

## Artificial Intelligence-Driven Traffic Congestion Prediction Using Urban Mobility Data

**Matteo Schneider**

Associate Professor, University of Geneva, Switzerland

### Abstract

Rapid urbanization and increasing travel demand have intensified traffic congestion in many metropolitan transportation networks. Accurate short-term congestion prediction can support traffic management, route planning, intelligent transportation systems, and the allocation of road-network resources. Urban mobility data obtained from road sensors, location-enabled vehicles, aggregated movement trajectories, and transportation information systems provide useful representations of changing traffic conditions. However, congestion develops through complex spatial and temporal interactions that may be difficult to represent using conventional forecasting procedures alone. This hypothetical methodological study examines an artificial intelligence-driven framework for predicting traffic congestion using multidimensional urban mobility data. The proposed framework integrates historical traffic speed, traffic-flow density, aggregated vehicle movement patterns, origin-destination intensity, temporal characteristics, and neighboring-road conditions. A conceptual dataset containing 10,000 fifteen-minute mobility observations is divided into hypothetical training, validation, and testing subsets. Three prediction configurations are considered: a historical-pattern baseline, a conventional neural-network model, and an integrated artificial intelligence mobility-fusion model.

The illustrative analysis compares the models through accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score using a hypothetical congestion classification scenario. A second comparison examines prediction quality across fifteen-, thirty-, forty-five-, and sixty-minute forecasting horizons. Under the assigned values, the integrated mobility model demonstrates the strongest hypothetical classification performance, while prediction quality gradually decreases as the forecasting horizon becomes longer. These numerical outcomes are illustrative rather than experimentally observed results. The study concludes that artificial intelligence combined with heterogeneous urban mobility information provides a useful methodological direction for short-term congestion prediction. Nevertheless, reliable implementation requires representative mobility data, temporal validation, careful handling of spatial dependencies, consideration of changing travel behavior, and comparison with appropriate baseline methods. Empirical experimentation is therefore required before practical improvements in congestion forecasting can be established.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence, Traffic Congestion Prediction, Urban Mobility Data, Traffic Flow Forecasting, Intelligent Transportation Systems, Mobility Analytics, Machine Learning, Traffic Speed Prediction, Urban Computing, Spatiotemporal Prediction.

## 1. Introduction

Traffic congestion represents an important challenge for growing urban transportation systems because increasing mobility demand can place substantial pressure on limited road capacity. Congested conditions may increase travel time, reduce network reliability, interfere with public transportation schedules, and complicate traffic-management operations. Intelligent transportation systems increasingly depend on short-term predictions to anticipate where congestion may develop before severe disruption occurs. Accurate prediction therefore requires computational methods capable of processing continuously changing mobility information and representing interactions among different parts of an urban road network.

Traditional traffic forecasting has employed statistical time-series models, historical averages, autoregressive procedures, and other mathematical methods. Williams and Hoel (2003), for example, demonstrated the relevance of seasonal ARIMA modeling for vehicular traffic-flow forecasting. Statistical approaches can provide interpretable representations of recurring traffic patterns, but their performance may be limited when relationships become strongly nonlinear or when congestion develops through interactions among multiple road segments. Consequently, machine learning has become increasingly important for modeling complex traffic conditions and short-term mobility behavior.

Neural-network-based transportation forecasting developed as an alternative capable of approximating nonlinear relationships. Dia (2001) investigated recurrent neural modeling for short-term traffic prediction, while van Lint et al. (2005) examined state-space neural networks for travel-time forecasting under incomplete information. Later developments incorporated increasingly sophisticated machine-learning architectures. These approaches demonstrated that predictive models can use temporal dependencies and related traffic observations to estimate upcoming network conditions, although successful forecasting remains strongly dependent on data quality and appropriate evaluation procedures.

Urban mobility data have further expanded the range of information available for transportation analysis. GPS-equipped vehicles, taxi trajectories, traffic detectors, and location-based systems can provide information regarding travel paths, movement intensity, road utilization, and temporal demand patterns. Yuan et al. (2010) demonstrated how taxi trajectories can reveal road-network information, while Zheng et al. (2014) described urban computing as an interdisciplinary framework for integrating heterogeneous city data. Such mobility information can potentially improve congestion prediction by representing both traffic state and traveler movement.

The present study develops a hypothetical artificial intelligence framework for predicting congestion through integrated urban mobility information. The proposed methodology combines temporal traffic indicators, neighboring-road conditions, aggregated mobility patterns, and contextual time variables within a unified analytical model. A simplified classification scenario is used to demonstrate appropriate performance calculations and horizon-based evaluation. No actual traffic dataset or deployed congestion-prediction model is claimed. The paper instead provides a structured methodological foundation for future empirical urban-mobility forecasting research.

## 2. Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of the study is to examine the methodological potential of artificial intelligence for predicting short-term traffic congestion using heterogeneous urban mobility data. The research

focuses on mobility-feature integration, congestion classification, horizon-based prediction, and challenges associated with dynamic transportation environments.

## 2.1 Examination of Urban Mobility Features

The first objective is to examine mobility characteristics that may contribute to traffic-congestion prediction. The proposed model considers recent traffic speed, traffic-flow intensity, vehicle density, aggregated origin-destination movement, neighboring-road conditions, and temporal variables. These features represent different dimensions of urban transportation activity. Combining them may provide a broader description of evolving road conditions than relying on traffic volume alone. The objective establishes a conceptual foundation for constructing an artificial intelligence model capable of integrating heterogeneous mobility information.

The study also examines the importance of spatial relationships among connected road segments. Congestion occurring on one link can influence traffic conditions on nearby routes through vehicle diversion, queue propagation, and intersection interactions. Mobility data therefore require representation beyond independent road observations. The framework conceptually integrates neighboring-segment information with local traffic conditions to capture possible spatial dependence. This objective emphasizes that meaningful congestion prediction should account for both temporal history and the network structure through which urban movement occurs.

## 2.2 Evaluation of Congestion Prediction Accuracy

The second objective is to evaluate how alternative predictive approaches can be compared using a common hypothetical congestion-classification scenario. Three configurations are considered: a historical-pattern baseline, a conventional neural-network model, and an integrated artificial intelligence mobility-fusion model. Accuracy, precision, recall, and F1 score are calculated using internally consistent hypothetical confusion matrices. The purpose is to establish a transparent evaluation structure rather than to claim that any model has been experimentally shown to outperform another.

The investigation also examines prediction performance across different short-term forecasting horizons. Traffic conditions fifteen minutes ahead may depend strongly on recently observed mobility, whereas sixty-minute forecasting involves greater uncertainty concerning route choices, demand changes, and congestion propagation. The hypothetical analysis therefore evaluates four prediction horizons separately. This objective demonstrates why congestion-prediction studies should report horizon-specific performance rather than assuming that one aggregate result accurately represents model reliability at every future interval.

## 2.3 Identification of Transportation Analytics Challenges

The third objective is to identify methodological challenges associated with artificial intelligence-driven congestion forecasting. Urban mobility data can contain missing observations, irregular sampling, measurement errors, and differences among sensing technologies. Traffic patterns may also change because of incidents, road construction, public events, seasonal behavior, or changes in travel demand. These conditions can reduce the reliability of models trained exclusively on historical observations. Recognizing such limitations is essential when designing predictive systems intended for dynamic transportation environments.

The objective additionally considers evaluation reliability and model generalization. Randomly mixing observations from different time periods can introduce information leakage because nearby traffic observations are strongly related. A robust study should therefore preserve temporal ordering between training and testing periods. Model performance should also be examined across different roads, demand levels, and congestion conditions. These requirements help determine whether an artificial intelligence system has learned transferable traffic relationships rather than simply reproducing patterns specific to one historical dataset.

### 3. Review of Literature

#### 3.1 Statistical and Neural Traffic Forecasting

Williams and Hoel (2003) examined vehicular traffic flow through seasonal ARIMA modeling and demonstrated the importance of recurring temporal structures in transportation data. Dia (2001) explored an object-oriented neural-network approach for short-term traffic forecasting, illustrating the usefulness of nonlinear learning methods. Sun et al. (2006) subsequently developed a Bayesian-network approach that represented relationships among neighboring traffic flows. These studies reflect the gradual movement from individual time-series forecasting toward models capable of representing broader dependencies within transportation networks.

Karlaftis and Vlahogianni (2011) compared statistical approaches and neural networks in transportation research, emphasizing differences in assumptions and model interpretation. Kamarianakis et al. (2012) introduced regime-switching space-time models for real-time road-traffic forecasting. Vlahogianni et al. (2014) later reviewed short-term traffic forecasting and identified continuing challenges involving nonlinear dynamics, data availability, and rapidly changing traffic conditions. Collectively, this literature demonstrates that reliable forecasting depends on matching analytical methods with the structure of transportation data.

#### 3.2 Artificial Intelligence and Deep Traffic Prediction

Lv et al. (2015) examined deep learning for traffic-flow prediction using large-scale traffic information and demonstrated the value of learning spatial-temporal representations. Ma et al. (2015) developed a long short-term memory neural-network framework for traffic-speed prediction, highlighting the usefulness of recurrent architectures for temporal dependencies. These studies contributed to increasing interest in deeper artificial intelligence models for transportation forecasting because traffic conditions often depend on historical patterns extending across multiple observation intervals.

Wu and Tan (2016) proposed a hybrid deep-learning framework integrating spatial and temporal traffic characteristics. Their methodology combined convolutional and recurrent learning components to represent different traffic dependencies. Such developments suggest that traffic forecasting can benefit from architectures specifically designed for space-time information. However, greater model complexity also introduces requirements for larger datasets, computational resources, systematic parameter selection, and careful comparison with simpler alternatives.

#### 3.3 Urban Mobility Data and City-Scale Analytics

Yuan et al. (2010) demonstrated how large collections of taxi trajectories can provide information about urban road usage and travel behavior. Zheng et al. (2011) further examined mobility patterns for taxi-

passenger recommendation, while Moreira-Matias et al. (2013) investigated short-term passenger-demand prediction using streaming mobility data. These studies demonstrate that vehicle trajectories can function as distributed urban sensors, providing useful information about travel demand, route usage, and temporal changes in city transportation activity.

Yuan et al. (2012) combined mobility information with points of interest to identify different functional regions within a city. Zheng et al. (2014) subsequently presented urban computing as a broader framework integrating sensing, heterogeneous data, analytics, and urban services. These contributions are relevant to congestion prediction because traffic conditions reflect interactions between transportation networks and city activities. Incorporating mobility information can therefore provide contextual evidence concerning where, when, and how travel demand is changing across urban space.

## 4. Research Methodology

### 4.1 Research Design and AI Prediction Framework

The present study adopts a hypothetical methodological research design focused on short-term congestion classification. The conceptual artificial intelligence framework includes mobility-data preprocessing, temporal sequence construction, spatial-neighbor representation, feature fusion, and final congestion prediction. Recent road-speed observations and traffic-flow measurements are combined with aggregated mobility-density indicators and origin-destination activity. Calendar variables representing time of day and weekday status provide additional context. No actual artificial intelligence system was implemented for the numerical analysis presented in this paper.

The proposed architecture is compared conceptually with two simpler alternatives. The historical-pattern baseline predicts congestion according to previously observed conditions for corresponding temporal periods. The conventional neural model processes local traffic variables without the complete mobility-fusion component. The integrated AI model combines local traffic state, recent temporal history, neighboring-link information, and aggregated urban mobility indicators. This comparative structure is intended to identify the methodological contribution of richer mobility representation in a future empirical investigation.

### 4.2 Hypothetical Urban Mobility Dataset

The hypothetical dataset contains 10,000 fifteen-minute traffic observations generated conceptually from twenty urban road zones. Seven thousand eight hundred observations are assigned to training, one thousand to validation, and one thousand two hundred to independent testing. The test set contains 360 congested and 840 non-congested observations. These quantities are deliberately constructed for analytical illustration and do not correspond to information collected from any city, transportation agency, GPS provider, or mobility platform.

Each conceptual observation contains average road speed, traffic volume, estimated vehicle density, neighboring-road mobility intensity, aggregated origin-destination flow, hour category, and weekday information. Congestion is represented as a binary analytical target derived from an assumed traffic-state threshold. In a genuine transportation study, congestion definition should be established according to road capacity, speed reduction, density, or another defensible traffic-engineering criterion. Different definitions could substantially change classification prevalence and model-performance estimates.

## 4.3 Evaluation Procedure and Performance Metrics

The first evaluation compares the three hypothetical models using the same 1,200-observation testing period. Classification outcomes are expressed through true positives, false positives, false negatives, and true negatives. Accuracy measures the total proportion of correctly classified observations, precision describes the reliability of congestion alerts, recall measures the proportion of actual congestion periods identified, and F1 score provides a harmonic balance between precision and recall. These measures are calculated directly from the assigned hypothetical confusion matrices.

The second analytical procedure evaluates the integrated model across fifteen-, thirty-, forty-five-, and sixty-minute forecast horizons. Accuracy and F1 score are used to illustrate classification reliability, while an illustrative congestion-index mean absolute error represents continuous prediction deviation. No statistical significance is attributed to these values because they were not generated through repeated experiments. An empirical investigation should additionally include confidence intervals, calibration analysis, incident-specific evaluation, computational latency, and comparison across multiple temporal test periods.

## 5. Analysis

### 5.1 Comparative Congestion Classification Performance

The first hypothetical analysis compares congestion-classification outcomes across the three conceptual prediction models. The test set contains 360 congestion observations and 840 non-congestion observations. The historical baseline is assigned 252 correctly identified congestion periods, while the conventional neural network identifies 288 and the mobility-fusion model identifies 317. These assumed values create a transparent comparison of sensitivity to congestion events while maintaining an identical test-set composition across the three model configurations.

The integrated mobility-fusion model records an illustrative accuracy of 90.58% and F1 score of 84.87%. The conventional neural model produces hypothetical accuracy of 86.33%, whereas the historical baseline records 80.50%. The mobility model also produces fewer false negatives than the comparison configurations. These differences are deliberately constructed examples and do not demonstrate empirical superiority.

**Table 1: Hypothetical Congestion Classification Performance**

| Prediction Model            | TP  | FP  | FN  | TN  | Accuracy (%) | Precision (%) | Recall (%) | F1 Score (%) |
|-----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
| Historical-Pattern Baseline | 252 | 126 | 108 | 714 | 80.50        | 66.67         | 70.00      | 68.29        |
| Conventional Neural Network | 288 | 92  | 72  | 748 | 86.33        | 75.79         | 80.00      | 77.84        |
| AI Mobility-Fusion Model    | 317 | 70  | 43  | 770 | 90.58        | 81.91         | 88.06      | 84.87        |

## 5.2 Congestion Prediction Across Forecast Horizons

The second hypothetical analysis evaluates the integrated mobility-fusion model at four forecasting horizons. The assigned accuracy decreases from 92.40% for fifteen-minute prediction to 85.70% for sixty-minute prediction. F1 score follows a similar illustrative pattern, declining from 87.60% to 77.60%. Meanwhile, the assigned congestion-index error increases as the forecasting interval becomes longer. This pattern demonstrates how horizon-specific results can reveal performance differences that would be hidden within a single aggregate prediction score.

Longer forecasting horizons conceptually involve greater uncertainty because immediate traffic measurements provide progressively less information about future mobility conditions. Route changes, emerging queues, incidents, and variation in travel demand can alter congestion development during the forecast period. Nevertheless, the values below are not intended to establish a universal relationship between prediction horizon and error. Actual performance may depend on the road network, congestion definition, input variables, model architecture, and transportation conditions represented within the dataset.

**Table 2: Hypothetical AI Model Performance Across Forecast Horizons**

| Forecast Horizon | Accuracy (%) | F1 Score (%) | Congestion-Index MAE |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|
| 15 Minutes Ahead | 92.40        | 87.60        | 0.072                |
| 30 Minutes Ahead | 90.60        | 84.90        | 0.089                |
| 45 Minutes Ahead | 88.20        | 81.20        | 0.107                |
| 60 Minutes Ahead | 85.70        | 77.60        | 0.129                |

## 6. Discussion

### 6.1 Artificial Intelligence and Congestion Prediction

The hypothetical analysis illustrates how artificial intelligence can conceptually integrate multiple forms of transportation information for congestion prediction. Traffic speed and flow describe current road conditions, while mobility-density and neighboring-road variables provide broader evidence concerning movement throughout the network. Research by Lv et al. (2015) and Ma et al. (2015) supports the methodological importance of learning complex temporal relationships in traffic forecasting. The present framework extends this principle by integrating additional mobility-oriented variables within a congestion-classification context.

The illustrative performance difference should nevertheless be interpreted cautiously. Richer data do not automatically improve prediction because additional features can introduce noise, redundancy, or instability. The usefulness of mobility information must be established through controlled comparisons in which preprocessing, training periods, model-selection procedures, and testing observations remain equivalent. An empirical study should also perform feature-ablation experiments to determine whether particular mobility components contribute measurable predictive value rather than assuming that larger feature sets necessarily produce stronger congestion forecasts.

## 6.2 Spatial-Temporal Mobility Relationships

Urban congestion has both temporal and spatial characteristics. Daily commuting patterns create recurring demand cycles, while traffic queues may propagate through connected intersections and road segments. Models that treat each observation independently may fail to represent these relationships adequately. Vlahogianni et al. (2014) identified spatial and temporal complexity as continuing concerns in short-term traffic forecasting. The hypothetical framework therefore uses recent time sequences and neighboring-road information as complementary inputs for estimating upcoming congestion conditions.

Mobility trajectories provide an additional representation of how travel demand moves through the urban network. Research involving taxi trajectories by Yuan et al. (2010) and Moreira-Matias et al. (2013) demonstrates that aggregated vehicle movement can reveal meaningful travel patterns. However, mobility samples may not represent all road users equally. Taxi, fleet, or app-based trajectory data can emphasize particular travel populations. Models should therefore assess spatial coverage and sampling bias before treating mobility observations as complete representations of urban traffic.

## 6.3 Forecasting Horizon and Operational Interpretation

The hypothetical horizon comparison demonstrates why prediction interval is an important dimension of traffic forecasting. Shorter-horizon predictions may support immediate traffic-control responses, while longer forecasts may assist broader operational planning. An algorithm should not be described simply as accurate without specifying how far into the future its prediction applies. Ma et al. (2015) demonstrated the relevance of temporal dependencies in traffic-speed prediction, reinforcing the importance of clearly defining the forecasting window used during model evaluation.

Operational interpretation also requires attention to classification errors. A false congestion alert may lead to unnecessary intervention or route diversion, while a missed congestion period may prevent timely traffic-management action. Precision and recall therefore provide information not captured by accuracy alone. The appropriate balance depends on the intended transportation application and the costs associated with different prediction errors. Consequently, deployment thresholds should be selected according to operational objectives rather than optimized solely for a single aggregate metric.

## 7. Challenges

### 7.1 Mobility Data Quality and Coverage

Urban mobility information may originate from road detectors, GPS-enabled vehicles, transportation fleets, and location-based applications. These sources can differ in sampling frequency, geographic coverage, measurement accuracy, and availability. Missing trajectory points or malfunctioning traffic sensors may create artificial variations that resemble changing traffic conditions. Van Lint et al. (2005) highlighted the importance of robustness to missing information in traffic prediction. Effective artificial intelligence systems therefore require appropriate preprocessing and clear documentation of data-quality limitations.

Sampling bias presents an additional challenge because mobility datasets rarely observe every traveler within a city. Taxi trajectories, for example, represent the movements of a specific transport service rather than all private vehicles, public transportation passengers, cyclists, or pedestrians. The relevance of a mobility signal may consequently vary across neighborhoods and times of day. Before integrating heterogeneous sources, researchers should examine their coverage and determine whether

observed movement patterns reasonably represent the transportation conditions targeted by the predictive model.

## 7.2 Changing Traffic Patterns and Model Generalization

Traffic conditions can change because of road construction, incidents, weather, new infrastructure, public events, school schedules, or long-term changes in travel behavior. Artificial intelligence models developed using historical mobility records may become less representative when these conditions change. A model that performs strongly during ordinary weekday traffic may therefore exhibit reduced reliability during unusual periods. Evaluation should include varied traffic states and, where possible, temporally separated test periods that reflect meaningful changes in transportation conditions.

Generalization across locations is similarly challenging because different road segments have different capacities, intersection structures, speed limits, and surrounding land uses. A model trained on central business-district traffic may not perform equally well in suburban corridors. Urban computing research emphasizes the heterogeneity of city environments. Consequently, city-scale congestion models should evaluate location-specific errors and avoid relying exclusively on overall network accuracy. Transferability across roads or cities should be demonstrated empirically rather than assumed.

## 7.3 Computational Complexity and Real-Time Deployment

Real-time congestion prediction requires models to process incoming mobility information quickly enough to support operational decisions. Large traffic networks may produce continuous streams of speed, flow, and trajectory observations from many locations. Complex artificial intelligence architectures can increase computational requirements, particularly when they repeatedly process long temporal histories and spatial relationships. A practical system must therefore balance predictive complexity with inference latency, memory requirements, and the frequency at which predictions need to be refreshed.

Another challenge involves maintaining models after deployment. Road networks and mobility patterns change, making periodic model reassessment necessary. Updating procedures should use clearly defined validation rules to avoid replacing a stable predictor in response to temporary fluctuations. Model versions, feature definitions, and training periods should be documented so that changes in prediction behavior can be investigated. Operational traffic forecasting consequently requires not only an accurate initial model but also a sustainable monitoring and maintenance framework.

## 8. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence-driven traffic congestion prediction offers a methodological approach for integrating heterogeneous urban mobility data within short-term transportation forecasting. The present hypothetical study developed a framework combining traffic speed, flow intensity, spatial-neighbor information, temporal characteristics, and aggregated mobility indicators. The methodology illustrates how these information sources can be incorporated into a comparative prediction design involving historical, conventional neural, and mobility-fusion models.

The hypothetical analytical results assigned the highest congestion-classification performance to the mobility-fusion configuration and demonstrated declining prediction quality across progressively longer forecasting horizons. These values are completely illustrative and should not be interpreted as

evidence that the proposed architecture has been experimentally validated. Actual performance improvements would require a representative urban dataset, implemented artificial intelligence models, chronological testing, appropriate statistical comparisons, and evaluation under varied transportation conditions.

The study concludes that urban mobility information has substantial methodological potential for improving understanding of evolving traffic conditions, particularly when spatial and temporal relationships are considered jointly. Future empirical research should examine mobility-data representativeness, missing observations, congestion-definition sensitivity, changing travel patterns, and real-time computational requirements. Rigorous evaluation of these factors can determine whether artificial intelligence-based mobility analytics provides reliable and operationally useful congestion forecasts in real urban transportation networks.

## References

1. Akhtar, M., & Moridpour, S. (2021). A review of traffic congestion prediction using artificial intelligence. *Journal of Advanced Transportation*, 2021, Article 8878011. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/8878011>
2. Afandizadeh, S., Abdolahi, S., & Mirzahosseini, H. (2024). Deep learning algorithms for traffic forecasting: A comprehensive review and comparison with classical ones. *Journal of Advanced Transportation*, 2024, Article 9981657. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2024/9981657>
3. Shaygan, M., Meese, C., Li, W., Zhao, X. G., & Nejad, M. (2022). Traffic prediction using artificial intelligence: Review of recent advances and emerging opportunities. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 145, Article 103921. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2022.103921>
4. Medina-Salgado, B., Sánchez-DelaCruz, E., Pozos-Parra, P., & Sierra, J. E. (2022). Urban traffic flow prediction techniques: A review. *Sustainable Computing: Informatics and Systems*, 35, Article 100739. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.suscom.2022.100739>
5. Sayed, S. A., Abdel-Hamid, Y., & Hefny, H. A. (2023). Artificial intelligence-based traffic flow prediction: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Electrical Systems and Information Technology*, 10, Article 13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43067-023-00081-6>
6. Vlahogianni, E. I., Karlaftis, M. G., & Golias, J. C. (2014). Short-term traffic forecasting: Where we are and where we're going. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 43, 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2014.01.005>
7. Lv, Y., Duan, Y., Kang, W., Li, Z., & Wang, F.-Y. (2015). Traffic flow prediction with big data: A deep learning approach. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 16(2), 865–873. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2014.2345663>
8. Polson, N. G., & Sokolov, V. O. (2017). Deep learning for short-term traffic flow prediction. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 79, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2017.02.024>
9. Yu, B., Yin, H., & Zhu, Z. (2018). Spatio-temporal graph convolutional networks: A deep learning framework for traffic forecasting. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 3634–3640). <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2018/505>

10. Li, Y., Yu, R., Shahabi, C., & Liu, Y. (2018). Diffusion convolutional recurrent neural network: Data-driven traffic forecasting. In International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR). <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SjiHXGWAZ>
11. Zhang, J., Zheng, Y., & Qi, D. (2017). Deep spatio-temporal residual networks for citywide crowd flows prediction. In Proceedings of the Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (pp. 1655–1661). AAAI Press.
12. Yao, H., Wu, F., Ke, J., Tang, X., Jia, Y., Lu, S., Gong, P., Ye, J., & Li, Z. (2018). Deep multi-view spatial-temporal network for taxi demand prediction. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 32(1). <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v32i1.11836>
13. Guo, S., Lin, Y., Feng, N., Song, C., & Wan, H. (2019). Attention based spatial-temporal graph convolutional networks for traffic flow forecasting. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 33(1), 922–929. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v33i01.3301922>
14. Wu, Z., Pan, S., Long, G., Jiang, J., & Zhang, C. (2019). Graph WaveNet for deep spatial-temporal graph modeling. In Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (pp. 1907–1913). <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2019/264>
15. Zhao, L., Song, Y., Zhang, C., Liu, Y., Wang, P., Lin, T., Deng, M., & Li, H. (2019). T-GCN: A temporal graph convolutional network for traffic prediction. IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems, 21(9), 3848–3858. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2019.2935152>
16. Ling, J., Lan, Y., Huang, X., et al. (2024). A multi-scale residual graph convolution network with hierarchical attention for predicting traffic flow in urban mobility. Complex & Intelligent Systems, 10, 3305–3317. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40747-023-01324-9>
17. Huang, J., et al. (2024). Multisource data fusion with graph convolutional neural networks for node-level traffic flow prediction. Journal of Advanced Transportation, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1155/atr/7109780>
18. Huo, Y., et al. (2024). Urban traffic flow prediction based on graph structure learning. Journal of Advanced Transportation, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1155/atr/7878081>
19. Zhu, R., Tang, J., He, X., Zhou, X., Huang, X., Wu, F., et al. (2024). SE-MAConvLSTM: A deep learning framework for short-term traffic flow prediction combining Squeeze-and-Excitation Network and Multi-Attention Convolutional LSTM Network. PLOS ONE, 19(12), Article e0312601. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0312601>
20. Ling, J., et al. (2024). A multi-scale residual graph convolution network with hierarchical attention for predicting traffic flow in urban mobility. Complex & Intelligent Systems. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40747-023-01324-9>