

## Matching I: Kidney Exchange

Teachers: Ariel Procaccia (this time) and Alex Psomas

## KIDNEY EXCHANGE



## EXAMPLE: KIDNEY EXCHANGE

- Cycle-Cover: Given a directed graph $G$ and $L \in \mathbb{N}$, find a collection of disjoint cycles of length $\leq L$ in $G$ that maximizes the number of covered vertices
- The problem is:
- Easy for $L=2$ (why?)
- Easy for unbounded $L$
- NP-hard for a constant $L \geq 3$
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## APPLICATION: UNOS

## UOS

UNITED NETWORK FOR ORGAN SHARING

## INCENTIVES

- In the past kidney exchanges were carried out by individual hospitals
- Today there are nationally organized exchanges; participating hospitals have little other interaction
- It was observed that hospitals match easy-to-match pairs internally, and enroll only hard-to-match pairs into larger exchanges
- Goal: incentivize hospitals to enroll all their pairs


## THE STRATEGIC MODEL

- Undirected graph (only pairwise matches!)
- Vertices = donor-patient pairs
- Edges = compatibility
- Each player controls subset of vertices
- Mechanism receives a graph and returns a matching
- Utility of player = \# its matched vertices
- Target: \# matched vertices (util. social welfare)
- Strategy: subset of revealed vertices
- But edges are public knowledge
- Mechanism is strategyproof (SP) if it is a dominant strategy to reveal all vertices


## OPT IS MANIPULABLE



## OPT IS MANIPULABLE



## APPROXIMATING SW

- Theorem [Ashlagi et al. 2010]: No deterministic SP mechanism can give a $2-\epsilon$ approximation
- Proof: We just proved it!
- Theorem [Kroer and Kurokawa 2013]: No randomized SP mechanism can give a $\frac{6}{5}-\epsilon$ approximation
- Proof: Homework 4


## SP MECHANISM: TAKE 1

- Assume two players
- The Match $_{\{\{1\},\{2\}\}}$ mechanism:
- Consider matchings that maximize the number of "internal edges"
- Among these return a matching with max cardinality


## ANOTHER EXAMPLE



## GUARANTEES

- $\mathrm{MATCH}_{\{\{1\},\{2\}\}}$ gives a 2-approximation
- Cannot add more edges to matching
- For each edge in optimal matching, one of the two vertices is in mechanism's matching
- Theorem (special case): $\operatorname{MATCH}_{\{\{1\},\{2\}\}}$ is strategyproof for two players


## PROOF OF THEOREM

- $M=$ matching when player 1 is honest, $M^{\prime}=$ matching when player 1 hides vertices
- $M \Delta M^{\prime}$ consists of paths and evenlength cycles, each consisting of alternating $M, M^{\prime}$ edges

Question
What's wrong with the illustration on the right?


## PROOF OF THEOREM

- Consider a path in $M \Delta M^{\prime}$, denote its edges in $M$ by $P$ and its edges in $M^{\prime}$ by $P^{\prime}$
- For $i, j \in\{1,2\}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{i j}=\left\{(u, v) \in P: u \in V_{i}, v \in V_{j}\right\} \\
& P_{i j}^{\prime}=\left\{(u, v) \in P^{\prime}: u \in V_{i}, v \in V_{j}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

- $\left|P_{11}\right| \geq\left|P_{11}^{\prime}\right|$, suppose $\left|P_{11}\right|=\left|P_{11}^{\prime}\right|$
- It holds that $\left|P_{22}\right|=\left|P_{22}^{\prime}\right|$
- $M$ is max cardinality $\Rightarrow\left|P_{12}\right| \geq\left|P_{12}^{\prime}\right|$
- $U_{1}(P)=2\left|P_{11}\right|+\left|P_{12}\right| \geq 2\left|P_{11}^{\prime}\right|+\left|P_{12}^{\prime}\right|=$ $U_{1}\left(P^{\prime}\right)$


## PROOF OF THEOREM

- Suppose $\left|P_{11}\right|>\left|P_{11}^{\prime}\right|$
- $\left|P_{12}\right| \geq\left|P_{12}^{\prime}\right|-2$
- Every subpath within $V_{2}$ is of even length
- We can pair the edges of $P_{12}$ and $P_{12}^{\prime}$, except maybe the first and the last
- $U_{1}(P)=2\left|P_{11}\right|+\left|P_{12}\right| \geq$
$2\left(\left|P_{11}^{\prime}\right|+1\right)+\left|P_{12}^{\prime}\right|-2=$
$U_{1}\left(P^{\prime}\right) ■$



## THE CASE OF 3 PLAYERS



## SP MECHANISM: TAKE 2

- Let $\Pi=\left(\Pi_{1}, \Pi_{2}\right)$ be a bipartition of the players
- The $\mathrm{MaTCH}_{\Pi}$ mechanism:
- Consider matchings that maximize the number of "internal edges" and do not have any edges between different players on the same side of the partition
- Among these return a matching with max cardinality (need tie breaking)


## EUREKA?

- Theorem [Ashlagi et al. 2010]: $\mathrm{MATCH}_{\Pi}$ is strategyproof for any number of players and any partition $\Pi$
- Recall: for $n=2, \operatorname{MATCH}_{\{\{1\},\{2\}\}}$ guarantees a 2-approximation


## Poll 1

Approximation guarantees given by
МАТСН $_{\Pi}$ for $n=3$ and $\Pi=\{\{1\},\{2,3\}\}$ ?

- 2-approx
- 4-approx
- 3-approx
- More than 4



## THE MECHANISM

- The MiX-AND-MATCH mechanism:
- Mix: choose a random partition $\Pi$ - Match: Execute MATCH $_{\Pi}$
- Theorem [Ashlagi et al. 2010]: Mix-ANDMATCH is strategyproof and guarantees a 2-approximation
- We only prove the approximation ratio


## PROOF OF THEOREM

- $M^{*}=$ optimal matching
- Create a matching $M^{\prime}$ such that $M^{\prime}$ is max cardinality on each $V_{i}$, and
$\sum_{i}\left|M_{i i}^{\prime}\right|+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j}\left|M_{i j}^{\prime}\right| \geq \sum_{i}\left|M_{i i}^{*}\right|+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j}\left|M_{i j}^{*}\right|$
- $M^{* *}=$ max cardinality on each $V_{i}$
- For each path $P$ in $M^{*} \Delta M^{* *}$, add $P \cap M^{* *}$ to $M^{\prime}$ if $M^{* *}$ has more internal edges than $M^{*}$, otherwise add $P \cap M^{*}$ to $M^{\prime}$
- For every internal edge $M^{\prime}$ gains relative to $M^{*}$, it loses at most one edge overall ■


## PROOF OF THEOREM

- Fix $\Pi$ and let $M^{\Pi}$ be the output of $\mathrm{MATCH}_{\Pi}$
- The mechanism returns max cardinality across $\Pi$ subject to being max cardinality internally, therefore
$\sum_{i}\left|M_{i i}^{\Pi}\right|+\sum_{i \in \Pi_{1}, j \in \Pi_{2}}\left|M_{i j}^{\Pi}\right| \geq \sum_{i}\left|M_{i i}^{\prime}\right|+\sum_{i \in \Pi_{1}, j \in \Pi_{2}}\left|M_{i j}^{\prime}\right|$


## PROOF OF THEOREM

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\left|M^{\Pi}\right|\right] & =\frac{1}{2^{n}} \sum_{\Pi}\left(\sum_{i}\left|M_{i i}^{\Pi}\right|+\sum_{i \in \Pi_{1}, j \in \Pi_{2}}\left|M_{i j}^{\Pi}\right|\right) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2^{n}} \sum_{\Pi}\left(\sum_{i}\left|M_{i i}^{\prime}\right|+\sum_{i \in \Pi_{1}, j \in \Pi_{2}}\left|M_{i j}^{\prime}\right|\right) \\
& =\sum_{i}\left|M_{i i}^{\prime}\right|+\frac{1}{2^{n}} \sum_{\Pi} \sum_{i \in \Pi_{1}, j \in \Pi_{2}}\left|M_{i j}^{\prime}\right| \\
& =\sum_{i}\left|M_{i i}^{\prime}\right|+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j}\left|M_{i j}^{\prime}\right| \geq \sum_{i}\left|M_{i i}^{*}\right|+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j}\left|M_{i j}^{*}\right| \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i}\left|M_{i i}^{*}\right|+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j}\left|M_{i j}^{*}\right|=\frac{1}{2}\left|M^{*}\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

