

# Ex-post Stability under Two-Sided Matching: Complexity and Characterization

Haris Aziz<sup>1</sup>, Peter Biro<sup>2,3</sup>, Gergely Csáji<sup>2,4</sup>, and Ali Pourmiri<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> UNSW Sydney, Australia

<sup>2</sup> Institute of Economics, HUN-REN KRTK, Hungary

<sup>3</sup> Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary

<sup>4</sup> Eötvös Lóránd Science University, Hungary

haris.aziz@unsw.edu.au, biro.peter@krtk.hu, csaji.gergely@gmail.com,  
alipourmiri@gmail.com

**Abstract.** A probabilistic approach to the stable matching problem has been identified as an important research area with several important open problems. When considering random matchings, ex-post stability is a fundamental stability concept. A prominent open problem is characterizing ex-post stability and establishing its computational complexity. We investigate the computational complexity of testing ex-post stability. Our central result is that when either side has ties in the preferences/priorities, testing ex-post stability is NP-complete. The result even holds if both sides have dichotomous preferences. On the positive side, we give an algorithm using an integer programming approach, that can determine a decomposition with a maximum probability of being weakly stable. We also consider stronger versions of ex-post stability (in particular robust ex-post stability and ex-post strong stability) and prove that they can be tested in polynomial time.

**Keywords:** Matching theory · Stability Concepts · Fairness · Random Assignment

*“One important question is about the characterization of ex-post stability when matchings are allowed to be random”—Kesten and Unver [33].*

## 1 Introduction

In a typical school choice program the students have preferences over the schools and they also have course priorities for the school seats based on distance and siblings [4], [1]. The standard mechanism used in practice is to break the ties by lottery, and then run the deferred-acceptance (DA) algorithm of Gale and Shapley for finding a stable matching [26]. This design was adopted in New York [2] and many cities across the US. This standard

approach was criticized by Erdil and Ergin [25]. They demonstrated by simulations on real datasets of the New York high school admissions that, if only the course priorities have to be obeyed, but not the priorities by lottery, then the standard solution could be Pareto-improved, giving strictly better schools for about 2-3% of the students without hurting anyone. Their proposal was however rejected by the decision makers, partly because any mechanism that improves upon the standard DA solution with lottery is inevitably manipulable [3]. Nevertheless, the intensive research on possible welfare improving mechanisms has continued. One important proposal was by Kesten [32], who proposed the efficiency-adjusted deferred acceptance mechanism (EADAM), or in other words, school choice with consent, by relaxing the stability requirements.

There has been several studies, both theoretical and practical, on whether a single tie-breaking for all schools or multiple-tie breaking for each school is better for the students [7], [6]. If there are no priorities at all, as in the redesigned Amsterdam high school choice program [39], then the DA with single tie-breaking is in fact equivalent to the classical *random priority* mechanism (that is also called *random serial dictatorship* in the literature). In each of these mechanisms with lotteries what we end up with is a probabilistic assignment, where every student has certain (ex-ante) probabilities of getting admission to the schools in her preference list.

When considering the classical object allocation problem with the random priority mechanism, the ex-ante probabilities can be potentially Pareto-improved in a stochastic dominance sense, meaning that for each student-school pair, the probability of the student getting admission to this school or to a better one of her preference can only increase, with a strict increase for at least one student-school pair. Pareto-improvement with stochastic dominance also means that the expected welfare of each student will also increase under any cardinal utilities, hence also the total (social) welfare is increasing. Bogomolnaia and Moulin [16] showed that indeed the standard random priority solution can be sometimes Pareto-improved, and they proposed a new mechanism, the so-called *probabilistic serial* mechanism that always provides an ex-ante Pareto-efficient solution (with some additional desirable properties, such as envy-freeness). The only serious drawback of this alternative mechanism is its manipulability for some cardinal utilities.

Now, suppose that we have a school choice application with course priorities and lottery, that leads to a probabilistic assignment, and we can Pareto-improve this assignment, e.g., by computing an alternative proba-

bilistic assignment with the probabilistic serial mechanism. Is it possible to decompose this random allocation into a convex combination of (ex-post) weakly stable matchings regarding the course priorities? We will demonstrate with Example 1 that such a case may indeed occur in practice.

The usage of smart lotteries for stable matching problems is in fact not a new idea. The resident allocation program in Israel used a simple random priority mechanism, but then they implemented two modifications: first they try to Pareto-improve the probabilities of the probabilistic assignment, and then they use a smart lottery by decomposing the probabilistic assignment into matchings where the couples are allocated to the same or geographically close hospitals [19]. Regarding school choice mechanism, Ashlagi and Shi [8] proposed to improve community cohesion in school choice by a smart lottery, where the students from the same neighbourhood are matched to the same schools with high chances in the final matchings. Such solutions can decrease the busing costs as well, which has been a crucial objective for the city of Boston, where the redesign was proposed. Demeulemeester et al. [23] studied also a school choice application with smart lotteries, where the goal of the decomposition was to avoid the possibility of selecting a bad matching where many children would remain unallocated.

Our approach, illustrated in Example 3.3, is very similar to the above mentioned ideas. The novelty of our result is that in this paper the desirable matchings in the decomposition are the (weakly) stable matchings with respect to the course priorities, similarly to the proposal of Erdil and Ergin [25]. In other words, our method can be used to seek Pareto-improvement in school choice assignment by keeping the final solution (weakly) stable with respect to the course priorities, but it works through the improvement of the probabilistic assignment. Note that our approach leaves it open what mechanism is used to compute the initial probabilities, probabilistic serial is one option, Pareto-improvement upon the standard DA with lotteries (used also in the resident allocation in Israel) in another one. The question we are focusing on is the decomposition of a probabilistic assignment into (weakly) stable matchings. We will show that this computational question is unfortunately NP-hard, even for dichotomous preferences. However, we give an IP-based method that can compute such a decomposition, if one exists, or otherwise a decomposition, where the probability of selecting a non-stable matching is minimized.

The above mentioned school choice and resident allocation applications can be interpreted also in context of many other object allocation

problems with priorities. In *refugee resettlement* problems the refugee families have preferences over the locations, and the locations may have priorities over the refugee families [22]. Here the complexity of the application is coming from the family sizes and their different needs in terms of services. Another standard object allocation application is *course allocation*, where students have preferences over bundles of courses and the courses may have weak rankings over the students, that are broken by lotteries. This is the case in the course allocation mechanism at ELTE university, the largest university in Hungary [40]. A version of the probabilistic serial mechanism was proposed and implemented at TU Munich for course allocation (without priorities), where a smart lottery is conducted [14]. The challenge in the latter decomposition is that here a feasible allocation is a many-to-many matching, where students receive bundles, and a decomposition of a probabilistic assignment into feasible allocations is only guaranteed to exist approximately, i.e., with small violations of quotas.<sup>5</sup>

Because of the potential applicability of our methodology in this wide range of practical problems, we decided to use a standard terminology of object allocation problems, where agents with preferences are getting assigned to items under (course) priorities.

For deterministic matchings, the most widely applied fairness concept is (weak) *stability* (also referred to as pairwise stability), which requires that there should be no agent  $i$  and item  $o$  such that both the agent prefers the object to her existing match and either the item is unassigned or it is assigned to an agent with lower priority than  $i$ <sup>6</sup>. A stronger version of the concept (referred to as strong stability) requires that in a weakly blocking pair either the preference of the agent or her priority for the item can be weak. Both concepts are well-understood in the context of deterministic matchings but less so in the context of probabilistic matchings.

---

<sup>5</sup> Finally, a simple practical example for classical one-to-one allocation problem under course, in fact dichotomous priorities, is the allocation of essay topics in the Market Design course at Corvinus University of Budapest. Here the students can submit their preferences over the possible essay topics, and they can also claim priorities for such topics that are related to their home countries (e.g., a French student can claim priority for the topics of French teacher allocations or French university admissions). Here, the standard method used is also the DA with lottery. However, as we can see also in Example 1, the students could potentially all benefit in expectation from an alternative lottery with improved probabilistic assignment decomposed into ex-post stable matchings.

<sup>6</sup> The notion of weak stability of a matching is also called in the literature of school choice as justified envy freeness (or simply fairness) for allocated objects and non-wastefulness for unallocated ones.

Whereas much of the matching literature focuses on deterministic matchings, there is increased focus on probabilistic matchings. There are several reasons randomization is useful including allowing a richer outcome space (may be essential to achieve fairness properties such as anonymity and (ex-ante) equal-treatment-of-equals, or to satisfy certain distributional constraints in expectation) and also to capture time sharing arrangements [9, 24, 37, 41]. A random matching specifies the probability with which each agent gets a particular item. In graph-theoretical terms, it is a fractional matching. Kesten and Unver [33] mention that “*The research on school-choice lotteries is a relatively new area in market design theory, and there are many remaining open questions.*” Research on random matching under preferences has also been highlighted as an important research direction in the Dagstuhl Workshop on Matching Under Preferences: Theory and Practice (2021) [10]. When there is a need to both consider ex-ante probabilistic constraints as well as the requirement to achieve stability ex-post, a fundamental algorithmic problem that arises is the following one:

*Can a given random matching be represented as a probability distribution over (weakly) stable integral / deterministic matchings?*

The problem above also captures the problem of checking whether a given random matching is ex-post stable or not.<sup>7</sup> This problem will be the central focus of our paper. The problem is intrinsically linked to the open problem highlighted by Kesten and Unver [33] concerning the characterization of ex-post stability when matchings are allowed to be random.

**Results** We show that when either agents have ties in their preferences or items have ties in their priorities, testing ex-post stability is NP-complete. In particular, we prove two complexity results: (1) deciding whether a random matching  $p$  is ex-post stable is NP-complete, even if one side has strict and the other has dichotomous preferences and (2) deciding whether a random matching  $p$  is ex-post stable is NP-complete, even if both sides have dichotomous preferences.

The results also give an explanation on why a simple and computationally tractable characterization of ex-post stability has eluded researchers. Woeginger [42] writes that “*the combinatorics of NP-complete problems*

---

<sup>7</sup> The complexity of the problem was highlighted as an open problem by Jay Sethuraman at the Dagstuhl Workshop on Matching Under Preferences: Theory and Practice [10].

Restriction	ex-post stability	ex-post strong stability	robust ex-post stability
strict prefs, strict priorities	in P [41]	in P (Th 6.8)	in P (Th 6.2)
dichotomous prefs, dichotomous priorities	NP-complete (Th 5.4)	in P (Th 6.8)	in P (Th 6.2)
strict prefs, dichotomous priorities	NP-complete (Th 5.1)	in P (Th 6.8)	in P (Th 6.2)
dichotomous prefs, strict priorities	NP-complete (Th 5.1)	in P (Th 6.8)	in P (Th 6.2)
no restrictions	NP-complete (Th 5.4)	in P (Th 6.8)	in P (Th 6.2)

**Table 1.** Complexity of testing stability

*usually is complicated and rather messy. If one proves theorems about properties and the behavior of NP-complete problems, then this usually involves lots of tedious case analysis.”*

To handle this NP-hard problem, we provide an integer programming formulation, that allows us to find a decomposition of a random matching  $p$  with a maximum probability of being weakly stable.

We then turn our attention to stronger versions of ex-post stability. We show that there is a polynomial time algorithm for testing ex-post strong stability and also find a decomposition into a convex combination of integral strongly stable matchings (if it exists). We also prove a similar result for *robust ex-post stability* that is another stability concept. Our complexity results are summarized in Table 1.

## 2 Related Work

The theory of stable matchings has a long history with several books written on the topic [29, 35, 38]. In the theory of matching under preferences, Roth et al. [37] presented several results regarding the stable matching polytope (when there are no ties) that also provide insights into random stable matching. Teo and Sethuraman [41] presented another paper that provides connections between linear programming formulations and stable matchings.

While the stable marriage problem was originally introduced only for strict preferences [27], for which a stable matching always exists and a simple and elegant algorithm can always find it, it turned out later that ties tend to have quite a big impact on the complexity of several related problems. The first paper to introduce ties was the paper of Irving [30], who gave efficient algorithms to find weakly, strongly and super stable matchings respectively, which correspond to the three natural generalization of stability depending on whether two, one, or zero agents must strictly improve in a blocking pair. Manlove et al. [36] showed that several problems related to stable marriage becomes NP-hard if ties are included,

the most famous one being the problem of finding a weakly stable matching of maximum size.

Bogomolnaia and Moulin [17] presented a seminal paper on random matchings when the items do not have any priorities. In this paper, we focus on the setting when items also have priorities. Our focus is also on stability concepts. Bogomolnaia and Moulin [18] then considered two-sided matching under dichotomous preferences.

Kesten and Unver [33] initiated a mechanism design approach to the stable random matching problem where they explore the compatibility of stability and efficiency and propose algorithms that satisfy ex-ante stability (a property that is stronger than ex-post stability). Afacan [5] considered a more general model in which objects have probabilities for prioritizing one agent over another. They present a weak stability concept called claimwise stability and propose an algorithm to achieve it. Aziz and Klaus [12] explore a hierarchy of stability concepts when considering random matchings and explored their relations and mathematical properties. Caragiannis et al. [20] considered stability under cardinal preferences. Aziz and Brandl [11] presented a general random allocation algorithm that can handle general feasibility constraints including those that are as a result of imposing stability concepts.

Chen et al. [21] considered the classical fractional stability concept as well as a concept based on cardinal utilities [20] and presented additional complexity results when stability is combined with other objectives such as maximum size or maximum welfare. Aziz et al. [13] examined the complexity of testing ex-post Pareto optimality and proved that the problem is coNP-complete.

### 3 Preliminaries

We use the formal model presented by Aziz and Klaus [12]. We consider the classic matching setting in which there are  $n$  agents and  $n$  items. The agents have preferences over items and items have priorities over agents. The preference relation of an agent  $i \in N$  over items is denoted by  $\succsim_i$  where  $\succ_i$  denotes the strict part of the preference and  $\sim_i$  denotes the indifference part. The priority relation of an item  $o \in O$  over agents is denoted by  $\succsim_o$  where  $\succ_o$  denotes the strict part of the preference and  $\sim_o$  denotes the indifference part. We say that a preference or priority relation is *dichotomous* if the items (agents respectively) are partitioned in at most two indifference classes. We say that a preference or priority

relation is *strict* if there is no indifference between any two items (agents respectively).

A **random matching**  $p$  is a bistochastic  $n \times n$  matrix  $[p(i, o)]_{i \in N, o \in O}$ , i.e.,

$$\text{for each pair } (i, o) \in N \times O, p(i, o) \geq 0, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\text{for each } i \in N, \sum_{o \in O} p(i, o) = 1, \text{ and} \quad (3.2)$$

$$\text{for each } o \in O, \sum_{i \in N} p(i, o) = 1. \quad (3.3)$$

Random matchings are often also referred to as *fractional matchings* [41]. For each pair  $(i, o) \in N \times O$ , the value  $p(i, o)$  represents the probability of item  $o$  being matched to agent  $i$ . A random matching  $p$  is **deterministic** if for each pair  $(i, o) \in N \times O$ ,  $p(i, o) \in \{0, 1\}$ . Alternatively, a deterministic matching is an integer solution to linear system (3.1), (3.2), and (3.3).

By [15], each random matching can be represented as a convex combination of deterministic matchings: a **decomposition** of a random matching  $p$  into deterministic matchings  $M_j$  ( $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ) equals a sum  $p = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j M_j$  such that for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $\lambda_j \in [0, 1]$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j = 1$ . We say that a deterministic matching  $M$  is **consistent** with random matching  $p$  if  $M(i, o) = 1$  implies  $p(i, o) > 0$ .

**Definition 3.1.** [*Stability for deterministic matchings*] A deterministic matching  $p$  has **no justified envy** or is **weakly stable** if there exists no agent  $i$  who is matched to item  $o'$  but prefers item  $o$  while item  $o$  is matched to some agent  $j$  with lower priority than  $i$ , i.e., there exist no  $i, j \in N$  and no  $o, o' \in O$  such that  $p(i, o') = 1$ ,  $p(j, o) = 1$ ,  $o \succ_i o'$ , and  $i \succ_o j$ .

A deterministic matching  $p$  is weakly stable if it satisfies the following inequalities: for each pair  $(i, o) \in N \times O$ ,

$$\sum_{o': o' \succ_i o} p(i, o') + \sum_{j: j \succ_o i} p(j, o) - p(i, o) \geq 1. \quad (3.4)$$

If one breaks all preference and priority ties, then the well-known deferred-acceptance algorithm [27] computes a deterministic matching that is weakly stable.

We now introduce the central concept of this paper, ex-post stability.

**Definition 3.2 (Ex-post stability).** A random matching  $p$  is **ex-post stable** if it can be decomposed into deterministic weakly stable matchings.



### 3.1 Motivation

As we argued in the introduction, in many applications involving random lotteries, and preferences/priorities of the agents on both sides, it is beneficial to have both some ex-ante fairness and ex-post stability. However, while there exists mechanisms that compute (weakly) stable matchings, and there exists many mechanisms that compute lotteries that are ex-ante fair, (e.g. Pareto-optimal), most of these do not guarantee ex-post stability too.

It is also important, given a random lottery, how the central authority implements it. Since stability is an important property in resident allocation, school choice and similar applications, it is natural to aim for implementing the lottery in a way such that the outcome is guaranteed to be weakly stable, or has a maximum probability of being weakly stable, since blocking pairs may cause certain deviations in the future, destabilizing the market and decreasing trust in the system.

Being able to determine whether the output of such an ex-ante fair mechanism can be written as a convex combination of weakly-stable matchings, or to compute a decomposition that has a maximum probability to result in a weakly stable matching allows us to compare these ex-ante fair mechanisms outputs and choose one that has the largest probability of being ex-post fair too. Hence, determining the ex-post stability of a random matching  $p$  is indeed a highly important task. While our main result shows that this problem is NP-hard even in very restricted settings, we give an algorithm utilizing integer programming techniques that not only decides this, but even if the answer is no, it finds a decomposition with a maximum probability of being weakly stable.

Finally, we give an example that illustrates that even if ex-post stability is crucial for an application, like the New York school choice, where a DA with uniform tie-breaking is used, there may be strict Pareto-improvements (where every student strictly improves) that still keep the solution ex-post stable. Hence, if we have an algorithm to determine ex-post stability of a matching, then we can look for such Pareto-improvements for the agents and check whether the resulting random matching is still ex-post stable, and if yes, then this allows each agent to improve in the solution without hurting ex-post stability.

*Example 3.3.* In this example, we show that if we compute an agent-optimal stable matching by breaking the ties randomly to define a random lottery as in the New York school choice program [2] (which is hence guaranteed to be ex-post stable), then it may be possible to find ex-ante

Pareto-improvements for the agent (or switch to an output of an ex-ante fair mechanism that produces better probabilities for the agents) that still result in an ex-post stable random matching. We have four agents  $a, b, c, d$  and four items  $o_1, o_2, o_3, o_4$  with the following priorities.

$$\begin{array}{l|l} a : o_1 \succ o_3 \succ o_4 \succ o_2 & o_1 : [a, b] \succ c \succ d \\ b : o_1 \succ o_4 \succ o_3 \succ o_2 & o_2 : [c, d] \succ a \succ b \\ c : o_2 \succ o_3 \succ o_4 \succ o_1 & o_3 : b \succ d \succ [a, c] \\ d : o_2 \succ o_4 \succ o_3 \succ o_1 & o_4 : a \succ c \succ [b, d] \end{array}$$

Here, the notation  $[i, j]$  for some agents  $i, j$  means that they have the same priority.

Here, in the first case, if we take the random matching  $p$  to be the uniform combination of all weakly stable matching, then we get  $p(a, o_1) = p(b, o_1) = p(c, o_2) = p(d, o_2) = \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $p(a, o_3) = p(b, o_4) = p(c, o_3) = p(d, o_4) = \frac{3}{8}$  and  $p(a, o_4) = p(b, o_3) = p(c, o_4) = p(d, o_3) = \frac{1}{8}$ .

However, if we take the random matching  $p(a, o_1) = p(a, o_3) = p(b, o_1) = p(b, o_4) = p(c, o_2) = p(c, o_3) = p(d, o_2) = p(d, o_4) = \frac{1}{2}$  (which in this case is the output of the famous eating mechanism run with only the agents' preferences), that is strictly better for all agents under any natural preferences over the probabilities consistent with their preference order. Furthermore, this matching can also be implemented as a lottery over weakly stable matchings  $M_1 = \{(a, o_1), (b, o_4), (c, o_3), (d, o_2)\}$  and  $M_2 = \{(a, o_3), (b, o_1), (c, o_2), (d, o_4)\}$  with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$  each.

Note also that this example can indeed occur in a school choice situation with course priorities, since having 3-4 priority categories in school choice is rather standard in the US applications where the only considerations for basic priorities is whether the student lives in the neighboring area of the school, and whether she/he already has a sibling attending the school.

#### 4 Ex post stability: Algorithm and Characterization Under Absence of Ties

First of all, we show that our assumption on  $|O| = |N|$  and the preferences being complete is without loss of generality. Indeed, given an arbitrary instance  $I$ , where the preferences can be incomplete and the number of agents and items can be different, we can create an equivalent instance  $I'$  with  $|O'| = |N'|$  and complete preferences as follows.

We start by creating a dummy item  $o_i$  for each agent  $i \in N$  and let  $O' := O \cup \{o_i \mid i \in N\}$ . Each agent's preference is extended by first

appending  $o_i$  being strictly worse than the originally acceptable items and then the rest of  $O'$  tied, but strictly worse than  $o_i$ . Then, we add  $|O'| - |N|$  dummy agents to  $N$ , who are indifferent between all items, obtaining  $N'$ . The priorities of the dummy items  $o_i$  are  $i \succ [N' \setminus i]$ , where brackets indicate a single tie. Finally, the items from  $O$  have their priorities extended by ranking the rest of the agents in a tie, but being strictly worse than any originally acceptable one.

It is straightforward to verify that given a deterministic stable matching  $M$  in  $I$ , we can extend it to a stable matching of  $I'$ , by matching the unmatched agents to their dummy items, and the dummy agents to the free items of  $O'$  arbitrarily. Furthermore, for a deterministic stable matching  $M'$  of  $I'$ , any agent of  $N$  must be with an originally acceptable item or with his dummy item, so if we delete all  $(i, o)$  pairs from it that correspond to dummy items/agents, or originally unacceptable pairs, then we must get a deterministic stable matching of  $I$ .

Hence, we may assume without loss of generality that we have an instance with complete preferences and that  $p$  is *bistochastic*, i.e.  $\sum_{o \in O: (i,o) \in E} p(i, o) = 1$  for each agent  $i$  and  $\sum_{i \in N: (i,o) \in E} p(i, o) = 1$  for each item  $o \in O$ , where  $E = N \times O$ .

We next observe that when both preferences and priorities are strict, then ex-post stability admits both a simple characterization, concise geometric description and also a polynomial-time algorithm to test ex-post stability.

**Definition 4.1 (Fractional stability and violations of fractional stability).** A random matching  $p$  is *fractionally stable* if for each pair  $(i, o) \in N \times O$ ,

$$\sum_{o': o' \succ_i o} p(i, o') + \sum_{j: j \succ_o i} p(j, o) - p(i, o) \geq 1, \quad (3.4)$$

Note that if ties are present, then fractional stability does not imply ex-post stability [12]

We note that ex-post stability can be tested in linear-time if preferences / priorities on both sides are strict.

**Proposition 4.2 ([41],[12]).** *Ex post stability can be tested in linear-time if preferences on both sides are strict. Furthermore, if a given a random matching is ex-post stable, there exists a polynomial-time algorithm to represent the random matching as a lottery over deterministic stable matchings.*

*Proof.* Under strict preferences and priorities, ex-post stability and fractional stability are equivalent [12]. So we just need to check for the linear constraints capturing fractional stability. In the strict preference setting, any fractional stable matching (equivalently ex-post stable matching) can be efficiently decomposed to a convex combination of deterministic stable matchings [41].  $\square$

## 5 Ex post stability: Complexity under the Presence of Ties

Next, we move to the general setting in which there may be ties in the preferences or priorities. Our first observation is as follows. Suppose that  $C$  denotes the set of all stable matchings of a given instance with weak preferences. The convex hull of all points in  $C$  is a subset of the polytope defined by the inequalities (3.1)-(3.4). Next, we prove that checking whether a random matching  $p$  is ex-post stable is NP-complete.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Deciding whether a random matching  $p$  is ex-post stable is NP-complete, even if one side's preferences/priorities are strict and the other's are dichotomous.*

*Proof.* To show NP membership, it is enough to show that there always exist a polynomial size witness for yes instances. This is true, since if a random matching  $p$  is in the convex hull of the characteristic vectors of weakly stable matchings, then by Caratheodory's Theorem it can be expressed as a convex combination of at most  $n^2 + 1$  weakly stable matchings also.

To show NP-hardness, we reduce from EXACT COVER BY 3-SETS (X3C). In this problem, we are given a family of 3-sets  $C_1, \dots, C_{3n}$  over elements  $a_1, \dots, a_{3n}$  and the question is whether there is an exact 3-cover among the 3-sets. This problem is NP-complete, even if each element  $a_i$  is contained in exactly three 3-sets [28].

X3C

Input: A finite set  $X = \{a_1, \dots, a_{3n}\}$  containing exactly  $3n$  elements; a collection  $C = \{C_1, \dots, C_{3n}\}$  of subsets of  $X$  each of which contains exactly 3 elements.

Question: Does  $C$  contain an exact cover for  $X$ , i.e. a sub-collection of 3-element sets  $D = (D_1, \dots, D_n)$  such that each element of  $X$  occurs in exactly one subset in  $D$ ?

Let  $I$  be such an instance of X3C. We construct an instance  $I'$  for our problem as follows.

For each element  $a_i$  we add an item  $a_i$ . For each set  $C_j$ , we add 6 items  $x_j^1, x_j^2, x_j^3$  and  $y_j^1, y_j^2, y_j^3$  and also 6 agents  $c_j^1, c_j^2, c_j^3$  and  $d_j^1, d_j^2, d_j^3$ . Then, we add  $3n$  collector agents  $z_1, \dots, z_{3n}$ . Finally, we add two more items  $o_1$  and  $o_2$  and two more agents  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ . Let  $C_j = \{a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}, a_{j_3}\}$ ,  $j_1 < j_2 < j_3$  be the  $j$ -th set in  $I$ . We refer to  $a_{j_1}$  as the first element in  $C_j$ ,  $a_{j_2}$  as the second and  $a_{j_3}$  as the third.

Let the preferences be the following. For the agents:

$$\begin{aligned} c_j^l &: a_{j_l}, y_j^l, x_j^{l-1}, x_j^l, \text{others} \\ d_j^l &: x_j^l, y_j^l, \text{others}, \\ s_1 &: o_2, (Y), o_1, \text{others} \\ s_2 &: o_1, o_2, \text{others} \\ z_j &: (X), \text{others} \end{aligned}$$

where  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$  taken (mod 3) and  $Y = \{y_j^l \mid j \in [3n], l \in [3]\}$ ,  $X = \{x_j^l \mid j \in [3n], l \in [3]\}$  and  $(S)$  for a set  $S$  indicates that the elements of  $S$  are ranked in an arbitrary strict order.

For the items, we have:


$$\begin{aligned} a_i &: [c^1(a_i), c^2(a_i), c^3(a_i)], [\text{others}] \\ x_j^l &: [c_j^l, c_j^{l+1}], [\text{others}] \\ y_j^l &: [d_j^l, s_1], [\text{others}] \\ o_1 &: [\text{every agent}] \\ o_2 &: [\text{every agent}] \end{aligned}$$

where  $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_{3n}\}$ ,  $i \in [3n]$ ,  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$  and  $c^k(a_i)$  is  $c_j^l$ , iff the  $k$ -th appearance of  $a_i$  is in the  $l$ -th position of the set  $C_j$  and the brackets indicate indifferences. Let the random matching  $p$  be:


1.  $p(c^k(a_i), a_i) = \frac{1}{3}$  for  $i \in [3n]$ ,  $k \in [3]$
2.  $p(c_j^l, x_j^l) = p(c_j^l, y_j^l) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$
3.  $p(d_j^l, x_j^l) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $p(d_j^l, y_j^l) = \frac{2}{3}$ ,  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$
4.  $p(s_1, o_1) = p(s_2, o_2) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $p(s_2, o_1) = p(s_1, o_2) = \frac{2}{3}$
5.  $p(z_k, x_j^l) = \frac{1}{9n}$  for each  $j, k \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$ .

This completes the construction of  $I'$ . The construction is illustrated in Figures 1 and 2.

As the proof is quite technical, we first provide the intuition behind the reduction. On one hand, we have a special agent  $s_1$ , who must get a bad partner in at least one of the matchings, which forces all items of one type (the  $y_i^j$ -s) to get an agent with highest priority by weak stability.



**Fig. 1.** The gadget for a set  $C_3 = \{a_3, a_5, a_8\}$  with the important edges in Theorem 5.1. The red, blue and green edges are the edges of  $M_1^k, M_2^k$  and  $M_3^k$  respectively, when the set  $C_3$  is part of the exact 3-cover. The  $p$  value on each edge is  $\frac{1}{3}$  times the number of colors the edge has. The dotted black lines represent the edges with  $p$  value 0.



**Fig. 2.** The gadget for a set  $C_3 = \{a_3, a_5, a_8\}$  with the important edges in Theorem 5.1. The red, blue and green edges are the edges of  $M_1^k, M_2^k$  and  $M_3^k$  respectively, when the set  $C_3$  is NOT part of the exact 3-cover. The  $p$  value on each edge is  $\frac{1}{3}$  times the number of colors the edge has. The dotted black lines represent the edges with  $p$  value 0.

Then, the gadgets for each set are constructed such that if all the  $y_i^j$  items are matched to their highest priority item  $d_i^j$ , then either all three element objects corresponding to the elements of the set are matched to the gadget, or none of them are.

We proceed to the formal proof.

**Proposition 5.2.** *If  $p$  is ex-post stable, then there exists an exact 3-cover.*

*Proof.* If  $p$  can be written as a convex combination of weakly stable matchings, then, because  $p(s_1, o_1) > 0$ , there has to be one matching in which the edge  $(s_1, o_1)$  is included. Let this matching be  $M$ .

$M$  is weakly stable, therefore  $s_1$  does not block with any items from  $Y$ . This can only happen, if each item from  $Y$  is matched to someone with at least as high priority, so  $(y_j^l, d_j^l) \in M$  for each  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$ . We also know that each  $c_j^l$  agent must be matched in  $M$ , so she is matched to either  $x_j^l$  or her element item.

We claim that for each  $j$ , either all of  $c_j^1, c_j^2, c_j^3$  are matched to items from  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_{3n}\}$ , or none of them are.

Suppose that it is not the case. Then, there is a  $j$  and an  $l$ , such that  $c_j^l$  is matched to  $x_j^l$ , but  $c_j^{l-1}$  is not matched to  $x_j^{l-1}$ . This implies  $x_j^{l-1}$  must be matched to an agent from  $Z$  in  $M$ , and therefore  $(c_j^l, x_j^{l-1})$  blocks  $M$ , contradiction.

Also, observe that each  $a_i$  must be matched with a  $c_j^l$  agent in  $M$ , since otherwise they would block with  $c^1(a_i)$ .

Therefore, if we take those  $C_j$  sets, for which  $c_j^1, c_j^2, c_j^3$  are matched to  $a_i$  items, they must form an exact 3-cover. □

Now, we move on to the other direction.

**Proposition 5.3.** *If there exists an exact 3-cover in  $I$ , then  $p$  is ex-post stable.*

*Proof.* We prove that  $p = \frac{1}{9n}(\sum_{k=1}^{3n} M_1^k + \sum_{k=1}^{3n} M_2^k + \sum_{k=1}^{3n} M_3^k)$ , where each  $M_i^k$  is weakly stable. For the sake of simplicity, suppose the exact cover of  $I$  is  $C_1, \dots, C_n$ . (by the symmetry of the construction and the fact that each  $a_i$  is in exactly 3 sets, we can suppose this by reindexing the sets). Then, for each  $a_i$ ,  $c^1(a_i) \in \{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$  and  $c^2(a_i), c^3(a_i) \notin \{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$ .

Now we define the  $9n$  matchings that will be the support of  $p$ . These are illustrated in Figures 1 and 2.

For each  $k$ , let edges of  $M_1^k$  be  $(c^1(a_i), a_i), (d_j^l, y_j^l)$  for  $j \leq n, i \in [3n], l \in [3]$  and  $(c_j^l, x_j^l), (d_j^l, y_j^l)$  for  $j > n$ . Furthermore  $(s_1, o_1)$  and  $(s_2, o_2)$  are also matched in  $M_1^k$ . Then, let  $x_t$  be the  $t$ -th  $x_j^l$  agent who has not obtained a partner yet,  $t \in [3n]$  (so  $x_1 = x_1^1, x_2 = x_1^2, \dots, x_{3n} = x_n^3$ ). Then, we match  $x_t$  to  $z_{t+k}$  in  $M_1^k$ , where  $t+k$  is taken modulo  $3n$ .

Now, we observe that removing  $C_1, \dots, C_n$ , the remaining sets will satisfy that each  $a_i$  is included in exactly 2 of them, since  $\{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$  is an exact 3-cover.

For each  $k$ , let the edges of  $M_2^k$  be  $(c_j^l, x_j^l), (d_j^l, y_j^l)$  for  $j \leq n$  and  $(c^2(a_i), a_i), i \in [3n]$ . The  $c_j^l$  agents that are not matched yet are matched to the corresponding  $y_j^l$ . The  $d_j^l$  agents are matched to  $y_j^l$ , if that item is not matched to  $c_j^l$  agents and to  $x_j^l$  otherwise. Then, we match  $(s_1, o_2), (s_2, o_1)$  in  $M_2^k$ . Finally, let  $x_t$  be the  $t$ -th  $x_j^l$  agent who has not obtained a partner yet,  $t \in [3n]$ . Then, we match  $x_t$  to  $z_{t+k}$  in  $M_2^k$ , where  $t+k$  is taken modulo  $3n$ .

For each  $k$ , let the edges of  $M_3^k$  be  $(c_j^l, y_j^l), (d_j^l, x_j^l)$  for  $j \leq n$  and  $(c^3(a_i), a_i), i \in [3n]$ . The  $c_j^l$  agents that are not matched yet are matched to the corresponding  $y_j^l$ . The  $d_j^l$  agents are matched to  $y_j^l$ , if that item is not matched to  $c_j^l$  agents and to  $x_j^l$  otherwise. Then, we match  $(s_1, o_2), (s_2, o_1)$  in  $M_3^k$ . Finally, let  $x_t$  be the  $t$ -th  $x_j^l$  agent who has not obtained a partner yet,  $t \in [3n]$ . Then, we match  $x_t$  to  $z_{t+k}$  in  $M_3^k$ , where  $t+k$  is taken modulo  $3n$ .

It is easy to see that the edges with weight  $\frac{1}{3}$  are included in exactly  $3n$  matchings, the ones with weight  $\frac{2}{3}$  are included in exactly  $6n$  matchings, the edges with weight  $\frac{1}{9n}$  are included in exactly one matching and all other edges are not included in any matching from  $\{M_1^k, M_2^k, M_3^k \mid k \in [3n]\}$ . Therefore,  $p = \frac{1}{9n}(\sum_{k=1}^{3n} M_1^k + \sum_{k=1}^{3n} M_2^k + \sum_{k=1}^{3n} M_3^k)$ .

Let  $k$  be an arbitrary index from  $\{1, \dots, 3n\}$ . It only remains to show that  $M_1^k, M_2^k$  and  $M_3^k$  are weakly stable matchings. Let us start with  $M_1^k$ .

Each  $a_i$  and  $y_j^l$  item and also  $o_1$  and  $o_2$  are matched to one of their best agents in  $M_1^k$ , so they cannot participate in any blocking. For an item  $x_j^l$ , either it is matched to one of its top agents, or it is matched to someone from  $Z$ . However,, even if it is with a collector agent from  $Z$ , all higher priority agents for it ( $c_j^l$  and  $c_j^{l+1}$ ) are matched to better items ( $a_i$ -s), so there is no blocking with  $x_j^l$  items either. Therefore,  $M_1^k$  is weakly stable.

The cases of  $M_2^k$  and  $M_3^k$  are similar, we only show stability of  $M_2^k$ . Again, each  $a_i$  item as well as  $o_1$  and  $o_2$  are matched to one of their highest priority options, so they cannot be part of a blocking pair. Each  $y_j^l$  agent



is matched to either  $c_j^l$  or  $d_j^l$ . There could only be a potential block, if  $y_j^l$  is matched to  $c_j^l$ . However, since  $s_1$  is matched to  $o_2$ , it cannot block with  $s_1$ , and since each  $d_j^l$  is matched to an at least as good item, it cannot block with  $d_j^l$  either. The  $x_j^l$  items also cannot block with anyone, since if they are not with one of their first choices (which are the only strictly higher priority ones than the agents of  $Z \cup \{d_j^l\}$ ), then each of their top agents ( $c_j^l$  and  $c_j^{l+1}$ ) are matched with someone strictly better (an  $a_i$  or  $y_j^l$ ).

This shows that  $p$  is indeed ex-post stable. □

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Now we show that the problem remains hard even if both sides have dichotomous preferences.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Deciding whether a random matching  $p$  is ex-post stable is NP-complete, even if the preferences / priorities of both sides are dichotomous.*

*Proof.* We reduce from x3C. The construction, the random matching  $p$  and the matchings  $M_i^k$ ,  $i \in [3]$ ,  $k \in [3n]$  are identical as in the proof of Theorem 5.1, only the preferences are modified. Let the new preferences be the following. For the agents:

$$\begin{aligned} c_j^l &: [a_{j_l}, y_j^l, x_j^{l-1}], [others] \\ d_j^l &: [every\ item], \\ s_1 &: [o_2, Y], [others] \\ s_2 &: [every\ item] \\ z_j &: [every\ item] \end{aligned}$$

where  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$  taken (mod 3) and  $Y = \{y_j^l \mid j \in [3n], l \in [3]\}$ .

For the items the priority orders are the same as in Theorem 5.1.

**Proposition 5.5.** *If  $p$  is ex-post stable, then there exists an exact 3-cover.*

*Proof.* The proof is exactly the same as it was in Theorem 5.1. □

Now, we move on to the other direction.

**Proposition 5.6.** *If there exists an exact 3-cover in  $I$ , then  $p$  is ex-post stable.*

*Proof.* Again, we prove that  $p = \frac{1}{9n}(\sum_{k=1}^{3n} M_1^k + \sum_{k=1}^{3n} M_2^k + \sum_{k=1}^{3n} M_3^k)$ , where each  $M_i^k$  is weakly stable and is defined the same.

Let  $k$  be an arbitrary index from  $\{1, \dots, 3n\}$ . It only remains to show that  $M_1^k, M_2^k$  and  $M_3^k$  are weakly stable matchings. Notice, that with the new preferences, in any matching, only agents from  $\{c_j^l \mid j \in [3n], l \in [3]\} \cup \{s_1\}$  could block, since others are totally indifferent.

Let us start with  $M_1^k$ . From the construction, it follows that  $s_1$  does not block with any agent from  $Y$ , since all of them are matched to a same priority agent. A  $c_j^l$  agent could only block, if it is assigned to  $x_j^l$ . Hence,  $x_j^{l-1}, y_j^l$  and  $a_{jl}$  are all assigned to at least as good agents, so no pair can block.

In the case of  $M_2^k$ ,  $s_1$  is with  $o_2$ , so it is not part of any blocking pair. A  $c_j^l$  agent could again only block, if it is with  $x_j^l$ . However, that can only happen with those set agent that correspond to the exact cover. Hence, all of their better items are with agents that have at least as high priorities.

In  $M_3^k$ , each agent is with a top choice, so it is obviously weakly stable. This shows that  $p$  is indeed ex-post stable.  $\square$

This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

We also obtain the following Theorem that may be of independent interest.

**Theorem 5.7.** *Deciding whether there is a weakly stable matching that is consistent with a random matching  $p$  is NP-complete.*

*Proof.* We use the same construction from Theorem 5.1, with the only difference, that instead of  $p(s_1, o_1) = p(s_2, o_2) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $p(s_2, o_1) = p(s_1, o_2) = \frac{2}{3}$  we have  $p(s_1, o_1) = p(s_2, o_2) = 1$ ,  $p(s_2, o_1) = p(s_1, o_2) = 0$ . Then, any consistent matching with  $p$  must contain  $(s_1, o_1)$ , so by the same argument, there exists an exact 3-cover.


And if there is an exact 3-cover, then the matching  $M_1^1$  will be a weakly stable matching consistent with  $p$ .  $\square$

## 5.1 Bounded length incomplete preferences

In this section we show that deciding ex-post stability remains NP-hard even with incomplete preferences of length at most 3. While in the beginning, we argued that any instance can be transformed to an instance having complete preferences, from both a practical and a complexity theoretical point of view, it is an important question whether short, incomplete

preferences make the problem simpler. Especially, since in most applications like resident matching or school choice, at least one of the sides tend to have very short preference lists.

In case of incomplete preferences, we make the assumption that some objects are unacceptable for an agent, which is expressed by its absence from the agents preference list.




**Fig. 3.** The construction for Theorem 5.8. The red, blue and green edges are the edges of  $M_1, M_2$  and  $M_3$  respectively, when the set  $C_j$  is part of the exact 3-cover. The  $p$  value on each edge is  $\frac{1}{3}$  times the number of colors the edge has. The dotted lines represent the edges with  $p$  value 0.


Sadly, short lists does not help in the complexity of ex-post stability.

**Theorem 5.8.** *Deciding whether a random matching  $p$  is ex-post stable is NP-complete, even if all preference and priority lists have length at most 3 and they are dichotomous.*


*Proof.* Membership in NP follows from the same argument as before. To show NP-hardness, we reduce from X3C. Let  $I$  be an instance of X3C. Let the sets be  $C_1, \dots, C_{3n}$  and the elements be  $a_1, \dots, a_{3n}$ . We construct an instance  $I'$  for our problem as follows. For each element  $a_i$  we add an item  $a_i$ . For each set  $C_j$ , we add 3 items  $y_j^1, y_j^2, y_j^3$ , 3 agents  $d_j^1, d_j^2, d_j^3$  and 6 gadgets  $G_j^1, G_j^2, G_j^3, H_j^1, H_j^2, H_j^3$ . The  $G_j^l$  gadgets are illustrated in Figure 5. They consists of 4 agents  $1c_{j,2}^l, 2c_{j,3}^l, 3c_{j,4}^l, 4c_{j,1}^l$  and 3 items  $1g_{j,2}^l, 2g_{j,3}^l, 3g_{j,4}^l$ . The  $H_j^l$  gadgets are illustrated in Figure 6. They consist of 4 items  $1x_{j,2}^l, 2x_{j,3}^l, 3x_{j,4}^l, 4x_{j,1}^l$  and 3 agents  $1h_{j,2}^l, 2h_{j,3}^l, 3h_{j,4}^l$ . Then, we add  $3n$  collector agents  $z_1, \dots, z_{3n}$ , one for each element. Finally, we add  $9n$  items  $o_j^l$  for  $j \in [3n], l \in [3]$  and  $9n$  more agents  $s_j^l$  for  $j \in [3n], l \in [3]$ . Let  $C_j = \{a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}, a_{j_3}\}, j_1 < j_2 < j_3$



**Fig. 4.** The construction for Theorem 5.8. The red, blue and green edges are the edges of  $M_1, M_2$  and  $M_3$  respectively, when the set  $C_j$  is not part of the exact 3-cover. The  $p$  value on each edge is  $\frac{1}{3}$  times the number of colors the edge has. The dotted lines represent the edges with  $p$  value 0.



**Fig. 5.** The gadget  $G_j^l$  with its neighbors  $1x_j^{l+1}, 3x_j^l, a_{j1}$  and  $y_j^l$ . The red, blue and green edges correspond to the matchings  $M_1, M_2, M_3$ , depending on which copy of  $c_j^l$  is matched to the outside. The  $p$  value on each edge is  $\frac{1}{3}$  times the number of colors the edge has.



**Fig. 6.** The gadget  $H_j^l$  with its neighbors  $1c_j^{l-1}, z_{j1}, 2c_j^l$  and  $d_j^l$ . The red, blue and green edges correspond to the matchings  $M_1, M_2, M_3$ , depending on which copy of  $x_j^l$  is matched to the outside. The  $p$  value on each edge is  $\frac{1}{3}$  times the number of colors the edge has. The dotted line has  $p$  value 0, and may be a blocking edge, if the red matching is taken in both  $G_j^l$  and  $H_j^{l+1}$ .

be the  $j$ -th set in  $I$ . We refer to  $a_{j1}$  as the first element in  $C_j$ ,  $a_{j2}$  as the second and  $a_{j3}$  as the third. Let the preferences (left) and priority lists (right) be the following.

$$\begin{array}{l|l}
 1c_j^l : [2g_{j,1}^l, 1x_j^{l+1}], 1g_j^l & 1x_j^l : [2h_{j,1}^l, 1c_j^{l-1}], 1h_j^l \\
 2c_j^l : [3x_j^l, 1g_j^l] & 2x_j^l : [1h_j^l, z_{j1}] \\
 3c_j^l : [a_{j1}, 2g_j^l, 3g_j^l] & 3x_j^l : [2h_{j,3}^l, 3h_j^l, 1c_j^l] \\
 4c_j^l : [y_j^l, 3g_j^l] & 4x_j^l : [d_j^l, 3h_j^l] \\
 1h_j^l : [1x_j^l, 2x_j^l] & 1g_j^l : [1c_j^l, 2c_j^l] \\
 2h_j^l : [1x_j^l, 3x_j^l] & 2g_j^l : [1c_j^l, 3c_j^l] \\
 3h_j^l : [3x_j^l, 4x_j^l] & 3g_j^l : [3c_j^l, 4c_j^l] \\
 d_j^l : [4x_j^l, y_j^l] & y_j^l : [d_j^l, s_j^l], 4c_j^l \\
 s_j^1 : [o_j^1, y_j^1], o_j^2 & o_j^1 : [s_j^1, s_{j-1}^3] \\
 s_j^2 : [o_j^2, y_j^2], o_j^3 & o_j^2 : [s_j^1, s_j^2] \\
 s_j^3 : [o_j^3, y_j^3], o_{j+1}^1 & o_j^3 : [s_j^2, s_j^3] \\
 z_i : [2X(a_i)] & a_i : [3C(a_i)]
 \end{array}$$

where  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$  taken (mod 3) and  $Y = \{y_j^l \mid j \in [3n], l \in [3]\}$ ,  $X = \{x_j^l \mid j \in [3n], l \in [3]\}$  and  $[S]$  for a set  $S$  indicates that the elements of  $S$  are tied. Also,  $2X(a_i)$  indicates the three  $2x_j^l$  objects for those  $j, l$  pairs, such that  $a_i$  is the  $l$ -th element of set  $C_j$ , while  $3C(a_i)$  indicates the three  $3c_j^l$  objects for those  $j, l$  pairs, such that  $a_i$  is the  $l$ -th element of set  $C_j$ . Observe that each list is dichotomous and each has at most

three entries. For an item  $a_i$  let  ${}_3C(a_i) = \{{}_3c_{j_{i1}}^{l_{i1}}, {}_3c_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}, {}_3c_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}\}$  be its three adjacent agents. Let the random matching  $p$  be defined as:

1.  $p({}_3c_{j_{i1}}^{l_{i1}}, a_i) = p({}_3c_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}, a_i) = p({}_3c_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}, a_i) = \frac{1}{3}$  for  $i \in [3n]$ .
2.  $p({}_1c_j^l, {}_1g_j^l) = p({}_3c_j^l, {}_2g_j^l) = p({}_3c_j^l, {}_3g_j^l) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$
3.  $p({}_1c_j^l, {}_2g_j^l) = p({}_2c_j^l, {}_1g_j^l) = p({}_4c_j^l, {}_3g_j^l) = \frac{2}{3}$ ,  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$
4.  $p({}_2c_j^l, {}_3x_j^l) = p({}_4c_j^l, y_j^l) = \frac{1}{3}$ , for  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$
5.  $p({}_1h_j^l, {}_1x_j^l) = p({}_2h_j^l, {}_3x_j^l) = p({}_3h_j^l, {}_3x_j^l) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$
6.  $p({}_2h_j^l, {}_1x_j^l) = p({}_1h_j^l, {}_2x_j^l) = p({}_3h_j^l, {}_4x_j^l) = \frac{2}{3}$ ,  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$
7.  $p(d_j^l, {}_4x_j^l) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $p(d_j^l, y_j^l) = \frac{2}{3}$ ,  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$
8.  $p(s_j^l, o_j^l) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  $p(s_j^l, o_j^{l+1}) = \frac{2}{3}$  for  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [2]$  and  $p(s_j^3, o_j^3) = \frac{1}{3}$ ,  
 $p(s_j^3, o_{j+1}^1) = \frac{2}{3}$  for  $j \in [3n]$ .
9.  $p(z_{i,2} x_{j_{i1}}^{l_{i1}}) = p(z_{i,2} x_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}) = p(z_{i,2} x_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}) = \frac{1}{3}$  for each  $i \in [3n]$ .

For any other edge  $p$  is 0. This completes the construction of  $I'$ . The whole construction together with the  $p$  values is illustrated in Figures 3, 4, 5 and 6.

**Proposition 5.9.** *If  $p$  is ex-post stable, then there exists an exact 3-cover.*

*Proof.* If  $p$  can be written as a convex combination of weakly stable matchings, then, because  $p(s_1^1, o_1^2) > 0$ , there has to be one matching in which the edge  $(s_1^1, o_1^1)$  is included. Let this matching be  $M$ . As each matching must be complete, as the sum of weights adjacent to any vertex is 1, and  $s_j^l$  cannot be matched to  $y_j^l$  as  $p(s_j^l, y_j^l) = 0$ , it must hold that each  $s_j^l$  receives its worst object simultaneously in  $M$ .  $M$  is weakly stable, therefore no  $(s_j^l, y_j^l)$  edge blocks it. This can only happen, if each  $y_j^l$  item is matched to someone with at least as high priority as  $s_j^l$ , so  $(y_j^l, d_j^l) \in M$  for each  $j \in [3n]$ ,  $l \in [3]$ . It is also clear that each item  $a_i$  must be matched to a  ${}_3c_j^l$  agent in  $M$ . Note that  $p({}_1c_j^l, {}_1x_j^{l+1}) = 0$  and the  $y_i^l$  items are all assigned to  $d_i^l$ . As  $M$  is complete and there are 4 agents and only 3 items in  $G_j^{l-1}$ , either  $({}_3c_j^l, a_{j_l}) \in M$  or  $({}_2c_j^l, {}_3x_j^l) \in M$  for every  $j, l$ . We claim that for each  $j$ , either all of  ${}_3c_j^1, {}_3c_j^2, {}_3c_j^3$  are matched to items from  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_{3n}\}$ , or none of them are. Suppose that it is not the case. Then, there is a pair  $j, l$  such that  $({}_2c_j^l, {}_3x_j^l) \in M$ , but  $({}_2c_j^{l+1}, {}_3x_j^{l+1}) \notin M$ . This means, that from the gadget  $H_j^{l+1}$ , only  ${}_2x_j^{l+1}$  can be matched out, in particular to  $z_{j_{l+1}}$ . Therefore,  $(z_{j_{l+1},2} x_j^{l+1}) \in M$ , so  $({}_1h_j^{l+1}, {}_1x_j^{l+1}) \in M$ , as  ${}_1h_j^{l+1}$  must be matched. Similarly,  $({}_1c_j^l, {}_1g_j^l) \in M$ , as  ${}_1g_j^l$  must be matched too. However, this is a contradiction, because the edge  $({}_1c_j^l, {}_1x_j^{l+1})$  would block  $M$ . Therefore, if we take those  $C_j$  sets, for which  ${}_3c_j^1, {}_3c_j^2, {}_3c_j^3$  are matched to  $a_i$  items, they must form an exact 3-cover.  $\square$

Now, we move on to the other direction.

**Proposition 5.10.** *If there exists an exact 3-cover in  $I$ , then  $p$  is ex-post stable.*

*Proof.* We prove that  $p = \frac{1}{3}(M_1 + M_2 + M_3)$ , where each  $M_i$  is weakly stable. For the sake of simplicity, suppose the exact cover of  $I$  is  $C_1, \dots, C_n$ . (by the symmetry of the construction and the fact that each  $a_i$  is in exactly 3 sets, we can suppose this by reindexing the sets). Then, for each  $a_i$ ,  $C_{j_{i1}} \in \{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$  and  $C_{j_{i2}}, C_{j_{i3}} \notin \{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$ . Now we define the 3 matchings that will be the support of  $p$ . The edges of the matchings are illustrated in Figures 3-6. Let edges of  $M_1$  be

$$\begin{aligned} & - \{(s_j^1, o_j^2), (s_j^2, o_j^3), (s_j^3, o_{j+1}^1) \mid j \in [3n]\} \cup \\ & - \{(d_j^l, y_j^l) \mid j \in [3n], l \in [3]\} \cup \\ & - \{(3c_{j_{i1}}^{l_{i1}}, a_i), (1c_{j_{i1}}^{l_{i1}}, 2g_{j_{i1}}^{l_{i1}}), (2c_{j_{i1}}^{l_{i1}}, 1g_{j_{i1}}^{l_{i1}}), (4c_{j_{i1}}^{l_{i1}}, 3g_{j_{i1}}^{l_{i1}}) \mid i \in [3n]\} \cup \\ & - \{(1c_j^l, 1g_j^l), (2c_j^l, 3x_j^l), (3c_j^l, 2g_j^l), (4c_j^l, 3g_j^l) \mid j \in \{n+1, \dots, 3n\}, l \in [3]\} \cup \\ & - \{(z_{i,2} x_{j_{i1}}^{l_{i1}}) \mid i \in [3n]\} \cup \\ & - \{(1h_j^l, 1x_j^l), (2h_j^l, 3x_j^l), (3h_j^l, 4x_j^l) \mid j \in [n], l \in [3]\} \cup \\ & - \{(1h_j^l, 2x_j^l), (2h_j^l, 1x_j^l), (3h_j^l, 4x_j^l) \mid j \in \{n+1, \dots, 3n\}, l \in [3]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we observe that removing  $C_1, \dots, C_n$ , the remaining sets will satisfy that each  $a_i$  is included in exactly 2 of them, since  $C_1, \dots, C_n$  is an exact 3-cover. Let edges of  $M_2$  be

$$\begin{aligned} & - \{(s_j^l, o_j^l) \mid j \in [3n], l \in [3]\} \cup \\ & - \{(3c_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}, a_i), (1c_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}, 2g_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}), (2c_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}, 1g_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}), (4c_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}, 3g_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}) \mid i \in [3n]\} \cup \\ & - \{(z_{i,2} x_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}) \mid i \in [3n]\} \cup \\ & - \{(1h_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}, 1x_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}), (2h_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}, 3x_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}), (3h_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}, 4x_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}) \mid i \in [3n], l \in [3]\} \cup \\ & - \{(d_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}, y_{j_{i2}}^{l_{i2}}) \mid i \in [3n]\}. \\ & - \text{For } j \leq n, l \in [3], \text{ we add the edges } \{(1c_j^l, 1g_j^l), (2c_j^l, 3x_j^l), (3c_j^l, 2g_j^l), (4c_j^l, 3g_j^l)\} \cup \\ & \quad \{(1h_j^l, 2x_j^l), (2h_j^l, 1x_j^l), (3h_j^l, 4x_j^l)\} \cup \{(d_j^l, y_j^l)\}. \\ & - \text{For those } j > n, l \in [3], \text{ such that } (j, l) \neq (j_{i2}, l_{i2}) \text{ for any } i \in [3n], \text{ we} \\ & \quad \text{add the edges } \{(1c_j^l, 2g_j^l), (2c_j^l, 1g_j^l), (3c_j^l, 3g_j^l), (4c_j^l, y_j^l)\} \cup \{(1h_j^l, 2x_j^l), (2h_j^l, 1x_j^l), (3h_j^l, 3x_j^l), (d_j^l, 4x_j^l)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let edges of  $M_3$  be

$$\begin{aligned} & - \{(s_j^l, o_j^l) \mid j \in [3n], l \in [3]\} \cup \\ & - \{(3c_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}, a_i), (1c_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}, 2g_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}), (2c_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}, 1g_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}), (4c_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}, 3g_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}) \mid i \in [3n]\} \cup \\ & - \{(z_{i,2} x_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}) \mid i \in [3n]\} \cup \end{aligned}$$

- $\{(1h_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}, 1x_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}), (2h_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}, 3x_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}), (3h_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}, 4x_{j_{i3}}^{l_{i3}}) \mid i \in [3n], l \in [3]\}$ .
- For  $j \leq n$ ,  $l \in [3]$ , we add the edges  $\{(1c_{j,2}^l, 2g_j^l), (2c_{j,1}^l, 3x_j^l), (3c_{j,3}^l, 4g_j^l)\} \cup \{(1h_{j,2}^l, 2x_j^l), (2h_{j,1}^l, 3x_j^l), (3h_{j,3}^l, 4x_j^l)\} \cup \{(d_{j,4}^l, 4x_j^l), (4c_{j,1}^l, y_j^l)\}$ .
- For those  $j > n$ ,  $l \in [3]$ , such that  $(j, l) \neq (j_{i3}, l_{i3})$  for any  $i \in [3n]$ , we add the edges  $\{(1c_{j,2}^l, 2g_j^l), (2c_{j,1}^l, 3g_j^l), (3c_{j,3}^l, 4g_j^l), (4c_{j,1}^l, y_j^l)\} \cup \{(1h_{j,2}^l, 2x_j^l), (2h_{j,1}^l, 3x_j^l), (3h_{j,3}^l, 4x_j^l), (d_{j,4}^l, 4x_j^l)\}$ .

It is easy to check that the edges with weight  $\frac{1}{3}$  are included in exactly 1 matchings, the ones with weight  $\frac{2}{3}$  are included in exactly 2 matchings, the edges with weight 0 are included in none of the matchings. Therefore,  $p = \frac{1}{3}(M_1 + M_2 + M_3)$ . It only remains to show that  $M_1, M_2$  and  $M_3$  are weakly stable matchings. Let us start with  $M_1$ . All items get a top priority agent, except  $1x_j^l$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $l \in [3]$ . However, for these items, their two better agents  $2h_j^l$  and  $1c_j^{l-1}$  are with an at least as good object  $3x_j^l$  and  $2g_j^l$  respectively. In both  $M_2$  and  $M_3$  all agents get a top item, except from the  $1c_j^l$  agents in the gadgets  $G_j^l$ , where  $2c_j^l$  is matched to  $3x_j^l$ . However, for these agents, both of their better objects  $2g_j^l$  and  $1x_j^{l+1}$  are matched to an agent with at least as high priority, because  $1x_j^{l+1}$  is with  $2h_j^{l+1}$  in both  $M_2$  and  $M_3$ . This shows that  $p$  is indeed ex-post stable.  $\square$

This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

## 5.2 An integer programming approach

Even though we have shown the problem to be NP-hard, in this section we provide a method to decide ex-post stability.

We give an algorithm based on integer programming, which, given a random matching  $p$ , finds a convex combination of perfect matchings  $M_1, \dots, M_k$ , such that  $p = \sum_l \lambda_l M_l$  and  $\sum_{l: M_l \text{ is weakly stable}} \lambda_l$  is maximal.

Our algorithm proceeds in two steps. First, we compute the maximum value  $|\lambda|_1 = \sum_{l=1}^{n^2+1} \lambda_l$  such that there are weakly stable matchings  $M_1, \dots, M_{n^2+1}$  with  $\sum_{l=1}^{n^2+1} \lambda_l M_l \leq p$  (coordinate-wise) with the integer program IP (5.1)-(5.7).



$$\max \quad \sum_{l=1}^{n^2+1} \lambda_l \quad (5.1)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{o' \succ_o i} M_l(i, o') + \sum_{j \succ_o i} M_l(j, o) - M_l(i, o) \geq 1 \quad ((i, o) \in N \times O, l \in [n^2 + 1]) \quad (5.2)$$

$$\sum_{l=1}^{n^2+1} \lambda_l \cdot M_l(i, o) \leq p(i, o) \quad ((i, o) \in N \times O) \quad (5.3)$$

$$\sum_o M_l(i, o) = 1 \quad (i \in N) \quad (5.4)$$

$$\sum_i M_l(i, o) = 1 \quad (o \in O) \quad (5.5)$$

$$\lambda_l \geq 0 \quad (l \in [n^2 + 1]) \quad (5.6)$$

$$M_l(i, o) \in \{0, 1\} \quad ((i, o) \in N \times O, l \in [n^2 + 1]) \quad (5.7)$$

Then in the second step, we write  $\frac{1}{1-|\lambda^*|_1}(p - \sum_{l=1}^{n^2+1} \lambda_l M_l)$  as a convex combination of deterministic matchings and then combine these two convex combinations into one, see Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Decomposing a random matching with maximum probability of being weakly stable

---

1. Compute an optimal solution  $(\lambda^*, M^*)$  of IP (5.1)-(5.7).
  2. Let  $p' = \frac{1}{1-|\lambda^*|_1}(p - \sum_{l=1}^{n^2+1} \lambda_l M_l^*)$ . This again gives a bistochastic matrix.
  3. Compute a decomposition of  $p'$  into  $n^2$  perfect matchings using the Birkhoff-Neumann algorithm:  $p' = \sum_{l=n^2+2}^{2n^2+1} \lambda_l M_l$ .
  4. **Return**  $(M_1^*, \dots, M_{n^2+1}^*, M_{n^2+2}, \dots, M_{2n^2+1})$  and  $(\lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_{n^2+1}^*, (1 - |\lambda^*|_1) \cdot \lambda_{n^2+2}, \dots, (1 - |\lambda^*|_1) \cdot \lambda_{2n^2+1})$
-

**Theorem 5.11.** *Algorithm 1 finds a decomposition  $p = \sum_l \lambda_l^* M_l^*$  into perfect deterministic matchings  $M_l$  such that  $\sum_{l: M_l \text{ is weakly stable}} \lambda_l^*$  is maximal.*

*Proof.* It is clear that the decomposition returned by the algorithm consists only of perfect matchings, hence it is a feasible decomposition. We only need to show that there is no other decomposition  $p' = \sum_l \lambda'_l M'_l$ , such that  $\sum_{l: M'_l \text{ is weakly stable}} \lambda'_l > \sum_{l: M_l^* \text{ is weakly stable}} \lambda_l^*$ .

Let  $\hat{p} = \sum_{l: M'_l \text{ is weakly stable}} \lambda'_l M'_l$ , where  $\lambda' = (\lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_k)$ . Then,  $\frac{1}{|\lambda'|_1} \hat{p}$  is in the convex hull of weakly stable matchings. Therefore, by Caratheodory's theorem, we get that there are  $n^2 + 1$  matchings  $M''_1, \dots, M''_{n^2+1}$  with  $(\lambda''_1, \dots, \lambda''_{n^2+1})$ , such that  $\frac{1}{|\lambda'|_1} \hat{p} = \sum_{l=1}^{n^2+1} \lambda''_l M''_l$  and  $|\lambda''|_1 = 1$ . Hence,  $\hat{p} = \sum_{l=1}^{n^2+1} |\lambda'|_1 \lambda''_l M''_l$ , so we can construct a solution  $(\hat{x}, \hat{\lambda})$  to the IP (5.1)-(5.7) such that  $|\lambda^*|_1 < |\hat{\lambda}|_1$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

## 6 Stronger Versions of Ex-post Stability

In this section, we consider stronger versions of ex-post stability.

### 6.1 Robust Ex-post Stability

*Robust ex-post stability*, is a natural strengthening of ex-post stability [12].

**Definition 6.1 (Robust ex-post stability).** A random matching  $p$  is *robust ex-post stable* if all of its decompositions are into deterministic and weakly stable matchings.

It follows easily that if we restrict attention to deterministic matchings, then both ex-post stability and robust ex-post stability coincide with weak stability and no envy (Definition 3.1).

**Theorem 6.2.** *Checking whether a given random matching  $p$  is robust ex-post stable is polynomial-time solvable.*

*Proof.* For each  $i \in N$  and  $o \in O$ , we check whether there exists an integral matching  $q$  consistent with  $p$  such that  $i$  is not matched to  $o$  under  $q$  and  $(i, o)$  form a blocking pair for  $q$ . This can be checked by testing whether there exists an allocation in which  $i$  is matched to some item  $o'$  such that

$o \succ_i o'$  and  $p(i, o') > 0$ ;  $o$  is matched to some agent  $j \in N$  such that  $i \succ_o j$  and  $p(j, o) > 0$ ; and each other agent  $k$  is matched to some item  $o''$  such that  $p(k, o'') > 0$ . This test can be solved in polynomial time by checking whether the underlying bipartite graph with the admissible edges admits a perfect matching.  $\square$

## 6.2 Ex-post Strong Stability

In this section, we consider a stability concept called ex-post strong stability which is based on a concept called *strong stability*.

**Definition 6.3 (Strong stability).** *A deterministic matching  $p$  is strongly stable if there is no pair  $(i, o) \notin p$ , such that both  $i$  and  $o$  weakly prefer each other to their match, and at least one of them strictly prefers it. Equivalently, it satisfies the following two conditions.*

1.  $\sum_{o' \succ_i o} p(i, o') + \sum_{i' \succ_o i} p(i', o) + \sum_{o' \sim_i o} p(i, o') \geq 1$
2.  $\sum_{o' \succ_i o} p(i, o') + \sum_{i' \succ_o i} p(i', o) + \sum_{i' \sim_o i} p(i', o) \geq 1$ .

Clearly strong stability implies weak stability. Note that under strict preferences, strong stability and weak stability are equivalent. A strongly stable matching may not exist but there is a linear-time algorithm to check if it exists or not and to find one if it exists [31].

The notion of strong stability for integral matchings lends itself to two natural stability concepts for the case of random matchings.

**Definition 6.4 (Ex post strong stability).** *A matching  $p$  is ex-post strongly stable if it can be represented as a convex combination of integral strongly stable matchings.*

**Definition 6.5 (Fractional strong stability).** *A random matching  $p$  is fractional strong stable if it satisfies the following two conditions.*

1.  $\sum_{o' \succ_i o} p(i, o') + \sum_{i' \succ_o i} p(i', o) + \sum_{o' \sim_i o} p(i, o') \geq 1$
2.  $\sum_{o' \succ_i o} p(i, o') + \sum_{i' \succ_o i} p(i', o) + \sum_{i' \sim_o i} p(i', o) \geq 1$

Clearly ex-post strong stability implies ex-post stability.

**Proposition 6.6.** *Fractional strong stability implies fractional stability.*

*Proof.* Suppose, the first condition of fractional strong stability is satisfied: for all  $(i, o)$ ,  $\sum_{o' \succ_i o} p(i, o') + \sum_{i' \succ_o i} p(i', o) + \sum_{o' \sim_i o} p(i, o') \geq 1$ . Then, for all  $(i, o)$ ,  $\sum_{o' \succ_i o; o' \neq o} p(i, o') + \sum_{i' \succ_o i} p(i', o) + p(i, o) \geq 1$  which means that fractional stability is satisfied.  $\square$

Next, we establish an equivalence between ex-post strong stability and fractional strong stability.

**Lemma 6.7 (Theorem 13 of Kunysz [34]).** *The following are equivalent. A random matching*

1. *satisfies fractional strong stability*
2. *is in the convex hull of deterministic strongly stable matchings.*

**Theorem 6.8.** *For weak preferences and priorities, there exists a polynomial-time algorithm to test ex-post strong stability and in case the answer is yes, there is a polynomial-time algorithm to find its representation as a convex combination of strongly stable deterministic matchings.*

*Proof.* Strong ex-post stability can be checked in polynomial time as follows. Strong ex-post stability is equivalent to fractional strong stability (Lemma 6.7). Fractional strong stability can be checked by considering  $2|N| \times |O|$  inequalities used in the definition of fractional strong stability. For a matching that satisfies fractional strong stability, it lies in the convex hull of the set of deterministic strongly stable matchings. Such a matching can be represented by a convex combination of strongly stable deterministic matchings by an algorithm of Kunysz [34] that uses a similar argument as that of Teo and Sethuraman [41].  $\square$

In the proof of Theorem 6.8, we invoke an algorithmic result of Kunysz [34]. For the sake of completeness and exposition, we give a description of the algorithm of Kunysz [34]. The proposed algorithms by Teo and Sethuraman [41] and its extension by Kunysz [34] are based on self-duality of the polytope defined by fractional strong stability. By using the self-duality and complementary slackness property it was shown that if  $p$  is an optimal solution and  $p(i, o) > 0$ , then

1.  $\sum_{o' \succ_i o} p(i, o') + \sum_{i' \succ_o i} p(i', o) + \sum_{o' \sim_i o} p(i, o') = 1$
2.  $\sum_{o' \succ_i o} p(i, o') + \sum_{i' \succ_o i} p(i', o) + \sum_{i' \sim_o i} p(i', o) = 1$
3.  $\sum_{i'} p(i', o) = 1$
4.  $\sum_{o'} p(i, o') = 1$

For each  $i$  and  $o$ , consider interval  $I_i = (0, 1]$  and  $I_o = (0, 1]$  that results into  $2n$  intervals. Corresponding to each  $p(i, o)$ , consider an interval of length  $p(i, o)$  and by abusing the notation denote the interval by  $p(i, o)$ . The intervals are also arranged in decreasing preference of  $i$ . This means that if  $o \succ o'$ , then interval  $p(i, o)$  appears before  $p(i, o')$ . Notice that indifferent preferences are arranged arbitrary next to each other. Since

we have that  $\sum_{o'} p(i, o') = 1$ , then  $\cup_{o'} p(i, o') = (0, 1]$ . Similarly, define sub-intervals  $p(i, o)$  for each  $I_o = (0, 1]$  and arrange them in increasing order.

First, consider the case where preferences are strict. Then, let  $u \in (0, 1]$  be an arbitrary number. Then, we get stable integral matching  $M_u$  as follows:  $i$  gets matched to  $o$  if  $u$  belongs to interval  $p(i, o) \subseteq I_i$ . Moreover,  $o$  gets matched to  $i$  if  $u$  belongs to interval  $p(i, o) \subseteq I_o$ . Notice that by the fact that sub-intervals in  $I_i$  and  $I_o$  are arranged in opposite way and

$$\sum_{o' \succ_i o} p(i, o') + \sum_{i' \succ_o i} p(i', o) + p(i, o) = 1.$$

One can observe that  $M_u$  is an integral matching. By sub-intervals construction, each  $I_i$  and  $I_o$  is partitioned to at most  $n$  intervals which are determined by  $n + 1$  distinct numbers. Since there are  $2n$  intervals, there are at most  $2n(n + 1)$  such numbers. Sort them as  $0 = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_s = 1$ , where  $s < 2n(n + 1)$ . Teo and Sethuraman showed that  $p = \sum_{t=1}^s (x_t - x_{t-1}) \cdot M_{x_t}$ .

Kunysz slightly modified the construction to handle the case where there are weak preferences. In this case one may not be able to construct an integral matching  $M_u$ ,  $u \in (0, 1]$ . Instead he defined an auxiliary bipartite graph  $H_u$  and then showed that there exists matching  $M_u$  in  $H_u$ . Then, finding the convex composition follows as Teo and Sethuraman's algorithm.

## 7 Conclusion

We undertook a study of testing stability of random matchings. Our central results are that testing ex-post stability is NP-complete even under severe restrictions. The computational hardness result also explains why a combinatorially simple and tractable characterization has eluded mathematicians and economists. Nonetheless, we provided a way to find an optimal decomposition using integer programming.

We also considered stronger versions of ex-post stability and presented polynomial-time algorithms for testing them. A natural research direction is to understand sufficient conditions on the preferences and priorities under which testing ex-post stability is polynomial-time solvable. Yet another research problem is understanding the conditions under which stability concepts coincide. Parameterized algorithms for the computationally hard problems is yet another research direction.

## Acknowledgment

The authors thank Onur Kesten, Isaiah Iliffe, Tom Demeulemeester, and M. Utku Ünver for comments. Aziz acknowledges the support by the NSF-CSIRO grant on 'Fair Sequential Collective Decision-Making' (Grant number RG230833). Biró and Csáji acknowledge the financial support by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Momentum Grant No. LP2021-2, and by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund, OTKA, Grant No. K143858. Csáji acknowledges support by the Ministry of Culture and Innovation of Hungary from the National Research, Development and Innovation fund, financed under the KDP-2023 funding scheme (grant number C2258525).

## Bibliography

- [1] Abdulkadiroğlu, A., Andersson, T., 2023. School choice, in: *Handbook of the Economics of Education*. Elsevier. volume 6, pp. 135–185.
- [2] Abdulkadiroğlu, A., Pathak, P.A., Roth, A.E., 2005. The new york city high school match. *American Economic Review* 95, 364–367.
- [3] Abdulkadiroğlu, A., Pathak, P.A., Roth, A.E., 2009. Strategy-proofness versus efficiency in matching with indifferences: Redesigning the nyc high school match. *American Economic Review* 99, 1954–1978.
- [4] Abdulkadiroğlu, A., Sönmez, T., 2003. School choice: A mechanism design approach. *American economic review* 93, 729–747.
- [5] Afacan, M.O., 2018. The object allocation problem with random priorities. *Games and Economic Behavior* 110, 71–89.
- [6] Allman, M., Ashlagi, I., Nikzad, A., 2023. On rank dominance of tie-breaking rules. *Theoretical Economics* 18, 707–748.
- [7] Arnosti, N., 2023. Lottery design for school choice. *Management Science* 69, 244–259.
- [8] Ashlagi, I., Shi, P., 2014. Improving community cohesion in school choice via correlated-lottery implementation. *Operations Research* 62, 1247–1264.
- [9] Aziz, H., 2019. A probabilistic approach to voting, allocation, matching, and coalition formation, in: Laslier, J.F., Moulin, H., Sanver, R., Zwicker, W.S. (Eds.), *The Future of Economic Design*. Springer-Verlag.
- [10] Aziz, H., Biró, P., Fleiner, T., Klaus, B., 2021. Matching under preferences: Theory and practice (dagstuhl seminar 21301). *Dagstuhl*

- Reports 11, 124–146. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/DagRep.11.6.124>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.4230/DagRep.11.6.124>.
- [11] Aziz, H., Brandl, F., 2022. The vigilant eating rule: A general approach for probabilistic economic design with constraints. *Games and Economic Behavior* 135, 168–187.
  - [12] Aziz, H., Klaus, B., 2019. Random matching under priorities: Stability and no envy concepts. *Social Choice and Welfare* , 213–259.
  - [13] Aziz, H., Mackenzie, S., Xia, L., Ye, C., 2015. Ex post efficiency of random assignments, in: *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS)*.
  - [14] Bichler, M., Merting, S., 2021. Randomized scheduling mechanisms: Assigning course seats in a fair and efficient way. *Production and Operations Management* 30, 3540–3559.
  - [15] Birkhoff, G., 1946. Three observations on linear algebra. *Univ. Nac. Tacuman Rev. Ser. A* 5, 147–151.
  - [16] Bogomolnaia, A., Moulin, H., 2001a. A new solution to the random assignment problem. *Journal of Economic theory* 100, 295–328.
  - [17] Bogomolnaia, A., Moulin, H., 2001b. A new solution to the random assignment problem. *Journal of Economic Theory* 100, 295–328.
  - [18] Bogomolnaia, A., Moulin, H., 2004. Random matching under dichotomous preferences. *Econometrica* 72, 257–279.
  - [19] Bronfman, S., Alon, N., Hassidim, A., Romm, A., 2018. Redesigning the Israeli medical internship match. *ACM Transactions on Economics and Computation (TEAC)* 6, 1–18.
  - [20] Caragiannis, I., Filos-Ratsikas, A., Kanellopoulos, P., Vaish, R., 2021. Stable fractional matchings. *Artificial intelligence* 295, 103416.
  - [21] Chen, J., Roy, S., Sorge, M., 2020. Fractional matchings under preferences: Stability and optimality. *CoRR* abs/2011.12259.
  - [22] Delacrétaz, D., Kominers, S.D., Teytelboym, A., 2023. Matching mechanisms for refugee resettlement. *American Economic Review* 113, 2689–2717.
  - [23] Demeulemeester, T., Goossens, D., Hermans, B., Leus, R., 2023. A pessimist’s approach to one-sided matching. *European Journal of Operational Research* 305, 1087–1099.
  - [24] Dogan, B., Yildiz, K., 2016. Efficiency and stability of probabilistic assignments in marriage problems. *Games and Economic Behavior* 95, 47–58.
  - [25] Erdil, A., Ergin, H., 2008. What’s the matter with tie-breaking? Improving efficiency in school choice. *American Economic Review* 98, 669–689.

- [26] Gale, D., Shapley, L.S., 1962a. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly* 69, 9–15.
- [27] Gale, D., Shapley, L.S., 1962b. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly* 69, 9–15.
- [28] Garey, M.R., Johnson, D.S., 1979. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W. H. Freeman.
- [29] Gusfield, D., Irving, R.W., 1989. *The stable marriage problem: Structure and algorithms*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA.
- [30] Irving, R. W., 1994. Stable marriage and indifference. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 48(3), 261–272.
- [31] Kavitha, T., Mehlhorn, K., Michail, D., Paluch, K.E., 2007. Strongly stable matchings in time  $O(nm)$  and extension to the hospitals-residents problem. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms* 3, 15.
- [32] Kesten, O., 2010. School choice with consent. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 125, 1297–1348.
- [33] Kesten, O., Unver, U., 2015. A theory of school choice lotteries. *Theoretical Economics* 10, 543–595.
- [34] Kunysz, A., 2018. An algorithm for the maximum weight strongly stable matching problem, in: *29th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2018, December 16-19, 2018, Jiaoxi, Yilan, Taiwan*, pp. 42:1–42:13.
- [35] Manlove, D.F., 2013. *Algorithmics of Matching Under Preferences*. World Scientific Publishing Company.
- [36] Manlove, D. F., Irving, R. W., Iwama, K., Miyazaki, S., Morita, Y., 2002. Hard variants of stable marriage. *Theoretical Computer Science* 276(1-2), 261–279.
- [37] Roth, A.E., Rothblum, U.G., Vande Vate, J.H., 1993. Stable matchings, optimal assignments, and linear programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 18, 803–828 803–828 803–828 803–828 803–828.
- [38] Roth, A.E., Sotomayor, M.A.O., 1990. *Two-Sided Matching: A Study in Game Theoretic Modelling and Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- [39] Ruijs, N., Oosterbeek, H., 2019. School choice in amsterdam: Which schools are chosen when school choice is free? *Education Finance and Policy* 14, 1–30.
- [40] Rusznák, A., Biró, P., Fleiner, R., 2021. Seat transfers in the course allocation mechanism of eötvös loránd university, in: *2021 IEEE 15th International Symposium on Applied Computational Intelligence and Informatics (SACI), IEEE*. pp. 503–508.



- [41] Teo, C.P., Sethuraman, J., 1998. The geometry of fractional stable matchings and its applications. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 23, 874–891.
- [42] Woeginger, G.J., 2003. Banks winners in tournaments are difficult to recognize. *Social Choice and Welfare* 20, 523–528.