

# Matching mechanisms for kidney transplantations

Tristan François

February 5, 2021

## 1 Two Simple Approaches

### Question 1

---

**Algorithm 1:** Direct Donation

---

**Input:** A number  $n$  of patient and, for all patients  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , their set of compatible donors  $K_i \subseteq \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ .

**Output:** A set of pairs donor-patient pairs  $c$  and a waiting list  $w$ .

```
1 initialization
2    $c = \emptyset$ ;
3    $w = []$ ;
4 begin
5   for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
6     if  $i \in K_i$  then
7        $c = c \cup \{(i, i)\}$ ;
8     else
9        $w.add(i)$ 
10  return  $c, w$ 
```

---

The implementation in python is pretty straightforward. The python function takes as parameter an integer  $n$  and an integer set array of size  $n$ . The use of python set allows to test the if condition in constant times. The only difference with pseudo-code is the use of a list rather than a set for the variable  $c$ . This choice was made to avoid the unnecessary heaviness of the set data structure, but does not change the complexity.

### Question 2

Our matching algorithm must prioritize the patients with the highest priority. It must also ensure that all patients will leave with a donor that suited them better than their paired donor and the waiting list, otherwise some patients may not participate in the exchange program.

Our greedy algorithm therefore consists of browsing the patients in descending order of priority and matching them to their preferred donor whose paired patient does not prefer the waiting list or his donor to the donor of the priority patient. Note that a patient can be matched to his own donor.

---

**Algorithm 2:** Greedy Matching

---

**Input:** A number  $n$  of patient, a strict priority list of the patients  $U$  and, for all patients  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , their set of compatible donors  $K_i \subseteq [1, n]$  and their strict preference relation  $P_i$  over  $K_i \cup \{k_i, w\}$ . The priority list is an integer list that starts with the index of the highest priority patient and goes to the index of the lowest priority patient.

**Output:** A matching  $M$ .

```

1 initialization
2    $M = \emptyset$ ;
3    $is\_matched = Boolean[1..n]$ ;
4    $sorted\_K = IntegerList[1..n]$ ;
5   for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
6      $is\_matched[i] = False$ ;
7      $sorted\_K[i] = sort(K_i, P_i)$  ; //  $\mathcal{O}(n \log(n))$ 
8 begin
9   /* Iterate over all patient by decreasing priority */
10  for  $u \in U$  do
11    if not  $is\_matched[u]$  then
12      for  $v \in sorted\_K[u]$  do
13        if not  $is\_matched[v]$  then
14          /* If  $t_v$  prefer  $k_u$  over  $k_v$  and  $w$  */
15          if  $k_v P_v k_u$  and  $k_v P_v w$  then
16             $M = M \cup \{(k_u, t_u), (k_v, t_v)\}$ ;
17             $is\_matched[u] = True$ ;
18             $is\_matched[v] = True$ ;
19            break;
20  return  $M$ 

```

---

We start by initializing an  $is\_matched$  array to keep track of which pair has already been matched and an integer list array  $sorted\_K$  that contains, for each patient of index  $i$ , the indexes of the preferred donors in descending order of preference. The sort function returns a list of the elements of  $K_i$  sorted in descending order according to the preference relation  $P_i$ .

The implementation is almost exactly the pseudo-code.

## 2 Efficient strategy-proof exchange mechanism

### Question 3

Let  $(k_1, t_1)$  be a pair of donor-patient and assume there is no cycle. Consider the chain starting from  $(k_1, t_1)$ . Since there is a finite number  $n$  of donor-patient pairs and there is no cycle, the chain cannot be infinite. Finally, since the only way for a chain to stop is that  $w$  belong to the chain,  $(k_1, t_1)$  is indeed a tail of a  $w$ -chain.

Thus either there exists a cycle, or each pair is the tail of some  $w$ -chain.

### Question 4

### Question 5

Let's run the Cycles and Chains Matching Algorithm with rule A on this example. Graphs associated with every round are shown in figure 1.

The initial graph contains a cycle  $C_1 = (k_3, t_3, k_2, t_2, k_{11}, t_{11})$ . The first round of the algorithm therefore consists in detecting this cycle, assigning the kidneys to the patients and then eliminating the cycle.

After removing the first circle, a new circle  $C_2 = (k_5, t_5, k_7, t_7, k_6, t_6)$  is formed. In the second round, this cycle is therefore deleted.

At the start of the third round, there is no more circle. The graph contains longest  $w$ -chains :  $W_1 = (k_8, t_8, k_4, t_4, k_9, t_9)$  and  $W_2 = (k_{10}, t_{10}, k_1, t_1, k_9, t_9)$ . Since the highest priority patient  $t_1$  is only present in  $W_2$ ,  $W_2$  is chosen. The kidneys are assigned and the chain remains in the graph for the next round but patients pointing to other kidneys than  $k_{10}$  in the chain are redirected.

After the redirect, a new circle  $C_3 = (k_4, t_4, k_8, t_8)$  has formed. The fourth round therefore consists in the elimination of this cycle.

There is no new circle and the patient  $t_{12}$  now points to  $k_{10}$  forming a chain of maximum length  $W_3 = (k_{12}, t_{12}, k_{10}, t_{10}, k_1, t_1, k_9, t_9)$ . Round 5 assigns kidneys  $k_{10}$  to patient  $t_{12}$  and there are no more patients with no kidneys. The algorithm stops.

The final matching is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} t_1 & t_2 & t_3 & t_4 & t_5 & t_6 & t_7 & t_8 & t_9 & t_{10} & t_{11} & t_{12} \\ k_9 & k_{11} & k_2 & k_8 & k_7 & k_5 & k_6 & k_4 & w & k_1 & k_3 & k_{10} \end{pmatrix}$$




Figure 1: State of the graph at every round.

### Question 6

If the selection rule keep in the procedure any selected  $w$ -chain at a non-terminal round, then every unassigned kidney is available at every round of the procedure. Therefore, at every round of the algorithm, a patient can only be assigned to his best choice among remaining kidneys. The only way to give him a better kidney is to take it back from a patient whose assignment occurs in a previous round. Since this patient had his best choice at the time, he will strictly disprefer the new matching. Thus, the exchange mechanism is efficient.

### Question 7

If we swap  $k_8$  and  $k_9$  in the order of preference of the twelfth patient, then in round 3 the longest  $w$ -chain becomes  $(k_{12}, t_{12}, k_8, t_8, k_4, t_4, k_9, t_9)$  and  $t_{12}$  is assigned to  $k_8$ , which he strictly prefers to  $k_{10}$ , that he would get by being honest about his preferences. Therefore the exchange mechanism with chain selection rule A is not strategy-proof.

### Question 8




Figure 2: State of the graph at every round.

### 3 Integer programming formulation

#### Question 9

In order to list all the minimal infeasible paths, we will simply use a recursive function **Aux** which, given a graph  $G$ , a vertex  $v$  and an integer  $k$ , returns all the paths of lengths  $k + 1$  starting at  $v$ . In order to avoid cycles, we add an *inpath* variable, a set containing the vertices already in the current path. Finally, we called this function on all the vertices of the graph.

---

**Algorithm 3:** Minimal infeasible paths

---

**Input:**  $G = (V, E)$  a graph and  $k$  the threshold.

**Output:** The set of all minimal infeasible paths.

```

1 begin
2    $paths = \emptyset$ ;
3   for  $v \in V$  do
4      $paths = paths \cup \{\text{Aux}(G, v, k, \emptyset)\}$ ;
5   return  $paths$ ;

/* Return the list of all minimal infeasible path starting
   from  $v$  */
6 Function  $\text{Aux}(G, v, k, inpath)$ :
7   if  $k = 0$  then
8     return  $\{v\}$ ;
9    $inpath = inpath \cup \{v\}$ ;
10   $paths = \emptyset$ ;
11  for  $neighbour \in v.neighbours$  do
12    if  $neighbour \notin inpath$  then
13      for  $path \in \text{Aux}(G, neighbour, k - 1, inpath)$  do
14         $paths = paths \cup \{path.add\_first(v)\}$ ;
15   $inpath = inpath \setminus \{v\}$ ;
16  return  $paths$ ;

```

---

The implementation in python is very similar to the pseudo-code, except that the algorithm returns a list of paths rather than a set. The graph is given in the form of adjacency lists, in order to be able to iterate quickly on the neighbors.

file	CPU time	$ V $	$ E $	number of paths
test2.txt	$0.097 * 10^{-3}$ seconds	12	18	45
test3.txt	$31.008 * 10^{-3}$ seconds	17	229	28188

Figure 3: Mean execution time over 1000 iterations on an Intel i5-6200U processor.

### Question 10

Let  $n$  be the number of patients and  $M$  the adjacency matrix of the graph. We will denote by  $m_{i,j}$  the coefficients of  $M$ . We therefore have  $m_{i,j} = 1$  if the kidney  $k_i$  is compatible with the patient  $t_j$  and  $m_{i,j} = 0$  otherwise. We also define  $\Pi$  as the set of minimal infeasible paths.

For all  $(i, j) \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket^2$ , we define a variable  $a_{i,j}$  which is equal to 1 if the kidney  $k_i$  is assigned to the patient  $t_j$  and equal to 0 otherwise. We denote by  $A$  the assignment matrix whose coefficients are  $a_{i,j}$ . Since we are trying to maximize the number of transplants, our objective function will be:

$$\max_A \sum_{(i,j) \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket^2} a_{i,j} \quad (1)$$

However, we are subject to a few of constraints. To begin with, by definition of  $a_{i,j}$ , we have the following first set of constraints.

$$\forall (i, j) \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket^2, a_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} \quad (2)$$

In addition a kidney  $k_i$  can only be assigned to a patient  $t_j$  if  $t_j$  is compatible with  $k_i$ , in other words  $a_{i,j}$  cannot be equal to 1 if  $m_{i,j}$  is 0. Therefore  $a_{i,j}$  is necessarily less than or equal to  $m_{i,j}$ . So we have a new set of constraints:

$$\forall (i, j) \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket^2, a_{i,j} \leq m_{i,j} \quad (3)$$

In addition, a patient cannot receive more than 1 kidney and a donor will not donate his kidney if his paired patient does not receive a kidney. Thus, we have:

$$\forall j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket, \sum_{i=1}^n a_{i,j} \leq 1 \quad (4)$$

$$\forall j \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket, \sum_{i=1}^n a_{j,i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n a_{i,j} \quad (5)$$

Finally, we need to verify that there is no exchange cycle of length more than the threshold  $K$ . To do this, it suffices to check that none of the minimal infeasible paths is taken. We thus obtain our last set of constraints:

$$\forall \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{K+1}\} \in \Pi, \sum_{k=1}^K a_{i_k, i_{k+1}} \leq K - 1 \quad (6)$$

Our integer linear program is therefore the maximization of 1 subject to 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

### Question 11

The relaxed problem is the same as before with constraint 2 replaced by a new constraint:

$$\forall (i, j) \in \llbracket 1, n \rrbracket^2, 0 \leq a_{i,j} \leq 1 \quad (7)$$



In the following algorithm, we assume given a function allowing to solve a linear program and returning the solution and the value of the objective function. If the problem is infeasible, the value of the objective function will be  $-\infty$ . We also assume given a function that test if the solution is an integer one.

At each node of the tree, we will force a variable  $a_{i,j}$  to take the value 0 on one branch and 1 on the other by adding the constraints  $a_{i,j} \leq 0$  and  $a_{i,j} \geq 1$ , then we'll take the best solution of the two branches.

---

**Algorithm 4:** Branch and Bound

---

**Input:** A linear problem *prob* and a set of relaxed variables *vars*

**Output:** A solution to the problem

```

1 begin
2   return BranchAndBound(prob, vars, 0,  $\emptyset$ )
3 Function BranchAndBound(prob, vars, best, solution):
4   score, new_sol = prob.solve();
5   if score =  $-\infty$  then
6     return best, solution;
7   else if score < best then
8     return best, solution;
9   else if IsIntegerSolution(new_sol) then
10    return score, new_sol;
11  else
12    x = vars.pop();
13    prob.add_constraint(x  $\geq$  1);
14    score1, new_sol1 = BranchAndBound(prob, vars, best, solution);
15    prob.remove_constraint(x  $\geq$  1);
16    prob.add_constraint(x  $\leq$  0);
17    score2, new_sol2 = BranchAndBound(prob, vars, best, solution);
18    prob.remove_constraint(x  $\leq$  0);
19    vars.add(x);
20    if score1 > score2 then
21      return score1, new_sol1;
22    else
23      return score2, new_sol2;

```

---

For the implementation, we used the Python `Pulp` library as the linear program solver. Unfortunately, it is not possible to simply remove a constraint from a linear problem with this library. Instead of the problem, we therefore pass the variables, the objective function and the list of constraints to each recursive call and we recreate the problem each time. Other than that, the implementation is very similar to pseudo-code.

## Question 12

The results of the previous algorithm are available in the following figure. Note that the execution time is very good because, in both cases, the relaxed problem directly gives an entire solution. The Branch-and-Bound algorithm is therefore unnecessary for the cases below. However, there are cases where the linear program does not give integer solutions. The code provided with the report contains functions capable of generating such cases.

file	CPU time	selected cycles	objective value
test2.txt	0.041 seconds	(0, 8, 2), (1, 10, 9), (3, 4, 5)	9
test3.txt	1.658 seconds	(0, 1, 14), (2, 6), (3), (4), (5), (7), (8, 16), (9, 10), (11), (12), (13), (15)	17

Figure 4: Results and mean execution time over 10 iterations on an Intel i5-6200U processor.

## Question 13