



A retrospective on Beckmann, McGuire and Winsten's *Studies in the Economics of Transportation**

David E. Boyce¹, Hani S. Mahmassani², Anna Nagurney³

¹ Professor Emeritus of Transportation and Regional Science, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois and Adjunct Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill, USA (e-mail: dboyce@uic.edu)

² Charles Irish Sr. Chair in Civil and Environmental Engineering, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA (e-mail: masmah@umd.edu)

³ John F. Smith Memorial Professor, Department of Finance and Operations Management Isenberg School of Management, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., USA (e-mail: nagurney@gbfn.umass.edu)

Received: 24 January 2004 / Accepted: 25 May 2004

Abstract. This article describes the impact and influence of the book, *Studies in the Economics of Transportation*, by M. Beckmann, C.B. McGuire and C.B. Winsten, published in 1956 by Yale University Press. Our focus is on the book's impacts on innovations in modeling, methodological developments and applications in transportation, regional science and other disciplines, which continue to this day.

JEL classification: R41, C6, N01

Key words: Traffic network equilibrium, history of regional science

* David Boyce is indebted to Martin Beckmann and C. Bart McGuire for interviews conducted in 1998 and 1999. Professor McGuire later conveyed to Boyce about three inches of files related to the preparation and editing of the book, which he had retained since the mid 1950s. These files were useful in preparing this review. Professors N.O. Jorgensen, Larry LeBlanc and Robert Oliver were also most helpful in responding to questions posed to them. Boyce also acknowledges the financial support of the UPS Foundation Transportation Program at the University of Pennsylvania and the services of the University Library.

Anna Nagurney is indebted to Professor Constantine Dafermos of Brown University and Professor F. Tom Sparrow of Purdue University for helpful and illuminating conversations as well as to Professor Dietrich Braess for helpful correspondence. She also acknowledges Martin Beckmann for his wisdom and advice that he has shared with her in many countries since her doctoral work at Brown University.

The authors are grateful to Professor Jessie Poon, the North American Editor, and to the three anonymous reviewers for their careful reading of the original manuscript and their many helpful suggestions and comments.

1 Introduction

“Demand refers to trips and capacity refers to flows on roads. The connecting link is found in the distribution of trips over the network according to the principle that traffic follows shortest routes in terms of average cost. The idea of equilibrium in a network can then be described as follows: . . . the existing traffic conditions are such as to call forth the demand that will sustain the flows that create these conditions.” (Beckmann, McGuire and Winsten 1955, p. 3.2; 1956, p. 59). When Martin Beckmann, Bartlett McGuire and Christopher Winsten (hereafter BMW) began the research in 1951 that resulted in *Part I* of *Studies in the Economics of Transportation*, their concept of traffic network equilibrium was novel. That they succeeded to formulate and extensively analyse a nonlinear optimisation problem whose optimality conditions correspond to this statement (and related behavioural assumptions) was an enormous advance in the rigorous modeling of network traffic. Here was a result never before achieved for urban traffic, and most unlikely for any complex system involving interactions of human behaviour with technology. Moreover, they provided a parallel model and analysis for the case of cost-minimising (now called *system optimum*) flows in a congested traffic network.

In 1956, their monograph, which included the study of railroad as well as highway transportation, was published by Yale University Press; it was issued earlier as Rand Corporation report, RM-1488-PR (hereafter Rand), on May 12, 1955. The research was conducted at the Cowles Commission for Research in Economics, then located at the University of Chicago, and led by T.C. Koopmans, who in his *Introduction* described the report as “exploratory studies . . . addressed to . . . various professions, including economists, traffic and railroad engineers, management scientists, operations researchers and mathematicians” (p. xi; Rand p. 1). Beckmann, a mathematical economist, was especially interested in linear programming and economic activity analysis. Winsten, a mathematician and economist, had an interest in applying probability concepts to industrial issues, whereas McGuire, an economist, provided a pragmatic and realistic check on the model development. Special thanks in Koopman’s *Introduction* were extended to George Dantzig, Harry Markowitz and William Vickrey, the last having recommended the manuscript for publication. Decades later, Koopmans, Markowitz and Vickrey were awarded Nobel Memorial Prizes in Economic Science, and Dantzig received the (U.S.) National Medal of Science.

Altogether, the book had three printings as well as a Spanish edition by 1959, and received eight favourable reviews. Smeed (1957) in *The Economic Journal* noted “it is refreshing to read a book that attempts to tackle the subject of road transport in a comprehensive and fundamental way.” Thrall (1958) in *Econometrica* found it “useful” as an example of operations research; “good illustrative material; a welcome addition to the literature.” Camp (1959) in *Operations Research* wrote that Chapters 1 to 4 “furnish a clear picture of a highway system as a servomechanism with complex feedback interactions among its parts, activated by the behavior of many drivers . . . a ‘must’ in the library of any operations researcher interested in highway or railroad transportation.” Peterson in the

Wall Street Journal on 2 January 1957, stated “this is a ‘heavy’ theoretical work by a group of economists searching for the optimum efficiency of railroad and highway systems.” However, no reviewer had recognised the true significance of the network equilibrium formulation achieved in *Part I* of the book, and no one linked that formulation to the need to forecast travel for the urban transportation planning studies begun in the mid-1950s in the U.S. and subsequently spread around the world, studies which sought to solve computationally the same problem formulated by the authors.

Moreover, it took over a decade before the book’s contributions gained the attention of researchers in the U.S. and France. At that time no journals and few conferences were devoted to basic research on transportation; information technology was in its infancy and the Internet for the timely dissemination of results was effectively unimaginable. Nevertheless, the impact of the book has been seminal, far-reaching and continues to this day on disciplines that did not even exist 50 years ago, such as computer science.

Some background

Students of regional science and transportation know that the topic of transportation had been studied prior to the 1950s in the context of optimal allocation of resources through linear programming by Hitchcock (1941) and Kantorovich (1942), who later shared the Nobel Memorial Prize with Koopmans, as well as by Koopmans (1947) and Dantzig (1951). However, there is no congestion in these classical transportation-type linear programming models. The problem of users of a congested transportation network seeking to determine their routes of travel from their origins to respective destinations, interestingly, was considered by Kohl (1841) and by Pigou (1920) for a two-node, two-link (or route) network, with further developments by Knight (1924). Both Pigou and Knight are cited in BMW. Fascinatingly, Koopmans in his introduction also acknowledged the work of Enke (1951) and Samuelson (1952) in terms of commodity transportation and the determination of interregional price differentials, a topic now known as spatial price equilibrium.

Wardrop (1952, p. 345), concurrently with the research of BMW, stated two widely-quoted criteria of traffic network utilisation, which have come to be termed, respectively, user-optimisation and system-optimisation (Dafermos and Sparrow 1969). Wardrop’s first criterion expresses that if travelers select their routes of travel from origins to destinations independently, at equilibrium “the journey times of all routes actually used are equal and less than those which would be experienced by a single vehicle on any unused route.” The user-optimised solution is also referred to in the literature as a *traffic network equilibrium* or a *traffic assignment*. His second criterion, in contrast, reflects the situation of a central controller who routes flows from origins to destinations so that “the average journey time is a minimum.” BMW showed that the minimum is reached when the marginal costs on used routes connecting each origin-destination pair are equal and minimal.

BMW were the first to provide a rigorous mathematical formulation of the conditions described by Wardrop's first criterion that allowed for the ultimate solution of the traffic network equilibrium problem in the context of certain link cost functions which are increasing functions of the flows on the links. In particular, they demonstrated that the optimality conditions in the form of Kuhn-Tucker (1951) conditions of an appropriately constructed optimisation problem coincided with Wardrop's first criterion. Hence, no traveler acting unilaterally will have any incentive to alter his route (assuming rational cost [time]-minimising behaviour) since his travel cost (travel time) is minimal. Independently, Charnes and Cooper (1958; 1961) in articles on traffic network equilibrium with fixed origin-destination flows, noted the relation to Nash (1951). Earlier, Prager (1954) had informally described a formulation related to Wardrop's principles, and emphasised that the travel time on a link may depend upon the flows on other links.

Thus, as shown by BMW, a traffic network problem in which there are numerous decision-makers acting independently and, as later also noted by Dafermos and Sparrow (1969), competing in the sense of Nash, could be reformulated (under appropriate assumptions) as a convex optimisation problem with a single objective function subject to linear constraints and non-negativity assumptions on the flows on the network. Jorgensen (1963) in his Master's thesis did not cite BMW, but noted the work of Wardrop (1952) and Charnes and Cooper (1961), and independently proposed an optimisation formulation of the traffic network equilibrium conditions in the case of fixed travel demands and separable link cost functions. His thesis and Pigou (1920) later influenced the Ph.D. thesis of Dafermos (1968), the basis of their now classical work, Dafermos and Sparrow (1969).

We discuss in this article some of the impacts of BMW. We first identify in Sect. 2 some of the major transportation-based innovations in modeling and methodological developments, since these two have often been intimately linked. In Sect. 3 we focus on innovations in applications to other fields, which continue to this day. Throughout we include direct quotes from BMW to emphasise its timeliness and enduring qualities.

2 Transportation-based innovations stemming from BMW

We now describe some of the major innovations in modeling and methodology that were motivated by BMW. Our emphasis in this section is on transportation and the contributions are presented more or less in chronological order to provide a progression of the intellectual developments and a timeline. How the book has contributed to, directly or indirectly, and anticipated innovations in several additional areas is subsequently highlighted.

2.1 Algorithms for solving the standard model of BMW

Despite the extent of their accomplishments, BMW did not propose an algorithm for solving their formulations computationally. As revealed by interviews in 1998 and 1999, the authors were aware of this need, but determined that computers

were at such an early stage of development that such efforts were impractical. However, Carroll (1959) reported that first generation mainframe computers were used to solve what amounts to a crude analogue of the model of BMW using shortest routes methods (then) recently devised by Moore (1957).

The first major methodological innovation in an article that cites BMW is Dafermos and Sparrow (1969) who coined the terms “user-optimised” and “system-optimising” to describe Wardrop’s first and second criteria and to clarify the underlying behaviour of travelers; they also proposed algorithms for solving problems with nonlinear cost (congestion) functions that explicitly exploited the network structure of these two problems and established convergence results for the schemes. Moreover, their article not only provided solution algorithms for networks of any topology, but also special-purpose ones in the case of topologies for which the flows could be computed exactly and in closed form. Tomlin (1966) had earlier considered linear cost functions, and exploited that feature in the development of his algorithm. Almond (1967) had constructed an algorithm for the determination of the user-optimised solution but only in the case of very simple networks. She cited BMW whereas Tomlin did not, although he did refer to Jorgensen (1963). Subsequently, Leventhal et al. (1973) proposed embedding a column generation procedure in the general equilibration procedures of Dafermos and Sparrow to allow for route generation as needed, rather than a priori, which could require large computer memory resources.

The first innovations in algorithms for traffic network equilibrium problems with exogenous origin-destination flows focused on the standard model of BMW, where by *standard* means the link cost functions are separable, that is, the cost on a link depends upon only the flow on that link. Bruynooghe et al. (1969) investigated two algorithms for this case. Netter (1972) described the properties of system-optimised versus user-optimised solutions. LeBlanc et al. (1975) proposed a linearisation algorithm based on Frank and Wolfe (1956), which was later widely implemented in practitioner software. Nguyen (1974, 1976) devised, implemented and compared three algorithms. The contributions of BMW were recognised in 1974 at the International Symposium on Traffic Equilibrium Methods in Montreal organised by Florian (1976).

Additional algorithms are described by Sheffi (1985), Nagurney (1993) and Patriksson (1994), which contains an extensive list of references, and in the survey by Florian and Hearn (1995). Bar-Gera (1999, 2002) recently proposed an origin-based assignment algorithm, which is especially effective for solving large-scale network problems precisely.

Initial attempts in the late 1960s to solve the problem posed by BMW focused on the case of fixed demand; although BMW did not formulate this case mathematically, it is, nevertheless, discussed. In Sect. 4.2.1 (pp. 83–86; Rand, pp. 3.23–3.30) the authors treat graphically cost minimisation on a network with two roads and fixed demand. Section 4.3.2 (pp. 91–92; Rand, pp. 4.19–4.21) provides a mathematical analysis of the minimisation of transportation costs on a network with fixed travel demands. Finally, Sect. 4.5.1 (pp. 99–101; Rand, pp. 4.31–4.34) presents an analysis of the tolling of two roads with a fixed number of users who differ in their values of time.

Efforts to construct algorithms for the more general, and significant, variable demand problem were actually stimulated by the four-step or sequential procedure (generation, distribution, mode split, and assignment) devised by practitioners in the late 1950s for forecasting travel. Two researchers began exploring how to “combine” the distribution and assignment steps into an integrated model, only to rediscover BMW’s original and more general formulation. Murchland (1970b) made an initial attempt, but it was Evans (1973, 1976) who proposed a partial linearisation scheme, which elegantly provided an efficient, convergent algorithm. Florian and Nguyen (1978) also studied this problem and proposed a full linearisation scheme. Bar-Gera and Boyce (2003) incorporated Bar-Gera’s origin-based algorithm into the variable demand problem using fixed-point concepts, and achieved very rapid convergence, as compared with Evans’s algorithm and the traditional sequential procedure with feedback.

2.2 *Toll policies*

BMW proposed “efficiency tolls,” such that by “charging everyone a toll equal to his contribution to the total cost of others, road users can be induced to make an efficient use of the available capacity” and considered how tolls could be constructed in the case of a simple network (p. 94; Rand, pp. 4.23–4.24). Earlier formulations had included those of Pigou (1920) and Vickrey (1952) whose “contributions to the economic theory of incentives under asymmetric information,” which included the efficient pricing of public services, later earned him a Nobel Prize. Walters (1961) utilised the network model of BMW for toll determination. Beckmann (1967a) further described optimal tolls for highways, tunnels and bridges. Dafermos and Sparrow (1971) and Dafermos (1973) described optimal resource allocation and tolls that guarantee that, once assigned, the user-optimised solution coincides with the system-optimised solution, so that individual travelers behave in a manner that is also optimal from a system or societal point of view.

Congestion pricing through tolls continues today as an area of active research. Bergendorff et al. (1997) suggested a new approach, which spawned a number of theses and articles. Verhoef (2002) examined another approach to tolling links in a congested network in which not all links can be tolled. Arnott (2001) proposed a new research agenda to move the economic theory of traffic congestion initiated by BMW and others to the microscopic level, and Small and Chu (2003) considered a model with more realistic cost functions that has its origins in BMW. Time-of-day tolling schemes are being applied with some success in Singapore and London.

2.3 *Extended traffic network models including models of urban location*

BMW focused on transportation networks in which the cost (or travel time) on a link, that is, a road segment, depended solely upon the flow on that link. Under such an assumption (i.e., separable functions and necessarily symmetric) they

could then prove their fundamental result. They noted, however, in their final chapter that included a discussion of “unsolved problems” that (p. 109; Rand, p. 5.13) “there are differences between classes of road users in their contribution to delays and to the deterioration of the road,” thus also anticipating the need for multiclass/multimodal traffic network modeling.

Dafermos in a series of articles in the early 1970s developed “extended” traffic network models, whose need was noted by Prager (1954), and also formulated tolls in the case of multiclass networks. In particular, Dafermos (1971; 1972) demonstrated that an analogous reformulation of the traffic network equilibrium conditions as a convex optimisation problem could be identified in the case of more general user link cost functions in which the cost on a link could depend on the flows on all links in the network, provided that a symmetry condition held either in the single-class user case or the multi-class user case, which allowed for different classes of travelers who perceive the travel cost on a link in an individual manner. In addition, extensions of the general equilibration algorithms contained in Dafermos and Sparrow (1969) along with convergence results, were obtained.

BMW clearly delineated that one should distinguish between short-run and long-run decision-making regarding transportation networks. Dafermos (1976) demonstrated, through the use of abstract networks, that one could capture long-run decision-making according to BMW in the form not only of route choice but also of origin and/or destination choice within a network equilibrium context. For additional abstract network constructs, see Nagurney and Dong (2002).

Boyce (1980) proposed a framework for constructing network equilibrium models of urban location, which allowed for the incorporation of the trip distribution problem. Boyce et al. (1983), motivated BMW and Evans (1976), presented a unified approach to deriving models of urban location, destination, mode and route choice; see also Erlander and Stewart (1990). Calibration of model parameters and estimation of coefficients of generalised link cost functions were also described. Boyce and Bar-Gera (2003) implemented selected parts of the framework for the multi-class case.

2.4 Variational inequality formulations and algorithms

Smith (1979) provided an alternative formulation of traffic network equilibrium, which Dafermos (1980) identified as a variational inequality problem. These fundamental articles based on BMW enabled the modeling, analysis and computation of solutions to traffic network equilibrium problems in which the assumption of a symmetric Jacobian is no longer needed. Simply stated, this condition means that the cost on one link depends on the flow on another link in the same fashion that the cost on the other link depends on the first link’s flow. In this case, important from the application standpoint, one could no longer reformulate the network equilibrium conditions as a solution to an optimisation problem. This understanding, along with rigorous computational schemes (Dafermos 1980, 1982, 1983) allowed for the solution of more general traffic network problems than had previously been possible. Moreover, since variational inequality problems are

typically solved as series of optimisation problems, advances in the development of the solution of symmetric traffic network problems could be applied to more general problem settings. The variational inequality framework revolutionised the formulation, analysis and solution of network equilibrium problems, generally, as well as other equilibrium problems.

Interestingly, variational inequalities were originally developed for the study of partial differential equations for problems drawn from mechanics (see Kinderlehrer and Stampacchia, 1980 and the references therein). In Chapter 3 (p. 63; Rand, p. 3.8) BMW stated that: “A well known characteristic of the equilibrium encountered in theoretical mechanics is that they may be regarded as solutions to certain extremum problems, a fact which has occasionally given rise to some speculation about nature’s grand design.”

BMW specifically emphasised elastic demand traffic network problems and developed a model, which allowed for the prediction not only of the traffic volumes on the links or roads of the network but also the travel demand associated with the origin-destination pairs. Hence there may be times when travelers opt not to travel at all due to the cost associated with congestion. As noted in Chapter 2 (p. 51; Rand, p. 2.19), “In general the demand for transportation between a given pair of locations would depend also on the costs or travel times to and from other locations.” Aashtiani and Magnanti (1981) considered a similar model, treating it as a nonlinear complementarity problem. Dafermos (1982), recognising the generality of the elastic demand traffic network model, proposed a multiclass, asymmetric model and formulated and solved it as a variational inequality problem.

2.5 *Dynamic transportation networks*

In the final chapter of *Part I* entitled, “Conclusion; Some Unsolved Problems,” BMW stated (p. 107; Rand, p. 5.9) that “The notion of a static equilibrium of flow in a network may be thought of as somewhat limited . . .” They proceeded to say that “While the equilibrium mechanism is operative during the relatively short periods of a constant load, one would like to see a more comprehensive model which contributes to our understanding of the time pattern itself.” Moreover, “While it is not difficult, by attaching time subscripts to the flow variables, to write down formally the equilibrium conditions . . . for a dynamic model this merely makes the analysis more complicated without explaining much that is new. An understanding of dynamic aspects of the traffic really depends on an understanding of demand substitution over time.”

Hence although BMW did not explicitly formulate dynamic traffic network models, the recognition of the importance of such models was explicit in the book. Yagar (1971), Hurdle (1974), and Merchant and Nemhauser (1978a, b) were some of the first contributors to the development of dynamic models with explicit flows, and the work of Merchant and Nemhauser (1978a, b) is often credited with being the first to consider dynamic route choices over general networks. In particular they studied dynamic system-optimised networks in the case of single destination

networks, and although they did not cite BMW, they did reference Dafermos and Sparrow (1969). Mahmassani and Herman (1984), in turn, citing BMW, built upon the work of Hendrickson and Kocur (1981), and generalised it to the situation where a user can adapt to congestion by not only changing his departure time but also by changing routes. Carey (1987), referencing BMW, provided a convex programming formulation of a dynamic system-optimised traffic network that could handle multiple destinations and multiple commodities.

Variational inequality theory has today become the theoretical basis for the analysis and computation of Wardrop equilibria in a within-day static traffic network. Motivated by concerns for realism, the within-day dynamic traffic assignment problem is receiving much attention (see among others, Janson 1991; Smith 1993; Friesz et al. 1993; Ran and Boyce 1996; Wu et al. 1998). Underlying a dynamic user equilibrium is a “doubly” dynamic system, which is comprised of a day-to-day adjustment process and a within-day realisation process. The day-to-day adjustment process addresses user behaviour in acquiring information and in adjusting departure time and route choices (Smith 1984; Mahmassani et al. 1986; Mahmassani 1990; Friesz et al. 1994; Zhang and Nagurney 1996; Nagurney and Zhang 1997). The within-day realisation process addresses the real time dynamic traffic flow as the realisation of the users’ route choices on the particular day, which in turn results in updated information feedback to the day-to-day process. A dynamic loading operation (Wu et al. 1998) is involved in this realisation process that loads the dynamic route departure rates into dynamic link volumes which then determine the dynamic link travel times as the feedback to the travelers. For some additional insights, see Cantarella and Cascetta (1995) and Zhang et al. (2001).

Motivated in great part by the need to introduce dynamics into the formal modeling and analysis of network systems – including transportation networks that had been studied primarily at an equilibrium state – Dupuis and Nagurney (1993) developed the basic theory of existence and uniqueness as well as computational procedures for what are now termed “projected dynamical systems” (see Nagurney and Zhang 1996). Importantly, the set of equilibrium states and thus solutions to a variational inequality problem, coincides with the set of stationary points of a particular non-classical dynamical system. We therefore see that both methodologies of (finite-dimensional) variational inequality theory and projected dynamical systems theory can trace the origins of their development, evolution and ultimately, their application . . . back to the traffic network equilibrium ideas of BMW.

2.6 Stability analysis and sensitivity analysis

The importance of stability analysis was also recognised in BMW, who stated (p. 70; Rand, p. 3.19): “An equilibrium would be just an extreme state of rare occurrence if it were not stable. Besides, the stability ‘in the small’ one may consider ‘stability in the large’. This latter type of stability is interesting . . . because one may want to use an analog of the adjustment process as a method of

computing an equilibrium solution by successive approximations.” Furthermore, BMW (p. 103; Rand, p. 103) emphasised the relevance of the equilibrium concept and stated that “the attainment of . . . an equilibrium does not exclude altogether the occurrence of fluctuations around the equilibrium points . . . All that equilibrium means is that there is some constant time average of delays, and that this mean value is all one can predict about traffic conditions in the future.”

Dafermos and Sparrow (1969) obtained stability analysis results in the context of user-optimised models in the static setting. Stability analysis using Lyapunov functions was addressed by Smith (1979; 1984). More recently, Nagurney and Zhang (1996), motivated by the connection between finite-dimensional variational inequality problems and dynamical systems as discussed above, obtained local and global stability analysis results for dynamic traffic network problems modeled as projected dynamical systems.

Sensitivity analysis is also central to decision-making, and in particular to the planning of transportation networks. Interestingly, Braess (1968), whose well-known paradox motivated much of the subsequent research in sensitivity analysis and networks, cited neither Wardrop (1952) nor BMW and constructed his paradox without familiarity of these publications (see Braess 2003). That article was followed by the contribution of Murchland (1970a), who elaborated upon the Braess paradox and reflected upon it in the context of BMW and Beckmann (1967b). Fisk (1979) also cited BMW and identified additional paradoxical phenomena in traffic networks. Stewart (1980) and Steinberg and Zangwill (1983) further spurred the investigation of sensitivity analysis in network equilibrium problems.

Dafermos and Nagurney (1984a, 1984b, 1984c) obtained sensitivity analysis and stability results for a variety of network equilibrium problems in a variational inequality framework. Dafermos and Nagurney (1984a) demonstrated how, in terms of traffic networks with general (asymmetric) user link cost functions, the addition of a route connecting an origin-destination pair that shared no links with any other route in the network, could never result in the Braess paradox. Moreover, they provided explicit formulae for the effects of cost function and demand changes on the incurred flows and route travel costs. Dafermos and Nagurney (1984b) in turn used the variational inequality formulation of traffic network equilibrium with fixed demands to provide directional effects of link cost function changes, and to demonstrate that small changes in the data yielded small changes in the resultant equilibrium link flows. Dafermos and Nagurney (1984c) provided similar results but in the context of a general spatial price equilibrium problem.

Braess and Koch (1979) established existence results in the case of multiclass user-optimised networks in which the symmetry assumption does not hold using fixed point arguments; they referenced Dafermos (1971, 1972). They also highlighted the importance of stability in the case of multiple equilibria. For additional references see Nagurney (1993).

Today, paradoxes on networks, due to the alternative behaviour of decision-makers, notably that of user-optimisation, which reflects non-cooperation, are garnering increasing attention in other scientific domains, including that of computer science, which we return to below.

3 Novel network applications

Several applications whose further development has benefited from BMW can now be briefly described. In his survey article Beckmann (1967b) noted that there are analogues of the elastic demand network equilibrium model for problems other than road traffic and included examples of electricity, steam, water, and natural gas distribution, as well as the routing of messages in a communication network.

3.1 Spatial price equilibrium networks and other economic equilibrium problems

In summarising the railroad transportation contributions of BMW, Koopmans noted the works of Enke (1951) and Samuelson (1952) in the development of frameworks, the former using an analogue to electronic circuits and the latter a linear programming problem, for the determination of interregional commodity flows and prices in the case of separated markets. BMW stated (p. 105; Rand, p. 5.5): “The principal difference between passenger transportation as discussed in this study and commodity transportation lies in the substitutability of commodity shipments from different origins to a given destination.” Subsequently, Takayama and Judge (1964) in the case of linear regional supply and demand functions and fixed interregional transportation costs, demonstrated how the governing spatial price equilibrium conditions could be reformulated as the Kuhn-Tucker conditions of a quadratic programming problem. In the article the authors thank Martin Beckmann for helpful comments.

Recall in spatial price equilibrium problems, the governing equilibrium conditions state that a commodity will be produced at a supply market, and shipped to a demand market, where it is consumed, if the price at the supply market plus the unit transportation cost is equal to the price at the demand market. If the price at the supply market plus the transportation cost exceeds the price that the consumers are willing to pay for the commodity at the demand market, then there will be no trade of the commodity between the pair of markets.

Florian and Los (1982) provided a synthesis of the Samuelson (1952) model and the BMW network equilibrium model with elastic demand to construct a spatial price equilibrium model on a general network. They also considered multi-commodity models and demonstrated that the governing equilibrium conditions satisfy a variational inequality problem akin to those arising in traffic network equilibrium models. Others had also been developing and extending the basic spatial price equilibrium models of Samuelson (1952) and Takayama and Judge (1964; 1971) (for a list of references, see Nagurney 1993). However, it was the researchers in transportation and regional science who truly exploited the connections between these two subjects, which had been identified concurrently with BMW.

Dafermos and Nagurney (1985) established an isomorphism between spatial price and traffic network equilibrium problems, which was further elaborated upon by Dafermos (1986) in the context of multicommodity/multiclass networks.

Interestingly, BMW in Chapter 5 (p. 106; Rand, 5.7) anticipated the existence of such a relationship in stating that: “Passenger transportation may in fact be included as a special case of commodity transportation.” Friesz et al. (1983, 1984), citing BMW, provided additional contributions to the modeling, analysis and solution of spatial price network equilibrium problems and forged the topic of freight network equilibrium.

Spatial price equilibrium models, in contrast to general economic equilibrium models, are necessarily partial equilibrium models. The network structure of spatial price equilibrium problems considered today often corresponds to the physical transportation network. The general economic equilibrium problem due to Walras (1874) can also be cast into a network equilibrium form on a simple single origin-destination pair network with disjoint routes as shown in Zhao and Nagurney (1993), who recognised the work of BMW (Nagurney 1993). It is fascinating to note that the classical portfolio optimisation problem of Markowitz (1959) can be transformed into a system-optimised traffic network problem with fixed demand on a network with special structure (Nagurney and Siokos 1997).

3.2 *Supply chain networks*

BMW explicitly recognised the generality of networks as a means of conceptualising even decision-making of a firm, with routes corresponding to production processes and the links corresponding to transformations as the material moves down the route from the origin to the destination. The routes abstracted the choices or production possibilities available to a firm. For example, BMW (p. 88; Rand, p. 4.13) provided an analogy of transportation networks to the theory of a firm and “consider a chemical or metallurgical material which is capable of various stages or modifications, and a firm which undertakes to transform it from certain stages to certain other stages. . . . Here the stages of the material correspond to locations, the transitions correspond to roads – and sequences of transformation processes . . . of the material, that is, the production methods – correspond to routes.”

Another application in which the concept of network equilibrium is garnering interest is *supply chain networks*, which is interdisciplinary by nature since it contains aspects of manufacturing, retailing, transportation, and economics, as well as operations research and management science. Zhang et al. (2003) have recently generalised Wardrop’s second criterion to consider not only routes but *chains* in the network to identify the “winning” supply chains. In that context, routes correspond to production processes and links can be either operation or interface links. Their framework allows for the modeling of competition between supply chains, which may entail several firms (producing, transporting, retailing, etc.).

Nagurney, Dong and Zhang (2001) appear to be the first to utilise network equilibrium concepts in the context of supply chain applications. In this model decision-makers, now located at the nodes of the network, are faced with their individual objective functions, which can include profit-maximisation, and seek to determine not only the optimal/equilibrium flows between tiers of nodes but also the prices of the product at the various tiers. The model therein was

subsequently generalised to include electronic commerce by Nagurney, Loo, Dong and Zhang (2002).

3.3 *Supernetworks*

The growing impact of the Information Age, coupled with similarities between traffic networks and communications networks in terms of the relevance of such concepts as system-optimisation and user-optimisation, along with issues of centralised versus decentralised control, have provided a setting in which the relationships between decision-making on such networks and associated trade-offs can be explored. Nagurney, Dong and Mokhtarian (2001; 2002) developed multicriteria network equilibrium models, which allowed for distinct classes of decision-makers, who individually weigh their criteria associated with utilised transportation versus telecommunications networks in a variety of activities (such as teleshopping and telecommuting). In these and related models, criteria such as time, cost, risk, as well as opportunity cost (all criteria noted in BMW) play a prominent role. Nagurney and Dong (2002) described the governing equilibrium conditions in the cases of fixed and elastic demand, and provided computational procedures and numerical examples demonstrating that the user-optimising principle was relevant in the context of these new types of networks termed *supernetworks*. They also traced the origins of the term back to the transportation and computer science literature.

3.4 *Computer scientists “discover” Beckmann, McGuire and Winsten*

As mentioned earlier, Beckmann (1967b) noted the relevance of network equilibrium concepts to communication networks. Bertsekas and Gallager (1987) realised the similarities between communication and transportation networks as well and had analysed the algorithms of Dafermos and Sparrow (1969).

But it was the Braess paradox that provided one of the main linkages between transportation science and computer science. Cohen and Kelly (1990) described a paradox analogous to that of Braess in the case of a queuing network. Later, Cohen and Horwitz (1991) investigated paradoxical behaviour in electrical and mechanical networks. Korilis et al. (1999) in turn developed methods to show how resources could be added efficiently to a non-cooperative network, including the Internet, so that the Braess paradox would not occur and cited the work of Dafermos and Nagurney (1984a). Roughgarden (2002a) further elaborated upon the Braess paradox and focused on the quantification of the worst possible loss in network performance arising from non-cooperative behaviour. He also designed algorithms for the design and management of the networks so that “selfish” (a term also used by BMW), that is, individual optimising behaviour, leads to a “socially desirable” outcome. He recognised the importance of the work of computer scientists, Koutsoupias and Papadimitrou (1999), who proposed the idea of bounding of the inefficiency of Nash equilibria, and that of BMW and

Dafermos and Sparrow (1969). The motivation for his thesis and its foundations draws heavily from the transportation science literature in the form of the traffic network equilibrium problem and its game theoretic aspects. The work is generating much interest among computer scientists and is also often referred to as “selfish routing” (see Roughgarden and Tardos 2002; Roughgarden 2001; 2002b).

4 Conclusion

In effect, almost 50 years after its publication, BMW is finding applications in disciplines that were non-existent when the book was published! We expect continued cross-fertilisation between many fields in which networks play a prominent role, with BMW serving as one of the fundamental references. Indeed, BMW laid the intellectual and economic science foundation for transportation systems analysis planning and evaluation for the rest of the 20th century and beyond. Moreover, as the above discussion reveals, the work provided linkages to other application areas and fields. The ideas and concepts are fundamental and are unlikely to change in the foreseeable future.

While considerable progress has been made on many of the problems insightfully identified in this seminal work, many remain active areas of investigation. Only recently have observational methods become practical in order to provide empirical support for the theories and methods addressed in the book. Potentially significant departures from the principles and methods of BMW may occur, however, in the contribution of technology to our ability to manage traffic systems, and, fundamentally, in the kinds of socio-technical changes that pervasive real-time information and ubiquitous access to the Internet might bring about.

In conclusion, we ask the following question: Have we left the next generation a contribution that is as far-reaching and thoughtful as what Beckmann, McGuire and Winsten have given us?

Notes

In this article we have attempted to trace some of the major impacts of Beckmann, McGuire and Winsten (1956) in terms of innovations in modeling, methodological developments and applications. This task has been challenging, not only because the book appeared a half century ago but also due to its depth and breadth of influence. This article is an outgrowth of the panel: A Retrospective of Beckmann, McGuire, and Winsten’s *Studies in the Economics of Transportation* held at the 50th North American Meetings of the Regional Science Association International in Philadelphia, PA, 20–22 November 2003. The authors of this article served as panelists, and Dr. Suzanne Evans of Birkbeck College, London, United Kingdom, was Chair and Discussant.

Through the efforts of David Boyce, Rand Report, Rand-RM-1488-PR (BMW 1955), is now available on the Internet. For the link to the report, along with the panel PPT presentations of Boyce, Nagurney (with accompanying article and many additional citations), and Mahmassani, see: <http://supernet.som.umass.edu/classics.htm>.

References

- Aashtiani HZ, Magnanti TL (1981) Equilibria on a congested transportation network. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic and Discrete Methods* 2: 213–226
- Almond J (1967) Traffic assignment with flow-dependent journey times. In: Edie LC, Herman R, Rothery R (eds) *Vehicular traffic science*. American Elsevier, New York
- Arnott R (2001) The economic theory of urban traffic congestion: A microscopic research agenda. Working Paper 502, Department of Economics, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA
- Bar-Gera H (1999) Origin-based algorithms for transportation network modeling. PhD thesis, Civil Engineering, University of Illinois at Chicago; available as Technical Report 103, National Institute of Statistical Sciences (<http://www.niss.org/downloadabletechreports.html>, accessed October 1999)
- Bar-Gera H (2002) Origin-based algorithms for the traffic assignment problem. *Transportation Science* 36: 398–417
- Bar-Gera H, Boyce DE (2003) Origin-based algorithms for combined travel forecasting models. *Transportation Research B* 37: 405–422
- Beckmann MJ (1967a) On optimal tolls for highways, tunnels and bridges. In: Edie LC, Herman R, Rothery R (eds) *Vehicular traffic science*. American Elsevier, New York
- Beckmann M (1967b) On the theory of traffic flows in networks. *Traffic Quarterly* 21: 109–116
- Beckmann M, McGuire CB, Winsten CB (1956) *Studies in the economics of transportation*. Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut; also published as Rand-RM-1488-PR, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, May 12, 1955
- Bergendorff P, Hearn DW, Ramana MV (1997) Congestion toll pricing of traffic networks. In: *Network optimization, Lecture notes in economics and mathematical systems*: 450, PM Pardalos, DW Hearn, WW Hager (eds), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, pp. 51–74
- Bertsekas DP, Gallager R (1987) *Data networks*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey
- Boyce DE (1980) A framework for constructing network equilibrium models of urban location. *Transportation Science* 14: 77–96
- Boyce D, Bar-Gera H (2003) Validation of multiclass urban travel forecasting models combining origin-destination, mode and route choice. *Journal of Regional Science* 43: 517–540
- Boyce DE, Chon KS, Lee YJ, Lin KT, LeBlanc LJ (1983) Implementation and computational issues for combined models of location, destination, mode, and route choice. *Environment and Planning A* 15: 1219–1230
- Braess D (1968) Über ein paradoxon der verkehrsplanung. *Unternehmensforschung* 12: 258–268
- Braess D (2003) Personal communication
- Braess D, Koch G (1979) On the existence of equilibria in asymmetrical multiclass-user transportation networks. *Transportation Science* 13: 56–63
- Bruynooghe M, Gilbert A, Sakarovich M (1969) Une methode d'affectation du trafic. In: Leutzbach W, Baron P (eds) *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on the Theory of Road Traffic*. Bundesminister für Verkehr, Abt. Strassenbau, Bonn, Germany
- Camp GD (1959) *Operations Research* 7: 262–263
- Cantarella GE, Cascetta E (1995) Dynamic processes and equilibrium in transportation networks: Toward a unifying theory. *Transportation Science* 29: 305–329
- Carey M (1987) Optimal time-varying flows on congested networks. *Operations Research* 35: 58–69
- Carroll Jr, JD (1959) A method of traffic assignment to an urban network. *Bulletin*: 224, Highway Research Board, Washington, DC, pp. 64–71

- Charnes A, Cooper WW (1958) Extremal principles for simulating traffic flow in a network. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, Washington DC, pp. 201–204
- Charnes A, Cooper WW (1961) Multicopy traffic networks. In: *Theory of traffic flow*. Herman R (ed), Elsevier, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, pp. 85–96
- Cohen JE, Kelly FP (1990) A paradox of congestion in a queuing network. *Journal of Applied Probability* 27: 30–34
- Cohen JE, Horwitz P (1991) Paradoxical behavior of mechanical and electrical networks. *Nature* 352: 699–701
- Dafermos SC (1968) Traffic assignment and resource allocation in transportation networks. Ph.D. thesis, Operations Research, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland
- Dafermos SC (1971) An extended traffic assignment model with applications to two-way traffic. *Transportation Science* 5: 366–389
- Dafermos SC (1972) The traffic assignment problem for multi-class user transportation networks. *Transportation Science* 6: 73–87
- Dafermos SC (1973) Toll patterns for multi-class user transportation networks. *Transportation Science* 7: 211–223
- Dafermos SC (1976) Integrated equilibrium flow models for transportation planning. In: Florian M (ed) *Traffic equilibrium methods: Lecture notes in economics and mathematical systems* 118. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, pp. 106–118
- Dafermos S (1980) Traffic equilibrium and variational inequalities. *Transportation Science* 14: 42–54
- Dafermos S (1982) The general multimodal network equilibrium problem with elastic demand. *Networks* 12: 57–72
- Dafermos S (1983) An iterative scheme for variational inequalities. *Mathematical Programming* 26: 40–47
- Dafermos S (1986) Isomorphic multiclass spatial price and multimodal traffic network equilibrium models. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 16: 197–209
- Dafermos S, Nagurney A (1984a) On some traffic equilibrium theory paradoxes. *Transportation Research B* 18: 101–110
- Dafermos S, Nagurney A (1984b) Sensitivity analysis for the asymmetric network equilibrium problem. *Mathematical Programming* 28: 174–185
- Dafermos S, Nagurney A (1984c) Sensitivity analysis for the general spatial economic equilibrium problem. *Operations Research* 32: 1069–1086
- Dafermos S, Nagurney A (1985) Isomorphism between spatial price and traffic equilibrium models. Lefschetz Center for Dynamical Systems Report No. 85–17, Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island
- Dafermos SC, Sparrow FT (1969) The traffic assignment problem for a general network. *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards* 73B: 91–118
- Dafermos SC, Sparrow FT (1971) Optimal resource allocation and toll patterns in user-optimized transportation networks. *Journal of Transport Economic Policy* 5: 184–200
- Dantzig GB (1951) Application of the simplex method to the transportation problem. In: Koopmans TC (ed) *Activity analysis of production and allocation*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp. 359–373
- Dupuis P, Nagurney A (1993) Dynamical systems and variational inequalities. *Annals of Operations Research* 44: 9–42
- Enke S (1951) Equilibrium among spatially separated markets: Solution by electronic analogue. *Econometrica* 10: 40–47
- Erlander S, Stewart NF (1990) *The gravity model in transportation analysis: Theory and extensions*. VSP, Utrecht, The Netherlands
- Evans SP (1973) Some applications of optimisation theory in transport planning Ph.D. thesis, Civil Engineering, University College London, England
- Evans SP (1976) Derivation and analysis of some models for combining trip distribution and assignment. *Transportation Research* 10: 37–57
- Fisk C (1979) More paradoxes in the equilibrium assignment problem. *Transportation Research B* 13: 305–309
- Florian M (1976) (ed) *Traffic equilibrium methods: Lecture notes in economics and mathematical systems* 118, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany

- Florian M, Hearn D (1995) Network equilibrium models and algorithms. In: Ball MO, Magnanti TL, Monma C, Nemhauser GL (eds) *Network routing: Handbooks in operations research and management science* 8. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam
- Florian M, Los M (1982) A new look at static spatial price equilibrium models. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 12: 579–597
- Florian M, Nguyen S (1978) A combined trip distribution modal split and assignment model. *Transportation Research* 12: 241–246
- Frank M, Wolfe P (1956) An algorithm for quadratic programming. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* 3: 95–110
- Friesz TL, Bernstein D, Smith TE, Tobin RL, Wie BW (1993) A variational inequality formulation of the dynamic network user equilibrium problem. *Operations Research* 41: 179–191
- Friesz TL, Bernstein D, Mehta J, Tobin RL, Ganjalizadeh S (1994) Day to day dynamic network disequilibrium and idealized traveler information systems. *Operations Research* 42: 1120–1136
- Friesz TL, Harker PT, Tobin RL (1984) Alternative algorithms for the general network spatial price equilibrium problem. *Journal of Regional Science* 24: 475–507
- Friesz TL, Tobin RL, Smith TE, Harker PT (1983) A nonlinear complementarity formulation and solution procedure for the general derived demand network equilibrium problem. *Journal of Regional Science* 23: 337–359
- Hendrickson C, Kocur G (1981) Schedule delay and departure time decisions in a deterministic model. *Transportation Science* 15: 62–77
- Hitchcock FL (1941) The distribution of a product from several sources to numerous facilities. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 20: 224–230
- Hurdle VF (1974) The effect of queuing on traffic assignment in a simple road network. *Proceedings of the 6th International Symposium on Transportation and Traffic Theory*. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam
- Janson BN (1991) Dynamic traffic assignment for an urban road network. *Transportation Research* 25B: 143–161
- Jorgensen NO (1963) Some aspects of the urban traffic assignment problem. Graduate Report, Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, July
- Kantorovich LV (1942) On the translocation of masses. *Comptes rendus (doklady) de l'Academie des Sciences de l'URSS* 37 reprinted in (1958) in *Management Science* 5: 1–4
- Kinderlehrer D, Stampacchia G (1980) *An introduction to variational inequalities and their applications*. Academic Press, New York
- Knight FH (1924) Some fallacies in the interpretation of social costs. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 38: 582–606
- Kohl JE (1841) *Der verkehr und die ansiedelungen der menschen in ihrer abh angigkeit von der gestaltung der erdorberfl ache*. Dresden, Leipzig, Germany
- Koopmans TC (1947) Optimum utilization of the transportation system. Proceedings of the International Statistical Conference. Washington DC; Also in *Econometrica* 17: 136–145
- Korilis YA, Lazar AA, Orda A (1999) Avoiding the Braess Paradox in non-cooperative networks. *Journal of Applied Probability* 36: 211–222
- Koutsoupias E, Papadimitrou CH (1999) Worst-case equilibria. *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Symposium on the Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*. pp. 404–413
- Kuhn HW, Tucker AW (1951) Nonlinear programming. In: Neyman J (ed) *Proceedings of the second Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability*. University of California Press, Berkeley, California
- LeBlanc LJ, Morlok EK, Pierskalla WP (1975) An efficient approach to solving the road network equilibrium traffic assignment problem. *Transportation Research* 9: 309–318
- Leventhal T, Nemhauser GL, Trotter Jr, L (1973) A column generation algorithm for optimal traffic assignment. *Transportation Science* 7: 168–176
- Mahmassani H (1990) Dynamic models of commuter behavior: Experimental investigation and application to the analysis of planned traffic disruptions. *Transportation Research A* 4: 465–484
- Mahmassani HS, Chang G-L, Herman R (1986) Individual decisions and collective effects in a simulated traffic system. *Transportation Science* 20: 258–271

- Mahmassani H, Herman R (1984) Dynamic user equilibrium departure time and route choice on idealized traffic arterials. *Transportation Science* 18: 362–384
- Markowitz HM (1959) *Portfolio selection: Efficient diversification of investments*. John Wiley & Sons, New York
- Merchant DK, Nemhauser GL (1978a) A model and an algorithm for the dynamic traffic assignment problems. *Transportation Science* 12: 183–199
- Merchant DK, Nemhauser GL (1978b) Optimality conditions for a dynamic traffic assignment model. *Transportation Science* 12: 200–207
- Moore EF (1957) The shortest path through a maze. *International Symposium on the Theory of Switching, Proceedings, Part II*, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA. Annals, Computation Lab. 30 (1959)
- Murchland JD (1970a) Braess's paradox of traffic flow. *Transportation Research* 4: 391–394
- Murchland JD (1970b) Road network traffic distribution in equilibrium. *Mathematical models in the social sciences* 8, Anton Hain Verlag, Meisenheim am Glan, Germany, pp. 145–183 (German translation)
- Nagurney A (1993) *Network economics: A variational inequality approach*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, Massachusetts
- Nagurney A, Dong J (2002) *Supernetworks: Decision-making for the information age*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, England
- Nagurney A, Dong J, Mokhtarian PL (2001) Teleshopping versus shopping: A multicriteria network equilibrium framework. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling* 34: 783–798
- Nagurney A, Dong J, Mokhtarian PL (2002) Multicriteria network equilibrium modeling with variable weights for decision-making in the Information Age with applications to telecommuting and teleshopping. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 26: 1629–1650
- Nagurney A, Dong J, Zhang D (2001) A supply chain network equilibrium model. *Transportation Research E* 38: 281–303
- Nagurney A, Loo J, Dong J, Zhang D (2002) Supply chain networks and electronic commerce: A theoretical perspective. *Netnomics* 4: 187–220
- Nagurney A, Siokos S (1997) *Financial networks: Statics and dynamics*. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Germany
- Nagurney A, Zhang D (1996) *Projected dynamical systems and variational inequalities with applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, Massachusetts
- Nagurney A, Zhang D (1997) Projected dynamical systems in the formulation, stability analysis, and computation of fixed-demand traffic network equilibria. *Transportation Science* 31: 147–158
- Nash JF (1951) Noncooperative games. *Annals of Mathematics* 54: 286–298
- Netter M (1972) Equilibrium and marginal cost pricing on a road network with several flow types. In: *Traffic Flow and Transportation, Proceedings of the 5th international Symposium on the Theory of Traffic Flow and Transportation*. Elsevier, New York
- Nguyen S (1974) An algorithm for the traffic assignment problem. *Transportation Science* 8: 203–216
- Nguyen S (1976) A unified approach to equilibrium methods for traffic assignment. In: Florian M (ed) *Traffic equilibrium methods: Lecture notes in economics and mathematical systems 118*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, pp. 148–182
- Patriksson M (1994) *The traffic assignment problem: Models and methods*. VSP, Utrecht, The Netherlands
- Peterson WH (1957) *Wall Street Journal*, 2 January, p. 8, column 6
- Pigou AC (1920) *The economics of welfare*. Macmillan, London, England
- Prager W (1954) Problems in traffic and transportation. *Proceedings of a Symposium in Operations Research in Business and Industry*, Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, Missouri, April
- Ran B, Boyce D (1996) *Modeling dynamic transportation networks*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany
- Roughgarden T (2001) Designing networks for selfish users is hard. *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science*, pp. 472–481
- Roughgarden T (2002a) Selfish routing. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
- Roughgarden T (2002b) How unfair is optimal routing? *Proceedings of the 13th Annual Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pp. 203–204

- Roughgarden T, Tardos E (2002) How bad is selfish routing? *Journal of the ACM* 49: 236–259
- Samuelson PA (1952) Spatial price equilibrium and linear programming. *American Economic Review* 42: 283–303
- Sheffi Y (1985) *Urban transportation networks: Equilibrium analysis with mathematical programming methods*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey
- Small KA, Chu X (2003) Hypercongestion. *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy* 37: 319–352
- Smeed RJ (1957) *The Economic Journal* 67: 116–117
- Smith MJ (1979) Existence, uniqueness and stability of traffic equilibria. *Transportation Research B* 13: 259–304
- Smith MJ (1984) The stability of a dynamic model of traffic assignment: An application of a method of Lyapunov. *Transportation Science* 18: 245–252
- Smith MJ (1993) A new dynamic traffic model and the existence and calculation of dynamic user equilibria on congested capacity constrained road network. *Transportation Research B* 27: 49–63
- Steinberg R, Zangwill W (1983) The prevalence of Braess's paradox. *Transportation Science* 17: 301–318
- Stewart NF (1980) Equilibrium vs. system-optimal flow: Some examples. *Transportation Research A* 14: 81–84
- Takayama T, Judge GG (1964) An intertemporal price equilibrium model. *Journal of Farm Economics* 46: 477–484
- Takayama T, Judge GG (1971) *Spatial and temporal price and allocation models*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- Thrall RM (1958) *Econometrica* 26 (1): January: p. 183
- Tomlin JA (1966) Minimum-cost multicommodity network flows. *Operations Research* 14: 45–51
- Verhoef ET (2002) Second-best congestion pricing in general static transportation networks with elastic demands. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 32: 281–310
- Vickrey WB (1952) The revision of the rapid transit fare structure of the City of New York. Finance Project, Mayor's Committee on Management Survey of the City of New York, Technical Monograph Number Three, New York, February
- Walras L (1874) *Elements d'economique politique pure*. Corbaz, Lausanne, Switzerland
- Walters AA (1961) Some theoretical aspects of road traffic research. *Econometrica* 29: 676–699
- Wardrop JG (1952) Some theoretical aspects of road traffic research. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers*, Part II 1: pp. 325–378
- Wu JH, Chen Y, Florian M (1998) The continuous dynamic network loading problem: A mathematical formulation and solution method. *Transportation Research B* 32: 173–187
- Yagar S (1971) Dynamic traffic assignment by individual path minimisation and queuing. *Transportation Research* 5: 179–196
- Zhang D, Dong J, Nagurney A (2003) A supply chain network economy: Modeling and qualitative analysis. In: Nagurney A (ed) *Innovations in financial and economic networks*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK
- Zhang D, Nagurney A (1996) On the local and global stability of a travel route choice adjustment process. *Transportation Research B* 30: 245–262
- Zhang D, Nagurney A, Wu JH (2001) On the equivalence between stationary link flow patterns and traffic network equilibria. *Transportation Research B* 35: 731–748
- Zhao L, Nagurney A (1993) A network formalism for pure exchange economic equilibria. In: Du DZ, Pardalos PM (eds) *Network optimization problems: Algorithms, complexity and applications*. World Scientific Press, Singapore