

### Università degli Studi dell'Aquila

Department of Information Engineering, Computer Science and Mathematics

PhD in Information and Communication Technologies

# **Optimization Models for Pedestrian Emergency Evacuation Planning**

XXXIV Doctoral Cycle

19/09/2022

Name: Evans Etrue Howard

Tutor: Prof. Claudio Arbib Co-Tutor: Prof. Antinisca Di Marco









Motivating Scenario: European Occurrences from Disasters (Natural and Technological from 1990 - 2020)



Natural Disasters

**Technological Disasters** 



# **Disaster management**



### Outline

Discussion of State-of-the-Art Pedestrian Emergency Models

Development of a Network Transformation and Conversion (NTC) model.

Formulation of Dynamic Cell Transmission Evacuation Planning (DyCTEP) model

Optimal Route Assignment Algorithm (ORAA).

Proposal of the Dynamic Earliest Arrival Flow (DEAF)

Extension of DyCTEP:
 Extended CTM
 Multiple Cell Sizes

Priority Multi-Party Capacity Constrained Route Planning (PMP-CCRP)

\* Application of models to real-life data

# Pedestrian Emergency Evacuation Models: State of the Art





Pedestrian Emergency Evacuation Models: State of the Art



# Pedestrian Emergency Evacuation Models: State of the Art







Depiction of the various types of cells used in the model







U-turn Node with group of connectors

Intersection Node with group of connectors



Depiction of various cells types used in the DyCTEP model



- The max ouflow from a cell is constrained by:  $S_i = \min\{y_i^t, Q_i\}$ \*
- The max inflow to a cell is constrained by:  $R_i = \min\{Q_i, n_i y_i^t\}$ \*
- And  $x_{ii}^t = \min\{S_i, R_i\}$ \*
- Therefore: \*

 $x_{ii}^{t} = \min\{y_{i}^{t}, Q_{i}, Q_{i}, (n_{i} - y_{i}^{t})\} or x_{ii}^{t} = \min\{y_{i}^{t}, c_{ii}, (n_{i} - y_{i}^{t})\}$ 

 $x_{i(k,k+1)}^t$ 

w

 $\delta_i^t$ 

 $q_i$ 

 $y_i^t$  $x_{ij}^t$ 

 $z_i^{t+1}$ 

 $Q_i^t$ 

 $= Q_i$  $\lambda_{ii} = \lambda_{ii}$ 

Decision Variables:

### Dynamic Cell Transmission Evacuation Planning (DyCTEP) model

### Model with congestion

To get a more realistic and accuate model, we take into account congestions at the arc capacities, which is modeled as a concave decreasing function of the cell capacity.



Congestion curve for arc capacity constraints

Linearizing the concavity one can replace constraint (1.10i) with the following:

• 
$$y_i^{t-1} = u_i^{t-1} + v_i^{t-1} + w_i^{t-1}$$
 and  $x_{ij}^t = \phi_{ij}^t + \chi_{ij}^t + \psi_{ij}^t$  (\*)

- $\begin{array}{ccc} & n'_{j} & & \\$ 
  - Consistency of the φ, χ and ψ variables with the *x* flow variables requires  $\chi = 0$  (ψ = 0) if φ (if  $\chi$ ) does not saturate its capacity.
  - This is ensured, at optimality, by the properties of basic solutions.

# **Optimal Route Assignment Algorithm (ORAA):**

- Since the solution of the dynamic optimization procedure described previously, gives an estimate of the lower bound on the total egress time.
- Proposal of a path generating procedure is paramount to aid stakeholders plan accordingly.

Algorithm 1: Greedy Heuristic for Evacuation Route Planning

**Input:** Dynamic network  $G_T = (N_T, A_T)$ , with the set of source and sink nodes,  $S \subset V$  and  $0 \subset V$  respectively and DT = book-keeping (using time-series dictionary) of all the network dynamics obtained after the implementation of the dynamic optimization model in sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2.

**Output:** Evacuation route plans for all evacuees.

- **1** Count the number  $w_{ij}$  of occurrences of (i, j) in DT.
- **2** Generate a weighted static graph G = (N, A, w) where w gives the arc frequencies calculated above.
- **3** Sort the arcs in G' from the highest to the lowest frequency.
- 4 Initialize  $T_r := (N, E)$  with  $E = \emptyset$  (empty forest)
- 5 while ( $T_r$  is not yet connected) do
- **6** Take an arc (i, j) with the largest frequency  $w_{ij}$  and check whether it forms or not a cycle with some arcs in E
- 7 If not,  $E := E \cup \{(i, j)\}.$
- **s** Return a spanning tree  $T_r$  of maximum weight.
- **9** Re-run the dynamic optimisation model of Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 on  $T_r$ .





С

Е

F

F



# **Complexity Analysis:**

Siven a graph G = (N, A): |N| = n and |A| = m. The time complexity is computed as:



- **\*** Time Complexity: O(Tmlogm + mlogn + mlogm + 1 + mlogm)
- ♦ Max arcs for complete graph:  $\frac{n(n-1)}{2} \Rightarrow O(n^2)$
- ♦ Min arcs for connected graph:  $n 1 \Rightarrow O(n)$
- ✤ Worse case: 0(Tmlogm)
- ✤ Best case: O(Tmlogn)



### Results

### Optimal distribution of flow units for source cell connectors

						Т	ime-step		Connectors / Arc								
								(1, 6)	(1, 10)	(2, 15)	(2, 13)	(3, 19)	(3, 22)	) (4, 26)	(4, 29)	(5, 32)	(5, 35)
Base Network	Total Network clearance	Total eg	ress ti	ime			0 1 2 3	$\begin{bmatrix} 0\\7\\7\\7 \end{bmatrix}$	0 5 5 5	0 5 5 5	0 5 5 5	0 5 5 5	0 5 5 5 5	0 5 5 5	0 5 5 9	0 5 5	0 5 5 5
	time (T)						4 5	7	5	о 0	э 0	о 0	о 0	5	0	5	0
DyCTEP	35	11422 (	3 hr 1(	) min	22secs)		6	77	0 5 5	0 0	5 5 0	0 5 5	5	5 0	0 0 0	0 0	5 5 0
DyCTEP - Congestion	52	14473 (	4 hr 1	min 1	2secs)		9 10 11	0 0 0	5 0 5	5 0 5	0 5	5 0	о о 0 0	5 5 5	5 5 0	0 0 0	0 5 0
ORAA	54	14605 (	4 hr 3	min 2	5 secs)		12 13 14	0	5 0 0	5 7 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	5 5 0	0 0 0	0 5 0	0 0 0	5 5 5
Shortest Path	72	19859 (	5 hr 3′	l min)			15 16 17	5 0	0	5 5 5	0 5 0	0 0 0	0 5 0	0 5 0	5 0 5	0 0 0	0 5 0
							18 19	0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	5 5	0 0	5 0	5 0	5 5
Optimal staging of flow units at source cells - DyCTEP						25 21	0	0 0	5 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	5 0	5 0	
Time (T)	0 1	2 3	4	5	6	78	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16 17	7 18	19	20
		76 64	57			26 20		15	10	5	5	5	0	0 (	) 0		0
		80 70 80 70	60 60	60 60		50 50 50 40		$\frac{40}{25}$	$\frac{35}{25}$	$\frac{30}{20}$	25 15			10 5 10 10	55 )5		0
Node	100 90 100 90	80 0 80 75	70	60		50 40 50 50		20 30	25 25	20 25	20			10 10		0	
		80 70	70	65		55 55		50	50	45	40			30 30		15	5

#### Optimal stagging at origin for DyCTEM vs DyCTEM-Congestion



Optimal stagging and flow distributions at the source cells for each time slot  $\tau$  for base model

Optimal stagging and flow distributions at the source cells for each time slot  $\tau$  for model with arc-congestion

### Comparison of the model performance



shortest path network)

**Optimal Routes generated by ORAA** 



**Optimal route assignment by Heuristic Algorithm** 

**Optimal destinations:** 

- The optimal distribution of flows at the destinations are as follows:
- Destination 15 (cell 100) received 135 flowunits (25% of the total demand).
- Destination 16 (cell 104) received 285 flowunits (57% of the total demand).
- Destination 17 (cell 105) received 80 flowunits (16% of the total demand).

### **Alternative Formulations**

- **\*** The DyCTEP discussed has a major weakness.
- The use of cells with fixed single size may lead to a too large number of cells, unnecessary to meet the required level of network and operation accuracy.
- So many cells imply an excessive number of constraints and variables in the optimization model, which may turn out to be unpractical for real use.
- **\*** Three different approaches are proposed to cope with this inconvenience.
- Dynamic Earliest Arrival Flow (DEAF)
- Extended CTM
- Multiple Cell-Sizes

### **Dynamic Earliest Arrival Flow (DEAF)**

Siven a network G = (N, A), let  $G_T = (N_T, A_T)$  be the TEG over horizon T, where  $N_T := \{i^t | i \in N; t \in T\}$  and



◆ Proposition: If n := |N| and m := |A| then n(T + 1) and (n + m)T + m - ∑<sub>(i,j)∈A</sub> λ<sub>ij</sub> are the upper bounds for the number of nodes and arcs in G<sub>T</sub> without the super-source and super-sink nodes, respectively

### Parameters and formulation:

Additional Parameters:

\*  $\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{ji}$ : The travel time, i.e the time needed to travel from node i to node j. \*  $q_i$ : The initial occupancy of cell i

\*  $z_i^{t+1}$ : Flows from node i at time *t* to the same node with travel time  $\lambda_{ii} = 1$ 

Problem (EAF): min 
$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} \sum_{i \in D} x_{i0}^{t}$$
 (5.1a)

$$z_i^{t+1} - z_i^t - \sum_{j:ji \in A} x_{ji}^{t-\lambda_{ji}} + \sum_{j:ij \in A} x_{ij}^t = 0, \quad \forall i \in V \setminus \{S \cup 0\}; t = 0, 1, \cdots, T$$
(5.1b)

$$z_0^{t+1} - z_0^t - \sum_{i:i0 \in D} x_{i0}^t = 0, \quad \forall t = 0, \cdots, T$$
 (5.1c)

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T} \sum_{i \in D} x_{i0}^{t} = \sum_{j \in S} q_j \tag{5.1d}$$

$$\sum_{j:ji\in A} x_{ji}^t + z_i^t \le n_i, \quad \forall i \in V \setminus \{0\}, t \in T$$
(5.1e)

$$0 \le x_{ij}^t \le c_{ij}, \quad \forall (ij) \in A, t = \{0, 1, \cdots, T - \lambda_{ij}\}$$
 (5.1f)

$$x_{si}^0 = q_i, \quad \forall i \in S \tag{5.1g}$$

$$z_i^0 = 0, \quad \forall i \in V \tag{5.1h}$$

$$z_i^t = 0, \quad \forall i \in D, \forall t \in T$$
 (5.1i)

# Multiple cell sizes approach

- To represent a given network with the CTM, it is necessary to choose a cell size that adequately matches the length of the network arcs.
- As one easily understand, this leads to a trade-off between the cell number (which greatly affects the number of side constraints and variables) and the accuracy of the network representation.



The DyCTEP is then extended using of multiple cell sizes, with larger cell sizes being integer multiples of a reference unit size (this is necessary to comply with the discrete nature of the DyCTEP approach).

# Extended CTM: Approach 1

- The basic idea of this approach is to divide a cell into subcells, where the number of subcells corresponds to the cell size of the cell (1, ..., n).
- A pedestrian needs at least one period to pass a subcell so that *n* subcells lead to a minimum travel time of *n* periods.
- The DyCTEP with multiple cell sizes using this approach can be formulated by replacing Eqns 1.10b by 3.2a, and
   1.10d by 3.2b and adding 4 more constraints (3.2c 3.2f)

$$y_i^t - y_i^{t-1} - \sum_{j:j \in A} x_{ji}^{t-1} + \sum_{j:i \neq A} x_{ij}^{t-1} = 0; \forall i \in C_1, t \in T, t > 0$$

$$(3.2a)$$

$$y_i^t - y_i^{t-1} - \sum_{j:j \in A} x_{ji}^{t-1} + \sum_{j:i j \in A} x_{ij}^{t-1} - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} x_{i(k,k+1)}^t + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} x_{i(k,k+1)}^{t-1} = 0; n \in K: n \ge 2; i \in C_n; t = \{2, \dots, T\}$$
(3.2c)

(1.10a)

(1.10b) (1.10c)

(1.10d) (1.10e)

(1.10f)

(1.10g)

(1.10h)

(1.10i) (1.10j)

(1.10k)

 $y_i^t - y_i^{t-1} + \sum_{j:ij \in A} x_{ij}^{t-1} =$ 

 $\sum x_{ji}^t \le \delta_i (n_i - y_i^t), \quad \forall i \in V \setminus \{S\}, t \in T$ 

 $\sum \ x_{ij}^t \leq Q_i, \quad \forall i \in V \setminus \{0\}, t \in T$ 

 $\sum \ x_{ij}^t - y_i^t \leq 0, \quad \forall i \in V \setminus \{0\}, t \in T$ 

 $0 \le x_{ij}^t + x_{ji}^t \le c_{ij}, \quad \forall (ij) \in A, t \in T$ 

 $x_{ii}^0 = 0, \quad \forall (i, j) \in A$ 

$$x_{i(k+1,k+2)} = x_{i(k,k+1)}; n \in K: n \ge 3; k = 1, 2, ..., n - 2; l \in C_n; t = \{2, ..., I\}$$

$$(3.2a) \text{ Problem: SO-DTA (CTM) : min } \sum_{t \in S \in V \setminus 0} y_t^t$$

$$\sum_{j:ij \in A} x_{ij}^t = x_{i(k-1,k)}^{t-1}; k \in K: k \ge 2; i \in C_n; t = \{2, ..., T\}$$

$$(3.2b) \text{ Problem: SO-DTA (CTM) : min } \sum_{t \in S \in V \setminus 0} y_t^t$$

$$y_t^{t-1} - \sum_{j:i \in A} x_{ij}^{t-1} - \sum_{j:i \in A} x_{ij}^{t-1} = 0, \forall i \in V \setminus \{S \cup 0\}, t \in T, t > 0$$

$$y_t^t - y_t^{t-1} - \sum_{j:i \in A} x_{ij}^{t-1} = 0, \forall i \in V \setminus \{S \cup 0\}, t \in T, t > 0$$

$$y_t^t - y_t^{t-1} - \sum_{j:i \in A} x_{ij}^{t-1} = 0, \forall i \in V \setminus \{S \cup 0\}, t \in T, t > 0$$

# Multiple Cell Sizes - Approach 2

- The concept of the second approach to capture multiple cell sizes is to limit traffic outflow with respect to traffic inflow of a cell so that a minimum travel time of *n* periods for a cell of size *n* can be ensured.
- **Solution** Because of constraint **1.10b** this assumption automatically holds for cells with size 1.
- ✤ For cells of size  $k \ge 2$ , we introduce constraint 3.3a to ensure a minimum travel time of  $k_i$  periods for a cell i of size  $k_i$ .
- The DyCTEP with multiple cell sizes using the 2nd approach can be formulated by adding the following constraint to the model formulation 1.10b 1.10k.

$$\bigstar \sum_{j:ij\in A} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t} x_{ij}^{\tau} \le \sum_{j:ji\in A} \sum_{\tau=1}^{\max(t-k_{i},1)} x_{ji}^{\tau} + \sum_{\tau=1}^{\max(t-k_{i}/2+1,1)} y_{i}^{\tau}; i \in V: k_{i} \ge 2; t = \{2, \dots, T\}$$
(3.3*a*)

### **Experimentation and Results**

- **•** Using the sample network from the previous example:
- ✤ Analysis of the various formulations was carried
- The unit time slot of  $\theta = 7$  secs was assumed and the analysis was performed for  $\tau = \{1, ..., 60\}$

#### Model size comparison

Model	# Variables	# Constraints
DyCTEP	14760	39474
DEAF	3416 (-76.9%)	8667 (-78.0%)
APPROACH 1	6776 (-54.1%)	12206 (-69.1%)
APPROACH 2	5700 (-61.4%)	10954 (-72.3%)
CONGESTION		
DyCTEP	59040 (+300%)	70175 (+77.8%)
DEAF	13440 (-8.9%)	22913 (-42.0%)
APPROACH 1	18278 (+23.8%)	24758 (-37.3%)
APPROACH 2	22800 (+54.5%)	26820 (-32.1%)

#### Model Network Total Egress Time **Clearance Time** (Time steps) **DyCTEP** 34 11422 (3 hr 10 min 22 secs) DEAF 59 14473 (4 hr 1 min 13 secs) **APPROACH 1** 46 13354 (3 hr 42 min 34 secs) **APPROACH 2** 49 14006 (3 hr 53 min 26 secs) CONGESTION DyCTEP 53 14605 (4 hr 3 min 25 secs) DEAF 94 33060 (9 hr 11 min 1 secs) **APPROACH 1** 17896 (4 hr 58 min 16 secs) 64 **APPROACH 2** 18971 (5 hr 13 min 11 secs) 69

#### Comparison of performance



### Results: Comparative analysis of egress times for different models

Real Life case application: L'Aquila

- For our case study, we considered Piazza del Duomo (L'Aquila) and took a 750m radii network along the streets
- Resulting in a network with total street length of 47353.602 meters.
- Using  $\theta$  = 7 secs, the transformed cell network is composed of 6492 cells and 7772 connectors.
- ✤ A total of 77 source nodes chosen s.t deg(i) ≥ 3.
- Initial source occupancy = 50 evacuees each, making a total of N =3850 people to be safely evacuated from the danger zone to the safe locations
- Destination nodes consist of 18 nodes (nodes 2, 4, 14, 19, 23, 34, 57, 58, 71, 84, 101, 116, 135, 144, 278, 279, 381, and 642 ) connected to the virtual super-sink node 0.



#### Results

Model	Network Clearance Time (Time steps)	Total Egress Time (Time Units)
DyCTEP	173	127203 = 35 hours 20 minutes and 3 seconds
DEAF	205	144885 = 40 hours 14 minutes and 30 seconds

\* An extra 5 hours needed to evacuate all the evacuees in DEAF as compared to DyCTEP

#### Comparison of Optimal destination flow distribution for models DyCTEP and DEAF



### Routes generated by ORAA on DyCTEP solution

 $|SD_1| = 1216 m$  $|SD_2| = 1118 m$  $|S_3D_3| = 1627 m$ 



### Routes assignment comparison betwen DyCTEP and DEAF (in green)

 $|SD_1| = 1330 m$  $|SD_2| = 1202 m$  $|S_3D_3| = 1745 m$ 



 $|SD_1| = 1216 m$  $|SD_2| = 1118 m$  $|S_3D_3| = 1627 m$ 

### Priority Multi-Party Capacity Constrained Route Planning



### Algorithm: PMP-CCRP

The Priority Multi-party Capacity Constrained Route Planning is an extension of the Capacity Constrained Route Planning (CCRP) of Shekhar et al.

Algorithm 2: Priority Multi-Party Capacity Constraint Route Planning (PMP-CCRP)

Input: spatial network G = (N, E), with the set of source and sink nodes,  $S \subset N$  and  $D \subset N$  respectively and book-keeping of available capacities of G using time-series dictionary

**Output:** Evacuation plan: Routes with schedules of evacuees on each path

- 1 Generate party specific pseudo sub-sources  $(E_s \text{ and } R_s)$  and pseudo sub-sinks  $(E_D \text{ and } R_D)$ connected to the respective source and sink nodes with 0 travel times and  $\infty$  capacities.
- **2** Add super-source  $(S_S)$  and super-sink  $(D_S)$  connected by edges of 0 travel times and  $\infty$  capacities to the respective sub-sources and sub-sinks.
- 3 Categorize each source node based on priority
- 4 while (any source has evacuees) do
- 5 Find the shortest path P between the two super nodes  $(S_S \text{ and } D_S)$  using the generalized Dijkstra's algorithm with edge travel times and node priorities as the weight criteria
- **6** Calculate the maximum flow  $x_{max}$  along this path P
- **7** Reserve the node and arc capacities
- 8 Update the book keeping dictionary
- 9 Output evacuation plan



### Simulations



**Endangered Capacity Constraint Graph** 



**Evacuated Capacity Constraint Graph** 

### **Experiments and Results**

- For test trial, generate a 9-by-9 Manhattan grid network
- Run simulate 1000 times on network
- ✤ Max node capacity: 5 10
- ✤ Max Arc Capacity: 3 5
- Travel times : 3 7
- Initial Pop: 3 to max node capacity
- Each node has 50% chance of including responder





	mean	std	min	25%	50%	75%	max
CCRP-EVA	35.654	3.752	24	33	36	38	50
CCRP-RESP	33.643	2.375	27	32	34	35	42
CCRP-TOTAL	69.297	4.682	56	66	69	72	85
PMP-CCRP	51.715	4.356	39	49	52	55	65
POP	451.4	17.00	395	441	452	462	505





#### **Research Contribution**

- The cell transmission model which was limited to only small networks was improved by developing network conversion model (NTC), to convert any size node-arc network into cell network.
- We proposed and applied the dynamic cell-transmission evacuation planning (DyCTEP) model to large scale networks to give better global solutions.
- We then incorporated arc-congestion, which is a situation where the speed at which the system empties is a decreasing function of cell/node occupancy y<sup>t</sup><sub>i</sub> into the model formulation, to mimic the bottlenecks on the streets in the real-life evacuation processes.
- We proposed a Heuristic Algorithm for optimal route assignment taking into consideration all network optimal flow dynamics captured in time.
- We proposed and implemented three new approaches, namely Dynamic Earliest Arrival Flow, Extended CTM and the Multiple Cells Approaches to cope with the inconveniences associated with DyCTEP.
- Finally, we proposed the priority multi-party capacity constrained route planning a heuristic algorithm and an extension of the CCRP by Shekhar et al. The proposed PMP-CCRP is equipped with the ability to plan for the evacuation of multiple parties with different objectives. That is, evacuees may begin their journey from an endangered source and travel to a safe destination, while inversely emergency responders may begin their journey from anywhere and travel to a dangerous location. It ensures that during the evacuation process, priority is given to high-risk areas, that is, evacuees in highly endangered zone are evacuated first before those in less risky areas.

### **Future Research**

- The future work will be the incorporation of the methods, algorithms and procedures described in this thesis in a novel smart city service that is able to guide evacuees and rescuers after a disaster to bring to safety as many people as possible out the risky and endangered places.
- The service must be fed by real-time information (which roads are safe enough, which are damaged by the disaster, how many people are in a specific area, and so on).
- Starting from our proposed algorithms, we plan to be able to specify, design and implement a smart city infrastructure and connected mobile app able to collect all the needed data. These together with the proposed algorithms will realize the rescue and evacuation service for smart cities of the future.
- We are studying to incorporate additional risk factors into the model, like those associated with each node and/or each arc/street.
- We also want to research on the development of a hybrid approach for evacuation planning by performing a mesoscopic study, where we try to factor the human behaviour in order to understand some individual interactions between pedestrians during evacuation.
- In the case of the multi-party capacity constrained route planning discussed, we are researching to include an examination on N number of party's interaction and route planning times.
- Another feature valuable for real-life emergency coordinators would be an ability to apply weighted priorities to better address the non-uniform urgency and importance each party brings regarding the larger scheme of things.

#### **Research Publications**

- Published:
  - Evans Etrue Howard, Pasquini Lorenza, Arbib Claudio, Di Marco Antinisca and Clementini Eliseo "Definition of an Enriched GIS Network for Evacuation Planning". In Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Geographical Information Systems Theory, Applications and Management (GISTAM 2021), pages 241-252
  - Ghulam Mudassir, Evans Etrue Howard, Lorenza Pasquini, Claudio Arbib, Antinisca Di Marco, and Giovanni Stilo "Toward Effective Response to Natural Disasters: a Data Science Approach". In IEEE Access 2021, volume 9, pp.167827-167844.
  - Evans Etrue Howard, Antinisca Di Marco and Claudio Arbib "Towards an Emergency Evacuation Planning Service". 7th Italian Conference on ICT for Smart Cities And Communities, 2021
- In progress:
  - Evans Etrue Howard, Pasquini Lorenza, Arbib Claudio, Di Marco Antinisca and Clementini Eliseo "Automatic generation of evacuation plans from real GIS data"
  - Evans Etrue Howard, Antinisca Di Marco and Claudio Arbib. "Mapping knowledge structure and research trends of Pedestrian Emergency Evacuation Models: A State of the Art." The entire literature reviewed is based on this article.



