

Graph-based many-to-one dynamic ride-matching for shared mobility services in congested networks

Seyed Mehdi Meshkani^{a,*}, Bilal Farooq^a

^a*Laboratory of Innovations in Transportation (LiTrans), Ryerson University, Canada*

Abstract

On-demand shared mobility systems require matching of one (one-to-one) or multiple riders (many-to-one) to a vehicle based on real-time information. We propose a novel graph-based algorithm (GMOMatch) for dynamic many-to-one matching problem in the presence of traffic congestion. The proposed algorithm, which is an iterative two-step method, provides high service quality and is efficient in terms of computational complexity. GMOMatch starts with a one-to-one matching in step 1 and is followed by solving a maximum weight matching problem in step 2 to combine the travel requests. To evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithm, it is compared with a ride-matching algorithm by IBM (Simonetto et al., 2019). Both algorithms are implemented in a micro-traffic simulator to assess their performance and also their impacts on traffic congestion. Downtown Toronto road network is chosen as the study area. In comparison to IBM algorithm, GMOMatch improves the service quality and traffic travel time by 32% and 4%, respectively. A sensitivity analysis is also conducted over different parameters to show their impacts on the service quality.

Keywords: Shared on-demand mobility, ride-matching, graph-based algorithm, congested network

1. Introduction

According to the United Nations (UN), 68 percent of the world's population will live in urban areas by 2050 (Ritchie, 2018). Such rapid growth in urbanization increases the demand for transportation (Tafreshian and Masoud, 2020). To simultaneously satisfy this demand and ameliorate the negative impacts of transportation (e.g. road congestion and emissions), more sustainable forms of transportation modes need to be conceived.

Over the last few years, with the advancements in information and communication technology, emergence of smartphones, and ubiquity of high-speed internet, on-demand shared mobility services such as ridehailing and ridesharing as more sustainable forms of transportation has gained extensive attention and have shown large growth in recent years (Agatz et al., 2011; Feng et al., 2017). Benefits of such system include point-to-point high level of service, decrease in traffic congestion and emissions, decline in parking space demand, and reduction in travel cost (Mourad et al., 2019; Najmi et al., 2017). However, a study conducted by Castiglione et al. (2018) to evaluate the traffic congestion in San Francisco between 2010 and 2016 showed that on-demand transportation companies such as Uber and Lyft contribute significantly to the increase in traffic congestion. In order to obtain sustainable benefits from such

*Corresponding Author.

Email addresses: smeshkani@ryerson.ca (Seyed Mehdi Meshkani), bilal.farooq@ryerson.ca (Bilal Farooq)

on-demand services, well-designed on-demand shared mobility systems need to be developed that can utilize the supply optimally, while providing high level of service.

Ride-matching problem as the core of ridehailing and ridesharing systems is the generalization of the dial-a-ride problem (DARP) (Tafreshian et al., 2020) that finds the best vehicle from a large pool of vehicle for a ride request (Yu et al., 2019). Many-to-one dynamic ride-matching refers to on-demand shared mobility services such as ridehailing and ridesharing where one vehicle can serve multiple riders. According to Lokhandwala and Cai (2018), ridesharing and increase in the vehicle occupancy rate can reduce the current taxi fleet by 59% while maintaining the service quality. Regarding the importance of ridesharing and vehicle occupancy rate on improving the efficiency of ride-matching systems, various studies have addressed the many-to-one ride-matching problem in which one vehicle can serve multiple riders (Masoud and Jayakrishnan, 2017b; Alonso-Mora et al., 2017; Simonetto et al., 2019; Tafreshian and Masoud, 2020). Computational complexity and service quality are two important aspects of such problems. Masoud and Jayakrishnan (2017b) utilized a FCFS method to match riders with vehicles. Although this method is efficient in terms of computational complexity, there is not any guarantee to provide the ride-matching system with a high-quality level of service, especially in the congested networks. Alonso-Mora et al. (2017) developed a multi-step algorithm for many-to-one ride-matching problem. The proposed algorithm is efficient in terms of service quality. However, they use a heuristic method to solve an integer optimization problem whose computational complexity may be an issue for scalability. Simonetto et al. (2019) proposed a ride-matching method based on linear assignment problem. The method is tractable computationally, nevertheless, because at each algorithm run time only a one-to-one matching problem is solved and riders are not combined, the quality of the service may not always be guaranteed. Tafreshian and Masoud (2020) proposed a many-to-one ridesharing algorithm based on graph partitioning. Although their algorithm is efficient computationally, they did not evaluate indicators related to the quality of the ridesharing service.

In this study we propose a novel graph-based heuristic algorithm (GMOMatch) for dynamic many-to-one ride-matching problem which reduces the complexity of the problem while providing high-quality service. The proposed algorithm is iterative and consists of two steps. In the first step, riders are assigned to vehicles through solving a one-to-one ride-matching problem. Then in the second step, a maximum weight matching problem is solved to combine riders with similar itineraries through the idea of matching of vehicles. Furthermore, the proposed algorithm is implemented on an agent-based micro-traffic simulator to measure different indicators and examine the impact of ride-matching algorithm on the traffic congestion. Finally, to evaluate the performance of our proposed algorithm, a comparison is conducted with the matching algorithm developed by Simonetto et al. (2019) at IBM. GMOMatch ride-matching algorithm can be applied on different types of shared mobility services (static/dynamic) such as ridehailing, ridesharing, microtransit, and shuttles.

The main contributions of this work are as follow:

1. Development of a novel heuristic algorithm for dynamic many-to-one ride-matching problem that is efficient in terms of computational complexity, while providing high-quality level of service.
2. Implementation of the algorithm on an agent-based micro-traffic simulator and assessment of various indicators in the presence of traffic congestion.

3. Comparative evaluation and sensitivity analysis of the performance of the proposed algorithm.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we briefly review the literature on ridehailing and ridesharing services. Section 3 introduces the dynamic ride-matching system, including system setting, system framework, and steps of the ride-matching algorithm (GMOMatch). The description of the case study, results and discussions are presented in section 4. Finally, Section 5 concludes our findings and provides some directions for future research.

2. Background

In this section, we review the existing literature on matching algorithms used in dynamic ridehailing and ridesharing services and then we explain how our work is different from them.

Dynamic ridehailing and ridesharing are two common types of on-demand shared mobility services. Dynamic ridehailing is a transportation service for compensation in which drivers and passengers are matched real-time (Shaheen et al., 2019). In such systems drivers unlike passengers do not have a tight time window (Tafreshian et al., 2020) which makes it more similar to a taxi service. Dynamic ridesharing is a service that connects drivers and passengers with similar itineraries and time schedule in order to split travel costs (Agatz et al., 2011; Shaheen et al., 2019). In both systems, drivers and passengers are connected by a mobility service provider, mostly through a mobile application based on real-time information (Agatz et al., 2012; Shaheen et al., 2019; Wang and Yang, 2019).

Ridehailing and ridesharing systems in the literature can be characterized by a variety of features such as matching type and modeling scale. Some research efforts in the literature focused on one-to-one matching problem in which a single driver/ vehicle can be matched with at most one rider (Agatz et al., 2011; Nourinejad and Roorda, 2016; Najmi et al., 2017; Lyu et al., 2019; Bertsimas et al., 2019; Özkan and Ward, 2020). while some other studies addressed the many-to-one matching problem where multiple riders are served by a single vehicle/driver (Jung et al., 2016; Alonso-Mora et al., 2017; Masoud and Jayakrishnan, 2017a,b; Qian et al., 2017; Simonetto et al., 2019).

Jung et al. (2016) introduced a Hybrid-Simulated Annealing (HSA) algorithm to solve dynamic ride-matching problem. They used Korea Transport Institute (KOTI) regional transportation planning model to simulate their proposed algorithm. Their results revealed that HSA can enhance the efficiency of dynamic ride-sharing systems. Masoud and Jayakrishnan (2017a) proposed a decomposition algorithm in order to convert the original many-to-many ride-matching problem into smaller sub-problems which are tractable computationally. They introduced a pre-processing procedure to reduce the size of the optimization problem. Sub-problems are independent from each other which allows computations to be done in parallel. To evaluate the performance of the decomposition algorithm, they generated 420 random instances which each instance is different in terms of number of riders and drivers. They applied it on a grid network with 49 stations. The number of participants varies between 20-400. Earliest departure times of all trips were generated randomly within a one-hour time period. Also, in another research effort, Masoud and Jayakrishnan (2017b) presented a real-time and optimal algorithm for many-to-many ride-matching problem which aims to maximize the number of served rider in the system. Their matching algorithm is based on FCFS while the participants' itineraries are determined using dynamic programming. In order to improve the quality of the solution obtained by FCFS, they introduced a P2P exchange method. To assess the performance of their algorithm, they generated multiple random

instances of ridesharing problem with different ratio of riders to drivers. The size of the participants is 1000. Similar to the previous study, they used a grid network with 59 stations and generated the trips randomly within a one-hour time period. [Qian et al. \(2017\)](#) addressed the taxi group ride problem (TGR) to optimally grouping passengers with similar itineraries. They proposed three algorithms, including exact, heuristic, and greedy algorithms. To evaluate the performance of the algorithm, they used two datasets, including 2015 NYC taxi data and 2009 Wuhan and Shenzhen data. Their results showed that the heuristic algorithm outperformed the other two in term of efficiency and solution quality and the proposed TGR algorithm can help to save over 47% of total travel miles if applied in real world.

[Alonso-Mora et al. \(2017\)](#) suggested a multi-step graph-based procedure to efficiently assign drivers to riders. Their algorithm allowed the use of low as well as high capacity vehicles. First, they created a shareability graph of requests and vehicles, then graph of candidate trips and vehicles that can execute them is created and finally, using integer linear programming (ILP), they optimally assign requests to vehicles. The computational complexity of the ILP is $O(mn^v)$ which m is the number of vehicles, n is the number of requests, and v is the maximum capacity of the vehicles. They deployed NYC taxi data to evaluate the performance of their algorithm. Their results showed that 98% of the taxi rides instead of 13000 taxis could be served with just 3,000 taxis of capacity four. [Simonetto et al. \(2019\)](#) used a federated architecture to linearly assign requests to vehicles. Their proposed system consisted of a context-mapping algorithm to filter vehicles, a single dial-a-ride problem to obtain optimal route and associated cost, and a linear assignment problem to optimally match requests to vehicles. They used NYC taxi datasets and the Melbourne Metropolitan Area dataset to show the performance of their ride-matching system. They compared their algorithm with [Alonso-Mora et al. \(2017\)](#) and reported less computational complexity while maintaining high-quality ride-matching level of service.

Another feature of ridehailing and ridesharing systems in the literature is the modeling scale. Most of the studies in the context of ridehailing and ridesharing have been simulated and implemented at macroscopic/mesoscopic scale ([Nourinejad and Roorda, 2016](#); [Masoud and Jayakrishnan, 2017a](#); [Alonso-Mora et al., 2017](#); [Simonetto et al., 2019](#); [Tafreshian and Masoud, 2020](#)). One of the issues associated with these scales is that it is not clear how the proposed ride-matching system and traffic congestion affect each other in the presence of other vehicles ([Guériau et al., 2020](#)). Some recent studies in the context of shared automated vehicles (SAVs) used microsimulation to address how SAVs affects urban mobility systems ([Dandl et al., 2017](#); [Oh et al., 2020](#); [Huang et al., 2020](#); [Guériau et al., 2020](#)). [Dandl et al. \(2017\)](#) deployed a microsimulation model to study how autonomous taxi system affects traffic network in the city of Munich. [Oh et al. \(2020\)](#) assessed the performance of shared driverless taxis including demand, supply and their interactions. On the supply side, they developed a heuristic matching and routing algorithm. [Huang et al. \(2020\)](#) explores the idea of using SAVs to bring first-mile last-mile connectivity to transit in automated mobility districts. [Guériau et al. \(2020\)](#) developed a reinforcement learning-based shared autonomous mobility on-demand system with dynamic ridesharing and rebalancing strategies where vehicles consider traffic congestion in their decisions.

In this literature, we reviewed some studies on many-to-one ridehailing and ridesharing services and also we addressed some studies which have used micro-traffic simulator. In [Alonso-Mora et al. \(2017\)](#), computational complexity is dependent on the vehicle capacity as reviewed, which may cause an issue for scalability. However, the computation complexity in our proposed algorithm is fixed and similar to the algorithm developed by [Simonetto et al. \(2019\)](#). Nevertheless, unlike [Simonetto et al. \(2019\)](#), where each

vehicle is matched with only one rider at each update time, our algorithm combines requests with similar itineraries which leads to utilizing available vehicles more efficiently, improving the quality of service, and enhancing the traffic congestion. Furthermore, to the best of our knowledge, there are just a few studies (Oh et al., 2020; Guérliau et al., 2020) in the context of ridehailing and ridesharing that developed a new ride-matching algorithm and applied it on a microsimulator to evaluate their performance in the presence of other vehicles. This study is one of the first research efforts that proposes a novel ride-matching algorithm and implements it on a micro-traffic simulator to examine its performance in the presence of other vehicles.

3. Methodology

In this section, we first introduce the general setup of a dynamic ride-matching system and its characteristics, then we propose the ride-matching (GMOMatch) algorithm.

3.1. Dynamic ride-matching system setup

We consider a set of ride requests $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_m\}$ and a set of vehicles $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ with total capacity of cap at time t . The ride-matching service aims to assign online ride requests to vehicles and find corresponding schedules while some constraints are satisfied. A ride request/rider refers to a person who places his/her order mostly through a mobile application to be picked up from his origin and to be dropped off at his destination. An available vehicle is a vehicle which has at least one empty space. Each available vehicle can be assigned no more than its current empty seats. Furthermore, a passenger refers to a ride request that has been assigned to a vehicle. This passenger can be already on-board or can be waiting to be picked up. The set of passengers assigned to a vehicle $v \in V$ is denoted by P_v .

Each request $r \in R$ consists of a request-time (t_r), origin (O_r), and destination (D_r). In addition, as in Agatz et al. (2011), we assume that each request (r) provides an earliest departure time from their origin (e_r) and latest time they would like to arrive at their destination (l_r) (see Fig. 1a). Furthermore, there is a time flexibility which specifies the difference between rider's earliest departure time and the latest time (q_r) he would like to depart and is computed as $f_r = l_r - e_r - T(O_r, D_r)$, where $T(O_r, D_r)$ is the travel time when rider directly goes from his origin to destination. Without the loss of generality in order to make the system more dynamic, in this study, we assume that travel request time and their earliest departure time are the same ($t_r = e_r$).

To solve the dynamic ride-matching problem in real time, we use rolling horizon strategy suggested by Agatz et al. (2011). In this strategy, the ride-matching algorithm is solved periodically at specific time over fixed time intervals referred to as "update time" $t_u^k (k = 0, 1, 2, \dots)$ and update interval ($\Delta^k = t_u^k - t_u^{k-1}$) (see Fig. 1b). During each update interval, new riders place their orders to get a ride. At each update time, system operator considers both new riders and those who have not been finalized or expired. A request is finalized when it has been assigned to a vehicle and expired when the current time exceeds its latest departure time, while the request was not assigned to a vehicle. Rolling horizon iterations continue until all riders exit the system either by being matching or by having expired. As an example, in Fig. 1b, when the system operator runs the ride-matching algorithm at current time t_u^{k+1} , it includes all of the new requests $\{r_4, r_5, r_6\}$ over update interval Δ^{k+1} and all requests $\{r_1, r_3\}$ related to previous update intervals Δ^k and Δ^{k-1} but $\{r_2\}$ which has been expired because the current time t_u^{k+1} exceeds r_2 's latest departure time.




Figure 1: Ridehailing framework setting

A set of constraints Z consists of a capacity constraint (z_0) and two time constraints (z_1, z_2). These constraints need to be satisfied so that one vehicle potentially is capable of serving a request. The zero constraint z_0 ensures that each vehicle has at least one empty space. In other words, zero constraint finds available vehicles. The first constraint (z_1) states that any request r should be picked up no longer than its latest departure time q_r and the second constraint (z_2) expresses that it should be dropped off no longer than its latest departure time l_r .

3.2. GMOMatch algorithm

Given a set of ride requests R and set of vehicles V at current time t from section 3.1, the many- to-one ride-matching problem is the matching of riders with vehicles such that each vehicle can be matched with multiple riders. In this problem vehicles can be low, medium, or high capacity. To solve this problem, we propose GMOMatch which is a graph-based iterative algorithm that returns requests-vehicles matching and pick up/drop off scheduling. Fig. 2 illustrates the GMOMatch algorithm along with a simple example.

The algorithm consists of two steps (Fig. 2a). In the first step, we consider a bipartite graph to match requests with vehicles. Vehicles can be idle or enroute. The output of this step is one-to-one matching and creating a set of assigned vehicles (Definition 1). In the second step which is iterative, we create a vehicle directed graph whose vertices are assigned vehicles. Then we solve a maximum weight matching problem to match assigned vehicles with each other (Definition 2) and combine associated requests. The main algorithm is also iterative and ends when some criteria are satisfied.

Definition 1. Let R_v be the assigned requests set, which is the set of requests assigned to vehicle v during the matching process. It is empty at the beginning of the matching at every update time t^k ($\forall v \in V: R_v = \emptyset$). A vehicle $v \in V$ is defined as an assigned vehicle if its requests set is not empty






Figure 2: Two-step iterative method

($R_v = \emptyset$). As an example in Fig. 3 (a) both vehicles v_n and v_n are assigned vehicles while in 3 (b) just v_n is considered assigned vehicle.

Definition 2 . Two assigned vehicles v_n and v_n are matched with each other when requests set of one of them depending on the direction of link between them is assigned to the other one. As presented in Fig. 3, vehicle v_n is matched with vehicle v_n (a) which means that its requests set is assigned to v_n (b).




Figure 3: Matching of vehicles

Figures 2b and 2c display a small example of how the proposed iterative method works in order to assign requests to vehicles. In Fig. 2b, the algorithm starts with one-to-one matching problem and assigns four requests (out of eight) to four vehicles. Then it is followed by matching of vehicles, which has two iterations and during which two vehicles matched together. This step ends until some criteria are satisfied. Since four non-assigned requests were still left, the second iteration comes in (Fig. 2c) to assign them to the vehicles. Again the algorithm continues until some criteria and constraints are met. In the following, these two steps will be explained in detail.

3.3. Step 1: one-to-one matching problem

The first step of the method is one-to-one matching problem, which can be represented by a bipartite graph $G = (I, L)$, where I is the set of nodes, including all requests and vehicles ($I = R \cup V$), and L is the set of links. Link $l_{rv} \in L$ between request r and vehicle v exists if constraint set Z is satisfied. Each link has a travel cost ($c_{rv} \in C$) where C is the set of travel costs and (c_{rv}) is defined as the time duration needed by a vehicle v to serve both its already scheduled passengers and request r . The goal of the proposed one-to-one matching problem is minimizing vehicles' total travel time.

Let M be the current location of vehicle $v \in V$, then z_1 and z_2 can be expressed mathematically as Eq. 1 and Eq. 2.

$$t + t_{rv}(M, O_r) \leq q_r \quad (1)$$

$$t + t_{rv}(M, O_r) + t_{rv}(O_r, D_r) \leq l_r \quad (2)$$

Where t is current time and equals update time $t = t_{it}^k$, $t_{rv}(M, O_r)$ is travel time from vehicle's current position to request's origin, and $t_{rv}(O_r, D_r)$ is travel time between request's origin and destination. As mentioned, Eq. 1 ensures that request r would be picked up by vehicle v no more than his latest departure time (q_r) and Eq. 2 expresses that request r would be dropped off no more than its latest arrival time (l_r).

To create a bipartite graph G , first we specify the set of vehicles that can potentially serve each request ($V_r^f, \forall r \in R$) and we name it the set of feasible vehicles for request r . To this end, for each travel request r a search space based on his time flexibility is created. By assuming request r is the first passenger to be picked up, all of the vehicles whose travel time from their current location to the request's origin are not more than request's flexibility are considered (Eq. 3). Vehicles can be idle or enroute. A vehicle is enroute if it already has been assigned to some passengers and is traveling to pick up/drop

off them. It is worth mentioning that creating search space for the requests can significantly reduce the computational complexity of the problem which will be explained further.

$$t_{rv}(M, O_r) \leq f_r \quad (3)$$

Given m number of requests and n number of vehicles, to calculate travel time the worst case is that for each request we consider all vehicles which is $O(mn)$ which scales linearly with the number of vehicles and requests. However, creating search space reduces the number of feasible vehicles significantly. Let k be the maximum number of feasible vehicles which is much less than number of vehicles $k \ll n$. In this case, the computational complexity would be $O(mk)$.

Proposition 1. vehicles that violate Eq. 3 (e.g. $t_{rv}(M, O_r) \geq f_r$) cannot serve request r .

Proof. Based on z_1 we have the inequality $t + t_{rv}(M, O_r) \leq q_r$. On the other hand, for each request r and vehicle v , $t \geq e_r$ and $t_{rv}(M, O_r) \geq f_r$. Thus, $t + t_{rv}(M, O_r) \geq e_r + f_r = q_r$ which shows z_1 is not satisfied and vehicle v cannot serve request r .

After finding vehicles for each request, their travel cost and optimal travel path is calculated. Each vehicle $v \in V$ has a current travel path (before considering request r) denoted by Λ_v and updated travel path (with considering request r) denoted by Λ_v , that specifies which locations need to be visited to pick up/drop off. As mentioned, the travel cost of request r ($c_{rv} \in C$) is the time duration of travel path (Λ_v) of vehicle v to serve its existing scheduled passengers as well as request r .

To obtain travel cost c_{rv} and optimal travel path Λ_v^* , a vehicle routing problem, which in the literature is known as a single-vehicle dial-a-ride problem (Häme, 2011; Liu et al., 2015; Ho et al., 2018), needs to be solved. The objective is to minimize the travelled path time of vehicle v subject to the constraint set Z . To do so, we propose a function whose inputs are spatiotemporal information of request r (Ω_r) (e.g. origin, destination, time window), current travel path (Λ_v) of vehicle v , spatiotemporal information of already scheduled passengers P_v (Θ_{P_v}) and available capacity of vehicle v (cap_v). This function is proposed as Eq. 4.

$$(c_{rv}, \Lambda_v) = PathCost(\Omega_r, \Lambda_v, \Theta_{P_v}, cap_v) \quad (4)$$

To solve the proposed single-vehicle DARP problem (adding a new request r to current vehicle path Λ_v), for vehicles which already have at most two scheduled passengers (four locations in their path to pick up/drop off), we enumerate all possible cases to compute the exact optimal path. For vehicles with more than two scheduled passengers, as in Alonso-Mora et al. (2017) and Simonetto et al. (2019), we use an insertion heuristic method (Algorithm 1) based on which new request's pick up and drop off locations are inserted, while the current order of the schedule of Λ_v is kept. For instance, the current travel path of vehicle v is $tour = (+p_2, -p_1, -p_2)$ which means passenger 2 pick up, passenger 1 drop off, and passenger 2 drop off. Passenger 3 can be added as $newtour = (+p_3, -p_3, +p_2, -p_1, -p_2)$, $newtour = (+p_3, +p_2, -p_1, -p_2, -p_3)$, $newtour = (+p_2, -p_1, +p_3, -p_2, -p_3)$, and The time duration of each $newtour$ is calculated and then the one with minimum travel time is chosen.

Given s be the number of scheduled locations (origin and destination) in the vehicle tour, based on the proposed insertion method there would be $(s + 1)$ spots for the new request's origin and destination. Thus, the computational complexity of the insertion method for one request is $O(s^2)$ and for the entire bipartite graph with mk edges is $O(mks^2)$.

Algorithm 1

```
tour  $\leftarrow \Lambda_v$ 
L  $\leftarrow \text{length}(\text{tour})$ 
1  $\leftarrow k$ 
tour( $w : y$ ) returns the  $w$ -th index to  $y$ -th index
for  $i=0:L$  do
    newtour  $\leftarrow [ \text{tour}(1 : i) \ O_r \ \text{tour}(i + 1 : \text{end}) ]$ 
    M  $\leftarrow \text{length}(\text{newtour})$ 
    for  $j=i+1:M$  do
        newtour  $\leftarrow [ \text{newtour}(1 : j) \ D_r \ \text{newtour}(j + 1 : \text{end}) ]$ 
        if newtour satisfies the constrains Z then
             $c_{rv}^k \leftarrow$  time duration of newtour
            newtourk  $\leftarrow$  newtour
            k + 1  $\leftarrow$  k
        end if
    end for
end for
k*  $\leftarrow \arg \min \{ c_{rv}^k \}_{k=1, \dots, \max k}$ 
return  $c_{rv} = c_{rv}^{k*} \quad \Lambda_v = \text{newtour}^{k*}$ 
```

The presented one-to-one matching problem can be mathematically formulated as an integer programming model (5). The decision variable x_{rv} is 1 if vehicle v and request r match with each other and 0 otherwise. The objective function (Eq. 5a) aims at minimizing the total travel time of the vehicles. Constrains 5b and 5c ensure that each vehicle/request is matched with one request/vehicle (if symmetric $|R| = |V|$). Due to the structure of constraints in linear assignment problems which is completely unimodular, the binary constraint $x_{rv} \in \{0, 1\}$ can be relaxed and expressed as Constraint 5d.

$$\min \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{v \in V(r,v) \in L} c_{rv} x_{rv} \quad (5a)$$

$$\sum_{r \in R: (r,v) \in L} x_{rv} = 1 \quad \forall v \in V \quad (5b)$$

$$\sum_{v \in V: R(r,v) \in L} x_{rv} = 1 \quad \forall r \in R \quad (5c)$$

$$0 \leq x_{rv} \leq 1 \quad (5d)$$

In case of being asymmetric, when the cardinal number of requests and vehicles are not equal ($|R| \neq |V|$), depending on which one of $|R|$ or $|V|$ is lower, $||R| - |V||$ artificial requests or vehicles should be added, respectively, to convert the problem to a symmetric one. In such case, the travel cost between a request/vehicle and an artificial vehicle/request is considered $c_{rv} = \infty \in C$. To solve the symmetric assignment problem 5, we use auction algorithm, which is considered as a very effective approach to such problems (Bertsekas, 1981).

The output of the one-to-one matching problem here is the matching of requests with vehicles and pick up/drop off scheduling (travel path).




Figure 4: Vehicle graph potential links

3.4. Step 2: Matching of vehicles

The second step of the algorithm is iterative. In the first iteration, the input is the output of step 1 while for the second iteration or so, the input is the output of previous iteration. Let $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\} \subseteq V$ be the set of assigned vehicles from step 1. P_v represents the updated P_v for assigned vehicles which is $P_v = R_v \cup P_v$. R_v for the assigned vehicles in the first iteration is just one request r (as the result of one-to-one matching) while for the next iterations because vehicles are matched with each other, it may have more requests.

We define a directed graph $G_v = (I, L)$ where I is the set of nodes representing assigned vehicles (V) and L is the set of directed links. Hereafter in this study graph G_v is called a vehicle graph. A directed link $l_{vv} \in L$ between any two vehicles v and v ($v, v \in V$) exists if some constraints and criteria set Z are satisfied. To create vehicle graph G_v , first we need to determine which nodes can be connected to each other. Fig. 4 showcases an example of the potential nodes that each node can be connected with. Fig. 4a represents a bipartite graph with four requests and seven vehicles. From step 1, we know that each request has a set of feasible vehicles (V_r^f). In Fig. 4b, through one-to-one assignment in step 1, requests and vehicles are matched together. As mentioned, assigned vehicles $V = \{v_1, v_4, v_5, v_6\}$ constitute the nodes of vehicle graph (Fig. 4c.). Each vehicle $v \in V$ in vehicle graph can only be connected to the set of feasible vehicles of request r (V_r^f). For instance, in vehicle graph in Fig. 4c, v_1 can only be connected to v_4 and v_6 because the set of feasible vehicles of request r_2 in request-vehicle bipartite graph (Fig. 4a) is $V_2^f = \{v_1, v_3, v_4, v_6\}$. Likewise, v_6 can be connected to v_1 and v_5 because r_3 's feasible vehicle set is $V_3^f = \{v_1, v_3, v_5, v_6\}$. However, v_5 in this vehicle graph as seen cannot be connected to any other vehicle since r_1 's feasible vehicle set is $V_1^f = \{v_2, v_3, v_5, v_7\}$.

Given the number of assigned vehicles n , in the worst case when each vehicle can be connected to all

other vehicles, the complexity is $O(n^2)$. However, because from step 1 (3.3) each request is connected to k feasible vehicles, in the worst case each vehicle can be connected to $(k - 1)$ vehicles. Thus the complexity is $O(nk)$.

After determining the feasible nodes for each node of vehicle graph, we need to create the set of directed links L . To do so, we define some criteria and constraints Z : z_1) only idle assigned vehicles can be matched with other assigned vehicles (idle/enroute) z_2) assigned vehicles with less occupants can be matched with assigned vehicles with more occupants z_3) the size of assigned requests set $|R_v|$ related to assigned vehicle $v \in V$ should be less than or equal of current available capacity of other vehicles.

Fig. 5 shows an example to clarify these criteria. Consider vehicle graph in Fig. 5a in which $\{v_1, v_2, v_4\}$ are idle and $\{v_3, v_5\}$ are enroute. It is assumed that the total capacity of vehicles is six, and two vehicles of v_3 and v_5 each has four occupants ($|P_3| = 4$ and $|P_5| = 4$).




Figure 5: Vehicle graph: creating set of links

Based on the first criteria (z_1), idles vehicles $\{v_1, v_2, v_4\}$ can match to any other vehicles while $\{v_3$ and $v_5\}$ as enroute vehicles cannot match. Fig. 5b represents the modified vehicle graph based on z_1 . Assuming that in the first iteration of step 2, v_2 is matched with v_1 , the vehicle graph in the second iteration is formed as Fig. 5c. In this Figure, based on the second criterion (z_2), v_4 can be matched with v_1 ($|P_4| = 1 \leq |P_1| = 2$), v_1 can be matched with v_3 ($|P_1| = 2 \leq |P_3| = 5$) and v_4 can be matched with v_5 ($|P_4| = 1 \leq |P_5| = 5$). The altered vehicle graph can be seen in Fig. 5d. The third criterion (z_3) expresses that vehicles should have enough empty space. For instance, in the obtained vehicle graph, shown in Fig. 5e, the set of assigned requests of v_1 ($R_1 = \{r_4, r_3\}$) which has two request members

cannot be matched with v_5 because it just has one empty space ($|R_1| = 2 \geq cap_5 = 1$) while v_4 can match to other vehicles of v_1 and v_5 .

In addition to these three criteria, constraints $Z = \{z_1, z_2\}$ mentioned in Step 1 should be satisfied. Notice that constraints should be checked for all members of assigned requests set R_v . As in Step 1, a routing function is used through which these two constraints are checked, and optimal path and associated cost is obtained. This routing function is as Eq. 6.

$$(c_{vv}, \Lambda^*) = PathCost(\Omega_{R_v}, \Lambda_v, \Theta_{P_v}, cap_v) \quad (6)$$

Where Ω_{R_v} is the spatiotemporal information related to members of assigned requests set (R_v), Λ_v is the updated travel path of vehicle v , Θ_{P_v} is the spatiotemporal information of updated scheduled passengers (P_v), cap_v is the available capacity of vehicle v , c_{vv} is the travel cost associated with the directed link (l_{vv}) and Λ^* is the optimal travel path of vehicle v . To calculate travel cost and optimal travel path, we modified the insertion heuristic method presented in Step 1 (e.g. Algorithm 1) to propose algorithm 2.

To illustrate this algorithm, consider two vehicles in Fig. 6 which v_1 is idle and v_2 is enroute. To assign $R_1 = \{r_1, r_2\}$ to v_2 (e.g. match v_1 to v_2), the current travel path of v_1 , which is represented by $tour = \Lambda_1$, is divided into two parts from the middle. To create new a travel path of v_2 , each part is added to Λ_2 , while keeping the current pick up/drop off orders. Notice that to create new path, part 1 of $tour$ should be placed before part 2. *newtour1* and *mewtour2* in Fig. 6 show two examples of new travel path of v_2 . For each new travel path, the time duration of each *newtour* is calculated and then the one with minimum travel time is chosen. Based on the set of travel costs $c_{vv} \in C$ acquired from Eq. 6, a set of directed links $l_{vv} \in L$ of vehicle graph is determined.

Similar to the previous insertion method, given s be the number of scheduled location in the vehicle tour, there will be $(s + 1)$ spots for the new riders' Part 1 and 2. Thus, the computational complexity of the insertion method for one request is $O(s^2)$ and for the entire vehicle graph with n k edges is $O(nks^2)$.

In the obtained directed vehicle graph, the purpose is to find a match to minimize the total travel cost. To solve this problem, we can convert it into a maximum weight matching problem in general graphs. To do so, without the loss of generality, we assume that the vehicle graph is undirected. We can impose this assumption because total weights are independent from links directions. Furthermore, all of the travel costs need to be multiplied by minus one. To solve maximum weight matching problem, we use Edmonds' algorithm (Saunders, 2013). The computational complexity of this algorithm is $O(|V|^3)$,




Figure 6: Creating new travel path

Algorithm 2

```
tour1 ←  $\Lambda_v$ 
tour breaks into two parts
1stP art ← tour first part
2ndP art ← tour second part
tour2 ←  $\Lambda_v$ 
L ← length(tour2)
L ← length(1stP art)
1 ← k
tour(w : y) returns the w-th index to y-th index
for i=0:L do
  newtour ← [ tour2(1 : i) 1stP art tour2(i + 1 : end)]
  M ← length(newtour)
  for j=i+L :M do
    newtour ← [ newtour(1 : j) 2ndP art newtour(j + 1 : end)]
    if newtour satisfies the constrains Z then
       $c_{vv}^{(k)}$  ← time duration of newtour
      newtourk ← newtour
      k + 1 ← k
    end if
  end for
end for
k* ← arg min $\{k=1, \dots, \max k\}$  { $c_{vv}^{(k)}$ }
return  $c_{vv} = c_{vv}^{(k^*)}$        $\Lambda_v^* = \textit{newtour}^k$ 
```

where V is the set of nodes and is equivalent to the set of assigned vehicles V in the vehicle graph.

As Step 2 of the algorithm is iterative, it continues until the set of directed links in vehicle graph is empty ($L = \emptyset$). This happens when feasible links are not satisfied criteria or constraints Z .

The algorithm stops when one of these conditions is satisfied: (1) set of travel requests is empty ($R = \emptyset$), (2) no available vehicles exist, or (3) set of links in bipartite graph G (step 1) is empty ($L = \emptyset$) which happens when constraints Z are not satisfied.

3.5. Properties of the algorithm

In this section, we provide some discussions related to the theoretical properties of GMOMatch algorithm in comparison with IBM algorithm developed by [Simonetto et al. \(2019\)](#) mostly in terms of computational complexity.

In IBM algorithm: 1) context mapping determines the potential vehicles for each request, 2) to specify vehicles travel path, a DARP problem using an insertion heuristic method is used, 3) an integer linear programming to assign requests to vehicles is solved, and 4) a rebalancing strategy for the vehicles is used. In GMOMatch algorithm, step 1 includes all stages of IBM algorithm except rebalancing. We create a search space to determine the potential vehicles for each request, which is equivalent to context mapping in IBM with the same computational complexity.

To specify the vehicle travel path, we use a heuristic insertion method with computation complexity of $O(s^2)$ for one request and $O(mks^2)$ for the entire bipartite graph which is a similar complexity as that of IBM. For solving integer linear programming with $N \times N$ cost matrix, both GMOMatch and IBM use auction algorithm with complexity of $O(N^3)$. Unlike IBM algorithm which does not combine requests, our GMOMatch combines requests in its second step. The maximum computational complexity in step 2 is related to solving maximum weight matching problem in a graph with computational complexity of $O(V^2 \cdot E)$ which V represents number of vertices and E is number of edges. As discussed, the computational complexity for both algorithms is the same. For solving linear assignment problem in step 1 of GMOMatch, other algorithms such as Hungarian algorithm with the same computational complexity of $O(N^3)$ as Auction algorithm can be used. However according to [Bertsekas \(1981\)](#), in large scale problems the auction algorithm outperforms the Hungarian. Furthermore, Hungarian algorithm does not guarantee convergence.

4. Numerical Experiment and Results

In this section, we briefly introduce the study area and explain how we synthesized the demand. Then the parameter settings for the simulation of GMOMatch on micro-traffic simulator are described. Furthermore, to evaluate the performance of the GMOMatch, we compare it with IBM algorithm and discuss on the obtained results. Finally, to assess how changing various variables and GMOMatch parameters affects the performance of the algorithm, a sensitivity analysis is conducted.

4.1. Implementation

We considered road network of Downtown Toronto as the study area. One of the reasons for choosing this network is that it faces recurrent congestion during morning and afternoon peak periods. Fig. 7 presents the road network of Downtown Toronto (3.14km x 3.31km) which consists of 268 nodes and 839 links.




Figure 7: Downtown Toronto street network

We developed both GMOMatch and the road network of Downtown Toronto in MATLAB and applied them on an in-house agent-based micro-traffic simulator (Djavadian and Farooq, 2018). The dynamic demand loading period in this study is 7:45am-8:00am (15 minutes) in the morning peak period. The demand used in this study is time dependent exogenous Origin-Destination (OD) demand matrices which is based on 5 minutes intervals and is obtained by applying 2018 growth factor on the travel data from the 2011 Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) of Toronto. The demand within 5 minutes are distributed randomly using a Poisson distribution. The demand also is randomly loaded on the nearest intersections. We consider all of the vehicles whose origins and/or destinations are within the study area, all of the vehicles traveling from study area surrounding zones to surrounding zones and half of those with one end in surrounding zones while another end is neither in study area nor surrounding zone. From the obtained demand which is 5,487 trips, we randomly extract a percentage of it (e.g. 10%, 15%, 20%, 25%) as the shared vehicles demand, while the rest of the demand is assumed to travel by their own single occupancy private vehicles. Also, in this study, we do not have any fleet size optimization and fleet size is determined exogenously.

Although, the network loading time is 15 minutes, the simulation time lasts until all passengers either arrive at their destination or leave the system. We assume that riders leave the system after their latest departure time if they are not assigned to any vehicles. Also, as mentioned in section 3.1, to make the ride-matching system more dynamic we assume that travel request time equals earliest departure time ($t_r = e_r$).

In order to evaluate the performance of our GMOMatch algorithm, we compare our results with a ride-matching algorithm (called IBM in this paper) developed by [Simonetto et al. \(2019\)](#) which is an algorithm based on linear assignment problem. We chose this algorithm because in terms of computational complexity it is one of the best algorithms in the literature while it maintains the quality of the service. In order to make a comparison, similar to GMOMatch we implement the IBM algorithm in MATLAB and applies it on the micro-traffic simulator. In both GMOMatch and IBM algorithms the shared vehicles are distributed proportional to the ridesharing demand such that locations with more demand have more shared vehicles. It is worth mentioning that the IBM algorithm in [Simonetto et al. \(2019\)](#), is capable of rebalancing vehicles, while in our GMOMatch, there is not any vehicle rebalancing. All simulations are implemented on three computers, including two computers with Core i7-8700 CPU, 3.20 GHz Intel with a 64-bit version of the Windows 10 operating system with 16.0 GB RAM and one computer with Core i7-6700K CPU, 4.00 GHz Intel with a 64-bit version of the Windows 10 operating system with 16.0 GB RAM.

4.2. Results

The first part of our results is related to comparing the performance of GMOMatch with IBM and in the second part, a sensitivity analysis is conducted to show the impact of different parameters on the quality of indicators. We considered eight indicators to measure for both algorithms. Table 1 shows the indicators with the abbreviations and their descriptions.

Table 1: Indicators, their abbreviations and descriptions

Indicators	Abbreviation	Description
Service rate (%)	SR	The percent of served requests per total requests
Average vehicle km traveled	VKT	Km traveled by each shared vehicle
Average detour time (min)	DT	The difference between shared ride travel time and direct travel time for a new request
Average wait time (min)	WT	The difference between new rider's pick up time and request time
Average traffic travel time (min)	TTT	Average all vehicles' travel time
Average traffic speed (km/hr)	TS	Average all vehicles' speed
Average number of assignment	No. A	Average number of request assignment per shared vehicle over the simulation period
Average computation time per call (sec)	-	Average time it takes the algorithm is solved at each update time


To compare the performance of GMOMatch with IBM, we created five scenarios by varying different fleet size (210, 230, 250, 270, 290). The shared vehicles demand is considered 25% of total demand (1,372 trips), flexibility is five minutes ($f = 5min$), vehicle capacity is four ($cap = 4$), and Update interval is $\Delta = 30sec$. Fig. 8 compares the performance of GMOMatch with IBM over different parameters. It is worth mentioning that the simulation for each algorithm took between 30 and 36 hours. Fig. 8a shows the service rate (SR) for two algorithms. As can be seen, for different fleet sizes, GMOMatch yields better service rate compared to the IBM such that for 290 fleet size, service rate for GMOMatch is 95.39%, while for IBM this number is 72.13% which shows a 32% improvement. One of the reasons for such huge difference is that IBM algorithm is based on one-to-one matching which means at each update time only one new request can be assigned to each vehicle despite of existing some requests with similar itineraries at one location. As shown in Fig. 8a, this feature affects the service rate negatively because in congested networks the probability of having several requests with similar itineraries is high, especially with specific origins/destinations such as first mile or last mile problems. On the other hand, GMOMatch by combining requests enhances the performance and with the same number of fleets and without any vehicle rebalancing increases the service rate which indicates the efficiency of the GMOMatch. In order to have a better comparison between two algorithms, in the other figures, besides the main indicator, we include service rate on the right side of the graphs.

Fig. 8b displays average VKT by shared vehicles over the simulation period. The GMOMatch shows lower values of VKT than IBM. For instance, for 290 fleet size, GMOMatch shows 16.07% improvement when compared to the IBM, while its service rate is 32% higher. One of the reasons is that in IBM because of one-to-one matching the vehicles which are enroute have to change their travel path more frequently and sometimes they may take long distance to pick up new passengers. This repetitive change in their travel path leads to increase in VKT. However, in the GMOMatch vehicles are usually assigned multiple passengers instead of one. This leads to having less change in travel path and decrease in VKT.


Fig. 8c and Fig. 8d demonstrate the average wait time (WT) and average detour time (DT) for different fleet sizes. Here it seems that there is not any significant difference between two algorithms. However, it should be noticed that GMOMatch with similar detour time and wait time as IBM served much higher number of requests. Because the network is highly congested, even passengers whose origins and destinations' distance are close to each other may experience high wait time and detour time.

Fig. 8e and Fig. 8f represents the average traffic travel time (TTT) and average traffic speed (TS) in the network. In the Fig. 8e, average traffic travel time for GMOMatch over different scenarios yields better results such that for 290 fleet size it shows 4.26% reduction when compared to IBM. Also, the average traffic speed in Fig. 8f, for all scenarios in GMOMatch shows higher speed values such that there is 4.07% increase for 290 fleet size. The reason is that IBM algorithm increases the number of shared vehicles in the road network because at each update time some idles shared vehicles may be assigned to new requests. These idles vehicles, which have only one occupant when start traveling, enter the road network and worsen the traffic congestion. However, combining requests in GMOMatch increases the vehicles' occupancy rate and reduces the number of shared vehicles on the road network. This leads to improvement in traffic travel time and traffic speed. These improvements are accompanied with higher service rate for GMOMatch as shown in the figures.


Fig. 8g displays the average number of assignments per vehicle during the simulation period. As can be seen in the figure the average number of assignments per vehicle for GMOMatch for different fleet size is higher than the IBM.




(a) Service rate (%)




(b) Average shared vehicle Km traveled-SR (%)




(c) Average wait time(min)-SR (%)




(d) Average detour time (min) -SR (%)




(e) Average traffic travel time (min)-SR (%)



(f) Average traffic speed (km/hr)-SR (%)



(g) Average No. assignment-SR (%)



(h) Computational time (min) per call-SR(%)

Figure 8: Different parameters vs fleet size: demand=25%, f=5min, cap=6

As discussed earlier, combining requests in GMOMatch compares with one-to-one matching in IBM improves the efficiency of the system because in the congested networks the probability of existing several requests with similar itineraries is high. Thus, at each update time a vehicle in GMOMatch algorithm may become fully-occupied while in the IBM just one request is assigned to the vehicle. In IBM algorithm because of one-to-one matching it takes more time for the vehicle to become fully-occupied.

Fig. 8h displays the average computational time per call for two algorithms. The computational time consists of two components of cost calculation time and total time. Cost calculation time for the GMOMatch includes creating bipartite graphs along with solving insertion method in Step 1, and creating vehicle graph plus solving insertion method in Step 2. Total time is the summation of cost calculation time and solution time. Solution time represents the time it takes to solve assignment problem in Step 1 and maximum wight matching problem in Step 2. As can be seen, most of the portion of computational time is related to cost calculation time in both algorithms. Although IBM algorithm reports less computational time than GMOMatch, its service rate yields much lower values. It is worth mentioning that, all of the cost calculations and travel times are computed on-line and there are no precomputed travel times. Using precomputed travel time or computing travel time with less frequencies (e.g. every five minutes instead of one minute) can significantly reduce the cost calculation time. Also, most of the calculations for creating bipartite graph in Step 1, vehicle graph in Step 2, and solving insertion method can be computed in parallel, which decrease the cost computational time remarkably.

The second part of the results are related to sensitivity analysis. Table 2 reports the results obtained by running simulations over different variables and significant algorithm parameters. Three scenarios have been created by varying demand, fleet size, vehicle capacity, and flexibility to see how changing different parameters affect the performance of the system.

In the first scenario, we considered four various demand percentage, including 10%, 15%, 20%, and 25% with 150 vehicles while keeping the other parameters constant. As reported, with 10% demand and 150 vehicle, service rate is 100% and all of the riders are served. As expected, by increasing demand, service rate reduces significantly such that with 25% demand, this number is 58.89%. From the results it is observed that the demand growth has risen vehicles kilometer traveled whereas it has decreased the

detour time as well as the waiting time. In the former, although SR decreases, vehicles serve more riders during the simulation period, thus, more VKT has been reported. However, in the latter, with the growth of demand the probability of finding a better match increases. A better match means riders with similar itineraries are grouped together and assigned to a vehicle which leads to reduction in waiting time and detour time. Finding a better match and decrease in detour time can mitigate traffic congestion because passengers' origins and destinations are close to each other. Thus, vehicles do not have to take longer distance to pick up/drop off passengers. As a result, vehicles may have less change in their travel path and less lane changing when traveling which means less interruption in the traffic flow and enhancement in traffic travel time and traffic speed. By increasing the demand, both cost calculation time and solution time increases. This is because the number of GMOMatch iterations, including main iterations and iterations related to step 2 goes up. When the demand increases while the fleet size is fixed, the number of new requests exceeds the number of available vehicles. On the other hand, the step 1 of GMOMatch is one-to-one matching, which means the maximum number of assigned requests equals the number of available vehicles. The remaining of the requests would be matched in the next algorithm iterations. Thus, both cost calculation time and solution time increases.

In the second scenario in Table 2, we used 25% demand, which is fixed for all instances. We considered three fleet size of 210, 230, and 250, and for each fleet size we tested three capacities of 4, 6, and 10. As expected, for each fleet size, by increasing the capacity service rate (SR) increases. Service rate for capacity 10 for all fleet size reports 100%. The reason is that in a congested network with high demand for shared vehicles within 15 minutes, there should be many requests whose origin and destinations are close to each other. Thus, all of them can be combined together and be assigned to one vehicle. This indicates the efficiency of using medium/high-capacity vehicles in case of existing enough requests with similar itineraries.

For each fleet size, VKT, the detour time and waiting time increase when the capacity increases from 4 to 6. One of the reasons is that for the capacity of 6, when the vehicles are enroute and have one or two empty spaces, they may be assigned new riders, which might lead to the rise in VKT, detour time and waiting time. For vehicles with capacity of 10, VKT has lower values when compared to the capacity of 6, while detour time and waiting time for fleet of 230 and 250 shows slightly higher values. Traffic travel time and traffic speed for vehicles with capacity of 10, for all three fleet size, show better values when compared to the capacity of 4 and 6. One of the reasons is that vehicles with capacity of 10 are able to transport more passengers at a time. Thus, their operation time over the simulation period would be less than vehicles with capacity of 6 and 4. This means existence of less vehicles in the road network which improves traffic travel time and traffic speed. Both indicators related to computational time for all the fleet sizes show an increase when using vehicles with more capacity. Using vehicles with more capacity may increase the number of iterations in the step 2 of the algorithm. This is because more empty seats are available for the vehicles and more vehicle matching and combining passengers may occur. However, there is a significant difference between vehicles with capacity of 10 and the other two capacities. Such a significant difference indicates that using high-capacity vehicles despite of improving the quality of service is computationally expensive, especially in the situations where the general level of demand is high.

In the third scenario, the demand is 25% and we considered four fleet size, including 170, 190, 210, and 230. For each fleet size, we tested two flexibility levels (i.e. 5 and 10 minutes). As expected for

Table 2: Results for different values of demand, fleet size, flexibility, and capacity

Scenarios	Fleet Size	Demand (%)	f (min)	Δ (sec)	cap	SR (%)	VKT	Detour (min)	Waiting (min)	Traffic Travel Time (min)	Traffic Speed (km/hr)	Cost Time (s)	Solution Time (s)
1	150	10	5	60	6	100.00	6.51	13.54	4.69	12.57	21.48	283	0.135
	150	15	5	60	6	89.16	6.72	11.90	4.56	11.96	22.41	451	0.214
	150	20	5	60	6	69.93	7.27	12.16	4.56	11.34	22.45	786	0.245
	150	25	5	60	6	58.89	7.46	11.14	4.21	10.84	23.20	963	0.302
2	210	25	5	60	4	79.44	6.70	10.25	3.61	11.05	23.18	538	0.140
	210	25	5	60	6	82.30	7.15	11.24	4.35	11.16	23.15	652	0.247
	210	25	5	60	10	100.00	6.66	11.47	4.22	10.79	23.52	1224	0.328
	230	25	5	60	4	85.52	6.54	10.24	3.52	11.19	23.05	523	0.133
	230	25	5	60	6	90.78	7.26	11.33	4.18	11.14	22.98	570	0.178
	230	25	5	60	10	100.00	6.67	12.02	4.35	10.82	23.19	1028	0.353
	250	25	5	60	4	91.88	6.47	10.38	3.47	11.31	22.67	416	0.487
	250	25	5	60	6	95.17	6.96	11.40	4.21	11.20	22.89	475	0.143
	250	25	5	60	10	100.00	6.53	11.68	4.29	10.92	23.22	1207	0.329
	170	25	5	60	6	70.30	7.50	11.15	4.16	11.04	23.36	764	0.316
	170	25	10	60	6	76.37	10.32	14.06	7.08	10.74	23.05	1017	0.173
	190	25	5	60	6	75.05	7.22	11.35	4.20	10.95	22.84	690	0.286
3	190	25	10	60	6	84.86	10.29	14.38	7.32	10.99	22.67	1127	0.186
	210	25	5	60	6	82.30	7.15	11.24	4.35	11.16	23.15	652	0.247
	210	25	10	60	6	94.22	10.21	14.09	6.96	10.96	23.10	911	0.234
	230	25	5	60	6	90.78	7.26	11.33	4.18	11.14	22.98	570	0.178
	230	25	10	60	6	100.00	10.25	13.93	7.19	11.05	22.65	910	0.221

$f = 10$, the SR is higher for all fleet size. It is because the riders stay in the ride-matching system 5 more minutes. During this 5 more minutes some vehicles would become available and can be assigned to riders. As a result of serving more riders, VKT increases for different fleet size compare to $f = 5$. Also, the detour time and waiting time reports higher values for $f = 10$ for all fleet size. This is because the riders have to wait more to be assigned and picked up. For higher detour time, one of the reasons is that the itineraries for riders who have not been assigned are less similar to each other which leads to rise in detour time. It seems that increasing flexibility does not have any significant effect on the traffic travel time and traffic speed. Both cost calculation time and solution time increases for $f = 10$. As reported for the cost calculation time, there is a significant difference between two flexibility. This is because, by increasing flexibility, at each update time, there are some new requests and many unmatched requests from previous update times. So, the number of requests is more than number of vehicles. As discussed earlier, this increases the number of main iterations of the algorithm which results in increase in cost calculation time.

5. Conclusion and future directions

We developed a novel graph-based algorithm (GMOMatch) for solving dynamic many-to-one ride-matching problem for shared on-demand mobility services in congested urban areas. The proposed

algorithm is efficient in terms of computational complexity as well as service quality. The algorithm which is an iterative two-step method starts with creating a bipartite graph and solving a one-to-one ride-matching problem in Step 1. Then in Step 2, we create a vehicle directed graph and solve a maximum weight matching problem to match the vehicles and combine associated passengers. To evaluate the performance of our algorithm, we compared it with a ride-matching algorithm developed by [Simonetto et al. \(2019\)](#) at IBM, which is based on linear assignment problem. We implemented two algorithms on an in-house micro-traffic simulator to compare their performance in the presence of traffic congestion. Downtown Toronto road network was chosen as the case study.

The results of the study demonstrated that the GMOMatch improved the service rate 32% when compared to IBM algorithm. Along with higher service rate, it showed either enhancement or similar performance for other indicators. VKT and number of assignment per vehicle showed 16.07% and 32% improvement, respectively. Also, although there was not any significant difference for the wait time and detour time between two algorithms, GMOMatch served much more requests than IBM. Furthermore, the results revealed that the GMOMatch alleviates traffic congestion by increasing the average traffic speed (4.07%) and reducing the average traffic travel time (4.26%) of the traffic on the network. Overall, it was shown that the GMOMatch algorithm ameliorates both service quality and traffic congestion. Moreover, we did a sensitivity analysis over some parameters, including demand, fleet size, flexibility, and vehicle capacity to examine the performance of GMOMatch by changing these parameters.

All of the cost computations in this study have been calculated centrally. In the future, distributed computing as well as different graph partitioning methods can be used in order to reduce the cost calculation time. Also, one can use distributed system designed by [Farooq and Djavadian \(2019, U.S. Provisional Pat. Ser. No. 62/865,725\)](#) to develop a distributed ride-matching system. Such distributed systems can significantly decrease the computational time. As mentioned, our data in this study was a simulated data. Having access to a real data can give better insight into the behaviour of users which would be helpful for adjustment of algorithm parameters in order to improve the efficiency of the ride-matching system. The proposed ride-matching algorithm in this study does not have any vehicles relocation. Predicting demand and based on that developing a vehicle relocation system using matching learning techniques can significantly enhance the quality of the service.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Dr. Shadi Djavadian for implementing the base traffic micro-simulator that was adapted in this study and for providing advice on the implementation of our ride-matching algorithms in the micro-simulator.

References

- N. Agatz, A. L. Erera, M. W. Savelsbergh, and X. Wang. Dynamic ride-sharing: A simulation study in metro atlanta. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 17:532–550, 2011.
- N. Agatz, A. Erera, M. Savelsbergh, and X. Wang. Optimization for dynamic ride-sharing: A review. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 223(2):295–303, 2012.
- J. Alonso-Mora, S. Samaranayake, A. Wallar, E. Frazzoli, and D. Rus. On-demand high-capacity ride-sharing via dynamic trip-vehicle assignment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(3):462–467, 2017.
- D. P. Bertsekas. A new algorithm for the assignment problem. *Mathematical Programming*, 21(1):152–171, 1981.
- D. Bertsimas, P. Jaillet, and S. Martin. Online vehicle routing: The edge of optimization in large-scale applications. *Operations Research*, 67(1):143–162, 2019.
- J. Castiglione, D. Cooper, B. Sana, D. Tischler, T. Chang, G. D. Erhardt, S. Roy, M. Chen, and A. Mucci. Tncs & congestion. 2018.
- F. Dandl, B. Bracher, and K. Bogenberger. Microsimulation of an autonomous taxi-system in munich. In *2017 5th IEEE International Conference on Models and Technologies for Intelligent Transportation Systems (MT-ITS)*, pages 833–838. IEEE, 2017.
- S. Djavadian and B. Farooq. Distributed dynamic routing using network of intelligent intersections. In *ITS Canada Annual General Meeting Conference, Niagara Falls*, 2018.
- B. Farooq and S. Djavadian. Distributed Traffic Management System with Dynamic End-to-End Routing, 2019, U.S. Provisional Pat. Ser. No. 62/865,725.
- G. Feng, G. Kong, and Z. Wang. We are on the way: Analysis of on-demand ride-hailing systems. *Available at SSRN 2960991*, 2017.
- M. Guériau, F. Cugurullo, R. Acheampong, and I. Dusparic. Shared autonomous mobility-on-demand: Learning-based approach and its performance in the presence of traffic congestion. *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, 2020.
- L. Häme. An adaptive insertion algorithm for the single-vehicle dial-a-ride problem with narrow time windows. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 209(1):11–22, 2011.
- S. C. Ho, W. Y. Szeto, Y.-H. Kuo, J. M. Leung, M. Petering, and T. W. Tou. A survey of dial-a-ride problems: Literature review and recent developments. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 111:395–421, 2018.
- Y. Huang, K. M. Kockelman, V. Garikapati, L. Zhu, and S. Young. Use of shared automated vehicles for first-mile last-mile service: Micro-simulation of rail-transit connections in austin, texas. *Transportation Research Record*, page 0361198120962491, 2020.
- J. Jung, R. Jayakrishnan, and J. Y. Park. Dynamic shared-taxi dispatch algorithm with hybrid-simulated annealing. *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 31(4):275–291, 2016.
- M. Liu, Z. Luo, and A. Lim. A branch-and-cut algorithm for a realistic dial-a-ride problem. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 81:267–288, 2015.
- M. Lokhandwala and H. Cai. Dynamic ride sharing using traditional taxis and shared autonomous taxis: A case study of nyc. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 97:45–60, 2018.
- G. Lyu, W. C. Cheung, C.-P. Teo, and H. Wang. Multi-objective online ride-matching. *Available at SSRN 3356823*, 2019.
- N. Masoud and R. Jayakrishnan. A decomposition algorithm to solve the multi-hop peer-to-peer ride-matching problem. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 99:1–29, 2017a.
- N. Masoud and R. Jayakrishnan. A real-time algorithm to solve the peer-to-peer ride-matching problem in a flexible ridesharing system. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 106:218–236, 2017b.
- A. Mourad, J. Puchinger, and C. Chu. A survey of models and algorithms for optimizing shared mobility. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 2019.
- A. Najmi, D. Rey, and T. H. Rashidi. Novel dynamic formulations for real-time ride-sharing systems. *Transportation research part E: logistics and transportation review*, 108:122–140, 2017.
- M. Nourinejad and M. J. Roorda. Agent based model for dynamic ridesharing. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 64:117–132, 2016.
- S. Oh, R. Seshadri, D.-T. Le, P. C. Zegras, and M. E. Ben-Akiva. Evaluating automated demand responsive transit using microsimulation. *IEEE Access*, 8:82551–82561, 2020.
- E. Özkan and A. R. Ward. Dynamic matching for real-time ride sharing. *Stochastic Systems*, 10(1):29–70, 2020.
- X. Qian, W. Zhang, S. V. Ukkusuri, and C. Yang. Optimal assignment and incentive design in the taxi group ride problem. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 103:208–226, 2017.
- H. Ritchie. Urbanization. *Our World in Data*, 2018. <https://ourworldindata.org/urbanization>.
- Saunders. Weighted maximum matching in general graphs - file exchange - matlab central. <https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/42827-weighted-maximum-matching-in-general-graphs>, 2013. (Accessed on 12/03/2020).
- S. Shaheen, A. Cohen, M. Randolph, E. Farrar, R. Davis, and A. Nichols. Shared mobility policy playbook. 2019.
- A. Simonetto, J. Monteil, and C. Gambella. Real-time city-scale ridesharing via linear assignment problems. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 101:208–232, 2019.
- A. Tafreshian and N. Masoud. Trip-based graph partitioning in dynamic ridesharing. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 114:532–553, 2020.
- A. Tafreshian, N. Masoud, and Y. Yin. Frontiers in service science: Ride matching for peer-to-peer ride sharing: A review and future directions. *Service Science*, 12(2-3):44–60, 2020.

- H. Wang and H. Yang. Ridesourcing systems: A framework and review. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, 129: 122–155, 2019.
- H. Yu, X. Jia, H. Zhang, X. Yu, and J. Shu. Psride: Privacy-preserving shared ride matching for online ride hailing systems. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 2019.