

Bond University  
Research Repository



## Recent advances in modeling the vulnerability of transportation networks

Wang, Zhiru; Chan, Albert P.C.; Yuan, Jingfeng; Xia, Bo; Skitmore, Martin; Li, Qiming

*Published in:*  
Journal of Infrastructure Systems

*DOI:*  
[10.1061/\(ASCE\)IS.1943-555X.0000232](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)IS.1943-555X.0000232)

*Licence:*  
Other

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

*Recommended citation(APA):*  
Wang, Z., Chan, A. P. C., Yuan, J., Xia, B., Skitmore, M., & Li, Q. (2015). Recent advances in modeling the vulnerability of transportation networks. *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, 21(2), Article 06014002. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)IS.1943-555X.0000232](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)IS.1943-555X.0000232)

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

# Recent Advances in Modeling the Vulnerability of Transportation Networks

Zhiru Wang<sup>1</sup>, Albert PC Chan<sup>2</sup>, Jingfeng Yuan<sup>3</sup>, Bo Xia<sup>4</sup>, Martin Skitmore<sup>5</sup>, Qiming Li<sup>6</sup>

**Abstract:** It is well known that, for major infrastructure networks such as electricity, gas, railway, road, and urban water networks, disruptions at one point have a knock on effect throughout the network. There is an impressive amount of individual research projects examining the vulnerability of critical infrastructure network. However, there is little understanding of the totality of the contribution made by these projects and their interrelationships. This makes their review a difficult process for both new and existing researchers in the field. To address this issue, a two-step literature review process is used, to provide an overview of the vulnerability of the transportation network in terms of four main themes - research objective, transportation mode, disruption scenario and vulnerability indicator –involving the analysis of related articles from 2001 to 2013. Two limitations of existing research are identified: (1) the limited amount of studies relating to multi-layer transportation network vulnerability analysis, and (2) the lack of evaluation methods to explore the relationship between structure vulnerability and dynamical functional vulnerability. In addition to indicating that more attention needs to be paid to these two aspects in future, the analysis provides a new avenue for the discovery of knowledge, as well as an improved understanding of transportation network vulnerability.

**Keywords:** disruption analysis; literature review; transportation network; vulnerability.

## Introduction

The overall objective of most national traffic policies of today is to provide society with an economical and sustainable transport network (Berdica 2002). However, there are many possible sources of degraded network performance, ranging from adverse weather to planned road works, as well as intentional harm arising from conflicts in labor relations or terrorist actions. Together with these, the increased complexity of the networks themselves and adaptive behavior of travelers, traffic congestion and other types of failures and delays with significant economic and social consequences can develop.

Such issues, termed the vulnerability of transportation networks, have been the subject of a wealth of research. This has now reached the point where a systematic analysis of academic journal articles is needed to assist researchers in exploring the current status and future trends (Tsai and Wen 2005). Several reviews have been conducted in the more general field of vulnerability of networked infrastructures. Murray et al. (2008) and Grubestic et al. (2008) conducted content analyses of vulnerability in the field of networked critical infrastructure. These analyses focused on networked critical infrastructure and methodologies for evaluating vulnerability. However, transportation networks are very different from other critical infrastructure, as their dynamic character is that of a carrier of agents. Other studies involve content analyses of the vulnerability, reliability, and robustness of degraded transportation networks, aiming to explore different definitions of vulnerability, reliability and robustness (Berdica 2002), diversity of related terms (Berdica 2002), evaluation methodologies (Murray et al. 2008), disruption protocols (Sullivan et al. 2009) and types

---

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D. candidate, School of Civil Engineering, Southeast University, 2 Sipailou, Nanjing, China (corresponding author). E-mail: zhiru.wang@seu.edu.cn

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Department of Building and Real Estate, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong, China

<sup>3</sup> Lecturer, School of Civil Engineering, Southeast University, 2 Sipailou, Nanjing, China

<sup>4</sup> Lecturer, School of Civil Engineering and Built Environment, Queensland University of Technology, 2 George Street, Brisbane, QLD, 4000, Australia

<sup>5</sup> Professor, School of Civil Engineering and Built Environment, Queensland University of Technology, 2 George Street, Brisbane, QLD, 4000, Australia

<sup>6</sup> Professor, Southeast University, School of Civil Engineering, 2 Sipailou, Nanjing, China

of indices for evaluation (Sullivan et al. 2009). Despite this existing literature, a more comprehensive content analysis of professional publications is needed to identify recent advances in modeling the vulnerability of transportation networks.

To provide a more clear picture of the current state of knowledge of future trends of the vulnerability of transportation networks, this paper presents an overview in term of four main themes - research objective, transportation mode, disruption scenario and vulnerability indicator - from associated publications published in journals and conferences from 2001 to 2013. Although these four research themes are considered separately for each transportation mode in most papers, the general comparison and summary not only provides a general research methodology for transportation vulnerability analysis and current state of knowledge, but also identifies areas in need of attention and provides researchers with a clear research direction in future.

### **Definition: the vulnerability of transportation networks**

The concept of vulnerability has three closely related interpretations in the literature. In the first interpretation, vulnerability is defined in terms of the idiom “little strokes fell great oaks” (Abrahamsson 1997), i.e. a relatively small incident can, if it happens in an unfortunate (critical) place and time, cause major damage or even the failure of the whole system through chain reactions. The second interpretation of vulnerability concerns *risk*. The vulnerability of the road transportation system is its susceptibility to incidents that result in considerable reductions in road network serviceability. The serviceability of a link/route/road network describes the possibility of using that network during a given period (Berdica 2002). The management of road network vulnerability involves an all-embracing framework that identifies a spectrum of incidents and collects data on probabilities and consequences to estimate risks, etc.

The third interpretation of vulnerability is partitioned into two components of probability and consequence (Erath et al. 2009; Jenelius 2009; Johansson and Hassel 2010; Tampère et al. 2007). The difficulty in estimating the probability of rare events is realized by researchers (Johansson and Hassel 2010) and only condition consequence and conditional criticality of components are assessed (Jenelius et al. 2006; Jenelius and Mattsson 2012).

By analyzing the origin of the word “vulnerable”, vulnerability is used to describe a kind of an Achilles’ heel - a deadly weakness in spite of an overall strength that can potentially lead to a downfall. Vulnerability is an inherent attribute of any system (Haimes 2006; Hood et al. 2003). The probability of an incident may obscure other potential network problems (Taylor and D’Este 2007). The definition of vulnerability defined in Abrahamsson (1997) is used by many researchers in the field of transportation network vulnerability (D’Este and Taylor 2003; Schuchmann 2010) and is also adopted here. With this definition, therefore, the vulnerability of transportation networks should answer three questions:

- Is there a weak component or geographical location, whose failure would cause major damage?
- How vulnerable is the network when the critical components or locations are damaged?
- To what types of disruption is transportation network vulnerable?

It is also helpful to define the relationship and difference between vulnerability and risk, reliability, robustness, flexibility and resilience of transportation networks under disruption etc, which are all concerned with incidents that transform a normal operation system into an abnormal statue. The most common of these are summarized in Table 1, with their interrelationships presented in Fig.1.

### **Research methodology**

According to the definition of vulnerability of transportation network, studies that are related to the vulnerability evaluation of transportation networks and vulnerable (critical) components identification are considered in this review. Then a thorough review was made of publications in well-known transportation research journals, special issues, and many related conference

proceedings to map the development of the vulnerability of transportation networks on the assumption that most research teams publish their findings through these high-level media. A two-step process was used as illustrated in Fig 2.

In the first step, a comprehensive search was conducted under the “Title/Keyword/Abstract” (T/K/A) field of the search engines “Scopus” and “Web of Knowledge.” Vulnerable spot identification under disruption is considered an essential part in vulnerability transportation networks but not in risk analysis. Because the risk probabilities of different locations of equipment where the incidents happen are not counted separately but counted together in one kind of risk factor, such as equipment (Trucco et al. 2008). Therefore, the effects of any part (section, crossing, change station, power unit etc.) can be not evaluated in risk analysis. Also vulnerable spot identification is not the essential part of reliability, resilience, robustness, flexibility analysis. If this is not the case, then words such as importance, critical, weak and vulnerable would be used in the paper (Derek et al. 2012; Berche et al. 2009). Therefore, the full search code was as follows:

```
TITLE-ABS-KEY(vulnerability OR vulnerable OR critical OR criticality OR weak OR weakness OR vital OR important OR importance OR disrupt OR disrupted OR degrade OR degraded OR survivability) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(transportation OR infrastructure OR road OR subway OR highway OR rail OR airline OR bus OR waterway) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(network) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(component OR link OR node OR station OR track OR location)) AND PUBYEAR > 2000 AND (LIMIT-TO(DOCTYPE, "ar") OR LIMIT-TO(DOCTYPE, "re") OR LIMIT-TO(DOCTYPE, "ip")) AND (LIMIT-TO(LANGUAGE, "English")) AND (LIMIT-TO(SRCTYPE, "j") OR LIMIT-TO(SRCTYPE, "k") OR LIMIT-TO(SRCTYPE, "b"))
```

In the second step, a content analysis of the selected papers was carried out to identify common research processes in vulnerability related studies. A critical review of the research objectives, transportation modes, disruption scenarios and vulnerability indicators was carried out to ascertain any changes, trends and areas yet in need of study.

## Results

There has been significant effort directed at developing methods and approaches for exploring the potential outcomes of unscheduled losses for transportation networks. The vast majority of this effort focused on staging a hypothetical network disruption and then assessing its impact on network performance (Sullivan et al. 2010). The purpose of this section is to summarize what is depicted in the vulnerability of transportation networks studies.

A common research methodology adopted by researchers comprises four key stages of (1) identification of research objectives; (2) transportation mode applications; (3) disruption scenarios definition; and (4) vulnerability indicators (Fig. 3). The first step of the research methodology is normally achieved via a comprehensive literature review, investigation of the industry, and communication with other researchers to identify research objectives. After identifying the research objectives, the second step of the study would typically be the selection of the transportation mode. This mode needs an additional review, as well as an investigation into the objectives of the selected transportation mode. How to establish the transportation network, such as graph theory or GIS, should also be considered in the second step. The third step of the methodology typically considers “disruption scenarios” by assumption of a location, duration, time of occurrence, the capacity reduction it induces and the number of components degraded simultaneously. The final step of this methodology is normally to establish the vulnerability indicator that will then deliver the initial findings of the research study. A content analysis was conducted from the four common steps.

### *Research objectives*

Through the comprehensive review of these published papers, the major research objectives and their frequencies were summarized in Table 2. Objectives 4 and 6 were conducted as essential parts in almost all previous research. However, the detailed analyses were different from the transportation

modes applied by the disruption scenarios used for the failure of components or locations, as well as for the impact factors included in the vulnerability indicators. In other words, the conclusions of two research efforts with the same research objectives would be different because of the differing transportation modes, the different disruption scenarios used for the failure of components or locations, and the different impact factors included in the vulnerability indicators.

### ***Transportation mode***

For different transportation modes, the research methodology and vulnerability characteristics are very different. An approach designed for a road network cannot be applied directly to a subway network, which is a frequency-based and strictly capacity-constrained system, with the interrelationship of stations and tracks being more significant than in a road network. For example, if an incident happens on a station in line 1, all the trains service in this line would be affected and restricted to a lower speed when passing by the degraded station. Therefore, arrive frequency of the downstream station would also be affected. Trains in other lines sharing the same downstream station and tracks should change timetable accordingly. Additionally, the interdependent relationships of a multi-layered intelligent transportation network, such as a subway or power sub-system providing traction power to the train operation system, cannot be reflected by the same approach applied to road networks.

To observe the popularity of these categories, the frequencies of the transportation mode were calculated. Table 3 indicates that Multi-layer transportation systems and frequency-based and capacity-constrained container transportation modes have received little attention in the literature.

### ***Disruption scenarios***

The simulation of a disruption with specific disruption parameters on a specific link is called a disruption scenario (Burgholzer et al. 2013). A disruption is described by its location and assumptions about its duration, its time of occurrence, the capacity reduction it induces and the number of components degraded simultaneously. In summary, there are eight types of disruption scenarios (see Table 4). Arbitrary combinations of these are used in the vulnerability of transportation networks literature.

The purpose of a targeted attack is not only to simulate disruptions but also to provide a short list for simulations incorporating a full network scan approach with traffic assignments which can be computationally intensive. For example, the well-known Chicago regional network for testing traffic assignment algorithms consists of 39018 links. For each link closure, a traffic assignment conducted on the Chicago regional network requires approximately half an hour. Consequently, the full scan approach can take about 2 years to identify most of the critical links in such a network. Therefore, a full network scan approach may not be viable for critical link identification in large-scale congested road networks (Chen et al. 2012).

Several approaches have been introduced in order to overcome the computational time problem. Pre-selection strategies firstly select links or nodes that are likely to be vulnerable based on criteria including high travel load links (Burgholzer et al. 2013), the most popular routes or links for travelers (Taylor 2012; Taylor and D'Este 2007), a high probability of disruptions (Nyberg and Johansson 2013), nodes with the highest degree (Qian et al. 2012; Zhang et al. 2011), capacity and volume based indicators (Knoop et al. 2012) and node or link indicators (Schintler et al. 2007; Zhang et al. 2011).

### ***Vulnerability indicator***

The value of the vulnerability index is used to quantify the impact of disruption events and answer the question of how system performance is explained (Burgholzer et al. 2013). The function of the vulnerability index is determined by the definition of vulnerability. As describe in the Introduction, vulnerability is composed of the probability of incidents and their consequences (P-C) as defined by

Berdica (2002), or consequences (C) as defined by D'Este and Taylor (2003) and Abrahamsson (1997). Therefore, the critical analysis of the vulnerability index is classified firstly according to whether the probability of failure is contained in the function as P-C or C (see Fig. 4).

The vulnerability of components, locations and the network as a whole to a failure depends on which impact factors are included in the vulnerability indicator. Firstly, a transportation system is a geospatial system in Euclidean space. Every segment of transportation has its location in this space, with specific geological conditions, facilities (hospital, school, office buildings etc.), population densities, etc. This Euclidean space-based factor is defined as a spatial-related factor. Secondly, in graph theory, transportation segments are represented by nodes and links, irrespective of the real location in Euclidean space and the Euclidean distance between two nodes, only considering pairwise relations between two nodes. The Euclidean distance can be reflected by the attributes of links in a weighted graph. The graph's topological characteristics in complex theory such as degree, cluster, betweenness and efficiency (Barabási and Albert, 1999) are used to describe the importance and position of the nodes and links in the network. These complex network-based factors are defined as topological-related factors. The role of the transportation system in society is to provide a travel service. However, both spatial-related factors and topological-related factors cannot solely reflect the transport function. Therefore, a traffic-related factor describes the unique attributes of a transportation system, such as traveler behavior, travel cost, traffic assignment, traffic flow on nodes and links, travel speed, capacity of road, capacity of container, frequency of container transport, etc.

In the vulnerability of transportation networks, the estimates of the impact of disruptions for components, locations and networks are based on three types of factors: spatial-related factors, topological-related factors and traffic-related factors, or the combination of all three (see Fig. 4). Although topological factors are implicit in traffic flow and assignment, the effects of transportation network vulnerability caused by the variation of topological structure cannot be analyzed if all three factors have not been analyzed separately. Likewise, the relationship between structure vulnerability and functional vulnerability cannot be found (Issacharoff et al. 2008). However, most of the literature conducts vulnerability estimation using only traffic-related factors and spatial-related factors, irrespective of the topological character of the network itself. Nine traffic assignment models were summarized in Table 5. These studies seem to ignore the relevant topological-related factors. They instead focus on providing a sound traffic assignment model under a disruption scenario.

Any network system, in fact, can be thought of as being intrinsically vulnerable, i.e. its functionality could be significantly reduced due to some failure produced by unexpected events, either internally or externally (Issacharoff et al. 2008). Complex network theory (Barabási and Albert, 1999) is widely used in the vulnerability analysis of transportation networks (Angeloudis and Fisk 2006; Berche et al. 2009; Derrible and Kennedy 2010a; Ghosh et al. 2011; Qian et al. 2012; Scardoni and Laudanna 2013; Schintler et al. 2007; Takadama et al. 2007; Yin and Xu 2010; Zhang et al. 2011; Zio et al. 2008), where topological-related factors are considered in the estimation of vulnerability. However, considering topologies alone is not enough to reflect the vulnerability of transportation networks accurately. Kurant et al. (2007) and Ghosh et al. (2011) used the number of trains on the link to weigh the link, thus evaluating how vulnerable the railway network is after links or nodes are removed. For both weighted and un-weighted topological transportation networks, it has been shown that the more heterogeneous the network, the more vulnerable it is to a targeted attack. This implies that, aside from structural vulnerability, it is necessary to consider the dynamical vulnerability of a transportation network, which is its functional response to a given disruption.

A combination of the topological and functional analysis approach has been applied to highway networks by Issacharoff et al. (2008). Here, a complex network theory based approach was used to estimate the structural vulnerability of highway networks using topological-related factors. A four-step static traffic assignment was used to estimate the functional vulnerability of highway networks by the total travel time increase for all the travelers. The results of the structure and functional vulnerability were found to be similar, with a linear dependence between the magnitude of

perturbation and the level of vulnerability. This implies that if a relationship between the topological characteristics and functional vulnerability could be found, it would be easy to assess the functional vulnerability of a transportation network by its structure.

Although the approach proposed by Issacharoff et al. (2008) makes considerable progress in the combination of topological and traffic related factors in vulnerability analysis, it is not capable of reflecting dynamic delay/congestion propagation (Shu-Bin et al. 2011; Wu et al. 2007; Zi-You et al. 2011). Because of this, a dynamic approach that combines topological and traffic related factors in the vulnerability analysis is desirable.

## **Future Directions**

### ***Vulnerability analysis of multi-layer transportation network***

The infrastructures on which our society depends are interdependent and interconnected across multiple layers. A failure of a very small fraction of nodes in one network may lead to the complete fragmentation of a system of several interdependent networks, due to both functional and physical interdependency. For example, in Italy's electrical blackout on 28 September 2003, the shutdown of power stations led directly to the failure of nodes in the Internet communication network, which in turn caused a further breakdown of power stations (Buldyrev et al. 2010).

Based on complex network theories, many researchers (Albert and Barabási 2002; Barabási and Albert 1999) have focused on the structural vulnerability of interdependent infrastructures (Apostolakis and Lemon 2005; Buldyrev et al. 2010; Chai et al. 2008; Hellström 2007; Little 2002; Matisziw et al. 2009; Ouyang et al. 2009; Rosato et al. 2008; Wang et al. 2013; Wang et al. 2012; Zhang and Peeta 2011). Although all of these focus on multi-layer, interdependent infrastructure, most deal with power and Internet networks (Buldyrev et al. 2010), power and gas pipeline networks (Ouyang et al. 2009; Wang et al. 2013), power and water networks (Wang et al. 2012) and power, water and natural gas networks (Apostolakis and Lemon 2005). The spread of resources and data flow in power, water, natural gas and Internet networks is different from passenger flow in transportation networks. The former spread is assigned by the operators, while passengers can choose any available path according to their experience and preference. Therefore, the methods of vulnerability estimation of multi-layer interdependent networks such as power, water, natural gas, Internet networks cannot be applied in multi-layer transportation systems.

A relatively simple approach proposed by Johansson and Hassel (2010) is used to estimate the vulnerability of multi-layer railway networks. The loss of service is evaluated as the fraction of travelers not able to reach their desired destination. Provided there is at least one possible way to travel between the stations, it is said that no consequences arise. Although this multi-layer-based vulnerability approach is designed for multi-layer railway networks, which have same sub-systems (electrical in-feed system, auxiliary power system, telecommunication system, and traction power system) as multi-layer subway networks, the former is schedule-based, while the latter is frequency based (Schmöcker et al. 2008). Congestion, a problem not present in railway networks, can be seen in subway networks during morning and night peak hours. It is a daily problem in many developed cities such as London, Tokyo, Shanghai and Beijing. Therefore, a specific approach is needed for vulnerability estimation of multi-layer subway networks, one that considers the frequency of train movements, the strict capacity constraint of stations and trains, congestion in stations and trains, queuing at stations and delay propagation on rail tracks.

### ***Relationship between structure vulnerability with dynamical functional vulnerability***

It has been widely observed in many areas that scale free networks are more vulnerable (structure vulnerable) than random networks (Barabási and Albert 1999). Additionally, networks with relatively higher clusters and lower degrees have proven less vulnerable than scale free networks, which have higher clusters and higher degrees (Angeloudis and Fisk 2006; Derrible and Kennedy 2010a). This means that topological characteristics such as degree, cluster and structure type help to determine the

structure vulnerability of the network.

Subway transportation networks have several kinds of structure types. The most typical ones are the radial network, dispersed network, grid network, ring-dispersed network, ring-grid network, ring-radial network (Vuchic 2005; Vukan 2004). The radial network is the most heterogeneous, as most tracks are connected by very few transfer stations, with most stations only on one track (Derrile and Kennedy 2010b). Therefore, the scale factor is higher than the other types of structure. The grid network is the most homogeneous network, as many stations are transfer stations passed by two or more tracks. The scale factor is lower than with the radial network. The type of transport network structure used is derived by travel demand, while traffic dynamics is in turn determined by the structure of the transportation networks. The stricter characteristic can be used to explain the formation mechanism of congestions and propagation (Zi-You et al. 2011). Therefore, it would be meaningful and interesting to explore the relationship between both structural vulnerability and characteristics and functional vulnerability.

Dynamic assignments should be considered in functional vulnerability analysis, as they are better at showing the exact location of congestion and at determining the development of congestion over time. This is important for correct modeling of the effects of variations in demand and capacity. The possibility of en-route route choice is important as, in practice, a certain percentage of the travelers change their route when they are informed of congestion at a specific location. However, it is very difficult to model the en-route choice of travelers correctly because of the uncertainty during such incidents (Knoop et al. 2012). It is not known how many people have information relating to the incident, or how they will respond to that information. Static transit assignment models cannot deal with the bottleneck induced congestion problem and are not able to properly evaluate the transit network under dramatically changing network conditions (e.g. passenger arrival rate and loading of transit services) during the period of analysis (Snelder et al. 2012).

## Conclusion

Four common aspects - research objectives, transportation modes, disruption scenarios and vulnerability indicators - were generalized from the 101 papers selected. Eight objectives of the vulnerability of transportation networks were identified. Road and highway networks were considered in 70% of these papers. Only 3% of approaches were developed for multi-layer railway networks and 7% for subway networks. Disruption scenarios are classified by their duration, time of occurrence, induced capacity reduction, simultaneously degraded number of components and the location of the disruption. Because computational intensiveness is an acknowledged problem in simulation-based vulnerability estimation, many pre-selected topological and functional indicators are used to overcome it. The vulnerability indicators are classified and analyzed from the impact factors they include, such as spatial-related factors, topological-related factors, and traffic-related factors. The vulnerability indicators most frequently found are traffic-related factor driven, with few including both topological-related and traffic-related factors.

The research findings of this study also offer two future directions. First, more focus on vulnerability analyses of multi-layer transportation networks is needed. As more electric transportation systems (subway, light rail, national railway, tram and electric highway) are provided in cities, there is an increased need for evaluating the vulnerability of transport networks from a multi-layer perspective. Second, a new method that can explore the relationship between the structural vulnerability and the functional vulnerability dynamically is needed to assess the functional vulnerability of a transportation network by its structure during the design phase when the traffic flow is difficult to forecast.

In adopting the four research themes, the general comparison and summary not only provides a general research methodology for transportation vulnerability analysis and current state of knowledge, but also identifies areas in need of attention and provides researchers with a clear research direction in future. The analysis provides an avenue to the discovery of new knowledge and



an improved understanding of transportation network vulnerability. A better understanding of the recent advances in modeling the vulnerability of transportation networks may enable the practitioners to appreciate the key issues in the vulnerability of transportation network development. This will then improve the serviceability of transportation networks in general.

### **Acknowledgement**

The research work for this paper was funded by the Priority Academic Program Development of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions (PAPD) and Hong Kong Polytechnic University Research Committee (Code No. G-u786). It was also partly funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 51178116 and No. 71001027).

**Table 1. Definition and references of vulnerability terminologies**

Term	Definition	Reference
risk	Risk is expressed as the probability of occurrence of a certain given event multiplied by the failure probability of a given infrastructure object and the consequences	Erath et al. 2009; Haines 2006
Reliability	Reliability is the probability that a network will deliver a required standard of performance	Taylor and Susilawati 2012
Resilience	Capability to resist and recover from a disruption	Chen and Miller-Hooks 2012; Miller-Hooks et al. 2012
Robustness	Robustness is the extent to which, under pre-specified circumstances, a network able to maintain the function for which it was originally designed	Snelder et al. 2012; Sullivan et al. 2010
Flexibility	Flexibility is the ability of a traffic network to expand its capacity to accommodate changes in demand for its use while maintaining a satisfactory level of performance	Cho 2002

**Table 2.** The major research objectives and their frequency

No.	Objective	Frequency (%)
1	define vulnerability and other related terms	8
2	conduct an overview of vulnerability analysis in networked infrastructure systems	6
3	describe the vulnerability assessment process qualitatively	2
4	estimate the impact of the loss of components and locations on the transportation network	50
5	estimate the impact of the loss of components and locations on a particular component or locations	16
6	identify the critical components of transportation network by calculating and ranking the impact on the whole network	33
7	provide a candidate list of disruption scenarios	9
8	determine how vulnerability depends on different variables	4

**Table 3.** Frequency of different transportation modes studied in the selected papers


Transportation mode	Frequency (%)
Intermodal transport network	3
Road network/highway	70
Railway network	8
Shipping network	1
Airline network	4
Subway	6
Multi-layer railway network	3
Multi-layer highway network	1
Public transportation network	1
Power and gas systems	1
Power and water systems	1

**Table 4. Eight types of disruption scenario**


Factors	Types	Citation
Degree of the closure: It is used to describe the degradation degree of one segment		
	<i>full closure</i>	Berdica and Mattsson 2007; Hernández and Gómez 2011; Johansson and Hassel 2010; Tang et al. 2009
	<i>partial closure</i>	Chen et al. 2007; Berdica and Mattsson 2007; Luathep et al. 2011; Nagurney and Qiang 2007; Sullivan et al. 2010
Number of disrupted components: The number of elements disrupted (single disruption and multiple) is used to describe how many segments degraded.		
	<i>single component</i>	Hernández and Gómez 2011; Jenelius et al. 2006; Yin and Xu 2010
	<i>multiple components</i>	Jenelius et al. 2006; Hernández and Gómez 2011; Jenelius and Mattsson, 2012
Disruption duration: Time duration from abnormal service to normal service.		
	<i>short-term duration</i>	Sullivan et al. 2010; Watling and Balijepalli 2012
	<i>long-term duration</i>	Masiero and Maggi 2012
Source of disruption: The degradation of component is caused by random failure or target attack.		
	<i>random attack</i>	Jenelius et al. 2006; Qian et al. 2012; Zhang et al. 2011
	<i>target attack</i>	Knoop et al. 2012; Qian et al. 2012

**Table 5.** Traffic assignment models used in vulnerability of transportation networks studies

Traffic assignment models	Citations
non-capacity constrained networks	Berdica and Mattsson 2007; Jenelius et al. 2006; Lu and Peng 2011; Nagurney et al. 2010; Peterson and Church 2008; Scott et al. 2006; Shiomi et al. 2011; Taylor and Susilawati 2012; Taylor and D'Este 2007; Watling and Balijepalli 2012
capacity constrained models	Chen et al. 2012; Issacharoff et al. 2008; Jenelius et al. 2006; Jenelius and Mattsson 2012; Karlaftis and Peeta 2009; Knoop et al. 2012; Knoop et al. 2008; Luathep et al. 2011; Nagurney and Qiang 2007
User Equilibrium model	Berdica and Mattsson 2007; Chen et al. 2012; Erath et al. 2009; Hernández and Gómez 2011; Issacharoff et al. 2008; Jenelius 2009; Jenelius et al. 2006; Nagurney et al. 2010; Qiang and Nagurney 2008; Scott et al. 2006; Shimamoto et al. 2008; Sullivan et al. 2010; Zhang and Levinson 2008
System optimizing model	Nagurney et al. 2010
Logit assignment model	Chen et al. 2007; Jenelius and Mattsson 2012; Masiero and Maggi 2012
All-or-Nothing model	Lu and Peng 2011; Taylor and Susilawati 2012
Stochastic Probit-based assignment model	Knoop et al. 2008; Lu and Peng 2011
Dynamic User Equilibrium	Burgholzer et al. 2013; Knoop et al. 2012
Game theory	Bell et al. 2008; Lou and Zhang 2011; Lownes et al. 2011; Murray-Tuite and Fei 2010; Murray-Tuite and Mahmassani 2004; Perea and Puerto 2013; Ukkusuri and Yushimito 2009




**Fig. 1.** Differences among the most related terms




**Fig. 2.** Two-step research framework (Ke et al. 2009)





**Fig. 3.** General research methodology in vulnerability of transportation networks



**Fig. 4.** Vulnerability indicators in transportation networks

---

1

2 **References**

- 3 Abdel-Rahim, A., Oman, P., Johnson, B., and Tung, L. W. (2007). "Survivability analysis of  
4 large-scale intelligent transportation system networks." *Transportation Research Record*,  
5 (2022), 9-20.
- 6 Abrahamsson, T. (1997). "Characterization of vulnerability in the road transport system." *Working*  
7 *Report*.
- 8 Albert, R., and Barabási, A. L. (2002). "Statistical mechanics of complex networks." *Reviews of*  
9 *Modern Physics*, 74(1), 47.
- 10 Angeloudis, P., and Fisk, D. (2006). "Large subway systems as complex networks." *Physica A:*  
11 *Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 367, 553-558.
- 12 Apostolakis, G. E., and Lemon, D. M. (2005). "A screening methodology for the identification and  
13 ranking of infrastructure vulnerabilities due to terrorism." *Risk Analysis*, 25(2), 361-376.
- 14 Barabási, A. L., and Albert, R. (1999). "Emergence of scaling in random networks." *Science*,  
15 286(5439), 509-512.
- 16 Bell, M. G. H., Kanturska, U., Schmöcker, J. D., and Fonzone, A. (2008). "Attacker-defender models  
17 and road network vulnerability." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A:*  
18 *Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 366(1872), 1893-1906.
- 19 Berche, B., Von Ferber, C., Holovatch, T., and Holovatch, Y. (2009). "Resilience of public transport  
20 networks against attacks." *European Physical Journal B*, 71(1), 125-137.
- 21 Berdica, K. (2002). "An introduction to road vulnerability: What has been done, is done and should be  
22 done." *Transport Policy*, 9(2), 117-127.
- 23 Berdica, K., and Mattsson, L. (2007). "Vulnerability: A model-based case study of the road network in  
24 Stockholm." *Critical Infrastructure*, 81-106.
- 25 Buldyrev, S. V., Parshani, R., Paul, G., Stanley, H. E., and Havlin, S. (2010). "Catastrophic cascade of  
26 failures in interdependent networks." *Nature*, 464(7291), 1025-1028.
- 27 Burgholzer, W., Bauer, G., Posset, M., and Jammerneegg, W. (2013). "Analysing the impact of  
28 disruptions in intermodal transport networks: A micro simulation-based model." *Decision*  
29 *Support Systems*, 54(4), 1580-1586.
- 30 Chai, C. L., Liu, X., Zhang, W. J., Deters, R., Liu, D., Dyachuk, D., Tu, Y. L., and Baber, Z. (2008).  
31 "Social network analysis of the vulnerabilities of interdependent critical infrastructures."  
32 *International Journal of Critical Infrastructures*, 4(3), 256-273.
- 33 Chen, A., Yang, C., Kongsomsaksakul, S., and Lee, M. (2007). "Network-based accessibility measures  
34 for vulnerability analysis of degradable transportation networks." *Networks and Spatial*  
35 *Economics*, 7(3), 241-256.
- 36 Chen, B. Y., Lam, W. H. K., Sumalee, A., Li, Q., and Li, Z. C. (2012). "Vulnerability analysis for  
37 large-scale and congested road networks with demand uncertainty." *Transportation Research*  
38 *Part A: Policy and Practice*, 46(3), 501-516.
- 39 Chen, L., and Miller-Hooks, E. (2012). "Resilience: an indicator of recovery capability in intermodal  
40 freight transport." *Transportation Science*, 46(1), 109-123.
- 41 Cho, D. J. (2002). "Three papers on measuring the reliability and flexibility of transportation system

---

42 capacity", University of Pennsylvania.

43 Derek, F., Kevin, H., William, L., and John, C. (2012). "Evaluation of resiliency of transportation  
44 networks after disasters." *Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2012(2284),  
45 109-116.

46

47 Derrible, S., and Kennedy, C. (2010a). "The complexity and robustness of metro networks." *Physica A:  
48 Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 389(17), 3678-3691.

49 Derrible, S., and Kennedy, C. (2010b). "Characterizing metro networks: state, form, and structure."  
50 *Transportation*, 37(2), 275-297.

51 D'Este, G. M., and Taylor, M. A. "Network vulnerability: an approach to reliability analysis at the level  
52 of national strategic transport networks." *Network Reliability of Transport. Proceedings of the  
53 1st International Symposium on Transportation Network Reliability (INSTR)*.

54 Erath, A., Birdsall, J., Axhausen, K. W., and Hajdin, R. (2009). "Vulnerability assessment  
55 methodology for Swiss road network." *Transportation Research Record*, 2137, 118-126.

56 Ghosh, S., Banerjee, A., Sharma, N., Agarwal, S., Ganguly, N., Bhattacharya, S., and Mukherjee, A.  
57 (2011). "Statistical analysis of the Indian Railway Network: A complex network approach."  
58 *Acta Physica Polonica B, Proceedings Supplement*, 4(2), 123-137.

59 Grubestic, T. H., Matisziw, T. C., Murray, A. T., and Snediker, D. (2008). "Comparative approaches for  
60 assessing network vulnerability." *International Regional Science Review*, 31(1), 88-112.

61 Haimes, Y. Y. (2006). "On the definition of vulnerabilities in measuring risks to infrastructures." *Risk  
62 Analysis*, 26(2), 293-296.

63 Hellström, T. (2007). "Critical infrastructure and systemic vulnerability: Towards a planning  
64 framework." *Safety Science*, 45(3), 415-430.

65 Hernández, L. G., and Gómez, O. G. (2011). "Identification of critical segments by vulnerability for  
66 freight transport on the paved road network of Mexico." *Investigaciones Geograficas*, 74,  
67 48-57.

68 Hood, J. N., Olivas, T., Slocter, C. B., Howard, B., and Albright, D. P. (2003). "Vulnerability  
69 assessment through integrated transportation analysis." *Transportation Research  
70 Record*(1822), 18-23.

71 Issacharoff, L., Lämmer, S., Rosato, V., and Helbing, D. (2008). "Critical infrastructures vulnerability:  
72 The highway networks." *Understanding Complex Systems*, 2008, 201-216.

73 Jenelius, E. (2009). "Network structure and travel patterns: explaining the geographical disparities of  
74 road network vulnerability." *Journal of Transport Geography*, 17(3), 234-244.

75 Jenelius, E., Petersen, T., and Mattsson, L. G. (2006). "Importance and exposure in road network  
76 vulnerability analysis." *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 40(7), 537-560.

77 Jenelius, E., Petersen, T., and Mattsson, L. (2006). "Road network vulnerability: Identifying important  
78 links and exposed regions." *Transportation Research A*, 40, 537-560.

79 Jenelius, E., and Mattsson, L. G. (2012). "Road network vulnerability analysis of area-covering  
80 disruptions: A grid-based approach with case study." *Transportation Research Part A: Policy  
81 and Practice*, 46(5), 746-760.

82 Johansson, J., and Hassel, H. (2010). "An approach for modelling interdependent infrastructures in the  
83 context of vulnerability analysis." *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*, 95(12),

---

84 1335-1344.

85 Jordán, F. (2008). "Predicting target selection by terrorists: A network analysis of the 2005 London  
86 underground attacks." *International Journal of Critical Infrastructures*, 4(1-2), 206-214.

87 Karlaftis, M. G., and Peeta, S. (2009). "Infrastructure planning, design, and management for big  
88 events." *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, 15(1), 1-2.

89 Ke, Y. J., Wang, S. Q., Chan, A., and Cheung, E. (2009). "Research trend of public-private partnership  
90 in construction journals." *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 135(10),  
91 1076-1086

92 Knoop, V. L., Snelder, M., van Zuylen, H. J., and Hoogendoorn, S. P. (2012). "Link-level vulnerability  
93 indicators for real-world networks." *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*,  
94 46(5), 843-854.

95 Knoop, V., van Zuylen, H., and Hoogendoorn, S. (2008). "The influence of spillback modelling when  
96 assessing consequences of blockings in a road network." *European Journal of Transport and  
97 Infrastructure Research*, 8(4), 287-300.

98 Kurant, M., Thiran, P., and Hagmann, P. (2007). "Error and attack tolerance of layered complex  
99 networks." *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, 76(2) 026103..

100 Li He, Z. P. C. Y., and A, R. (2008). "Concepts and Assessment Methods of Vulnerability." *Progress  
101 in Geography*, 2, 18-25.

102 Little, R. G. (2002). "Controlling cascading failure: Understanding the vulnerabilities of interconnected  
103 infrastructures." *Journal of Urban Technology*, 9(1), 109-123.

104 Lou, Y., and Zhang, L. (2011). "Defending transportation networks against random and targeted  
105 attacks." *Transportation Research Record*, 2234, 31-40.

106 Lownes, N. E., Wang, Q., Ibrahim, S., Ammar, R. A., Rajasekaran, S., and Sharma, D. (2011).  
107 "Many-to-many game-theoretic approach for the measurement of transportation network  
108 vulnerability." *Transportation Research Record*, 2263, 1-8.

109 Lu, Q. C., and Peng, Z. R. (2011). "Vulnerability analysis of transportation network under scenarios of  
110 sea level rise." *Transportation Research Record*, 2263, 174-181.

111 Luathep, P., Sumalee, A., Ho, H. W., and Kurauchi, F. (2011). "Large-scale road network vulnerability  
112 analysis: A sensitivity analysis based approach." *Transportation*, 38(5), 799-817.

113 Masiero, L., and Maggi, R. (2012). "Estimation of indirect cost and evaluation of protective measures  
114 for infrastructure vulnerability: A case study on the transalpine transport corridor." *Transport  
115 Policy*, 20, 13-21.

116 Matisziw, T. C., Murray, A. T., and Grubestic, T. H. (2009). "Exploring the vulnerability of network  
117 infrastructure to disruption." *Annals of Regional Science*, 43(2), 307-321.

118 Miller-Hooks, E., Zhang, X., and Faturechi, R. (2012). "Measuring and maximizing resilience of  
119 freight transportation networks." *Computers and Operations Research*, 39(7), 1633-1643.

120 Murray, A. T., Matisziw, T. C., and Grubestic, T. H. (2008). "A methodological overview of network  
121 vulnerability analysis." *Growth and Change*, 39(4), 573-592.

122 Murray-Tuite, P. M., and Fei, X. (2010). "A Methodology for assessing transportation network  
123 terrorism risk with attacker and defender interactions." *Computer-Aided Civil and  
124 Infrastructure Engineering*, 25(6), 396-410.

125 Murray-Tuite, P. M., and Mahmassani, H. S. (2004). "Methodology for determining vulnerable links in

---

126 a transportation network." *Transportation Research Record*, 1882, 88-96.

127 Nagurney, A., Qiang, Q., and Nagurney, L. S. (2010). "Environmental impact assessment of  
128 transportation networks with degradable links in an era of climate change." *International*  
129 *Journal of Sustainable Transportation*, 4(3), 154-171.

130 Nagurney, A., and Qiang, Q. (2007). "Robustness of transportation networks subject to degradable  
131 links." *EPL*, 80(6) 68001..

132 Nyberg, R., and Johansson, M. (2013). "Indicators of road network vulnerability to storm-felled trees."  
133 *Natural Hazards*, 1-15 185-199..

134 Ouyang, M., Hong, L., Mao, Z. J., Yu, M. H., and Qi, F. (2009). "A methodological approach to  
135 analyze vulnerability of interdependent infrastructures." *Simulation Modelling Practice and*  
136 *Theory*, 17(5), 817-828.

137 Perea, F., and Puerto, J. (2013). "Revisiting a game theoretic framework for the robust railway network  
138 design against intentional attacks." *European Journal of Operational Research*, 226(2),  
139 286-292.

140 Peterson, S. K., and Church, R. L. (2008). "A framework for modeling rail transport vulnerability."  
141 *Growth and Change*, 39(4), 617-641.

142 Qian, Y. S., Wang, M., Kang, H. X., Zeng, J. W., and Liu, Y. F. (2012). "Study on the road network  
143 connectivity reliability of valley city based on complex network." *Mathematical Problems in*  
144 *Engineering*, .

145 Qiang, Q., and Nagurney, A. (2008). "A unified network performance measure with importance  
146 identification and the ranking of network components." *Optimization Letters*, 2(1), 127-142.

147 Rosato, V., Issacharoff, L., Tiriticco, F., Meloni, S., Porcellinis, S., and Setola, R. (2008). "Modelling  
148 interdependent infrastructures using interacting dynamical models." *International Journal of*  
149 *Critical Infrastructures*, 4(1), 63-79.

150 Scardoni, G., and Laudanna, C. (2013). "Identifying critical road network areas with node centralities  
151 interference and robustness." *Studies in Computational Intelligence*, 424, 245-255.

152 Schintler, L. A., Kulkarni, R., Gorman, S., and Stough, R. (2007). "Using raster-based GIS and graph  
153 theory to analyze complex networks." *Networks and Spatial Economics*, 7(4), 301-313.

154 Schmöcker, J., Bell, M. G., and Kurauchi, F. (2008). "A quasi-dynamic capacity constrained  
155 frequency-based transit assignment model." *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*,  
156 42(10), 925-945.

157 Schuchmann, G. (2010). "Road network vulnerability-evaluation of measures in ranking damages and  
158 developments." *Periodica Polytechnica: Civil Engineering*, 54(1), 61-65.

159 Scott, D. M., Novak, D. C., Aultman-Hall, L., and Guo, F. (2006). "Network Robustness Index: A new  
160 method for identifying critical links and evaluating the performance of transportation  
161 networks." *Journal of Transport Geography*, 14(3), 215-227.

162 Shimamoto, H., Kurauchi, F., Schmöcker, J. D., and Bell, M. G. H. (2008). "Evaluating critical lines  
163 and stations considering the impact of the consequence using transit assignment model -case  
164 study of London's underground network." *Journal of Advanced Transportation*, 42(3),  
165 291-310.

166 Shiomi, Y., Seto, Y., and Uno, N. (2011). "Model for location of medical facility and evaluation of  
167 vulnerability and accessibility of road network." *Transportation Research Record*, 2234,

- 
- 168 41-48.
- 169 Shu-Bin, L., Jian-Jun, W., Zi-You, G., Yong, L., and Bai-Bai, F. (2011). "The analysis of traffic  
170 congestion and dynamic propagation properties based on complex network." 50701-050701.
- 171 Snelder, M., van Zuylen, H. J., and Immers, L. H. (2012). "A framework for robustness analysis of  
172 road networks for short term variations in supply." *Transportation Research Part A: Policy  
173 and Practice*, 46(5), 828-842.
- 174 Sullivan, J. L., Aultman-Hall, L., and Novak, D. C. (2009). "A review of current practice in network  
175 disruption analysis and an assessment of the ability to account for isolating links in  
176 transportation networks." *Transportation Letters: The International Journal of Transportation  
177 Research*, 1(4), 271-280.
- 178 Sullivan, J. L., Novak, D. C., Aultman-Hall, L., and Scott, D. M. (2010). "Identifying critical road  
179 segments and measuring system-wide robustness in transportation networks with isolating  
180 links: A link-based capacity-reduction approach." *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and  
181 Practice*, 44(5), 323-336.
- 182 Takadama, K., Majima, T., Watanabe, D., and Katsuhara, M. (2007). "Exploring quantitative  
183 evaluation criteria for service and potentials of new service in transportation: Analyzing  
184 transport networks of railway, subway, and waterbus." *Lecture Notes in Computer Science  
185 (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in  
186 Bioinformatics)*, 4881 LNCS, 1122-1130.
- 187 Tampère, C. M. J., Stada, J., Immers, B., Peetermans, E., and Organe, K. (2007). "Methodology for  
188 identifying vulnerable sections in a national road network." *Transportation Research Record  
189* (2012), 1-10.
- 190 Tang, X., Cheng, L., and Xu, S. (2009). "Identification of critical links under earthquake hazards for  
191 highway networks." *Journal of Southeast University (English Edition)*, 25(4), 531-535.
- 192 Taylor, M. A. P. (2012). "Network vulnerability in large-scale transport networks." *Transportation  
193 Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 46(5), 743-745.
- 194 Taylor, M. A. P., and Susilawati. (2012). "Remoteness and accessibility in the vulnerability analysis of  
195 regional road networks." *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 46(5),  
196 761-771.
- 197 Taylor, M. A., and D'Este, G. M. (2007). "Transport network vulnerability: a method for diagnosis of  
198 critical locations in transport infrastructure systems." *Critical infrastructure*, 9-30.
- 199 Tsai, C. C., and Wen, M. L. (2005). "Research and trends in science education from 1998 to 2002: A  
200 content analysis of publication in selected journals." *International Journal of Science  
201 Education*, 27(1), 3-14.
- 202 Trucco, P., Cagno, E., Ruggeri, F., and Grande, O. (2008). "A Bayesian Belief Network modelling of  
203 organisational factors in risk analysis: A case study in maritime transportation." *Reliability  
204 Engineering & System Safety*, 93(6), 845-856.
- 205
- 206 Ukkusuri, S. V., and Yushimito, W. F. (2009). "A methodology to assess the criticality of highway  
207 transportation networks." *Journal of Transportation Security*, 2(1-2), 29-46.
- 208 Vuchic, V. R. (2005). *Urban transit*, Wiley.
- 209 Vukan, R. V. (2004). *Urban Transit Operation, Planning and Economics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

---

210 Wang, S., Hong, L., Ouyang, M., Zhang, J., and Chen, X. (2013). "Vulnerability analysis of  
211 interdependent infrastructure systems under edge attack strategies." *Safety Science*, 51(1),  
212 328-337.

213 Wang, S., Hong, L., and Chen, X. (2012). "Vulnerability analysis of interdependent infrastructure  
214 systems: A methodological framework." *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*,  
215 391(11), 3323-3335.

216 Watling, D., and Balijepalli, N. C. (2012). "A method to assess demand growth vulnerability of travel  
217 times on road network links." *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 46(5),  
218 772-789.

219 Weixi, Z. (2006). "A study and assessment on vulnerability of the region development," Tianjing  
220 University.

221 Wu, J. J., Sun, H. J., and Gao, Z. Y. (2007). "Cascading failures on weighted urban traffic equilibrium  
222 networks." *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 386(1), 407-413.

223 Yin, H. Y., and Xu, L. Q. (2010). "Measuring the structural vulnerability of road network: A network  
224 efficiency perspective." *Journal of Shanghai Jiaotong University (Science)*, 15(6), 736-742.

225 Zhang, J., Xu, X., Hong, L., Wang, S., and Fei, Q. (2011). "Networked analysis of the Shanghai  
226 subway network, in China." *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 390(23-24),  
227 4562-4570.

228 Zhang, L., and Levinson, D. (2008). "Investing for reliability and security in transportation networks."  
229 *Transportation Research Record*, 2041, 1-10.

230 Zhang, P., and Peeta, S. (2011). "A generalized modeling framework to analyze interdependencies  
231 among infrastructure systems." *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 45(3),  
232 553-579.

233 Zio, E., Sansavini, G., Maja, R., and Marchionni, G. (2008). "An analytical approach to the safety of  
234 road networks." *International Journal of Reliability, Quality and Safety Engineering*, 15(1),  
235 67-76.

236 Zi-You, G., Shu-Bin, L., Jian-Jun, W., Yong, L., and Bai-Bai, F. (2011). "The analysis of traffic  
237 congestion and dynamic propagation properties based on complex network." *Acta Physica*  
238 *Sinica*, 5(60) 050701.

239