

# The Stable Matching Lattice under Changed Preferences, and Associated Algorithms

Rohith Reddy Gangam<sup>1</sup>, Tung Mai<sup>2</sup>, Nitya Raju<sup>\*3</sup>, and Vijay V. Vazirani<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of California, Irvine

<sup>2</sup>Adobe Research

<sup>3</sup>University of Maryland, College Park

## Abstract

[MV18] introduced a fundamental new algorithmic question on stable matching, namely finding a matching that is stable under two “nearby” instances, where “nearby” meant that in going from instance  $A$  to  $B$ , only *one agent* changes its preference list. By first establishing a sequence of structural results on the lattices of  $A$  and  $B$ , [MV18] and [GMRV22] settled all algorithmic questions related to this case. The current paper essentially settles the general case.

Assume that instance  $B$  is obtained from  $A$ , both on  $n$  workers and  $n$  firms, via changes in the preferences of  $p$  workers and  $q$  firms. If so, we will denote the change by  $(p, q)$ . Thus [MV18, GMRV22] settled the case  $(0, 1)$ , since they adopt the convention that one firm changes its preferences. Let  $\mathcal{M}_A$  and  $\mathcal{M}_B$  be the sets of stable matchings of instances  $A$  and  $B$ , and let  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$  be their lattices. Our results are:

1. For  $(0, n)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  is a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and of  $\mathcal{L}_B$ . We can efficiently obtain the worker-optimal and firm-optimal stable matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ . We also obtain the associated partial order, as promised by Birkhoff’s Representation Theorem, and use it to enumerate these matchings with polynomial delay.
2. For  $(1, n)$ , the only missing results are the partial order and enumeration.
3. We give an example with  $(2, 2)$  for which  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  fails to be a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ .

In light of the fact that for  $(n, n)$ , determining if  $(\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B) = \emptyset$  is NP-hard [MO19], a number of open questions arise; in particular, closing the gap between  $(2, 2)$  and  $(n, n)$ .

---

\*This work was done while the author was a student at the University of California, Irvine.

# 1 Introduction

The seminal 1962 paper of Gale and Shapley [GS62] on stable matching launched the field of matching-based market design. Over the decades, the remarkably deep and elegant structural, algorithmic and game theoretic properties of stable matchings were explored by numerous researchers and led to far-reaching applications, e.g., see [EIV23], culminating in the award of the 2012 Nobel Prize in Economics.

Five years ago, [MV18] identified a fundamental new question on stable matching, namely finding a matching that is stable under two “nearby” instances, where “nearby” meant that in going from instance  $A$  to  $B$ , only *one agent* changes its preference list. This turned out to be a fairly loaded question and its answer required two papers, as detailed below. Both papers first established new structural results on the lattices of nearby instances and then used them to derive the algorithms. As described in the abstract and detailed below, *the current paper essentially settles the general case.*

Let  $A$  be an instance of stable matching on  $n$  workers and  $n$  firms. [MV18] studied the special case when the change in the preference list of one agent, say firm  $f$ , involved an *upward shift*. Let  $f$ 's preference list be  $\{\dots, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k, w, \dots\}$ . Move up the position of worker  $w$  so  $f$ 's list becomes  $\{\dots, w, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k, \dots\}$ , and let  $B$  be the resulting instance. Let  $\mathcal{M}_A$  and  $\mathcal{M}_B$  be the sets of stable matchings of instances  $A$  and  $B$ , and let  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$  be their lattices. [MV18] showed that  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  is a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and of  $\mathcal{L}_B$  and that  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  is a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ . Building on these structural results, [MV18] gave polynomial time algorithms to determine if  $(\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B) \neq \emptyset$  and if so to find the worker-optimal and firm-optimal stable matchings in its lattice. They also found the associated partial order of this lattice, as promised by Birkhoff's Representation Theorem.

[GMRV22] studied the general case of nearby instances, i.e., firm  $f$  *arbitrarily permutes* its preference list. They showed that whereas  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  is still a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and of  $\mathcal{L}_B$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  may not be a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ ; however,  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  is a join semi-sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ , see Section 2.2. By introducing the notion of *compression* of the Birkhoff partial order, they gave efficient algorithms for all the questions considered by [MV18].

Our investigation of the general case started with Question 1, whose positive resolution would have led to a general fact about the class of finite distributive lattices, as described below.

**Question 1.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two arbitrary instances of stable matching on  $n$  workers and  $n$  firms. Is  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ , under its meet and join operations, and also of  $\mathcal{L}_B$ , under its meet and join operations?*

It is well known that the stable matching lattice is *universal* in the class of finite distributive lattices in the following sense: Given any lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  from this class, there is a stable matching instance, of an appropriate size, such that its lattice  $\mathcal{L}_A$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{L}$  [Bla84]. If the answer to Question 1 were “yes”, we would get the following general fact about this class: Let  $U$  be a finite set and let  $A$  and  $B$  be its subsets each of which supports a partial order which is a finite distributive lattice,  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$ , respectively. Then  $\mathcal{L}_A \cap \mathcal{L}_B$  is a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ , under its meet and join operations, and also of  $\mathcal{L}_B$ , under its meet and join operations.

Unfortunately, the answer to Question 1 is “no”, as stated in Theorem 12. The smallest counter-example we could find has  $n = 4$ , and  $B$  is obtained from  $A$  by changing the preferences of two firms and two workers.

Assume that instance  $B$  is obtained from  $A$  via changes in the preferences of  $p$  workers and  $q$  firms. If so, we will denote the change by  $(p, q)$ . As a result of the negative answer, we need to determine the parameters  $(p, q)$  for which the answer is “yes”. Thus [MV18, GMRV22] showed that the answer is yes for  $(0, 1)$  and Theorem 12 shows that the answer is no for  $(2, 2)$ .

For a choice of parameters  $(p, q)$  we also would like to answer the following algorithmic questions:

1. Determine if  $(\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B) \neq \emptyset$ .
2. If the answer to the first question is “yes”, efficiently obtain the worker-optimal and firm-optimal stable matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ .
3. Also obtain the associated partial order, as promised by Birkhoff’s Representation Theorem.
4. Use this partial order to enumerate the matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  with polynomial delay.

Our results are:

1. For  $(0, n)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  is a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and of  $\mathcal{L}_B$ . Furthermore, we can affirmatively answer all four algorithmic questions stated above. We note that the algorithms for the second question are generalizations of the Gale-Shapley deferred acceptance algorithm; however because of the asymmetry between workers and firms, we need to give specialized algorithms for obtaining the worker-optimal and firm-optimal stable matchings. All this holds for  $(0, k)$ , for any  $k \leq n$  as well.
2. For  $(1, n)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  is a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and of  $\mathcal{L}_B$ , and we can affirmatively answer the first two algorithmic questions. Once again, because of the asymmetry between workers and firms, we need to give specialized algorithms for obtaining the worker-optimal and firm-optimal stable matchings, and once again, these results hold for  $(1, k)$ , for any  $k \leq n$  as well. Regarding the third question we prove that the Birkhoff partial order can be obtained efficiently for  $(1, n)$  if and only if it can be obtained efficiently for  $(1, 1)$ .
3. As stated above, for  $(2, 2)$  we give an example for which  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  fails to be a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ .

For this case  $(2, 2)$  we do not know the complexity of determining if  $(\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B) \neq \emptyset$ , though we believe a polynomial time algorithm is likely. If so, in light of the fact that for  $(n, n)$ , determining if  $(\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B) = \emptyset$  is NP-hard ([MO19, CNS18]), closing the gap between  $(2, 2)$  and  $(n, n)$  becomes an important question, i.e., for what choices of parameters in this range is this question in  $\mathcal{P}$  and when does NP-hardness set in.

[MV18] had given an application of this problem to *robust stable matching*. Let  $D$  be the domain from which instance  $B$  is picked. For [MV18],  $|D| = O(n^3)$ , i.e., the number of different instances  $B$  that can arise from instance  $A$  via upward shifts. Assume there is a probability distribution over  $D$ , so that  $B$  is picked with this distribution. The question is to find a matching that is stable for  $A$  and maximizes the probability of being stable for  $B$ . This problem is efficiently solvable.

With [GMRV22], the domain increased to  $2n(n!)$  and our work increases it to  $(n!)^{n+1}$ . However, this application is not a significant one.

This problem has yet to find a niche application. Since the problem is a fundamental one and with ever more diverse and impactful matching markets being launched into our economy, e.g., see [EIV23, ftToC19], it will not be surprising if a niche application is eventually found<sup>1</sup>.

Building on [MV18], [CSS21] defines another notion of robustness based on swaps. A *swap* is a reversal of two consecutive agents in the preference list of a worker or a firm. Given an instance  $A$  and a parameter  $d$ , they call a stable matching  $M$  to be *d-robust* if it remains stable after  $d$  arbitrary swaps. They use structural properties of the stable matching lattice to efficiently determine if instance  $A$  admits a *d-robust* matching.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 The stable matching problem and the lattice of stable matchings

A stable matching problem takes as input a set of  $n$  workers,  $\mathcal{W} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$  and a set of  $n$  firms,  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n\}$ , collectively referred to as agents; Each agent  $a \in \mathcal{W} \cup \mathcal{F}$  has a preference profile  $(\succ_a)$  that is a complete preference ranking (a strict total order) over the agents of the other type. The notation  $w_i \succ_f w_j$  indicates that firm  $f$  strictly prefers  $w_i$  to  $w_j$  in its preference list. A similar notation is used for worker preferences.

A matching  $M$  is a one-to-one correspondence between  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$ . For each pair  $(w, f) \in M$ ,  $w$  is called the partner of  $f$  in  $M$  (or  $M$ -partner) and vice versa. For a matching  $M$ , a pair  $(w, f) \notin M$  is said to be a *blocking pair* if they prefer each other to their partners, that is if  $f \succ_w M(w)$  and  $w \succ_f M(f)$ . A matching  $M$  is *stable* if it has no blocking pairs.

Let  $M$  and  $M'$  be two stable matchings. We say that  $M$  *dominates*  $M'$ , denoted  $M \preceq M'$ , if every worker weakly prefers its partner in  $M$  to  $M'$ . Define the relation *predecessor* as the transitive closure of dominates. For two stable matchings,  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , stable matching  $M$  is a *common predecessor* of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  if it is a predecessor of both  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ . Furthermore,  $M$  is a *lowest common predecessor* of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  if it is a common predecessor  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , and there is no other common predecessor  $M'$  such that  $M$  is a predecessor of  $M'$ . Analogously, one can define the notions of *successor* and *highest common successor*. This dominance partial order has the following property: For any two stable  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , their lowest common predecessor is unique and their highest common successor is unique, i.e., the partial order is a *lattice*; the former is called the *meet*, denoted  $M_1 \wedge M_2$ , and the latter is called the *join*, denoted  $M_1 \vee M_2$ .

One can show that  $M_1 \wedge M_2$ , is the matching that results when each worker chooses its more preferred partner from  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ ; it is easy to show that this matching is also stable. Interestingly,  $M_1 \wedge M_2$  is also the matching that results when each firm chooses its lesser preferred partner from  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ . Similarly,  $M_1 \vee M_2$  is the matching that results when each worker(/firm) chooses its less(/more) preferred partner from  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ ; this matching is also stable. Because of this interesting duality of the stable matching lattice, all the above relations can be equivalently

---

<sup>1</sup>There are several prominent examples of problems which were studied because of their fundamental nature, without any applications in mind, but years later, they were found to be immensely important in practice, e.g., online bipartite matching [KVV90].

defined in terms of firms, and the lattice properties will still hold true. Additionally, the lattice operations *join* and *meet* distribute, i.e., given three stable matchings  $M, M', M''$ ,

$$M \vee (M' \wedge M'') = (M \vee M') \wedge (M \vee M'') \quad \text{and} \quad M \wedge (M' \vee M'') = (M \wedge M') \vee (M \wedge M'').$$

It is easy to see that the lattice must contain a matching,  $M_{\top}$ , that dominates all others and a matching  $M_{\perp}$  that is dominated by all others.  $M_{\top}$  is called the *worker-optimal stable matching*, since in it, each worker is matched to its most preferred firm among all stable matchings. This is also the *firm-pessimal stable matching*. Similarly,  $M_{\perp}$  is the *worker-pessimal* and *firm-optimal stable matching*. And since the number of matchings stable under any instance is finite, the stable matching lattice is always a *finite distributive lattice*.

## 2.2 Birkhoff's Theorem, sublattices and compressions

**Definition 1.** A closed set of a poset is a set  $S$  of elements of the poset such that if an element is in  $S$  then all of its predecessors are also in  $S$ .

It is easy to see that the family of closed sets (also called lower sets) of a partial order, say  $\Pi$ , is closed under union and intersection and forms a distributive lattice, with join and meet being these two operations, respectively; let us denote it by  $L(\Pi)$ . Birkhoff's theorem [Bir37], which has also been called *the fundamental theorem for finite distributive lattices*, e.g., see [Sta96], states that corresponding to any finite distributed lattice,  $\mathcal{L}$ , there is a partial order, say  $\Pi$ , whose lattice of closed sets  $L(\Pi)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{L}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{L} \cong L(\Pi)$ . We will say that  $\Pi$  *generates*  $\mathcal{L}$ .

**Theorem 2.** (Birkhoff [Bir37]) Every finite distributive lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  is isomorphic to  $L(\Pi)$ , for some finite poset  $\Pi$ .

A *join semi-sublattice*  $\mathcal{L}_j$  of a distributive lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{L}$  such that for any two elements  $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $x \vee y \in \mathcal{L}_j$  whenever  $x, y \in \mathcal{L}_j$ . Similarly, a *meet semi-sublattice*  $\mathcal{L}_m$  of a distributive lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  is subset of  $\mathcal{L}$  such that for any two elements  $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $x \wedge y \in \mathcal{L}_m$  whenever  $x, y \in \mathcal{L}_m$ . A *sublattice*  $\mathcal{L}'$  of a distributive lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{L}$  that is a join and meet semi-sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}$ .

The *Hasse diagram* of a poset is a directed graph with a vertex for each element in poset, and an edge from  $x$  to  $y$  if  $x \prec y$  and there is no  $z$  such that  $x \prec z \prec y$ , i.e., all precedences implied by transitivity are suppressed.

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the lattice generated by poset  $\Pi$  and let  $H(\Pi)$  denote the Hasse diagram of  $\Pi$ . Consider the following operations to derive a new poset  $\Pi'$ : Choose a set  $E$  of directed edges and add them to  $H(\Pi)$ . Let  $H_E$  be the resulting graph. Let  $H'$  be the graph obtained by shrinking the strongly connected components of  $H_E$ ; let  $\Pi'$  be the partial order defined by the non-shrunk edges of  $H'$  on its nodes. Then  $\Pi'$  is called a *compression* of  $\Pi$ . Then

**Theorem 3.** ([GMRV22] Theorem 1) There is a one-to-one correspondence between the compressions of  $\Pi$  and the sublattices of  $L(\Pi)$  such that if sublattice  $\mathcal{L}'$  of  $L(\Pi)$  corresponds to compression  $\Pi'$ , then  $\mathcal{L}'$  is generated by  $\Pi'$ .

Let  $\mathcal{L}'$  be the sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}$  generated by  $\Pi'$ . We will say that the set of edges  $E$  defines  $\mathcal{L}'$ . It can be seen that, while a set of edges,  $E$ , uniquely defines a sublattice  $L(\Pi')$ , there may be multiple edge sets that define the same sublattice.

One way to define partial order for the stable matching lattice is using the concept of “rotations”. The partial order of rotations can be found efficiently and has a succinct representation, even if the lattice itself is exponentially large ([IL86]). [GI89] describes one of the many ways to efficiently enumerate stable matchings using the rotation poset (algorithm in Figure 3.8). Compressions defined on the rotation poset characterize sublattices of the original lattice by grouping rotations into “meta-rotations” and giving a partial order over them. Using poset of “meta-rotations” instead of the rotation poset, we can efficiently enumerate matchings in the *sublattice*. (Details about rotation poset can be found in Appendix A, though they aren’t necessary for this paper).

### 2.3 Lattices of nearby instances

We will use the notation  $\mathcal{M}_I$  and  $\mathcal{L}_I$  to represent the set of matchings stable with respect to an instance  $I$  and its corresponding lattice. Instances  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k$  ( $k \geq 2$ ) are said to be  $(p, q)$ , if they are all defined on the *same* set of  $n$  workers and  $n$  firms, and the *same* set of  $p$  workers and  $q$  firms permute, possibly back to the same preference, their preferences from any  $A_i$  to  $A_j$ . Let us consider two instances  $A$  and  $B$  that are  $(0, 1)$  or  $(1, 0)$ .

As the number of matchings stable under an instance can be exponential in  $n$ , checking the stability of every matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A$  with respect to  $B$  can take exponential time. Nonetheless, the following results (statements modified to suit the notation of this paper) from [GMRV22] reveal the structure of such matchings and present polynomial time algorithms to find them.

**Theorem 4.** ([GMRV22] Theorem 29) *If a lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  can be partitioned into a sublattice  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and a semi-sublattice  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , and there is a polynomial time oracle that answers if any  $x \in \mathcal{L}$  is in  $\mathcal{L}_1$  or  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , then, an edge set defining  $\mathcal{L}_1$  can be found in polynomial time.*

**Lemma 1.** *If instances  $A$  and  $B$  are  $(0, 1)$  (or  $(1, 0)$ ) then*

1. ([GMRV22] Proposition 6)  $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  is a sublattice of both  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$ .
2. ([GMRV22] Lemma 31)  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  is a join (or meet) semi-sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ .
3. ([GMRV22] Proposition 32) A set of edges defining the sublattice  $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  can be computed in polynomial time.

These results can be extended to multiple instances in the following way. Let  $A, B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k$  are such that each instance  $B_i$  is formed from instance  $A$  by arbitrarily permuting the preference of one agent (possibly a different agent for each  $B_i$ ), i.e.,  $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}, A$  and  $B_i$  are  $(1, 0)$  or  $(0, 1)$ . Lemma 1 tells us that each  $\mathcal{L}_i = \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_i}$  is a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ . Let the edge set defining each  $\mathcal{L}_i$  be  $E_i$  and let  $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_1} \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_2} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_k}$ . Then

**Theorem 5.** 1. ([GMRV22] Corollary 7)  $\mathcal{L}'$  is a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ .

2. ([GMRV22] Lemma 33)  $E = \cup_i E_i$  defines  $\mathcal{L}'$ .

3. ([GMRV22] Theorem 2)  $E$ , and hence the partial order  $\Pi'$  generating  $L'$ , can be computed efficiently.
4. ([GI89] Theorem 3.5.1) Matchings in  $\mathcal{L}'$  can be enumerated efficiently.

## 2.4 Linear programming formulation




Figure 1: Finding integral stable matching from a fractional solution(Picture from [EIV23])

A well-known result about the stable matching problem is that it has a linear programming formulation that has integral optimal vertices, which yields an efficient algorithm to find the corresponding stable matchings. The formulation of the LP 1 is given below. The third constraint disallows blocking pairs, as an equivalent condition for a worker-firm pair  $(w, f)$  to not be a blocking pair of a matching  $M$  under instance  $A$  is to ensure that if  $w$  is matched to someone worse than  $f$ , then  $f$  is matched to someone better than  $w$ . The remaining conditions ensure that  $x$  is a fractional perfect matching.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max 0 \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_w x_{wf} = 1 \quad \forall w \in W, \\
& \quad \quad \sum_f x_{wf} = 1 \quad \forall f \in F, \\
& \quad \quad \sum_{f >_w^A f'} x_{wf'} - \sum_{w' >_f^A w} x_{w'f} \leq 0 \quad \forall w \in W, \forall f \in F, \\
& \quad \quad x_{wf} \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in W, \forall f \in F.
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

A solution  $x$  to the LP 1 can be converted into an integral perfect matching in the following way. Construct  $2n$  unit intervals, each corresponding to an agent. For each worker,  $w$ , break its interval  $I_w$  into  $n$  subintervals, each of length  $x_{wf}$  (note that  $\sum_f x_{wf} = 1$ ) ordered from  $w$ 's most preferred firm to the least. Repeat the same process with each firm  $f$ 's interval  $I_f$ , but reverse the ordering of the subintervals from their least to the most preferred worker. Choose  $\theta$  uniformly at random from the interval  $[0, 1]$ , and determine which subinterval  $\theta$  belongs to, in each agent's interval. The probability that any of these subintervals is of zero length is zero, so we assume this case doesn't happen. Given this, let  $\mu_\theta : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  represents the firm corresponding to the subinterval containing  $\theta$  for each worker and  $\mu'_\theta : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$  represents the worker corresponding

to the subinterval containing  $\theta$  for each firm. Then, these functions can be shown to be bijections (or perfect matchings). In fact, they are inverses of each other and are stable for any  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ .

**Lemma 2.** [TS98] *If  $\mu_\theta(w) = f$  then  $\mu'_\theta(f) = w$ .*

**Lemma 3.** [TS98] *For each  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\mu_\theta$  is stable.*

**Theorem 6.** [Van89] *The stable matching polytope given by LP 1 has integral optimal vertices, i.e., it is a convex hull of stable matchings.*

### 3 Setting I

In this setting, we look at instances with the same preferences on the workers' side and differing preferences on the firms' side, i.e., instances that are  $(0, n)$ . The case of  $(n, 0)$  is equivalent. We start by recalling the following proposition from [GMRV22]. (All omitted proofs and examples can be found in Appendix B, C and D).

**Proposition 7.** ([GMRV22] Proposition 6) *If  $A$  and  $B$  are  $(0, n)$  then the matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  form a sublattice in each of the two lattices.*

The proposition shows that the join and meet of stable matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  under the ordering of  $\mathcal{L}_A$  are the same as in  $\mathcal{L}_B$ , which means that workers agree about which stable matchings in the intersection they prefer. The main driver in this setting is the fact that workers have the *same preferences* across the different instances, which allows us to use many arguments that apply to the stable matching lattices of single instances. Additionally, the set  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  forms the same sublattice in  $\mathcal{L}_A$  as well as  $\mathcal{L}_B$  in that the partial orders are the same, that is  $(\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B, \preceq_A) = (\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B, \preceq_B)$ . This implies the existence of worker-optimal and firm-optimal stable matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  and indicates that we could expect a version of the Deferred Acceptance algorithm to work in the setting.

This motivates the notion of a “compound” instance that captures agent preferences from all individual instances, and we present a variant of the Deferred Acceptance (DA) algorithm on this new instance that finds these matchings. See Algorithm 8 that generates a compound instance.

**Definition 2.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be  $(0, n)$ . Define compound instance  $X$  as follows:*

1. *For worker  $w \in \mathcal{W}$ , their preference list in  $X$  is the same as their list in  $A$  and  $B$ .*
2. *For firm  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , they prefer worker  $w_i$  to worker  $w_j$  in  $X$ , if and only if they prefer  $w_i$  to worker  $w_j$  in  $A$  as well as in  $B$ , i.e.,*

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \forall w_i, w_j \in \mathcal{W}, w_i >_f^X w_j \Leftrightarrow (w_i >_f^A w_j \text{ and } w_i >_f^B w_j)$$

In the compound instance, workers have totally ordered preference lists while firms have partially ordered preference lists. If a firm  $f$  does not have a strict preference between two workers  $w_i$  and  $w_j$  under  $X$ , we say  $f$  is indifferent between them and denote this  $w_i \sim_f^X w_j$ .

For matching  $M$ , the worker-firm pair  $(w, f) \notin M$ , is said to be *beststrongly blocking* with respect to  $M$  if  $w$  prefers  $f$  to its  $M$ -partner and  $f$  either prefers  $w$  or is indifferent between  $w$  and its  $M$ -partner. A matching  $M$  with no strong blocking pairs is said to be strongly stable under  $X$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}_X$  represent the set of matchings strongly stable under preference profile  $X$ . The notion of compound instances is made important in our context by the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.** *If  $X$  is the compound instance of  $A$  and  $B$  then a matching  $M$  is strongly stable under  $X$  if and only if it is stable under both  $A$  and  $B$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{M}_X = \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ .*

### 3.1 Worker and firm optimal matchings

**WORKEROPTIMALFORCOMPOUNDINSTANCE( $X$ ):**  
**Input:** Compound stable matching instance  $X$   
**Output:** Perfect matching  $M$  or  $\boxtimes$   
Each worker has a list of all firms in decreasing order of priority.

1. Until all workers receive an acceptance or some worker is rejected by all firms, do:
  - (a)  $\forall w \in W : w$  proposes to their best uncrossed firm.
  - (b)  $\forall f \in F : f$  tentatively accepts their *best-ever* proposal, i.e., the proposal that they strictly prefer to every other proposal ever received, and rejects the rest.
  - (c)  $\forall w \in W : w$  is rejected by a firm  $f$ , they cross  $f$  off their list.
2. If all workers got an acceptance, output the perfect matching( $M$ ); Else output  $\boxtimes$ .

Figure 2: Algorithm to find the worker-optimal stable matching using compound instance  $X$

**FIRMOPTIMALFORCOMPOUNDINSTANCE( $X$ ):**  
**Input:** Compound stable matching instance  $X$ .  
**Output:** Perfect matching  $M$  or  $\boxtimes$ .  
Each firm has a DAG of all workers in representing its partial order preferences.

1. Until all firms receive an acceptance or some firm is rejected by all workers, do
  - (a)  $\forall f \in F : f$  proposes to the "*best*" *uncrossed workers*, i.e., to every uncrossed worker with no other strictly better uncrossed worker that they prefer.
  - (b)  $\forall w \in W : w$  tentatively accepts the best proposal and rejects the rest.
  - (c)  $\forall f \in F : f$  is rejected by a worker  $w$ , they cross  $w$  off their *DAG*.
2. If all firms received an acceptance, output the perfect matching( $M$ ); Else output  $\boxtimes$

Figure 3: Algorithm to find the firm-optimal stable matching using compound instance  $X$

The original Deferred Acceptance Algorithm 7 works in iterations. In each iteration, three steps happen. (a) The proposing side, say workers, propose to their best firm that hasn't yet rejected them; (b) Each firm tentatively accepts their best proposal of the round and rejects all others; (c) All workers cross off the firms that rejected them; And the loop continues. If at any point a perfect matching is found, that matching is outputted as stable. The core reasoning of the

algorithm is that whenever a rejection occurs, that worker-firm pair can never be matched in any stable matching. We modify this algorithm to find the worker and firm optimal stable matchings in the intersection for the  $(0, n)$  setting, aiming to prevent strong blocking pairs.

**Theorem 8.** *Algorithms 2 and 3 find the worker and firm optimal matchings respectively if they exist.*

The worker-optimal Algorithm 2 (equivalent to algorithms presented in [MO19, FKJ16, GMRV22]) differs from the DA algorithm as follows. Every firm receives a set of proposals from the workers and accepts a single proposal only if it is strictly better than *every* proposal it has *ever* received, including proposals in previous iterations. This prevents strong blocking pairs where the firm is indifferent between its match and another worker. Observe that a firm may end up rejecting all proposals in a round if they are indifferent between the potential matches, and this is necessary to avoid strong blocking pairs.

In firm optimal Algorithm 3 the firms propose, but they have a directed acyclic graph (DAG) representing partial order preferences. Each firm proposes to *all* of the best uncrossed workers  $w$  in their preference DAG, that is all workers  $w$  for whom there is no  $w'$  that  $f$  strictly prefers, i.e.  $w' \succ_f^X w$ . As in the DA algorithm, workers accept their best option and reject the rest. Since workers have completely ordered lists, when a worker rejects a firm for a better match, they cannot form a blocking pair with the rejected firm. The other possibility is when a firm proposes to multiple workers who all tentatively accept their proposal. It must be the case that one of these workers eventually rejects the firm for a better match, or the algorithm terminates and returns no perfect matching. Note that when instances  $A$  and  $B$  are the same, instance  $X$  has total order preferences on both sides and the algorithms revert to the original DA algorithm.

### 3.2 Birkhoff's partial order

Note that when instances  $A$  and  $B$  are  $(0, n)$ , as Lemma 5 states and Figure 9 shows  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  is not necessarily a semi-sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ .

**Lemma 5.** *If  $A$  and  $B$  are  $(0, n)$ , then  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  is not always a semi-sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ .*

This shows that Theorem 4 cannot be used directly to find Birkhoff's partial order. To get around this, we define  $n$  hybrid instances,  $B_1, \dots, B_n$ , so that  $A$  and  $B_i$  are  $(0, 1), \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Specifically, the preference profile of agent  $x$  in instance  $B_i$  is given by

$$\succ_x^{B_i} = \begin{cases} \succ_x^B, & \text{if } x = f_i \\ \succ_x^A, & \text{if } x \neq f_i \end{cases}$$

i.e., instance  $B_i$  is exactly the same as instance  $A$  except for the preferences of firm  $f_i$  where it is like instance  $B$ . Defined this way, Theorem 9 states that matchings that are stable under both  $A$  and  $B$  are exactly those that are stable under  $A, B_1, B_2, \dots$  and  $B_n$ .

**Theorem 9.**  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B = \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_1} \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_2} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_n}$

**Theorem 10.** *If  $A$  and  $B$  are  $(0, n)$ , Birkhoff's partial order generating  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  can be computed efficiently and the matchings can be enumerated efficiently.*

*Proof.* Since each  $B_i$  differs from instance  $A$  at only exactly agent, we first use Lemma 1 to find the edge sets  $E_i$  representing  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_i}$ . From Theorem 5, the union of these edge sets define the sublattice  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  and can be used to enumerate the matchings efficiently.  $\square$

### 3.3 Extension to Multiple Instances

The results extend to multiple instances. Let  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k$  all be  $(0, n)$ . Then

**Theorem 11.**  *$\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{M}_{A_1} \cap \mathcal{M}_{A_2} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{M}_{A_k}$  is a sublattice of each of  $\mathcal{L}_{A_i}$ . The worker and firm optimal matchings of  $\mathcal{L}'$  and Birkhoff's partial order can be found in polynomial time and its matchings can be enumerated with polynomial delay.*

**Corollary 1.** *Strongly stable matchings of an instance  $Y$  with partial order preferences on one-side form a lattice. Each partial order has a finite number of linear extensions and it follows that for any instance  $Y$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_Y$ , can be written as an intersection of finitely many lattices. But since the number of linear extensions can be exponential in  $n$ , this does not give an efficient way to derive its Birkhoff's partial order.*

## 4 Setting II

In the setting , both workers and firms are allowed to have different preferences going from instance  $A$  to  $B$ . This is the most general setting possible as  $A$  and  $B$  do not need to have any similarity apart from being defined over the same universe of agents.

We will demonstrate examples that show that the *join* and *meet* operations are no longer equivalent in  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$ . As a result the argument used in the previous setting in Proposition 7 does not extend. In fact for stable matchings  $M, M' \in \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ , it may be the case that some workers prefer  $M$  to  $M'$  in  $A$  but prefer  $M'$  to  $M$  in  $B$ , which is not possible in Setting I. Specifically even if the intersection is a sublattice, the base set is  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ , but the partial orders  $\leq_A \neq \leq_B$  may be different.

A trial-and-error approach shows that the intersection may be a sublattice for many instances. The structure of the sublattice may be more general as the *join* and *meet* operators may not be equivalent in  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$  (i.e.,  $(\vee_A, \wedge_A) \neq (\vee_B, \wedge_B)$ ). The example in Figure 10 demonstrates this where the intersection is a sublattice, but the partial ordering of the stable matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  differs.

Instance  $B$  is obtained from instance  $A$  by permuting the preferences of workers 1 and 2, and firms  $a$  and  $b$ . It can be seen that taking the join (or meet) of any two matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  yields another matching in the intersection regardless of which instance you consider, however workers 1 and 2 prefer  $M_2$  to  $M_1$  in  $A$  while they prefer  $M_1$  to  $M_2$  in  $B$ . Figure 4 illustrates this change in the partial ordering of matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  depending on the underlying instance.

$M_1 = \{1b, 2a, 3d, 4c, 5e, 6f\}$  and  $M_2 = \{1a, 2b, 3c, 4d, 5f, 6e\}$  are both stable under  $A$  and  $B$ .  
 $X_1 = M_1 \wedge_A M_2 = \{1a, 2b, 3c, 4d, 5e, 6f\}$  and  $X_2 = M_1 \vee_A M_2 = \{1b, 2a, 3d, 4c, 5f, 6e\}$ .

$Y_1 = M_1 \wedge_B M_2 = \{1b, 2a, 3c, 4d, 5e, 6f\}$  and  $Y_2 = M_1 \vee_B M_2 = \{1a, 2b, 3d, 4c, 5f, 6e\}$ .




Figure 4: Lattices  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$  from Example 10

**Theorem 12.** *If  $A$  and  $B$  are  $(p, q)$  with  $p, q \geq 2$ , then  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  may not be a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ .*

But, as theorem 12 states, it is not always the case that the intersection is a sublattice. So, we have seen that for  $(0, n)$ , the intersection is a sublattice, but for  $(2, 2)$ , it is not. The following question arises - what is the boundary where the property of “the intersection is a sublattice” breaks? We will show that for  $(1, n)$  the intersection is still a sublattice. Let  $\mathcal{W} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n\}$ . Let  $A$  and  $B$  be stable matching instances on  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $w_1$  and an arbitrary number of firms might permute their preferences from  $A$  to  $B$  -  $A$  and  $B$  are  $(1, n)$ .

**Theorem 13.** *If  $A$  and  $B$  are  $(1, n)$ , then  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  is a sublattice of both  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assume  $|\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B| > 1$  and let  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  be two different matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ . Let  $\vee_A$  and  $\vee_B$  be the join operations under  $A$  and  $B$  respectively. Likewise, let  $\wedge_A$  and  $\wedge_B$  be the meet operations under  $A$  and  $B$ .

$M_1 \vee_A M_2$  is the matching obtained by assigning each worker to its less preferred partner from  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  according to instance  $A$ . Since the preferences of workers  $w_2, w_3, \dots, w_n$  are identical in  $A$  and  $B$ , each of their less preferred partner from  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are also the same in  $A$  and  $B$  so  $\forall w \neq w_1, (M_1 \vee_A M_2)(w) = (M_1 \vee_B M_2)(w)$ .  $M_1 \vee_A M_2$  and  $M_1 \vee_B M_2$  are stable matchings under their respective instances and so, are also perfect. Since each of the above  $n - 1$  workers is assigned the same partner in both the perfect matchings, the  $n^{\text{th}}$  worker,  $w_1$  should also be assigned the same remaining firm as its partner in both matchings.

Therefore,  $M_1 \vee_A M_2 = M_1 \vee_B M_2$ . A similar argument can be applied to show that  $M_1 \wedge_A M_2 = M_1 \wedge_B M_2$ . Hence, the operators *join* and *meet* under instances  $A$  and  $B$  are equivalent and

$M_1 \vee_A M_2$  and  $M_1 \wedge_A M_2$  are both in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ . The theorem follows.  $\square$

## 4.1 Worker and Firm Optimal Algorithms

Theorem 13 indicates that if instances  $A$  and  $B$  have different preference profiles for  $n$  firms and one worker, the notion of worker and firm-optimal stable matchings is valid. However, constructing a compound instance does not work as the characterization used in Lemma 4 does not extend when there are partially ordered preferences on both sides. Instead, we exploit the fact that the partial order of stable matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  is the same in  $\mathcal{L}_A$  as in  $\mathcal{L}_B$ . Specifically, the matching  $M \in \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  that is optimal for workers according to their preferences in  $A$ , is optimal for workers according to their preferences in  $B$  as well.

**Theorem 14.** *Algorithms 5 and 6 find the worker and firm optimal matchings respectively if they exist.*

The worker optimal algorithm runs the DA algorithm simultaneously in multiple rooms, where the preference lists for each room correspond to individual instances. Agents consider the preferences based on the rooms and in each room, workers propose and firms tentatively accept their best proposals and reject the rest - however, the rejections apply across all rooms. For example, if a worker is rejected by a firm in room  $R_A$ , they cross that firm off their list in *all* rooms. This ensures that if a perfect matching is found, it is stable with respect to all instances. The main issue that needs to be dealt with is the possibility of the algorithm terminating with distinct perfect matchings in different rooms. Lemma 20 shows that this outcome is not possible, and this is largely a consequence of the fact that the intersection has the same partial order in both lattices.

The firm optimal algorithm operates similarly with the firms proposing and the workers tentatively accepting. The key modification here is that when workers reject firms, they *preemptively* reject *all* other firms that are worse according to their list in *all* rooms, including firms that haven't proposed to them yet. This step ensures the same perfect matching is found in all the rooms.

## 4.2 Birkhoff's partial order

Let  $w_1 \in W, f_1, \dots, f_n \in F$  be the workers and firms who have different preferences in  $A$  and  $B$ . We use an idea similar to that in Section 3.2. Let  $B_X$  denote the stable matching instance where the preference lists of all agents in  $X$  are the same as in  $B$ , and for the remaining agents are the same as in  $A$ . Then,

**Theorem 15.**  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B = \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_{\{w_1, f_1\}}} \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_{\{w_1, f_2\}}} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_{\{w_1, f_n\}}}.$

**Corollary 2.** *Finding Birkhoff's partial order for  $(1, n)$  is in  $\mathcal{P}$  if and only if finding Birkhoff's partial order for  $(1, 1)$  is in  $\mathcal{P}$ .*

The characterization requires that the smaller instances include changes from a worker and a firm. Certain blocking pairs are introduced in instance  $B$  only when a worker *and* a firm involved have modified lists, and this cannot be captured when the changes are restricted to one side.

WORKEROPTIMAL( $A, B$ ):

**Input:** Stable matching instances  $A$  and  $B$

**Output:** Perfect matching  $M$  or  $\boxtimes$  or “No Idea”

Assume there are two rooms,  $\mathcal{R}_A$  and  $\mathcal{R}_B$  corresponding to instances  $A$  and  $B$  respectively. Each worker has a list, initialized to all firms, that they look at while proposing.

1. Until there is no rejection in any room or some worker is rejected by all firms, do:
  - (a)  $\forall I \in \{A, B\}, \forall w \in W : w$  proposes to their best-in- $I$  uncrossed firm in  $\mathcal{R}_I$ .
  - (b)  $\forall I \in \{A, B\}, \forall f \in F : f$  tentatively accepts their best-in- $I$  proposal in room  $\mathcal{R}_I$  and rejects the rest.
  - (c)  $\forall w \in W : if w$  is rejected by a firm  $f$  in *any* room, they cross  $f$  off their list.
2. (a) If some worker is rejected by all firms, output  $\boxtimes$ .  
 (b) Else, the acceptances define perfect matchings in each room. If they are the same in all rooms, output the perfect matching( $M$ ). If not, output “No Idea”.

Figure 5: Algorithm to find the worker-optimal stable matching. Note that proposers(workers) have a single list(/set) across rooms. They might propose to different firms in different rooms but they look at all the rejections and synchronize their lists in step 2(c).

**Lemma 6.** *If  $A$  and  $B$  are  $(1, 1)$ , then  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  is not always a semi-sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ .*

However unlike in  $(0, 1)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  is not always a semi-sublattice in  $(1, 1)$ ; see example in Figure 12. As a result, Theorem 4 cannot be used here and the problem of finding Birkhoff’s partial order for  $(1, 1)$ , and hence  $(n, 1)$ , remains open along with finding a way to enumerate the matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  with polynomial delay.

### 4.3 LP-Approach

For a single stable matching instance, there is a linear programming formulation where the vertices of the polyhedron are *integral* (see Section 2.4), yielding an efficient way to find stable matchings. We will similarly define a linear program whose integral optimal vertices correspond to stable matchings under instances  $A$  and  $B$ .

The linear program is given below - the first two and last constraints ensure that any solution  $x$  is a fractional perfect matching, and the remaining two constraints prevent blocking pairs with respect to either instance.

FIRMOPTIMAL( $A, B$ ):

**Input:** Stable matching instances  $A$  and  $B$

**Output:** Perfect matching  $M$  or  $\boxtimes$  or “No Idea”

Assume there are two rooms,  $\mathcal{R}_A$  and  $\mathcal{R}_B$  corresponding to instances  $A$  and  $B$  respectively. Each firm has a list, initialized to all workers, that they look at while proposing.

1. Until there is no rejection in any room or some firm is rejected by all firms, do:
  - (a)  $\forall I \in \{A, B\}, \forall f \in F : f$  proposes to their best-in- $I$  uncrossed worker in  $\mathcal{R}_I$ .
  - (b)  $\forall I \in \{A, B\}, \forall w \in W : w$  tentatively accepts their best-in- $I$  proposal (call it  $f_w^I$ ) in room  $\mathcal{R}_I$  and rejects the rest.
  - (c)  $\forall I \in \{A, B\}, \forall w \in W : w$  sends *preemptive rejections* to all  $f'$  that they haven't rejected already, who are worse than their current option in  $\mathcal{R}_I$ , i.e.,  $f_w^I \succeq_w^I f'$ .
  - (d)  $\forall f \in F : f$  is rejected by a worker  $w$  in some room, they cross  $w$  off their list.
2. (a) If some firm is rejected by all workers, output  $\boxtimes$ .  
(b) Else, the acceptances define perfect matchings in each room. If they are the same in all rooms, output the perfect matching( $M$ ). If not, output “No Idea”.

Figure 6: Algorithm to find the firm-optimal stable matching. Note that, in step 2(c), workers may send rejections to firms that haven't yet proposed to them.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max 0 \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_w x_{wf} = 1 \quad \forall w \in W, \\
& \sum_f x_{wf} = 1 \quad \forall f \in F, \\
& \sum_{f \succ_w^A f'} x_{wf'} - \sum_{w' \succ_f^A w} x_{w'f} \leq 0 \quad \forall w \in W, \forall f \in F, \\
& \sum_{f \succ_w^B f'} x_{wf'} - \sum_{w' \succ_f^B w} x_{w'f} \leq 0 \quad \forall w \in W, \forall f \in F, \\
& x_{wf} \geq 0, \quad \forall w \in W, \forall f \in F.
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

A solution to Equation 2 is clearly a fractional stable matching under both  $A$  and  $B$ . Choose  $\theta \in [0, 1]$  with uniform probability and construct two integral perfect matchings  $\mu_\theta^A$  and  $\mu_\theta^B$  as explained in Section 2.4.

**Lemma 7.** *The two integral perfect matchings are identical, i.e.,  $\mu_\theta^A = \mu_\theta^B$ .*

**Corollary 3.**  $\mu_\theta^A$  ( $= \mu_\theta^B$ ) is stable under both  $A$  and  $B$  and the polyhedron described by LP 2 has integer optimal vertices.

This means the LP can be used to find a stable matching in the setting  $(1, n)$  (and so, also for  $(0, n)$ ). Note that the method no longer works for  $(2, 2)$ - the proof of Lemma 7 does not hold

anymore. For this reason, we believe that the polyhedron here might not have integral vertices.

#### 4.4 Extension to Multiple instances

The results from this section extend from two instances to multiple instances. Let  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k$  be  $k$  stable matching instances which are all  $(1, n)$ , i.e.,  $n - 1$  of the  $n$  workers have the same preference profiles in all of them. Then

**Theorem 16.**  $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{M}_{A_1} \cap \mathcal{M}_{A_2} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{M}_{A_k}$  is a sublattice of each of  $\mathcal{L}_{A_i}$ . The LP formulation can be used to find stable matchings in  $\mathcal{L}'$  and the worker and firm optimal matchings can be found in polynomial time.

## References

- [Bir37] Garrett Birkhoff. Rings of sets. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 3(3):443–454, 1937.
- [Bla84] Charles Blair. Every finite distributive lattice is a set of stable matchings. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 37(3):353–356, 1984.
- [CNS18] Jiehua Chen, Rolf Niedermeier, and Piotr Skowron. Stable marriage with multi-modal preferences. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation, EC '18*, page 269–286, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [CSS21] Jiehua Chen, Piotr Skowron, and Manuel Sorge. Matchings under preferences: Strength of stability and tradeoffs. *ACM Trans. Econ. Comput.*, 9(4), oct 2021.
- [EIV23] Federico Echenique, Nicole Immorlica, and Vijay V. Vazirani, editors. *Online and Matching-Based Market Design*. Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- [FKJ16] Linda Farczadi, Georgiou Konstantinos, and Könemann Jochen. Stable marriage with general preferences. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 59(4):683–699, 2016.
- [ftToC19] Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing. Online and matching-based market design, 2019. <https://simons.berkeley.edu/programs/market2019>.
- [GI89] Dan Gusfield and Robert W Irving. *The stable marriage problem: structure and algorithms*. MIT press, 1989.
- [GMRV22] Rohith Reddy Gangam, Tung Mai, Nitya Raju, and Vijay V. Vazirani. A Structural and Algorithmic Study of Stable Matching Lattices of "Nearby" Instances, with Applications. In *42nd IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science (FSTTCS 2022)*, 2022.
- [GS62] David Gale and Lloyd S Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 69(1):9–15, 1962.
- [IL86] Robert W Irving and Paul Leather. The complexity of counting stable marriages. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 15(3):655–667, 1986.

- [KVV90] Richard M Karp, Umesh V Vazirani, and Vijay V Vazirani. An optimal algorithm for on-line bipartite matching. In *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 352–358. ACM, 1990.
- [MO19] Shuichi Miyazaki and Kazuya Okamoto. Jointly stable matchings. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 38(2):646–665, 2019.
- [MV18] Tung Mai and Vijay V. Vazirani. Finding stable matchings that are robust to errors in the input. In *European Symposium on Algorithms*, 2018.
- [Sta96] Richard Stanley. *Enumerative combinatorics*, vol. 1, Wadsworth and Brooks/Cole, Pacific Grove, CA, 1986; second printing, 1996.
- [TS98] Chung-Piaw Teo and Jay Sethuraman. The geometry of fractional stable matchings and its applications. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 23(4):874–891, 1998.
- [Van89] John H. Vande Vate. Linear programming brings marital bliss. *Operations Research Letters*, 8(3):147–153, 1989.

## A The Partial Order of Rotations

DEFERREDACCEPTANCEALGORITHM( $A$ ):

**Input:** Stable matching instance  $A$

**Output:** Perfect matching  $M$

Each worker has a list of all firms in decreasing order of priority.

1. Until all firms receive a proposal, do:
  - (a)  $\forall w \in W, w$  proposes to their best uncrossed firm.
  - (b)  $\forall f \in F, f$  tentatively accepts their *best* proposal and rejects the rest.
  - (c)  $\forall w \in W$ , if  $w$  is rejected by a firm  $f$ , they cross  $f$  off their list.
2. Output the perfect matching( $M$ ).

Figure 7: Deferred Acceptance Algorithm with workers proposing, taken from [EIV23]

COMPOUNDINSTANCE( $A, B$ ):

**Input:** Stable matching instances  $A$  and  $B$  with same preferences on the workers' side.

**Output:** Instance  $X$ .

1.  $\forall w \in W, w$ 's preferences in  $X$  are the same as in  $A$  and  $B$ .
2.  $\forall f \in F, \forall w_i, w_j \in W, w_i >_f^X w_j$  if and only if  $w_i >_f^A w_j$  and  $B \in S, w_i >_f^B w_j$
3. Return  $X$ .

Figure 8: Subroutine for constructing a compound instance.

For the lattice of stable matchings, the partial order  $\Pi$  defined in Birkhoff's Theorem has additional useful structural properties. First, its elements are rotations. A *rotation* takes  $r$  matched

worker-firm pairs in a fixed order, say  $\{w_0f_0, w_1f_1, \dots, w_{r-1}f_{r-1}\}$ , and “cyclically” changes the matches of these  $2r$  agents. The number  $r$ , the  $r$  pairs, and the order among the pairs are so chosen that when a rotation is applied to a stable matching containing all  $r$  pairs, the resulting matching is also stable; moreover, there is no valid rotation on any subset of these  $r$  pairs, under any ordering. Hence, a rotation can be viewed as a minimal change to the current matching that results in a stable matching.

Any worker-firm pair,  $(w, f)$ , belongs to at most one rotation. Consequently, the set  $R$  of rotations underlying  $\Pi$  satisfies  $|R|$  is  $O(n^2)$ , and hence,  $\Pi$  is a succinct representation of  $\mathcal{L}$ ; the latter can be exponentially large.  $\Pi$  will be called the *rotation poset* for  $\mathcal{L}$ .

Second, the rotation poset helps traverse the lattice as follows. For any closed set  $S$  of  $\Pi$ , the corresponding stable matching  $M(S)$  can be obtained as follows: start from the worker-optimal matching in the lattice and apply the rotations in set  $S$ , in any topological order consistent with  $\Pi$ . The resulting matching will be  $M(S)$ . In particular, applying all rotations in  $R$ , starting from the worker-optimal matching, leads to the firm-optimal matching.

The following process yields a rotation for a stable matching  $M$ . For a worker  $w$  let  $s_M(w)$  denote the first firm  $f$  on  $w$ 's list such that  $f$  strictly prefers  $w$  to its  $M$ -partner. Let  $next_M(w)$  denote the partner in  $M$  of firm  $s_M(f)$ . A *rotation*  $\rho$  *exposed* in  $M$  is an ordered list of pairs  $\{w_0f_0, w_1f_1, \dots, w_{r-1}f_{r-1}\}$  such that for each  $i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq r-1$ ,  $w_{i+1}$  is  $next_M(w_i)$ , where  $i+1$  is taken modulo  $r$ . In this paper, we assume that the subscript is taken modulo  $r$  whenever we mention a rotation. Notice that a rotation is cyclic and the sequence of pairs can be rotated.  $M/\rho$  is defined to be a matching in which each worker not in a pair of  $\rho$  stays matched to the same firm and each worker  $w_i$  in  $\rho$  is matched to  $f_{i+1} = s_M(w_i)$ . It can be proven that  $M/\rho$  is also a stable matching. The transformation from  $M$  to  $M/\rho$  is called the *elimination* of  $\rho$  from  $M$ .

**Lemma 8** ([GI89], Theorem 2.5.4). *Every rotation appears exactly once in any sequence of elimination from  $M_0$  to  $M_z$ .*

Let  $\rho = \{w_0f_0, w_1f_1, \dots, w_{r-1}f_{r-1}\}$  be a rotation. For  $0 \leq i \leq r-1$ , we say that  $\rho$  *moves*  $w_i$  *from*  $f_i$  *to*  $f_{i+1}$ , and *moves*  $f_i$  *from*  $w_i$  *to*  $w_{i-1}$ . If  $f$  is either  $f_i$  or is strictly between  $f_i$  and  $f_{i+1}$  in  $w_i$ 's list, then we say that  $\rho$  *moves*  $w_i$  *below*  $f$ . Similarly,  $\rho$  *moves*  $f_i$  *above*  $w$  if  $w$  is  $w_i$  or between  $w_i$  and  $w_{i-1}$  in  $f_i$ 's list.

## A.1 The rotation poset

A rotation  $\rho'$  is said to *precede* another rotation  $\rho$ , denoted by  $\rho' \prec \rho$ , if  $\rho'$  is eliminated in every sequence of eliminations from  $M_0$  to a stable matching in which  $\rho$  is exposed. If  $\rho'$  precedes  $\rho$ , we also say that  $\rho$  *succeeds*  $\rho'$ . If neither  $\rho' \prec \rho$  nor  $\rho' \succ \rho$ , we say that  $\rho'$  and  $\rho$  are *incomparable*. Thus, the set of rotations forms a partial order via this precedence relationship. The partial order on rotations is called *rotation poset* and denoted by  $\Pi$ .

**Lemma 9** ([GI89], Lemma 3.2.1). *For any worker  $w$  and firm  $f$ , there is at most one rotation that moves  $w$  to  $f$ ,  $w$  below  $f$ , or  $f$  above  $w$ . Moreover, if  $\rho_1$  moves  $w$  to  $f$  and  $\rho_2$  moves  $w$  from  $f$  then  $\rho_1 \prec \rho_2$ .*

**Lemma 10** ([GI89], Lemma 3.3.2).  $\Pi$  contains at most  $O(n^2)$  rotations and can be computed in polynomial time.

Consequently,  $\Pi$  is a succinct representation of  $\mathcal{L}$ ; the latter can be exponentially large. And rotations also help in the efficient enumeration of stable matchings([GI89], Chapter 3.5). If we know the edge set defining a sublattice(see 2.3 for definition)  $\mathcal{L}'$  of a stable matching lattice, the corresponding compression defines a partial order on the “meta-rotations”(groups of rotations). This new partial order can be used to efficiently enumerate the matchings in sublattice  $\mathcal{L}'$ .

## B Examples and Figures

<table style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">1</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">2</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">3</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">4</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">5</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td></tr> </table>	1	a	b	d	c	e	2	b	a	c	d	e	3	c	d	b	a	e	4	b	d	c	a	e	5	c	e	a	b	c	<table style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">a</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">b</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">c</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">d</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">e</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td></tr> </table>	a	4	2	1	3	5	b	3	1	2	4	5	c	2	4	3	1	5	d	1	3	4	2	5	e	5	1	2	3	4	<table style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">a</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">b</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">c</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">d</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">e</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td></tr> </table>	a	4	2	1	3	5	b	1	4	2	3	5	c	4	5	3	1	2	d	1	3	4	2	5	e	5	1	2	3	4
1	a	b	d	c	e																																																																																							
2	b	a	c	d	e																																																																																							
3	c	d	b	a	e																																																																																							
4	b	d	c	a	e																																																																																							
5	c	e	a	b	c																																																																																							
a	4	2	1	3	5																																																																																							
b	3	1	2	4	5																																																																																							
c	2	4	3	1	5																																																																																							
d	1	3	4	2	5																																																																																							
e	5	1	2	3	4																																																																																							
a	4	2	1	3	5																																																																																							
b	1	4	2	3	5																																																																																							
c	4	5	3	1	2																																																																																							
d	1	3	4	2	5																																																																																							
e	5	1	2	3	4																																																																																							
workers' preferences in $A$	firms' preferences in $A$	firms' preferences in $B$																																																																																										

Figure 9:  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  is not a semi-sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ . Preferences are in decreasing order.

<table style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">1</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">f</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">2</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">f</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">3</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">f</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">4</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">f</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">5</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">f</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">6</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">f</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td></tr> </table>	1	a	b	c	d	e	f	2	b	a	c	d	e	f	3	c	d	a	b	e	f	4	d	c	a	b	e	f	5	e	f	a	b	c	d	6	f	e	a	b	c	d	<table style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">a</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">6</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">b</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">6</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">c</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">6</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">d</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">6</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">e</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">6</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">f</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">6</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td></tr> </table>	a	2	1	3	4	5	6	b	1	2	3	4	5	6	c	4	3	1	2	5	6	d	3	4	1	2	5	6	e	6	5	1	2	3	4	f	5	6	1	2	3	4
1	a	b	c	d	e	f																																																																															
2	b	a	c	d	e	f																																																																															
3	c	d	a	b	e	f																																																																															
4	d	c	a	b	e	f																																																																															
5	e	f	a	b	c	d																																																																															
6	f	e	a	b	c	d																																																																															
a	2	1	3	4	5	6																																																																															
b	1	2	3	4	5	6																																																																															
c	4	3	1	2	5	6																																																																															
d	3	4	1	2	5	6																																																																															
e	6	5	1	2	3	4																																																																															
f	5	6	1	2	3	4																																																																															
workers' preferences in $A$	firms' preferences in $A$																																																																																				
<table style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">1</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">f</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">2</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">f</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">3</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">f</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">4</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">f</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">5</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">f</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">6</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">f</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">e</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td></tr> </table>	1	b	a	c	d	e	f	2	a	b	c	d	e	f	3	c	d	a	b	e	f	4	d	c	a	b	e	f	5	e	f	a	b	c	d	6	f	e	a	b	c	d	<table style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">a</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">6</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">b</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">6</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">c</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">6</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">d</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">6</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">e</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">6</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">f</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">5</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">6</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td></tr> </table>	a	1	2	3	4	5	6	b	2	1	3	4	5	6	c	4	3	1	2	5	6	d	3	4	1	2	5	6	e	6	5	1	2	3	4	f	5	6	1	2	3	4
1	b	a	c	d	e	f																																																																															
2	a	b	c	d	e	f																																																																															
3	c	d	a	b	e	f																																																																															
4	d	c	a	b	e	f																																																																															
5	e	f	a	b	c	d																																																																															
6	f	e	a	b	c	d																																																																															
a	1	2	3	4	5	6																																																																															
b	2	1	3	4	5	6																																																																															
c	4	3	1	2	5	6																																																																															
d	3	4	1	2	5	6																																																																															
e	6	5	1	2	3	4																																																																															
f	5	6	1	2	3	4																																																																															
workers' preferences in $B$	firms' preferences in $B$																																																																																				

Figure 10: Worker and firm preferences(from most preferred to least)

<table style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">1</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">2</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">3</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">4</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td></tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">workers' preferences in A</p>	1	a	b	c	d	2	b	c	a	d	3	d	c	a	b	4	c	d	a	b	<table style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">a</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">b</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">c</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">d</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td></tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">firms' preferences in A</p>	a	2	4	1	3	b	1	2	3	4	c	3	4	2	1	d	4	3	2	1
1	a	b	c	d																																					
2	b	c	a	d																																					
3	d	c	a	b																																					
4	c	d	a	b																																					
a	2	4	1	3																																					
b	1	2	3	4																																					
c	3	4	2	1																																					
d	4	3	2	1																																					
<table style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">1</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">2</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">b</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">d</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">3</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px; color: red;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px; color: red;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">4</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px; color: red;">d</td><td style="padding-left: 10px; color: red;">a</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">c</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">b</td></tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">workers' preferences in B</p>	1	a	b	c	d	2	b	c	a	d	3	c	d	a	b	4	d	a	c	b	<table style="margin: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">a</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">b</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px;">4</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">c</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px; color: red;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px; color: red;">2</td><td style="padding-left: 10px; color: red;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px; color: red;">1</td></tr> <tr><td style="padding-right: 5px;">d</td><td style="border-left: 1px solid black; padding-left: 5px; color: red;">3</td><td style="padding-left: 10px; color: red;">4</td><td style="padding-left: 10px; color: red;">1</td><td style="padding-left: 10px; color: red;">2</td></tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">firms' preferences in B</p>	a	2	4	1	3	b	1	2	3	4	c	4	2	3	1	d	3	4	1	2
1	a	b	c	d																																					
2	b	c	a	d																																					
3	c	d	a	b																																					
4	d	a	c	b																																					
a	2	4	1	3																																					
b	1	2	3	4																																					
c	4	2	3	1																																					
d	3	4	1	2																																					

Figure 11:  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  is not a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ . Preferences are in decreasing order.

## C Omitted Proofs

*Proof of Proposition 7.* If  $|\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B| \leq 1$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  is a trivial sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$  and  $\mathcal{L}_B$ . So, assume  $|\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B| > 1$  and let  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  be matchings in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ . Let  $\vee_A$  and  $\vee_B$  be the join operations under A and B respectively, and let  $\wedge_A$  and  $\wedge_B$  be the meet operations under A and B.

By definition of join operation in Section 2.1,  $M_1 \vee_A M_2$  is the matching obtained by assigning each worker to its less preferred partner (or equivalently, each firm to its more preferred partner) from  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  according to instance A. Since the list of each worker is identical in A and B, its less preferred partner from  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  is also the same in A and B. Therefore,  $M_1 \vee_A M_2 = M_1 \vee_B M_2$ . A similar argument can be applied to show that  $M_1 \wedge_A M_2 = M_1 \wedge_B M_2$ . Hence,  $M_1 \vee_A M_2$  and  $M_1 \wedge_A M_2$  are both in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  proving that  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  forms a sublattice in each of the two lattices.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.* Let  $(w, f)$  be a strong blocking pair for matching  $M$  under  $X$ . As  $w$  has the same preference lists in A and B, they must strictly prefer  $f$  to  $M(w)$  in both instances.  $f$  must either strictly prefer  $w$  to its  $M$ -partner or is indifferent between them. In both cases,  $f$  must prefer  $w$  to its  $M$ -partner in at least one of A and B. Hence  $(w, f)$  is a blocking pair for  $M$  under that instance. The other direction follows along similar lines.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 5.* Consider instances A and B as given in Figure 9. The set of workers is  $\mathcal{W} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  and the set of firms is  $\mathcal{F} = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ . Instance B is obtained from instance A by permuting firm  $b$  and  $c$ 's lists. Consider matchings  $M_1 = \{1b, 2a, 3c, 4d, 5e\}$  and  $M_2 = \{1a, 2b, 3d, 4c, 5e\}$  that are both stable matchings with respect to instance A. With respect to instance B,  $M_1$  has blocking pair  $(5, c)$  and  $M_2$  has blocking pair  $(4, b)$ . Hence  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are both in  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$ . However, the *join* with respect to A is  $M_1 \vee_A M_2 = \{1b, 2a, 3d, 4c, 5e\}$  which is stable with respect to A and B.

Similarly, we see that  $M_3 = \{1b, 2c, 3d, 4a, 5e\}$  and  $M_4 = \{1d, 2a, 3b, 4c, 5e\}$  are stable with respect

<table style="border-collapse: collapse; margin: auto;"> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">b</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">c</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">e</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">2</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">b</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">c</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">e</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">3</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">c</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">b</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">e</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">c</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">e</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">b</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">5</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">e</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">b</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">c</td></tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center; margin-top: 5px;">workers' preferences in A</p>	1	a	b	c	d	e	2	b	c	a	d	e	3	c	a	b	d	e	4	d	c	e	a	b	5	e	d	a	b	c	<table style="border-collapse: collapse; margin: auto;"> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">2</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">3</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">b</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">3</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">2</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">c</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">2</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">3</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">5</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">3</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">2</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">e</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">5</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">2</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">3</td></tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center; margin-top: 5px;">firms' preferences in A</p>	a	2	3	1	4	5	b	3	1	2	4	5	c	1	2	3	4	5	d	5	3	4	1	2	e	4	5	1	2	3
1	a	b	c	d	e																																																								
2	b	c	a	d	e																																																								
3	c	a	b	d	e																																																								
4	d	c	e	a	b																																																								
5	e	d	a	b	c																																																								
a	2	3	1	4	5																																																								
b	3	1	2	4	5																																																								
c	1	2	3	4	5																																																								
d	5	3	4	1	2																																																								
e	4	5	1	2	3																																																								
<table style="border-collapse: collapse; margin: auto;"> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">b</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">c</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">e</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">2</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">b</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">c</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">e</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px; color: red;">3</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">c</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px; color: red;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">b</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">e</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">c</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">e</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">b</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">5</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">e</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">b</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">c</td></tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center; margin-top: 5px;">workers' preferences in B</p>	1	a	b	c	d	e	2	b	c	a	d	e	3	c	d	a	b	e	4	d	c	e	a	b	5	e	d	a	b	c	<table style="border-collapse: collapse; margin: auto;"> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">a</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">2</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">3</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">b</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">2</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">3</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px; color: red;">c</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px; color: red;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px; color: red;">3</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px; color: red;">2</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">5</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">d</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">5</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">3</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">2</td></tr> <tr><td style="border-right: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;">e</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">4</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">5</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">1</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">2</td><td style="padding: 2px 5px;">3</td></tr> </table> <p style="text-align: center; margin-top: 5px;">firms' preferences in B</p>	a	2	4	1	3	5	b	1	2	3	4	5	c	1	4	3	2	5	d	5	3	4	1	2	e	4	5	1	2	3
1	a	b	c	d	e																																																								
2	b	c	a	d	e																																																								
3	c	d	a	b	e																																																								
4	d	c	e	a	b																																																								
5	e	d	a	b	c																																																								
a	2	4	1	3	5																																																								
b	1	2	3	4	5																																																								
c	1	4	3	2	5																																																								
d	5	3	4	1	2																																																								
e	4	5	1	2	3																																																								

Figure 12:  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  is not a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$  even when the setting is  $(1, 1)$

to  $A$  but have blocking pairs  $(1, a)$  and  $(4, d)$  respectively, under  $B$ . However, their *meet*,  $M_3 \vee_A M_4 = \{1b, 2a, 3d, 4c, 5e\}$  is stable with respect to  $A$  and  $B$ .

Hence  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  is not a semi-sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ . □

*Proof of Theorem 9.* We will show that any blocking pair for a perfect matching under the preference lists of instance  $A$  or instance  $B$  is a blocking pair under the preference lists of at least one of the instances  $A$  and  $B_1, \dots, B_n$ , and vice versa.

Let  $M$  be a perfect matching with a blocking pair under the preference lists in  $A$  or in  $B$ . If it has a blocking pair under  $A$ , then  $M$  is clearly not in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_1} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_n}$ . Suppose  $(w, f)$  be a blocking pair for  $B$  and  $f \succ_w^B M(w)$  and so,  $w \succ_f^B M(f)$ . Workers have identical lists in all instances, so  $w$  prefers  $f$  to  $M(w)$  in every instance  $B_i$ . Firm  $f$  has the same preference list in  $B$  and in  $B_k$  for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then  $w \succ_f^{B_k} M(f)$  and  $(w, f)$  is a blocking pair for instance  $B_k$ , so  $M$  is not a stable matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_1} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_n}$ .

Let  $M$  be a perfect matching with blocking pair  $(w, f)$  under the preference lists in one of the instances  $A, B_1, \dots, B_n$ . As in the previous case, if  $(w, f)$  is a blocking pair under the preference lists of  $A$  then  $M$  is not a stable matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ . Otherwise,  $(w, f)$  is a blocking pair for some instance  $B_k$ . We will show that  $(w, f)$  must be a blocking pair for  $B$ .

Assume that  $f$  is not the agent whose preference list is identical in  $B$  and  $B_k$ . Then both  $w$  and  $f$  have identical preference lists in  $A$  and in  $B_k$ , and so, this is a blocking pair for  $A$ . Otherwise, it must be the case that  $f$  changed its preference list in  $B_k$  and has the same changed list in  $B$ . Then  $(w, f)$  is a blocking pair for  $B$  as well, as  $f \succ_w^B M(w)$  and  $w \succ_f^B M(f)$ . We conclude that the sets are equal. □

*Proof of Theorem 11.* The proof that  $\mathcal{L}'$  a sublattice is similar to Proposition 7. The Deferred Ac-

ceptance algorithms to find worker and firm optimal matchings work on the new compound instance  $X$ , where firm  $f$  prefers worker  $w_i$  to worker  $w_j$  if and only if they does so in **all** the instances. Birkhoff's partial order for  $\mathcal{L}'$  can be found by finding the edge set representing  $\mathcal{M}_{A_1} \cap \mathcal{M}_{A_i}$  for each instance  $A_i$  and the union of these edge sets defines  $\mathcal{L}'$ . This gives us a way to efficiently enumerate the matchings.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 12.* The example in Figure 11 shows that the intersection is not necessarily a sublattice in  $(2,2)$ . Instance  $B$  differs from  $A$  in the preferences of workers 3 and 4 and firms  $c$  and  $d$ . Consider matchings  $M_1 = \{1a, 2b, 3c, 4d\}$  and  $M_2 = \{1b, 2a, 3d, 4c\}$  that are stable under  $A$  and  $B$ . However,  $M = M_1 \vee_A M_2 = \{1a, 2b, 3d, 4c\}$  is not stable under  $B$  as  $a >_4 c$  and  $4 >_a 1$  so  $4a$  is a blocking pair of  $M$  under  $B$ . And so, if there are at least two agents on each side having different preferences in  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$  is not a sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 6.* Consider instances  $A$  and  $B$  as given in Figure 12. The set of workers is  $\mathcal{W} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  and the set of firms is  $\mathcal{F} = \{a, b, c, d, e\}$ . Instance  $B$  is obtained from instance  $A$  by permuting the lists of firm  $c$  and worker 3. Consider matchings  $M_1 = \{1b, 2c, 3a, 4d, 5e\}$  and  $M_2 = \{1a, 2b, 3c, 4e, 5d\}$  that are both stable with respect to  $A$ . With respect to instance  $B$ ,  $M_1$  has blocking pair  $(3, d)$  and  $M_2$  has blocking pair  $(4, c)$ . Hence  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are both in  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$ . However, the *join* with respect to  $A$  is  $M_1 \vee_A M_2 = \{1a, 2b, 3c, 4d, 5e\}$  which is stable with respect to  $A$  and  $B$ .

Similarly, we see that  $M_3 = \{1c, 2a, 3b, 4d, 5e\}$  and  $M_4 = \{1b, 2c, 3a, 4e, 5d\}$  are stable with respect to  $A$  but have blocking pairs  $(3, d)$  and  $(4, c)$  respectively, under  $B$ . However, their *meet*,  $M_3 \vee_A M_4 = \{1c, 2a, 3b, 4e, 5d\}$  is stable with respect to  $A$  and  $B$ .

Hence  $\mathcal{M}_A \setminus \mathcal{M}_B$  is not a semi-sublattice of  $\mathcal{L}_A$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 15.* ( $\supseteq$ ) Let  $\mu \notin \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ . Then  $\mu$  has a blocking pair with respect to  $A$  or  $B$ . If it is  $A$  then it is trivially not in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_{\{w_1, f_1\}}} \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_{\{w_1, f_2\}}} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_{\{w_1, f_n\}}}$ . So suppose it has a blocking pair  $(w, f)$  with respect to  $B$ .

Suppose  $w = w_1$  and  $f \in \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ . So  $f >_w^B \mu(w)$  and  $w >_f^B \mu(f)$ . But these are the preferences of  $w$  and  $f$  in  $B_{\{w, f\}}$ , so  $\mu \notin \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_{\{w_1, f_1\}}} \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_{\{w_1, f_2\}}} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_{\{w_1, f_n\}}}$ .

Else  $w \neq w_1$  and  $f \in \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ . Then  $w$  has the same preferences in  $A$  and  $B$ , as well as in every  $B_{\{w_1, f\}}$ , while  $f$  has the same preferences in  $B$  and  $B_{\{w_1, f\}}$ . Hence  $(w, f)$  is a blocking pair for instance  $B_{w_1, f}$ .

( $\subseteq$ ) Similarly, consider  $\mu \notin \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_{w_1, f_1}} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{M}_{B_{w_1, f_n}}$ . Then  $\mu$  has blocking pair  $w, f$  and as in the previous case, assume the blocking pair is not with respect to  $A$ . Then it is with respect to some instance  $B_{\{w_1, f_i\}}$ .

There are three cases:

1.  $w \neq w_1$  and  $f = f_i$ : Then  $f_i$  has the same list in  $B$  and  $B_{w_i, f_i}$ ,  $w$  has the same list in  $A$  and  $B$  and  $B_{w_i, f_i}$ , hence it is a blocking pair with respect to  $B$ .
2.  $w = w_1$  and  $f \neq f_i$ : Then  $w_i$  has the same list in  $A$  and  $B$  and  $B_{\{w_i, f_i\}}$ ,  $f$  has the same list in  $A$  and  $B$  and  $B_{\{w_i, f_i\}}$ , hence it is a blocking pair with respect to  $B$ .

3.  $w = w_1$  and  $f = f_i$ : Then  $w_1$  has the same list in  $B$  and  $B_{\{w_i, f_i\}}$  only,  $f$  has the same list in  $B$  and  $B_{\{w_i, f_i\}}$ , hence it is a blocking pair with respect to  $B$ .

The other case of  $w \neq w_1$  and  $f \neq f_1$  does not arise because then,  $(w, f)$  would be a blocking pair of  $A$  which cannot be as  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_A$ .

Hence  $w, f$  is a blocking pair with respect to  $B$  and  $\mu \notin \mathcal{M}_B$ , hence it is not in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ .

We conclude that the sets are the same.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 7.*  $\mu_\theta^A$  and  $\mu_\theta^B$  are perfect matchings and we know that the preferences of  $n - 1$  workers  $w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}$  are the same in  $A$  and  $B$ . This means that these  $n - 1$  workers are paired to  $n - 1$  distinct firms in both matchings. Since they are perfect matchings, the  $n^{\text{th}}$  worker must be paired with the remaining firm. Hence the matchings are identical.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 16.*  $\mathcal{L}'$  is a sublattice of each  $\mathcal{L}_{A_i}$  as a corollary of Theorem 13. The LP approach can be used to find stable matchings in the intersection. The new formulation will have  $k$  blocking pair conditions - one for each instance  $A_i$  to say that no worker-firm pair  $(w, f)$  is a blocking pair for  $x$  under that instance. The Algorithms 5 and 6 can be used to find the worker and firm optimal matchings. Define a room for each instance and run the Deferred Acceptance algorithm in each room according to the preferences of the corresponding instance. If the same perfect matching  $M$  is obtained in every room, it is outputted by the algorithm and is stable with respect to all instances.  $\square$

## D Proofs of Algorithms

We prove Theorem 8 in sections D.1 and D.2. And we prove Theorem 14 in Sections D.3 and D.4.

### D.1 Proof of Algorithm 2

We have  $A$  and  $B$  which are  $(0, n)$ , meaning workers have complete order preferences and firms have partial order preferences in  $X$ . In Algorithm 2, workers propose, and unlike in Algorithm 7, firms (tentatively) accept only that worker, that it strictly prefers to every other proposal it has received - in this round and in all previous rounds.

**Lemma 11.** *If firm  $f$  rejects worker  $w$  in any round of Algorithm 2,  $w$  and  $f$  can never be matched in any matching strongly stable under  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Assume there is a rejection (otherwise, it is trivial). Let a firm  $f$  reject worker  $w$ . We will show that any matching  $M$  such that  $(w, f) \in M$  has a strong blocking pair. We will induct on the round number when the rejection happens.

Assume the rejection happens in the first round.  $f$  only rejects  $w$  in the first round if it received a proposal from another worker  $w'$  that it prefers or is indifferent to. And since  $w'$  proposed to  $f$  on the first round, it must prefer  $f$  to  $M(w')$ . Hence,  $(w', f)$  is a strong blocking pair to  $M$ .

Let the rejection happen in some round  $k(> 1)$ . Now, if  $f$  rejects  $w$ , then there is some worker  $w'$  that is proposed to  $f$  in this or previous rounds and  $w' >_f^X w$  or  $w' \sim_f^X w$ . If  $w'$  got rejected by  $f$  in an earlier round, then, by the induction hypothesis,  $w'$  cannot be matched to any firm it proposed to before  $f$  and  $f$  in any stable matching. And so,  $f >_w' M(w')$ . And so,  $(w', f)$  is a strong blocking pair.  $\square$

**Lemma 12.** *If  $X$  admits a strongly stable matching, then algorithm 2 finds one.*

*Proof.* Suppose there exists a strongly stable matching but the algorithm terminated outputting  $\boxtimes$ . This only happens when a worker gets rejected by all the firms. But, by lemma 11, this means that this worker has no feasible partner in any of the strongly stable matchings, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 13.** *If algorithm 2 returns a matching, it must be strongly stable under  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Assume not. Let  $(w, f)$  be a blocking pair to the matching given by the algorithm. But then,  $w$  should have proposed to  $f$  in the run of the algorithm and got rejected. And so,  $f$  should get matched to something better at the end of the algorithm, implying  $(w, f)$  is not a strong blocking pair, a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 14.** *If algorithm 2 returns a matching, it must be worker-optimal strongly stable matching.*

*Proof.* If not, some worker  $w$  has a better partner in the worker optimal matching. But then, that worker would have proposed to that partner and got rejected in the algorithm, giving rise to a contradiction.  $\square$

## D.2 Proof of Algorithm 3

We have  $A$  and  $B$  which are  $(0, n)$ , meaning workers have complete order preferences and firms have partial order preferences in  $X$ . In algorithm 3, firms propose, and unlike in algorithm 7, they can propose to multiple workers in the same iteration.

**Lemma 15.** *If worker  $w$  rejects firm  $f$  in any round of algorithm 3,  $w$  and  $f$  can never be matched in any matching stable under both instances  $A$  and  $B$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose for contradiction that  $w$  is a worker that rejected firm  $f$  in some round but they are matched in stable matching  $\mu$ .

We proceed by induction on the number of rounds. Suppose  $w$  rejects  $f$  in the first round. Then there is another firm  $f_1$  that  $w$  strictly prefers to  $f$ . Since the firms propose to “best”-uncrossed workers and it is the first round, there is no worker  $w'$  such that  $f$  prefers  $w'$  to  $w$ , that is  $w >_{f_1} w'$  or  $w \sim_{f_1} w'$ . Consider stable matching  $\mu$  where  $w$  is matched to  $f$ . Then as  $f_1 >_w f$  and  $w >_{f_1} w'$  or  $w \sim_{f_1} w'$ ,  $(w, f_1)$  is a strong blocking pair for  $\mu$ .

Suppose  $w$  rejects  $f$  in the  $k$ th round. Then there is a firm  $f_k$  who  $w$  strictly prefers to  $f$ . One of the following cases must hold:

1.  $w >_{f_k} \mu(f_k)$  or  $w \sim_{f_k} \mu(f_k)$ . In this case,  $(w, f_k)$  is a strong blocking pair for  $\mu$ .
2.  $\mu(f_k) >_{f_k} w$ . Then  $f_k$  must have proposed to  $\mu(f_k)$  in a previous round and been rejected by  $\mu(f_k)$ . Applying the inductive hypothesis, there exists a different strong blocking pair  $(w', f')$  for  $\mu$  as  $f_k$  and  $\mu(f_k)$  are matched, hence  $\mu$  is not stable.

□

**Lemma 16.** *Algorithm 3 terminates.*

*Proof.* For any given round in the execution of the algorithm, one of the following cases must hold:

1. There are less than  $n$  proposals to make in round  $k$ . Then there is a firm  $f$  that has no uncrossed worker to propose in its list(DAG). Then the algorithm will terminate before this round and output  $\boxtimes$ .
2. There are exactly  $n$  proposals are given to  $n$  distinct workers. All workers get only a single proposal, so there is either a rejection or the algorithm terminates at the end of the round and outputs a perfect matching.
3. There are more than  $n$  proposals. Then there is at least one worker  $w$  that receives multiple proposals.  $w$  rejects at least one of these proposals and at least one firm crosses  $w$  off its list.

This shows that at the end of every round, there is either a rejection or the algorithm terminates. Since there are only  $O(n^2)$  rejections possible, the algorithm terminates in  $\text{poly}(n)$  rounds. □

**Lemma 17.** *If  $X$  admits a strongly stable matching, then algorithm 3 finds one.*

*Proof.* Suppose there exists a strongly stable matching but the algorithm terminated outputting  $\boxtimes$ . This only happens when a firm gets rejected by all the workers. But, by lemma 15, this means that this firm has no feasible partner in any of the strongly stable matchings, which is a contradiction. □

**Lemma 18.** *If algorithm 3 returns a matching, it must be strongly stable under  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Assume not. Let  $(w, f)$  be a blocking pair to the matching given by the algorithm. But then,  $f$  should have proposed to  $w$  in the run of the algorithm and got rejected. And so,  $w$  should get matched to something better at the end of the algorithm, implying  $(w, f)$  is not a strong blocking pair, a contradiction. □

**Lemma 19.** *If algorithm 3 returns a matching, it must be firm-optimal strongly stable matching.*

*Proof.* If not, some firm  $f$  has a better partner in the firm optimal matching. But then, that firm would have proposed to that partner and got rejected in the algorithm, leading to a contradiction. □

Note that both the above proofs work for any compound instance  $X$  which has partial order preferences on one side and complete order on the other side. So, instead of just two instances, we can have many more as explained in section 3.3. Also note that both the algorithms work exactly like the original Deferred acceptance algorithm if  $X$  has complete order preferences on both sides, i.e., instances  $A$  and  $B$  are the same.

### D.3 Proof of Algorithm 5

The algorithm involves running the Deferred Acceptance algorithm in different rooms with workers proposing and returning the worker optimal matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ , given  $A$  and  $B$  are  $(1, n)$ . Let  $w_1$  be the worker with different preferences in  $A$  and  $B$ .

**Lemma 20.** *The algorithm terminates and always returns a perfect matching or  $\boxtimes$*

*Proof.* The algorithm always terminates since there is at least one rejection per iteration before the final iteration.

Suppose the algorithm terminates with two distinct perfect matchings,  $\mu_A$  in room  $A$  and  $\mu_B$  in room  $B$ . So, there must exist a worker  $w \neq w_1$  with the same preferences in  $A$  and  $B$  but different matches in  $\mu_A$  and  $\mu_B$ . Such a worker must exist since only  $w_1$  changed their preferences, and the matchings are perfect. Suppose without loss of generality that  $\mu_A(w) \succ_w^{A,B} \mu_B(w)$ . As  $w$  has the same lists in  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $w$  must have proposed to  $\mu_A(w)$  in room  $B$ , been rejected and crossed them off their list. However, per the algorithm,  $w$  should have also crossed off  $\mu_A(w)$  their list in room  $A$ , hence  $\mu_A$  cannot be a perfect matching achieved in room  $A$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 21.** *If firm  $f$  rejects  $w$  in either room,  $w$  and  $f$  cannot be matched in any matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ .*

*Proof.* We use the property of the DA algorithm for single instance  $A$  that says that if a firm  $f$  rejects worker  $w$ , then  $(w, f)$  are not matched in any stable matching with respect to  $A$  ([GS62]).

Suppose, without loss of generality, let  $f$  reject  $w$  in room  $A$ . Then  $(w, f)$  are not matched in any stable matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A$ . Hence they cannot be matched in any stable matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 22.** *If  $A$  and  $B$  admit a stable matching under both, then algorithm 5 finds one.*

*Proof.* Suppose there exists such a stable matching but the algorithm terminated outputting  $\boxtimes$ . This only happens when a worker gets rejected by all the firms. But, by lemma 21, this means that this worker has no feasible partner in any of the stable matchings, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 23.** *If algorithm 5 returns a matching, it must be stable under both  $A$  and  $B$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mu$  is the perfect matching returned and without loss of generality suppose it has blocking pair  $(w, f)$  with respect to  $A$ . That is,  $f \succ_w^A \mu(w)$  and  $w \succ_f^A \mu(f)$ . Then  $w$  must have proposed to  $f$  during some iteration of the algorithm and been rejected in room  $A$  for some worker  $w'$  that  $f$  preferred to  $w$ , eventually ending up with  $\mu(f)$ . As firms always get better

matches as the algorithm progresses, it must be the case that  $\mu(f) >_f w$  and  $(w, f)$  is not a blocking pair.  $\square$

**Lemma 24.** *If algorithm 5 returns a matching, it must be worker-optimal matching.*

*Proof.* If not, some worker  $w \neq w_1$  has a better partner in the worker optimal matching. But then, that worker would have proposed to that partner every room and got rejected in one of them, giving rise to a contradiction.  $\square$

#### D.4 Proof of Algorithm 6

The algorithm involves running the Deferred Acceptance algorithm in different rooms with firms proposing and returning the firm optimal matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ , given  $A$  and  $B$  are  $(1, n)$ . Let  $w_1$  be the worker with different preferences in  $A$  and  $B$ .

**Lemma 25.** *The algorithm terminates and always returns a perfect matching or  $\boxtimes$ .*

*Proof.* The algorithm terminates since there is at least one rejection per iteration.

Suppose the algorithm terminates with distinct perfect matchings  $\mu_A$  in room  $A$  and  $\mu_B$  in room  $B$ . Then there is some worker  $w \neq w_1$  who has the same lists in  $A$  and  $B$  who has distinct matches  $\mu_A(w)$  and  $\mu_B(w)$ . Suppose without loss of generality that  $\mu_A(w) >_w^{A,B} \mu_B(w)$ . So  $w$  must have received a proposal from  $\mu_A(w)$  in some iteration since to be tentatively matched a worker must have received a proposal from that firm. Workers reject all firms that are less preferred in all the rooms, so  $w$  must have rejected  $\mu_B(w)$  in room  $R_A$  as well in room  $R_B$ , so  $\mu_B$  cannot be the final perfect matching in room  $R_B$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 26.** *If firm  $f$  rejects  $w$  in either room,  $w$  and  $f$  cannot be matched in any strongly stable matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ .*

*Proof.* We use the property of the DA algorithm for single instance  $A$  that says that if a firm  $f$  is rejected by worker  $w$ , then  $(w, f)$  are not matched in any stable matching with respect to  $A$  ([GS62]). But we note the additional fact that workers should only get matched to something better than  $f$  from then on. It is the same as preemptively rejecting all firms down the list than  $f$ , the idea that we carry over to this algorithm. Suppose that, without loss of generality, let  $w$  reject  $f$  in room  $A$ . Then  $(w, f)$  are not matched in any stable matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A$ . Hence they cannot be matched in any stable matching in  $\mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 27.** *If  $A$  and  $B$  admit a stable matching under both, then algorithm 6 finds one.*

*Proof.* Suppose there exists such a stable matching but the algorithm terminated outputting  $\boxtimes$ . This only happens when a firm gets rejected by all the workers. But, by lemma 26, this means that this firm has no feasible partner in any of the stable matchings, which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**Lemma 28.** *If Algorithm 6 returns a matching, it must be stable under both  $A$  and  $B$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose the algorithm returns perfect matching  $\mu$  and assume, without loss of generality, it has blocking pair  $(w, f)$  with respect to  $A$ . That is  $w \succ_f^A \mu(f)$  and  $f \succ_w^A \mu(w)$ . Then  $f$  must have proposed to  $w$  during some iteration of the algorithm in room  $R_A$  and been rejected for some firm  $f'$  that  $w$  preferred (under  $A$ ), and  $w$  eventually ends up with  $\mu(w)$  which it prefers the most. Hence  $\mu(w) \succ_w^A f$  which contradicts our assumption that  $(w, f)$  is a blocking pair.  $\square$

**Lemma 29.** *If Algorithm 6 returns a matching, it must be firm-optimal matching.*

*Proof.* If not, some firm  $f$  has a better partner in the firm optimal matching. But then, that firm would have proposed to that partner in all the rooms and got rejected in a room, leading to a contradiction.  $\square$