

Popular matchings with weighted voters^{*}

Klaus Heeger^a, Ágnes Cseh^{b,c}

^a*Technische Universität Berlin, Algorithmics and Computational Complexity, Germany*

^b*Institute of Economics, HUN-REN Centre for Economic and Regional Studies,
Budapest, Hungary*

^c*Department of Mathematics, University of Bayreuth, Germany*

Abstract

In the POPULAR MATCHING problem, we are given a bipartite graph $G = (A \cup B, E)$ and for each vertex $v \in A \cup B$, strict preferences over the neighbors of v . Given two matchings M and M' , matching M is more popular than M' if the number of vertices preferring M to M' is larger than the number of vertices preferring M' to M . A matching M is called *popular* if there is no matching M' that is more popular than M .

We consider a natural generalization of POPULAR MATCHING where every vertex has a weight. Then, we call a matching M more popular than matching M' if the weight of vertices preferring M to M' is larger than the weight of vertices preferring M' to M . For this case, we show that it is NP-hard to find a popular matching. Our main result is a polynomial-time algorithm that delivers a popular matching or a proof for its non-existence in instances where all vertices on one side have weight c for some $c > 3$ and all vertices on the other side have weight 1.

Keywords: popular matching, stable matching, complexity, algorithm

1. Introduction

The simple majority voting rule offers a natural way of aggregating voters' preferences. Already Condorcet [1] used pairwise comparisons to calculate

^{*}Ágnes Cseh was supported by the János Bolyai Research Fellowship. Klaus Heeger was supported by DFG Research Training Group 2434 “Facets of Complexity” and DFG project FPTinP (NI 369/16).

the winning candidate, establishing his famous paradox on the smallest voting instance not admitting a majority winner.

The concept of majority voting translates to other scenarios where voters submit preference lists. One such field is the area of two-sided matchings under preferences, where popular matchings [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] serve as a voting-based alternative to the well-known notions of stable matchings [7, 8] and Pareto optimal matchings [9]. In short, a popular matching M is a simple majority winner among all matchings, as it guarantees that no matter what alternative matching is offered on the market, a weak majority of the non-abstaining agents will opt for M . Restricted to matching instances on bipartite graphs, the popular matching problem has been studied in two models.

- *House allocation (i.e. one-sided preferences)*. One side of the graph consists of agents who have strictly ordered preferences and cast votes, while the other side is formed by houses with no preferences or votes.
- *Two-sided preferences*. Vertices on both sides are agents, who all have strictly ordered preferences and cast votes. This setting is analogous to the classic stable marriage model.

In this paper, we focus on the latter model and extend it to a direction motivated by voting. More specifically, we supply the agents in the instance with weights. The vote of each agent then counts with multiplicity: the larger the weight is, the more influence this agent has on the outcome of the voting between two matchings. Analogous weighted voting [10] scenarios arise naturally in various real-life problems. In committees [11], the vote of persons on different posts might be weighted differently when tallying them. In liquid democracy [12], the delegates' votes also count with multiplicity, depending on the number of agents they represent. Another interpretation of weighted voters might be that prioritized voters are assigned a larger weight in order to ensure their beneficial treatment [13]. Also, coalitions often decide to vote together, in which case the decision made within the coalition will also be counted with multiplicity [14].

Weighted voting readily translates to vertex-weighted graphs in the context of matchings. It follows already from the Condorcet paradox that the existence of a popular matching is not guaranteed if the vertices are weighted, as Figure 1 demonstrates. However, the complexity of deciding whether a popular matching exists in a given instance was open until now.




Figure 1: With certain vertex weights, no popular matching exists in this instance. The lists on the left side as well as the numbers on the edges indicate the preferences of the vertices: For every $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, a_i 's first choice is b_1 , while its second choice is b_2 . The Condorcet paradox with no majority winner corresponds to assigning weight 1 to a_1, a_2, a_3 and weight 0 to b_1, b_2 . For example, matching $M_1 := \{\{a_1, b_1\}, \{a_2, b_2\}\}$ is less popular than $M_2 := \{\{a_2, b_1\}, \{a_3, b_2\}\}$. Matching M_2 is less popular than $M_3 := \{\{a_3, b_1\}, \{a_1, b_2\}\}$. Finally, M_3 is less popular than M_1 . The presence of 0-weight vertices is not necessary: the same example works also with weight 3 for a_1, a_2, a_3 and weight 1 for b_1, b_2 .

Another motivation for popular matchings arises from the context of stable matchings. While stable matchings provide a local stability criterion (the absence of so-called blocking pairs), popularity takes a more global perspective and does not forbid local instabilities but only global instabilities, i.e. a complete matching preferred to the current matching. Therefore, popular matchings have been proposed as an alternative to stable matchings [15] as they may be larger than stable matchings. In the context of bipartite stable matching problems, the different sides often represent fundamentally different agents (i.e. when considering the admission of students to colleges, then one side represents the students, while the other side represents the free slots at colleges); consequently, it is natural to assign larger weights to preferences of one side than to the preferences of the other side. Recently, Kavitha [16] suggested to search for popular matchings when the vote of each vertex from one side is counted with multiplicity $c > 1$ and each vertex from the other side with multiplicity 1.

1.1. Related work

Matchings under preferences constitute a field actively researched by both Computer Scientists and Economists [17, 18, 5]. Besides two-sided matchings, majority voting has also been defined for the roommates problem [19, 20],

spanning trees [21], permutations [22, 23], the ordinal group activity selection problem [24], and branchings [25]. Matchings in bipartite graphs are nevertheless the most actively researched area [26, 19, 27, 28, 20, 29, 30] of the majority voting rule outside of the usual voting scenarios. In the context of matchings it was first introduced by Gärdenfors [2] for matching markets with two-sided preferences, and then studied by Abraham et al. [3] in the house allocation model. Polynomial-time algorithms to find a popular matching were given in both settings. In the two-sided preferences model, it was already noticed by Gärdenfors [2] that all stable matchings are popular, which implies that in standard bipartite stable matching instances, popular matchings always exist. In fact, stable matchings are the smallest size popular matchings, as shown by Biró et al. [31], while maximum size popular matchings can be found in polynomial time as well [15, 32]. Notice that as soon as there are vertices with different weights, for example in the house allocation model, where one side has weight 0, the existence of a popular matching is not guaranteed any more.

A natural extension of various matching problems is to consider graphs with edge or vertex weights. Notice however that the two weighted extensions define inherently different problems for popularity. If vertices are weighted, as in our setting, then this weight influences the voting power of an agent and redefines the more popular relation between matchings. If edge weights are given, the vertices vote exactly as in the non-weighted version, but the matchings carry a different total weight, and the goal is to find a maximum weight matching, subject to popularity.

For house allocation instances with edge weights and strict preferences, a maximum weight one among popular matchings can be found in $O(n + m)$ time [33], where n is the number of vertices and m is the number of edges in the graph. For instances with two-sided preferences, Faenza et al. [19] showed that it is **NP**-complete to decide if there exists a popular matching that contains two given edges, which is a very restricted case of popular matchings with edge weights. The same authors provided a 2-approximation algorithm for non-negative edge weights. **NP**-hardness was established for edge-weighted non-bipartite instances a couple of years earlier already [29].

The vertex-weighted case has been studied extensively in the house allocation setting. Mestre [34] presented algorithms to find a popular matching, or a proof for its non-existence. For instances with strict preference lists, he gave an $O(n + m)$ time algorithm, while for preference lists with ties, he solved the problem in $O(\min\{k\sqrt{n}, n\}m)$ time, where k is the number of

distinct weights the agents are given. The algorithm for strict lists was later extended to capacitated house allocation instances by Sng and Manlove [4], who posed the complexity of the case with weakly ordered preferences as an open problem. Itoh and Watanabe [35] studied the existence probability of a popular matching in random house allocation instances with vertex weights. Ruangwises and Itoh [36] designed an algorithm to compute the approximability measure introduced by McCutchen [37] and called unpopularity factor for a given matching. As a byproduct, they also developed a polynomial algorithm to verify the popularity of a given matching, even in non-bipartite instances.

Kavitha [16] gave a polynomial-time algorithm for finding a matching which is popular when each vertex has weight 1 and simultaneously is popular in the house allocation setting, i.e. when each vertex from A has weight 1 while each vertex from B has weight 0.

1.2. Structure of the paper and our contribution

We define our notation and main problem in Section 2. There we also sketch three relevant known techniques. We extend one of these, the concept of a witness, to the vertex-weighted case in Section 3. Then in Section 4 we give two different hardness reductions to show that finding a popular matching is NP-hard even if the vertex weight function is very restricted. A strong inapproximability result is also provided there for the problem variant with edge costs. We complement these findings in Section 5 with our main result, an algorithm to find a popular matching in polynomial time (if any exists) for instances where the weight of every vertex in A is a constant $c > 3$, while the weight of every vertex in B is 1. We pose open questions in Section 6 and provide detailed examples in the Appendix.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we first introduce the notation we use, and then describe three known techniques we rely on in our proofs.

2.1. Notation, input, and the popularity criterion

In our input, a simple bipartite graph $G = (A \cup B, E)$ on n vertices and m edges is given. We denote the set of vertices by $V = A \cup B$, the set of vertices adjacent to $v \in V$ in G by $N_G(v)$, and the set of edges incident to $v \in V$ in G by $\delta_G(v)$. The vertices of G are equipped with weights determined by

the weight function $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$. Furthermore, each vertex $v \in V$ has a strictly ordered preference list \succ_v over the vertices in $N_G(v)$, where $u \succ_v z$ means that v prefers u to z . We assume that being matched to any vertex in $N_G(v)$ is preferred to staying unmatched. We may drop the subscript G if it is clear from context.

A *matching* $M \subseteq E$ is a set of pairwise disjoint edges. A matching M is *perfect* if every vertex is covered by an edge of M . For each matching M and vertex $v \in V$, let $M(v)$ denote the vertex M matches v to. If v remains unmatched in M , then we write $M(v) := \perp$. The preference list \succ_v naturally defines a preference relation between any two matchings M and M' for each $v \in V$: vertex v prefers M to M' if $M(v) \succ_v M'(v)$. If $M(v) = M'(v)$, then v is indifferent between M and M' .

Given two matchings M and M' , let $V^+(M, M')$ be the set of vertices preferring M to M' . We define

$$\Delta_w(M, M') := \sum_{v \in V^+(M, M')} w(v) - \sum_{v \in V^+(M', M)} w(v).$$

A matching M is *popular* if $\Delta_w(M, M') \geq 0$ for every matching M' . In words, M is popular if it is never beaten in a pairwise comparison with another matching, where each vertex casts a vote for its preferred matching with the multiplicity of its weight. We call an edge $e \in E(G)$ *popular* if it is contained in some popular matching. We now formally define the main problem studied in this paper.

POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS

Input: A bipartite graph $G = (A \cup B, E)$, $(\succ_v)_{v \in V}$, and vertex weights $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$.

Question: Is there a popular matching M ?

2.2. Popular matching characterizations

We now sketch useful known techniques for characterizing popular matchings in house allocation instances, instances with two-sided lists, and finally, instances with weighted voters.

2.2.1. House allocation instances

We first focus on house allocation instances, which correspond to the subcase of our problem definition with $w(a) = 1$ for each $a \in A$ and $w(b) = 0$

for each $b \in B$. The characterization of Abraham et al. [3] uses the notion of an f -post and s -post of a vertex $a \in A$.

Definition 1. *The f -post $f(a)$ of $a \in A$ is the first vertex in the preferences of a . The s -post $s(a)$ of $a \in A$ is the vertex that is best-ranked among all vertices that are not the f -post of any vertex, i.e. the best-ranked vertex among $B \setminus \{f(a') : a' \in A\}$. If no such vertex exists, then we set $s(a) := \perp$.*

The following characterization of popular matchings leads to an $O(n+m)$ algorithm that outputs either a largest cardinality popular matching or a proof for its nonexistence.

Theorem 2 (Abraham et al. [3]). *In a house allocation instance, a matching M is popular if and only if the following conditions are both fulfilled.*

- *Each vertex b such that $b = f(a)$ for some $a \in A$ is matched in M to some $a' \in A$ with $b = f(a')$.*
- *For each vertex $a \in A$, it holds that $M(a) \in \{f(a), s(a)\}$.*

2.2.2. Instances with two-sided lists

Now we turn to instances with two-sided preferences and unit weights, i.e. $w(v) = 1$ for each $v \in V$. Let \tilde{G} be the graph G augmented with a loop at each vertex, such that each vertex is its own last choice. This allows us to regard any matching M in G as a perfect matching \tilde{M} in \tilde{G} by including loops at all vertices left unmatched in M . First we define the vote of $u \in V$ for $v \in N_G(u)$ as

$$\text{vote}_u^M(v) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \{u, v\} \in M, \\ 1 & \text{if } u \text{ is unmatched in } M \text{ or } v \succ_u M(u), \text{ and} \\ -1 & \text{otherwise (i.e. } M(u) \succ_u v \text{).} \end{cases}$$

This function allows us to express the total votes of the two end vertices of an edge as follows. For an edge $e = \{u, v\}$, we define $\text{vote}^M(e) := \text{vote}_u^M(v) + \text{vote}_v^M(u)$. For loops, $\text{vote}^M(\{u, u\}) = 0$ if u is matched to itself in \tilde{M} , else $\text{vote}^M(\{u, u\}) = -1$. For any matching M' in G , it is easy to see that $\text{vote}^M(\tilde{M}') := \sum_{e \in \tilde{M}'} \text{vote}^M(e) = \Delta_{w=1}(M', M)$. This delivers the first characterization of popular matchings in instances with two-sided preferences.

Theorem 3 (Kavitha et al. [38]). *M is popular in G if and only if for every perfect matching \tilde{M}' in \tilde{G} it holds that $\text{vote}^M(\tilde{M}') \leq 0$.*

The second characterization follows from LP-duality and the fact that G is a bipartite graph.

Theorem 4 (Kavitha et al. [38, 39]). *A matching M in $(G = (V = A \cup B, E), (\succ_v)_{v \in V})$ is popular if and only if there exists a vector $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, \pm 1\}^n$ such that*

- $\sum_{v \in V} \mathbf{y}_v = 0$,
- $\mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_b \geq \text{vote}^M(\{a, b\}) \quad \forall \{a, b\} \in E$, and
- $\mathbf{y}_v \geq \text{vote}^M(\{v, v\}) \quad \forall v \in V$.

2.2.3. Instances with weighted voters

Ruangwises and Itoh [36] extended Theorem 3 to instances with weighted voters. They redefined the vote of $u \in V$ for $v \in N_G(u)$ as

$$\widetilde{\text{vote}}_u^M(v) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \{u, v\} \in M, \\ w(u) & \text{if } M(u) = \perp \text{ or } v \succ_u M(u), \text{ and} \\ -w(u) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For an edge $e = \{u, v\}$, Ruangwises and Itoh [36] defined $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) := \widetilde{\text{vote}}_u^M(v) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_v^M(u)$. For a loop $e = \{v, v\}$, they set $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) = -w(v)$ if v is matched in M and $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) = 0$ otherwise. Note that for any matching M' in G , we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\tilde{M}') := \sum_{e \in \tilde{M}'} \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) = \Delta_w(M', M)$.

Theorem 5 (Ruangwises and Itoh [36]). *M is popular if and only if for every matching \tilde{M}' in \tilde{G} it holds that $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\tilde{M}') \leq 0$, where \tilde{G} is the input graph G augmented with a loop $\{v, v\}$ for every vertex $v \in V$, as defined in Section 2.2.2.*

3. Witness of popularity

We now extend Theorem 4 to two-sided instances with weighted voters. The proof is essentially analogous to the proof of Theorem 4: Start with the characterization of popular matchings from Theorem 5, formulate this as an LP using the standard bipartite matching LP and then dualize the LP.

Theorem 6. For POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS, matching M is popular if and only if there exists a vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Q}^V$ with $\sum_{v \in V} \mathbf{y}_v = 0$ such that $\mathbf{y}_v + \mathbf{y}_u \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e)$ for every edge $e = \{u, v\} \in E(G)$, $\mathbf{y}_v \geq 0$ for every vertex unmatched by M , and $\mathbf{y}_v \geq -w(v)$ for every $v \in V$.

Proof. The perfect matching polytope for bipartite graphs (that is, the convex hull of all perfect matchings) can be described by the inequalities $x_e \geq 0$ for every edge e and $\sum_{e \in \delta(v)} x_e = 1$ for every vertex v [40] (see also [41, Theorem 18.1]). Applying this to the instance \tilde{G} constructed in Section 2.2.2, we can express the problem of finding a perfect matching in \tilde{G} by the following linear program (1).

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{e \in E(\tilde{G})} \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) x_e \mid \sum_{e \in \delta_{\tilde{G}}(v)} x_e = 1 \ \forall v \in V, x_e \geq 0 \ \forall e \in E(\tilde{G}) \right\} \quad (1)$$

Dualizing LP (1) results in LP (2).

$$\min \left\{ \sum_{v \in V} y_v \mid y_v + y_u \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{u, v\}) \ \forall \{u, v\} \in E(G), y_v \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{v, v\}) \right\} \quad (2)$$

Note that the matching M always induces a solution of cost 0 to LP (1). By the strong duality for linear programs (see e.g. [41, Theorem 5.4]), it follows that LP (2) admits a solution of cost 0 if and only if the optimal solution of LP (1) has cost 0. This is equivalent to every perfect matching in \tilde{G} having cost at most 0, which is by Theorem 5 equivalent to M being popular. \square

Theorem 6 motivates the following definition of a witness:

Definition 7 (Witness). Let $G = (V = A \cup B, E)$ together with preferences for each $v \in V$ and vertex weights $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ be an instance of POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS. Given a popular matching M , a witness of M is a vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Q}^V$ such that

- $\sum_{v \in V} \mathbf{y}_v = 0$, $\mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_b \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\})$ for every edge $\{a, b\} \in E(G)$,
- $\mathbf{y}_v \geq 0$ for each vertex $v \in V$ which is unmatched in M , and
- $\mathbf{y}_v \geq -w(v)$ for each vertex $v \in V$ which is matched in M .

For matching M and vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Q}^V$, we call an edge $\{a, b\}$ conflicting if $\mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_b < \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\})$.

An example of popular matchings together with a witness can be found in Figure A.10 together with Table A.3 in the Appendix. By Theorem 6, a matching M is popular if and only if there exists a witness of M .

4. NP-hardness

In this section, we show that two highly restricted variants of POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS are NP-complete. The first variant (see Section 4.1) assumes a set of non-unit weight vertices of constant size and only 2 kinds of weights for them. The second variant assumes that all vertices on each side of the bipartition have identical weights (see Section 4.2). Finally, we show a strong inapproximability result for the case that there are utilities on the edges and one aims to find a popular matching of maximum utility (see Section 4.3).

4.1. Constant number of non-unit weight agents

We now show that determining the existence of a popular matching is NP-complete even if all but 14 agents have weight 1. In order to do so, we reduce from the NP-complete problem of deciding, given an instance of POPULAR MATCHING (with two-sided preferences and unit weights) and two edges e_1 and e_2 , whether there is a popular matching containing both e_1 and e_2 [19]. The reduction consists of replacing each of e_1 and e_2 by the gadget from Figure 2. Intuitively, the gadget from Figure 2 ensures that every popular matching in the constructed instance “contains” e_1 and e_2 .

Theorem 8. POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS is NP-complete, even if all but 14 vertices have weight one, and for each vertex, its weight is one, two, or four.

We first briefly sketch the proof before giving the formal reduction and correctness proof. Given an instance \mathcal{I} of POPULAR MATCHING WITH TWO FORCED EDGES, we replace each forced edge $\{u, z\}$ by the gadget depicted in Figure 2. All agents not contained in such a gadget have weight one. We call the resulting instance \mathcal{J} . Note that the matchings in instance \mathcal{J} will always be called $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ (plus possibly a superscript), while matchings in instance \mathcal{I} will be denoted by $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ (plus possibly a superscript).

$$\begin{aligned}
a_u^i &: b_u^1 \succ b_u^2 \succ b_u^3 \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\} \\
a_z^1 &: b_u^1 \succ z \succ b_z^1 \succ b_z^2 \\
a_z^i &: b_z^1 \succ b_z^2 \text{ for } i \in \{2, 3\} \\
b_u^1 &: u \succ a_u^1 \succ a_u^2 \succ a_z^1 \\
b_u^i &: a_u^1 \succ a_u^2 \text{ for } i \in \{2, 3\} \\
b_z^i &: a_z^1 \succ a_z^2 \succ a_z^3 \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\}
\end{aligned}$$




Figure 2: An example of the edge gadget for a forced edge $\{u, z\}$, where u ranks z at the k -th position, and z ranks u at the ℓ -th position. Squared vertices have weight four, trapezes have weight two, and round vertices have weight one.

Given a popular matching $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ in \mathcal{I} containing the two forced edges, we construct a popular matching $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ in \mathcal{J} by replacing each forced edge $\{u, z\}$ by the edges $\{a_u^2, b_u^2\}$, $\{a_u^1, b_u^3\}$, $\{a_z^2, b_z^2\}$, $\{a_z^3, b_z^1\}$, $\{u, b_u^1\}$, and $\{a_z^1, z\}$. To show that $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ is popular, one first shows that when comparing $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ to any other matching $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ in \mathcal{J} , then the summed weighted vote of the agents added in the two edge gadgets will never be in favor of $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$. As a second step, we show that if there is a matching $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ which is more popular than $M_{\mathcal{J}}$, then we may assume that $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ contains either edges $\{u, b_u^1\}$ and $\{z, a_z^1\}$ or neither edge $\{u, b_u^1\}$ nor $\{z, a_z^1\}$ for every forced edge $\{u, z\}$. Consequently, if matching $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ is more popular than $M_{\mathcal{J}}$, then also the matching M' arising from $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ by “inverting” the edge gadgets (i.e. removing the edges in the edge gadgets and adding edge $\{u, z\}$ whenever $\{u, b_u^1\}$ and $\{a_z^1, z\}$ are contained in $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$) is more popular than M . Thus, the popularity of M implies the popularity of $M_{\mathcal{J}}$.

For the reverse direction, given a popular matching $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ in \mathcal{J} , the first step is to show that $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ contains $\{u, b_u^1\}$ and $\{a_z^1, z\}$ for every forced edge $\{u, z\}$.

The matching $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ arising from $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ by inverting the edge gadgets is then a popular matching in \mathcal{I} which contains every forced edge. This finishes the proof sketch.

We now give the formal reduction and proof of Theorem 8.

Proof of Theorem 8. For a set of vertices $X \subseteq V$ and two matchings $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ and $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$, we say that X prefers $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ to $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ if

$$\sum_{v \in V^+(M_{\mathcal{J}}, M'_{\mathcal{J}}) \cap X} w(v) - \sum_{v \in V^+(M'_{\mathcal{J}}, M_{\mathcal{J}}) \cap X} w(v) > 0.$$

neu) By Theorem 5, POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS is in NP, as a popular matching can be used as a certificate. To show NP-hardness, we reduce from POPULAR MATCHING WITH TWO FORCED EDGES, which was shown to be NP-complete by Faenza et al. [19].

POPULAR MATCHING WITH TWO FORCED EDGES

Input: A popular matching instance and a set F of two edges.

Question: Does there exist a popular matching M with $F \subseteq M$?

We can assume without loss of generality that F is a matching, as otherwise no matching can contain F . Let $\mathcal{I} = (G = (A \cup B, E), (\succ_v)_{v \in A \cup B}, F)$ be an instance of this problem.

Construction. We replace each forced edge $e = \{u, z\} \in F$, where $u \in A$ and $z \in B$, by an edge gadget. The edge gadget contains ten vertices $b_u^1, b_u^2, b_u^3, a_u^1, a_u^2$ and $a_z^1, a_z^2, a_z^3, b_z^1$, and b_z^2 , as depicted in Figure 2, and it is asymmetric in u and z . We set $w(v) = 1$ for all $v \in A \cup B$, $w(b_u^i) = 4 = w(a_z^i)$, $w(a_u^1) = 1$, $w(a_u^2) = 2$, and $w(b_z^i) = 1$. We call the resulting instance \mathcal{J} .

Note that all agents outside the two edge gadgets have weight one, while each edge gadget contains one agent of weight two and six agents of weight four. Thus, all but 14 vertices have weight one, and the remaining vertices have weight two or four.

We define a “projection” π from any matching $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ in \mathcal{I} (which may contain 0, 1, or 2 forced edges) to some matching in \mathcal{J} via

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(M_{\mathcal{I}}) := & (M_{\mathcal{I}} \setminus F) \cup \{ \{a_u^2, b_u^2\}, \{a_u^1, b_u^3\}, \{a_z^2, b_z^2\}, \{a_z^3, b_z^1\} : \{u, z\} \in F \} \cup \\ & \{ \{u, b_u^1\}, \{a_z^1, z\} : \{u, z\} \in F \cap M_{\mathcal{I}} \} \cup \{ \{a_z^1, b_u^1\} : \{u, z\} \in F \setminus M_{\mathcal{I}} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, given a matching $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ in \mathcal{I} , the function π computes an “equivalent” matching $\pi(M_{\mathcal{I}})$ in the instance \mathcal{J} . Equivalent here means that a matching $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ containing both forced edges is popular if and only if $\pi(M_{\mathcal{I}})$ is popular, which we will prove later, in Claims 3 and 4. Furthermore, we define a “projection” ρ from each matching $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ in \mathcal{J} to some matching in \mathcal{I} via $\rho(M_{\mathcal{J}}) = (M_{\mathcal{J}} \cap E(\mathcal{I})) \cup \{\{u, z\} \in F : \{u, b_u^1\} \in M_{\mathcal{J}} \wedge \{a_z^1, z\} \in M_{\mathcal{J}}\}$. Intuitively, ρ is the inverse of π . Given a matching $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ in \mathcal{J} , matching $\rho(M_{\mathcal{J}})$ is popular in \mathcal{I} if and only if $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ is popular in \mathcal{J} , as we will see later. Note that $\rho(\pi(M_{\mathcal{I}})) = M_{\mathcal{I}}$ for any matching $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ in \mathcal{I} .

Before proving the correctness of the reduction, we present two helpful claims. First, we show that for every matching $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ in \mathcal{I} containing the forced edges, in order to show popularity of $\pi(M_{\mathcal{I}})$ it is sufficient to compare $\pi(M_{\mathcal{I}})$ with $\pi(M'_{\mathcal{I}})$ for every matching $M'_{\mathcal{I}} \in \mathcal{I}$.

Claim 1. *Let $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a matching in \mathcal{I} containing both forced edges, and $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ be any matching in \mathcal{J} . Let $X := \{b_u^i, a_z^i : i \in [3]\}$ and $Y := \{a_u^j, b_z^j : j \in [2]\}$ for a forced edge $\{u, z\}$. Then $X \cup Y$ does not prefer $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ to $M_{\mathcal{J}} := \pi(M_{\mathcal{I}})$.*

If $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ is more popular than $M_{\mathcal{J}}$, then in \mathcal{J} there exists a matching $M''_{\mathcal{J}}$ that is more popular than $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ and for each forced edge $\{u, z\}$, the matching $M''_{\mathcal{J}}$ contains either the edge $\{a_z^1, b_u^1\}$ or the edges $\{u, b_u^1\}$ and $\{a_z^1, z\}$.

Proof of Claim 1. First, we show that $X \cup Y$ does not prefer $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ to $M_{\mathcal{J}}$. In order to do so, we make a case distinction based on which edges are contained in $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Case 1: $\{a_z^1, b_u^1\} \in M'_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Then a_z^1 prefers $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ while b_u^1 prefers $M_{\mathcal{J}}$, and thus, their votes cancel out.

Case 1.1: $\{a_u^1, b_u^2\} \in M'_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Then a_u^1 and b_u^2 prefer $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$, while b_u^3 and a_u^2 prefer $M_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Case 1.2: $\{a_u^1, b_u^2\} \notin M'_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Then none of the vertices a_u^1, a_u^2, b_u^2 , and b_u^3 prefers $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$.

In each of Case 1.1 and Case 1.2, $\{a_u^1, a_u^2, b_u^2, b_u^3\}$ does not prefer $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ to $M_{\mathcal{J}}$. Symmetric arguments show that $\{a_z^2, a_z^3, b_z^1, b_z^2\}$ does not prefer $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$, and therefore, $X \cup Y$ does not prefer $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ to $M_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Case 2: $\{a_z^1, b_u^1\} \notin M'_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Then neither a_z^1 nor b_u^1 prefers $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ to $M_{\mathcal{J}}$. We first look at vertices $a_u^1, a_u^2, b_u^1, b_u^2$, and b_u^3 .

Case 2.1: $\{u, b_u^1\} \in M'_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Then we already saw in Case 1.1 that $\{a_u^1, a_u^2, b_u^2, b_u^3\}$ does not prefer $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ to $M_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Case 2.2: $\{u, b_u^1\} \notin M'_\mathcal{J}$.

Then b_u^1 prefers $M_\mathcal{J}$ to $M'_\mathcal{J}$. Note that b_u^2 can prefer $M'_\mathcal{J}$ to $M_\mathcal{J}$ only if $\{a_u^1, b_u^2\} \in M'_\mathcal{J}$, which implies that $M_\mathcal{J} \succ_{b_u^3} M'_\mathcal{J}$. Consequently, vertices b_u^1 , b_u^2 , and b_u^3 contribute to the vote for $M_\mathcal{J}$ by weight at least 4, while a_u^1 and a_u^2 only cast votes of summed weight 3. Therefore, $\{a_u^1, a_u^2, b_u^1, b_u^2, b_u^3\}$ does not prefer $M'_\mathcal{J}$ to $M_\mathcal{J}$.

Symmetric arguments show that also $\{a_z^1, a_z^2, a_z^3, b_z^1, b_z^2\}$ does not prefer $M'_\mathcal{J}$ to $M_\mathcal{J}$.

We now prove the second part of the claim. Let $\{u, z\}$ be a forced edge. If $M'_\mathcal{J}$ contains either $\{a_z^1, b_u^1\}$ or both of $\{u, b_u^1\}$ and $\{a_z^1, z\}$, then there is nothing to show. So assume that $M'_\mathcal{J}$ contains neither $\{a_z^1, b_u^1\}$ nor both of $\{u, b_u^1\}$ and $\{a_z^1, z\}$. We make a case distinction depending on what $M'_\mathcal{J}$ looks like. In each case, we will construct another matching $M''_\mathcal{J}$ which is also more popular than $M_\mathcal{J}$. In order to show that $M''_\mathcal{J}$ is more popular than $M_\mathcal{J}$, we will show that $\Delta^* := \Delta_w(M_\mathcal{J}, M''_\mathcal{J}) - \Delta_w(M_\mathcal{J}, M'_\mathcal{J}) \leq 0$. This implies that $\Delta_w(M_\mathcal{J}, M''_\mathcal{J}) = \Delta_w(M_\mathcal{J}, M'_\mathcal{J}) + \Delta^* \leq \Delta_w(M_\mathcal{J}, M'_\mathcal{J}) < 0$, i.e. that $M''_\mathcal{J}$ is more popular than $M_\mathcal{J}$.

Case 1: b_u^1 is unmatched in $M'_\mathcal{J}$.

Then the matching $M''_\mathcal{J}$ arising from $M'_\mathcal{J}$ by adding $\{a_z^1, b_u^1\}$ to $M'_\mathcal{J}$ (and possibly deleting an edge incident to a_z^1) is also more popular than $M_\mathcal{J}$: Agent b_u^1 prefers $M_\mathcal{J}$ to both $M'_\mathcal{J}$ and $M''_\mathcal{J}$, so b_u^1 contributes 0 to Δ^* . Agent a_z^1 prefers $M''_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1) = b_u^1$ to $M_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1) = z$ but does not prefer $M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)$ to $M_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)$. Thus, a_z^1 contributes at most $-w(a_z^1) = -4$ to Δ^* . Finally, $M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)$ can contribute at most $2w(M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)) = 2$ to Δ^* . Thus, we have $\Delta^* \leq -w(a_z^1) + 2w(M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)) = -2$.

Case 2: $M'_\mathcal{J}(b_u^1) = a_u^i$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Then there exists some $j \in \{2, 3\}$ such that b_u^j is unmatched in $M'_\mathcal{J}$. The matching $M''_\mathcal{J}$ arising from $M'_\mathcal{J}$ by adding $\{a_z^1, b_u^1\}$ and $\{a_u^i, b_u^j\}$ to $M'_\mathcal{J}$ (and possibly deleting an edge incident to a_z^1) results in a matching more popular than $M_\mathcal{J}$: Only b_u^1 , b_u^j , a_u^i , a_z^1 , and $M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)$ may vote differently between $M'_\mathcal{J}$ and $M_\mathcal{J}$ compared to their vote between $M''_\mathcal{J}$ and $M_\mathcal{J}$. Agent b_u^1 prefers $M_\mathcal{J}$ to both $M'_\mathcal{J}$ and $M''_\mathcal{J}$. Thus, $b_u^1 \in V^+(M_\mathcal{J}, M'_\mathcal{J})$ if and only if $b_u^1 \in V^+(M_\mathcal{J}, M''_\mathcal{J})$ implying that b_u^1 contributes 0 to Δ^* . Agent b_u^j is unmatched in $M'_\mathcal{J}$ and therefore prefers both $M''_\mathcal{J}$ and $M_\mathcal{J}$ to $M'_\mathcal{J}$. Thus, b_u^j contributes at most 0 to Δ^* . Agent a_u^i is matched to its last choice in $M_\mathcal{J}$ and thus does not prefer $M_\mathcal{J}$ to $M'_\mathcal{J}$ or $M''_\mathcal{J}$. Thus, a_u^i contributes at most $w(a_u^i) \leq 2$ to Δ^* . Agent a_z^1 prefers $M''_\mathcal{J}$ to $M_\mathcal{J}$. Therefore, a_z^1 contributes 0 to Δ^* if a_z^1 prefers $M'_\mathcal{J}$ to $M_\mathcal{J}$, $-w(a_z^1)$ if a_z^1 is indifferent between $M'_\mathcal{J}$ and $M_\mathcal{J}$, and $-2w(a_z^1)$ otherwise.

From here on, we consider two subcases.

Case 2.1: $\{a_z^1, z\} \in M'_\mathcal{J}$.

Then a_z^1 and z are indifferent between $M'_\mathcal{J}$ and $M_\mathcal{J}$. Thus, a_z^1 contributes $w(a_z^1) = -4$ to Δ^* and z contributes $w(z) = 1$ to Δ^* . Therefore, we have $\Delta^* \leq 2 - 4 + 1 = -1$.

Case 2.2: $\{a_z^1, z\} \notin M'_\mathcal{J}$.

Then a_z^1 prefers $M''_\mathcal{J}$ to $M_\mathcal{J}$ but prefers $M_\mathcal{J}$ to $M'_\mathcal{J}$. Thus, a_z^1 contributes $-2w(a_z^1) = 8$ to Δ^* . Agent $M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)$ can have arbitrary preferences between $M'_\mathcal{J}$, $M''_\mathcal{J}$, and $M_\mathcal{J}$ and hence $M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)$ contributes at most $2w(M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)) = 2$ to Δ^* . Thus, we have $\Delta^* \leq w(a_u^1) - 2w(a_z^1) + 2w(M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)) \leq 2 - 8 + 2 = -4$.

Case 3: $M'_\mathcal{J}$ contains $\{u, b_u^1\}$.

Then the matching $M''_\mathcal{J}$ arising from $M'_\mathcal{J}$ by adding $\{a_z^1, b_u^1\}$ to $M'_\mathcal{J}$ (and deleting $\{u, b_u^1\}$ as well as possibly an edge incident to a_z^1) is also more popular than $M_\mathcal{J}$: Agent b_u^1 is indifferent between $M_\mathcal{J}$ and $M'_\mathcal{J}$ but prefers $M_\mathcal{J}$ to $M''_\mathcal{J}$. Thus, b_u^1 contributes $w(b_u^1)$ to Δ^* . Agent a_z^1 prefers $M''_\mathcal{J}$ to $M_\mathcal{J}$ but prefers $M_\mathcal{J}$ to $M'_\mathcal{J}$. Thus, a_z^1 contributes $-2w(a_z^1)$ to Δ^* . Agent $M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)$ (respectively $M'_\mathcal{J}(b_u^1) = u$) contributes at most $2w(M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1))$ (respectively $2w(M'_\mathcal{J}(b_u^1)) = 2$) to Δ^* . Consequently, we have $\Delta^* \leq -2w(a_z^1) + w(b_u^1) + 2w(M'_\mathcal{J}(a_z^1)) + 2w(M'_\mathcal{J}(b_u^1)) = 0$ (using $w(M'_\mathcal{J}(b_u^1)) = 1$ as $M'_\mathcal{J}(b_u^1) = u$ for the last equality). \blacksquare

We now show that “projecting” two matchings $M_\mathcal{I}$ and $M'_\mathcal{I}$ from \mathcal{I} to \mathcal{J} via π does not influence whether $M_\mathcal{I}$ is more popular than $M'_\mathcal{I}$ or not. This will be used to prove that for a popular matching $M_\mathcal{J}$ in \mathcal{J} , matching $\rho(M_\mathcal{J})$ is popular in \mathcal{I} .

Claim 2. *For any two matchings $M_\mathcal{I}$ and $M'_\mathcal{I}$ in \mathcal{I} , we have $\Delta(M_\mathcal{I}, M'_\mathcal{I}) = \Delta_w(\pi(M_\mathcal{I}), \pi(M'_\mathcal{I}))$.*

Proof of Claim 2. Consider a forced edge $\{u, z\}$ that appears in $M_\mathcal{I}$, but not in $M'_\mathcal{I}$. Then $\pi(M_\mathcal{I}) \succ_{b_u^1} \pi(M'_\mathcal{I})$ and $\pi(M'_\mathcal{I}) \succ_{a_z^1} \pi(M_\mathcal{I})$ hold. Similarly, if the forced edge $\{u, z\}$ is contained in $M'_\mathcal{I}$, but not in $M_\mathcal{I}$, then $\pi(M'_\mathcal{I}) \succ_{b_u^1} \pi(M_\mathcal{I})$ and $\pi(M_\mathcal{I}) \succ_{a_z^1} \pi(M'_\mathcal{I})$ hold.

Since b_u^1 and a_z^1 have the same weight, and all other vertices are matched identically in $M_\mathcal{I}$ and $M'_\mathcal{I}$, the claim follows. \blacksquare

Correctness. We are now ready to prove the correctness of the reduction.

Claim 3. *For each $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ in \mathcal{I} that is a popular matching containing the set F of forced edges, there is a popular matching in \mathcal{J} .*

Proof of Claim 3. Let $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a popular matching in \mathcal{I} containing the set F of forced edges. We claim that $M_{\mathcal{J}} := \pi(M_{\mathcal{I}})$ is popular in \mathcal{J} . Assume for a contradiction that $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ is less popular than a matching $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$. By Claim 1, we may assume that for each forced edge $\{u, z\}$, matching $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ contains either edges $\{u, b_u^1\}$ and $\{a_z^1, z\}$ or edge $\{a_z^1, b_z^1\}$. We define $M'_{\mathcal{I}} := \rho(M'_{\mathcal{J}})$, and claim that $M'_{\mathcal{I}}$ is more popular than $M_{\mathcal{I}}$, a contradiction to the popularity of $M_{\mathcal{I}}$.

Since $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ contains either edges $\{u, b_u^1\}$ and $\{a_z^1, z\}$ or edge $\{a_z^1, b_z^1\}$ for every forced edge $\{u, z\}$, every vertex in $A \cup B$ votes between $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ and $M'_{\mathcal{I}}$ the same as between $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ and $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$. Furthermore, the set S of vertices from the edge gadget do not prefer $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ to $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ by Claim 1. It follows that the vertices in V prefer $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ to $M_{\mathcal{J}}$, and thus, $M'_{\mathcal{I}}$ is more popular than $M_{\mathcal{I}}$. ■

Claim 4. *For each popular matching $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ in \mathcal{J} , there is a popular matching in \mathcal{I} that contains the set F of forced edges.*

Proof of Claim 4. Let $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ be a popular matching in \mathcal{J} . We first show by case distinction that for each forced edge $\{u, z\} \in F$, matching $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ contains edges $\{u, b_u^1\}$ and $\{a_z^1, z\}$. We assume for a contradiction that $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ does not contain these edges, and distinguish three cases. For each of the three cases, we construct a more popular matching, contradicting the popularity of $M_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Case 1: Vertex b_u^1 is matched neither to u nor to a_z^1 .

In this case, we construct a more popular matching $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ by replacing the edges $\{a_u^1, M_{\mathcal{J}}(a_u^1)\}$ and $\{a_u^2, M_{\mathcal{J}}(a_u^2)\}$ by the edges $\{a_u^1, M_{\mathcal{J}}(a_u^2)\}$ and $\{a_u^2, b_u^j\}$, where b_u^j is unmatched in $M_{\mathcal{J}}$. The matching $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ is more popular than $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ as b_u^j and $M_{\mathcal{J}}(a_u^2)$ prefer $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ while at most $M_{\mathcal{J}}(a_u^1)$, vertices a_u^1 and a_u^2 prefer $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ to $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$, and it holds that $w(b_u^j) + w(M_{\mathcal{J}}(a_u^2)) = 8 > w(M_{\mathcal{J}}(a_u^1)) + w(a_u^1) + w(a_u^2) = 7$.

Case 2: Vertex a_z^1 is matched neither to z nor to b_u^1 .
This case is symmetric to Case 1.

Case 3: Vertex b_u^1 is matched to a_z^1 .

In this case, we construct a matching $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ from $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ by matching b_u^1 to a_u^2 , and a_u^1 to $M_{\mathcal{J}}(a_u^2)$. Matching $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$ is more popular than $M_{\mathcal{J}}$, because

- vertices $M_{\mathcal{J}}(a_u^2)$, b_u^1 , and a_u^2 prefer $M'_{\mathcal{J}}$, while at most a_z^1 , vertex b_u^j for at most one $j \in \{2, 3\}$, and a_u^1 prefer $M_{\mathcal{J}}$,
- and $w(b_u^1) = w(a_z^1) = w(M_{\mathcal{J}}(a_u^2)) = w(b_u^j)$, and $w(a_u^2) > w(a_u^1)$.

Thus, $M_{\mathcal{I}} := \rho(M_{\mathcal{J}})$ contains every forced edge. It remains to show that $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ is popular. For a contradiction, assume that $M'_{\mathcal{I}}$ is more popular than $M_{\mathcal{I}}$. We claim that $M'_{\mathcal{J}} := \pi(M'_{\mathcal{I}})$ wins against $M_{\mathcal{J}}$, contradicting the popularity of $M_{\mathcal{J}}$.

For every forced edge $\{u, z\}$, matching $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ has to contain the edges $\{a_u^2, b_u^2\}$ and $\{a_u^1, b_u^3\}$, as otherwise matching b_u^1 and b_u^2 along these edges yields a more popular matching. Similarly, $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ contains edges $\{a_z^2, b_z^2\}$ and $\{a_z^3, b_z^1\}$ or edges $\{a_z^2, b_z^1\}$ and $\{a_z^3, b_z^2\}$ as otherwise $M_{\mathcal{J}}$ would not be popular. In both cases, the votes of a_z^2 , a_z^3 , b_z^1 , and b_z^2 sum up to zero. Thus, by the same arguments as in the proof of Claim 2, we have $0 < \Delta_w(M'_{\mathcal{I}}, M_{\mathcal{I}}) = \Delta_w(M'_{\mathcal{J}}, M_{\mathcal{J}})$ (using that $M'_{\mathcal{I}}$ is more popular than $M_{\mathcal{I}}$ for the inequality). This contradicts the popularity of $M_{\mathcal{J}}$. \blacksquare

This finishes the proof of Theorem 8. \square

4.2. Identical weights on each side

We now consider the variant that all agents on one side have weight one while all agents on the other side have weight c for some $1 < c \leq 2$. To show that also this variant of POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS is NP-complete, we reduce from 3-SAT. As usual, the reduction is based on variable and clause gadgets. However, the reduction also uses another gadget which we call "6-path gadget" (one might view this gadget also as part of the variable gadgets). The idea behind the 6-path gadget is to ensure that the two solutions from the variable gadgets do not weakly dominate each other (where weak dominance is defined as in Section 5.2.2).

Theorem 9. *For any constant $1 < c \leq 2$, POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS is NP-complete even if $w(a) = c$ for all $a \in A$ and $w(b) = 1$ for all $b \in B$.*

Proof. Membership in NP was shown in Theorem 5. Fix a constant $1 < c \leq 2$. To show NP-hardness, we reduce from 3-SAT, the restriction of SATISFIABILITY to instances where every clause contains exactly three literals. Let X be the set of variables.

Construction. We first describe the 3 types of gadgets in our reduction.




Figure 3: The 6-path gadget (left) and the variable gadget for a variable x (right). Vertices in A are squared. Agent b_3 ranks the agents a_x ($x \in X$) from the variable gadgets at rank 1 to $|X|$. For concreteness, we assign rank 5 to the agent a_x in the above example.

6-path gadget. The 6-path gadget consists of a path on 6 vertices a_1 , a_2 , a_3 , b_1 , b_2 , and b_3 . The preferences of the vertices are described in Figure 3 (where vertices a_x for every $x \in X$ will be defined when describing variable gadgets).

Variable gadgets. An example of a variable gadget is depicted in Figure 3. The variable gadget for a variable x contains four vertices a_x , \bar{a}_x , b_x^t , and b_x^f . Vertex a_x as well as \bar{a}_x prefers b_x^t to b_x^f , and vertices b_x^t and b_x^f prefer a_x to \bar{a}_x . Intuitively, matching a_x to b_x^t (and therefore also \bar{a}_x to b_x^f) corresponds to setting variable x to **true**, while matching \bar{a}_x to b_x^t (and therefore also a_x to b_x^f) corresponds to setting variable x to **false**.

Every variable gadget is connected to the 6-path gadget via edge $\{a_x, b_3\}$, where a_x prefers both b_x^f and b_x^t to b_3 , and b_3 prefers a_x to a_3 (the preferences of b_3 between two vertices a_x and $a_{x'}$ are arbitrary).

Clause gadgets. An example of a clause gadget is depicted in Figure 4. A clause gadget for clause C contains twelve vertices a_k^C , \hat{a}_k^C , b_k^C , and \hat{b}_k^C for all $k \in [3]$. The preferences of these vertices over other vertices of the clause gadget are described in Figure 4. There are several popular matchings inside the depicted gadget. Our proof will use the following three popular matchings, indicating that the first, second, or third literal of the clause is

satisfied.

$$\begin{aligned}
M_1^C &= \left\{ \{\hat{a}_1^C, b_1^C\}, \{a_1^C, \hat{b}_1^C\}, \{\hat{a}_2^C, \hat{b}_2^C\}, \{a_2^C, b_2^C\}, \{\hat{a}_3^C, \hat{b}_3^C\}, \{a_3^C, b_3^C\} \right\} \\
M_2^C &= \left\{ \{\hat{a}_1^C, \hat{b}_1^C\}, \{a_1^C, b_1^C\}, \{\hat{a}_2^C, b_2^C\}, \{a_2^C, \hat{b}_2^C\}, \{\hat{a}_3^C, \hat{b}_3^C\}, \{a_3^C, b_3^C\} \right\} \\
M_3^C &= \left\{ \{\hat{a}_1^C, \hat{b}_1^C\}, \{a_1^C, b_1^C\}, \{\hat{a}_2^C, \hat{b}_2^C\}, \{a_2^C, b_2^C\}, \{\hat{a}_3^C, b_3^C\}, \{a_3^C, \hat{b}_3^C\} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

In Figure 4, these are marked by dotted, thick, and gray edges, in this order. Their three witnesses are shown next to the respective vertices, in green, red, and gray, in this order for M_1^C, M_2^C , and M_3^C . Intuitively, the k -th literal of clause C is selected to be satisfied if the popular matching contains edges $\{a_k^C, \hat{b}_k^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_k^C\}$, while a matching containing edges $\{a_i^C, b_i^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_i^C, \hat{b}_i^C\}$ poses no condition on whether the i -th literal is satisfied. The clause gadget is designed in such a way that it selects an arbitrary literal of the clause to be true.

We have that $A = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\} \cup \{a_x, \bar{a}_x : x \in X\} \cup \{a_k^C, \hat{a}_k^C : k \in [3], C \text{ clause}\}$ and $B = \{b_1, b_2, b_3\} \cup \{b_x^t, b_x^f : x \in X\} \cup \{b_k^C, \hat{b}_k^C : k \in [3], C \text{ clause}\}$ and set $w(a) := c$ for every $a \in A$ and $w(b) = 1$ for every $b \in B$.

Connection between variable and clause gadgets. We now describe the connection between variable and clause gadgets. We process the clauses in arbitrary order. Consider a clause C , and let y be the i -th literal in C . If y is a non-negated variable x , then we add edge $\{a_i^C, b_x^f\}$, where a_i^C inserts b_x^f directly after b_i^C in its preferences, and b_x^f appends a_i^C at the end of its preferences. Otherwise y is the negation $\neg x$ of some variable x . Then we add edge $\{\hat{a}_i^C, b_x^f\}$, where \hat{a}_i^C appends b_x^f at the end of its preferences and b_x^f inserts \hat{a}_i^C directly after a_x in its preferences. As an example, consider a variable x which appears in clauses $C_1 = x \vee \dots$, $C_2 = \neg x \vee \dots$, and $C_3 = x' \vee \neg x \vee x''$. Then the preferences of b_x^f are $a_x \succ \hat{a}_2^{C_3} \succ \hat{a}_1^{C_2} \succ \bar{a}_x \succ a_1^{C_1}$.

Having described our construction, we now turn to proving the correctness of the reduction.

Satisfying assignment implies popular matching. Let $f : X \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ be a satisfying assignment. We construct a popular matching M as follows. First, M contains edges $\{a_i, b_i\}$ for $i \in [3]$. For every variable $x \in X$ with $f(x) = \text{true}$, we add edges $\{a_x, b_x^t\}$ and $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^f\}$ to M , while for all other variables, we add edges $\{a_x, b_x^f\}$ and $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^t\}$. For every clause C , there is at least one literal that is satisfied by f . We fix one such literal x_C and define $k_C \in [3]$ to be the number such that x_C is the k_C -th literal in C . We




Figure 4: An example of a clause gadget for a clause $C = x \vee \neg y \vee z$. Vertices in A are squared. Matchings M_1 , M_2 , and M_3 are depicted by the dotted, bold, and gray edges, respectively. A witness for M_1 , M_2 , and M_3 are given by the green, red, and gray numbers, respectively.

add $M_{k_C}^C$ to M , i.e. we add edges $\{a_{k_C}^C, \hat{b}_{k_C}^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_{k_C}^C, b_{k_C}^C\}$ as well as edges $\{a_j^C, b_j^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_j^C, \hat{b}_j^C\}$ for $j \in [3] \setminus \{k_C\}$ to M .

Claim 5. M is popular.

Proof of Claim 5. We give a witness \mathbf{y} of M in Table 1. It remains to show that this is indeed a feasible witness. It is straightforward to verify that there is no conflicting edge inside any of the gadgets. For an edge $e = \{a_x, b_3\}$ between a variable and the 6-path gadget, we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) = 1 - c$. Since $\mathbf{y}_{a_x} \geq -1$, we have $\mathbf{y}_{a_x} + \mathbf{y}_{b_3} \geq -1 + 2 - c = 1 - c = \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e)$, and thus e is not conflicting. For an edge e between a variable and a clause gadget, we make a case distinction.

Case 1: $e = \{a_k^C, b_x^f\}$ for some clause C , $k \in [3]$, and $x \in X$.

In this case, the k -th literal of C is x .

Case 1.1: $k = k_C$ (and thus $x = x_C$).

Then $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) = c - 1$ and $\mathbf{y}_{a_k^C} = 1$. By the definition of k_C , we have $f(x) = \text{true}$ and thus $\mathbf{y}_{b_x^f} = 2 - c$. Thus, $\mathbf{y}_{a_k^C} + \mathbf{y}_{b_x^f} = 3 - c \geq c - 1 = \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e)$ using $c \leq 2$ for the inequality.

Case 1.2: $k \neq k_C$.

Then we have $M(a_k^C) = b_k^C$ and thus $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) = -c - 1$. Since $\mathbf{y}_{a_k^C} \geq -c$ and $\mathbf{y}_{b_x^f} \geq -1$, it follows that $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) \leq \mathbf{y}_{a_k^C} + \mathbf{y}_{b_x^f}$.

Case 2: $e = \{\hat{a}_k^C, b_x^f\}$ for some clause C , $k \in [3]$, and $x \in X$.

In this case, the k -th literal of C is $\neg x$.

Case 2.1: $k = k_C$ (and thus $x = x_C$).

By the definition of k_C , we have $f(x) = \text{false}$ and therefore $M(b_x^f) = a_x$. Thus, we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) = -c - 1$. Since $\mathbf{y}_{\hat{a}_k^C} \geq -c$ and $\mathbf{y}_{b_x^f} \geq -1$, we have $\mathbf{y}_{\hat{a}_k^C} + \mathbf{y}_{b_x^f} \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e)$.

Case 2.2: $k \neq k_C$.

Then we have $\mathbf{y}_{\hat{a}_k^C} \geq -1$. If $f(x) = \text{true}$, then $M(b_x^f) = \hat{a}_x$ and $\mathbf{y}_{b_x^f} = 2 - c$. Thus, we have $\mathbf{y}_{\hat{a}_k^C} + \mathbf{y}_{b_x^f} \geq -1 + 2 - c = 1 - c = \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e)$. If $f(x) = \text{false}$, then $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) = -c - 1 \leq \mathbf{y}_{\hat{a}_k^C} + \mathbf{y}_{b_x^f}$. ■

Popular matching implies satisfying assignment. Let M be a popular matching. We start with a technical observation we will frequently rely on in our proof.

Vertex	Value of \mathbf{y}	Vertex	Value of \mathbf{y}	Condition
a_1	$-c$	b_1	c	
a_2	-1	b_2	1	
a_3	$c-2$	b_3	$2-c$	
a_x	-1	b_x^t	1	$f(x) = \text{true}$
\bar{a}_x	$c-2$	b_x^f	$2-c$	
a_x	1	b_x^t	c	$f(x) = \text{false}$
\bar{a}_x	$-c$	b_x^f	-1	
\hat{a}_1^C	$-c$	\hat{b}_1^C	-1	$k_C = 1$
a_1^C	1	b_1^C	c	
\hat{a}_2^C	-1	\hat{b}_2^C	1	
a_2^C	$-c$	b_2^C	c	
\hat{a}_3^C	-1	\hat{b}_3^C	1	
a_3^C	$-c$	b_3^C	c	
\hat{a}_1^C	1	\hat{b}_1^C	-1	$k_C = 2$
a_1^C	$2-c$	b_1^C	$c-2$	
\hat{a}_2^C	$-c$	\hat{b}_2^C	-1	
a_2^C	1	b_2^C	c	
\hat{a}_3^C	1	\hat{b}_3^C	-1	
a_3^C	$2-c$	b_3^C	$c-2$	
\hat{a}_1^C	1	\hat{b}_1^C	-1	$k_C = 3$
a_1^C	$2-c$	b_1^C	$c-2$	
\hat{a}_2^C	-1	\hat{b}_2^C	1	
a_2^C	$-c$	b_2^C	c	
\hat{a}_3^C	$-c$	\hat{b}_3^C	-1	
a_3^C	1	b_3^C	c	

Table 1: A witness of M .

Observation 10. *In instances where $w(a) > 0$ for each $a \in A$ and $w(b_1) = w(b_2)$ for each $b_1, b_2 \in B$, each popular matching M covers every vertex $b \in B$ that is the first choice of some $a \in A$.*

Proof of Observation 10. If M leaves b unmatched, then $(M \setminus \{\{a, M(a)\}\}) \cup \{\{a, b\}\}$ is more popular than M , a contradiction to the popularity of M . ■

Notice that in our construction, the vertex weights are identical and positive on each side, and thus, each first-choice vertex must be matched in all popular matchings.

Claim 6. *Matching M contains edges $\{a_k, b_k\}$ for every $k \in [3]$.*

Proof of Claim 6. Observation 10 implies that b_1 and b_2 are matched in M . More specifically, M contains $\{a_1, b_1\}$ as otherwise $(M \setminus \{\{a_2, b_1\}\}) \cup \{\{a_1, b_1\}\}$ would be more popular than M . Further, M contains $\{a_2, b_2\}$ as otherwise $(M \setminus \{\{a_3, b_2\}\}) \cup \{\{a_2, b_2\}\}$ would be more popular than M . Assume for a contradiction that M does not contain $\{a_3, b_3\}$. Then a_3 is unmatched. If b_3 was also unmatched, then $M \cup \{\{a_3, b_3\}\}$ would be more popular than M , so we must have $\{a_x, b_3\} \in M$ for some variable $x \in X$. Then $(M \setminus \{\{a_x, b_3\}, \{\bar{a}_x, b_x^t\}\}) \cup \{\{a_3, b_3\}, \{a_x, b_x^t\}\}$ (note that b_x^t is either unmatched or matched to \bar{a}_x) is more popular than M , a contradiction. Thus, M contains $\{a_3, b_3\}$. ■

Claim 7. *M contains edges $\{a_x, b_x^t\}$ and $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^f\}$ or edges $\{a_x, b_x^f\}$ and $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^t\}$ for every variable $x \in X$.*

Proof of Claim 7. Assume for a contradiction that the claim does not hold for a variable $x \in X$. Due to the maximality of M and to Claim 6, M contains edge $\{a_k^C, b_x^f\}$ or $\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_x^f\}$ for some clause C and $k \in [3]$. Observation 10 implies that a_x is matched as it is the first choice of b_x^t . By Claim 6, a_x is not matched to b_3 and as b_x^f is matched to a_k^C or \hat{a}_k^C for some clause C and $k \in [3]$, it follows that a_x is matched to b_x^t . Consequently, \bar{a}_x is unmatched as it is matched neither to b_x^t nor to b_x^f . We will now show that there exists an alternating path starting in \bar{a}_x such that augmenting M with this path results in a matching more popular than M . If M contains $\{a_k^C, b_x^f\}$, then $(M \setminus \{\{a_k^C, b_x^f\}\}) \cup \{\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^f\}\}$ is more popular than M , contradicting the popularity of M . Thus, M contains $\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_x^f\}$. If b_k^C or \hat{b}_k^C was unmatched (call this unmatched vertex b), then $(M \setminus \{\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_x^f\}\}) \cup \{\{a_k^C, b\}\}$ would be more popular than M , contradicting the popularity of M . Thus, M contains edges

$\{a_k^C, \hat{b}_k^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_{k-1}^C, b_k^C\}$ (interpreting $k-1$ modulo 3). By Observation 10, b_{k-1}^C is not unmatched. If $\{a_{k-1}^C, b_{k-1}^C\} \in M$, then

$$(M \setminus \{\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_x^f\}, \{\hat{a}_{k-1}^C, b_k^C\}, \{a_{k-1}^C, b_{k-1}^C\}\}) \cup \\ \{\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^f\}, \{\hat{a}_k^C, b_k^C\}, \{\hat{a}_{k-1}^C, b_{k-1}^C\}, \{a_{k-1}^C, \hat{b}_{k-1}^C\}\}$$

is more popular than M , contradicting the popularity of M . Thus, we have $\{\hat{a}_{k-2}^C, b_{k-1}^C\} \in M$ (also interpreting $k-2$ modulo 3). Then one of b_{k-2}^C and \hat{b}_{k-2}^C is unmatched and we call the unmatched vertex b . Then

$$(M \setminus \{\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_x^f\}, \{\hat{a}_{k-1}^C, b_k^C\}, \{\hat{a}_{k-2}^C, b_{k-1}^C\}\}) \cup \\ \{\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^f\}, \{\hat{a}_k^C, b_k^C\}, \{\hat{a}_{k-1}^C, b_{k-1}^C\}, \{\hat{a}_{k-2}^C, b\}\}$$

is more popular than M , contradicting the popularity of M . ■

Claim 8. M does not contain edge $\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_{k+1}^C\}$ for any clause C and any $k \in [3]$ (where $k+1$ is taken modulo 3).

Proof of Claim 8. Assume for a contradiction that M contains $\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_{k+1}^C\}$ for some $k \in [3]$. If M contains $\{\hat{a}_i^C, b_{i+1}^C\}$ for every $i \in [3]$ (considering $i+1$ modulo 3), then $(M \setminus \{\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_{k+1}^C\}, \{\hat{a}_{k-1}^C, b_k^C\}, \{\hat{a}_{k+1}^C, b_{k-1}^C\}\}) \cup \{\{\hat{a}_i^C, b_i^C\} : i \in [3]\}$ is more popular than M , a contradiction. Thus, we may assume without loss of generality that M does not contain $\{\hat{a}_{k-1}^C, b_k^C\}$. By Observation 10, vertex b_k^C is not unmatched. Thus, we have $\{a_k^C, b_k^C\} \in M$ and \hat{b}_k^C is unmatched. If a_{k+1}^C or \hat{a}_{k+1}^C was unmatched (call this unmatched vertex a), then $(M \setminus \{\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_{k+1}^C\}, \{a_k^C, b_k^C\}\}) \cup \{\{a, b_{k+1}^C\}, \{\hat{a}_k^C, b_k^C\}, \{a_k^C, \hat{b}_k^C\}\}$ would be more popular than M , contradicting the popularity of M . Thus, using Claim 7, M contains edges $\{a_{k+1}^C, \hat{b}_{k+1}^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_{k+1}^C, b_{k-1}^C\}$. Using Claim 7, one of a_{k-1}^C or \hat{a}_{k-1}^C is unmatched (call this unmatched vertex a^*). Then

$$(M \setminus \{\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_{k+1}^C\}, \{a_k^C, b_k^C\}, \{\hat{a}_{k+1}^C, b_{k-1}^C\}\}) \cup \\ \{\{a^*, b_{k-1}^C\}, \{\hat{a}_{k+1}^C, b_{k+1}^C\}, \{\hat{a}_k^C, b_k^C\}, \{a_k^C, \hat{b}_k^C\}\}$$

is more popular than M , a contradiction to the popularity of M . ■

Claim 9. For every clause C , there exists some $k \in [3]$ such that matching M contains edges $\{a_k^C, \hat{b}_k^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_k^C\}$.

Proof of Claim 9. From the fact that every popular matching is maximal and from Claims 7 and 8 follows that M contains either edges $\{a_i^C, b_i^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_i^C, \hat{b}_i^C\}$ or edges $\{a_i^C, \hat{b}_i^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_i^C, b_i^C\}$ for every $i \in [3]$. So assume for a contradiction that M contains $\{a_i^C, b_i^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_i^C, \hat{b}_i^C\}$ for every $i \in [3]$. Then

$$(M \setminus \{\{a_i^C, b_i^C\}, \{\hat{a}_i^C, \hat{b}_i^C\} : i \in [3]\}) \cup \\ \{\{\hat{a}_1^C, b_2^C\}, \{a_1^C, \hat{b}_1^C\}, \{\hat{a}_2^C, b_3^C\}, \{a_2^C, \hat{b}_2^C\}, \{\hat{a}_3^C, b_1^C\}, \{a_3^C, \hat{b}_3^C\}\}$$

is more popular than M , a contradiction to the popularity of M . \blacksquare

Claim 10. *Assume that M contains edges $\{a_k^C, \hat{b}_k^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_k^C\}$ for some clause C and some $k \in [3]$. If the k -th literal of C is x for a variable $x \in X$, then M contains $\{a_x, b_x^t\}$ and $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^f\}$. If the k -th literal of C is $\neg x$ for a variable $x \in X$, then M contains $\{a_x, b_x^f\}$ and $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^t\}$.*

Proof of Claim 10. First assume that the k -th literal of C is x but M does not contain edges $\{a_x, b_x^t\}$ and $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^f\}$. By Claim 7, M contains edges $\{a_x, b_x^f\}$ and $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^t\}$. Then $(M \setminus \{\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^t\}, \{a_x, b_x^f\}, \{a_k^C, \hat{b}_k^C\}\}) \cup \{\{a_x, b_x^t\}, \{a_k^C, b_k^f\}\}$ is more popular than M , a contradiction to the popularity of M .

Now assume that the k -th literal of C is $\neg x$ but M does not contain edges $\{a_x, b_x^f\}$ and $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^t\}$. By Claim 7, M contains edges $\{a_x, b_x^t\}$ and $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^f\}$. Then $(M \setminus \{\{a_1, b_1\}, \{a_2, b_2\}, \{a_3, b_3\}, \{a_x, b_x^t\}, \{\bar{a}_x, b_x^f\}, \{a_k^C, \hat{b}_k^C\}, \{\bar{a}_k^C, b_k^C\}\}) \cup \{\{a_2, b_1\}, \{a_3, b_2\}, \{a_x, b_3\}, \{\bar{a}_x, b_x^t\}, \{\hat{a}_k^C, b_x^f\}, \{a_k^C, b_k^C\}\}$ is more popular than M , a contradiction to the popularity of M . \blacksquare

Claim 11. *Any popular matching implies a satisfying assignment.*

Proof of Claim 11. Let M be a popular matching. By Claim 7, for each variable x , matching M contains either $\{a_x, b_x^t\}$ and $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^f\}$, or the edges $\{\bar{a}_x, b_x^t\}$ and $\{a_x, b_x^f\}$. In the former case, we set the variable to **true**, while we set the variable to **false** in the latter case. It remains to show that every clause is satisfied by one variable. By Claim 9, for every clause C , there is some $k \in [3]$ such that $\{a_k^C, \hat{b}_k^C\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_k^C, b_k^C\}$ are in M . By Claim 10, it follows that the k -th literal of C is satisfied. \blacksquare

With this we have finished the proof of Theorem 9. \square

Note that except for Case 1.1 in the proof of Claim 5, the whole proof works for all $1 < c \leq 3$. The condition $c \leq 3$ is used in the 6-path gadget: if $c > 3$, then the 6-path gadget does not admit a popular matching and thus

the whole constructed instance does not have a popular matching (the given witness \mathbf{y} would not be feasible because $\mathbf{y}_{b_3} = 2 - c < -1$ for $c > 3$).

Remark 11. *Reducing from a restricted version of 3-SAT where every variable appears at most three times and making one copy the 6-path gadget for every variable gadget, the hardness also extends to graphs of maximum degree five.*

4.3. Maximum-Utility popular matchings

In Section 5, we will show that POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS can be solved in linear time if all agents from A have weight c for some $c > 3$ while all agents from B have weight 1. In this problem, the input additionally contains a function $\omega : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ on the edges, and the goal is to find a popular matching maximizing $\sum_{e \in M} \omega(e)$ among all popular matchings. We show that the resulting problem is hard even to approximate by a reduction from INDEPENDENT SET. Note that this is in sharp contrast to the 2-approximation for the unit-vertex-weight case [19] and also with the optimal house allocation case with weighted voters, for which the results of Mestre [34] and McDermid and Irving [33] imply that an optimal popular matching can be computed in polynomial time.

Theorem 12. *Even if $w(a) = c > 3$ for all $a \in A$, $w(b) = 1$ for all $b \in B$, and every edge $e \in E$ has weight 0 or 1, approximating a maximum edge-weight popular matching by a factor of $O(n^{1-\epsilon})$ is NP-hard for any $\epsilon > 0$.*

Proof. Fix a constant $c > 3$. We reduce from INDEPENDENT SET. The input (G, ℓ) consists of a graph G and an integer ℓ , while the goal is to decide whether G has an independent vertex set of size ℓ . Zuckerman [42] showed that this problem cannot be approximated within $O(|V(G)|^{1-\epsilon})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, unless $\text{P} = \text{NP}$. To simplify notation in our reduction, we fix an arbitrary orientation for each edge in G .

Construction. For each $v \in V(G)$, we add a 4-cycle containing vertices a_v, \hat{a}_v, b_v , and \hat{b}_v —not unlike in the variable gadget in Theorem 9. For each edge $e = \{u, z\} \in E(G)$, we fix an orientation (u, z) and add the edge $\{\hat{a}_z, \hat{b}_u\}$. The preferences are depicted in Figure 5. We have $A = \{a_v, \hat{a}_v : v \in V(G)\}$ and $B = \{b_v, \hat{b}_v : v \in V(G)\}$. We set $w(a) = c$ for every $a \in A$ and $w(b) = 1$ for every $b \in B$. For every $v \in V(G)$, we set $\omega(\{a_v, \hat{b}_v\}) := 1$, while for all other edges e we set $\omega(e) = 0$.

Correctness. We now prove the correctness of the above reduction.




Figure 5: An example instance constructed from the triangle on the left in the proof of Theorem 12. Squared brackets denote an arbitrary ordering of the corresponding vertices. The set of edges leaving v is denoted by $\delta^-(v)$, while the set of edges entering v is denoted by $\delta^+(v)$. Thick edges mark the popular matching corresponding to the independent vertex set $\{v\}$.

Claim 12. *If G has an independent set of size ℓ , then there exists a popular matching M with $\omega(M) = \sum_{e \in M} \omega(e) \geq \ell$.*

Proof of Claim 12. Let X be an independent set of size ℓ . Consider matching $M := \{\{a_v, b_v\}, \{\hat{a}_v, \hat{b}_v\} : v \in V(G) \setminus X\} \cup \{\{a_v, \hat{b}_v\}, \{\hat{a}_v, b_v\} : v \in X\}$. Clearly, $\omega(M) = \ell$, so it remains to show that M is popular. We define a witness \mathbf{y} of M in Table 2.

Vertex	Value of \mathbf{y}	Vertex	Value of \mathbf{y}	Condition
a_v	$-c$	b_v	c	$v \in V(G) \setminus X$
\hat{a}_v	-1	\hat{b}_v	1	
a_v	1	b_v	c	$v \in X$
\hat{a}_v	$-c$	\hat{b}_v	-1	

Table 2: A witness of M .

Consider an edge $e = \{\hat{a}_v, \hat{b}_z\}$ with $v \neq z$. Then $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e) = 1 - c$. If $v \notin X$, then $\mathbf{y}_{\hat{a}_v} + \mathbf{y}_{\hat{b}_v} \geq -1 - 1 = -2 \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e)$ as $c > 3$. Otherwise we have $z \notin X$ (as X is an independent set) and consequently, $\mathbf{y}_{a_v} + \mathbf{y}_{\hat{b}_z} = -c + 1 = \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e)$. Thus, e is not conflicting. It is straightforward to verify that for every $v \in V(G)$, none of the edges $\{a_v, b_v\}$, $\{a_v, \hat{b}_v\}$, $\{\hat{a}_v, b_v\}$, and $\{\hat{a}_v, \hat{b}_v\}$ is conflicting. Thus, M is a popular matching. ■

Claim 13. *No popular matching contains an edge $\{\hat{a}_v, \hat{b}_z\}$ for $z \neq v$.*

Proof of Claim 13. For every $v \in V(G)$, we have that $f(\hat{a}_v) = b_v$ and $s(\hat{a}_v) = \hat{b}_v$. Lemma 18 and Theorem 2 imply that for any vertex $v \in V$, any popular matching contains $\{\hat{a}_v, b_v\}$ or $\{\hat{a}_v, \hat{b}_v\}$. Consequently, no popular matching can contain edge $\{\hat{a}_v, \hat{b}_z\}$ for $z \neq v$. ■

Claim 14. *If there exists a popular matching M with $\omega(M) = \sum_{e \in M} \omega(e) \geq \ell$, then G admits an independent set of size ℓ .*

Proof of Claim 14. Let $X := \{v \in V(G) : \{a_v, \hat{b}_v\} \in M\}$. Clearly $|X| \geq \ell$, so it is enough to show that X is an independent set. Assume for a contradiction that there exists an edge $e = (v, z) \in E(G)$ with $v \in X$ and $z \in X$. By Claim 13 and the fact that every popular matching is maximal, matching M contains edges $\{\hat{a}_v, b_v\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_z, b_z\}$. Then

$$M' := (M \setminus \{\{\hat{a}_v, b_v\}, \{a_v, \hat{b}_v\}, \{a_z, \hat{b}_z\}, \{\hat{a}_z, b_z\}\}) \cup \{\{a_v, b_v\}, \{\hat{a}_z, \hat{b}_v\}, \{a_z, b_z\}\}$$

is more popular than M (because a_v, a_z, b_v, b_z , and \hat{b}_v prefer M' while only \hat{a}_v, \hat{a}_z , and \hat{b}_z prefer M), a contradiction to the popularity of M . ■

The correctness of the reduction follows from Claims 12 and 14 and the corresponding hardness result for INDEPENDENT SET [42]. This finishes the proof of Theorem 12. □

5. Algorithm for different weights for A and B

Following up on Theorems 9 and 12, we now consider the case that all vertices from one side of the bipartition have a weight $c > 3$ while all vertices from the other side of the bipartition have weight 1. The main result of this section is that this restricted variant of POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS is solvable in polynomial time if $c > 3$. Before we describe the algorithm, we show some structural properties for the witnesses of popular matchings.

5.1. Structural properties of witnesses

We now restrict the value domain of possible witnesses. This technique has been used by Kavitha [43] upon defining truly popular matchings for non-bipartite instances.

Given an edge $e = \{a, b\} \in E$, we call a witness \mathbf{y} of a popular matching M *tight on e* if and only if $\mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_b = \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(e)$. It follows from complementary slackness that every witness is tight on every edge contained in some popular matching.

Lemma 13. *Let e be an edge which is contained in a popular matching M^* . For any popular matching M with witness \mathbf{y} , we have that \mathbf{y} is tight on e .*

Proof. Let P and D be the primal LP (1) and dual LP (2) from Theorem 6 for M . Because both M and M^* are popular, it holds that $\Delta_w(M, M^*) = 0$. Thus, we have that M^* is an optimal solution for P . The statement now follows from complementary slackness (complementary slackness states that for every optimal solutions \mathbf{x} to a primal LP, in any optimal solution to the dual LP the inequality corresponding to any non-zero variable in \mathbf{x} must be tight, i.e. fulfilled with equality; see e.g. [41, Equation 5.13]). □

We observe the following direct consequences of Lemma 13:

Observation 14. *Let \mathbf{y} be a witness of a popular matching M . Then $\mathbf{y}_a = -\mathbf{y}_b$ for every $\{a, b\} \in M$. Further, $\mathbf{y}_a \leq 1$ for every $a \in A$ and $\mathbf{y}_b \leq c$ for every $b \in B$. For each unmatched agent v , we have $\mathbf{y}_v = 0$.*

Proof. For any edge $\{a, b\} \in M$, applying Lemma 13 to the inequality $\mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_b \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\}) = 0$ implies $\mathbf{y}_a = -\mathbf{y}_b$. Using this, the inequalities $\mathbf{y}_a \geq -c$ and $\mathbf{y}_b \geq -1$ now imply $\mathbf{y}_b \leq c$ and $\mathbf{y}_a \leq 1$. It remains to consider unmatched agents. Note that $0 \geq \sum_{v \in V} \mathbf{y}_v = \sum_{\{a, b\} \in M} (\mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_b) + \sum_{v \in V: M(v)=\perp} \mathbf{y}_v = \sum_{v \in V: M(v)=\perp} \mathbf{y}_v$. As $\mathbf{y}_v \geq 0$ for every unmatched $v \in V$ (as $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{v, v\}) = 0$), it follows that $\mathbf{y}_v = 0$ for every unmatched $v \in V$. \square

Next, we prove that for each popular matching, there exists a witness taking one of only six possible values at each vertex. More precisely, we can find a witness \mathbf{y} with $\mathbf{y}_a \in R^a := \{-c, 1 - c, 2 - c, -1, 0, 1\}$ for all $a \in A$ and $\mathbf{y}_b \in R^b := \{-1, 0, 1, c - 2, c - 1, c\}$ for all $b \in B$. We call such a witness *nice*. The idea behind the proof of the existence of such a nice witness is that, given a witness \mathbf{y} , we can either increase \mathbf{y}_a by some $\varepsilon > 0$ for all $a \in A$ with \mathbf{y}_a being not nice (i.e. $\mathbf{y}_a \notin R^a$) and decrease \mathbf{y}_b by some $\varepsilon > 0$ for all $b \in B$ with $\mathbf{y}_b \notin R^b$, or decrease \mathbf{y}_a and increase \mathbf{y}_b , which results in another feasible witness that takes “nice” values at more vertices.

Lemma 15. *Let M be a popular matching. Then there exists a nice witness of M .*

Proof. For a vertex v , let R^v be the set of possible values of a nice witness at v , i.e. $R^v = \{-c, 1 - c, 2 - c, -1, 0, 1\}$ if $v \in A$ and $R^v = \{-1, 0, 1, c - 2, c - 1, c\}$ if $v \in B$. Let \mathbf{y} be a witness of M , and let $S(\mathbf{y})$ be the set of vertices v such that $\mathbf{y}_v \notin R^v$. We assume that \mathbf{y} is a witness minimizing the cardinality of $S(\mathbf{y})$. Assume for a contradiction that $S(\mathbf{y}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $v \in S(\mathbf{y})$ and $r \in R^v$ such that $|y_v - r|$ is minimized. Set $x := r - \mathbf{y}_v$.

First assume that $v \in A$. We construct a new witness \mathbf{y}' as follows: For each vertex $a \in A \cap S(\mathbf{y})$, we set $\mathbf{y}'_a := \mathbf{y}_a + x$, and for each vertex $b \in B \cap S(\mathbf{y})$, we set $\mathbf{y}'_b := \mathbf{y}_b - x$. Since $-c \in R^a$ for every $a \in A$ and $-1 \in R^b$ for every $b \in B$, the definition of x implies that $\mathbf{y}'_v \geq -w(v)$ for every $v \in V$. By Observation 14, we have $\mathbf{y}_u = 0 \in R^u$ for each unmatched vertex u . Again by Observation 14, a matched vertex u fulfills $\mathbf{y}_u \in R^u$ if and only if $\mathbf{y}_{M(u)} \in R^{M(u)}$, and therefore, $|A \cap S(\mathbf{y})| = |B \cap S(\mathbf{y})|$. Thus, we have $\sum_{v \in A \cup B} \mathbf{y}'_v = \sum_{v \in A \cup B} \mathbf{y}_v + x \cdot |A \cap S(\mathbf{y})| - x \cdot |B \cap S(\mathbf{y})| = 0$. For any edge $\{a, b\}$ with either $a, b \in S(\mathbf{y})$ or $a, b \notin S(\mathbf{y})$, we have $\mathbf{y}'_a + \mathbf{y}'_b = \mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_b$,

and thus, \mathbf{y}' also satisfies $\mathbf{y}'_a + \mathbf{y}'_b \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\})$. So assume that only one end vertex of edge $\{a, b\}$ is in $S(\mathbf{y})$. This implies $\{a, b\} \notin M$. Thus, we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\}) \in \{-c-1, 1-c, c-1, 1+c\}$. If $a \notin S(\mathbf{y})$, i.e. $\mathbf{y}_a \in R^a$, then (since $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\}) - \mathbf{y}_a \leq \mathbf{y}_b \leq c$ using Observation 14 for the last inequality) it follows that $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\}) - \mathbf{y}_a$ is either at most -1 or contained in $\{0, 1, c-2, c-1, c\}$. By the definition of x and because $b \in S(\mathbf{y})$, for any $r \in R^b$ with $\mathbf{y}_b \geq r$, we have $\mathbf{y}_b \geq r + |x|$. Since $-1, 0, 1, c-2, c-1$, and c are all contained in R^b , it follows from $\mathbf{y}_b \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\}) - \mathbf{y}_a$ that also $\mathbf{y}_b \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\}) - \mathbf{y}_a + |x|$. Since $|\mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_b - (\mathbf{y}'_a + \mathbf{y}'_b)| = |x|$, we have $\mathbf{y}'_a + \mathbf{y}'_b \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\})$. If $b \notin S(\mathbf{y})$, i.e. $\mathbf{y}_b \in R^b$, then (since $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\}) - \mathbf{y}_b \leq \mathbf{y}_a \leq 1$ using Observation 14 for the last inequality) it follows that $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\}) - \mathbf{y}_b$ is at most $-c$ or contained in $\{1-c, 2-c, -1, 0, 1\}$. Since $-c, 1-c, 2-c, -1, 0$, and 1 are all contained in R^a , it follows from $\mathbf{y}_a \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\}) - \mathbf{y}_b$ that also $\mathbf{y}_a \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\}) - \mathbf{y}_b + |x|$. Since $|\mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_b - (\mathbf{y}'_a + \mathbf{y}'_b)| = |x|$, we have $\mathbf{y}'_a + \mathbf{y}'_b \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b\})$. We have shown that \mathbf{y}' is a witness of M . Clearly, $S(\mathbf{y}') \subseteq S(\mathbf{y})$, and since $v \notin S(\mathbf{y}')$, it follows that $|S(\mathbf{y}')| < |S(\mathbf{y})|$, a contradiction.

The case $v \in B$ is symmetric. \square

We further classify nice witnesses depending on which values they attain to be *even* or *odd*.

Definition 16. *A witness containing only the values $-c, 2-c, -1, 1, c-2$, and c is odd. A witness containing only the values $1-c, 0$, and $c-1$ is even.*

Lemma 17. *Let M_1 and M_2 be popular matchings and C a connected component of $M_1 \triangle M_2$. Then every nice witness \mathbf{y} of M_1 on C is either even or odd.*

Proof. Since the witness is nice, it can only take values

$$-c, 1-c, 2-c, -1, 0, 1, c-2, c-1, c.$$

For any edge $\{a, b\} \in E(C)$ with $\{a, b\} \notin M_i$, we have that $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_i}(\{a, b\}) \in \{-c-1, 1-c, c-1, 1+c\}$. Fix a vertex $v \in V(C)$. If $\mathbf{y}_v \in \{-c, 2-c, -1, 1, c-2, c\}$, then Lemma 13 implies that $\mathbf{y}_u \in \{-c, 2-c, -1, 1, c-2, c\}$ for all neighbors $u \in N_C(v)$. By iterating this argument, it follows that \mathbf{y} is odd. Otherwise we have $\mathbf{y}_v \in \{1-c, 0, c-1\}$. Then Lemma 13 implies that $\mathbf{y}_u \in \{1-c, 0, c-1\}$ for all neighbors u of v , implying that \mathbf{y} is even. \square

5.2. The algorithm

Having shown structural properties of witnesses, we can now describe the algorithm.

Our algorithm consist of the following three stages. Each of these stages is illustrated on an example in Appendix A.

1. Pruning non-popular edges

We reduce the set of edges that may appear in a popular matching to two incident edges per vertex. This allows us to decompose the graph containing the edges that may appear in a popular matching into a disjoint union of paths and cycles.

2. Computing “local” witnesses

For each path or cycle component, we show that we can restrict ourselves to up to four possible “local” witnesses of popularity.

3. Constructing a “global” witness

Our algorithm greedily recognizes local witnesses that cannot be part of a global witness. At termination, we have either constructed a global witness and thus found a popular matching, or dismissed all local witnesses for one component. In the latter case, we conclude that no popular matching exists.

5.2.1. Pruning non-popular edges

We start by computing a subgraph of degree at most two at each vertex that contains every popular edge. First, we show that for every vertex $a \in A$, there are at most two other vertices to which a can be matched in a popular matching, namely $f(a)$ and $s(a)$. To do so, given an instance \mathcal{I} , we show that each popular matching is also popular in the instance \mathcal{I}' where the weight of each vertex in B is reduced to 0, while the rest of \mathcal{I}' equals \mathcal{I} . Since $w(a) = c$ for each $a \in A$, this modified instance is equivalent to a house allocation instance, for which there is a characterization of popular matchings that relies on $f(a)$ and $s(a)$ vertices, as presented in Theorem 2. We remark that this key lemma does not hold anymore when vertices from A may have different weights or weight smaller or equal to three.

Lemma 18. *Let \mathcal{I} be an instance of POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS such that $w(a) = c > 3$ for all $a \in A$ and $w(b) = 1$ for all $b \in B$. Any popular matching M in the instance \mathcal{I} is also popular in the instance \mathcal{I}' that arises from \mathcal{I} by setting $w(b) = 0$ for all $b \in B$.*

Proof. Let M be a popular matching in \mathcal{I} , and assume for a contradiction that there is a matching that is more popular than M in \mathcal{I}' . Then, by Theorem 2, there exists a vertex $a \in A$ not matched to its f -post while its f -post is unmatched, a vertex $a \in A$ not matched to its f -post $f(a)$ while $f(a)$ is matched to a vertex a' with $f(a') \neq f(a)$, or a vertex $a \in A$ matched neither to its f -post nor its s -post. In the first case, matching a to its f -post clearly results in a more popular matching. In the second case, matching a to its f -post $f(a)$ and a' to its f -post $f(a')$ (possibly breaking up the matching of $f(a')$) results in a more popular matching M' since a and a' prefer M' while at most one vertex in A , namely $M(f(a'))$, and three vertices in B , namely $M(a)$, $f(a)$, and $f(a')$, can prefer M . Consequently, the weight of agents preferring M' to M is $2c$ which is larger than the weight of agents preferring M to M' which is at most $c + 3$ (here we use $c > 3$). So assume that the third case applies and neither of the first two cases applies for any vertex. Note that this implies that a prefers $s(a)$ to $M(a)$. We construct a matching M^* more popular than M in \mathcal{I} from M by matching a to its s -post $s(a)$, and if $s(a)$ is matched by M to a vertex a' , then also matching a' to its f -post $f(a')$ (possibly breaking up the matching of $f(a')$). Note that $f(a') \neq s(a)$ by the definition of an s -post. Matching M^* is more popular matching M since a and a' prefer M^* while at most one vertex in A , namely $M(f(a'))$, and three vertices in B , namely $M(a)$, $s(a)$, and $f(a')$, can prefer M . Consequently, the weight of agents preferring M^* to M is $2c$ which is larger than the weight of agents preferring M to M^* which is at most $c + 3$ (here we use $c > 3$). \square

We define a subgraph $H^{\deg(A) \leq 2}$ of G that contains all edges of the form $\{a, f(a)\}$ or $\{a, s(a)\}$ for some $a \in A$ —no other edge can appear in a popular matching by Theorem 2 and Lemma 18. Our goal is to also restrict the degree of each vertex in B to at most two. We first briefly sketch the proof before giving the formal reduction and correctness proof. Consider a vertex $b \in B$ which is contained in a cycle C . Each vertex $a \in A \cap V(C)$ has to be matched along an edge from C by Lemma 18, and since $|B \cap V(C)| = |A \cap V(C)|$, it follows that every vertex from $b \in B \cap V(C)$ is also matched along an edge of C . Consequently, we can delete every edge incident to a vertex in C if this edge is not in $E(C)$. This reduces $H^{\deg(A) \leq 2}$ to a graph $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$ that is a disjoint union of cycles and trees. For every tree T , one can show that for every vertex $b \in B$, there are at most two edges incident to b that appear in a popular matching (see Claim 16 for the proof). For every component

of $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$ that is a tree, we can compute the set of edges contained in a popular matching (in the instance restricted to solely this tree) via bottom-up induction, resulting in a graph $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$, which contains every popular edge and whose maximum degree is two by claim 16. Therefore, $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ is a disjoint union of paths and cycles, and furthermore, every connected component of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ consists of two disjoint popular matchings. This finishes the proof sketch.

Lemma 19. *We can compute in $O(n+m)$ time a subgraph $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ of G such that $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ contains every popular edge, $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ is a disjoint union of paths and cycles, and every edge in $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ is contained in a popular matching in $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$.*

The proof of Lemma 19 consists of several steps. We start by reducing $H^{\deg(A)\leq 2}$ to a subgraph $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$ that contains every popular edge and whose connected components are trees or cycles. The basic idea here is that any edge incident to a cycle can be deleted as such an edge cannot be contained in a popular matching.

Claim 15. *Let H be the graph with edges $\{a, f(a)\}$ and $\{a, s(a)\}$ for all $a \in A$. For every cycle C in H , each popular matching M matches all vertices in C along edges of C , i.e. for every $v \in V(C)$ with $\{v, v_1\}$ and $\{v, v_2\} \in E(C)$, we have $M(v) = v_1$ or $M(v) = v_2$.*

Proof. If the statement is not true, then there exists a cycle C containing a vertex v that is unmatched or is matched via an edge $\{v, M(v)\} \notin E(C)$. Theorem 2 and Lemma 18 imply that $M(a) \in V(C)$ for every $a \in A \cap V(C)$. Since $|A \cap V(C)| = |B \cap V(C)|$, it follows that every vertex $b \in B \cap V(C)$ is matched to a vertex $a \in A \cap V(C)$. Since no edge $\{a, b\} \in E(G) \setminus E(C)$ with $a \in A \cap V(C)$ and $b \in B \cap V(C)$ can be part of a popular matching by Theorem 2 and Lemma 18, the claim follows. \square

Thus, we define $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$ to be the graph arising from $H^{\deg(A)\leq 2}$ by exhaustively deleting for every cycle $C \in H^{\deg(A)\leq 2}$ all edges incident to a vertex in $V(C)$ if they are not in $E(C)$. Note that $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$ consists of a disjoint union of cycles and trees. As our goal is to reach a graph that has maximum degree two, we now take care of high-degree vertices in $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$.

Claim 16. *For any vertex $v \in V(H^{C+\mathcal{T}})$, there are at most two edges incident to v that can appear in a popular matching in $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$.*

Proof. As every vertex in A has degree at most two, the lemma holds for every vertex in A .

So consider some $b \in B$. Assume for a contradiction that there are three popular matchings M_1 , M_2 , and M_3 such that b prefers $a_1 := M_1(b)$ to $a_2 := M_2(b)$, and prefers a_2 to $a_3 := M_3(b)$. Let \mathbf{y}^i be a nice witness of M_i for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. We distinguish two cases:

Case 1: $b = f(a)$ for some $a \in A$.

Theorem 2 and Lemma 18 imply that $f(a_1) = b$. Thus, for every $i \in \{2, 3\}$, we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_i}(\{a_1, b\}) = c + 1$, and therefore (as $\mathbf{y}_a \leq 1$ and $\mathbf{y}_b \leq c$ for every $a \in A$, $b' \in B$, and witness \mathbf{y} by Observation 14), $\mathbf{y}_b^2 = c = \mathbf{y}_b^3$. Therefore, Lemma 17 implies that both \mathbf{y}^2 and \mathbf{y}^3 are odd on the connected component C of $M_2 \triangle M_3$ that contains b . However, since $M_2 \triangle M_3$ is not a cycle (otherwise $\{a_1, b\}$ would have been deleted from $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$), it follows that there is a vertex $u \in V(C)$ that is unmatched in M_i for some $i \in \{2, 3\}$. This implies that $\mathbf{y}_u^i = 0$ by Observation 14. By Lemma 17, it follows that \mathbf{y}^i is even on C , a contradiction to \mathbf{y}^i being odd on C .

Case 2: $b = s(a)$ for some $a \in A$.

By Theorem 2 and Lemma 18, it follows that $M_1(a_3) = f(a_3) = M_2(a_3)$. Thus, we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_i}(\{a_3, b\}) = -c - 1$ for every $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By Lemma 13, we have $\mathbf{y}_{a_3}^1 + \mathbf{y}_b^1 = -c - 1 = \mathbf{y}_{a_3}^2 + \mathbf{y}_b^2$, implying $\mathbf{y}_b^1 = -1 = \mathbf{y}_b^2$ (and $\mathbf{y}_{a_3}^1 = -c = \mathbf{y}_{a_3}^2$). Therefore, Lemma 17 implies that both \mathbf{y}^1 and \mathbf{y}^2 are odd on the connected component C of $M_1 \triangle M_2$ containing b . However, since $M_1 \triangle M_2$ is not a cycle (otherwise $\{a_3, b\}$ would have been deleted from H), it follows that there is a vertex u in C that is unmatched in M_i for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$. This implies that $\mathbf{y}_u^i = 0$ by Observation 14. By Lemma 17, it follows that \mathbf{y}^i is even on C , a contradiction to \mathbf{y}^i being odd on C . \square

Let now $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ be the graph whose edge set is the disjoint union of popular matchings in each component of $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$. We now show that $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ can be computed in polynomial time, starting with the connected components consisting of cycles.

Observation 20. *Let C be a cycle in $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$. Then we can compute the set of popular matchings in C in linear time.*

Proof. Theorem 2 and Lemma 18 imply that every popular matching must match every vertex in $V(C)$. Thus, there are only two different candidates for a popular matching, and these can be checked for popularity in linear

time by Theorem 5. Note that on cycles, a simple dynamic program allows to find a maximum-weight matching in linear time. \square

The next claim shows how to compute the set of edges in a popular matching for a tree, implying that $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ can be computed in linear time. We remark that this result holds for arbitrary trees, not only for trees in $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$.

Claim 17. *If T is a tree, then the set of edges that appear in at least one popular matching in T can be computed in linear time.*

Proof. We compute the set of edges contained in a popular matching via dynamic programming. Fix an arbitrary vertex $r \in V(T)$ to be the root of T . For a vertex $v \in V(T)$, we denote by T_v the subtree of T rooted at v ; so $T_r = T$. Let $X := \{-c, 1 - c, 2 - c, -1, 0, 1, c - 2, c - 1, c\}$ be the set of values a nice witness can attain. In this proof, we first define edge set $F_v^{e,x}$, capturing the set of edges f such that there is some popular matching M in T_v with $e, f \in M$ that fulfills the additional constraint that there is a witness \mathbf{y} of M with $\mathbf{y}_v = x$. If $e = \perp$, then we drop the condition that $e \in M$. Then we present our dynamic program and prove that it indeed computes $F_v^{e,x}$ and also outputs the set of popular edges for the root node. Finally, we elaborate on the running time.

General approach of the dynamic program. The dynamic program performs bottom-up induction on T : starting from the leaves, it decides at each vertex v whether a matching on T_v together with a witness \mathbf{y} can potentially be extended to a popular matching and a witness on T . To make this decision, it is enough to know the value of \mathbf{y}_v and the vertex to which v is matched to (if any). Thus, for each vertex $v \in V(T)$, every $e \in \delta_T(v) \cup \{\perp\}$ (representing the edge with which v is matched, where \perp indicates that v remains unmatched), and every possible witness $x \in X$, the dynamic program creates one edge set $F_v^{e,x}$. This set shall consist of the edges that appear in any popular matching together with e on T_v and have a witness \mathbf{y} with $\mathbf{y}_v = x$.

Defining $F_v^{e,x}$. If $e = \{v, z\}$ is the upward edge incident to v in T , then any matching containing e is not contained in T_v , but only in $T_v \cup \{z\}$. To capture this, we define $T_v^e := T_v \cup \{z\}$ if $e = \{v, z\}$ is the upward edge at v , and $T_v^{e'} := T_v$ for all $e' \in (\delta(v) \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{\perp\}$. If $e = \{v, z\} \in \delta_T(v)$, then define $F_v^{e,x}$ to be the union of all edges appearing in some popular matching M on T_v^e with $e \in M$ and having a witness \mathbf{y} with $\mathbf{y}_v = x$ assuming that at least one such popular matching exists; if no such matching exists, then we

set $F_v^{e,x} = \square$. If $e = \perp$, then we define $F_v^{e,x}$ to be the union of all edges appearing in some popular matching M on T_v with v being unmatched and having a witness \mathbf{y} with $\mathbf{y}_v = x$ assuming that at least one such popular matching exists; if no such matching exists, then we set $F_v^{e,x} = \square$.

We will now present a dynamic program computing sets $\hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ (we will later show that $F_v^{e,x} = \hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ for every e, x , and v).

Computing $\hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ for leaves. The dynamic program computes the sets $\hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ via bottom-up induction (i.e. processing the vertices of the tree starting with the leaves and then “going up” the tree towards the root). For a leaf v , this set can be computed in constant time as follows. First note that T_v^\perp contains only a single vertex (namely v), and thus the empty matching is the unique popular matching (with unique witness $\mathbf{y}_v = 0$ by Observation 14). Consequently, we set $\hat{F}_v^{\perp,x} = \emptyset$ if $x = 0$ and $\hat{F}_v^{\perp,x} = \square$ for all $x \in X \setminus \{0\}$. We also need to compute $\hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ for the unique edge $e = \{v, z\}$ incident to v . The graph T_v^e admits a unique popular matching, namely $M := \{e\}$. Each feasible witness \mathbf{y} for M fulfills $\mathbf{y}_z = -\mathbf{y}_v$ (by Observation 14) and $-w(v) \leq \mathbf{y}_v \leq w(z)$ (and indeed any \mathbf{y} fulfilling these two conditions is a witness for M). Thus, we set $\hat{F}_v^{e,x} = \{e\}$ if $-w(v) \leq x \leq w(z)$, and $\hat{F}_v^{e,x} = \square$ for all other values of x . From these observations it follows that $\hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ is computed correctly (i.e. it coincides with the above definition of $F_v^{e,x}$) for each leaf v .

Deriving the set of popular edges from the dynamic program. For the root r , the union of $\hat{F}_r^{e,x}$ over every $e \in \delta_T(r) \cup \{\perp\}$ and every $x \in X$ is the set of popular edges.

Computing $\hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ for parent nodes. We continue by showing how to compute $\hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ for a vertex v from the sets $\hat{F}_d^{e_d, x_d}$ for every child d of v , every $e_d \in \delta_T(d) \cup \{\perp\}$, and $x_d \in X$. Denote the set of children of v by $C(v)$. For every child $d \in C(v)$ such that d is not an endpoint of e , we define $S_d^{e,x}$ to be the set containing every pair (e_d, x_d) with $\hat{F}_d^{e_d, x_d} \neq \square$ such that $\{d, v\}$ does not violate the condition of a witness. More precisely, $S_d^{e,x}$ contains every pair (e_d, x_d) with $e_d \in \delta_T(d) \cup \{\perp\}$ such that $\hat{F}_d^{e_d, x_d} \neq \square$ and $\widetilde{\text{vote}}_d^{e_d}(v) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_v^e(d) \leq x + x_d$. For the child d^* with $e = \{v, d^*\}$ (if such a child exists; this is not the case when e is the upward edge or $e = \perp$), we set $S_{d^*}^{e,x} := \{(e, -x)\}$. An example of $S_d^{e,x}$ and the computation of $\hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ can be seen in Figure 6. The intuition here is that in order to extend the edge e to a popular matching with a witness \mathbf{y} with $\mathbf{y}_v = x$, this extension needs to

contain, for each child d that is not an endpoint of e , a popular matching M_d on T_d together with a witness \mathbf{y}^d such that $\widehat{\text{vote}}_d^{M_d}(v) + \widehat{\text{vote}}_v^e(d) \leq \mathbf{y}^d + x$ (and in fact, this condition is also sufficient). The set $S_d^{e,x}$ now precisely contains the pairs (e_d, x_d) that fulfill this condition. Consequently, the set $\hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ is computed as follows: If $S_d^{e,x} = \emptyset$ for some child $d \in C(v)$, then there is no popular matching which contains e and fulfills $\mathbf{y}_v = x$ and so we set $\hat{F}_v^{e,x} := \square$. Otherwise, taking the union over an arbitrary popular matching in T_d containing e_d and having a witness with $\mathbf{y}_d = x_d$ for some $(e_d, x_d) \in S_d^{e,x}$ for every child d and the edge e results in a popular matching in T_v , and so we set $\hat{F}_v^{e,x} := (\{e\} \setminus \{\square\}) \cup \bigcup_{d \in C(v)} \bigcup_{(e_d, x_d) \in S_d^{e,x}} F_d^{e_d, x_d}$.

$F_v^{e,x}$ is computed correctly. We now prove by bottom-up induction that $F_v^{e,x}$ is computed correctly, i.e. we have $F_v^{e,x} = \hat{F}_v^{e,x}$. For the leaves, we argued that $F_v^{e,x} = \hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ already when describing how to compute $\hat{F}_v^{e,x}$. So fix a non-leaf node v , an element $e \in \delta_T(v) \cup \{\perp\}$, and some $x \in X$. We will show $\hat{F}_v^{e,x} = F_v^{e,x}$ in two steps: first we show that $F_v^{e,x} \subseteq \hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ and then we show that $\hat{F}_v^{e,x} \subseteq F_v^{e,x}$.

Showing $F_v^{e,x} \subseteq \hat{F}_v^{e,x}$. First we show that $F_v^{e,x} \subseteq \hat{F}_v^{e,x}$. Consider an edge $f \in F_v^{e,x}$. By the definition of $F_v^{e,x}$, there is a popular matching M on T_v^e with $e \in M$ if $e \in \delta(v)$ and with v being unmatched in M if $e = \perp$ such that there exists a witness \mathbf{y} of M with $\mathbf{y}_v = x$. This implies that for every child $d \in C(v)$, we have that $F_d^{\{d, M(d)\}, \mathbf{y}_d} \neq \square$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $\hat{F}_d^{\{d, M(d)\}, \mathbf{y}_d} = F_d^{\{d, M(d)\}, \mathbf{y}_d} \neq \square$. Thus, we have that $\hat{F}_v^{e,x} \neq \square$. If $f = \{v, p\} = e$ where p is the parent of v , then clearly $f \in \hat{F}_v^{e,x}$. Otherwise f is contained in $E(T_d^{e_d})$ for some child $d \in C(v)$. By induction, we have that $f \in \hat{F}_d^{\{d, M(d)\}, \mathbf{y}_d}$, implying that $f \in \hat{F}_v^{e,x}$.

Showing $\hat{F}_v^{e,x} \subseteq F_v^{e,x}$. Next, we show that $\hat{F}_v^{e,x} \subseteq F_v^{e,x}$. Consider an edge $f \in \hat{F}_v^{e,x}$. We will show that there exists a popular matching M containing f on T_v^e with $e \in M$ if $e \in \delta_T(v)$ and with v being unmatched in M if $e = \perp$ such that there exists a witness \mathbf{y} of M with $\mathbf{y}_v = x$. Since $f \in \hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ there exist $(e_d, x_d) \in S_d^{e,x}$ for every $d \in C(v)$ such that $f \in (\{e\} \setminus \{\square\}) \cup \bigcup_{d \in C(v)} \hat{F}_d^{e_d, x_d}$ and $\hat{F}_d^{e_d, x_d} \neq \square$. By induction, we have $\hat{F}_d^{e_d, x_d} = F_d^{e_d, x_d}$ for every child d . Consequently, for every child d , there exists a popular matching M_d with witness \mathbf{y}^d such that $\mathbf{y}_d^d = x_d$ and $M_d(d) \neq v$, and if $f \in E(T_v)$, then we can construct M_d such that it contains f .




Figure 6: An example for the computation of $\hat{F}_v^{e,x}$ where $e = \{v, c_2\}$ and $x = -1$. The edge e is depicted in red. The sets $S_{c_i}^{e,x}$ for $i \in [3]$ are the following:

- c_1 : There are two popular matchings in T_{c_1} , namely $M_{c_1}^1 := \{\{w_1, c_1\}\}$ and $M_{c_1}^2 := \{\{w_1, x_1\}, \{w_2, c_1\}\}$. The unique witness \mathbf{y}^1 for $M_{c_1}^1$ fulfills $\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^1 = c - 1$ but we have $\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^1 + x = c - 2 < \widetilde{\text{vote}}_{c_1}^{M_{c_1}^1}(v) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_v^e(c_1) = -1 + c$. Thus $(\{w_1, c_1\}, x') \notin S_{c_1}^{e,x}$ for every $x' \in X$. Matching $M_{c_1}^2$ has a unique witness \mathbf{y}^1 with $\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^1 = c$ and we have $\mathbf{y}_{c_1}^1 + x = c - 1 = \widetilde{\text{vote}}_{c_1}^{M_{c_1}^2}(v) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_v^e(c_1)$. Consequently, $S_{c_1}^{e,x} = \{(\{w_2, c_1\}, c)\}$.
- c_2 : The only popular matching in $T_{c_2}^e$ is $\{e, \{w_3, x_2\}\}$, and this matching has a feasible witness \mathbf{y}^2 with $\mathbf{y}_{c_2}^2 = -x$, so we have $S_{c_2}^{e,x} = \{(e, -x)\}$.
- c_3 : There are two popular matchings in T_{c_3} , namely $M_{c_3}^1 := \{\{w_4, c_3\}\}$ and $M_{c_3}^2 := \{\{w_5, c_3\}, \{w_4, x_3\}\}$. The unique witness \mathbf{y}^3 for $M_{c_3}^1$ fulfills $\mathbf{y}_{c_3}^3 = c - 1$ and we have $\mathbf{y}_{c_3}^3 + x = c - 2 \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}_{c_3}^{M_{c_3}^1}(v) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_v^e(c_3) = 1 - c$. Thus, $(\{w_1, c_1\}, c - 1) \in S_{c_3}^{e,x}$. Matching $M_{c_3}^2$ has a unique witness \mathbf{y}^3 with $\mathbf{y}_{c_3}^3 = c$ and we have $\mathbf{y}_{c_3}^3 + x = c - 1 > \widetilde{\text{vote}}_{c_3}^{M_{c_3}^2}(v) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_v^e(c_3) = 1 - c$. Thus, $(\{w_5, c_3\}, c) \in S_{c_3}^{e,x}$. Consequently, we have $S_{c_3}^{e,x} = \{(\{w_4, c_1\}, c - 1), (\{w_5, c_1\}, c)\}$.

From the sets $S_{c_i}^{e,x}$ for $i \in [3]$, it follows that $\hat{F}_v^{e,x} = \{\{w_2, c_1\}, \{w_1, x_1\}\} \cup \{\{v, c_2\}, \{w_3, x_2\}\} \cup \{\{w_4, c_3\}, \{w_5, c_3\}, \{w_4, x_3\}\}$.

Then $(\{e\} \setminus \{\perp\}) \cup \bigcup_{d \in C(v)} M_d$ is a popular matching containing f (if $e = f$, then this follows by the definition of the new matching; otherwise f is contained in M_d for some child $d \in C(v)$), of which a witness can be constructed by setting $\mathbf{y}_u := \mathbf{y}_u^d$ for every $u \in T_d$ and every child $d \in C(v)$ and $\mathbf{y}_v := x$. No conflicting edge can be contained in T_d for some d because \mathbf{y}^d is a feasible witness, and $\{v, d\}$ is not conflicting for every child d because $\widetilde{\text{vote}}_d^{e_d}(v) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_v^e(d) \leq x + x_d$.

Running time. It remains to analyze the running time. Consider a vertex $v \in V(G)$ and fix some $x \in X$. We process the edges from $\delta(v)$ in order according to the preferences of v . Thus, when turning from one edge $e = \{v, c\}$ to the next edge $e' = \{v, c'\}$, sets $S_d^{e, x}$ and $S_d^{e', x}$ can only change for $d \in \{c, c'\}$. Consequently, the computation of $\hat{F}_v^{e, x}$ can be done in amortized constant time when only the corresponding backtracking information is stored instead of the set of edges appearing in a popular matching. It follows that we need $O(\deg(v))$ time for vertex v , and consequently $O(n)$ time in total. \square

We are now ready to prove Lemma 19.

Proof of Lemma 19. By Lemma 18 and Theorem 2 we can compute a graph $H^{\deg(A) \leq 2}$ containing every popular edge and fulfilling $\deg(a) \leq 2$ for every $a \in A$. Applying Claim 15 results in a graph $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$ such that $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$ contains every popular edge and every connected component of $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$ is a cycle or a tree. Applying Claims 16 and 17, we compute from $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$ a subgraph $H^{\leq 2}$ such that $H^{\leq 2}$ contains every popular edge and has maximum degree two. For every connected component C of $H^{\leq 2}$, we apply Observation 20 or Claim 17 to exhaustively delete every edge not contained in a popular matching in C . The resulting graph $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ fulfills the requirements of the lemma.

The running time follows from the observation that $H^{\deg(A) \leq 2}$ can be computed in $O(n + m)$ time. \square

While restricting the set of edges which can appear in a popular matching to disjoint paths and cycles as in Lemma 19 is a severe restriction, we remark that this does not immediately imply tractability: For example, for the instance constructed in the reduction in Theorem 9, we know that a set of disjoint cycles (one for each variable and one for each clause gadget) together with three edges from the 6-path gadget such that any popular matching is a subset of these edges, but still deciding the existence of a popular matching is NP-hard.

5.2.2. Computing “local” witnesses

We first restrict for each connected component of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ the set of possible nice witnesses, and afterwards dismiss possible witnesses one by one, until we either found a popular matching or have no witness remaining for a connected component and conclude that no popular matching exists. The idea here is to order the nice witnesses (and the matching whose popularity the witness proves) by how “good” they are on the vertices in B . Given such an order, we can apply the following algorithm: At the beginning, we assign to each connected component C the witness that is optimal for $B \cap V(C)$. This induces a matching M by taking for every connected component the matching whose popularity is verified by the corresponding witness. Whenever a conflicting edge, i.e. an edge $\{a, b\}$ with $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(a) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(b) > \mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_b$, occurs, we know that the only way to eliminate this conflict is to change the witness (and possibly also the matching) on the connected component C_a containing a , or, in one special case, the witness on the connected component containing b . Therefore, we dismiss the current witness for C_a and replace it with the next witness in the order we set up on them. This procedure eventually terminates with a feasible witness (and thus also a popular matching), or dismisses all witnesses for a connected component of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$. In the latter case, we know that no popular matching exists.

We now describe how we order the witnesses for one connected component of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$. Consider a connected component C of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$, two popular matchings M_1 and M_2 , and two witnesses \mathbf{y}^1 and \mathbf{y}^2 of them. If we have that (i) $\mathbf{y}_b^1 \geq \mathbf{y}_b^2 + 2$ or (ii) $\mathbf{y}_b^1 \geq \mathbf{y}_b^2$ and $M_1 \succeq_b M_2$, then \mathbf{y}^1 is clearly better than \mathbf{y}^2 for b , i.e. any conflicting edge $\{a, b\}$ for \mathbf{y}^1 will also be conflicting for \mathbf{y}^2 . This leads to the following definition:

Definition 21. *Let C be a connected component of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$. A witness \mathbf{y}^1 of a popular matching M_1 on C (strongly) dominates a witness \mathbf{y}^2 of a popular matching M_2 on C at a vertex $b \in B \cap V(C)$ if (i) $\mathbf{y}_b^1 \geq \mathbf{y}_b^2 + 2$ or (ii) $\mathbf{y}_b^1 \geq \mathbf{y}_b^2$ and $M_1 \succeq_b M_2$. Witness \mathbf{y}^1 strongly dominates \mathbf{y}^2 if \mathbf{y}^1 strongly dominates \mathbf{y}^2 for each vertex $b \in B \cap C$. An odd witness \mathbf{y}^1 weakly dominates a witness \mathbf{y}^2 if (i) \mathbf{y}^1 strongly dominates \mathbf{y}^2 or (ii) \mathbf{y}^2 is even and \mathbf{y}^1 strongly dominates $\mathbf{y}^2 - \mathbf{1}$.*

From now on, we will refer “strong dominance” just by “dominance”. Note that only an odd witness can weakly dominate another witness; for even witnesses, weak dominance is not defined. We will show (Claims 20

and 21) that domination at a vertex $b \in B$ already implies domination on the whole connected component of H^{C+P} . This dominance relationship then induces an order of the odd witnesses. However, there may be pairs of odd and even witnesses that do not dominate each other, e.g. it may happen that \mathbf{y}^1 is even, \mathbf{y}^2 is odd, $\mathbf{y}_b^1 = \mathbf{y}_b^2 + 1$ and $M_2 \succ_b M_1$. When considering only conflicting edges $\{a, b\}$ (note that these conflicting edges may be between different components of H^{C+P}) for which the witness in the component containing a is odd, it is irrelevant whether $\mathbf{y}_b = \mathbf{y}_b^1$ or $\mathbf{y}_b = \mathbf{y}_b^2$ holds because $\widetilde{\text{vote}}_a^M(b) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_b^M(a) \in \{-1 - c, 1 - c, c - 1, 1 + c\}$ for every matching M . This idea is captured by weak dominance. We now formalize the implications of the (weak) dominance relation.

Lemma 22. *Let C and D be two connected components of H^{C+P} , and let \mathbf{y}^C and \mathbf{y}^D be nice witnesses for two popular matchings M^C and M^D on C and D . Assume that there is a conflicting edge $\{a, b\}$ for matching $M^C \cup M^D$ with $a \in V(C) \cap A$ and $b \in V(D) \cap B$.*

If \mathbf{y}^C is odd, then $\{a, b\}$ is also conflicting when exchanging \mathbf{y}^D for a witness that \mathbf{y}^D weakly dominates.

Proof. Let $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^D$ be a witness of a popular matching M on D that is dominated by \mathbf{y}^D . If $\mathbf{y}_b^D \geq \hat{\mathbf{y}}_b^D + 2$, then $\mathbf{y}_a^C + \hat{\mathbf{y}}_b^D \leq \mathbf{y}_a^C + \mathbf{y}_b^D - 2 < \widetilde{\text{vote}}_a^{M^C}(b) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_b^{M^D}(a) - 2 \leq \widetilde{\text{vote}}_a^{M^C}(b) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_b^M(a) + 2 - 2 = \widetilde{\text{vote}}_a^{M^C}(b) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_b^M(a)$ (the strict inequality holds because $\{a, b\}$ is conflicting and the last inequality because $\widetilde{\text{vote}}_{b'}^{M'}(a') \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ for every matching M' , vertex $a' \in A, b' \in B$) and consequently $\{a, b\}$ is also conflicting when exchanging \mathbf{y}^D for $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^D$.

If $\mathbf{y}_b^D \geq \hat{\mathbf{y}}_b^D$ and b does not prefer $M(b)$ to $M^D(b)$, then $\mathbf{y}_a^C + \hat{\mathbf{y}}_b^D \leq \mathbf{y}_a^C + \mathbf{y}_b^D < \widetilde{\text{vote}}_a^{M^C}(b) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_b^{M^D}(a) \leq \widetilde{\text{vote}}_a^{M^C}(b) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_b^M(a)$ and consequently $\{a, b\}$ is also conflicting when exchanging \mathbf{y}^D for $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^D$.

If \mathbf{y}^D weakly dominates $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^D$ but \mathbf{y}^D does not dominate $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^D$, then $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^D$ is even and $\mathbf{y}^D + \mathbf{1}$ dominates $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^D$. The above arguments yield $\mathbf{y}_a^C + \hat{\mathbf{y}}_b^D < \widetilde{\text{vote}}_a^{M^C}(b) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_b^M(a) + 1$. Since \mathbf{y}^C is odd and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^D$ is even, we have $\mathbf{y}_a^C \in \{-c, 2 - c, -1, 1\}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_b^D \in \{0, c - 1\}$. It follows that $\mathbf{y}_a^C + \hat{\mathbf{y}}_b^D \in \{-c, 2 - c, -1, 1, c - 2, c\}$, while $\widetilde{\text{vote}}_a^{M^C}(b) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_b^M(a) \in \{-1 - c, 1 - c, c - 1, 1 + c\}$. Using $c > 3$, a case distinction on the possible values which $\mathbf{y}_a^C + \hat{\mathbf{y}}_b^D$ can attain shows that even $\mathbf{y}_a^C + \hat{\mathbf{y}}_b^D < \widetilde{\text{vote}}_a^{M^C}(b) + \widetilde{\text{vote}}_b^M(a)$ holds, proving the lemma. \square

Next, we show that we can restrict the set of possible nice witnesses for

every connected component in such a way that the witnesses are in a weak dominance relation to each other. Note that we use here that for every connected component C of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$, each edge in C is contained in at least one popular matching in C .

Lemma 23. *For each connected component C of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$, we can compute in linear time a set Y of up to four nice witnesses with the properties below (depending on whether C contains a single edge, a path, or a cycle), such that for any feasible witness \mathbf{y} of a popular matching M , there exists a witness $\mathbf{y}' \in Y$ that can replace the values \mathbf{y}_v for every $v \in V(C)$.*

- If C contains only a single edge e , then
 - $Y = \{\mathbf{y}^{e,1}, \mathbf{y}^{e,2}, \mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}\}$, where $\mathbf{y}^{e,1}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$ are odd and $\mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}$ is even, and
 - $\mathbf{y}^{e,1}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$ weakly dominates $\mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}$.
- If C is a path containing at least three vertices, then
 - $Y = \{\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}, \mathbf{y}^{P,\text{even}}\}$ where $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}$ is odd and $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{even}}$ is even, and
 - $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}$ weakly dominates $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{even}}$.
- If C is a cycle, then
 - $Y = \{\mathbf{y}^{C,1}, \mathbf{y}^{C,2}\}$ or $Y = \{\mathbf{y}^{C,1}, \mathbf{y}^{C,2}, \mathbf{y}^{C,0}, \mathbf{y}^{C,\text{even}}\}$ where $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$, $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$, and $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$ are odd and $\mathbf{y}^{C,\text{even}}$ is even, and
 - $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$ or $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$, witness $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$, and $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$ weakly dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,\text{even}}$.

The proof of Lemma 23 is split into three parts (Claims 18, 20 and 22), where Claim 18 shows the statement for components consisting of a single edge, Claim 20 shows the statement for paths with at least three vertices, and Claim 22 shows the statement for cycles.

We first consider components consisting of a single edge.

Claim 18. *Let P be a connected component of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ consisting of a single edge $e = \{a, b\}$, and assume that G admits at least one popular matching.*

Then there exist three witnesses $\mathbf{y}^{e,1}$, $\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$, and $\mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}$ such that $\mathbf{y}^{e,1}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$, witness $\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$ weakly dominates $\mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}$, and for every popular matching M in G with nice witness \mathbf{y} , there exists some $\mathbf{y}^e \in \{\mathbf{y}^{e,1}, \mathbf{y}^{e,2}, \mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}\}$ such that \mathbf{y}' defined by $\mathbf{y}'_a := \mathbf{y}^e_a$, $\mathbf{y}'_b := \mathbf{y}^e_b$, and $\mathbf{y}'_v := \mathbf{y}_v$ is a witness of M .

Proof. Let M be a popular matching. By Lemma 15, there exists a nice witness \mathbf{y} . Furthermore, M contains e : If M would not contain e , then a and b are unmatched (since $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ contains every popular edge and e is a connected component of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$), implying that $M \cup \{e\}$ is more popular than M , a contradiction. By Observation 14, it follows that $\mathbf{y}_a = -\mathbf{y}_b$.

We first consider the case that $b = f(a)$. We define

- $\mathbf{y}_a^{e,1} := -c$ and $\mathbf{y}_b^{e,1} := c$,
- $\mathbf{y}_a^{e,2} := 2 - c$ and $\mathbf{y}_b^{e,2} := c - 2$, and
- $\mathbf{y}_a^{e,\text{even}} := 1 - c$ and $\mathbf{y}_b^{e,\text{even}} := c - 1$.

Clearly, $\mathbf{y}^{e,1}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$ weakly dominates $\mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}$. It remains to show that, given a popular matching M with nice witness \mathbf{y} , there exists some $\mathbf{y}^e \in \{\mathbf{y}^{e,1}, \mathbf{y}^{e,2}, \mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}\}$ such that \mathbf{y}' defined by $\mathbf{y}'_a := \mathbf{y}_a^e$, $\mathbf{y}'_b := \mathbf{y}_b^e$, and $\mathbf{y}'_v := \mathbf{y}_v$ for $v \in V(G) \setminus \{a, b\}$ is a witness of M . If $\mathbf{y}_a \leq 2 - c$, then Lemma 15 implies that $\mathbf{y}_a = \mathbf{y}_a^e$ and $\mathbf{y}_b = \mathbf{y}_b^e$ for some $\mathbf{y}^e \in \{\mathbf{y}^{e,1}, \mathbf{y}^{e,2}, \mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}\}$, and this \mathbf{y}^e fulfills the claim. Thus, we assume $\mathbf{y}_a \geq -1$, which implies $\mathbf{y}_b = -\mathbf{y}_a < \mathbf{y}_b^{e,2}$. We claim that we can choose $\mathbf{y}^e := \mathbf{y}^{e,2}$ in this case. We assume for a contradiction that there exists a conflicting edge $\{a', b'\}$. Note that $\mathbf{y}'_v \geq \mathbf{y}_v$ for all $v \neq a$, and thus we have $a = a'$. Since $b = f(a)$, we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}_a^M(\{a, b'\}) = -c$ and consequently $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, b'\}) \leq 1 - c$. Because $\mathbf{y}'_{b'} \geq -w(b') = -1$, it follows that $\{a', b'\}$ is not conflicting, a contradiction.

We now handle the case $b = s(a)$. We define

- $\mathbf{y}_a^{e,1} := -1$ and $\mathbf{y}_b^{e,1} := 1$,
- $\mathbf{y}_a^{e,2} := 1$ and $\mathbf{y}_b^{e,2} := -1$, and
- $\mathbf{y}_a^{e,\text{even}} := 0$ and $\mathbf{y}_b^{e,\text{even}} := 0$.

Again, $\mathbf{y}^{e,1}$ clearly dominates $\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$ weakly dominates $\mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}$. It remains to show that, given a popular matching M with nice witness \mathbf{y} , there exists some $\mathbf{y}^e \in \{\mathbf{y}^{e,1}, \mathbf{y}^{e,2}, \mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}\}$ such that \mathbf{y}' defined by $\mathbf{y}'_a := \mathbf{y}_a^e$, $\mathbf{y}'_b := \mathbf{y}_b^e$, and $\mathbf{y}'_v := \mathbf{y}_v$ for every $v \in V(G) \setminus \{a, b\}$ is a witness of M . If $\mathbf{y}_a \geq -1$, then Lemma 15 implies that $\mathbf{y}_a = \mathbf{y}_a^e$ and $\mathbf{y}_b = \mathbf{y}_b^e$ for some $\mathbf{y}^e \in \{\mathbf{y}^{e,1}, \mathbf{y}^{e,2}, \mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}\}$, and this \mathbf{y}^e fulfills the claim. Thus, we assume that $\mathbf{y}_a \leq 2 - c$. Then $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^M(\{a, f(a)\}) \geq c - 1 > 2 = 2 - c + c \geq \mathbf{y}_a + \mathbf{y}_{f(a)}$. The first inequality holds as a prefers $f(a)$ to $M(a) = s(a)$ by definition

of $f(a)$, and the last inequality follows from $\mathbf{y}_{b'} \leq c$ for every $b' \in B$ by Observation 14, a contradiction to \mathbf{y} being a witness of M . \square

We now turn to paths with at least three vertices. We start with a helpful claim.

Claim 19. *Let M_1 and M_2 be two popular matchings. Then every path P in $M_1 \triangle M_2$ has one end vertex in A and the other one in B .*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that P has both end vertices in A , and let a_1 and a_2 be these end vertices. Without loss of generality a_1 is matched in M_1 and a_2 is matched in M_2 . Let \mathbf{y}^1 and \mathbf{y}^2 be nice witnesses of M_1 and M_2 . Since a_1 is unmatched in M_2 , it follows that $\mathbf{y}_{a_1}^2 = 0$ and thus, \mathbf{y}^2 is even on P . Since a_2 is unmatched in M_1 , it follows that $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^1 = 0$ and thus, \mathbf{y}^1 is even on P . Let $b := M_2(a_2)$, $a := M_1(b)$, and $b' := M_2(a)$. We have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}_{a_2}^{M_1}(b) = c$. Further, because $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^1 = 0$ and $\mathbf{y}_b \leq c$ (as $\mathbf{y}_{b^*} \leq c$ for every $b \in B$ by Observation 14), we have $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^1 + \mathbf{y}_b^1 \leq c$. It follows from Lemma 13 that $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_1}(\{a_2, b\}) = \mathbf{y}_b^1 = c - 1 = -\mathbf{y}_a^1$. Thus, $a \succ_b a_2$. Again Lemma 13 (this time applied to $\{a, b'\}$) implies that $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_1}(\{a, b'\}) = 1 - c$. Consequently, $b \succ_a b'$ holds. Thus, we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_2}(\{a, b\}) = c + 1$, and consequently, $\mathbf{y}_a^2 = 1$ and $\mathbf{y}_b^2 = c$. However, this implies that \mathbf{y}^2 is odd, a contradiction to \mathbf{y}^2 being even.

The case that both end vertices of P are in B leads to a contradiction by symmetric arguments. \square

We now describe the witnesses for path components.

Claim 20. *Let P be a connected component of $H^{c+\mathcal{P}}$ that is a path with at least three vertices and let M_1 and M_2 be the two popular matchings on P such that M_2 leaves at least one vertex in P unmatched.*

Then there is a unique nice witness $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}$ for M_1 and a unique nice witness $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{even}}$ for M_2 , and $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}$ weakly dominates $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{even}}$.

Proof. Let M_1^P and M_2^P be the two popular matchings in P . By Claim 19, one end vertex a_1 of P is in A and the other end vertex is contained in B . Let $P = \langle a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, a_3, b_3, \dots, a_k, b_k \rangle$. We assume without loss of generality that a_1 (and b_k) are unmatched in M_2^P . First, we prove by induction on i that for every $i \leq \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil$,

- $f(a_{2i}) = b_{2i-1} = f(a_{2i-1})$ and $s(a_{2i}) = b_{2i} = s(a_{2i+1})$ (in particular, a_{2i} and b_{2i} exist),
- $a_{2i} \succ_{b_{2i-1}} a_{2i-1}$ and if $2i < k$, then $a_{2i} \succ_{b_{2i}} a_{2i+1}$,
- every witness $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}$ for M_1^P fulfills $\mathbf{y}_{a_{2i-1}}^{P,\text{odd}} = -c$, $\mathbf{y}_{a_{2i}}^{P,\text{odd}} = 1$, $\mathbf{y}_{b_{2i-1}}^{P,\text{odd}} = c$, and $\mathbf{y}_{b_{2i}}^{P,\text{odd}} = -1$, and
- every witness $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{even}}$ for M_2^P fulfills $\mathbf{y}_{a_{2i-1}}^{P,\text{even}} = 0$, $\mathbf{y}_{a_{2i}}^{P,\text{even}} = 1-c$, $\mathbf{y}_{b_{2i-1}}^{P,\text{even}} = c-1$, and $\mathbf{y}_{b_{2i}}^{P,\text{even}} = 0$.

From this, one easily observes that $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}$ weakly dominates $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{even}}$ and the lemma follows.

We first show the first bullet point. By Lemma 18 and Theorem 2, a_1 being unmatched in M_2^P implies that $b_1 = M_1^P(a_1) = f(a_1)$. Note that $b_1 = f(a_1)$ implies $b_1 \neq s(a_2)$ by the definition of $s(a_2)$. Applying Lemma 18 and Theorem 2 to a_2 implies that $f(a_2) = b_1$ and $s(a_2) = b_2$ (note that a_2 needs to exist as $b_1 = f(a_1)$ cannot be unmatched in a popular matching by Lemma 18 and Theorem 2). Iterating these arguments now implies the first bullet point: Because $b_{2i} = s(a_{2i})$, Lemma 18 and Theorem 2 imply that $b_{2i} = s(a_{2i+1})$ which then implies $f(a_{2i+1}) = b_{2i+1}$ (and in particular the existence of a_{2i+1} as b_{2i+1} cannot be unmatched in a popular matching). This now implies that $f(a_{2i+2}) = b_{2i+1}$ which implies $s(a_{2i+2}) = b_{2i+2}$.

We continue by showing the remaining bullet points. For $i = 1$, due to the popularity of M_2^P , it follows that $a_2 \succ_{b_1} a_1$ (otherwise $M_2' := (M_2^P \setminus \{\{a_2, b_1\}\}) \cup \{\{a_1, b_1\}\}$ is more popular). As a_1 is unmatched in M_2 , we have $\mathbf{y}_{a_1}^{P,\text{even}} = 0$ and $\widetilde{\text{vote}}_{a_1}^{M_2}(b_1) = c-1$. By Lemma 13, it follows that $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^{P,\text{even}} = \widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_2}(\{a_1, b_1\}) = c-1$ and thus $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^{P,\text{even}} = 1-c$. Applying again Lemma 13 to the edge $\{a_2, b_2\}$, we conclude that $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^{P,\text{even}} = 0$, and if a_3 exists, then b_2 prefers a_2 to a_3 . Since $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_1}(\{a_2, b_1\}) = c+1$, it follows that $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^{P,\text{odd}} = c$ and $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^{P,\text{odd}} = 1$, implying $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^{P,\text{odd}} = -1$ and $\mathbf{y}_{a_1}^{P,\text{odd}} = -c$.

The argument for the induction step is basically identical: As $\mathbf{y}_{b_{2i}}^{P,\text{even}} = 0$, we have $\mathbf{y}_{a_{2i+1}}^{P,\text{even}} = 0$. By the first bullet point, $f(a_{2i+1}) = b_{2i+1}$, which implies $\widetilde{\text{vote}}_{a_{2i+1}}^{M_2}(b_{2i+1}) = c$. Because $\mathbf{y}_{b_{2i+1}}^{P,\text{even}} \leq c$ by Observation 14 and $\mathbf{y}_{a_{2i+1}}^{P,\text{even}} + \mathbf{y}_{b_{2i+1}}^{P,\text{even}} \geq \widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_2}(\{a_{2i+1}, b_{2i+1}\})$, we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_2}(\{a_{2i+1}, b_{2i+1}\}) = c-1$. Applying Lemma 13 to $\{a_{2i+1}, b_{2i+1}\}$, it follows that $\mathbf{y}_{b_{2i+1}}^{P,\text{even}} = c-1$.

and thus $\mathbf{y}_{2i+2}^{P,\text{even}} = 1 - c$. Therefore, b_{2i+1} prefers a_{2i+2} to a_{2i+1} . Applying again Lemma 13 to the edge $\{a_{2i+2}, b_{2i+2}\}$, we conclude that $\mathbf{y}_{b_{2i+2}}^{P,\text{even}} = 0$, and if a_{2i+3} exists, then b_{2i+2} prefers a_{2i+2} to a_{2i+3} . Since $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_1}(\{a_{2i+2}, b_{2i+1}\}) = c + 1$, it follows that $\mathbf{y}_{b_{2i+1}}^{P,\text{odd}} = c$ and $\mathbf{y}_{a_{2i+2}}^{P,\text{odd}} = 1$, implying $\mathbf{y}_{b_{2i+2}}^{P,\text{odd}} = -1$ and $\mathbf{y}_{a_{2i+1}}^{P,\text{odd}} = -c$. \square

We now turn to the cycle components of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$. First, we show that if \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at one vertex $b \in B$, then this already implies that \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 .

Claim 21. *Let C be a cycle component of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$. Let M_1 and M_2 be two popular matchings in C , and \mathbf{y}^1 and \mathbf{y}^2 be odd witnesses of M_1 and M_2 such that \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at some $b^* \in V(B) \cap V(C)$. Then \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at every $b \in V(B) \cap V(C)$.*

Proof. Let \mathbf{y}^1 be a witness of M_1 , and \mathbf{y}^2 be a witness of M_2 . If $M_1 = M_2$, then the claim follows from Lemma 13. Thus, we assume $M_1 \neq M_2$. Let $M_1 = \{\{a_i, b_i\} : i \in [k]\}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $M_2 = \{\{a_{i+1}, b_i\} : i \in [k-1]\} \cup \{\{a_1, b_k\}\}$.

Let $b^* = b_j$ such that \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b^* . We will show that \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 also at b_{j+1} , implying the claim. To simplify notation, we assume without loss of generality that $j = 1$.

Case 1: $b_1 = f(a_1)$.

By Theorem 2 and Lemma 18, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k alternates between f -posts and s -posts, implying that $b_{2i-1} = f(a_{2i-1}) = f(a_{2i})$ for every i , and $b_{2i} = s(a_{2i-1}) = s(a_{2i})$. Because a_2 prefers b_1 to $M_1(a_2) = b_2$, we have the following: $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_1}(\{a_2, b_1\}) \geq c - 1$. This, together with $\mathbf{y}_{a_2} \leq 1$, by Observation 14 implies $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^1 \geq c - 2$. Similarly, because a_1 prefers b_1 to $M_2(a_1) = b_k$, we have $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^2 \geq c - 2$.

Case 1.1: $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^1 = c - 2$.

We will show that this case leads to a contradiction and therefore cannot occur. Since \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b_1 , it follows that $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^2 = c - 2$, and b_1 prefers a_1 to a_2 . This implies $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_2}(\{a_1, b_1\}) = c + 1$. Since $\mathbf{y}_{a_1}^2 \leq 1$ by Observation 14, this contradicts \mathbf{y}^2 being a witness of M_2 .

Case 1.2: $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^1 = c$.

Case 1.2.1: $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^2 = c - 2$.

Then b_1 prefers a_2 to a_1 , since otherwise $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_2}(\{a_1, b_1\}) = c + 1 > \mathbf{y}_{a_1}^2 + \mathbf{y}_{b_1}^2$ (using $\mathbf{y}_{a_1}^2 \leq 1$ by Observation 14 for the inequality), contradicting \mathbf{y}^2

being a witness of M_2 . Thus, we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_1}(\{a_2, b_1\}) = c + 1$. Since $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^1 = c$, we have $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^1 = 1$, which implies $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^1 = -1$ by Observation 14. Because $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^2 = 2 - c$ (due to $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^2 = c - 2$ and Observation 14) and $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_2}(\{a_2, b_2\}) \in \{-1 - c, 1 - c\}$, Lemma 13 implies $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^2 = -1$ and $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_2}(\{a_2, b_2\}) = 1 - c$. In particular, b_2 prefers $M^1(b_2) = a_2$ to $M^2(b_2) = a_3$, implying that \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b_2 .

Case 1.2.2: $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^2 = c$.

Then we have $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^2 = -c$ by Observation 14. Since \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b_1 , we have $a_1 \succ_{b_1} a_2$. Thus, we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_1}(\{b_1, a_2\}) = c - 1$. Lemma 13 implies that $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^1 = -1$ and consequently $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^1 = 1$ by Observation 14. If $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^2 = -1$, then \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b_2 . Otherwise we have $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^2 \geq 1$. Since $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_2}(\{a_2, b_2\}) \in \{-c - 1, 1 - c\}$, Lemma 13 implies $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_2}(\{a_2, b_2\}) = 1 - c$ and $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^2 = 1$. This implies $a_2 \succ_{b_2} a_3$, and therefore, \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b_2 .

Case 2: $b_1 = s(a_1)$.

By Theorem 2 and Lemma 18, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k alternates between f -posts and s -posts, implying that $b_{2i-1} = s(a_{2i-1}) = s(a_{2i})$ for every i , and $b_{2i} = f(a_{2i-1}) = f(a_{2i})$. Thus, we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_1}(\{a_2, b_2\}) \in \{-c - 1, -c + 1\}$ and $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_2}(\{a_1, b_1\}) \in \{-c - 1, -c + 1\}$. Lemma 13 now implies that $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^1 \leq 1$ and $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^2 \leq 1$.

Case 2.1: $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^1 = -1$.

Since \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b_1 , we have $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^2 = -1$, and $a_1 \succ_{b_1} a_2$. Lemma 13 applied to $\{a_2, b_1\}$ implies $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^1 = -c$ which then implies $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^1 = c$. Observation 14 implies $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^2 = 1$. If $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^2 = c - 2$, then \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b_2 . Otherwise, we have $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^2 = c$. Applying Lemma 13 to $\{a_2, b_2\}$ now implies that $a_2 \succ_{b_2} a_3$, and thus \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b_2 .

Case 2.2: $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^1 = 1$.

If $a_1 \succ_{b_1} a_2$, then $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_1}(\{a_2, b_1\}) = -1 - c < -c + 1 \leq \mathbf{y}_{a_2}^1 + \mathbf{y}_{b_1}^1$, a contradiction to Lemma 13. Thus, we have $a_2 \succ_{b_1} a_1$. Applying Lemma 13 to $\{a_2, b_1\}$ implies $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^1 = -c$ and thus $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^1 = c$ by Observation 14. As \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b_1 , it follows that $\mathbf{y}_{b_1}^2 = -1$ and thus $\mathbf{y}_{a_2}^2 = 1$ by Observation 14. If $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^2 \leq c - 2$, then \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b_2 . Otherwise $\mathbf{y}_{b_2}^2 = c$, and applying Lemma 13 to $\{a_2, b_2\}$ implies $a_2 \succ_{b_2} a_3$, and thus \mathbf{y}^1 dominates \mathbf{y}^2 at b_2 . \square

We can now show that the witnesses in a cycle component (weakly) dominate each other.

Claim 22. *Let C be a connected component of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ that is a cycle. Then C has two popular matchings M_0^C and M_1^C such that M_0^C has exactly one (odd) witness $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$, while M_1^C has either one witness $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ or three nice witnesses $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$, $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$, and $\mathbf{y}^{C,\text{even}}$.*

If M_1^C has one witness, then $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$.

If M_1^C has three nice witnesses, then $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$, witness $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$ weakly dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,\text{even}}$.

Proof. Since every vertex $a \in A \cap V(C)$ can have at most two edges to $f(a)$ and $s(a)$, it follows that $f(a) \in V(C)$ for all $a \in V(C) \cap A$. Let $b \in B \cap H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ be the f -post of at least one vertex in A . Then b prefers one of its neighbors in C to the other, say, $a_1 \succ_b a_2$. Assuming that M_0^C contains $\{a_2, b\}$, it follows that $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_0^C}(\{a_1, b\}) = c + 1$. Thus, we have $\mathbf{y}_{a_1} = 1$ and $\mathbf{y}_b = c$ for every witness of M_0^C , implying that every witness of M_0^C is odd. By Lemma 13, it follows that the witness of M_0^C is unique.

Considering M_1^C , note that we have $\widetilde{\text{vote}}^{M_1^C}(\{a_2, b\}) = c - 1$. Let \mathbf{y} be a nice witness of M_1^C . Because $\mathbf{y}_a \leq 1$ by Observation 14, we have $\mathbf{y}_b \in \{c - 2, c - 1, c\}$. If $\mathbf{y}_b = c - 1$, then also \mathbf{y}^+ defined as $\mathbf{y}_v^+ := \begin{cases} \mathbf{y}_v + 1 & v \in A \\ \mathbf{y}_v - 1 & v \in B \end{cases}$ and

\mathbf{y}^- defined as $\mathbf{y}_v^- := \begin{cases} \mathbf{y}_v - 1 & v \in A \\ \mathbf{y}_v + 1 & v \in B \end{cases}$ are feasible witnesses. If there exists a

feasible witness $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ with $\mathbf{y}_b^{C,1} = c$ and a feasible witness \mathbf{y}^3 with $\mathbf{y}_b^3 = c - 2$,

then also $\mathbf{y}^{C,\text{even}}$ defined as $\mathbf{y}_v^{C,\text{even}} := \begin{cases} \mathbf{y}_v^{C,1} + 1 & v \in A \\ \mathbf{y}_v^{C,1} - 1 & v \in B \end{cases}$ is a feasible witness.

Consequently, M_1^C admits either one witness (with $\mathbf{y}_b \in \{c, c - 2\}$) or three witnesses.

It remains to show that the witnesses (weakly) dominate each other. First assume that M_1^C admits exactly one witness $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$. Then we have $\mathbf{y}_b^{C,1} \in \{c, c - 2\}$. If $\mathbf{y}_b^{C,1} = c - 2$, then $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ at b . Otherwise $\mathbf{y}_b^{C,1} = \mathbf{y}_b^{C,0}$, and because b prefers M_1^C to M_0^C , we have that $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ at b . Claim 21 implies that either $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ or $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$. The claim follows (possibly by switching the names of M_0^C and M_1^C).

Assume that M_1^C admits three witnesses $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$, $\mathbf{y}^{C,\text{even}}$, and $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$ with $\mathbf{y}_b^{C,1} = c$, $\mathbf{y}_b^{C,\text{even}} = c - 1$, and $\mathbf{y}_b^{C,2} = c - 2$. Because b prefers M_1^C to M_0^C , it follows that $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ at b . Since $\mathbf{y}_b^{C,0} = c = \mathbf{y}_b^{C,2} + 2$, it follows that $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$ at b . Claim 21 implies that $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ dominates

$\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$. Since $\mathbf{y}_b^{C,2} + \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{y}_b^{C,\text{even}}$ for every $b \in B$, it follows that $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$ weakly dominates $\mathbf{y}^{C,\text{even}}$. \square

We remark that Lemma 23 requires that each agent from A has the same weight and each agent from B has the same weight (see Appendix B for an example where agents from B have different weights and the witnesses are not in a dominance relation).

5.2.3. Constructing a “global” witness

Lemmas 19 and 23 lead to the following algorithm (see Algorithm 1 for a pseudocode description). We start by ordering the witnesses according to the weak dominance relation and assigning to each edge component the odd witness $\mathbf{y}^{e,1}$, to each path component $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}$, and to each cycle component $\mathbf{y}^{C,1}$ (Lines 2 to 6). Whenever we encounter a conflicting edge $\{a, b\}$, we distinguish two cases: If the witness in the component containing a is even, then this will be the only witness remaining for the component containing a and we dismiss the witness in the component C containing b (see Lines 9 to 13). Otherwise, we dismiss the witness in the component C containing a (Lines 15 to 18). In both cases, we assign a new witness (together with a matching) to C as follows: If there is an undismissed odd witness of C , then we assign this witness to C (the only case when this witness is not unique is if C is a cycle component and neither $\mathbf{y}^{C,2}$ nor $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ have been dismissed; in this case we assign $\mathbf{y}^{C,0}$ to C). If no undismissed odd witness of C exists, then we assign the even witness to C . If we eventually dismissed all witnesses for one component, then we conclude that there is no popular matching (Lines 12 and 17). Otherwise, we eventually found a matching together with a witness of it, and we return this matching.

Theorem 24. *If all vertices in A have weight c for some $c > 3$ and every vertex in B has weight 1, then a maximum-cardinality popular matching (if one exists) can be computed in $O(n + m)$ time.*

Proof. We claim that Algorithm 1 computes a maximum-cardinality popular matching in linear time. We start by analyzing the running time of Algorithm 1. The computation of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ takes $O(n + m)$ time due to Lemma 19. There are $O(n)$ connected components of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$; thus at most $O(n)$ partial witnesses get dismissed. As we only need to check whether an edge is conflicting if the witness on one of the two connected components incident to

Algorithm 1 for POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS

Input: A POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS instance \mathcal{I}

Output: A popular matching in \mathcal{I} or no if no popular matching exists

- 1: Compute $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$.
 - 2: **for each** connected component C of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ **do**
 - 3: Compute the set of popular matchings together with their nice witnesses.
 - 4: Create a list $L(C)$ of the witnesses by
 - $L(C) = (\mathbf{0})$ if C contains only one vertex,
 - $L(C) = (\mathbf{y}^{e,1}, \mathbf{y}^{e,2}, \mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}})$ if C contains exactly one edge e ,
 - $L(C) = (\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}, \mathbf{y}^{P,\text{even}})$ if C is a path with at least three edges, or
 - $L(C) = (\mathbf{y}^{C,1}, \mathbf{y}^{C,0})$ if C is a cycle and each popular matching in C has only one nice witness, or
 - $L(C) = (\mathbf{y}^{C,1}, \mathbf{y}^{C,0}, \mathbf{y}^{C,2}, \mathbf{y}^{C,\text{even}})$ otherwise.
 - 5: Set \mathbf{y}^C to be the first witness of $L(C)$ to C .
 - 6: For each vertex $v \in V$, set $\mathbf{y}_v := \mathbf{y}_v^C$ where C is the connected component of $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$ containing v .
 - 7: **while** there is a conflicting edge $\{a, b\}$ for \mathbf{y} **do**
 - 8: Let C_a be the connected component containing a , and C_b be the connected component containing b .
 - 9: **if** the witness assigned to C_a is odd **then**
 - 10: Dismiss the witness assigned to C_a from $L(C_a)$.
 - 11: **if** $L(C_a)$ is empty **then**
 - 12: **return no**
 - 13: Set $\mathbf{y}_v := \mathbf{y}_v^{C_a}$ for every $v \in V(C_a)$ where \mathbf{y}^{C_a} is the first witness of $L(C_a)$.
 - 14: **else**
 - 15: Dismiss the witness assigned to C_b from $L(C_b)$.
 - 16: **if** $L(C_b)$ is empty **then**
 - 17: **return no**
 - 18: Set $\mathbf{y}_v := \mathbf{y}_v^{C_b}$ for every $v \in V(C_b)$ where \mathbf{y}^{C_b} is the first witness of $L(C_b)$.
 - 19: **return** the matching M constructed by taking for each connected component C the popular matchings belonging to the witnesses assigned to C .
-

it changed, we need to check for each edge only a constant number of times whether it is conflicting. From this, the running time follows.

To show the correctness of the algorithm, first observe that if a component is assigned its even witness, then it is the only remaining witness that has not been dismissed. We will now show that whenever a witness \mathbf{y}^{sub} is dismissed (which can happen in Line 10 or 15), then there is no popular matching together with a witness \mathbf{y} such that $\mathbf{y}_v^{\text{sub}} = \mathbf{y}_v$ for every $v \in V(C)$. At the beginning, the statement is clear since no witness has been dismissed. Consider the first witness \mathbf{y}^{sub} of a connected component C deleted by the algorithm that is a subwitness of a witness \mathbf{y} of some matching, and let $\{a, b\}$ be the conflicting edge because of which \mathbf{y}^{sub} was dismissed. If \mathbf{y}^{sub} was deleted in Line 10, then $a \in V(C)$, \mathbf{y}^{sub} is odd, and the current witness in the component C^b containing b weakly dominates all other non-dismissed witnesses on this component by Lemma 23. Note that \mathbf{y} restricted to C^b is not dismissed by the choice of \mathbf{y}^{sub} . Consequently, Lemma 22 implies that $\{a, b\}$ is conflicting for \mathbf{y} , a contradiction.

If \mathbf{y}^{sub} was deleted in Line 15, then $b \in V(C)$, the witness in the component containing a is even, and consequently the only non-dismissed witness \mathbf{y}^{sub} on this component. Therefore, by the definition of \mathbf{y}^{sub} , every witness \mathbf{y} of some popular matching coincides with $\mathbf{y}_a^{\text{sub}}$ on a , and therefore cannot coincide with \mathbf{y}^{sub} on b (as otherwise the edge $\{a, b\}$ would be conflicting for \mathbf{y}).

Finally, we show that there is no larger popular matching than the computed one. Let C be a connected component which is a path and let M_1 and M_2 be the two popular matchings on C . Assume without loss of generality that $|M_1| \leq |M_2|$. Then at least one vertex v of C is unmatched by M_2 . This implies that every witness \mathbf{y}^2 of M_2 has $\mathbf{y}_v^2 = 0$, implying that \mathbf{y}^2 is even. Because we initially assign the odd witness (and thus corresponding to the larger matching M_1) to this connected component, the computed matching will contain the smaller matching only if no popular matching contains M_1 . Thus, the computed matching is of maximum cardinality among all popular matchings. \square

6. Future directions

We discovered an unusual pattern in the complexity of POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS in instances where the weights on one side are fixed at 1. A solution is guaranteed to exist and easy to find if the

weight c of the other side equals 1. Then, for $1 < c \leq 2$, the problem becomes NP-complete as Theorem 9 shows. Polynomial-time solvability then returns for $3 < c$, but no-instances occur. A straightforward open question is whether POPULAR MATCHING WITH WEIGHTED VOTERS can be solved in polynomial time when all vertices in A have weight $2 < c \leq 3$ and all vertices in B have weight 1.

Furthermore, it would be interesting whether allowing each vertex from one side an individual weight larger than three (or some other constant c) while all vertices from the other side still have weight one is also solvable in polynomial time.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the anonymous reviewers of earlier versions of the paper, whose suggestions helped to improve the presentation.




Figure A.7: The input instance for our example execution of the algorithm.

Appendix A. Example execution of the algorithm

We now present an example execution for our algorithm from Theorem 24. The input instance is depicted in Figure A.7.

Appendix A.1. Phase 1: Pruning edges

In the first phase of the algorithm, see Section 5.2.1, we prune non-popular edges in three steps, each of which results in the graph $H^{\deg(A) \leq 2}$, $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$, and $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$, respectively. Figures A.8 to A.10 depict these three graphs.

1. In the first step, we compute $f(v)$ and $s(v)$ for every vertex $v \in V(G)$. This results in graph $H^{\deg(A) \leq 2}$, depicted in Figure A.8. For example, for vertex a_1 , $f(a_1) = b_1$, because b_1 is the first choice of a_1 . The second choice of a_1 is b_8 , but since $b_8 = f(a_8)$, $s(a_1) \neq b_8$. Instead, $s(a_1) = b_1$.
2. In the second step, we delete every edge incident to a cycle, resulting in graph $H^{C+\mathcal{T}}$ (see Figure A.9). There are two cycles in the graph $H^{\deg(A) \leq 2}$ in Figure A.8, but only one of them is incident to an edge. This edge is $\{a_{10}, b_3\}$.
3. In the third step, we consider each connected component, which is either a tree or a cycle, and exhaustively delete every edge not contained in a popular matching in this component. This results in the graph $H^{C+\mathcal{P}}$, depicted in Figure A.10. In our example, only the component on vertices $\{a_7, a_8, a_9, b_7, b_8, b_9\}$ has such an edge, all other components have popular matchings that cover all edges.




Figure A.8: The graph $H^{\deg(A) \leq 2}$.




Figure A.9: The graph H^{C+T} .




Figure A.10: The graph H^{C+P} .

Appendix A.2. Phase 2: Computing “local” witnesses

In the second phase, we compute witnesses for each connected component of H^{C+P} , as described in Section 5.2.2. These “local” witnesses are depicted in Table A.3.

Appendix A.3. Phase 3: Constructing a “global” witness

We now turn to the final step of the algorithm, which prunes “local” witnesses step-by-step until we found a “global” witness. Throughout this phase, each connected component of H^{C+P} is assigned a “local” witness. Initially, witnesses $\mathbf{y}^{C_1,1}$, $\mathbf{y}^{C_2,1}$, $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}$, and $\mathbf{y}^{e,1}$ are assigned to the four non-trivial components of H^{C+P} . We now choose an arbitrary order of conflicting edges. We start with edge $\{a_9, b_{10}\}$. Because $\mathbf{y}^{e,1}$ is odd, we dismiss $\mathbf{y}^{e,1}$ and assign $\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$. Next, we choose edge $\{a_{10}, b_8\}$. Because the witness $\mathbf{0}$ for a_{10} is even, we dismiss $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}$ and assign $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{even}}$. Now edge $\{a_1, b_8\}$ becomes conflicting and we choose it. Because $\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{even}}$ is even, we dismiss $\mathbf{y}^{C_1,1}$ and assign $\mathbf{y}^{C_1,0}$. Now edge $\{a_3, b_2\}$ becomes conflicting and we choose it. Because $\mathbf{y}^{C_2,1}$ is odd, we dismiss witness $\mathbf{y}^{C_2,1}$ and assign $\mathbf{y}^{C_2,2}$. Afterwards, there are no conflicting edges, and thus, we found the popular matching $M = \{\{a_2, b_1\}, \{a_1, b_2\}, \{a_4, b_3\}, \{a_3, b_6\}, \{a_6, b_5\}, \{a_5, b_3\}, \{a_8, b_8\}, \{a_9, b_9\}\}$.

Appendix B. Example for non-dominating witnesses for non-unit weights for B

If we drop the assumption that vertices from B have weight 1 and allow them instead to have arbitrary weights not larger than 1, then Lemma 23

Witness	Matching	Vertex	Value of \mathbf{y}	Vertex	Value of \mathbf{y}
$\mathbf{y}^{C_{1,1}}$	$\{\{a_2, b_2\}, \{a_1, b_1\}\}$	a_2	$-c$	b_2	c
		a_1	-1	b_1	1
$\mathbf{y}^{C_{1,0}}$	$\{\{a_2, b_1\}, \{a_1, b_2\}\}$	a_2	1	b_2	c
		a_1	$-c$	b_1	-1
$\mathbf{y}^{C_{1,2}}$	$\{\{a_2, b_2\}, \{a_1, b_1\}\}$	a_2	$2 - c$	b_2	$c - 2$
		a_1	1	b_1	-1
$\mathbf{y}^{C_{1,\text{even}}}$	$\{\{a_2, b_2\}, \{a_1, b_1\}\}$	a_2	$1 - c$	b_2	$c - 1$
		a_1	0	b_1	0
$\mathbf{y}^{C_{2,1}}$	$\{\{a_4, b_3\}, \{a_3, b_6\}, \{a_6, b_5\}, \{a_5, b_4\}\}$	a_4	$-c$	b_4	-1
		a_3	-1	b_3	c
		a_6	$-c$	b_6	1
		a_5	1	b_5	c
$\mathbf{y}^{C_{2,2}}$	$\{\{a_4, b_4\}, \{a_3, b_3\}, \{a_6, b_6\}, \{a_5, b_5\}\}$	a_4	1	b_4	-1
		a_3	$-c$	b_3	c
		a_6	1	b_6	-1
		a_5	$2 - c$	b_5	$c - 2$
$\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{odd}}$	$\{\{a_8, b_7\}, \{a_7, b_8\}\}$	a_8	1	b_8	c
		a_7	$-c$	b_7	-1
$\mathbf{y}^{P,\text{even}}$	$\{\{a_8, b_8\}\}$	a_8	$1 - c$	b_8	$c - 1$
		a_7	0	b_7	0
$\mathbf{y}^{e,1}$	$\{\{a_9, b_9\}\}$	a_9	$-c$	b_9	c
$\mathbf{y}^{e,2}$	$\{\{a_9, b_9\}\}$	a_9	$2 - c$	b_9	$c - 2$
$\mathbf{y}^{e,\text{even}}$	$\{\{a_9, b_9\}\}$	a_9	$1 - c$	b_9	$c - 1$
	\emptyset	a_{10}	0		
	\emptyset			b_{10}	0

Table A.3: The set of witnesses for the connected components of $H^{c+\mathcal{P}}$. The components are separated by a double horizontal line in the table.




Figure B.11: An example for an instance where each agent from A has weight $c > 3$ and each agent from B has weight at most 1 such that the witnesses are not in a dominance relation. Each squared vertex has weight $c > 3$, each black circular vertex has weight 1, and each white (circular) vertex has weight $\frac{1}{3}$.

does not hold any more: As an example, consider Figure B.11. There are two popular matchings (one containing the green edges, the other containing the red dotted edges), each having a unique witness (indicated by the green and red numbers). At vertex b^* , neither witness dominates the other.

References

- [1] J. A. N. d. C. d. Condorcet, Essai sur l'application de l'analyse à la probabilité des décisions rendues à la pluralité des voix, L'Imprimerie Royale, 1785.
- [2] P. Gärdenfors, Match making: Assignments based on bilateral preferences, Behavioral Science 20 (3) (1975) 166–173.
- [3] D. J. Abraham, R. W. Irving, T. Kavitha, K. Mehlhorn, Popular matchings, SIAM Journal on Computing 37 (2007) 1030–1045.
- [4] C. T. Sng, D. F. Manlove, Popular matchings in the weighted capacitated house allocation problem, Journal of Discrete Algorithms 8 (2010) 102–116.

- [5] D. F. Manlove, *Algorithmics of Matching Under Preferences*, World Scientific, 2013.
- [6] Á. Cseh, Popular matchings, *Trends in Computational Social Choice* 105 (3) (2017).
- [7] D. Gale, L. S. Shapley, College admissions and the stability of marriage, *American Mathematical Monthly* 69 (1962) 9–15.
- [8] M. Baïou, M. Balinski, The stable allocation (or ordinal transportation) problem, *Mathematics of Operations Research* 27 (3) (2002) 485–503.
- [9] D. J. Abraham, K. Cechlárová, D. F. Manlove, K. Mehlhorn, Pareto optimality in house allocation problems, in: *Proceedings of the 15th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2004*, Springer, 2004, pp. 3–15.
- [10] J. F. Banzhaf III, Weighted voting doesn't work: A mathematical analysis, *Rutgers Law Review* 19 (1964) 317–343.
- [11] W. H. Riker, L. S. Shapley, *Weighted voting: a mathematical analysis for instrumental judgments*, Vol. 10, HeinOnline, 1966.
- [12] A. Kahng, S. Mackenzie, A. Procaccia, Liquid democracy: An algorithmic perspective, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 70 (2021) 1223–1252.
- [13] W. M. Crain, R. Tollison, The influence of representation on public policy, *The Journal of Legal Studies* 6 (2) (1977) 355–361.
- [14] S. Ansolabehere, J. M. Snyder Jr, A. B. Strauss, M. M. Ting, Voting weights and formateur advantages in the formation of coalition governments, *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (3) (2005) 550–563.
- [15] C.-C. Huang, T. Kavitha, Popular matchings in the stable marriage problem, *Information and Computation* 222 (2013) 180–194.
- [16] T. Kavitha, Popular matchings with one-sided bias, in: *47th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2020*, Vol. 168 of LIPIcs, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020, pp. 70:1–70:18.

- [17] A. E. Roth, The economics of matching: Stability and incentives, *Mathematics of Operations Research* 7 (4) (1982) 617–628.
- [18] J. W. Hatfield, F. Kojima, Group incentive compatibility for matching with contracts, *Games and Economic Behavior* 67 (2) (2009) 745–749.
- [19] Y. Faenza, T. Kavitha, V. Powers, X. Zhang, Popular matchings and limits to tractability, in: *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2019, SIAM, 2019*, pp. 2790–2809.
- [20] S. Gupta, P. Misra, S. Saurabh, M. Zehavi, Popular matching in roommates setting is NP-hard, *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory* 13 (2) (2021).
- [21] A. Darmann, Popular spanning trees, *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science* 24 (05) (2013) 655–677.
- [22] A. van Zuylen, F. Schalekamp, D. P. Williamson, Popular ranking, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 165 (2014) 312–316.
- [23] S. Kraiczky, Á. Cseh, D. Manlove, On weakly and strongly popular rankings, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 340 (2023) 134–152.
- [24] A. Darmann, A social choice approach to ordinal group activity selection, *Mathematical Social Sciences* 93 (2018) 57–66.
- [25] T. Kavitha, T. Király, J. Matuschke, I. Schlotter, U. Schmidt-Kraepelin, Popular branchings and their dual certificates, *Mathematical Programming* 192 (1-2) (2022) 567–595.
- [26] F. Brandl, T. Kavitha, Two problems in max-size popular matchings, *Algorithmica* 81 (7) (2019) 2738–2764.
- [27] Y. Faenza, T. Kavitha, Quasi-popular matchings, optimality, and extended formulations, *Mathematics of Operations Research* 47 (1) (2022) 427–457.
- [28] T. Király, Z. Mészáros-Karkus, Finding strongly popular b -matchings in bipartite graphs, *European Journal of Combinatorics* 88 (2020).

- [29] C.-C. Huang, T. Kavitha, Popularity, mixed matchings, and self-duality, *Mathematics of Operations Research* 46 (2) (2021) 405–427.
- [30] M. O. Afacan, I. Bó, Strategy-proof popular mechanisms, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 102 (2022) 102734.
- [31] P. Biró, R. W. Irving, D. F. Manlove, Popular matchings in the marriage and roommates problems, in: *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Algorithms and Complexity, CIAC 2010*, Vol. 6078 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2010, pp. 97–108.
- [32] T. Kavitha, A size-popularity tradeoff in the stable marriage problem, *SIAM Journal on Computing* 43 (2014) 52–71.
- [33] E. McDermid, R. W. Irving, Popular matchings: Structure and algorithms, *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization* 22 (2011) 339–358.
- [34] J. Mestre, Weighted popular matchings, *ACM Transactions on Algorithms* 10 (1) (2014) 2:1–2:16.
- [35] T. Itoh, O. Watanabe, Weighted random popular matchings, *Random Structures & Algorithms* 37 (4) (2010) 477–494.
- [36] S. Ruangwises, T. Itoh, Unpopularity factor in the marriage and roommates problems, *Theory of Computing Systems* 65 (3) (2021) 579–592.
- [37] R. M. McCutchen, The least-unpopularity-factor and least-unpopularity-margin criteria for matching problems with one-sided preferences, in: *Proceedings of the 8th Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics, LATIN 2008*, Vol. 4957 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2008, pp. 593–604.
- [38] T. Kavitha, J. Mestre, M. Nasre, Popular mixed matchings, *Theoretical Computer Science* 412 (2011) 2679–2690.
- [39] T. Kavitha, Popular half-integral matchings, in: *Proceedings of the 43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP 2016*, Vol. 22, 2016, pp. 1–13.
- [40] G. Birkhoff, Tres observaciones sobre el algebra lineal, *Univ. Nac. Tucumán. Revista A.* 5 (1946) 147–151.

- [41] A. Schrijver, Combinatorial optimization. Polyhedra and efficiency (3 volumes), Springer, 2003.
- [42] D. Zuckerman, Linear degree extractors and the inapproximability of max clique and chromatic number, *Theory of Computing* 3 (2007) 103–128.
- [43] T. Kavitha, Popular roommates in simply exponential time, in: *Proceedings of the 39th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2019*, Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019, pp. 20:1–20:15.