

# The Set of Stable Matchings and the Core in a Matching Market with Ties and Matroid Constraints\*

Naoyuki Kamiyama

Institute of Mathematics for Industry  
Kyushu University  
Fukuoka, Japan  
kamiyama@imi.kyushu-u.ac.jp

## Abstract

In this paper, we consider a many-to-one matching market where ties in the preferences of agents are allowed. For this market with capacity constraints, Bonifacio, Juarez, Neme, and Oviedo proved some relationship between the set of stable matchings and the core. In this paper, we consider a matroid constraint that is a generalization of a capacity constraint. We prove that the results proved by Bonifacio, Juarez, Neme, and Oviedo can be generalized to this setting.

## 1 Introduction

Stability, which was introduced by Gale and Shapley [6], is one of the most central properties in a matching market. This property guarantees that there does not exist an unmatched pair such that both agents in this pair have incentive to deviate from the current matching. Furthermore, the core is another important set of solutions in a matching market. We say that a matching  $\mu$  is dominated by another matching  $\sigma$  if there exists a coalition  $C$  of agents such that (i) in  $\sigma$ , the agents in  $C$  are matched to agents in  $C$ , and (ii) the agents in  $C$  prefer  $\sigma$  to  $\mu$ . Then the core is the set of matchings that are not dominated by any other matching. It is known that the set of stable matchings coincides with the core in a one-to-one matching market with strict preferences (see, e.g., [19, Appendix 2]).

In this paper, we consider a matching market where ties in the preferences of agents are allowed, i.e., an agent may be indifferent between potential partners. For this matching market, Irving [8] introduced the following three definitions of stability. The first one is weak stability<sup>1</sup>. This guarantees that there does not exist an unmatched pair of agents such that both agents prefer the other agent in this pair to the current partner. Irving [8] proved that there always exists a weakly stable matching and we can find a weakly stable matching in polynomial time by slightly modifying the algorithm of Gale and Shapley [6] for strict preferences. The second one is strong stability. This guarantees that there does not exist an unmatched pair of agents such that both agents weakly prefer<sup>2</sup> the other agent in this pair to the current partner, and at least one of the agents prefers the other agent in this pair to the current partner. The last one is super-stability. This guarantees that there does not exist an unmatched pair of agents

---

\*This work was supported by JST ERATO Grant Number JPMJER2301, Japan.

<sup>1</sup>In [1], a weakly stable matching in this paper is simply called a stable matching.

<sup>2</sup>This means that both agent prefers the other agent in this pair to the current partner, or they are indifferent between the other agent in this pair and the current partner.

such that both agents weakly prefer the other agent in this pair to the current partner. It is known that a super-stable matching and a strongly stable matching may not exist [8]. Irving [8] proved that, in the one-to-one setting, we can check the existence of a strongly stable matching and a super-stable matching in polynomial time (see also [17]). Irving, Manlove, and Scott [9] proved that, in the many-to-one setting with capacity constraints, we can check the existence of a super-stable matching in polynomial time. Furthermore, Irving, Manlove, and Scott [10] and Kavitha, Mehlhorn, Michail, and Paluch [16] proved that, in the many-to-one setting with capacity constraints, we can check the existence of a strongly stable matching in polynomial time.

Bonifacio, Juarez, Neme, and Oviedo [1] considered the relationship between the set of stable matchings and the core in a many-to-one matching market with ties and capacity constraints. Bonifacio, Juarez, Neme, and Oviedo [1] first introduced the following three definitions of the core. The first one is the weak core<sup>3</sup>. This is the set of matchings such that there does not exist a coalition of agents such that the agents in this coalition prefer the new matching. The second one is the strong core. This is the set of matchings such that there does not exist a coalition of agents such that the agents in this coalition weakly prefer the new matching, and at least one of the agents in this coalition prefers the new matching. The last one is the super core. This is the set of matchings such that there does not exist a coalition of agents such that the agents in this coalition weakly prefer the new matching, and at least one of the agents in this coalition is matched to different agents in the new matching. Then Bonifacio, Juarez, Neme, and Oviedo [1] proved that, under the assumption that the preferences are responsive, the set of weakly stable matchings is contained in the weak core, the set of strongly stable matchings coincides with the strong core, and the set of super-stable matchings coincides with the super core.

In this paper, we consider the relationship between the set of stable matchings and the core in a matching market with ties and matroid constraints. Matroids can express not only capacity constraints but also more complex constraints including hierarchical capacity constraints. Thus, matroid constraints are important from not only the theoretical viewpoint but also the practical viewpoint, and the stable matching problem with matroid constraints has been actively studied (see, e.g., [3, 4, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]). In this paper, we prove that the results proved in [1] can be generalized to this setting.

## 2 Preliminaries

For each set  $X$  and each element  $x$ , we define  $X + x := X \cup \{x\}$  and  $X - x := X \setminus \{x\}$ . For each set  $X$ , we define  $X - \emptyset := X$ . For each positive integer  $z$ , we define  $[z] := \{1, 2, \dots, z\}$ .

### 2.1 Matroids

A pair  $\mathbf{M} = (U, \mathcal{I})$  of a finite set  $U$  and a non-empty family  $\mathcal{I}$  of subsets of  $U$  is called a *matroid* if, for every pair of subsets  $I, J \subseteq U$ , the following conditions are satisfied.

- (I1) If  $I \subseteq J$  and  $J \in \mathcal{I}$ , then  $I \in \mathcal{I}$ .
- (I2) If  $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $|I| < |J|$ , then there exists an element  $u \in J \setminus I$  such that  $I + u \in \mathcal{I}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{M} = (U, \mathcal{I})$  be a matroid. Then an element in  $\mathcal{I}$  is called an *independent set of  $\mathbf{M}$* . An inclusion-wise maximal independent set of  $\mathbf{M}$  is called a *base of  $\mathbf{M}$* . Then (I2) implies that all the bases of  $\mathbf{M}$  have the same size. For every independent set  $I$  of  $\mathbf{M}$ , if there exists a base  $B$

---

<sup>3</sup>In [1], the weak core in this paper is simply called the core.

of  $\mathbf{M}$  such that  $|I| = |B|$ , then  $I$  is a base of  $\mathbf{M}$ . A subset  $X \subseteq U$  such that  $X \notin \mathcal{I}$  is called a *dependent set* of  $\mathbf{M}$ . An inclusion-wise minimal dependent set of  $\mathbf{M}$  is called a *circuit* of  $\mathbf{M}$ .

**Lemma 1** (See, e.g., [18, Lemma 1.1.3]). *Let  $\mathbf{M}$  be a matroid, and let  $C_1, C_2$  be distinct circuits of  $\mathbf{M}$  such that  $C_1 \cap C_2 \neq \emptyset$ . Then for every element  $u \in C_1 \cap C_2$ , there exists a circuit  $C$  of  $\mathbf{M}$  such that  $C \subseteq (C_1 \cup C_2) - u$ .*

Let  $\mathbf{M} = (U, \mathcal{I})$  be a matroid, and let  $I$  be an independent set of  $\mathbf{M}$ . Then for every element  $u \in U \setminus I$  such that  $I + u \notin \mathcal{I}$ , (I1) implies that  $I + u$  contains a circuit  $C$  of  $\mathbf{M}$  as a subset, and  $u \in C$ . It follows from Lemma 1 that such a circuit is uniquely determined. This circuit is called the *fundamental circuit of  $u$  with respect to  $I$  and  $\mathbf{M}$* . For each element  $u \in U \setminus I$  such that  $I + u \notin \mathcal{I}$ , let  $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}}(u, I)$  denote the fundamental circuit of  $u$  with respect to  $I$  and  $\mathbf{M}$ . It is known that, for every element  $u \in U \setminus I$  such that  $I + u \notin \mathcal{I}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}}(u, I)$  is the set of elements  $v \in I + u$  such that  $I + u - v \in \mathcal{I}$  (see, e.g., [18, p.20, Exercise 5]). For each element  $u \in U \setminus I$  such that  $I + u \notin \mathcal{I}$ , we define  $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}}(u, I) := \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}}(u, I) - u$ .

Let  $\mathbf{M} = (U, \mathcal{I})$  be a matroid. For each subset  $X \subseteq U$ , we define  $\mathcal{I}|X := \{I \in \mathcal{I} \mid I \subseteq X\}$  and  $\mathbf{M}|X := (X, \mathcal{I}|X)$ . Then it is known that  $\mathbf{M}|X$  is a matroid for every subset  $X \subseteq U$  (see, e.g., [18, p.20]).

## 2.2 Setting

Throughout this paper, we are given a finite simple undirected bipartite graph  $G = (V, E)$ . We assume that the vertex set  $V$  of  $G$  is partitioned into  $D, H$ , and every edge in the edge set  $E$  of  $G$  connects a vertex in  $D$  and a vertex in  $H$ . We call a vertex in  $D$  (resp.  $H$ ) a *doctor* (resp. *hospital*). For each doctor  $d \in D$  and each hospital  $h \in H$ , if there exists an edge connecting  $d$  and  $h$ , then  $(d, h)$  denotes this edge. For each subset  $F \subseteq E$  and each doctor  $d \in D$  (resp. hospital  $h \in H$ ), we define  $F(d)$  (resp.  $F(h)$ ) as the set of edges  $(d', h') \in F$  such that  $d' = d$  (resp.  $h' = h$ ).

For each hospital  $h \in H$ , we are given a matroid  $\mathbf{M}_h = (E(h), \mathcal{I}_h)$  such that, for every edge  $e \in E(h)$ , we have  $\{e\} \in \mathcal{I}_h$ . For each doctor  $d \in D$ , we are given a transitive and complete<sup>4</sup> binary relation  $\succsim_d$  on  $E(d) \cup \{\emptyset\}$  such that, for every edge  $e \in E(d)$ , we have  $e \succsim_d \emptyset$  and  $\emptyset \not\succeq_d e$ . For each hospital  $h \in H$ , we are given a transitive and complete binary relation  $\succsim_h$  on  $\mathcal{I}_h$  such that, for every independent set  $I \in \mathcal{I}_h$ , we have  $I \succsim_h \emptyset$  and  $\emptyset \not\succeq_h I$ . For each doctor  $d \in D$  and each pair of elements  $e, f \in E(d) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ , we write  $e \succ_d f$  (resp.  $e \sim_d f$ ) if  $e \succsim_d f$  and  $f \not\succeq_d e$  (resp.  $e \succsim_d f$  and  $f \succsim_d e$ ). For each hospital  $h \in H$  and each pair of independent sets  $I, J \in \mathcal{I}_h$ , we write  $I \succ_h J$  (resp.  $I \sim_h J$ ) if  $I \succsim_h J$  and  $J \not\succeq_h I$  (resp.  $I \succsim_h J$  and  $J \succsim_h I$ ). Furthermore, for each hospital  $h \in H$  and each pair of edges  $e, f \in E(h)$ , we write  $e \succ_h f$ ,  $e \sim_h f$ , and  $e \sim_h f$  instead of  $\{e\} \succ_h \{f\}$ ,  $\{e\} \sim_h \{f\}$ , and  $\{e\} \sim_h \{f\}$ , respectively.

In this paper, we assume that, for every hospital  $h \in H$ ,  $\succsim_h$  is *responsive*. More precisely, for every hospital  $h \in H$ , we assume that  $\succsim_h$  satisfies the following conditions.

- For every independent set  $I \in \mathcal{I}_h$  and every edge  $e \in I$ , we have  $I \succ_h I - e$ .
- For every independent set  $I \in \mathcal{I}_h$  and every pair of edges  $e \in E(h) \setminus I$  and  $f \in I$  such that  $I + e - f \in \mathcal{I}_h$ ,  $I + e - f \succ_h I$  if and only if  $e \succ_h f$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $h$  be a hospital in  $H$ . Then for every independent set  $I \in \mathcal{I}_h$  and every pair of edges  $e \in E(h) \setminus I$  and  $f \in I$  such that  $I + e - f \in \mathcal{I}_h$ ,  $I + e - f \succ_h I$  (resp.  $I + e - f \sim_h I$ ) if and only if  $e \succ_h f$  (resp.  $e \sim_h f$ ).*

<sup>4</sup>For every pair of elements  $e, f \in E(d) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ , at least one of  $e \succsim_d f$  and  $f \succsim_d e$  holds.

*Proof.* Define  $J := I + e - f$ . Then  $J + f - e = I \in \mathcal{I}_h$ . Thus, the definition of  $\succsim_h$  implies that  $J + f - e \succsim_h J$  (i.e.,  $I \succsim_h I + e - f$ ) if and only if  $f \succsim_h e$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

A subset  $\mu \subseteq E$  is called a *matching in  $G$*  if the following conditions are satisfied.

- For every doctor  $d \in D$ , we have  $|\mu(d)| \leq 1$ .
- For every hospital  $h \in H$ , we have  $\mu(h) \in \mathcal{I}_h$ .

For each matching  $\mu$  in  $G$  and each doctor  $d \in D$  such that  $\mu(d) \neq \emptyset$ , we do not distinguish  $\mu(d)$  and the unique element in  $\mu(d)$ .

If, for each hospital  $h \in H$ , we are given a positive integer  $c_h$  and we define  $\mathcal{I}_h$  as the family of subsets  $F \subseteq E(h)$  such that  $|F| \leq c_h$ , then our setting coincides with the setting considered in [1]. This kind of matroid is called a *uniform matroid*. In addition, we give another example of our model. For each hospital  $h \in H$ , we are given a family  $\mathcal{P}_h$  of subsets of  $E(h)$  such that, for every pair of distinct elements  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_h$ ,  $X \cap Y = \emptyset$  or  $X \subseteq Y$  or  $Y \subseteq X$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{P}_h$  is a *laminar family*). In addition, for each hospital  $h \in H$  and each element  $P \in \mathcal{P}_h$ , we are given a positive integer  $c_h(P)$ . Define  $\mathcal{I}_h$  as the family of subsets  $F \subseteq E(h)$  such that, for every element  $P \in \mathcal{P}_h$ ,  $|F \cap P| \leq c_h(P)$ . Then it is known that the ordered pair  $\mathbf{M}_h = (E(h), \mathcal{I}_h)$  defined in this way is a matroid. This kind of constraint was considered in, e.g., [7].

### 2.3 Stable matchings

Let  $\mu$  be a matching in  $G$ . Let  $e = (d, h)$  be an edge in  $E \setminus \mu$ . Then we say that  $e$  *weakly blocks* (resp. *strongly blocks*)  $\mu$  on  $d$  if  $e \succsim_d \mu(d)$  (resp.  $e \succ_d \mu(d)$ ). We say that  $e$  *weakly blocks* (resp. *strongly blocks*)  $\mu$  on  $h$  if at least one of the following conditions is satisfied.

- $\mu(h) + e \in \mathcal{I}_h$ .
- $\mu(h) + e \notin \mathcal{I}_h$ , and there exists an edge  $f \in D_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$  such that  $e \succsim_h f$  (resp.  $e \succ_h f$ ).

We say that  $e$  *strongly blocks*  $\mu$  if  $e$  strongly blocks  $\mu$  on both  $d$  and  $h$ . We say that  $e$  *weakly blocks*  $\mu$  if  $e$  weakly blocks  $\mu$  on both  $d$  and  $h$ , and  $e$  strongly blocks  $\mu$  on at least one of  $d$  and  $h$ . We say that  $e$  *super weakly blocks*  $\mu$  if  $e$  weakly blocks  $\mu$  on both  $d$  and  $h$ .

Let  $\mu$  be a matching in  $G$ . Then  $\mu$  is said to be *weakly stable* if any edge in  $E \setminus \mu$  does not strongly block  $\mu$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  denote the set of weakly stable matchings in  $G$ . Furthermore,  $\mu$  is said to be *strongly stable* if any edge in  $E \setminus \mu$  does not weakly block  $\mu$ . Let  $\mathcal{SS}$  denote the set of strongly stable matchings in  $G$ . Finally,  $\mu$  is said to be *super-stable* if any edge in  $E \setminus \mu$  does not super weakly block  $\mu$ . Let  $\mathcal{SSS}$  denote the set of super-stable matchings in  $G$ .

### 2.4 Core

For each matching  $\mu$  in  $G$  and each non-empty subset  $C \subseteq V$ ,  $\mu$  is said to be *consistent with  $C$*  if, for every vertex  $v \in C$ ,  $\mu(v) \subseteq E(C)$ , where  $E(C)$  denotes the set of edges  $(d, h) \in E$  such that  $d, h \in C$ . For each non-empty subset  $C \subseteq V$ , let  $\mathcal{M}(C)$  denote the set of matchings in  $G$  that are consistent with  $C$ .

Let  $\mu$  be a matching in  $G$ . Let  $C$  be a non-empty subset of  $V$ . We say that  $C$  *strongly blocks*  $\mu$  if there exists a matching  $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(C)$  such that, for every vertex  $v \in C$ ,  $\sigma(v) \succ_v \mu(v)$ . We say that  $C$  *weakly blocks*  $\mu$  if there exists a matching  $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(C)$  satisfying the following conditions.

- For every vertex  $v \in C$ ,  $\sigma(v) \succsim_v \mu(v)$ .
- There exists a vertex  $v \in C$  such that  $\sigma(v) \succ_v \mu(v)$ .

Furthermore, we say that  $C$  *super weakly blocks*  $\mu$  if there exists a matching  $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(C)$  satisfying the following conditions.

- For every vertex  $v \in C$ ,  $\sigma(v) \succ_v \mu(v)$ .
- There exists a vertex  $v \in C$  such that  $\sigma(v) \neq \mu(v)$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\mu$  be a matching  $\mu$ . Let  $C$  be a non-empty subset of  $V$  that super weakly blocks  $\mu$ . Then  $C \cap H \neq \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $C$  super weakly blocks  $\mu$ , there exists a matching  $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(C)$  such that (i)  $\sigma(v) \succ_v \mu(v)$  for every vertex  $v \in C$ , and (ii) there exists a vertex  $v \in C$  such that  $\sigma(v) \neq \mu(v)$ .

Assume that  $C \cap H = \emptyset$ . Then for every doctor  $d \in C \cap D$ ,  $\sigma(d) = \emptyset$ . Let  $d$  be a doctor in  $C \cap D$  such that  $\sigma(d) \neq \mu(d)$ . Since  $\sigma(d) = \emptyset$ , we have  $\mu(d) \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mu(d) \succ_d \sigma(d)$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $\sigma(d) \succ_d \mu(d)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote the set of matchings  $\mu$  in  $G$  such that there does not exist a non-empty subset of  $V$  that strongly blocks  $\mu$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}_S$  denote the set of matchings  $\mu$  in  $G$  such that there does not exist a non-empty subset of  $V$  that weakly blocks  $\mu$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}_{SS}$  denote the set of matchings  $\mu$  in  $G$  such that there does not exist a non-empty subset of  $V$  that super weakly blocks  $\mu$ .

Bonifacio, Juarez, Neme, and Oviedo [1] proved that if the matroids are uniform matroids, then  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ ,  $\mathcal{SS} = \mathcal{C}_S$ , and  $\mathcal{SSS} = \mathcal{C}_{SS}$ . We prove that these results hold in our setting.

## 2.5 Useful lemma

The following lemma is used to prove Lemma 5.

**Lemma 4** (Brualdi [2]). *Let  $\mathbf{M}$  be a matroid, and let  $B, B'$  be distinct bases of  $\mathbf{M}$ . Then for every element  $e \in B \setminus B'$ , there exists an element  $f \in B' \setminus B$  such that  $e \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}}(f, B)$  and  $f \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}}(e, B')$ .*

The following lemma plays an important role in the next section. For reader's convenience, we give its proof.

**Lemma 5** (Gabow, Glover, and Klingman [5]). *Let  $\mathbf{M}$  be a matroid, and let  $B, B'$  be distinct bases of  $\mathbf{M}$ . Define  $k := |B \setminus B'|$ . Then there exist an ordering  $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k)$  of the elements in  $B \setminus B'$  and an ordering  $(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k)$  of the elements in  $B' \setminus B$  satisfying the following conditions.*

- For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , we have  $e_i \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}}(f_i, B)$ .
- For every integer  $i \in [k]$ ,  $(B' \setminus \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_i\}) \cup \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i\}$  is a base of  $\mathbf{M}$ .

*Proof.* Lemma 4 implies that there exist an element  $e_1 \in B \setminus B'$  and an element  $f_1 \in B' \setminus B$  such that  $e_1 \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}}(f_1, B)$  and  $B' - f_1 + e_1$  is a base of  $\mathbf{M}$ . Thus, we assume that  $k \geq 2$ .

Let  $\ell$  be an integer in  $[k - 1]$ . We assume that there exist elements  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_\ell \in B \setminus B'$  and  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_\ell \in B' \setminus B$  such that the orderings  $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_\ell)$  and  $(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_\ell)$  satisfy the conditions in this lemma for every integer  $i \in [\ell]$ . Define the base  $B^\circ$  of  $\mathbf{M}$  by

$$B^\circ := (B' \setminus \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_\ell\}) \cup \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_\ell\}.$$

Let  $x$  be an element in  $B \setminus B^\circ$ . Notice that  $x \in B \setminus (B' \cup \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_\ell\})$ . Lemma 4 implies that there exists an element  $y \in B^\circ \setminus B$  such that  $x \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}}(y, B)$  and  $y \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}}(x, B^\circ)$ . Notice that  $y \in B' \setminus (B \cup \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_\ell\})$ . Thus, by defining  $e_{\ell+1} := x$  and  $f_{\ell+1} := y$ , we can obtain elements  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{\ell+1} \in B \setminus B'$  and  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{\ell+1} \in B' \setminus B$  satisfying the conditions in this lemma. This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3 Results

In this section, we give the results of this paper. Our proofs are based on the proofs in [1].

**Theorem 1.**  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mu$  be a matching in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Assume that  $\mu \notin \mathcal{C}$ . Then there exist a non-empty subset  $C \subseteq V$  and a matching  $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(C)$  such that, for every vertex  $v \in C$ ,  $\sigma(v) \succ_v \mu(v)$ . Notice that since  $C$  super weakly blocks  $\mu$ , Lemma 3 implies that  $C \cap H \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $h$  be a hospital in  $C \cap H$ . If  $\sigma(h) \subseteq \mu(h)$ , then  $\mu(h) \succ_h \sigma(h)$ . This contradicts the fact that  $\sigma(h) \succ_h \mu(h)$ . Thus,  $\sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h) \neq \emptyset$ . If there exists an edge  $(d, h) \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$  such that  $\mu(h) + (d, h) \in \mathcal{I}_h$ , then since  $d \in C$  (i.e.,  $\sigma(d) \succ_d \mu(d)$ ),  $(d, h)$  strongly blocks  $\mu$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$ . Thus, for every edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ , we have  $\mu(h) + e \notin \mathcal{I}_h$ .

Assume that there exist edges  $e = (d, h) \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$  and  $f \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$  such that we have  $e \succ_h f$ . Then since  $d \in C$  (i.e.,  $\sigma(d) \succ_d \mu(d)$ ),  $e$  strongly blocks  $\mu$ . Thus, for every edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$  and every edge  $f \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$ , we have  $f \succ_h e$ .

Define  $\mathbf{M}'_h := \mathbf{M}_h | (\mu(h) \cup \sigma(h))$ . Since  $\mu(h) + e \notin \mathcal{I}_h$  for every edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ ,  $\mu(h)$  is a base of  $\mathbf{M}'_h$ . Define  $B'$  as a base of  $\mathbf{M}'_h$  such that  $\sigma(h) \subseteq B'$ . Since  $\sigma(h) \in \mathcal{I}_h$ , (I3) guarantees the existence of such a base  $B'$  of  $\mathbf{M}'_h$ . Then we have  $B' \succ_h \sigma(h)$ . Lemma 5 implies that there exist an ordering  $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k)$  of the elements in  $\mu(h) \setminus B'$  and an ordering  $(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k)$  of the elements in  $B' \setminus \mu(h)$  satisfying the following conditions.

- For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , we have  $e_i \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}'_h}(f_i, \mu(h))$ .
- For every integer  $i \in [k]$ ,  $B'_i := (B' \setminus \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_i\}) \cup \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i\}$  is a base of  $\mathbf{M}'_h$ .

Notice that, for every integer  $i \in [k]$ , we have  $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}'_h}(f_i, \mu(h)) = \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(f_i, \mu(h))$ . Furthermore, for every integer  $i \in [k]$ ,  $B'_i \in \mathcal{I}_h$ .

For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , since  $f_i \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ , we have  $e_i \succ_h f_i$ . Define  $B'_0 := B'$ . Then for every integer  $i \in [k]$ , we have  $B'_i = B'_{i-1} + e_i - f_i$ . Notice that  $B'_k = \mu(h)$ . For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , since  $e_i \succ_h f_i$ ,  $B'_i \succ_h B'_{i-1}$ . Thus,  $\mu(h) = B'_k \succ_h B'_0 \succ_h \sigma(h)$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $\sigma(h) \succ_h \mu(h)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Notice that [1, Example 1] shows that  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  does not necessarily hold even when, for every hospital  $h \in H$ ,  $\mathbf{M}_h$  is a uniform matroid.

**Theorem 2.**  $\mathcal{SS} = \mathcal{C}_S$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mu$  be a matching in  $\mathcal{C}_S$ . Assume that  $\mu \notin \mathcal{SS}$ . Then there exists an edge  $e = (d, h) \in E \setminus \mu$  that weakly blocks  $\mu$ . If  $\mu(h) + e \in \mathcal{I}_h$ , then we can prove that  $V(\mu(h) + e)$  weakly blocks  $\mu$  by setting  $\sigma := \mu + e - \mu(d)$ , where  $V(F)$  denotes the set of end vertices of the edges in  $F$  for each subset  $F \subseteq E$ . Thus, we can assume that  $\mu(h) + e \notin \mathcal{I}_h$ . First, we consider the case where  $e \sim \mu(d)$ . In this case, since  $e$  weakly blocks  $\mu$ , there exists an edge  $f \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$  such that  $e \succ_h f$ . Notice that  $\mu(h) + e - f \succ_h \mu(h)$ . Thus, we can prove that  $V(\mu(h) + e - f)$  weakly blocks  $\mu$  by setting  $\sigma := \mu + e - f - \mu(d)$ . Next, we consider the case where  $e \succ \mu(d)$ . In this case, since  $e$  weakly blocks  $\mu$ , there exists an edge  $f \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$  such that  $e \succ_h f$ . Notice that  $\mu(h) + e - f \succ_h \mu(h)$ . Thus, we can prove that  $V(\mu(h) + e - f)$  weakly blocks  $\mu$  by setting  $\sigma := \mu + e - f - \mu(d)$ . This is a contradiction.

Let  $\mu$  be a matching in  $\mathcal{SS}$ . Assume that  $\mu \notin \mathcal{C}_S$ . Then there exist a non-empty subset  $C \subseteq V$  and a matching  $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(C)$  satisfying the following conditions.

- For every vertex  $v \in C$ ,  $\sigma(v) \succ_v \mu(v)$ .

- There exists a vertex  $v \in C$  such that  $\sigma(v) \succ_v \mu(v)$ .

Since  $C$  super weakly blocks  $\mu$ , Lemma 3 implies that  $C \cap H \neq \emptyset$ .

First, we consider the case where there exists a hospital  $h \in C \cap H$  such that  $\sigma(h) \succ_h \mu(h)$ . If  $\sigma(h) \subseteq \mu(h)$ , then  $\mu(h) \succ_h \sigma(h)$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $\sigma(h) \succ_h \mu(h)$ . Thus,  $\sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h) \neq \emptyset$ . If there exists an edge  $(d, h) \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$  such that  $\mu(h) + (d, h) \in \mathcal{I}_h$ , then since  $d \in C$  (i.e.,  $\sigma(d) \succ_d \mu(d)$ ),  $(d, h)$  weakly blocks  $\mu$ . This contradicts the fact that  $\mu \in \mathcal{SS}$ . Thus, for every edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ , we have  $\mu(h) + e \notin \mathcal{I}_h$ .

Assume that there exist edges  $e = (d, h) \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$  and  $f \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$  such that we have  $e \succ_h f$ . Then since  $d \in C$  (i.e.,  $\sigma(d) \succ_d \mu(d)$ ),  $e$  weakly blocks  $\mu$ . Thus, for every edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$  and every edge  $f \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$ , we have  $f \succ_h e$ .

Define  $\mathbf{M}'_h := \mathbf{M}_h | (\mu(h) \cup \sigma(h))$ . Then since  $\mu(h) + e \notin \mathcal{I}_h$  for every edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ ,  $\mu(h)$  is a base of  $\mathbf{M}'_h$ . Define  $B'$  as a base of  $\mathbf{M}'_h$  such that  $\sigma(h) \subseteq B'$ . Then we have  $B' \succ_h \sigma(h)$ . Lemma 5 implies that there exist an ordering  $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k)$  of the elements in  $\mu(h) \setminus B'$  and an ordering  $(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k)$  of the elements in  $B' \setminus \mu(h)$  satisfying the following conditions.

- For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , we have  $e_i \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}'_h}(f_i, \mu(h)) = \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(f_i, \mu(h))$ .
- For every integer  $i \in [k]$ ,  $B'_i := (B' \setminus \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_i\}) \cup \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i\} \in \mathcal{I}_h$ .

For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , since  $f_i \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ , we have  $e_i \succ_h f_i$ . Define  $B'_0 := B'$ . Then for every integer  $i \in [k]$ , we have  $B'_i = B'_{i-1} + e_i - f_i$ . Notice that  $B'_k = \mu(h)$ . For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , since  $e_i \succ_h f_i$ ,  $B'_i \succ_h B'_{i-1}$ . Thus,  $\mu(h) = B'_k \succ_h B'_0 \succ_h \sigma(h)$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $\sigma(h) \succ_h \mu(h)$ .

Next, we assume that  $\sigma(h) \sim_h \mu(h)$  for every hospital  $h \in C \cap H$ . In this case, there exists a doctor  $d \in C \cap D$  such that  $\sigma(d) \succ_d \mu(d)$ . Let  $g = (d, h)$  denote  $\sigma(d)$ . If there exists an edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$  such that  $\mu(h) + e \in \mathcal{I}_h$ , then  $e$  weakly blocks  $\mu$ . Thus,  $\mu(h) + e \notin \mathcal{I}_h$  for every edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ . If there exists an edge  $f \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(g, \mu(h))$  such that  $g \succ_h f$ , then  $g$  weakly blocks  $\mu$ . Thus,  $f \succ_h g$  for every edge  $f \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(g, \mu(h))$ . Furthermore, if there exist an edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus (\mu(h) + g)$  and an edge  $f \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$  such that  $e \succ_h f$ , then  $e$  weakly blocks  $\mu$ . Thus,  $f \succ_h e$  for every edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus (\mu(h) + g)$  and every edge  $f \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$ .

Define  $\mathbf{M}'_h := \mathbf{M}_h | (\mu(h) \cup \sigma(h))$ . Then since  $\mu(h) + e \notin \mathcal{I}_h$  for every edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ ,  $\mu(h)$  is a base of  $\mathbf{M}'_h$ . Define  $B'$  as a base of  $\mathbf{M}'_h$  such that  $\sigma(h) \subseteq B'$ . Then we have  $B' \succ_h \sigma(h)$ . Lemma 5 implies that there exist an ordering  $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k)$  of the elements in  $\mu(h) \setminus B'$  and an ordering  $(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k)$  of the elements in  $B' \setminus \mu(h)$  satisfying the following conditions.

- For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , we have  $e_i \in \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}'_h}(f_i, \mu(h)) = \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(f_i, \mu(h))$ .
- For every integer  $i \in [k]$ ,  $B'_i := (B' \setminus \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_i\}) \cup \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i\} \in \mathcal{I}_h$ .

For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , since  $f_i \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ , we have  $e_i \succ_h f_i$ . Define  $B'_0 := B'$ . Then for every integer  $i \in [k]$ , we have  $B'_i = B'_{i-1} + e_i - f_i$ . Notice that  $B'_k = \mu(h)$ . For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , since  $e_i \succ_h f_i$ ,  $B'_i \succ_h B'_{i-1}$ . Furthermore, if  $f_i = g$ , then  $e_i \succ_h f_i$  and  $B'_i \succ_h B'_{i-1}$ . Thus,  $\mu(h) = B'_k \succ_h B'_0 \succ_h \sigma(h)$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $\sigma(h) \sim_h \mu(h)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.**  $\mathcal{SSS} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{SS}}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mu$  be a matching in  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{SS}}$ . Assume that  $\mu \notin \mathcal{SSS}$ . Then there exists an edge  $e = (d, h) \in E \setminus \mu$  that super weakly blocks  $\mu$ . If  $\mu(h) + e \in \mathcal{I}_h$ , then we can prove that  $V(\mu(h) + e)$  super weakly blocks  $\mu$  by setting  $\sigma := \mu + e - \mu(d)$ . Assume that  $\mu(h) + e \notin \mathcal{I}_h$ . Then since  $e$  super weakly blocks  $\mu$ , there exists an edge  $f \in \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$  such that  $e \succ_h f$ . Notice that  $\mu(h) + e - f \succ_h \mu(h)$ . Thus, we can prove that  $V(\mu(h) + e - f)$  super weakly blocks  $\mu$  by setting  $\sigma := \mu + e - f - \mu(d)$ . This is a contradiction.

Let  $\mu$  be a matching in  $\mathcal{SSS}$ . Assume that  $\mu \notin \mathcal{C}_{SS}$ . Then there exist a non-empty subset  $C \subseteq V$  and a matching  $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(C)$  satisfying the following conditions.

- For every vertex  $v \in C$ ,  $\sigma(v) \succ_v \mu(v)$ .
- There exists a vertex  $v \in C$  such that  $\sigma(v) \neq \mu(v)$ .

Lemma 3 implies that  $C \cap H \neq \emptyset$ .

First, we prove that there exists a hospital  $h \in C \cap H$  such that  $\sigma(h) \neq \mu(h)$ . Let  $v$  be a vertex in  $C$  such that  $\sigma(v) \neq \mu(v)$ . If  $v \in H$ , then the proof is done. Assume that  $v \in D$ . Since  $\sigma(v) \succ_v \mu(v)$ ,  $\sigma(v) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $g = (v, h)$  denote  $\sigma(v)$ . Then  $h \in C$ . Since  $\sigma(v) \neq \mu(v)$ , we have  $g \in \sigma(h)$  and  $g \notin \mu(h)$ . Thus,  $\sigma(h) \neq \mu(h)$ .

Let  $h$  be a hospital in  $C \cap H$  such that  $\sigma(h) \neq \mu(h)$ . If  $\sigma(h) \subsetneq \mu(h)$ , then  $\mu(h) \succ_h \sigma(h)$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $\sigma(h) \succ_h \mu(h)$ . Thus,  $\sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h) \neq \emptyset$ . If there exists an edge  $(d, h) \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$  such that  $\mu(h) + (d, h) \in \mathcal{I}_h$ , then since  $d \in C$  (i.e.,  $\sigma(d) \succ_d \mu(d)$ ),  $e$  super weakly blocks  $\mu$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $\mu \in \mathcal{SSS}$ . Thus, for every edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ , we have  $\mu(h) + e \notin \mathcal{I}_h$ .

Assume that there exist edges  $e = (d, h) \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$  and  $f \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$  such that we have  $e \succ_h f$ . Then since  $d \in C$  (i.e.,  $\sigma(d) \succ_d \mu(d)$ ),  $e$  super weakly blocks  $\mu$ . Thus, for every edge  $e = (d, h) \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$  and every edge  $f \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(e, \mu(h))$ , we have  $f \succ_h e$ .

Define  $\mathbf{M}'_h := \mathbf{M}_h | (\mu(h) \cup \sigma(h))$ . Then since  $\mu(h) + e \notin \mathcal{I}_h$  for every edge  $e \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ ,  $\mu(h)$  is a base of  $\mathbf{M}'_h$ . Define  $B'$  as a base of  $\mathbf{M}'_h$  such that  $\sigma(h) \subseteq B'$ . Then we have  $B' \succ_h \sigma(h)$ . Lemma 5 implies that there exist an ordering  $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k)$  of the elements in  $\mu(h) \setminus B'$  and an ordering  $(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k)$  of the elements in  $B' \setminus \mu(h)$  satisfying the following conditions.

- For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , we have  $e_i \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{M}'_h}(f_i, \mu(h)) = \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{M}_h}(f_i, \mu(h))$ .
- For every integer  $i \in [k]$ ,  $B'_i := (B' \setminus \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_i\}) \cup \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_i\} \in \mathcal{I}_h$ .

For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , since  $f_i \in \sigma(h) \setminus \mu(h)$ ,  $e_i \succ_h f_i$ . Define  $B'_0 := B'$ . For every integer  $i \in [k]$ , since  $e_i \succ_h f_i$ ,  $B'_i \succ_h B'_{i-1}$ . Thus,  $\mu(h) = B'_k \succ_h B'_0 \succ_h \sigma(h)$ . However, this contradicts the fact that  $\sigma(h) \succ_h \mu(h)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Finally, we consider algorithmic implications of our results. Theorems 2 and 3 imply that if we can determine whether  $\mathcal{SS} \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{SSS} \neq \emptyset$ , then we can determine whether  $\mathcal{C}_S \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{SS} \neq \emptyset$ . It is known that, under the assumption that we are given independence oracles for the matroids, we can determine whether  $\mathcal{SS} \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{SSS} \neq \emptyset$  in polynomial time [14, 15]. Thus, under the same assumption, we can determine whether  $\mathcal{C}_S \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{SS} \neq \emptyset$  in polynomial time.

## References

- [1] Agustín G. Bonifacio, Noelia Juarez, Pablo Neme, and Jorge Oviedo. Core and stability notions in many-to-one matching markets with indifferences. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 53(1):143–157, 2024.
- [2] Richard A. Brualdi. Comments on bases in dependence structures. *Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 1(2):161–167, 1969.
- [3] Tamás Fleiner. A fixed-point approach to stable matchings and some applications. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 28(1):103–126, 2003.
- [4] Tamás Fleiner and Naoyuki Kamiyama. A matroid approach to stable matchings with lower quotas. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 41(2):734–744, 2016.



- [5] Harold Gabow, Fred Glover, and Darwin Klingman. A note on exchanges in matroid bases. Technical Report Cneter for Cybernetic Studies Research Report CS 184, The University of Texas, 1974.
- [6] David Gale and Lloyd S. Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 69(1):9–15, 1962.
- [7] Chien-Chung Huang. Classified stable matching. In Moses Charikar, editor, *Proceedings of the 21st Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1235–1253, Philadelphia, PA, 2010. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [8] Robert W. Irving. Stable marriage and indifference. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 48(3):261–272, 1994.
- [9] Robert W. Irving, David F. Manlove, and Sandy Scott. The hospitals/residents problem with ties. In Magnús M. Halldórsson, editor, *Proceedings of the 7th Scandinavian Workshop on Algorithm Theory*, volume 1851 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 259–271, Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany, 2000. Springer.
- [10] Robert W. Irving, David F. Manlove, and Sandy Scott. Strong stability in the hospitals/residents problem. In Helmut Alt and Michel Habib, editors, *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, volume 2607 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 439–450, Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany, 2003. Springer.
- [11] Naoyuki Kamiyama. Stable matchings with ties, master preference lists, and matroid constraints. In Martin Hoefer, editor, *Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Algorithmic Game Theory*, volume 9347 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 3–14, Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany, 2015. Springer.
- [12] Naoyuki Kamiyama. Many-to-many stable matchings with ties, master preference lists, and matroid constraints. In Edith Elkind, Manuela Veloso, Noa Agmon, and Matthew E. Taylor, editors, *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 583–591, Richland, SC, 2019. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- [13] Naoyuki Kamiyama. On stable matchings with pairwise preferences and matroid constraints. In Amal El Fallah Seghrouchni, Gita Sukthankar, Bo An, and Neil Yorke-Smith, editors, *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, pages 584–592, Richland, SC, 2020. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems.
- [14] Naoyuki Kamiyama. A matroid generalization of the super-stable matching problem. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 36(2):1467–1482, 2022.
- [15] Naoyuki Kamiyama. Strongly stable matchings under matroid constraints. Technical Report arXiv:2208.11272, arXiv, 2022.
- [16] Telikepalli Kavitha, Kurt Mehlhorn, Dimitrios Michail, and Katarzyna E. Paluch. Strongly stable matchings in time  $O(nm)$  and extension to the hospitals-residents problem. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 3(2):Article 15, 2007.
- [17] David F. Manlove. Stable marriage with ties and unacceptable partners. Technical Report TR-1999-29, The University of Glasgow, Department of Computing Science, 1999.

- [18] James G. Oxley. *Matroid Theory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2nd edition, 2011.
- [19] Alvin E. Roth. Common and conflicting interests in two-sided matching markets. *European Economic Review*, 27(1):75–96, 1985.