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Hubs, or central trans-shipment facilities, allow the construction of a network where large numbers of direct connections can be replaced with fewer, indirect connections. Hub-and-spoke configurations reduce and simplify network construction costs, centralize commodity handling and sorting, and allow carriers to take advantage of scale economies through consolidation of flows. Such networks have widespread application in transportation. This paper presents a structured review of research on the hub network design problem. Three critical design questions need to be considered: (a) are the nodes in the network assigned exclusively to a single hub? (b) are direct node-to-node linkages permitted to bypass the hub facilities? and, (c) are the hub facilities fully interconnected? The nature and difficulty of the hub network design problem depends on the analyst’s judgement with respect to these questions. We review analytical research papers, and give brief empirical examples of eight different network design protocols.

Keywords: hub and spoke, network design, location
switching operation which is the basis for the definitions in this paper. For the FAA the term hub is taken to mean a geographical area, classified on the basis of the percentage of total passengers enplaned in that area. For example, in the 1991 Airport activity statistics publication, the FAA defined a large hub in 1991 as an area which enplaned at least 4 283 192 passengers (ie at least 1% of total passengers). These large hubs accounted for 28 community areas, with 55 airports, and enplaned 73.16% of all passengers (see also Shaw, 1993, p. 48; and Dempsey and Goetz, 1992).

In package delivery systems, such as United Parcel Service, the hub terminology is used to denote almost all major sorting centres. The company, in 1992, had over 2250 operating facilities; of these, over 200 are identified as hubs! Clearly, however, their major air hubs are the kind of centre we are concerned with here. There are four such facilities: a main hub (Louisville, KY), and three regional air hubs (in Philadelphia PA, Dallas TX, and Ontario CA). In this paper, the term hub refers to this more specialized meaning; that is, it is used to denote a major sorting or switching centre in a many-to-many distribution system. Therefore, the key idea is that the flow between a set of origin and destination cities passes through one or more hubs, en route to the final destination.

The hub network design problem, as it is discussed in this paper, is a complex mixture of locational analysis and spatial interaction theory (O’Kelly, 1986). In its most general form, this problem involves: (1) finding the optimal locations for the hub facilities; (2) assigning non-hub origins and destinations to the hubs; (3) determining linkages between the hubs; and, (4) routeing flows through the network. Not only is the number of the decision variables large, but the solutions to these individual problems are highly interdependent. In practical terms, there are at least three approaches to handling the complexity. The first is to adopt a partial approach, whereby some aspects of the decision variables are simplified for mathematical convenience. An example of this strategy is the common assumption that transportation costs are independent of flow volume, despite the well-known importance of scale effects in reality (Campbell, 1990a). The second is to find a decomposition of the problem into convenient subproblems as exemplified by the division of the network into backbone and feeder subnets (see examples in Chan and Ponder, 1979; Chung et al., 1992). Finally, the third approach is to recognize the inherent mathematical difficulty, and to seek a local rather than a global optimum to the problem. Thus several researchers have begun to develop sophisticated mathematical programming heuristics for hub design (Abdinnour and Venkataramanan, 1992; Klincewicz, 1991, 1992; O’Kelly, 1987; O’Kelly et al., 1993; Skorin-Kapov and Skorin-Kapov, 1992).

A set of convenient but restrictive modelling assumptions can be exploited in order to manage the hub network design problem. The standard hub network topology, which we call Protocol A, consists of a relatively large number of nodes each directly connected to only one of a small number of completely interconnected hubs, ie, the pure ‘hub and spoke’ configuration. Protocol A serves as the basis for many efforts to solve the hub network design problem (eg, Campbell, 1991a, 1991b; Klincewicz, 1991, 1992; O’Kelly, 1986, 1987, 1992a, 1992b; O’Kelly and Miller, 1991; Skorin-Kapov and Skorin-Kapov, 1992). Later in this paper, we discuss variants on the hub network design problem, and we call them Protocol B, C, . . . , H.

Although the standard hub network topology is convenient from an analytical point of view, researchers have had to relax some of its restrictions in order to remain relevant to real-world distribution problems. In general, these extensions greatly complicate the design problem, requiring the use of additional simplifying assumptions in order to be tractable. As a result, approaches to the hub problem have become extremely non-standardized. Partly due to these disparate approaches even basic definitional issues regarding the components of a hub network are unresolved in the literature, as reflected in our discussion of varying hub definitions.

Our goal in this paper is to organize the growing literature on hub network design and provide a framework for standardizing the hub network design problem. In this paper, we review the characteristics of the hub network design problem and develop a series of design features that clearly specify the rules for constructing a particular hub network type. This framework can serve as a standard language for comparing different hub network design applications. In addition, the protocols indicate the complexity of different design problems and suggest a broad strategy for addressing these problems.

In the next section of this paper, we discuss properties of the standard hub network design problem. In the third section, we identify common departures from Protocol A restrictions in real-world hub networks and review attempts by researchers to accommodate these complexities. In the fourth section, we develop a series of hub network designs as a standard classification system for this problem. This includes a formal statement of definitional issues that have been neglected in the literature, presentation of the classification system and discussion of the system’s implications for the design problem. The fifth and final section provides some concluding comments.

**Hub network design under Protocol A**

The standard hub network Protocol A is defined as the product of three simplifying restrictions: (1) all hubs are fully interconnected; (2) all nodes are
connected to only one hub; and, (3) there are no direct non-hub to non-hub (intermodal) connections. An example can be seen in Figure 1. The conceptualization of the standard hub network is similar to Aykin (1993) who refers to a network like Protocol A as a 'strict hubbing policy'.

The Protocol A design has two important properties. One property is deterministic routing. Given fixed hub locations, allocations of non-hub origins and destination to hubs, and the triangle inequality with respect to distance, there is only one shortest path between any origin–destination pair in the network. Since each non-hub origin and destination is connected to only one hub and all hubs are interconnected, the triangular distance inequality means that the shortest path can be found simply by choosing the direct connections between a non-hub origin or destination and its hub and between the hubs if necessary. A second property is a p-median problem constraint set: Protocol A network characteristics allow the hub network design problem to be stated in similar format to a traditional optimal location problem. The location literature has in turn been a fruitful source of algorithms for the hub location problem. These two properties allow the hub network design problem to be stated as analogues to traditional location problems. Table 1 summarizes these linkages.

Under Protocol A, the minisum (ie minimize aggregate flow cost) single-hub problem in planar space can be stated as an easily solved Weber least-cost location problem (O'Kelly, 1986). Also, the minimax (ie minimize the most costly network flow) single-hub problem in planar space can be solved as a round-trip location problem for which efficient solution algorithms exist (O'Kelly and Miller, 1991). The minisum, multihub problem in planar space can be treated as a multifacility location–allocation problem (Aykin and Brown, 1992). If distances are measured as squared Euclidean distances, convenient mathematical properties facilitate the solution of very large planar hub location models (O'Kelly, 1992b). The objective function for the minisum, multihub problem in discrete space under Protocol A can be stated as a quadratic assignment problem with constraints similar to the p-median problem (O'Kelly, 1987). While this latter problem is difficult to solve optimally (Aykin, 1988; Aykin and Brown, 1992; O'Kelly, 1986, 1987), several heuristic procedures have been developed. These procedures differ mostly with regard to node-hub assignment methods (see Campbell, 1991a, 1991b; Klincewicz, 1991, 1992; O'Kelly, 1987; Skorin-Kapov and Skorin-Kapov, 1992).

It may also be noted from Table 1 that several Protocol A design problems are either trivial, or unsolved to date. In the former category are single-facility problems in discrete space: under both minisum and minimax objectives, this problem can be solved through simple enumeration. More complex, and still unsolved, is the multiple-hub, minimax problem in both planar and discrete space, although Campbell (1991a, 1991b) has introduced a number of formulations which extend covering models to the hub network design problem.

Relaxing Protocol A restrictions

The generic 'hub and spoke' topology serves as the basis for the many-to-many distribution problem in a variety of empirical transport and communication applications. However, the characteristics of these real-world distribution problems have resulted in hub network configurations that typically violate one or more of the Protocol A restrictions.

Figures 2 and 3 illustrate empirical hub network applications in air and ground transportation, respectively. Figure 2 provides the route structure (as of May 1991) for Skyway Airlines, a regional air passenger carrier based in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Several of the network properties violate Protocol A restrictions. Internodal connections are present (eg Madison–Rockford, Saginaw–Flint, Kalamazoo–Lansing). Also evident is a feature known as a 'spider leg' (Marsten and Mueller, 1980) in which service locations are arranged in purely linear fashion (eg Peoria–Bloomington/Normal–Detroit). Figure 3 illustrates the US route structure for Yellow Freight systems. Figure 3a provides the feeder (spoke) linkages to regional hubs, while Figure 3b indicates the interhub 'linehaul' linkages. Protocol A restrictions are violated at both network levels: several nodes are connected to more than one hub and the interhub network is not fully interconnected.

Several researchers have examined design problems for hub networks with more complex topologies than allowed hitherto. In some special cases, modification of the Protocol A restrictions actually simplifies the design problem. For example, when multiple-hub assignment is allowed, the allocation of nodes to hubs can be expressed under certain conditions as a linear assignment problem (Campbell, 1991a, 1991b). O'Kelly and Lao (1991) show that a model with allocations to both a mini- and a master-hub can be solved optimally using

![Figure 1 Example Protocol A network](image-url)
linear programming. In general, however, relaxing Protocol A restrictions greatly complicates the hub network design problem. This added complexity has necessitated the use of additional restrictions in order to manage the design problem. Table 2 provides some examples.

One of the more common Protocol A relaxations attempted is the assignment of nodes to more than one hub. Multiple-hub assignment can save transportation costs by tailoring the selection of hubs to the eventual destinations of the flows being shipped from an origin node thus reducing the distance travelled. In addressing this routeing problem Daganzo (1987), and Hall (1987) are able to derive analytical solutions only by restricting the spatial dimension of the problem to linear space or $L_1$ metric (the latter metric limits travel to rectangular dimensions). Daganzo (1987) and Hall (1987) also fix the locations and service areas of the hubs. This restriction is relaxed by Campbell (1990a, 1990b).

Partial interhub connections concentrate flows at particular hub facilities, which allows the exploitation of flow-processing economies of scale. Leung et al (1990) allow partially interconnected hubs as well as multiple hub assignment by separating the node-hub assignment problem from the interhub routeing problem. The routeing problem is solved by treating it as a multicommodity flow problem, with each commodity distinguished by its origin-destination pair. Chou (1990) restricts topology to partially interconnected hubs by requiring the network to be minimally connected. Since the network is a minimal
spanning tree, routing can be determined through the connectivity matrix. Chou (1990) also relaxes this restriction somewhat by introducing a link-capacity constraint which can result in a more connected topology.

Internodal linkages can provide direct service between locations that have a high degree of interaction. The interesting aspect of this Protocol A relaxation is that, although the analyst may permit certain routes to be served directly, the model determines whether or not such direct routes are economically viable (see for instance Aykin, 1992). In practice, the use of direct node-to-node connections to ‘bleed off’ larger predictable flows from the hubs is noted in air express. It should be emphasized that in terms of our definitions, these direct node-to-node pairs do not create a hub at the node, as the usual hub trans-shipment functions are absent. Nevertheless, if a node is directly connected to a large number of other nodes, there would seem to be a strong case for developing full hub functionality at that location. In a slightly different vein, Flynn and Ratick (1988) allow these linkages in the form of ‘stopover’ air service in their air transport network model. However, the overall network is already established, and the design problem consists of feeding additional service into the established hub network. One of the most general hub network design models was formulated by Powell and Sheffi (1983). Their analysis includes both a statement of the optimal design problem and a heuristic solution procedure. The optimal version requires only one directional link to enter and leave each node or hub, but this restriction is relaxed in the heuristic solution procedure. The solution procedure is a local improvement strategy in which the user broadly directs
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Table 2 Examples of hub network modelling with Protocol A violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Protocol A violation allowed</th>
<th>Additional restrictions</th>
<th>Routing mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell (1990a)</td>
<td>Assignment of nodes to multiple hubs</td>
<td>Linear or ( L_1 ) space</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell (1990b)</td>
<td>Assignment of nodes to multiple hubs</td>
<td>Linear space*</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou (1990)</td>
<td>Partial interconnection of hubs</td>
<td>Network required to be minimally connected subject to possible link capacity constraint</td>
<td>Connectivity matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daganzo (1987)</td>
<td>Assignment of nodes to multiple hubs</td>
<td>Hub locations fixed ( L_1 ) space</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynn and Ratick (1988)</td>
<td>Intermodal linkages</td>
<td>Hub service areas fixed in size and shape</td>
<td>Multiobjective, hierarchical weighted covering model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall (1987)</td>
<td>Assignment of nodes to multiple hubs Hubs not connected</td>
<td>Hub locations fixed ( L_1 ) space</td>
<td>One- and two-hub routing heuristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall (1989)</td>
<td>Assignment of nodes to multiple hubs Hubs not connected</td>
<td>Hub locations fixed ( L_1 ) space</td>
<td>One- and two-hub routing heuristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell and Sheffi (1983)</td>
<td>Assignment of nodes to multiple hubs Hubs partially interconnected</td>
<td>Problem solved through user-directed local improvement heuristic with prespecified sequence of possible network changes</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Euclidian space version uses Protocol A.

the search for network changes, followed by interactive modifications.

Table 2 illustrates the wide variety of restrictions exploited in order to facilitate model solutions for relatively complex configurations. Restrictions include: (i) limitations on the spatial dimension of the problem (eg Campbell, 1990a, 1990b; Daganzo, 1987; Hall, 1987); (ii) fixing selected components of the network or limiting their complexity (Chou, 1990, 1993; Daganzo, 1987; Hall, 1987; Leung et al, 1990); (iii) restricting the scope of the analysis (Flynn and Ratick, 1988); and (iv) partitioning the overall design problem into more manageable components (Leung et al, 1990; Powell and Sheffi, 1983). Thus, approaches to the hub network design problem beyond the Protocol A restrictions are disparate. This creates difficulty in comparing (and even defining) the hub network design problem across a wide range of applications.

A hub network classification system

In this section of the paper, we provide a common framework for the hub network design problem. This framework consists of formal definitions of hub network components and a classification system based on combinations of specific network design rules within the definitional parameters. We discuss the definitional issue first and then present the classification system. Finally, we discuss the implications of our system for the hub network design problem.

Addressing the hub network design problem for a wide variety of possible configurations raises some very basic definitional issues that have not been considered in the literature. However, these basic definitions are important in order to establish the basic ground rules that characterize a hub network. Without formal definitions of basic hub network components, the hub network design problem cannot be consistent across different applications.

A hub network consists of three major components: service nodes, hubs and arcs. A ‘service node’ is a point location from which flows can originate and into which only flows which are destined for that location can enter. A ‘hub’ has the characteristics of a service node (ie it can be a flow origin and destination) but also allows the passage of through-flows or trans-shipment flows which are not destined for that location. All throughflow that enters a hub must also exit that hub. Hubs are not differentiated by class or hierarchy: we assume for now that a hub can handle any amount of throughflow.

The arcs that connect the service nodes and hubs must have the following properties: (1) every service node must be connected to at least one hub; (2) a valid path must exist between all hubs. These two properties ensure that a feasible path will exist
between all origins and destinations in the network. Also observe that a service node which is directly connected to all other service nodes does not influence the hub network design problem. Therefore we disregard a service node as part of the hub network if it essentially bypasses that network.

Note that property 1 does not allow the ‘spider leg’ configuration unless the intermediate node (eg Bloomington/Normal in Figure 2) is defined as a hub, since that location receives throughflow. This does not greatly reduce the generality of the hub network classification since hubs can handle any amount of throughflow, even if this flow is from only one service node. In fact, intermediate nodes in a spider leg configuration do perform one of the major services of a hub (ie the consolidation of flows), although other services (ie sorting) may not be performed. Recently, Kuby and Gray (1993) have developed an analysis of the hub network design problem with stopovers and feeders. They suggest that in the case of Federal Express, spider leg links to the hub at Memphis are common and require careful analysis.

Since we are primarily concerned with the situation where hubs are selected from the existing set of origins and destinations (ie the discrete space problem, meaning that hubs are also flow origins and destinations), network configurations in which hubs have no interconnections (see, eg, Hall, 1987, 1989) are not valid since this would make certain hubs (as flow destinations) inaccessible from portions of the network. From the perspective of our classification system, we would consider these configurations as separate but intermeshed hub networks.

As noted earlier, the Protocol A network is the product of three assumptions: (i) all hubs are fully interconnected; (ii) all non-hub nodes are connected to only one hub; and (iii) there are no internodal (direct service node to service node) connections. Any or all of these rules can be relaxed as long as the basic assumptions discussed in this section are not violated. This provides three binary decision variables with which to define hub network types. The three decisions are:

(D1) Node assignment either one hub assignment, or multihub assignment.

(D2) Direct node-node either not allowed, or allowed.

(D3) Hub interconnection either full, or partial.

The three binary decision variables create $2^3 = 8$ hub network classes, which are defined in Table 3. Example networks can be seen in Figure 4.

While it is difficult to find an exact match in the real world to these prototypical networks, there are several excellent representative examples. Protocol A is similar to the Rockwell International interplant communications system illustrated in Fotheringham and O’Kelly (1989, p. 172). Protocol B can be seen in the satellite communications network design proposed by Helme and Magnanti (1989). Note that in their approach (see p. 431, Figure 2), each node is connected to one of the available hubs, but these hubs are not all connected directly to one another. Instead they have a link to a super hub (satellite). Protocols C and D can be seen to a certain extent in some financial networks which have single-hub assignment, but varying degrees of direct node-to-node connections and interhub connectivity (Weinstein, 1982). Protocol E is seen in McShan and Windle (1989, p. 213) where there are connected hubs, but multiple-hub allocations. The Yellow Freight system shown in Figure 3 is an excellent example of Protocol F. Many air passenger systems illustrated in Shaw (1993) exemplify Protocols G and H.

A key feature of our classification system concerns the complexity of the hub network design problem. The basic design questions inherent in all protocols are the locations of hubs and the assignment of non-hub nodes to hubs. Beyond this, each protocol differs with regard to the freedom to configure arcs in the network. For example, in Protocol A there are no ‘free’ arcs: hubs must be fully interconnected, only one arc connects any node to any hub, and direct internodal connections are not allowed. In contrast, all arcs (existing and potential) in a Protocol H network are free for variable reconfiguration within the constraints of that protocol. Table 4 indicates the decision variables that occur in each of the design problems.

An important implication for hub network design is that while the consideration of all possible configurations for a hub network results in a very complex design problem, the use of the classification system allows this complexity to be managed to a

**Table 3 Hub network classification system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design class</th>
<th>Node-hub assignment</th>
<th>Internodal connections</th>
<th>Interhub connectivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protocol A</td>
<td>Single hub only</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol B</td>
<td>Single hub only</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol C</td>
<td>Single hub only</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol D</td>
<td>Single hub only</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol E</td>
<td>Multiple hubs allowed</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol F</td>
<td>Multiple hubs allowed</td>
<td>Not allowed</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol G</td>
<td>Multiple hubs allowed</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol H</td>
<td>Multiple hubs allowed</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 4 Example Protocol A–H networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design class</th>
<th>Design variables</th>
<th>Empirical examples</th>
<th>Analysis examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Node-single hub assignment</td>
<td>Interplant communications</td>
<td>Chou (1990); Helme and Magnanti (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Node-single hub assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chou (1990); Helme and Magnanti (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Node-single hub assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown at this time (4/93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Node-single hub assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown at this time (4/93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol E</td>
<td>Hub location</td>
<td>Air passenger networks</td>
<td>Campbell (1990a, 1990b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Node-multiple hub assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leung et al (1990); Powell and Sheffi (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol F</td>
<td>Hub location</td>
<td>Yellow Freight</td>
<td>Leung et al (1990); Powell and Sheffi (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Node-multiple hub assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Node-multiple hub assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Node-multiple hub assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The empirical examples and references are discussed in the text.

Table 4 Hub network design issues under different protocols with examples
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substantial degree. The design protocols allow the decision maker to trade off the complexity of the problem against the combination of design features inherent in each network archetype. A decision maker can assess these trade-offs and choose a network type as a first approximation of the design for the particular application. Then, a specific configuration, determined according to the relatively limited number of design changes within that protocol, can be explored. For example, if a distribution problem has large amounts of interaction between some service node pairs, the decision maker may wish to abandon the convenient but restrictive Protocol A design archetype in favour of the more complex Protocol C archetype which allows internodal connections. In addition, if benefits can be derived from concentrating flows at hubs, the decision maker can also allow partial interhub connectivity by using Protocol D. However, this would make the design problem even more complex. If this complexity is undesirable, internodal connectivity could be sacrificed in favour of partial interhub connectivity by using Protocol B. Thus, the choice of a design protocol involves trade-offs between problem complexity and desired network properties relative to the particular distribution problem the decision maker is attempting to resolve.

Conclusion

Hub networks are used for solving a class of the many-to-many distribution problem. Hubs allow the construction of indirect linkages between origins and destinations, which can benefit operating costs, service provision and market position. These networks are used for air and ground transportation and communication and can have a variety of configurations. However, the design problem for all but the simplest network topologies can be extremely complex. Due to the nature of this design problem, researchers have been forced to rely on restrictive problem assumptions and have used a wide range of non-standardized approaches to the problem. In this paper, we have synthesized existing approaches to the hub network design problem and presented a framework for standardizing the problem. By doing so, we have identified examples of prototypical networks, anticipated the occurrence of other hybrid network configurations and drawn attention to some gaps in the analytical literature on these nets.

This paper has introduced the reader to the complexity of the hub-and-spoke network design problem. There are many further complexities that could be introduced. The obvious directions are to include capacity constraints (as suggested by Aykin, 1993) and to determine a dynamic facility siting plan (as suggested by Campbell, 1990b). Apart from these extensions, however, is the idea that the hub network ought to be chosen without any a priori restrictions on the types of connections permitted.

In other words, the analyst should be able to determine the properties of the best network plan, including the level of interhub linkage, the provision of direct routes, and so on. The contribution of this paper has been to classify the types of hub network structure that can emerge. It remains a major research problem to offer a prescription for the best type of network for the various transport applications.
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