) are reported instead. The interpretation of the incidence rate ratios in this Bayesian negative binomial model is as follows: as the number of SCEs per 10,000 miles increases by one unit, the number of crashes per mile is multiplied by $\exp(\beta)$. A 95% credible interval is the interval such that the posterior probability of the parameter of interest falling within that range given the data is 95% (McElreath, 2020). If the 95% CI of the incidence rate ratio includes one, then one is a plausible value for the true incidence rate ratio in this case, and the parameter of the variable will be deemed statistically insignificant. If the 95% credible interval excludes one, then the parameter will be considered as statistically significant.

3.3.3. Model validation and assessment

Since four different SCEs and/or multiple covariates were included in the models at the same time, it is important to check for the presence of multicollinearity. Recall that in Section 3.1, we examined the correlations among pairs of predictors and found that the pairwise correlations are small. Here, we attempt to investigate whether a linear dependence exists among three or more of our variables through computing the variance inflation factors. If the regressors are uncorrelated, the variance inflation factor obtains its minimum value of 1. In statistical practice, a inflation factor less than 4 requires no additional investigation of linear dependence among the regressors and values greater than 10 indicate serious multicollinearity requiring model corrections (Vatcheva et al., 2016).

We used Pareto smoothed importance-sampling leave-one-out cross-validation to check the goodness-of-fit of and compare different models (Vehtari et al., 2015, 2017). Instead of exact cross-validation that refits the model with different subsamples, this algorithm uses fast, efficient, and stable importance sampling weights to approximate leave-one-out cross-validation (Gelfand et al., 1992; Gilks et al., 1996). It is used to estimate the expected log predicted density (ELPD_{LOO}), the effective number of parameters (P_{LOO}), and the LOO Information Criterion (LOOIC) for a model. The ELPD_{LOO} is the average leave-one-out predictive density given the data (similar to the log likelihood in maximum likelihood estimation), and larger ELPD_{LOO} values indicate better model prediction. LOOIC is an information criterion similar to the widely applicable information criterion: its value is close to $-2 \times \text{ELPD}_{\text{LOO}}$, and smaller LOOIC suggest better models (Vehtari et al., 2017). Compared with other statistics such as the widely applicable information criterion, deviance information criterion, and other variants (Spiegelhalter et al., 2002; Watanabe, 2010), Pareto smoothed importance-sampling leave-one-out is both fast and stable in computing. P_{LOO} is an estimate of the effective number of parameters, and the value should be close to the real number of parameters in a well-specified model. These statistics (ELPD_{LOO}, P_{LOO}, and LOOIC) are calculated to compare the model predictive performance and identify any potential badly-specified models. We also used posterior predictive checks to examine the prediction accuracy (Gelman et al., 2013, Chapter 6). The interpretation of these goodness-of-fit and model comparison statistics will be explained in Section 4.

3.4. Statistical software used

All data cleaning, statistical modeling, and visualization were performed in the statistical computing environment **R** 3.6.0 (R Core Team, 2019). The haversine method distance was computed using the `distHaversine()` function in `geosphere` package (Hijmans, 2019). The Bayesian negative binomial model was conducted using the `stan_glm()` function in `rstanarm` package (Goodrich et al., 2018). The leave-one-out cross-validation statistics were computed using the `loo()` function in `loo` package (Vehtari et al., 2019). To facilitate the adoption of our methodology, we provide a link of a compiled **R** Markdown file, containing the code for data aggregation and model building, and their associated results, in the supplementary materials section.

4. Results

4.1. The association of SCEs with crashes, injuries, and fatalities among commercial truck drivers

Table 6 presents the Bayesian negative binomial models' results explaining the variation in number of crashes, injuries, and fatalities separately using either a pooled SCE predictor (i.e., four SCEs as one variable), or four SCE predictors (i.e., the four SCEs represented using four variables). In column 2, we present the results for explaining the differences in the number of crashes accumulated by each driver as

a function of pooling the counts of SCEs, while accounting for differences in the observed covariates and differences in total miles driven. The coefficient of the “all SCEs” predictor in the second column suggests that a unit increase in the number of any type of SCE per 10,000 miles was associated with an 8.4% (95% CI: 8.0-8.8%) increase in the rate of crashes. When broken down by the four different SCEs in the third column, one can note the following: (a) the coefficients of all four predictors and their 95% CIs are larger than 1, indicating (similar to the pooled model) that an increase in any of the four SCEs is associated with an increase in the number of crashes; (b) a unit increase in the number of instances of rolling stability system initiation was associated with the largest, 50.4% (95% CI: 41.4-60.0%), in the number of crashes per mile; and (c) when holding other SCEs constant, a unit increase in either the initiation of the rolling stability or collision mitigation systems has larger effects when compared to increases in hard brakes or headway alerts. An implication from observation (c) is that the effect of driver-less maneuvers are larger than alerts and actions where the driver may be involved. Conceptually, this is an intuitive result since these maneuvers can be categorized as more “aggressive last-minute” interventions that attempt to mitigate a crash by overriding the driver’s control. The coefficients of the covariates suggested that older drivers, higher average speed, male, as well as final-mile and intermodal (compared to dedicated) drivers, were associated with lower rate of crashes.

Compared with the models for crashes, the results for injuries and fatalities (columns 4-7) tend to be less conclusive since the number of recorded injuries and fatalities are much smaller. In the injuries-pooled model (column 4), a unit increase in the number of any type of SCEs per 10,000 miles was associated with 8.7% (95% CI: 4.8%-13.6%) increase in the number of injuries per mile. When stratified into four different types of SCEs, all 95% CIs of incidence rate ratios included one, which indicated weak (statistically insignificant) evidence for modeling injuries or fatalities, although the posterior means were positive. In the two models using the number of fatalities as the outcome variable (columns 6 and 7), all 95% CIs of incidence rate ratios included one and the CIs were very wide.

4.2. *The consistency of the association between crashes and the four different SCEs*

Table 7 shows the estimates of posterior incidence rate ratios and their CIs in the Bayesian negative binomial models for all the included drivers. Note that we include both the pooled and four SCE models from Table 6 to facilitate the comparison with the four different models corresponding to when each of the headways, hard brakes, rolling stability or collision mitigation predictors were included. From the presented results, similar conclusions can be made to the insights gained from examining the pooled and four SCE models. Specifically, the coefficients of each of the main predictors were larger than one (with the associated 95% credible interval excluding one), providing statistically strong evidence that the rates of the individual SCEs were positively associated with the rates of crashes. Furthermore, the rolling stability coefficient

Table 6: Bayesian negative binomial regressions with the rate of SCEs predicting crashes, injuries, and fatalities

Variables	Crashes: pooled	Crashes: four SCEs	Injuries: pooled	Injuries: four SCEs	Fatalities: pooled	Fatalities: four SCEs
Intercept	0.054 (0.047, 0.062)	0.048 (0.042, 0.054)	0.013 (0.002, 0.070)	0.012 (0.002, 0.064)	0.008 (0.000, 1.855)	0.011 (0.000, 5.179)
All SCEs	1.084 (1.080, 1.088)		1.087 (1.048, 1.136)		0.973 (0.791, 1.149)	
Headways		1.033 (1.026, 1.040)		1.061 (0.961, 1.181)		0.955 (0.592, 1.478)
Hard brakes		1.081 (1.075, 1.087)		1.080 (0.995, 1.177)		0.957 (0.652, 1.387)
Rolling stability		1.504 (1.414, 1.600)		1.773 (0.684, 5.439)		1.631 (0.043, 102.8)
Collision mitigation		1.222 (1.198, 1.245)		1.174 (0.987, 1.535)		0.866 (0.200, 3.632)
Age	0.992 (0.990, 0.993)	0.992 (0.991, 0.993)	0.987 (0.970, 1.004)	0.986 (0.969, 1.004)	0.966 (0.912, 1.020)	0.965 (0.906, 1.030)
Mean speed	0.979 (0.976, 0.982)	0.982 (0.979, 0.985)	0.967 (0.929, 1.007)	0.970 (0.931, 1.009)	0.915 (0.797, 1.049)	0.910 (0.778, 1.050)
Gender: male	0.817 (0.756, 0.886)	0.808 (0.754, 0.867)	0.825 (0.301, 2.149)	0.800 (0.298, 2.176)	1.770 (0.074, 54.444)	1.953 (0.062, 80.045)
Gender: unknown	0.975 (0.785, 1.199)	0.954 (0.777, 1.149)	1.022 (0.094, 8.499)	0.993 (0.092, 9.338)	0.093 (0, 76.2)	0.093 (0, 115.6)
Business unit: Inter-modal	0.698 (0.670, 0.727)	0.717 (0.690, 0.745)	0.459 (0.265, 0.788)	0.467 (0.280, 0.789)	0.354 (0.068, 1.573)	0.341 (0.044, 2.057)
Business unit: Final-mile	0.907 (0.861, 0.954)	0.897 (0.852, 0.943)	0.710 (0.352, 1.420)	0.675 (0.330, 1.321)	1.576 (0.209, 10.438)	1.536 (0.140, 13.475)
Type: Over-the-road	1.071 (0.994, 1.151)	1.094 (1.022, 1.174)	0.785 (0.321, 1.942)	0.801 (0.306, 1.955)	0.410 (0.022, 5.402)	0.388 (0.014, 6.205)
Type: Regional	1.003 (0.957, 1.045)	1.012 (0.969, 1.057)	0.472 (0.265, 0.821)	0.463 (0.263, 0.820)	0.389 (0.064, 1.970)	0.379 (0.050, 2.214)
Fit statistics:						
sample size	31828	31828	31828	31828	31828	31828
ELPD _LOO	-39985.2 (236.5)	-39770.2 (233.5)	-1134.5 (80.8)	-1137.3 (81.1)	-182.4 (37.9)	-182.4 (37.9)
P _LOO	18.1 (1.1)	30 (2.4)	13.9 (3.6)	16.4 (4)	11.3 (3.2)	11.3 (3.2)
LOOIC	79970.4 (472.9)	79540.5 (467.1)	2269.1 (161.5)	2274.6 (162.1)	364.7 (75.7)	364.7 (75.7)

Notes:

The SCEs were measured as the number of events per 10,000 miles driven.
 Incidence rate ratios and their associated 95% credible intervals are reported for all variables (predictors and covariates).
 For the fit statistics, (.) indicates the standard error of the computed statistic.

is the largest, followed by the crash mitigation coefficient, confirming that an increase in more aggressive interventions results in more crashes.

4.3. The influence of business units and driver types on the association between crashes and SCEs

Since the driving behaviors and routing patterns vary significantly among different business units and driver types, we also conducted Bayesian negative binomial models (four SCEs) for drivers in different business units and types, and the results are shown below in Table 8. The posterior incidence rate ratios and CIs of four SCEs are consistent with those in Table 6. All four type of SCEs were positively associated with the number of crashes per mile. None of the CIs included one except for headways in the dedicated and over-the-road unit. These stratified results indicate strong evidence that SCEs were positively associated with crashes in different business units and driver types. Among the four types of SCEs, rolling stability had the highest incidence rate ratios, followed by collision mitigation, hard brake, and headway.

4.4. Diagnostic statistics and model selection

We computed the variance inflation factors described in Section 3.3.3 to test for multicollinearity. Table 9 captures the results for all the negative binomial models where individual predictors are used for each of the SCEs. The results capture all three investigated outcomes (crashes, fatalities and injuries) as well as the stratification of the drivers' data set by business unit and driver type. From the table, all variance inflation factors are less than or equal to 1.3. Hence, we can conclude that the variation of each of the regression coefficients are not inflated and that there is no evidence of any multicollinearity issues (Vatcheva et al., 2016).

All the models and truck drivers have Pareto k diagnostic statistics of less than 0.7 (not shown in the tables), which suggests no signal for model misspecification (Vehtari et al., 2015, 2017). The estimated effective number of parameters ($P_{\text{L}00}$ in Tables 6, 7, 8), were similar to the total number of parameters in the models. These two results suggest that the negative binomial models were reasonably specified models given the large number of observations in this study (Vehtari et al., 2017, 2015). The LOOIC in the tables can be used to compare different models, with lower values indicating better models. For example, in Table 7, the “Four SCEs” model has the lowest LOOIC (79,540.5) among the six models. However, the standard errors of the LOOIC statistic (in parentheses) suggest that the model with all four SCEs was not significantly better than the pooled model.

To investigate the models' predictive accuracy, we adopt the approach of Gelman et al. (2013, Section 6.3) who suggested simulating some function of the data and parameter, and comparing it with the observed value of a particular quantity. For our trucking safety application, we examined the proportion of zero crashes since it corresponds to a crash-free trip, which is of interest to truck drivers and operators

Table 7: Bayesian negative binomial regressions predicting crashes with different combination of SCEs

Variables	Pooled model	Four SCEs	Headways	Hard brakes	Rolling stability	Collision mitigation
Intercept	0.054 (0.047, 0.062)	0.048 (0.042, 0.054)	0.090 (0.079, 0.103)	0.057 (0.050, 0.066)	0.082 (0.072, 0.093)	0.073 (0.064, 0.083)
All SCEs		1.084 (1.080, 1.088)				
Headways		1.033 (1.026, 1.040)	1.077 (1.069, 1.085)			
Hard brakes		1.081 (1.075, 1.087)		1.109 (1.102, 1.116)		
Rolling stability		1.504 (1.414, 1.600)			2.147 (2.015, 2.295)	
Collision mitigation		1.222 (1.198, 1.245)				1.343 (1.316, 1.369)
Age	0.992 (0.990, 0.993)	0.992 (0.991, 0.993)	0.989 (0.988, 0.990)	0.991 (0.989, 0.992)	0.989 (0.988, 0.991)	0.990 (0.988, 0.991)
Mean speed	0.979 (0.976, 0.982)	0.982 (0.979, 0.985)	0.971 (0.968, 0.973)	0.980 (0.977, 0.983)	0.973 (0.970, 0.976)	0.975 (0.973, 0.978)
Gender: male	0.817 (0.756, 0.886)	0.808 (0.754, 0.867)	0.848 (0.785, 0.919)	0.823 (0.762, 0.887)	0.845 (0.787, 0.909)	0.826 (0.770, 0.891)
Gender: unknown	0.975 (0.785, 1.199)	0.954 (0.777, 1.149)	1.097 (0.896, 1.347)	1.096 (0.884, 1.349)	1.018 (0.842, 1.239)	1.058 (0.870, 1.299)
Business unit: Inter-modal	0.698 (0.670, 0.727)	0.717 (0.690, 0.745)	0.706 (0.679, 0.735)	0.701 (0.672, 0.730)	0.735 (0.706, 0.765)	0.729 (0.700, 0.758)
Business unit: Final-mile	0.907 (0.861, 0.954)	0.897 (0.852, 0.943)	0.925 (0.882, 0.971)	0.904 (0.865, 0.948)	0.922 (0.880, 0.967)	0.901 (0.859, 0.942)
Type: Over-the-road	1.071 (0.994, 1.151)	1.094 (1.022, 1.174)	1.053 (0.981, 1.131)	1.064 (0.994, 1.140)	1.067 (0.990, 1.144)	1.106 (1.030, 1.182)
Type: Regional	1.003 (0.957, 1.045)	1.012 (0.969, 1.057)	0.971 (0.928, 1.015)	0.994 (0.950, 1.037)	0.973 (0.932, 1.016)	0.984 (0.943, 1.028)
Fit statistics:						
sample size	31828	31828	31828	31828	31828	31828
ELPD_LOO	-39985.2 (236.5)	-39770.2 (233.5)	-40792.7 (238.9)	-40315.5 (237.2)	-40710.1 (237.8)	-40503.2 (239.4)
P_LOO	18.1 (1.1)	30 (2.4)	19.8 (1.9)	18.2 (1.2)	15.9 (0.8)	16.1 (1)
LOOIC	79970.4 (472.9)	79540.5 (467.1)	81585.4 (477.8)	80631 (474.5)	81420.1 (475.7)	81006.5 (478.7)

Notes:

The SCEs were measured as the number of events per 10,000 miles driven.

Incidence rate ratios and their associated 95% credible intervals are reported for all variables (predictors and covariates).

For the fit statistics, (.) indicates the standard error of the computed statistic.

Table 8: Bayesian negative binomial regressions with SCEs predicting crashes, stratified by business units and driver types

variables	Dedicated Local	Dedicated Over-the-road	Dedicated Regional	Inter-modal Local	Inter-modal Regional	Final-mile Over-the-road	Final-mile Regional
Intercept	0.055 (0.040, 0.076)	0.015 (0.008, 0.027)	0.062 (0.046, 0.084)	0.026 (0.020, 0.033)	0.021 (0.013, 0.033)	0.047 (0.021, 0.102)	0.033 (0.022, 0.049)
Headways	1.026 (1.011, 1.042)	1.001 (0.993, 1.010)	1.048 (1.032, 1.067)	1.026 (1.012, 1.042)	1.060 (1.038, 1.082)	1.082 (1.020, 1.149)	1.050 (1.031, 1.068)
Hard brakes	1.069 (1.057, 1.080)	1.241 (1.194, 1.293)	1.163 (1.140, 1.188)	1.047 (1.040, 1.054)	1.114 (1.093, 1.138)	1.086 (1.049, 1.131)	1.183 (1.154, 1.211)
Rolling stability	1.528 (1.367, 1.733)	1.648 (1.269, 2.229)	1.676 (1.467, 1.951)	1.419 (1.284, 1.578)	2.477 (1.590, 3.717)	4.320 (2.210, 9.522)	1.175 (1.039, 1.369)
Collision mitigation	1.163 (1.127, 1.203)	1.318 (1.132, 1.540)	1.362 (1.292, 1.440)	1.212 (1.174, 1.252)	1.577 (1.422, 1.766)	1.134 (0.952, 1.353)	1.170 (1.121, 1.234)
Age	0.992 (0.989, 0.995)	0.988 (0.982, 0.993)	0.993 (0.990, 0.996)	0.995 (0.993, 0.998)	0.986 (0.982, 0.990)	0.999 (0.989, 1.010)	0.997 (0.993, 1.000)
Mean speed	0.976 (0.970, 0.983)	1.016 (1.005, 1.027)	0.968 (0.962, 0.974)	0.994 (0.987, 1.000)	1.000 (0.988, 1.012)	0.973 (0.958, 0.988)	0.983 (0.973, 0.994)
Gender: male	0.883 (0.702, 1.083)	0.868 (0.631, 1.227)	0.844 (0.716, 0.997)	0.749 (0.650, 0.862)	0.841 (0.691, 1.029)	0.675 (0.433, 1.027)	0.751 (0.634, 0.893)
Gender: unknown	1.065 (0.589, 1.908)	1.378 (0.706, 2.617)	0.576 (0.325, 0.980)	1.287 (0.774, 2.079)	0.194 (0.044, 0.626)		0.816 (0.571, 1.158)
Fit statistics:							
sample size	6950	1797	7405	6429	3339	943	4963
ELPD_LOO	-9300.8 (125.3)	-2416.9 (52.2)	-9799.1 (112.1)	-7624.2 (90.8)	-3912.6 (70.5)	-1139.8 (40)	-5293.9 (85.4)
P_LOO	30.6 (5)	14.3 (2.5)	20.4 (2.6)	17.4 (2.3)	13.9 (1.7)	11 (1.6)	19.4 (2.9)
LOOIC	18601.6 (250.6)	4833.8 (104.5)	19598.1 (224.2)	15248.3 (181.6)	7825.2 (141)	2279.5 (79.9)	10587.7 (170.8)

Notes:

The SCEs were measured as the number of events per 10,000 miles driven.

Incidence rate ratios and their associated 95% credible intervals are reported for all variables (predictors and covariates).

For the fit statistics, (.) indicates the standard error of the computed statistic.

alike. The probability of having zero crashes is, of course, an unknown quantity, but its posterior distribution can be estimated by simulating samples using Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. In this section, we limit our analysis to the models whose outcomes were crashes since the accident and fatality models indicated that our observed events were insufficient for statistical inference (based on the size of the credible interval in Table 6).

Figure 4 shows the posterior distributions, which are indicated by the histograms in light blue, for the posterior probability of zero crashes under each of the six models considered in Table 7. The observed

Table 9: Variance inflation factor test for multicollinearity.

Outcome	Crash	Fatality	Injury	Crash	Crash	Crash	Crash	Crash	Crash	Crash
Samples	All drivers	All drivers	All Drivers	Dedicated ∩ Local	Dedicated ∩ Regional	Dedicated ∩ OTR	Intermodal ∩ Local	Intermodal ∩ Regional	Final-mile ∩ Regional	Final-mile ∩ OTR
Headways	1.030	1.030	1.030	1.049	1.024	1.012	1.044	1.040	1.073	1.037
Hard brakes	1.031	1.031	1.031	1.027	1.063	1.047	1.020	1.031	1.077	1.184
Rolling stability	1.024	1.024	1.024	1.029	1.013	1.047	1.024	1.010	1.053	1.159
Collision mitigation	1.038	1.038	1.038	1.024	1.048	1.056	1.056	1.046	1.118	1.236
Age	1.006	1.006	1.006	1.003	1.007	1.005	1.004	1.004	1.004	1.011
Ping speed	1.270	1.270	1.270	1.007	1.012	1.012	1.015	1.015	1.011	1.047
Gender	1.005	1.005	1.005	1.001	1.002	1.005	1.004	1.004	1.010	1.008
Business unit	1.096	1.096	1.096							
Driver type	1.140	1.140	1.140							

proportion of zero crashes is indicated by the vertical line in each part of Figure 4. For all six models, the observed proportion of zero crashes was considerably less than what would be predicted by the model. Note that the magnitude of this prediction bias is small, usually around 0.015. In other words, while both models (with and without business units and driver types) perform reasonably well in predicting the mean numbers of SCEs, the model with business units and driver types does a better job predicting the proportion of zero crashes. This suggests that different business units and driver types should be accounted for in the model.

Based partly on the result from Figure 4, we ran the model with all four SCEs (model 2) separately for each of the seven business units and driver types. The corresponding posterior predictive check for zero crashes is shown in Figure 5. Here, the vertical lines are much closer to the simulated posterior distribution. This suggests that different business units and driver types should be accounted for in the model.

5. Discussion and conclusions

5.1. Summary of the main contributions

In line with previous studies on the association between crashes and SCEs in NDSs (Guo et al., 2010; Gordon et al., 2011; Simons-Morton et al., 2012; Wu and Jovanis, 2012; Guo and Fang, 2013; Pande et al., 2017; Gitelman et al., 2018), this study provides statistically significant and robust evidence that there is a positive association between SCEs and crashes based on routinely collected NDS and kinematic data




Figure 4: Graphical posterior predictive checks with zero count test statistic for the Bayesian negative binomial models for all drivers. The x -axis is the proportion of zero crashes and y -axis is probability density. The solid black line is the observed proportion, while the light blue histogram is from 100 simulated predictions

from 31,828 American truck drivers. We found that one unit increase in the number of any type of SCEs per 10,000 miles was associated with 8.4% (95% CI: 8-8.8%) increase in SCEs per mile and 8.7% (95% CI: 4.8%-13.6%) increase in the number of injuries per mile. The increase was different for different types of SCEs: 3.3% (95% CI: 2.6-4.0%) for headways, 8.1% (95% CI: 7.5-8.7%) for hard brakes, 50.4% (95% CI: 41.4-60.0%) for rolling stability, and 22.2% (95% CI: 19.8-24.5%) for collision mitigation. The results are consistent when stratified by different business units and driver types. This work provides statistically strong and robust evidence that SCEs are positively associated with crashes and injuries among commercial truck drivers. Furthermore, this study demonstrates that the “severity” of the SCE is associated with the crash rate, where the two automated maneuvers (involving the initiation of the forward-collision mitigation and rolling stability systems) were shown to have a statistically significant larger effects on crash rates when compared to hard brakes and head way (which can be seen as less severe maneuvers/alerts).

The current study contributes to the existing literature in three respects. First, this paper overcomes the small sample size issues in previous crashes and crash surrogates papers, which typically includes 300 or fewer drivers or vehicles and fewer than 100 crashes (Guo et al., 2010; Gitelman et al., 2018). Our study involves 1,000 times as many driving hours and miles and includes more than 30,000 commercial truck drivers and 30,000 crashes; this allows us to investigate the association between four different types of




Figure 5: Graphical posterior predictive checks with zero count test statistic for the Bayesian negative binomial models, stratified by business unit and driver types. The x -axis is the proportion of zero crashes and y -axis is probability density. The solid black line is the observed proportion, while the light blue histogram is from 100 simulated predictions.

SCEs and crashes, as well as stratified analyses across business units and driver types. Second, the evidence of the association between crashes and crash surrogates among truck drivers has been scarce. Our study gives insights to this less studied field using a nationwide large-scale sample. Third, this paper explores the association between SCEs and human injuries and fatalities, which has not been investigated in previous papers but represents important research questions that require detailed study given that they constitute an important component of truck routing models used in practice (Hu et al., 2020).

5.2. Practical relevance of our work to trucking operators

Our findings have given evidence to support the long held belief that critical events are associated with crashes. Much of the literature on truck safety has presumed that such an association exists, but little evidence has been provided. Our study is the only study, to the best of our knowledge, that quantifies this association for commercial truck drivers. Consequently, our results allow for the use of SCEs (specifically the initiation of the rolling stability system, the initiation of the collision mitigation system, hard brakes and/or headway alerts) as proxies for crashes. The ability to use a more frequent outcome will allow for more statistical power when investigating variables that affect (trucking) safety.

From a trucking operator's perspective, the SCE data used in this study are routinely collected with the

wide-scale adoption of sensor-based monitoring systems in practice. In many cases, the data have not been used in enhancing/transforming safety operations because: (a) it is unclear whether or how the SCEs and crashes are associated; (b) the trucking operators may not know how to aggregate the acquired ping data into a more meaningful unit of analysis; (c) the modeling/coding of this data may be difficult especially for smaller operators with limited statistical and engineering resources. In this study, we have demonstrated the positive relationship of the SCEs with the number of crashes recorded for a large number of drivers. Furthermore, our stratified models by driver type and business unit indicate that the incorporation of such information can enhance the predictions obtained from the model. To facilitate the adoption of our work by industry practitioners, we host a compiled **R** Markdown document containing our code, results and analysis on a freely accessible website (see link in the supplementary materials section). The use of the open-source **R** programming language can make the adoption of our work more accessible for trucking operators of different sizes.

The knowledge of the positive association between the four SCEs and crashes can be incorporated by trucking operators using several approaches. First, recent statistics indicate that more than 90% of traffic crashes are influenced by driver behavior (Federal Highway Administration, 2019). While our naturalistic driving data does not include video images, it explicitly captures important behavioral factors such as driving speed, aggressive driving through headway alerts, and potential distraction/drowsiness with an increased rate of the three other SCEs (at least when compared to drivers on similar routes). Thus, trucking operators can use our estimated model coefficients, e.g., 50.4% for the initiation of the rolling stability system, in driver training/education. Second, operators can provide incentives to their drivers to reduce their recorded number of SCEs through behavioral based safety programs (Jun et al., 2007). Third, by examining the operator's historical record of SCE data, operators can develop scheduling and routing policies that attempt to minimize the number of recorded SCEs (Mehdizadeh et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2020).

5.3. Limitations and suggestions for future research

This study has several limitations that can be investigated in future studies. First, since the exact time of the crashes were not recorded, we are not able to find out which and how many SCEs directly cause crashes, which is a crucial question in Heinrich's Triangle (Guo et al., 2010). Second, although we have a relatively large number of drivers and high mileage driven, the number of injuries or fatalities is not sufficiently large for stratified analyses. The statistical evidence on the number of injuries is strong only when we combine four types of SCEs, while the evidence on fatalities in either of the two models is not strong given the small number of fatalities. Third, the data does not include traffic or weather variables, which are important predictors of crashes. Fourth, this study used a cross-sectional observatory design and no experiments were involved, so we should not make any causal statements on this association. Exploring

the causal relationship between SCEs and crashes requires well-designed experiments or state-of-start causal inference models for observatory data, which is beyond the scope of this study and could be a direction that future studies can focus on. Fifth, the haversine method to calculate the distance may not reflect the true miles driven by the sample drivers since it calculates the shortest distance between two points. Despite these facts, it is the most feasible and cost-effective algorithm to estimate the distance between two points for this study.

Despite these limitations, we demonstrate in this paper the positive association between safety critical events and crashes/injuries/fatalities. Our study features several orders of magnitude more data volume than previous studies in terms of number of drivers, hours driven, miles driven, number of crashes, and the count of surrogate events, as well as a previously unexamined population: commercial truck drivers. These results indicate that the emerging widespread use of technology for monitoring kinematic events can effectively be used for naturalistic driving studies.

Supplemental materials

To encourage future research and/or adoption of our work by trucking operators, we provide an **R** Markdown document which provides the code used for aggregating the ping data into trips and statistical modeling. Our code and analysis can be freely accessed at <https://caimiao0714.github.io/Github-SCE-crash/>. We provide a sample CSV file, where we masked the driver ID as well as the coordinates (by rounding them to one digit) at https://github.com/caimiao0714/Github-SCE-crash/blob/master/data/sample_ping.csv. The purpose of providing the sample file is to provide some insight into the ping data frequency, shape, and speed values. Note that we cannot provide the ping or the aggregated data based on the terms of our nondisclosure agreement.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (CMMI-1635927 and CMMI-1634992); the Ohio Supercomputer Center (PMIU0138 and PMIU0162); the University of Cincinnati Education and Research Center Pilot Research Project Training Program; the Transportation Informatics Tier I University Transportation Center (TransInfo); and a Google Cloud research grant.

References

- Bendix®, 2007. Bendix® ABS-6 Advanced with ESP® Stability System - frequently asked questions to help you make an intelligent investment in stability. Bendix Commercial Vehicle Systems LLC, a member of the Knorr-Bremse Group. https://www.bendix.com/media/documents/products_1/absstability/truckstractors/StabilityFAQ.pdf. [Published March 2007; accessed April 19, 2020].

Blower, D., 2017. Estimating motor carrier management information system crash file underreporting from carrier records. Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. Office of Analysis, Research, and Technology. FMCSA-RRR-16-025. <https://doi.org/10.21949/1502548>. [Published online August 1, 2017; accessed April 19, 2020].

Cooper, P., 1984. Experience with traffic conflicts in Canada with emphasis on “post encroachment time” techniques, in: International calibration study of traffic conflict techniques. Springer, pp. 75–96.

Dingus, T.A., Hanowski, R.J., Klauer, S.G., 2011. Estimating crash risk. *Ergonomics in Design* 19, 8–12.

Dingus, T.A., Klauer, S.G., Neale, V.L., Petersen, A., Lee, S.E., Sudweeks, J., Perez, M.A., Hankey, J., Ramsey, D., Gupta, S., et al., 2006. The 100-Car Naturalistic Driving Study. Phase 2: Results of the 100-Car Field Experiment. Technical Report. United States. Department of Transportation. National Highway Traffic Safety. URL: <https://trid.trb.org/view/783477>.

Dunson, D.B., 2001. Commentary: practical advantages of Bayesian analysis of epidemiologic data. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 153, 1222–1226.

Eenink, R., Barnard, Y., Baumann, M., Augros, X., Utesch, F., 2014. UDRIVE: the European naturalistic driving study, in: Proceedings of Transport Research Arena, TRA 2014, 14-17 Apr 2014, Paris, France. IFSTTAR. URL: <http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/93078/>.

Evans, L., Wasielewski, P., 1982. Do accident-involved drivers exhibit riskier everyday driving behavior? *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 14, 57–64.

Evans, L., Wasielewski, P., 1983. Risky driving related to driver and vehicle characteristics. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 15, 121–136.

Federal Highway Administration, 2019. Human factors. U.S. Department of Transportation, <https://highways.dot.gov/research/research-programs/safety/human-factors>. [Updated December 2, 2019; accessed April 29, 2020].

FMCSA, 2019. Large Truck and Bus Crash Facts 2017. <https://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/safety/data-and-statistics/large-truck-and-bus-crash-facts-2017>. [Online; accessed 20-April-2020].

Gelfand, A.E., Dey, D.K., Chang, H., 1992. Model determination using predictive distributions with implementation via sampling-based methods. Technical Report. Department of Statistics, Stanford University. URL: <https://statistics.stanford.edu/sites/g/files/sbiybj6031/f/SOL%20ONR%20462.pdf>.

Gelman, A., Carlin, J.B., Stern, H.S., Dunson, D.B., Vehtari, A., Rubin, D.B., 2013. Bayesian Data Analysis. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

- Gelman, A., Rubin, D.B., et al., 1992. Inference from iterative simulation using multiple sequences. *Statistical Science* 7, 457–472.
- Gilks, W., Richardson, S., Spiegelhalter, D., 1996. Model determination using sampling-based methods. Chapman and Hall, London. chapter 9. pp. 145–161.
- Gitelman, V., Bekhor, S., Doveh, E., Pesahov, F., Carmel, R., Morik, S., 2018. Exploring relationships between driving events identified by in-vehicle data recorders, infrastructure characteristics and road crashes. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 91, 156–175.
- Goodrich, B., Gabry, J., Ali, I., Brilleman, S., 2018. rstanarm: Bayesian applied regression modeling via Stan. URL: <http://mc-stan.org/>. r package version 2.17.4.
- Gordon, T.J., Kostyniuk, L.P., Green, P.E., Barnes, M.A., Blower, D., Blankespoor, A.D., Bogard, S.E., 2011. Analysis of crash rates and surrogate events: unified approach. *Transportation Research Record* 2237, 1–9.
- Grove, K., Atwood, J., Hill, P., Fitch, G., DiFonzo, A., Marchese, M., Blanco, M., 2015. Commercial motor vehicle driver performance with adaptive cruise control in adverse weather. *Procedia Manufacturing* 3, 2777–2783.
- Guo, F., Fang, Y., 2013. Individual driver risk assessment using naturalistic driving data. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 61, 3–9.
- Guo, F., Klauer, S.G., Hankey, J.M., Dingus, T.A., 2010. Near crashes as crash surrogate for naturalistic driving studies. *Transportation Research Record* 2147, 66–74.
- Hankey, J.M., Perez, M.A., McClafferty, J.A., 2016. Description of the SHRP 2 naturalistic database and the crash, near-crash, and baseline data sets. Technical Report. Virginia Tech Transportation Institute. URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/10919/70850>.
- He, Z., Hu, J., Park, B.B., Levin, M.W., 2019. Vehicle sensor data-based transportation research: Modeling, analysis, and management. *Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems* 23, 99–102.
- Heinrich, H.W., 1931. Industrial Accident Prevention: A Scientific Approach. New York & London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Hickman, J.S., Hanowski, R.J., Bocanegra, J., 2018. A synthetic approach to compare the large truck crash causation study and naturalistic driving data. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 112, 11–14.
- Hijmans, R.J., 2019. geosphere: Spherical Trigonometry. URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=geosphere>. r package version 1.5-10.

Hu, Q., Cai, M., Mohabbati-Kalejahi, N., Mehdizadeh, A., Yazdi, A., Ali, M., Vinel, A., Rigdon, S.E., Davis, K.C., Megahed, F.M., 2020. A review of data analytic applications in road traffic safety. part 2: Prescriptive modeling. Sensors 20, 1096. doi:10.3390/s20041096.

Hydén, C., 1987. The development of a method for traffic safety evaluation: The Swedish traffic conflicts technique. Bulletin Lund Institute of Technology, Department .

Imperialou, M., Quddus, M., 2019. Crash data quality for road safety research: current state and future directions. Accident Analysis & Prevention 130, 84–90.

John, S., 2019. 11 incredible facts about the \$700 billion US trucking industry. Business Insider: Markets Insider. <https://markets.businessinsider.com/news/stocks/trucking-industry-facts-us-truckers-2019-5-1028248577>. [Published online June 3, 2019; accessed April 19, 2020].

Jun, J., Ogle, J., Guensler, R., 2007. Relationships between crash involvement and temporal-spatial driving behavior activity patterns: use of data for vehicles with global positioning systems. Transportation Research Record 2019, 246–255.

Katrakazas, C., Quddus, M., Chen, W.H., Deka, L., 2015. Real-time motion planning methods for autonomous on-road driving: State-of-the-art and future research directions. Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies 60, 416–442.

Lord, D., Mannering, F., 2010. The statistical analysis of crash-frequency data: a review and assessment of methodological alternatives. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice 44, 291–305.

McElreath, R., 2020. Statistical rethinking: A Bayesian course with examples in R and Stan. CRC press.

Mehdizadeh, A., Cai, M., Hu, Q., Yazdi, A., Ali, M., Mohabbati-Kalejahi, N., Vinel, A., Rigdon, S.E., Davis, K.C., Megahed, F.M., 2020. A review of data analytic applications in road traffic safety. part 1: Descriptive and predictive modeling. Sensors 20, 1107. doi:10.3390/s20041107.

Neale, V.L., Dingus, T.A., Klauer, S.G., Sudweeks, J., Goodman, M., 2005. An overview of the 100-car naturalistic study and findings, in: Proceedings - 19th International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles (ESV), Washington, D.C., June 6-9, 2005, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. p. 10p. URL: <https://trid.trb.org/view/815278>.

NHTSA's National Center for Statistics and Analysis, 2019. 2017 data: large trucks. U.S. Department of Transportation. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Traffic Safety Facts. DOT HS 812 663. <https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/812663>. [Published online January 2019; accessed April 19, 2020].

Pande, A., Chand, S., Saxena, N., Dixit, V., Loy, J., Wolshon, B., Kent, J.D., 2017. A preliminary investigation of the relationships between historical crash and naturalistic driving. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 101, 107–116.

R Core Team, 2019. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. URL: <https://www.R-project.org/>.

Revelle, W., Condon, D.M., Wilt, J., French, J.A., Brown, A., Elleman, L.G., 2016. Web and phone based data collection using planned missing designs. Sage Publications, Inc. pp. 578–595. doi:10.4135/9781473957992.

Revelle, W., Wilt, J., Rosenthal, A., 2010. Individual Differences in Cognition: New Methods for Examining the Personality-Cognition Link. Springer New York, New York, NY. pp. 27–49. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-1210-7_2.

Risser, R., 1985. Behavior in traffic conflict situations. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 17, 179–197.

Saleh, J.H., Saltmarsh, E.A., Favaro, F.M., Brevault, L., 2013. Accident precursors, near misses, and warning signs: critical review and formal definitions within the framework of discrete event systems. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* 114, 148–154.

Shi, Q., Abdel-Aty, M., 2015. Big data applications in real-time traffic operation and safety monitoring and improvement on urban expressways. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 58, 380–394.

Shmueli, G., et al., 2010. To explain or to predict? *Statistical Science* 25, 289–310.

Simons-Morton, B.G., Zhang, Z., Jackson, J.C., Albert, P.S., 2012. Do elevated gravitational-force events while driving predict crashes and near crashes? *American Journal of Epidemiology* 175, 1075–1079.

Sinnott, R.W., 1984. Virtues of the haversine. *Sky and Telescope* 68, 158–159.

Spiegelhalter, D.J., Best, N.G., Carlin, B.P., Van Der Linde, A., 2002. Bayesian measures of model complexity and fit. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 64, 583–639.

Stern, H.S., Blower, D., Cohen, M.L., Czeisler, C.A., Dinges, D.F., Greenhouse, J.B., Guo, F., Hanowski, R.J., Hartenbaum, N.P., Krueger, G.P., et al., 2019. Data and methods for studying commercial motor vehicle driver fatigue, highway safety and long-term driver health. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 126, 37–42.

The White House, 2020. Remarks by President Trump celebrating America's truckers. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-celebrating-americas-truckers/>. [Issued on April 16, 2020; accessed April 19, 2020].

- Theofilatos, A., Yannis, G., Kopelias, P., Papadimitriou, F., 2019. Impact of real-time traffic characteristics on crash occurrence: Preliminary results of the case of rare events. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 130, 151–159.
- Tsai, Y.T., Alhwiti, T., Swartz, S.M., Megahed, F.M., 2015. The effects of socio-economic and public policy factors on us highway safety. *Journal of Transportation Law, Logistics, and Policy* 82, 31–48.
- Tsai, Y.T., Swartz, S.M., Megahed, F.M., 2018. Estimating the relative efficiency of highway safety investments on commercial transportation. *Transportation Journal* 57, 193–218.
- United States Geological Survey, 2014. USGS Small-scale Dataset - 1:1,000,000-Scale Major Roads of the United States 201403 Shapefile. <https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/581d052be4b08da350d524ce>. [Online; accessed 20-September-2019].
- Vatcheva, K.P., Lee, M., McCormick, J.B., Rahbar, M.H., 2016. Multicollinearity in regression analyses conducted in epidemiologic studies. *Epidemiology (Sunnyvale, Calif.)* 6.
- Vehtari, A., Gabry, J., Yao, Y., Gelman, A., 2019. loo: Efficient leave-one-out cross-validation and waic for Bayesian models. URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=loo>. r package version 2.1.0.
- Vehtari, A., Gelman, A., Gabry, J., 2017. Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-one-out cross-validation and WAIC. *Statistics and Computing* 27, 1413–1432.
- Vehtari, A., Simpson, D., Gelman, A., Yao, Y., Gabry, J., 2015. Pareto smoothed importance sampling. [arXiv:1507.02646](https://arxiv.org/abs/1507.02646).
- Wali, B., Khattak, A.J., 2020. Harnessing ambient sensing & naturalistic driving systems to understand links between driving volatility and crash propensity in school zones—a generalized hierarchical mixed logit framework. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 114, 405–424.
- Watanabe, S., 2010. Asymptotic equivalence of bayes cross validation and widely applicable information criterion in singular learning theory. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 11, 3571–3594.
- Wu, K.F., Aguero-Valverde, J., Jovanis, P.P., 2014. Using naturalistic driving data to explore the association between traffic safety-related events and crash risk at driver level. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 72, 210–218.
- Wu, K.F., Jovanis, P.P., 2012. Crashes and crash-surrogate events: Exploratory modeling with naturalistic driving data. *Accident Analysis & Prevention* 45, 507–516.