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Abstract—The passenger flow organizational schemes have directly impact on the operational efficiency and order of metro transfer stations. Firstly, the new but reasonable index system of the passenger flow organizational schemes is provided, which involves the aspects of transfer time, distance, detour distance, transfer volume, etc. Then, the corresponding quantified method of each index is come up with to handle the investigative data. Finally, based on the multi-layer fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method, we evaluate the organizational schemes of Beitucheng transfer station in Beijing Subway, aiming to differentiate the scale of each scheme as well as the priority selection for passengers.

Index Terms—Metro transfer station, passenger flow organizational scheme, multi-layer fuzzy comprehensive evaluation, priority selection.

I. INTRODUCTION

Extremely expanding as the urban transport network is, metro transfer stations are playing more significant roles. It directly affects the operation efficiency and order of metro transfer station whether the passenger flow organizational schemes are efficient or not. However, there doesn’t exist some reasonable evaluation indexes for the transfer schemes. Therefore, some further research should be urgently done to improve the transfer organizational efficiency.

Better measures of passenger organization was proposed in [1] based on the characteristics of passenger flow in the transfer station and considered constitution and distribution of passenger organization. Song and Zheng [2] did some research on the transfer mode and the combination of platform considering the passenger influence, then gave the reasonable mode to interchange and reduce the transfer times, which is proved to improve the transfer efficiency greatly. In addition, Yang and Xu [3] simulated the key problems of large-scale pedestrian organization at urban rail transfer station under the background of Shanghai World Expo, finally proposed some improvements to the optimization and station facilities as well as some suggestions to guide rational distribution of station staff. All these previous works ([4-5], included) that analyzed the passenger flow organization problems are lack of the actual analysis to the passenger flow data during the rush hours, which maybe can’t match the actual situation. Although some evaluation indexes were proposed to evaluate the transfer station, they are not suitable the evaluation of passenger flow organization of transfer station during rush hours, however, the evaluation of passenger flow organization is crucial to be done. Therefore, this paper establishes the evaluation index system and the corresponding quantified method that are suitable to the evaluation of passenger flow organization. The establishment and method is based on the actual situation of transfer station during rush hours. Multi-layer fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method is presented to evaluate the schemes.

II. THE EVALUATION INDEX SYSTEM OF PASSENGER FLOW ORGANIZATIONAL SCHEMES

Metro transfer stations act the important role of passenger flow collection and distribution during rush hours. The passengers who are in the transfer station need to transfer from one line to another as soon as possible so that they won’t be late for work. And at the same time, getting rid of unexpected situation is the inner expectation and the service they deserve as well as a comfortable environment. Therefore, in order to insure the transfer efficiency, the transfer schemes should not only be high performance and convenient, also be safe and comfortable. The paper establishes the evaluation index system of passenger flow organizational schemes (Fig.1) according to the principle of “entirety, hierarchy, independence, measurability”, and takes the main factors above into consideration at the same time.
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The indexes of each layer are explaining and quantified as bellows:

A. Ratio of Transfer Time

On Feb. 27th 2012, “Urban Rail Transit Engineering Design Standard (Opinion Soliciting Draft)” was proposed
as the new standard of metro construction in Beijing, which specifies that the transfer time of one-platform-interchange should be less than 1 minute, 3 and 5 minutes of transfer time at node and channel respectively.

Let $t_{ab}^i$ denote the ratio of transfer time of the $i$-th scheme between line A and line B. And $t_{ab}$ denote the corresponding transfer time. $t_0$ stands for the max standard transfer time, which equals to 1 or 3 according to the standard above. Then we define the transfer time ratio $r_{ab}^i$ with the following formula:

$$r_{ab}^i = t_{ab}^i / t_0$$

(1)

$r_{ab}^i$ is a negative index, it means that the higher the value is, the transfer time consumed is more, the corresponding scheme is worst.

Submit your manuscript electronically for review.

B. Ratio of Transfer Volume Per Hour

Let $Q_{ab}^i$ denote the transfer volume of the $i$-th scheme between line A and line B during the time $t$, then the transfer volume per hour $Q_{ab}$ can derive from the formula (2):

$$Q_{ab}^i = Q_{ab}(t) / t$$

(2)

We define the ratio of transfer volume per hour as below: If there are $c$ schemes between line A and line B, and $c_i$ of them derive from the same transfer channel or facility, with the corresponding transfer volume per hour of $Q_{ab}$ ($i = 1, 2, ..., k$), so we have the ratio of transfer volume per hour $\alpha_{ab}^i$:

$$\alpha_{ab}^i = \frac{Q_{ab}^i}{\sum c_i Q_{ab}}, (i = 1, 2, ..., k)$$

(3)

We analogically assume the ratio the best when between 75-85 percent with reference to [7], because the ratio is unreasonable if it is more or less than that. When the ratio is tending to 1 or 0, it means nearly all the passengers assemble at the same scheme, which may cause potential danger.

C. Numbers of Conflict Points

With reference to the concepts of conflict point in road traffic, define: If every two routes of passenger flow can’t converge, when passengers take the route $P_o$ from origin $O_i$ to destination $D_j$ and take the route $P_m$ from origin $O_k$ to destination $D_m$, we consider the intersection of the two route a conflict point. General speaking, the less conflict point a scheme has, the better.

D. Transfer Distance

We have the same definition of transfer distance with the general urban rail transfer station [7]: Let $H$ denote the horizontal distance of the two transfer stations, $V$ denote the vertical distance, so we have the transfer distance $D$ from (4):

$$D = H + kV$$

(4)

where $k$ is the coefficient of distance increasing up/down stairs when going up stairs, $k=4.0$; $k=2.0$ for down stairs and 1.0 for elevators.

Due to the actual situation of each transfer station, the distance varies a lot. Therefore, the ranges of evaluation scale of transfer distance need treat differently.

E. Detour Coefficient

Let $D_{ab}^i$ denote the actual transfer distance $i$-th scheme between line A and line B, $c$ denote the total number of the transfer schemes. So the detour coefficient $\chi_{ab}^i$ is defined as the ratio between $D_{ab}^i$ and the average transfer distance:

$$\chi_{ab}^i = D_{ab}^i \left( \frac{1}{c} \sum c_i D_{ab}^i \right)$$

(5)

Detour coefficient is also a negative index, which means that the higher value of the detour coefficient is, the actual transfer distance is farther, and affects the passengers more.

F. Safety during the Transfer Process

This is a quite complex index, which involves many aspects such as safety of the transfer facility and the safe measures to ensure the passengers’ safety. But in order to differentiate the sub-evaluation index and come up with a quantified method, we analyze the main factors. The safety during transfer, to a large extent, affects the passengers’ satisfaction towards the passenger flow organizational schemes at the station. This is a qualitative index, and we classify the scales by scoring.

G. Comforts during the Transfer Process

When transferring in the transfer station, few passengers would dwell at one place for a long time, so the evaluation of comfort mainly takes feeling caused by the facility that passengers use during the process into consideration, including the vertical height of the stairs, elevators or not. As we all know, when going up or down stairs and whether there are elevators, we have the different feelings. Therefore, we take the number of stair steps and elevators or not as the quantified factor [9].

With careful analysis and reference to the definition of transfer distance, we come up with the following function between comfort and height of stairs, horizontal distance, vertical height and the elevator using or not:

$$\varphi = (40\% a_d + 60\% a_c) V^\text{up} + b H + (40\% a_d + 60\% a_c) V^\text{down}$$

(6)

In formula (6), $\varphi$, represents for the comfort during the transfer process, $V^\text{up}, V^\text{down}$ represents the vertical height of up or down stairs respectively, $H$ is the horizontal transfer distance. The percentage of 40 and 60 means the probability of passengers who choose the stairs and elevators in rush hours (here we use the compromise value) [8].In addition, $a, b, c, d$ is the coefficient of transfer comfort, with the value determined in Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Up</td>
<td>Horizontally Elevator Down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. EVALUATION ANALYSIS OF PASSENGER FLOW ORGANIZATIONAL SCHEMES

To demonstrate the index system and evaluate the organizational schemes, a transfer station of Beijing Subway — Beitucheng Station, is chosen for case analysis. Beitucheng is a station that connects line 8 and 10, the layout structure is shown in Fig. 2, in which \( i = 1,2,\ldots,23 \) represent the facility that passengers pass through.

Here we mainly talk about the transfer passengers in the station because quite a large number of the passengers accomplish the transfer process rather than in or out of the station. When passengers transfer, the schemes mainly come from the following choices, showed in Table II:

**TABLE II: THE SCHEMES OF PASSENGER FLOW ORGANIZATIONAL SCHEMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Direction</th>
<th>Line 8—Line 10</th>
<th>Line 10—Line 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer I</td>
<td>V : 6→7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer II</td>
<td>V : 5→7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer III</td>
<td>V : 4→2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer IV</td>
<td>V : 4→2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In Table II, the order number \( I \sim VII \) represent the \( i \)-th scheme, and we regard the scheme \((5) \sim (7)\) and \((5) \sim (7)\) as the same scheme and number the order V.

A. Evaluation Indexes Scale Ranges of Passenger Flow Organizational Schemes

According to the analysis and quantified method of all the indexes and the investigative data (shown in appendix 1), we can derive the scale and corresponding value ranges in Table III. In the table, \( u_i \) \((i = 1,2,\ldots,7)\) represents the corresponding index respectively in 2.1 to 2.7. And all of these ranges are suggested in relation with their properties and actual value of the certain station.

**TABLE III: THE SCALE AND EVALUATION VALUE RANGE OF THE INDEXES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1~0.9</td>
<td>0.9~0.75</td>
<td>0.75~0.6</td>
<td>0.6~0.4</td>
<td>0.4~0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( u )</td>
<td>&gt;0.2</td>
<td>0.2~0.4</td>
<td>0.4~0.6</td>
<td>0.6~0.8</td>
<td>&gt;0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( u )</td>
<td>0.75~0.85</td>
<td>0.6~0.75</td>
<td>0.5~0.6</td>
<td>0.4~0.5</td>
<td>0.3~0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( u )</td>
<td>0.85~0.9</td>
<td>0.9~1</td>
<td>0.9~0.94</td>
<td>0.94~0.98</td>
<td>0 ~0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( u )</td>
<td>&lt;0</td>
<td>3~4</td>
<td>5~6</td>
<td>7~9</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( u )</td>
<td>50~100</td>
<td>50~100</td>
<td>100~150</td>
<td>150~200</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( u )</td>
<td>0.8~12</td>
<td>1.2~1.6</td>
<td>1.6~2</td>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( u )</td>
<td>90~100</td>
<td>75~90</td>
<td>60~75</td>
<td>40~60</td>
<td>&lt;40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( u )</td>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>40~80</td>
<td>80~120</td>
<td>120~160</td>
<td>160~200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Multi-layer Fuzzy Comprehensive Evaluation of Passenger Flow Organizational Schemes

We choose the multi-layer fuzzy comprehensive evaluation method to analyze the organizational schemes in Beitucheng transfer station, based on the former analysis of the involved indexes and the processed data (appendix 2).

Firstly, establish the evaluation set for indexes. The set should be divided into two layers: The first layer is composed of “high performance, convenient, safety and comfort”, which is denoted by \( U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4 \). The second layer is sub-index set that explicitly illustrates \( U_i (i = 1,2,3,4) \), and \( U_i = \{ u_{1i}, u_{2i}, u_{3i}, u_{4i} \} \), \( U_{j} = \{ u_{j1} \} \) [10].

Secondly, regard the seven schemes of Beitucheng station as the elements of the evaluation set. Then, differentiate the weight of each index by Delphi, and correct the weight with entropy, seen in Table IV.

**TABLE IV: THE WEIGHT OF EACH INDEXES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Indexes System</th>
<th>First Layer</th>
<th>Second Layer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( U_1 )</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U_2 )</td>
<td>(0.55)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U_3 )</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( U_4 )</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indexes value is fuzzed by trapezoidal fuzzy membership functions, and the fuzzier data is shown as below:

**TABLE V: THE FUZZY MEMBERSHIP VALUE OF EACH INDEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Direction</th>
<th>Line 8—Line 10</th>
<th>Line 10—Line 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheme I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To avoid the failure of the multi-layer fuzzy comprehensive method because of the operator, we operate the matrix with \( M (\ast, v) \) represented by "\( \ast \)", so let \( W_c \) denote the weight of \( U_j (i = 1,2,3,4) \), and \( w_c \) denote the weight of \( u_j (j = 1,2,\ldots,7) \), \( B_i (i = 1,2,3,4) \) denote the fuzzy relationship matrix of the second layer, we have:

\[
A = \left[ \begin{array}{c}
W_{1c}^1 [ (w_{c1})^1 \cdot B_1 ] \\
W_{2c}^1 [ (w_{c2})^1 \cdot B_1 ] \\
W_{3c}^1 [ (w_{c3})^1 \cdot B_1 ] \\
W_{4c}^1 [ (w_{c4})^1 \cdot B_1 ] \\
\end{array} \right]
\]

Here,

\[
W_{1c} = \left( 0.8125 \begin{array}{cccc}
0.8 & 0.5 & 0.4625 & 0.2 \\
0.6875 & 0.125 & 0.85 & 0.7375 \\
0.5 & 0.4 & 0.5 & 1 \\
0.3687 & 0.3207 & 0.5142 & 0.5337 \\
0.6875 & 0.6438 & 0.825 & 0.8438 \\
0.73 & 0.66 & 0.78 & 0.84 \\
0.5045 & 0.4325 & 0.7228 & 0.7521 \\
\end{array} \right)
\]

\[
W_{2c} = \left( 0.5 \begin{array}{cccc}
0.11 & 0 & 0.425 & 0.2 \\
0.6875 & 0.125 & 0.85 & 0.7375 \\
0.5 & 0.4 & 0.5 & 1 \\
0.3687 & 0.3207 & 0.5142 & 0.5337 \\
0.6875 & 0.6438 & 0.825 & 0.8438 \\
0.73 & 0.66 & 0.78 & 0.84 \\
0.5045 & 0.4325 & 0.7228 & 0.7521 \\
\end{array} \right)
\]

\[
W_{3c} = \left( 0.45 \begin{array}{cccc}
0.3687 & 0.3207 & 0.5142 & 0.5337 \\
0.6875 & 0.6438 & 0.825 & 0.8438 \\
0.73 & 0.66 & 0.78 & 0.84 \\
0.5045 & 0.4325 & 0.7228 & 0.7521 \\
\end{array} \right)
\]

\[
W_{4c} = \left( 0.4 \begin{array}{cccc}
0.3687 & 0.3207 & 0.5142 & 0.5337 \\
0.6875 & 0.6438 & 0.825 & 0.8438 \\
0.73 & 0.66 & 0.78 & 0.84 \\
0.5045 & 0.4325 & 0.7228 & 0.7521 \\
\end{array} \right)
\]
According to the results of formula (7), we have the final evaluation result:

\[ A = (0.6233 \ 0.4992 \ 0.6629 \ 0.6616 \ 0.8118 \ 0.4981 \ 0.4883) \]

Refer to Table III, we can differentiate the scale of each passenger flow organizational scheme. The score of scheme V is 0.8118, falling in the scale B, so the scheme V is Scale B, the others are analyzed analogically. Finally, we get the evaluation result in Table VI.

### IV. CONCLUSIONS

The paper mainly focuses on the evaluation of passenger flow organizational schemes in metro station. New evaluation indexes and quantified methods which are reasonable and measurable in the evaluation of passenger flow organizational schemes are proposed. At the end of the paper, we exemplify the metro transfer station—Beitucheng transfer station of Beijing Subway, and based on the multi-comprehensive method, demonstrate the evaluation index system and evaluate seven schemes when passengers transfer. In addition, we come up with the priority selection of the scheme of the same scale in view of the evaluation results, aiming to improve the transfer efficiency of passengers.

Of course, the result of the evaluation can be also utilized by the operation department to optimize transfer organization.

### APPENDIX

The investigative data of the current scheme values in Beitucheng transfer station of Beijing Subway is shown in Appendix 1, and the reasonable processed data is shown in Appendix 2.

### REFERENCES


Yong Qin received the undergraduate degree in traffic control engineering from Shanghai Railway University, Shanghai, China, the M.S. degree in transportation automation and control engineering from Shanghai Railway University, Shanghai, China, and the Ph.D. degree in traffic information engineering and control from China Academy of Railway Sciences, Beijing, China. He is a Professor with State Key laboratory of Rail Traffic Control and Safety (Beijing Jiaotong University). His research interests are in the area of intelligent transportation systems, railway safety guard and emergency management, rail network management and traffic model. Dr. Qin is a member of the Intelligent Automation Committee of Chinese Automation Association, also a member of Fuzzy Mathematics and Systems Committee of Systems Engineering Society of China.

Jie Xu received the undergraduate degree in safety engineering from Shandong University of Science and Technology, Tai’an, Shandong, China, the M.S. degree in transportation engineering from Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China, and the Ph.D. degree in transportation plan and management from the Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China.

He is an Associate Professor with State Key laboratory of Rail Traffic Control and Safety (Beijing Jiaotong University). His research interests are in the area of railway operation and optimum, railway safety guard, pre-warning and emergency management of Urban Rail Transit, traffic-flow theory.