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## Introduction

- Trains operate in a dense network leading to a complex environment with high pressure on traffic managers and traffic controllers.
- Accurate information concerning train arrival times is useful for both passengers and railway operators.
- Railways are an important means for freight transport which should be tracked precisely to the benefit of the customer.


## Introduction

Existing literature
Predominantly focused on predicting delays for a given railway line (e.g. Wen et al. (2020), Huang et al. (2020)). Exceptions are Oneto et al. (2018) and Yaghini et al. (2013).

## Contributions

(1) Real-time analysis on the entire railway network.
(2) Inclusion of spatial features. The directly connected train stations (neighbors) are together with their importance included via a spatial matrix.
(3) We benchmark our advocated approach with both a spatial regression and a rules-based approach for the entire network

## Real-time data structure

- The close-to-real-time data structure is developed by INFRABEL, the Belgium railway infrastructure company, and comprises the entire train network which is one of the most dense in the world.
- From this data, 3 feature types are constructed to predict train delays in real-time: temporal, spatial and operational features.
- With this input data, we predict the delay for the 5 upcoming stops for a specific train.
- We focus on September 2020, resulting in a data structure of over 2 million observations of trains passing a signal


## Real-time data structure

- In total, we have 130 input features that belong to one of the following features categories.

| Features |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Temporal | Spatial | Operational |
| Day | Spatial delay | Current delay (diff) |
| Hour | Distance BC/AN | Arr-Dep-Pass |
| Minute | GPS coords station | Buffer times |
|  | Delay influencers | Route planning char. |
|  | Av. delay (diff) station |  |

## Real-time data structure

Descriptive analysis: Distribution of delays



## Real-time data structure

## Descriptive analysis: Temporal variation



## Real-time data structure

Descriptive analysis: Summary statistics

|  | count | mean | std | $\min$ | $25 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $\max$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| delay | 1802033.0 | 99.15 | 235.38 | -200.0 | -6.00 | 33.00 | 117.00 | 1800.0 |
| delaydif | 1758674.0 | 1.06 | 48.30 | -2000.0 | -13.00 | 0.00 | 7.00 | 2000.0 |
| delayPTCARpass | 1155305.0 | 102.19 | 198.66 | -200.0 | 4.00 | 47.00 | 130.00 | 1800.0 |
| delayspatialpass | 1802033.0 | 49.59 | 124.18 | -200.0 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 55.87 | 1800.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass1 | 1783298.0 | 83.27 | 185.82 | -200.0 | 8.36 | 32.87 | 80.20 | 1800.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass2 | 1784413.0 | 105.50 | 107.21 | -200.0 | 34.77 | 76.44 | 145.85 | 1800.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass3 | 1125140.0 | 132.27 | 245.45 | -200.0 | 11.00 | 62.00 | 149.50 | 1800.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass4 | 1644804.0 | 83.16 | 138.14 | -200.0 | 15.33 | 42.14 | 98.33 | 1708.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass5 | 1780419.0 | 66.37 | 117.11 | -200.0 | 3.50 | 33.75 | 87.50 | 1800.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass6 | 1748435.0 | 122.49 | 158.03 | -200.0 | 25.00 | 73.25 | 168.33 | 1800.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass7 | 1725345.0 | 96.73 | 173.40 | -200.0 | 2.50 | 46.33 | 128.00 | 1800.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass8 | 1684687.0 | 114.88 | 158.17 | -200.0 | 22.33 | 74.50 | 156.33 | 1800.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass9 | 1743145.0 | 123.74 | 174.30 | -200.0 | 32.70 | 73.75 | 149.25 | 1800.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass10 | 1393256.0 | 161.31 | 180.29 | -200.0 | 58.50 | 122.00 | 210.50 | 1800.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass11 | 1790879.0 | 95.60 | 92.22 | -200.0 | 31.50 | 71.18 | 135.29 | 1800.0 |
| delayinfluencerpass12 | 1788730.0 | 118.00 | 101.38 | -200.0 | 47.10 | 92.78 | 160.84 | 1800.0 |

## Real-time data struture

Descriptive analysis: Correlogram

|  | Delay | Lagged <br> Delay | Spatial <br> delay | Delay <br> Infl. 12 | Peak |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Delay | 1.00 | 0.89 | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.07 |
| Lagged Delay | 0.89 | 1.00 | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.07 |
| Spatial delay | 0.18 | 0.19 | 1.00 | 0.10 | 0.08 |
| Delay Influencer 12 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 0.27 |
| Peak | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 1.00 |

## Model set-up

## Recurrent Neural Network

- A sequence-to-sequence Recurrent Neural Network with Long Short-Term Memory (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997).
- We train on 2 weeks, validate on 1 week and test on one day.
- The RNN is benchmarked against the rules-based system and the spatial regression by the use of MAE and RMSE.


## Benchmarking delay predictions

## RNN: Training



## Benchmarking delay predictions

RNN: Predicted vs. actual delay per output sequence


(d) Sequence 4

(e) Sequence 5

## A first benchmarking exercise

|  | Spatial reg. | RNN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All sequences |  |
| RMSE | 0.042 | 0.040 |
| MAE | 0.024 | 0.022 |
|  | Sequence 1 |  |
| RMSE | 0.027 | 0.025 |
| MAE | 0.013 | 0.013 |
|  | Sequence 2 |  |
| RMSE | 0.035 | 0.033 |
| MAE | 0.019 | 0.018 |
|  | Sequence 1 |  |
| RMSE | 0.042 | 0.040 |
| MAE | 0.024 | 0.0230 |
|  | Sequence 4 |  |
| RMSE | 0.049 | 0.046 |
| MAE | 0.029 | 0.027 |
|  | Sequence 5 |  |
| RMSE | 0.054 | 0.052 |
| MAE | 0.032 | 0.030 |

## Conclusion

- The Belgian railway transportation network is one of the most dense in the world and is an ideal testing ground for transportation delay prediction in a spatially interdependent environment
- We propose a sequence-to-sequence neural network framework to predict train delays while including spatial features
- Our preliminary benchmarking exercise highlights the usefulness of our approach
- Further research is warranted on the importance of the different feature groups for delay prediction


## References I

Hochreiter, S. and Schmidhuber, J. (1997). Long short-term memory. Neural computation, 9(8):1735-1780.
Huang, P., Wen, C., Fu, L., Lessan, J., Jiang, C., Peng, Q., and Xu, X. (2020). Modeling train operation as sequences: A study of delay prediction with operation and weather data. Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, 141:102022.
Oneto, L., Fumeo, E., Clerico, G., Canepa, R., Papa, F., Dambra, C., Mazzino, N., and Anguita, D. (2018). Train delay prediction systems: a big data analytics perspective. Big data research, 11:54-64.

## References II

Wen, C., Mou, W., Huang, P., and Li, Z. (2020). A predictive model of train delays on a railway line. Journal of Forecasting, 39(3):470-488.
Yaghini, M., Khoshraftar, M. M., and Seyedabadi, M. (2013). Railway passenger train delay prediction via neural network model. Journal of advanced transportation, 47(3):355-368.

