

A new approach to bipartite stable matching optimization

Tamás Fleiner^{*} András Frank[†] Tamás Király[‡]

September 10, 2024

Abstract

As a common generalization of previously solved optimization problems concerning bipartite stable matchings, we describe a strongly polynomial network flow based algorithm for computing ℓ disjoint stable matchings with minimum total cost. The major observation behind the approach is that stable matchings, as edge sets, can be represented as certain cuts of an associated directed graph. This allows us to use results on disjoint cuts directly to answer questions about disjoint stable matchings. We also provide a construction that represents stable matchings as maximum-size antichains in a partially ordered set (poset), which enables us to apply the theorems of Dilworth, Mirsky, Greene and Kleitman directly to stable matchings. Another consequence of these approaches is a min-max formula for the minimum number of stable matchings covering all stable edges.

Keywords: stable matchings, packing and covering, polynomial algorithms, network flows, posets, chains and antichains

1 Introduction

By a bipartite preference system, we mean a bipartite graph $G = (U, W; E)$ (with possible parallel edges) endowed with a (strict) preference list of the edges (from better to worse) incident to v for every node v of G . Sometimes we refer to the elements of U as boys while the elements of W are girls.

A matching M of G is called stable if it dominates every non-matching edge $f = uw$ in the sense that M has an element $e = u'w$ which is girl-better (at w) than f or M has an element $e = uw'$ which is boy-better (at u) than f . The set of stable matchings will be denoted by $\mathcal{SM} = \mathcal{SM}(G)$. The starting result of the area is the theorem of Gale and Shapley [29] stating that a bipartite preference system always admits a stable matching, and, in addition, each stable matching covers the same node-set, implying that they have the same cardinality.

Since the groundbreaking work of Gale and Shapley, there has been extensive research on finding efficient algorithms for more involved optimization problems over the set of stable matchings. In particular, two fundamental approaches have been proposed for solving the weighted stable matching problem in bipartite graphs.

The first approach relies on linear programming. Polynomial-size polyhedral descriptions of the stable matching polytope of bipartite preference systems have been found by Vande Vate [56] and by Rothblum

^{*}Department of Computer Science and Information Theory, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Magyar tudósok körútja 2, Budapest, H-1117. Research was supported by ELKH-ELTE Egerváry Research Group and the K143585 OTKA Grant. E-mail: fleiner@cs.bme.hu

[†]ELKH-ELTE Egerváry Research Group, Department of Operations Research, Eötvös Loránd University Budapest, Pázmány P. s. 1/c, Budapest H-1117. E-mail: andras.frank@ttk.elte.hu

[‡]ELKH-ELTE Egerváry Research Group, Department of Operations Research, Eötvös Loránd University Budapest, Pázmány P. s. 1/c, Budapest H-1117. Research was supported by the Lendület Programme of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences - grant number LP2021-1-1/2021, by the Ministry of Innovation and Technology of Hungary from the National Research, Development, and Innovation Fund - grant number ELTE TKP 2021-NKTA62 and grant number K143858. E-mail: tamas.kiraly@ttk.elte.hu

[51]. Thus, general LP-solving techniques can efficiently solve the weighted stable matching problem. The properties of the stable matching polytope were further explored by Roth, Rothblum and Vande Vate [50] and by Teo and Sethuraman [55], among others.

The second approach, presented in detail in the book of Gusfield and Irving [34], is based on a one-to-one correspondence between stable matchings and members of a certain ring-family. Actually, they consider two different models. Both give rise to a network flow based algorithm for finding a maximum weight (or minimum cost) stable matching, but the first one is conceptually simpler, while the second one, relying on the concept of rotations, is algorithmically more efficient. Actually, this algorithm, developed by Irving, Leather, and Gusfield [40] considers only the special case when the cost-function reflects (or defines) the preference list of persons. It was later observed by several researchers (see e.g., [9] and [41]) that the same technique works for general edge costs, as well, and yields a strongly polynomial algorithm.

Here we introduce a new ring-family to model the structure of stable matchings. Like the ring-family of Gusfield and Irving, the members of this one are also in a one-to-one correspondence with stable matchings, where intersection and union correspond to the standard meet and join operations on stable matchings. The model describes a direct correspondence between the set of stable matchings of a bipartite graph and a set of certain *st*-cuts (defining the members of the ring-family) of an associated digraph having only $|E_{st}| - |W| + 2$ nodes (where $|E_{st}|$ denotes the set of stable edges). We remark that our model also does not lean on rotations. There is, however, a major difference between the ring-family in the book of Gusfield and Irving [34] and the one in our approach.

The point is that a ring-family representation in itself is not enough for solving packing and covering problems on stable matchings, because it does not necessarily encode edge-disjointness. To give an obvious example, a preference system with two stable matchings can be represented as a ring family on a single element, with the two sets of the family being the emptyset and the one-element set. However, this representation provides no information on whether the two stable matchings are edge-disjoint. The approach in [34] does not address this problem, as it does not discuss packing and covering problems.

The major advantage of our ring-family model is that, beyond handling maximum weight stable matching problems, it also provides min-max formulas and MFMC-based algorithms for various packing and covering problems. A basic packing problem of stable matchings aims at finding a maximum number of (pairwise) disjoint stable matchings (or equivalently, deciding if there are ℓ disjoint stable matchings). Perhaps a bit surprisingly, this was considered and solved only recently, by Ganesh et al. [30].

Our present model makes it possible to manage a common generalization of the weighted stable matching problem and the packing problem. For example, we describe an algorithm for finding ℓ disjoint cheapest stable matchings. Actually, we solve the even more general problem of finding ℓ disjoint stable matchings with minimum total cost. As a consequence, an algorithm is described to determine the minimum number of stable matchings covering all stable edges (the ones occurring in some stable matching).

Beside the new ring-family model, we also introduce another approach. Here the ground-set is the set E_{st} of stable edges, and we define a certain partial order on E_{st} induced by the reference system on G to get a poset P_G . This poset has the specific feature that all its inclusion-wise maximal antichains have the same size, and these largest antichains are precisely the stable matchings of G . This poset model allows us to use packing and covering results for antichains (like the ones of Dilworth, Mirsky, or Greene and Kleitman) in order to solve packing and covering problems for stable matchings. For example, we describe min-max formulas and strongly polynomial algorithms both for the minimum number of stable matchings covering all stable edges, and for the maximum w -weight of the union of ℓ stable matchings. Based on this correspondence, we describe a two-phase greedy algorithm for finding a minimum number of stable matchings covering a lower-bound function f on the set of stable edges.

1.1 Notions and notation

Let $\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{Z}$ denote the set of real, rational, and integer numbers, respectively. When only non-negative values are allowed, we use the notation $\mathbf{R}_+, \mathbf{Q}_+, \mathbf{Z}_+$. When $+\infty$ is also allowed, we use the notation

$\overline{\mathbf{R}}_+, \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_+, \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_+$. We shall consider $+\infty$ as an integer. For a function $h : V \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and a subset $Z \subseteq V$, we use the notation $\widetilde{h}(Z) := \sum[h(v) : v \in Z]$.

For two elements u and v of a ground-set V , a subset $Z \subseteq V$ is a $v\bar{u}$ -set if $v \in Z \subseteq V - u$. For a family \mathcal{F} of subsets, $\cup\mathcal{F}$ denotes the union of the members of \mathcal{F} . A subset $X \subseteq V$ is said to **block** the family \mathcal{F} if X intersects each member of \mathcal{F} . Such a set X is also called a **blocker** of \mathcal{F} , while an inclusionwise minimal blocker is referred to as a **minimal blocker**.

A set (collection) of distinct subsets of a ground set is called a **set-system**, while a collection of not necessarily distinct subsets is a **family** of sets. A set-system \mathcal{R} is called a **ring of sets** or a **ring-set** (or just a ring, or ?set-ring?) if it is closed under the operations of intersection and union. When a subset is allowed to appear in more than one copies, we speak of a **ring-family**.

By adding the empty set and the ground-set, we obtain again a ring-set, and thus we may a priori assume that $\{\emptyset, V\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$. The sets \emptyset and V are the **trivial** members of \mathcal{R} while the other members are **non-trivial**. A ring-set is **non-trivial** if it has a non-trivial member. The set of non-trivial members of a ring-set \mathcal{R} will be denoted by \mathcal{R}' .

Though a ring-set \mathcal{R} may have an exponential number of members, it can be encoded with the help of a function $C_{\mathcal{R}} : V \rightarrow 2^V$, where $C_{\mathcal{R}}(u)$ is the unique smallest member of \mathcal{R} containing u (that is, $C_{\mathcal{R}}(u)$ is the intersection of all members of \mathcal{R} containing u).

We call the function $C_{\mathcal{R}}$ the **code** of \mathcal{R} . It consists of $|V|$ non-empty subsets of V . A non-empty set $Z \subseteq V$ is in \mathcal{R} precisely if $C_{\mathcal{R}}(u) \subseteq Z$ holds for every element $u \in Z$ (that is, $Z = \cup\{C_{\mathcal{R}}(u) : u \in Z\}$).

If $v \in C_{\mathcal{R}}(u) - u$ for some $v \in V - u$, then the arc uv will be referred to as a **code-arc** of \mathcal{R} . The digraph $D_{\mathcal{R}}$ on V formed by the code-arcs is called the **code-digraph** of \mathcal{R} . A subset Z of V is a member of \mathcal{R} if and only if no arc of the code-digraph leaves Z .

From an algorithmic point of view, when we say that we are given a ring-set \mathcal{R} , it means that \mathcal{R} is given by its code or code-digraph. Another natural subroutine to encode \mathcal{R} tells for any ordered pair of nodes in V whether or not there is a $u\bar{v}$ -member of \mathcal{R} . Obviously v is in $C_{\mathcal{R}}(u)$ if and only if the answer is no, and hence the two descriptions of \mathcal{R} are equivalent.

Let $D = (V, A)$ be a loopless digraph, $s^* \in V$ a specified source-node with no entering arcs, and $t^* \in V$ a specified sink-node with no leaving arcs. Let \mathcal{R}^* denote the ring-set consisting of the empty set, the ground-set V and all the s^*t^* -subsets of V .

For a subset $X \subseteq V$, let $\text{OUT}_D(X)$ denote the set of arcs leaving X . By an s^*t^* -cut of D we mean the set of arcs leaving an $s^*\bar{t}^*$ -subset $Z \subseteq V$, where Z is called the **out-shore** of the cut.

In the standard Max-flow Min-cut (MFMC) problem, we are given a capacity-function $g : A \rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{R}}_+$ (serving as an upper bound) on the set of arcs of D . We say that g is integer-valued if its finite values are integers.

Let the **out-capacity** $\delta_g(Z)$ of a subset $Z \subseteq V$ of nodes be the g -sum of the arcs leaving Z while $\varrho_g(Z) := \delta_g(V - Z)$. For every flow $x \geq 0$ in D , we have $\delta_x(s^*) = \varrho_x(t^*)$ and this common value is the **amount** of x . A simple property of flows x is that $\delta_x(Z) - \varrho_x(Z) = \delta_x(s^*)$ holds for every $s^*\bar{t}^*$ -set Z . A flow x is **g -feasible** or just **feasible** if $x \leq g$, and this is why sometimes we refer to g as a capacity-function.

The primal MFMC problem aims at finding a feasible flow of maximum flow amount while the dual problem is about finding s^*t^* -cut with minimal g -value or equivalently finding an $s^*\bar{t}^*$ -set $Z \subseteq V$ of minimum $\delta_g(Z)$ value.

The classic MFMC theorem of Ford+Fulkerson states that $\max = \min$, and if g is integer-valued, then the maximum flow may be chosen integer-valued. By the algorithms of Edmonds and Karp, Dinits, or Goldberg and Tarjan, both a maximum flow and a minimum cut can be computed in strongly polynomial time (when g is rational- or integer-valued). For a general overview of these algorithms, see the book of Schrijver [52].

1.2 Stable matchings

The books of Gusfield and Irving [34] and of Manlove [45] provide a rich overview of definitions and results on stable matchings. Here we recall some of those which are important in the present work.

An edge of G is called **stable** if it belongs to a stable matching. Let E_{st} denote the set of stable edges (that is, the union of all stable matchings). An edge e is **marginal** if its removal does not affect the set of stable edges. The removal of a marginal edge f may result in a new marginal edge and it also may happen that an originally marginal edge h stops to be marginal, that is, $G - f - h$ may have a new stable matching.

An easily provable basic observation is that if we consider the best edge $e = st$ incident to a node s , then any edge incident to t which is worse than e at t is marginal, and hence its deletion does not affect the set of stable edges. Therefore we can delete all the edges incident to t which are worse than e . By going through all nodes s of G and carrying out this edge-deletion process, and finally deleting the arising singleton nodes, we obtain a graph in which the set of stable matchings is the same as in the starting graph. (Note that this procedure is essentially a proof of the theorem of Gale and Shapley stating that there always exists a stable matching and that the set of nodes covered by a stable matching is the same for each stable matching.) Furthermore, the set of girl-best edges is a stable matching (which coincides with the set of boy-worst edges) and, symmetrically, the set of boy-best edges is a stable matching (which coincides with the set of girl-worst edges).

Therefore we may assume henceforth that the original graph $G = (U, W; E)$ itself has the property that each stable matching is a perfect matching, and both the set of girl-best edges and the set of boy-best edges form a stable matching. Let $n := |W| (= |U|)$.

Another fundamental property (see Lemma 1.3.1 in [34]) is that if M and N are two (distinct) stable matchings, then the set of girl-best edges in $M \cup N$ is a stable matching, denoted by $M \wedge N$, as well as the set of girl-worst edges, denoted by $M \vee N$. Moreover, $M \wedge N$ is the set of boy-worst edges, while $M \vee N$ is the set of boy-best edges. These two operations define a distributive lattice on the set of stable matchings. Actually, the following generalization is also valid.

Claim 1.1 *If E' is the union of an arbitrary set of stable matchings, then the set of girl-best edges in E' is a stable matching and so is the set of the girl-worst edges, as well. The set of girl-best edges coincide with the set of boy-worst edges, and, symmetrically, the set of girl-worst edges coincide with the set of boy-best edges.* ■

By applying this claim to the set of stable matchings containing a stable edge e , one obtains that in the union of stable matchings containing e there is a unique girl-best stable matching containing e , denoted by M_e , which coincides with the boy-worst stable matching containing e .

We can conclude that the arguments and algorithms concerning the set of all stable matchings of G can be extended to the set of stable matchings containing a given stable edge e . For example, for the algorithms to be developed below, we may assume that the (unique) girl-best stable matching M_e containing e is available for each stable edge e of G . Claim 1.1 immediately implies the following.

Claim 1.2 *For any stable matching $M = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ of G , one has $M = M_{e_1} \vee \dots \vee M_{e_n}$.* ■

We call a matching of G **stable extendible** or just **extendible** if it is a subset of a stable matching.

Claim 1.3 *A matching M of G is stable extendible if and only if $M \cup M'$ is a matching for any (and hence for each) stable matching M' of G' , where G' denotes the graph arising from $G - M$ by deleting all edges dominated by M . In particular, with the help of a single application of the Gale+Shapley algorithm one can decide if a matching M of G is stable extendible or not, and if so, the algorithm provides the unique girl-best stable matching including M .*

Proof. If $M \cup M'$ is a matching for a stable matching M' of G' , then it is clearly a stable matching of G , that is, M is extendible. Conversely, if M can be extended to a stable matching $M \cup M'$ of G , then M' must be a stable matching of G' , since if G' had an edge e not dominated by M' , then e is dominated by an element of M but such an edge e is not in G' . ■

2 Ring-sets on digraphs

In this preparatory section we do not deal with stable matchings at all. Instead, we investigate some flow and tension problems concerning ring-sets, which shall be used in forthcoming sections to solve various optimization problems on stable matchings.

2.1 Largest h -independent packing of ring-set members

Let $D = (V, A)$ be a loopless digraph with source-node s^* and a sink-node t^* . We assume that every node is reachable from s^* . Let $h : A \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_+$ be a non-negative integer-valued function on the arc set of D . We call a family of subsets of nodes **h -independent** if every arc a of D leaves at most $h(a)$ members of the family. In the special case of $h \equiv 1$, we speak of **arc-independence**. A subset $L \subseteq A$ of arcs **out-covers** a subset $X \subset V$ of nodes if it contains at least one arc leaving X , that is, if $\delta_L(X) \geq 1$. For a set-system \mathcal{F} , we say that L **out-covers** \mathcal{F} if L out-covers each member of \mathcal{F} .

Let $\mathcal{R}_0 (\subseteq \mathcal{R}^*)$ be a non-trivial ring-set (given by its code) on the node-set of digraph $D = (V, A)$, and suppose that each non-trivial member of \mathcal{R}_0 is an s^*t^* -set. Recall that \mathcal{R}'_0 denotes the set of non-trivial members of \mathcal{R}_0 . Let ν_h denote the maximum number of (not necessarily distinct) h -independent members of \mathcal{R}'_0 , and let

$$\tau_h := \min\{\tilde{h}(L) : L \subseteq A, L \text{ out-covers } \mathcal{R}'_0\}.$$

THEOREM 2.1 *For digraph $D = (V, A)$, function h , and ring-set \mathcal{R}_0 , we have $\nu_h = \tau_h$. By a single application of Dijkstra's shortest path algorithm, both a h -independent family of ν_h members of \mathcal{R}_0 and a subset $L \subseteq A$ of $\tau_h (= \nu_h)$ arcs out-covering \mathcal{R}'_0 can be computed. In addition, a maximum h -independent family may be chosen so as to form a chain.*

Proof. As the inequality $\max \leq \min$ is straightforward, we concentrate on the reverse inequality. For every node $u \in V$ and node $v \in C_{\mathcal{R}_0}(u)$, add the code-arc uv to D , and let $D' = (V, A')$ denote the extended digraph. We shall refer to the members of A as original arcs. By its definition, no code-arc leaves any set $Z \in \mathcal{R}_0$. Define a cost-function $c' : A' \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_+$, as follows.

$$c'(a) := \begin{cases} h(a) & \text{if } a \in A \\ 0 & \text{if } a \in A' - A. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

By a single application of Dijkstra's algorithm, we can compute an s^* -rooted spanning arborescence of D' in which the (unique) s^*v -path is a c' -cheapest s^*v -path of D' for all nodes v . Let $\pi'(v)$ denote the c' -cost of this path.

Since there is a code-arc from t^* to every other node, and the c' -cost of every code-arc is 0, we have $\pi'(s^*) = 0 \leq \pi'(v) \leq \pi'(t^*)$ for every node v . If $\pi'(t^*) = 0$, then D' includes an s^*t^* -path P of 0 cost. Let P' denote the subset of original arcs of P . Since no code-arc leaves any member of \mathcal{R}_0 , P' out-covers \mathcal{R}_0 . As the total h -cost of P' is 0, we obtain that $\nu_h \leq \tau_h = 0 \leq \nu_h$, that is, $\nu_h = \tau_h$.

Therefore we may assume that $\pi'(t^*) > 0$. Let q ($q \geq 1$) denote the number of distinct positive values of π' and let $(0 =) \mu_0 < \mu_1 < \dots < \mu_q (= \pi'(t^*))$ denote the distinct values of π' .

A well-known property is that the (integer-valued) function π' is a feasible potential in the sense that that $\Delta_{\pi'}(a) \leq c'(a)$ holds for every arc $a = uv$ of D' where $\Delta_{\pi'}(a) := \pi'(v) - \pi'(u)$ denotes the **potential-drop** induced by π' . Moreover, an s^*t^* -path is c' -cheapest if and only if it consists of tight arcs (where tight means that $\Delta_{\pi'}(a) = c'(a)$).

Consider the level sets L_0, L_1, \dots, L_{q-1} ($\subseteq V - t^*$) defined by $L_i := \{v \in V : \pi'(v) = \mu_i\}$, along with the induced chain $\mathcal{C} := \{V_0 \subset V_1 \subset \dots \subset V_{q-1}\}$ where $V_i := L_0 \cup \dots \cup L_i$. Since no set V_i is left by any arc with 0 c' -cost, it follows that each V_i is in \mathcal{R}_0 .

Let \mathcal{C}' denote the chain of sets in which each set V_i occurs $\mu_{i+1} - \mu_i$ times ($i = 0, \dots, q-1$). Then $|\mathcal{C}'| = \mu_q$. Let P be c' -cheapest s^*t^* -path of D' whose c' -cost is μ_q . It follows from the feasibility of π' that P leaves each set V_i exactly once (that is, P does not enter V_i). Furthermore, the unique arc of P leaving V_i is an original arc whose c' -cost (that is, its h -value) is $\mu_{i+1} - \mu_i$.

It follows from these that the chain \mathcal{C}' consists of μ_q members of \mathcal{R}'_0 and these sets form a h -independent family, from which $\nu_h \geq \mu_q$. On the other hand, the original arcs of P out-cover \mathcal{R}'_0 , and the sum $\tilde{c}'(P)$ of h -values of these arcs is μ_q . Therefore we have $\tau_h \leq \mu_q \leq \nu_h \leq \tau_h$, and hence $\nu_h = \tau_h$ follows. ■

2.1.1 A two-phase greedy algorithm for the special case $h \equiv 1$

In the special case $h \equiv 1$, Theorem 2.1 can be reformulated in the following simpler form.

Corollary 2.2 *In digraph $D = (V, A)$, let \mathcal{R}_0 ($\subseteq \mathcal{R}^*$) be a non-trivial ring-set (given by its code). Then the maximum number ν_1 of the arc-independent members of \mathcal{R}_0 is equal to the minimum number τ_1 of arcs out-covering \mathcal{R}_0 . The optimal arc-independent system may be chosen to be a chain. With the help of a two-phase greedy algorithm, both a largest arc-independent chain and a smallest arc-set out-covering \mathcal{R}_0 can be computed in polynomial time.*

Proof. The Dijkstra algorithm occurring in the proof of Theorem 2.1, when applied to the case $h \equiv 1$, is concerned with a special $(0, 1)$ -valued cost-function. In this case, the Dijkstra algorithm (for computing the largest arc-independent chain $\mathcal{C} = \{V_0 \subset \dots \subset V_{q-1}\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}'_0$ along with an s^*t^* -path consisting of a minimum number of original arcs) can be replaced by the following two-phase greedy algorithm.

Phase 1 consists of subsequent steps for $i = 1, 2, \dots$. In Step 1, let V_1 be the (unique) smallest member of \mathcal{R}_0 containing s^* . Since \mathcal{R}_0 is non-trivial, $t^* \notin V_0$. In Step $i+1$ of the first phase ($i = 1, 2, \dots$), consider the set V_i computed in the previous step. Let V'_i denote the set of nodes consisting of V_i and the heads of original arcs leaving V_i .

If there is no member of \mathcal{R}_0 including V'_i but not containing t^* , then we define $q := i$ and Phase 1 terminates by outputting the arc-independent chain $V_1 \subset \dots \subset V_q$ consisting of members of \mathcal{R}_0 . If \mathcal{R}_0 has a member including V'_i but not containing t^* , then let V_{i+1} be the unique smallest such member. (This is nothing but the set of nodes reachable in D' from V'_i .)

In Phase 2, by starting at node t^* and stepping back one-by-one, we can build up in a greedy way a reverse dipath from t^* to s^* which consists of exactly q original arcs and at most q code-arcs. Let P denote the corresponding s^*t^* -dipath in D' . By the construction, P leaves each V_i ($i = 1, \dots, q$) exactly once along an original arc and all other arcs of P are code-arcs. Moreover, since no member of \mathcal{R}_0 is left by a code-arc, the q original arcs of P out-cover every member of \mathcal{R}_0 . Therefore, we have $\tau_1 \leq q \leq \nu_1 \leq \tau_1$ and hence $\tau_1 = q = \nu_1 = \tau_1$. ■

2.2 Minimizing the out-capacity $\delta_g(Z)$ over the members of a ring-set

Let $D = (V, A)$ be a digraph with a source-node s^* and a sink-node t^* . Let $g : A \rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_+$ be an upper bound or capacity function on the arc-set A , where $\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_+ = \mathbf{Z}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$. As is well-known, there are strongly polynomial algorithms [11, 13] for computing a minimum g -capacity s^*t^* -cut, or equivalently, an s^*t^* -set Z that minimizes $\delta_g(Z)$. Our present goal is to show how such an algorithm (working with augmenting paths) can be used to compute a member Z of a non-trivial ring-set $\mathcal{R}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{R}^*$ (given by its code) for which $\delta_g(Z)$ is as small as possible. Actually, it turns out that the minimizer sets also form a ring-set, and we not only compute a single minimizer but the code of this ring-set. This will be an important tool in stable matching applications.

Recall that for a ring-set \mathcal{R}_0 , \mathcal{R}'_0 denotes the set of non-trivial members of \mathcal{R}_0 .

Lemma 2.3 *Let $\mathcal{R}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{R}^*$ be a non-trivial ring-set given by its code. Suppose that $\delta_g(Z) \geq 1$ holds for each member Z of \mathcal{R}_0 (which is an s^*t^* -set). Let*

$$\gamma_1 := \min\{\delta_g(Z) : Z \in \mathcal{R}'_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_1 := \{Z \in \mathcal{R}_0 : \delta_g(Z) = \gamma_1\} \cup \{\emptyset, V\}.$$

Then \mathcal{R}_1 is a ring-set whose code can be computed in strongly polynomial time by an MFMC algorithm.

Proof. If $\gamma_1 = \infty$, then $\delta_g(X) = \infty$ holds for every non-trivial member X of \mathcal{R}_0 . In this case, $\mathcal{R}_1 = \mathcal{R}_0$, and hence the code of \mathcal{R}_1 is ab ovo available.

Therefore we can assume that γ_1 is finite. As δ_g is a submodular set-function, the system \mathcal{R}_1 is a ring-set. Indeed, for sets $X, Y \in \mathcal{R}'_1$ we have

$$\gamma_1 + \gamma_1 = \delta_g(X) + \delta_g(Y) \geq \delta_g(X \cap Y) + \delta_g(X \cup Y) \geq \gamma_1 + \gamma_1,$$

from which we have $\delta_g(X \cap Y) = \gamma_1$ and $\delta_g(X \cup Y) = \gamma_1$.

To prove the second part, we extend D by adding the code-arcs of \mathcal{R}_0 . We also extend g to the code-arcs a' by letting $g(a') := +\infty$.

Let $D' = (V, A')$ denote the extended digraph, and g' the extended capacity-function.

Since no code-arc leaves any member Z of \mathcal{R}_0 , we have $\delta_g(Z) = \delta_{g'}(Z)$. Furthermore, $\delta_{g'}(X) = +\infty$ holds for every s^*t^* -set $X \notin \mathcal{R}_0$, so it follows that the $\delta_{g'}$ -minimizer s^*t^* -sets of D' are the members of \mathcal{R}'_1 (that is, the δ_g -minimizer members of \mathcal{R}'_0).

Let x be a g' -feasible flow in D' with maximum flow amount (in short, a maximum flow) whose flow amount by the MFMC theorem is γ_1 . Consider the standard auxiliary digraph D'' (introduced in the Ford-Fulkerson MFMC algorithm) associated with flow x (in which uv is an arc if $uv \in A'$ and $x(uv) < g'(uv)$, or if $vu \in A'$ and $x(vu) > 0$).

Now $\mathcal{R}_1 = \{Z \in \mathcal{R}^* : \delta_{D''}(Z) = 0\}$, and hence $C_{\mathcal{R}_1}(u)$ is nothing but the set of nodes reachable from u in D'' . (which always contains s^* by the definition of D''). Therefore the code of \mathcal{R}_1 can be computed by $|V|$ applications of a path-finding (or reachability) subroutine. \blacksquare

The lemma can easily be extended to the case when not only one single function g is given on A but more.

Corollary 2.4 *Let $\mathcal{R}_0 (\subseteq \mathcal{R}^*)$ be a non-trivial ring-set given by its code, and let g_1, g_2, \dots, g_k be non-negative integer-valued functions on the arc-set of digraph D . Let*

$$\gamma_1 := \min\{\delta_{g_1}(Z) : Z \in \mathcal{R}'_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_1 := \{Z \in \mathcal{R}'_0 : \delta_{g_1}(Z) = \gamma_1\} \cup \{\emptyset, V\},$$

and for $i = 2, \dots, k$ let

$$\gamma_i := \min\{\delta_{g_i}(Z) : Z \in \mathcal{R}'_{i-1}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_i := \{Z \in \mathcal{R}'_{i-1} : \delta_{g_i}(Z) = \gamma_i\} \cup \{\emptyset, V\}.$$

Then each of the set-systems $\mathcal{R}^ \supseteq \mathcal{R}_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathcal{R}_k$ is a ring-set whose codes can be computed in strongly polynomial time with an MFMC algorithm. In particular, the non-trivial members of \mathcal{R}_k are exactly those non-trivial sets $Z \in \mathcal{R}_0$ for which $\delta_{g_1}(Z)$ is minimum, and within this, $\delta_{g_2}(Z)$ is minimum, and within this $\delta_{g_3}(Z)$ is minimum, and so on.*

Proof. By applying Lemma 2.3 separately k times in a sequence to the ring-sets $\mathcal{R}_0, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{k-1}$, the statement follows immediately. \blacksquare

3 Associating a digraph with the preference system on G

Let $G = (U, W; E)$ be a bipartite graph endowed with a preference system, and let E_{st} denote the set of stable edges. We assume throughout that each stable matching is a perfect matching. Let $n := |U| = |W|$. The goal of this section is to associate a digraph D with G along with a ring-set \mathcal{R}_D on D in such a way that there will be a simple one-to-one correspondence between the stable matchings of G and the cuts belonging to the members of \mathcal{R}_D (that is, the arc-sets $\text{OUT}_D(X)$ for $X \in \mathcal{R}_D$).

We emphasize already here that the role of girls and boys in this definition is asymmetric since only the girl preferences play a direct role. (Of course, the boy preferences are implicitly involved in the set of stable edges.)

Let us define a digraph $D = (V, A)$, as follows. D will have two types of arcs: stable and dummy. Let $s^* \in V$ be a source-node and $t^* \in V$ a sink-node of D . With every girl $w \in W$, we associate a (one-way) s^*t^* -path P_w in D which will be referred to as a **girl-path** of D . The arcs of P_w correspond to the stable edges of G incident to w , and they follow each other in the (girl) preference order of the stable edges incident to w . In particular, the first arc of P_w (whose tail is s^*) corresponds to the girl-best edge at w , while the last arc of P_w (whose head is t^*) corresponds to the girl-worst edge at w . The girl-paths are internally disjoint, and we shall refer to the arcs of girl-paths as **stable arcs** of D . Therefore, D has $|E_{\text{st}}| - |W| + 2$ nodes. The stable arc of D assigned to a stable edge $e \in E$ of G will be denoted by $a_e = t_e h_e$, where t_e is the tail of a_e and h_e is the head of a_e .

Before defining the dummy arcs of D , consider a stable matching $M = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ of G , and let w_i denote the end-node of e_i in W . Let $A_M := \{a_{e_1}, \dots, a_{e_n}\}$ denote the set of stable arcs of D corresponding to the elements of M , and let $L(M)$ denote the set of those nodes of D which are on the subpath of a girl-path P_{w_i} starting at s^* and ending at $t(a_i)$ for some $i = 1, \dots, n$.

For every stable edge e of G , consider the corresponding arc $a_e = t_e h_e$ of D . Let $t_e v$ be a **dummy arc** of D for each node $v \in L(M_e)$. In particular, this means that there is a dummy arc from t_e to every node preceding t_e in the girl-path containing a_e .

Claim 3.1 *A stable matching N is girl-better than another stable matching M if and only if $L(N) \subseteq L(M)$.* ■

Claim 3.2 *Let M be a stable matching and e a stable edge which is either in M or girl-better than some member of M . Then $L(M_e) \subseteq L(M)$.* ■

Claim 3.3 *If M and N are stable matchings of G , then*

$$L(M \wedge N) = L(M) \cap L(N) \quad \text{and} \quad L(M \vee N) = L(M) \cup L(N). \quad (2)$$

■

Let

$$\mathcal{R}_D := \{Z \subset V : \text{an } s^*t^*\text{-set with no leaving dummy arc}\}. \quad (3)$$

The set-system \mathcal{R}_D is a ring-set. By the definition of dummy arcs, every girl-path leaves a member Z of \mathcal{R}_D exactly once, that is, $\delta_D(Z) = n$. We call this n -element set of arcs leaving Z a **stable s^*t^* -cut** of D .

3.1 Stable matchings of G versus stable s^*t^* -cuts of D

The clue to our suggested solution of various optimization problems concerning bipartite stable matchings is that there is a natural one-to-one correspondence between the stable matchings of G and the stable s^*t^* -cuts of the digraph D associated with G . This is formulated in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.4 *For every set $Z \in \mathcal{R}_D$, the n stable arcs of D leaving Z correspond to the n elements of a stable matching M of G for which $L(M) = Z$ and $A_M = \text{OUT}_D(Z)$.*

Conversely, for every stable matching M of G , the set $Z := L(M)$ is in \mathcal{R}_D , and the n stable arcs of D corresponding to the n elements of M are the arcs leaving Z , that is, $A_M = \text{OUT}_D(Z)$.

Proof. To prove the first part, consider the set $\text{OUT}_D(Z) := \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ of arcs leaving Z (where a_i is a member of the girl-path P_{w_i}).

Let e_1, \dots, e_n denote the stable edges of G corresponding to the arcs a_1, \dots, a_n , that is, $a_i = a_{e_i}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, consider the girl-best stable matching $M_i := M(e_i)$ containing e_i .

We claim that $L(M_i) \subseteq Z$, since if there were a node v in $L(M_i) - Z$, then the dummy arc $t_{a_i}v$ would leave Z , contradicting the property that no dummy arc leaves Z . From these it follows that $Z = \cup\{L(M_i) : i = 1, \dots, n\}$.

Consider now the stable matching $M' := M_1 \vee \dots \vee M_n$. It follows from the second half of observation (2) that $L(M') = L(M_1) \cup \dots \cup L(M_n) = Z$, and hence $A_{M'} = \text{OUT}_D(Z) = A_M$, that is $M = M'$, from which the first half of the lemma follows.

To prove the second half, let $M = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be a stable matching of G , let $Z := L(M)$ and $A_M := \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. By Claim 1.2, we have $M = M_{e_1} \vee \dots \vee M_{e_n}$. It follows from the second half of observation (2) that $Z = L(M) = L(M_{e_1}) \cup \dots \cup L(M_{e_n})$. Therefore no dummy arc leaves Z , that is, $\text{OUT}_D(Z) = A_M$. ■

Lemma 3.4 implies the following.

THEOREM 3.5 *Let M be a stable matching of G , and let Z be a non-trivial member of ring-set \mathcal{R}_D . Then*

$$Z = L(M) \text{ holds if and only if } \text{OUT}_D(Z) = A(M). \quad (4)$$

The two equalities in (4) determine a one-to-one correspondence between the stable matchings M of G and the non-trivial members Z of ring-set \mathcal{R}_D . ■

If we apply Theorem 2.1 to the digraph associated with a bipartite preference system, then Lemma 3.4 implies the following.

Corollary 3.6 *Let h be a non-negative integer-valued function on the edge-set of a bipartite graph G endowed with a preference system. The maximum number of h -independent stable matchings is equal to the minimum h -value of a blocker of stable matchings. In particular, the maximum number of disjoint stable matchings is equal to the minimum number of edges blocking all stable matchings. Furthermore, by a single application of Dijkstra's cheapest path algorithm, both a largest packing of h -independent family of stable matchings and a minimum h -cost blocker of stable matchings can be computed in strongly polynomial time.* ■

We hasten to emphasize that in Theorem 4.6 we shall show that the same approach works in a more complex situation when the goal is finding a maximum number of h -independent c -cheapest stable matchings where c is a non-negative cost-function on the set of stable edges.

4 Cheapest stable matchings

Let c be an integer-valued cost-function on the set of stable edges of G . Rothblum [51] provided a particularly simple polyhedral description of the polytope of stable matchings that uses $(0, 1)$ -inequalities and the number of these inequalities is only (n^2) . Therefore the general purpose linear programming algorithm of Tardos [53] to solve combinatorial linear programs in strongly polynomial time can be applied to compute a c -cheapest stable matching.

By relying on the fundamental concept of rotations, a cheapest stable matching can also be computed with the help of a standard network flow subroutine, see the books of Gusfield and Irving [34] and of Manlove [45].

The first goal of the present section is to describe a direct algorithm to compute a cheapest stable matching in strongly polynomial time that uses only network flows and does not need the concept of rotations. The second goal is to develop an algorithm for packing c -cheapest stable matchings.

4.1 How to find a cheapest stable matching

In this section, we show how a c -cheapest stable matching of G can be computed with the help of a single MFMC algorithm that finds a minimum capacity s^*t^* -cut of the digraph $D = (V, A)$ associated with the preference system on G as described in Section 3. Even more, we can compute the code of the ring-set defined by all cheapest stable matchings.

Since each stable matching has the same cardinality, one can shift c by a constant, and hence it can be assumed that c is non-negative (even that c is everywhere positive). Let us define the capacity function g_c on A as follows.

$$g_c(a) := \begin{cases} c(e) & \text{if } a = a_e \text{ is the stable arc of } D \text{ associated with } e \in E_{\text{st}} \\ +\infty & \text{if } a \text{ is a dummy arc of } D. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Obviously

$$\mathcal{R}_D = \{Z \subseteq V - t^* : s^* \in Z, \delta_{g_c}(Z) \text{ is finite}\}.$$

Theorem 3.5 immediately gives rise to the following.

THEOREM 4.1 *For the correspondence described in Theorem 3.5 between the stable matchings M of G and the non-trivial members Z of ring-set \mathcal{R}_D , one has*

$$\delta_{g_c}(Z) = \tilde{c}(M).$$

*This is a one-to-one correspondence between the c -cheapest stable matchings M of G and those non-trivial members Z of ring-set \mathcal{R}_D which minimize $\delta_{g_c}(Z)$. Consequently, finding a c -cheapest stable matching of G can be done by computing an s^*t^* -cut of D with minimum g_c -capacity, which is doable by a strongly polynomial MFMC subroutine. ■*

Corollary 4.2 *The set of cheapest stable matchings of G is closed under the operations meet \wedge and join \vee , and hence there exists a (unique) girl-best cheapest stable matching among all cheapest stable matchings (which is the boy-worst cheapest matching). The cheapest stable matching provided by the algorithm mentioned in Theorem 4.1 provides this girl-best cheapest stable matching.*

Proof. As is well known, the shores of minimum capacity s^*t^* cuts containing s^* form a ring-set \mathcal{R}_{\min} ($\subseteq \mathcal{R}_D$). This implies the first part of the corollary via Lemma 3.4. The MFMC algorithms of Edmonds and Karp or the one by Dinits computes the unique smallest member of \mathcal{R}_{\min} , from which the second part also follows. ■

By applying Lemma 2.3 to ring-set $\mathcal{R}_0 := \mathcal{R}_D$, we obtain the following.

Corollary 4.3 *Let \mathcal{R}_1 denote the set-system consisting of the δ_{g_c} -minimizer members of ring-set \mathcal{R}_D along with the trivial sets $\{\emptyset, V\}$. Then \mathcal{R}_1 is a ring-set whose code can be computed in strongly polynomial time. The correspondence in (4) provides a one-to-one correspondence between the members of lattice of cheapest stable matchings and the non-trivial members of ring-set \mathcal{R}_1 .*

A polyhedral description of the convex hull of stable matching was given by Rothblum [51]. This is quite simple and uses only a small number of inequalities. In this light, it is perhaps surprising that the literature, to our best knowledge, does not know about a result which exhibit this polytope as a member of integral polyhedra defined by circulations, tensions, submodular flows, L_2 -/ M_2 -convex sets. The following corollary shows that such an embedding does exist.

Corollary 4.4 *The polytope of stable matchings of a bipartite preference system can be obtained as the projection of a feasible tension polyhedron.*

Proof. Consider the digraph D associated with G along with the ring-set \mathcal{R}_D . Recall that the non-trivial members of \mathcal{R}_D are exactly those s^*t^* -sets, which are not left by any dummy arc and left by exactly n stable arcs of D . Furthermore, such leaving arc-sets correspond to the stable matchings of G . Consider the following polyhedron of feasible potentials. Let $\Pi := \{\pi : \pi(s^*) = 0, \pi(t^*) = 1, \Delta_\pi(e) \leq 1 \text{ for every stable arc and } \Delta_\pi(e) \leq 0 \text{ for every dummy arc}\}$. Let Δ_Π denote the set of potential-drops defined by the members of Π . Then the vector $\underline{1} - \chi(X)$ is in Π for every member X of \mathcal{R}_D , and conversely, for every integer-valued (and hence $(0, 1)$ -valued) element of Π , the set of 0-valued components is a member of \mathcal{R}_D .

Moreover, by projecting Δ_Π on the set of stable arcs of D , we obtain a polyhedron which is integral (and hence its vertices are actually $(0, 1)$ -valued) and its integral elements correspond to the edge-sets leaving some members of \mathcal{R}_D , which members just correspond to the stable matchings of G . ■

Remark 4.1 It is not difficult to read out a min-max formula from Corollary 4.4 for the minimum cost of a stable matching. By relying on the weighted version of the theorem of Dilworth, we develop in Section 8 (Corollary 8.9) a linear system of stable matchings which is TDI (along with an explicit min-max formula for the maximum weight of a stable matching). It is important to emphasize that Rothblum [51] provided an linear description of the polytope of stable matchings, which uses only $O(|E|)$ linear inequality. In addition, Király and Pap [41] proved that this linear description of Rothblum is actually TDI. It is an interesting challenge to derive the TDI-ness of the Rothblum system from Corollary 4.4. •

4.1.1 Multiple cost-function

Suppose now that we are given not only a single cost function on the edge-set of G , but k : c_1, \dots, c_k . We may assume that these are non-negative. In the multiple cost-function stable matching problem, we are interested in finding a stable matching which is cheapest with respect to c_1 , within this, it is cheapest with respect to c_2 , within this, it is cheapest with respect to c_3 , and so on. Similarly to the case $k = 1$, this problem can also be managed with the help of network flows, as follows.

Consider again the digraph $D = (V, A)$ associated with G in Section 3. Let g_i denote the capacity function on A assigned to c_i in the way described in (5). Due to Corollary 2.4, we can compute an s^*t^* -set Z which is not left by any dummy arc and for which $\delta_{g_1}(Z)$ is minimum, within this $\delta_{g_2}(Z)$ is minimum and so on. By Theorem 4.1, the n stable arcs of D leaving Z correspond to a stable matching of G which minimizes the multiple cost-function $\{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$.

In section 5, we will show how this multiple cost stable matching algorithm can be used to solve a general fair matching problem.

4.1.2 Forbidden and forced edges

We show how the algorithm for computing a cheapest stable matching can be used for deciding whether there is a stable matching which is disjoint from a specified subset $F \subseteq E_{\text{st}}$ of **forbidden** edges and includes a specified subset $N \subseteq E_{\text{st}}$ of **forced** edges. We may assume that N is a matching and $N \cap F = \emptyset$. Throughout, we shall refer to the not-forbidden stable edges as **free** edges.

To this end, define a cost-function c_0 to be 0 on the forced edges, to be $n + 1$ on the forbidden edges, and to be 1 on the other edges. The expected stable matching M exists if and only if the minimal c_0 -cost

of a stable matching of G is $n - |N|$. In addition, by applying the algorithm outlined above for finding a minimum multiple cost stable matching, we can compute for a given cost-function c a minimum c -cost stable matching M for which $N \subseteq M \subseteq E - F$.

By using a different approach, in Corollary 8.9 we shall provide a simple characterization for free subsets of edges which include a stable matching.

4.2 Packing cheapest stable matchings

The one-to-one correspondence given in Lemma 3.4 between the stable matchings of a bipartite graph G and stable s^*t^* -cuts of the associated digraph D can be used not only for finding a cheapest stable matching but for finding ℓ disjoint cheapest stable matchings, as well.

Here the basic problem aims at finding a maximum number of disjoint stable matchings. Ganesh et al. [30] developed a linear time algorithm for this packing problem, however, they did not consider whether there is here a min-max formula.

Here we provide a solution to the problem of finding ℓ disjoint cheapest stable matchings. When $\ell = 1$, this is just the cheapest stable matching problem. When $c \equiv 0$, this is just the packing problem of stable matchings.

THEOREM 4.5 *Let c be a non-negative cost-function on the edge-set of bipartite graph $G = (U, W; E)$ endowed with a preference system. The maximum number of disjoint c -cheapest stable matchings is equal to the minimum cardinality of a blocker of c -cheapest stable matchings. There is a strongly polynomial two-phase greedy algorithm for computing a largest set of disjoint c -cheapest stable matchings and a minimum cardinality blocker of c -cheapest stable matchings.*

Proof. Consider the correspondence described in Corollary 4.3 between cheapest stable matchings and the non-trivial members of the ring-set \mathcal{R}_1 occurring in the corollary. Based on this, the min-max formula in the theorem is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.1 when it is applied to the special case $h \equiv 1$. Furthermore, the algorithmic part of the theorem is a special case of the algorithm described in Section 2.1.1. ■

Remark 4.2 At first sight it may seem a bit surprising that the formal analogue of the min-max formula in Theorem 4.5 concerning maximum packings of perfect matchings of a bipartite graph (without a preference system) fails to hold. That is, it is not true that in a perfectly matchable bipartite graph the maximum number of edge-disjoint perfect matchings is equal to the minimum number of edges blocking all perfect matchings. To see this, consider the bipartite graph G consisting of three openly disjoint paths of three edges connecting nodes s and t . This is an elementary bipartite graph (that is, every edge belongs to a perfect matching) in which each perfect matching uses the middle edge of two of the three st -paths. Therefore G has no two disjoint perfect matchings. On the other hand, for every edge e of G , there is a perfect matching avoiding e , that is, the perfect matchings cannot be met by a single edge.

It should be noted that there is a good characterization for the existence of ℓ disjoint perfect matchings of a bipartite graph (see, for example, Corollary 21.4c in the book of Schrijver [52]). •

By using Theorem 2.1 in its general form, Theorem 4.5 can be extended as follows. Let h be a non-negative integer-valued function on the set of stable edges of G . Call a family of (not necessarily distinct) stable matchings **h -independent** if every stable edge e belongs to at most $h(e)$ stable matchings.

THEOREM 4.6 *Let c be a cost-function and $h \geq 0$ an integer-valued upper-bound function on the set of stable edges of a bipartite graph G . The maximum number of h -independent c -cheapest stable matchings is equal to the minimum total h -value of a set of stable edges intersecting all c -cheapest stable matchings. In particular (when $c \equiv 0$), the maximum number of h -independent stable matchings is equal to*

$$\min\{\tilde{h}(L) : L \subseteq E_{\text{st}}, L \text{ intersects every stable matching}\}.$$

Moreover, a maximum h -independent family of c -cheapest stable matchings and a set of edges of minimum total h -value intersecting all cheapest stable matchings can be computed in strongly polynomial time by a single application of Dijkstra's algorithm. \blacksquare

5 Fair stable matchings

In the cheapest stable matching problem there was only a single cost-function and we wanted to minimize the total cost of a stable matching. It is a natural requirement to find a stable matching which is fair or egalitarian in some sense among the persons (the nodes of G). For example, one may want to minimize the number of those persons who get in M their worst stable edge. To manage this problem, define a cost-function $c : E_{\text{st}} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$, as follows.

$$c(e) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when } e \text{ is not the worst stable edge at either of its end-nodes} \\ 1 & \text{when } e \text{ is the worst stable edge at exactly one of its end-nodes} \\ 2 & \text{when } e \text{ is the worst stable edge at both of its end-nodes.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

For such a c , the cost of a stable matching is exactly the number of those persons who get their worst incident stable edge. Therefore a minimum c -cost stable matching is one that minimizes the number of persons who got their worst stable edge.

This fairness concept, however, is not appropriately sensitive because it does not take into consideration preferences other than the worst ones, and there is indeed a rich literature concerning the various concepts of fairness. These are discussed in the books of Gusfield and Irving [34] and of Manlove [45], and in more recent papers of Cooper and Manlove [5, 6]. In what follows, we consider a more refined fairness concept that seems to subsume previous polynomially solvable classes.

Let $H := \{1, \dots, h^*\}$ where $h^* := 2|E_{\text{st}}|$. Suppose that at each person (that is, at each node v of G) not only a strict preference list is specified for the edges ending at v but we assign a number $h(v, e) \in H$ to the ordered node-edge pairs (v, e) (where $e \in M$ is an edge incident to v) in such a way that these values at v are distinct and $h(v, e) > h(v, f)$ if e is better (at v) than f . These values are different at a given node v , but otherwise they may be equal. For example, it is allowed for a stable edge $e = uw$ that $h(u, e) = h(w, e)$.

For a stable matching M , the M -level $\lambda_M(v)$ of a node $v \in V$ is defined by $\lambda_M(v) := h(v, e)$ where e is the element of M incident to v . For a value $\lambda \in H$, we call a stable edge $e = uw$ λ -feasible if $h(u, e) \geq \lambda$ and $h(w, e) \geq \lambda$. We say that a stable matching is λ -feasible if it consists of λ -feasible edges, or equivalently the M -level of each node is at least λ .

We call a stable matching M h -fair (from below) or just **fair** with respect to function h if the number of nodes with M -level 1 is as small as possible, within this, the number of nodes with M -level 2 is as small as possible, within this, the number of nodes with M -level 3 is as small as possible, and so on. Our goal is to develop an algorithm for computing an h -fair stable matching.

We define iteratively a sequence $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_k$ of members of H and a sequence $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_k$ of positive integers for which $\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_k = 2n$.

Let $\lambda_1 \in H$ be the largest value such that there is a stable matching M for which the M -level of every node is at least λ_1 . Let \mathcal{SM}_1 denote the set of λ_1 -feasible stable matchings. Let β_1 denote the minimum number of nodes with M -level λ_1 , where the minimum is taken over all members M of \mathcal{SM}_1 . If $\beta_1 = 2n$, that is, if the M -level of each node is μ_1 for every $M \in \mathcal{SM}_1$, then, by letting $k := 1$, the iterative sequence of definitions terminates. (In this case, every member M of \mathcal{SM}_1 consists of edges $e = uw$ for which $h(e, u) = h(e, v) = \lambda_1$, and hence \mathcal{SM}_1 is the wanted set of h -fair stable matchings.) If $\beta_1 < 2n$, we define \mathcal{SM}'_1 to be the set of those members M of \mathcal{SM}_1 for which the number of nodes with M -level λ_1 is β_1 .

Suppose now that $\lambda_{i-1}, \beta_{i-1}, \mathcal{SM}'_{i-1} \subset \mathcal{SM}_{i-1}$ have already been defined for a subscript $i \geq 2$. Let $\lambda_i \in H$ ($\lambda_i > \lambda_{i-1}$) be the largest value such that there is a stable matching $M \in \mathcal{SM}'_{i-1}$ for which the

M -level of every node of G is either one of the values $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i-1}$ or at least λ_i . Let \mathcal{SM}_i denote the set of these stable matchings. Let β_i denote the minimum number of nodes with M -level λ_i , where the minimum is taken over all members M of \mathcal{SM}_i .

If $\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_i = 2n$, then, by letting $k := i$, the iterative sequence of definitions terminates. (In this case, it holds for every member M of \mathcal{SM}_k that there are β_i nodes of M -level μ_i for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and hence \mathcal{SM}_k is the wanted set of h -fair stable matchings.)

If $\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_i < 2n$, we define \mathcal{SM}'_i to be the set of those members M of \mathcal{SM}_i for which the number of nodes with M -level λ_i is β_i .

The algorithm for computing an h -fair stable matching Our next goal is to show how the parameters μ_i and β_i introduced above can be computed for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Accordingly, the algorithm consists of k stages, each divided into two halves.

In the first half of Stage 1, we compute λ_1 , as follows. With subsequent applications of the algorithm outlined in Section 4.1.2, we check one-by-one for values $\lambda := h^*, h^* - 1, \dots$ whether there is a λ -feasible stable matching M . Then λ_1 is the first λ in this sequence for which a λ -feasible stable matching exists.

In the second half of Stage 1, we compute a member M of \mathcal{SM}_1 for which the number of nodes with M -level λ_1 is as small as possible. (This minimum number was denoted by β_1 .) To this end, define a cost-function c_1 on stable edges, as follows.

$$c_1(e) := \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } h(e, v) = \lambda_1 \text{ for both end-nodes } v \text{ of } e \\ 1 & \text{if } h(e, v) = \lambda_1 \text{ for exactly one end-node } v \text{ of } e \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Observe that the c_1 -cost of a member M of \mathcal{SM}_1 is the number of nodes with M -level λ_1 , and hence $\beta_1 = \min\{\tilde{c}_1(M) : M \in \mathcal{SM}_1\}$. Therefore, with the help of the multiple cost-function algorithm outlined in Section 4.1.1, β_1 can be computed. If $\beta_1 = 2n$, then $k = 1$ and, as noted above at the definition of β_1 , \mathcal{SM}_1 is the wanted set of h -fair stable matchings. If $\beta_1 < 2n$, then the second half and hence the whole Stage 1 halts, and the algorithm turns to subsequent stages, which are analogous to Stage 1.

For describing Stage $i \geq 2$, suppose that the values $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i-1}$ and the values $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{i-1}$ have already been computed, as well as the families $\mathcal{SM}'_{i-1} \subseteq \mathcal{SM}_{i-1}$ of stable matchings. Similarly to Stage 1, we can compute in the first half of Stage i the largest value $\lambda_i \in H$ for which there is member M of \mathcal{SM}'_{i-1} such that the M -level of every node is either one of $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{i-1}$ or at least λ_i .

In the second half of Stage i , we compute a member M of \mathcal{SM}_i for which the number of nodes with M -level λ_i is as small as possible. (This minimum number was denoted by β_i .) To this end, define a cost-function c_i on stable edges, as follows.

$$c_i(e) := \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } h(e, v) = \lambda_i \text{ for both end-nodes } v \text{ of } e \\ 1 & \text{if } h(e, v) = \lambda_i \text{ for exactly one end-node } v \text{ of } e \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

The c_i -cost of a member M of \mathcal{SM}_i is the number of nodes with M -level λ_i , and hence $\beta_i = \min\{\tilde{c}_i(M) : M \in \mathcal{SM}_i\}$. Therefore, with the help of the multiple cost-function algorithm outlined in Section 4.1.1, β_i can also be computed. If $\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_i = 2n$, then $k = i$ and, \mathcal{SM}_k is the wanted set of h -fair stable matchings. If $\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_i < 2n$, then the second half and hence the whole Stage i halts.

There will be a subscript i for which $\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \dots + \beta_i = 2n$ holds in Stage i , and this is the moment when the whole algorithm terminates. ■

6 Optimal packing of st -cuts of a digraph

Our next goal is to solve the problem of finding ℓ disjoint stable matchings whose union is of minimum cost for a given cost-function. This will be discussed only in the next section: here we work out the

corresponding optimization problem in the digraph associated with the preference system on G .

6.1 Min-max formula and algorithm

Let $D = (V, A)$ be a loopless digraph with source-node $s \in V$ and sink-node $t \in V$, for which we suppose that $\varrho(s) = \delta(t) = 0$. Let $g : A \rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_+$ be an integer-valued capacity-function (allowing value $+\infty$). Throughout we assume that g is integer-valued but the presented approach can immediately be extended to the case when g is rational-valued.

A non-negative function $z : A \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ is an *st-flow* (or just a flow), if $\varrho_z(v) = \delta_z(v)$ holds for every node $v \in V - \{s, t\}$. The flow z is *g-feasible*, if $z \leq g$. The **amount** of flow z is $\delta_z(s)$ ($= \varrho_z(t)$). We say that an arc $a \in A$ is *g-finite* if $g(a)$ is finite, while an *st-cut* is *g-finite* (or just finite) if each of its arcs is *g-finite*. (As before, *st-cut* is the set of arcs leaving an $s\bar{t}$ -set $Z \subset V$.)

Let ℓ be a positive integer, and suppose that there are ℓ arc-disjoint *g-finite st-cuts*, which is equivalent to requiring that every *st-path* contains at least ℓ *g-finite arcs*. (This problem is nothing but a shortest path problem.)

We call the union of ℓ arc-disjoint *st-cuts* an ℓ -**cut**. The *g-capacity* (or just the capacity or the *g-value*) of an ℓ -cut $L \subseteq A$ is $\tilde{g}(L)$, that is, the sum of *g-capacities* of the *st-cuts* in L . The system of $s\bar{t}$ -sets Z_1, \dots, Z_ℓ is **arc-independent** if the ℓ *st-cuts* defined by these sets are arc-disjoint.

The major problem of this section is finding and characterizing ℓ -cuts with minimum *g-capacity*. In the special case $\ell = 1$, This is answered by the MFMC theorem. For a min-max formula concerning the general case $\ell \geq 1$, consider an integer-valued *st-flow* z , which may not be *g-feasible*. We call an arc a **overloaded** if $z(a) > g(a)$. The **surplus** of arc $a \in A$ is:

$$\omega_z(a) := (z(a) - g(a))^+,$$

where $x^+ := \max\{x, 0\}$. The **surplus** $\omega(z)$ of a flow z is the sum of the surpluses of its arcs, that is,

$$\omega(z) := \sum [(z(a) - g(a))^+ : a \in A].$$

THEOREM 6.1 *Suppose that the digraph $D = (V, A)$ admits a *g-finite ℓ -cut* (which is the union of ℓ arc-disjoint *g-finite st-cuts*), or equivalently, every *st-path* has at least ℓ *g-finite arcs*. Then:*

(A)

$$\min\{\tilde{g}(L) : L (\subseteq A) \text{ an } \ell\text{-cut}\} = \tag{9}$$

$$\max\{\ell\delta_z(s) - \omega(z) : z \text{ an integer-valued } st\text{-flow}\}. \tag{10}$$

Moreover, both a \tilde{g} -minimizer ℓ -cut L in (9) and an integral *st-flow* z maximizing (10) can be computed in strongly polynomial time with the help of the min-cost flow algorithm of Ford and Fulkerson.

(B) *An ℓ -cut L defined by arc-independent $s\bar{t}$ -sets Z_1, \dots, Z_ℓ is an optimal solution to (9) if and only if there exists an integer-valued *st-flow* z for which the following optimality criteria hold for every arc $a \in A$.*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{lll} \text{(O1)} & z(a) > g(a) & \Rightarrow a \in L \\ \text{(O2)} & z(a) < g(a) & \Rightarrow a \in A - L \\ \text{(O3)} & z(a) > 0 & \Rightarrow a \text{ does not enter any } Z_i. \end{array} \right. \tag{11}$$

(C) *The ℓ -cut minimizing (9) may be chosen in such a way that its defining ℓ arc-independent $s\bar{t}$ -sets form a chain.*

Proof. We start with the proof of Part **(C)**.

For a system \mathcal{F} of $\tilde{s}\bar{t}$ -sets, let $\tilde{\delta}_g(\mathcal{F}) := \sum[\delta_g(X) : X \in \mathcal{F}]$. Consider an ℓ -cut minimizing (9) for which the square-sum $\sum[|X|^2 : X \in \mathcal{F}]$ of its defining arc-independent set-system \mathcal{F} is minimum. We claim that \mathcal{F} is a chain.

Suppose indirectly that \mathcal{F} has two members X and Y for which $X - Y$ and $Y - X$ are non-empty. Then the modified set-system $\mathcal{F}' := \mathcal{F} - \{X, Y\} \cup \{X \cap Y, X \cup Y\}$ is also arc-independent, for which $\delta_g(X) + \delta_g(Y) \geq \delta_g(X \cap Y) + \delta_g(X \cup Y)$ implies that $\tilde{\delta}_g(\mathcal{F}) \geq \tilde{\delta}_g(\mathcal{F}') \geq \tilde{\delta}_g(\mathcal{F})$, and hence $\tilde{\delta}_g(\mathcal{F}') = \tilde{\delta}_g(\mathcal{F})$ follows that is, the ℓ -cut defined by \mathcal{F}' is also a minimizer of (9), contradicting the assumption that the square-sum of \mathcal{F} is minimum.

We note that this simple direct proof helps understanding the structure of smallest ℓ -cuts but actually we do not really need it since the algorithmic proof below for the min-max formula provides automatically such a chain.

In order to prove **(A)**, we consider first the easier direction $\max \leq \min$. To this end, let $L \subseteq A$ be an ℓ -cut which is the set of arcs leaving one of the members Z_1, \dots, Z_ℓ of an arc-independent system of $\tilde{s}\bar{t}$ -sets. Let A_i denote the set of arcs leaving Z_i , that is, L is the union of the ℓ disjoint sets A_i . Furthermore let z be an st -flow, and let $A_{>} := \{a \in A : z(a) > g(a)\}$ and $A_{\leq} := \{a \in A : z(a) \leq g(a)\}$. Then

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{g}(A_i) = \tilde{g}(A_i \cap A_{\leq}) + \tilde{g}(A_i \cap A_{>}) \\ \geq \tilde{z}(A_i \cap A_{\leq}) + \tilde{g}(A_i \cap A_{>}) \\ = \tilde{z}(A_i \cap A_{\leq}) + \tilde{z}(A_i \cap A_{>}) - [\tilde{z}(A_i \cap A_{>}) - \tilde{g}(A_i \cap A_{>})] \\ = \tilde{z}(A_i) - [\tilde{z}(A_i \cap A_{>}) - \tilde{g}(A_i \cap A_{>})], \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

and here equality holds if and only if $\tilde{z}(A_i \cap A_{\leq}) = \tilde{g}(A_i \cap A_{\leq})$. From this estimation, we obtain the following.

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{g}(L) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \tilde{g}(A_i) \\ \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \tilde{z}(A_i) - [\tilde{z}(A_i \cap A_{>}) - \tilde{g}(A_i \cap A_{>})] \\ \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \tilde{z}(A_i) - \omega(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \delta_z(Z_i) - \omega(z) = \ell \delta_z(s) - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \varrho_z(Z_i) - \omega(z) \\ \geq \ell \delta_z(s) - \omega(z), \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

from which the inequality $\max \leq \min$ follows.

To prove the non-trivial inequality $\max \geq \min$ for **(A)** and statement **(B)**, we derive first the following.

Claim 6.2 *In the estimation (13), equality holds throughout if and only if each of the three optimality criteria in (11) is met.*

Proof. The first inequality in (13) holds with equality if and only if $\tilde{z}(A_i \cap A_{\leq}) = \tilde{g}(A_i \cap A_{\leq})$ holds for each $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, that is, $z(a) \geq g(a)$ holds for each arc a leaving some Z_i , and this is exactly Optimality criterion **(O2)**. The second inequality holds with equality if and only if every overloaded arc is in L , and this is exactly Optimality criterion **(O1)**. Finally, the third inequality holds with equality if and only if $z(a) = 0$ holds for every arc a entering some Z_i , and this is exactly Optimality criterion **(O3)**. ■

Next, we construct an integer-valued st -flow z^* along with an ℓ -cut L^* for which the defining set-system \mathcal{F}^* consisting of arc-independent $\tilde{s}\bar{t}$ -sets Z_1, \dots, Z_ℓ is a chain, and each inequality in the estimation (13) is met by equality, and hence, by Claim 6.2, the optimality criteria in (11) hold.

For each g -finite arc $e \in A$, add a parallel copy e' . Let A' denote the set of these new arcs and let $A_1 := A \cup A'$. Define the capacity-function $g_1 : A_1 \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_+$ and the cost-function $c_1 : A_1 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as follows.

$$g_1(e) := \begin{cases} g(e) & \text{if } e \in A \\ +\infty & \text{if } e \in A', \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

$$c_1(e) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } e \in A' \\ 0 & \text{if } e \in A. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Consider the classic Ford-Fulkerson algorithm [25] for computing a c_1 -cheapest g_1 -feasible integral st -flow in digraph $D_1 := (V, A_1)$. (See also the version of the algorithm outlined in pages 128-129 of the book [27].) Recall that the cost-function c_1 is $(0, 1)$ -valued, and the capacity-function g_1 is integer-valued.

At a given stage of the run of the algorithm, we have at hand a current integer-valued potential $\pi \geq 0$ defined on V , for which $\pi(s) = 0$, along with a g_1 -feasible st -flow $z : A_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_+$ meeting the following optimality criteria.

$$\begin{cases} \text{(F1)} & c_1(e) > \Delta_\pi(e) & \Rightarrow & z(e) = 0 \\ \text{(F2)} & c_1(e) < \Delta_\pi(e) & \Rightarrow & z(e) = g_1(e), \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where $\Delta_\pi(e) := \pi(v) - \pi(u)$ for arc $e = uv \in A_1$.

At the beginning, $\pi \equiv 0$ and $z \equiv 0$. In the procedure, two kinds of phases alternately follow each other: π -augmenting and z -augmenting phases. In a π -augmenting phase, we increase the π -value of certain nodes by 1, without changing the current flow z , in such a way that the optimality criteria continue to hold, and the value of $\pi(t)$ is increased by 1 at each π -augmenting step.

In a flow-augmenting phase the current potential π remains unchanged. This π and the current flow z define an auxiliary digraph in a standard way. With the help of a shortest st -path in the auxiliary digraph, we increase the flow-amount as much as possible. As Edmonds+Karp and Dinits proved, after at most $O(|V||A|)$ such flow augmentations the flow-augmenting phase terminates and we turn to the next potential augmenting phase.

The whole algorithm terminates when the current value of $\pi(t)$ reaches ℓ . Let π_1 denote this final potential, while the current flow at this moment is denoted by z_1 . Recall that π_1 and z_1 meet the Optimality criteria (16).

Let K denote the flow-amount of z_1 . Then z_1 is a c_1 -cheapest flow in digraph D_1 among the g_1 -feasible flows of amount K . Note that π_1 and z_1 have been obtained after ℓ potential augmentations and $\ell + 1$ maximum flow computations, that is, in strongly polynomial time.

If $g(a)$ is finite and $z_1(a') \geq 1$, for an arc $a \in A$, then $z_1(a) = g(a)$, since if we had $z_1(a) \leq g(a) - 1$, then decreasing $z_1(a')$ by 1 and increasing $z_1(a)$ by 1, we would obtain another flow of amount K whose c_1 -cost would be smaller (by 1) than that of z_1 .

Define the function z^* on arc-set A , as follows.

$$z^*(a) := \begin{cases} z_1(a) & \text{if } g(a) = +\infty \\ z_1(a) + z_1(a') & \text{if } g(a) < +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Then z^* is a flow in D with flow-amount K .

Let $Z_i := \{v \in V : \pi_1(v) \leq i - 1\}$ ($i = 1, \dots, \ell$). Then $s \in Z_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq Z_\ell \subseteq V - t$ form a chain \mathcal{F}^* of sets. Let L^* denote the set of arcs of D leaving the members of chain \mathcal{F}^* .

Claim 6.3 *The members of \mathcal{F}^* are arc-independent in D (that is, each arc $a = uv \in A$ leaves at most one member), in particular, the members of \mathcal{F}^* are distinct.*

Proof. The arc-independence of \mathcal{F}^* is equivalent to requiring that $\Delta_{\pi_1}(a) = \pi_1(v) - \pi_1(u) \leq 1$ for every arc $a = uv \in A$. But this holds indeed since if $g(a) = +\infty$, then $z_1(a) < +\infty = g(a) = g_1(a)$, and by (F2), we have $\pi_1(v) \leq \pi_1(u)$, that is, such an arc a cannot leave any Z_i . If in turn $g(a) < +\infty$, then $a' \in A'$ and hence $z_1(a') < +\infty = g_1(a')$. By (F2), we have $1 = c_1(a') \geq \Delta_{\pi_1}(a') = \pi_1(v) - \pi_1(u)$. ■

Claim 6.4 *The ℓ -cut L^* and the flow z^* meet the optimality criteria (11) of the theorem.*

Proof. To prove **(O1)**, suppose that $z^*(a) > g(a)$ for some arc $a = uv \in A$. Then $z_1(a') \geq 1$, and hence, by relying on **(F1)**, we have $1 = c_1(a') \leq \Delta_{\pi_1}(a') = \pi_1(v) - \pi_1(u)$. Therefore arc a does indeed leave some Z_i , that is, a is in L^* , and thus **(O1)** holds.

To prove **(O2)**, assume that $z^*(a) < g(a)$ holds for some arc $a = uv \in A$. Then **(F2)** implies that $0 = c_1(a) \geq \Delta_{\pi_1}(a) = \pi_1(v) - \pi_1(u)$, that is, arc a does not leave any Z_i , showing that a is in $A - L^*$, and hence **(O2)** holds.

To prove **(O3)**, assume that $z^*(a) (= z_1(a)) > 0$. holds for some arc $a \in uvA$. Then **(F1)** implies $0 = c_1(a) \leq \Delta_{\pi_1}(a) = \pi_1(v) - \pi_1(u)$, that is, $\pi_1(v) \geq \pi_1(u)$, and hence a cannot enter any set Z_i , implying that **(O3)** holds. ■

Summing up, we proved that the Ford+Fulkerson algorithm for computing a cheapest feasible flow constructs an ℓ -cut L^* and an integral st -flow z^* which meet the optimality criteria (11), proving in this way the non-trivial inequality $\max \geq \min$.

In addition, when the strongly polynomial maximum flow algorithm of Edmonds+Karp or Dinits is used as a subroutine, the Ford+Fulkerson algorithm is strongly polynomial since the cost-function in question is $(0, 1)$ -valued. ■■

6.2 Packing st -cuts defined by a ring-set

Theorem 6.1 has a self-refining nature in the sense that it easily implies the following extension. Let \mathcal{R} be a ring-set containing \emptyset and V whose non-trivial members are $s\bar{t}$ -sets. We assume that \mathcal{R} is described by its **code-digraph** a $D_{\mathcal{R}} = (V, A_{\mathcal{R}})$ where uv is an arc of the code-digraph if $u \in V - t$ and uv does not leave any member of \mathcal{R} , or equivalently, node v is in the (unique) minimal member of \mathcal{R} containing u . We call a g -finite st -cut of D **\mathcal{R} -compatible** if its out-shore is a member of \mathcal{R} , while a g -finite arc-set $L \subseteq A$ is an **\mathcal{R} -compatible ℓ -cut** if it is the disjoint union of ℓ \mathcal{R} -compatible st -cuts. We are interested in finding an \mathcal{R} -compatible ℓ -cut L for which $\tilde{g}(L)$ is minimum.

To manage this problem, extend function g (originally defined on the arc-set of D) to the code-arcs of \mathcal{R} by defining it $+\infty$ on each code-arc. Let $D^+ = (V, A^+)$ denote the digraph obtained from D by adding each code-arc. Then every $s\bar{t}$ -set which is not in \mathcal{R} admits a leaving arc with capacity $+\infty$.

By applying Theorem 6.1 to D^+ , we obtain the following min-max formula.

Corollary 6.5 *Let $D = (V, A)$ be digraph endowed with a non-negative, integer-valued function g on A . Let \mathcal{R} be a ring-set (given by its code-digraph) containing \emptyset and V whose non-trivial members are $s\bar{t}$ -sets. Let D^+ denote the digraph obtained from D by adding the arcs of the code-digraph of \mathcal{R} . We assume that D has a g -finite \mathcal{R} -compatible ℓ -cut. Then*

$$\min\{\tilde{g}(L) : L (\subseteq A) \text{ an } \mathcal{R}\text{-compatible } \ell\text{-cut}\} = \tag{18}$$

$$\max\{\ell\delta_z(s) - \omega(z) : z \text{ an integer-valued } st\text{-flow in } D^+\}. \tag{19}$$

Moreover, both a \tilde{g} -minimizer ℓ -cut L in (18) and an integral st -flow z maximizing (19) can be computed in strongly polynomial time with the help of the min-cost flow algorithm of Ford and Fulkerson. ■

7 Packing and covering problems of stable matchings

7.1 Disjoint stable matchings with minimum total cost

Theorem 4.5 provided an answer to the problem of finding ℓ disjoint minimum c -cost stable matchings. As a natural generalization, one may be interested in finding ℓ disjoint stable matchings for which the c -cost of their union is minimum with respect to a rational cost-function c . We may assume that c is non-negative, and that c is actually integer-valued.

THEOREM 7.1 *Assume that the bipartite graph G has ℓ disjoint stable matchings. With the help of a min-cost flow algorithm (as described in Section 4), it is possible to compute ℓ disjoint stable matchings whose union has minimum c -cost.*

Proof. Consider the digraph D (with source-node s^* and sink-node t^*) associated with the preference system on G in Section 3, as well as the function g_c on A associated with the cost-function c on the set of stable edges of G . Recall the definition of ring-set \mathcal{R}_D and Corollary 2.4 which established a one-to one correspondence between the stable matchings of G and the \mathcal{R}_D -compatible s^*t^* -cuts of D .

In this correspondence, the c -cost of a stable matching was equal to the g_c -capacity of the corresponding \mathcal{R}_D -compatible s^*t^* -cut of D . Based on this, Section 4 described how a minimum c -cost stable matching can be computed by an MFMC algorithm that computes a minimum g_c -capacity \mathcal{R}_D -compatible s^*t^* -cut of D .

Exactly the same correspondence shows that the problem of finding ℓ disjoint stable matchings whose union is of minimum c -cost can be solved by computing ℓ disjoint \mathcal{R}_D -compatible s^*t^* -cuts of D for which the g_c -value of their union is minimum. But such an algorithm was described in Section 6.2. ■

7.2 Maximum weight union of stable matchings

Suppose now that w is a non-negative integer-valued function on E_{st} and we are interested in finding ℓ not necessarily disjoint stable matchings of a preference system on $G = (U, W; E)$ whose union is of maximum w -weight. Since each stable matching has the same cardinality, the version of this problem when the ℓ stable matchings are required to be disjoint, is equivalent to the cheapest packing problem discussed in Section 7.1. Also, we may actually assume that the weight-function w is actually strictly positive.

To manage the general case when disjointness is not expected, we introduce the operation of adding a parallel edge to the preference system. For a stable edge e of G , let e' be a new edge which is parallel to e . We define e to be girl-better and boy-worse than e' , while the preference relations of e' to other edges in $E - e$ is the same as the ones of e . (That is, if e is, for example, girl-better than f , then e' is also girl-better than f).

Let $G' = (U, W; E')$ denote the bipartite graph arising from G by adding $\ell - 1$ edges parallel to e for each stable edge e of G . Define a weight-function w' on E' by letting $w'(e) := w(e)$ for each original stable edge and $w'(e') := 0$ for a new edge e' .

Lemma 7.2 *The maximum w -weight of the union of ℓ (not necessarily disjoint) stable matchings of G is equal to the maximum w' -weight of the union of ℓ disjoint stable matchings of G' .*

Proof. Consider first ℓ disjoint stable matchings M'_1, \dots, M'_ℓ of G' whose union L' has maximum w' -weight. Let M_i denote the stable matching of G corresponding to M'_i and let L denote the union of these M_i 's. Since w is strictly positive, it follows that if a parallel copy e' of a stable edge e is in M'_i , then e is in M_i . Therefore L is the union of ℓ stable matchings of G for which $\tilde{w}(L) = \tilde{w}'(L')$.

Second, let L be the union of stable matchings M_1, M_2, \dots, M_ℓ of G . These determine ℓ disjoint stable matchings $M'_1, M'_2, \dots, M'_\ell$ of G' with union L' for which $\tilde{w}'(L') = \tilde{w}(L)$, from which the claim follows ■.

By Lemma 7.2, the algorithmic approach formulated in Theorem 7.1 can be used to compute ℓ stable matchings of G whose union is of maximum w -cost.

8 Posets and stable matchings

In Section 3, we described a ring-set \mathcal{R}_D on a digraph D which encoded the set of stable matchings. Here we show that there is a poset on the set E_{st} of stable edges of G which directly captures the main structural properties of stable matchings. With this link, we can apply theorems (and algorithms) concerning posets, such as the ones of Dilworth, Mirsky, and Greene+Kleitman.

Throughout this section $P = (S, \prec)$ is a poset on an n -element ground-set S . Recall that Dilworth's theorem [10] stated that the maximum cardinality $\alpha := \alpha(P)$ of an antichain of P is equal to the minimum number of chains covering S . A maximum cardinality antichain is called a **Dilworth-antichain** or, in short, a **D-antichain**.

Let $\mathcal{C} := \{C_1, \dots, C_\alpha\}$ be a smallest partition of S into chains ensured by Dilworth's theorem. Clearly, a D-antichain contains exactly one element from each C_i . For two D-antichains A_1 and A_2 , their **join** $A_1 \vee A_2$ (**meet** $A_1 \wedge A_2$) consists of the largest (smallest) elements of $A_1 \cup A_2$. It is well-known that these are D-antichains for which an element of $C_i \cap A_1 \cap A_2$ belongs to both the join and the meet, while if C_i contains two distinct elements of $A_1 \cup A_2$, then the larger one is in $A_1 \vee A_2$ and the smaller one is in $A_1 \wedge A_2$. This implies that there is a unique lowest and a unique highest D-antichain of P .

Mirsky's theorem (sometimes called the polar-Dilworth theorem) states the maximum cardinality γ_1 of a chain is equal to the minimum number of antichains covering S . The theorem of Greene+Kleitman [31] is a min-max formula for the maximum cardinality of the union of ℓ antichains (see Theorem 8.11 below). In the special case $\ell = 1$, this gives back Dilworth, while in the special case $\ell = \gamma_1$, this gives back Mirsky.

It should also be emphasised that Mirsky's theorem has a simple algorithmic proof (based on a two-phase greedy algorithm: see below). Dilworth's theorem also has an elegant algorithmic proof (due to Fulkerson [28]) which is based on a reduction to Kőnig's min-max theorem on maximum matchings. We note that the D-antichain obtained by this algorithm is the unique lowest (or highest) D-antichain. For the Greene+Kleitman theorem, Frank [26] provided an algorithmic proof based on the min-cost flow algorithm of Ford and Fulkerson [25].

8.1 D-antichain-extendible posets

We call a poset **D-antichain-extendible** if every maximal antichain is a D-antichain, or equivalently, every antichain can be extended to a D-antichain.

Lemma 8.1 *An antichain A of a poset $P = (S, \preceq)$ can be extended to a D-antichain if and only if every subset of A with at most two incomparable elements can be extended. A poset is D-antichain-extendible if and only if every antichain with at most two elements can be extended to a D-antichain.*

Proof. The second half immediately follows from the first. The necessity of the condition of the first part is immediate. To prove the sufficiency, we may assume that $|A| \geq 3$ and every proper subset of A can be extended to a D-antichain. Let α denote the cardinality of a D-antichain and $\{C_1, \dots, C_\alpha\}$ a partition of S into chains. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, let a_i denote the single element of $A \cap C_i$.

By the assumption, $A - a_i$ can be extended to a D-antichain A'_i for each $i = 1, 2, 3$. If $a_i \in A'_i$ for some $i = 1, 2, 3$, then we are done, so suppose that this is not the case. Let b_i denote the single element of $C_i \cap A'_i$.

As b_i is comparable with a_i for each $i = 1, 2, 3$, there are two among these subscripts, say $i = 1, 2$, for which the order relation between a_1 and b_1 is the same as the one between a_2 and b_2 . So we may assume that $a_1 \prec b_1$ and $a_2 \prec b_2$. But then the meet $A'_1 \wedge A'_2$ is a D-antichain including the whole A . ■

Consider again the bipartite graph $G = (U, W; E)$ endowed with a preference system on its edge-set, and define the **G -induced poset** $P_G := (E_{\text{st}}, \preceq)$, as follows. For two distinct (though not necessarily incident) stable edges e and f of G , we say that e is larger than f in P_G , in notation, $e \succ f$ if f is (strictly) girl-better than that edge in M_e which is incident to f in W , where M_e is the girl-best stable matching containing e . (In particular, if a stable edge $f \neq e$ is girl-better than e , then $e \succ f$.) Observe that if $e \succ f$, then, for any stable matching M containing e , f is (strictly) girl-better than that edge in M which is incident to f in W .

Lemma 8.2 *The relation \preceq on the elements of E_{st} is transitive and antisymmetric, that is, P_G is a poset. Moreover, P_G is D-antichain-extendible.*

Proof. Lemma 3.4 implies the following.

Claim 8.3 For distinct stable edges e and f of G , $e \succ f$ holds if and only if the head of the stable arc a_f of D (associated with f) belongs to $L(M_e)$. ■

The claim immediately implies the first part of the lemma.

Claim 8.4 Two distinct stable edges e and f are incomparable in P_G if and only if there is a stable matching containing both.

Proof. Suppose first that e and f are comparable, say $e \succ f$. If, indirectly, there were a stable matching N containing both e and f , then $M_e \wedge N$ (consisting of the girl-best elements of $M_e \cup N$) would be a stable matching containing e which is girl-better than M_e contradicting the definition of M_e .

Suppose now that no stable matching contains both e and f , in particular $e \notin M_f$ and $f \notin M_e$, and indirectly e and f are not comparable in P_G . Then the head of arc a_f is not in $L(M_e)$, from which the tail of a_f is not in $L(M_e)$ either, and analogously, neither the head nor the tail of a_e is in $L(M_f)$. But then $M_e \vee M_f$ is a stable matching containing both e and f . ■

By applying Lemma 8.1 to poset P_G , we obtain that P_G is indeed D-antichain-extendible. ■■

Remark 8.1 We note that a fundamental tool of the book of Gusfield and Irving [34] to manage structural and optimization problems of stable matchings is a certain poset $\Pi(M)$ associated with a bipartite preference system. For example, their Theorem 3.4.2 characterizes matchings of G which can be extended to a stable matchings. It should, however, be emphasized that their poset is different from the present P_G since the ground-set of $\Pi(M)$ is the set of rotations while the ground-set of P_G is E_{st} . •

Remark 8.2 It should be emphasised that the above concept of induced poset can be extended to stable b -matchings and even to matroid kernels, implying that the solutions of the optimization problems discussed in the rest of this section can be extended to those concerning matroid kernels. These will be worked out in a forthcoming paper [23]. •

We call a subset K of stable edges **anti-stable** if no two elements of K belong to the same stable matching. (In the literature, an anti-blocker of a set-system \mathcal{F} is a subset of the ground-set that intersects each member of \mathcal{F} in at most one element. Therefore, $K \subset E_{st}$ is anti-stable precisely if it is an anti-blocker of the set of stable matchings). Claim 8.4 shows that a set $K \subseteq E_{st}$ is anti-stable if and only if K is a chain of poset P_G , which is equivalent to requiring that the stable matchings M_e ($e \in K$) form a chain in the distributive lattice of stable matchings.

8.2 Dilworth and Mirsky

In this section we discuss algorithmic approaches to the weighted versions of theorems of Mirsky and Dilworth.

8.2.1 Weighted Mirsky

The theorem of Mirsky immediately implies its weighted version (see, Theorem 14.3 in the book of Schrijver [52] or Theorem 2.4.30 in [27]), which is as follows.

THEOREM 8.5 (weighted Mirsky) Given a non-negative integer-valued function f on the ground-set S of a poset P , the minimum number of antichains covering f is equal to the maximum f -value of a chain. The optimal f -covering family of antichains can be chosen in such a way that the number of distinct antichains is at most $|S|$. There is a two-phase greedy algorithm (see, [27] Page 102) which computes such a minimum family of antichains in the first phase and a chain with maximum total f -value in the second. When P is D-antichain-extendible, the f -covering antichains may be chosen D-antichains. ■

For completeness, we outline the two-phase greedy algorithm cited in the theorem. The first phase computes an f -covering family \mathcal{A} of antichains that contains at most n distinct antichains. Let $f_0 := f$. In Step i ($i = 1, 2, \dots$), define A_i to be the set of minimal f_{i-1} -positive elements of P . Let $\mu_i := \min\{f_{i-1}(s) : s \in A_i\}$, and define f_i by

$$f_i(s) := \begin{cases} f_{i-1}(s) - \mu_i & \text{if } s \in A_i \\ f_{i-1}(s) & \text{if } s \in S - A_i. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Phase 1 terminates when the current weight-function becomes identically zero. Obviously, the sets A_1, \dots, A_k defined in Phase 1 are antichains. Let the family \mathcal{A} consist of μ_i members of A_i ($i = 1, \dots, k$). Then \mathcal{A} consists $\sum \mu_i$ antichains and each element s of P belongs to exactly $f(s)$ members of \mathcal{A} .

In Phase 2, we proceed backward on the antichains A_k, A_{k-1}, \dots, A_1 . Select first an arbitrary element p_1 of A_k . Let i be the largest subscript for which A_i does not contain p_1 (if there is any). Since p_1 is not in A_i but it is in A_{i+1} , there is an element p_2 of A_i which is smaller than p_1 . Continuing in this way, we are building a chain $C = \{p_1, \dots, p_t\}$ until the construction cannot be continued since p_t is in A_1 . It follows that $\tilde{f}(C) = \sum[\mu_i : i = 1, \dots, k] = |\mathcal{A}|$.

By applying Theorem 8.5 to the poset P_G , we get the following.

Corollary 8.6 *The minimum number of stable matchings of a bipartite preference system covering a non-negative integer-valued function f on E_{st} is equal to the maximum total f -value of an anti-stable set of edges. In particular, the minimum number of stable matchings covering all stable edges is equal to the maximum cardinality of an anti-stable set. Furthermore, with the help of the two-phase greedy algorithm concerning the weighted Mirsky problem, both a minimum family of stable matchings covering f (which contains at most $|E_{\text{st}}|$ distinct members) and an anti-stable set with maximum total f -value can be computed in strongly polynomial time. \blacksquare*

8.2.2 Weighted Dilworth

Let $P = (S, \preceq)$ be a poset. It is well-known (and follows from Dilworth's theorem) that the graph defined by P (in which uv is an edge if u and v are comparable) is perfect. The first part of the next proposition follows from Theorem 5 of the paper [43] while the second part is a consequence of Theorem 4 of the paper [4] of Cook, Fonlupt, and Schrijver.

Proposition 8.7 *The polytope of antichains of a poset $P = (S, \preceq)$ is described by the following linear system.*

$$\{x \in \mathbf{R}_+^S : \tilde{x}(C) \leq 1 \text{ for every (maximal) chain } C \text{ of } P\}.$$

Moreover, this system is TDI and admits the integer Caratheodory property.

We say that a family \mathcal{C} of chains **covers** a non-negative weight-function $w : S \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_+$ if every element $s \in S$ occurs in at least $w(s)$ members of \mathcal{C} . The following theorem is a direct consequence of Proposition 8.7, where Part **(A)** is nothing but the weighted extension of Dilworth's theorem (see, for example, Theorem 14.3 in [52]).

THEOREM 8.8 (A) (weighted Dilworth) *Given a non-negative integer-valued function w on the ground-set of a poset $P = (S, \preceq)$, the maximum w -weight of an antichain of P is equal to the minimum number of chains covering w . If P is D -antichain-extendible, then the maximum w -weight antichain may be chosen to be a D -antichain.*

(B) *The minimizer w -covering family of chains can be chosen in such a way that the number of distinct chains is at most $|S|$.*

Part **(A)** follows easily from the original theorem of Dilworth if we replace each element $s \in S$ by $w(s)$ elements which form an antichain and the new elements have the same relationship to other elements as s has. This approach, however, does not provide a polynomial time algorithm for computing a maximum w -weight antichain (the primal problem) and a minimum cover of w by chains (the dual problem).

By applying Proposition 8.7 and Theorem 8.8 to poset P_G , we get the following.

Corollary 8.9 *Consider a preference system on a bipartite graph $G = (U, W; E)$ in which each stable matching is a perfect matching. A linear system describing the polytope of stable matchings is as follows.*

$$\{x \in \mathbf{R}_+^{E_{\text{st}}} : \tilde{x}(E_{\text{st}}) = |U| \text{ and } \tilde{x}(A) \leq 1 \text{ for every (maximal) anti-stable set } A \subseteq E_{\text{st}}\}.$$

This system is TDI. For a non-negative integer-valued weight-function w on E_{st} , the maximum w -weight of a stable matching of a preference system defined on G is equal to the minimum number of anti-stable sets covering w . The smallest w -covering family of anti-stable sets can be chosen in such a way that it contains at most $|E_{\text{st}}|$ distinct anti-stable sets. In particular, a given set H of stable edges includes a stable matching if and only if H cannot be covered by less than $|W|$ anti-stable sets. ■

Remark 8.3 As we already indicated in Remark 4.1, Rothblum [51] provided an linear description of the polytope of stable matchings, which uses only $O(|E|)$ linear inequality, and this system was shown to be TDI by Király and Pap [41]. It is an interesting challenge to derive the TDI-ness of the Rothblum system from Corollary 8.9. •

Our goal is to provide a constructive proof of Part **(A)** of Theorem 8.8 by describing a strongly polynomial algorithm that solves both the primal and the dual problem. The algorithm proves Part **(B)** only in a slightly weaker form by providing an optimal family of chains containing at most $4n$ distinct chains. (From a theoretical point of view it might be interesting to prove algorithmically **(B)** but in stable matching applications this is not a central issue.)

The approach may be viewed as a weighted extension of Fulkerson's [28] elegant proof for the Dilworth theorem, which is based on a reduction to König's theorem.

Let $b : V \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_+$ be a non-negative integer-valued function on the node-set of a bipartite graph. A function $z : E \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_+$ is called a **b -matching** if $d_z(v) \leq b(v)$ holds for every node v of G . (Note that z may have components larger than 1.) We need the following extension of König's theorem (see, for example, Theorem 21.1 in the book [52] of Schrijver in its special case $w \equiv 1$.)

Lemma 8.10 *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a bipartite graph and $b : V \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_+$ a function on its node-set. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\tilde{z}(E) : z \text{ a } b\text{-matching of } G\} = \\ \min\{\tilde{b}(L) : L \subseteq V \text{ a covering of } E\}. \end{aligned}$$

The optimal b -matching can be chosen in such a way that the set of z -positive edges forms a forest, and hence it consists of at most $|V| - 1$ edges.

Proof. The min-max formula follows immediately from the linear programming duality theorem and from the fact that the node-edge-incidence matrix of a bipartite graph is totally unimodular.

To see the second part of the lemma, let z be an optimal b -matching and suppose that there is a circuit $C = \{e_1, e_k, \dots, e_{2k}\}$ consisting of z -positive edges. Let α denote the minimum of these z -values, and suppose that this minimum is attained on edge e_1 .

Decrease the z -values on the edges of C with odd subscript by α and increase the z -values on edges with even subscript by α . Let z' denote the modified vector. Then z' is also an optimal b -matching for which the number of z' -positive edges is smaller than the number of z -positive edges. ■

It is also a well-known fact that both a largest b -matching and a minimum b -weight covering of the edge-set can be computed in strongly polynomial time by applying a standard MFMC algorithm.

Let's turn to the algorithmic proof of the non-trivial direction $\max \geq \min$ of the min-max formula in Theorem 8.8. We may assume that w is strictly positive since if $w(s) = 0$ for some element $s \in S$, then the removal of s from P affects neither the maximum weight of antichains nor a family of chains covering w .

We assign a bipartite graph $G_P = (S', S''; E_P)$ to poset $P = (S, \preceq)$, where S' and S'' are disjoint copies of S , and $u'v''$ is an edge if $u \succ v$. Apply Lemma 8.10 to the function b defined on the node-set of G_P where

$$b(s') := b(s'') := w(s) \quad (s \in S).$$

Let $L_0 \subseteq S' \cup S''$ be a minimum b -value covering of the edge-set of G_P , and let z_0 an optimal b -matching of G_P , for which the set of z_0 -positive edges form a forest. Then the number of z_0 -positive edges is at most $2n$. By Lemma 8.10, we have

$$\tilde{b}(L_0) = \tilde{z}_0(E_P).$$

Since w (and hence b , as well) is strictly positive, the set L_0 is an inclusionwise minimal covering of E_P . It is not possible for an element $s \in S$ that both s' and s'' belong to L_0 . Indeed, if $s' \in L_0$, then it follows from the minimality of L_0 that there is an element $t_1 \in S$ for which $s \succ t_1$ and $t_1'' \notin L_0$, and analogously, if $s'' \in L_0$, then there is an element $t_2 \in S$ for which $t_2 \succ s$ and $t_2' \notin L_0$. But then $t_2 \succ t_1$, and hence $t_2't_1''$ is also an edge of G_P , which is not covered by L_0 . Therefore it is indeed not possible that both s' and s'' are in L_0 .

Let $A_* := \{s \in S : s', s'' \notin L_0\}$. Then A_* is an antichain of P for which

$$\tilde{w}(A_*) = \tilde{w}(S) - \tilde{b}(L_0) = \tilde{w}(S) - \tilde{z}_0(E_P). \quad (21)$$

Consider the acyclic digraph $D_P = (V_P, A_P)$ where $V_P := S \cup \{s, t\}$ and

$$A_P := \{uv : u, v \in S, u \succ v\} \cup \{sv : v \in S\} \cup \{vt : v \in S\}.$$

Define function $z_* : A_P \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_+$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} z_*(uv) &:= z_0(u'v'') \quad \text{if } u, v \in S \text{ and } u \succ v, \\ z_*(sv) &:= w(v) - d_{z_0}(v'') \quad \text{if } v \in S, \\ z_*(vt) &:= w(v) - d_{z_0}(v') \quad \text{if } v \in S. \end{aligned}$$

It can easily be seen that z_* forms an st -flow which is positive on at most $4n$ arcs. By (21), the flow-amount of z_* is

$$\delta_{z_*}(s) = \sum_{v \in S} [w(v) - d_{z_0}(v')] = \tilde{w}(S) - \tilde{z}_0(E_P) = \tilde{w}(A_*). \quad (22)$$

It is a well-known property of flows that an arbitrary non-negative integer-valued flow z which is positive on ℓ arcs can be produced in a greedy way as the sum of at most ℓ path-flows (where a path-flow is a constant integer along an st -path and 0 otherwise).

Therefore z_* can be obtained as the sum of at most $4n$ path-flows. Since $\rho_{z_*}(v) = w(v) = \delta_{z_*}(v)$ holds for every node $v \in S$ of digraph D_P , by restricting these path-flows to S , we obtain a family of chains of P covering w and consisting of $\delta_{z_*}(s)$ chains, in which the number of distinct chains is at most $4n$. ■■

8.3 The theorem of Greene+Kleitman

A fundamental theorem of Greene+Kleitman [31] provided a profound extension of Dilworth' theorem by formulating and proving an elegant min-max formula for the maximum cardinality α_ℓ of the union of ℓ antichains. For a convenient and concise optimality criterion, the concept of orthogonality was introduced in [26]. A family \mathcal{A} of disjoint antichains and a family \mathcal{C} of disjoint chains are called **orthogonal** if $S = (\cup \mathcal{A}) \cup (\cup \mathcal{C})$ and each member of \mathcal{A} intersects (in one element) each member of \mathcal{C} .

THEOREM 8.11 (Greene+Kleitman) *In a poset $P = (S, \preceq)$, the maximum cardinality α_ℓ of the union of ℓ antichains is equal to the minimum of*

$$\ell|\mathcal{C}| + |S - \cup \mathcal{C}|$$

where the minimum is taken over all families \mathcal{C} of disjoint chains. A family \mathcal{A}_ℓ of ℓ disjoint antichains has a maximum cardinality union if and only if there exists a family of disjoint chains orthogonal to \mathcal{A}_ℓ . ■

In the paper of Frank [26] (see also Section 3.6.2 of book [27]), a strongly polynomial algorithm, based on the min-cost flow algorithm of Ford and Fulkerson, was described to compute a family \mathcal{A}_ℓ of ℓ antichains whose union has a maximum number of elements, along with a family of chains which is orthogonal to \mathcal{A}_ℓ . The theorem of Greene+Kleitman immediately implies the following.

Corollary 8.12 *In a poset $P = (S, \preceq)$, the maximum number of disjoint D -antichains is equal to the minimum number of elements intersecting all D -antichains.* ■

The algorithm in [26], when specialized to this case, computes in strongly polynomial time both the largest set of disjoint D -antichains and the smallest set of elements intersecting all D -antichains.

In a D -antichain-extendible poset, the maximum cardinality of the union of ℓ antichains is the same as the maximum cardinality of the union of ℓ D -antichains, and therefore Theorem 8.11 provides a min-max theorem for this case. Note, however, that the ℓ antichains in Theorem 8.11 with a largest union can trivially be chosen to be pairwise disjoint, while in the case of the D -antichain packing problem, this cannot be an expectation. Therefore, it is useful to extend the concept of orthogonality to the case when the family of antichains may have non-disjoint members, as follows. A family \mathcal{A} of (not necessarily disjoint) antichains and a family \mathcal{C} of disjoint chains are **orthogonal** if

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} S = (\cup \mathcal{A}) \cup (\cup \mathcal{C}), \\ \text{each member of } \mathcal{A} \text{ intersects (in one element) each member of } \mathcal{C}, \\ \text{the members of } \mathcal{A}, \text{ when restricted to } \cup \mathcal{C}, \text{ are disjoint.} \end{array} \right.$$

With this notion, Theorem 8.11 transforms into the following.

THEOREM 8.13 *In a D -antichain-extendible poset $P = (S, \preceq)$, the maximum cardinality α_ℓ of the union of ℓ D -antichains is equal to the minimum of*

$$\ell|\mathcal{C}| + |S - \cup \mathcal{C}|$$

where the minimum is taken over all families \mathcal{C} of disjoint chains. A family \mathcal{A}_ℓ of ℓ disjoint D -antichains has a maximum cardinality union (that is, $|\cup \mathcal{A}_\ell| = \alpha_\ell$) if and only if there exists a system of disjoint chains orthogonal to \mathcal{A}_ℓ . ■

Let $G = (U, W; E)$ be a bipartite graph endowed with a preference system. Let \mathcal{M}_ℓ be a family of ℓ not necessarily disjoint stable matchings, and let \mathcal{K} be a system of disjoint anti-stable sets. We say that \mathcal{M}_ℓ and \mathcal{K} are **orthogonal** if

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} E_{\text{st}} = \cup \mathcal{M}_\ell \cup \cup \mathcal{K}, \\ \text{each member of } \mathcal{M}_\ell \text{ intersects (in one element) each member of } \mathcal{K}, \\ \text{the members of } \mathcal{M}_\ell, \text{ when restricted to } \cup \mathcal{K}, \text{ are disjoint.} \end{array} \right.$$

By applying Theorem 8.13 to the G -induced poset P_G , we obtain the following.

Corollary 8.14 *Given a preference system on a bipartite graph G , the maximum cardinality of the union of ℓ (non-necessarily disjoint) stable matchings is equal to the minimum of*

$$\ell|\mathcal{K}| + |E_{\text{st}} - \cup \mathcal{K}| \tag{23}$$

where \mathcal{K} is a system of disjoint anti-stable sets. A family \mathcal{M}_ℓ of ℓ stable matchings has a union with maximum cardinality if and only if there is a system of disjoint anti-stable sets which is orthogonal to \mathcal{M}_ℓ . ■

In Section 7.2, we described an algorithm for the weighted extension of this last problem when, given a weight-function w , we wanted to find ℓ (non-necessarily disjoint) stable matchings for which the w -weight of their union is maximum.

8.4 An algorithm for packing D-antichains

Corollary 8.6 provided a min-max formula for the minimum number of matchings covering a lower-bound function f . Its proof relied on a two-phase greedy algorithm concerning the weighted Mirsky's theorem. In this section, we investigate the packing counter-part of this problem when for a given upper-bound function h we want to find a maximum number of stable matchings such that each edge e belongs to at most $h(e)$ of them.

Let $P = (S, \preceq)$ be again a poset and let $h : S \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_+$ be non-negative integer-valued upper-bound function. Let $\alpha := \alpha_P$ denote the cardinality of a D -antichain, while $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}_P$ is the set of D -antichains of P . We say that a family of D -antichains is **h -independent** if every element $s \in S$ belongs to at most $h(s)$ members of the family. A subset $B \subseteq S$ **blocks** (or is a **blocker** of) \mathcal{D} if it intersects all members of \mathcal{D} . For example, (by Dilworth's theorem) any chain in a smallest chain-decomposition of P is a blocker of \mathcal{D} . It should, however, be noted that there exists a D -antichain-extendible poset in which no smallest blocker of D -antichains is a chain.

THEOREM 8.15 *Given a non-negative integer-valued function h on the ground-set S of a poset P , the maximum cardinality of an h -independent family of D -antichains is equal to the minimum h -value of a blocker $B \subseteq S$ of D -antichains. A largest h -independent family of antichains can be chosen in such a way that the number of distinct antichains is at most $|S|$.*

We remark that the theorem for $h \equiv 1$ is a special case (or consequence) of Theorem 8.11 of Greene and Kleitman. For general h , the min-max formula follows from this if we replace each element $s \in S$ by a chain of $h(s)$ new elements. Since this approach is not polynomial in h , we show how the algorithm described in the proof of Theorem 2.1 can be used.

Algorithmic proof of Theorem 8.15. Let $\{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_\alpha\}$ be a Dilworth decomposition of P into chains where α denotes the cardinality of the largest antichain of P . Define a digraph $D = (V, A)$ in which $s^*, t^* \in V$ and D consists of α openly disjoint s^*t^* -paths P_1, \dots, P_α . Here P_i has $|C_i|$ arcs and the arcs of P_i correspond to the elements of C_i in such a way the an arc e of P_i precedes another arc f of P_i

if the element of C_i corresponding to e is larger than the element of C_i corresponding f . Let $h(e)$ be the h -value of the element of the poset corresponding to e .

For a D-antichain A' , we associate with A' the set of nodes of D which precede the α arcs of D corresponding to the elements of A' . (In particular, this means the singleton $\{s^*\}$ is associated with the unique highest D-antichain of P , while the set $V - t^*$ is associated with the lowest D-antichain.)

The system of subsets of V associated with the D-antichains of P form a ring-set \mathcal{R}_0 . By applying Theorem 2.1 and its algorithmic proof to this special digraph and ring-set, we obtain Theorem 8.15 as well as an algorithm to compute a largest family \mathcal{F} of h -independent D-antichains of poset P along with a blocker B of D-antichains for which $\tilde{h}(B)$ is minimum (that is, $|\mathcal{F}| = \tilde{h}(B)$). ■

Remark 8.4 Suppose that in Theorem 8.15 we are also given a non-negative integer-valued weight-function w on S . It is an easy exercise to prove that not only the D-antichains are closed under the meet and join operations, but the maximum w -weight D-antichains as well. Therefore the algorithmic proof of Theorem 8.15 outlined above can be easily extended to one that computes a largest family of h -independent maximum w -weight antichains along with a blocker B of maximum w -weight D-antichains for which $\tilde{h}(B)$ is minimum.

When we specialize this to the G -induced poset P_G , we obtain a min-max formula for the maximum number of h -independent maximum w -weight stable matchings, and this result is just equivalent to Theorem 4.6. •

In the special case $h \equiv 1$ of Theorem 8.15, we are back at Corollary 3.6. We emphasize, however, that Theorem 8.15 can be applied to matroid kernels as well [23].

8.4.1 Weighted Greene+Kleitman

Let $w : S \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_+$ be a weight-function. For a w -independent family \mathcal{C} of chains, we say that an element $s \in S$ is **unsaturated** if it is contained in less than $w(s)$ members of \mathcal{C} . For $s \in S$, let

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(s) := w(s) - |\{C \in \mathcal{C} : s \in C\}|$$

By a standard element-multiplication technique, the Greene+Kleitman theorem immediately implies its weighted extension.

THEOREM 8.16 *Let w be a non-negative integer-valued weight-function on the ground-set of poset $P = (S, \preceq)$. The maximum w -weight $\alpha_{\ell}(w)$ of the union of ℓ antichains is equal to the minimum of*

$$\ell|\mathcal{C}| + \sum_{s \in S} \sigma_{\mathcal{C}}(s)$$

*where the minimum is taken over all w -independent families \mathcal{C} of chains. The minimizer family \mathcal{C} can be chosen in such a way that the number of its distinct members is at most $|S|$. A family \mathcal{A}_{ℓ} of ℓ disjoint antichains has a maximum w -weight union if and only if there exists a w -independent family \mathcal{C} of chains which is orthogonal to \mathcal{A}_{ℓ} in the sense that **(A)** $\cup \mathcal{A}_{\ell}$ contains each element unsaturated by \mathcal{C} and **(B)** each member of \mathcal{A} intersects (in one element) each member of \mathcal{C} . ■*

8.4.2 Disjoint D-antichains with cheapest union

For an application in a subsequent work [23], we show how the approach in Corollary 6.5 can be applied to constructing ℓ disjoint D-antichains of a poset $P = (S, \preceq)$ endowed with a cost-function $c : S \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}_+$ for which the c -cost of their union is minimum.

Let α denote the cardinality of a D-antichain. By Dilworth, there is a partition $\{C_1, \dots, C_{\alpha}\}$ of S into α chains. Let D be a digraph consisting of α openly disjoint st -paths, where the arcs of path P_i

correspond to the elements of C_i . For an arc a of D let $g(a)$ be the c -cost of the corresponding element of S .

For a D-antichain A of P , let $A_- := \{u : u \preceq v \text{ for some } v \in A\}$ denote the lower ideal of A , and let A' denote the arcs of D corresponding to the elements of A . Now the set of nodes of D preceding A' corresponds to A_- , and these sets associated with the D-antichains of P form a ring-family \mathcal{R} . It follows that Corollary 6.5, when applied to this case, results in an \mathcal{R} -compatible ℓ -cut L of D whose g -value is minimum, and this L defines a family of ℓ disjoint D-antichains of P for which the c -cost of their union is minimum.

This algorithm for computing ℓ disjoint D-antichains can easily be used for

(*) finding ℓ not necessarily disjoint D-antichains whose union is of maximum w -weight.

To this end, replace each element $s \in S$ by a chain of ℓ elements, where the weight of the first element of the chain is $w(s)$ and zero of the others. Then ℓ disjoint D-antichains with maximum total weight determines an optimal solution to (*).

With the help of a standard construction, we can solve the following more general problem. Suppose that we are given ℓ cost-function non-negative c_1, \dots, c_ℓ on S , and want to find ℓ disjoint D-antichains A_1, \dots, A_ℓ for which the sum $\tilde{c}_1(A_1) + \dots + \tilde{c}_\ell(A_\ell)$ is minimum. This can be done as follows. Let S_1, \dots, S_ℓ be disjoint copies of S and let $S^* := S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_\ell$, and let P_i is a copy of P on S_i . Define a poset $P^* = (S^*, \prec^*)$, as follows. Every element of S_i is smaller than every element of S_j for $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$, while the restriction of P^* to S_i is P_i . Define the cost-function c^* on S^* , as follows. $c^*(t) = c_i(t)$ for $t \in S_i$.

Then the union of ℓ disjoint D-antichains of P^* arises as the union of ℓ disjoint D-antichains of P_i for some $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. It follows that the problem of finding ℓ disjoint D-antichains A_1, \dots, A_ℓ of P for which $\sum[\tilde{c}_i(A_i) : i = 1, \dots, \ell]$ is minimum is equivalent to finding ℓ disjoint D-antichains of P^* for which the c^* -cost of their union is minimum, and an algorithmic approach to this was described in the first half of this section.

Corollary 8.17 *Given ℓ cost-functions c_1, \dots, c_ℓ on the set of stable edges of a bipartite preference system, there is a strongly polynomial algorithm for constructing disjoint stable matchings M_1, \dots, M_ℓ for which $\sum[\tilde{c}_i(M_i) : i = 1, \dots, \ell]$ is as small as possible. In particular, there is a strongly polynomial algorithm to decide whether ℓ disjoint matchings can be extended to ℓ disjoint stable matchings. ■*

Acknowledgement We are grateful to Ágnes Cseh, Péter Madarasi, David Manlove, and András Sebő for their invaluable comments and suggestions.

References

- [1] V. Bansal, A. Agrawal, V.S. Malhotra, *Polynomial time algorithm for an optimal stable assignment with multiple partners*. Theoretical Computer Science, 379 (2007) 317-328.
- [2] M. Cochand, A. Gaillard, and H. Gröflin, *Lattice matrices, intersection of ring families and dicuts*, Discrete Mathematics, 110 (1992) 61-80.
- [3] M. Cochand, A. Gaillard, and H. Gröflin, *Optimum partitioning into intersections of ring families*, Discrete Applied Mathematics, 76 (1997) 81-91.
- [4] W.J. Cook, J. Fonlupt, and A. Schrijver, *An integer analogue of Carathéodory's theorem*, J. Combinatorial Theory, Ser B. 40 (1986) 63-70.
- [5] F. Cooper and D.F. Manlove, *Algorithms for new types of fair stable matchings*, in Proceedings of SEA '20: the 18'th Symposium on Experimental Algorithms, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics, p. 1-13, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum for Informatik, 2020.

- [6] F. Cooper and D.F. Manlove, *Two-sided profile-based optimality in the stable marriage problem*, ATXIV: 1905.06626v3, 11 Sep 2020.
- [7] X. Chen, G. Ding, X. Hu, and W. Zang, *The Maximum-Weight Stable Matching Problem: Duality and Efficiency*, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics, 26(3) (2012) 1346-1360.
- [8] W.H. Cunningham, *Minimum cuts, modular functions, and matroid polyhedra*, Networks, 15 (1985) 205-215.
- [9] B.C. Dean and S. Munshi, *Faster algorithms for stable allocation problems*, Algorithmica, 58, 59-81 (2010) DOI 10.1007/s00453-010-9416-y
- [10] R.P. Dilworth, *A decomposition theorem for partially ordered sets*, Annals of Mathematics 51(2) (1950) 161-166.
- [11] E.A. Dinits, *Algorithm for solution of a problem of maximum flow in a network with power estimation* (in Russian), Soviet Mathematics Doclady, 11 (1970) 1277–1280.
- [12] R.J. Duffin, *The extremal length of a network*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 5 (1962) 200–215.
- [13] J. Edmonds and R.M. Karp, *Theoretical improvements in algorithmic efficiency for network flow problems*, J. ACM, 19 (1972) 248-264.
- [14] A. Eguchi, S. Fujishige, and A. Tamura, *A generalized Gale-Shapley algorithm for a discrete-concave stable-marriage model*, in: Algorithms and Computation, (ISAAC 2003) 495-504, Lecture Notes in Computer Science (book series LNCS, Volume 2906, Springer, Berlin).
- [15] Yuri Faenza and Xuan Zhang, *Affinely representable lattices, stable matchings, and choice functions*, Mathematical Programming, Ser. B, 197 (2023) 721-760. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-0-01838-z>
- [16] U. Faigle and B. Peis, *Two-phase greedy algorithms for some classes of combinatorial linear programs*, Journal ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG), 6(4) (August 2010) Article No. 65. A preliminary version appeared in the Proceedings of SODA, 2008, San Francisco, 161–166.
- [17] Tomás Feder, *A new fixed point approach for stable networks and stable marriages*, Journal of Computer and System Sciences, 45 (1992) 233-284.
- [18] E.M. Fenoaltea, I.B. Baybusinov, J. Zhao, L. Zhou, Y.-C. Zhang, *The stable marriage problem: an interdisciplinary review from the physicist's perspective*, Physics Reports, 917 (2021) 1-80.
- [19] T. Fleiner, *A matroid generalization of the stable matching polytope*, in: Proceedings of IPCO '01, the 8th Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, (2001) Vol. 2081, (Springer) 111–114.
- [20] T. Fleiner, *A fixed-point approach to stable matchings and some applications*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 28/1 (2003) 103-126.
- [21] T. Fleiner, *On stable matchings and flows*, Algorithms, 7(1) (2014) 1-14.
- [22] T. Fleiner, *Combinatorics of stable matchings*, in: Online and Matching-Based Market Design, (eds.: F. Echenique, N. Immorlica, V.V. Vazirani, Cambridge University Press (2023), 264-382. Online ISBN: 9781108937535 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108937535>
- [23] T. Fleiner, A. Frank, T. Király *Optimization problems on matroid kernels*, in preparation.

- [24] T. Fleiner and Zs. Jankó, *On weighted kernels of two posets*, Order, 33(1) (2016) 734-744.
- [25] L.R. Ford and D.R. Fulkerson, *Flows in Networks*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton NJ., 1962.
- [26] A. Frank, *On chain and antichain families of a partially ordered set*, J. Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B, 29(2) (1980) 176-184.
- [27] A. Frank, *Connections in Combinatorial Optimization*, Oxford University Press, 2011. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 38.
- [28] D.R. Fulkerson, *Note on Dilworth's decomposition theorem for partially ordered sets*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 7 (1956) 701-702.
- [29] D. Gale and L.S. Shapley, *College admissions and the stability of marriage*, American Mathematical Monthly, 69 (1962) 9-15.
- [30] A. Ganesh, V. Prakash, P. Nimbhorkar, and G. Philip, *Disjoint Stable Matchings in Linear Time*, in: Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science, 47th International Workshop, WG 2021, Warsaw, Poland, June 23-25, 2021, Revised Selected Papers, Jun 2021, Pages 94-105, arXiv:2011.13248v2 [cs.DS] 4 Jul 2021
- [31] C. Greene and D.J. Kleitman, *The structure of Sperner k -families*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Ser. A, 20 (1976) 41-68.
- [32] H. Gröflin and A.J. Hoffman, *On matroid intersections*, Combinatorica, 1 (1981) 43-47.
- [33] Dan Gusfield, *Three fast algorithms for four problems in stable marriage*, SIAM J. Comput. 16(1) (1987) 111-128.
- [34] D. Gusfield and R.W. Irving, *The stable marriage problem: structure and algorithms*, MIT Press, 1989, Foundations of Computing Series.
- [35] A.J. Hoffman, *On lattice polyhedra III: blockers and antiblockers of lattice clutters*, Math. Programming Study, 8 (1978) 197-207.
- [36] A.J. Hoffman, *Ordered sets and linear programming*, in: Ordered Sets (I. Rival ed.) (1982) D. Reidel Publishing Company, 619-654.
- [37] C.A. Micchelli (editor), *Selected Papers of Alan Hoffman with Commentary*, World Scientific, 2003 (ISBN: 981-02-4198-4).
- [38] R.W. Irving, *An efficient algorithm for the "stable room-mates" problem*, J. Algorithms, 6 (1985) 577-595.
- [39] R.W. Irving and P. Leather, *The complexity of counting stable marriages*, SIAM J. Comput. 15 (1986) 655-667.
- [40] R.W. Irving, P. Leather, and D. Gusfield, *An efficient algorithm for the "optimal" stable marriage*, J. of the Association for Computing Machinery (JACM), 34(3) (July 1987) 532-543.
- [41] T. Király and J. Pap, *Total dual integrality of Rothblum's description of the stable marriage polyhedron*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 33(2) (2008), 283-290.
- [42] D.E. Knuth, *Marriages Stables*, Les Presses de l'Universite de Montreal, Montreal, QC, Canada, 1976. [English translation in: *Stable Marriage and its relation to other combinatorial problems*, Vol. 10 of CRM Proceedings and Lecture Notes, Amer. Math. Soc., 1997.]

- [43] L. Lovász, *Normal hypergraphs and the perfect graph conjecture*, Discrete Mathematics 2 (1972) 253-267 [reprinted as: *Normal hypergraphs and the weak perfect graph conjecture*, in: Topics on Perfect Graphs (C. Berge, V. Chvatal, eds.) [Annals of Discrete Mathematics 21], North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 29-42].
- [44] T. Mai and V.V. Vazirani, *A Natural generalization of stable matching solved via new insights into ideal cuts*, ARXIV 2018.
- [45] D.F. Manlove, *Algorithmics of matching under preferences*, Ser. on Theoretical Computer Science: Vol. 2, ISBN 978-981-4425-24-7 (hardcover) 2013, World Scientific. (GBP 133)
- [46] D. McVitie and L.B. Wilson, *The stable marriage problem*, Commun. ACM, 14 (1971) 486-492.
- [47] L. Mirsky, *A dual of Dilworth's decomposition theorem*, American Mathematical Monthly, 78(8) (1971) 876-877. doi:10.2307/2316481
- [48] K. Murota and Y. Yokoi, *On the lattice structure of stable allocations in two-sided discrete-concave market*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 40(2) (May 2015) 460-473.
- [49] J-C. Picard, *Maximal closure of a graph and applications to combinatorial problems*, Management Science, 22 (11) (July, 1976).
- [50] A.E. Roth, U.G. Rothblum, and J.H. Vande Vate, *Stable matchings, optimal assignments, and linear programming*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 18(4) (1993) 803-828.
- [51] U.G. Rothblum, *Characterization of stable matchings as extreme point of a polytope*, Math. Programming Ser. A, 54 (1992) 57-67.
- [52] A. Schrijver, *Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency*, Springer, 2003. Vol 24 of the series Algorithms and Combinatorics.
- [53] É. Tardos, *A strongly polynomial algorithm to solve combinatorial linear programs*, Operations Research, 32 (1986) 250-256.
- [54] C.-P. Teo and J. Sethuraman, *LP based approach to optimal stable matchings*, Proceedings of the eight Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 1997), 710-719.
- [55] C.-P. Teo and J. Sethuraman, *The geometry of fractional stable matchings and its applications*, Mathematics of Operations Research, 23(4) (1998) 874-891
- [56] J.E. Vande Vate, *Linear programming brings marital bliss*, Operations Research Letters, 8(3) (1989) 147-153.