

Maximally Satisfying Lower Quotas in the Hospitals/Residents Problem with Ties*

Hiromichi Goko[†] Kazuhisa Makino[‡] Shuichi Miyazaki[§] Yu Yokoi[¶]

October 13, 2021

Abstract

Motivated by the serious problem that hospitals in rural areas suffer from a shortage of residents, we study the Hospitals/Residents model in which hospitals are associated with lower quotas and the objective is to satisfy them as much as possible. When preference lists are strict, the number of residents assigned to each hospital is the same in any stable matching due to the well-known rural hospitals theorem; thus there is no room for algorithmic interventions. However, when ties are introduced in preference lists, this is not the case because the number of residents may vary over stable matchings.

In this paper, we formulate an optimization problem that asks to find a stable matching with the maximum total satisfaction ratio for lower quotas. We first investigate how the total satisfaction ratio varies over choices of stable matchings in four natural scenarios. We provide exact values of these maximum gaps in all scenarios. Subsequently, we propose a strategy-proof approximation algorithm for our problem; in one scenario it solves the problem optimally, and in the other three scenarios, which are NP-hard, it yields a better approximation factor than a naive tie-breaking method. Finally, we show inapproximability results for the above-mentioned three NP-hard scenarios.

*This work was partially supported by the joint project of Kyoto University and Toyota Motor Corporation, titled “Advanced Mathematical Science for Mobility Society”.

[†]Frontier Research Center, Toyota Motor Corporation, Aichi 471-8572, Japan, E-mail: hiromichi_goko@mail.toyota.co.jp

[‡]Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan., E-mail: makino@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp, Supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP20H05967, JP19K22841, and JP20H00609.

[§]Academic Center for Computing and Media Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan, E-mail: shuichi@media.kyoto-u.ac.jp, Supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP20K11677.

[¶]Principles of Informatics Research Division, National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo 101-8430, Japan, E-mail: yokoi@nii.ac.jp, Supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP18K18004 and JST, PRESTO Grant Number JPMJPR212B.

1 Introduction

The Hospitals/Residents model (HR), a many-to-one matching model, has been extensively studied since the seminal work of Gale and Shapley [13]. Its input consists of a set of residents and a set of hospitals. Each resident has a preference over hospitals; similarly, each hospital has a preference over residents. In addition, a positive integer called the upper quota is associated with each hospital, which specifies the maximum number of residents it can accept. In this model, stability is the central solution concept, which requires the nonexistence of a blocking pair, i.e., a resident–hospital pair that has an incentive to deviate jointly from the current matching. In the basic model, each agent (resident or hospital) is assumed to have a strict preference for possible partners. For this model, the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm (also known as the deferred acceptance mechanism) is known to find a stable matching. This algorithm has advantages from both computational and strategic viewpoints: it runs in linear time and is strategy-proof for residents.

In reality, people typically have indifference among possible partners. Accordingly, a stable matching model that allows *ties* in preference lists was introduced [21]. For such a model, several definitions of stability are possible. Among them, *weak stability* provides a natural concept, in which agents have no incentive to move within the ties. It is known that if we break the ties of an instance I arbitrarily, any stable matching of the resultant instance is a weakly stable matching of I . Hence, the Gale–Shapley algorithm can still be used to obtain a weakly stable matching. In applications, typically ties are broken randomly or participants are forced to report strict preferences even if their true preferences have ties. Hereafter, “stability” in the presence of ties implies “weak stability” unless otherwise stated.

It is commonly known that HR plays an important role not only in theory but also in practice; for example, in assigning students to high schools [1, 2] and residents to hospitals [31]. In such applications, “imbalance” is one of the major problems. For example, hospitals in urban areas are generally more popular than those in rural areas; hence it is likely that the former are well-staffed whereas the latter suffer from a shortage of doctors. One possible solution to this problem is to introduce a *lower quota* in each hospital, which specifies the minimum number of residents required by a hospital, and obtain a stable matching that satisfies both the upper and lower quotas. However, such a matching may not exist in general [17, 29], and determining if such a stable matching exists is known to be NP-complete (which is an immediate consequence from page 276 of [30]).

In general, it is too pessimistic to assume that a shortage of residents forces hospitals to go out of operation. In some cases, the hospital simply has to reduce its service level, according as how much its lower quota is satisfied. In this scenario, a hospital wishes to satisfy the lower quota as much as possible, if not complete. To formulate this situation, we introduce the following optimization problem, which we call *the Hospitals/Residents problem with Maximally Satisfying Lower Quotas (HR-MSLQ)*. Specifically, let R and H be the sets of residents and hospitals, respectively. All members in R and H have complete preference lists that may contain ties. Each hospital h has an upper quota $u(h)$, the maximum number of residents it can accept. The stability of a matching is defined with respect to these preference lists and upper quotas, as in conventional HR. In addition, a lower quota $\ell(h)$ is associated with each hospital h , which specifies the minimum number of residents to keep its service level. We assume that $\ell(h) \leq u(h) \leq |R|$ for each $h \in H$. For a stable matching M , let $M(h)$ be the set of residents assigned to h . The *satisfaction ratio*, $s_M(h)$, of hospital $h \in H$ (with respect to $\ell(h)$) is defined as $s_M(h) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{|M(h)|}{\ell(h)} \right\}$. Here, we let $s_M(h) = 1$ if $\ell(h) = 0$, because the lower quota is automatically satisfied in this case. The satisfaction ratio reflects the situation in which hospital h 's service level increases linearly up to $\ell(h)$ but does not increase after that even though h is

still willing to accept $u(h) - \ell(h)$ more residents. These $u(h) - \ell(h)$ positions may be considered as “marginal seats,” which do not affect the service level but provide hospitals with advantage, such as generous work shifts. Our HR-MSLQ problem asks to maximize the total satisfaction ratio over the family \mathcal{M} of all stable matchings in the problem instance, i.e.,

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{h \in H} s_M(h).$$

The following are some remarks on our problem: (1) To our best knowledge, almost all previous works on lower quotas have investigated cases with no ties and have assumed lower quotas to be hard constraints. Refer to the discussion at the end of this section. (2) Our assumption that all preference lists are complete is theoretically a fundamental scenario to study the satisfaction ratio of lower quotas. Moreover, there exist several cases in which this assumption is valid [5, 15]. For example, according to Goto et al. [15], a complete list assumption is common in student–laboratory assignment in engineering departments of Japanese universities because it is mandatory that every student be assigned. (3) If preference lists contain no ties, the satisfaction ratio $s_M(h)$ is identical for any stable matching M because of the *rural hospitals theorem* [14, 31, 32]. Hence, there is no chance for algorithms to come into play if the stability is not relaxed. If preference lists contain ties, then the rural hospitals theorem implies that our task is essentially finding an optimal tie-breaking. However, it is unclear how to find such a tie-breaking. (4) Alternative objective functions may be considered to reflect our objective of satisfying the lower quotas. In Appendix A, we introduce three such natural objective functions and briefly discuss their behaviors.

Our Contributions. First, we study the goodness of any stable matching in terms of the total satisfaction ratios. For a problem instance I , let $\text{OPT}(I)$ and $\text{WST}(I)$, respectively, denote the maximum and minimum total satisfaction ratios of the stable matchings of I . For a family of problem instances \mathcal{I} , let $\Lambda(\mathcal{I}) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)}$ denote the maximum gap of the total satisfaction ratios. In this paper, we consider the following four fundamental scenarios of \mathcal{I} : (i) *general model*, which consists of all problem instances, (ii) *uniform model*, in which all hospitals have the same upper and lower quotas, (iii) *marriage model*, in which each hospital has an upper quota of 1 and a lower quota of either 0 or 1, and (iv) *R-side ML model*, in which all residents have identical preference lists. The exact values of $\Lambda(\mathcal{I})$ for all such fundamental scenarios are listed in the first row of Table 1, where $n = |R|$. In the uniform model, we write $\theta = \frac{u(h)}{\ell(h)}$ for the ratio of the upper and lower quotas, which is common to all hospitals. Further detailed analyses can be found in Table 3 of Appendix D.

Subsequently, we consider our problem algorithmically. Note that the aforementioned maximum gap corresponds to the approximation factor of the *arbitrarily tie-breaking Gale–Shapley algorithm*, which is frequently used in practice; this algorithm first breaks ties in the preference lists of agents arbitrarily and then applies the Gale–Shapley algorithm on the resulting preference lists. This correspondence easily follows from the rural hospitals theorem, as explained in Proposition 28 in Appendix D.

In this paper, we show that there are two types of difficulties inherent in our problem HR-MSLQ for all scenarios except (iv), i.e., the *R-side ML model*. Even for scenarios (i)–(iii), we show that (1) the problem is NP-hard and (2) there is no algorithm that is strategy-proof for residents and always returns an optimal solution; see Section 6 and Appendix C.

We then consider strategy-proof approximation algorithms. We propose a strategy-proof algorithm `DOUBLE PROPOSAL`, which is applicable in all above possible scenarios, whose approximation factor is substantially better than the arbitrary tie-breaking method. The approximation factors are listed in the second row of Table 1, where ϕ is a function defined by $\phi(1) = 1$,

$\phi(2) = \frac{3}{2}$, and $\phi(n) = n(1 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) / (n + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)$ for any $n \geq 3$. Note that $\frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1} < \theta$ holds whenever $\theta > 1$. We also provide inapproximability results in the last row, where ϵ denotes an arbitrarily small positive constant.

	General	Uniform	Marriage	R -side ML
Maximum gap $\Lambda(\mathcal{I})$ (i.e., Approx. factor of arbitrary tie-breaking GS)	$n + 1$	θ	2	$n + 1$
Approx. factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL	$\phi(n)$ ($\sim \frac{n+2}{3}$)	$\frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$	1.5	1
Inapproximability	$n^{\frac{1}{4} - \epsilon}$ *	$\frac{3\theta + 4}{2\theta + 4} - \epsilon^\dagger$	$\frac{9}{8} - \epsilon^\dagger$	—

* Under $P \neq NP$

† Under the Unique Games Conjecture

Table 1: Maximum gap $\Lambda(\mathcal{I})$, approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL, and inapproximability of HR-MSLQ for four fundamental scenarios \mathcal{I} .

Techniques. Our algorithm DOUBLE PROPOSAL is based on the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm and is inspired by previous research on approximation algorithms [26, 18] for another NP-hard problem called MAX-SMTI. Unlike in the conventional Gale–Shapley algorithm, our algorithm allows each resident r to make proposals twice to each hospital. Among the hospitals in the top tie of the current preference list, r prefers hospitals to which r has not yet proposed to those r has proposed to once. When a hospital h receives a new proposal from r , h may accept or reject it, and in the former case, h may reject a currently assigned resident to accommodate r . In contrast to the conventional Gale–Shapley algorithm, a rejection may occur even if h is not full. If at least $\ell(h)$ residents are currently assigned to h and at least one of them has not been rejected by h so far, then h rejects such a resident, regardless of its preference. In this process, the algorithm dynamically finds a tie-break in the lists of residents.

The main difficulty in our problem originates from the complicated form of our objective function $s(M) = \sum_{h \in H} \min\{1, \frac{|M(h)|}{\ell(h)}\}$. In particular, non-linearity of $s(M)$ makes the analysis of the approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL considerably hard. We therefore introduce some new ideas and techniques to analyze the maximum gap Λ and approximation factor of our algorithm, which is one of the main novelties of this paper.

To estimate approximation factor of the algorithm, we need to compare objective values of a stable matching M output by the algorithm and an (unknown) optimal stable matching N . A typical technique used to compare two matchings is to consider a graph of their union. In the marriage model, the connected components of the union are paths and cycles, both of which are easy to analyze; however, this is not the case in a general many-to-one matching model. For some problems, this approach still works via “cloning,” which transforms an instance of HR into that of the marriage model by replacing each hospital h with upper quota $u(h)$ by $u(h)$ hospitals with upper quota 1. Unfortunately, however, in HR-MSLQ there seems to be no simple way to transform the general model into the marriage model because of the non-linearity of the objective function.

In our analysis of the uniform model, the union graph of M and N may have a complex structure. We categorize hospitals using a procedure like breadth-first search starting from the set of hospitals h with the satisfaction ratio $s_N(h)$ larger than $s_M(h)$, which allows us to provide a tight bound on the approximation factor. For the general model, instead of using the union graph, we define two vectors that distribute the values $s(M)$ and $s(N)$ to the residents. By

making use of the local optimality of M proven in Section 3, we compare such two vectors and give a tight bound on the approximation factor.

We finally remark that the improvement of DOUBLE PROPOSAL over the maximum gap shows that our problem exhibits a different phenomenon compared with MAX-SMTI because the approximation factor of MAX-SMTI cannot be improved from a naive tie-breaking method if strategy-proofness is imposed [18].

Related Work. Recently, the Hospitals/Residents problems with lower quotas are quite popular in the literature; however, most of these studies are on settings without ties. The problems related to HR-MSLQ can be classified into three models. The model by Hamada et al. [17], denoted by HR-LQ-2 in [29], is the closest to ours. The input of this model is the same as ours, however the hard and soft constraints are different from ours; their solution must satisfy both upper and lower quotas, the objective being to maximize the stability (e.g., to minimize the number of blocking pairs). Another model, introduced by Biró et al. [6] and denoted by HR-LQ-1 in [29], allows some hospitals to be closed; a closed hospital is not assigned any resident. They showed that it is NP-complete to determine the existence of a stable matching. This model was further studied by Boehmer and Heeger [7] from a parameterized complexity perspective. Huang [20] introduced the *classified stable matching* model, in which each hospital defines a family of subsets R of residents and each subset of R has an upper and a lower quota. This model was extended by Fleiner and Kamiyama [11] to a many-to-many matching model where both sides have upper and lower quotas. Apart from these, several matching problems with lower quotas have been studied in the literature, whose solution concepts are different from stability [4, 12, 27, 28, 35].

2 Problem Definition

Let $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$ be a set of residents and $H = \{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_m\}$ be a set of hospitals. Each hospital h has a lower quota $\ell(h)$ and an upper quota $u(h)$ such that $\ell(h) \leq u(h) \leq n$. We sometimes denote a hospital h 's quota pair as $[\ell(h), u(h)]$ for simplicity. Each resident has a preference list over hospitals, which is complete and may contain ties. If a resident r prefers a hospital h_i to h_j , we write $h_i \succ_r h_j$. If r is indifferent between h_i and h_j (including the case that $h_i = h_j$), we write $h_i =_r h_j$. We use the notation $h_i \succeq_r h_j$ to mean that $h_i \succ_r h_j$ or $h_i =_r h_j$ holds. Similarly, each hospital has a preference list over residents and the same notations as above are used. In this paper, a preference list is denoted by one row, from left to right according to the preference order. Two or more agents with equal preference is included in parentheses. For example, " $r_1: h_3 (h_2 h_4) h_1$ " is a preference list of resident r_1 such that h_3 is the top choice, h_2 and h_4 are the second choice with equal preference, and h_1 is the last choice.

An *assignment* is a subset of $R \times H$. For an assignment M and a resident r , let $M(r)$ be the set of hospitals h such that $(r, h) \in M$. Similarly, for a hospital h , let $M(h)$ be the set of residents r such that $(r, h) \in M$. An assignment M is called a *matching* if $|M(r)| \leq 1$ for each resident r and $|M(h)| \leq u(h)$ for each hospital h . For a matching M , a resident r is called *matched* if $|M(r)| = 1$ and *unmatched* otherwise. If $(r, h) \in M$, we say that r is *assigned to* h and h is *assigned* r . We sometimes abuse notation $M(r)$ to denote a unique hospital where r is assigned. A hospital h is called *deficient* or *sufficient* if $|M(h)| < \ell(h)$ or $\ell(h) \leq |M(h)| \leq u(h)$, respectively. Additionally, a hospital h is called *full* if $|M(h)| = u(h)$ and *undersubscribed* otherwise.

A resident–hospital pair (r, h) is called a *blocking pair* for a matching M (or we say that (r, h) *blocks* M) if (i) r is either unmatched in M or prefers h to $M(r)$ and (ii) h is either

undersubscribed in M or prefers r to at least one resident in $M(h)$. A matching is called *stable* if it admits no blocking pair. Recall that the satisfaction ratio of a hospital h (which is also called *the score* of h) in a matching M is defined by $s_M(h) = \min\{1, \frac{|M(h)|}{\ell(h)}\}$, where we define $s_M(h) = 1$ if $\ell(h) = 0$. The *total satisfaction ratio* (also called *the score*) of a matching M , is the sum of the scores of all hospitals, that is, $s(M) = \sum_{h \in H} s_M(h)$. The Hospitals/Residents problem with Maximally Satisfying Lower Quotas, denoted by *HR-MSLQ*, is to find a stable matching M that maximizes the score $s(M)$. The optimal score of an instance I is denoted by $\text{OPT}(I)$.

Note that if $|R| \geq \sum_{h \in H} u(h)$, then all hospitals are full in any stable matching (recall that preference lists are complete). Hence, all stable matchings have the same score $|H|$, and the problem is trivial. Therefore, throughout this paper, we assume $|R| < \sum_{h \in H} u(h)$. In this setting, all residents are matched in any stable matching as an unmatched resident forms a blocking pair with an undersubscribed hospital.

3 Algorithm

In this section, we present our algorithm *DOUBLE PROPOSAL* for *HR-MSLQ* along with a few of its basic properties. Its strategy-proofness and approximation factors for several models are presented in the following sections.

Our proposed algorithm *DOUBLE PROPOSAL* is based on the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm, but allows each resident r to make proposals twice to each hospital. Here, we explain ideas underlying this modification.

Let us apply the ordinary resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm to *HR-MSLQ*, which starts with an empty matching $M := \emptyset$ and repeatedly updates M by a proposal-acceptance/rejection process. In each iteration, the algorithm takes a currently unassigned resident r and lets her propose to the hospital at the top of her current list. If the preference list of resident r contains ties, the proposal order of r depends on how to break the ties in her list. Hence, we need to define a priority rule among hospitals in a tie. Recall that our objective function is given by $s(M) = \sum_{h \in H} \min\{1, \frac{|M(h)|}{\ell(h)}\}$. This value immediately increases by $\frac{1}{\ell(h)}$ if r proposes to a deficient hospital h , whereas it does not increase if r proposes to a sufficient hospital h' , although the latter may cause a rejection of some resident if h' is full. Therefore, a naive greedy approach is to let r first prioritize deficient hospitals over sufficient hospitals and then prioritize those with small lower quotas among deficient hospitals. This approach is useful for improving the approximation factor; however, it is not enough to have better factor for many instances, as a deficient hospital h in some iteration might become sufficient later and it might be better that r makes a proposal to a hospital other than h in the tie. Furthermore, this naive approach sacrifices strategy-proofness as demonstrated by Example 23 in Appendix B. This failure of strategy-proofness follows from adaptivity of this tie-breaking rule, in the sense that the proposal order of each resident is affected by the other residents' behavior.

In our algorithm *DOUBLE PROPOSAL*, each resident can propose twice to each hospital. If the head of r 's preference list is a tie when r makes a proposal, then the hospitals to which r has not proposed yet are prioritized. This idea was inspired by an algorithm of [18]. Recall that each hospital h has upper quota $u(h)$ and lower quota $\ell(h)$. In our algorithm, we use $\ell(h)$ as a dummy upper quota. Whenever $|M(h)| < \ell(h)$, a hospital h accepts any proposal. If h receives a new proposal from r when $|M(h)| \geq \ell(h)$, then h checks whether there is a resident in $M(h) \cup \{r\}$ who has not been rejected by h so far. If such a resident exists, h rejects that resident regardless of the preference of h . Otherwise, we apply the usual acceptance/rejection operation, i.e., h accepts r if $|M(h)| < u(h)$ and otherwise replaces r with the worst resident

r' in $M(h)$. Roughly speaking, the first proposals are used to implement priority on deficient hospitals and the second proposals are used to guarantee the stability.

Formally, our algorithm DOUBLE PROPOSAL is described in Algorithm 1. For convenience, in the preference list, a hospital h not included in a tie is regarded as a tie consisting of h only. We say that a resident is *rejected* by a hospital h if she is chosen as r' in Lines 12 or 17. To argue strategy-proofness, we need to make the algorithm deterministic. To this end, we remove arbitrariness using indices of agents as follows. If there are multiple hospitals (resp., residents) satisfying the condition to be chosen at Lines 5 or 7 (resp., at Lines 12 or 17), take the one with the smallest index (resp., with the largest index). Furthermore, when there are multiple unmatched residents at Line 3, take the one with the smallest index. In this paper, DOUBLE PROPOSAL always refers to this deterministic version.

Algorithm 1 DOUBLE PROPOSAL

Input: An instance I where each $h \in H$ has quotas $[\ell(h), u(h)]$.

Output: A stable matching M .

```

1:  $M := \emptyset$ 
2: while there is an unmatched resident do
3:   Let  $r$  be any unmatched resident and  $T$  be the top tie of  $r$ 's list.
4:   if  $T$  contains a hospital to which  $r$  has not proposed yet then
5:     Let  $h$  be such a hospital with minimum  $\ell(h)$ .
6:   else
7:     Let  $h$  be a hospital with minimum  $\ell(h)$  in  $T$ .
8:   end if
9:   if  $|M(h)| < \ell(h)$  then
10:    Let  $M := M \cup \{(r, h)\}$ .
11:   else if there is a resident in  $M(h) \cup \{r\}$  who has not been rejected by  $h$  then
12:    Let  $r'$  be such a resident (possibly  $r' = r$ ).
13:    Let  $M := (M \cup \{(r, h)\}) \setminus \{(r', h)\}$ .
14:   else if  $|M(h)| < u(h)$  then
15:     $M := M \cup \{(r, h)\}$ .
16:   else {i.e., when  $|M(h)| = u(h)$  and all residents in  $M(h) \cup \{r\}$  have been rejected by  $h$  once}
17:    Let  $r'$  be any resident that is worst in  $M(h) \cup \{r\}$  for  $h$  (possibly  $r' = r$ ).
18:    Let  $M := (M \cup \{(r, h)\}) \setminus \{(r', h)\}$ .
19:    Delete  $h$  from  $r'$ 's list.
20:   end if
21: end while
22: Output  $M$  and halt.

```

We state two properties of DOUBLE PROPOSAL here. The proofs are provided in Appendix B.

Lemma 1. *Algorithm DOUBLE PROPOSAL runs in linear time and outputs a stable matching.*

In addition to the stability, the output of DOUBLE PROPOSAL satisfies the following property, which plays a key role in the analysis of the approximation factors in Section 5.

Lemma 2. *Let M be the output of DOUBLE PROPOSAL, r be a resident, and h and h' be hospitals such that $h =_r h'$ and $M(r) = h$. Then, we have the following:*

- (i) *If $\ell(h) > \ell(h')$, then $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h')$.*
- (ii) *If $|M(h)| > \ell(h)$, then $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h')$.*

Lemma 2 states some local optimality of DOUBLE PROPOSAL. Suppose that we reassign r from h to h' . By this change, h may lose and h' may gain score, but Lemma 2 says that the objective value does not increase. To see this, note that if the objective value would increase, h' must gain score and h either does not lose score or loses less score than h' gains. The former and the latter are the “if” parts of (ii) and (i), respectively, and in either case the conclusion $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h')$ implies that h' cannot gain score by accepting one more resident.

4 Strategy-proofness

An algorithm is called *strategy-proof* for residents if it gives residents no incentive to misrepresent their preferences. The precise definition follows. An algorithm that always outputs a matching deterministically can be regarded as a mapping from instances of HR-MSLQ into matchings. Let A be an algorithm. We denote by $A(I)$ the matching returned by A for an instance I . For any instance I , let $r \in R$ be any resident, who has a preference \succeq_r . Additionally, let I' be an instance of HR-MSLQ which is obtained from I by replacing \succeq_r with some other \succeq'_r . Furthermore, let $M := A(I)$ and $M' := A(I')$. Then, A is strategy-proof if $M(r) \succeq_r M'(r)$ holds regardless of the choices of I , r , and \succeq'_r .

In the setting without ties, it is known that the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm is strategy-proof for residents (even if preference lists are incomplete) [9, 16, 33]. Furthermore, it has been proved that no algorithm can be strategy-proof for both residents and hospitals [33]. As with many existing papers on two-sided matching, we use the term “strategy-proofness” to refer to strategy-proofness for residents.

Before proving the strategy-proofness of DOUBLE PROPOSAL, we remark that the exact optimization and strategy-proofness are incompatible even if a computational issue is set aside. The following fact is demonstrated by Examples 24 and 25 in Appendix C.

Proposition 3. *There is no algorithm that is strategy-proof for residents and returns an optimal solution for any instance of HR-MSLQ. The statement holds even for the uniform and marriage models.*

This proposition implies that, if we require strategy-proofness for an algorithm, then we should consider approximation even in the absence of computational constraints. Now, we show the strategy-proofness of our approximation algorithm.

Theorem 4. *Algorithm DOUBLE PROPOSAL is strategy-proof for residents.*

Proof. To establish the strategy-proofness, we show that an execution of DOUBLE PROPOSAL for an instance I can be described as an application of the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm to an auxiliary instance I^* . The construction of I^* is based on the proof of Lemma 8 in [18]; however, we need nontrivial extensions.

Let R and H be the sets of residents and hospitals in I , respectively. An auxiliary instance I^* is an instance of the Hospitals/Residents problem that has neither lower quotas nor ties and allows incomplete lists. The set of residents in I^* is $R' \cup D$, where $R' = \{r'_1, r'_2, \dots, r'_n\}$ is a copy of R and $D = \{d_{j,p} \mid j = 1, 2, \dots, m, p = 1, 2, \dots, u(h_j)\}$ is a set of $\sum_{j=1}^m u(h_j)$ dummy residents. The set of hospitals in I^* is $H^\circ \cup H^\bullet$ where each of $H^\circ = \{h_1^\circ, h_2^\circ, \dots, h_m^\circ\}$ and $H^\bullet = \{h_1^\bullet, h_2^\bullet, \dots, h_m^\bullet\}$ is a copy of H . Each hospital $h_j^\circ \in H^\circ$ has an upper quota $u(h_j)$ while each $h_j^\bullet \in H^\bullet$ has an upper quota $\ell(h_j)$.

For each $r'_i \in R'$, her preference list is defined as follows. Consider a tie $(h_{j_1} h_{j_2} \dots h_{j_k})$ in r'_i 's preference list. Let $\{j'_1, j'_2, \dots, j'_k\}$ be a permutation of $\{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\}$ such that $\ell(h_{j'_1}) \leq \ell(h_{j'_2}) \leq \dots \leq \ell(h_{j'_k})$, and for each j'_p, j'_q with $\ell(h_{j'_p}) = \ell(h_{j'_q})$, $p < q$ implies $j'_p < j'_q$. We

replace the tie $(h_{j_1} h_{j_2} \cdots h_{j_k})$ with a strict order of $2k$ hospitals $h_{j_1}^\bullet h_{j_2}^\bullet \cdots h_{j_k}^\bullet h_{j_1}^\circ h_{j_2}^\circ \cdots h_{j_k}^\circ$. The preference list of r'_i is obtained by applying this operation to all ties in r_i 's list, where a hospital not included in any tie is regarded as a tie of length one. The following is an example of the correspondence between the preference lists of r_i and r'_i :

$$\begin{aligned} r_i &: (h_2 h_4 h_5) h_3 (h_1 h_6) \quad \text{where } \ell(h_4) = \ell(h_5) < \ell(h_2) \text{ and } \ell(h_6) < \ell(h_1) \\ r'_i &: h_4^\bullet h_5^\bullet h_2^\bullet h_4^\circ h_5^\circ h_2^\circ h_3^\bullet h_3^\circ h_6^\bullet h_1^\bullet h_6^\circ h_1^\circ \end{aligned}$$

For each $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, the dummy residents $d_{j,p}$ ($p = 1, 2, \dots, u(h_j)$) have the same list:

$$d_{j,p} : h_j^\circ h_j^\bullet$$

For $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, let $P(h_j)$ be the preference list of h_j in I and let $Q(h_j)$ be the strict order on R' obtained by replacing residents r_i with r'_i and breaking ties so that residents in the same tie of $P(h_j)$ are ordered in ascending order of indices. The preference lists of hospitals h_j° and h_j^\bullet are then defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} h_j^\circ &: Q(h_j) \quad d_{j,1} d_{j,2} \cdots d_{j,u(h_j)} \\ h_j^\bullet &: d_{j,1} d_{j,2} \cdots d_{j,u(h_j)} \quad r'_1 r'_2 \cdots r'_n \end{aligned}$$

Let M be the output of DOUBLE PROPOSAL applied to I . For each resident r_i , there are two cases: she has never been rejected by $M(r_i)$, and she had been rejected once by $M(r_i)$ and accepted upon her second proposal. Let M_1 be the set of pairs $(r_i, M(r_i))$ of the former case and M_2 be that of the latter. Note that $|M_1(h_j)| \leq \ell(h_j)$ for any h_j . Define a matching M^* of I^* by

$$\begin{aligned} M^* &= \{ (r'_i, h_j^\circ) \mid (r_i, h_j) \in M_2 \} \cup \{ (r'_i, h_j^\bullet) \mid (r_i, h_j) \in M_1 \} \\ &\cup \{ (d_{j,p}, h_j^\circ) \mid 1 \leq p \leq u(h_j) - |M_2(h_j)| \} \\ &\cup \{ (d_{j,p}, h_j^\bullet) \mid u(h_j) - |M_2(h_j)| < p \leq \min\{u(h_j) - |M(h_j)| + \ell(h_j), u(h_j)\} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the following holds.

Lemma 5. *M^* coincides with the output of the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm applied to the auxiliary instance I^* .*

We defer the proof of this lemma to Appendix C and now complete the proof of the theorem.

Given an instance I , suppose that some resident r_i changes her preference list from \succeq_{r_i} to some other \succeq'_{r_i} . Let J be the resultant instance. Define an auxiliary instance J^* from J in the manner described above. Let N be the output of DOUBLE PROPOSAL for J and N^* be a matching defined from N as we defined M^* from M . By Lemma 5, the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm returns M^* and N^* for I^* and J^* , respectively. Note that all residents except r'_i have the same preference lists in I^* and J^* and so do all hospitals. Therefore, by the strategy-proofness of the Gale–Shapley algorithm, we have $M^*(r'_i) \succeq'_{r'_i} N^*(r'_i)$. By the definitions of I^* , J^* , M^* , and N^* , we have $M(r_i) \succeq_{r_i} N(r_i)$, which means that r_i is no better off in N than in M with respect to her true preference \succeq_{r_i} . Thus, DOUBLE PROPOSAL is strategy-proof for residents. \square

5 Maximum Gaps and Approximation Factors of DOUBLE PROPOSAL

In this section, we analyze the approximation factors of our algorithm, together with the maximum gaps Λ for the four models mentioned in Section 1. All results in this section are sum-

marized in the first and second rows of Table 1 in Section 1. Most of the proofs are deferred to Appendix D, which gives the full version of this section.

For an instance I of HR-MSLQ, let $\text{OPT}(I)$ and $\text{WST}(I)$ respectively denote the maximum and minimum scores over all stable matchings of I , and let $\text{ALG}(I)$ be the score of the output of our algorithm `DOUBLE PROPOSAL`. Proposition 28 in Appendix D shows that $\text{WST}(I)$ can be the score of the output of the algorithm that first breaks ties arbitrarily and then applies the Gale–Shapley algorithm for the resultant instance. Therefore, the maximum gap is equivalent to the approximation factor of such arbitrary tie-breaking GS algorithm.

For a model \mathcal{I} (i.e., subfamily of problem instances of HR-MSLQ), let

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{I}) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)}.$$

In subsequent subsections, we provide exact values of $\Lambda(\mathcal{I})$ and $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I})$ for the four fundamental models. Recall our assumptions that preference lists are complete, $|R| < \sum_{h \in H} u(h)$, and $\ell(h) \leq u(h) \leq n$ for each $h \in H$.

5.1 General Model

Let \mathcal{I}_{Gen} denote the family of all instances of HR-MSLQ, which we call *general model*.

Proposition 6. *The maximum gap for general model satisfies $\Lambda(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Gen}}) = n + 1$. Moreover, this equality holds even if residents have a master list, and the preference lists of hospitals contain no ties.*

We next obtain the value of $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Gen}})$. Recall that ϕ is a function of $n = |R|$ defined by $\phi(1) = 1$, $\phi(2) = \frac{3}{2}$, and $\phi(n) = n(1 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) / (n + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)$ for $n \geq 3$.

Theorem 7. *The approximation factor of `DOUBLE PROPOSAL` for the general model satisfies $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Gen}}) = \phi(n)$.*

We provide a full proof in Appendix D, where Proposition 35 provides an instance $I \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{Gen}}$ such that $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)} = \phi(n)$. Here, we present the ideas to show $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)} \leq \phi(n)$ for any $I \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{Gen}}$.

Proof sketch of Theorem 7. Let M be the output of the algorithm and N be an optimal stable matching. We define vectors p_M and p_N on R , which distribute the scores to residents. For each $h \in H$, among residents in $M(h)$, we set $p_M(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$ for $\min\{\ell(h), |M(h)|\}$ residents and $p_M(r) = 0$ for the remaining $|M(h)| - \min\{\ell(h), |M(h)|\}$ residents. Similarly, we define p_N from N . We write $p_M(A) := \sum_{r \in A} p_M(r)$ for any $A \subseteq R$. By definition, $p_M(M(h)) = s_M(h)$ and $p_N(N(h)) = s_N(h)$ for each $h \in H$, and hence $s(M) = \sum_{h \in H} s_M(h) = p_M(R)$ and $s(N) = \sum_{h \in H} s_N(h) = p_N(R)$. Thus, $\frac{p_N(R)}{p_M(R)}$ needs to be bounded.

Let $R' = \{r'_1, r'_2, \dots, r'_n\}$ be a copy of R and identify p_N as a vector on R' . Consider a bipartite graph $G = (R, R'; E)$ whose edge set is $E := \{(r_i, r'_j) \in R \times R' \mid p_M(r_i) \geq p_N(r'_j)\}$. For any matching $X \subseteq E$ in G , denote by $\partial(X) \subseteq R \cup R'$ the set of vertices covered by X . Then, $|R \cap \partial(X)| = |R' \cap \partial(X)| = |X|$, and further, $p_M(R \cap \partial(X)) \geq p_N(R' \cap \partial(X))$ from the definition of E . Therefore, the existence of a large matching in G helps us bound $\frac{p_N(R)}{p_M(R)}$. The key part of our proof is showing that (\star) G admits a matching X with $|X| \geq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$.

In the full proof in Appendix D, the required bound of $\frac{p_N(R)}{p_M(R)}$ is obtained by using a stronger version of (\star) . Here we concentrate on showing (\star) . To this end, we divide R into

$$\begin{aligned} R_+ &:= \{r \in R \mid M(r) \succ_r N(r)\}, \\ R_- &:= \{r \in R \mid N(r) \succ_r M(r) \text{ or } [M(r) =_r N(r), p_N(r) > p_M(r)]\}, \text{ and} \\ R_0 &:= \{r \in R \mid M(r) =_r N(r), p_M(r) \geq p_N(r)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let R'_+, R'_-, R'_0 be the corresponding subsets of R' . We show the following two properties.

- There is an injection $\xi_+ : R_+ \rightarrow R'$ such that $p_M(r) = p_N(\xi_+(r))$ for every $r \in R_+$.
- There is an injection $\xi_- : R'_- \rightarrow R$ such that $p_N(r') = p_M(\xi_-(r'))$ for every $r' \in R'_-$.

We first define ξ_+ . For each hospital h with $M(h) \cap R_+ \neq \emptyset$, there is $r \in M(h) \cap R_+$ with $h = M(r) \succ_r N(r)$. By the stability of N , h is full in N . Then, we can define an injection $\xi_+^h : M(h) \cap R_+ \rightarrow N(h)$ so that $p_M(r) = p_N(\xi_+^h(r))$ for all $r \in M(h) \cap R_+$. By regarding $N(h)$ as a subset of R' and taking the direct sum of ξ_+^h for all hospitals h with $M(h) \cap R_+ \neq \emptyset$, we obtain a required injection $\xi_+ : R_+ \rightarrow R'$.

We next define ξ_- . For each hospital h' with $N(h') \cap R'_- \neq \emptyset$, any $r \in N(h') \cap R'_-$ satisfies either $h' = N(r) \succ_r M(r)$ or $[h' = N(r) =_r M(r), p_N(r) > p_M(r)]$. If some $r \in N(h') \cap R'_-$ satisfies the former, the stability of M implies that h' is full in M . If all $r \in N(h') \cap R'_-$ satisfy the latter, they all satisfy $0 \neq p_N(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h')}$, and hence $|N(h') \cap R'_-| \leq \ell(h')$. Additionally, $p_N(r) > p_M(r)$ implies either $p_M(r) = 0$ or $\ell(h') < \ell(h)$, where $h := M(r)$. Observe that $p_M(r) = 0$ implies $|M(h)| > \ell(h)$. By Lemma 2, each of $\ell(h') < \ell(h)$ and $|M(h)| > \ell(h)$ implies $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h') \geq |N(h') \cap R'_-|$. Then, in any case, we can define an injection $\xi_-^{h'} : N(h') \cap R'_- \rightarrow M(h')$ such that $p_N(r') = p_M(\xi_-^{h'}(r'))$ for all $r' \in N(h') \cap R'_-$. By taking the direct sum of $\xi_-^{h'}$ for all hospitals h' with $M(h') \cap R_- \neq \emptyset$, we obtain $\xi_- : R'_- \rightarrow R$.

Let $G^* = (R, R'; E^*)$ be a bipartite graph (possibly with multiple edges), where E^* is the disjoint union of E_+, E_- , and E_0 , defined by

$$\begin{aligned} E_+ &:= \{ (r, \xi_+(r)) \mid r \in R_+ \}, \\ E_- &:= \{ (\xi_-(r'), r') \mid r' \in R'_- \}, \text{ and} \\ E_0 &:= \{ (r, r') \mid r \in R_0 \text{ and } r' \text{ is the copy of } r \}. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: A graph $G^* = (R, R'; E^*)$

See Fig. 1 for an example. By the definitions of ξ_+, ξ_- , and R_0 , any edge (r, r') in E^* belongs to E , and hence any matching in G^* is also a matching in G . Since $\xi_+ : R_+ \rightarrow R'$ and $\xi_- : R'_- \rightarrow R$ are injections, we observe that every vertex in G^* is incident to at most two edges in E^* . Then, E^* is decomposed into paths and cycles, and hence E^* contains a matching of size at least $\lceil \frac{|E^*|}{2} \rceil$. Since $|E^*| = |R_+| + |R_-| + |R_0| = n$, we obtain (\star) . \square

5.2 Uniform Model

Let $\mathcal{I}_{\text{Uniform}}$ denote the family of uniform problem instances of HR-MSLQ, where an instance is called *uniform* if upper and lower quotas are uniform. In the rest of this subsection, we assume that ℓ and u are nonnegative integers to represent the common lower and upper quotas, respectively, and let $\theta := \frac{u}{\ell} (\geq 1)$. We call $\mathcal{I}_{\text{Uniform}}$ the *uniform model*.

Proposition 8. *The maximum gap for the uniform model satisfies $\Lambda(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Uniform}}) = \theta$. Moreover, this equality holds even if preference lists of hospitals contain no ties.*

Theorem 9. *The approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL for the uniform model satisfies $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Uniform}}) = \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$.*

Note that $\frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1} < \theta$ whenever $\ell < u$ because $\theta - \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1} = \frac{(\theta - 1)^2}{2\theta - 1}$. Here is the ideas to show that $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)} \leq \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$ holds for any $I \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{Uniform}}$.

Proof sketch of Theorem 9. Let M be the output of the algorithm and N be an optimal stable matching, and assume $s(M) < s(N)$. Consider a bipartite graph $(R, H; M \cup N)$, which may have multiple edges. Take an arbitrary connected component, and let R^* and H^* be the sets of residents and hospitals, respectively, contained in it. It is sufficient to bound $\frac{s_N(H^*)}{s_M(H^*)}$.

Let H_0 be the set of all hospitals in H^* having strictly larger scores in N than in M , i.e.,

$$H_0 := \{h \in H^* \mid s_N(h) > s_M(h)\}.$$

Using this, we sequentially define

$$R_0 := \{r \in R^* \mid N(r) \in H_0\},$$

$$H_1 := \{h \in H^* \setminus H_0 \mid \exists r \in R_0 : M(r) = h\},$$

$$R_1 := \{r \in R^* \mid N(r) \in H_1\},$$

$$H_2 := H^* \setminus (H_0 \cup H_1), \text{ and}$$

$$R_2 := R^* \setminus (R_0 \cup R_1).$$




Figure 2: Example with $[\ell, u] = [2, 3]$.

See Fig. 2 for an example. We use scaled score functions $v_M := \ell \cdot s_M$ and $v_N := \ell \cdot s_N$ and write $v_M(A) = \sum_{h \in A} v_M(h)$ for any $A \subseteq H$. We bound $\frac{v_N(H^*)}{v_M(H^*)}$, which equals to $\frac{s_N(H^*)}{s_M(H^*)}$. Note that the set of residents assigned to H^* is R^* in both M and N . The scores differ depending on how efficiently those residents are assigned. In this sense, we may think that a hospital h is assigned residents “efficiently” in M if $|M(h)| \leq \ell$ and is assigned “most redundantly” if $|M(h)| = u$. Since $v_M(h) = \min\{\ell, |M(h)|\}$, we have $v_M(h) = |M(h)|$ in the former case and $v_M(h) = \frac{1}{\theta} \cdot |M(h)|$ in the latter. We show that hospitals in H_1 provide us with advantage of M ; any hospital in H_1 is assigned residents either efficiently in M or most redundantly in N .

For any $h \in H_0$, $s_M(h) < s_N(h)$ implies $|M(h)| < \ell$. Then, the stability of M implies $M(r) \succeq_r N(r)$ for any $r \in R_0$. Hence, the following $\{H_1^{\succ}, H_1^{\doteq}\}$ defines a bipartition of H_1 :

$$H_1^{\succ} := \{h \in H_1 \mid \exists r \in M(h) \cap R_0 : h \succ_r N(r)\},$$

$$H_1^{\doteq} := \{h \in H_1 \mid \forall r \in M(h) \cap R_0 : h =_r N(r)\}.$$

For each $h \in H_1^{\succ}$, as some r satisfies $h \succ_r N(r)$, the stability of N implies that h is full, i.e., h is assigned residents most redundantly in N . Note that any $h \in H_1^{\succ}$ satisfies $v_M(h) \geq v_N(h)$ because $h \notin H_0$, and hence $v_M(h) = v_N(h) = \ell$. Then, $|N(h)| = u = \theta \cdot v_N(h) = (\theta - 1) \cdot v_M(h) + v_N(h)$ for each $h \in H_1^{\succ}$. Additionally, for any $h \in H^*$, we have $|N(h)| \geq \min\{\ell, |N(h)|\} = v_N(h)$. Since $|R^*| = \sum_{h \in H^*} |N(h)|$, we have

$$|R^*| \geq (\theta - 1) \cdot v_M(H_1^{\succ}) + v_N(H_1^{\succ}) + v_N(H^* \setminus H_1^{\succ}) = (\theta - 1) \cdot v_M(H_1^{\succ}) + v_N(H^*).$$

For each $h \in H_1^{\doteq}$, there is $r \in R_0$ with $M(r) = h =_r N(r)$. As $r \in R_0$, the hospital $h' := N(r)$ belongs to H_0 , and hence $|M(h')| < \ell$. Then, Lemma 2(ii) implies $|M(h)| \leq \ell$, i.e., h is assigned residents efficiently in M . Note that any $h \in H_0$ satisfies $v_M(h) < v_N(h) \leq \ell$. Then, the number of residents assigned to $H_0 \cup H_1^{\doteq}$ is $v_M(H_0 \cup H_1^{\doteq})$. Additionally, the number of residents assigned to $H_1^{\succ} \cup H_2$ is at most $\theta \cdot v_M(H_1^{\succ} \cup H_2)$. Then, we have

$$|R^*| \leq v_M(H_0 \cup H_1^{\doteq}) + \theta \cdot v_M(H_1^{\succ} \cup H_2) = v_M(H^*) + (\theta - 1) \cdot v_M(H_1^{\succ} \cup H_2).$$

From these two estimations of $|R^*|$, we obtain $v_N(H^*) \leq (\theta - 1) \cdot v_M(H_2) + v_M(H^*)$, which gives us a relationship between $v_M(H^*)$ and $v_N(H^*)$. Combining this with other inequalities, we can obtain the required upper bound of $\frac{v_N(H^*)}{v_M(H^*)}$. \square

5.3 Marriage Model

Let $\mathcal{I}_{\text{Marriage}}$ denote the family of instances of HR-MSLQ, in which each hospital has an upper quota of 1. We call $\mathcal{I}_{\text{Marriage}}$ the *marriage model*. By definition, $[\ell(h), u(h)]$ in this model is either $[0, 1]$ or $[1, 1]$ for each $h \in H$. Since this is a one-to-one matching model, the union of two stable matchings can be partitioned into paths and cycles. By applying standard arguments used in other stable matching problems, we can obtain $\Lambda(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Marriage}}) = 2$ and $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Marriage}}) = 1.5$ (see Appendix D for the proofs).

As shown in Example 24, there is no strategy-proof algorithm that can achieve an approximation factor better than 1.5 even in the marriage model. Therefore, we cannot improve this ratio without sacrificing strategy-proofness.

5.4 Resident-Side Master List Model

Let $\mathcal{I}_{\text{R-ML}}$ denote the family of instances of HR-MSLQ in which all residents have the same preference list. This is well studied in the stable matching literature [8, 22, 23, 24]. We call $\mathcal{I}_{\text{R-ML}}$ the *R-side ML model*. We have already shown in Proposition 6 that $\Lambda(\mathcal{I}_{\text{R-ML}}) = n + 1$. Our algorithm, however, solves this model exactly, where the proof can be found in Appendix D.

Note that this is not the case for the hospital-side master list model, which is NP-hard as shown in Theorem 14 below. This difference highlights asymmetry of two sides in HR-MSLQ.

6 Hardness Results

We obtain various hardness and inapproximability results for HR-MSLQ. Due to the space constraint, here we only summarize the results and defer proofs to Appendix E.

First, we show that HR-MSLQ in the general model is inapproximable and we cannot hope for a constant factor approximation.

Theorem 10. *HR-MSLQ is inapproximable within a ratio $n^{\frac{1}{4}-\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ unless $P=NP$.*

We then show inapproximability results for the uniform model and the marriage model under the Unique Games Conjecture (UGC).

Theorem 11. *Under UGC, HR-MSLQ in the uniform model is not approximable within a ratio $\frac{3\theta+3}{2\theta+4} - \epsilon$ for any positive ϵ .*

Theorem 12. *Under UGC, HR-MSLQ in the marriage model is not approximable within a ratio $\frac{9}{8} - \epsilon$ for any positive ϵ .*

Furthermore, we give two examples showing that HR-MSLQ is NP-hard even in very restrictive settings. The first is a marriage model for which ties appear in one side only.

Theorem 13. *HR-MSLQ in the marriage model is NP-hard even if there is a master preference list of hospitals and ties appear in only preference lists of residents or only preference lists of hospitals.*

The other is a setting like the capacitated house allocation problem, where all hospitals are indifferent among residents.

Theorem 14. *HR-MSLQ in the uniform model is NP-hard even if all the hospitals quotas are $[1, 2]$, preferences lists of all residents are strict, and all hospitals are indifferent among all residents (i.e., there is a master list of hospitals consisting of a single tie).*

References

- [1] Atila Abdulkadiroğlu, Parag A. Pathak, and Alvin E. Roth: The New York city high school match, *American Economic Review*, **95** (2005), pp. 364–367.
- [2] Atila Abdulkadiroğlu, Parag A. Pathak, Alvin E. Roth, and Tayfun Sönmez: The Boston public school match, *American Economic Review*, **95** (2005), pp. 368–371.
- [3] David J. Abraham, Katarína Cechlárová, David F. Manlove, and Kurt Mehlhorn: Pareto optimality in house allocation problems, Xiaotie Deng and Ding-Zhu Du, editors, *Algorithms and Computation, 16th International Symposium, ISAAC 2005, Sanya, Hainan, China, December 19-21, 2005, Proceedings* **3827** of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2005, pp. 1163–1175.
- [4] Ashwin Arulsevan, Ágnes Cseh, Martin Groß, David F. Manlove, and Jannik Matuschke: Matchings with lower quotas: Algorithms and complexity, *Algorithmica*, **80** (2018), pp. 185–208.
- [5] Itai Ashlagi, Amin Saberi, and Ali Shameli: Assignment mechanisms under distributional constraints, *Oper. Res.*, **68** (2020), pp. 467–479.
- [6] Péter Biró, Tamás Fleiner, Robert W. Irving, and David F. Manlove: The College Admissions problem with lower and common quotas, *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, **411** (2010), pp. 3136–3153.
- [7] Niclas Boehmer and Klaus Heeger: A fine-grained view on stable many-to-one matching problems with lower and upper quotas, Xujin Chen, Nikolai Gravin, Martin Hoefer, and Ruta Mehta, editors, *Web and Internet Economics - 16th International Conference, WINE 2020, Beijing, China, December 7-11, 2020, Proceedings* **12495** of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2020, pp. 31–44.
- [8] Robert Brederbeck, Klaus Heeger, Dusan Knop, and Rolf Niedermeier: Multidimensional stable roommates with master list, Xujin Chen, Nikolai Gravin, Martin Hoefer, and Ruta Mehta, editors, *Web and Internet Economics - 16th International Conference, WINE 2020, Beijing, China, December 7-11, 2020, Proceedings* **12495** of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2020, pp. 59–73.
- [9] Lester E. Dubins and David A. Freedman: Machiavelli and the Gale-Shapley algorithm, *The American Mathematical Monthly*, **88** (1981), pp. 485–494.
- [10] Szymon Dudycz, Mateusz Lewandowski, and Jan Marcinkowski: Tight approximation ratio for minimum maximal matching, Andrea Lodi and Viswanath Nagarajan, editors, *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization - 20th International Conference, IPCO 2019, Ann Arbor, MI, USA, May 22-24, 2019, Proceedings* **11480** of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2019, pp. 181–193.
- [11] Tamás Fleiner and Naoyuki Kamiyama: A matroid approach to stable matchings with lower quotas, *Math. Oper. Res.*, **41** (2016), pp. 734–744.
- [12] Daniel Fragiadakis, Atsushi Iwasaki, Peter Troyan, Suguru Ueda, and Makoto Yokoo: Strategyproof matching with minimum quotas, *ACM Trans. Economics and Comput.*, **4** (2015), pp. 6:1–6:40.

- [13] David Gale and Lloyd S. Shapley: College admissions and the stability of marriage, *The American Mathematical Monthly*, **69** (1962), pp. 9–15.
- [14] David Gale and Marilda Sotomayor: Some remarks on the stable matching problem, *Discret. Appl. Math.*, **11** (1985), pp. 223–232.
- [15] Masahiro Goto, Atsushi Iwasaki, Yujiro Kawasaki, Ryoji Kurata, Yosuke Yasuda, and Makoto Yokoo: Strategyproof matching with regional minimum and maximum quotas, *Artificial Intelligence*, **235** (2016), pp. 40–57.
- [16] Dan Gusfield and Robert W. Irving: Foundations of computing series, *The Stable marriage problem - structure and algorithms.*, MIT Press, 1989.
- [17] Koki Hamada, Kazuo Iwama, and Shuichi Miyazaki: The Hospitals/Residents problem with lower quotas, *Algorithmica*, **74** (2016), pp. 440–465.
- [18] Koki Hamada, Shuichi Miyazaki, and Hiroki Yanagisawa: Strategy-proof approximation algorithms for the stable marriage problem with ties and incomplete lists, Pinyan Lu and Guochuan Zhang, editors, *30th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2019, December 8-11, 2019, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics, Shanghai, China* **149** of *LIPICs*, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019, pp. 9:1–9:14.
- [19] Joseph D. Horton and Kyriakos Kilakos: Minimum edge dominating sets, *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, **6** (1993), p. 375–387.
- [20] Chien-Chung Huang: Classified stable matching, Moses Charikar, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2010, Austin, Texas, USA, January 17-19, 2010*, SIAM, 2010, pp. 1235–1253.
- [21] Robert W. Irving: Stable marriage and indifference, *Discret. Appl. Math.*, **48** (1994), pp. 261–272.
- [22] Robert W. Irving, David F. Manlove, and Sandy Scott: The stable marriage problem with master preference lists, *Discret. Appl. Math.*, **156** (2008), pp. 2959–2977.
- [23] Naoyuki Kamiyama: Stable matchings with ties, master preference lists, and matroid constraints, Martin Hoefer, editor, *Algorithmic Game Theory - 8th International Symposium, SAGT 2015, Saarbrücken, Germany, September 28-30, 2015, Proceedings* **9347** of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2015, pp. 3–14.
- [24] Naoyuki Kamiyama: Many-to-many stable matchings with ties, master preference lists, and matroid constraints, Edith Elkind, Manuela Veloso, Noa Agmon, and Matthew E. Taylor, editors, *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and MultiAgent Systems, AAMAS '19, Montreal, QC, Canada, May 13-17, 2019*, International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems, 2019, pp. 583–591.
- [25] Dénes König: Über graphen und ihre anwendung auf determinantentheorie und mengenlehre, *Mathematische*, **77** (1916), p. 453–465.
- [26] Zoltán Király: Linear time local approximation algorithm for maximum stable marriage, *Algorithms*, **6** (2013), pp. 471–484.

- [27] Prem Krishnaa, Girija Limaye, Meghana Nasre, and Prajakta Nimbhorkar: Envy-freeness and relaxed stability: Hardness and approximation algorithms, Tobias Harks and Max Klimm, editors, *Algorithmic Game Theory - 13th International Symposium, SAGT 2020, Augsburg, Germany, September 16-18, 2020, Proceedings* **12283** of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2020, pp. 193–208.
- [28] Krishnapriya A. M., Meghana Nasre, Prajakta Nimbhorkar, and Amit Rawat: How good are popular matchings?, Gianlorenzo D’Angelo, editor, *17th International Symposium on Experimental Algorithms, SEA 2018, June 27-29, 2018, L’Aquila, Italy* **103** of *LIPICs*, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018, pp. 9:1–9:14.
- [29] David F. Manlove **2** of *Series on Theoretical Computer Science: Algorithmics of Matching Under Preferences*, WorldScientific, 2013.
- [30] David F. Manlove, Robert W. Irving, Kazuo Iwama, Shuichi Miyazaki, and Yasufumi Morita: Hard variants of stable marriage, *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, **276** (2002), pp. 261–279.
- [31] Alvin Roth: The evolution of the labor market for medical interns and residents: A case study in game theory, *Journal of Political Economy*, **92** (1984), pp. 991–1016.
- [32] Alvin Roth: On the allocation of residents to rural hospitals: A general property of two-sided matching markets, *Econometrica*, **54** (1986), pp. 425–27.
- [33] Alvin E. Roth: The economics of matching: Stability and incentives, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **7** (1982), pp. 617–628.
- [34] Alexander Schrijver: *Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency*, Springer, 2003.
- [35] Yu Yokoi: Envy-free matchings with lower quotas, *Algorithmica*, **82** (2020), pp. 188–211.
- [36] David Zuckerman: Linear degree extractors and the inapproximability of max clique and chromatic number, *Theory Comput.*, **3** (2007), pp. 103–128.

A Other Objective Functions

This paper investigates approximability and inapproximability of the problem of maximizing the total satisfaction ratio over the family \mathcal{M} of stable matchings. This is formulated as

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{h \in H} s_M(h), \quad \text{where } s_M(h) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{|M(h)|}{\ell(h)} \right\}.$$

To formulate the objective of “filling lower quotas of hospitals as much as possible,” other objective functions can be considered. Here we briefly discuss on three alternative objective functions below.

(a) Maximizing the minimum satisfaction ratio:

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \min_{h \in H} s_M(h).$$

(b) Maximizing the number of satisfied hospitals:

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} |\{h \in H \mid s_M(h) = 1\}|.$$

(c) **Maximizing the number of residents filling lower quotas:**

$$\max_{M \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{h \in H} v_M(h), \quad \text{where } v_M(h) = \min\{\ell(h), |M(h)|\}.$$

We first provide a hardness result that is used to show the difficulty of approximation of those alternatives. Let us define a decision problem HR-D as follows. An input of HR-D is a pair (I, h^*) consisting of an HR instance I and a specified hospital h^* in I , we are asked whether I admits a stable matching in which h^* is assigned at least one resident.

Theorem 15. *The problem HR-D is NP-complete.*

Proof. Membership in NP is obvious. We give a reduction from an NP-complete problem COM-SMTI [22]. An input of this problem is a stable marriage instance consisting of n men and n women, each having an incomplete preference list with ties. The problem asks if there exists a weakly stable matching of size n .

Let I be an instance of COM-SMTI consisting of n men m_1, \dots, m_n and n women w_1, \dots, w_n . We will construct an instance I' of HR-D as follows. The set of residents is $R = \{r_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{r\}$ and the set of hospitals is $H = \{h_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{h, h^*\}$, where h^* is the specified hospital. An upper quota of each hospital is 1.

Let $P(m_i)$ and $P(w_i)$ be the preferences lists of m_i and w_i in I , respectively. Then, we define $P'(r_i)$ as the list obtained from $P(m_i)$ by replacing each w_j by h_j . Similarly, let $P'(h_i)$ be the list obtained from $P(w_i)$ by replacing each m_j by r_j . The preference lists of agents in I' are as follows, where “...” denotes an arbitrary strict order of all agents missing in the list.

$$\begin{array}{llll} r_i: & P'(r_i) & \cdots & h^* \\ r: & \cdots & h^* & h \\ & & & h_i \quad [1]: \quad P'(h_i) \quad r \quad \cdots \\ & & & h \quad [1]: \quad \cdots \\ & & & h^* \quad [1]: \quad r \quad \cdots \end{array}$$

Suppose that I admits a weakly stable matching M of size n . Then, $M' = \{(r_i, h_j) \mid (m_i, w_j) \in M\} \cup \{(r, h^*)\}$ is a stable matching of I' in which h^* is assigned.

Conversely, suppose that I' admits a stable matching M' in which h^* is assigned. Since the preference lists are all complete and the number of hospitals exceeds that of residents by one, all agents but one hospital are assigned in M' . If $M'(r_i) = h^*$ for some i , then r_i forms a blocking pair with the unassigned hospital; hence we have that $M'(r) = h^*$. Then, each h_i must be assigned a resident in $P'(h_i)$, as otherwise (r, h_i) blocks M' . Thus M' defines a perfect matching between $\{r_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $\{h_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. It is not hard to see that $M = \{(m_i, w_j) \mid (r_i, h_j) \in M'\}$ is a weakly stable matching of I of size n . \square

Proposition 16. *For the objective function (a), there is no polynomial-time algorithm whose approximation factor is bounded unless $P=NP$.*

Proof. We show the claim by a reduction from HR-D. Given an instance (I, h^*) of HR-D, let I' be an instance of HR-MSLQ obtained from I by setting lower quotas as $\ell(h^*) = 1$ and $\ell(h) = 0$ for any $h \in H \setminus \{h^*\}$. Note that the sets of stable matchings in I and I' are the same. Then, the optimal value of I' is 1 if (I, h^*) is a yes instance and 0 otherwise. Hence, any algorithm with a bounded approximation factor can distinguish these two cases. \square

The proof of Proposition 16 utilizes the fact that assigning a resident to a hospital with lower quota of 0 does not contribute to the objective function at all. However, even without such hospitals, approximation of this objective function is impossible.

Proposition 17. *Proposition 16 holds even if lower quotas of all hospitals are positive.*

Proof. We modify the proof of Proposition 16 as follows. In the construction of I' , for each $h \in H \setminus \{h^*\}$, we set $\ell(h) = 1$ and increase the upper quota of h by 1 from that in I . Hence, all lower quotas are 1 in I' . We also add $|H|$ dummy residents $\{d_h \mid h \in H \setminus \{h^*\}\}$. Each $h \in H \setminus \{h^*\}$ adds d_h at the top of its preference list and adds other $|H| - 1$ dummy residents at the bottom of its list in an arbitrary order. Each dummy resident d_h puts h at the top of her list, followed by the other hospitals in any order. We can observe that, for any $h \in H \setminus \{h^*\}$, (d_h, h) is a pair in any stable matching. Thus, the problem reduces to the one in Proposition 16 and our claim is proved. \square

We then turn to the objective function (b).

Proposition 18. *Solving the problem with objective function (b) exactly is NP-hard. There exists an algorithm whose approximation factor is at most n . (Recall that n is the number $|R|$ of residents.)*

Proof. The first claim easily follows from a reduction from HR-D. Given an instance (I, h^*) of HR-D, let I' be an HR-MSLQ instance obtained from I by setting lower quotas as $\ell(h^*) = 1$ and $\ell(h) = 0$ for any $h \in H \setminus \{h^*\}$. Then, the optimal value of I' is $|H|$ if (I, h^*) is a yes instance and $|H| - 1$ otherwise.

For the second claim, we show that the following naive algorithm attains an approximation factor of n . Given an HR-MSLQ instance I consisting of R and H , the algorithm first constructs a bipartite graph $(R, H; E)$ with $E = \{(r, h) \in R \times H \mid h \text{ is included in the top tie of } r\}$. Let $d(h)$ be the degree of each hospital $h \in H$ in this graph. If $d(h) < \ell(h)$ for every $h \in H$, then the algorithm returns an arbitrary stable matching; otherwise, the algorithm takes any h^* with $d(h^*) \geq \ell(h^*)$, breaks the ties of I so that h^* has the highest rank in any tie including h^* , and returns any stable matching of the resultant instance.

In the former case, we can easily see that any stable matching is a subset of E ; hence the optimal value is 0. Hence, any stable matching is optimal. In the latter case, the hospital h^* is assigned at least $\ell(h^*)$ residents, and hence the objective value of the output matching is at least $\max\{1, |\{h \in H \mid \ell(h) = 0\}|\}$. As the optimal value is at most $n + |\{h \in H \mid \ell(h) = 0\}|$, the approximation factor of this algorithm is at most n . \square

Note that the approximation factor mentioned in Proposition 18 cannot be attained by our algorithm DOUBLE PROPOSAL: it may return a stable matching of value 0 even when there exists a stable matching of positive objective value. As the algorithm in the above proof is just a simple greedy algorithm and there is no inapproximability result for this problem, its approximability may be worth investigating further.

Finally, we consider the objective function (c).

Proposition 19. *For the objective function (c), there is no polynomial-time algorithm whose approximation factor is bounded unless $P=NP$.*

Proof. By the reduction used to show Proposition 16, we see that it is NP-hard to distinguish the two cases where the optimal objective value is 0 and 1. \square

As shown above, the problem with the objective function (c) is inapproximable. Fortunately, however, it is approximable if all hospitals have positive lower quotas, in contrast to the objective function (a). We show that our algorithm DOUBLE PROPOSAL presented in Section 5 attains an approximation factor better than the arbitrary tie-breaking GS algorithm.

Proposition 20. *For the objective function (c), DOUBLE PROPOSAL attains the approximation factor shown in the second row of Table 2 if all hospitals have positive lower quotas.*

Proof. We show the approximation factors: For the R-side ML model, the output of DOUBLE PROPOSAL is an optimal solution by Lemma 2(ii) and Lemma 43. For the marriage model, the assumption that all lower quotas are positive implies that any hospital has quotas $[1, 1]$. Then, every stable matching M satisfies $\sum_{h \in H} v_M(h) = n$, and hence the approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL is clearly 1. For the uniform model, the approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL for the objective function $\sum_{h \in H} v_M(h)$ is equivalent to that for $\sum_{h \in H} s_M(h)$, which is $\frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$ by Theorem 9. For the general model, the approximation factor is obtained by combining Claims 21 and 22 below. \square

In Table 2 below, we also present the maximum gap for the objective function (c) when all lower quotas are positive. The values for the marriage and uniform models follow from the above arguments. The maximum gap of n for the general and R-side ML models can be obtained by modifying the proof of Proposition 6 (note that $H_0 := \{h \in H \mid \ell(h) = 0\} = \emptyset$ under the assumption of positive lower quotas).

	General	Uniform	Marriage	R-side ML
Maximum gap $\Lambda(\mathcal{I})$ (i.e., Approx. factor of arbitrary tie-breaking GS)	n	θ	1	n
Approx. factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL	$\frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1}{2}$	$\frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$	1	1

Table 2: Maximum gap $\Lambda(\mathcal{I})$ and approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL for the objective function (c) when lower quotas of all hospitals are positive.

Claim 21. *For the objective function (c), if all hospitals have positive lower quotas, the approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL is at least $\frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1}{2}$ for the general model.*

Proof. We provide a family of instances each of which admits a stable matching with objective value $\frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1}{2}$ times as large as that of the output of DOUBLE PROPOSAL. Let $R = R' \cup R''$ where $R' = \{r'_1, r'_2, \dots, r'_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}\}$ and $R'' = \{r''_1, r''_2, \dots, r''_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}\}$ and the set of hospitals is given as $H = \{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n\} \cup \{x, y\}$. Then, $|R| = n$ and $|H| = n + 2$. The preference lists are given as follows, where “(R)” represents the tie consisting of all residents.

$$\begin{array}{llll}
r'_i: & x & h_i & \cdots & x & [1, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor]: & (R) \\
r''_i: & x & y & \cdots & y & [1, n]: & (R) \\
& & & & h_i & [1, 1]: & (R)
\end{array}$$

If indices are defined so that residents in R' have smaller indices compared with those in R'' , then DOUBLE PROPOSAL returns $M = \{(r'_i, x) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\} \cup \{(r''_i, y) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil\}$, whose objective value is $v_M(x) + v_M(y) = 2$. Define N' by $N' = \{(r'_i, h_i) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\} \cup \{(r''_i, x) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$ and let $N = N'$ if n is even and $N = N' \cup \{(r''_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}, y)\}$ if n is odd. Then, N is a stable matching whose objective value is $\frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1}{2}$. \square

Claim 22. *For the objective function (c), if all hospitals have positive lower quotas, the approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL is at most $\frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1}{2}$ for the general model.*

Proof. Take any instance and let N be an optimal solution and M be the output of DOUBLE PROPOSAL. We use the notation $v_M(H') = \sum_{h \in H'} v_M(h)$ for any $H' \subseteq H$ and define $v_N(H')$ similarly. Consider a bipartite graph $(R, H; M \cup N)$, which may have multiple edges. Take an arbitrary connected component and let R^* and H^* be the sets of residents and hospitals, respectively, contained in it. It is sufficient to bound $\frac{v_N(H^*)}{v_M(H^*)}$.

For any $h \in H$, let $r_M(h) = |M(h)| - v_M(h)$, which is the number of residents assigned to h redundantly in M . We write $r_M(H') = \sum_{h \in H'} r_M(h)$ for any $H' \subseteq H$. We define $r_N(h)$ and $r_N(H')$ similarly for N . Define the sets H_0, R_0, H_1, R_1, H_2 , and R_2 as in the proof of Theorem 9. By the arguments there, using Lemma 2(ii), we can see that each $h \in H_1$ satisfies either $|N(h)| = u(h)$ or $|M(h)| \leq \ell(h)$, each of which implies $r_M(h) \leq r_N(h)$. Then, we have $r_M(H_1) \leq r_N(H_1)$. Moreover, the definition of H_0 implies $r_M(h) = 0$ for each $h \in H_0$, and hence $r_M(H_0) \leq r_N(H_0)$. Thus, we have $r_M(H_0 \cup H_1) - r_N(H_0 \cup H_1) \leq 0$.

Note that $v_N(H^*) + r_N(H^*) = |R^*| = v_M(H^*) + r_M(H^*)$, and hence $v_N(H^*) = v_M(H^*) + r_M(H^*) - r_N(H^*)$. If $H_2 = \emptyset$, then $r_M(H^*) - r_N(H^*) = r_M(H_0 \cup H_1) - r_N(H_0 \cup H_1) \leq 0$, and hence clearly $\frac{v_N(H^*)}{v_M(H^*)} \leq 1$. We then assume $H_2 \neq \emptyset$ in the rest of the proof.

By the definitions of H_1 and H_2 , at least one resident is assigned to each of them in M . By the assumption that all hospitals have positive lower quotas, we obtain $v_M(H_1) \geq 1$ and $v_M(H_2) \geq 1$, and hence $v_M(H^*) \geq 2$. Thus,

$$\frac{v_N(H^*)}{v_M(H^*)} = \frac{v_M(H^*) + r_M(H^*) - r_N(H^*)}{v_M(H^*)} \leq \frac{2 + r_M(H^*) - r_N(H^*)}{2}.$$

We now bound the value of $r_M(H^*) - r_N(H^*)$. By the definitions of r_M and r_N , we have

$$r_M(H_2) - r_N(H_2) = \sum_{h \in H_2} |M(h)| - v_M(H_2) - \left\{ \sum_{h \in H_2} |N(h)| - v_N(H_2) \right\}.$$

Additionally, $-v_M(H_2) + v_N(H_2) \leq 0$, $\sum_{h \in H_2} |N(h)| = |R_2|$, and $\sum_{h \in H_2} |M(h)| \leq |R_2| + |R_1|$ by the definitions of H_0, H_1 , and H_2 . Substituting them, we obtain $r_M(H_2) - r_N(H_2) \leq |R_1|$. We also have $|R_1| = v_N(H_1) + r_N(H_1) \leq v_M(H_1) + r_N(H_1) = \sum_{h \in H_1} |M(h)| - r_M(H_1) + r_N(H_1)$ and $\sum_{h \in H_1} |M(h)| \leq n - \sum_{h \in H_2} |M(h)| = n - v_M(H_2) - r_M(H_2) \leq n - 1 - r_M(H_2)$. Combining them, we obtain

$$r_M(H_2) - r_N(H_2) \leq n - 1 - r_M(H_2) - r_M(H_1) + r_N(H_1),$$

which implies $r_M(H_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - 1 - r_M(H_1) + r_N(H_2) + r_N(H_1))$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} r_M(H^*) - r_N(H^*) &\leq r_M(H_2) + r_M(H_1) - r_N(H_2) - r_N(H_1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(n - 1 + r_M(H_1) - r_N(H_1) - r_N(H_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $r_M(H_1) - r_N(H_1) \leq 0$ and $-r_N(H_2) \leq 0$, we obtain $r_M(H^*) - r_N(H^*) \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$, which implies $r_M(H^*) - r_N(H^*) \leq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil - 1$ by the integrality of $r_M(H^*) - r_N(H^*)$. Thus, we obtain $\frac{v_N(H^*)}{v_M(H^*)} \leq \frac{2 + r_M(H^*) - r_N(H^*)}{2} \leq \frac{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1}{2}$. \square

Note that, in HR-MSLQ, $\ell(h)$ positions among $u(h)$ can be regarded as prioritized positions of hospital h . In our original objective function, the value of such position is $\frac{1}{\ell(h)}$. Therefore, prioritized positions of hospitals with small lower quotas have higher values. In contrast, the objective function (c) treats all prioritized positions evenly. For this version of objective function, our algorithm DOUBLE PROPOSAL performs better than the base line algorithm, in contrast to objective functions (a) and (b).

We can also observe that the proofs of approximation factors shown in Table 2 uses Lemma 2(ii) but does not use (i). This means that prioritizing hospitals with small lower quotas at Lines 5

and 7 of DOUBLE PROPOSAL does not play any role. Hence, we can adopt any rule for choosing a hospital, which makes it possible to modify DOUBLE PROPOSAL to treat hospitals fairly, without degrading the approximation factor.

B Complements for Section 3 (Algorithm)

This section provides an example and proofs omitted in Section 3.

We first provide an example that demonstrates that introducing a greedy tie-breaking method into the Gale–Shapley algorithm in an adaptive manner destroys the strategy-proofness for residents.

Example 23. Consider the following instance I (in the uniform model), consisting of five residents and three hospitals.

r_1 :	h_1	h_2	h_3	h_1 [1, 2]:	r_2	r_3	r_5	r_1	r_4
r_2 :	$(h_1$	$h_2)$	h_3	h_2 [1, 2]:	r_2	r_4	r_1	r_3	r_5
r_3 :	h_1	h_2	h_3	h_3 [1, 2]:	r_1	r_2	r_3	r_4	r_5
r_4 :	h_2	h_1	h_3						
r_5 :	h_1	h_3	h_2						

Consider an algorithm that is basically the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm and let each resident prioritize deficient hospitals over sufficient hospitals among the hospitals in the same tie. Its one possible execution is as follows. First, r_1 proposes to h_1 and is accepted. Next, as h_1 is sufficient while h_2 is deficient, r_2 proposes to h_2 and is accepted. If we apply the ordinary Gale–Shapley procedure afterwards, then we obtain a matching $\{(r_1, h_3), (r_2, h_2), (r_3, h_1), (r_4, h_2), (r_5, h_1)\}$. Thus, r_1 is assigned to her third choice.

Let I' be an instance obtained by swapping h_1 and h_2 in r_1 's preference list. If we run the same algorithm for I' , then r_1 first proposes to h_2 . Next, as h_2 is sufficient while h_1 is deficient, r_2 proposes to h_1 and is accepted. By applying the ordinary Gale–Shapley procedure afterwards, we obtain $\{(r_1, h_2), (r_2, h_1), (r_3, h_1), (r_4, h_2), (r_5, h_3)\}$. Thus, r_1 is assigned to a hospital h_2 , which is her second choice in her original list. Therefore, this manipulation is successful for r_1 .

We show that our algorithm DOUBLE PROPOSAL finds a stable matching in linear time.

Lemma 24. *Algorithm DOUBLE PROPOSAL runs in linear time and outputs a stable matching.*

Proof. Since all agents have complete preference lists, the input size is $O(|R||H|)$. As each resident proposes to each hospital at most twice, the while loop is iterated at most $2|R||H|$ times. Note that, at Lines 5 and 7, a resident prefers hospitals with smaller $\ell(h)$, and hence we need to sort hospitals in each tie in an increasing order of the values of ℓ . Since $0 \leq \ell(h) \leq n$ for each $h \in H$, ℓ has only $|R| + 1$ possible values. Therefore, the required sorting can be done in $O(|R||H|)$ time as a preprocessing step by a method like bucket sort. Thus, our algorithm runs in linear time.

It is clear from the algorithm that the output is a matching. Observe that a hospital h is deleted from r 's list only if h is full. Additionally, once h becomes full, it remains so afterwards. Since each resident has a complete preference list and $|R| < \sum_{h \in H} u(h)$, preference lists of residents never become empty. Therefore, all residents are matched in the output M .

Suppose, to the contrary, that M is not stable. Then, there exists a pair (r, h) such that (i) r prefers h to $M(r)$ and (ii) h is either undersubscribed in M or prefers r to at least one resident in $M(h)$. By the algorithm, (i) means that r is rejected by h twice. Just after the

second rejection of r , h is full and all residents in $M(h)$ have once been rejected by h and they are no worse than r for h . Since $M(h)$ is monotonically improving for h afterwards, at the end of the algorithm h is still full and no resident in $M(h)$ is worse than r , which contradicts (ii). \square

Here is a property of the output of DOUBLE PROPOSAL, which plays a key role in the analysis of the approximation factor in Section 5.

Lemma 24. *Let M be the output of DOUBLE PROPOSAL, r be a resident, and h and h' be hospitals such that $h =_r h'$ and $M(r) = h$.*

- (i) *If $\ell(h) > \ell(h')$, then $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h')$.*
- (ii) *If $|M(h)| > \ell(h)$, then $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h')$.*

Proof. (i) Since $h =_r h'$, $\ell(h) > \ell(h')$, and r is assigned to h in M , the definition of the algorithm (Lines 4, 5, and 7) implies that r proposed to h' and was rejected by h' before she proposes to h . Just after this rejection occurred, $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h')$ holds. Since $|M(h')|$ is monotonically increasing, we also have $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h')$ at the end.

(ii) Since $|M(h)| > \ell(h)$, $|M(h)|$ changes from $\ell(h)$ to $\ell(h) + 1$ at some moment of the algorithm. By Line 11 of the algorithm, at any point after this, $M(h)$ consists of only residents who have once been rejected by h . Since $M(r) = h$ for the output M , at some moment r must have made the second proposal to h . By Line 4 of the algorithm, $h =_r h'$ implies that r has been rejected by h' at least once, which implies that $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h')$ at this moment and also at the end. \square

C Complements for Section 4 (Strategy-proofness)

In this section, we give some examples related to Section 4 and a proof of Lemma 5, which is used to show the strategy-proofness of our algorithm.

C.1 Incompatibility between Optimization and Strategy-proofness

Here, we provide two examples which shows that solving HR-MSLQ exactly is incompatible with strategy-proofness even if we ignore computational efficiency. This incompatibility holds even for restrictive models. The first example is an instance in the marriage model in which ties appear in only preference lists of hospitals. The second example is an instance in the uniform model in which ties appear in only preference lists of residents.

Example 24. Consider the following instance I , consisting of two residents and three hospitals.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 r_1: & h_1 \quad h_2 \quad h_3 & h_1 [1, 1]: & (r_1 \quad r_2) \\
 r_2: & h_1 \quad h_2 \quad h_3 & h_2 [1, 1]: & (r_1 \quad r_2) \\
 & & h_3 [0, 1]: & (r_1 \quad r_2)
 \end{array}$$

Then, I has two stable matchings $M_1 = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_2)\}$ and $M_2 = \{(r_1, h_2), (r_2, h_1)\}$, both of which have the score 3. Let A be an algorithm that outputs a stable matching with maximum score for any instance of HR-MLQS. Without loss of generality, suppose that A returns M_1 . Next, let I' be obtained from I by replacing r_2 's list with $h_1 \succ'_{r_2} h_3 \succ'_{r_2} h_2$. Then, stable matchings for I' are $M_3 = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_3)\}$ and $M_4 = \{(r_1, h_2), (r_2, h_1)\}$, which have scores 2 and 3, respectively. Since A should return one with maximum score, the output is M_4 , in which r_2 is assigned to h_1 while she is assigned to h_2 in M_1 . As $h_1 \succ_{r_3} h_2$ in her true preference, this is a successful manipulation for r_2 , and A is not strategy-proof.

Example 24 shows that there is no strategy-proof algorithm for HR-MLQS that attains approximation factor better than 1.5 even if there are no computational constraints.

Example 25. Consider the following instance I , consisting of six residents and five hospitals, where the notation “ \dots ” at the tail of lists means an arbitrary strict order of all agents missing in the list.

r_1 : $h_1 \quad \dots$	h_1 [1, 2]: $r_1 \quad r_2 \quad r_6 \quad \dots$
r_2 : $h_3 \quad h_2 \quad h_1 \quad \dots$	h_2 [1, 2]: $r_2 \quad \dots$
r_3 : $h_3 \quad \dots$	h_3 [1, 2]: $r_3 \quad r_4 \quad r_2 \quad \dots$
r_4 : $(h_3 \quad h_4) \quad \dots$	h_4 [1, 2]: $r_5 \quad r_4 \quad r_6 \quad \dots$
r_5 : $h_4 \quad \dots$	h_5 [1, 2]: $r_6 \quad \dots$
r_6 : $h_4 \quad h_5 \quad h_1 \quad \dots$	

This instance I has two stable matchings

$$M_1 = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_2), (r_3, h_3), (r_4, h_3), (r_5, h_4), (r_6, h_4)\}, \text{ and}$$

$$M_2 = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_3), (r_3, h_3), (r_4, h_4), (r_5, h_4), (r_6, h_5)\},$$

both of which have the score 4. Let A be an algorithm that outputs an optimal solution for any input. Then, A must output either M_1 or M_2 .

Suppose that A outputs M_1 . Let I' be an instance obtained by replacing r_2 's preference list from $h_3 \succ_{r_2} h_2 \succ_{r_2} h_1 \dots$ to $h_3 \succ_{r_2} h_1 \succ_{r_2} h_2 \dots$. Then, the stable matchings I' admits are M_2 and $M'_1 = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_1), (r_3, h_3), (r_4, h_3), (r_5, h_4), (r_6, h_4)\}$, whose score is 3. Hence, A must output M_2 . As a result, r_2 is assigned to a better hospital h_3 than h_2 so this manipulation is successful.

If A outputs M_2 , then r_6 can successfully manipulate by changing $h_4 \succ_{r_6} h_5 \succ_{r_6} h_1 \dots$ to $h_4 \succ_{r_6} h_1 \succ_{r_6} h_5 \dots$. The instance obtained by this manipulation has two stable matchings M_1 and $M'_2 = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_3), (r_3, h_3), (r_4, h_4), (r_5, h_4), (r_6, h_1)\}$, whose score is 3. Hence, A must output M_1 and r_6 is assigned to h_4 , better than h_5 .

C.2 Proof of Lemma 5

Here we show that M^* coincides with the output of the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm applied to the auxiliary instance I^* , where the matching M^* and the auxiliary instance I^* are defined in the proof of Theorem 4. Since it is known that the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm outputs the resident-optimal stable matching (see e.g., [16]), it suffices to show the stability and resident-optimality of M^* .

The analysis goes as follows: Although matchings M_1 , M_2 , and M^* are defined for the final matching M of I , we also refer to them for a temporal matching M at any step of the execution of DOUBLE PROPOSAL. When some event occurs in DOUBLE PROPOSAL, we remove some pairs from the instance I^* , where removing (r, h) from I^* means to remove r from h 's list and h from r 's list. The removal operations are defined shortly. We then investigate M , M^* , and I^* at this moment and observe that some property holds for M^* and I^* . This property is used to show the stability and resident-optimality of the final matching M^* .

Here are the definitions of removal operations.

- **Case (1) r_i is rejected by h_j for the first time.** In this case, we remove (r'_i, h_j^\bullet) from I^* . Just after this happens, by the priority rule on indices at Line 12, we have (i) $|M(h_j)| \geq \ell(h_j)$ and (ii) every $r_k \in M_1(h_j)$ satisfies $k < i$. Note that (i) implies

$\min\{u(h_j) - |M(h_j)| + \ell(h_j), u(h_j)\} = u(h_j) - |M(h_j)| + \ell(h_j)$, and hence M^* assigns $\ell(h_j) - |M_1(h_j)|$ dummy residents to h_j^\bullet . Additionally, M^* assigns $|M_1(h_j)|$ residents r'_k to h_j^\bullet and (ii) implies that $k < i$ for every k . Thus, at this moment, the hospital h_j^\bullet is full in M^* with residents better than r'_i .

- **Case (2) r_i is rejected by h_j for the second time.** In this case, we remove (r'_i, h_j°) from I^* . Just after this happens, by Lines 16, 17, and the priority rule on indices, $M(h_j) = M_2(h_j)$, $|M(h_j)| = u(h_j)$, and every $r_k \in M_2(h_j)$ satisfies either (a) $r_k \succ_{h_j} r_i$ or (b) $r_k =_{h_j} r_i$ and $k < i$, each of which implies $r'_k \succ_{h_j^\circ} r'_i$. Thus, at this moment, the hospital h_j° is full in M^* with residents better than r'_i .
- **Case (3) $|M_2(h_j)|$ increases by 1, from $u(h_j) - p$ to $u(h_j) - p + 1$ for some p ($1 \leq p \leq u(h_j)$).** In this case, we remove one or two pairs depending on p .

We first remove $(d_{j,p}, h_j^\circ)$ from I^* . Just after this happens, we have $u(h_j) - |M_2(h_j)| = p - 1$ and hence $M^*(h_j^\circ) = \{r'_i \mid r_i \in M_2(h_j)\} \cup \{d_{j,1}, d_{j,2}, \dots, d_{j,p-1}\}$. Thus, at this moment, the hospital h_j° is full in M^* with residents better than $d_{j,p}$.

If, furthermore, p satisfies $1 \leq p \leq u(h_j) - \ell(h_j)$, we remove $(d_{j,\ell(h_j)+p}, h_j^\bullet)$ from I^* . Just after this happens, we have $|M_2(h_j)| = u(h_j) - p + 1 > \ell(h_j)$. Note that, by Lines 11–13, when $|M(h_j)|$ exceeds $\ell(h_j)$, any resident in $M(h_j)$ is once rejected by h_j , and this invariant is maintained till the end of the algorithm. Hence, $|M_1(h_j)| = 0$ and $|M_2(h_j)| = |M(h_j)|$ hold. Then, $M^*(h_j^\bullet) = \{d_{j,p}, d_{j,p+1}, \dots, d_{j,p+\ell(h_j)-1}\}$. Thus, at this moment, the hospital h_j^\bullet is full in M^* with residents better than $d_{j,\ell(h_j)+p}$.

Now we will see two properties of M^* at the termination of DOUBLE PROPOSAL.

Claim 26. *If (r, h) is removed from I^* by DOUBLE PROPOSAL, h is full in M^* with residents better than r .*

Proof. In all Cases (1)–(3) of the removal operation, we have observed that, just after (r, h) is removed from I^* , h is full in M^* with residents better than r . We will show that this property is maintained afterwards, which completes the proof.

Note that M^* changes only when M changes and this occurs at Lines 10, 13, 15, and 18. Let r_i be the resident chosen at Line 3 and h_j be the hospital chosen at Line 5 or 7. We show that, for each of the above cases, if the condition is satisfied before updating M , it is also satisfied after the update.

Suppose that M changes as $M := M \cup \{(r_i, h_j)\}$ at Line 10. Before application of Line 10, $|M(h_j)| < \ell(h_j)$. This implies that $M_1(h_j) = M(h_j)$ and $M_2(h_j) = \emptyset$, so $M^*(h_j^\circ) = \{d_{j,1}, \dots, d_{j,u(h_j)}\}$ and $M^*(h_j^\bullet)$ consists of less than $\ell(h_j)$ residents in R' . Since we assume that h is full, h cannot be h_j^\bullet . When Line 10 is applied, $M^*(h_j^\circ)$ does not change so we are done.

Suppose that M changes as $M := (M \cup \{(r_i, h_j)\}) \setminus \{(r_{i'}, h_j)\}$ at Line 13. If $i' = i$, M is unchanged, so suppose that $i' \neq i$. Note that $r_{i'}$ is not rejected by h_j yet. If r_i is not rejected by h_j yet, M_2 does not change, M_1 changes as $M_1 := (M_1 \cup \{(r_i, h_j)\}) \setminus \{(r_{i'}, h_j)\}$, and $i' > i$. Hence, $M^*(h_j^\circ)$ does not change and $M^*(h_j^\bullet) := (M^*(h_j^\bullet) \cup \{r'_i\}) \setminus \{r'_{i'}\}$. If r_i is once rejected by h_j , $M_2 := M_2 \cup \{(r_i, h_j)\}$ and $M_1 := M_1 \setminus \{(r_{i'}, h_j)\}$. Then, $M^*(h_j^\circ) := (M^*(h_j^\circ) \cup \{r'_i\}) \setminus \{d_{j,k}\}$ and $M^*(h_j^\bullet) := (M^*(h_j^\bullet) \cup \{d_{j,k}\}) \setminus \{r'_{i'}\}$ for some k . Hence, the condition is satisfied for both h_j° and h_j^\bullet .

Suppose that M changes as $M := M \cup \{(r_i, h_j)\}$ at Line 15. By the condition of this case, $M_1(h_j) = \emptyset$ and $M_2(h_j) = M(h_j)$ before the application of Line 15. Then, by application of Line 15, M_1 does not change and $M_2 := M_2 \cup \{(r_i, h_j)\}$. Then, $M^*(h_j^\circ) := (M^*(h_j^\circ) \cup \{r'_i\}) \setminus \{d_{j,k}\}$

and $M^*(h_j^\bullet) := (M^*(h_j^\bullet) \cup \{d_{j,k}\}) \setminus \{d_{j,k+\ell}\}$ for some k . Hence, the condition is satisfied for both h_j° and h_j^\bullet .

Suppose that M changes as $M := (M \cup \{(r_i, h_j)\}) \setminus \{(r_{i'}, h_j)\}$ at Line 18. If $i' = i$, M is unchanged, so suppose that $i' \neq i$. By the condition of this case, $M_1(h_j) = \emptyset$ and $M_2(h_j) = M(h_j)$ before the application of Line 18. Then, by application of Line 18, M_1 does not change, $M_2 := (M_2 \cup \{(r_i, h_j)\}) \setminus \{(r_{i'}, h_j)\}$, and either $(r_i \succ_{h_j} r_{i'})$ or $(r_i =_{h_j} r_{i'})$ and $i < i'$. Then, $M^*(h_j^\bullet)$ does not change, so the condition is satisfied for h_j^\bullet . Additionally, $M^*(h_j^\circ) := (M^*(h_j^\circ) \cup \{r_{i'}\}) \setminus \{r_i\}$ and $r_i \succ_{h_j^\circ} r_{i'}$, so the condition is satisfied for h_j° . \square

Claim 27. *If a resident r is matched in M^* , then $M^*(r)$ is at the top of r 's preference list in the final I^* . If a resident r is unmatched in M^* , then r 's preference list is empty.*

Proof. First note that, for every i , since r_i is matched in M , r_i' is matched in M^* . Consider a resident r_i' such that $(r_i', h_j^\bullet) \in M^*$ for some j . Then, $(r_i, h_j) \in M_1$. Since r_i is not rejected by h_j , the pair (r_i', h_j^\bullet) is not removed. Consider a hospital h such that $h \succ_{r_i'} h_j^\bullet$. If h is $h_{j'}^\bullet$ or $h_{j'}^\circ$ for some j' such that $h_{j'} \succ_{r_i} h_j$ in I , r_i is rejected by $h_{j'}$ twice, and both $h_{j'}^\bullet$ and $h_{j'}^\circ$ are removed from r_i' 's list. If $h = h_{j'}^\bullet$ for some j' such that $h_{j'} =_{r_i} h_j$ in I , then $(\ell(h_{j'}) < \ell(h_j))$ or $(\ell(h_{j'}) = \ell(h_j)$ and $j' < j)$, so r_i must have proposed to and been rejected by $h_{j'}$ before. Therefore $h_{j'}^\bullet$ is removed from r_i' 's list.

Consider a resident r_i' such that $(r_i', h_j^\circ) \in M^*$ for some j . Then, $(r_i, h_j) \in M_2$. Since r_i is rejected by h_j only once, (r_i', h_j°) is not removed. Consider a hospital h such that $h \succ_{r_i'} h_j^\circ$. If h is $h_{j'}^\bullet$ or $h_{j'}^\circ$ for some j' such that $h_{j'} \succ_{r_i} h_j$ in I , then the same argument as above holds. If $h = h_{j'}^\bullet$ for some j' such that $h_{j'} =_{r_i} h_j$ in I , r_i is rejected by $h_{j'}$ once, and hence $h_{j'}^\bullet$ is removed from r_i' 's list. If $h = h_{j'}^\circ$ for some j' such that $h_{j'} =_{r_i} h_j$ in I , then $(\ell(h_{j'}) < \ell(h_j))$ or $(\ell(h_{j'}) = \ell(h_j)$ and $j' < j)$, so r_i is rejected by $h_{j'}$ twice. Therefore $h_{j'}^\circ$ is removed from r_i' 's list.

Next we consider dummy residents. Consider a pair $(d_{j,q}, h_j^\circ) \in M^*$. By the definition of M^* , we have $1 \leq q \leq u(h_j) - |M_2(h_j)|$, and hence $|M_2(h_j)| \leq u(h_j) - q$. Thus $|M_2(h_j)|$ never reaches $u(h_j) - q + 1$ so this q does not satisfy the condition of p in Case (3) of the removal operation. Therefore Case (3) is not executed for this q so $(d_{j,q}, h_j^\circ)$ is not removed. Since h_j° is already at the top of $d_{j,q}$'s list, we are done.

Consider a pair $(d_{j,q}, h_j^\bullet) \in M^*$. By the definition of M^* , we have $u(h_j) - |M_2(h_j)| < q \leq \min\{u(h_j) - |M(h_j)| + \ell(h_j), u(h_j)\}$. The first inequality implies $|M_2(h_j)| > u(h_j) - q$. This means that $|M_2(h_j)|$ reaches $u(h_j) - q + 1$ at some point, so q satisfies the condition of p in Case (3). Therefore Case (3) is executed for this q and hence $(d_{j,q}, h_j^\bullet)$ is removed. If $(d_{j,q}, h_j^\bullet)$ were removed, by the condition of Case (3), $|M_2(h_j)|$ would reach $u(h_j) - (q - \ell(h_j)) + 1$, so we would have $|M_2(h_j)| > u(h_j) - (q - \ell(h_j))$. Additionally, as described in the explanation of Case (3), we would have $|M_2(h_j)| = |M(h_j)|$, and then the second inequality implies $q \leq u(h_j) - |M_2(h_j)| + \ell(h_j)$, i.e., $|M_2(h_j)| \leq u(h_j) - (q - \ell(h_j))$, a contradiction. So $(d_{j,q}, h_j^\bullet)$ is not removed.

Finally, if $d_{j,q}$ is unmatched in M^* , then we have $q > \min\{u(h_j) - |M(h_j)| + \ell(h_j), u(h_j)\}$. If $u(h_j) - |M(h_j)| + \ell(h_j) \geq u(h_j)$, we have $q > u(h_j)$ but this is a contradiction. Hence, we have $q > u(h_j) - |M(h_j)| + \ell(h_j)$. Then, $|M_2(h_j)| = |M(h_j)| - |M_1(h_j)| > u(h_j) - q + \ell(h_j) - \ell(h_j) = u(h_j) - q$, as $|M_1(h_j)| \leq \ell(h_j)$. This satisfies the condition of Case (3), so $(d_{j,q}, h_j^\circ)$ is removed. Recall that $q \leq u(h_j)$ holds by definition. Additionally, since $|M(h_j)| \leq u(h_j)$, the condition $q > u(h_j) - |M(h_j)| + \ell(h_j)$ implies $q > \ell(h_j)$. Hence, we have $1 \leq q - \ell(h_j) \leq u(h_j) - \ell(h_j)$ and so $(d_{j,q}, h_j^\bullet)$ is removed. \square

We now show the nonexistence of a blocking pair in M^* at the end of the algorithm. Suppose that $h \succ_r M^*(r)$ for some $r \in R' \cup D$ and $h \in H^\circ \cup H^\bullet$. By Claim 27, $h \succ_r M^*(r)$ implies that

(r, h) is removed during the course of DOUBLE PROPOSAL. Then, by Claim 26, h is full in M^* with residents better than r , so (r, h) cannot block M^* .

Finally, we show that M^* is resident-optimal. Suppose, to the contrary, that there is a stable matching N^* of I^* such that the set $R^* := \{r \in R' \cup D \mid N^*(r) \succ_r M^*(r)\}$ is nonempty. By Claim 27, for each $r \in R^*$, the pair $(r, N^*(r))$ is removed at some point of the algorithm. Let $r^0 \in R^*$ be a resident such that (r^0, h^0) (where $h_0 := N^*(r^0)$) is removed first during the algorithm. Let M_0^* be the matching just after this removal. Then, by recalling the argument in the definitions of removal operations (1)–(3), we can see that h^0 is full in M_0^* with residents better than r^0 . Note that $M_0^*(h^0) \setminus N^*(h^0) \neq \emptyset$ because $|M_0^*(h^0)| \geq |N^*(h^0)|$ and $r^0 \in N^*(h^0) \setminus M_0^*(h^0)$. Take any resident $r^1 \in M_0^*(h^0) \setminus N^*(h^0)$ and let $h^1 := N^*(r^1)$. Since h^0 is at the top of r^1 's current list and (r^1, h^1) is not yet removed by the choice of r^0 , $h^0 \succ_{r^1} h^1$ holds. Then, (r^1, h^0) blocks N^* , which contradicts the stability of N^* .

D Full Version of Section 5 (Maximum Gaps and Approximation Factors of DOUBLE PROPOSAL)

This is a full version of Section 5. Here we analyze the approximation factors of our algorithm DOUBLE PROPOSAL, together with the maximum gaps Λ for several models mentioned in Section 2.

For an instance I of HR-MSLQ, let $\text{OPT}(I)$ and $\text{WST}(I)$ respectively denote the maximum and the minimum scores over all stable matchings of I , and let $\text{ALG}(I)$ be the score of the output of our algorithm. For a model \mathcal{I} (i.e., subfamily of problem instances of HR-MSLQ), let

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{I}) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)}.$$

The maximum gap $\Lambda(\mathcal{I})$ represents a worst approximation factor of a naive algorithm that first breaks ties arbitrarily and then apply the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm. Let us first confirm this fact. For this purpose, it suffices to show that the worst objective value is indeed realized by the output of such an algorithm.

Proposition 28. *Let I be an instance of HR-MSLQ. There exists an instance I' such that (i) I' is obtained by breaking the ties in I and (ii) the residents-oriented Gale–Shapley algorithm applied to I' outputs a matching M' with $s(M') = \text{WST}(I)$.*

To see this, we remind the following two known results. They are originally shown for the Hospitals/Residents model, but it is easy to see that they hold for HR-MSLQ too.

Theorem 29 ([30]). *Let I be an instance of HR-MSLQ and let M be a matching in I . Then, M is (weakly) stable in I if and only if M is stable in some instance I' of HR-MSLQ without ties obtained by breaking the ties in I .*

The following claim is a part of the famous rural hospitals theorem. The original version states stronger conditions for the case with incomplete preference lists.

Theorem 30 ([14, 31, 32]). *For an instance I' of HR-MSLQ that has no ties, the number of residents assigned to each hospital does not change over all stable matchings of I' .*

Proof of Proposition 28. Let M be a stable matching of I that attains $\text{WST}(I)$. By Theorem 29, there is an instance I' of HR-MSLQ without ties such that it is obtained by breaking the ties in I and M is a stable matching of I' . Let M' be the output of the resident-oriented Gale–Shapley

algorithm applied to I' . Since both M' and M are stable matchings of I' , which has no ties, Theorem 30 implies that any hospital is assigned the same number of residents in M' and M . Thus, $s(M') = s(M) = \text{WST}(I)$ holds. \square

In the rest, we analyze $\Lambda(\mathcal{I})$ and $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I})$ for each model. All results in this section are summarized in Table 3, which is a refinement of the first and second rows of Table 1. Here, we split each model into three sub-models according to on which side ties are allowed to appear. The ratio for $\Lambda(\mathcal{I})$ when ties appear only in hospitals' side, which is the same as $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I})$ for all four cases, is derived by observing the proofs of the approximation factor of our algorithm. In Table 3, n represents the number of residents and a function ϕ is defined by $\phi(1) = 1$, $\phi(2) = \frac{3}{2}$, and $\phi(n) = n(1 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) / (n + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)$ for any $n \geq 3$. In the uniform model, we write $\theta = \frac{u(h)}{\ell(h)}$ for the ratio of the upper and lower quotas, which is common to all hospitals. Note that $\frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1} < \theta$ holds whenever $\theta > 1$.

	General			Uniform			Marriage			R -side ML		
	H	R	Both	H	R	Both	H	R	Both	H	R	Both
Max gap $\Lambda(\mathcal{I})$ (ATB+GS)	$\phi(n)$ (Cor.36)	$n + 1$ (Prop.6)		$\frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$ (Cor.38)	θ (Prop.8)		1.5 (Cor.41)	2 (Prop.39)		1 (Cor.44)	$n + 1$ (Prop.6)	
APPROX(\mathcal{I}) (DOUBLE PROPOSAL)	$\phi(n)$ (Thm.7)			$\frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$ (Thm.9)			1.5 (Thm.40)			1 (Thm.42)		

Table 3: Maximum gap $\Lambda(\mathcal{I})$ (equivalently, approximation factor of the arbitrarily tie-breaking Gale–Shapley algorithm) and approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL of HR-MSLQ for four fundamental models \mathcal{I} . Here H and R represent the restrictions in which ties appear in only preference lists of residents and hospitals, respectively.

Recall that the following conditions are commonly assumed in all models: all agents have complete preference lists, $\ell(h) \leq u(h) \leq n$ for each hospital $h \in H$, and $|R| < \sum_{h \in H} u(h)$. From these, it follows that in any stable matching any resident is assigned to some hospital.

D.1 General Model

We first analyze our model without any additional assumption. Before evaluating our algorithm, we provide a worst case analysis of a tie-breaking algorithm.

Proposition 31. *The maximum gap for general model satisfies $\Lambda(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Gen}}) = n + 1$. Moreover, this equality holds even if residents have a master list, and the preference lists of hospitals contain no ties.*

Proof. We first show $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} \leq n + 1$ for any instance I of HR-MSLQ. Let N and M be stable matchings with $s(N) = \text{OPT}(I)$ and $s(M) = \text{WST}(I)$, respectively. Recall that $\ell(h) \leq n$ is assumed for any hospital h . Let $H_0 \subseteq H$ be the set of hospitals h with $\ell(h) = 0$. Then

$$s(N) = |H_0| + \sum_{h \in H \setminus H_0} \min\{1, \frac{|N(h)|}{\ell(h)}\} \leq |H_0| + \sum_{h \in H \setminus H_0} \min\{1, \frac{|N(h)|}{1}\} \leq |H_0| + n,$$

$$s(M) = |H_0| + \sum_{h \in H \setminus H_0} \min\{1, \frac{|M(h)|}{\ell(h)}\} \geq |H_0| + \sum_{h \in H \setminus H_0} \min\{1, \frac{|M(h)|}{n}\}.$$

In case $|H_0| = 0$, we have $\sum_{h \in H \setminus H_0} \min\{1, \frac{|M(h)|}{n}\} = \sum_{h \in H} \min\{1, \frac{|M(h)|}{n}\} \geq 1$, and hence $\frac{s(N)}{s(M)} \leq \frac{n}{1} = n$. In case $|H_0| \geq 1$, we have $s(M) \geq |H_0|$, and $\frac{s(N)}{s(M)} \leq \frac{|H_0| + n}{|H_0|} = 1 + \frac{n}{|H_0|} \leq 1 + n$. Thus, $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} \leq n + 1$ for any instance I .

We next show that there exists an instance I with $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} = n+1$ that satisfies the conditions required in the statement. Let I be an instance consisting of n residents $\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$ and $n+1$ hospitals $\{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{n+1}\}$ such that

- the preference list of every resident consists of a single tie containing all hospitals,
- the preference list of every hospital is an arbitrary complete list without ties, and
- $[\ell(h_i), u(h_i)] = [1, 1]$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $[\ell(h_{n+1}), u(h_{n+1})] = [0, n]$.

This instance satisfies the conditions in the statement. Since any resident is indifferent among all hospitals, a matching is stable whenever all residents are assigned. Let $N = \{(r_i, h_i) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $M = \{(r_i, h_{n+1}) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Then, $s(N) = n+1$ while $s(M) = 1$. Thus we obtain $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} = n+1$. \square

We next show that the approximation factor of our algorithm is $\phi(n)$. Recall that ϕ is a function of $n = |R|$ defined by

$$\phi(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & n = 1, \\ \frac{3}{2} & n = 2, \\ \frac{n(1+\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}{n+\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} & n \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 7. *The approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL for the general model satisfies $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Gen}}) = \phi(n)$.*

Proof. Here we only show $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Gen}}) \leq \phi(n)$, since this together with Proposition 35 shown later implies the required equality.

Let M be the output of the algorithm and let N be an optimal stable matching. We define vectors p_M and p_N on R , which are distributions of scores to residents. For each hospital $h \in H$, its scores in M and N are $s_M(h) = \min\{1, \frac{|M(h)|}{\ell(h)}\}$ and $s_N(h) = \min\{1, \frac{|N(h)|}{\ell(h)}\}$, respectively. We set $\{p_M(r)\}_{r \in M(h)}$ and $\{p_N(r)\}_{r \in N(h)}$ as follows. Among $M(h) \cap N(h)$, take $\min\{\ell(h), |M(h) \cap N(h)|\}$ residents arbitrarily and set $p_M(r) = p_N(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$ for them. If $|M(h) \cap N(h)| > \ell(h)$, set $p_M(r) = p_N(r) = 0$ for the remaining residents in $M(h) \cap N(h)$. If $|M(h) \cap N(h)| < \ell(h)$, then among $M(h) \setminus N(h)$, take $\min\{\ell(h) - |M(h) \cap N(h)|, |M(h) \setminus N(h)|\}$ residents arbitrarily and set $p_M(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$ for them. If there still remains a resident r in $M(h) \setminus N(h)$ with undefined $p_M(r)$, set $p_M(r) = 0$ for all such residents. Similarly, define $p_N(r)$ for residents in $N(h) \setminus M(h)$.

By definition, for each $h \in H$, we have $p_M(M(h)) = s_M(h)$ and $p_N(N(h)) = s_N(h)$, where the notation $p_M(A)$ is defined as $p_M(A) = \sum_{r \in A} p_M(r)$ for any $A \subseteq R$ and $p_N(A)$ is defined similarly. Since each of $\{M(h)\}_{h \in H}$ and $\{N(h)\}_{h \in H}$ is a partition of R , we have

$$s(M) = p_M(R), \quad s(N) = p_N(R).$$

Thus, what we have to prove is $\frac{p_N(R)}{p_M(R)} \leq \phi(n)$, where $n = |R|$.

Note that, for any resident $r \in R$, the condition $M(r) = N(r)$ means that $r \in M(h) \cap N(h)$ for some $h \in H$. Then, the above construction of p_M and p_N implies the following condition for any $r \in R$, which will be used in the last part of the proof (in the proof of Claim 34).

$$M(r) = N(r) \implies p_M(r) = p_N(r). \quad (1)$$

For the convenience of the analysis below, let $R' = \{r'_1, r'_2, \dots, r'_n\}$ be the copy of R and identify p_N as a vector on R' . Consider a bipartite graph $G = (R, R'; E)$, where the edge set E is defined by $E = \{(r_i, r'_j) \in R \times R' \mid p_M(r_i) \geq p_N(r'_j)\}$. For a matching $X \subseteq E$ (i.e., a subset of E covering each vertex at most once), we denote by $\partial(X) \subseteq R \cup R'$ the set of vertices covered by X . Then, we have $|R \cap \partial(X)| = |R' \cap \partial(X)| = |X|$.

Lemma 31. $G = (R, R'; E)$ admits a matching X such that $|X| \geq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. Furthermore, in case $s(M) < 2$, such a matching X can be chosen so that $p_M(R \cap \partial(X)) \geq 1$ holds and any $r \in R \setminus \partial(X)$ satisfies $p_M(r) \neq 0$.

We postpone the proof of this lemma and now complete the proof of Theorem 7. There are two cases (i) $s(M) \geq 2$ and (ii) $s(M) < 2$.

We first consider the case (i). Assume $s(M) \geq 2$. By Lemma 31, there is a matching $X \subseteq E$ such that $|X| \geq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. The definition of E implies $p_M(R \cap \partial(X)) \geq p_N(R' \cap \partial(X))$. We then have $p_N(R') = p_N(R' \cap \partial(X)) + p_N(R' \setminus \partial(X)) \leq p_M(R \cap \partial(X)) + p_N(R' \setminus \partial(X)) = \{p_M(R) - p_M(R \setminus \partial(X))\} + p_N(R' \setminus \partial(X))$, which implies the first inequality of the following consecutive inequalities, where others are explained below.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{s(N)}{s(M)} &= \frac{p_N(R')}{p_M(R)} \\ &\leq \frac{p_M(R) - p_M(R \setminus \partial(X)) + p_N(R' \setminus \partial(X))}{p_M(R)} \\ &\leq \frac{p_M(R) + |R' \setminus \partial(X)|}{p_M(R)} \\ &\leq \frac{2 + |R' \setminus \partial(X)|}{2} \\ &\leq \frac{2 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}{2} \\ &\leq \phi(n). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality uses the facts that $p_M(r) \geq 0$ for any $r \in R$ and $p_N(r') \leq 1$ for any $r' \in R'$. The third follows from $p_M(R) = s(M) \geq 2$. The fourth follows from $|X| \geq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$ as it implies $|R' \setminus \partial(X)| = |R'| - |X| \leq n - \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. The last one $\frac{2 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}{2} \leq \phi(n)$ can be checked for $n = 1, 2$ easily and for $n \geq 3$ as follows:

$$\phi(n) - \frac{2 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}{2} = \frac{n(1 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}{n + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} - \frac{2 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}{2} = \frac{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor (n - 2 - \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)}{2(n + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)} = \frac{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor (\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil - 2)}{2(n + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)} \geq 0.$$

Thus, we obtain $\frac{s(N)}{s(M)} \leq \phi(n)$ as required.

We next consider the case (ii). Assume $s(M) < 2$. By Lemma 31, then there is a matching $X \subseteq E$ such that $|X| \geq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$, $p_M(R \cap \partial(X)) \geq 1$, and $p_M(r) \neq 0$ for any $r \in R \setminus \partial(X)$. Again, by the definition of E , we have $p_M(R \cap \partial(X)) \geq p_N(R' \cap \partial(X))$, which implies the first inequality of the following consecutive inequalities, where others are explained below.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{s(N)}{s(M)} &= \frac{p_N(R')}{p_M(R)} \\ &\leq \frac{p_M(R \cap \partial(X)) + p_N(R' \setminus \partial(X))}{p_M(R \cap \partial(X)) + p_M(R \setminus \partial(X))} \\ &\leq \frac{p_M(R \cap \partial(X)) + |R' \setminus \partial(X)|}{p_M(R \cap \partial(X)) + \frac{1}{n}|R \setminus \partial(X)|} \\ &\leq \frac{1 + |R' \setminus \partial(X)|}{1 + \frac{1}{n}|R \setminus \partial(X)|} \\ &\leq \frac{1 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}{1 + \frac{1}{n}\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} = \phi(n). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows from the facts that $p_N(r') \leq 1$ for any $r' \in R'$ and $p_M(r) \neq 0$ for any $r \in R \setminus \partial(X)$. Note that $p_M(r) \neq 0$ implies $p_M(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)} \geq \frac{1}{n}$ where $h := M(r)$. The third

follows from $p_M(R \cap \partial(X)) \geq 1$. The last one follows from $|R' \setminus \partial(X)| = |R \setminus \partial(X)| = n - |X| \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Thus, we obtain $\frac{s(N)}{s(M)} \leq \phi(n)$ also for this case. \square

Proof of Lemma 31. To show the first claim of the lemma, we intend to construct a matching in G of size at least $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. We need some preparation for this construction.

Divide the set R of residents into three parts:

$$\begin{aligned} R_+ &:= \{ r \in R \mid M(r) \succ_r N(r) \}, \\ R_- &:= \{ r \in R \mid N(r) \succ_r M(r) \text{ or } [M(r) =_r N(r), p_N(r) > p_M(r)] \}, \text{ and} \\ R_0 &:= \{ r \in R \mid M(r) =_r N(r), p_M(r) \geq p_N(r) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Let R'_+, R'_-, R'_0 be the corresponding subsets of R' .

Claim 32. *There is an injection $\xi_+ : R_+ \rightarrow R'$ such that $p_M(r) = p_N(\xi_+(r))$ for every $r \in R_+$. There is an injection $\xi_- : R_- \rightarrow R$ such that $p_N(r') = p_M(\xi_-(r'))$ for every $r' \in R'_-$.*

Proof. We first construct $\xi_+ : R_+ \rightarrow R'$. Set $M(R_+) := \{ M(r) \mid r \in R_+ \}$. For each hospital $h \in M(R_+)$, any $r \in M(h) \cap R_+$ satisfies $h = M(r) \succ_r N(r)$. By the stability of N , then h is full in N . Therefore, in $N(h)$, there are $\ell(h)$ residents with p_N value $\frac{1}{\ell(h)}$ and $u(h) - \ell(h)$ residents with p_N value 0. Since $|M(h)| \leq u(h)$ and p_M values are $\frac{1}{\ell(h)}$ for $\min\{|M(h)|, \ell(h)\}$ residents, we can define an injection $\xi_+^h : M(h) \cap R_+ \rightarrow N(h)$ such that $p_M(r) = p_N(\xi_+^h(r))$ for every $r \in M(h) \cap R_+$. By regarding $N(h)$ as a subset of R' and taking the direct sum of ξ_+^h for all $h \in M(R_+)$, we obtain an injection $\xi_+ : R_+ \rightarrow R'$ such that $p_M(r) = p_N(\xi_+(r))$ for every $r \in R_+$.

We next construct $\xi_- : R'_- \rightarrow R$. Define $N(R'_-) := \{ N(r') \mid r' \in R'_- \}$. For each $h' \in N(R'_-)$, any resident $r \in N(h') \cap R'_-$ satisfies either $h' = N(r) \succ_r M(r)$ or $[h' = N(r) =_r M(r), p_N(r) > p_M(r)]$. In case some resident r satisfies $h' = N(r) \succ_r M(r)$, the stability of M implies that h' is full in M . Then, we can define an injection $\xi_-^{h'} : N(h') \cap R'_- \rightarrow M(h')$ in the manner we defined ξ_+^h above and $p_N(r') = p_M(\xi_-^{h'}(r'))$ holds for any $r' \in N(h') \cap R'_-$. We then assume that all residents $r \in N(h') \cap R'_-$ satisfy $[h' = N(r) =_r M(r), p_N(r) > p_M(r)]$. Then, all those residents satisfy $0 \neq p_N(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h')}$, and hence $|N(h') \cap R'_-| \leq \ell(h')$. Additionally, $p_N(r) > p_N(r)$ implies either $p_M(r) = 0$ or $\ell(h') < \ell(h)$, where $h := M(r)$. Observe that $p_M(r) = 0$ implies $|M(h)| > \ell(h)$. As we have $h =_r h'$ and $M(r) = h$, by Lemma 2, each of $\ell(h') < \ell(h)$ and $|M(h)| > \ell(h)$ implies $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h')$, and hence there are $\ell(h')$ residents whose p_M values are $\frac{1}{\ell(h')}$. Since $p_N(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h')}$ for all residents $r \in N(h') \cap R'_-$, we can define an injection $\xi_-^{h'} : N(h') \cap R'_- \rightarrow M(h')$ such that $p_N(r') = p_M(\xi_-^{h'}(r')) = \frac{1}{\ell(h')}$ for every $r' \in N(h') \cap R'_-$. By taking the direct sum of $\xi_-^{h'}$ for all $h' \in M(R'_-)$, we obtain an injection $\xi_- : R'_- \rightarrow R$ such that $p_N(r') = p_M(\xi_-(r'))$ for every $r' \in R'_-$. \square

We now define a bipartite graph which may have multiple edges. Let $G^* = (R, R'; E^*)$, where E^* is the disjoint union of E_+ , E_- , and E_0 , where

$$\begin{aligned} E_+ &:= \{ (r, \xi_+(r)) \mid r \in R_+ \}, \\ E_- &:= \{ (\xi_-(r'), r') \mid r' \in R'_- \}, \text{ and} \\ E_0 &:= \{ (r, r') \mid r \in R_0 \text{ and } r' \text{ is the copy of } r \}. \end{aligned}$$

See Fig. 3 for an example. Note that E^* can have multiple edges between r and r' if $(r, r') = (r, \xi_+(r)) = (\xi_-(r'), r')$. By the definitions of ξ_+ , ξ_- , and R_0 , any edge (r, r') in E^* satisfies $p_M(r) \geq p_N(r')$. Since $E = \{ (r, r') \mid p_M(r) \geq p_N(r') \}$, any matching in G^* is also a matching in G .

Then, the following claim completes the first statement of the lemma.




Figure 3: A graph $G^* = (R, R'; E^*)$. The upper and lower rectangles represent R and R' , respectively. The edge sets E_+ , E_- , and E_0 are respectively represented by downward directed edges, upward directed edges, and undirected edges. (The same figure as Fig. 1.)

Claim 33. G^* admits a matching whose size is at least $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$, and so does G .

Proof. Since $\xi_+ : R_+ \rightarrow R'_+$ and $\xi_- : R'_- \rightarrow R_-$ are injections, every vertex in G^* is incident to at most two edges in E^* as follows: Each vertex in R_+ (resp., R'_-) is incident to exactly one edge in E_+ (resp., E_-) and at most one edge in E_- (resp., E_+). Each vertex in R_- (resp., R'_+) is incident to at most one edge in E_- (resp., E_+). Each vertex in R_0 (resp., R'_0) is incident to exactly one edge in E_0 and at most one edge in E_+ (resp., E_-).

Since E^* is the disjoint union of E_+ , E_- , and E_0 , we have $E^* = |E_+| + |E_-| + |E_0| = |R_+| + |R_-| + |R_0| = n$. As every vertex is incident to at most two edges in E^* , each connected component K of G^* forms a path or a cycle. In K , we can take a matching that contains at least a half of the edges in K . (Take edges alternately along a path or a cycle. For a path with odd edges, let the end edges be contained.) The union of such matchings in all components forms a matching in G^* whose size is at least $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. \square

In the rest, we show the second claim of Lemma 31. Suppose that there is a matching Y in G . Then, there is a maximum matching X in G such that $\partial(Y) \subseteq \partial(X)$. This follows from the behavior of the augmenting path algorithm to compute a maximum matching in a bipartite graph (see e.g., [34]). In this algorithm, a matching, say X , is repeatedly updated to reach the maximum size. Through the algorithm, $\partial(X)$ is monotone increasing. Therefore, if we initialize X by Y , it finds a maximum matching with $\partial(Y) \subseteq \partial(X)$. Additionally, note that $\partial(Y) \subseteq \partial(X)$ implies $p_M(R \cap \partial(Y)) \leq p_M(R \cap \partial(X))$ as p_M is a nonnegative vector. Therefore, the following claim completes the proof of the second claim of the lemma.

Claim 34. If $s(M) < 2$, then there is a matching Y in G such that $p_M(R \cap \partial(Y)) \geq 1$ holds and any $r \in R \setminus \partial(Y)$ satisfies $p_M(r) \neq 0$.

Proof. We first consider the case where $p_M(r^*) = 0$ for some $r^* \in R$. For $h := M(r^*)$ we have $|M(h)| > \ell(h)$, and hence $p_M(M(h)) = 1$. Since $s(M) < 2$, any hospital other than h should be deficient. Therefore, the value of p_M can be 0 only for residents in $M(h)$.

- If $M(h) \cap R_+ \neq \emptyset$, then as shown in the proof of Claim 32, h is full in N . Then, there is an injection $\xi : M(h) \rightarrow N(h)$ such that $p_M(r) = p_N(r)$ for any $r \in M(h)$. Hence, $Y := \{(r, \xi(r)) \mid r \in M(h)\} \subseteq E$ is a matching in G satisfying the required conditions.
- If $M(h) \cap R_- \neq \emptyset$, take any $r \in M(h) \cap R_-$ and set $h' := N(r)$. As shown in the proof of Claim 32, then $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h')$, i.e., h' is sufficient. Note that we have $p_M(r) \neq p_N(r)$ only if $M(r) \neq N(r)$ by the condition (1). Since $r \in R_-$ implies either $h' \succ_r h$ or $p_N(r) > p_M(r)$, we have $h' \neq h$, which contradicts the fact that h is the unique sufficient hospital. Thus, $M(h) \cap R_- \neq \emptyset$ cannot happen.

- If $M(h) \cap R_+ = \emptyset$ and $M(h) \cap R_- = \emptyset$, we have $M(h) \subseteq R_0$. Then, by connecting each resident in $M(h)$ to its copy in R' , we can obtain a matching satisfying the required conditions.

We next consider the case where $p_M(r) \neq 0$ for any $r \in R$. Then, our task is to find a matching $Y \subseteq E$ with $p_M(R \cap \partial(Y)) \geq 1$. With this assumption, for any resident $r \in R$ with $h = M(r)$, we always have $p_M(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$.

- If $R_+ \neq \emptyset$, then $M(R_+) := \{M(r) \mid r \in R_+\} \neq \emptyset$. Since $\sum_{h \in M(R_+)} |M(h) \cap R_+| = |R_+|$ and $\sum_{h \in M(R_+)} |N(h) \cap R_+| \leq |R_+|$, there is at least one hospital $h \in M(R_+)$ such that $|M(h) \cap R_+| \geq |N(h) \cap R_+|$. Let h be such a hospital. Since $h \in M(R_+)$, as shown in the proof of Claim 32, h is full in N and there are $\ell(h)$ residents r with $p_N(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$. We intend to show that there are at least $\ell(h)$ residents r with $p_M(r) \geq \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$, which implies the existence of a required Y . Regard $N(h)$ as a subset of R' . If there is some $r' \in N(h) \cap R'_-$, as seen in the proof of Claim 32, there are $\ell(h)$ residents r with $p_M(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$, and we are done. So, assume $N(h) \cap R'_- = \emptyset$, which implies $N(h) \subseteq R'_+ \cup R'_0$. Since $|M(h) \cap R_+| \geq |N(h) \cap R_+|$, at least $|N(h) \cap R_+|$ residents in R_+ belongs to $M(h)$. As p_M is positive, then at least $|N(h) \cap R_+|$ residents $r \in M(h)$ satisfy $p_M(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$. Additionally, by the definition of E_0 , each $r \in N(h) \cap R_0$ satisfies $p_M(r) \geq p_N(r)$, where $p_N(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$ for at least $\ell(h) - |N(h) \cap R_+|$ residents in $N(h) \cap R_0$. Thus, at least $\ell(h)$ residents $r \in R$ satisfy $p_M(r) \geq \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$.
- If $R_- \neq \emptyset$, then $N(R_-) := \{N(r) \mid r \in R_-\} \neq \emptyset$. Similarly to the argument above, there is at least one hospital $h \in N(R_-)$ such that $|N(h) \cap R_-| \geq |M(h) \cap R_-|$. Let h be such a hospital. Since $h \in N(R_-)$, as shown in the proof of Claim 32, h is sufficient in M and there are $\ell(h)$ residents r with $p_M(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$. We intend to show that there are at least $\ell(h)$ residents r with $p_N(r) \leq \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$. If there is some $r \in M(h) \cap R_+$, we are done as in the previous case. So, assume $M(h) \cap R_+ = \emptyset$, which implies $M(h) \subseteq R_- \cup R_0$. Since $|N(h) \cap R_-| \geq |M(h) \cap R_-|$, at least $|M(h) \cap R_-|$ residents r in R_- belongs to $N(h)$, and satisfies $p_N(r) \in \{\frac{1}{\ell(h)}, 0\}$. Additionally, by the definition of E_0 , each $r \in M(h) \cap R_0$ satisfies $p_N(r) \leq p_M(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$. Thus, at least $\ell(h)$ residents $r \in R$ satisfy $p_N(r) \leq \frac{1}{\ell(h)}$.
- If $R_+ = \emptyset$ and $R_- = \emptyset$, then $R_0 = R$ and E_0 forms a matching and we have $\partial(E) \cap R = R$. Since $p_M(r) = \frac{1}{\ell(h)} \geq \frac{1}{n}$ for any $h \in H$ and $r \in M(h)$, we have $p_M(\partial(E) \cap R) \geq 1$.

Thus, in any case, we can find a matching with required conditions. \square

Thus we completed the proof of the second claim of the lemma. \square

The above analysis for Theorem 7 is tight as shown by the following proposition.

Proposition 35. *For any natural number n , there is an instance I with n residents such that $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)} = \phi(n)$. This holds even if ties appear in only preference lists of hospitals or only preference lists of residents.*

Proof. As the upper bound is shown in Theorem 7, it suffices to give an instance I with $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)} \geq \phi(n)$. Recall that $\phi(1) = 1$, $\phi(2) = \frac{3}{2}$, and $\phi(n) = n(1 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) / (n + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)$ for $n \geq 3$.

Case $n = 1$ is trivial because $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)}$ is always at least 1. For $n \geq 2$, we construct instances I_1 and I_2 such that $\frac{\text{OPT}(I_1)}{\text{ALG}(I_1)} \geq \phi(n)$, $\frac{\text{OPT}(I_2)}{\text{ALG}(I_2)} \geq \phi(n)$, and in I_1 (resp., in I_2) ties appear in only preference lists of hospitals (resp., residents).

In case $n = 2$, consider the following instance I_1 with two residents and three hospitals.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
r_1: & h_1 \ h_2 \ h_3 & h_1 [1, 1]: & (\ r_1 \ r_2 \) \\
r_2: & h_1 \ h_3 \ h_2 & h_2 [1, 1]: & r_1 \ r_2 \\
& & h_3 [0, 1]: & r_1 \ r_2
\end{array}$$

Recall that we delete arbitrariness in DOUBLE PROPOSAL using the priority rules defined by indices. Then, h_1 prefers the second proposal of r_1 to that of r_2 . Therefore, DOUBLE PROPOSAL returns $\{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_3)\}$, whose score is 2. Since $\{(r_1, h_2), (r_2, h_1)\}$ is also a stable matching and has the score 3, we obtain $\frac{\text{OPT}(I_1)}{\text{ALG}(I_1)} = \frac{3}{2} = \phi(2)$.

The instance I_2 for $n = 2$ is given as follows.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
r_1: & (\ h_1 \ h_2 \) \ h_3 & h_1 [0, 1]: & r_1 \ r_2 \\
r_2: & h_2 \ h_3 \ h_1 & h_2 [1, 1]: & r_1 \ r_2 \\
& & h_3 [1, 1]: & r_1 \ r_2
\end{array}$$

The algorithm proceeds as follows. First, r_1 makes the first proposal to h_1 as its lower quota is smaller than that of h_2 . Since $\ell(h_1) = 0$, this proposal is immediately rejected. Then, r_1 makes the first proposal to h_2 , and it is accepted. Next, r_2 makes the first proposal to h_2 . Since neither of r_1 and r_2 have been rejected by h_2 , the one with larger index, i.e., r_2 is rejected. Then, r_2 makes the second proposal to h_2 , and then r_1 is rejected by h_2 because r_1 has not been rejected by h_2 . Then, r_1 goes into the second round of the top tie and makes the second proposal to h_1 . As h_1 has upper quota 1 and is currently assigned no resident, this proposal is accepted, and the algorithm terminates with the output $\{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_2)\}$, whose score is 2. On the other hand, a matching $\{(r_1, h_2), (r_2, h_3)\}$ is stable and has a score 3. Thus $\frac{\text{OPT}(I_2)}{\text{ALG}(I_2)} = \frac{3}{2} = \phi(2)$.

In the rest, we show the claim for $n \geq 3$. In both I_1 and I_2 , the set of residents is given as $R = R' \cup R''$ where $R' = \{r'_1, r'_2, \dots, r'_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}\}$ and $R'' = \{r''_1, r''_2, \dots, r''_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}\}$ and the set of hospital is given as $H = \{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_n\} \cup \{x, y\}$. Then, $|R| = n$ and $|H| = n + 2$.

The preference lists in I_1 are given as follows. Here “(R)” represents the tie consisting of all residents and “[R]” denotes an arbitrary strict order of all residents. The notation “...” at the tail of lists means an arbitrary strict order of all agents missing in the list.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
r'_i: & x \ h_i \ \dots & x [\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil]: & (\ R \) \\
r''_i: & x \ y \ \dots & y [n, n]: & [\ R \] \\
& & h_i [1, 1]: & [\ R \]
\end{array}$$

As each resident has a strict preference order, she makes two proposals to the same hospital sequentially. If indices are defined so that residents in R' have smaller indices than those in R'' , then we can observe that our algorithm DOUBLE PROPOSAL returns the matching

$$M_1 = \{(r'_i, x) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil\} \cup \{(r''_i, y) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}.$$

Its score is $s(M_1) = s_{M_1}(x) + s_{M_1}(y) = 1 + \frac{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}{n} = \frac{1}{n}(n + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)$. Next, define N_1 by

$$N_1 = \{(r'_i, h_i) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil\} \cup \{(r''_i, x) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$$

and let $\tilde{N}_1 := N_1$ if n is even and $\tilde{N}_1 := (N_1 \setminus \{(r'_1, h_1)\}) \cup \{(r'_1, x)\}$ if n is odd. We can check that \tilde{N}_1 is a stable matching and its score is $s(\tilde{N}_1) = 1 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Therefore, $\frac{\text{OPT}(I_1)}{\text{ALG}(I_1)} \geq \frac{s(\tilde{N}_1)}{s(M_1)} = \phi(n)$.

The preference lists in I_2 are given as follows. Similarly to the notation “[R],” we denote by “[R']” and “[R'']” arbitrary strict orders of all residents in R' and R'' , respectively.

$$\begin{array}{lll}
r'_i: & (x \ y) \ \cdots & x \ [\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil]: \ [R'] \ [R''] \\
r''_i: & x \ h_i \ \cdots & y \ [n, n]: \ [R] \\
& & h_i \ [1, 1]: \ [R]
\end{array}$$

Then, we can observe that DOUBLE PROPOSAL returns a matching \tilde{M}_2 which is defined as follows. First, define M_2 by

$$M_2 = \{(r'_i, y) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil\} \cup \{(r''_i, x) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$$

and let $\tilde{M}_2 := M_2$ if n is even and $\tilde{M}_2 := (M_2 \setminus \{(r'_1, y)\}) \cup \{(r'_1, x)\}$ if n is odd. Its score is $s(\tilde{M}_2) = s_{\tilde{M}_2}(x) + s_{\tilde{M}_2}(y) = 1 + \frac{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}{n} = \frac{1}{n}(n + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor)$. Next, define N_2 by

$$N_2 = \{(r'_i, x) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil\} \cup \{(r''_i, h_i) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}.$$

We can observe that N_2 is a stable matching and its score is $s(N_2) = 1 + \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Thus, $\frac{\text{OPT}(I_2)}{\text{ALG}(I_2)} \geq \frac{s(N_2)}{s(\tilde{M}_2)} = \phi(n)$. \square

Corollary 36. *Among instances in which ties appear in only preference lists of hospitals, $\max_I \frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} = \phi(n)$.*

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 7, we can observe that the inequality $\frac{s(N)}{s(M)} \leq \phi(n)$ is obtained if both M and N are stable and M satisfies the properties in Lemma 2. Note that the properties in Lemma 2 are satisfied by any stable matching if there is no ties in the preference lists of residents, because $h =_r h'$ cannot happen for any $r \in R$ and $h, h' \in H$. Therefore, the maximum value of $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)}$ is at most $\phi(n)$. Further the instance I_1 in the proof of Proposition 35 shows that the value is at least $\phi(n)$. \square

D.2 Uniform Model

In the uniform model, upper quotas and lower quotas are same for all hospitals. Let ℓ and u be the common lower and upper quotas, respectively, and let $\theta := \frac{u}{\ell} (\geq 1)$. We first provide a worst case analysis of a tie-breaking algorithm.

Proposition 37. *The maximum gap for the uniform model satisfies $\Lambda(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Uniform}}) = \theta$. Moreover, this equality holds even if preference lists of hospitals contain no ties.*

Proof. We first show $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} \leq \theta$ for any instance I of the uniform model with $\theta = \frac{u}{\ell}$. Let N and M be stable matchings with $s(N) = \text{OPT}(I)$ and $s(M) = \text{WST}(I)$. Clearly,

$$s(N) = \sum_{h \in H} \min\{1, \frac{|N(h)|}{\ell}\} \leq \sum_{h \in H} \frac{|M(h)|}{\ell} = \frac{|R|}{\ell}.$$

Note that $|M(h)| \leq u$ implies $\min\{1, \frac{|M(h)|}{\ell}\} = |M(h)| \cdot \min\{\frac{1}{|M(h)|}, \frac{1}{\ell}\} \geq \frac{|M(h)|}{u}$. Then

$$s(M) = \sum_{h \in H} \min\{1, \frac{|M(h)|}{\ell}\} \geq \sum_{h \in H} \frac{|M(h)|}{u} = \frac{|R|}{u}.$$

Therefore, we have $\frac{s(N)}{s(M)} \leq \frac{u}{\ell} = \theta$.

Next, we provide an instance I with $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} = \theta$ in which ties appear in only preference lists of residents. Let I be an instance of the uniform model with quotas $[\ell, u]$ consisting of $\ell \cdot u$ residents and u hospitals such that




Figure 4: An example of a connected component in $N \cup M$ for the case $[\ell, u] = [2, 3]$. Hospitals and residents are represented by squares and circles, respectively. The matchings N and M are represented by solid (black) lines and dashed (red) lines, respectively. (The same figure as Fig. 2.)

- the preference list of every resident consists of a single tie containing all hospitals, and
- the preference list of every hospital is an arbitrary complete list without ties.

Since any resident is indifferent among all hospitals, a matching is stable whenever all residents are assigned. Let M be a matching that assigns u residents to ℓ hospitals and no resident to $u - \ell$ hospitals. Additionally, let N be a matching that assigns ℓ residents to all u hospitals. Then, $s(M) = \ell$ while $s(N) = u$. Thus we obtain $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} = \frac{u}{\ell} = \theta$. \square

We show that the approximation factor of our algorithm is $\frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$ for this model. Since $\theta - \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1} = \frac{\theta^2 - 2\theta + 1}{2\theta - 1} = \frac{(\theta - 1)^2}{2\theta - 1}$, we see $\frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$ is strictly smaller than θ whenever $\ell < u$.

Theorem 9. *The approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL for the uniform model satisfies $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}_{\text{uniform}}) = \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$.*

Proof. Here we only show $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Gen}}) \leq \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$, since this together with Proposition 37 shown later implies the required equality.

Since any stable matching is optimal when $\ell = u$, we assume in the following that $\ell < u$, which implies that $\theta > 1$.

Let M be the output of the algorithm and let N be an optimal stable matching. Suppose $s(N) > s(M)$ since otherwise the claim is trivial. Consider a bipartite graph $(R, H; M \cup N)$, which may have multiple edges. To complete the proof, it is sufficient to show that the approximation factor is attained in each component of the graph. Take any connected component and let R^* and H^* respectively denote the set of residents and hospitals in the component. We define a partition $\{H_0, H_1, H_2\}$ of H^* and a partition $\{R_0, R_1, R_2\}$ of R^* as follows (See Fig. 4).

First, we set

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_0 &:= \{h \in H^* \mid s_N(h) > s_M(h)\} \text{ and} \\
 R_0 &:= \{r \in R^* \mid N(r) \in H_0\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

That is, H_0 is the set of all hospitals in the component for which the optimal stable matching N gets scores larger than M . The set R_0 consists of residents assigned to H_0 in the optimal

matching N . We then define

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &:= \{ h \in H^* \setminus H_0 \mid \exists r \in R_0 : M(r) = h \}, \\ R_1 &:= \{ r \in R^* \mid N(r) \in H_1 \}, \\ H_2 &:= H^* \setminus (H_0 \cup H_1), \text{ and} \\ R_2 &:= R^* \setminus (R_0 \cup R_1). \end{aligned}$$

For convenience, we use a scaled score function $v_M(h) := \ell \cdot s_M(h) = \min\{\ell, |M(h)|\}$ for each $h \in H$ and write $v_M(H') := \sum_{h \in H'} v_M(h)$ for any $H' \subseteq H$. We define $v_N := \ell \cdot s_N(h) = \min\{\ell, |N(h)|\}$ similarly. We now show the following inequality, which completes the proof:

$$\frac{v_N(H_0 \cup H_1 \cup H_2)}{v_M(H_0 \cup H_1 \cup H_2)} \leq \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}. \quad (2)$$

Let $\alpha := v_N(H_0) - v_M(H_0) > 0$. Then, $\alpha \leq v_N(H_0) = \sum_{h \in H_0} \min\{\ell, |N(h)|\} \leq \sum_{h \in H_0} |N(h)| = |R_0|$. Note that M assigns each resident in R_0 to a hospital in H_0 or H_1 by the definition of H_1 . Then, $\sum_{h \in H_0 \cup H_1} |M(h)| \geq |R_0| \geq \alpha$. Since $\ell \geq \frac{1}{\theta} |M(h)|$ and $|M(h)| \geq \frac{1}{\theta} |M(h)|$, we have that $v_M(H_0 \cup H_1) = \sum_{h \in H_0 \cup H_1} \min\{\ell, |M(h)|\} \geq \sum_{h \in H_0 \cup H_1} \frac{1}{\theta} |M(h)| \geq \frac{\alpha}{\theta}$, i.e.,

$$v_M(H_0 \cup H_1) \geq \frac{\alpha}{\theta}. \quad (3)$$

Let $\beta := v_N(H_1 \cup H_2) - v_M(H_1)$. Then, we have

$$v_N(H_0 \cup H_1 \cup H_2) = \alpha + \beta + v_M(H_0 \cup H_1). \quad (4)$$

We separately consider two cases: (i) $\beta \geq \frac{\alpha}{\theta-1}$ and (ii) $\beta \leq \frac{\alpha}{\theta-1}$.

First, consider the case (i). Since $v_N(h) \leq v_M(h)$ for any $h \in H_1 \cup H_2$, we have $v_M(H_0 \cup H_1 \cup H_2) \geq v_M(H_0) + v_N(H_1 \cup H_2) = \beta + v_M(H_0 \cup H_1)$. Combining this with the equation (4), we obtain (2) in this case.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{v_N(H_0 \cup H_1 \cup H_2)}{v_M(H_0 \cup H_1 \cup H_2)} &\leq \frac{\alpha + \beta + v_M(H_0 \cup H_1)}{\beta + v_M(H_0 \cup H_1)} \\ &= 1 + \frac{\alpha}{\beta + v_M(H_0 \cup H_1)} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{\alpha}{\frac{\alpha}{\theta-1} + \frac{\alpha}{\theta}} \\ &= \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the second inequality follows from the inequality (3) and the condition (i).

We next consider the case (ii) $\beta \leq \frac{\alpha}{\theta-1}$, which is the main part of the proof. Since any $h \in H_0$ satisfies $v_N(h) > v_M(h)$, we have $v_M(h) < \ell \leq u$ for any $h \in H_0$, i.e., any $h \in H_0$ is undersubscribed in M . Then, any $r \in R_0 = \{ r \in R^* \mid N(r) \in H_0 \}$ satisfies $M(r) \succ_r N(r)$ since otherwise $(r, N(r))$ blocks M , which contradicts the stability of M . Partition H_1 into two sets:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1^\succ &:= \{ h \in H_1 \mid \exists r \in R_0 : M(r) = h \succ_r N(r) \} \text{ and} \\ H_1^\preceq &:= H_1 \setminus H_1^\succ. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for any $h \in H_1^\preceq$, all residents $r \in R_0$ with $M(r) = h$ satisfy $M(r) =_r N(r)$. We claim that

$$v_M(H_2) \geq \frac{1}{\theta}(\alpha + \beta), \quad (5)$$

which can be proven by estimating $|R^*|$ in two ways.

For the first estimation, we further partition R_1 into $R_1^\succ := \{r \in R_1 \mid N(r) \in H_1^\succ\}$ and $R_1^\bar{:=} \{r \in R_1 \mid N(r) \in H_1^\bar{:=}$. By the stability of N , each $h \in H_1^\succ$ is full in N , since there exists a resident $r \in R_0$ with $h \succ_r N(r)$, implying that $|N(h)| = u$ and $v_N(h) = \ell$. Thus we have $|R_1^\succ| = u \cdot |H_1^\succ| = \frac{u}{\ell} \cdot v_N(H_1^\succ) = \theta \cdot v_N(H_1^\succ)$. Additionally, since each $h \in H_1^\succ$ satisfies $v_M(h) \geq v_N(h)$ by $h \notin H_0$, we have $v_M(h) = v_N(h) = \ell$, which implies $v_M(H_1^\succ) = v_N(H_1^\succ)$. We therefore represent $|R_1^\succ|$ as $|R_1^\succ| = (\theta - 1) \cdot v_M(H_1^\succ) + v_N(H_1^\succ)$. Further, by definition, we have $|R_0| \geq v_N(H_0)$, $|R_1^\bar{=} \geq v_N(H_1^\bar{=}$, and $|R_2| \geq v_N(H_2)$. Combining them together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |R^*| &= |R_0| + |R_1| + |R_2| \geq v_N(H_0) + (\theta - 1) \cdot v_M(H_1^\succ) + v_N(H_1^\succ) + v_N(H_1^\bar{=} + v_N(H_2) \\ &= \alpha + \beta + v_M(H_0 \cup H_1) + (\theta - 1) \cdot v_M(H_1^\succ). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

For the second estimation of $|R^*|$, we define another partition $\{S_0, S_1^\bar{=}, S_{\text{rest}}\}$ of R^* depending on the matching M :

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &:= \{r \in R^* \mid M(r) \in H_0\}, \\ S_1^\bar{=} &:= \{r \in R^* \mid M(r) \in H_1^\bar{=}\}, \text{ and} \\ S_{\text{rest}} &:= R^* \setminus (S_0 \cup S_1^\bar{=}). \end{aligned}$$

We show that $|S_0| = v_M(H_0)$, $|S_1^\bar{=} = v_M(H_1^\bar{=}$, and $|S_{\text{rest}}| \leq \theta \cdot v_M(H_1^\succ \cup H_2)$. Since any $h \in H_0$ satisfies $\ell \geq v_N(h) > v_M(h)$, we have $v_M(h) = |M(h)|$, which proves the first equality $|S_0| = v_M(H_0)$. For the second equality, recall that, for each $h \in H_1^\bar{=}$, there exists a resident $r \in R_0$ with $M(r) = h$ and $M(r) \prec_r N(r)$. Since for any $r \in R_0$, the hospital $h' := N(r)$ belongs to H_0 , we have $v_N(h') > v_M(h') = \min\{\ell, |M(h')|\}$, which implies $|M(h')| < \ell$. From this together with Lemma 2, we have $|M(h)| \leq \ell$, which shows that $v_M(h) = |M(h)|$ for each $h \in H_1^\bar{=}$, i.e., the second equality. The third equality follows from the fact that all residents in S_{rest} are assigned to $H_1^\succ \cup H_2$.

By the three equalities above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |R^*| &= |S_0| + |S_1^\bar{=} + |S_{\text{rest}}| \leq v_M(H_0) + v_M(H_1^\bar{=}) + \theta \cdot v_M(H_1^\succ \cup H_2) \\ &= v_M(H_0 \cup H_1) + (\theta - 1) \cdot v_M(H_1^\succ) + \theta \cdot v_M(H_2), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

which together with (6) proves our claim (5).

By using (4) and (5), we obtain the required inequality (2) also for the case (ii):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{v_N(H_0 \cup H_1 \cup H_2)}{v_M(H_0 \cup H_1 \cup H_2)} &\leq \frac{\alpha + \beta + v_M(H_0 \cup H_1)}{\frac{1}{\theta}(\alpha + \beta) + v_M(H_0 \cup H_1)} \\ &= 1 + \frac{(\theta - 1)\alpha + (\theta - 1)\beta}{\alpha + \beta + \theta \cdot v_M(H_0 \cup H_1)} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{(\theta - 1)\alpha + (\theta - 1)\beta}{2\alpha + \beta} \\ &= 1 + \frac{\theta - 1}{2} + \frac{\theta - 1}{2} \cdot \frac{\beta}{2\alpha + \beta} \\ &\leq \frac{\theta + 1}{2} + \frac{\theta - 1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2(\theta - 1) + 1} \\ &= \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the second inequality follows from the inequality (3), and the third inequality follows from the condition $\beta \leq \frac{\alpha}{\theta-1}$ of this case (ii) and the condition $2\alpha + \beta > 0$, where the latter is obtained from $2\alpha + \beta > \alpha + \beta = v_N(H_0 \cup H_1 \cup H_2) - v_M(H_0 \cup H_1) > 0$. \square

The above analysis for Theorem 9 is tight, as seen from the following proposition.

Proposition 37. *There is an instance I of the uniform model such that $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)} = \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$. This holds even if ties appear in only preference lists of hospitals or only preference lists of residents.*

Proof. As the upper bound is shown in Theorem 9, it suffices to give an instance I with $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)} \geq \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$. Further, since the case $\theta = 1$ is trivial, we assume $\theta > 1$, i.e., $\ell < u$. We construct two instances I_1 and I_2 each of which satisfies this inequality and in I_1 (resp., in I_2) ties appear in only preference lists of hospitals (resp., residents).

Both I_1 and I_2 consist of $2(u - \ell)u + \ell u$ residents and $(u - \ell)u + (u - \ell) + u$ hospitals. The set of residents is $R = A \cup B \cup C$ where $A = \{a_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq u - \ell, 1 \leq j \leq u\}$, $B = \{b_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq u - \ell, 1 \leq j \leq u\}$, and $C = \{c_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq u, 1 \leq j \leq \ell\}$. The set of hospitals is $H = X \cup Y \cup Z$ where $X = \{x_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq u - \ell, 1 \leq j \leq u\}$, $Y = \{y_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq u - \ell\}$, and $Z = \{z_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq u\}$. (Fig. 5 shows a pictorial representation of a small example.)

The preference lists in I_1 are given as follows, where “(R)” and “[R]” respectively represent a single tie containing all members of R and an arbitrary strict order on R .

$$\begin{array}{ll} a_{i,j}: & y_i \ x_{i,j} \ \cdots & x_{i,j} \ [\ell, u]: & [\ R \] \\ b_{i,j}: & y_i \ z_j \ \cdots & y_i \ [\ell, u]: & (\ R \) \\ c_{i,j}: & z_i \ \cdots & z_i \ [\ell, u]: & [\ R \] \end{array}$$

Note that, for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, u - \ell$, the hospital y_i is the first choice of $2u$ residents $\{a_{i,j}, b_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq j \leq u\}$. Recall that we delete arbitrariness in DOUBLE PROPOSAL using the priority rules defined by indices. If we set indices on residents so that residents in A have smaller indices than those in B , then y_i prioritizes residents in A over those in B . We then observe that the output of the algorithm is

$$M = \{(a_{i,j}, y_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq u - \ell, 1 \leq j \leq u\} \cup \{(b_{i,j}, z_j) \mid 1 \leq i \leq u - \ell, 1 \leq j \leq u\} \\ \cup \{(c_{i,j}, z_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq u, 1 \leq j \leq \ell\}.$$

In M , the hospitals $x_{i,j}$, y_i , and z_i are assigned 0, u , and u residents, respectively. Then, their scores in M are 0, 1, and 1, respectively. Hence, we obtain $s(M) = |Y| + |Z| = (u - \ell) + u$.

Next, define a matching N by

$$N = \{(a_{i,j}, x_{i,j}) \mid 1 \leq i \leq u - \ell, 1 \leq j \leq u\} \cup \{(b_{i,j}, y_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq u - \ell, 1 \leq j \leq u\} \\ \cup \{(c_{i,j}, z_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq u, 1 \leq j \leq \ell\}.$$

It is straightforward to see that this is a stable matching. In N , the hospitals $x_{i,j}$, y_i , and z_i are assigned 1, u , and ℓ residents, respectively. Then, their scores in N are $\frac{1}{\ell}$, 1, and 1, respectively. Hence, $s(N) = \frac{1}{\ell}|X| + |Y| + |Z| = \frac{(u - \ell)u}{\ell} + (u - \ell) + u$. From these, we obtain

$$\frac{\text{OPT}(I_1)}{\text{ALG}(I_1)} \geq \frac{s(N_1)}{s(M_1)} = \frac{\frac{(u - \ell)u}{\ell} + (u - \ell) + u}{(u - \ell) + u} = \frac{(u - \ell)u + \ell(u - \ell) + \ell u}{\ell(u - \ell) + \ell u} = \frac{u^2 + \ell u - \ell^2}{2\ell u - \ell^2} = \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}.$$

Next, we define I_2 . The preference lists in I_2 are given as follows. Similarly to the notation “[R],” we denote by “[B]” and “[$A \cup C$]” arbitrary strict orders of all residents in B and $A \cup C$, respectively.




Figure 5: An example with $[\ell, u] = [3, 5]$. An optimal matching N is represented by solid (black) lines while the output M of the algorithm is represented by dashed (red) lines.

$$\begin{array}{lll}
 a_{i,j}: & y_i & x_{i,j} \quad \cdots \\
 b_{i,j}: & (y_i & z_j) \quad \cdots \\
 c_{i,j}: & z_i & \cdots
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ll}
 x_{i,j} [\ell, u]: & [R] \\
 y_i [\ell, u]: & [B][A \cup C] \\
 z_i [\ell, u]: & [R]
 \end{array}$$

If we set indices on hospitals so that those in Z have smaller indices than those in Y , in DOUBLE PROPOSAL, each $b_{i,j}$ makes (the second) proposal to z_j before to y_i . Then, we can observe the output of the algorithm coincides with the matching M defined above. Additionally, we see that the matching N defined above is a stable matching of I_2 . Therefore, we can obtain $\frac{\text{OPT}(I_2)}{\text{ALG}(I_2)} \geq \frac{s(N)}{s(M)} = \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$. \square

Corollary 38. *Among instances of the uniform model in which ties appear in only preference lists of hospitals, $\max_I \frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} = \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$.*

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 9, we can observe that the inequality $\frac{s(N)}{s(M)} \leq \frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$ is obtained if both M and N are stable and M satisfies the property given as Lemma 2(ii). Note that this property is satisfied by any stable matching if there is no ties in the preference lists of residents, because $h =_r h'$ cannot happen for any $r \in R$ and $h, h' \in H$. Therefore, the maximum value of $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)}$ is at most $\frac{\theta^2 + \theta - 1}{2\theta - 1}$. Further the instance I_1 in the proof of Proposition 37 shows that this bound is tight. \square

D.3 Marriage Model

In the marriage model, the upper quota of each hospital is 1. Therefore, $[\ell(h), u(h)]$ is either $[0, 1]$ or $[1, 1]$ for each $h \in H$. We first provide a worst case analysis of a tie-breaking algorithm.

Proposition 39. *The maximum gap for the marriage model satisfies $\Lambda(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Marriage}}) = 2$. Moreover, this equality holds even if ties appear in only preference lists of residents.*

Proof. We first show $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} \leq 2$ for any instance I of the marriage model. Let N and M be stable matchings with $s(N) = \text{OPT}(I)$ and $s(M) = \text{WST}(I)$. Consider a bipartite graph $G = (R, H : N \cup M)$, where we consider an edge used in both N and M as a length-two cycle in G . Since N and M are one-to-one matchings in which all residents are assigned, each component is an alternating cycle or an alternating path whose two end vertices are both in H .

Take any connected component. It suffices to show that the sum of the scores of the hospitals in this component in N is at most twice of that in M . The case of a cycle is trivial since every hospital in it has the score of 1. Therefore, consider a path. Then, one of two terminal hospitals,

say h_1 , is incident only to N and the other, say h_2 , is only to M . We then have $s_N(h_1) = 1$ and $s_M(h_2) = 1$. The value $s_M(h_1)$ is 1 if $\ell(h_1) = 0$ and 0 otherwise. Similarly, $s_N(h_2)$ is 1 if $\ell(h_2) = 0$ and 0 otherwise. For any non-terminal hospital h , we have $s_N(h) = s_M(h) = 1$. If there are k non-terminal hospitals, then the sum of scores in this component in N is $1 + s_N(h_2) + k$ while that in M is $1 + s_M(h_1) + k$. Since $k \geq 0$, $s_N(h_2) \leq 1$, and $s_M(h_1) \geq 0$, we have $\frac{1 + s_N(h_2) + k}{1 + s_M(h_1) + k} \leq 2$.

Next, we provide an instance I with $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} = 2$. Let I be an instance containing one resident r and two hospitals h_1 and h_2 such that r is indifferent between h_1 and h_2 and quotas are defined as $[\ell(h_1), u(h_1)] = [1, 1]$ and $[\ell(h_2), u(h_2)] = [0, 1]$. Then, $N = \{(r, h_1)\}$ and $M = \{(r, h_2)\}$ are both stable matchings and we have $s(N) = 2$ while $s(M) = 1$. \square

Theorem 40. *The approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL for the marriage model satisfies $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}_{\text{Marriage}}) = 1.5$. Moreover, this is best possible for the marriage model, if strategy-proofness is required.*

Proof. We first show that $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)} \leq 1.5$ holds for any instance I of the marriage model. Let M be the output of DOUBLE PROPOSAL and let N be an optimal stable matching. By the arguments in the proof of Proposition 39, it suffices to show that there is no component of $G = (R, H; N \cup M)$ that forms a path with two edges $(r, h_1) \in N$, $(r, h_2) \in M$ with $\ell(h_1) = 1$ and $\ell(h_2) = 0$. Suppose conversely that there is such a path. As h_1 is assigned no resident in M , we have $h_2 = M(r) \succeq_r h_1$ by the stability of M . Similarly, the stability of N implies $h_1 = N(r) \succeq_r h_2$, and hence $h_1 =_r h_2$. Since $|M(h_2)| = 1 > \ell(h_2)$, Lemma 2(ii) implies $|M(h_1)| \geq \ell(h_1) = 1$, which contradicts $|M(h_1)| = 0$.

To see that $\max_I \frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{ALG}(I)} \geq 1.5$ even if ties appear in only preference lists of hospitals or only that of residents, see the instances I_1 and I_2 defined for $n = 2$ in Proposition 35. These two are instances of the marriage model and satisfy $\frac{\text{OPT}(I_1)}{\text{ALG}(I_1)} = \frac{\text{OPT}(I_2)}{\text{ALG}(I_2)} = \phi(2) = 1.5$. \square

It is worth mentioning that, for the marriage model, our algorithm attains the best approximation factor in the domain of strategy-proof algorithms. As shown in Example 24, there is no strategy-proof algorithm that achieves an approximation factor better than 1.5 even in the marriage model. Therefore, we cannot improve this ratio without harming strategy-proofness for residents.

Corollary 41. *Among instances of the marriage model in which ties appear in only preference lists of hospitals, $\max_I \frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)} = 1.5$.*

Proof. If the preference lists of the residents have no ties, the proof of Theorem 40 works for any pair of stable matchings, since it cannot be $h_1 =_r h_2$. Hence, the upper bound follows. The lower bound follows from the instance I_1 mentioned there. \square

D.4 Resident-Side Master List Model

In the resident-side master list case, the preference lists of all residents are the same. Even with this restriction, the maximum value of $\frac{\text{OPT}(I)}{\text{WST}(I)}$ can be $n + 1$ as shown in Proposition 6. Our algorithm, however, solves this special case exactly.

Theorem 42. *The approximation factor of DOUBLE PROPOSAL for the R-side master list model satisfies $\text{APPROX}(\mathcal{I}_{R\text{-ML}}) = 1$, i.e., DOUBLE PROPOSAL can solve the R-side master list model exactly.*

Proof. Let I be an instance and P be the master preference list of residents over hospitals. For convenience, we suppose that P is a strictly ordered list of ties T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k , by regarding a hospital that does not belong to any tie as a tie of length one. For each i , let $u(T_i) = \sum_{h \in T_i} u(h)$. Let z be the index (if any) such that $\sum_{i=1}^{z-1} u(T_i) < |R|$ and $\sum_{i=1}^z u(T_i) > |R|$. If there is an integer p such that $\sum_{i=1}^p u(T_i) = |R|$, we define $z = p + 0.5$.

A tie T_i is called *full* if $1 \leq i < z$ and *empty* if $z < i \leq k$. In case z is an integer, the tie T_z is called *intermediate*. The following lemma gives a necessary condition for a matching to be stable in I .

Lemma 43. *Any stable matching of I assigns $u(h)$ residents to each hospital h in a full tie and no resident to each hospital in an empty tie.*

Proof. Let M be a stable matching. Suppose that $|M(h)| < u(h)$ holds for a hospital h in a full tie. Then, there must be a resident r such that $M(r) = h'$ and $h \succ_r h'$. Thus (r, h) blocks M , a contradiction. Suppose that $|M(h)| > 0$ holds for a hospital h in an empty tie. Let r be a resident in $M(h)$. Then, there must be an undersubscribed hospital h' such that $h' \succ_r h$. Thus (r, h') blocks M , a contradiction. \square

Let M be the output of DOUBLE PROPOSAL and N be an optimal solution. For contradiction, suppose that $s(M) < s(N)$. By Lemma 43, $s_M(h) = s_N(h)$ for any hospital h in a full tie or in an empty tie. Hence, the difference of the scores of M and N is caused by hospitals in the intermediate tie. In the following, we concentrate on the intermediate tie, and if we refer to a hospital, it always means a hospital in the intermediate tie.

Suppose that there is a hospital h such that $|M(h)| > \ell(h)$. Then, by Lemma 2(ii), $|M(h')| > \ell(h')$ holds for any hospital h' in this tie. Therefore, the score of each hospital is 1 in M and it is impossible that $s(M) < s(N)$. Hence, in the following, we assume that $|M(h)| \leq \ell(h)$ for each hospital h .

Suppose that there are q different lower quotas for hospitals in the intermediate tie, and let them be $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_q$ such that $\ell_1 < \ell_2 < \dots < \ell_q$. For $1 \leq i \leq q$, let L_i be the set of hospitals whose lower quota is ℓ_i . For $1 \leq i \leq q$, let $S_M(i) = \sum_{h \in L_1 \cup L_2 \cup \dots \cup L_i} s_M(h)$ and $S_N(i) = \sum_{h \in L_1 \cup L_2 \cup \dots \cup L_i} s_N(h)$. By the assumption $s(M) < s(N)$, there exists an index i such that $S_M(i) < S_N(i)$ and let i^* be the minimum one. Then, there is a hospital $h' \in L_{i^*}$ such that $|M(h')| < \ell(h')$, as otherwise all hospitals in L_{i^*} have the score 1 in M and this contradicts the choice of i^* . Since $|M(h)| \leq \ell(h)$ for each hospital h , N assigns strictly more residents to hospitals in $L_1 \cup L_2 \cup \dots \cup L_{i^*}$ than M , as otherwise $S_M(i^*) < S_N(i^*)$ would not hold. Then, there is a resident r and a hospital $\tilde{h} \in L_i$ ($i > i^*$) such that $M(r) = \tilde{h}$. Since $\tilde{h} =_r h'$ and $\ell(\tilde{h}) > \ell(h')$, Lemma 2(i) implies that $|M(h')| \geq \ell(h')$, but this contradicts the fact we have derived above. \square

Corollary 44. *If there is a master preference list of residents that contains no ties, then any stable matching is optimal.*

Proof. This corollary is easily derived from the proof of Theorem 42. Since there are no ties in the master preference list, the intermediate tie (if any) consists of a single hospital. Hence, Lemma 43 implies that the number of residents assigned to each hospital does not depend on the choice of a stable matching. This completes the proof. \square

E Proofs of Hardness Results

In this section, we give omitted proofs of hardness results given in Section 6. For readability, we give proofs of Theorems 12, 11, and 10 in this order.

E.1 Proof of Theorem 12

We show the theorem by a reduction from the *minimum maximal matching problem* (MMM for short). In this problem, we are given an undirected graph G and are asked to find a maximal matching of minimum size, denoted by $\text{OPT}(G)$. It is known that under UGC, there is no polynomial-time algorithm to distinguish between the following two cases: (i) $\text{OPT}(G) \leq (\frac{1}{2} + \delta)n$ and (ii) $\text{OPT}(G) \geq (\frac{2}{3} - \delta)n$ for any positive constant δ , even for bipartite graphs with n vertices in each part [10]:

Let $G = (U, V; E)$ ($|U| = |V| = n$) be an instance of MMM, where $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$ and $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$. We will construct an instance I of HR-MSLQ in the marriage model. I consists of n residents $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$ and $2n$ hospitals $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$. For convenience, we use u_i and v_i as the names of vertices in G and agents in I interchangeably.

Preference lists and quotas of hospitals are defined in Fig. 6. Here, $N(u_i)$ is the set of neighbors of u_i in G , namely, $N(u_i) = \{v_j \mid (u_i, v_j) \in E\}$ and “ $(N(u_i))$ ” is the tie consisting of all hospitals in $N(u_i)$. The notation “ $(N(v_i))$ ” in v_i 's list is defined similarly. The notation “ \dots ” at the tail of lists means an arbitrary strict order of all agents missing in the list.

$$\begin{array}{ll} u_i: (N(u_i)) y_i \cdots & v_i [0, 1]: (N(v_i)) \cdots \\ & y_i [1, 1]: u_i \cdots \end{array}$$

Figure 6: Preference lists of residents and hospitals.

In the following, we show that $\text{OPT}(I) = 2n - \text{OPT}(G)$. If so, the above mentioned hardness implies that it is UG-hard to distinguish between the cases (i') $\text{OPT}(I) \geq (\frac{3}{2} - \delta)n$ and (ii') $\text{OPT}(I) \leq (\frac{4}{3} + \delta)n$. This in turn implies that an approximation algorithm with an approximation factor smaller than $\frac{9-6\delta}{8+6\delta}$ would refute UGC. Since δ can be taken arbitrarily small, if we set $\delta < \frac{12\epsilon}{17-9\epsilon}$, the theorem is proved.

We first show that $\text{OPT}(I) \geq 2n - \text{OPT}(G)$. Let L be an optimal solution of G , i.e., a maximal matching of G of size $\text{OPT}(G)$. Then, we construct a matching M of I as $M = M_1 \cup M_2$ where $M_1 = \{(u_i, v_j) \mid (u_i, v_j) \in L\}$ and $M_2 = \{(u_i, y_i) \mid u_i \text{ is unmatched in } L\}$.

We show that M is stable. If a resident u_i is matched in M_1 , she is matched with a top choice hospital so she cannot be a part of a blocking pair. Suppose that a resident u_i who is matched in M_2 (with y_i) forms a blocking pair. Then, u_i is unmatched in L and the counterpart of the blocking pair must be some $v_j \in N(u_i)$. Note that v_j is unmatched in M since, by construction of M , if a hospital v_j is matched, then it is assigned a top choice resident and hence cannot form a blocking pair. From the above arguments, we have that $(u_i, v_j) \in E$ but both u_i and v_j are unmatched in L , which contradicts maximality of L .

The score of each v_i is 1 because its lower quota is 0. Since all residents are matched in M , $|M_1| + |M_2| = n$. By construction $|M_1| = |L|$ holds, so the total score of hospitals in Y is $|M_2| = n - |M_1| = n - |L| = n - \text{OPT}(G)$. Hence, we have that $\text{OPT}(I) \geq s(M) = n + |M_2| = 2n - \text{OPT}(G)$.

Next, we show that $\text{OPT}(I) \leq 2n - \text{OPT}(G)$. Let M be an optimal solution for I , a stable matching of I whose score is $\text{OPT}(I)$. Since each v_i 's score is 1 without depending on the matching, $\text{OPT}(I) \geq n$ and we can write $\text{OPT}(I) = n + k$ for a nonnegative integer k . Here, k coincides the number of hospitals of Y matched in M .

As mentioned in Sec. 2, every resident is matched in M . Note that, for any i , resident u_i is not matched with any hospital in “ \dots ” part, as otherwise, (u_i, y_i) blocks M , a contradiction (note that u_i is the unique first choice of y_i). Among n residents, k ones are matched with

hospitals in Y , so the remaining $n - k$ ones are matched with hospitals in V .

Let us define a matching L of G as $L = \{(u_i, v_j) \mid (u_i, v_j) \in M\}$. Then, from the above observations, $|L| = n - k = 2n - \text{OPT}(I)$. We show that L is maximal in G . Suppose not and that $(u_i, v_j) \in E$ but both u_i and v_j are unmatched in L . Then, u_i is matched with y_i and v_j is unmatched in M , which implies that (u_i, v_j) blocks M , contradicting the stability of M . Therefore, $\text{OPT}(G) \leq |L| = 2n - \text{OPT}(I)$, which completes the proof.

E.2 Proof of Theorem 11

The proof is a nontrivial extension of that of Theorem 12. As a reduction source, we use MMM for bipartite graphs (see the proof of Theorem 12 for definition). Let $G = (U, V, E)$ be an input bipartite graph for MMM where $|U| = |V| = n$. We will construct an instance I for HR-MSLQ in the uniform model. The set of residents is $X \cup R$ where $X = \{x_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq \ell\}$ and $R = \{r_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq u - \ell\}$. The set of hospitals is $H \cup Y$ where $H = \{h_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $Y = \{y_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq u - \ell\}$.

Preference lists of agents are given in Fig. 7. Here, $N(u_i)$ is defined as $N(u_i) = \{h_j \mid (u_i, v_j) \in E\}$ and “ $(N(u_i))$ ” denotes the tie consisting of all hospitals in $N(u_i)$. $N(v_i)$ is defined as $N(v_i) = \{r_{j,k} \mid (u_j, v_i) \in E, 1 \leq k \leq u - \ell\}$ and “ $(N(v_i))$ ” is the tie consisting of all residents in $N(v_i)$. As before, the notation “ \dots ” at the tail of the list means an arbitrary strict order of all agents missing in the list.

$$\begin{array}{ll} x_{i,j}: & h_i \ \cdots \qquad \qquad \qquad h_i \ [\ell, u]: \quad x_{i,1} \ \cdots \ x_{i,\ell} \ (N(v_i)) \ \cdots \\ r_{i,j}: & (N(u_i)) \ y_{i,j} \ \cdots \qquad \qquad \qquad y_{i,j} \ [\ell, u]: \quad r_{i,j} \ \cdots \end{array}$$

Figure 7: Preference lists of residents and hospitals.

It would be helpful to informally explain here an idea behind the reduction. The $u - \ell$ residents $r_{i,j}$ ($1 \leq j \leq u - \ell$) correspond to the vertex $u_i \in U$ of G , and a hospital h_i corresponds to the vertex $v_i \in V$ of G . The first choice of the ℓ residents $x_{i,j}$ ($1 \leq j \leq \ell$) is h_i and h_i 's first ℓ choices are $x_{i,j}$ ($1 \leq j \leq \ell$), so all $x_{i,j}$ s are assigned to h_i in any stable matching. These $x_{i,j}$ s fill the ℓ positions of h_i , so h_i 's score is 1 and there remains $u - \ell$ positions. Then, the residents in R ($u - \ell$ copies of vertices of U) and the hospitals in H (corresponding to vertices of V) form a matching that simulates a maximal matching of G . A resident $r_{i,j}$ unmatched in this maximal matching will be assigned to $y_{i,j}$, by which $y_{i,j}$ obtains a score of $\frac{1}{\ell}$. Thus a smaller maximal matching of G can produce a stable matching of I of larger score.

Formally, we will prove that the equation $\text{OPT}(I) = n + \frac{u-\ell}{\ell}(n - \text{OPT}(G)) (= n + (\theta - 1)(n - \text{OPT}(G)))$ holds. Then, by (i) and (ii) in the proof of Theorem 12, it is UG-hard to distinguish between the cases (i'') $\text{OPT}(I) \geq (1 + (\theta - 1)(\frac{1}{2} - \delta))n$ and (ii'') $\text{OPT}(I) \leq (1 + (\theta - 1)(\frac{1}{3} + \delta))n$. This implies that existence of a polynomial-time approximation algorithm with an approximation factor smaller than $\frac{1+(\theta-1)(\frac{1}{2}-\delta)}{1+(\theta-1)(\frac{1}{3}+\delta)} = \frac{3\theta+3-6(\theta-1)\delta}{2\theta+4+6(\theta-1)\delta}$ would refute UGC.

Then, the theorem holds by setting $\delta < \frac{2}{15}\epsilon < \frac{(2\theta+4)^2\epsilon}{6(\theta-1)((5\theta+4)-(2\theta+4)\epsilon)}$.

First, we show that $\text{OPT}(I) \geq n + \frac{u-\ell}{\ell}(n - \text{OPT}(G))$. Let L be a minimum maximal matching of G . Let us define a matching M of I as $M = M_1 \cup M_2 \cup M_3$, where $M_1 = \{(x_{i,j}, h_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq \ell\}$, $M_2 = \{(r_{i,j}, h_k) \mid (u_i, v_k) \in L, 1 \leq j \leq u - \ell\}$, and $M_3 = \{(r_{i,j}, y_{i,j}) \mid u_i \text{ is unmatched in } L, 1 \leq j \leq u - \ell\}$.

We show that M is stable. Since all residents in X are assigned to a top choice hospital, none of them can be a part of a blocking pair. This also holds for a resident $r_{i,j}$ if she is assigned to a hospital in $N(u_i)$. Hence, only a resident $r_{i,j}$ who is assigned to $y_{i,j}$ can form a blocking

pair with some $h_k \in N(u_i)$. This means that $(u_i, v_k) \in E$ but u_i is unmatched in L . Observe that, by construction of M , h_k is assigned ℓ residents $x_{k,1}, \dots, x_{k,\ell}$, and is either assigned $u - \ell$ more residents in $N(v_k)$, in which case h_k is full, or assigned no more residents, in which case h_k is undersubscribed. In the former case, h_k cannot prefer $r_{i,j}$ to any of residents in $M(h_k)$, so the latter case must hold. This implies that v_k is unmatched in L . Thus $L \cup \{(u_i, v_k)\}$ is a matching of G , contradicting the maximality of L .

Since each h_i is assigned ℓ residents in M_1 , h_i 's score is 1. Hence, the total score of hospitals in H is n . Among $(u - \ell)n$ residents in R , $(u - \ell)|L|$ ones are assigned to hospitals in H , so the remaining $(u - \ell)(n - |L|)$ ones are assigned to hospitals in Y . Such residents are assigned to different hospitals, so the total score of hospitals in Y is $\frac{1}{\ell}(u - \ell)(n - |L|)$. Thus the score of M is $n + \frac{1}{\ell}(u - \ell)(n - |L|) = n + \frac{u - \ell}{\ell}(n - \text{OPT}(G))$, so it results that $\text{OPT}(I) \geq n + \frac{u - \ell}{\ell}(n - \text{OPT}(G))$.

Next, we show that $\text{OPT}(I) \leq n + \frac{u - \ell}{\ell}(n - \text{OPT}(G))$. Let M be a stable matching of maximum score, that is, $s(M) = \text{OPT}(I)$. As observed above, each h_i is assigned ℓ residents $x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \dots, x_{i,\ell}$ of X and hence the score of each hospital h_i is 1. Additionally, we can see that $r_{i,j}$ is not assigned to any hospital in “ \dots ” part, as otherwise, $(r_{i,j}, y_{i,j})$ blocks M . We construct a bipartite (multi-)graph $G_M = (U, V; F)$ where $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$ and $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ are identified with vertices of G , and we have an edge $(u_i, v_k)_j \in F$ if and only if $(r_{i,j}, h_k) \in M$. Here, a subscript j of edge $(u_i, v_k)_j$ is introduced to distinguish multiplicity of edge (u_i, v_k) . The degree of each vertex of G_M is at most $u - \ell$, so by König's edge coloring theorem [25], G_M is $(u - \ell)$ -edge colorable and each color class c induces a matching M_c ($1 \leq c \leq u - \ell$) of G_M . Note that each M_c is a matching of G because $(u_i, v_k) \in M_c$ means $(u_i, v_k) \in F$, which implies $(r_{i,j}, h_k) \in M$, which in turn implies $h_k \in N(u_i)$ and hence $(u_i, v_k) \in E$. We then show that M_c is a maximal matching of G . Suppose not and that $M_c \cup \{(u_a, v_b)\}$ is a matching of G . Then, u_a in G_M is not incident to an edge of color c , but since there are $u - \ell$ colors in total, u_a 's degree in G_M is less than $u - \ell$. This implies that $r_{a,p}$ for some p is not assigned to any hospital in $N(u_a)$ (and hence unmatched or assigned to $y_{a,p}$) in M . A similar argument shows that v_b 's degree in G_M is less than $u - \ell$ and hence h_b is undersubscribed in M . These imply that $(r_{a,p}, h_b)$ blocks M , a contradiction.

Hence, we have shown that each M_c is a maximal matching of G , so its size is at least $\text{OPT}(G)$. Since $\{M_c \mid 1 \leq c \leq u - \ell\}$ is a partition of F , we have that $|F| \geq (u - \ell)\text{OPT}(G)$. There are $(u - \ell)n$ residents in R and at least $(u - \ell)\text{OPT}(G)$ of them are assigned to a hospital in H , so at most $(u - \ell)(n - \text{OPT}(G))$ residents are assigned to hospitals in Y . Each such resident contributes $\frac{1}{\ell}$ for a hospital's score and hence the total score of hospitals in Y is at most $\frac{u - \ell}{\ell}(n - \text{OPT}(G))$. Since, as observed above, the total score of hospitals in H is n , we have that $\text{OPT}(I) \leq n + \frac{u - \ell}{\ell}(n - \text{OPT}(G))$.

E.3 Proof of Theorem 10

We show the theorem by way of a couple of reductions, one from the maximum independent set problem (*MAX-IS*) to the maximum 2-independent set problem (*MAX-2-IS*), and the other from *MAX-2-IS* to *HR-MSLQ*.

For an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, a subset $S \subseteq V$ is an *independent set* of G if no two vertices in S are adjacent. S is a *2-independent set* of G if the distance between any two vertices in S is at least 3. *MAX-IS* (resp. *MAX-2-IS*) asks to find an independent set (resp. 2-independent set) of maximum size. Let us denote by $\text{IS}(G)$ and $\text{IS}_2(G)$, respectively, the sizes of optimal solutions of *MAX-IS* and *MAX-2-IS* for G . We assume without loss of generality that input graphs are connected. It is known that unless $\text{P}=\text{NP}$ there is no polynomial-time algorithm, given a graph $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$, to distinguish between the two cases $\text{IS}(G_1) \leq |V_1|^{\epsilon_1}$ and $\text{IS}(G_1) \geq |V_1|^{1 - \epsilon_1}$, for any constant $\epsilon_1 > 0$ [36].

Now we give the first reduction, which is based on the NP-hardness proof of MMM [19]. Let $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ be an instance of MAX-IS. We construct an instance $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ of MAX-2-IS as $V_2 = V_1 \cup E_1 \cup \{s\}$ and $E_2 = \{(v, e) \mid v \in V_1, e \in E_1, e \text{ is incident to } v \text{ in } G_1\} \cup \{(s, e) \mid e \in E_1\}$, where s is a new vertex not in $V_1 \cup E_1$. For any two vertices u and v in V_1 , if their distance in G_1 is at least 2 then that in G_2 is at least 4. Hence, any independent set in G_1 is also a 2-independent set in G_2 . Conversely, for any 2-independent set S in G_2 , $S \cap V_1$ is independent in G_1 and $|S \cap (V_2 \setminus V_1)| \leq 1$. These facts imply that $\text{IS}_2(G_2)$ is either $\text{IS}(G_1)$ or $\text{IS}(G_1) + 1$. Since $|E_2| = 3|E_1| \leq \frac{3}{2}|V_1|^2$, distinguishing between $\text{IS}_2(G_2) \leq |E_2|^{\epsilon_2}$ and $\text{IS}_2(G_2) \geq |E_2|^{1/2-\epsilon_2}$ for some constant $\epsilon_2 > 0$ would imply distinguishing between $\text{IS}(G_1) \leq |V_1|^{\epsilon_1}$ and $\text{IS}(G_1) \geq |V_1|^{1-\epsilon_1}$ for some constant $\epsilon_1 > 0$, which in turn implies P=NP.

We then proceed to the second reduction. Let $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ be an instance of MAX-2-IS. Let $n_2 = |V_2|$, $m_2 = |E_2|$, $V_2 = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n_2}\}$, and $E_2 = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{m_2}\}$. We construct an instance I of HR-MSLQ as follows. For an integer p which will be determined later, define the set of residents of I as $R = \{r_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n_2, 1 \leq j \leq p\}$, where $r_{i,j}$ corresponds to the j th copy of vertex $v_i \in V_2$. Next, define the set of hospitals of I as $H \cup Y$, where $H = \{h_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq m_2\}$ and $Y = \{y_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n_2, 1 \leq j \leq p\}$. The hospital h_k corresponds to the edge $e_k \in E_2$ and the hospital $y_{i,j}$ corresponds to the resident $r_{i,j}$.

We complete the reduction by giving preference lists and quotas in Fig. 8, where $1 \leq i \leq n_2$, $1 \leq j \leq p$, and $1 \leq k \leq m_2$. Here, $N(v_i) = \{h_k \mid e_k \text{ is incident to } v_i \text{ in } G_2\}$ and “ $(N(v_i))$ ” denotes the tie consisting of all hospitals in $N(v_i)$. Similarly, $N(e_k) = \{r_{i,j} \mid e_k \text{ is incident to } v_i \text{ in } G_2, 1 \leq j \leq p\}$ and “ $(N(e_k))$ ” is the tie consisting of all residents in $N(e_k)$. The notation “ \dots ” means an arbitrary strict order of all agents missing in the list.

$$\begin{array}{ll} r_{i,j}: & (N(v_i)) \quad y_{i,j} \quad \dots \\ & h_k [0, p]: (N(e_k)) \quad \dots \\ & y_{i,j} [1, 1]: r_{i,j} \quad \dots \end{array}$$

Figure 8: Preference lists of residents and hospitals.

We will show that $\text{OPT}(I) = m_2 + p \cdot \text{IS}_2(G_2)$. To do so, we first see a useful property. Let $G_3 = (V_3, E_3)$ be the subdivision graph of G_2 , i.e., $V_3 = V_2 \cup E_2$ and $E_3 = \{(v, e) \mid v \in V_2, e \in E_2, e \text{ is incident to } v \text{ in } G_2\}$. Then, the family $\mathcal{I}_2(G_2)$ of 2-independent sets in G_2 is characterized as follows [19]:

$$\mathcal{I}_2(G_2) = \left\{ V_2 \setminus \bigcup_{e \in M} \{\text{endpoints of } e\} \mid \text{maximal matching } M \text{ in } G_3 \right\}.$$

In other words, for a maximal matching M of G_3 , if we remove all vertices matched in M from V_2 , then the remaining vertices form a 2-independent set of G_2 , and conversely, any 2-independent set of G_2 can be obtained in this manner for some maximal matching M of G_3 .

Let S be an optimal solution of G_2 in MAX-2-IS, i.e., a 2-independent set of size $\text{IS}_2(G_2)$. Let \tilde{M} be a maximal matching of G_3 corresponding to S . We construct a matching M of I as $M = M_1 \cup M_2$, where $M_1 = \{(r_{i,j}, h_k) \mid (v_i, e_k) \in \tilde{M}, 1 \leq j \leq p\}$ and $M_2 = \{(r_{i,j}, y_{i,j}) \mid v_i \in S, 1 \leq j \leq p\}$. It is not hard to see that each resident is matched by exactly one of M_1 and M_2 and no hospital exceeds its upper quota.

We then show the stability of M . Residents matched by M_1 is assigned to a first choice hospital, so if there were a blocking pair, then it is of the form $(r_{i,j}, h_k)$ where $M(r_{i,j}) = y_{i,j}$ and $h_k \in N(v_i)$. Then, v_i is unmatched in \tilde{M} . Additionally, all residents assigned to h_k (if any) are its first choice, hence h_k must be undersubscribed in M . Then, e_k is unmatched in \tilde{M} .

$h_k \in N(v_i)$ implies that there is an edge $(v_i, e_k) \in E_3$, so $\tilde{M} \cup \{(v_i, e_k)\}$ is a matching of G_3 , contradicting the maximality of \tilde{M} . Hence, M is stable in I .

A hospital in H has a lower quota 0, so it obtains the score of 1. The number of hospitals in Y that are assigned a resident is $|M_2| = p|S| = p \cdot \text{IS}_2(G_2)$. Hence, $s(M) = m_2 + p \cdot \text{IS}_2(G_2)$. Therefore we have that $\text{OPT}(I) \geq s(M) = m_2 + p \cdot \text{IS}_2(G_2)$.

Conversely, let M be an optimal solution for I , i.e., a stable matching of score $\text{OPT}(I)$. Note that each $r_{i,j}$ is assigned to a hospital in $N(v_i) \cup \{y_{i,j}\}$ as otherwise $(r_{i,j}, y_{i,j})$ blocks M . Similarly to the proof of Theorem 11, we construct a bipartite multi-graph $G_M = (V_2, E_2; F)$ where $V_2 = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n_2}\}$ and $E_2 = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{m_2}\}$ are identified with vertices and edges of G_2 , respectively, and an edge $(v_i, e_k)_j \in F$ if and only if $(r_{i,j}, h_k) \in M$. As before, a subscript j of edge $(v_i, e_k)_j$ is introduced to distinguish multiplicity of edge (v_i, e_k) . The degree of each vertex of G_M is at most p , so by König's edge coloring theorem [25], G_M is p -edge colorable and each color class c induces a matching M_c ($1 \leq c \leq p$) of G_M . By the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 11, we can show that each M_c is actually a maximal matching of G_3 . Let M_* be a minimum cardinality one among them.

Define a subset S of V_2 by removing vertices that are matched in M_* from V_2 . By the above observation, S is a 2-independent set of G_2 . We will bound its size. Note that $s(M) = \text{OPT}(I)$ and each hospital in H obtains the score of 1, so M assigns residents to $\text{OPT}(I) - m_2$ hospitals in Y and each such hospital receives one resident. There are pn_2 residents in total, among which $\text{OPT}(I) - m_2$ ones are assigned to hospitals in Y , so the remaining $pn_2 - (\text{OPT}(I) - m_2)$ ones are assigned to hospitals in H . Thus E_3 contains this number of edges and so $|M_*| \leq \frac{pn_2 - (\text{OPT}(I) - m_2)}{p} = n_2 - \frac{\text{OPT}(I) - m_2}{p}$. Since $|V_2| = n_2$ and exactly one endpoint of each edge in M_* belongs to V_2 , we have that $|S| = |V_2| - |M_*| \geq \frac{\text{OPT}(I) - m_2}{p}$. Therefore $\text{IS}_2(G_2) \geq |S| \geq \frac{\text{OPT}(I) - m_2}{p}$. Hence, we obtain $\text{OPT}(I) = m_2 + p \cdot \text{IS}_2(G_2)$ as desired. Now we let $p = m_2$, and have that $\text{OPT}(I) = m_2(1 + \text{IS}_2(G_2))$.

Since $n = |R| = n_2 m_2 \leq (m_2)^2$, distinguishing between $\text{OPT}(I) \leq n^\delta$ and $\text{OPT}(I) \geq n^{1/4-\delta}$ for some δ would distinguish between $\text{IS}_2(G_2) \leq (m_2)^{\epsilon_2}$ and $\text{IS}_2(G_2) \geq (m_2)^{1/2-\epsilon_2}$ for some constant $\epsilon_2 > 0$. A polynomial-time $n^{1/4-\epsilon}$ -approximation algorithm for HR-MSLQ can distinguish between the above two cases for a constant $\delta < \epsilon/2$. Hence, existence of such an algorithm implies $\text{P}=\text{NP}$. This completes the proof.

E.4 Proof of Theorem 14

We give a reduction from the minimum Pareto optimal matching problem (*MIN-POM*) [3] defined as follows. An instance of MIN-POM consists of a set $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$ of agents and a set $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\}$ of houses. Each agent has a strict and possibly incomplete preference list over houses, but houses have no preference. A matching M is an assignment of houses to agents such that each agent is assigned at most one house and each house is assigned to at most one agent. We write $M(s)$ the house assigned to s by M if any. An agent s *strictly prefers* a matching M to a matching M' if s prefers $M(s)$ to $M'(s)$ or s is assigned a house in M but not in M' . An agent s is *indifferent* between M and M' if $M(s) = M'(s)$ or s is unassigned in both M and M' . An agent s *weakly prefers* M to M' if s strictly prefers M to M' or is indifferent between them. A matching M *Pareto dominates* a matching M' if every agent weakly prefers and at least one agent strictly prefers M to M' . A matching M is *Pareto optimal* if there is no matching that dominates M . MIN-POM asks to find a Pareto optimal matching of minimum size. It is known that MIN-POM is NP-hard [3].

We now show the reduction. Let I be an instance of MIN-POM as above. We can assume without loss of generality that the number of agents and the number of houses are the same, as otherwise, we may add either dummy agents with empty preference list or dummy houses which

no agent includes in a preference list, without changing the set of Pareto optimal matchings. We let $|S| = |T| = n$. We will construct an instance I' of HR-MSLQ from I . The set of residents of I' is $R = A \cup B \cup C$, where $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$, $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}$, and $C = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$, and the set of hospitals is $H = X \cup Y \cup Z$, where $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$, and $Z = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n\}$. The set A of residents and the set X of hospitals correspond, respectively, to the set S of agents and the set T of houses of I . The upper and the lower quotas of each hospital is $[1, 2]$ and each hospital's preference list is a single tie including all residents, as stated in the theorem. We then show preference lists of residents. For each agent $s_i \in S$ of I , let $P(s_i)$ be her preference list and define $P'(a_i)$ as the list obtained from $P(s_i)$ by replacing the occurrence of each t_j by x_j . The preference lists of residents are shown in Fig. 9, where for a set D , the notation $[D]$ denotes an arbitrary strict order of the hospitals in D . For later use, some symbols are written in boldface.

$$\begin{array}{llll}
a_i: & \mathbf{P'(a_i)} & \mathbf{y_i} & [(X \setminus P'(a_i)) \cup (Y \setminus \{y_i\})] \quad [Z] \\
b_i: & \mathbf{x_i} & [Z] & [(X \cup Y) \setminus \{x_i\}] \\
c_i: & \mathbf{z_i} & [Z \setminus \{z_i\}] & [X \cup Y]
\end{array}$$

Figure 9: Preference lists of residents.

Here we briefly explain an idea behind the reduction. For the correctness, we give a relationship between optimal solutions of I and I' . To this aim, we show that there is an optimal solution of I' such that a resident b_i is assigned to a hospital x_i for each i and a resident c_i is assigned to a hospital z_i for each i . Then, each hospital in $X \cup Z$ obtains the score of 1. Note that each hospital in X has the remaining capacity of 1. Residents in A and hospitals in X simulates a matching between S and T of I , i.e., a matching between A and X is stable if and only if a matching between S and T is Pareto optimal. If this matching is small, then unmatched a_i can go to the hospital y_i , by which y_i obtains the score of 1. Hence, a Pareto optimal matching of I of smaller size gives us a stable matching of I' of higher score.

Now we proceed to a formal proof. Let $\text{OPT}(I)$ and $\text{OPT}(I')$ be the values of optimal solutions for I and I' , respectively. Our goal is to show $\text{OPT}(I) = 3n - \text{OPT}(I')$.

Let M be an optimal solution for I , i.e., a Pareto optimal matching of size $\text{OPT}(I)$. We define a matching M' of I' as $M' = \{(a_i, x_j) \mid (s_i, t_j) \in M\} \cup \{(a_i, y_i) \mid s_i \text{ is unmatched in } M\} \cup \{(b_i, x_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{(c_i, z_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. We show that M' is stable. Since residents in $B \cup C$ are assigned to the top choice hospital and each resident $a_i \in A$ is assigned to a hospital in $P'(a_i) \cup \{y_i\}$, if there were a blocking pair for M' , it is of the form (a_i, x_j) for some $x_j \in P'(a_i)$. Hence, s_i 's preference list includes t_j . As x_j 's preference list is a single tie of all residents, x_j must be unmatched in M' , which implies that t_j is unmatched in M . If $(a_i, y_i) \in M'$ then s_i is unmatched in M , so $M \cup \{(s_i, t_j)\}$ Pareto dominates M , a contradiction. If $(a_i, x_k) \in M'$ for some k , then $x_j \succ_{a_i} x_k$, so $(s_i, t_k) \in M$ and $t_j \succ_{s_i} t_k$. Thus $(M \setminus \{(s_i, t_k)\}) \cup \{(s_i, t_j)\}$ Pareto dominates M , a contradiction. The numbers of hospitals in X , Y , and Z that are assigned at least one resident are n , $n - \text{OPT}(I)$, and n , respectively, so $s(M') = 3n - \text{OPT}(I)$. Hence, we have that $\text{OPT}(I') \geq s(M') = 3n - \text{OPT}(I)$.

For the other direction, we first show that there exists an optimal solution for I' , i.e., a stable matching of score $\text{OPT}(I')$, that contains (b_i, x_i) and (c_i, z_i) for all i ($1 \leq i \leq n$). Let us call this property Π .

We begin with observing that in any stable matching, any resident is assigned to a hospital written in boldface in Fig. 9. Let M' be any stable matching for I' . First, observe that (i) $(a_i, z_j) \notin M'$ for any i and j . This is because there are at least $2n$ hospitals in $X \cup Y$ preferred to z_j by a_i , and their $4n$ positions cannot be fully occupied by only $3n$ residents. Next, we show

that (ii) $(b_i, h) \notin M'$ for any i and $h \in (X \cup Y) \setminus \{x_i\}$. The reason is similar to that for (i): If $(b_i, h) \in M'$, then all hospitals in Z must be full. But as shown above, no resident in A is assigned a hospital in Z , so these $2n$ positions must be occupied by residents in $B \cup C$. However, this is impossible by $2n - 1$ residents (note that b_i is assumed to be assigned to a hospital not in Z). The same argument as (ii) shows that (iii) $(c_i, h) \notin M'$ for any i and $h \in X \cup Y$. We then show that (iv) $(a_i, h) \notin M'$ for any i and $h \in (X \setminus P'(a_i)) \cup (Y \setminus \{y_i\})$. For contradiction, suppose that there are k such residents a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_k} . Then, to avoid blocking pairs, all hospitals y_{i_1}, \dots, y_{i_k} must be full, but by (ii) and (iii) above, no resident in $B \cup C$ can be assigned to a hospital in Y . It then results that these $2k$ positions are occupied by k agents a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_k} , a contradiction.

Now let M' be an optimal solution for I' . Of course M' satisfies (i)–(iv) above. We show that M' can be modified to satisfy the property Π without breaking the stability and decreasing the score.

- (1) (Re)assign every b_i to x_i and every c_i to z_i and let M'_1 be the resulting assignment. The followings are properties of M'_1 . Every resident is assigned to one hospital. By property (i), each hospital z_i is assigned one resident c_i . By properties (i) and (iv), each hospital y_i is assigned at most one resident a_i . A hospital x_i is assigned a resident b_i and at most two other residents of A who are assigned to it by M' . Hence, x_i is assigned at most three residents.
- (2) Let x_i be a hospital that is assigned three residents in M'_1 . Then, $M'_1(x_i) = \{a_j, a_k, b_i\}$ for some j and k . We choose either one agent of A from $M'_1(x_i)$, say a_j , and delete (a_j, x_i) from M'_1 . We do this for all such hospitals x_i and let M'_2 be the resulting assignment. Note that M'_2 satisfies all upper quotas and hence is a matching. Note also that any hospital in X that is full in M' is also full in M'_2 .
- (3) Let $A_2 \subseteq A$ be the set of residents who is unmatched in M'_2 . Order residents in A_2 arbitrarily, and apply the serial dictatorship algorithm in this order, i.e., in a resident a_i 's turn, assign a_i to the most preferred hospital that is undersubscribed. Note that in this process a_i is assigned to a hospital in $P'(a_i) \cup \{y_i\}$ because y_i is unassigned in M'_2 . Let M'_3 be the resulting matching.

It is not hard to see that M'_3 satisfies the property Π . Note that any hospital in $X \cup Z$ is assigned at least one resident in M'_3 . Additionally, by the properties (i)–(iv), if a hospital y_i is assigned a resident in M' then she is a_i , and by the modifications (1)–(3), the pair (a_i, y_i) is still in M'_3 . Hence, we have that $c(M'_3) \geq c(M')$. It remains to show the stability of M'_3 . Residents in $B \cup C$ are assigned to the first choice hospital, so they do not participate in a blocking pair. Consider a resident a in A . If $M'_3(a) = M'(a)$ then a cannot form a blocking pair because M' is stable and any hospital $h \in X$ that is full in M' is also full in M'_3 . If $M'_3(a) \neq M'(a)$, then a is reassigned at the modification (3). By the assignment rule of (3), any hospital preferred to $M'_3(a)$ by a is full. Therefore a cannot form a blocking pair. Thus we have shown that M'_3 is an optimal solution that satisfies property Π .

We construct a matching M of I from M'_3 as $M := \{(s_i, t_j) \mid (a_i, x_j) \in M'_3\}$. M is actually a matching because in $(b_j, x_j) \in M'_3$ for each j so x_j can be assigned at most one resident from A . As noted above, all hospitals in $X \cup Z$ are assigned in M'_3 , yielding a score of $2n$. Hence, we can write $\text{OPT}(I') = 2n + \alpha$ for some nonnegative integer α . Note that α is the number of hospitals in Y that are assigned at least one resident in M'_3 , and equivalently, the number of residents in A assigned to a hospital in Y . Since each resident in A is assigned to a hospital $x_j \in X$ for some j or a hospital $y_i \in Y$, we have that $|M| = n - \alpha = 3n - \text{OPT}(I')$.

We can see that M is *maximal* since if $M \cup \{(s_p, t_q)\}$ is a matching of I , then $M'_3(a_p) = y_p$ and x_q is undersubscribed in M'_3 , so (a_p, x_q) blocks M'_3 , contradicting the stability of M'_3 . We can see that M is *trade-in-free*, i.e., there is no pair of an agent s_p and a house t_q such that t_q is unmatched in M , s_p is matched in M , and s_p prefers t_q to $M(s_p)$. This is because if such a pair exists, then x_q is undersubscribed in M'_3 and a_p prefers x_q to $M'_3(a_p)$, contradicting the stability of M'_3 . A *coalition* of M is defined as a set of agents $C = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}\}$ for some $k \geq 2$ such that each a_i prefers $M(a_{i+1})$ to $M(a_i)$, where $i+1$ is taken modulo k . *Satisfying* a coalition C means updating M as $M := (M \setminus \{(a_i, M(a_i)) \mid 0 \leq i \leq k-1\}) \cup \{(a_i, M(a_{i+1})) \mid 0 \leq i \leq k-1\}$. Note that satisfying a coalition maintains the matching size, maximality, and trade-in-freeness. As long as there is a coalition, we satisfy it. This sequence of satisfying operations eventually terminates because at each operation at least two residents will be strictly improved (and none will be worse off). Then, the resulting matching M is maximal, trade-in-free, and coalition-free. It is known (Proposition 2 of [3]) that a matching is Pareto optimal if and only if it is maximal, trade-in-free, and coalition-free. Hence, M is Pareto optimal and $|M| = 3n - \text{OPT}(I')$. Thus $\text{OPT}(I) \leq |M| = 3n - \text{OPT}(I')$.

We have shown that $\text{OPT}(I) = 3n - \text{OPT}(I')$, which means that computing $\text{OPT}(I')$ in polynomial time implies computing $\text{OPT}(I)$ in polynomial time.

E.5 Proof of Theorem 13

We give a reduction from a decision problem COM-SMTI-2ML. An instance of this problem consists of the same number n of men and women. There are two master lists, both of which may contain ties; one is a master list of men that includes all women, and the other is a master list of women that includes all men. Each man's preference list is derived from the master list of men by deleting some women (and keeping the relative order of the remaining women), and each woman's preference list is derived similarly from the master list of women. (However, in the following argument, we do not use the fact that there is a master list of men.) If w is included in m 's preference list, we say that w is *acceptable* to m . Without loss of generality, we assume that acceptability is mutual, i.e., m is acceptable to w if and only if w is acceptable to m . The problem COM-SMTI-2ML asks if there exists a weakly stable matching of size n . It is known that COM-SMTI-2ML is NP-complete even if ties appear in preference lists of one side only (Theorem 3.1 of [22]).

Let I be an instance of COM-SMTI-2ML consisting of n men m_1, \dots, m_n and n women w_1, \dots, w_n . We will construct an instance I' of HR-MSLQ as follows. The set of residents is $R = \{r_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and the set of hospitals is $H = \{h_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n+1\}$. Hospitals h_i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) has quotas $[1, 1]$ and the hospital h_{n+1} has quotas $[0, 1]$. A preference list of each hospital is derived from the master list of women in I by replacing a man m_i with a resident r_i for each i . Let $P(m_i)$ be a (possibly incomplete) preference list of m_i in I . We construct $P'(r_i)$ from $P(m_i)$ by replacing each woman w_j with a hospital h_j . Then, the preference list of r_i is defined as

$$r_i: P'(r_i) \ h_{n+1} \ \dots$$

where " \dots " means an arbitrary strict order of all hospitals missing in the list. Now the reduction is completed. Note that if preference lists of men (resp. women) of I do not contain ties, the preference lists of residents (resp. hospitals) of I' do not contain ties.

For the correctness, we show that I is a yes-instance if and only if I' admits a stable matching of score $n+1$. If I is a yes-instance, there exists a perfect stable matching M of I . We construct a matching M' of I' in such a way that $(r_i, h_j) \in M'$ if and only if $(m_i, w_j) \in M$. It is easy to see that the score of M' is $n+1$. We show that M' is stable. Suppose not and let (r_i, h_j)

be a blocking pair for M' . Note that $j \neq n + 1$ because each resident is assigned to a better hospital than h_{n+1} . Then, we have that $h_j \succ_{r_i} M'(r_i)$ and $r_i \succ_{h_j} M'(h_j)$. By construction of M' , $M'(r_i)$ is in $P'(r_i)$ and hence h_j is also in $P'(r_i)$, meaning that w_j is acceptable to m_i . The fact $h_j \succ_{r_i} M'(r_i)$ in I' implies $w_j \succ_{m_i} M(m_i)$ in I . Since m_i is acceptable to w_j , the fact $r_i \succ_{h_j} M'(h_j)$ in I' implies $m_i \succ_{w_j} M(w_j)$ in I . Thus (m_i, w_j) blocks M in I , a contradiction.

Conversely, suppose that there is a stable matching M' of I' such that $s(M') = n + 1$. Since $s(M') = n + 1$, M' forms a perfect matching between R and $H \setminus \{h_{n+1}\}$. If r_i is assigned to a hospital in the “ \dots ” part, then r_i and h_{n+1} form a blocking pair for M' , a contradiction. Hence, each r_i is assigned to a hospital in $P'(r_i)$. Then, $M = \{(m_i, w_j) \mid (r_i, h_j) \in M'\}$ is a perfect matching of I . It is not hard to see that M is stable in I because if (m_i, w_j) blocks M then (r_i, h_j) blocks M' .