

Structural and Algorithmic Results for Stable Cycles and Partitions in the Roommates Problem*

Frederik Glitzner  and David Manlove 

School of Computing Science, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ, UK
f.glitzner.1@research.gla.ac.uk, david.manlove@glasgow.ac.uk

Abstract

In the STABLE ROOMMATES problem, we seek a *stable matching* of the agents into pairs, in which no two agents have an incentive to deviate from their assignment. It is well known that a stable matching is unlikely to exist, but a *stable partition* always does and provides a succinct certificate for the *unsolvability* of an instance. Furthermore, apart from being a useful structural tool to study the problem, every stable partition corresponds to a *stable half-matching*, which has applications, for example, in sports scheduling and time-sharing.

We establish new structural results for stable partitions and show how to enumerate all stable partitions and the cycles included in such structures efficiently. We also adapt optimality criteria from stable matchings to stable partitions and give complexity and approximability results for the problems of computing such “fair” and “optimal” stable partitions.

Through this research, we contribute to a deeper understanding of stable partitions from a combinatorial point of view, as well as the computational complexity of computing “fair” or “optimal” stable half-matchings in practice, closing the gap between integral and fractional stable matchings and paving the way for further applications of stable partitions to unsolvable instances and computationally hard stable matching problems.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The STABLE ROOMMATES problem (SR) is a classical combinatorial problem with applications to computational social choice. Consider a group of friends that want to play one hour of tennis, where everyone has preferences over who to play with. Can we match them into pairs such that no two friends prefer to play with each other rather than their assigned partners? If the problem instance I admits such a *stable matching* M which does not admit a *blocking pair* of agents which would rather be matched to each other than their partners in M , then we call I *solvable*. Otherwise, we call I *unsolvable*. Even an instance with as few as 4 agents may be unsolvable as Gale and Shapley [24] showed. A solvable instance is shown in Example 1, where a_1 ranks the agents a_2, a_5, a_3 , etc., in linear order. The problem instance admits the matching $M = \{\{a_1, a_2\}, \{a_3, a_4\}, \{a_5, a_6\}\}$ indicated in circles, the stability of which can be easily verified by hand by looking at all agents that are not matched to their first choice and seeing that no agent preferred to their partner would rather be matched to them than their partner. On the other hand, Example 2 shows an example instance with six agents that does not admit any stable matching (for which we will see a certificate later).

*Frederik Glitzner is supported by a Minerva Scholarship from the School of Computing Science, University of Glasgow. David Manlove is supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, grant number EP/X013618/1.

a_1	a_2	a_5	a_3	a_4	a_6
a_2	a_5	a_3	a_1	a_6	a_4
a_3	a_4	a_2	a_6	a_1	a_5
a_4	a_1	a_2	a_5	a_3	a_6
a_5	a_6	a_2	a_1	a_4	a_3
a_6	a_5	a_3	a_2	a_4	a_1

Example 1: A solvable SR instance

a_1	a_2	a_5	a_3	a_4	a_6
a_2	a_4	a_3	a_1	a_6	a_5
a_3	a_5	a_4	a_1	a_2	a_6
a_4	a_1	a_5	a_6	a_2	a_3
a_5	a_6	a_2	a_4	a_1	a_3
a_6	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4	a_5

Example 2: An unsolvable SR instance

There are many practical applications of the SR model. As the name suggests, it can model campus housing allocation where two students either share a room or a flat [42]. Furthermore, SR can model pairwise kidney exchange markets [37], with centralised matching schemes existing, for example, in the US [1], Netherlands [34], and UK [2]. SR can also model peer-to-peer networks, such as file-sharing networks [23], and pair formation in chess tournaments [35].

First proposed by Gale and Shapley [24], the problem is, historically, a non-bipartite extension well-studied in its own right of the classical STABLE MARRIAGE problem (SM), where the set of agents can be partitioned into two sets such that every agent from one set has complete preferences over all agents from the other set, but does not accept to be matched with anyone from their own set. The authors showed that any SM problem instance admits at least one stable matching, and that such a matching can be found in linear time.

In SR, a problem instance I and a matching M can be represented in the form of preference lists and a set of pairs or as a complete graph and a set of edges, respectively. These representations are equivalent. The SR problem is well-studied [28, 38], and Irving [30] presented an algorithm to find a stable matching or decide that none exists in linear time, which is referred to as *Irving's algorithm*. Furthermore, there is a wide range of algorithms and structural results for special kinds of stable matchings, including algorithms for finding stable matchings that satisfy further optimality constraints on the structure of the matching. For example, the *profile* is often used in fairness measures of a matching, which is a vector $(p_1 \dots p_n)$ where p_i captures the number of agents that are matched to their i th choice, and n is the number of agents. However, naturally, these optimality properties cannot be realised if the instance is unsolvable.

Pittel and Irving [45] presented some empirical evidence relating to solvability probability, denoted P_n , which is the probability that a uniformly random SR instance admits at least one stable matching. Their results suggest that for instances with 100 to 2000 agents, P_n appears to decline from around 64% down to around 33%. Mertens [39, 41] extended the results through extensive simulations and conjectured that with an even number of agents n , $P_n \simeq e\sqrt{2\pi^{-1}}n^{-\frac{1}{4}}$. Thus, it is clear that as n grows large, stable matchings are unlikely to be a good solution concept in practice as they are unlikely to exist. In the past, many alternative solution concepts have been proposed, such as *stable partitions* [51], *maximum stable matchings* [52], *almost-stable matchings* [3], *popular matchings* [25], and more, some of which leave many agents unassigned or are NP-hard to compute.

One of the fundamental SR-related questions posed by Gusfield and Irving [28] asked about the existence of a succinct certificate for the unsolvability of an instance. The question was answered positively by Tan [51], who generalised the notion of a stable matching to a new structure called a *stable partition*. A stable partition is a cyclic permutation Π of the agents, where every agent prefers their successor in Π over their predecessor in Π , and no two agents strictly prefer each other over their predecessors (for example, $\Pi = (a_1 a_2 a_3)(a_4 a_5 a_6)$ is the unique stable partition of Example 2, indicated in dotted and unbroken circles). Tan proved that cycles of odd length are invariant for all stable partitions of an instance and that an instance is unsolvable if and only if any stable partition contains a cycle of odd length. Over 20 years

after their initial publication, Manlove [38] described the work on stable partitions in the 1990s as a key landmark in the progress made on the SR problem after 1989.

Although proposed and studied as a succinct certificate for the unsolvability of an SR instance, the notion of a stable partition was adopted as a solution concept in itself. Remaining in the tennis analogy, a stable partition can be interpreted as an assignment of the friends into half-hour sessions, or a weekly-alternating schedule. The stability definition leads to a guaranteed solution in which every friend plays either for exactly one hour with some other friend or two half-hour sessions with two different friends, at most one agent does not play at all, and no two friends who would like to play more time with each other (in Example 2, agents a_1, a_2, a_3 would all play half-hour matches with each other and a_4, a_5, a_6 would do too). Note that for any solvable instance, any stable partition can be transformed into a stable matching in linear time, and for unsolvable instances, some agents are guaranteed to be in half-time partnerships.

Some have highlighted the advantages of considering truly fractional stable matchings, whereas stable matchings are inherently integral, and stable partitions can be interpreted as stable half-integral matchings [14]. While stable fractional matchings might be advantageous in applications such as time-sharing [47], it is unlikely to be a suitable solution concept for other applications. For example, a tennis schedule for a set of friends where everyone plays many times for varying durations, which could be very short, is unlikely to be satisfactory.

Overall, stable partitions are an important structure and tool in the study of SR and in the field of stable matchings. They can be used to show properties about instances, algorithms, and structures and pose an efficient solution concept to solvable and unsolvable instances at the intersection of stable integral and fractional matchings. Surprisingly, though, stable partitions themselves have not received nearly as much attention as stable matchings. This motivates our study of stable partition structures in more detail, specifically the investigation of different cycle types, the algorithmics of stable cycle and partition enumeration, how profile-optimality in the case of stable matching and maximum utility in the case of stable fractional matching adapts to stable partitions, and which of these variants are efficiently solvable or approximable.

1.2 Our Contributions

In this paper, we prove new structural results for stable partitions, allowing us to construct algorithms to enumerate stable partitions and to compute or approximate various types of optimal stable partitions.

Specifically, we characterise the structure of *reduced stable partitions* (i.e., stable partitions with no cycles of even length larger than 2) in a given SR instance I by proving a bijective correspondence between the set of reduced stable partitions and the set of stable matchings of a solvable sub-instance of I . With this, we show how the set of all reduced stable partitions can be enumerated efficiently.

We build on these results by considering all stable partitions, not necessarily reduced. We show that any non-reduced stable partition can be constructed from two reduced stable partitions and leverage our previous result to enumerate all stable partitions. However, a deeper structural investigation yields the non-trivial result that any predecessor-successor pair can be part of at most one cycle of length larger than 2. This proves that the union of all stable partitions of any instance with n agents contains at most $O(n^2)$ cycles, and we show how these can be enumerated in $O(n^4)$ time. We then use these structural insights to improve on the previous enumeration algorithm for all stable partitions, denoted $P(I)$, and present a more efficient algorithm that runs in $O(|P(I)|n^3 + n^4)$ time.

Finally, we adapt six natural fairness measures and optimality criteria from stable matchings to stable partitions. We prove that finding a stable partition that minimises the maximum predecessor rank (called *minimum-regret stable partition*) is the only tractable problem variant of these, while the remaining five are NP-hard to compute. Furthermore, although two of the

NP-hard optimisation problem variants are polynomial-time approximable within a factor of 2, one of them is not approximable within any constant factor.

All of these results are consistent with those previously known about stable matchings, strengthening the tight correspondence between stable matchings and stable partitions observed from the beginning of this work. Overall, our results shed more light on the complexity-theoretic and structural properties of stable partitions.

1.3 Related Work

Stable Matchings Irving [29] and Gusfield [26] published an extensive collection of early structural results, leading to a book discussing the structure and algorithms of the SM and SR problems by Gusfield and Irving [28]. They proved, for example, that the stable matchings of a given instance form a semi-lattice structure, that the same set of agents are unassigned in every stable matching of the same instance and that, of a given SR instance I with n agents, all stable pairs (union of all pairs part of some stable matching) and all stable matchings, denoted $S(I)$, can be found in $O(n^3 \log n)$ and $O(|S(I)|n^2 + n^3 \log n)$ time, respectively. Later, Feder [21] used a 2-SAT reduction to obtain improved time complexities for the last two problems, solving them in $O(n^3)$ and $O(|S(I)|n + n^2)$ time, respectively.

With regards to the complexity of profile-optimal stable matching problems, *minimum-regret* is one of few efficiently solvable ones, with a linear-time algorithm presented by Gusfield and Irving [28]. On the other hand, Feder [20] proved that finding an egalitarian (minimum sum of ranks of agents assigned) stable matching for SR is NP-hard. Later, Feder [21], and Gusfield and Pitt [27] gave 2-approximation algorithms for the problem using a reduction to 2-SAT. The hardness result is refined by Cseh et al. [17] who established NP-hardness even when preference lists are of length at most 3. On the other hand, Chen et al. [13] showed that the problem is fixed-parameter tractable with respect to egalitarian cost. Cooper [15] showed that for an instance with regret r , the problems of finding *rank-maximal* (lexicographically maximal profile), *generous* (lexicographically minimal inverse profile), *first-choice maximal* (maximum number of first choices achieved), and *regret-minimal* (minimum number of agents assigned to r) stable matchings, if they exist, are all NP-hard. Simola and Manlove [50] extended these results to short preference lists and presented some approximability results.

As a natural way to deal with unsolvable instances, Abraham et al. [3] introduced the problem of finding *almost-stable* matchings, which are matchings with a minimum number of blocking pairs. They proved that the problem is NP-hard and not approximable within $n^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, unless P=NP. Later, Biró et al. [9] extended the study of this problem to bounded preference lists, showing that the problem remains inapproximable within any constant factor even for preference lists of lengths at most 3.

Stable Partitions In his original paper, Tan [51] provided a linear-time algorithm similar to Irving’s algorithm to compute a stable partition, referred to as *Tan’s algorithm*, and showed that every SR instance admits at least one stable partition. An alternative proof for the existence of stable half-matchings in more general settings was provided by Aharoni and Fleiner [4], and extended by Biró and Fleiner [7] using Scarf’s Lemma. Tan and Hsueh [53] considered the online version of the problem of finding a stable partition, in which a new agent a_i arrives and the preference lists are modified. They showed how to update, in linear time, an existing stable partition, for the instance prior to arrival of a_i , to a new stable partition for the instance after a_i arrives. The entire process, in which a stable partition is built from scratch for all n arriving agents, takes $O(n^3)$ time and is known as the Tan-Hsueh algorithm.

Pittel [43] derived a range of probabilistic results about the original algorithm by Tan. Specifically, he showed, for example, that every stable partition is likely to be almost a stable matching, in the sense that at most $O(\sqrt{(n \log n)})$ members are likely to be involved in the cycles

of odd length three or more. He also showed that the expected number of stable partitions is $O(\sqrt{n})$. This work was extended by Pittel [44], who showed that the expected total number of reduced stable partitions grows proportionally to $O(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$. Pittel also showed that the expected total number of cycles of odd length grows proportionally to $O(n^{\frac{1}{4}} \log n)$ and that, with high probability, the total length of all its cycles of odd length, denoted n_{odd} , is below $\sqrt{n} \log n$.

With regards to experimental results related to components of stable partitions, Mertens [39] analysed n_{odd} for unsolvable instances sampled from complete uniform random graphs and conjectured that the expected total number is $\Theta(\sqrt{n(\log n)^{-1}})$. Furthermore, Mertens [40] presented the exact probabilities for specific component types for small instances.

Stable partitions are also used to show various other results with regards to the SR problem. For example, Biró et al. [6] proved some useful properties of the algorithm by Tan and Hsueh [53]. A key result is that in the algorithm, the agent that arrives last gets their best-possible partner in any stable matching. Similarly, in their study of almost-stable matchings, Abraham et al. [3] used stable partitions to prove bounds on the number of blocking pairs. Finally, stable partitions are also used in exact and approximation algorithms for finding almost-stable matchings by Biró et al. [9].

Similar Problems and Extensions Over time, many variations of SR have been studied, such as SRT (where ties are allowed in the preferences) [31, 46, 49, 36], SRI (where incomplete preferences are permitted) [17], or both, denoted SRTI [31]. Another extension of SR is the problem of finding stable fractional matchings. One advantage of fractional matchings is the natural integration of cardinal utilities rather than purely ordinal preferences, as highlighted by Anshelevich et al. [5]. Caragiannis et al. [11] were the first to study a combined model of stable fractional matchings with cardinal preferences in the SM context from a computational complexity point of view. The authors established the NP-hardness of computing an optimal solution in terms of a stable fractional matching with highest overall utility achieved. As a special case of SR, these hardness results carry over to the SRI problem. Recently, Chen et al. [14] expanded on these results and completed the complexity classification of optimising for overall utility or the number of fully matched agents in both the SM and SR settings with and without ties. They established that a stable fractional matching always exists, but that both optimisation problems are NP-hard when considering cardinal utilities. Furthermore, they showed that stable partitions are a 2-approximation of the optimisation problem of finding stable fractional matchings with the maximum number of agents fully matched in the presence of ties.

Building on theory for bipartite problem restrictions by Crawford and Knoer [16] and Kelso and Crawford [33], Fleiner [22] showed how, under some assumptions, the strict linearly-ordered preference lists can be replaced with choice functions, which are a generalisation of ordinal rankings and can capture more complex preference behaviours, while keeping the problem polynomial-time solvable. Irving and Scott [32] introduced a many-to-many extension of SR called STABLE FIXTURES and have a linear-time algorithm to find a stable matching or report that none exists. This was later extended by Biró et al. [8] to include payments. A similar extension many-to-many extensions where parallel edges are allowed, i.e., agents can be matched to each other multiple times, was studied by Ceclárová and Fleiner [12] and extended by Borbel'ová and Ceclárová [10]. Dean and Munshi [18] investigated the even more general STABLE ALLOCATION problem and used transformations between non-bipartite and bipartite instances to derive efficient algorithms.

As an alternative to stability, a matching M is *popular* if there does not exist some matching M' which is preferred by more agents than those that prefer M . Gupta et al. [25] and Faenza et al. [19] simultaneously proved that the problem of deciding whether a matching is popular is NP-complete. Schlotter and Cseh [48] extended this result to maximize the utility of a matching that is popular but admits only a few blocking pairs, proving that finding a popular matching with at most one blocking pair is already NP-hard.

1.4 Structure of the Paper

In Section 2, we present a mixture of existing and new formal definitions and known results relevant to this paper. In Section 3, we characterise and exploit the structure of reduced stable partitions, longer cycles, and all stable partitions. Finally, in Section 4, we adapt common profile-based optimality criteria from stable matchings to stable partitions and investigate the complexity and approximability of these problems. We finish with a discussion of the results and some related open problems in Section 5.

2 Formal Definitions and Preliminary Results

In Section 2.1, we will outline some crucial concepts and their notation with regards to stable matchings, stable partitions, and their different components. Following, Section 2.2 will introduce some natural fairness and optimality measures previously studied in the literature for stable matchings and adapt them for our study of stable partitions.

2.1 Stable Matchings, Partitions, and Cycles

We begin this section by defining SR instances formally as follows.

Definition 2.1 (SR Instance). Let $I = (A, \succ)$ be an SR *instance* where $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$, also denoted $A(I)$, is a set of $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$ agents and every agent $a_i \in A$ has a strict preference ranking or *preference relation* \succ_i over all other agents $a_j \in A \setminus \{a_i\}$. For stable partitions, we will assume that \succ is extended such that every agent ranks themselves last.

Note that in this work, we assume an even number of agents. However, it has been shown [28] that most concepts and results transfer over to the case where the number of agents is odd and we accept an unmatched (but non-blocking) agent. Furthermore, there will be cases where we transform an SR instance with *complete preferences* (i.e. a ranking \succ in which all agents rank all other agents but themselves) into an instance with *incomplete preferences* (technically denoted by SRI), but all existing techniques that we use still apply in the SRI case.

A solution to an SR instance is now defined.

Definition 2.2 (Stable Matchings). Let $I = (A, \succ)$ be an SR instance. M is a *matching* of I if it is an assignment of some agents in A into pairs such that no agent is contained in more than one pair of M . A *blocking pair* of a matching M is a pair of two agents $a_i, a_j \in A$ such that either a_j is unassigned in M or $a_i \succ_j M(a_j)$, and either a_i is unassigned or $a_j \succ_i M(a_i)$, where $M(a_i)$ is the partner of a_i in M . If M does not admit any blocking pair, then it is called *stable*. A stable matching is *complete* if it contains all $|A|$ agents.

Clearly any stable matching of an instance with complete preferences and even number of agents will be complete, as there can only be an even number of pairs, and any two unmatched agents would rather be matched to each other than to be unmatched.

Definition 2.3 (Solvability and Sub-Instances). Let $I = (A, \succ)$ be an SR instance. I is *solvable* if it admits at least one stable matching, otherwise it is *unsolvable*. $I' = (A', \succ')$ is a *sub-instance* or a *restriction* of I if $A' \subseteq A$ and $a_i \succ'_k a_j$ for all agents $a_i, a_j, a_k \in A'$ where $a_i \succ_k a_j$.

As previously mentioned, stable partitions Π are permutations on the subset of agents. Therefore, they can be written in cyclic notation where every agent is part of exactly one cycle. A formal definition follows.

Definition 2.4 (Stable Partition). Let $I = (A, \succ)$ be an SR instance. Then a partition Π is *stable* if it is a permutation of A and

- (T1) $\forall a_i \in A$ we have $\Pi(a_i) \succeq_i \Pi^{-1}(a_i)$, and
(T2) $\nexists a_i, a_j \in A$, $a_i \neq a_j$, such that $a_j \succ_i \Pi^{-1}(a_i)$ and $a_i \succ_j \Pi^{-1}(a_j)$,

where $\Pi(a_i) \succeq_i \Pi^{-1}(a_i)$ means that either a_i 's successor in Π is equal to its predecessor, or the successor has a better rank than the predecessor in the preference list of a_i .

Each stable partition Π corresponds to a stable half-matching in the sense that each successor-predecessor pair in Π is assigned a half-integral match (such that two agents are fully matched precisely if they are in a transposition). In the study of stable partitions, it is important to differentiate between different kinds of cycles that may or may not be part of a stable partition.

Definition 2.5 (Cycles). Let I be an SR instance and let $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_k})$ be an ordered collection of one or more agents in I . Then C is a *cycle* and we can *apply* cycle C to some agent $a_{i_j} \in C$ to get its successor in C , denoted by $C(a_{i_j})$. Similarly, we can apply the inverse $C^{-1} = (a_{i_1} a_{i_k} \dots a_{i_2})$ to a_{i_j} to get its predecessor in C , denoted by $C^{-1}(a_{i_j})$. The same holds for sets of disjoint cycles.

We will implicitly assume two disjoint cycles C_1, C_2 can be added under concatenation $C_1 ++ C_2$, which will simply be denoted by $C_1 C_2$ when obvious. A cycle C_1 can be removed from a collection of cycles C using rules of set difference, simply denoted by $C \setminus C_1$.

Definition 2.6 (Stable Cycles). Let I be an SR instance and let C be a cycle. If there exists some stable partition Π of I such that $C \in \Pi$, then C is a *stable cycle* of I . A stable cycle of odd length is called an *odd cycle*, of length 2 a *transposition*, and of even length larger than 2 an *even cycle* of I . Clearly, for every stable partition Π of I , $\Pi = \mathcal{T} \mathcal{E} \mathcal{O}_I$, where \mathcal{T} denotes the transpositions, \mathcal{E} the even cycles, and \mathcal{O}_I the odd cycles of Π . Let $A(C)$ denote the set of agents contained in a single cycle or a collection of cycles C . Unless specified otherwise, let $n_1 = |A(\mathcal{T} ++ \mathcal{E})|$ and $n_2 = |A(\mathcal{O}_I)|$.

Definition 2.7 (Reduced Stable Partition). A cycle is called *reduced* if its length is either 2 or odd, otherwise it is called *non-reduced*. Similarly, a stable partition Π is reduced if it consists only of reduced cycles, and non-reduced if not.

We will also need a definition for sub-sequences of cycles.

Definition 2.8 (Partial Cycles). Let I be an SR instance and let $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_k} \dots)$ be a cycle where only some agents $a_{i_1} \dots a_{i_k}$ and their position in the cycle are known. Then we call C a *partial cycle* and if there exist agents $a_{i_{k+1}} \dots a_{i_r}$ such that $(a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_k} a_{i_{k+1}} \dots a_{i_r})$ is a stable cycle, then C is a *partial stable cycle* and the sequence of agents $a_{i_{k+1}} \dots a_{i_r}$ is a *completion* of C .

Now we can introduce the notion of blocking agents and pairs for stable partitions. Note that the definition is very close to that of blocking pairs of stable matchings, and it should be clear from the context which definition applies.

Definition 2.9 (Blocking Pairs and Agents). Let $I = (A, \succ)$ be an SR instance and let Π be a partition of A . Then an agent $a_i \in A$ *blocks* Π (is a *blocking agent*) if $\Pi^{-1}(a_i) \succ_i \Pi(a_i)$. Two agents a_i, a_j *block* (form a *blocking pair*) of Π if $a_j \succ_i \Pi^{-1}(a_i)$ and $a_i \succ_j \Pi^{-1}(a_j)$. In the second case, we can also say that (wlog) a_i *blocks* Π *with* a_j .

The following has been shown and will also be assumed throughout this work.

Theorem 2.10 ([51, 52]). The following properties hold for any SR instance I .

- I admits at least one stable partition and any non-reduced stable partition can be transformed into a reduced one by breaking down its longer even length cycles into collections of transpositions.

- Any two stable partitions Π_a, Π_b of I contain exactly the same odd cycles, not only having the same agents involved but also in the same order within the cycles.
- I admits a complete stable matching if and only if no stable partition of I contains an odd cycle.

Note that if an SR instance I admits a stable matching $M = \{\{a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}\}, \dots, \{a_{i_{2k-1}}, a_{i_{2k}}\}\}$ consisting of k pairs, then it can be denoted interchangeably with its induced collection of transpositions $\Pi = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2}) \dots (a_{i_{2k-1}} a_{i_{2k}})$, which is a stable partition of I .

2.2 Optimality and Fairness of Matchings and Partitions

As previously noted, there are different measures of fairness and optimality for stable matchings considered in the literature. The main measure is the *profile* $p(M)$ of a matching M , a vector $(p_1 \dots p_{n-1})$, where p_i counts the number of agents assigned to their i th choice in M . We define a similar measure for stable partitions, accounting for all half-assignments in the associated half-matching.

Definition 2.11. Let I be an SR instance with n agents and Π a stable partition of I . An agent a_i has *rank* i for an agent a_j if it appears at position $i - 1$ in a_j 's preference list. The *successor profile*, denoted $p^s(\Pi) = (p_1^s \dots p_n^s)$, captures the number of agents p_i^s whose successor in Π has rank i . Analogously, let $p^p(\Pi)$ denote the *predecessor profile* of Π . Finally, let $p(\Pi) = (p_1 \dots p_n)$ denote the combined *profile* of Π , where $p_i = p_i^s + p_i^p$. Similarly, for a stable cycle C , let $p^s(C), p^p(C)$, and $p(C)$ denote the profiles containing the number and positions of predecessors, successors, or both achieved in C .

For some stable partition Π of n agents, the sum of all entries in $p^s(\Pi)$ and $p^p(\Pi)$ add up to n each, such that those in $p(\Pi)$ add up to $2n$, one for each half-assignment and counting a full assignment as two half-assignments.

One simple measure of optimality for a stable matching M of a solvable instance I is its *regret*, which is the rank of the worst assigned agent in M . Similarly, the regret of I is the minimum regret over all its stable matchings. We will consider the same for stable partitions.

Definition 2.12. Let Π be a stable partition and let $p(\Pi)$ be its profile. Then the *regret* of Π , denoted $r(\Pi)$, is the rank of the worst-ranked agent assigned in Π , which is the index of the last positive entry in $p(\Pi)$. Similarly, for C some cycle of agents, let $r(C)$ be the rank of the worst-ranked agent assigned in C .

Finally, another important optimality measure of a stable matching M is its *cost*, which is a weighted sum of its profile. Again, the same can be defined for stable partitions.

Definition 2.13. Let Π be a stable partition and let $p(\Pi)$ be its profile. Then the *cost* of Π , denoted $c(\Pi)$, is the sum of ranks achieved in Π , averaged over the predecessor and successor assignments. Specifically, we define $c(\Pi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i < n} p_i(\Pi) * i$.

We include the factor of half for consistency with stable matchings, as the profile entries sum up to $2n$. This constant factor does not affect our optimisation problems. For the same reason, we also do not sum up to n , as an agent assigned to someone of rank n is assigned to itself, which can never happen in stable matchings. As any two self-assigned agents would block in an instance with complete preference lists, there can be at most one self-assigned agent in a stable partition, and this is an odd cycle and thus invariant, so this again does not affect our optimisation problems.

Some associated problem variants for stable matchings are the following.

Definition 2.14. Let I be a solvable SR instance. A *minimum-regret* stable matching is a stable matching of I with regret r such that no other stable matching has lower regret. A *regret-minimal* stable matching is a minimum-regret stable matching such that no other minimum-regret stable matching satisfies fewer choices of rank r . A *first-choice maximal* stable matching is a stable matching of I such that no other stable matching satisfies more first choices. Finally, a (egalitarian) *cost-optimal* stable matching of I is a stable matching such that no other stable matching has a lower cost.

With our definitions of profile, regret, and cost for stable partitions, we can define analogous optimality measures for stable partitions (and thus stable half-matchings). For some, we need an order on profiles as defined below.

Definition 2.15. Let $p = (p_1 \dots p_n), p' = (p'_1 \dots p'_n)$ be two profile vectors. Then $p = p'$ if $p_i = p'_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. If $p \neq p'$, let k be the first position in which they differ. We define $p \succ p'$ if $p_k > p'_k$. Furthermore, we define $p \succeq p'$ if either $p \succ p'$ or $p = p'$. Finally, we will call $p^{rev} = (p_n \dots p_1)$ the *reverse profile* of p .

The optimality criteria are defined as follows.

Definition 2.16. Let Π be a stable partition of some SR instance I with n agents and regret r and let $p(\Pi)$ be its profile. Then Π is a

- *minimum-regret* stable partition of I if, for all stable partitions Π' of I , we have $r(\Pi) \leq r(\Pi')$,
- *first-choice maximal* stable partition of I if, for all stable partitions Π' of I with profile $p(\Pi')$, we have $p_1(\Pi) \geq p_1(\Pi')$,
- *rank-maximal* stable partition of I if, for all stable partitions Π' of I with profile $p(\Pi')$, we have $p(\Pi) \succeq p(\Pi')$,
- *regret-minimal* stable partition of I if Π is a minimum-regret stable partition and, for all minimum regret stable partitions Π' of I with profile $p(\Pi')$, we have $p_r(\Pi) \leq p_r(\Pi')$,
- *generous* stable partition of I if, for all stable partitions Π' of I with profile $p(\Pi')$, we have $p^{rev}(\Pi') \succeq p^{rev}(\Pi)$, and
- *egalitarian* stable partition of I if, for all stable partitions Π' of I , we have $c(\Pi) \leq c(\Pi')$.

3 Structure of Stable Cycles, Transpositions, and Partitions

First, we will formalise and characterise the structure of reduced stable partitions in Section 3.1. Then, naturally, we will extend the study to all stable partitions. This requires the study of stable cycles. After showing various results about the structure of even cycles in Section 3.2, we focus on algorithmic questions related to the enumeration of all reduced and non-reduced stable cycles in Section 3.3, finishing this section with an enumeration algorithm for all stable partitions in Section 3.4 which ties together most of our results.

3.1 Structure of Reduced Stable Partitions

Let $I = (A, \succ)$ be an instance of SR and let Π_i be any reduced stable partition of I . We know that its odd cycles \mathcal{O}_I are invariant under all stable partitions of I , while the transpositions might not be. Let $I_E = (A', \succ')$, where $A' = A \setminus A(\mathcal{O}_I)$ and \succ' is the restriction of \succ to the agents in A' , be the instance I restricted to agents in transpositions.

Lemma 3.1. Let Π_i be any reduced stable partition of an SR instance I . Then Π_i is the union $M_i \mathcal{O}_I$ of its odd cycles \mathcal{O}_I and a perfect stable matching M_i of the sub-instance I_E of I constructed above as a cyclic permutation of transpositions.

Proof. By definition of reduced stable partitions, Π_i is the union $M_i\mathcal{O}_I$ of transpositions M_i and its invariant odd cycles \mathcal{O}_I . Note first that if $M_i = \emptyset$, then $A(\mathcal{O}_I) = A$, so $A' = \emptyset$ and $I_E = \emptyset$. Therefore, M_i is trivially perfect and stable in I_E .

Otherwise, suppose that $M_i \neq \emptyset$ with $|A'| \in 2\mathbb{N}$, where M_i is not a stable matching in I_E . Note first that M_i is a matching in I_E as the transpositions are disjoint due to Π_i being a partition, and only include agents in A' by construction. Then either some partners a_r, a_s in M_i would not find each other acceptable anymore in \succ' , or there would be at least one blocking pair consisting of two agents a_r, a_s in A' that prefer each other over their partners in M_i in the preference relation \succ' .

Consider first the case where some $\{a_r, a_s\} \in M_i$ would not find each other acceptable anymore in \succ' . This cannot happen, as $A(M_i) \cap A(\mathcal{O}_I) = \emptyset$, so the pair would not be removed in the construction of \succ' , where \succ' is restricted to agents not in \mathcal{O}_I .

Furthermore, M_i cannot admit a blocking pair in I_E . Suppose that $\{a_r, a_s\} \subseteq A'$ was a blocking pair in I_E , then $a_r \succ'_s M_i(a_s)$ and $a_s \succ'_r M_i(a_r)$. However, because all agents in A' are contained in transpositions in Π_i , we know that $M_i(a_r) = \Pi_i(a_r) = \Pi_i^{-1}(a_r)$ and $M_i(a_s) = \Pi_i(a_s) = \Pi_i^{-1}(a_s)$. Because \succ' is contained in \succ , this would let us conclude that $a_r \succ_s \Pi_i^{-1}(a_s)$ and $a_s \succ_r \Pi_i^{-1}(a_r)$, a contradiction of stability condition T2 of Π_i .

Finally, every agent has complete preference lists in I_E , so if M_i is stable, it must be a perfect matching. Otherwise, there would be two unmatched agents in A' that would rather be matched to each other than to be unmatched, contradicting the stability of M_i . \square

On the other hand, we are not guaranteed that there is a bijection between the set $P(I)$ of all reduced stable partitions of I and the set $S(I_E)$ of all stable matchings of I_E . Consider the instance I in Example 3. It admits the reduced stable partition $\Pi_0 = (a_1 a_2)(a_3 a_4)(a_5 a_6 a_7)(a_8 a_9 a_{10})$. Now clearly $\mathcal{O}_I = (a_5 a_6 a_7)(a_8 a_9 a_{10})$ and $I_E = (\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}, \succ')$. However, I_E admits the stable matchings $S(I_E) = \{M_1, M_2\}$ where $M_1 = \{\{a_1, a_2\}, \{a_3, a_4\}\}$ and $M_2 = \{\{a_1, a_3\}, \{a_2, a_4\}\}$. While $M_1\mathcal{O}_I$ is the original stable partition Π_0 , $M_2\mathcal{O}_I$ does not correspond to a stable partition of I as agents $\{a_1, a_5\}$ would violate condition T2. Specifically, $a_5 \succ_1 a_3$ and $a_1 \succ_5 a_7$. In Example 3, this is indicated by M_2 in dotted circles and the violating pair in unbroken circles.

a_1	<u>a₂</u>	a_5	a_3	...
a_2	a_4	<u>a₁</u>	...	
a_3	a_1	<u>a₄</u>	...	
a_4	<u>a₃</u>	a_2	...	
a_5	a_1	<u>a₆</u>	<u>a₇</u>	...
a_6	<u>a₇</u>	<u>a₅</u>	...	
a_7	<u>a₅</u>	<u>a₆</u>	...	
a_8	<u>a₉</u>	<u>a₁₀</u>	...	
a_9	<u>a₁₀</u>	<u>a₈</u>	...	
a_{10}	<u>a₈</u>	<u>a₉</u>	...	

Example 3: SR instance with stable Π_0 as **successors** and predecessors

To deal with the case where enumerating the stable matchings of I_E is not enough, we can reduce I_E further. Specifically, all pairs of agents $\{a_i, a_j\} \subseteq A'$ need to be deleted (made mutually unacceptable) from the preference relation \succ' whenever there exists an agent $a_r \in A(\mathcal{O}_I)$ such that $a_i \succ_r \mathcal{O}_I^{-1}(a_r)$ and $a_r \succ_i a_j$. This is equivalent to truncating the preference list of a_i at the first agent $a_s \in A'$ such that $a_s \succ_i a_r$, for the best-ranked such $a_r \in A(\mathcal{O}_I)$ of a_i , and removing a_i from the preference list of every agent in A' that is less preferred by a_i . The deletion operations do not reduce the set of agents, just the preference relation, so we let

the resulting sub-instance of I_E be denoted by $I_T = (A', \succ'')$ (Algorithm 1 captures all steps to compute I_T from I). We assume that preference comparison and partner lookup can be done in constant time, such that the procedure takes at most linear time overall.

Algorithm 1 Construct $I_T(I)$, constructs I_T from SR instance I

Input: I : an SR instance

Output: I_T : a solvable sub-instance of I

```

1:  $I_T \leftarrow I$ 
2:  $M_0 \mathcal{O}_I \leftarrow \text{ReducedStablePartition}(I)$ 
3: for  $a_r$  in  $A(\mathcal{O}_I)$  do
4:   remove  $a_r$  from  $I_T$ 
5: end for
6: for  $a_i$  in  $A(M_0)$  do
7:   delete  $\leftarrow \text{False}$ 
8:   for  $a_j$  in preference list of  $a_i$  in  $I$  (in order of preference) do
9:     if  $a_j$  in  $A(\mathcal{O}_I)$  and  $a_i \succ_j \mathcal{O}_I^{-1}(a_j)$  then
10:      delete  $\leftarrow \text{True}$ 
11:    end if
12:    if delete and  $\{a_i, a_j\}$  acceptable in  $I_T$  then
13:      make  $\{a_i, a_j\}$  mutually unacceptable in  $I_T$ 
14:    end if
15:  end for
16: end for
17: return  $I_T$ 

```

Although these deletions might destroy some stable matchings admitted by I_E , we must ensure that I_T still admits at least one.

Lemma 3.2. Let $\Pi_i = M_i \mathcal{O}_I$ be any reduced stable partition of an SR instance I and let I_T be its sub-instance as constructed above. Then M_i is a perfect stable matching of I_T .

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, M_i is a perfect stable matching of I_E . As \succ'' is contained in \succ' , M_i cannot admit more blocking pairs in I_T than in I_E . Thus, if M_i were not a stable matching in I_T , then this would have to be because M_i is not a valid matching. This would only occur if two agents in M_i were made mutually unacceptable in the construction of I_T from I_E .

Suppose that $\{a_i, a_j\} \in M_i$ find each other acceptable in \succ' , but do not find each other acceptable anymore in \succ'' . Then their respective preference list entries would have been removed in the deletion operations. Without loss of generality (wlog), suppose this was because there exists some agent $a_r \in \mathcal{O}_I$ such that $a_i \succ_r \mathcal{O}_I^{-1}(a_r)$ and $a_r \succ_i a_j$. Then $\{a_i, a_j\}$ could not belong to M_i as a_i and a_r would contradict stability condition T2 with respect to Π_i . Therefore, matched agents in M_i still consider each other mutually acceptable in \succ'' .

Thus, M_i is also a perfect stable matching of I_T . □

We can now show the correspondence between the stable matchings of I_T and the reduced stable partitions of I .

Theorem 3.3. M_i is a perfect stable matching of I_T if and only if $M_i \mathcal{O}_I$ is a reduced stable partition of I , where I_T is constructed as above and \mathcal{O}_I are the invariant odd cycles of I .

Proof. First, suppose that M_i is a perfect stable matching of I_T . We want to show that $M_i \mathcal{O}_I$ is a reduced stable partition of I . Suppose not, then either $M_i \mathcal{O}_I$ is not a partition, not reduced, or it violates one of the stability conditions T1 or T2.

$M_i \mathcal{O}_I$ would not be a partition of I if either there was an agent $a_r \in A$ such that $a_r \notin A(M_i \mathcal{O}_I)$ or if there was an agent $a_r \in A(M_i \mathcal{O}_I)$ that is in multiple different cycles. The first

case cannot happen because $A = A' \uplus A(\mathcal{O}_I)$ and by Lemma 3.2, I_T admits a perfect stable matching. All stable matchings admitted by an SR instance have the same size, so every agent in A' is matched in M_i . Thus, every agent $a_r \in A$ is either in M_i or in \mathcal{O}_I and so $a_r \in A(M_i \mathcal{O}_I)$. The second case cannot happen by construction. If $a_r \in \mathcal{O}_I$, then by construction of \mathcal{O}_I and I_E , a_r only appears once in \mathcal{O}_I and $a_r \notin A'$, so $a_r \notin M_i$. If $a_r \in A'$, then it was not deleted during the construction of I_E and so $a_r \notin \mathcal{O}_I$. Because M_i is a matching, a_r will only be matched to one other agent and thus appear only once in the induced collection of transpositions. This also confirms that the partition is reduced because all cycles are either of odd length or of length two.

Condition T1 cannot be violated by $M_i \mathcal{O}_I$ as \mathcal{O}_I was found in such a way that T1 holds and because M_i is a collection of transpositions which means that for all agents $a_r \in A'$, a_r 's predecessor is also their successor.

Finally, suppose that $M_i \mathcal{O}_I$ violates T2 with a pair of agents $a_r, a_s \in A = A' \uplus A(\mathcal{O}_I)$, then there are three cases. First, suppose that $a_r, a_s \in A'$. This means that the agents are not partners in M_i but would rather be matched to each other. This cannot happen due to stability of M_i in I_T . Now suppose that $a_r, a_s \in A(\mathcal{O}_I)$. This cannot happen, as \mathcal{O}_I was chosen in such a way that it satisfies T2. Lastly, suppose that, wlog, $a_r \in A'$ and $a_s \in A(\mathcal{O}_I)$. Then $a_s \succ_r (M_i \mathcal{O}_I)^{-1}(a_r) = M_i(a_r)$ and $a_r \succ_s (M_i \mathcal{O}_I)^{-1}(a_s) = \mathcal{O}_I^{-1}(a_s)$. However, in this case, the pair $\{a_r, M_i(a_r)\}$ would have been deleted from \succ' during the construction of I_T from I_E and thus $\{a_r, M_i(a_r)\}$ could not be matched in M_i , a contradiction.

Now for the reverse implication, suppose that $M_i \mathcal{O}_I$ is a reduced stable partition of I , where M_i is the collection of transpositions, if any, and \mathcal{O}_I is the collection of odd cycles. By Lemma 3.2, M_i is a perfect stable matching of I_T . \square

Corollary 3.4. The number of reduced stable partitions that an SR instance I with $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$ agents admits is equal to the number of stable matchings that its sub-instance I_T with $n - |A(\mathcal{O}_I)|$ agents admits.

With these results, we now have a procedure to enumerate all reduced stable permutations.

Theorem 3.5. We can enumerate all reduced stable partitions of an SR instance $I = (A, \succ)$ in $O(|S(I_T)|n + n^2)$ time, where I_T is the sub-instance of I as constructed above, $S(I_T)$ is the set of all stable matchings of I_T , and $n = |A|$.

Proof. The procedure is given as follows (steps 1-3 can be performed together using Algorithm 1):

1. Compute any reduced stable permutation $\Pi = M_0 \mathcal{O}_I$ of I , for example using the algorithm presented by Tan [51].
2. Construct the instance $I_E = (A', \succ')$ from I by restricting A and \succ to all agents $a_i \notin A(\mathcal{O}_I)$.
3. Construct the instance $I_T = (A', \succ'')$ from I_E by removing all agent pairs $\{a_i, a_j\} \subseteq A'$ from \succ' whenever there exists an agent $a_r \in A(\mathcal{O}_I)$ such that $a_i \succ_r \mathcal{O}_I^{-1}(a_r)$ and $a_r \succ_i a_j$.
4. Enumerate all stable matchings $S(I_T)$ of instance I_T , for example using the algorithm by Feder [21].
5. For every matching $M_i \in S(I_T)$, construct and output the corresponding reduced stable partition $M_i \mathcal{O}_I$.

Steps 1-3 can be carried out in $O(n^2)$ steps using Algorithm 1 as a stable partition can be found in linear time using the algorithm by Tan [51] and converted into a reduced stable partition in linear time by breaking down even length cycles into transpositions. Furthermore, the first loop takes $O(n)$ time and the second one takes $O(n^2)$ time by the number of agents, assuming constant time lookup for preference comparisons and partners in \mathcal{O}_I . Step 4 can be carried out in $O(|S(I_T)|n_1 + n_1^2)$ steps using the algorithm presented in Feder [21]. Depending on the

presentation of the output, step 5 can be carried out in $O(|S(I_T)|n)$ steps under the assumption that we want to print all cycles for every reduced stable partition. As all steps can be carried out sequentially, we arrive at the stated worst-case complexity. \square

3.2 Structure of Longer Even Cycles

Reduced stable partitions are canonical in the sense that they cannot be broken down into smaller cycles. However, while Tan [52] shows that any stable cycle of even length greater than two can be decomposed into a stable collection of transpositions, it may be of theoretical interest to look at how longer cycles can be constructed from a collection of transpositions. Naively, we could try any combination of transpositions to construct longer even cycles. However, this would quickly lead to a combinatorial explosion due to the potential number of transpositions involved.

First, we look at the different ways to decompose an even cycle into transpositions.

Lemma 3.6. Any even cycle $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_{2k}})$ of some stable partition Π where $k \geq 2$ can be broken into two distinct collections of transpositions $C_1 = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2})(a_{i_3} a_{i_4}) \dots (a_{i_{2k-1}} a_{i_{2k}})$ and $C_2 = (a_{i_1} a_{i_{2k}})(a_{i_2} a_{i_3}) \dots (a_{i_{2k-2}} a_{i_{2k-1}})$ such that both partitions $\Pi_1 = (\Pi \setminus C) \uplus C_1$ and $\Pi_2 = (\Pi \setminus C) \uplus C_2$ are stable.

Proof. By definition of even cycles, we know that $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_{2k}})$ is of length $2k \geq 4$. Suppose that Π_1 or Π_2 are not stable. Then either condition T1 or T2 must be violated. However, if Π satisfies T1, then both Π_1 and Π_2 must satisfy T1 because the repartitioned agents are now in transpositions, such that their predecessors equal their successors, trivially satisfying the condition. Thus, suppose (wlog) that although Π satisfies T2, Π_1 does not. Then there exist agents $a_{i_p}, a_{i_q} \in C$ such that we have $a_{i_p} \neq a_{i_q}$, $a_{i_q} \succ_{i_p} \Pi_1^{-1}(a_{i_p}) = C_1(a_{i_p})$, and $a_{i_p} \succ_{i_q} \Pi_1^{-1}(a_{i_q}) = C_1(a_{i_q})$. However, we know that for all agents $a_{i_r} \in C$, we have $C_1(a_{i_r}) \succeq_{i_r} C^{-1}(a_{i_r}) = \Pi^{-1}(a_{i_r})$, contradicting stability of C . Thus, both Π_1 and Π_2 are stable partitions satisfying T1 and T2. \square

However, there might be more ways to rearrange the agents of an even cycle into a stable collection of disjoint transpositions. Consider the instance I shown in Example 4 which admits the stable partition (indicated in the figure with successors in bold and predecessors underlined) $\Pi = (a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 a_5 a_6)$. I also admits the reduced stable partitions $\Pi_1 = (a_1 a_2)(a_3 a_4)(a_5 a_6)$, $\Pi_2 = (a_1 a_6)(a_2 a_3)(a_4 a_5)$, and $\Pi_3 = (a_1 a_4)(a_2 a_5)(a_3 a_6)$, corresponding to three stable matchings of I , where Π_3 is indicated in the figure through circles.

a_1	$\textcircled{a_4}$	a_2	<u>a_6</u>	\dots
a_2	a_3	<u>a_1</u>	$\textcircled{a_5}$	\dots
a_3	$\textcircled{a_6}$	a_4	<u>a_2</u>	\dots
a_4	a_5	<u>a_3</u>	$\textcircled{a_1}$	\dots
a_5	$\textcircled{a_2}$	a_6	<u>a_4</u>	\dots
a_6	a_1	<u>a_5</u>	$\textcircled{a_3}$	\dots

Example 4: SR instance with at least five stable partitions

While Π_1 and Π_2 can be derived from Π by Lemma 3.6, Π_3 is different in the way that it does not preserve the structure of Π . Note, though, that I also admits the stable partition $\Pi_4 = (a_1 a_4 a_3 a_6 a_5 a_2)$, which can be broken into Π_1 and Π_3 in a similar manner. In fact, when combining two such collections of transpositions Π_a and Π_b with empty intersection into one large cycle C , there are just two options, only one of which can be correct. Start with an arbitrary agent, say a_1 , and note that either $C(a_1) = \Pi_a(a_1)$ and $C^{-1}(a_1) = \Pi_b(a_1)$,

or $C(a_1) = \Pi_b(a_1)$ and $C^{-1}(a_1) = \Pi_a(a_1)$. From there, just alternate between the stable partitions Π_a and Π_b and continue until the cycle is complete. Note though that although one of the constructions must satisfy stability condition T1, condition T2 might not be satisfied. Consider, for example, the cycle $(a_1 a_4 a_5 a_2 a_3 a_6)$ produced by joining Π_3 and Π_2 , which satisfies T1 but not T2, as, for example agents $\{a_1, a_2\}$ prefer each other over their predecessors.

Theorem 3.7. Any non-reduced stable partition Π can be constructed from two reduced stable partitions Π_a, Π_b .

Proof. Consider an arbitrary stable partition $\Pi = \mathcal{T} ++ \mathcal{E} ++ \mathcal{O}_I$, where \mathcal{T} are the stable transpositions, \mathcal{E} are the even cycles of length larger than 2, and \mathcal{O}_I are the odd cycles. Then we have shown in Lemma 3.6 that we can break down each cycle $c \in \mathcal{E}$ into two different collections of transpositions. Now we can consider the reduced stable partitions Π_a and Π_b where in Π_a every even cycle in \mathcal{E} is broken down in one way and in Π_b the other way. Then precisely, $\Pi_a \cap \Pi_b = \mathcal{T} ++ \mathcal{O}_I$, so the symmetric difference $D = \Pi_a \Delta \Pi_b$ contains precisely the transpositions formed by breaking down each cycle $c \in \mathcal{E}$ in two different ways.

Now in combination with Lemma 3.6, we know that the symmetric difference is precisely the set $D = \{(a_{i_j} a_{i_{j+1}}) \mid (a_{i_0} a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_{2k-1}}) \in \mathcal{E} \wedge 0 \leq j \leq 2k - 1\}$, where addition is taken modulo $2k$ to account for the cyclic structure. Thus, knowing D , we have overlapping transpositions such that every agent a_{i_j} is contained in exactly two transpositions $(a_{i_j} a_{i_{j+1}})$ and $(a_{i_{j-1}} a_{i_j})$. We can now reconstruct \mathcal{E} cycle by cycle by simply aligning the transpositions as informally shown below Example 4, where a_{i_j} 's preferences will uniquely determine the alignment by determining whether $a_{i_{j-1}}$ or $a_{i_{j+1}}$ must be the successor to satisfy stability condition T1.

The result follows as $\Pi = (\Pi_a \cap \Pi_b) ++ \mathcal{E}$, where \mathcal{E} is constructed from $\Pi_a \Delta \Pi_b$. \square

This gives a naive way to construct all stable partitions from the set of reduced stable partitions.

Corollary 3.8. We can construct all stable partitions, $P(I)$, of an SR instance I from its set of reduced stable partitions, $RP(I)$, in $O(|RP(I)|^2 n^2)$ time without repetitions.

Proof. Knowing that any stable partition can be constructed from two reduced stable partitions due to Theorem 3.7, we can conclude that in addition to all reduced stable partitions $RP(I)$, we can find all other stable partitions admitted by I by considering every one of the $\binom{|RP(I)|}{2} = O(|RP(I)|^2)$ pairs of reduced stable partitions, constructing each candidate partition and verifying in $O(n^2)$ time that it satisfies T1 and T2.

This process will not generate repetitions, as two distinct pairs of reduced stable partitions will never generate the same non-reduced stable partition candidate. To see this, let $\{\Pi_a, \Pi_b\}, \{\Pi_c, \Pi_d\}$ be two distinct pairs of reduced stable partitions where agent a_{i_1} is in a different transposition in each of them. Then, when merging Π_a and Π_b to a non-reduced stable partition candidate Π using the method above, we have either $\Pi(a_{i_1}) = \Pi_a(a_{i_1})$ or $\Pi(a_{i_1}) = \Pi_b(a_{i_1})$ and similar when merging Π_c and Π_d to candidate Π' . However, we know $\{\Pi_a(a_{i_1}), \Pi_b(a_{i_1})\} \cap \{\Pi_c(a_{i_1}), \Pi_d(a_{i_1})\} = \emptyset$, so clearly $\Pi \neq \Pi'$. \square

However, as $|RP(I)|$ may be exponential in n and we have seen that many combinations of reduced stable partitions do not lead to a non-reduced stable partition, we focus the study on stable cycles themselves and how they could be useful in enumerating all stable partitions directly.

First, to refine the search for longer even cycles, we can show restrictions on the combinatorics of agents. We want to show that it suffices to know a predecessor-successor pair of agents in a partial even cycle $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots)$ to find a completion if one exists, and that we can find such a completion in polynomial time. For this, we show that the correspondence between C and $C \setminus \{a_{i_2}\}$, where the latter is a potential odd cycle of some related instance. Specifically,

we propose the method outlined in Algorithm 2 to transform the instance I appropriately to an instance I_S such that it admits the desired invariant odd cycle if it exists. Specifically, the procedure takes as input the instance and a predecessor-successor pair a_{i_1}, a_{i_2} of the partial (not necessarily stable) cycle in question and creates an instance I_S related to I without agent a_{i_2} in which the preference lists of all agents preferred by a_{i_2} over a_{i_1} in I are modified in I_S such that a_{i_1} takes the spot of a_{i_2} and its previous entry is deleted, and these agents, if not preferred by a_{i_1} over a_{i_2} , are promoted in the preference list of a_{i_1} in I_S to before the rank position of a_{i_2} in a_{i_1} 's preference list in I while maintaining the relative preference order given by a_{i_2} in I .

Algorithm 2 Construct $I_S(I, a_{i_1}, a_{i_2})$, constructs I_S from SR instance I

Input: I : an SR instance; a_{i_1} : an agent of some partial (not-necessarily stable) cycle of I ; a_{i_2} : the successor of a_{i_1} in the partial cycle in question

Output: I_S : an instance in which a_{i_1}, a_{i_2} are in an odd cycle if the partial cycle is stable

- 1: $I_S \leftarrow I$ (make a copy)
- 2: **for** agent a_r preferred by a_{i_2} over a_{i_1} **do**
- 3: delete a_{i_1} from preference list of a_r in I_S
- 4: replace a_{i_2} by a_{i_1} in preference list of a_r in I_S
- 5: **end for**
- 6: $k \leftarrow \text{rank}_{a_{i_1}}(a_{i_2})$
- 7: **for** agent a_r preferred by a_{i_2} (in order) over a_{i_1} but not by a_{i_1} over a_{i_2} **do**
- 8: move a_r up in the preference list of a_{i_1} to rank-position k in I_S
- 9: $k \leftarrow k + 1$
- 10: **end for**
- 11: delete a_{i_2} from I_S altogether
- 12: **return** I_S

Lemma 3.9. Let I be an SR instance, let $(a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots)$ be a partial cycle of I , and let I_S be the instance constructed from I using Algorithm 2. If $(a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots)$ has a completion to an even stable cycle in I , then a_{i_1} belongs to an odd stable cycle in I_S .

Proof. Suppose that $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} a_{i_3} \dots a_{i_{2k}})$ is an even cycle in a stable partition Π of I for some agents $a_{i_3} \dots a_{i_{2k}}$. We claim that $C' = (a_{i_1} a_{i_3} \dots a_{i_{2k}})$ is an odd cycle of any stable partition Π' in I_S . For this, we need to prove that stability conditions T1 and T2 are satisfied.

For T1, by stability of Π , in I , we have that a_{i_1} prefers a_{i_2} to $a_{i_{2k}}$ and a_{i_2} prefers a_{i_3} to a_{i_1} . Hence, by construction, a_{i_1} prefers a_{i_3} to $a_{i_{2k}}$ in I_S . Also, a_{i_3} prefers a_{i_4} to a_{i_2} in I by stability of Π , so a_{i_3} prefers a_{i_4} to a_{i_1} in I_S since a_{i_2} prefers a_{i_3} to a_{i_1} in I .

For T2, suppose that $\{a_r, a_s\}$ block Π' in I_S . First, suppose that $a_r = a_{i_1}$. Then $a_s \neq a_{i_3}$ as $(\Pi')^{-1}(a_{i_3}) = a_{i_1}$ and a_{i_1} prefers a_s to $a_{i_{2k}}$ in I_S . Suppose that a_{i_2} prefers a_s to a_{i_1} in I . Then a_s replaced a_{i_2} with a_{i_1} in I_S . This means that $\{a_{i_2}, a_{i_s}\}$ blocks Π in I , a contradiction. Therefore, a_{i_2} does not prefer a_s to a_{i_1} in I , so a_s remains in the same position in the preference list of a_{i_1} in I_S as it was in I , so $\{a_{i_1}, a_s\}$ blocks Π in I , a contradiction.

Now suppose that $a_r = a_{i_3}$. Then a_{i_3} prefers a_s to a_{i_1} in I_S . We know that a_{i_2} prefers a_{i_3} to a_{i_1} in I . Hence, by construction of I_S , a_{i_3} prefers a_s to a_{i_2} . Also since $a_s \neq a_{i_1}$ and $a_s \neq a_{i_3}$, it must be the case that $(\Pi')^{-1}(a_s) = \Pi^{-1}(a_s)$, so $\{a_{i_3}, a_s\}$ block Π in I , a contradiction.

Lastly, if $\{a_r, a_s\} \cap \{a_{i_1}, a_{i_3}\} = \emptyset$, then clearly $\{a_r, a_s\}$ block Π in I as $(\Pi')^{-1}(a_r) = \Pi^{-1}(a_r)$, $(\Pi')^{-1}(a_s) = \Pi^{-1}(a_s)$, a_r prefers a_s to $\Pi^{-1}(a_r)$ and a_s prefers a_r to $\Pi^{-1}(a_s)$. \square

Due to odd cycles being invariant, we can use the statement above to reason about the structural restrictions of longer even cycles implied by a predecessor-successor pair.

Lemma 3.10. If $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} a_{i_3} \dots a_{i_{2k}})$ and $C' = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} a'_{i_3} \dots a'_{i_{2l}})$ are both even cycles of I , then $k = l$ and $a_{i_j} = a'_{i_j}$ for $3 \leq j \leq 2k$.

Proof. Consider even cycles C, C' of I . Then by Lemma 3.9, we must have stable odd cycles $(a_{i_1} a_{i_3} \dots a_{i_{2k}})$ and $(a_{i_1} a'_{i_3} \dots a'_{i_{2l}})$ in the instance I_S using the transformation from I in Algorithm 2. However, because a_1 is in both cycles and odd cycles are invariant, they are the same cycles and the result follows. \square

Now note that this also implies that no instance can admit, for example, the following two stable partitions: $\Pi = (a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 a_5 a_6), \Pi' = (a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4)(a_5 a_6)$.

Lemma 3.11. If some stable partition Π of SR instance I contains an even cycle $C = (a_{i_1} \dots a_{i_k})$, then C cannot be contained in a longer even cycle $C' = (a_{i_1} \dots a_{i_k} a_{j_1} \dots a_{j_l})$ of some other stable partition Π' of I .

Proof. We can consider any predecessor-successor pair in C to see that Lemma 3.10 implies that there cannot exist such a C' . \square

The results also greatly restrict the number of even cycles that an instance can admit.

Lemma 3.12. Any SR instance with n agents admits at most $O(n_1^2 + n_2) = O(n^2)$ cycles of length not equal to two, where $n_2 = |A(\mathcal{O}_I)|$ and $n_1 = n - n_2$.

Proof. As odd cycles are invariant and any agent can be in at most one odd cycle, there are at most n_2 odd cycles.

Due to Lemma 3.10, any candidate predecessor-successor pair is part of at most one even stable cycle, and hence any pair of agents can be consecutively ordered in at most two even stable cycles. Thus, we have at most $O(n_1^2)$ even stable cycles of length not equal to two. \square

Finally, Lemma 3.10 also establishes the following powerful result.

Theorem 3.13. Let $(a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots)$ be a partial cycle in some SR instance I . In linear time, we can determine whether this partial cycle has a completion $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} a_{i_3} \dots a_{i_{2k}})$ to an even cycle of some stable partition of I , or report that no such completion exists. If a completion C to a stable even cycle does exist, then C must be unique.

Proof. We can construct I_S from I using the Algorithm 2 and find some stable partition Π' of I_S , all in linear time. Now, if a_{i_1} does not belong to an odd stable cycle C' of Π' , then by Lemma 3.9, $(a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots)$ has no completion to a stable even cycle of I .

Otherwise, suppose that $C' = (a_{i_1} a_{i_3} \dots a_{i_{2k}})$ is an odd stable cycle of Π' . Then the cycle $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} a_{i_3} \dots a_{i_{2k}})$ is an even stable cycle of I unless $\{a_{i_1}, a_{i_3}\}$ block in $(\Pi' \setminus C') \uparrow C$.

Thus, we can either output C , which is unique by Lemma 3.10, or it must be the case that “no” is the correct answer, as by the same Lemma, if $(a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots)$ has a completion to an even stable cycle in I , then $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} a_{i_3} \dots a_{i_{2k}})$ is the only candidate. \square

We have shown above that if C is a partial even stable cycle of the considered instance I , then we must have a corresponding invariant odd cycle C' of some related instance of I , and that therefore, C has a unique completion. Furthermore, Theorem 3.13 establishes that we only need to consider a potential successor-predecessor pair to see whether that pair is indeed part of some longer unique stable even cycle, and we can do so in linear time.

Furthermore, given an instance I and a (non-partial) candidate cycle C , we can also efficiently verify whether it is in some stable partition as it is, by Theorem 3.13, sufficient to consider any successor-predecessor pair in it. If so, we can also explicitly construct a stable partition Π containing C using the method described in the proof, where $\Pi = (\Pi' \setminus C') \uparrow C$.

Corollary 3.14. Given an SR instance I and a candidate (not necessarily stable) cycle C of even length, we can verify whether C is stable and, if so, construct a stable partition Π containing C , all in linear time.

3.3 All Stable Cycles

With stable matchings, we can consider the problem of finding all stable pairs, which is defined as the union of all pairs contained in some stable matching of an SR instance I ,

$$SP(I) = \{\{a_i, a_j\} \in M \mid M \in S(I)\}$$

where $S(I)$ is the set of all stable matchings admitted by I . Similarly, one can ask about the fixed pairs, which are the pairs contained in all stable matchings of I . Analogously, we introduce the corresponding questions for stable partitions: given an SR instance I , what are all the stable cycles, denoted $SC(I)$, admitted by some stable partition of the instance? Similarly, what are the (fixed) stable cycles, denoted $FC(I)$, admitted by all its stable partitions?

We have seen how to enumerate all reduced stable partitions of an instance and also how to reconstruct longer even cycles from transpositions, allowing us to enumerate all stable partitions, not necessarily reduced. However, the enumeration of reduced stable partitions might naturally run in time exponential in the number of agents, similar to the enumeration of all stable matchings of a solvable instance. In contrast, when only looking at stable pairs rather than matchings, Feder [21] presented an $O(n^3)$ algorithm to find them in a SR instance with n agents. Therefore, it is natural to ask whether we can construct a similar efficient algorithm for finding all stable cycles of a stable partition.

Given an SR instance I , we are looking to find stable cycles

$$SC(I) = \{C \in \Pi \mid \Pi \in P(I)\}$$

where $P(I)$ are all stable partitions admitted by I . Now note that the odd cycles \mathcal{O}_I are invariant and can be computed efficiently, so we require to find the union of all stable cycles of even length. Observe that

$$\mathcal{O}_I \subseteq FC(I) \subseteq RSC(I) \subseteq SC(I),$$

where $RSC(I)$ are the reduced stable cycles (i.e. stable transpositions and odd cycles) of I . This is because for any stable cycle C of even length larger than 2, we can break it into two collections of stable transpositions by Lemma 3.6, such that C cannot be fixed. Note that if $|P(I)| = 1$, then the second and third inclusions hold with equality and if, furthermore, $|A(\mathcal{O}_I)| = n$, then the first inequality also holds with equality. Thus, we can find all reduced fixed cycles directly in $O(n^2)$ time by constructing the odd cycles \mathcal{O}_I , which are fixed, and the sub-instance I_T (computed using Algorithm 1). Then, we can compute the reduced phase-1 table of I_T , from which we can directly derive the fixed pairs (i.e. fixed stable transpositions) as proven by Gusfield and Irving [28].

Theorem 3.15. Given an SR instance I with n agents, we can find all its fixed cycles in linear time.

Theorem 3.3 states that any reduced stable partition Π_i is the union of some stable matching M_i of the sub-instance I_T of I (constructed by Algorithm 1), and \mathcal{O}_I . Therefore, in order to find all stable transpositions, we can apply the known all stable pairs algorithm to I_T .

Lemma 3.16. Given an SR instance I with n agents, we can find all reduced stable cycles, $RSC(I)$, i.e. odd cycles and stable transpositions, in $O(n^2 + n_1^3)$ time, where $n_1 = n - |A(\mathcal{O}_I)|$.

Proof. We know that we can find all stable pairs of a solvable SR instance with n_1 agents in $O(n_1^3)$ time using the algorithm by Feder [21].

Consider any pair p produced by the algorithm. Then p is a stable pair of some stable matching M of I_T , so by Theorem 3.3, $M\mathcal{O}_I$ is a reduced stable partition of I and thus p a stable transposition. Similarly, if t is some stable transposition of I , then there exists some

reduced stable partition Π_i containing t . By Theorem 3.3, there exists some stable matching M_i of I_T such that $\Pi_i = M_i \mathcal{O}_I$. As t is a transposition, we must have that $t \in M_i$, so the stable pairs algorithm must detect and output t .

The complexity follows directly from the size of I_T and the justification by Feder [21]. \square

This lets us extend Lemma 3.12 to include transpositions.

Theorem 3.17. Any SR instance with n agents admits at most $O(n_1^2 + n_2) = O(n^2)$ stable cycles, where $n_2 = |A(\mathcal{O}_I)|$ and $n_1 = n - n_2$.

Proof. By Gusfield and Irving [28] we know that any solvable instance with k agents admits at most $O(k^2)$ stable pairs, so we will have at most $O(n_1^2)$ stable transpositions. Due to Lemma 3.12, there are also at most $O(n_1^2 + n_2)$ stable cycles that are not transpositions, so the result follows. \square

Now to compute all stable cycles, not necessarily reduced or fixed, we can use our previous work on reconstructing stable cycles of even length larger than 2 to show the following.

Theorem 3.18. Given an SR instance I with n agents, we can find all its stable cycles, $SC(I)$, in $O(n_1^2(n^2 + n_1)) = O(n^4)$ time, where $n_2 = |A(\mathcal{O}_I)|$ and $n_1 = n - n_2$.

Proof. Due to Lemma 3.16, we can find all reduced stable cycles, i.e. all stable transpositions and odd cycles, in $O(n^2 + n_1^3)$ time.

Now with regards to the stable cycles of even length larger than 2, we can consider all pairs of agents that could be part of a longer even stable cycle. There are $\binom{n}{2} = O(n^2)$ such subsets in general, but we can limit ourselves to the stable transpositions we found in the previous step due to Theorem 3.7, in which we showed that any even cycle can be broken into at least two collections of stable transpositions, therefore no agent pair that is not a stable transposition will lead to an even stable cycle.

For each pair $\{a_i, a_j\}$, we need to consider each of the two orderings $(a_i a_j \dots)$ and $(a_j a_i \dots)$. Clearly, there are $O(n_1^2)$ such pairs. Then, for each ordering, we can try to find its unique completion in $O(n^2)$ time due to Theorem 3.13 and finally verify that it is a stable cycle, also in $O(n^2)$ time due to Corollary 3.14. Altogether, we consider $O(n_1^2)$ candidates and need $O(n^2)$ time for each, therefore requiring $O(n_1^2 n^2)$ time. As any consecutively ordered pair of agents will only be part of at most one stable cycle of length larger than 2 by Theorem 3.13, we can eliminate all such pairs from the candidate set once detected. This will ensure that the even cycles are enumerated exactly once.

Altogether, the steps take $O(n_1^2(n^2 + n_1))$, or $O(n^4)$ time. \square

3.4 Enumerating Stable Partitions

Now that we know how to find all stable cycles of our SR instance I efficiently, we show that this leads to an alternative approach to enumerating all stable partitions, $P(I)$, compared to the naive method from Corollary 3.8. In this procedure, we will recursively build up all stable partitions, starting with the invariant odd cycles and adding one additional cycle with each recursive call. Simultaneously, at each recursive step, we fix an arbitrary agent not yet in any cycle of the partial partition and branch on all its cycles (as given by $SC(I)$) that, together with the current partial partition, lead to at least one stable partition. This way, the recursive tree consists of paths leading from the origin (a partial stable partition containing only the odd cycles) to all leaf nodes (all stable partitions).

The procedure `EnumPI` implements the logic described in the previous paragraph to enumerate all stable partitions. The parameter “cycles” contains a partial stable partition and grows with each recursive call until it is a full stable partition. The parameter “agents” contains all agents in I not yet in any cycle of “cycles” and is naturally decreasing in size as “cycles” grows.

Finally, the parameter SC contains all cycles of some stable partition of I containing some agent in “agents”, not necessarily compatible with “cycles” (in the sense that not every cycle in SC belongs to a stable partition with “cycles”). Note that by this behaviour, if “agents” is empty, then “cycles” is a stable partition and we print it. If not, then the algorithm proceeds to return and remove an arbitrary agent a_i from “agents”. Then, the algorithm checks whether there is a unique cycle c containing a_i such that “cycles” $++$ c is part of some stable partition of I using the procedure `FC` from Algorithm 3. If there is a unique such c , then we reduce the set of stable cycles SC to SC_{red} which does not contain any cycles with agents in c and recurse with the increased partial stable partition “cycles” $++$ c , the reduced set of stable cycles to choose from SC_{red} , and the reduced set of remaining agents “agents” $\setminus A(c)$.

If there is no unique choice c , then the procedure loops through all candidate cycles $c' \in SC$ that contain a_i , at least two of which must correspond to a partial stable partition “cycles” $++$ c' by construction. Whether “cycles” $++$ c' does correspond to a partial stable partition or only a collection of cycles that is not a subset of any stable partition can be determined with the procedure `verify` which is omitted but uses the result from Corollary 3.14 to check whether the collection of cycles completes to a stable partition. If so, we, again, create the appropriate SC_{red} and recurse as above.

The helper function `FC` which will speed up the execution of calls where the partial partition (in the sense that the cycles contained in the parameter are part of some stable partition, but may be missing some cycles) only allows one fixed cycle from all candidate cycles that contain the set agent. This must always be a transposition. To see this, consider an SR instance I . If we have a collection of cycles C including all odd cycles that are part of some stable partition of I and a single agent $a_i \in A(I)$ not in $A(C)$, then by the existence of stable partitions, there must exist a cycle $c \notin C$ such that $C ++ c$ is part of some stable partition of I . Now if c is unique, then c must be a transposition. Suppose not, then c must be of even length at least 4 (by C containing all odd cycles), but then we can break it into two collections of stable transpositions c_1, c_2 such that also $C ++ c_1$ and $C ++ c_2$ are part of some stable partition. Thus, unique choices must be transpositions.

Now, the procedure `FC` described in Algorithm 3 takes such a collection of cycles C as input “cycles”, as well as a single agent $a_i \in A(I) \setminus A(C)$ and generates a sub-instance I' of I consisting only of the agents not in C with their preference lists truncated such that any stable partition Π of I' corresponds to a stable partition $\Pi ++ C$ of I . In fact, I' must be solvable as there must exist some such stable partition by construction and if any would contain an odd cycle, “cycles” would not contain all odd cycles. Thus, by the argument in the previous paragraph, to check whether the agent a_i is in a unique cycle c such that $C ++ c$ is a stable partition of I , it suffices to apply the fixed pairs algorithm for stable matchings, for example using the linear time procedure (denoted by `getFixedPairs`) by Gusfield and Irving [28], and returning (through an $O(n)$ search) the fixed pair containing a_i , if it exists, otherwise returning null to report that no such fixed pair exists (to indicate that the choice is not unique).

Overall, our method to enumerate $P(I)$ first finds all $O(n_1^2 + n_2)$ stable cycles, $SC(I)$, in $O(n_1^2(n^2 + n_1))$ time as previously shown, and then calling the procedure `EnumPI` described in Algorithm 4 with stable cycles $SC(I) \setminus \mathcal{O}_I$ as parameter SC , the invariant odd cycles \mathcal{O}_I as parameter “cycles”, and agents $A(I) \setminus A(\mathcal{O}_I)$ as parameter “agents”.

Theorem 3.19. Let I be an instance of SR with n agents. Then Algorithm 4 enumerates all stable partitions $P(I)$ of I without repetition in $O(|P(I)|n^3 + n^4)$ time, or more specifically, $O((|P(I)| + n_1)n_1n^2 + n_1^3)$ time, where $n_2 = |A(\mathcal{O}_I)|$ and $n_1 = n - n_2$, when called as described above.

Proof. To establish correctness, note that by definition of stable cycles, each stable cycle is contained in at least one stable partition and all stable partitions are made up only of (some, not necessarily all) stable cycles. At every node in the recursive tree, if all previous cycles on the

Algorithm 3 FC(cycles, a_i), Fixed Cycle Helper Function for Algorithm 4

Input: cycles: a collection of cycles which is a subset of some stable partition of I and includes all odd cycles of I ; a_i : a single agent in $A(I) \setminus A(\text{cycles})$

Output: pair : a pair of two agents in $A(I) \setminus A(\text{cycles})$, potentially null

```
1:  $I' \leftarrow I$  (make a copy of  $I$ )
2: for cycle in cycles do
3:   for  $a_j$  in cycle do
4:     for  $a_p$  preferred by  $a_j$  over  $\text{cycle}^{-1}(a_j)$  in  $I$  do
5:       delete  $a_j$  and all successors of  $a_j$  from  $a_p$ 's preference list in  $I'$  (if exists)
6:     end for
7:     delete  $a_j$  from the set of agents of  $I'$  altogether
8:   end for
9: end for
10: fixed  $\leftarrow$  getFixedPairs( $I'$ )
11: if  $\{a_i, a_k\}$  in fixed for some  $a_k \in A(I')$  then
12:   return ( $a_i, a_k$ )
13: end if
14: return null
```

Algorithm 4 Enum $P_I(SC, \text{cycles}, \text{agents})$, recursively enumerates all stable partitions $P(I)$

Input: SC : all cycles of some stable partition of I containing some agent in “agents” and no agent in $A(\text{cycles})$; cycles: a collection of cycles which is a subset of some stable partition of I and includes all odd cycles of I ; agents: all agents in $A(I) \setminus A(\text{cycles})$

```
1: if agents =  $\emptyset$  then
2:   print(cycles)
3:   return
4: end if
5:  $a_i \leftarrow$  agents.pop()
6: fixed  $\leftarrow$  FC( $I, \text{cycles}, a_i$ )
7: if fixed  $\neq$  null then
8:    $SC_{red} \leftarrow \{(a_{j_1} \dots a_{j_k}) \in SC \mid \forall 1 \leq s \leq k, a_{j_s} \text{ not in fixed}\}$ 
9:   Enum $P_I(SC_{red}, \text{cycles} \# \text{fixed}, \text{agents} \setminus A(\text{fixed}))$ 
10: else
11:   for cycle in  $SC$  containing  $a_i$  do
12:     if verify(cycles  $\#$  cycle) then
13:        $SC_{red} \leftarrow \{(a_{j_1} \dots a_{j_k}) \in SC \mid \forall 1 \leq s \leq k, a_{j_s} \text{ not in cycle}\}$ 
14:       Enum $P_I(SC_{red}, \text{cycles} \# \text{cycle}, \text{agents} \setminus A(\text{cycle}))$ 
15:     end if
16:   end for
17: end if
```

recursive path are compatible, i.e., belong to some stable partition together, then if a_i is null, all agents are part of some cycle and thus the path represents a stable partition and we can stop. Otherwise, if a_i is not null, there must be some cycle or cycles C in their SC parameter that $\text{cycles} \# c$ is compatible for all $c \in C$. If $|C| = 1$, then we will detect it using the procedure FC and can immediately filter out all cycles in SC from further consideration that contain any agent in c . Similarly, if $|C| > 1$, then we will need to consider all cycles in SC that contain a_i , check whether it is compatible with cycles and, if so, recurse with a subset of SC not containing any cycles with overlapping agents. This procedure detects every stable partition exactly once, as by construction, every path contains distinct sets of cycles such that every

agent is contained exactly once. As the first call passes only the odd cycles to the procedure, it is trivially compatible as the odd cycles are invariant, and correctness follows by induction.

Now with regards to the computational complexity, note that in the recursive tree, there will be exactly $|P(I)|$ leaf nodes, $O(|P(I)|n_1)$ internal nodes with one child because each stable partition will contain $O(n)$ cycles and the odd cycles are given, and $O(|P(I)|)$ internal nodes with at least two children by properties of binary trees. Every leaf and internal node with one child takes $O(n^2)$ time due to Algorithm 3 and building SC_{red} , and every internal node with more children takes $O(n_1n^2)$ time because we consider at most $O(n_1)$ different stable cycles. This is because each agent can be contained in $O(n_1)$ transpositions and can have at most $O(n_1)$ successors in even cycles, and by lemma 3.10 in at most one even cycle per predecessor-successor pair. We noted in the description of Algorithm 3 that testing whether a candidate set of cycles is part of a stable partition takes $O(n^2)$ time, and building SC_{red} also takes $O(n_1^2)$ time. Thus, the recursive procedure takes, overall, $O(|P(I)|n_1n^2)$ time, with an additional $O(n_1^2(n^2 + n_1))$ overhead to compute all stable cycles once. \square

4 Complexity of Profile-Optimal Stable Partitions


We have shown how to efficiently enumerate all reduced stable partitions admitted by an SR instance I . However, as the size of the set $S(I_T)$ of all stable matchings of the sub-instance I_T of I (constructed using Algorithm 1) can, in general, be exponential in the number of agents n , this might not be a good solution to finding a reduced stable partition with some special property. Therefore, we might be interested in computing some “fair” or “optimal” stable partitions directly. As the odd cycles of SR instances are invariant, there is no point in seeking odd cycles with special properties for a given instance. However, we can consider the set of stable partitions of a given instance and seek, for example, a reduced stable partition with minimum regret. In this case, it is not enough to simply leverage the result from Theorem 3.3, as we are deleting entries in the preference lists during the construction of I_T , which makes the resulting profile entries in the larger instance inconsistent. For this, we use a *padding method* by replacing deleted agents in the preference lists by dummy agents which are guaranteed to be matched to each other by construction. Therefore, a solvable instance similar to I_T is created in which the ranks are maintained and known algorithms can be applied. This method and its correctness is outlined in Section 4.1. Section 4.2 establishes the computational complexity of computing various types of stable partitions directly, and 4.3 gives some details about the approximability of the problems that we show to be NP-hard in general.

4.1 Padding Method

Whenever, during the construction of I_E and I_T , an agent is supposed to be deleted from some preference list, we can instead replace the corresponding preference list entry to be deleted with a dummy agent entry that is guaranteed to be matched to another dummy agent in any stable matching or partition by making them rank each other as their respective first choices. Agents in odd cycles are automatically replaced in all preference lists of agents that are not in odd cycles and can be deleted altogether at the end of the transformation. Clearly, for an instance with n agents, we need at most n dummy agents in the transformation as they can be reused across but not within preference lists. If the number of required dummy agents is odd, we can simply add one more dummy agent to guarantee that all dummy agents are in fixed pairs of any stable matching of the transformed instance. As we are replacing all agents in odd cycles with dummy agents in fixed pairs, we transform the instance I to a solvable instance I_P with at most $2n$ agents, allowing us to apply any of the known algorithms now to find stable matchings satisfying additional optimality criteria with no asymptotic increase in complexity. We denote these k fixed pairs by $D = (d_1 d_2) \dots (d_{k-1} d_k)$ and can map the solution M in I_P back to a

solution Π for the original instance I by excluding the dummy agents and including the original odd cycles, i.e., $\Pi = (M \setminus D) \uparrow \mathcal{O}_I$.

The transformation from I to I_P is illustrated in Example 5 on the instance previously shown in Example 3. Two dummy agents, d_1 and d_2 , are introduced, replacing the preference list entries that would otherwise be deleted in the construction of I_T . The changes due to the transformation are indicated using dotted circles and the stable matching corresponding to the one in Example 3 is indicated using unbroken circles.



Example 5: An instance I_P transformed from I of Example 3

The correctness of the correspondence is established by the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.1. Let $I = (A, \succ)$ be any SR instance and let I_P be constructed from I as described above. Then M is a stable matching of I_P if and only if $\Pi = (M \setminus D) \uparrow \mathcal{O}_I$ is a reduced stable partition of I , where D is the collection of dummy agent fixed pairs and \mathcal{O}_I are the invariant odd cycles of I .

Proof. It suffices to show that M is a stable matching of I_P if and only if $M \setminus D$ is a stable matching of I_T constructed from I using Algorithm 1. Then, by Theorem 3.3, $M \setminus D$ is a stable matching of I_T if and only if $\Pi = (M \setminus D) \uparrow \mathcal{O}_I$ is a reduced stable partition of I and the result follows.

Indeed, if M is a stable matching of I_P , then $M \setminus D$ is a matching of I_T . Suppose $M \setminus D$ is not stable in I_T , then, by the construction of I_P , there exist two agents $a_i, a_j \in A \setminus A(\mathcal{O}_I)$ that prefer each other over their partners in $M \setminus D$. However the preference relations of all agents in $A \setminus A(\mathcal{O}_I)$ are the same for I_P and I_T , so this would contradict the stability of M in I_P .

On the other hand, if M' is a stable matching of I_T , then $M' \cup D$ is a matching in I_P as we have $A(D) \cap A(M') = \emptyset$. Suppose that $M' \cup D$ is not stable in I_P . As the preference relations in I_T for all agents matched in M' remain the same in I_P , no two agents matched in M' can block $M' \cup D$ in I_P . Also, no dummy agent can block with another dummy agent or an agent matched in M' , because all dummy agents are matched to their first choice. \square

4.2 Complexity of Problems

The padding method allows us to establish further results on the correspondence between stable partitions and stable matchings. Specifically, we show that the profile-based optimality criteria for stable matchings carry over naturally to stable partitions and we can show that the computational complexity results are consistent.

First, we look at stable partitions with minimum regret. Using the padding method, we can show that the problem of finding a minimum-regret stable partition is tractable.

Lemma 4.2. Let I be an SR instance, let $\Pi = M_0 \mathcal{O}_I$ be a reduced stable partition of I , where M_0 is a collection of transpositions and \mathcal{O}_I are the odd cycles in Π , and I_P be the transformed instance using the padding method. If M_0 is a stable matching of I_P with minimum regret, then Π is a reduced stable partition with minimum regret.

Proof. Lemma 4.1 states that if M_0 is a minimum-regret stable matching of I_P , then $\Pi = (M_0 \setminus D) \uplus \mathcal{O}_I$ is a reduced stable partition of I , where D are the fixed pairs of dummy agents.

Now suppose that there exists a reduced stable partition $\Pi' \neq \Pi$ such that $r(\Pi') < r(\Pi)$. Then again, by Lemma 4.1, we must have $\Pi' = M_1 \mathcal{O}_I$, where $M_1 \neq M_0$ is some stable matching of I_P . Note that the dummy agents do not affect the regret of the partition, as all of them are matched to their first choice by construction. Now, if $r(\Pi') < r(\Pi)$, then we must have that $r(M_1) < r(M_0)$ by invariance of $r(\mathcal{O}_I)$. This contradicts that M_0 is a minimum-regret stable matching of I_P , proving the statement. \square

Note that the converse does not necessarily hold, because a reduced stable partition $\Pi = M_0 \mathcal{O}_I$ as above could have $r(M_0) < r(\Pi) = r(\mathcal{O}_I)$.

We can furthermore show that there is no gap in minimum regret between the set of reduced stable partitions and the set of stable partitions.

Lemma 4.3. Let Π be a minimum-regret reduced stable partition of some SR instance I and let $r(\Pi)$ be its regret. Then for any stable partition Π' of I , we have $r(\Pi) \leq r(\Pi')$.

Proof. Suppose not, then there exists some non-reduced minimum regret stable partition Π' of instance I which has smaller regret $r_1 = r(\Pi')$ than the reduced stable partition Π with minimum regret $r_2 = r(\Pi)$ over all reduced stable partitions.

The odd cycles are invariant for all stable partitions, so $r_2 > r_1$ must come from choosing transpositions over longer even cycles. However, we can show that breaking down an even cycle $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_{2k}})$ preserves its regret, i.e. that $r(C) = r(C')$, where $C' = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2}) \dots (a_{i_{2k-1}} a_{i_{2k}})$. This holds because any agent's predecessor in C' is at least as good as their predecessor in C due to stability condition T1. As this transformation does not impact stability due to Lemma 3.6 and because we can break down every even cycle larger than 2 like this, some reduced stable partition can achieve the same regret as any non-reduced stable partition, therefore proving the statement. \square

Theorem 4.4. A stable partition with minimum regret always exists and can be computed in linear time.

Proof. Gusfield and Irving [28] already showed that we can compute a stable matching with minimum regret in linear time for solvable instances. Thus, we can compute any reduced stable partition, derive the solvable instance I_P from any SR instance I , find a stable matching with minimum regret, and map it back to the instance I , which produces the correct result due to Lemma 4.2. Lemma 4.3 states that the minimum regret reduced stable partition is also a minimum regret stable partition. Existence follows from the existence of stable partitions and all computation and transformation steps can be performed in linear time. \square

Consistent with stable matchings, minimum regret remains an exception concerning the tractability of profile-based optimal stable partitions. We now also consider the following decision problems.

Definition 4.5. Given an SR instance I with n agents and regret r , an integer k , and a vector $\sigma \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}^n$, let

- FC-DEC-SR-SP denote the problem of deciding whether I admits a stable partition Π where $p_1(\Pi) \geq k$,
- RANK-DEC-SR-SP denote the problem of deciding whether I admits a stable partition Π where $p(\Pi) \succeq \sigma$,
- RM-DEC-SR-SP denote the problem of deciding whether I admits a minimum regret stable partition with at most k r th choices,
- GEN-DEC-SR-SP denote the problem of deciding whether I admits a stable partition Π where $\sigma^{rev} \succeq p^{rev}(\Pi)$, and

- EGAL-DEC-SR-SP denote the problem of deciding whether I admits a stable partition with cost at most k .

For all of these problems, we show that no non-reduced stable partition is “better” with regards to our optimality criteria than the best reduced stable partition, which allows us to only consider reduced stable partitions. Knowing the NP-completeness of the associated problems above for stable matchings, we can show that all of these problems are NP-complete for stable partitions, even if the instance is solvable. One might ask whether the same result holds for unsolvable instances, which have some different structural properties. Using a reduction from solvable instances, we can show that this is indeed the case.

First, to show the next statements, the following Lemma establishes that no non-reduced stable partition satisfies more first-choices than the maximum number of first-choices satisfied by any reduced stable partition.

Lemma 4.6. Let $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_k})$ be an even cycle with $k \geq 4$ and profile $p(C)$. Then both collections of transpositions $C_1 = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2}) \dots (a_{i_{k-1}} a_{i_k})$ and $C_2 = (a_{i_1} a_{i_k}) \dots (a_{i_{k-2}} a_{i_{k-1}})$ are stable and either $p_1(C_1) \geq p_1(C)$ or $p_1(C_2) \geq p_1(C)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.6, both C_1 and C_2 are stable. Now for $a_{i_j} \in C$, we know that $C(a_{i_j}) \succ_{i_j} C^{-1}(a_{i_j})$ by stability condition T1 and the fact that C is longer than a transposition, therefore proving strict inequality. Thus, any agent a_{i_j} that contributes a first choice in C must rank their successor as a first choice and no agent in C can have their predecessor ranked as a first choice. Therefore, any such agent a_{i_j} adds exactly 1 to $p_1(C)$. Now if we break C into transpositions, an agent a_{i_j} who is paired with their first choice successor now has their first choice as successor and predecessor simultaneously, thus adding 2 either to $p_1(C_1)$ or to $p_1(C_2)$. Now for any two agents a_{i_r}, a_{i_s} that get their first choice in C and have an even number of agents between them, one will get their first choice assigned in C_1 and one in C_2 . Any two such agents that have an odd number of agents between them will both get their first choice assigned in C_1 or C_2 . Hence, at least one of C_1 and C_2 will achieve at least as many first choices as in C . \square

This lets us limit the search for first-choice maximal stable partitions on reduced stable partitions, as we can always break down longer even cycles into transpositions efficiently without loss of first-choice maximality.

Lemma 4.7. FC-DEC-SR-SP is NP-complete, even if the given instance is solvable.

Proof. Note that FC-DEC-SR-SP is in NP, as given instance I , integer k , and partition Π , we can check whether Π is a stable partition of I and verify that it has at least k first-choices, all in linear time.

Cooper [15] proved that FC-DEC-SR-SM, the problem of deciding whether a solvable SR instance I with complete preference lists admits a stable matching with at least k first choices, is NP-complete. To establish our result, we will show that for a solvable instance I with complete preference lists, I admits a stable matching M where $p_1(M) \geq k$ if and only if I admits a stable partition Π where $p_1(\Pi) \geq 2k$.

Suppose that I admits a stable matching $M = \{\{a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}\} \dots \{a_{i_{n-1}}, a_{i_n}\}\}$ with at least k first choices, i.e. at least k agents are assigned a partner that is ranked first in their preference list. Then, immediately, M has an associated stable partition $\Pi = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2}) \dots (a_{i_{n-1}} a_{i_n})$, in which at least k agents have a successor that is their first-choice. As all cycles are transpositions, their predecessors are also their successors, so in the associated profile $p(\Pi)$, we will have $p_1(\Pi) \geq 2k$ as desired.

For the other direction, suppose that I admits a stable partition Π with at least $2k$ first choices in $p(\Pi)$. By Lemma 4.6 we can break down Π into a reduced stable partition Π' if Π is not reduced, such that $p_1(\Pi') \geq p_1(\Pi) \geq 2k$. Because we assume that I is solvable, by Theorem 3.3, Π' corresponds to a stable matching M of I and so $p_1(M) = \frac{p_1(\Pi')}{2} \geq k$ as desired. \square

Theorem 4.8. Let I be an SR instance and k an integer. FC-DEC-SR-SP, the problem of deciding whether I admits a stable partition with at least k first choices, is NP-complete, even if I is solvable and even if I is unsolvable.

Proof. If I is solvable, the result follows immediately from Lemma 4.7.

Now suppose that we can, in polynomial time, decide FC-DEC-SR-SP for an unsolvable instance I . Then we could also solve the problem for solvable instances, contradicting the above. Specifically, take any solvable instance I_1 with n agents and transform it to an unsolvable instance I_2 by adding six agents a_{n+1}, \dots, a_{n+6} with preferences given in Example 6, where $a_{n+i} = b_i$, such that they form two invariant three-cycles in any stable partition without satisfying any first-choices. One can easily verify the construction by checking that each agent prefers their successor over their predecessor and no two agents prefer each other over their predecessors. As the three-cycles are of odd length, they must be invariant. Finally, I_2 is clearly unsolvable due to the new odd cycles, but any stable partition Π_2 of I_2 corresponds to a stable partition $\Pi_1 = \Pi_2 \setminus \{(a_{n+1} a_{n+2} a_{n+3})(a_{n+4} a_{n+5} a_{n+6})\}$ of I_1 and vice versa. Furthermore, $p_1(\Pi_1) = p_1(\Pi_2)$, so some stable partition of I_1 satisfies at least k first-choices if and only if some stable partition of I_2 satisfies at least k first-choices. \square

b_1	b_4	b_2	b_3	\dots
b_2	b_4	b_3	b_1	\dots
b_3	b_5	b_1	b_2	\dots
b_4	b_3	b_5	b_6	\dots
b_5	b_1	b_6	b_4	\dots
b_6	b_1	b_4	b_5	\dots

Example 6: Added 3-cycles for first-choice maximal reduction

The hardness of finding rank-maximal stable partitions follows directly from the previous result.

Theorem 4.9. RANK-DEC-SR-SP is NP-complete, even if the given instance is solvable and even if it is unsolvable.

Proof. Note that RANK-DEC-SR-SP is in NP, as given an instance I , vector σ , and partition Π , we can check whether Π is a stable partition of I and check whether $p(\Pi) \succeq \sigma$, all in linear time.

We showed above in Theorem 4.8 that FC-DEC-SR-SP is NP-complete for solvable and for unsolvable instances. Now given a problem instance (I, k) to FC-DEC-SR-SP, (I, k) is a yes-instance if and only if $(I, (k \ 0 \dots 0))$ is a yes-instance to RANK-DEC-SR-SP. \square

A similar result holds for regret-minimal stable partitions.

First, the following Lemma establishes that no non-reduced minimum-regret stable partition with regret r satisfies less r th choices than any reduced minimum-regret stable partition with minimal r th choices satisfied.

Lemma 4.10. Let $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_k})$ be an even cycle with profile p and regret r of some instance I with n agents. Then both $C_1 = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2}) \dots (a_{i_{k-1}} a_{i_k})$ and $C_2 = (a_{i_1} a_{i_k}) \dots (a_{i_{k-2}} a_{i_{k-1}})$ are stable and either $p_r(C_1) \leq p_r(C)$ and $p_j(C_1) = 0$ for all $r < j \leq n$ or $p_r(C_2) \leq p_r(C)$ and $p_j(C_2) = 0$ for all $r < j \leq n$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.6, both C_1 and C_2 are stable. Now for any $a_{i_j} \in C$, we know $C(a_{i_j}) \succ_{i_j} C^{-1}(a_{i_j})$ by stability condition T1 and the fact that C is longer than a transposition, therefore

proving strict inequality. Thus, any agent a_{i_j} that gets their r th choice in C must rank their successor better than r . Therefore, any such agent a_{i_j} contributes exactly 1 to $p_r(C)$. Now if we break C into transpositions, an agent a_{i_j} who is paired with their r th choice predecessor now has them also as their successor, thus adding 2 to either $p_r(C_1)$ or $p_r(C_2)$. Clearly, $p_j(C_1) = p_j(C_2) = 0$ for all $r < j \leq n$ is true, as everyone gets a partner in C_1, C_2 no worse than their predecessor in C . Now for any two agents a_{i_l}, a_{i_m} that get their r th choice predecessor in C and have an even number of agents between them, one will get their r th choice assigned in C_1 and one in C_2 . For any two such agents that have an odd number of agents between them will both get their r th choice assigned in either C_1 or C_2 . Hence, the result follows. \square

This, again, lets us consider reduced partitions and use existing complexity results.

Lemma 4.11. RM-DEC-SR-SP is NP-complete, even if the given instance is solvable.

Proof. Note that RM-DEC-SR-SP is in NP, as given instance I with minimum regret r , integer k , and partition Π , we can check whether Π is a minimum regret stable partition of I and verify that it assigns at most k r th choices, all in linear time.

Cooper [15] proved that RM-DEC-SR-SM, the problem of deciding whether a solvable SR instance I admits a stable matching with at most k r th-choices and 0 choices higher than r , is NP-complete. Note that this is equivalent to saying that the problem of deciding whether I admits a minimum-regret stable matching with at most k r th choices is NP-complete. To establish our result, we will show that for an instance I with complete preference lists, I admits a minimum-regret stable matching M with at most k r th choices in $p(M)$ if and only if I admits a minimum-regret stable partition Π with at most $2k$ r th choices in $p(\Pi)$.

Suppose that I admits a minimum-regret stable matching $M = \{\{a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}\} \dots \{a_{i_{n-1}}, a_{i_n}\}\}$ with at most k r th choices, i.e. at most k agents are assigned a partner that is ranked in the r th position of their preference list. Then, immediately, M has an associated minimum-regret stable partition $\Pi = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2}) \dots (a_{i_{n-1}} a_{i_n})$, in which at most k agents have a predecessor that is ranked in their r th position. As all cycles are transpositions, their predecessors are also their successors, so in the associated profile we will have $p_r(\Pi) \leq 2k$ as desired.

For the other direction, suppose I admits a minimum-regret stable partition Π with $p_r(\Pi) \leq 2k$. By Lemma 4.10 we can furthermore suppose that Π is reduced, because if Π is not reduced, then we can break its even cycles into a stable collection of transpositions in a way that does not increase the number or index of worst-choice assignments. Because we assume that I is solvable, by Lemma 4.2, Π corresponds to a minimum regret stable matching M of I , and because all cycles in Π are transpositions, we know that $p_r(\Pi) = 2p_r(M)$, as desired. \square

Theorem 4.12. Let I be an SR instance with regret r and let k be an integer. RM-DEC-SR-SP, the problem of deciding whether I admits a minimum-regret stable partition with at most k r th choices, is NP-complete, even if I is solvable and even if I is unsolvable.

Proof. If I is solvable, the result follows immediately from Lemma 4.11.

If I is unsolvable, we can use the same construction as in Theorem 4.8 to show that NP-completeness follows from the solvable case. \square

This immediately lets us establish hardness results for generous stable partitions.

Theorem 4.13. GEN-DEC-SR-SP is NP-complete, even if the given instance is solvable and even if it is unsolvable.

Proof. Note that GEN-DEC-SR-SP is in NP, as given an instance I , vector σ , and partition Π , we can check that Π is a stable partition of I and check that $\sigma^{rev} \succeq p^{rev}(\Pi)$, all in linear time.

We showed above in Theorem 4.12 that RM-DEC-SR-SP is NP-complete for solvable and for unsolvable instances. Now given a problem instance (I, k) to RM-DEC-SR-SP, (I, k) is a

yes-instance if and only if (I, σ) is a yes-instance to GEN-DEC-SR-SP, where r is the minimum regret of any stable partition of I , $\sigma_r = k$, $\sigma_i = n$ for $i < r$ and $\sigma_i = 0$ for $i > r$.

In this construction, both problems ask whether there exists a stable partition Π of I where at most k agents are assigned their r th choice and no agent is assigned to anyone worse than their r th choice, as any stable partition satisfies $p_i(\Pi) < \sigma_i$ for $i < r$, so the result follows. \square

Finally, we consider minimising the profile-based (egalitarian) cost of a stable partition.

Again, the following lemma lets us reduce the search to reduced stable partitions.

Lemma 4.14. Let $C = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2} \dots a_{i_k})$ be an even cycle with cost $c(C)$. Then both collections of transpositions $C_1 = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2}) \dots (a_{i_{k-1}} a_{i_k})$ and $C_2 = (a_{i_1} a_{i_k}) \dots (a_{i_{k-2}} a_{i_{k-1}})$ are stable and either $c(C_1) \leq c(C)$ or $c(C_2) \leq c(C)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.6, both C_1 and C_2 are stable. Now let c_1, c_2 be the costs of C_1, C_2 , respectively. Let $\text{rank}_s(C) = (sr_1 sr_2 \dots sr_k)$ be the vector of successor ranks for agents $i_1 \dots i_k$, i.e., sr_j is the rank of $C(a_{i_j})$ on a_{i_j} 's preference list and define $\text{rank}_p(C)$ the same for predecessors. Then $c(C) = \text{sum}(\text{rank}_s(C) + \text{rank}_p(C))$, and similarly for C_1, C_2 , by definition. However, by construction, we have that $\text{rank}_s(C_1) = (sr_1 pr_2 sr_3 \dots pr_k) = \text{rank}_p(C_1)$ and $\text{rank}_s(C_2) = (pr_1 sr_2 pr_3 \dots sr_k) = \text{rank}_p(C_2)$. Then $c_1 + c_2 = 2c(C)$, so the result follows. \square

This helps us in establishing the intractability of the problem.

Lemma 4.15. EGAL-DEC-SR-SP is NP-complete, even if the given instance is solvable.

Proof. Note that EGAL-DEC-SR-SP is in NP, as given instance I , integer k , and partition Π , we can check whether Π is a stable partition of I and verify that it has cost at most k , all in linear time.

Feder [20] proved that EGAL-DEC-SR-SM, the problem of deciding whether I admits a stable matching with cost at most k , is NP-complete, even if I is solvable. To establish our result, we will show that for an instance I with complete preference lists, I admits a stable matching M with cost at most k if and only if I admits a stable partition Π with cost at most k .

By solvability of I and Theorem 3.3, any stable matching $M = \{\{a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}\} \dots \{a_{i_{n-1}}, a_{i_n}\}\}$ corresponds to a reduced stable partition $\Pi = (a_{i_1} a_{i_2}) \dots (a_{i_{n-1}} a_{i_n})$ and vice versa. Furthermore, by definition of cost, $c(\Pi) = c(M)$. Also, by Lemma 4.14, there is no gap in minimum cost between reduced stable partitions and non-reduced stable partitions, and we know that we can turn any non-reduced stable partition into a reduced stable partition without an increase in cost. Thus, the result follows. \square

Theorem 4.16. Let I be an SR instance and k be an integer. EGAL-DEC-SR-SP, the problem of deciding whether I admits a stable partition with egalitarian cost at most k , is NP-complete, even if I is solvable and even if I is unsolvable.

Proof. If I is solvable, the result follows immediately from Lemma 4.15.

If I is unsolvable, we can use the same construction as in Theorem 4.8 to show that NP-completeness follows from the solvable case, as the cost of the added 3-cycles in the reduction is fixed and can be added onto the parameter k . \square

Note that all NP-hardness arguments above assume a solvable (sub)instance that is computationally difficult in the considered context. However, the smaller the sub-instance, the easier to compute an optimal solution, as there is no choice involved in the odd cycles. In the extreme case, all agents are part of odd cycles, which means that there exists a unique stable partition for the instance which is automatically optimal regardless of the objective.

4.3 Approximability of the NP-hard Problems

After seeing how profile optimality transfers from matchings to partitions in terms of computational complexity, we can similarly consider whether approximation methods carry over. We have shown the NP-hardness of computing egalitarian, first-choice maximal, rank-maximal, regret-minimal, and generous stable partitions. However, there is no known measure of approximability for rank-maximal or generous profiles even for stable matchings, so it is unclear what an approximation could look like for stable partitions. We postpone this for future work and focus on the first-choice maximal, and regret-minimal, and egalitarian problems.

Theorem 4.17. The problem of finding a first-choice maximal stable partition Π of some SR instance I does not admit a polynomial-time approximation algorithm with any constant-factor performance guarantee, even if I is solvable and even if I is unsolvable, unless $P=NP$.

Proof. Simola and Manlove [50] proved that there does not exist any constant factor approximation algorithm for the first-choice maximal stable matching problem, unless $P=NP$. Thus, for this proof, it suffices to show that if there was a polynomial-time approximation algorithm for regret-minimal stable partitions with any constant performance guarantee c , then we could also solve the respective stable matching problem.

Indeed, let I be any solvable SR instance and let opt be the maximum number of first choices achieved in any stable matching of I . We have previously shown in Theorem 4.8 that $2opt$ is the maximum number of first choices achieved in the profile of any stable partition of I and that it can be achieved by some reduced stable partition. Thus, if we could approximate a first-choice maximal stable partition problem within c , then we could find a reduced stable partition Π with at least $\frac{2opt}{c}$ first choices in the profile, corresponding to $\frac{opt}{c}$ first choices in the corresponding stable matching profile, which is a contradiction to the fact that there is no constant factor approximation algorithm for the stable matching version of the problem.

Furthermore, if we had a c -approximation algorithm for unsolvable instances, then we could transform any solvable instance I with n agents into an unsolvable one by adding two forced odd cycles $(a_{n+1} a_{n+2} a_{n+3})(a_{n+4} a_{n+5} a_{n+6})$ similar to the proof of Theorem 4.8 using the preference list construction from Example 6, where $a_{n+i} = b_i$. Clearly, the preferences admit the desired 3-cycles as stability conditions T1 and T2 are satisfied. Furthermore, as the cycles are of odd length, we can immediately conclude that they are unique, and must thus be part of any stable partition. The cycles do not satisfy any additional first choices which could affect the correctness of the reduction to prove the inapproximability of first-choice maximal stable partitions of unsolvable instances within any constant factor. \square

For the other problems, we can use some known results about approximating special stable matchings.

Definition 4.18. Let I be an instance of SR. Then a matching M is a solution to the OPTIMAL SR problem if M is a solution to the SR problem and $\sum_{a_i \in A_M} c_i(M(a_i))$ is minimal, where A_M is the set of agents matched in M and $c_i(a_j)$ is the (real-valued) cost of being matched to a_j from a_i 's point of view.

Teo and Sethuraman [54] showed that if the cost function furthermore satisfies that for each agent a_k with complete ordinal preferences $a_{k_1} \succ_k \dots \succ_k a_{k_{n-1}}$, there exists an agent a_{k_l} such that $c_k(a_{k_{m-1}}) \geq c_k(a_{k_m})$ for all $1 < m \leq l$ and $c_k(a_{k_{m'}}) \leq c_k(a_{k_{m'+1}})$ for all $l \leq m' < n-1$, then OPTIMAL SR is approximable within a factor of 2 using an integer programming approach computable in polynomial time.

Note that for first-choice maximal stable partitions, it is not possible to apply this approximation method, as there is no suitable cost function that satisfies the additional criteria. However, Simola and Manlove [50] previously showed how the 2-approximation of OPTIMAL SR can be used to approximate regret-minimal stable matchings, and we showed that this is also true for stable partitions.

Theorem 4.19. The problem of finding a regret-minimal stable partition Π of some SR instance I admits a polynomial-time approximation algorithm with a performance guarantee of 2.

Proof. Again, we know that because all odd cycles are invariant and can be found in polynomial time, we show that we can 2-approximate the even cycles, which actually gives an overall performance guarantee significantly better than 2 if the number of agents in odd cycles is large compared to the number of agents in the instance.

Let Π_p be a minimum regret stable partition of I with profile p , which always exists and we have shown to be computable in linear time, and let r be the minimum regret. If $r = 1$ or $p_r = p_r|_{\mathcal{O}_I}$, i.e. all profile entries at position r are caused by half-matchings in odd cycles, there is no variability and we found an optimal solution. Otherwise, we showed that $\Pi_p = M'\mathcal{O}_I$ for a minimum-regret stable matching M of I_P with dummy agents removed. Some match in M causes an entry at position r in the profile of Π , none of which can be with a dummy agent as they are all matched to each other and rank their match first in their preference list. We define the cost function

$$c_i(a_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{rank}_i(a_j) \geq r \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, c satisfies the condition by Teo and Sethuraman [54] as preference lists correspond to a cost sequence $0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1$ with $r - 1$ zeros and $n - r$ ones. Furthermore, as we know that every agent in S_P can be matched to some other agent of rank at least as good as r , we can truncate the preference lists of every agent at rank $r + 1$. Then $\sum_{a_i \in A_M} c_i(M(a_i))$ is exactly the number of agents in I_P that are matched to their r th choice. Now, let Π_{opt} be an optimal stable partition, then we can apply the 2-approximation algorithm for OPTIMAL SR with cost function c to S_P to get a matching M'' with dummy agents removed such that $p_r(M''\mathcal{O}_I) = p_r(M'') + p_r(\mathcal{O}_I) \leq 2(p_r(M_{opt}) + p_r(\mathcal{O}_I)) = 2p_r(\Pi_{opt})$ as desired. \square

Similarly, we showed that there also exists a suitable cost function to approximate egalitarian stable partitions using this method.

Theorem 4.20. The problem of finding an egalitarian stable partition Π of some SR instance I admits a polynomial-time approximation algorithm with a performance guarantee of 2.

Proof. We will show that we can define a suitable cost function c such that when applying the 2-approximation algorithm to the OPTIMAL SR problem to the solvable instance I_P derived from I by the padding method, we find a solution to the egalitarian stable partition problem with a performance guarantee of 2. Even more, we know that because all odd cycles are invariant and can be found in polynomial time, we show that we can 2-approximate the even cycles, which actually gives an overall performance guarantee significantly better than 2 if the number of agents in odd cycles is large compared to the number of agents in the instance. Indeed, the natural cost function $c_i(a_j) = \text{rank}_i(a_j)$ works to approximate an egalitarian stable matching within 2, as $c_k(a_{k_i})$ is strictly increasing for i from 1 to $n - 1$. Also, the solution M will satisfy $\sum_{a_i \in A_M} c_i(M(a_i)) = c(M)$ minimal as desired.

Now we want to show that $\Pi = M\mathcal{O}_I$, where M is a 2-approximation of an egalitarian stable matching of I_P with dummy agents removed and \mathcal{O}_I are the invariant odd cycles of I , is a 2-approximation of an optimal egalitarian stable partition $\Pi_{opt} = M'\mathcal{O}_I$ of I , where M' is an egalitarian stable matching of I_P as previously shown. Recall that $c(\Pi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i < n} p_i * i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a_i} (\text{rank}_i(\Pi(a_i)) + \text{rank}_i(\Pi^{-1}(a_i)))$. Thus, $c(\Pi) = c(M) + c(\mathcal{O}_I)$ and similarly for $c(\Pi_{opt})$, such that $c(\Pi) > 2c(\Pi_{opt})$ implies $c(M) > 2c(M')$, a contradiction. Therefore, the method gives a 2-approximation for the egalitarian stable partition problem and can be computed in polynomial time. \square

These results are consistent with the approximability results of stable matchings, which fits the theme of compatibility and close correspondence throughout this research.

5 Discussion and Open Problems

In this paper, we have shown various new insights into the structure of stable partitions. Specifically, that there is a close correspondence between reduced stable partitions of unsolvable instances and stable matchings of certain solvable sub-instances, how even cycles can be constructed from transpositions and partial cycles, with the highlight being a result proving that a predecessor-successor pair is sufficient to find the unique stable cycle of even length larger than 2 (if one exists). Using these insights, we also provided the first algorithms to efficiently enumerate all reduced and non-reduced stable cycles and partitions of a given problem instance, which could be useful for a variety of cases. Furthermore, we showed how the stable matching notions of profile- and cost-optimality carry over to stable partitions and which of the problems are efficiently computable. Although we assumed complete preference lists throughout this work, the same results and algorithms should apply to SRI instances (SR instances with incomplete lists). This bridges the gap between stable matchings, which do not always exist, and fractional matchings, which always exist but may not be useful in certain practical applications.

For a comparative overview of the complexity results previously known and newly established, see Table 7. There, we consider maximum welfare stable fractional matchings as egalitarian for consistency. With regards to approximation bounds for the optimisation versions of the NP-complete decision problem variants above, Table 8 compares the existing results for stable matchings to the new results for stable partitions presented here.

	M	SP	FM
Always Exists	No	Yes	Yes
Find Any (if exists)	$O(n^2)$ [30]	$O(n^2)$ [51]	$O(n^2)$ [11]
Find $SP(I)/SC(I)$	$O(n^3)$ [21]	$O(n_1^2(n^2 + n_1))$ (Thm 3.18)	
Find $FP(I)/FC(I)$	$O(n^2)$ [28]	$O(n^2)$ (Thm 3.15)	
Find $S(I)/RP(I)$	$O(S(I) n + n^2)$ [21]	$O(S(I_T) n + n^2)$ (Thm 3.5)	
Find $P(I)$		$O((P(I) + n_1)n_1n^2 + n_1^3)$ (Thm 3.19)	
Min Regret	$O(n^2)$ [28]	$O(n^2)$ (Thm 4.4)	
Egalitarian	NP-hard [20]	NP-hard (Thm 4.16)	NP-hard [11]
First-Choice Max	NP-hard [15]	NP-hard (Thm 4.8)	
Rank-Max	NP-hard [15]	NP-hard (Thm 4.9)	
Regret-Min	NP-hard [15]	NP-hard (Thm 4.12)	
Generous	NP-hard [15]	NP-hard (Thm 4.13)	

Table 7: Complexity classification of different SR problems related to Stable Matchings (M), Stable Partitions (SP), and Fractional Matchings (FM) under ordinal stability. Contributions in colour. Not applicable or not a natural problem to study in gray. n is the number of agents in the instance, n_1 of which are not in invariant odd cycles.

	Stable Matching	Stable Partition
Egalitarian	2-approximable [21]	2-approximable (Thm 4.20)
Regret-Min	2-approximable [50]	2-approximable (Thm 4.19)
First-Choice Max	Not approx within any $c \in \mathbb{R}$ [50]	Not approx within any $c \in \mathbb{R}$ (Thm 4.17)

Table 8: Approximation Results for Different SR Problems. Contributions in color.

Overall, we have shown a close correspondence between stable matchings and stable partitions in every way, from instance and solution structure to the computational complexity and approximability of problem variants. However, there are still many open problems related to stable partitions and other topics of this paper. One direction for future work is to improve

on the complexity results presented here, for example by investigating whether a technique similar to the 2-SAT reduction by Feder [21] in the enumeration of $SP(I)$ and $S(I)$ or the transformations between non-bipartite to bipartite instances presented by Dean and Munshi [18] can speed up the enumeration of $SC(I)$ and $P(I)$. One could also explore stable fractional matchings more, looking into fast enumeration of such matchings and partnerships, or adapting optimality criteria similar to the ones formulated here. Currently, it is not clear what a suitable definition for an approximation ratio could look like for the rank-maximal- and generous-profile problems, neither for matchings nor for partitions. On the structural side, it would be interesting to study whether stable half-matchings form a semi-lattice, as is the case for stable matchings [28]. It would also be interesting to confirm that the results presented here do indeed hold as expected in the cases of incomplete preference lists and an odd number of agents. There might also be a closer relationship than currently discovered between the structure of stable partitions and approximate or exact solutions to computationally difficult problems such as the almost-stable matching problem, where some results presented here might help. Finally, it could be investigated how stable partitions can be useful in the presence of ties in the preference lists, for example in approximating large weakly stable matchings, or how stable partitions can be generalised to the many-to-many setting, such as the STABLE FIXTURES problem [32].

Acknowledgements We would like to thank the anonymous MATCH-UP and SAGT reviewers for their helpful suggestions.

References

- [1] <http://www.paireddonation.org> (Alliance for Paired Donation website). Accessed 17 June 2024.
- [2] <http://www.organdonation.nhs.uk> (Organ Donation and Transplantation Directorate, NHS Blood and Transplant website). Accessed 17 June 2024.
- [3] D. J. Abraham, P. Biró, and D. Manlove. ““Almost stable” matchings in the roommates problem”. In: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* 3879 (2006), pp. 1–14. ISSN: 16113349. DOI: 10.1007/11671411_1.
- [4] R. Aharoni and T. Fleiner. “On a lemma of Scarf”. In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B* 87.1 (2003), pp. 72–80. ISSN: 0095-8956. DOI: 10.1016/S0095-8956(02)00028-X.
- [5] E. Anshelevich, S. Das, and Y. Naamad. “Anarchy, Stability, and Utopia: Creating Better Matchings”. In: *Algorithmic Game Theory*. Ed. by M. Mavronicolas and V. G. Papadopoulos. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009, pp. 159–170. ISBN: 978-3-642-04645-2. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-04645-2_15.
- [6] P. Biró, K. Cechlárová, and T. Fleiner. “The dynamics of stable matchings and half-matchings for the stable marriage and roommates problems”. In: *International Journal of Game Theory* 36 (3-4 Mar. 2008). ISSN: 00207276. DOI: 10.1007/S00182-007-0084-3.
- [7] P. Biró and T. Fleiner. “Fractional Solutions for NTU-Games”. In: *Discrete Optimization* 22 (Mar. 2015). DOI: 10.1016/j.disopt.2015.02.002.
- [8] P. Biró, W. Kern, D. Paulusma, and P. Wojtuczky. “The stable fixtures problem with payments”. In: *Games and Economic Behavior* 108 (Mar. 2018), pp. 245–268. ISSN: 0899-8256. DOI: 10.1016/J.GEB.2017.02.002.
- [9] P. Biró, D. Manlove, and E. J. McDermid. ““Almost stable” matchings in the Roommates problem with bounded preference lists”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 432 (May 2012), pp. 10–20. ISSN: 0304-3975. DOI: 10.1016/J.TCS.2012.01.022.

- [10] V. Borbel'ová and K. Cechlárová. "Rotations in the stable b-matching problem". In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 411 (16-18 Mar. 2010), pp. 1750–1762. ISSN: 0304-3975. DOI: 10.1016/J.TCS.2010.01.017.
- [11] I. Caragiannis, A. Filos-Ratsikas, P. Kanellopoulos, and R. Vaish. "Stable fractional matchings". In: *ACM EC 2019 - Proceedings of the 2019 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation* (June 2019), pp. 21–39. DOI: 10.1145/3328526.3329637.
- [12] K. Cechlárová and T. Fleiner. "On a generalization of the stable roommates problem". In: *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)* 1 (1 July 2005), pp. 143–156. ISSN: 15496333. DOI: 10.1145/1077464.1077474.
- [13] J. Chen, D. Hermelin, M. Sorge, and H. Yedidsion. "How hard is it to satisfy (almost) all roommates?" In: *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics, LIPIcs* 107 (July 2017). ISSN: 18688969. DOI: 10.4230/LIPIcs.ICALP.2018.35.
- [14] J. Chen, S. Roy, and M. Sorge. "Fractional Matchings under Preferences: Stability and Optimality". In: *IJCAI International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence* 1 (Aug. 2021), pp. 89–95. ISSN: 1045-0823. DOI: 10.24963/IJCAI.2021/13.
- [15] F. Cooper. "Fair and large stable matchings in the stable marriage and student-project allocation problems". PhD thesis. University of Glasgow, 2020.
- [16] V. P. Crawford and E. M. Knoer. "Job Matching with Heterogeneous Firms and Workers". In: *Econometrica* 49.2 (1981), pp. 437–450. ISSN: 00129682, 14680262. DOI: 10.2307/1913320.
- [17] Á. Cseh, R. W. Irving, and D. Manlove. "The Stable Roommates Problem with Short Lists". In: *Theory of Computing Systems* 63.1 (2019), pp. 128–149. DOI: 10.1007/s00224-017-9810-9.
- [18] B. C. Dean and S. Munshi. "Faster Algorithms for Stable Allocation Problems". In: *Algorithmica* 58.1 (Sept. 2010), pp. 59–81. ISSN: 1432-0541. DOI: 10.1007/s00453-010-9416-y.
- [19] Y. Faenza, T. Kavitha, V. Powers, and X. Zhang. "Popular matchings and limits to tractability". In: *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SODA '19. San Diego, California: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2019, pp. 2790–2809.
- [20] T. Feder. "A new fixed point approach for stable networks and stable marriages". In: *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 45.2 (1992), pp. 233–284. ISSN: 0022-0000. DOI: 10.1016/0022-0000(92)90048-N.
- [21] T. Feder. "Network flow and 2-satisfiability". In: *Algorithmica* 11 (3 Mar. 1994), pp. 291–319. ISSN: 01784617. DOI: 10.1007/BF01240738.
- [22] T. Fleiner. "The stable roommates problem with choice functions". In: *Algorithmica (New York)* 58 (1 Sept. 2010), pp. 82–101. ISSN: 01784617. DOI: 10.1007/s00453-009-9314-3.
- [23] A.-T. Gai, F. Mathieu, F. de Montgolfier, and J. Reynier. "Stratification in P2P networks: Application to BitTorrent". In: *Proceedings of ICDCS '07: the 27th IEEE International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems*. IEEE Computer Society, 2007.
- [24] D. Gale and L. S. Shapley. "College Admissions and the Stability of Marriage". In: *The American Mathematical Monthly* 69 (1 Jan. 1962), p. 9. ISSN: 00029890. DOI: 10.2307/2312726.
- [25] S. Gupta, P. Misra, S. Saurabh, and M. Zehavi. "Popular Matching in Roommates Setting Is NP-hard". In: *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory (TOCT)* 13 (2 Mar. 2021). ISSN: 19423462. DOI: 10.1145/3442354.

- [26] D. Gusfield. “The Structure of the Stable Roommate Problem: Efficient Representation and Enumeration of All Stable Assignments”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 17 (4 July 1988), pp. 742–769. ISSN: 00975397. DOI: 10.1137/0217048.
- [27] D. Gusfield and L. Pitt. “A bounded approximation for the minimum cost 2-sat problem”. In: *Algorithmica* 8 (1-6 Dec. 1992), pp. 103–117. ISSN: 01784617. DOI: 10.1007/BF01758838.
- [28] D. Gusfield and R. W. Irving. *The stable marriage problem : structure and algorithms*. Cambridge (Mass.) : MIT press, 1989.
- [29] R. W. Irving. “On the stable roommates problem”. In: *Department of Computing Science, University of Glasgow Research Report CSC/86/R5* (1986).
- [30] R. W. Irving. “An efficient algorithm for the “stable roommates” problem”. In: *Journal of Algorithms* 6 (4 Dec. 1985), pp. 577–595. DOI: 10.1016/0196-6774(85)90033-1.
- [31] R. W. Irving and D. Manlove. “The Stable Roommates Problem with Ties”. In: *Journal of Algorithms* 43 (1 Apr. 2002), pp. 85–105. ISSN: 0196-6774. DOI: 10.1006/JAGM.2002.1219.
- [32] R. W. Irving and S. Scott. “The stable fixtures problem—A many-to-many extension of stable roommates”. In: *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 155 (16 Oct. 2007), pp. 2118–2129. ISSN: 0166-218X. DOI: 10.1016/J.DAM.2007.05.015.
- [33] A. S. Kelso and V. P. Crawford. “Job Matching, Coalition Formation, and Gross Substitutes”. In: *Econometrica* 50.6 (1982), pp. 1483–1504. ISSN: 00129682, 14680262. DOI: 10.2307/1913392.
- [34] M. d. Klerk et al. “The Dutch national living donor kidney exchange program”. In: *American Journal of Transplantation* 5 (2005), pp. 2302–2305.
- [35] E. Kujansuu, T. Lindberg, and E. Mäkinen. “The Stable Roommates Problem and Chess Tournament Pairings”. In: *Divulgaciones Matemáticas* 7.1 (1999), pp. 19–28.
- [36] A. Kunysz. “The Strongly Stable Roommates Problem”. In: *24th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2016)*. Ed. by P. Sankowski and C. Zaroliagis. Vol. 57. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs). Dagstuhl, Germany: Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2016, 60:1–60:15. ISBN: 978-3-95977-015-6. DOI: 10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2016.60.
- [37] D. Manlove and G. O’Malley. “Paired and altruistic kidney donation in the UK: Algorithms and experimentation”. In: *Proceedings of SEA ’12: the 11th International Symposium on Experimental Algorithms*. Vol. 7276. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2012, pp. 271–282.
- [38] D. Manlove. *Algorithmics of Matching Under Preferences*. Vol. 2. Series on Theoretical Computer Science. WorldScientific, 2013. ISBN: 978-981-4425-24-7. DOI: 10.1142/8591.
- [39] S. Mertens. “Random stable matchings”. In: *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2005 (10 Oct. 2005), P10008. DOI: 10.1088/1742-5468/2005/10/P10008.
- [40] S. Mertens. “Small random instances of the stable roommates problem”. In: *J. Stat. Mech* (2015), p. 06034. DOI: 10.1088/1742-5468/2015/06/P06034.
- [41] S. Mertens. “Stable roommates problem with random preferences”. In: *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* 2015 (1 Jan. 2015), P01020. ISSN: 1742-5468. DOI: 10.1088/1742-5468/2015/01/P01020.
- [42] N. Perach, J. Polak, and U. Rothblum. “A stable matching model with an entrance criterion applied to the assignment of students to dormitories at the Technion”. In: *International Journal of Game Theory* 36.3-4 (2008), pp. 519–535.

- [43] B. Pittel. “On a Random Instance of a ‘Stable Roommates’ Problem: Likely Behavior of the Proposal Algorithm”. In: *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* 2 (1 1993), pp. 53–92. ISSN: 1469-2163. DOI: 10.1017/S0963548300000481.
- [44] B. Pittel. “On random stable partitions”. In: *International Journal of Game Theory* 48 (2 June 2019), pp. 433–480. ISSN: 00207276. DOI: 10.1007/S00182-018-0635-9.
- [45] B. Pittel and R. W. Irving. “An upper bound for the solvability probability of a random stable roommates instance”. In: *Random Structures & Algorithms* 5.3 (1994), pp. 465–486. DOI: 10.1002/rsa.3240050307.
- [46] E. Ronn. “NP-complete stable matching problems”. In: *Journal of Algorithms* 11 (2 June 1990), pp. 285–304. ISSN: 0196-6774. DOI: 10.1016/0196-6774(90)90007-2.
- [47] A. E. Roth, U. G. Rothblum, and J. H. V. Vate. “Stable Matchings, Optimal Assignments, and Linear Programming”. In: *Mathematics of Operations Research* 18.4 (1993), pp. 803–828. ISSN: 0364765X, 15265471. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3690124>.
- [48] I. Schlotter and Á. Cseh. *Maximum-utility popular matchings with bounded instability*. 2022. arXiv: 2205.02189 [cs.DM].
- [49] S. Scott. “A Study of Stable Marriage Problems with Ties”. PhD thesis. University of Glasgow, 2005.
- [50] S. Simola and D. Manlove. *Profile-based optimal stable matchings in the Roommates problem*. 2021. arXiv: 2110.02555 [cs.DS].
- [51] J. J. Tan. “A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a complete stable matching”. In: *Journal of Algorithms* 12 (1 Mar. 1991), pp. 154–178. ISSN: 0196-6774. DOI: 10.1016/0196-6774(91)90028-W.
- [52] J. J. Tan. “Stable matchings and stable partitions”. In: *International Journal of Computer Mathematics* 39 (1-2 Jan. 1991), pp. 11–20. DOI: 10.1080/00207169108803975.
- [53] J. J. Tan and Y.-C. Hsueh. “A generalization of the stable matching problem”. In: *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 59 (1 Apr. 1995), pp. 87–102. ISSN: 0166-218X. DOI: 10.1016/0166-218X(93)E0154-Q.
- [54] C.-P. Teo and J. Sethuraman. “LP based approach to optimal stable matchings”. In: *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*. SODA ’97. New Orleans, Louisiana, USA: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1997, pp. 710–719. ISBN: 0898713900.