

On (Coalitional) Exchange-Stable Matching

Jiehua Chen, Adrian Chmurovic, Fabian Jogl, and Manuel Sorge
TU Wien, Austria
{jiehua.chen, manuel.sorge}@tuwien.ac.at

Abstract

We study (*coalitional*) *exchange stability*, which Alcalde [Review of Economic Design, 1995] introduced as an alternative solution concept for matching markets involving property rights, such as assigning persons to two-bed rooms. Here, a matching of a given STABLE MARRIAGE or STABLE ROOMMATES instance is called *coalitional exchange-stable* if it does not admit any *exchange-blocking coalition*, that is, a subset S of agents in which everyone prefers the partner of some other agent in S . The matching is *exchange-stable* if it does not admit any *exchange-blocking pair*, that is, an exchange-blocking coalition of size two.

We investigate the computational and parameterized complexity of the COALITIONAL EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE (resp. COALITIONAL EXCHANGE ROOMMATES) problem, which is to decide whether a STABLE MARRIAGE (resp. STABLE ROOMMATES) instance admits a coalitional exchange-stable matching. Our findings resolve an open question and confirm the conjecture of Cechlárová and Manlove [Discrete Applied Mathematics, 2005] that COALITIONAL EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE is NP-hard even for complete preferences without ties. We also study bounded-length preference lists and a local-search variant of deciding whether a given matching can reach an exchange-stable one after at most k *swaps*, where a swap is defined as exchanging the partners of the two agents in an exchange-blocking pair.

1 Introduction

An instance in a matching market consists of a set of agents that each have preferences over other agents with whom they want to be matched with. The goal is to find a matching, i.e., a subset of disjoint pairs of agents, which is *fair*. A classical notion of fairness is *stability* [13], meaning that no two agents can form a *blocking pair*, i.e., they would prefer to be matched with each other rather than with the partner assigned by the matching. This means that a matching is fair if the agents cannot take local action to improve their outcome. If we assign property rights via the matching, however, then the notion of blocking pairs may not be actionable, as Alcalde [3] observed: For example, if the matching represents an assignment of persons to two-bed rooms, then two persons in a blocking pair may not be able to deviate from the assignment because they may not find a new room that they could share. Instead, we may consider the matching to be *fair* if no two agents form an *exchange-blocking pair*, that is, they would prefer to have each other's partner rather than to have the partner given by the matching [3]. In other words, they would like to *exchange* their partners. Note that such an exchange would be straightforward in the room-assignment problem mentioned before. We refer to Alcalde [3], Cechlárová [9], and Cechlárová and Manlove [10] for more discussion and examples of markets involving property rights.

If a matching does not admit an exchange-blocking pair, then we say the matching is *exchange-stable*. If we also want to exclude the possibility that several agents may collude to favorably exchange partners, then we arrive at *coalitional exchange-stability* [3], a concept that is more stringent than the exchange-stability. In contrast to classical stability and exchange-stability for perfect matchings (i.e., everyone is matched), it is not hard to observe that coalitional exchange-stability implies *Pareto-optimality*, another fairness concept

which asserts that no other matching can make at least one agent better-off without making some other agent worse-off (see also Abraham and Manlove [2]). Note that, in contrast, the classical Gale/Shapley stability and Pareto-optimality are incompatible to each other.

Cechlárová and Manlove [10] showed that the problem of deciding whether an exchange-stable matching exists is NP-hard, even for the marriage case (where the agents are partitioned into two subsets of equal size such that each agent of either subset has preferences over the agents of the other subset) with complete preferences but without ties. They left open whether the NP-hardness transfers to the case with coalitional exchange-stability, but observed NP-containment.

Our contributions. We study the algorithmic complexity of problems revolving around (coalitional) exchange-stability. In particular, we establish a first NP-hardness result for deciding coalitional exchange-stability, confirming a conjecture of Cechlárová and Manlove [10]. The NP-hardness reduction is based on a novel *switch-gadget* wherein each preference list contains at most three agents. Utilizing this, we can carefully complete the preferences so as to prove the desired NP-hardness. We then investigate the impact of the maximum length d of a preference list. We find that NP-hardness for both exchange-stability and coalitional exchange-stability starts already when $d = 3$, while it is fairly easy to see that the problem becomes polynomial-time solvable for $d = 2$. For $d = 3$, we obtain a fixed-parameter algorithm for exchange-stability regarding a parameter which is related to the number of switch-gadgets.

Finally, we look at a problem variant, called PATH TO EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE, for uncoordinated (or decentralized) matching markets. Starting from an initial matching, in each iteration, the two agents in an exchange-blocking pair may exchange their partners. An interesting question regarding the behavior of the agents in uncoordinated markets is whether such iterative exchange actions can reach a stable state, i.e., exchange-stability, and how hard is it to decide. It is fairly straight-forward to verify that if the number k of exchanges is bounded by a constant, then we can decide in polynomial-time whether an exchange-stable matching is reachable since there are only polynomially many possible sequences of exchanges to be checked. From the parameterized complexity point of view, this leads to an XP algorithm for k , that is, the exponent in the polynomial running time depends on k . We show that this dependency is unlikely to be removed by showing $W[1]$ -hardness with respect to k .

Related work. Alcalde [3] introduced (coalitional) exchange stability and discussed restricted preference domains where (coalitional) exchange stability is guaranteed to exist. Abizada [1] showed a weaker condition (on the preference domain) to guarantee the existence of exchange stability. Cechlárová and Manlove [10] proved that it is NP-complete to decide whether an exchange-stable matching exists, even for the marriage case with complete preferences without ties. Aziz and Goldwasser [4] introduced several relaxed notions of coalitional exchange-stability and discussed their relations.

The PATH TO EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE (P-ESM) problem is inspired by the PATH-TO-STABILITY VIA DIVORCES (PSD) problem as originally introduced by Knuth [17], see also Biró and Norman [5] for more background. Very recently, Chen [11] showed that PSD is NP-hard and $W[1]$ -hard when parameterized by the number of divorces. P-ESM can also be considered a local search problem and is a special case of the LOCAL SEARCH EXCHANGE-STABLE SEAT ARRANGEMENT (LOCAL-STA) problem as introduced by Bodlaender et al. [6]: Given a set of agents, each having cardinal preferences (i.e., real values) over the other agents, an undirected graph G with the same number of vertices as agents, and an initial assignment (bijection) of the agents to the vertices in the graph, is it possible to swap two agents' assignments iteratively so as to reach an exchange-stable assignment?

Herein an assignment is called *exchange-stable* if no two agents can each have a higher sum of cardinal preferences over the other’s neighboring agents. If the given graph solely consists of disjoint edges, then PATH TO EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE is equivalent to LOCAL-STA. Bodlaender et al. [7] showed that their problem is W[1]-hard when parameterized by the number k of swaps. Their reduction relies on the fact that the given graph contains cliques and stars and the preferences of the agents may contain ties. We strengthen their result by showing that LOCAL-STA is W[1]-hard even if the given graph consists of disjoint edges and the preferences do not have ties.

Finally, we mention that Irving [16] and McDermid et al. [18] studied the complexity of computing stable matchings in the marriage setting with preference lists, requiring additionally that the matching be man-exchange stable, that is, no two men form an exchange-blocking pair. The resulting problem is NP-hard, even if the men’s preference lists are of length at most c for each $c \geq 4$ [18], but it becomes polynomial-time solvable when the men’s preference lists have length at most three [16]. This contrasts with COALITIONAL EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE which, as we show, remains NP-hard even when all preference lists have length at most three.

Organization. In Section 2, we introduce relevant concepts and notation, and define our central problems. In Section 3, we investigate the complexity of deciding (coalitional) exchange-stability, both when the preferences are complete and when the preferences length are bounded. In Section 4, we provide algorithms for profiles with preference length bounded by three. In Section 5, we turn to the local search variant of reaching exchange-stability. Due to space constraints, results marked by \star are deferred to a full version.

2 Basic Definitions and Observations

For each natural number t , we denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ by $[t]$.

Let $V = \{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$ be a set of $2n$ agents. Each agent $i \in V$ has a nonempty subset of agents $V_i \subseteq V$ which it finds *acceptable* as a partner and has a *strict preference list* \succ_i on V_i (i.e., a linear order on V_i). The *length* of preference list \succ_i is defined as the number of acceptable agents of i , i.e., $|V_i|$. Here, $x \succ_i y$ means that i *prefers* x to y .

We assume that the acceptability relation among the agents is *symmetric*, i.e., for each two agents x and y it holds that x is acceptable to y if and only if y is acceptable to x . For two agents x and y , we call x *most acceptable* to y if x is a maximal element in the preference list of y . For notational convenience, we write $X \succ Y$ to indicate that for each pair of agents $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ it holds that $x \succ y$.

A *preference profile* \mathcal{P} is a tuple $(V, (\succ_i)_{i \in V})$ consisting of an agent set V and a collection $(\succ_i)_{i \in V}$ of preference lists for all agents $i \in V$. For a graph G , by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ we refer to its vertex set and edge set, respectively. Given a vertex $v \in V(G)$, by $N_G(v)$ and $d_G(v)$ we refer to the neighborhood of v and degree of v in G , respectively. To a preference profile \mathcal{P} with agent set V we assign an *acceptability graph* $G(\mathcal{P})$ which has V as its vertex set and two agents are connected by an edge if they find each other acceptable. A preference profile \mathcal{P} may have the following properties:

- It is *bipartite*, if the agent set V can be partitioned into two agent sets U and W of size n each, such that each agent from one set has a preference list over a subset of the agents from the other set.
- It has *complete* preferences if the underlying acceptability graph $G(\mathcal{P})$ is a complete graph or a complete bipartite graph on two disjoint sets of vertices of equal size; otherwise it has *incomplete* preferences.

We say that \mathcal{P} has *bounded length* d if each preference list in \mathcal{P} has length at most d .

(Coalitional) exchange-stable matchings. A *matching* M for a given profile \mathcal{P} is a subset of disjoint edges from the underlying acceptability graph $G(\mathcal{P})$. Given a matching M for \mathcal{P} , and two agents x and y , if it holds that $\{x, y\} \in M$, then we use $M(x)$ (resp. $M(y)$) to refer to y (resp. x), and we say that x and y are their respective assigned *partners* under M and that they are *matched* to each other; otherwise we say that $\{x, y\}$ is an *unmatched pair* under M . If an agent x is *not* assigned any partner by M , then we say that x is *unmatched by* M and we put $M(x) = x$. We assume that each agent x prefers to be matched than remaining unmatched. To formalize this, we will always say that x prefers all acceptable agents from V_x to himself x .

A matching M is *perfect* if every agent is assigned a partner. It is *maximal* if for each unmatched pair $\{x, y\} \in E(G(\mathcal{P})) \setminus M$ it holds that x or y is matched under M . For two agents x, u , we say that x *envies* y under M if x prefers the partner of y , i.e., $M(y)$, to his partner $M(x)$. We omit the “under M ” if it is clear from the context.

We say that matching M admits an *exchange-blocking coalition* (in short *ebc*) if there exists a sequence $\rho = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{r-1})$ of r agents, $r \geq 2$, such that each agent x_i envies her successor x_{i+1} in ρ (index $i + 1$ taken modulo r). The *size* of an ebc is defined as the number of agents in the sequence. An *exchange-blocking pair* (in short *ebp*) is an ebc of size two. We say that a matching M of \mathcal{P} is *exchange-stable* (resp. *coalitional exchange-stable*) if it does not admit any ebp (resp. ebc.) Note that an coalitional exchange-stable matching is exchange-stable.

For an illustration, let us consider the following example.

Example 1. The following bipartite preference profile \mathcal{P} with agent sets $U = \{x, y, z\}$ and $W = \{a, b, c\}$ admits 2 (coalitional) exchange-stable matchings M_1 and M_2 with $M_1 = \{\{x, c\}, \{y, b\}, \{z, a\}\}$ (marked in red boxes) and $M_2 = \{\{x, b\}, \{y, c\}, \{z, a\}\}$ (marked in blue boxes). Matching M_3 with $M_3 = \{\{x, c\}, \{y, a\}, \{z, b\}\}$ is not exchange-stable and hence not coalitional exchange-stable since for instance (y, z) is an exchange-blocking pair of M_3 .

$$\begin{aligned} x: & a \succ \boxed{b} \succ \boxed{c}, & a: & y \succ x \succ \boxed{z}, \\ y: & \boxed{b} \succ a \succ \boxed{c}, & b: & \boxed{x} \succ \boxed{y} \succ z, \\ z: & \boxed{a} \succ c \succ b, & c: & \boxed{x} \succ \boxed{y} \succ z. \end{aligned}$$

As already observed by Cechlárová and Manlove [10], exchange-stable (and hence coalitional exchange-stable) matchings may not exist, even for bipartite profiles with complete preferences.

Example 2. The following bipartite preference profile \mathcal{P} with agent sets $U = \{x, y, z\}$ and $W = \{a, b, c\}$ admits one exchange-stable matching M with $M = \{\{x, b\}, \{y, c\}, \{z, a\}\}$. However, it is not coalitional exchange-stable as for instance (x, y, z) is an ebc.

$$\begin{aligned} x: & a \succ b \succ c, & a: & y \succ z \succ x, \\ y: & b \succ c \succ a, & b: & z \succ x \succ y, \\ z: & c \succ a \succ b, & c: & x \succ y \succ z. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, if a matching M is coalitional exchange-stable, then it is maximal.

Lemma 1. Every exchange-stable matching is maximal.

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a preference profile and M be an exchange-stable matching of \mathcal{P} .

Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that there exists an unmatched pair $\{x, y\} \in E(G(\mathcal{P})) \setminus M$ with $M(x) = x$ and $M(y) = y$. Since x and y are acceptable to each other, by our assumption that each agent prefers to be matched than remaining unmatched, we obtain that x prefers y to $M(x)$, and y prefers x to $M(y)$. In other words, (x, y) is an exchange-blocking pair of M , a contradiction. \square

Moreover, ebc can only happen on cycles.

Lemma 2. Let \mathcal{P} be a preference profile and let M be a maximal matching of \mathcal{P} . Then, for each ebc ρ of M with $\rho = (x_0, \dots, x_{r-1})$ it holds that $\{x_0, M(x_0), \dots, x_{r-1}, M(x_{r-1})\}$ forms a (not necessarily induced) cycle in $G(\mathcal{P})$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{P}, M, ρ be as defined in the statement with $\rho = (x_0, \dots, x_{r-1})$. By definition each agent x_i , $0 \leq i \leq r-1$, envies his successor x_{i+1} in ρ ($i+1$ taken modulo r). In other words, $\{x_i, M(x_{i+1})\} \in E(G(\mathcal{P}))$ holds for each $i \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$. Since M is maximal, for each $x_i \in \rho$ it must also hold that agent x_i or agent $M(x_{i+1})$ must be matched, i.e., $x_i \neq M(x_i)$ or $x_{i+1} \neq M(x_{i+1})$.

Define the following pieces for all $i \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$: $(s_i) := (M(x_i), x_i)$ if $\{x_i, M(x_i)\} \in M$; $(s_i) = (x_i)$ otherwise. Then, it is straightforward to verify that $(s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{r-1}, M(x_0))$ is a cycle in $G(\mathcal{P})$. \square

Central problem definitions. We are interested in the computational complexity of deciding whether a given profile admits a coalitional exchange-stable matching.

COALITIONAL EXCHANGE-STABLE ROOMMATES (CESR)

Input: A preference profile \mathcal{P} .

Question: Does \mathcal{P} admit a coalitional exchange-stable matching?

The bipartite restriction of CESR, called COALITIONAL EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE (CESM), has as input a *bipartite* preference profile. EXCHANGE-STABLE ROOMMATES (ESR) and EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE (ESM) are defined analogously.

We are also interested in the case when the preferences have bounded length. In this case, not every coalitional exchange-stable (or exchange-stable) matching is perfect. In keeping with the literature [9, 10], we focus on the perfect case.

d -COALITIONAL EXCHANGE-STABLE ROOMMATES (d -CESR)

Input: A preference profile \mathcal{P} with preferences of bounded length d .

Question: Does \mathcal{P} admit a coalitional exchange-stable and *perfect* matching?

We analogously define the bipartite restriction d -COALITIONAL EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE (d -CESM), d -EXCHANGE-STABLE ROOMMATES (d -ESR), and d -EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE (d -ESM). Note that the above problems are contained in NP [10].

Finally, we investigate a local search variant regarding exchange-stability. To this end, given two matchings M and N of the same profile \mathcal{P} , we say that M is *one-swap reachable* from N if there exists an exchange-blocking pair (x, y) of N such that $M = (N \setminus \{\{x, N(x)\}, \{y, N(y)\}\}) \cup \{\{x, y\}, \{N(x), N(y)\}\}$. Accordingly, we say that M is *k -swaps reachable* from N if there exists a sequence $(M_0, M_1, \dots, M_{k'})$ of k' matchings of profile \mathcal{P} such that (a) $k' \leq k$, $M_0 = N$, $M_{k'} = M$, and (b) for each $i \in [k']$, M_i is one-swap reachable from M_{i-1} .

For an illustration, let us consider Example 1 again.

Example 3. Consider matching M_3 from Example 1, which admits two ebps (x, z) and (y, z) . If we let y and z exchange their partners, then we reach M_1 , which is (coalitional) exchange-stable. If we let x and z exchange their partners, however, then we reach matching $M_4 = \{\{x, b\}, \{y, a\}, \{z, c\}\}$, which will never reach an exchange-stable matching due to the following: (x, y) is a unique exchange-blocking pair of M_4 . If we let x and y exchange partners under M_4 , then we obtain matching M_5 with $M_5 = \{\{x, a\}, \{y, b\}, \{z, c\}\}$, and it admits a unique exchange-blocking pair (a, b) . If we let a and b exchange partners under M_5 , then we obtain matching M_4 , again.

The local search problem variant that we are interested in is defined as follows:

PATH TO EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE (P-ESM)

Input: A bipartite preference profile \mathcal{P} , a matching M_0 of \mathcal{P} , and an integer k .

Question: Does \mathcal{P} admit an exchange-stable matching M which is k -swap reachable from M_0 ?

3 Deciding (Coalitional) Exchange-Stability is NP-complete

Cechlárová and Manlove [10] proved NP-completeness for deciding whether a profile with complete and strict preferences admits an exchange-stable matching, by reducing from the NP-complete R-3SAT problem, where each clause has at most three literals and each literal appears at most two times [14]. It is, however, not immediate how to adapt Cechlárová and Manlove's proof to show hardness for coalitional exchange-stability since their constructed exchange-stable matching is not always coalitional exchange-stable. To obtain a hardness reduction for coalitional exchange-stable, we first study the case when the preferences have length bounded by three, and show that 3-COALITIONAL EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE is NP-hard, even for strict preferences. The idea is different than that by Cechlárová and Manlove. To simplify the reduction, we will reduce from an NP-complete variant of R-3SAT.

(2,2)-3SAT

Input: A Boolean formula $\phi(X)$ with variable set X in 3CNF, i.e., a set of clauses each containing at most 3 literals, such that no clause contains both the positive and the negated literal of the same variable and each literal appears *exactly* two times.

Question: Is ϕ satisfiable?

Lemma 3. (2,2)-3SAT is NP-complete.

Proof. Clearly, the problem belongs to NP. We provide a reduction from the NP-complete R-3SAT, where each clause has either at most three literals and each literal appears at most two times [14].

First, we assume that no variable appears only negatively or only positively: if this were the case for some variable, then we could set it to true or false and simplify the formula. Second, we assume that no clause contains both the positive and negated literal of the same variable more as otherwise it is always satisfiable and we can delete it from the formula.

Now, for each literal lit_i (either x_i or \bar{x}_i) which appears only once, add two new variables a_i and b_i , and four new clauses $(\text{lit}_i, a_i, \bar{b}_i)$, (a_i, \bar{b}_i) , (\bar{a}_i, b_i) , and (\bar{a}_i, b_i) .

It is straight-forward to see that in the constructed instance no clause contains the positive and negated literal of the same variable and each literal appears exactly two times. Moreover, the original instance is a yes-instance if and only if the newly constructed instance is a yes-instance for (2,2)-3SAT since the newly added variables only affect the newly added clauses which can be satisfied by setting all newly added variables to true. \square

A crucial ingredient for our reduction is the following *switch-gadget* which enforces that each exchange-stable matching results in a valid truth assignment. The gadget and its properties are summarized in the following lemma.

Lemma 4 (\star). Let \mathcal{P} be a bipartite preference profile on agent sets U and W . Let $A = \{a^z \mid z \in \{0, 1, \dots, 6\}\}$ and $B = \{b^z \mid z \in \{0, 1, \dots, 6\}\}$ be two disjoint sets of agents, and let $Q = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\}$ be four further distinct agents with $A \cup \{\alpha, \gamma\} \subseteq U$ and $B \cup \{\beta, \delta\} \subseteq W$. The preferences of the agents from A and B are as follows; the preferences of the other





Figure 1: The three possible exchange-stable matchings discussed in Lemma 4.

agents are arbitrary but fixed.



Define the following matchings:

$$N^1 := \{\{\alpha, b^0\}, \{a^6, \delta\}\} \cup \{\{a^{z-1}, b^z\} \mid z \in [6]\},$$

$$N^2 := \{\{a^0, \beta\}, \{\gamma, b^6\}\} \cup \{\{a^z, b^{z-1}\} \mid z \in [6]\},$$

$$N^D := \{\{\alpha, b^0\}, \{a^0, \beta\}, \{a^6, \delta\}, \{\gamma, b^6\}, \{a^1, b^2\}, \{a^2, b^1\}, \{a^3, b^3\}, \{a^4, b^5\}, \{a^5, b^4\}\}.$$

See Figure 1 for an illustration of the gadget and the matchings above. Then, every perfect matching M of \mathcal{P} satisfies the following.

- (1) If M is exchange-stable, then (i) either $N^1 \subseteq M$, or (ii) $N^2 \subseteq M$, or (iii) $N^D \subseteq M$.
- (2) If $N^1 \subseteq M$, then every ebc of M which involves an agent from A (resp. B) also involves α (resp. δ).
- (3) If $N^2 \subseteq M$, then every ebc of M which involves an agent from A (resp. B) also involves γ (resp. β).
- (4) If $N^D \subseteq M$, then every ebc of M which involves an agent from A (resp. B) also involves an agent from $\{\alpha, \gamma\}$ (resp. $\{\beta, \delta\}$).

Proof. For statement (1), since M is perfect, every agent is matched. In particular, $M(a^3) \in \{b^2, b^3, b^4\}$. We show that if M is exchange-stable, then the partner $M(a^3)$ decides which of the three cases in the first statement holds.

If $M(a^3) = b^2$, then $M(a^2) \neq b^3$ as otherwise (b^2, b^3) is an exchange-blocking pair. Hence, $M(a^2) = b^1$ and $M(b^3) = a^4$ since b^2 , a^2 , and a^3 are already matched to other agents. By the acceptability relations, $M(a^1) = b^0$, $M(a^0) = \beta$, $M(b^4) = a^5$, $M(b^5) = a^6$, and $M(b^6) = \gamma$. This implies that M satisfies the condition given in case (1ii).

If $M(a^3) = b^3$, then $M(a^2) \neq b^2$ and $M(a^4) \neq b^4$ as otherwise (a^2, a^3) or (b^3, b^4) is an exchange-blocking pair. Hence, $M(a^2) = b^1$ and $M(a^4) = b^5$ since b^3 is already matched to a^3 . By the acceptability relations, $M(b^2) = a^1$, $M(b^4) = a^5$, $M(a^0) = \beta$, $M(a^6) = \delta$, $M(b^0) = \alpha$, $M(b^6) = \gamma$. This implies that M satisfies the condition given in case (1iii).

If $M(a^3) = b^4$, then $M(a^4) \neq b^3$ as otherwise (a^3, a^4) is an exchange-blocking pair. Hence, $M(a^4) = b^5$ and $M(b^3) = a^2$ since b^5 and a^2 are the only agents available to a^4 and b^3 , respectively. By the acceptability relations, $M(a^5) = b^6$, $M(a^6) = \delta$, $M(b^2) = a^1$, $M(b^1) = a^0$, and $M(b^0) = \alpha$. This implies M satisfies the condition given in case (1i). Together, this completes the proof for Statement (1).

To show Statements (2)–(4), we show their contra-positives, by means of a straightforward verification. For Statement (2), assume that $N^1 \subseteq M$ and let ρ denote an arbitrary ebc of M which does not involve α .

We aim to show that ρ does not involve any agent from A . Suppose, for the sake contradiction, that ρ involves an agent x with $x \in A$.

Certainly, ρ cannot involve any agent from $S = \{a^0, a^2, a^5\}$ since each of the agents from S already receives his most-preferred agent. Moreover, $x \neq a^1$ since a^1 only envies the partner of b^0 , which is α and $\alpha \notin \rho$. Consequently, $x \neq a^3$, because a^3 envies only $a^1, a^2 \in S \cup \{a^1\}$. Thus, $x \neq a^4$ because a^4 envies only a^3 and a^2 . Finally, $x \neq a^6$ because a^6 envies only a^4 , a contradiction.

Analogously, assume that $N^1 \subseteq M$ and let ρ denote an arbitrary ebc of M which does not involve δ . Certainly, ρ cannot involve any agent from $S = \{b^1, b^4, b^6\}$ since each of the agents from S already receives his most-preferred agent. Moreover, $x \neq b^5$ since b^5 only envies the partner of a^6 , which is δ , but $\delta \notin \rho$. Consequently, $x \neq b^3$. It follows that, $x \neq b^2$, because b^2 envies only b^3 and b^4 . Finally, $x \neq b^0$, because b^0 envies only b^2 , a contradiction. This completes the proof for Statement (2).

For Statement (3), assume that $N^2 \subseteq M$ and let ρ denote an arbitrary ebc of M which does not involve γ . Suppose, for the sake contradiction, that ρ involves an agent x with $x \in A$. Certainly, $x \notin \{a^1, a^3, a^6\}$ since each of these agents is matched with his most preferred partner. Moreover, $x \neq a^5$ since $\gamma \notin \rho$. Consequently, $x \notin \{a^4, a^2, a^0\}$ by an analogous reasoning, a contradiction.

Analogously, assume that $N^2 \subseteq M$ and let ρ denote an arbitrary ebc of M which does not involve β . Suppose, for the sake contradiction, that ρ involves an agent x with $x \in B$. Certainly, $x \notin \{b^0, b^3, b^5\}$ since each of these agents is matched with his most preferred partner. Moreover, $x \neq b^1$ since $\beta \notin \rho$. Consequently, $x \notin \{b^2, b^4, b^6\}$ by an analogous reasoning, a contradiction. This completes the proof for Statement (3).

For Statement (4), assume that $N^D \subseteq M$ and let ρ denote an arbitrary ebc of M which involves neither α nor γ . Suppose, for the sake contradiction, that ρ involves an agent x with $x \in A$. Certainly, $x \notin \{a^1, a^5\}$ since a^1 only envies α and a^5 only envies γ , but neither α nor γ is included in ρ . Consequently, $x \neq a^3$ since a^3 only envies a^1 . Using a similar reasoning, we infer that $x \notin \{a^2, a^4, a^6, a^0\}$. Altogether, no agent from A is involved in ρ .

Analogously, assume that $N^D \subseteq M$ and let ρ denote an arbitrary ebc of M which involves neither β nor δ . Certainly, $x \notin \{b^1, b^5\}$ since b^1 only envies β and b^5 only envies δ . Consequently, $x \neq b^3$ since b^3 only envies b^5 . Using a similar reasoning, we infer that $x \notin \{b^2, b^4, b^6, b^0\}$. Altogether, no agent from B is involved in ρ . This completes the proof for Statement (4). \square

Using Lemma 4, we are able to show NP-completeness for bounded preference length.

Theorem 1. 3-CESM, 3-ESM, 3-CESR, and 3-ESR are NP-complete.

Proof. As already mentioned by Cechlárová and Manlove [10], coalitional exchange-stable and thus, all problems are in NP. For the sake of completeness, we show the NP-containment here. Given a preference profile \mathcal{P} and a matching M , we can check in polynomial time whether M is coalitional exchange-stable for \mathcal{P} as follows. Compute an auxiliary directed graph H that has the agent set V as vertices and an arc (u, v) if agent u envies v under M . Observe that M admits an exchange-blocking coalition if and only if there is a directed




Figure 2: The preferences constructed in the proof for Theorem 1. Recall that for each variable $x_i \in X$, the index $\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)$ (resp. $\mathfrak{o}_1(\bar{x}_i)$) denotes the smallest index of the clause which contains x_i (resp. \bar{x}_i). For each clause $C_j \in \phi$, the expression $[E_j]$ (resp. $[F_j]$) denotes an arbitrary but fixed order of the agents in E_j (resp. F_j).

cycle in H . Thus, it suffices to check for a directed cycle in H . It follows that all problems are in NP.

For the NP-hardness, it is enough to show that 3-CESM and 3-ESM are NP-hard. We use the same reduction from (2,2)-3SAT for both. Let (X, C) be an instance of (2,2)-3SAT where $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\hat{n}}\}$ is the set of variables and $\phi = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{\hat{m}}\}$ the set of clauses.

We construct a bipartite preference profile on two disjoint agent sets U and W . The set U (resp. W) will be partitioned into three different agent-groups: the variable-agents, the switch-agents, and the clause-agents. The general idea is to use the variable-agents and the clause-agents to determine a truth assignment and satisfying literals, respectively. Then, we use the switch-agents from Lemma 4 to make sure that the selected truth assignment is consistent with the selected satisfying literals. For each $\text{lit}_i \in X \cup \bar{X}$ that appears in two different clauses C_j and C_k with $j < k$, we use $\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)$ and $\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)$ to refer to the indices j and k ; recall that in ϕ each literal appears exactly two times. For example, if literal x_i appears in C_3 and C_5 , then $\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i) = 3$ and $\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i) = 5$.

For illustration of the construction below, refer to Figure 2.

The variable-agents. For each variable $x_i \in X$, introduce 6 *variable-agents* $v_i, w_i, x_i, \bar{x}_i, y_i, \bar{y}_i$. Add v_i, x_i, \bar{x}_i to U , and w_i, y_i, \bar{y}_i to W . For each literal $\text{lit}_i \in X \cup \bar{X}$ let $y(\text{lit}_i)$ denote the corresponding Y -variable-agent y_i (or \bar{y}_i). Define $\bar{X} := \{\bar{x}_i \mid i \in [\hat{n}]\}$, and

$\bar{Y} := \{\bar{y}_i \mid i \in [\hat{n}]\}$.

The clause-agents. For each clause $C_j \in C$, introduce two *clause-agents* c_j, d_j . Further, for each literal $\text{lit}_i \in C_j$ with $\text{lit} \in \{x, \bar{x}\}$, introduce two more *clause-agents* e_j^i, f_j^i . Add c_j, f_j^i to U , and d_j, e_j^i to W .

For each clause $C_j \in \phi$, define $E_j := \{e_j^i \mid \text{lit}_i \in C_j\}$, and $F_j := \{f_j^i \mid \text{lit}_i \in C_j\}$. Moreover, define $E := \bigcup_{C_j \in \phi} E_j$ and $F := \bigcup_{C_j \in \phi} F_j$.

The switch-agents. For each clause $C_j \in C$, and each literal $\text{lit}_i \in C_j$ introduce fourteen *switch-agents* $a_{i,j}^z, b_{i,j}^z, z \in \{0, 1, \dots, 6\}$. Define $A_{i,j} = \{a_{i,j}^z \mid z \in \{0, 1, \dots, 6\}\}$ and $B_{i,j} = \{b_{i,j}^z \mid z \in \{0, 1, \dots, 6\}\}$. Add $A_{i,j}$ to U and $B_{i,j}$ to W .

In total, we have the following agent sets:

$$U := \{v_i \mid i \in [\hat{n}]\} \cup X \cup \bar{X} \cup \{c_j \mid j \in [\hat{m}]\} \cup F \cup \bigcup_{C_j \in \phi \wedge \text{lit}_i \in C_j} A_{i,j},$$

$$W := \{w_i \mid i \in [\hat{n}]\} \cup Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup \{d_j \mid j \in [\hat{m}]\} \cup E \cup \bigcup_{C_j \in \phi \wedge \text{lit}_i \in C_j} B_{i,j}.$$

Note that we use the same symbol x_i for both the variable and the variable-agent to strengthen the connection. The meaning will, however, be clear from the context.

The preference lists. The preference lists of the agents are shown in Figure 2. Herein, the preferences of the switch-agents of each occurrence of the literal correspond to those given in Lemma 4. Note that all preferences are specified up to defining the agents $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $\delta_{i,j}$, which we do now. Defining them in an appropriate way will connect the two groups of switch-agents that correspond to the same literal as well as literals to clauses. For each literal $\text{lit}_i \in X \cup \bar{X}$, recall that $\mathfrak{o}_1(i)$ and $\mathfrak{o}_2(i)$ are the indices of the clauses which contain lit_i with $\mathfrak{o}_1(i) < \mathfrak{o}_2(i)$. Define the agents $\alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}, \delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}, \alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}$, and $\delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}$ as follows:

$$\alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)} := \text{lit}_i, \quad \delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)} := b_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}^0, \quad \alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)} := a_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^6, \quad \delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)} := y(\text{lit}_i). \quad (1)$$

For an illustration, assume that literal x_4 appears in C_3 and C_5 , and literal \bar{x}_4 only appears in C_2 and C_6 with

$$C_2 = (x_2 \vee \bar{x}_4 \vee \bar{x}_5), \quad C_3 = (x_1 \vee x_4 \vee x_6), \quad C_5 = (x_3 \vee x_4), \quad C_6 = (\bar{x}_4 \vee x_5).$$

Then, $\alpha_{4,3} = x_4, \delta_{4,3} = b_{4,5}^0, \alpha_{4,5} = a_{4,3}^6, \delta_{4,5} = y_4, \alpha_{4,2} = \bar{x}_4, \delta_{4,2} = b_{4,6}^0, \alpha_{4,6} = a_{4,6}^6$, and $\delta_{4,6} = \bar{y}_4$. The relevant part of the acceptability graph for the variable-agents, switch-agents, and clause-agents which correspond to literal x_4 and clauses C_3, C_5 are depicted in Figure 3.

This completes the construction of the instance for 3-COALITIONAL EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE, which can clearly be done in polynomial-time. Let \mathcal{P} denote the constructed instance with $\mathcal{P} = (U \uplus W, (\succ_x)_{x \in U \cup W})$. It is straight-forward to verify that \mathcal{P} is bipartite and contains no ties and that each preference list \succ_x has length bounded by three.

Before we give the correctness proof, for each literal $\text{lit}_i \in X \cup \bar{X}$ and each clause C_j with $\text{lit}_i \in C_j$ we define the following three matchings:

$$N_{i,j}^1 := \{\{\alpha_{i,j}, b_{i,j}^0\}, \{a_{i,j}^6, \delta_{i,j}\}\} \cup \{\{a_{i,j}^{z-1}, b_{i,j}^z\} \mid z \in [6]\},$$

$$N_{i,j}^2 := \{\{a_{i,j}^0, e_j^i\}, \{b_{i,j}^6, f_j^i\}\} \cup \{\{a_{i,j}^z, b_{i,j}^{z-1}\} \mid z \in [6]\},$$

$$N_{i,j}^D := \{\{\alpha_{i,j}, b_{i,j}^0\}, \{a_{i,j}^0, e_j^i\}, \{a_{i,j}^6, \delta_{i,j}\}, \{f_j^i, b_{i,j}^6\}, \{a_{i,j}^1, b_{i,j}^2\}, \{a_{i,j}^2, b_{i,j}^1\}, \{a_{i,j}^3, b_{i,j}^3\}, \{a_{i,j}^4, b_{i,j}^5\}, \{a_{i,j}^5, b_{i,j}^4\}\}.$$

Now we show the correctness, i.e. ϕ admits a satisfying assignment if and only if \mathcal{P} admits a perfect and coalitional exchange-stable (resp. exchange-stable) matching. For the ‘‘only if’’ direction, assume that $\sigma: X \rightarrow \{t, f\}$ ϕ is a satisfying assignment for ϕ . Then, we define a perfect matching M as follows.




Figure 3: Relevant part of the acceptability graph for variable x_4 , clauses C_3 , and C_5 discussed in the proof of Theorem 1.

- For each variable $x_i \in X$, let $M(\bar{x}_i) := w_i$ and $M(v_i) := \bar{y}_i$ if $\sigma(x_i) = \mathbf{t}$; otherwise, let $M(x_i) := w_i$ and $M(v_i) := y_i$.
- For each clause $C_j \in \phi$, fix an arbitrary literal whose truth value satisfies C_j and denote the index of this literal as $\mathbf{s}(j)$. Then, let $M(c_j) := e_j^{\mathbf{s}(j)}$ and $M(f_j^{\mathbf{s}(j)}) := d_j$.
- Further, for each literal $\text{lit}_i \in X \cup \bar{X}$ and each clause C_j with $\text{lit}_i \in C_j$, do the following:
 - (a) If $\mathbf{s}(j) = i$, then add to M all pairs from $N_{i,j}^1$.
 - (b) If $\mathbf{s}(j) \neq i$ and lit_i is set true under σ (i.e., $\sigma(x_i) = \mathbf{t}$ iff. $\text{lit}_i = x_i$), then add to M all pairs from $N_{i,j}^D$.
 - (c) If $\mathbf{s}(j) \neq i$ and lit_i is set false under σ (i.e., $\sigma(x_i) = \mathbf{t}$ iff. $\text{lit}_i = \bar{x}_i$), then add to M all pairs from $N_{i,j}^2$.

One can verify that M is perfect. Hence, it remains to show that M is coalitional exchange-stable. Note that this would also imply that M is exchange-stable.

Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that M admits an exchange-blocking coalition ρ . First, observe that for each variable-agent $z \in X \cup \bar{X} \cup Y \cup \bar{Y}$ it holds that $M(z)$ either is matched with his most-preferred partner (i.e., either v_i or w_i) or only envies someone who is matched with his most-preferred partner. Hence, no agent from $X \cup \bar{X} \cup Y \cup \bar{Y}$ is involved in ρ . Analogously, no agent from $E \cup F$ is involved in ρ .

Next, we claim the following.

Claim 1 (\star). *For each literal $\text{lit}_i \in X \cup \bar{X}$ and each clause C_j with $\text{lit}_i \in C_j$, it holds that neither $\alpha_{i,j}$ nor $\delta_{i,j}$ is involved in ρ .*

Proof. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that there exists some $\text{lit}_i \in X \cup \bar{X}$ with $\text{lit}_i \in C_j$ such that $\alpha_{i,j} \in \rho$ or $\delta_{i,j} \in \rho$.

If $\alpha_{i,j} \in \rho$, then by the definition of $\alpha_{i,j}$, it follows that $j = \mathbf{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)$ as otherwise $\alpha_{i,j} = \text{lit}_i$ which would be a contradiction because we have just shown that no agent from $X \cup \bar{X}$ is involved in ρ . This implies that $\alpha_{i,j} = a_{i,\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^6 \in \rho$. We infer from the preferences of $a_{i,\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^6$ that $M(a_{i,\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^6) = \delta_{i,\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}$. By the definition of M , we have that $N_{i,\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^1 \subseteq M$ or $N_{i,\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^D \subseteq M$. From Lemma 4(2) and Lemma 4(4) (setting $\alpha = \alpha_{i,\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}$, $\beta = e_{\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^i$, $\gamma = f_{\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^i$, and $\delta = \delta_{i,\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}$) we infer that ρ involves $f_{\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^i \in F$ or ρ involves $\alpha_{i,\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}$; observe that $\alpha_{i,\mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)} = \text{lit}_i \in X$. This is a contradiction since we have already proved that no agent from $X \cup \bar{X} \cup F$ is involved in ρ .

If $\delta_{i,j} \in \rho$, then by the definition of $\delta_{i,j}$, we have $j = \mathbf{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)$ as otherwise $\delta_{i,j} = y(\text{lit}_i)$ which would be a contradiction because we have just shown that no agent from $Y \cup \bar{Y}$ is involved in ρ . This implies that $\delta_{i,j} = b_{i,\mathbf{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}^0 \in \rho$. By the preferences of $b_{i,\mathbf{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}^0$ we

infer that $M(b_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}^0) = \alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}$. By the definition of M , we have that $N_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}^1 \subseteq M$ or $N_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}^D \subseteq M$. By Lemma 4(2) and Lemma 4(4) (setting $\alpha = \alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}$, $\beta = e_{\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}^i$, $\gamma = f_{\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}^i$, and $\delta = \delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}$), we infer that ρ involves $e_{\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}^i \in E$ or $\delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)}$; observe that $\delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)} = y(\text{lit}_i)$. This is a contradiction since we have already proved that no agent from $Y \cup \overline{Y} \cup E$ is involved in ρ . (of Claim 1) \diamond

Now, using the above observations and claim, we continue with the proof. We successively prove that no agent is involved in ρ , starting with the agents in U .

- If v_i is involved in ρ for some $i \in [\hat{n}]$, then he only envies someone who is matched with y_i . By the definition of M , this means that $M(y_i) = a_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}^6$ and that v_i envies $a_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}^6$. Hence, $a_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}^6$ is also involved in ρ . Moreover, since $M(a_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}^6) = y_i$, we have $N_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}^1 \subseteq M$ or $N_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}^D \subseteq M$. By Lemma 4(2) and Lemma 4(4) (setting $\alpha = \alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}$, $\beta = e_{\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}^i$, $\gamma = f_{\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}^i$, and $\delta = \delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}$), ρ involves an agent from $\{\alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}, f_{\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}^i\}$. Since no agent from F is involved in ρ , it follows that ρ involves $\alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_2(x_i)}$, a contradiction to Claim 1.
- Analogously, if $c_j \in \rho$ for some $j \in [\hat{m}]$, then this means that E_j contains two agents e_j^i and e_j^t such that $M(c_j) = e_j^t$ but c_j prefers e_j^i to e_j^t , and $M(e_j^i) \in \rho$. Since M is perfect and c_j is not available, it follows that $M(e_j^i) = a_{i,j}^0$, implying that $a_{i,j}^0 \in \rho$. Moreover, by the definition of M we have that $N_{i,j}^2 \subseteq M$ or $N_{i,j}^D \subseteq M$. By Lemma 4(3) and Lemma 4(4) (setting $\alpha = \alpha_{i,j}$, $\beta = e_j^i$, $\gamma = f_j^i$, and $\delta = \delta_{i,j}$), ρ involves an agent from $\{\alpha_{i,j}, f_j^i\}$, a contradiction since no agent from F_j is involved in ρ and by Claim 1 $\alpha_{i,j}$ is not in ρ .
- Analogously, we can obtain a contradiction if w_i with $i \in [\hat{n}]$ is in ρ : By the definition of M , if $w_i \in \rho$, then $M(x_i) = b_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}^0$ and w_i envies $b_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}^0$. Hence, $b_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}^0$ is also involved in ρ . Moreover, since $M(b_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}^0) = x_i$, it follows that $N_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}^1 \subseteq M$ or $N_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}^D \subseteq M$. By Lemma 4(2) and Lemma 4(4) (setting $\alpha = \alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}$, $\beta = e_{\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}^i$, $\gamma = f_{\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}^i$, and $\delta = \delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}$), ρ involves an agent from $\{e_{\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}^i, \delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}\}$. Since no agent from E is involved in ρ , it follows that ρ involves $\delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(x_i)}$, a contradiction to Claim 1.
- Again, analogously, if $d_j \in \rho$ for some $j \in [\hat{m}]$, then we obtain that $\delta_{i,j}$ is involved in ρ , which is a contradiction to Claim 1.
- Finally, if ρ involves an agent from $A_{i,j}$ (resp. $B_{i,j}$), then by Lemma 4(2)–(4) (setting $\alpha = \alpha_{i,j}$, $\beta = e_j^i$, $\gamma = f_j^i$, and $\delta = \delta_{i,j}$), it follows that ρ involves an agent from $\{\alpha_{i,j}, f_j^i\}$ (resp. $\{\beta_{i,j}, e_j^i\}$), a contradiction to our observation and to Claim 1.

Summarizing, we have showed that M is coalitional exchange-stable and exchange-stable.

For the “if” direction, assume that M is a perfect and exchange-stable matching for \mathcal{P} . We show that there is a satisfying assignment for ϕ . Note that this then also implies that, if M is perfect and coalitional exchange-stable, then there is a satisfying assignment for ϕ .

We claim that the selection of the partner of w_i defines a satisfying truth assignment for ϕ . More specifically, define a truth assignment $\sigma: X \rightarrow \{\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{f}\}$ with $\sigma(x_i) = \mathfrak{t}$ if $M(w_i) = \overline{x}_i$, and $\sigma(x_i) = \mathfrak{f}$ otherwise. We claim that σ satisfies ϕ . To this end, consider an arbitrary clause C_j and the corresponding clause-agent. Since M is perfect, it follows that $M(c_j) = e_j^i$ for some $\text{lit}_i \in C_j$. Since e_j^i is not available, it also follows that $M(a_{i,j}^0) = b_{i,j}^1$. By Lemma 4(1) (setting $\alpha = \alpha_{i,j}$, $\beta = e_j^i$, $\gamma = f_j^i$, and $\delta = \delta_{i,j}$), it follows that $N_{i,j}^1 \subseteq M$. In particular, $M(\alpha_{i,j}) = b_{i,j}^0$ so that $\alpha_{i,j}$ is not available to other agents anymore.

We aim to show that $\alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}$ is matched to $b_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(i)}^0$, which implies that lit_i is not available to w_i since $\alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)} = \text{lit}_i$. We distinguish between two cases;

- If $j = \mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)$, then by definition, it immediately follows that that $\alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}$ is matched to $b_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^0$.
- If $j = \mathfrak{o}_2(\text{lit}_i)$, then by definition, it holds that $\alpha_{i,j} = a_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^6$ and $\delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)} = b_{i,j}^0$. In other words, $M(a_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^6) = \delta_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}$. By Lemma 4(1) (setting $\alpha = \alpha_{i,\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}$, $\beta = e_{\mathfrak{o}_1(\text{lit}_i)}^i$,

$\gamma = f_{o_1(\text{lit}_i)}^i$, and $\delta = \delta_{i,o_1(\text{lit}_i)}$, it follows that $N_{i,j}^1 \subseteq M$ or $N_{i,j}^D \subseteq M$. In both cases, it follows that $\alpha_{i,o_1(i)}$ is matched to $b_{i,o_1(i)}^0$.

We just showed that lit_i is *not* available to w_i . Since M is perfect, it follows that $M(w_i) = \bar{x}_i$ if $\text{lit}_i = x_i$, and $M(w_i) = \bar{x}_i$ otherwise. By definition, we have $\sigma(x_i) = \mathbf{t}$ if $\text{lit}_i = x_i$ and $\sigma(x_i) = \mathbf{f}$ otherwise. This implies that C_j is satisfied under σ , implying that σ is a satisfying assignment.

We have thus proved that there is a satisfying assignment for ϕ if and only if there is a perfect coalitional exchange-stable (resp. exchange-stable) matching for \mathcal{P} . \square

Next, we show how to complete the preferences of the agents constructed in the proof of Theorem 1 to show hardness for complete and strict preferences.

Theorem 2. *CESM and CESR are NP-complete even for complete and strict preferences.*

Proof. CESM is contained in NP by the same argument as in Theorem 1. For NP-hardness we adapt the proof of Theorem 1. Recall that in that proof, for a given R-3SAT instance (X, ϕ) with $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\hat{n}}\}$ and $\phi = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{\hat{m}}\}$, we construct two disjoint agent sets U and W with

$$U := \{v_i \mid i \in [\hat{n}]\} \cup X \cup \bar{X} \cup \{c_j \mid j \in [\hat{m}]\} \cup F \cup \bigcup_{C_j \in \phi \wedge \text{lit}_i \in C_j} A_{i,j},$$

$$W := \{w_i \mid i \in [\hat{n}]\} \cup Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup \{d_j \mid j \in [\hat{m}]\} \cup E \cup \bigcup_{C_j \in \phi \wedge \text{lit}_i \in C_j} B_{i,j}, \text{ where}$$

$\bar{X} := \{\bar{x}_i \mid i \in [\hat{n}]\}$, $\bar{Y} := \{\bar{y}_i \mid i \in [\hat{n}]\}$, $A_{i,j} = \{a_{i,j}^z \mid z \in \{0, 1, \dots, 6\}\}$, $B_{i,j} = \{b_{i,j}^z \mid z \in \{0, 1, \dots, 6\}\}$, $E_j := \{e_j^i \mid \text{lit}_i \in C_j\}$, $F_j := \{f_j^i \mid \text{lit}_i \in C_j\}$, and $E := \bigcup_{C_j \in \phi} E_j$ and $F := \bigcup_{C_j \in \phi} F_j$. For each agent $z \in U \cup W$ let L_z denote the preference list of z constructed in the proof. The basic idea is to extend the preference list L_z by appending to it the remaining agents appropriately.

We introduce some more notations. We abuse the expression $t \in L_z$ to mean that t is some agent in the preference list L_z . Let \triangleright_U and \triangleright_W denote two arbitrary but fixed linear orders of the agents in U and W , respectively. Now, for each subset of agents $S \subseteq U$ (resp. $S \subseteq W$), let $[S]$ denote the fixed order of the agents in S induced by \triangleright_U (resp. \triangleright_W), and let $S \setminus L_z$ denote the subset $\{t \in S \mid t \notin L_z\}$, where $z \in W$ (resp. $z \in U$). Finally, for each agent $z \in U$ (resp. $z \in W$), let R_z denote the subset of agents which do not appear in L_z or in $Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup E$ (resp. $X \cup \bar{X} \cup F$). That is, $R_z := (W \setminus (Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup E)) \setminus L_z$ (resp. $R_z := (U \setminus (X \cup \bar{X} \cup F)) \setminus L_z$).

Now, we define the preferences of the agents as follows.

$$\forall z \in U, z: L_z \succ [(Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup E) \setminus L_z] \succ [R_z], \text{ and } \forall z \in W, z: L_z \succ [(X \cup \bar{X} \cup F) \setminus L_z] \succ [R_z].$$

For instance, the complete preference list of an agent called $a_{i,j}^0$ (corresponding to the literal lit_i which appears in clause C_j) is

$$a_{i,j}^0: b_{i,j}^1 \succ e_j^i \succ [X \cup \bar{X} \cup F \setminus \{e_j^i\}] \succ \left[\left(\bigcup_{\text{lit}_i \in C_j} B_{i,j} \right) \cup \{c_j \mid j \in [\hat{m}]\} \cup \{v_i \mid i \in [\hat{n}]\} \setminus \{b_{i,j}^1\} \right].$$

Let \mathcal{P}' denote the newly constructed preference profile. Clearly, the constructed preferences are complete and strict. It remains to show the correctness. Assume that ϕ admits a satisfying assignment $\sigma: X \rightarrow \{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{f}\}$. First of all, observe that the following claim holds.

Claim 2. *Besides the agents of $X \cup \bar{X} \cup F \cup Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup E$ every other agent appears as the most-preferred agent of some other agent.*

Using this, we claim the following for each coalitional exchange-stable matching of \mathcal{P}' .

Claim 3 (\star). *If M is a coalitional exchange-stable matching for \mathcal{P}' , then*

- (i) *for each agent $z \in U \cup W$ it holds that $M(z) \notin R_z$, and*
- (ii) *for each agent $z \in (U \cup W) \setminus (X \cup \bar{X} \cup F \cup Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup E)$ it holds that $M(z) \in L_z$.*

Proof. Let M be a coalitional exchange-stable matching of \mathcal{P}' . By Lemma 1, M is maximal. Since $G(\mathcal{P}')$ is complete it follows that M is perfect. For Statement (i), suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that there exists an agent $z_0 \in U \cup W$ such that $M(z_0) \in R_{z_0}$. This means that $M(z_0) \notin X \cup \bar{X} \cup F \cup Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup E$. Now consider the following inductive definition of agents z_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ such that

- (a) z_i prefers $M(z_{i-1})$ to $M(z_i)$,
- (b) $M(z_i) \notin X \cup \bar{X} \cup F \cup Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup E$, and
- (c) $z_i \notin \{z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}\}$.

Let z_{i-1} already be defined. Since $M(z_{i-1}) \notin X \cup \bar{X} \cup F \cup Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup E$, by Claim 2, there exists an agent who considers $M(z_{i-1})$ as the most-preferred agent. Define z_i to be an arbitrary agent who considers $M(z_{i-1})$ as the most-preferred agent. Clearly, (a) holds. Observe that z_0 prefers $M(z_0)$ to $M(z_i)$ since otherwise (z_0, z_1, \dots, z_i) would form an exchange-blocking coalition. Thus, $M(z_i) \in R_{z_0}$, which implies (b). Finally, for the sake of contradiction assume that (c) does not hold, that is, there is an agent z_j with $j < i$ such that $z_j = z_i$. By definition, z_j and z_i consider $M(z_{j-1}) = M(z_{i-1})$ as the most-preferred agent. Since M is a matching, $z_{j-1} = z_{i-1}$, a contradiction to the fact that $z_{i-1} \notin \{z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{i-2}\}$. Hence, we have found an infinite sequence of pairwise distinct agents, a contradiction, proving Statement (i).

For Statement (ii), suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that there exists an agent $z \in U \cup W \setminus (X \cup \bar{X} \cup F \cup Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup E)$ such that $M(z) \notin L_z$. By symmetry, it follows that $z = M(M(z)) \notin L_{M(z)}$. By the first statement, $z \notin R_{M(z)}$. Hence, $z \in (X \cup \bar{X} \cup F \cup Y \cup \bar{Y} \cup E) \setminus L_{M(z)}$, a contradiction. (of Claim 3) \diamond

Now, we are ready to show the correctness, i.e., ϕ admits a satisfying assignment if and only if \mathcal{P}' admits a coalitional exchange-stable matching.

For the “only if” direction, assume that ϕ admits a satisfying assignment, say $\sigma: X \rightarrow \{t, f\}$. We claim that the coalitional exchange-stable matching M for \mathcal{P} that we defined in the “only if” direction of the proof for Theorem 1 is a coalitional exchange-stable matching for \mathcal{P}' . Clearly, M is a perfect matching for \mathcal{P}' since $G(\mathcal{P}')$ is a supergraph of $G(\mathcal{P})$. Since each agent $z \in U \cup W$ has $M(z) \in L_z$, for each two agents $z, z' \in U$ (resp. W), it holds that z envies z' only if $M(z') \in L_z$. In other words, if M would admit an exchange-blocking coalition $\rho = (z_0, z_1, \dots, z_{r-1})$ ($r \geq 2$) for \mathcal{P}' , then for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, r-1\}$ it must hold that $M(z_i) \in L_{z_{i-1}}$ (z_{i-1} taken modulo r). But then, ρ is also an exchange-blocking coalition for \mathcal{P} , a contradiction to our “only if” part of the proof for Theorem 1.

For the “if” direction, let M be a coalitional exchange-stable matching for \mathcal{P}' . Note that in the “if” part of the proof of Theorem 1 we heavily utilize the properties given in Lemma 4(1). Now, to construct a satisfying assignment for ϕ from M , we will prove that the lemma also holds for profile \mathcal{P}' . To this end, for each literal $\text{lit}_i \in X \cup \bar{X}$ and each clause C_j with $\text{lit}_i \in C_j$, we recall the three matchings that we have defined before:

$$N_{i,j}^1 := \{\{\alpha_{i,j}, b_{i,j}^0\}, \{a_{i,j}^6, \delta_{i,j}\}\} \cup \{\{a_{i,j}^{z-1}, b_{i,j}^z\} \mid z \in [6]\},$$

$$N_{i,j}^2 := \{\{a_{i,j}^0, e_j^i\}, \{b_{i,j}^6, f_j^i\}\} \cup \{\{a_{i,j}^z, b_{i,j}^{z-1}\} \mid z \in [6]\},$$

$$N_{i,j}^D := \{\{\alpha_{i,j}, b_{i,j}^0\}, \{a_{i,j}^0, e_j^i\}, \{a_{i,j}^6, \delta_{i,j}\}, \{f_j^i, b_{i,j}^6\}, \{a_{i,j}^1, b_{i,j}^2\}, \{a_{i,j}^2, b_{i,j}^1\}, \{a_{i,j}^3, b_{i,j}^3\}, \{a_{i,j}^4, b_{i,j}^5\}, \{a_{i,j}^5, b_{i,j}^4\}\},$$

where the agents $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $\delta_{i,j}$ were defined according to equations (1) (on Page 10):

Claim 4 (\star). *Matching M satisfies that for each literal $\text{lit}_i \in X \cup \overline{X}$ and each clause $C_j \in \phi$ with $\text{lit}_i \in C_j$, either (i) $N_{i,j}^1 \subseteq M$, or (ii) $N_{i,j}^2 \subseteq M$, or (iii) $N_{i,j}^D \subseteq M$.*

Proof. The proof is almost the same as the one given for Lemma 4(1). We repeat for the sake of completeness.

Since M is coalitional exchange-stable for \mathcal{P}' , by Claim 3(ii) it follows that

$$\forall \text{lit}_i \in X \cup \overline{X}, \forall C_j \in \phi \text{ with } \text{lit}_i \in C_j, \forall z \in \{0, 1, \dots, 6\}: M(a_{i,j}^z) \in \mathcal{L}_{a_{i,j}^z}. \quad (2)$$

We distinguish between three subcases.

If $M(a_{i,j}^3) = b_{i,j}^2$, then $M(a_{i,j}^2) \neq b_{i,j}^3$ as otherwise $(b_{i,j}^2, b_{i,j}^3)$ is an exchange-blocking pair. Hence, $M(a_{i,j}^2) = b_{i,j}^1$ and $M(b_{i,j}^3) = a_{i,j}^4$ since $b_{i,j}^2$, $a_{i,j}^2$, and $a_{i,j}^3$ are already matched to others. By (2), $M(a_{i,j}^1) = b_{i,j}^0$, $M(a_{i,j}^0) = e_j^i$, $M(b_{i,j}^4) = a_{i,j}^5$, $M(b_{i,j}^5) = a_{i,j}^6$, and $M(b_{i,j}^6) = f_j^i$. This implies that M contains $N_{i,j}^2$.

If $M(a_{i,j}^3) = b_{i,j}^3$, then $M(a_{i,j}^2) \neq b_{i,j}^2$ and $M(a_{i,j}^4) \neq b_{i,j}^4$ as otherwise $(a_{i,j}^2, a_{i,j}^3)$ or $(b_{i,j}^3, b_{i,j}^4)$ is an exchange-blocking pair. By (2), $M(a_{i,j}^2) = b_{i,j}^1$ and $M(a_{i,j}^4) = b_{i,j}^5$ since $b_{i,j}^3$ is already matched to $a_{i,j}^3$. Again, by (2), $M(b_{i,j}^2) = a_{i,j}^1$, $M(b_{i,j}^4) = a_{i,j}^5$, $M(a_{i,j}^0) = e_j^i$, $M(a_{i,j}^6) = \delta_{i,j}$, $M(b_{i,j}^0) = \alpha_{i,j}$, $M(b_{i,j}^6) = f_j^i$. This implies that M contains $N_{i,j}^D$.

Finally, if $M(a_{i,j}^3) = b_{i,j}^4$, then $M(a_{i,j}^4) \neq b_{i,j}^3$ as otherwise $(a_{i,j}^3, a_{i,j}^4)$ is an exchange-blocking pair. Hence, by (2), $M(a_{i,j}^4) = b_{i,j}^5$ and $M(b_{i,j}^3) = a_{i,j}^2$ since $b_{i,j}^4$ and $a_{i,j}^2$ are the only agents available to $a_{i,j}^4$ and $b_{i,j}^3$, respectively. By the acceptability relations, $M(a_{i,j}^5) = b_{i,j}^6$, $M(a_{i,j}^6) = \delta_{i,j}$, $M(b_{i,j}^2) = a_{i,j}^1$, $M(b_{i,j}^1) = a_{i,j}^0$, and $M(b_{i,j}^0) = \alpha_{i,j}$. This implies that M contains $N_{i,j}^1$. Together, this completes the proof for Statement (4). (of Claim 4) \diamond

Now we show that the function $\sigma: X \rightarrow \{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{f}\}$ with $\sigma(x_i) = \mathbf{t}$ if $M(w_i) = \overline{x}_i$, and $\sigma(x_i) = \mathbf{f}$ otherwise is a satisfying truth assignment for ϕ . Clearly, ϕ is a valid truth assignment since by Claim 3(ii) every variable agent w_i is matched to either x_i or \overline{x}_i . We claim that σ satisfies ϕ . To this end, consider an arbitrary clause C_j and the corresponding clause-agent c_j . By Claim 3(ii), we know that $M(c_j) = e_j^i$ for some $\text{lit}_i \in C_j$. Since e_j^i is not available, by Claim 3(ii), it also follows that $M(a_{i,j}^0) = b_{i,j}^1$. By Claim 4, it follows that $N_{i,j}^1 \subseteq M$. In particular, $M(\alpha_{i,j}) = b_{i,j}^0$ so that $\alpha_{i,j}$ is not available to other agents anymore.

We aim to show that $\alpha_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}$ is matched to $b_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}^0$ by M , which implies that lit_i is not available to w_i since $\alpha_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)} = \text{lit}_i$ by the definition of $\alpha_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}$. We distinguish between two cases;

- If $j = \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)$, then by the definition of $\alpha_{i,j}$, it follows that $\alpha_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}$ is matched to $b_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}^0$, as required.
- If $j = \circ_2(\text{lit}_i)$, then by the definition of $\alpha_{i,j}$ we have $\alpha_{i,j} = a_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}^6$ and by the definition of $\delta_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}$ we have $\delta_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)} = b_{i, \circ_2(\text{lit}_i)}^0 = b_{i,j}^0$. In particular, since $M(\alpha_{i,j}) = b_{i,j}^0$ we have $M(a_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}^6) = \delta_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}$. By Claim 4, it follows that $N_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}^1 \subseteq M$ or $N_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}^D \subseteq M$. In both cases, it follows that $\alpha_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}$ is matched to $b_{i, \circ_1(\text{lit}_i)}^0$.

We just showed that lit_i is *not* available to w_i . Hence, by Claim 3(ii), $M(w_i) = \overline{x}_i$ if $\text{lit}_i = x_i$, and $M(w_i) = \overline{x}_i$ otherwise. By definition, we have that $\sigma(x_i) = \mathbf{t}$ if $\text{lit}_i = x_i$ and $\sigma(x_i) = \mathbf{f}$ otherwise. This implies that C_j is satisfied under σ , implying that σ is a satisfying assignment. \square

4 Algorithms for Bounded Preferences Length

In this section we give algorithms for the profiles with bounded preference length. In Subsection 4.1 we give linear-time algorithms for length at most two, and in Subsection 4.2 we give a fixed-parameter algorithm for length at most three.

ALGORITHM 1: Algorithm for checking coalitional exchange-stability when each preference list has length bounded by two.

Input: A preference profile \mathcal{P} with preferences length at most two.
Output: A coalitional exchange-stable matching for \mathcal{P} or **no** if none exists.

```

1  $M \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2 if  $G(\mathcal{P})$  contains a connected component of odd size then return no;
3 foreach connected component  $C$  in  $G(\mathcal{P})$  do
4   if  $G(\mathcal{P})[C]$  is a path then
5     Let  $E(G(\mathcal{P})[C]) = \{\{x_0, x_1\}, \{x_1, x_2\}, \dots, \{x_{2t-2}, x_{2t-1}\}\}$ 
6      $M \leftarrow M \cup \{\{x_{2i-2}, x_{2i-1}\} \mid i \in [t]\}$ 
7   if  $G(\mathcal{P})[C]$  is a cycle then
8     Let  $E(G(\mathcal{P})[C]) = \{\{x_0, x_1\}, \{x_1, x_2\}, \dots, \{x_{2t-2}, x_{2t-1}\}, \{x_{2t-1}, x_0\}\}$ 
9      $M_1 \leftarrow \{\{x_{2i-2}, x_{2i-1}\} \mid i \in [t]\}$ 
10     $M_2 \leftarrow \{\{x_{2i-1}, x_{2i}\} \mid i \in [t-1]\} \cup \{\{x_{2t-1}, x_0\}\}$ 
11    if  $M_1$  is coalitional exchange-stable for  $\mathcal{P}$  restricted to  $C$  then  $M \leftarrow M \cup M_1$ ;
12    else if  $M_2$  is coalitional exchange-stable for  $\mathcal{P}$  restricted to  $C$  then  $M \leftarrow M \cup M_2$ ;
13    else return no;
14 return  $M$ 

```

4.1 Preference list length at most two

Bounding the length of the preference lists by two allows us to decide whether a coalitional exchange-stable and perfect matching exists in linear time. The reason is that for preferences of length at most two, the underlying acceptability graph consists of disjoint paths and cycles. Together with Lemma 2, we infer that only agents from a cycle may induce exchange-blocking coalitions, and hence can be checked for coalitional exchange-stability in linear time.

Theorem 3. 2-ESM, 2-ESR, 2-CESM, and 2-CESR can be solved in linear time.

Proof. Let \mathcal{P} be a preference profile with preference lists length bounded by two, meaning that $G(\mathcal{P})$ consists of solely paths and cycles. We consider each path and cycle independently. Since we are aiming for a perfect matching which is exchange-stable or coalitional exchange-stable, by Lemma 2, it suffices to only consider cycles of even length as paths do not induce any exchange-blocking coalitions and cycles of odd length cannot result in a perfect matching.

Now, for cycles of even length, since there are only two possible perfect matchings, we check whether one of them avoids exchange-blocking coalition or exchange-blocking pair.

We illustrate the above idea for checking coalitional exchange-stability via algorithm 1. To obtain algorithm for exchange-stability, we only need to exchange coalitional exchange-stable with exchange-stable in lines 11–12.

Since constructing all perfect matchings for a path or a cycle (there are at most two) and checking each of them upon coalitional exchange-stability can be done in linear time, the described algorithms run in linear time. \square

4.2 Fixed-parameter algorithms for 3-ESR

We now turn to preference length at most three (i.e., 3-ESR). In Theorem 1 we have seen that even this case remains NP-hard, even for bipartite preference profiles. Moreover, the proof suggests that a main obstacle that one has to deal with when solving 3-ESM (and hence 3-EXCHANGE-STABLE ROOMMATES) are the switch gadgets. Here we essentially show that they are indeed the *only* obstacles, that is, if there are few of them present in the input,

then we can solve the problem efficiently. We capture the essence of the switch gadgets with the following structure that we call hourglasses.

Definition 1. Let \mathcal{P} be a preference profile and $V_H \subseteq V$ a subset of $2h$ agent with $V_H = \{u_i, w_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq h-1\}$. We call the subgraph $G(\mathcal{P})[V_H]$ induced by V_H an *hourglass* of height h if it satisfies the following:

- For each $i \in \{0, h-1\}$ the vertex degree of u_i and w_i are both at least two in $G(\mathcal{P})[V_H]$;
- For each $i \in [h-2]$, the vertex degree of u_i and w_i are exactly three in $G(\mathcal{P})[V_H]$;
- For each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, h-1\}$ we have $\{u_i, w_i\} \in E(G(\mathcal{P})[V_H])$;
- For each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, h-2\}$ we have $\{u_i, w_{i+1}\}, \{u_{i+1}, w_i\} \in E(G(\mathcal{P})[V_H])$.

For the sake of readability, we refer to the agents u_i and w_i from V_H as *layer- i* agents. We call an hourglass H *maximal* if no larger agent subset $V' \supsetneq V(H)$ exists which may also induce an hourglass.

Given a matching M for \mathcal{P} and an hourglass H in $G(\mathcal{P})$, we say that M is *perfect for H* if for each agent $v \in V(H)$ it holds that $M(v) \in V(H) \setminus \{v\}$. Further, we say that M is *exchange-stable for H* if no two agents from $V(H)$ can form an exchange-blocking pair.

Notice that the smallest hourglass has height two and is a four-cycle. Figure 4 shows a maximal hourglass of height three which contains two different non-maximal hourglasses of height two.

Now, we are ready to show the following fixed-parameter tractability result.

Theorem 4 (\star). *An instance of 3-ESR with $2n$ agents and ℓ maximal hourglasses can be solved in $O(6^\ell \cdot n\sqrt{n})$ time.*

The main ideas are as follows. The first observation is that a matching for a maximal hourglass can interact with the rest of the graph in only six different ways: The only agents in an hourglass H of height h that may have neighbors outside are the layer-0 and layer- $h-1$ agents; let us call them *connecting agents* of H . Matching M may match these agents either to agents inside or outside H . Requiring M to be perfect means that an even number of the connecting agents has to be matched inside H . This then gives a bound of at most six different possibilities of the matching M with respect to whether the connecting agents are matched inside or outside H (see Figure 5). Let us call this the *signature* of M with respect to H . Hence, we may try all 6^ℓ possible combinations of signatures for all hourglasses and check whether one of them leads to a solution (i.e., exchange-stable matching).

The second observation that helps is that each exchange-blocking pair of a perfect matching yields a four-cycle and hence, has to be contained in some maximal hourglass. Thus, the task of checking whether a combination of signatures leads to a solution decomposes into (a) checking whether each maximal hourglass H allows for an exchange-stable matching adhering to the signature we have chosen for H and (b) checking whether the remaining acceptability graph after deleting all agents considered by the chosen signatures admits a perfect matching.

Task (b) can clearly be done in $O(n \cdot \sqrt{n})$ time by performing any maximum-cardinality matching algorithm (note that the graph $G(\mathcal{P})$ has $O(n)$ edges). We then prove that task (a) for all six signatures can be reduced to checking whether a given hourglass admits a perfect and exchange-stable matching. This, in turn, we show to be linear-time solvable by giving a dynamic program that fills a table, maintaining some limited but crucial facts about the structure of partial matchings for the hourglass.

In the remainder of this section we prove Theorem 4. To this end, let \mathcal{P} denote an input instance of 3-ESR. We observe that the hourglasses are the only parts where an exchange-blocking pair can form:

Observation 1. *For each exchange-blocking pair (x, y) of a perfect matching M of \mathcal{P} there exists an hourglass in $G(\mathcal{P})$ which contains both x, y and their partners under M .*




Figure 4: An hourglass of height three.

Proof. Let M be an arbitrary perfect matching of \mathcal{P} which admits an exchange-blocking pair, say $\{x, y\}$. Then, it must hold that $\{x, M(x)\}, \{x, M(y)\}, \{y, M(y)\}, \{y, M(x)\} \in E(G(\mathcal{P}))$. This implies that $\{x, y, M(x), M(y)\}$ induces an hourglass of height two. \square

Perfect and exchange-stable matchings for a maximal hourglass . We can check in linear time whether a perfect and exchange-stable matching exists for a given hourglass.

Lemma 5. *Let H be a height- h maximal hourglass with agents $V(H) = \{u_i, w_i \mid i \in \{0, 1, \dots, h-1\}\}$. In $O(h)$ time, one can decide whether there exists a perfect and exchange-stable matching for H .*

Proof. Clearly, if $h \leq 4$, we can check for existence of a perfect and exchange-stable matching in constant time. Otherwise, we distinguish between three cases.

Case 1: $\{u_0, w_{h-1}\}, \{u_{h-1}, w_0\} \in E(H)$ This means that H is bipartite, then we claim that the matching M with $M := \{u_{i-1}, w_i \mid i \in [h]\}$ (indices taken modulo h) is perfect and exchange-stable for H . Clearly, M is perfect for H . Since $h \geq 5$, any alternating cycle wrt. M has length at least six. By Lemma 2, we immediately obtain that M is exchange-stable for H . Hence, in this case, we immediately return **yes** by returning M .

Case 2: $\{u_0, u_{h-1}\}, \{w_0, w_{h-1}\} \in E(H)$. By an analogous reasoning as above matching u_0 with u_{h-1} and w_0 with w_{h-1} will not induce an exchange-blocking pair since $h \geq 5$. By the definition of hourglasses for the other layers, there are two possible types of perfect matchings for layer 0: adding both $\{u_0, u_{h-1}\}$ and $\{w_0, w_{h-1}\}$ to the matching, or none of them. For the former type, we reduce to checking for a perfect and exchange-stable matching for the sub-hourglass H' with $H' = H[\{u_i, w_i \mid i \in [h-2]\}]$. Notice that in H' the layer-0 agents both have degree two. For the latter type, we may as well assume that u_0 and w_0 have degree two in H . We will check whether either type leads to a perfect and exchange-stable matching. We return **yes** if either type leads to a **yes** answer, using the $O(h)$ -time algorithm for the last case.

Case 3: $d_H(u_0) = 2$ or $d_H(w_0) = 2$. This means that all perfect and exchange-stable matchings for H must match u_0 with w_0 or match u_0 and w_0 with the agents from layer 1. Notice that this pattern will continue until the last but one layer. We need some notions to describe the pattern in more details. For each $i \in \{0, \dots, h-1\}$, we say that layer i is *horizontally matched* in M if $\{u_i, w_i\} \in M$. For each $i \in [h-1]$, we say that layers $i-1$ and i are *cross-matched* in M if $\{u_{i-1}, w_i\}, \{u_i, w_{i-1}\} \in M$. Then, by induction, we observe that for each $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, h-1\}$, layer- i is either horizontally matched or cross-matched. To check which match yields a correct answer, we can use dynamic programming (DP).

The dynamic program aims to fill two tables D_h, D_c , each of size $O(h)$, which specify for each layer whether there exists a perfect matching that ends with a cross-match or a horizontal match. Formally, $D_h[i] = \mathbf{true}$ if there exists a perfect and exchange-stable matching for $H[\{u_z, w_z \mid 0 \leq z \leq i\}]$ where layer i is horizontally matched, and $D_h[i] = \mathbf{false}$ otherwise. Analogously, $D_c[i] = \mathbf{true}$ if there exists a perfect and exchange-stable matching for $H[\{u_z, w_z \mid 0 \leq z \leq i\}]$ where layers $i-1$ and i are cross-matched, and $D_c[i] = \mathbf{false}$

otherwise. Clearly, by definition, there exists a perfect and exchange-stable matching for the entire hourglass H which match the agents from H among themselves if and only if $D_h[h-1]$ or $D_c[h-1]$ is **true**. Hence, to show our desired statement it suffices to show that we can compute $D_h[h-1]$ and $D_c[h-1]$ correctly in $O(h)$ time.

Next, we describe how to fill the tables. First, we fill the table for layer $i = 0$, i.e., $D_h[0]$ and $D_c[0]$. The only possibility for a perfect and exchange-stable matching ending for layer 0 is a horizontal match, i.e., $D_c[0] := \mathbf{false}$ and $D_h[0] := \mathbf{true}$. For $i = 1$, we have two possible perfect matchings such that agents from layer up to 1 are matched among themselves, and thus can determine $D_h[1]$ and $D_c[1]$ in constant time.

Now, to compute the remaining entries of tables D_h and D_c , we claim that for all $i \in \{2, \dots, h-1\}$, the following holds:

$$D_h[i] := D_c[i-1] \vee (D_h[i-1] \wedge \tau_h^{i-1,i}), \quad (3)$$

$$D_c[i] := (D_c[i-2] \vee D_h[i-2]) \wedge \tau_c^{i-1,i}. \quad (4)$$

Herein, $\tau_c^{i-1,i}$ is set **true** if and only if cross-matching layers $i-1$ and i is exchange-stable for $H[\{u_{i-1}, w_{i-1}, u_i, w_i\}]$. Analogously, $\tau_h^{i-1,i}$ is set **true** if and only if horizontally matching layers $i-1$ and i respectively is exchange-stable for $H[\{u_{i-1}, w_{i-1}, u_i, w_i\}]$.

It remains to prove that the equations (3)–(4) are correct.

We first prove equation 3. “ $D_h[i] \Rightarrow D_c[i-1] \vee (D_h[i-1] \wedge \tau_h^{i-1,i})$ ”: Let M be a matching witnessing that $D_h[i] = \mathbf{true}$. If M cross-matches layers $i-2$ and $i-1$, then $D_c[i-1] = \mathbf{true}$. Otherwise, M matches layer $i-1$ horizontally. Thus $D_h[i-1] \wedge \tau_h^{i-1,i} = \mathbf{true}$.

“ $D_h[i] \Leftarrow D_c[i-1] \vee (D_h[i-1] \wedge \tau_h^{i-1,i})$ ”: If $D_c[i-1] = \mathbf{true}$, then there is a perfect and exchange-stable matching M for layers 0 to $i-1$ that cross-matches layers $i-2$ and $i-1$. Extending M to layer i by matching layer i horizontally yields a perfect and exchange-stable matching for layers up to i because of the following:

- u_i (resp. w_i) does not envy u_{i-1} (resp. w_{i-1}).
- u_{i-2} (resp. w_{i-2}) does not envy u_i (resp. w_i).

Otherwise, $D_h[i-1] \wedge \tau_h^{i-1,i} = \mathbf{true}$. That is, there is a perfect matching M for layers 0 to $i-1$ which matches layer $i-1$ horizontally and, since $\tau_h^{i-1,i} = \mathbf{true}$, extending M to layer i by matching it horizontally does not incur an exchange-blocking pair.

Now we show equation (4). “ $D_c[i] \Rightarrow (D_c[i-2] \vee D_h[i-2]) \wedge \tau_c^{i-1,i}$ ”: Consider a matching M for layers 0 to i witnessing $D_c[i] = \mathbf{true}$. Since M is exchange-stable and layers i and $i-1$ are cross-matched by M , we have $\tau_c^{i-1,i} = \mathbf{true}$. Clearly, either layer $i-2$ is horizontally matched or layers $i-3$ and $i-2$ are cross-matched by M and hence, $D_c[i-2] = \mathbf{true}$ or $D_h[i-2] = \mathbf{true}$.

“ $D_c[i] \Leftarrow (D_c[i-2] \vee D_h[i-2]) \wedge \tau_c^{i-1,i}$ ”: Since $D_c[i-2] \vee D_h[i-2] = \mathbf{true}$, there is a perfect and exchange-stable matching M for layers up to $i-2$. Since $\tau_c^{i-1,i}$ is true, cross-matching layers $i-1$ and i is exchange-stable for $H[\{u_{i-1}, w_{i-1}, u_i, w_i\}]$. Observe that adding to M the two pairs $\{u_{i-1}, w_i\}$ and $\{u_i, w_{i-1}\}$ yields an exchange-stable matching for layers 0 to i because neither u_{i-2} nor w_{i-2} envy u_{i-1} or w_{i-1} , respectively, and neither u_i nor w_i envies u_{i-2} or w_{i-2} , respectively.

Finally, it is straight-forward to see that the table entries can be computed in $O(h)$ time by using the just proved equations (3)–(4). \square

Overview and solution structure. We now give an overview of how the algorithm works. Exchange-blocking pairs form only inside hourglasses (Observation 1), therefore any perfect matching which is exchange-stable for all hourglasses are exchange-stable. The bound on the preference list length implies that a maximal hourglass H of height h has at most four agents (u_0, w_0, u_{h-1} and w_{h-1}) that might have a partner outside of H . Each of these four vertices can either be matched to a partner inside or outside the hourglass.

Lemma 6 below shows that there are only six different ways a perfect matching can assign partners outside the hourglass to these four vertices. Note that these six possibilities also include that a matching might not assign partners outside the hourglass to these four vertices. We check each of these possibilities to see if they can be part of an exchange-stable matching on the hourglass. Finally, we consider all combinations of possible matchings for different hourglasses. If one of these combination is an exchange-stable matching for all hourglasses and can be extended to form a perfect matching for the rest of the graph, then we return YES. Otherwise, we return NO.

First, observe that there are only six categories for a perfect matching to match the agents of an hourglass:

Lemma 6. *Let H be a height- h hourglass with $V(H) = \{u_i, w_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq h-1\}$, then every perfect matching M for \mathcal{P} falls into one of the six categories (here, all indices taken modulo h ; also see Figure 5):*

- (I) For all $i \in [h-1]$, we have $M(u_i) = w_{i-1}$.
- (II) For all $i \in [h-1]$, we have $M(u_{i-1}) = w_i$.
- (III) For all $i \in [h-1]$, we have $M(u_i), M(w_i) \in V(H) \setminus \{u_0, w_0\}$.
- (IV) For all $i \in [h-1]$ we have $M(u_{i-1}), M(w_{i-1}) \in V(H) \setminus \{u_{h-1}, w_{h-1}\}$.
- (V) For all $i \in [h-2]$ we have $M(u_i), M(w_i) \in V(H) \setminus \{u_0, w_0, u_{h-1}, w_{h-1}\}$.
- (VI) For all $i \in [h-2]$, we have $M(u_i) \in \{w_{i-1}, w_i, w_{i+1}\}$, and $M(u_0) \in \{w_0, w_1\}$, $M(w_0) \in \{u_0, u_1\}$, $M(u_{h-1}) \in \{w_{h-2}, w_{h-1}\}$, $M(w_{h-1}) \in \{u_{h-2}, u_{h-1}\}$.

Proof. The statement can be verified by checking the partners of the agents from layer-0 and layer- $h-1$. For the sake of completeness, we prove the statement. Let $H, h, V(H)$, and M be as defined. Now, consider a specific subgraph $H' \subseteq H$ the agents from layer-0 and layer- $h-1$ have degree two and the remaining layers has degree three. Formally, $V(H') = V(H)$ and $E(H') = \{\{u_i, w_i\} \mid 0 \leq i \leq h-1\} \cup \{\{u_i, w_{i+1}\}, \{u_{i+1}, w_i\} \mid 0 \leq i \leq h-2\}$ (indices taken modulo h). Notice that H' is a bipartite graph on two equal-size subsets. Hence, under M an even number of agents from $V(H)$ are matched outside of H' , i.e., $|M \setminus E(H')| \in \{0, 2, 4\}$. If $M \subseteq E(H')$, then M corresponds to category (VI).

If $|M \setminus E(H')| = 4$, then M corresponds to category (V).

If $|M \setminus E(H')| = 2$, then we can infer that exactly one agent from $\{u_0, u_{h-1}\}$ and exactly one agent from $\{w_0, w_{h-1}\}$ are matched outside of H' . This gives four combinations, each corresponding to one of the four categories from (III), (I), (II), and (IV). \square

Checking for eligible matchings for hourglasses. Next, we show that, given a height- h hourglass H and a category $i \in \{(I), \dots, (VI)\}$, we can check in $O(h)$ time whether there exists an exchange-stable matching for H which belongs to category i (see Lemma 6 and Figure 5). We will consider several categories together. Below, in Observation 2 we consider categories (I)–(II). Lemma 7 then shows that checking for a matching in categories (III), (IV), (V) reduces to checking category (VI) on a smaller sub-hourglass.

Observation 2. *Let H be a maximal hourglass of height h and with $V(H) = \{u_i, w_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq h-1\}$ in $G(\mathcal{P})$. If $h \geq 5$ and \mathcal{P} admits a perfect matching which, restricted to the agents in $V(H)$, belongs to category (I) or (II) (see Figure 5), then this matching is perfect and exchange-stable for H .*

Proof. Let M be a perfect matching for \mathcal{P} which, when restricted to the agents from $V(H)$, belongs to either category (I) or category (II). This implies that H is bipartite. Since M is perfect, by Lemma 2, each exchange-blocking pair induces a length-4 alternating cycle wrt. M . However, since $h \geq 5$, every alternating cycle wrt. M containing an edge $\{x, M(x)\}$ with $x \in V(H)$ has length at least six. So no two agents from $V(H)$ form an exchange-blocking pair. \square




Figure 5: Six categories of perfect matchings for an hourglass (see Lemma 6). Notice that the edges which are incident to some vertices without labels may not belong to the hourglass.

Lemma 7. *Let H be a maximal hourglass of height h and with $V(H) = \{u_i, w_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq h-1\}$ in $G(\mathcal{P})$. Deciding whether an exchange-stable matching exists for H exists which belongs to category (III), (IV), or (V) can be done in $O(h)$ time.*

Proof. By Lemma 5, to show the statement, it suffices to show that checking for an exchange-stable matching in category (III), (IV), or (V) can be reduced to checking whether there exists a perfect and exchange-stable matching in category VI for the smaller hourglasses H' obtained by ignoring the agents from layer-0 (category III), layer- $(h-1)$ (category IV), or both (category V).

Since the other categories work analogously, we only prove the equivalence for category III. Let $H, h, V(H)$ be as defined. Define the induced subgraph $H' := H[\{u_i, w_i \mid i \in [h-1]\}]$.

For the forward direction, assume that M is an exchange-stable matching for H and falls in category (III). We claim that the following matching M' , derived from M by removing the pairs matching the agents from $\{u_0, w_0\}$, is perfect and exchange-stable for $H'[\{u_i, w_i \mid i \in [h-1]\}]$. Clearly, by the definition of category (III), the new matching M' is perfect for H' . It is straight-forward to see that exchange-stable for H' since $M' \subseteq M$ and M is exchange-stable for H .

For the backward direction, assume that M' is a perfect and exchange-stable matching for H' . Without loss of generality, assume that both u_0 and w_0 have degree three in $G(\mathcal{P})$ as otherwise no exchange-stable matching in category (III) exists. For notational convenience, let x and y denote the third neighbors of u_0 and w_0 , respectively, outside of H . Notice that such agents must exist and $x \neq y$ as otherwise no matching in category (III) exists. Now, we claim that matching M derived from M' by $M := M' \cup \{\{u_0, x\}, \{w_0, y\}\}$ is exchange-stable for H . Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that M is not exchange-stable for H , and let (a, b) denote an exchange-blocking pair with $a, b \in V(H)$. Clearly, at least one of $\{a, b\}$, say a , is from layer-0 as otherwise (a, b) would also be exchange-blocking H' . By symmetry, suppose that $a = u_0$. By Observation 1, there must be an hourglass which contains (u_0, b) , a contradiction to H being maximal. \square

FPT algorithm. We describe an algorithm which solves 3-ESM in $f(6^\ell \cdot n \cdot \sqrt{n})$ time, where ℓ denotes the maximal number of hourglass. We are given an instance \mathcal{P} of 3-ESR. First, we find all maximal hourglasses in $G(\mathcal{P})$; call them H_1, \dots, H_ℓ . Notice that each maximal

ALGORITHM 2: Algorithm to find a maximal hourglass

Input: A preference profile \mathcal{P} with agent set V and with preferences length at most three.

Output: A maximal hourglass in $G(\mathcal{P})$ or **no** if none exists.

▷ Recursively extend an hourglass $G'[U \cup W]$ to one more layer

```
1 MaxHG( $u, w, U, W, G'$ ):
2   if  $\exists x \in N_{G'}(u) \setminus \{w\}$  and  $y \in N_{G'}(w) \setminus \{u\}$  s.t.  $\{x, y\} \in E(G')$  then
3      $U \leftarrow U \cup \{y\}$ 
4      $W \leftarrow W \cup \{x\}$ 
5      $G' \leftarrow G' - x - y$ 
6     MaxHG( $x, y, U, W, G'$ )
7 Main():
8    $G_1 \leftarrow G$ ;
9   foreach  $\{u, w\} \in E(G_1)$  s.t.  $d_{G_1}(u) \geq 2$  and  $d_{G_1}(w) \geq 2$  do
10     $U_1 \leftarrow \emptyset; W_1 \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
11    ▷ Try to find a four-cycle and build the first half of a maximal hourglass
12    if  $\exists a \in N_{G_1}(u) \setminus \{w\}$  and  $b \in N_{G_1}(w) \setminus \{u\}$  s.t.  $\{a, b\} \in E(G')$  then
13       $U_1 \leftarrow U_1 \cup \{u, b\}$ 
14       $W_1 \leftarrow W_1 \cup \{w, a\}$ 
15       $G_1 \leftarrow G_1 - \{u, a\} - \{w, b\}$ 
16      MaxHG( $a, b, U_1, W_1, G_1$ )
17      ▷ Try to extend to build the second half of the maximal hourglass
18      if  $\exists a \in N_{G_1}(u) \setminus \{w\}$  and  $b \in N_{G_1}(w) \setminus \{u\}$  s.t.  $\{a, b\} \in E(G')$  then
19         $U_1 \leftarrow U_1 \cup \{b\}$ 
20         $W_1 \leftarrow W_1 \cup \{a\}$ 
21        MaxHG( $a, b, U_1, W_1, G_1$ )
22      if  $|U_1| \geq 2$  then return  $(U_1, W_1)$ ;
23       $G_1 \leftarrow G_1 - \{u, w\}$ 
24  return no
```

hourglass can be found in time linear in the height of the hourglass (see algorithm 2). Since each two maximal hourglass in such profiles are vertex disjoint, we can find all maximal hourglasses in linear time.

Next, for each H_i , $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, we check for each of the six categories described in Lemma 6 whether there is an exchange-stable matching for H_i in that category. Then we iterate through all possible combinations of hourglasses H_i and those categories for which matchings for H_i exist. For each combination, we check if any agent outside an hourglass is assigned more than one partner. If this is the case then go to the next combination. Otherwise, delete all maximal hourglasses and all agents already covered by this combination and compute a perfect matching on the remaining instance. If such a perfect matching exists then return the corresponding perfect matching, otherwise try the next combination. Should no combination result in a perfect matching, return **no**.

Let us investigate the running time of this algorithm. By Observation 2 and Lemmas 5 and 7 we can check the possible categories for each hourglass in linear time; note that for hourglasses of constant height we can even check the corresponding category in constant. In total there are 2^ℓ possible combinations. Using a maximum-cardinality matching algorithm (see e.g., Hopcroft and Karp [15], running time proven by Micali and Vazirani [19]) we check for a perfect matching in $O(n \cdot \sqrt{n})$ time (recall that the acceptability graph has $O(n)$ edges). In total this gives us a running time of $O(6^\ell \cdot n \cdot \sqrt{n})$ which, if correct, shows that the problem is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to the number of maximal hourglasses.

It remains to show that the algorithm is correct. If \mathcal{P} admits a perfect and exchange-stable matching M , then M is exchange-stable for each maximal hourglass H_i , $i \in [\ell]$, such

that each agent in $V(H_i)$ is matched. By Lemma 6, for each maximal hourglass H_i , M corresponds to one of the (up to) six possible categories. Hence, M corresponds to one of the 6^ℓ combinations, say C . Moreover, since M is perfect and no two maximal hourglass share the same vertex, combination C must lead to a perfect matching. By Observation 1, the found perfect matching is exchange-stable for \mathcal{P} .

Now, if our algorithm returns a perfect matching M , then there exists a combination of the categories which is exchange-stable for all maximal hourglasses. Together with Observation 1, we infer that it is perfect and exchange-stable for \mathcal{P} .

Hence, we have proved Theorem 4.

5 Paths to Exchange-Stability

In this section we study the parameterized complexity of P-ESM with respect to the number of swaps. Observe that it is straightforward to decide an instance of P-ESM with $2n$ agents in $O((2n)^{2k+2})$ time by trying k times all of the $O(n^2)$ possibilities for the next swap and then checking whether the resulting matching is exchange-stable. The next theorem shows that the dependency of the exponent in the running time cannot be removed unless the unlikely collapse $\text{FPT} = \text{W}[1]$ occurs.

Theorem 5 (\star). *PATH TO EXCHANGE-STABLE MARRIAGE is $\text{W}[1]$ -hard with respect to the number k of swaps.*

Proof. We provide a parameterized reduction from the $\text{W}[1]$ -hard INDEPENDENT SET problem, parameterized by the size of the independent set [12]. Therein, we are given a graph H and an integer k and want to decide whether there is a k -vertex *independent* set, i.e., a subset of k pairwise nonadjacent vertices.

Let $I = (H, k)$ be an instance of INDEPENDENT SET with $V(H) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ being the set of vertices and $E(H)$ be the set of edges. We construct an instance $I' = (\mathcal{P}, M_0, 2k)$ of P-ESM where \mathcal{P} has two disjoint agent sets U and W , each of size $2n + k$.

Both U and W consists of k *selector-agents* and $2n$ *vertex-agents* with preferences which encode the adjacency of the vertices in $V(H)$. More precisely, for each $j \in [k]$, we create two selector-agent, called s_j and t_j , and add them to U and W , respectively. For each $i \in [n]$, we create four vertex-agents, called x_i, u_i, y_i, w_i , add x_i and u_i to U , and add y_i and w_i to W . Altogether, we have $U = \{s_j \mid j \in [k]\} \cup \{u_i, x_i \mid i \in [n]\}$ and $W = \{t_j \mid j \in [k]\} \cup \{w_i, y_i \mid i \in [n]\}$.

We can now define the preferences of the agents from $U \cup W$. For notational convenience, we define two subsets of agents which shall encode the neighborhood of a vertex: For each vertex $v_i \in V(H)$, define $Y(v_i) := \{y_z \mid \{v_i, v_z\} \in E(H)\}$ and $U(v_i) := \{u_z \mid \{v_i, v_z\} \in E(H)\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \forall j \in [k]: s_j &: w_1 \succ \dots \succ w_n \succ t_j, & t_j &: u_1 \succ \dots \succ u_n \succ x_1 \succ \dots \succ x_n \succ s_j, \\ \forall i \in [n]: x_i &: t_1 \succ \dots \succ t_k \succ y_i, & y_i &: u_i \succ x_i \succ [U(v_i)], \\ \forall i \in [n]: u_i &: w_i \succ [Y(v_i)] \succ y_i \succ t_1 \succ \dots \succ t_k, & w_i &: s_1 \succ \dots \succ s_k \succ u_i. \end{aligned}$$

Figure 6 illustrates the underlying acceptability graph for a graph consisting of a single edge. Herein, $[Y(v_i)]$ (resp. $[U(v_i)]$) denotes the unique preference list where the agents in $Y(v_i)$ (resp. $U(v_i)$) are ordered ascending according to their indices.

Observe that the acceptability graph $G(\mathcal{P})$ includes the following edges: For all $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [n]$, the edges $\{s_i, t_i\}$, $\{s_i, w_j\}$, $\{t_i, x_j\}$, $\{t_i, u_j\}$, $\{w_j, u_j\}$, $\{y_j, x_j\}$, $\{y_j, u_j\}$ are in $E(G(\mathcal{P}))$. Additionally, for each $j \in [n]$ and $x \in \Lambda_H(j)$, $\{y_j, u_x\} \in E(G(\mathcal{P}))$, i.e., whenever $\{v_j, v_x\} \in E(H)$, there is an edge between agents y_j and u_x in $E(G(\mathcal{P}))$.




Figure 6: The left part shows graph $H = (\{v_1, v_2\}, \{\{v_1, v_2\}\})$. Then $(H, 1)$ is an instance of INDEPENDENT SET. We reduce this instance to the P-ESM instance of which the acceptability graph is shown on the right.

We define an initial matching M_0 on $G(\mathcal{P})$ as $M_0 = \{\{s_j, t_j\} \mid j \in [k]\} \cup \{\{w_i, u_i\}, \{y_i, x_i\} \mid i \in [n]\}$. The task is to determine if we can find a matching M_t in at most $2k$ steps, starting from M_0 . This completes the construction of I' , which can clearly be done in polynomial time. It is straight-forward to check that that \mathcal{P} is bipartite and the construction is a parameterized reduction.

Next, we show the correctness of the reduction, i.e., I is a positive instance of INDEPENDENT SET if and only if I' is a positive instance of P-ESM.

Assume we are given a positive instance of INDEPENDENT SET. We need to show that we can find an exchange-stable matching for the constructed instance of P-ESM in $2k$ swaps from M_0 . Let $\{v_{j_1}, \dots, v_{j_k}\}$ be the vertices of the independent set. Then for each $z \in [k]$, we know that (t_z, w_{j_z}) form an exchange-blocking pair of M_0 since $M_0(t_z) = s_z$ and $M_0(w_{j_z}) = u_{j_z}$. Furthermore, w_{j_z} prefers s_z to u_{j_z} and t_z prefers u_{j_z} over s_z . Therefore, we swap their partners and eventually obtain M_k with $M_k(t_z) = u_{j_z}$ and $M_k(w_{j_z}) = s_z$ for all $z \in [k]$. The partners of the remaining agents remain unchanged, i.e., are the same as in M_0 . Now, for each $z \in [k]$, (x_{j_z}, u_{j_z}) form an exchange-blocking pair of M_k . We swap their partners and obtain the matching M_{2k} where $M_{2k}(x_{j_z}) = t_z$ and $M_{2k}(u_{j_z}) = y_{j_z}$ for all $z \in [k]$. The partners of the remaining agents remain unchanged, i.e., are the same as in M_0 . It remains to be shown that M_{2k} is exchange-stable. For this we show that no agent can be part of an exchange-blocking pair in M_{2k} :

- For each $z \in [k]$, selector-agent s_z is matched to w_{j_z} . Since all selector agents from $S := \{s_z \mid z \in [k]\}$ have the same preferences over $\{w_i \mid i \in [n]\}$, no two agents from S can form an ebp. Neither can an agent from S and an agent from $\{u_i \mid i \in [n]\}$ jointly form an exchange-blocking pair since u_i is either matched with its most-preferred agent or matched with y_i who is not acceptable to s_j . Finally, no agent from S can form with an agent from $X := \{x_z \mid z \in [k]\}$ an exchange-blocking pair since every agent from S either prefers its own partner or does not find the partner of the agents from X acceptable.
- For each $j \in [n]$, vertex-agent x_j is either matched to some selector-agent t_i or to y_j . If x_j is matched to some t_i . Then x_j prefers any t_l with $l < i$. However, any such t_l is matched to some $x_{j'}$ agent that also prefers t_l over t_i .

If x_j is matched to y_j . Then x_j prefers any t_i over its partner y_j , however t_i is matched to some $x_{j'}$ agent. This $x_{j'}$ does not find y_j acceptable. Therefore x_j is not part of any exchange-blocking pairs.

- For each $j \in [n]$, vertex-agent u_j is either matched to w_j or to y_j . In the first case, u_j does not prefer anyone over its current partner. In the second case, u_j is matched to y_j . Then we know that w_j is matched to some s_i agent. Agent u_j envies s_i , however s_i cannot be part of an exchange-blocking pair.

Agent u_j also prefers any y_l with $\{v_j, v_l\} \in E(H)$ over y_j . Since v_j is in the independent set, we know that any adjacent vertex v_l is not in the set. Therefore agent y_l is matched to x_l . Agent x_l does not find y_j acceptable, so (u_j, x_l) is not an exchange-blocking pair. Therefore u_j is not part of any exchange-blocking pairs.

- For each $i \in [k]$, selector-agent t_i is matched to some x_j and prefers any u_m and all x_l with $l < j$. Agent u_m is either matched to agent y_m (and y_m is matched to its most acceptable partner and does not envy any other agent's partner) or w_m (who does not find x_j acceptable). An agent x_l is either matched to some other $t_{i'}$ agent (who also prefers x_l over x_j) or to y_l (who does not find x_j acceptable). Therefore t_i is not part of any exchange-blocking pairs.
- For each $j \in [n]$, vertex-agent y_j is either matched to u_j or to x_j . In the first case, u_j is most acceptable to agent y_j and therefore y_j does not envy any other agent. In the second case, y_j prefers only u_j over x_j . We know that u_j must be matched to w_j and w_j does not find x_j acceptable. Therefore y_j cannot be part of any exchange-blocking pairs.
- For each $j \in [n]$, vertex-agent w_j is either matched to some s_i or to u_j . In the first case, it will prefer any s_l with $l < i$. However s_l is matched to some $w_{j'}$ who also prefers s_l over s_i and thus does not form an exchange-blocking pair with w_j .

In the second case, w_j is matched to u_j and prefers any $s_{i'}$ agent. However, $s_{i'}$ is matched to some agent $w_{j'}$, and $w_{j'}$ does not find u_j acceptable. Therefore w_j cannot be part of an exchange-blocking pairs.

For the backwards direction, assume that $(\mathcal{P}, M_0, 2k)$ is a positive instance, meaning that there exists a perfect and exchange-stable matching M_t that can be reached in at most $2k$ swaps from M_0 (and $t \leq 2k$). We show that the set $X = \{v_j \mid \{s_i, w_j\} \in M_t, i \in [k], j \in [n]\}$ is an independent set of size k implying that (H, k) is a positive instance of INDEPENDENT SET.

Claim 5. *Each s_i is matched to some w_j in M_t .*

Proof. Towards a contradiction assume there is an s_i that is matched to t_i . Since we can assume that $k < n$, there must be some w_j that is not matched to any $s_{i'}$ agent. Hence w_j must be matched to u_j which means that M_t admits the exchange-blocking pair (w_j, t_i) . This is a contradiction as M_t is exchange-stable. (of Claim 5) \diamond

Claim 6. *No y_j is matched to u_l in M_t with $j \neq l$.*

Proof. Suppose y_j is matched to u_l . Then x_j must be matched to some t_i . However, t_i prefers u_l over x_j and y_j prefers x_j over u_l meaning that (t_i, y_j) is an exchange-blocking pair. Contradiction! (of Claim 6) \diamond

Claim 7. *No u_j is matched to t_i in M_t .*

Proof. Suppose u_j is matched to some t_i . Due to Claim 6 we know that y_j cannot be matched to some u_l that is not u_j . Then y_j must be matched to x_j . However, this makes (u_j, x_j) an exchange-blocking pair. Contradiction! (of Claim 7) \diamond

Claim 8. *If w_j is matched to s_i in M_t , then $M_t(y_j) = u_j$.*

Proof. If $M_t(w_j) = s_i$, then u_j must be matched to y_j since it cannot be matched to any $t_{i'}$ agent (Claim 7) nor to some y_l with $j \neq l$ (Claim 6). (of Claim 8) \diamond

Claim 9. X contains exactly k vertices.

Proof. We know that every s_i is matched to some w_j (Claim 5). A vertex v_j is selected into X if w_j is matched to some s_i . Since there are k different s_i agents, we will select exactly k vertices into X . (of Claim 9) \diamond

Claim 10. No two vertices in X are neighbors.

Proof. Suppose we have selected two neighboring vertices v_j, v_l , then w_j is matched to some s_i while agent w_l is matched to some $s_{i'}$ agent. By Claim 8 it follows that $M_t(y_j) = u_j$ and $M_t(y_l) = u_l$. This means that (u_j, u_l) is an exchange-blocking pair, which is a contradiction since we assume that M_t is exchange-stable. (of Claim 10) \diamond

Due to Claims 9 and 10 we know that X contains exactly k vertices and that there is no $x, y \in X$ such that $\{x, y\}$ is an edge in $E(H)$. This means that (H, k) is a positive instance of INDEPENDENT SET which concludes the proof of Theorem 5. \square

6 Conclusion

We conclude by mentioning that all obtained results transfer to the case when the preferences may contain ties (i.e., two agents are considered equally good).

Regarding preference restrictions [8], it would be interesting to know whether deciding (coalitional) exchange-stability for complete preferences would become tractable for restricted preferences domains, such as single-peakedness or single-crossingness.

Moreover, as it is unclear whether the number of exchange steps is polynomially bounded, the NP-containment of the problem of checking whether a given matching may reach an exchange-stable matching is open.

References

- [1] A. Abizada. Exchange-stability in roommate problems. *Review of Economic Design*, 23:3–12, 2019. 2
- [2] D. J. Abraham and D. F. Manlove. Pareto optimality in the roommates problem. Technical report, University of Glasgow, Department of Computing Science, 2004. TR-2004-182. 2
- [3] J. Alcalde. Exchange-proofness or divorce-proofness? Stability in one-sided matching markets. *Review of Economic Design*, 1:275–287, 1994. 1, 2
- [4] H. Aziz and A. Goldwaser. Coalitional exchange stable matchings in marriage and roommate market. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS '17)*, pages 1475–1477, 2017. Extended Abstract. 2
- [5] P. Biró and G. Norman. Analysis of stochastic matching markets. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 42(4):1021–1040, 2013. 2
- [6] H. L. Bodlaender, T. Hanaka, L. Jaffke, H. Ono, Y. Otachi, and T. C. van der Zanden. Hedonic seat arrangement problems. In A. E. F. Seghrouchni, G. Sukthankar, B. An, and N. Yorke-Smith, editors, *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS '20)*, pages 1777–1779, 2020. Extended Abstract. 2
- [7] H. L. Bodlaender, T. Hanaka, L. Jaffke, H. Ono, Y. Otachi, and T. C. van der Zanden. Hedonic seat arrangement problems. Technical report, arXiv:2002.10898 (cs.GT), 2020. 3
- [8] R. Bredereck, J. Chen, U. P. Finnendahl, and R. Niedermeier. Stable roommate with narcissistic, single-peaked, and single-crossing preferences. *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, 34(53):1–29, 2020. 26
- [9] K. Cechlárová. On the complexity of exchange-stable roommates. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 116(3):279–287, 2002. 1, 5
- [10] K. Cechlárová and D. F. Manlove. The exchange-stable marriage problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 152(1-3):109–122, 2005. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8
- [11] J. Chen. Reaching stable marriage via divorces is hard. Technical report, arXiv:1906.12274(cs.GT), 2020. 2
- [12] M. Cygan, F. V. Fomin, L. Kowalik, D. Lokshantov, D. Marx, M. Pilipczuk, M. Pilipczuk, and S. Saurabh. *Parameterized Algorithms*. Springer, 2015. 23
- [13] D. Gale and L. S. Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 120(5):386–391, 1962. 1
- [14] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability—A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman and Company, 1979. 6
- [15] J. E. Hopcroft and R. M. Karp. An $n^{5/2}$ algorithm for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 2(4):225–231, 1973. 22
- [16] R. W. Irving. Stable matching problems with exchange restrictions. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 16(4):344–360, 2008. 3

- [17] D. Knuth. *Mariages Stables*. Les Presses de L'Université de Montréal, 1976. [2](#)
- [18] E. McDermid, C. T. Cheng, and I. Suzuki. Hardness results on the man-exchange stable marriage problem with short preference lists. *Information Processing Letters*, 101(1): 13–19, 2007. [3](#)
- [19] S. Micali and V. V. Vazirani. An $o(\sqrt{|v|}|e|)$ algorithm for finding maximum matching in general graphs. In *Proceedings of the 21st Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS '80)*, pages 17–27, 1980. [22](#)