

# Combinatorial and Computational Insights about Patient-to-room Assignment under Consideration of Roommate Compatibility

Tabea Brandt<sup>a,1,\*</sup>, Christina Büsing<sup>a,1,\*</sup>, Felix Engelhardt<sup>a,1,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Chair of Combinatorial Optimization, RWTH Aachen University,  
Ahornstraße 55, 52074 Aachen, Germany*

---

## Abstract

During a hospital stay, a roommate can significantly influence a patient's overall experience both positively and negatively. Therefore, hospital staff tries to assign patients together to a room that are likely to be compatible. However, there are more conditions and objectives to be respected by the patient-to-room assignment (PRA), e.g., ensuring gender separated rooms and avoiding transfers. In this paper, we review the literature for reasons why roommate compatibility is important as well as for criteria that can help to increase the probability that two patients are suitable roommates. We further present combinatorial insights about computing patient-to-room assignments with optimal overall roommate compatibility. We then compare different IP-formulations for PRA as well as the influence of different scoring functions for patient compatibility on the runtime of PRA integer programming (IP) optimisation. Using these results and real-world data, we conclude this paper by developing and evaluating a fast IP-based solution approach for the dynamic PRA.

*Keywords:* combinatorial optimization, hospital bed management, patient-to-room assignment, mixed integer programming, patient admission scheduling, dynamic planning

---

## 1. Introduction

In hospitals, patients tend to spend the majority of their time not in surgery, but in their bed in their designated hospital room. The patient-to-room assignment problem (PRA) problem is the operational problem of allocating patients

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email addresses:* [brandt@combi.rwth-aachen.de](mailto:brandt@combi.rwth-aachen.de) (Tabea Brandt),  
[buesing@combi.rwth-aachen.de](mailto:buesing@combi.rwth-aachen.de) (Christina Büsing), [engelhardt@combi.rwth-aachen.de](mailto:engelhardt@combi.rwth-aachen.de)  
(Felix Engelhardt)

<sup>1</sup>This work was supported by the German research council (DFG) Research Training Group 2236 UnRAVeL. Declarations of interest: none

to such hospital rooms while respecting room capacities, hospital policies and medical constraints. The PRA was first formulated by Demeester et al. [12]. Their definition of PRA already contains one type of user preference, i.e., patient preferences regarding double/single room choice [12]. This important special case together with the role of patient transfers is covered in detail by Büsing et al. [5].

In this work, we systematically consider different patients' preferences regarding suitable roommates as optimization objectives. However, what does constitute a suitable roommate is by no means an easy question. Andersen et al. performed a meta-synthesis of qualitative studies on the subject; they identify three categories of how patients experience their roommate: as an enforced companion, as an expert on illness and hospital life, and/or as a care provider [3]. Such a companion can be the source of grief, as found in Adams et al.'s work on noise and sleep quality [1], or a roommate can be source of company (and loss of privacy), as found by Roos et al. [36].

Patient roommate preferences also link in with the ongoing scientific debate about the advantages and disadvantages of single vs. multiple bed room ward designs (e.g., see [18, 35, 34]), which is not the focus of this work. However, we would like to note that many factors considered advantages or disadvantages of multi bed rooms, especially concerning social aspects, are highly dependent on the specific roommate chosen.

It is important that roommate preferences are not just preferences, but translate into healthcare outcomes. A recent study by Sehgal, who analyses a large hospital dataset with respect to the impact of socio-demographic factors and clinical condition a patient's roommates on clinical outcomes, found that these factors influence patients length of stay [40]. An older but similar result is by Kulik et al., who showed that having a pre- or post-operative roommate can have an impact on patients' healthcare outcomes [30, 29]. In talks with practitioners, we found healthcare issues with "patient conflicts", e.g., having multiple patients with asthma in the same room are to be avoided.

Additionally, there is also an economic case to be made for considering patient preferences in PRA. Luther et al. look at patient roommates as a type customer-to-customer interaction. They find that this interaction affects overall patient satisfaction with a hospital [32], which is validated with a follow-up study by Hantel and Benkenstein [22]. Underlining this, in a quantitative data analysis, Young and Chen find that "Hospitality experiences create a halo effect of patient goodwill, while medical excellence and patient safety do not." [46]. This fits hospital practice, where practitioners tend to group patients together by age, types and/or severity of illnesses to improve patient satisfaction [38]. Thus, assigning patient roommates that are in line with their preferences can increase overall patient satisfaction at little additional cost. This is important, as patient satisfaction is not only an indicator for quality of care [10], but also closely linked to patient loyalty [24, 31].

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: We first give a short overview over related literature in Section 2, and formally define PRA in Section 3. In Section 4, we consider the complexity of finding a feasible patient-

to-room assignment with optimal roommate suitability and show that such a solution can be found in polynomial time. Then, in Section 5, we categorize existing research on patient preferences from a mathematical modelling perspective, and derive both general classes and specific examples of preference functions. In Section 6, we propose and computationally compare different integer programming (IP) formulations for PRA under consideration of roommate compatibility. Then, in Section 7 we consider different integer programming formulations for modelling preference objectives. These formulations are then compared in computational study. Finally, we end with a short conclusion in Section 8 focusing on implications for practical modelling and further research.

## 2. Literature

There exists various literature regarding hospital bed management. For example, it was suggested in [42] that health-care spending can be reduced by planning the utilisation of hospital resources efficiently. In [16, 44, 15], simulation models were developed to help evaluate such planning strategies. Furthermore, a decision support system for bed-assignments has been proposed in [11] which aims to mimic decisions that are performed by professional hospital staff.

The specific problem that we consider and expand on in this paper was introduced and modelled by Demeester et al. [13] in 2010: the operational task of assigning patients to hospital-rooms subject to hospital policies, where both the wishes of patients and medical nursing needs are considered in order to determine how well each room is suited for a patient. This problem is known as the patient-to-room assignment problem.

In the original definition, Demeester et al. [13] assumed that both the admission and departure date of each patient is known in advanced. Ceschia and Schaerf expanded on this task in [8] by considering emergency patients as well, for which these dates are not known until the patients are admitted.

Since 2010, various different approaches to solve PRA have been proposed, such as a tabu search algorithm [13], a metaheuristic [19], a simulated annealing algorithm [8] and a hybrid simulated annealing algorithm [14]. Furthermore, many variations of PRA have been proposed: in [8], the problem has been extended to a dynamic context to which the authors adapted their solution technique that was proposed to the static problem. Vancroonenburg et al. proposed an integer linear program to solve a similar dynamic extension of the PRA in [43], by considering uncertainty of patients' length of stay as well as emergency patients whose arrival date is only known at the time when they are admitted to the hospital. An issue that occurs for PRA in a dynamic context is that the quality of the solution for the whole time horizon (long-term objective) is often bad when repeatedly optimising the assignment of newly registered patients (short-term objective). In [47], Yi-Hang Zhu et al. studied the compatibility of such short-term and long-term objectives. Schäfer et al. proposed a decision support model in [38] that anticipates trade-off between the objective value and handling overflow situations created both by arrivals of emergency patients and

the uncertainty of the patients' length of stay, based on historical probability distributions. Schmidt et al. examined efficiency of methods to solve PRA with elective patients, where uncertainty of each patient's length of stay is considered in [39]. This was done by modelling each patient's length of stay by a log-normally distributed random variable for each patient. Representing this problem as a binary integer program, three heuristics, an exact approach and a mixed integer program solver were introduced and compared. In [19], a detailed comparison of variations of the problem that is considered in different papers is given. While patients' preferences for room-equipment or the layout of rooms have been considered for the patient-to-room assignment already, e.g., in [13, 43, 38, 8, 19], preferences regarding room-mates have not yet been modelled for PRA. In real-life situations, such wishes are sometimes considered by hospital staff [41].

Further and independently of PRA, there are various papers that examine which preferences patients have regarding room-layout and equipment, such as [33, 45, 25]. For example, evidence suggests that in general, patients experience a more pleasant stay if they are assigned into single- or double-rooms, according to [4]. However, only little research about preferences regarding room-mates can be found. In [17], patient-preferences of US-veterans were analysed. It was observed that the most positive aspect for patients in shared rooms is conversations with room-mates. Therefore, it is desirable for such patients to be assigned room-mates that share similar interests. While there are many factors that determine how well patients get along, these are hard to establish beforehand for hospital staff. However, one factor that can easily be taken into account is the age of each patient. In [9], it was observed that a large age difference between room-mates sharing a hospital room is often undesirable for patients.

### 3. Problem Definition

Mathematically, we consider PRA, over a finite planning horizon  $\mathcal{T} := \{1, \dots, T\}$  and a set of rooms  $\mathcal{R} = \{1, \dots, R\}$ . Each room  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  has a capacity  $c_r \in \mathbb{N}$  which is equal to its number of beds located in  $r$ . Further, we have a set  $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, P\}$  of patients. The set  $\mathcal{P}$  is the disjoint union of female patients  $\mathcal{P}^f$  and male patients  $\mathcal{P}^m$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^f \cup \mathcal{P}^m$ . Each patient  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  has an arrival period  $a_p \in \mathcal{T}$  as well as a discharge period  $d_p \in \mathcal{T}$ . We assume that a patient does no longer need a bed in this last time period and define the set of time periods for which patient  $p$  has to be assigned to a bed as

$$\mathcal{T}(p) := \{t \in \mathcal{T} \mid a_p \leq t < d_p\}.$$

Based on the arrival and discharge dates of each patient, we denote the set of patients that need to be assigned to a room during time period  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  as

$$\mathcal{P}(t) := \{p \in \mathcal{P} \mid t \in \mathcal{T}(p)\}.$$

Analogously, we define for any subset  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  of patients the respective subset of patients who need a room in time period  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  as  $S(t) := S \cap \mathcal{P}(t)$ . We suppose that both the arrival date and the discharge date is fixed in advance.

We further assume that we have a black box function  $w$  which efficiently computes a natural value that denotes the roommate fit. We define  $w$  over the set of all subsets of patients, i.e., the power set  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P})$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  which is defined as

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}) := \{S \subseteq \mathcal{P}\}.$$

We then define the preference function  $w$  as

$$w : \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0, S \mapsto w(S),$$

where  $w(S) = 0$  means the patients in  $S$  fit perfectly together as roommates. In general, specifying  $w(S)$  is a highly complex task in real life. We elaborate possible criteria that can be taken into account in Section 5 and discuss respective properties of  $w$ . Remark that it is also possible to define  $w$  such that a higher value corresponds to a better fit. For the structural analysis in this paper, we prefer our definition.

The task in PRA is to allocate every patient  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  to a hospital room  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  for each  $t \in \mathcal{T}(p)$  so that each room accommodates only either male or female patients and the rooms' capacities are respected while maximizing the overall roommate fit and minimizing the total number of transfers. That means we search an assignment

$$z : \{(p, t) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{R} \mid t \in \mathcal{T}(p)\} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$$

subject to:

1. Each patient  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  is assigned to exactly one room  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  in each time period  $t \in \mathcal{T}(p)$ , i.e.,  $z$  is well defined.
2. The rooms' capacities are respected in every time period, i.e.,

$$|\mathcal{P}^z(r, t)| := |\{p \in \mathcal{P} \mid z(p, t) = r\}| \leq c_r \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}, t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

3. Female and male patients never share a room, i.e.,

$$z(\mathcal{P}^f, t) \cap z(\mathcal{P}^m, t) = \emptyset \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

4. The overall roommate fit is as good as possible, i.e., we minimize

$$f^w(z) := \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} w(\mathcal{P}^z(r, t)).$$

5. We need as few transfers of patients between rooms as possible, i.e., we minimize

$$f^{\text{trans}}(z) := \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} |\{t \in \mathcal{T}(p) \setminus \{a_p\} : z(p, t) \neq z(p, t-1)\}|$$

#### 4. Complexity

In this section, we first define the task of determining an optimal roommate choice for a specific day as a combinatorial optimization problem: the roommate problem (RMP). We then examine the underlying combinatorial structure and expose connections to other known combinatorial problems. Remark that we can compute the best roommate-fit value independently for every single time period (since we allow arbitrary many transfers).

Therefore, we consider in this section only one arbitrary but fixed time period  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  and abbreviate the set of female patients who are in hospital in time period  $t$  with

$$\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{P}^f(t),$$

and respectively the set of male patients needing a bed in time period  $t$  with

$$\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{P}^m(t).$$

We further denote their cardinality with  $F := |\mathcal{F}|$  and  $M := |\mathcal{M}|$ , and with

$$R_c := |\{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid c_r = c\}|$$

the number of rooms with a specific capacity  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We define the problem of finding an optimal partition of patients into roommates in time period  $t$  as follows.

**Definition 1** (RMP). Let a set of female patients  $\mathcal{F}$ , a set of male patients  $\mathcal{M}$ , a set of rooms  $\mathcal{R}$  with capacities  $c_r \in \mathbb{N}$  for  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ , and a scoring function  $w : \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$  be given. In the roommate problem (RMP), the task is then to find a collection  $\mathcal{S}$  of subsets of patients that represent a feasible patient-to-room assignment with optimal patient fit, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S} := \{S_r \subseteq \mathcal{P} \mid r \in \mathcal{R}\},$$

so that

- i) every patient is assigned to at most one room, i.e.,  $S_r \cap S_u = \emptyset$  f.a.  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,
- ii) every patient is assigned to a room, i.e.,  $\bigcup_{r \in \mathcal{R}} S_r = \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{M}$ ,
- iii) rooms are separated by sex, i.e.,  $S_r \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$  or  $S_r \cap \mathcal{M} = \emptyset$  f.a.  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,
- iv) the room capacities are respected, i.e.,  $|S_r| \leq c_r$  f.a.  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,
- v) the overall patient fit is optimal, i.e.,  $w(\mathcal{S}) := \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} w(S_r)$  is minimal.

Remark that we can check the feasibility of a given RMP instance as described in [6]. We therefore concentrate in the remaining part of this section on instances whose feasibility we can check in polynomial time and especially on the case of room capacities  $c_r \in \{1, 2\}$ . Since RMP is trivial for instances with only single rooms, we further assume that at least one double exists, i.e.,

$R_2 \geq 1$ . Then, we can find an optimal solution to a feasible RMP instance by solving a minimum weighted perfect matching problem (MWPM): Let a feasible RMP instance  $\mathcal{I}$  be given, we then construct a weighted and undirected graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}} = (V, E, \ell)$  as follows. We construct a vertex for every patient and  $k := 2R - F - M$  auxiliary vertices representing single rooms and beds that stay empty, i.e.,

$$V := \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{M} \cup \underbrace{\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}}_{=: X}.$$

Then, edges of a perfect matching in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  can connect

- i) two patient-vertices, representing them as roommates;
- ii) a patient vertex and an auxiliary vertex, representing that the patient is alone in a room;
- iii) two auxiliary vertices, representing an empty room.

However, we have to ensure that the number of matching edges connecting two patient vertices is less or equal to the number of double rooms. We therefore compute the number  $\alpha$  of single rooms that have to be used as

$$\alpha := \max \{F + M - 2R_2, 0\}.$$

We then use the first  $\alpha$  auxiliary vertices to ensure that there are at least  $\alpha$  edges connecting patient vertices with auxiliary vertices in every perfect matching. For easier lucidity, we denote the set of these vertices by  $X_1 := \{v_1, \dots, v_\alpha\}$  and the remaining auxiliary vertices as  $X_2 := \{v_{\alpha+1}, \dots, v_k\}$ . Remark that  $X_1 = \emptyset$  if  $\alpha = 0$ .

We construct three types of edges, cf. Fig. 1: between all vertices that represent potential roommates, between all patient vertices and auxiliary vertices, and between all vertices in  $X_2$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} E := & \{pq \mid p, q \in \mathcal{F} \text{ or } p, q \in \mathcal{M}\} \\ & \cup \{px \mid p \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{M}, x \in X\} \\ & \cup \{xy \mid x, y \in X_2\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the cost function  $\ell$  using the patient-fit function  $w$ :

$$\ell : E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0, uv \mapsto \begin{cases} w(\{u, v\}), & \text{if } u, v \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{M} \\ w(\{v\}), & \text{if } v \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{M}, u \in X \\ w(\emptyset), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We prove that an RMP instance  $\mathcal{I}$  can be solved by computing a minimum-weighted perfect matching in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  in two steps. First, we prove that  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  always contains a perfect matching (if  $\mathcal{I}$  is feasible). Second, we show how a perfect matching in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  corresponds to a solution of RMP.




Figure 1: Graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a feasible RMP instance with room capacities  $c_r \in \{1, 2\}$  and at least one double room. The graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  then contains a perfect matching.*

*Proof.* Let  $k := 2R - F - M$ . If  $k = 0$ , then  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  consists of the two complete subgraphs  $G_{\mathcal{I}}[\mathcal{F}]$  and  $G_{\mathcal{I}}[\mathcal{M}]$ . Since  $\mathcal{I}$  is feasible, we have  $c_r = 2$  f.a.  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  and both  $F$  and  $M$  are even which implies the existence of a perfect matching.

We prove that  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  also contains a perfect matching if  $k \geq 1$  by using Tutte's 1-factor theorem. Therefore, let  $U \subsetneq V$ . If  $U = \emptyset$ , then we have no odd components in  $G_{\mathcal{I}} - \emptyset = G_{\mathcal{I}}$  since  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  is connected with  $|V| = 2R$ .

So, let  $|U| \geq 1$ . By construction of  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ , there are only two possibilities to choose  $U$  so that  $G_{\mathcal{I}} - U$  is no longer connected:

1.  $X \subseteq U$ , then  $G_{\mathcal{I}} - U$  is a subgraph of  $G_{\mathcal{I}}[\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{M}]$  which consists of at most two connected components. Therefore, it remains to show here that  $|U| = 1$  implies that at most one of  $G_{\mathcal{I}}[\mathcal{F}]$  or  $G_{\mathcal{I}}[\mathcal{M}]$  odd, i.e., either  $F$  or  $M$  is even. Since the original RMP instance is feasible, we have

$$1 = |U| = |X| = k = 2R - F - M.$$

Which implies directly that one of  $F$  and  $M$  is even and the other one is odd. Hence,  $G_{\mathcal{I}} - U$  has at most  $|U|$  odd components.

2.  $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{M} \subseteq U$ , then  $G_{\mathcal{I}} - U$  is a subgraph of  $G_{\mathcal{I}}[X]$  which consists of at most  $\alpha + 1$  connected components. If  $\alpha = 0$ , then  $G_{\mathcal{I}} - U$  is connected as  $G_{\mathcal{I}}[X_2]$  is a complete graph. So, let  $\alpha \geq 1$ . Then  $G_{\mathcal{I}} - U$  has at most  $\alpha + 1$  connected components. Since  $R_2 \geq 1$ , we have

$$\alpha + 1 = F + M - 2R_2 + 1 \leq F + M - 1 < F + M \leq |U|.$$

Hence,  $G_{\mathcal{I}} - U$  has at most  $|U|$  odd components.



Overall,  $G_{\mathcal{I}} - U$  contains at most  $|U|$  odd components for every  $U \subseteq V$ . Therefore,  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  contains a perfect matching according to Tutte's 1-factor theorem.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a feasible RMP instance. A minimum-weight perfect matching in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  corresponds to an optimal solution of  $\mathcal{I}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $H \subseteq E$  be a minimum-weight perfect matching in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ . We define the collection  $\mathcal{S}$  as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} := & \{ \{p, q\} \mid pq \in H, p, q \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{M} \} \\ & \cup \{ \{p\} \mid px \in H, p \in \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{M}, x \in X \} \\ & \cup \{ \emptyset \mid xy \in H, x, y \in X \} \end{aligned}$$

Condition i) is satisfied as  $H$  is a matching, condition ii) is satisfied as the matching  $H$  is perfect, and condition iii) is satisfied by construction of the graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ . We show that condition iv) is also satisfied by proving that there are not more than  $R_2$  elements with cardinality 2 in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Assume to the contrary that there are  $\beta > R_2$  matching edges between patient vertices in  $H$ . From  $\beta > R_2$  it follows directly that there must be enough patients to feasibly fill  $\beta$  double rooms, i.e.,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{F}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{M}{2} \right\rfloor \geq \beta > R_2.$$

Thus, we also have  $F + M > 2R_2$  which implies  $\alpha \geq 1$ . The total number of patient vertices that are incident to an edge in  $H$  is therefore

$$2\beta + \alpha > 2R_2 + F + M - 2R_2 = F + M.$$

This is a contradiction as we only have  $F + M$  patient vertices in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ . Hence, condition iv) is satisfied and  $\mathcal{S}$  represents a feasible solution for  $\mathcal{I}$ .

It remains to show that  $\mathcal{S}$  represents an optimal solution. Assume to the contrary that there exists a solution  $\mathcal{S}'$  for  $\mathcal{I}$  with  $w(\mathcal{S}') < w(\mathcal{S})$ . Let

$$\mathcal{S}'_2 := \{ S \in \mathcal{S}' \mid |S| = 2 \}$$

be the set of all roommate pairs and

$$\mathcal{S}'_1 := \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}' : |S|=1} S = \{y_1, \dots, y_u\}$$

be the set of all patients who are alone in a room. As  $\mathcal{S}'$  is a feasible solution for  $\mathcal{I}$ , we have  $|\mathcal{S}'_2| \leq R_2$  and  $|\mathcal{S}'_1| + |\mathcal{S}'_2| \leq R_1 + R_2$ . Then, it follows directly that  $\alpha \leq |\mathcal{S}'_1|$ . Moreover, it follows with  $2|\mathcal{S}'_2| + |\mathcal{S}'_1| = F + M$  that

$$\begin{aligned} k - |\mathcal{S}'_1| &= 2R_2 + 2R_1 - F - M - |\mathcal{S}'_1| \\ &= 2R_2 + 2R_1 - 2|\mathcal{S}'_2| - 2|\mathcal{S}'_1| \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

and even. Hence, we can define an edge set  $H' \subseteq E$  that represents solution  $\mathcal{S}'$  in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} H' := & \{pq \mid \{p, q\} \in \mathcal{S}'_2\} \\ & \cup \{y_i v_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq u\} \\ & \cup \{v_{u+1} v_{u+2}, v_{u+3} v_{u+4}, \dots, v_{k-1} v_k\} \end{aligned}$$

which is a perfect matching in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  by construction. Since

$$\ell(H') = w(\mathcal{S}') < w(\mathcal{S}) = \ell(H),$$

this is a contradiction to  $H$  being a minimum-weight perfect matching in  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ .  $\square$

With the graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ , we can thus solve the RMP to optimality using known algorithms for the minimum weighted perfect matching problem.

**Theorem 4.** *RMP with capacities  $c_r \in \{1, 2\}$  can be solved to optimality in  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ .*

*Proof.* The graph  $G_{\mathcal{I}}$  can be constructed in  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  with  $n = 2R$  and Korte and Vygen [26] report an algorithm for minimum weighted perfect matching problem with runtime  $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ .  $\square$

Using Theorem 4, we can compute the optimal roommate-fit score  $w_t^{\min}$  for each time period  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ . Using the exact computation of  $w_t^{\min}$ , we know that their sum over all time periods  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  is a tight lower bound on the total objective value for  $f^w$ , i.e.,

$$f^w \geq w^{\min} := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} w_t^{\min}. \quad (1)$$

This bound can always be achieved as long as arbitrary many transfers may be used.

We use these combinatorial insights in Section 6 to compute the optimal value of  $f^w$ . This allows us, on the one hand, to assess the quality of a found solution w.r.t. the roommate suitability, and on the other hand, we can also integrate it directly into our dynamic solution approach. However, in order to integrate roommate suitability into our solution approach for PRA, we need a calculable scoring function. In the next section, Section 5, we first give an overview about criteria for roommate suitability that are reported in literature. Second, we present the five scoring functions that we use to evaluate how the choice of scoring function influences the runtime and solution quality in Section 6.

## 5. Measuring the roommate fit

Assessing how roommates influence a patient's satisfaction and health outcomes in hospital is an ongoing discussion in literature. For surgical wards, already in 1983 Kulik et al. reported that sharing a room with a post-operative

patient statistically decreases a patient’s anxiety of their own surgery [28]. Later, they also found that having a roommate statistically decreases a patient’s post-operative recovery time [27].

Another positive influence is reported by recent studies on oncology wards. There, fellow roommates with similar diagnosis, severity and age can be a great source of information and hope [23]. However, it is also reported that the loss of privacy can lead to patients withholding relevant information or preventing them from asking questions [2]. Positive effects are foremost reported if patients can relate to each other well.

Being able to relate and communicate not only increases patients’ well-being but can also measurably reduce patients’ length-of-stay. Schäfer et al. report that the age difference is generally a good indicator for predicting how well patients get along [37]. However, Hantel and Benkenstein [21] report that roommates’ personality and behaviour is more significant. Sehgal [40] study the impact of numerous social attributes on the length-of-stay to determine which of them can be used as indicator for (statistically) good roommate pairs.

Looking at the criteria mentioned by Sehgal [40], they can be described by scoring functions of one of the following three types.

- I) Arbitrary patient-fit scores  $w(S) \in \mathbb{Q}$  or  $\mathbb{N}_0$ , or rather, since the patient set is finite,  $w(S) \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$  for an  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ . An example for such arbitrary scores is the age difference of patients.
- II) Scores that indicate a good fit versus indifference  $w(S) \in \{0, 1\}$ , e.g., indicating whether patients speak a common language.
- III) Scores that indicate a good fit versus indifference  $w(S) \in \{0, 1\}$  but also have a special structure, e.g., the patients can be divided in different categories, e.g., by age class, and have a good fit, i.e.,  $w(S) = 0$  iff all patients in  $S$  are in the same category and  $w(S) = 1$  otherwise.

Although the reports in literature are ambiguous how well age difference is suited to predict a good patient fit, we use it in our computational study since it is the only criterion that is included in our data. We present four different functions to model age difference, at least one of type I) to III) each, and compare their impact on the runtime. Additionally, we propose a scoring function that models the positive influence of mixing pre- and postoperative patients by assuming that a surgery takes place on the second day of each patient’s stay. Therefore, let  $e_p$  denote the age of patient  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ .

**Absolut age difference** We define  $w(S)$  as the maximal age difference of patients in  $S$ , i.e.,

$$w(S) := \max_{p \in S} \{e_p\} - \min_{p \in S} \{e_p\}.$$

For  $|S| = 2$ , the value  $w(S)$  corresponds to the absolut age difference of the two patients and, for  $|S| = 1$ , the value  $w(S) = 0$ . This defines a patient-fit score of Type I).

**Bounded age difference** We request that the age difference between two patients in  $S$  is less or equal to  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , i.e.,

$$w(S) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } (\max_{p \in S}\{e_p\}) - (\min_{p \in S}\{e_p\}) \leq k \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This defines a patient-fit score of Type II).

**Age classes** We divide the patients into different age classes of size  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and either count the number of age classes represented in  $S$ , i.e.,

$$w(S) := |\left\{ \left\lceil \frac{e_p}{k} \right\rceil \mid p \in S \right\}|$$

or we check whether all patients in  $S$  are in the same age class, i.e.,

$$w(S) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } |\left\{ \left\lceil \frac{e_p}{k} \right\rceil \mid p \in S \right\}| = 1, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This defines a patient-fit score of Type I) or II), respectively.

**Weighted age difference** We measure the relative age difference of two patients, with an offset  $\epsilon > 0$  to ensure a finite value, i.e.,

$$w(S)_\epsilon := \frac{\max_{p \in S}\{e_p\} + \epsilon}{\min_{p \in S}\{e_p\} + \epsilon}.$$

Notably,  $w(S)_\epsilon - 1$  directly corresponds to the numeric percentage of deviation. This defines a patient-fit score of Type I).

Of course, there are various further possibilities to assess the similarity of roommates' age. Especially for larger room sizes, the following two models can be interesting: asking that every patient has at least one roommate of similar age, i.e.,

$$w(S) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \forall p \in S \exists q \in S \setminus \{p\} : |\{e_p\} - \{e_q\}| \leq k \text{ (or } \lceil \frac{e_p}{k} \rceil = \lceil \frac{e_q}{k} \rceil), \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

or asking that the age classes represented in  $S$  are balanced. Therefore, let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  be the age classes' size and  $l := |\left\{ \left\lceil \frac{e_p}{k} \right\rceil \mid p \in S \right\}|$  the number of age classes in  $S$ . Further, let  $S_1, \dots, S_l \subseteq S$  be a partition of  $S$  based on the patients' age classes, i.e.,  $\bigcup_{i=1}^l S_i = S$  and  $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq l$ , with

$$|\left\{ \left\lceil \frac{e_p}{k} \right\rceil \mid p \in S_i \right\}| = 1$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq l$ . Then, we define

$$w(S) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } ||S_i| - |S_j|| \leq x \quad \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq l, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for a constant  $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Both functions define a patient-fit score of type II). However, all our instances contain rooms with capacities less or equal to 2. Therefore, we do not include them in our computational study.

For modelling the pairing of pre- and post-surgery patients we simply assume that every patient has surgery on their first or second day in hospital since we lack data on the patient's surgery date:

**Pre/post surgery** We request that there is at least one time period between the admission dates of the earliest and latest arriving patients in  $S$ , i.e.,

$$w(S) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } (\max_{p \in S}\{a_p\}) - (\min_{p \in S}\{a_p\}) > 1 \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This defines a patient-fit score of Type II).

The presented concepts can easily be transferred to other criteria for a good roommate fit, e.g., common television preferences.

## 6. Finding fitting roommates using linear programs

In [6], we proposed and compared several IP formulations for PRA with the objectives of minimizing transfers ( $f^{\text{trans}}$ ) and maximizing single-room requests ( $f^{\text{priv}}$ ) in terms of their computational performance. In this section, we use the best performing IPs from [6] and integrate roommate compatibility into them. For more information on the objectives  $f^{\text{trans}}$  and  $f^{\text{priv}}$ , we refer to [6].

Since all our instances contain only rooms with at most two beds, we focus on this case only and use binary variables  $y$  to indicate whether two patients share a room. We present again both general IPs that allow arbitrary transfers in Section 6.1, and IPs which prohibit transfers by construction in Section 6.2.

### 6.1. General integer programming formulation

In this section, we integrate the maximization of single-room requests into the best performing IP (H) from [6]. To encode whether two patients  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$  share a room in time period  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ , we use three-dimensional binary variables  $y_{pqt}$ :

$$y_{pqt} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if patients } p \text{ and } q \text{ share a room in time period } t, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Thus, the total score of patients who are assigned to the same rooms is given by

$$f^w := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\substack{p, q \in \mathcal{P}(t) \\ p \neq q}} w_{pq} y_{pqt}. \quad (3)$$

Additionally to variables  $y_{pqt}$ , we use the following variables:

$$x_{prt} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if patient } p \text{ is assigned to room } r \text{ in time period } t, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

$$\delta_{prt} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if patient } p \text{ is transferred from room } r \text{ to another room} \\ & \text{after time period } t \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

$$g_{rt} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if there is a female patient assigned to room } r \text{ in time} \\ & \text{period } t, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

$$s_{prt} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } p \text{ is alone in room } r \text{ in time period } t, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

As in IP (H), we ensure that all patients are assigned to rooms for every time period of their stay using

$$\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} x_{prt} = 1 \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, p \in \mathcal{P}(t), \quad (8)$$

and use the combined capacity, sex-separation, and single-room constraints

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}^f(t)} x_{prt} + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}^f \cap \mathcal{P}^*(t)} (c_r - 1) s_{prt} \leq c_r g_{rt} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, r \in \mathcal{R}, \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}^m(t)} x_{prt} + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}^m \cap \mathcal{P}^*(t)} (c_r - 1) s_{prt} \leq c_r (1 - g_{rt}) \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, r \in \mathcal{R}, \quad (10)$$

with

$$s_{prt} \leq x_{prt} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, p \in \mathcal{P}^*(t), r \in \mathcal{R}. \quad (11)$$

We then model the choice of roommates via

$$y_{pqt} \geq x_{prt} + x_{qrt} - 1 \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, p, q \in \mathcal{P}(t), p \neq q. \quad (12)$$

Brandt, Büsing, and Engelhardt [6] showed that it makes sense to fix  $f^{\text{priv}}$  to its optimum, if  $f^{\text{priv}}$  has the highest priority, instead of modelling it directly as objective function using

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}^*(t)} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} s_{prt} \geq s_t^{\max} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (13)$$

Analogously, we can fix  $f^w$  to its minimum, alternatively to minimizing  $f^w$ , using

$$\sum_{\substack{p, q \in \mathcal{P}(t) \\ p \neq q}} w_{pq} y_{pqt} \leq w_t^{\min} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (14)$$

In this section, we showcase how the objective setting and choice of scoring function influences the runtime. We use the insights gained in our previous computational studies to reduce the number of setups to evaluate and compare the following three IP formulations:

$$(Q) \max (-f^{\text{trans}}, f^{\text{priv}}, -f^{\text{w}}) \text{ s.t. Eqs. (8) to (12),}$$

$$(R) \min (f^{\text{w}}, f^{\text{trans}}) \text{ s.t. constraints of IP (Q), Eq. (13),}$$

$$(S) \min f^{\text{trans}} \text{ s.t. constraints of IP (R), Eq. (14).}$$

The objectives' order determines again their priority in optimisation, i.e.,  $\min(f^{\text{w}}, f^{\text{trans}})$  means that first  $f^{\text{w}}$  is minimised and then  $f^{\text{trans}}$ . IP (Q) is the direct extension of IP (H) where we give  $f^{\text{priv}}$  a higher priority than  $f^{\text{w}}$  as this models the reality on most wards according to personal communication with practitioners. With IP (R), we compute the optimal value for the patient compatibility under the condition that the maximum number of single-room requests is fulfilled while minimizing the number of needed transfers as second objective. The resulting values are interesting to assess the sensibility of an integration of  $w^{\text{min}}$  into the IP formulation, which we then evaluate using IP (S). Additionally, we derive from a comparison of IPs (R) and (Q) whether it is computationally easier to optimize  $f^{\text{trans}}$  or  $f^{\text{w}}$ . However, our code can easily be adapted to evaluate other objective settings [7].

To perform the computational study, we further have to choose a tangible scoring function. First computational results showed that the bounded-age-difference scoring function performs best among all scoring functions proposed in Section 5 while the weighted-age-difference scoring function performs worst. Therefore, we use those two scoring functions to evaluate the performance of IPs (Q), (R), and (S). Again, our code can easily be adapted to evaluate other scoring functions [7].

The formulations for IPs (Q) to (S) were implemented in *python* 3.10.4 and solved using *Gurobi 11.0.0* [20] with a time limit of 4 hours. All computations were done on the RWTH High Performance Computing Cluster using CLAIX-2018-MPI with Intel Xeon Platinum 8160 Processors "SkyLake" (2.1 GHz, 16 CPUs per task, 3.9 GB per CPU). The code can be found at [7]. We illustrate in Fig. 2 on the y-axis the number of instances that have been solved to optimality or proven to be infeasible within the time frame depicted on the x-axis. To assess the runtime-costs for integrating patient compatibility, we also include again the performance of IP (H).

First, we notice that IP (S), depending on the scoring function, performs even better than IP (H) or only slightly worse. However, we have to keep in mind that IP (S) is proven to be infeasible for 32 (19) instances using the weighted-age-difference (bounded-age-difference) scoring function. If we consider only instances for which IP (S) is feasible, IP (H) performs better than IP (S). Further, we notice that IP (Q) outperforms IP (R) which indicates that optimizing  $f^{\text{w}}$  is computationally harder than optimizing  $f^{\text{trans}}$ . Moreover, if we consider again only instances where IP (S) is feasible, IP (Q) performs also




Figure 2: Comparison of IPs (Q) - (S) using 62 real-life instances, maximum runtime 4h

better than IP (S). Hence, the runtime advantage of IP (S) lies in proving infeasibility, i.e., that the  $w^{\min}$  cannot be achieved if single-room requests are fixed to maximum. Overall, our results show that the choice of scoring function influences the IP’s runtime more than the choice of IPs.

Regarding the achieved objective values, we observe that no transfers are needed in all optimal solutions found for IPs (Q) and (S) and in all but one optimal solutions for IP (R). This result is impressive as all but three optimal solutions found for IP (R) achieve  $f^w = w^{\min}$  and all but six optimal solutions found for IP (Q). Therefore, we evaluate IP formulations that prohibit transfers by construction in the next section.

### 6.2. Integer programming formulation without transfers

Analogously to [6], we propose and evaluate IP formulations where transfers are prohibited by construction. Therefore, we integrate in this section the choice of roommates into the best performing IP (P) from [6].

Since our IP forbids arbitrary transfers, we can restrict ourselves to two-dimensional binary variables  $y_{pq}$  that encode whether two patients  $p, q \in \mathcal{P}$  share a room at some time during their stay:

$$y_{pq} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if patients } p \text{ and } q \text{ share a room,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

To model the total roommate score correctly, we calculate the length of the common stay of patients  $p$  and  $q$  as

$$\text{los}(p, q) := \min\{d_p, d_q\} - \max\{a_p, a_q\} \quad (16)$$



and the set of potential roommates  $\mathcal{P}^R$  as the tuples of patients with the same sex and intersecting hospital stays, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}^R := \{(p, q) \mid (p, q \in \mathcal{P}^f \text{ or } p, q \in \mathcal{P}^m) \text{ and } \text{los}(p, q) > 0\}. \quad (17)$$

Then, the total roommate score is given by

$$f^w := \sum_{(p,q) \in \mathcal{P}^R} \text{los}(p, q) w_{pq} y_{pq}. \quad (18)$$

Additionally to variables  $y_{pq}$ , we use the following binary variables  $x_{pr}$ ,  $g_{rt}$ , and  $s_{prt}$  for  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ , and  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ :

$$x_{pr} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if patient } p \text{ is assigned to room } r, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

$$g_{rt} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if there is a female patient assigned to room } r \text{ in time} \\ & \text{period } t, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

$$s_{prt} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } p \text{ is alone in room } r \text{ in time period } t, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

As in IP (P), we first ensure that all patients are assigned to rooms for every time period of their stay

$$\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} x_{pr} = 1 \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}, \quad (20)$$

fix the previous patient-room assignments via

$$x_{pr} = 1 \quad \forall (p, r) \in \mathcal{F}, \quad (21)$$

and use the combined capacity, sex-separation, and single-room constraints

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}^f(t)} x_{pr} + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}^f \cap \mathcal{P}^*(t)} (c_r - 1) s_{prt} \leq c_r g_{rt} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, r \in \mathcal{R}, \quad (22)$$

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}^m(t)} x_{pr} + \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}^m \cap \mathcal{P}^*(t)} (c_r - 1) s_{prt} \leq c_r (1 - g_{rt}) \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, r \in \mathcal{R}, \quad (23)$$

with

$$s_{prt} \leq x_{pr} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, p \in \mathcal{P}^*(t), r \in \mathcal{R}. \quad (24)$$

We also again fix  $f^{\text{priv}}$  to its optimal value via

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}^*(t)} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} s_{prt} \geq s_t^{\max} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (13)$$




Figure 3: Comparison of IPs (T) - (V) using 62 real-life instances, maximum runtime 4h

and then model the choice of roommates via

$$y_{pq} \geq x_{pr} + x_{qr} - 1 \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, p, q \in \mathcal{P}(t), p \neq q. \quad (25)$$

Analogously to Section 6.2, we can fix  $f^w$  to its minimum, alternatively to minimizing  $f^w$ , using

$$\sum_{\substack{p,q \in \mathcal{P}^f(t) \\ \text{los}(p,q) > 0}} w_{pq} y_{pq} + \sum_{\substack{p,q \in \mathcal{P}^m(t) \\ \text{los}(p,q) > 0}} w_{pq} y_{pq} \leq w_t^{\min} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (26)$$

Analogously to Section 6.1, we compare the following IP-formulations

$$(T) \max (f^{\text{priv}}, -f^w) \text{ s.t. Eqs. (20) to (25),}$$

$$(U) \min f^w \text{ s.t. constraints of IP (T), Eq. (13),}$$

$$(V) \min 0 \text{ s.t. constraints of IP (U), Eq. (26),}$$

and use the bounded-age-difference, and the weighted-age-difference scoring functions to evaluate their performance. However, our code can easily be adapted to evaluate other objective settings and scoring functions [7].

We observe that IP (V) performs comparable to IP (P). However, we have to keep in mind that IP (V) is proven to be infeasible for 31 (42) instances for the bounded-age-difference (weighted-age-difference) scoring function while for IP (P) only 17 instances are infeasible. If we consider only instances that are feasible for IP (V), we observe that IP (P) performs best, followed by (V) which performs only slightly better than (U). Moreover, our results show again the significant influence of the chosen scoring function on the runtime of all proposed IP formulations. We will examine this influence further in the next section,

where we integrate the concept of roommate compatibility into our dynamic solution approach and evaluate all five scoring functions that we proposed in Section 5.

## 7. Integrating the roommate fit into dynamic PRA

In this section, we use the developed IP formulations from Sections 6.1 and 6.2 to integrate roommate compatibility into solution approach that we proposed in [6] for the dynamic patient-to-room assignment problem (dynamic PRA). In dynamic PRA, the patient stays become known iteratively at their registration date. The task is then to find in every time period a patient-to-room assignment for all registered patients that respects the previous room assignment of already arrived patients. We denote the set of those pre-assigned room assignments with

$$\mathcal{F} \subset \{p \in \mathcal{P} \mid a_p = 0\} \times \mathcal{R}.$$

Naturally, we would use IP (V) as first IP in our solution approach as it performed best on the large instances in the previous section. However, we have to weigh the advantage regarding the optimization time of IP (V) against the multiple computation of  $w_t^{\min}$  which has to be done in each iteration for every remaining time period of the planning horizon. Therefore, it might be more efficient to use IP (U) instead of (V) in the initial step of our algorithm, although IP (V) performed better on the large instances in the previous section. Furthermore, we compare the impact of all five scoring functions that we proposed in Section 5 on the algorithm’s runtime.

In general, the idea of our approach remains the same as in [6], since we still optimize primarily for  $f^{\text{priv}}$  while keeping the runtime acceptable for practical purposes (based on conversations with practitioners): First, we check combinatorially whether the instance is feasible. Second, we check whether we can find a solution that is optimal for  $f^{\text{priv}}$ ,  $f^{\text{trans}}$ , and  $f^{\text{w}}$  either using IP (V) or IP (U). If not, we third ask for an optimal solution w.r.t.  $f^{\text{priv}}$  and maximize  $f^{\text{w}}$  while transferring only currently present patients (*same-day transfers*). If this is still not possible, we relax in the fourth step the fixation of  $f^{\text{priv}}$  to  $s^{\max}$  and maximize first the number of fulfilled single-room requests while only using same-day transfers. If we still find no feasible solution, we finally allow arbitrary transfers and use IP (Q) to compute a feasible solution. After successful computation, we fix all patient-room assignments for patients that are in hospital in the current time period by adding them to set  $\mathcal{F}$  while removing outdated ones. We then update the patient set and continue analogously with the next time period.

To formalize this solution approach, we need variants of IPs (T) and (U) that allow same-day transfers:

$$(T^*) \max (f^{\text{priv}}, -f^{\text{w}}, \sum_{(r,p) \in \mathcal{F}} x_{pr}) \text{ s.t. constraints of (T) without Eq. (21)}$$

$$(U^*) \max (-f^{\text{w}}, \sum_{(r,p) \in \mathcal{F}} x_{pr}) \text{ s.t. constraints of (U) without Eq. (21)}$$




Figure 4: Algorithm for dynamic PRA optimization of single-room requests, patient compatibility and transfers




Figure 5: Runtime of algorithm for dynamic PRA with  $T = 365$

A visualization of our solution approach is provided in Fig. 4.

We evaluate our algorithm again on our 62 real-world instances spanning a whole year. As a result, we get that all instances use 365 iterations of the algorithm and all are solved within less than 600 seconds per year, cf. Fig. 5. For application purposes however, the runtime per iteration is more interesting than the total runtime of 365 iterations. Therefore, we report in Fig. 6 the runtime of all  $2 \cdot 6 \cdot 62 \cdot 365 = 271560$  iterations on a log-scale axis using boxplots. We aggregate the results for the different scoring functions into one boxplot as separate (log-scaled) boxplots are identical to the eye. Hence, the observed different runtimes are the result of statistical outliers, i.e., a minority of iterations that take significantly longer to solve.

The results show that more than 95% of the iterations are solved well in less than a second (for any scoring function) if we use IP (U) in the first step, cf. Fig. 6a. We further observe that, in this case, the use of a scoring function




Figure 6: Runtime per iteration of the algorithm for dynamic PRA

increases the range of runtimes while decreasing the median runtime in comparison to ignoring patient compatibility. If we use IP (V) in the first step, we observe again that the use of a scoring function increases the range of runtimes but also increases significantly the median runtime. In this case, only about 90% of the iterations are solved in less than a second (for any scoring function).

To evaluate the impact of the time needed for computing  $w^{\min}$  in every iteration, we depict in Fig. 6b for every iteration the time that was needed to solve all IPs in that iteration. We aggregate again the results for the different scoring functions into one boxplot as separate (log-scaled) boxplots are identical to the eye. We observe that the difference between both versions is much smaller if we consider only the needed optimization time. Hence, the computation of  $w^{\min}$  using a minimum weighted perfect matching problem is the reason for the slow runtime when using IP (V). Our results show further that, if no scoring function is used, it is slightly faster to use IP (V) in the first step. However, if roommate compatibility is optimized, then it is overall faster to use IP (U) in the first step. Remark that the results also show that there is a significant amount of instances where the using IP (V) in the first step is faster. Therefore, we also evaluated whether using a rough estimate for  $w^{\min}$  as bound leads to a computational advantage of IP (V) by using  $2 \cdot w^{\min}$  instead of  $w^{\min}$ . The boxplots of the corresponding runtimes and optimization times per iteration, however, showed no noticeable differences to those depicted in Fig. 6. Hence, the time needed to compute  $w^{\min}$  in every iteration significantly impacts the iteration's runtime but it is not the decisive factor regarding the decision of using IP (U) or (V) in the first step.

In conclusion, we use the bound  $w^{\min}$  to assess again the quality of the computed solutions: Using IP (U) or (V) has no significant influence on the solution quality. In both cases, the optimal overall compatibility score was achieved for the same 19-26 instances, depending on the scoring function. This result is especially impressive as the required amount of transfers and fulfilled single-room requests is comparable to the case where no compatibility of roommates is

considered. We further observe that for each chosen scoring function the same instances lead to high or low quality solutions with regard to roommate compatibility. Determining the reasons behind this behaviour, however, is still an open question.

## 8. Conclusion

In this paper, we presented novel combinatorial insights for the patient-to-room assignment problem with regard to choosing most compatible roommates. We showed how an optimal partition of patients into roommates can be computed for wards with single and double rooms using known algorithms for the minimum weighted perfect matching problem. A precondition is however that we can measure the compatibility of patients as roommates. We gave an overview about criteria for high compatibility mentioned in literature, classified them, and proposed five specific scoring functions that we used in our computational studies. The roommate compatibility of patients also links in with the ongoing scientific debate about the advantages and disadvantages of single vs. multiple bed room ward designs (e.g., see [18, 35, 34]), which is not the focus of this work. However, we would like to remark that many factors of considered advantages or disadvantages of multi-bed rooms, especially concerning social aspects, are highly dependent on the specific roommate chosen.

We further explored the performance of different IP formulations for modelling patient compatibility. Using all our insights, we integrated roommate compatibility into our IP-based solution approach for dynamic PRA which obtains high quality solutions in reasonable time. One of our key insights here is that integrating our combinatorial insights regarding optimal compatibility of roommates is helpful to assess a solution’s quality, but not for efficient optimization. Another key insight is that  $f^w$  seems to take longer to optimize using IPs than  $f^{\text{priv}}$ . In general, the comparison of runtime and needed time for solving IPs showed that solving the IPs takes only a fraction of the overall runtime of an iteration. Hence, the runtime can very likely be improved by choosing a more efficient implementation of the algorithm. Our current implementation is designed to allow easy evaluation of different variants. Optimizing the implementation with regard to the runtime is planned for future work as well as an evaluation of the performance of different solvers.

Overall, this paper provides a proof of concept that it is possible to efficiently integrate roommate compatibility into algorithms for PRA so that the runtime is suitable for real-world application, even if considering multiple objectives at the same time.

## 9. Acknowledgements

We thank the team at RWTH Aachen University hospital for their support. We thank Jens Brandt for his input regarding efficient implementation and coding. We further thank Daniel Müller for the extraordinary first take on

patient compatibility in his master thesis. Although none of his results made it into the paper, it provided a good starting point for the research that led to this paper. Simulations were performed with computing resources granted by RWTH Aachen University.

## References

- [1] Corey Adams et al. “The silent threat: investigating sleep disturbances in hospitalized patients”. In: *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 36.2 (2024). Cited by: 1; All Open Access, Hybrid Gold Open Access. DOI: 10.1093/intqhc/mzae042.
- [2] Lene Andersen - before Larsen, Birte Larsen, and Regner Birkelund. “A companionship between strangers – learning from fellow people with cancer in oncology wards”. In: *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 71 (July 2014). DOI: 10.1111/jan.12490.
- [3] Lene Andersen - before Larsen, Birte Larsen, and Regner Birkelund. “An ambiguous relationship - a qualitative meta-synthesis of hospitalized somatic patients’ experience of interaction with fellow patients”. In: *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences* 27 (July 2012). DOI: 10.1111/j.1471-6712.2012.01054.x.
- [4] Michael Bayer and Tobias Jaeck. *Qualitätsmanagement im Krankenhaus: Organisationsbindung von Mitarbeitern und Zufriedenheit von Patienten*. Inst. für Soziologie, 2006.
- [5] Tabea Brandt, Christina Büsing, and Felix Engelhardt. *Structural Insights and an IP-based Solution Method for Patient-to-room Assignment under Consideration of Single Room Entitlements*. 2024.
- [6] Tabea Brandt, Christina Büsing, and Felix Engelhardt. *Structural Insights and an IP-based Solution Method for Patient-to-room Assignment under Consideration of Single Room Entitlements*. 2024.
- [7] Tabea Brandt and Felix Engelhardt. *TabeaBrandt/patient-to-room\_assignment: v3 - Integration of roommate compatibility*. Version v3. Feb. 2025. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14889786.
- [8] Sara Ceschia and Andrea Schaerf. “Local search and lower bounds for the patient admission scheduling problem”. In: *Computers & Operations Research* 38 (10 2011), pp. 1452–1463.
- [9] Habib Chaudhury, Atiya Mahmood, and Maria Valente. “The use of single patient rooms versus multiple occupancy rooms in acute care environments”. In: *Coalition for Health Environments Research (CHER)*, Simon Fraser University (2004).
- [10] Paul D. Cleary and Barbara J. McNeil. “Patient Satisfaction as an Indicator of Quality Care”. In: *Inquiry* 25.1 (1988), pp. 25–36. ISSN: 00469580, 19457243.

- [11] Daniel Clerkin, Peter J Fos, and Frederick E Petry. “A decision support system for hospital bed alignment”. In: *Journal of Healthcare Management* 40 (3 1995), p. 386.
- [12] Peter Demeester, Patrick De Causmaecker, and Greet Vanden Berghe. “A Tabu Search Algorithm for Assigning Patients to Beds Efficiently”. In: (Jan. 2007).
- [13] Peter Demeester et al. “A hybrid tabu search algorithm for automatically assigning patients to beds”. In: *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine* 48 (1 Jan. 2010), pp. 61–70. ISSN: 09333657. DOI: 10.1016/j.artmed.2009.09.001.
- [14] Khoulood Dorgham et al. “A hybrid simulated annealing approach for the patient bed assignment problem”. In: *Procedia Computer Science* 159 (2019), pp. 408–417.
- [15] M Barry Dumas. “Hospital bed utilization: an implemented simulation approach to adjusting and maintaining appropriate levels.” In: *Health services research* 20 (1 1985), p. 43.
- [16] M Barry Dumas. “Simulation modeling for hospital bed planning”. In: *Simulation* 43 (2 1984), pp. 69–78.
- [17] Wyatt Ehrlander, Fazalit Ali, and Katherine Chang Chretien. “Multioccupancy hospital rooms: Veterans’ experiences and preferences”. In: *Journal of Hospital Medicine* 4 (8 2009), E22–E27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.491>.
- [18] Irene van de Glind, Stanny de Roode, and Anne Goossensen. “Do patients in hospitals benefit from single rooms? A literature review”. In: *Health Policy* 84.2-3 (2007). Cited by: 112, pp. 153–161. DOI: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2007.06.002.
- [19] Rosita Guido, Maria Carmela Groccia, and Domenico Conforti. “An efficient matheuristic for offline patient-to-bed assignment problems”. In: *European Journal of Operational Research* 268 (2 2018), pp. 486–503.
- [20] Gurobi Optimization, LLC. *Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual*. 2024.
- [21] Saskia Hantel and Martin Benkenstein. “Roommates in Hospitals - A New and Relevant Dimension of Health Care Quality Models”. In: *Journal of Service Management Research* 3 (Jan. 2019), pp. 82–90. DOI: 10.15358/2511-8676-2019-2-82.
- [22] Saskia Hantel and Martin Benkenstein. “The stranger in my room: The fellow patient as the fourth dimension of patient satisfaction”. In: *Health Services Management Research* 33 (Jan. 2020), p. 0951484820901666. DOI: 10.1177/0951484820901667.
- [23] Astrid Isaksen and Eva Gjengedal. “The Significance of Fellow Patients for the Patient With Cancer”. In: *Cancer Nursing* 23 (Nov. 2000), pp. 382–91. DOI: 10.1097/00002820-200010000-00010.



- [24] Daniel P. Kessler and Deirdre Mylod. “Does patient satisfaction affect patient loyalty?” In: *International journal of health care quality assurance* 24.4 (2011), pp. 266–273. ISSN: 0952-6862. DOI: 10.1108/09526861111125570.
- [25] Eun Young Kim et al. “Exploring Healing Design Elements for Patient Room Design: Preferences of Adolescent Patients from Surgical Units”. In: *Global Journal of Health Science* 14 (8 2022), pp. 1–9.
- [26] Bernhard Korte and Jens Vygen. *Combinatorial Optimization*. Sixth. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-56039-6.
- [27] J. A. Kulik, D. Shelby, and R. N. Cooper. “The effects of fellow patients on the emotional well-being and satisfaction with care of postoperative cosmetic surgery patients”. In: *Plastic and reconstructive surgery* 106.6 (2000), 1407–14, discussion 1415–6. ISSN: 0032-1052. DOI: 10.1097/00006534-200011000-00032.
- [28] James Kulik, Philip Moore, and Heike Mahler. “Stress and Affiliation: Hospital Roommate Effects on Preoperative Anxiety and Social Interaction”. In: *Health psychology : official journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association* 12 (Mar. 1993), pp. 118–24. DOI: 10.1037/0278-6133.12.2.118.
- [29] James A. Kulik, Heike I. M. Mahler, and Philip J. Moore. “Social comparison and affiliation under threat: effects on recovery from major surgery.” In: *Journal of personality and social psychology* 71 5 (1996), pp. 967–79.
- [30] James A. Kulik, Philip J. Moore, and Heike I. M. Mahler. “Stress and affiliation: hospital roommate effects on preoperative anxiety and social interaction.” In: *Health psychology : official journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association* 12 2 (1993), pp. 118–24.
- [31] Sha Liu et al. “The Impact of Patient Satisfaction on Patient Loyalty with the Mediating Effect of Patient Trust”. In: *Inquiry : a journal of medical care organization, provision and financing* 58 (2021), p. 469580211007221. DOI: 10.1177/00469580211007221.
- [32] Louisa Luther, Martin Benkenstein, and Katja Rummelhagen. “Enhancing patients’ hospital satisfaction by taking advantage of interpersonal similarity”. In: *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 30 (May 2016), pp. 50–58. DOI: 10.1016/j.jretconser.2015.12.002.
- [33] Daphne Nash et al. “Indigenous preferences for inpatient rooms in Australian hospitals: A mixed-methods study in cross-cultural design”. In: *HERD: Health Environments Research & Design Journal* 14 (1 2021), pp. 174–189.
- [34] Eva Persson, Patrice Anderberg, and Anna Kristensson Ekwall. “A room of one’s own - Being cared for in a hospital with a single-bed room design”. In: *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences* 29.2 (2015). Cited by: 31, pp. 340–346. DOI: 10.1111/scs.12168.

- [35] Eva Persson and Sylvia Määttä. “To provide care and be cared for in a multiple-bed hospital room”. In: *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences* 26.4 (2012). Cited by: 14, pp. 663–670. DOI: 10.1111/j.1471-6712.2012.00976.x.
- [36] Anne Roos et al. “Trading company for privacy: A study of patients’ experiences”. In: *Nursing Ethics* 27 (Sept. 2019). DOI: 10.1177/0969733019874497.
- [37] F. Schäfer et al. “Operational patient-bed assignment problem in large hospital settings including overflow and uncertainty management”. In: *Flexible Services and Manufacturing Journal* 31 (2019), pp. 1012–1041. DOI: 10.1007/s10696-018-9331-0.
- [38] Fabian Schäfer et al. “Operational patient-bed assignment problem in large hospital settings including overflow and uncertainty management”. In: *Flexible services and manufacturing journal* 31 (2019), pp. 1012–1041. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10696-018-9331-0>.
- [39] Robert Schmidt, Sandra Geisler, and Cord Spreckelsen. “Decision support for hospital bed management using adaptable individual length of stay estimations and shared resources”. In: *BMC medical informatics and decision making* 13 (1 2013), pp. 1–19.
- [40] Neil Jay Sehgal. “Social influences on length of hospitalization in a major academic medical center”. In: *Social Sciences & Humanities Open* 7.1 (2023), p. 100338. ISSN: 2590-2911. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2022.100338>.
- [41] Nicole Stab and Winfried Hacker. “Stationsorganisation im Krankenhaus”. In: *Entwicklung und Erprobung eines kriteriengeleiteten Bewertungs-und Gestaltungsverfahrens* 1 (2016).
- [42] Joseph K H Tan, Edward McCormick, and Samuel B Sheps. “Utilization care plans and effective patient data management”. In: *Journal of Health-care Management* 38 (1 1993), p. 81.
- [43] Wim Vancroonenburg, Patrick De Causmaecker, and Greet Vanden Berghe. “A study of decision support models for online patient-to-room assignment planning”. In: *Annals of Operations Research* 239 (1 Apr. 2016), pp. 253–271. ISSN: 15729338. DOI: 10.1007/s10479-013-1478-1.
- [44] G Vassilacopoulos. “A simulation model for bed allocation to hospital inpatient departments”. In: *Simulation* 45 (5 1985), pp. 233–241.
- [45] Laure Verschoren et al. “Designing child-sized hospital architecture: Beyond preferences for colours and themes”. In: (2015).
- [46] Cristobal Young and Xinxiang Chen. “Patients as consumers in the market for medicine: The halo effect of hospitality”. In: *Social Forces* 99.2 (2020). Cited by: 22; All Open Access, Bronze Open Access, pp. 504–531. DOI: 10.1093/sf/soaa007.
- [47] Yi-Hang Zhu et al. “Compatibility of short and long term objectives for dynamic patient admission scheduling”. In: *Computers & Operations Research* 104 (2019), pp. 98–112.