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(P1)

We are Team #22768821 from Shanghai Experimental School, and today we will introduce The Optimal Boarding & Disembarking Method.

(P2)

This is the structure for our presentation.

(P3)

To begin with, we’ll look at the structure of our model,

(P4)

Time and efficiency play a vital role in air transportation. Therefore, it's necessary to build a model that provides the best strategy for different types of aircraft and on various occasions.

What’s new about our model is that we include mostly theoretical mathematical analyses. They can justify our model's notions, concepts, and results and simplify the calculation.

Our model can be divided into three parts: Math Model, Optimisation in a mathematical account and Programming.

(P5)

This flowchart demonstrates the process of boarding. The main factor that causes the queue is passengers’ stowing their luggage.

(P6)

Assumptions should make our model discrete but also plausible. This is the main reason for making most of the seemingly impulsive hypothesis afterwards.

We assume that the time wasted while passengers try to stuff extra luggage into their seats is qualitatively equivalent to that spent while stowing extra luggage.

Additionally, we hypothesise that passengers always walk at the maximum possible speed.

We assume that the velocity in a particular cell remains constant. This is because it can simplify calculations and wouldn’t cause much inaccuracy.

(P7)

In the model, the definition of time and velocity differs from SI. We make these changes to make the calculations simpler.

(P8)

Here is how we calculate the total time systematically.

(P9)

The loop here indicates that we calculate the total time based on recursion. According to the discreteness of our model, the process of calculating total time can be reduced to finding a recursion formula for any passenger-based variable. We chose (velocity) as that variable out of simplicity and authenticity concerns.

(P10)

Before turning the spotlight on the analysis, we’ll first construct the space of cells and coordinates as shown on the slide.

(P11)

First, we’ll calculate the velocity according to the density. We’d stress that the visibility range is taken as because is proper and realistic. It also decides the time step (if taken as , the time step can be or sec), reducing the complexity of the simulation.

(P12)

Next, we use Greenshields speed-density linear model to develop the relation between and.

(P13)

After that, we use dot products of vectors to calculate distribution according to density, as the slide shows.

(P14)

Additionally, we label the cells and trace between which two adjacent cells is located.

(P15)

This animation shows how we calculate time and velocity.

(P16)

Finally, we get the recursion formula, showing that speeds are interconnected linearly ( can be understood as the real-life speed). And we’ll also use two methods to justify our deductions: first on the next slide and then in the Sensitivity Analysis part.

(P17)

Now we’ll tackle the congestion state. We divided the task into two parts: stowing luggage and offering seats. The first is trivial (but we’ll later add *discompliance* factors to this in the SA).

Offering seats can be calculated mathematically using permutation and the preservation of order.

Here is the schematic diagram for this procedure.

(P18)

To unite these seemingly separate states somehow, we use a *state* parameter to indicate a passenger’s current movement status: moving, stowing luggage, or waiting in a queue. These states are interconvertible, and we’ll do this with the interconversion formula recursively within every timestep.

(P19)

The transformation formula is given as shown. Note that the multiplication of matrixes and vectors again ensures linearity.

Therefore, the only remaining problem is when a passenger takes his seat and disappears. According to programmatic views, we use deletion in the queue to tackle this, which is relatively trivial.

(P20)

Here we give the results. The weights can be calculated easily done with matrix multiplications.

(P21)

After obtaining all these indicators, we will calculate the total time.

(P22)

This part will focus on the modelling approach to minimise the total time.

(P23)

Our work can be divided into inspiration from our previous calculations and strict mathematical proof.

Empirically, we’ll raise *parallelity* to describe the proportion of occupied aisle cells. The higher the parallelity, the more efficient the system is and the faster the strategy is. The formulae of parallelity are shown in the slide.

(P24)

We’ll prove the intuitive idea proposed in the previous slide.

Based on the linear model, we can do these analyses according to the fact that linear optimums occur on the verges. The flow chart gives detailed analyses.

(P25)

Secondly and mathematically, we can justify this using a critical claim. You can refer to this in the essay, and we’ll not attach importance to this as we’ve already explained the ideas behind it.

**Animation**

(P26)

The starting point and destination of the passengers are exchanged, only adding the prerequisite that passengers leave from aisle to window. Therefore, the best strategy should be similar to boarding. The passengers have already been in an ideal queue, thus spending less time than boarding because of higher parallelity.

**Animation**

(P27)

Besides the total time, passengers’ satisfaction is also an essential factor to consider. In real-life experiences, dissatisfaction mainly comes from queuing and offering seats. Additionally, fellow passengers may be split, causing dissatisfaction. The total dissatisfaction index is the weighted sum of the three factors, respectively 1, 250 and 10.

(P28)

These are the results after the application of our model.

(P29)

We can see that Steffen Sub-Perfect is the fastest and back to front is the most satisfactory plan.

(P30)

We conducted a Sensitivity Analysis on different passengers.

(P31)

Random boarding is the most sensitive for longer stowing time and reduced passengers, while queue-jumping affects all methods.

(P32)

These are the major conclusions drawn from our sensitivity analysis: Random is far more sensitive than front to back, for randomised sequences can result in immeasurable effects. Back-to-front is the best overall because it is the least sensitive and has better time and satisfaction.

(P33)

Now we will extend our model to different aircraft,

(P34)

starting with the development of coordinates, as demonstrated on the screen.

(P35)

And for the TETA aircraft, we define the grid as shown.

(P36)

This is Claim Two, which helps us find the best strategy for the two kinds of aircraft. We prioritised the cells from main to block and introduced efficiency to assess how good a scheme is qualitatively.

(P37)

In the end, we conclude that these two aircraft can be divided into smaller individual parts that are similar to ordinary one-aisle aircraft.

(P38)

To optimise the whole plan, we need to apply it to in-group and between-group sequences. We arranged for inner group passengers to fill empty blocks to ensure that every cell is used. The graph shows our best strategy for Flying Wing aircraft.

(P39)

And here is the result for the TETA aircraft.

(P40)

To sum up the strengths and weaknesses,

(P41)

our model features mathematical and programmatic accuracy. Multiple situations are considered using similar codes, so universality and efficiency are other benefits.

And for the weaknesses, we introduced quite a few abstract variables, making our model complex. The boarding schemes we devised are also hard to operate in reality.

(P42)

Thank you!