

Geometry of Interest (GOI): Spatio-Temporal Destination Extraction and Partitioning in GPS Trajectory Data

Seyed Morteza Mousavi · Aaron Harwood · Shanika Karunasekera ·
Mojtaba Maghrebi

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In this paper, we propose a method for extracting the geometries of interest (GOIs) of a mobile object which we define as the geometries of the points of interest (POIs) which a mobile object frequently visits. Based on extracted GOIs the area of a long-term GPS trajectory is partitioned into a grid area with inhomogeneous shaped cells. This proposes a method consists of three phases: (i) extracting the geometry of stay regions based on the concepts of time-value and the time-weighted centroid, (ii) determining the geometry of destination regions based on the extracted stay regions using a geometry based hierarchical clustering, and (iii) partitioning the trajectory area based on the geometry of the destination regions and their visit frequency. The extracted GOIs can effectively represent the geometries of the POIs of the mobile object while guaranteeing the characteristics of a valid partitioning. The

proposed method is tested using a field database covering the trajectory of a mobile object with the length of 3.5 years, and the achieved results are compared to the state-of-the-art. Our experimental results show that the proposed stay extraction can detect valid stay regions with only one track point while the other methods lose those stays. Moreover, analysis of the outcomes of the method using empirical observation shows that the quality of the extracted stay regions, destination regions and the GOIs extracted by our proposed method is considerably higher than those extracted by methods proposed in the state-of-the-art.

Keywords Trajectory Data, Spatio-Temporal Partitioning, Geometry of Interest, Time-Value, Time-Weighted Centroid, Destination Extraction

1 Introduction

In recent years, due to developments and improvement of different positioning systems such as Global Positioning Systems (GPS) and the Internet of Things, various research has been devoted to collect, store and analyze moving object trajectory data from a spatio-temporal perspective. Mining GPS trajectories collected from vehicles, animals and people's daily movement and public transport systems has received a growing amount of attention. In this field researchers have tried to derive knowledge for solving practical problems (e.g. traffic and transportation management systems (Min and Wynter, 2011; Krumm, 2011), animal migration and movement monitoring (Handcock et al, 2009; Ungar et al, 2005), transportation mode estimation (Zheng et al, 2010, 2008a), and location-based social networks (Zheng et al, 2012b; Li and Chen, 2009)). Beyond the promising opportunities, there are some challenging

NICTA VRL, Department of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne, Australia
Tel.: +61-405967448
E-mail: mousavi@student.unimelb.edu.au

Department of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne, Australia
Tel.: +61-383441351
E-mail: aharwood@unimelb.edu.au

Department of Computing and Information Systems, The University of Melbourne, Australia
Tel.: +61-383441351
E-mail: karus@unimelb.edu.au

School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, UNSW, Australia
Tel.: +61-383441351
E-mail: maghrebi@unsw.edu.au

issues such as GPS coverage and noise, power and communication limitations, and privacy issues that must be considered as the bottlenecks in GPS trajectories (Trajcevski, 2011).

In our research, as an overall view, we aim to develop a comprehensive scheme for location prediction in mobile object databases. As the first step in our analysis, we need to construct the time series of the mobile objects based on their GPS trajectories and the significant places which they have travelled. These significant places are called points of interest (POIs). Thus, before constructing the time series, we need to detect the location and the geometry of the POIs. We assume that the GPS trajectory datasets only contain the collected timestamp, latitude and longitude of a moving object during the data collection period. Therefore, other knowledge about the trajectory such as POIs and their geometries are not known a priori and are required to be derived from the GPS trajectory.

In this paper we propose a method to partition the trajectory area into a grid area such that each cell in the grid represents the *geometry* of one of the POIs of the moving object. We call the geometry of a point of interest (POI) as Geometry of Interest (GOI). Using the extracted GOIs and the partitioned trajectory area, we can easily extract the time series (with annotations about the POIs) by only using the geometric operator *intersection* (Bogorny et al, 2009) instead of performing the nearest neighbor query and similar methods which are only possible with a priori known POIs. The time series generation algorithm parses the trajectory chronologically and labels each GPS track point with the Identification of the visited place at each time stamp. This labeling process finds the POI or significant place that intersects with the geometry of the track point. Therefore, before performing the time series generation phase, the minimum bounding rectangle (MBR) of the trajectory is needed to be partitioned into a grid. Hence, in the first place, the time series generation method requires the accurate geometry of the POIs. Obviously, the geometries of the POIs are required not to be overlapping otherwise the intersection operator is not able to label the track points accurately. Moreover, since every GPS track point is required to be labeled by a cell ID, the whole trajectory area is required to be covered by either the geometry of the POIs or the other cells in the grid.

The quality of the extracted geometries has significant impact on the accuracy and quality of any application using the extracted time series based on that GOIs. Such applications which perform inference based on the extracted time series include location prediction (Xue et al, 2013; Song et al, 2006; Scellato

et al, 2011a; Gidófalvi and Dong, 2012), transportation systems (Sharman and Roorda, 2011; Greaves and Figliozzi, 2008), map-matching and path inference (Zheng et al, 2012a; Yuan et al, 2010; Rahmani and Koutsopoulos, 2013), vehicular networks (Zhu et al, 2011), location based social networks (Li and Chen, 2009; Xiao et al, 2014), life patterns (Ye et al, 2009; Jeung et al, 2011) animal movement analysis (Li et al, 2011; Handcock et al, 2009; Ungar et al, 2005), and the theory of Time Geography (Winter and Yin, 2011, 2010; Long and Nelson, 2013).

Aiming for that, before generating the time series, researchers partition the area of the mobile object trajectory using six approaches which are discussed in section 2. Our partitioning method discussed in this paper fits into the category of the time restricted spatio-temporal approach. The approach has two phases. Firstly, they extract the *stays* that are defined as a set of GPS observations that a moving object has stayed there for a time duration greater or equal than a predefined minimum time threshold (T_{min}) and within a predefined Euclidean vicinity distance (D_{max}). Secondly, they merge the resulting stay points to extract the destinations of the moving objects POIs (Ye et al (2009); Xiao et al (2010); Zheng et al (2009); Xiao et al (2014); Hariharan and Toyama (2004); Kang et al (2005)).

Our method improves the previous methods which use the same approach, in both stay and destination construction phases. In the stay extraction phase, we propose a novel clustering method for constructing the stay regions using the concepts of time-value and time-weighted centroid which are defined in section 4. In the destination construction phase, we propose a geometry based hierarchical agglomerative clustering method for merging the stay regions based on a geometric similarity measure. The experimental results show significant improvement in the quality of the constructed stay and destination geometries compared to the previous works.

Moreover, the related works do not explicitly partition the trajectory area. Instead, they use POI ranking and classification methods (Bhattacharya et al, 2015; Shaw et al, 2013; Lian and Xie, 2011), use the nearest neighbour queries (implicitly using partitioning methods such as Voronoi diagrams) to label the GPS trajectories with the Id of the POIs. As above mentioned, POI ranking methods and nearest neighbour query are only applicable when the coordinates of the POIs are a priori known and, therefore, do not apply to so many applications such as analysis of the movement of animals (e.g. bird or fish movement), and in places with no predefined POIs.




Fig. 1 The Results of the Spatio-Temporal Partitioning Phases.

To tackle the problem, as the *third phase*, we propose a partitioning method which divides the minimum bounding rectangle (MBR) of the mobile objects trajectory into a grid with inhomogeneous cells. The cells of the grid are either the GOIs or the fixed sized cells. Our method guarantees the characteristics of a valid spatial partitioning method. Fig 1 shows an overview of the results of the three phases of our partitioning method.

The performance of the three phases of the method is analysed based on a dataset collected from vehicles in an urban environment using cluster analysis and empirical observation. In the stay extraction phase, our method outperforms the baseline methods by making the higher number of stay regions with better geometries and more related to the real world POIs. In the destination extraction phase, the performance and the accuracy of our method are considerably higher than the baseline methods, considering the number and the geometric similarity of the geometries of the extracted destination to the real world. Moreover, our method is able to partition the trajectory area based on the extracted destinations resulting in a grid which guarantees the characteristics of a valid spatial partition.

The main contributions of this research can be summarized as follows:

- Proposing a novel spatio-temporal method to extract the GOIs of a mobile object. This method is developed to be used as a pre-processing phase in GPS trajectory data analyses.
- Proposing time-value and time-weighted centroid parameters which are effective in clustering.
- Introducing a novel agglomerative hierarchical clustering method to merge the stay regions based on

their geometric shapes and a predefined similarity coefficient.

- Developing a partitioning method to partition the trajectory area into a grid which guarantees the characteristics of a valid partition.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we discuss the research works related to our problem. In section 3, the problem is preliminarily defined. Since the proposed concepts of time-value and time-weighted centroid are addressed in the methodology section, we introduce these concepts in section 4 before discussing the methodology. In section 5.1, the related works about stay region extraction are discussed, and our proposed method for stay region extraction based on the concepts of time-value and the time-weighted centroid are discussed. In section 5.2, two methods which have been frequently used in related works are discussed, and a novel geometry based agglomerative hierarchical clustering method for merging the similar stay regions and extracting the destination geometries is introduced and compared with the two discussed related works. In section 5.3, our partitioning method which constructs a grid with inhomogeneous cells using the destination geometries constructed in the previous phase of the method is introduced. In section 6, the quality of our method compare to the related works using quantitative, and empirical observation is discussed. Finally, in section 7, the introduced method is summarized, and the achieved results and the future works are discussed.

2 Related Works

In recent years, various works have considered trajectory data pre-processing, indexing and storage and analysis (Zheng and Zhou, 2011). These trajectories could be collected by social networks (Cho et al, 2011; Scellato et al, 2011b; Ye et al, 2010), sensor networks (Ji and Zha, 2004), RFIDs (Kouroggi et al, 2006), WiFi (Song et al, 2004, 2006), accelerometer (Thiagarajan et al, 2009), internet of things (Macagnano et al, 2014), and cellular networks (Si et al, 2010; Pathirana et al, 2003). Among all of these kinds of trajectories, our work is focused on the trajectories collected by GPS sensors. GPS trajectories have been used in various research works in different applications as discussed in section 1, however, our work is a pre-processing prerequisite for all of them which attempts to extract the GOIs of each mobile objects. These GOIs and the time series generated based on them can be used by all of those applications.

In the related works in different applications the GPS trajectory data involved, there are six approaches taken in partitioning the trajectory area into a grid.

The first approach is to partition the trajectory area into a homogeneous grid to represent the regions of interest (e.g. (Xue et al, 2013)). The shape of the cells is often considered as triangular, square, rectangular, or hexagonal polygons. The main problem with this approach is the degree of granularity of the cell. Coarse granularity leads to each of the grid cells cover a wide area which might include various POIs. The fine granularity leads the geometry of one POI to lie into different cells. Obviously, these problems have significant drawbacks on the degree of the time series extracted based on such grids.

The second approach defines the POIs as the area being covered by a wireless accesspoint (Song et al, 2004, 2006) in wireless networks or the area covered by base transceiver stations (BTS) of a cellular network (Si et al, 2010; Pathirana et al, 2003; Laasonen et al, 2004). The geometries of the POIs are constructed using circular area or hexagonal polygons around the access points or the BTS. The main problem with this approach is that estimating a fixed geometry for the area covered by a wireless access point or a BTS is not straight forward due to various reasons such as signal power, noise and obstacles, particularly in the urban areas. Also, the problems, above-mentioned, related to the granularity of the covered area in this approach remains unsolved. For example, the covered area by a BTS in a cellular network might cover a very wide area which covers various POIs or a the covered area of an access point might

not cover the whole area of a POI (covered by more than one access points).

The third approach is to construct the geometries of the POIs based on the GPS track points in the trajectory datasets using simple spatial clustering methods without considering the temporal aspects of the GPS trajectories. Spatial clustering methods perform very similar to the classic clustering schemes such as KMeans (MacQueen, 1967; Ashbrook and Starner, 2003), Gaussian mixture model (GMM) (Banfield and Raftery, 1993), DBSCAN (Ester et al, 1996; Zhou et al, 2004) and hierarchical clustering methods (Jr., 1963; Sharman and Roorda, 2011). These methods simply cluster using measures such as the distance between GPS points or density connectivity in a two-dimensional Cartesian space without taking the third dimension *time* into consideration.

As the fourth approach, research works (Scellato et al, 2011a; Li et al, 2012, 2011) have used *frequency map based* spatial-temporal clustering methods for extracting significant places in the trajectory area. They partition the area into the very fine grid with equi-sized cells and assign a weight to each cell around each GPS point based on the duration of the GPS staying at that point. This weight assigned to each cell is computed based on the assumption that the real position of a mobile object has a normal distribution with standard deviation $\sigma = 10m$ (Scellato et al, 2011a). Then they generate a frequency map which contains peaks that give information about the region of significant places. They consider regions that are above a predefined visit frequency threshold as POIs. Note that, these works, involve the parameter *time* in their clustering method indirectly by considering the visit frequency of the extracted significant places. Therefore, we can call their method as *semi* spatio-temporal.

The main problem in the third and the fourth approach is the inaccuracy in the number and the geometry of the extracted POIs. They merely consider the density of the GPS track points in a neighbourhood in the trajectory area as an indicator of a significant place or a POI. This assumption that the places which have more density of the GPS track points are more significant for the user than the places with less density is not always true. Consider a mobile object often moves on a road network between its POIs regularly and repetitively. Obviously, during the journeys between the POIs, there are some places which are being visited and, therefore, have higher GPS track point density, while they are not the mobile objects POI. For example, the conjunctions with traffic lights or the road segments with high traffic load often have a high density of GPS track points in the GPS trajectories. These two approaches

consider these kinds of places as POIs because they are not able to distinguish between POIs (with high GPS track point density) and the other places with nearly the same density. The semi spatio-temporal clustering approach has the same problem because for example the conjunctions with the traffic lights often have high density and also very high visit frequency (the same or even higher than the POIs) leading to the methods not able to distinguish between POIs and the places with high visit frequency.

The fifth spatio-temporal approach is incorporating the speed restrictions in finding the stop and moves (E.g. (Palma et al, 2008; Bhattacharya et al, 2012)). This approach assumes the clusters with the GPS track points with lower speed are more likely to be stop points. This approach is not applicable in GPS datasets where the GPS speed is not available, or the speed is not easily computable (e.g. in trajectories with low sampling rate and with large time gaps). Moreover, there are some scenarios where defining a threshold for maximum speed is not straight forward. For example, assume a mobile object carrying a GPS-enabled mobile phone. During the daily travelling activities, he might have different transportation modes (e.g. walk, bike, train, car, bus, etc.) (Zheng et al, 2010, 2008a). In each of the transportation modes the speed threshold should be different since the average walking speed is different to driving. Furthermore, even if we assume the same transportation mode for the mobile object throughout the trajectory (e.g. walk), places like shopping centers, zoos, parks, campuses, and so many other POIs exist where the mobile object stays in their geometry while keeping moving (speed is greater than zero).

The sixth approach is the *time restricted* spatio-temporal clustering. Research works (Ye et al, 2009; Xiao et al, 2010; Zheng et al, 2009; Xiao et al, 2014; Hariharan and Toyama, 2004; Kang et al, 2005) perform time restricted spatio-temporal clustering methods for extracting the centroids of the destinations of mobile objects (POIs) in two phases. Firstly, they extract the stay regions based on predefined spatio-temporal restrictions, secondly, they merge the stay regions to construct the destinations. They provide a specific definition of a valid spatio-temporal cluster. A valid cluster (stay region) is a region (a vicinity distance with radius $\Delta D \leq D_{max}$) within which the mobile object has stayed (stopped or kept moving) for a time span $\Delta T \geq T_{min}$ where T_{min} , is a time span threshold. By defining these two restrictions, the methods can distinguish between POIs and the other places with high GPS track point density and visit frequency. The POIs is defined as a bounded neighbourhood with the minimum area; a mobile object stays for a considerable period

(often much longer than the time spent on the road networks and the conjunctions).

This sixth approach is highly used in research works such as (Ye et al, 2009; Xiao et al, 2010; Zheng et al, 2009, 2008b; Xiao et al, 2014) conducted in Microsoft Research Asia. Hariharan et al., in (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004) define the time and vicinity distance based on the diameter of the extracted stay regions. These works are the most relevant works to our method. However, they merely find and report destination points (centroid of the POIs) to be used in the next phase in time series extraction which is the nearest neighbour query (labeling the extracted centroid of the POIs by the name of the nearest POIs in the real world). They do not consider the geometry and shape of the POIs and anything related to the partitioning process. Moreover, our method is different to them fundamentally because we use the concept of time-weighted centroid and time-value in our clustering process.

Among all the works discussed above, in this paper, we choose two of the works proposed and used in (Ye et al, 2009) and (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004) as the baseline to compare the performance of our proposed methods in stay and destination extraction phases (discussed in 6 in detail).

Note that the above-discussed partitioning methods are useful for the applications which do not have access to the geometries or the coordinates of the centroids of the POIs. Partitioning with a priori known POIs is often done using spatial partitioning methods such as Voronoi diagrams (Aurenhammer, 1991) or the POI ranking methods (Bhattacharya et al, 2015; Alvarez et al, 2007; Shaw et al, 2013; Lane et al, 2010; Lian and Xie, 2011). Obviously, these methods are out of the focus of this paper since we aim for finding the geometries of the POIs (which we do not have any information about them a priori) by only using GPS trajectories.

3 Problem Definition

Definition 1 *The trajectory of a moving object is a sequence of time stamped GPS observations (points), $\mathcal{T} = \{p_i\}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, where $p_i = (t_i, x_i, y_i)$ indicates the spatio-temporal data of the moving object at time t_i . The parameters t_i , x_i , and y_i , are the time stamp and $(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}^2$ Cartesian plane of the moving object respectively. in our GPS trajectories, $\forall p \in \mathcal{T}$, $i, j = 1, 2, \dots$, $t_i^p > t_j^p \iff i > j$. There are no other guarantees such as constant sampling rate.*

For each point p_i in a GPS trajectory. We compute the area of the trajectory by finding its mini-

mum bounding rectangle (the smallest rectangle that contains all the GPS points of the trajectory) in the Cartesian plane $\in \mathcal{R}^2$.

As a big picture, given a GPS trajectory, our problem is to spatiotemporally partition our trajectory area into a grid with inhomogeneous cells such that it guarantees two characteristics of a validly partitioned area, as follows:

- ✓ The geometry of extracted partitions are mutually disjoint which means that there do not exist any two partitions in the partitioned area such that the area of intersection of them is greater than zero.
- ✓ The union of all the partitions, covers the whole trajectory area which means that all the GPS points in the trajectory can be assigned to one partition.

Moreover, the partitioning method must maximize the geometric similarity between the geometry of the extracted GOIs and the geometry of the POIs in the real world (discussed in section 6).

The proposed solution to this problem has three phases with three distinct problem definitions which are discussed in section 5 in detail.

4 Concept of Time-Value and Time-Weighted Centroid

In the process of collecting GPS observations which are often done by GPS devices installed on vehicles or the GPS sensors in mobile phones and other GPS-enabled devices, ideally, we would like to collect each GPS observation at predefined sample times, with constant sampling rate. For example, we would like to have one sample point every 10 seconds or every one minute. However, due to various reasons, it is not applicable. One major reason is the fact that GPS devices consume a considerable amount of power. People who carry such mobile devices usually tend to keep their GPS sensor off. This fact has a dramatic impact on the quality of the collected GPS trajectories. Another reason is poor GPS coverage in places such as urban environments and particularly in indoor locations. Besides, the process of GPS data collection is often terminated by the user at certain times. For instance, when a vehicle parks in a place and the driver turns the engine off, the GPS device goes off as well. Thus, we have a considerable duration of time for which no GPS observation has been collected. So, we have frequent and long term data loss in such trajectories.

Therefore, typically we have two types of collected GPS observations. The first type is the GPS observations that are collected in short time intervals without

significant time gap. For instance, consider a vehicle that has been moving on a motorway, and the GPS device has been collecting one sample every 10 seconds. The time difference between each point and the consecutive one (time gap) was only 10 seconds. Consider another scenario in which a vehicle has collected a sequence of GPS observation in every 10 second time interval while moving and eventually, it has reached its destination and stopped for a while (all night, parked at a house). During this time, the GPS device was turned off. Therefore, the last GPS observation that was stored in the trajectory was the very last one before or when the vehicle stopped. The time gap between this GPS observation and the consecutive one (the very first GPS observation collected after the vehicle starts again) in this scenario is significantly bigger than the first scenario. In both scenarios, we consider the time gap between these two consecutive collected GPS points as the *time-value* of the first one.

Definition 2 For a GPS point p_i in the trajectory \mathcal{T} , we define the *time-value* as:

$$tv_i^p = t_{i+1}^p - t_i^p \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, n. \quad (1)$$

where t_i^p indicates the time stamp of point p_i .

In our model, the time-value of each GPS point represents the degree of significance of that GPS point. It is obvious that the information value of the very last GPS point collected in our second scenario is much higher than the GPS points in the first scenario. In the second scenario, the last collected GPS observation represents the location of a destination or the car park near that destination or the place which the GPS signal has been lost because the moving object has entered an indoor environment of that destination. In other words, the time-value of this GPS point represents the degree of significance of that point. Therefore, we need to consider the time-value of each GPS point carefully throughout our method in the process of extracting the stay regions. We incorporate the concept of time-value of GPS points in computing the *time-weighted centroid* of stay regions.

Definition 3 The centroid $c_i = (c_i^x, c_i^y)$ of a set of points $PS = \{p_m, p_{m+1}, \dots, p_n\}$, is computed as:

$$c_i^x = \frac{\sum_{i=m}^n x_i^p}{|PS|}, \quad c_i^y = \frac{\sum_{i=m}^n y_i^p}{|PS|} \quad (2)$$

where, x_i^p and y_i^p are the x and y coordinates of point p_i , and $|PS|$ is the cardinality of the point set PS .

In Eq. 2, the values of all the GPS points are considered the same in computing the centroid. This approach

has been used in all of the related works which attempt to calculate the centroid of a set of points. Contrary to the previous works, we incorporate the time-value of each GPS point tv_i^p in computing the centroid to have the time-weighted centroid.

Definition 4 *The time-weighted centroid (twc_i^x, twc_i^y) of a set of points $PS = \{p_m, p_{m+1}, \dots, p_n\}$ is defined as:*

$$twc_i^x = \frac{\sum_{i=m}^n x_i^p \times tv_i^p}{\sum_{i=m}^n tv_i^p \times |PS|} \quad twc_i^y = \frac{\sum_{i=m}^n y_i^p \times tv_i^p}{\sum_{i=m}^n tv_i^p \times |PS|} \quad (3)$$

where, tv_i^p is the time-value of point p_i computed using Eg. 1, and $|PS|$ is the cardinality of the point set PS .

In Eq. 3, the time-value of each GPS point is considered as the weight or degree of significance of each point in computing the centroid. By this, we discriminate our GPS points in our process based on the value of information they give us about the location of the mobile object. By incorporating the time-value, the centroid will be more biased to and closer to the locations where long term stops have taken place. Obviously, when a mobile object has stopped in the car park of the house for eight hours, the centroid of the stay point must be biased to the location reported by the last GPS point collected at that car park or before entering the car park. By this, the computed centroid is much more accurate than the one that was computed by considering the same weight for all the GPS points.

This approach in computing the centroid of a set of points has a significant impact in extracting the stay regions and spatio-temporal partitioning, as will be discussed in section 5 and in section 6.

5 Methodology

5.1 Spatio-Temporal Extraction of Stay Regions

The first step in our spatio-temporal partitioning method is to extract stay regions. Aiming for that we convert the GPS trajectory into a meaningful time series composed of a sequence of *stays* and *moves*. We define a stay s_i as an *event* which has been taken place within the trajectory period of a mobile object. The event has happened in a geographical region or neighborhood called a stay region. A stay region is an area in which the mobile object spends some time $\Delta t \geq T_{min}$. During this time, the mobile object can be either moving or stopping provided that it does not pass the boundary of the region. The boundary of the region is calculated based on the roaming distance $\Delta d \leq D_{max}$

which is the maximum distance that a moving object can stray from the centroid of the stay region. The centroid of the stay region is calculated iteratively as the centroid of all the stay GPS track points. For example, if a mobile object is stopped in a car park for 8 hours starting from 9 AM to 5 PM, the event is the visit to the car park, the starting time of the event is 9 AM (arrival time) and the ending time of the event is 5 PM (departure time). The stay region is the car park area because it was within the distance threshold of the region centroid for 8 hours (more than the minimum stray time). Each stay has a set of GPS points (point set) which indicates the GPS observations which were collected within the stay period.

Definition 5 *We define stay $s_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ is defined as $s_i = (id_i, g_i, ps_i, c_i, at_i, dt_i)$, where $id_i, ps_i, g_i, c_i, at_i, dt_i$ are the identification, geometry, point set, centroid, arrival time and departure time of s_i , respectively. ps_i is a sub trajectory of the mobile object trajectory which is defined as a set of consecutive points $\{p_m, p_{m+1}, \dots, p_n\}$, where $\forall k, m < k \leq n$, $Dist(c_i, p_k) \leq D_{max}$, and $Dist(c_i, p_{n+1}) > D_{max}$ where c_i is the centroid of the points in ps_i . g_i is the polygon which the convex polygon (Andrew, 1979) of the point set ps_i .*

Notably, our approach in extracting stay points is different to the previous works (Ye et al, 2009; Xiao et al, 2010; Zheng et al, 2009, 2008b; Xiao et al, 2014) and their predecessor (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004) as follows. Firstly, in previous works, the output of the stay generation phase is only a point that is defined as the centroid of all points in ps_i . However, we consider a stay as an event happening in a geographical region with an arbitrary shape.

Secondly, the definition of a Δd in our approach is different to the related works. In (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004), Δd is defined as the Euclidean *diameter* of the coordinates of elements of a stay. This means that the diameter (the longest Euclidean distance between two points in the set) of a stay must not be greater than Δd . They iteratively add a point to the sub-trajectory p_i and recompute the diameter of p_i . If the diameter, remains less than D_{max} after adding the new point, they keep the point in p_i . Otherwise, they remove the point from p_i , close and save s_i , and start constructing a new stay. Ye et al., in (Ye et al, 2009) have taken the very first chronological point in each stay as the reference point and have defined Δd as the Euclidean distance between each new point and the reference point. They do not refresh the reference point coordinate when adding a new point to the stay. However, in our method(Alg. 1), Δd is defined as the

Algorithm 1: Time-Weighted Centroid Based Stay Region Extraction (Our Method)

```

input :  $P$  (A set of GPS points), vicinity distance
         threshold  $D_{max}$ , time span threshold  $T_{min}$ 
output: A set of Stays  $S$  where
          $s_k = (id_k, g_k, ps_k, c_k, at_k, dt_k)$ 
Data: Coordinate twc
1    $\Delta d \leftarrow 0, \Delta t \leftarrow 0, i \leftarrow 0, j \leftarrow 0, token \leftarrow 0$ 
2   foreach  $p_i \in P$  do
3   |    $p_i.tv \leftarrow \text{ComputeTimeValue}(p_i)$ 
4   |   end
5   |   while  $i < |P|$  do
6   |   |    $ps_k.insert(p_i)$ 
7   |   |    $twc \leftarrow \text{TimeWeightedCentroid}(ps_k)$ 
8   |   |    $j \leftarrow i + 1$ 
9   |   |    $token \leftarrow 0$ 
10  |   |   while  $j < |P|$  do
11  |   |   |    $\Delta d \leftarrow \text{EuclideanDistance}(twc, p_j)$ 
12  |   |   |   if  $\Delta d > D_{max}$  then
13  |   |   |   |    $\Delta t \leftarrow (t_j^p + tv_j^p) - t_i^p$ 
14  |   |   |   |   if  $\Delta t \geq T_{min}$  then
15  |   |   |   |   |    $id_k \leftarrow k$ 
16  |   |   |   |   |    $g_k \leftarrow$ 
17  |   |   |   |   |    $\text{ComputeConvexHull}(PS)$ 
18  |   |   |   |   |    $c_k \leftarrow \text{GeometryCentroid}(g_k)$ 
19  |   |   |   |   |    $at_k \leftarrow t_i^p$ 
20  |   |   |   |   |    $dt_k \leftarrow t_j^p + tv_j^p$ 
21  |   |   |   |   |    $s_k = (id_k, g_k, ps_k, c_k, at_k, dt_k)$ 
22  |   |   |   |   |    $S.insert(s_k)$ 
23  |   |   |   |   |    $i \leftarrow j$ 
24  |   |   |   |   |    $token \leftarrow 1$ 
25  |   |   |   |   |    $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
26  |   |   |   |   |   break
27  |   |   |   |   |   end
28  |   |   |   |   |    $ps_k.insert(p_j)$ 
29  |   |   |   |   |    $twc \leftarrow \text{TimeWeightedCentroid}(ps_k)$ 
30  |   |   |   |   |    $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
31  |   |   |   |   |   end
32  |   |   |   |   |   if  $token \neq 1$  then
33  |   |   |   |   |   |    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
34  |   |   |   |   |   end
35  |   |   |   |   |   end
36  |   |   |   |   |   return  $S$ 

```

Euclidian distance between the time-weighted centroid of the stay to the new point which is being examined (line 11 in Alg. 1).

Thirdly, the calculation of the parameter Δt in our method is different to the previous works. In the previous works, the parameter is defined as $\Delta t \leftarrow (t_j^p) - t_i^p$, which means the time difference of the first and the last GPS observation in the stay. In our method we incorporate the time-value of the last point (tv_j^p) and define the Δt as: $\Delta t \leftarrow (t_j^p + tv_j^p) - t_i^p$. This means that we consider the time gap between the last point and its successor point in the trajectory to compute Δt .

In our method (showed in Alg. 1), having a current stay, for each new GPS observation in the trajectory,

if the condition $\Delta d > D_{max}$ and $\Delta t > T_{min}$, are true, we close the current stay, store it, and make a new stay with the GPS observation as the first point in its point set. Otherwise, we add the new GPs observation to the point set of the current stay, update the time-weighted centroid of the current stay, and keep examining the next points in the trajectory. In other words by adding each point to the stay, we refresh the coordinate of the centroid of the stay using time-weighted centroid of the points of the current stay.

To calculate the geometry of the region g_i within which the stay s_i has taken place, we compute the convex hull of the set of points $ps_i = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$. The convex hull of a set of points is the smallest polygon that contains all of the points (Andrew, 1979). Then, we add a predefined geometric buffer around the convex hull polygon to compensate for the GPS noise. The width of the buffer is set to 10 meters (Navstar, 2008). We assign a unique numeric identification id_i to each stay s_i . We calculate the centroid (c_i) of the points in ps_i by finding the average x and y coordinates in the point set by incorporating the time-value of each point. The parameter at_i indicates the arrival time of stay s_i which is the time that the moving object has arrived in the region (g_i). The value of at_i is set as the time-stamp of the first GPS point in the point set. Similarly, dt_i is the departure time of stay s_i which is the time that the moving object has departed the region g_i . dt_i is set as the time-stamp of the last GPS point in ($p_n \in ps_i$) plus the time-value of the last point ($t_n + tv_n$).

5.1.1 Time Complexity

In the worst case, the time complexity our method is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ for n track points in the trajectory. However, in practice, since the sum of the track point of the extracted stays are considerably fewer than n , we can consider it much more efficient. Note that, the inner loop in Alg. 1 deals with computing the centroids of the stay regions which depends on the number of the track points in each stay. Since a large number of track points in the trajectory are not clustered in the stays (due to restrictions of a valid stay), the sum of the track points of the stays is much lower than n . Computing the diameter of the stays in (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004) is more complex than computing the centroid in our method, since for computing the diameter, we need to compute the distance of each point to all of the other points in the cluster with the time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$. Therefore, we can consider the complexity of the method, in the worst case, $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ for n track points in the trajectory. The time complexity of the method proposed by (Ye et al, 2009) is $\mathcal{O}(n)$ which is lower than our

method since they do not refresh the coordinate of the reference point while making the stay region.

5.2 From Stay Regions to Destination Regions

So far, we extracted all the stays in the trajectory \mathcal{T} . Assume a moving object visits a certain place every day (e.g. home). If we extract every stay throughout a trajectory period with a long time duration, e.g., one year or more, we would have at least 365 visits to that stay. As we extract the stay cluster spatiotemporally, we would have at least 365 stays with approximately the same geometry. At this stage, we need to filter the duplicated stays extracted which represent the same destination region. Aiming for that, we detect the stays that have approximately the same geometry and merge them together. After the merging phase, we will have a set of destinations with unique geometries and Identification.

Note that the geometry of the stay is not necessarily the same as the geometry of the visited place because people might park their cars near their house and not always at their house. Moreover, after entering the home car park (indoor location) the GPS coverage might be lost, or the GPS device might be switched off. So, we cannot expect the stay extractor methods to estimate the geometry of the destinations themselves.

In related works, there are two major schemes for merging the stays. In both schemes, they have a set of stay *points*. They attempt to cluster the stay points such that the stay points that have close distance are clustered into the same destination. By this, all of the stay points that represent one destination with a finite region are clustered together. By merging the stay points, we can determine the geometry of the destinations by generating the convex hull bounding each cluster. Ye et al. in research works (Ye et al, 2009) use density based clustering OPTICS (Ankerst et al, 1999). Hariharan et al. in (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004) use a hierarchical clustering method for clustering the stay points.

In this section, we introduce and analyze the two methods mentioned above and propose a novel agglomerative hierarchical clustering method that incorporates the geometry and shape of each stay in extracting the destinations. We will compare these methods based on their performance in extracting the destinations.

Ye et al. in (Ye et al, 2009), have used the density of neighbourhood of stay points in a group as a measure of similarity. In other words, the stay points which have more dense neighbours (stay points with many nearby neighbors closely packed together) make a cluster (destination) and stay points that lie alone in low-density

regions are considered as outliers and removed. After running OPTICS clustering method on the set of extracted stay points, the result is a set of destinations (each destination is a set of stay points). The centroid of each destination becomes the representative of that final destination. One major problem of density-based clustering methods such as OPTICS is the fact that we need to define two parameters: neighborhood distance ϵ (*eps*) and the minimum number of points required to form a dense region (*minPts*). The performance and output of the methods are strongly sensitive to the values chosen for these two parameters.

For instance, in our application, if we choose a relatively big value for parameter (*minPts*), the density-based clustering methods will consider lots of stay points as noise or outliers in the clustering and eliminate them because they have the lower density of neighbours than (*minPts*). Assume a stay point has been visited only twice in the time duration of our GPS trajectory and the location of these stay points is far apart from the others. Therefore, assuming centroids of the extracted stay regions (stay points) are close enough to each other, the neighborhood density of these stay points is still very low. Hence, they are highly likely to become considered as noise in the clustering and be eliminated, although the destinations represented by these stay points are very significant places in our application, and we need to have a record of the visit to them in our time series. In other words, using density-based clustering methods, we do not have enough control over how the method keeps or eliminates stay points and destinations. Unfortunately, Ye et al. (Ye et al, 2009), have only reported that OPTICS clustering method has the best performance in their experiments. They have not provided further information about the parameters that they have used in their destination extraction method and have not discussed the performance of their methods since they have considered it as a *trivial* pre-processing phase in their applications.

Hariharan et al., in (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004) have used a clustering method which tries to find each pair of stay points which have maximum similarity to each other and merge them together iteratively until there are no remaining similar pairs of clusters which have not been merged. They have defined a similarity criteria which indicates if the diameter of the resulting region of merging two stay points is less than or equal to a given upper bound threshold D_{min} (minimum merged diameter), these two stay points will be merged. This process continues until all similar stay points are merged. The result is a set of stay points which are considered as the final destinations.

Although the results of both methods discussed above were a point representing the destination (centroid), to have a coherent analysis framework in our experiments and to be able to compare these two methods with our method, we generate a convex hull for each resulting clusters of stay points (destinations) in both methods. The convex hull represents the geometry of each destination.

Algorithm 2: Geometric Similarity Based Destination Detection Method

input : A set of stay regions S , Jaccard similarity threshold J_{min} visit frequency threshold F_{min}
output: A set of destination regions D
Data: Destination d , $InterList$, $RTreeIndex$

```

1   $JSim_{max} \leftarrow 0, JSim \leftarrow 0, firstSimIndex \leftarrow 0,$   

    $secondSimIndex \leftarrow 0$ 
2  foreach  $s_i \in S$  do
3  |    $f_i \leftarrow 1$ 
4  | end
5  | while ( $JSim_{max} < J_{min}$ ) do
6  |    $RTreeIndex.Update(S)$ 
7  |    $i \leftarrow 0, JSim_{max} \leftarrow 0$ 
8  |   while ( $i < |S|$ ) do
9  |   |    $interList \leftarrow$   

10 |   |    $RTreeIndex.FindIntersectingStays(s_i)$ 
11 |   |    $j \leftarrow 0$ 
12 |   |    $JSim \leftarrow 0$ 
13 |   |    $JSim_{max} \leftarrow 0$ 
14 |   |   while ( $j < |interList|$ ) do
15 |   |   |    $JSim \leftarrow$   

16 |   |   |    $Area(g_i \cap interList[j]) / Area(g_i \cup interList[j])$ 
17 |   |   |   if ( $JSim > JSim_{max}$ ) then
18 |   |   |   |    $JSim_{max} \leftarrow JSim$ 
19 |   |   |   |    $maxIndex \leftarrow$   

20 |   |   |   |    $FindIndex(S, interList[j])$ 
21 |   |   |   end
22 |   |   |    $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
23 |   |   end
24 |   |    $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
25 |   end
26 |   if ( $JSim_{max} > J_{min}$ ) then
27 |   |    $s_i.MergePoints(s_{maxIndex})$ 
28 |   |    $g_i \leftarrow g_i \cup g_{maxIndex}$ 
29 |   |    $f_i \leftarrow f_i + f_{maxIndex}$ 
30 |   |    $S.remove(s_{maxIndex})$ 
31 |   end
32 |   else
33 |   |   break
34 |   end
35 end
36 foreach ( $d_k \in D$ ) do
37 |   if  $f_k < F_{min}$  then
38 |   |    $D.remove(d_i)$ 
39 |   end
40 end
41 return  $D$ 

```

In our method, we define a similarity measure that incorporates the geometry of each stay point in extracting the destinations. We define a criterion that helps us control our merging process in our hierarchical clustering method so that we can decide whether to merge two stay regions or not. Alg. 2 shows the pseudo-code of our method. We use an R-Tree indexing method to index the geometry of each stay $g_i \in S$. Subsequently, at each step, we send a query to the R-Tree to find only the clusters which their geometry intersects with the current stay geometry. The result is a list of stays ($interList$). Then, we compute the most similar stay geometry in $interList$ to our current stay region (g_i) in a loop. We use a similarity measure which is inspired by famous similarity measure Jaccard Similarity Coefficient (Han, 2005) which is a statistic used for comparing the similarity and diversity of sample sets. We define the similarity of two geometries (g_i, g_j) as the measure of similarity of two stay regions as follows:

$$JSimilarity(g_i, g_j) = \frac{Area(g_i \cap g_j)}{Area(g_i \cup g_j)}. \quad (4)$$

After finding the similarity of all pairs in S , if $JSim_{max} = 0$, this means that there is no intersecting pair of stay regions in S . If $JSim_{max} > 0$, then there is still, at least, a pair of interesting stay regions in S . $s_{maxIndex}$ represents the stay region that has the highest similarity to our current stay s_i in the second loop in Alg. 2. To decide whether we need to merge the current stay s_i and $s_{maxIndex}$, we compare their similarity coefficient ($JSim_{max}$) with J_{min} . If ($JSim_{max} > J_{min}$), we merge the two stays by adding all the GPS points in stay $s_{maxIndex}$ to s_i and computing the new region geometry of our current stay g_i as the geometric union of two geometries.

The condition $JSim_{max} > j_{min}$ is the key point in our algorithm. We merge two stays provided that the degree of their similarity be greater than a similarity threshold. For example, if $J_{min} = 0$, the method merges the current stay s_i with the stay with maximum intersection $s_{maxIndex}$, regardless of the similarity degree between them. If $J_{min} = 0.1$ then the method merges the current stay with $s_{maxIndex}$ only if their similarity coefficient is greater than 0.1. This means that two stay regions must be *similar enough* to be merged. By adjusting this threshold, we can decide whether to merge the stays or not. By increasing the threshold J_{min} , we reduce the chance that a pair of stays is merged and by decreasing it we increase the likelihood of two stays being merged. Notably, for instance if we set $J_{min} = 0.2$, there will be overlapping stay regions after our method terminates because there still exist overlapping stays

that have not been merged, since their similarity was lower than $J_{min} = 0.2$ although they intersect.

By adjusting this threshold, we can control the process of destination extraction. Consider a university student (mobile object) carrying a GPS-enabled mobile phone within the university campus. During a typical day, the mobile object that often visits a few places on the university campus such as different conference or lecture rooms, dining rooms, shops or their supervisors' offices. Based on the distance of the stay regions, the convex hull of the collected GPS points of each region might overlap or not. If the distances between these stay regions are very close (the university campus is in a very compact area), the probability of this overlaps increases. In this case, if we set $J_{min} = 0$, the chance that a large number of stay regions being merged increases because the method merges two intersecting stays regardless of their degree of similarity. So, the number of final extracted destination decreases dramatically and the scale or size of the extracted destination increases. Therefore, by using very low J_{min} , we lose data granularity because we merge so many stay regions and make fewer destinations with more coarse granularity. For example, if the student goes to the dining room that is close to his lecture room and stays there for 10 minutes ($\geq \mathcal{T}_{min}$), the two stay regions will be highly likely merged and the data about a valid visit to the dining room will be lost in our final extracted time series based on the extracted destinations and the GPS trajectory.

On the other hand, if we choose a high value for J_{min} , the likelihood of two intersecting and overlapping stay regions being merged decreases. So, we will have finer granularity in our resulting destinations. In this case, the dining room and the lecturing room might be distinguished and separated in the final destinations set. Note that, if we use a very high value for J_{min} , our final Destination-Grid will be very fine. If the grid becomes very fine, we will have new problems because we will have so many extracted destinations that were not separate in the real world. This means that the method might not merge the stay regions that was related to the same destination. This will also make serious problems in our resulting time series.

After merging stay region pairs, we compute the visit frequency of the resulting stay region as the sum of visit frequency of the current stay f_i and the most similar stay region $s_{maxIndex}$. As the last step in destination extraction method, we remove the stay region $s_{maxIndex}$ since it has been already merged to s_i . We consider the frequency of visits to each destination as a useful criterion for the extraction of the significant destinations (POIs). As a result, we can decide whether we consider a cluster of stay regions (destination) as a

POI or consider it as a trivial cluster (noise). The last loop in Alg. 2 removes the destinations which have been visited with the frequency less than F_{min} .

Fig. 2 clearly shows the impact of different values of J_{min} in the destination extraction method. Fig. 2(a) shows the stay regions extracted from the previous phase in a chosen area in a very larger area. As it is evident, there are a large number of stays that have intersections and overlaps. Fig. 2(b) shows the destination extraction results with parameter $J_{min} = 0$. As a result, the method has merged all the intersecting cells and made only two destinations with coarse granularity. $J_{min} = 0.1$ results in Fig. 2(c). Since the similarity degree of two bigger clusters on the top of the picture was less than 0.1, two areas have not been merged although they intersect. By increasing J_{min} to higher values, the number of destinations increases and a large number of overlapping destinations remain separated. Fig. 2(d) shows an interesting result of the method. As we can see, there is a small area inside the bigger area at the top. The small area is completely covered by the bigger area. However, because the similarity of them is lower than $J_{min} = 0.2$, they have not been merged. This shows that the method is able to separate an area which was covered by a bigger area. As an example in the real world, we can consider a lecture room area (small area) inside a university campus (bigger area).

Notably, if we set J_{min} as a larger value near 1, we will have many stay regions representing the same stay regions that are not merged. Interestingly, if we set $J_{min} = 1$, we will have exactly all the stay regions as destination regions because the probability that two stay regions have identical convex hulls (and accordingly $JSim = 1$) is approximately zero.

5.2.1 Time Complexity

Zheng et al., in (Ye et al, 2009) have used OPTICS (Ankerst et al, 1999) clustering method to cluster the centroid of the stay regions to extract the destination regions. The time complexity of OPTICS algorithm is $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ with and $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ without spatial indexing.

The time complexity of the hierarchical clustering method provided by Hariharan et al. (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004) is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ in the worst case. Since the method uses simple geometric operators such as nearest neighbour and diameter calculation, the runtime of the method is acceptable.

The complexity of our method (Alg. 2) in the worst case, is $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$. However, we use R-Tree indexing method to reduce the runtime of our method in finding the intersecting cells. We perform the internal search (to find the most similar geometry to the cur-




Fig. 2 Results of the Destination Extraction Phase With Different Values of J_{min} .

rent geometry) by searching only the intersecting cells instead of searching the whole space of the geometries. The most costly part in our method is finding the degree of similarity between two geometries (Eq. 4). Finding the geometry of the intersection and the union of two geometries are costly geometric operators which can not be facilitated by methods such as spatial indexing.

5.3 From Destination Regions to Geometries of Interest (GOIs)

So far, we have extracted the list of destination regions and estimated their geometries. In this stage, we need to partition our trajectory area into a grid area with inhomogeneous cells such that the two characteristics of a valid partitioning are guaranteed (discussed in section 3).

Aiming for that, firstly, we make a grid area with equi-sized rectangular shaped cells with very fine granularity (e.g. 1 million cells). The grid covers the area minimum bounding rectangle (MBR) of our GPS trajectory \mathcal{T} . We name this grid *Micro-Grid* (MG). Then we make a grid with inhomogeneous cells by considering the geometry of each destination region in D as a cell. We name this grid *Destination-Grid* (DG). The problem here is how to convert the Destination-Grid (DG) to the resulting grid called *GOI-Grid* (GG) with mutually disjoint cells. To do so, we make an R-Tree index for the DG cells. This R-tree will be used to facilitate and improve the efficiency of the next steps of the method. For each cell in Micro-Grid ($m_i \in MG$), we find the cell in DG ($d_j \in DG$) which maximizes the *geometric similarity* with m_i . The similarity metrics we use is inspired by Jaccard similarity (JS) similar to what defined in Eq. 4.

We also defined and examined another geometric similarity metric as the Euclidean distance of the centroid of the polygon of a cell in Micro-Grid (c_i^m) to the centroid of the geometry of the polygon of the cell in Destination-Grid (c_j^d). We call this geometric similarity as Polygon Centroid Similarity (PCS). Formally:

$$PCS(m_i, d_j) = \frac{1}{EucDistance(c_i^m, c_j^d)}.$$

Then for each cell $m_i \in MG$, we find $d_j \in DG$ which maximizes the Geometric Similarity (GS). Formally:

$$d_j \in DG = \operatorname{argmax}_{d_j} GS(c_i, d_j).$$

Next, we label m_i as a cell that represents a tiny part of the destination d_j in the Destination-Grid and add it to the GOI-Grid. We continue this process until there are no remaining cells in MG which have an intersection with any of the cells in DG . Formally,

$$\forall m_i \in MG, \nexists d_j \in DG \mid Area(m_i \cap d_j) > 0.$$

Now, we have our GOI-Grid with a very fine granularity where each cell is labeled as part of a destination geometry. By merging the geometries of all the cells labeled as a part of each cell in DG , we make the GOI-Grid (depicted in Fig 3(d)). Since we find the most similar destination for each cell $m_i \in MG$, we only label it to be a part of the geometry of only one destination in DG . Therefore, it is impossible for a cell in GOI-Grid to be a part of more than one destination. Therefore, all the cells in the Final-Grid are geometrically disjoint.

Fig. 3(d) and Fig. 3(c) show the performance of both geometric similarity metrics. As is clearly seen, the resulting GOI-Grid using JS resembles the Destination-Grid much better because the PCS method is biased to the centroid of the polygon and makes the shape of the




Fig. 3 Partitioning Results Using Two Geometric Similarity Metrics.

resulting polygon less similar to the corresponding cell in the Destination-Grid.

Although our Final-Grid is disjoint and, therefore, guarantees the first condition of a valid spatial condition, the grid does not cover all of the area of the minimum bounding rectangle of the trajectory. This means that there might be a GPS observation that does not lie in the geometry of one of the current GOI-Grid cells. To tackle this problem, we insert all the cells $m_i \in MG$, which were not already labeled, into the GOI-Grid resulting in the Final-Grid. This results in, all of the area of the MBR of the trajectory \mathcal{T} being covered by either the cells of GOI-Grid or the cells of the Micro-Grid in the Final-Grid.

5.3.1 Time Complexity

In the process of assigning each of the cells in Micro-Grid to the cells in GOI-Grid, the method finds the most geometrically similar destination (in Destination-Grid) using the geometric similarity measure (Eq. 4). Therefore, in the worst case the complexity of the method is $\mathcal{O}(nm)$, where n is the number of cells in the Micro-Grid and m is the number of cells in the Destination-Grid. Therefore, the granularity of the Micro-Grid has a significant impact on the runtime of our method. To increase the efficiency of the method we use R-Tree indexing to index the cells in the Destination-Grid. Then for each cell in the Micro-Grid, we find maximum geometrically similar destination among the intersecting destinations. Thus, it is not required to search all the destinations in the Destination-Grid to find the most similar destination.

6 Experimental Evaluation

In this section, we analyze the performance of our proposed method in comparison with methods proposed in (Ye et al, 2009) and (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004) in three phases of the method. In our research, we use a set of GPS trajectories collected from mobile objects in real world. The dataset is collected in Anchorage, Alaska, USA as a part of the project FreeSim (Miller and Horowitz, 2007; Miller, 2009b,a). The trajectory we use in our experiments in this paper has been collected from a vehicle for the duration of about 42 months from 2010 to 2013 with varying sampling rate from one sample every 10 seconds to one sample every two minutes. We implemented all the methods in our Java-based framework called Mobility Analyser. We used ELKI machine learning library (Schubert et al, 2015), to implement the OPTICS clustering algorithm in the destination extraction phase.


6.1 Stay Extraction Experimental Results

We implemented the method depicted in Alg. 1 and three methods proposed in (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004), and (Ye et al, 2009). We set parameters $D_{max} = 100meters$ and $T_{min} = 60min$ in our experimental analysis. We set the $Diameter_{min} = 200meters$ in the Diameter based method.


Tables 1 shows a comparison of the experimental results for each stay extraction method run on the trajectory. As it is clearly seen, our time-weighted clustering method outperforms the other two methods in the number of extracted clusters. Moreover, our method detects and report the stay regions with single point while the other methods simply lose the stay regions.

Stay Extraction Method	Number of Extracted Stay Regions	Number of Single Sized Stay Regions
Reference Point Based (Ye et al, 2009)	3568	0
Diameter Based (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004)	3587	0
Time-Weighted Centroid Based (Our Method)	4127	292


Table 1 Spatio-temporal Stay Region Extraction Results ($T_{min} = 60min$)




(a) Map of the Selected Area in Anchorage, Alaska, USA (Mapnik)



(b) Diameter Based Stay Extraction Method ($T_{min} = 60min, Diam_{max} = 200m$)



(c) Reference Point Based Based Stay Extraction Method ($T_{min} = 60min, Diam_{max} = 200m$)



(d) Time-Weighted Centroid Based Stay Extraction Method ($T_{min} = 60min, D_{max} = 100m$)

Fig. 4 Stay Region Extraction Results

As the second criteria for evaluating the stay region detection methods, we use empirical observation to compare the performance of our stay region extraction method with the other two methods. Fig. 4 shows a visual perspective of the extracted stay regions by each stay region extraction method discussed above in a selected area of the main GPS trajectory. We selected this particular region (Fig. 4(a)) because it contains visual clearly depicted places which indicate the car parks. We consider the car parks as the highly potential places which a vehicle stops when visiting a place in the neighbourhood. Therefore, we consider their geometries as the ground truth for empirical observation. We cropped the GPS trajectory only to cover the selected area by removing all the GPS track point lie outside the geometry of the selected area.

As it is seen in Fig. 4(b), the extracted stay regions by diameter based method does not have acceptable results. Although the exacted stay regions intersect with the car park regions, however, they cover the considerable areas outside the ca parks. The Geolife stay extraction method depicted in Fig. 4(c) has much better performance compared to diameter based method since most of the extracted stay regions intersect with the car parks. However, in the left bottom side of the area, irregular and not relevant stays (according to the car park geometries) are evident. Fig. 4(d) shows the extracted stays using our proposed method. Although there are some minor stay regions extracted outside the car parks geometries (in places the same as those in Fig. 4(c)), the extracted stay regions are more compact and more reg-

ular and more biased to the car parks geometries than those in Fig 4(c).

The first reason which leads our method to perform better is that our method detects the clusters with only one member (stay regions with only one GPS track point). Table 1 shows that our method has extracted 292 clusters or stay regions with only one member. This is since the other three methods need at least two GPS points in a cluster to make a valid cluster which has the duration greater than T_{min} with vicinity distance D_{max} . However, there are considerable cases in the real world that a mobile object stays in vicinity distance D_{max} for a time greater than T_{min} but and the subsequent GPS point lies outside the vicinity distance. In these cases, we can consider the stay at the stop point as a cluster with a single member (stay with single GPS track point) because it guarantees both conditions of a valid stay ($\Delta t \geq T_{min}$ and D_{max} and $\Delta d > D_{max}$). All three previous methods compute the value of Δt as the time distance between two consecutive points. However, our method (Alg. 1), incorporates the time-value of the current track point in computing the Δt as $(t_j^p + tv_j^p) - t_i^p$. The time-value of the current track point compensated the cases where the next point lies outside the current stay region but the time distance is long enough, leading to the stay point with only one track point being detected.

The second reason is, similarly, there are other clusters which have members more than one but the time duration of the stay by considering the time-value of the last point in the cluster ($\Delta t \leftarrow (t_j^p + tv_j^p) - t_i^p$) becomes greater or equal to T_{min} . In this cases, our method extracts these kinds of clusters while the other two methods are not capable of extracting them.

The third reason is the use of the time-weighted centroid as the reference point instead of a considering a point in (Ye et al, 2009; Xiao et al, 2014). Considering time-value in computing the time-weighted centroid leads to the points with long stops having more weight in computing the centroids and making the resulting centroids more biased to the real places. Since the diameter based method (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004) does not use a centroid point or a reference point and instead uses the diameter of the stay region as the condition of a valid stay, it performs much less accurate than both methods and extracts fewer stay regions.

6.2 Destination Extraction Experimental Results


In this section, we examine and compare our method with two destination extraction methods using the same cropped GPS trajectory discussed in 6.1 which covers the selected area depicted in 4(a).

Table 2 shows the results for three methods for the same trajectory analysed in section 6.1. We set parameter $F_{min} = 1$ for our method (Geometric Similarity Based) and $T_{min} = 60min$ for all of the methods. It is evident that the parameters $Diameter_{min}$, $minPts$, and J_{min} have a significant impact on the number of extracted destinations in the three methods. In the diameter based method, the larger $Diameter_{min}$ leads to a fewer number of destinations since destinations with the larger area are constructed. The parameter $minPts$ has a significant impact on the number and the geometry of the density based method. The higher $minPts$ leads to a fewer number of destinations. The greater J_{min} in our method leads to higher number of destinations.


Although table 6.2 provided useful information about the number of the extracted destinations by each of the methods, it does not provide more information about the quality of the extracted destination geometries.

Another way for analysis of the performance of our method compared to the other methods is to visualise the extracted destination on the map. Aiming for that we use the same cropped trajectory we used in section 6.1 (the selected area is showed in Fig. 4(a)). Fig. 5 shows the results of the destination extraction methods. As it is evident the diameter based method (Fig. 5(a)) does not have acceptable performance in extracting the geometries of the destinations. Although the extracted destinations do cover the car parks, they have areas much larger than the car park areas, and also, they have significant overlaps. Density based method has more acceptable performance than diameter based. However, it loses some car parks. Moreover, it covers places not related to the car parks. For example, the destination depicted in the very bottom of Fig. 5(b) shows a destination which is constructed on the road network instead of the car park. Fig. 5(c) shows the destinations extracted by our geometric similarity based method. Comparing the destinations depicted in Fig. 5(c) with the other two methods shows much better accuracy in our method. Our method has constructed destination regions with much more acceptable geometric similarity to the car parks. They intersect with almost all the car parks which the mobile object has visited according to its trajectory.

To analyse the effect of J_{min} , the geometric based destination extraction method is run using two values for J_{min} . Figures 5(c) and 5(e) show the destination extraction results using $J_{min} = 0$ and $J_{min} = 0.1$ respectively. As it is evident in the figures, the value $J_{min} = 0$ leads to all the geometries of all the destinations being disjoint. By setting J_{min} to values more than zero, there



(a) Diameter Based Destination Extraction Method ($T_{min} = 60min, Diameter_{max} = 300m$)




(b) Density Based Destination Extraction Method ($T_{min} = 60min, D_{max} = 100m, minPts = 6, eps = 100m$)



(c) Geometric Similarity Based Destination Extraction Method ($T_{min} = 60min, D_{max} = 100m, J_{min} = 0, F_{min} = 1$)




(d) Geometric Similarity Based Method ($T_{min} = 60min, D_{max} = 100m, J_{min} = 0, F_{min} = 6$)



(e) Geometric Similarity Based Destination Extraction Method ($T_{min} = 60min, D_{max} = 100m, J_{min} = 0.10, F_{min} = 1$)



(f) Geometric Similarity Based Method ($T_{min} = 60min, D_{max} = 100m, J_{min} = 0.10, F_{min} = 6$)



(g) GOI Grid, Geometric Similarity Based Method ($T_{min} = 60min, D_{max} = 100m, J_{min} = 0.10, F_{min} = 6$)



(h) Final-Grid, Geometric Similarity Based Method ($T_{min} = 60min, D_{max} = 100m, J_{min} = 0.10, F_{min} = 6$)

Fig. 5 Destination-Grid, GOI-Grid and Final-Grid Extraction Results

Destination Extraction Method	Parameters	Number of Stays	Number of Destinations
Diameter Based (Hariharan and Toyama, 2004)	$Diameter_{min} = 200m$	3587	304
Diameter Based	$Diameter_{min} = 300m$	3587	166
Diameter Based	$Diameter_{min} = 400m$	3587	128
Diameter Based	$Diameter_{min} = 500m$	3587	92
Density Based (Ye et al, 2009)	$eps = 100m, minPts = 3$	3566	456
Density Based	$eps = 100m, minPts = 6$	3566	206
Density Based	$eps = 100m, minPts = 9$	3566	120
Density Based	$eps = 100m, minPts = 12$	3566	79
Geometric Similarity Based (Our Method)	$J_{min} = 0$	4127	364
Geometric Similarity Based	$J_{min} = 0.05$	4127	434
Geometric Similarity Based	$J_{min} = 0.10$	4127	490
Geometric Similarity Based	$J_{min} = 0.15$	4127	549

Table 2 Destination Regions Extraction Results ($T_{min} = 60min, F_{min} = 1$)

might be intersecting destination regions in the results. Also, by setting the parameter J_{min} to higher values in the distance $(0, 1)$ the number of the destinations increases. The value $J_{min} = 1$ leads the number of the extracted destinations to be the same as the number of the stays being merged.

Figures 5(c) and 5(e) show the extracted destinations with $F_{min} = 1$. Figures 5(d) and 5(f) show the extracted destinations with $F_{min} = 6$. Comparison of the figures clearly shows the effect of parameter F_{min} in our destination extraction method. The destinations with fewer visit frequencies have been eliminated from the Destination-Grids, and only the destinations which have the highest intersection and the most geometric similarity to car park areas have been left.

Moreover, Comparing two figures 5(d) and 5(f) show the effect of the value of J_{min} on the extracted destinations. The extracted destinations in both figures are quite similar except for the destination in the middle of the area. Fig. 5(d) has merged the area of the two neighbouring car parks together while Fig. 5(f) has extracted two distinct geometries for the same destination. This shows the better performance of the method with parameter $J_{min} = 0.1$. A closer scrutiny shows that the similarity of the other destinations to the corresponding car parks is slightly higher than in Fig 5(f) since it the method filtered out the stay regions not quite relevant to the car parks better than the method with $J_{min} = 0$.

Fig. 5(g) and Fig. 5(h) show the final results of our partitioning process. After extracting the stay regions and extracting the destination geometries by merging the stay regions, we construct the GOI and Final-Grids using our partitioning method discussed in 5.3. The GOI-Grid, which is the result of the partitioning the trajectory area based on the destinations in Fig. 5(f) is showed in Fig. 5(g). It is clearly seen that the partitioning method has resolved the problem of two desti-

nations having a geometric intersection. The two destination regions in the middle of the Fig. 5(f) have been partitioned into two distinct cells in GOI-Grid without having any intersection.

The Final-Grid is depicted in Fig. 5(h). The Final-Grid is the last result of our partitioning. It guarantees two characteristics of a valid partition. It covers all the trajectory area which leads to the time series generator method be able to label all the GPS track points regardless of the fact that they intersect with a GOI or not. The cells in the Final-Grid do not overlap since each cell in the Micro Grid is assigned to only one cell in the GOI-Grid. The union of all the Final-Grid cell makes the minimum bounding rectangle of the trajectory area.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

The problem of extracting the geometries of points of interest of mobile objects (GOIs) has been overlooked in the related works and only been consider as a minor pre-processing phase in the applications which deal with trajectory data. In this paper, we proposed and analyzed a novel and comprehensive method for spatio-temporal partitioning of the areas of a trajectory of a moving object. To the best of our knowledge, this research is the only research work which covers all the steps of the spatio-temporal partitioning while it outperforms the performance of the state-of-the-art. This research shows that the previous commonly used destination extraction methods do not perform acceptably, and it is required to be addressed with more attention. For the future work, We will focus on improving the performance and the accuracy of our proposed partitioning methods by using the data aggregation and outlier detection techniques. We will apply the method as a

pre-processing phase in our location prediction method in GPS trajectories and analyse the methods effect on the quality of the generated time series and the performance of the location prediction methods.

Acknowledgement

A version of this technical report has been submitted to the Springer Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing (Springer, 2016) and it is under review.

References

- Alvares LO, Bogorny V, Kuijpers B, de Macedo JAF, Moelans B, Vaisman A (2007) A model for enriching trajectories with semantic geographical information. In: Proceedings of the 15th Annual ACM International Symposium on Advances in Geographic Information Systems, ACM, New York, NY, USA, GIS '07, pp 22:1–22:8
- Andrew A (1979) Another efficient algorithm for convex hulls in two dimensions. *Information Processing Letters* 9(5):216 – 219
- Ankerst M, Breunig MM, Kriegel HP, Sander J (1999) Optics: ordering points to identify the clustering structure. In: *ACM Sigmod Record*, ACM, vol 28, pp 49–60
- Ashbrook D, Starner T (2003) Using gps to learn significant locations and predict movement across multiple users. *Personal and Ubiquitous Computing* 7(5):275–286
- Aurenhammer F (1991) Voronoi diagrams—a survey of a fundamental geometric data structure. *ACM Comput Surv* 23(3):pp. 345–405
- Banfield JD, Raftery AE (1993) Model-based gaussian and non-gaussian clustering. *Biometrics* pp 803–821
- Bhattacharya T, Kulik L, Bailey J (2012) Extracting significant places from mobile user gps trajectories: A bearing change based approach. In: Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems, ACM, New York, NY, USA, SIGSPATIAL '12, pp 398–401
- Bhattacharya T, Kulik L, Bailey J (2015) Automatically recognizing places of interest from unreliable {GPS} data using spatio-temporal density estimation and line intersections. *Pervasive and Mobile Computing* 19:pp. 86 – 107
- Bogorny V, Kuijpers B, Alvares LO (2009) St-dmql: a semantic trajectory data mining query language. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* 23(10):1245–1276
- Cho E, Myers SA, Leskovec J (2011) Friendship and mobility: User movement in location-based social networks. In: Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, ACM, New York, NY, USA, KDD '11, pp 1082–1090
- Ester M, Kriegel H, S J, Xu X (1996) A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise. AAAI Press, pp 226–231
- Gidófalvi G, Dong F (2012) When and where next: individual mobility prediction. In: *MobiGIS*, pp 57–64
- Greaves S, Figliozzi M (2008) Collecting commercial vehicle tour data with passive global positioning system technology: Issues and potential applications. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* 2049:158–166
- Han J (2005) *Data Mining: Concepts and Techniques*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA
- Handcock RN, Swain DL, Bishop-Hurley GJ, Patison KP, Wark T, Valencia P, Corke P, O'Neill CJ (2009) Monitoring animal behaviour and environmental interactions using wireless sensor networks, gps collars and satellite remote sensing. *Sensors* 9(5):pp. 3586–3603
- Hariharan R, Toyama K (2004) Project lachesis: Parsing and modeling location histories. In: Egenhofer M, Freksa C, Miller H (eds) *Geographic Information Science, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 3234, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp 106–124
- Jeung H, Yiu ML, Jensen CS (2011) Trajectory pattern mining. In: *Computing with Spatial Trajectories*, pp 143–177
- Ji X, Zha H (2004) Sensor positioning in wireless ad-hoc sensor networks using multidimensional scaling. In: *INFOCOM 2004. Twenty-third Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies*, vol 4, pp 2652–2661 vol.4
- Jr JHW (1963) Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 58(301):236–244
- Kang JH, Welbourne W, Stewart B, Borriello G (2005) Extracting places from traces of locations. *SIGMOBILE Mob Comput Commun Rev* 9(3):58–68
- Kouroggi M, Sakata N, Okuma T, Kurata T (2006) Indoor/outdoor pedestrian navigation with an embedded gps/rfid/self-contained sensor system. In: Pan Z, Cheok A, Haller M, Lau R, Saito H, Liang R (eds) *Advances in Artificial Reality and Tele-Existence, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 4282, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp 1310–1321
- Krumm J (2011) Trajectory analysis for driving. In: *Computing with Spatial Trajectories*, pp 213–241

- Laasonen K, Raento M, Toivonen H (2004) Adaptive on-device location recognition. In: Ferscha A, Matern F (eds) *Pervasive Computing, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 3001, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp 287–304
- Lane ND, Lymberopoulos D, Zhao F, Campbell AT (2010) Hapori: Context-based local search for mobile phones using community behavioral modeling and similarity. In: *Proceedings of the 12th ACM International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, UbiComp '10, pp 109–118
- Li N, Chen G (2009) Analysis of a location-based social network. In: *Computational Science and Engineering, 2009. CSE '09. International Conference on*, vol 4, pp 263–270
- Li Z, Han J, Ji M, Tang LA, Yu Y, Ding B, Lee JG, Kays R (2011) Movemine: Mining moving object data for discovery of animal movement patterns. *ACM TIST* 2(4):pp. 37–57
- Li Z, Han J, Ding B, Kays R (2012) Mining periodic behaviors of object movements for animal and biological sustainability studies. *Data Min Knowl Discov* 24(2):pp. 355–386
- Lian D, Xie X (2011) Learning location naming from user check-in histories. In: *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, GIS '11, pp 112–121
- Long J, Nelson T (2013) A review of quantitative methods for movement data. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SCIENCE* 27(2):pp. 292 – 318
- Macagnano D, Destino G, Abreu G (2014) Indoor positioning: A key enabling technology for iot applications. In: *Internet of Things (WF-IoT), 2014 IEEE World Forum on*, pp 117–118
- MacQueen J (1967) Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Statistics*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Calif., pp 281–297
- Miller J (2009a) Dynamically computing fastest paths for intelligent transportation systems. *Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, IEEE 1(1):pp. 20–26
- Miller J (2009b) Fastest path analysis in a vehicle-to-infrastructure intelligent transportation system architecture. In: *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, 2009 IEEE*, pp 1125–1130
- Miller J, Horowitz E (2007) Freesim - a free real-time freeway traffic simulator. In: *Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference, 2007. ITSC 2007. IEEE*, pp 18–23
- Min W, Wynter L (2011) Real-time road traffic prediction with spatio-temporal correlations. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 19(4):pp. 606 – 616
- Navstar G (2008) Gps standard positioning service (sps). URL <http://www.gps.gov/technical/ps/2008-SPS-performance-standard.pdf>
- Palma AT, Bogorny V, Kuijpers B, Alvares LO (2008) A clustering-based approach for discovering interesting places in trajectories. In: *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, SAC '08, pp 863–868
- Pathirana PN, Savkin AV, Jha S (2003) Mobility modelling and trajectory prediction for cellular networks with mobile base stations. In: *Proceedings of the 4th ACM International Symposium on Mobile Ad Hoc Networking & Computing*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, MobiHoc '03, pp 213–221
- Rahmani M, Koutsopoulos HN (2013) Path inference from sparse floating car data for urban networks. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 30:pp. 41 –54
- Scellato S, Musolesi M, Mascolo C, Latora V, Campbell AT (2011a) Nextplace: A spatio-temporal prediction framework for pervasive systems. In: *Pervasive*, pp 152–169
- Scellato S, Noulas A, Mascolo C (2011b) Exploiting place features in link prediction on location-based social networks. In: *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, KDD '11, pp 1046–1054
- Schubert E, Koos A, Emrich T, Züfle A, Schmid KA, Zimek A (2015) A framework for clustering uncertain data. *PVLDB* 8(12):1976–1987
- Sharman B, Roorda M (2011) Analysis of freight global positioning system data: Clustering approach for identifying trip destinations. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* (2246):83–91
- Shaw B, Shea J, Sinha S, Hogue A (2013) Learning to rank for spatiotemporal search. In: *Proceedings of the Sixth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, WSDM '13, pp 717–726
- Si H, Wang Y, Yuan J, Shan X (2010) Mobility prediction in cellular network using hidden markov model. In: *Consumer Communications and Networking Conference (CCNC), 2010 7th IEEE*, pp 1–5
- Song L, Kotz D, Jain R, He X (2004) Evaluating location predictors with extensive wi-fi mobility data. In: *INFOCOM 2004. Twenty-third Annual Joint Con-*

- ference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies, vol 2, pp 1414–1424 vol.2
- Song L, Deshpande U, Kozat U, Kotz D, Jain R (2006) Predictability of wlan mobility and its effects on bandwidth provisioning. In: INFOCOM 2006. 25th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications. Proceedings, pp 1–13
- Springer (2016) Journal of ambient intelligence and humanized computing. URL <http://www.springer.com/engineering/computational+intelligence+and+complexity/journal/12652>
- Thiagarajan A, Ravindranath L, LaCurts K, Madden S, Balakrishnan H, Toledo S, Eriksson J (2009) Vtrack: accurate, energy-aware road traffic delay estimation using mobile phones. In: Proceedings of the 7th ACM Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems, ACM, New York, NY, USA, SenSys '09, pp 85–98
- Trajcevski G (2011) Uncertainty in spatial trajectories. In: Computing with Spatial Trajectories, pp 63–107
- Ungar ED, Henkin Z, Gutman M, Dolev A, Genizi A, Ganskopp D (2005) Inference of animal activity from gps collar data on free-ranging cattle. *Rangeland Ecology & Management* 58(3):pp. 256–266
- Winter S, Yin ZC (2010) Directed movements in probabilistic time geography. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* 24(9):pp. 1349–1365
- Winter S, Yin ZC (2011) The elements of probabilistic time geography. *GeoInformatica* 15(3):pp. 417–434
- Xiao X, Zheng Y, Luo Q, Xie X (2010) Finding similar users using category-based location history. In: Proceedings of the 18th SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems, ACM, New York, NY, USA, GIS '10, pp 442–445
- Xiao X, Zheng Y, Luo Q, Xie X (2014) Inferring social ties between users with human location history. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing* 5(1):pp. 3–19
- Xue AY, Zhang R, Zheng Y, Xie X, Huang J, Xu Z (2013) Destination prediction by sub-trajectory synthesis and privacy protection against such prediction. In: IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE 2013), IEEE
- Ye M, Yin P, Lee WC (2010) Location recommendation for location-based social networks. In: Proceedings of the 18th SIGSPATIAL International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems, ACM, New York, NY, USA, GIS '10, pp 458–461
- Ye Y, Zheng Y, Chen Y, Feng J, Xie X (2009) Mining individual life pattern based on location history. In: Mobile Data Management: Systems, Services and Middleware, 2009. MDM '09. Tenth International Conference on, pp 1–10
- Yuan J, Zheng Y, Zhang C, Xie X, Sun GZ (2010) An interactive-voting based map matching algorithm. In: Proceedings of the 2010 Eleventh International Conference on Mobile Data Management, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, MDM '10, pp 43–52
- Zheng K, Zheng Y, Xie X, Zhou X (2012a) Reducing uncertainty of low-sampling-rate trajectories. In: Proceedings of the 2012 IEEE 28th International Conference on Data Engineering, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, ICDE '12, pp 1144–1155
- Zheng VW, Zheng Y, Xie X, Yang Q (2012b) Towards mobile intelligence: Learning from {GPS} history data for collaborative recommendation. *Artificial Intelligence* 184185:pp. 17–37
- Zheng Y, Zhou X (eds) (2011) Computing with Spatial Trajectories. Springer
- Zheng Y, Li Q, Chen Y, Xie X, Ma WY (2008a) Understanding mobility based on gps data. In: Proceedings of the 10th international conference on Ubiquitous computing, ACM, New York, NY, USA, UbiComp '08, pp 312–321
- Zheng Y, Li Q, Chen Y, Xie X, Ma WY (2008b) Understanding mobility based on gps data. In: Proceedings of the 10th international conference on Ubiquitous computing, ACM, New York, NY, USA, UbiComp '08, pp 312–321
- Zheng Y, Zhang L, Xie X, Ma WY (2009) Mining interesting locations and travel sequences from gps trajectories. In: Proceedings of the 18th international conference on World wide web, ACM, New York, NY, USA, WWW '09, pp 791–800
- Zheng Y, Chen Y, Li Q, Xie X, Ma WY (2010) Understanding transportation modes based on gps data for web applications. *ACM Trans Web* 4(1):1:1–1:36
- Zhou C, Frankowski D, Ludford P, Shekhar S, Terveen L (2004) Discovering personal gazetteers: An interactive clustering approach. In: Proceedings of the 12th Annual ACM International Workshop on Geographic Information Systems, ACM, New York, NY, USA, GIS '04, pp 266–273
- Zhu K, Niyato D, Wang P, Hossain E, In Kim D (2011) Mobility and handoff management in vehicular networks: a survey. *Wireless communications and mobile computing* 11(4):pp. 459–476