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## Objective

## Definition

Dailyzing: grouping of trains into one daily-path.

## Objective:

Group non-daily trains in clusters (i.e., achieve Dailyzing) for:

- Efficient track utilization.
- Faster and efficient time-tabling.


## Problem Formulation

## Problem statement:

Clustering/grouping of non-daily trains which occupy the same space (station/block section) at the same time on different days ${ }^{1}$.


Figure 1: Distance Vs Time (Train path)
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## GQD Data: Routes Information



Figure 2: GQD route map
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## Data preprocessing

Route-wise division of all trains.

Removal of Daily trains.

Modulo 86400 operation.

Removal of single touch trains in a given route.

Removal of geo-loops: train leaves the route and returns at the same station.

Legs separation: train jumping routes.

Up/down block section classification.

## Methodology: Distance metric

## Distance metric:

Similarity/dissimilarity matrix generation averaged over all block sections: distance/closeness metric.
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$$
\text { SimilarityScore }=\left\{\begin{array}{lc}
\cos \left(\frac{\pi\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}-\mathbf{T}_{j}\right)}{2 \times \text { Time_Window }^{2}}\right), \quad \text { if Time_Window }>\left|\mathbf{T}_{i}-\mathbf{T}_{j}\right|, \\
0, & \text { otherwise. }
\end{array}\right.
$$

where $\mathbf{T}_{i}, \mathbf{T}_{j}$ : times of arrival for the Train $i$ and $\operatorname{Train} j$ respectively, at a given block-section, Time_Window: allowed time within which two trains are considered to be similar.

## Methodology: Clustering techniques used

## K-Means, [1957]:

- Centroid based clustering algorithm: partitions data into the clusters based on closeness to cluster centroids.
- Requires a pre-defined number of clusters information.
- Not always converges to global minima.


Figure 4: Clustering with K-means $(\mathrm{k}=10)^{2}$
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## Methodology: Clustering techniques contd.

## DBSCAN (Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise), [1996]:

- Density-based clustering algorithm: closely packed data are grouped.
- Hyper-parameters: Epsilon (radius of the neighborhood to consider) and minPoints (minimum number of points to consider as dense).
- works with arbitrarily shaped clusters, robust to outliers.
- not purely deterministic; not good in large density variation data.


Figure 5: DBSCAN algorithm overview ${ }^{3}$
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## Methodology: Clustering techniques contd.

## HAC (Hierarchical Agglomerated Clustering), [1967]:

- Connectivity based clustering algorithm
- Builds hierarchy of cluster: starts with each data point as a cluster, then merges and moves up the hierarchy.
- Hyperparameter: linkage method and affinity (distance metric) method.
- Linkage influences the shape of the cluster (For example, single linkage method leads to spherical shape).


Figure 6: HAC: Dendogram ${ }^{a}$


Figure 7: Data points
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## HAC: Hyper-parameter Tuning

Choosing the best linkage and affinity for Agglomerative clustering is done based on the number of clusters formed and the cluster size.

| Route | Total unique <br> trains | Total clustered <br> trains | Number of <br> clusters | Maximum number of <br> trains in cluster | Total number of <br> conflicting cluster |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 257 | 172 | 66 | 6 | 6 |
| 2 | 256 | 151 | 57 | 7 | 4 |
| 3 | 166 | 105 | 32 | 7 | 2 |
| 4 | 194 | 132 | 47 | 5 | 1 |
| 5 | 123 | 65 | 25 | 7 | 3 |
| 6 | 251 | 158 | 56 | 3 |  |

Hierarchical Clustering (Ward linkage and Variable time window).

| Route | Total unique <br> trains | Total clustered <br> trains | Number of <br> clusters | Maximum number of <br> trains in cluster | Total number of <br> conflicting cluster |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 257 | 187 | 63 | 6 | 5 |
| 2 | 256 | 151 | 55 | 6 | 4 |
| 3 | 166 | 98 | 33 | 6 | 3 |
| 4 | 194 | 129 | 41 | 7 | 0 |
| 5 | 123 | 79 | 27 | 7 | 3 |
| 6 | 251 | 155 | 57 | 6 | 1 |

Hierarchical Clustering (average linkage and Variable time window based on station distance)

## Hyper-parameter tuning contd...

| Route | Total unique <br> trains | Total clustered <br> trains | Number of <br> clusters | Maximum number of <br> trains in cluster | Total number of <br> conflicting cluster |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 257 | 208 | 67 | 7 | 7 |
| 2 | 256 | 184 | 60 | 7 | 10 |
| 3 | 166 | 103 | 34 | 6 | 2 |
| 4 | 194 | 138 | 48 | 7 | 2 |
| 5 | 123 | 71 | 26 | 5 | 3 |
| 6 | 251 | 162 | 58 | 7 | 2 |

Hierarchical Clustering (average linkage and Optimized fixed time window)

Similarly, a "time window" could be an optimal "fixed" time window or "variable" time window based on block-sections size.

## Results: HAC for all routes

| Route <br> number | Total unique <br> trains | Total conflict free <br> clustered trains | Total number of <br> clusters |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 257 | 208 | 77 |
| 2 | 256 | 178 | 64 |
| 3 | 166 | 123 | 43 |
| 4 | 194 | 146 | 54 |
| 5 | 123 | 73 | 30 |
| 6 | 251 | 198 | 57 |

Hierarchical Agglomerative Clustering for all routes

## Results: Comparative study of clustering techniques

|  |  | HAC |  | DBSCAN |  | K-means |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route <br> number | Total <br> unique <br> trains | Number of <br> conflict free <br> clustered trains | Time <br> taken <br> (sec) | Number of <br> conflict free <br> clustered trains | Time <br> taken <br> (sec) | Number of <br> conflict free <br> clustered trains | Time <br> taken <br> $(\mathrm{sec})$ |
| 1 | 257 | 208 | 2.15 | 173 | 13.70 | 198 | 312.70 |
| 2 | 256 | 178 | 3.19 | 134 | 19.03 | 179 | 458.18 |
| 3 | 166 | 123 | 1.37 | 85 | 5.79 | 115 | 142.20 |
| 4 | 194 | 146 | 2.52 | 132 | 5.38 | 150 | 224.95 |
| 5 | 123 | 73 | 0.85 | 57 | 1.66 | 78 | 82.15 |
| 6 | 251 | 198 | 3.74 | 167 | 16.12 | 190 | 313.70 |

Table 5: Comparative study of different clustering techniques and their execution time

## Results and Discussion

The following table is generated using IRCTC website ${ }^{4}$. Train clusters have very similar and complementing trains.

| Train No. | 12882 | 12888 | 12896 | 15643 | $\mathbf{2 2 8 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 8 3 6}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source-Dest. | PURI-KOL | PURI-KOL | PURI-KOL | PURI-HWH | SBP-SHM | PURI-SHM |
| Days of the week | Monday, Wed. | Sunday | Thursday | Saturday | Friday | Tuesday |
| Start time | $22: 05$ | $22: 05$ | $22: 05$ | $22: 15$ | $19: 40$ | $22: 05$ |
| End Time | $06: 50$ | $06: 50$ | $06: 50$ | $07: 05$ | $06: 50$ | $06: 50$ |


| Train No. | 12218 | 12484 | 12918 | 22660 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source-Dest. | CDG-KCVL | ASR-KCVL | NZM-ADI | YNRK-KCVL |
| Days of the week | Wed.,Friday | Sunday | Saturday | Monday |
| Start time | $09: 30$ | $05: 55$ | $13: 25$ | $06: 15$ |
| End Time | $12: 30$ | $12: 30$ | $03: 20$ | $12: 30$ |


| Train No. | 12247 | 12907 | 12909 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source-Dest. | BDTS-NZM | BDTS-NZM | BDTS-NZM |
| Days of the week | Friday | Wed., Sunday | Tue, Thur, Saturday |
| Start time | $17: 30$ | $17: 30$ | $17: 30$ |
| End Time | $10: 15$ | $10: 15$ | $10: 15$ |

Clustered trains comparison with actual running trains data from IRCTC website.
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## Conclusion

Clusters generated based on the Hierarchical Agglomerative Clustering (HAC) method match with actual running trains data.

The clusters generated:

- complement each other very well
- very few conflicting clusters

The time required by HAC algorithm to generate clusters is within 3-4 seconds, faster than other techniques like K-means, DBSCAN clustering.

## Future Work

Faster timetabling procedure: grouped non-daily trains can be represented by a daily train, scheduling which automatically schedules others in the group.

Possibility of new trains: clusters with fewer than seven members can accommodate more non-daily trains. Hence, availability to introduce new trains.

Efficient clustering will help in determining under-utilized resources.

Suggestion for better timetabling, i.e., rescheduling some trains could lead to better compaction and efficient resource utilization.

## Questions ??

## GQD Data illustration

| TRAIN | WEEKDAYS | STATION | ARVL | BLCKSCTN | DAY | Direction |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11111 | $0,0,1,0,0,0,0$ | MTJ | 61500 | MTJ-BTSR | 1 | down |
| 11111 | $0,0,1,0,0,0,0$ | BTSR | 61860 | BTSR-VRBD | 1 | down |
| 11111 | $0,0,1,0,0,0,0$ | VRBD | 62160 | VRBD-AJH | 1 | down |
| 11111 | $0,0,1,0,0,0,0$ | AJH | 62460 | AJH-CHJ | 1 | down |
| 11111 | $0,0,1,0,0,0,0$ | CHJ | 62760 | CHJ-KSV | 1 | down |

GQD Sample dataset

This is a sample from GQD dataset where :

- TRAIN : denotes train number
- WEEKDAYS : '1' denotes that train runs on that day of the week
- STATION : denotes the station through which the train passes
- ARVL : arrival time of the train at the given station
- BLCKSCTN : is the block section
- DAY : day of journey of the train when it commenced from source
- Direction : is the direction of the train depending on the route
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