



AKADEMIA GÓRNICZO-HUTNICZA IM. STANISŁAWA STASZICA W KRAKOWIE
WYDZIAŁ ELEKTROTECHNIKI, AUTOMATYKI,
INFORMATYKI I INŻYNIERII BIOMEDYCZNEJ

KATEDRA INFORMATYKI STOSOWANEJ

Praca dyplomowa magisterska

Niespójności niekompletnych macierzy porównań parami
Inconsistency of incomplete pairwise comparisons matrices

Autor:

Kierunek studiów:

Opiekun pracy:

Dawid Talaga

Informatyka

dr hab. Konrad Kułakowski

Kraków, 2018

Uprzedzony o odpowiedzialności karnej na podstawie art. 115 ust. 1 i 2 ustawy z dnia 4 lutego 1994 r. o prawie autorskim i prawach pokrewnych (t.j. Dz.U. z 2006 r. Nr 90, poz. 631 z późn. zm.): „Kto przywłaszcza sobie autorstwo albo wprowadza w błąd co do autorstwa całości lub części cudzego utworu albo artystycznego wykonania, podlega grzywnie, karze ograniczenia wolności albo pozbawienia wolności do lat 3. Tej samej karze podlega, kto rozpowszechnia bez podania nazwiska lub pseudonimu twórcy cudzy utwór w wersji oryginalnej albo w postaci opracowania, artystycznego wykonania albo publicznie zniekształca taki utwór; artystyczne wykonanie, fonogram, wideogram lub nadanie.”, a także uprzedzony o odpowiedzialności dyscyplinarnej na podstawie art. 211 ust. 1 ustawy z dnia 27 lipca 2005 r. Prawo o szkolnictwie wyższym (t.j. Dz. U. z 2012 r. poz. 572, z późn. zm.): „Za naruszenie przepisów obowiązujących w uczelni oraz za czyny uchybiające godności studenta student ponosi odpowiedzialność dyscyplinarną przed komisją dyscyplinarną albo przed sądem koleżeńskim samorządu studenckiego, zwanym dalej «sądem koleżeńskim».”, oświadczam, że niniejszą pracę dyplomową wykonałem(-am) osobiście i samodzielnie i że nie korzystałem(-am) ze źródeł innych niż wymienione w pracy.

*Serdecznie dziękuję Promotorowi Panu dr. hab.
Konradowi Kułakowskiemu za zainteresowanie
mnie tematem PC oraz życzliwe wsparcie.
Dziękuję moim Rodzicom, dzięki którym mogłem
rozwijać się i studiować oraz bliskim mi osobom,
które dodawały mi wiary w moje siły.*

Contents

1. Introduction

1.1. The Pairwise Comparisons method

People have made decisions for ages. Some of them are very simple and come easily but others, more complicated, require deeper analysis. It happens when there are many compared objects, which are complex and the selection criterion is hard to measure clearly. Fortunately, the development of mathematics brought an interesting tool - *The Pairwise Comparisons (PC) Method*. The first case of using the method (in a very simple version) is the election system described by *Ramond Llull* (Colomer, 2013) in the thirteenth century. Its rules were based on the fact that the candidates were pairwise compared with each other and the winner was the one who won in the largest number of direct comparisons. The method was reinvented in the eighteenth century by *Condorcet* and *Borda* (Kulakowski, 2016) as they proposed it in their voting system. In the twentieth century, the method found the application in the theory of social choice, the main representatives of which were the Nobel prize winners *Keneth Arrow* (Arrow, 1950) and *Amartya Sen* (Sen, 1977). The current shape of the method was influenced by the changes introduced by *Fechner* [Fechner 1966] and then refined by *Thurstone* (Thurstone, 1994). However, the breakthrough was the introduction to the method *The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)* by *Saaty* (Saaty, 2008), which allowed to compare many more complex objects and create a hierarchical structure. The main aim of this paper is to check which method of calculating the inconsistency is the best in this case. In order to do it, a series of tests was carried out on various known inconsistency indexes, taking into account many different parameters: the matrix size, the amount of missing data, a level of inconsistency. The results of the research are included below.

The PC method is based on the assumption that it is not worth comparing all objects at the same time. It is better to compare them in pairs and then gather the results together. Such pairwise comparisons are much more intuitive and natural for a human being. How can one be sure that these judgments are consistent? Or what to do if some comparisons are missing? In such a case, is it worth taking the *PC method* at all?

The answer to the first question is the concept of inconsistency introduced into the method. This paper tries to answer the next two questions - meaning to examine whether available methods for determining inconsistencies give reliable results when a part of the comparisons are missing.

1.2. Cele pracy

The main aim of this paper is to check which method of calculating the inconsistency is the best when some comparisons are missing. In order to do it, a series of tests was carried out on various known inconsistency indexes, taking into account many different parameters: the matrix size, the amount of missing data, a level of inconsistency. Testy zostały zaimplementowane w języku R, który dobrze nadaje się do obliczeń numerycznych.

Od początku pisania pracy nie było wiadome, jaki będzie rezultat prac. Rozważano, że któryś z istniejących współczynników niespójności okaże się odpowiedni również dla macierzy niepełnych lub testy wykażą, że nie istnieje taka metoda obliczania niespójności. The results of the research are included below.

1.3. Zawartość i struktura pracy

Praca składa się z części teoretycznej oraz z opisu przeprowadzonych badań i ich wyników. Łącznie daje to 6 rozdziałów.

W drugim rozdziale została zaprezentowana metoda porównywania parami oraz problem niespójności danych. Zrozumienie podstaw jest konieczne, aby przejść do kolejnych kroków.

W trzecim rozdziale zaprezentowano kilkanaście dostępnych metod liczenia współczynnika niespójności dla macierzy porównań parowych.

W kolejnym rozdziale przedstawiono pomysły, dzięki którym możliwe jest przeprowadzenie testów. Są to modyfikacje istniejących współczynników niespójności, które pozwalają dostosować je do macierzy niepełnych oraz algorytm wyznaczający jakość zmodyfikowanych współczynników.

W piątym rozdziale zaprezentowano wyniki badań oraz omówiono otrzymane rezultaty.

Ostatni rozdział to podsumowanie wykonanej pracy, wyciągnięte wnioski i pomysły na dalsze pogłębienie tematu.

2. The Pairwise Comparisons method

2.1. The PC matrix

The *PC method* is used to choose the best alternative from a set of concepts. However, this goal is achieved by comparing in pairs. A numerical value is assigned to each pair. It not only determines which alternative is preferred but also informs about the intensity of this preference. In this way, the finite set of concepts $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ is transformed into a *PC matrix* $M = (m_{ij})$, where $m_{i,j} \in R$ and $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The *PC matrix* for n concepts is following:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & m_{12} & \dots & m_{1n} \\ m_{21} & 1 & \dots & m_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ m_{n1} & m_{n2} & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

It is worth noting that the values m_{ij} and m_{ji} represent the same pair. Therefore, one should expect that $m_{ji} = \frac{1}{m_{ij}}$. If

$$\forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\} : m_{ij} = \frac{1}{m_{ji}}, \quad (2.1)$$

the matrix is called a *reciprocal*.


2.2. The weight vector

The PC matrix is the basis for calculating the method. It is used in a function $\mu : C \rightarrow R$ that assigns a positive real number to each alternative in the set C . The vector

$$\mu = [\mu(c_1), \dots, \mu(c_n)]$$

formed in this way is called *the weight vector* or *the priority vector* (see Rys. 2.1). It informs which alternative has won.

There are many ways to calculate the vector μ , among the popular ones are the method using the matrix's eigenvalues or the method based on geometric means (Saaty et al., 1998).



Rys. 2.1. Diagram of calculating the weight vector

2.3. Inconsistency

The second important parameter describing the *PC matrix* is *consistency*. The matrix is consistent if

$$\forall i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\} : m_{ik} = m_{ij}m_{jk}. \quad (2.2)$$

Three numbers that should meet this assumption are called a *triad*.

If the matrix is consistent and the weight vector μ is computed, then for each variables i, j , where $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ meets the equation:

$$ij = \frac{\mu_i}{\mu_j}. \quad (2.3)$$

In practice, it is very rare for a matrix M to be completely consistent. In the long history of the PC method, many methods have been developed to calculate inconsistencies. Many of them are based directly on the definition of consistency ([eq:consistent]), some methods use the eigenvalues of the matrix, others are based on the assumption that each fully consistent matrix fulfills the condition ([eq:consistent2]).

3. Inconsistency indexes

3.1. Inconsistency indexes for complete matrixes

This subsection presents sixteen common inconsistency indexes. Their detailed description, including the formulas, is necessary to modify them in the next step so that they can also work for incomplete matrices. Many of them have been described and tested numerically in (Brunelli et al., 2013). In all methods, it is assumed that the *PC matrix* is reciprocal.

3.1.1. Saaty index

This is one of the most important and popular indexes and was introduced by *Saaty* (Saaty, 1977). In order to determine inconsistency, the matrix's eigenvalue should be computed. The author used the dependence that the largest eigenvalue of the matrix is equal to its dimension if and only if the given matrix is completely consistent. On this assumption, he based his thoughts and proposed the formula:

$$CI(A) = \frac{\lambda_{max} - n}{n - 1}, \quad (3.1)$$

where λ_{max} is the principal eigenvalue of the PC matrix and n is its dimension.

3.1.2. Geometric consistency index

This index on the assumption ([eq:consistent2]) was proposed by *Crawford* and *Williams* (Crawford et al., 1985) and then refined by *Aguaròn* and *Moreno-Jiménez* (Aguaron et al., 2003). In this case the priority vector should be calculated using the geometric mean method. Consider ([eq:consistent2]) one can create a matrix:

$$E = \left[e_{ij} \mid e_{ij} = a_{ij} \frac{w_j}{w_i} \right], \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3.2)$$

The inconsistency index is calculated as follows:

$$GCI = \frac{2}{(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i+1}^n \ln^2 e_{ij}. \quad (3.3)$$

3.1.3. Koczkodaj index

One of the most popular inconsistency indexes was proposed by *Koczkodaj* (Koczkodaj, 1993). It is based directly on the definition of consistency ([eq:consistent]). The value of the inconsistency index for one triad ([triad]) was defined as:

$$K_{i,j,k} = \min\left\{\frac{1}{a_{ij}} \left| a_{ij} - \frac{a_{ik}}{a_{jk}} \right|, \frac{1}{a_{ij}} \left| a_{ik} - a_{ij}a_{jk} \right|, \frac{1}{a_{jk}} \left| a_{jk} - \frac{a_{ik}}{a_{ij}} \right| \right\}. \quad (3.4)$$

This formula has been simplified by Duszak and Koczkodaj (Duszak et al., 1994) and is given as:

$$K(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \min\left\{\left| 1 - \frac{\beta}{\alpha\gamma} \right|, \left| 1 - \frac{\alpha\gamma}{\beta} \right| \right\}, \quad \text{where } \alpha = a_{ij}, \beta = a_{ik}, \gamma = a_{jk} \quad (3.5)$$

Then it was generalized (Duszak et al., 1994) for $n > 2$. Finally, the inconsistency index has the following form:

$$K = \max\{K(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) | 1 \leq i < j < k \leq n\}. \quad (3.6)$$

It is worth noting that not only does the coefficient find the greatest inconsistency but also indicates the place in which it occurs.

3.1.4. Kazibudzki indexes

Based on the Koczkodaj inconsistency index and observation that $\ln(\frac{\alpha\gamma}{\beta}) = -\ln(\frac{\beta}{\alpha\gamma})$, *Kazibudzki* proposed several additional inconsistency indexes (Kazibudzki, 2016). Instead of the formula for inconsistency of the triad [eq:k-abg], he introduced two new formulas:

$$LTI(\alpha, \beta\gamma) = \left| \ln\left(\frac{\alpha\gamma}{\beta}\right) \right|, \quad (3.7)$$

$$LTI * (\alpha, \beta\gamma) = \ln^2\left(\frac{\alpha\gamma}{\beta}\right). \quad (3.8)$$

Based on the above equations, *Kazibudzki* proposed new indexes. The simplest ones use the geometric mean of the triads. Thus, new indexes could be written in the form:

$$MLTI(LTI) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [LTI_i(\alpha, \beta\gamma)], \quad (3.9)$$

$$MLTI(LTI*) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [LTI *_i (\alpha, \beta\gamma)]. \quad (3.10)$$

After further research *Kazibudzki* introduces another inconsistency index (Kazibudzki, 2017), again based on ([eq:liti*]). It was defined as $CM(LTI*) = \frac{MEAN[LTI*(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)]}{1 + MAX[LTI*(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)]}$. Hence,

$$CM(LTI*) = \frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [LTI *_i (\alpha, \beta, \gamma)]}{1 + \max\{LTI *_i (\alpha, \beta, \gamma)\}}. \quad (3.11)$$

3.1.5. Index of determinants

This index was proposed by *text*Pelaez and *Lamata* (Peláez et al., 2003) and is also based on the concept of triad. The authors noticed that *PCM matrices* can be construct on the basis of triads. Their determinant is closely related to the consistency of the matrix.

For every triad (a_{ik}, a_{ij}, a_{jk}) one can build a matrix in the form:

$$T_{ijk} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_{ij} & a_{ik} \\ \frac{1}{a_{ij}} & 1 & a_{jk} \\ \frac{1}{a_{ik}} & \frac{1}{a_{jk}} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } i < j < k. \quad (3.12)$$

The determinant of this matrix is:

$$\det(A) = \frac{a_{ik}}{a_{ij}a_{jk}} + \frac{a_{ij}a_{jk}}{a_{ik}} - 2. \quad (3.13)$$

If the matrix is fully consistent, then $\det(A) = 0$, else $\det(A) > 0$. Based on the above considerations, the authors introduced the new inconsistency index that can be formulated as follows:

$$CI^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{a_{ik}}{a_{ij}a_{jk}} + \frac{a_{ij}a_{jk}}{a_{ik}} - 2 \right). \quad (3.14)$$

3.1.6. Kułakowski and Szybowski indexes

Kułakowski and *Szybowski* proposed two further inconsistency indexes (Kulakowski et al., 2014), which are also based on triads. They use the fact that the number of triads that can be found in a *PCM matrix* is

$$\binom{n}{3} = \frac{n!}{(n-3)!3!} = \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{6}. \quad (3.15)$$

The index is formulated as follows:

$$I_1 = \frac{6 \sum_{t \in T} K(t)}{n(n-1)(n-2)}, \quad (3.16)$$

where $K(t)$ is the Koczkodaj index for triad $t = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ of the set of all triads T .

The second inconsistency index is similar:

$$I_2 = \frac{6 \sqrt{\sum_{t \in T} K^2(t)}}{n(n-1)(n-2)}. \quad (3.17)$$

Indexes can be combined with each other to create new coefficients. In this way *Kułakowski* and *Szybowski* proposed two new indexes. The first one is based on ([eq:K]) and ([eq:I1]). This index allows to choose what effect on the result should the greatest inconsistency found have and what the average

inconsistency of all triads. The new nconsistency index looks as follows:

$$I_{\alpha} = \alpha K + (1 - \alpha)I_1, \quad (3.18)$$

where $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$.

The second index expands the first one by ([eq:I2]):

$$I_{\alpha,\beta} = \alpha K + \beta I_1 + (1 - \alpha - \beta)I_2. \quad (3.19)$$

3.1.7. Harmonic consistency index

Index introduced by *Stein* and *Mizzi* and it presents a completely new method of inconsistency counting (Stein et al., 2007). At the beginning it requires the creation of an auxiliary vector $s = (s_1, \dots, s_n)^T$, where n is the dimension of the matrix A , for which the index will be calculated. Each element of the vector s is the sum of values in one column of the matrix A . Hence,

$$s_j = \sum_{i=1}^n a_{ji} \quad \forall j. \quad (3.20)$$

The authors proved that if the matrix A is consistent, then $\sum_{j=1}^n s_j^{-1} = 1$. The formula for the mean harmonic looks as follows (Brunelli, 2015):

$$HM = \frac{n}{\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{s_j}}. \quad (3.21)$$

The final formula for inconsistency index was obtained by normalizing the above equation ([eq:hm']):

$$HCI = \frac{(HM(s) - n)(n + 1)}{n(n - 1)}. \quad (3.22)$$

3.1.8. Golden and Wang index

This index was introduced by *Golden* and *Wang* (Golden et al., 1989). It assumes that the priority vector was calculated using the geometric mean method, then normalized to add up to 1. In this way $vectorg^* = [g_1^*, \dots, g_n^*]$ was obtained, where n is the dimension of the matrix A . The next step is to normalize each column of the matrix A . After this, the sum of the elements of each column in matrix A is 1. The obtained matrix is marked with the symbol A^* . The inconsistency index is defined as follows:

$$GW = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}^* - g_i^*|. \quad (3.23)$$

3.1.9. Salo and Hamalainen index

The index proposed by *Salo* and *Hamalainen* (Salo et al., 1995; Kazibudski, 2016) uses the definition of inconsistency ([eq:consistent]), however it requires the creation of an auxiliary matrix, in which each element is the smallest and largest discrepancy from consistency based on formula ([eq:consistent]). The index takes all triads into account:

$$R = (r_{ij})_{n \times n} = \begin{pmatrix} [\underline{r}_{11}, \bar{r}_{11}] & \cdots & [\underline{r}_{1n}, \bar{r}_{1n}] \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ [\underline{r}_{n1}, \bar{r}_{n1}] & \cdots & [\underline{r}_{nn}, \bar{r}_{nn}] \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.24)$$

where $\underline{r}_{ij} = \min \{a_{ik}a_{kj} \mid k = 1, \dots, n\}$, $\bar{r}_{ij} = \max \{a_{ik}a_{kj} \mid k = 1, \dots, n\}$ and n is the dimension of the tested matrix A . A numerical example was presented in (Brunelli, 2015). Based on the resulting matrix R , the authors proposed the following inconsistency index:

$$CM = \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{\bar{r}_{ij} - \underline{r}_{ij}}{(1 + \bar{r}_{ij})(1 + \underline{r}_{ij})}. \quad (3.25)$$

3.1.10. Cavallo and D'Apuzzo index

The authors *Cavallo* and *D'Apuzzo* based their index on triads but they conducted studies on a new path, generalizing them for linear, ordered abelian groups (Cavallo et al., 2009; Cavallo et al., 2010). Thanks to this, the index can be used also with other relations (Brunelli et al., 2013). Index for relation max can be presented in the form of a formula:

$$I_{CD} = \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} \prod_{j=i+1}^{n-2} \prod_{k=j+1}^n \left(\max \left\{ \frac{a_{ik}}{a_{ij}a_{jk}}, \frac{a_{ij}a_{jk}}{a_{ik}} \right\} \right)^{\frac{1}{\binom{n}{3}}}. \quad (3.26)$$

3.1.11. Relative error

This index, proposed by *Barzaili* (Jonathan, ??), requires calculation of the weight vector using the arithmetic mean method for each row and creation of two additional matrices. Thus, the weight vector is

$$w_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij},$$

where n is the dimension of the matrix. The two auxiliary matrices are calculated according to the formulas:

$$C = (c_{ij}) = (w_i - w_j)$$

$$E = (e_{ij}) = (a_{ij} - c_{ij})$$

Ultimately, the formula for the *Relative error* is following:

$$RE(A) = \frac{\sum_{ij} e_{ij}^2}{\sum_{ij} a_{ij}^2}. \quad (3.27)$$

3.2. Inconsistency indexes for incomplete matrixes

There are no inconsistency indexes for incomplete matrices. However, Those presented in chapter (3) could be use in such cases. It requires usually a slight modification of the index definition or calculation only for selected data. Below the ways in which the examined indexes have been adjusted to be able to deal with incomplete matrices are presented.

Saaty index

The input matrix is modified using the method proposed by *Harker* (Harker, 1987). It means that values $c+1$, where c is the number of non-empty elements in a given row, are places on the diagonal.

Geometric consistency index

During calculating the weight vector by the geometric mean, empty values are omitted. Additionally, in the formula ([eq:GCI]) only non-empty elements e_{ij} are used. The reason for this exclusion is that the domain of the logarithmic function is R^+ .

Koczkodaj index, Kazibudzki indexes, Index of determinants:

Only those triads which do not contain empty values are taken into account.

Kulakowski and Szybowski indexes

Only those triads which do not contain empty values are taken into account. In addition, the number of triads is no longer calculated according to the formula ([eq:KulSzynPo3]) but determined directly by counting the number of triads.

Harmonic consistency index:

No modification.

Golden and Wang index:

During calculating the weight vector by the geometric mean empty values are omitted.

Salo and Hamalainen:

No modification.

Cavallo and D'Appuzo:

During calculating the product ([eq:CavDAp]) empty values are omitted.

Relative index:

No modification.

Zaproponowane sposoby modyfikacji współczynników pozwalają na użycie ich do macierzy niepełnych. Nie gwarantują jednak najlepszych rezultatów, do tego potrzebne są kolejne testy. Istniejące współczynniki można modyfikować na wiele różnych sposobów. W tej pracy skupiono się na tym, żeby modyfikacje nie były zbyt duże. Celem jest sprawdzenie istniejących współczynników, a nie utworzenie nowego współczynnika.

4. Studies of inconsistency indexes for incomplete matrices

The presented inconsistency indexes have been tested. Their aim was to select those indexes which will give reliable results for incomplete matrices. Therefore, it was decided that the measure of the indexes' quality would be a *relative error* (expressed as a percentage), which took into account the value of the index for a full, inconsistent matrix and the value of the index for the same matrix after partial decomposition. To be sure that the results were fair, all indexes were tested on the same set of matrices. The different sizes of the matrices, the levels of incompleteness and the levels of inconsistency were taken into account. Then, in order to compare the indexes easily and to select the best ones, the results were averaged using the arithmetic mean. While building the algorithm to solve the problem (Kazibudzki, 2017) was used.

4.1. Algorithm

The algorithm of test of inconsistency indexes:

1. Randomly generate a vector $w = [w_1, \dots, w_n]$ and a consistent *PCM matrix* associated with it $PCM = (m_{ij})$, where $m_{ij} = \frac{w_i}{w_j}$.
2. Disrupt the matrix by multiplying its elements (excluding the diagonal) by the value of d , randomly selected from the range $(\frac{1}{x}, x)$.
3. Replace values m_{ij} , where $i < j$ by values m_{ji} .
4. Calculate values of index with all methods for the created matrix.
5. Remove some values from the matrix by removing some of values. The level of incompleteness should be $g\%$.
6. Calculate the values of inconsistencies by all methods for the decomposed matrix.
7. Calculate the relative error for each index.
8. Repeat steps 1 to 10 X_1 times.
9. Calculate the average relative error for each inconsistency index for the *PCM matrix*.
10. Repeat steps 1 to 10 X_2 times.
11. Calculate the average relative error for each index by averaging the values obtained in step 9.

4.2. Details of algorithm

The above algorithm was carried out for values $X_1 = 100$, $X_2 = 100$. Tests were started for values d in the range $(1.1, 1.2, \dots, 4)$ and then the results were averaged. It means that the average relative error of one index was calculated on the basis of 4000 matrices, each of which decomposed randomly 100 times. It gave together 400000 tests how good the index was.

In addition, tests were carried out for various sizes of matrices.

The results are divided into two parts:

1. A constant degree of incompleteness, different size of the matrix.
2. Different degrees of incompleteness, constant size of the matrix.

The aim of such a division is to pay attention to how the inconsistency indexes behave when the size of the matrix and the degree of incompleteness are changing. The results of the research are presented below.

4.3. Implementation