

Stable marriage and roommates problems with restricted edges: complexity and approximability

Ágnes Cseh^{1*} and David F. Manlove^{2**}

¹ Institute for Mathematics, TU Berlin, e-mail: cseh@math.tu-berlin.de

² School of Computing Science, University of Glasgow,
e-mail: David.Manlove@glasgow.ac.uk

Abstract. In the stable marriage and roommates problems, a set of agents is given, each of them having a strictly ordered preference list over some or all of the other agents. A matching is a set of disjoint pairs of mutually accepted agents. If any two agents mutually prefer each other to their partner, then they block the matching, otherwise, the matching is said to be stable. In this paper we investigate the complexity of finding a solution satisfying additional constraints on restricted pairs of agents. Restricted pairs can be either *forced* or *forbidden*. A stable solution must contain all of the forced pairs, while it must contain none of the forbidden pairs.

Dias et al. [5] gave a polynomial-time algorithm to decide whether such a solution exists in the presence of restricted edges. If the answer is no, one might look for a solution close to optimal. Since optimality in this context means that the matching is stable and satisfies all constraints on restricted pairs, there are two ways of relaxing the constraints by permitting a solution to: (1) be blocked by some pairs (as few as possible), or (2) violate some constraints on restricted pairs (again as few as possible).

Our main theorems prove that for the (bipartite) stable marriage problem, case (1) leads to NP-hardness and inapproximability results, whilst case (2) can be solved in polynomial time. For the non-bipartite stable roommates instances, case (2) yields an NP-hard but 2-approximable problem. In the case of NP-hard problems, we also discuss polynomially solvable special cases, arising from restrictions on the lengths of the preference lists, or upper bounds on the numbers of restricted pairs.

1 Introduction

In the classical *stable marriage problem* (SM) [9], a bipartite graph is given, where one color class symbolizes a set of men U and the other color class stands for a

* Supported by COST Action IC1205 on Computational Social Choice and by the Deutsche Telekom Stiftung. Part of this work was carried out whilst visiting the University of Glasgow.

** Supported by grant EP/K010042/1 from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council.

set of women W . Man u and woman w are connected by edge uw if they find one another mutually acceptable. Each participant provides a strictly ordered preference list of the acceptable agents of the opposite gender. An edge uw *blocks* matching M if it is not in M , but each of u and w is either unmatched or prefers the other to their partner. A *stable matching* is a matching not blocked by any edge. From the seminal paper of Gale and Shapley [9], we know that the existence of such a stable solution is guaranteed. Moreover, the solutions form a distributive lattice [18]. The two extreme points of this lattice are called the *man- and woman-optimal stable matchings* [9]. These assign each man/woman their best partner reachable in any stable matching. Another interesting and handy property of stable solutions is the so-called Rural Hospitals Theorem. Part of this theorem states that if an agent is unmatched in one stable matching, then all stable solutions leave him unmatched [10].

One of the most widely studied extensions of SM is the *stable roommates problem* (SR) [9,13], defined on general graphs instead of bipartite graphs. The notion of a blocking edge is as defined above (except that it can now involve any two agents in general), but several results do not carry over to this setting. For instance, the existence of a stable solution is not guaranteed any more. On the other hand, there is a linear-time algorithm to find a stable matching or report that none exists [13]. Moreover, the corresponding variant of the Rural Hospitals Theorem holds in the roommates case as well: the set of matched agents is the same for all stable solutions [11].

Both SM and SR are widely used in various applications. In markets where the goal is to maximize social welfare instead of profit, the notion of stability is especially suitable as an optimality criterion [20]. The oldest and most common area of applications is employer allocation markets [22]. On one side, job applicants are represented, while the job openings form the other side. Each application corresponds to an edge in the bipartite graph. The employers rank all applicants to a specific job offer and similarly, each applicant sets up a preference list of jobs. Given a proposed matching M of applicants to jobs, if an employer-applicant pair exists such that the position is not filled or a worse applicant is assigned to it, and the applicant received no contract or a worse contract, then this pair blocks M . In this case the employer and applicant find it mutually beneficial to enter into a contract outside of M , undermining its integrity. If no such blocking pair exists, then M is stable. Stability as an underlying concept is also used to allocate graduating medical students to hospitals in many countries [21].

Forced and forbidden edges in SM and SR open the way to formulate various special requirements on the sought solution. In certain market situations, a contract is for some reason particularly important, or to the contrary, not wished by the majority of the community or by the central authority in control. In such cases, forcing or forbidding the edge and then seeking a stable solution ensures that the wishes on these specific contracts are fulfilled while stability is guaranteed. Henceforth, the term *restricted edge* will be used to refer either to a forbidden edge or a forced edge. The remaining edges of the graph are referred as *unrestricted edges*.

Note that simply deleting forbidden edges or fixing forced edges and searching for a stable matching on the remaining instance does not solve the problem of finding a stable matching with restricted edges. The deleted edge or edges adjacent to the fixed edge can block that matching. Therefore, to meet both requirements on restricted edges and stability, more sophisticated methods are needed.

The attention of the community was drawn very early to the characterization of stable matchings that must contain a prescribed set of edges. In the seminal book of Knuth [18], forced edges first appeared under the term *arranged marriages*. Knuth presented an algorithm that finds a stable matching with a given set of forced edges or reports that none exists. This method runs in $O(n^2)$ time, where n denotes the number of vertices in the graph. Gusfield and Irving [11] provided an algorithm based on rotations that terminates in $O(|Q|^2)$ time, following $O(n^4)$ pre-processing time, where Q is the set of forced edges. This latter method is favoured over Knuth's if multiple forbidden sets of small cardinality are proposed.

Forbidden edges appeared only in 2003 in the literature, and were first studied by Dias et al. [5]. In their paper, complete bipartite graphs were considered, but the methods can easily be extended to incomplete preference lists. Their main result was the following (in the following theorem, and henceforth, m is the total number of edges in the graph).

Theorem 1 (Dias et al. [5]). *The problem of finding a stable matching in a SM instance with forced and forbidden edges or reporting that none exists is solvable in $O(m)$ time.*

While Knuth's method relies on basic combinatorial properties of stable matchings, the other two algorithms make use of *rotations*. We refer the reader to [11] for background on these. The problem of finding a stable matching with forced and forbidden edges can easily be formulated as a weighted stable matching problem (that is, we seek a stable matching with minimum weight, where the weight of a matching M is the sum of the weights of the edges in M). Let us assign all forced edges weight 1, all forbidden edges weight -1 , and all remaining edges weight 0. A stable matching satisfying all constraints on restricted edges exists if and only if there is a stable matching of weight $|Q|$ in the weighted instance. With the help of rotations, maximum weight stable matchings can be found in $O(\min(n, \sqrt{K})n^2 \log(K/n^2 + 2))$ time, where K is the weight of the optimal solution [6,7]. This bound can be simplified significantly in our case, because $K \leq n$. The runtime of the algorithm finding a maximum weight stable matching is therefore $O(n^{2.5})$.

Since finding a weight-maximal stable matching in SR instances is an NP-hard task [6], it follows that solving the problem with forced and forbidden edges requires methods different from the aforementioned weighted transformation. Fleiner et al. [8] showed that any SR instance with forbidden edges can be converted into another stable matching problem involving ties that can be solved in $O(m)$ time [15] and the transformation has the same time complexity as well, leading to the following result.

Theorem 2 (Fleiner et al. [8]). *The problem of finding a stable matching in an SR instance with forced and forbidden edges or reporting that none exists is solvable in $O(m)$ time.*

As we have seen so far, answering the question as to whether a stable solution containing all forced and avoiding all forbidden edges exists can be solved efficiently in the case of both SM and SR. We thus concentrate on cases where the answer to this question is no. What kind of approximate solutions exist then and how can we find them?

Our contribution. Since optimality is defined by two criteria, it is straightforward to define approximation from those two points of view. In Case (1), all constraints on restricted edges must be satisfied, and we seek a matching with the minimum number of blocking edges. In Case (2), we seek a stable matching that violates the fewest constraints on restricted edges. The optimization problems that arise from each of these cases are defined formally in Section 2.

In Section 3, we consider Case (1): that is, all constraints on restricted edges must be fulfilled, while the number of blocking edges is minimized. We show that in the SM case, this problem is computationally hard and not approximable within $n^{1-\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, unless $P = NP$. We also discuss special cases for which this problem becomes tractable. This occurs if the maximum degree of the graph is at most 2 or if the number of blocking edges in the optimal solution is a constant. We point out a striking difference in the complexity of the two cases with only forbidden and only forced edges: the problem is polynomially solvable if the number of forbidden edges is a constant, whereas, as opposed to this, it is NP-hard even if the instance contains a single forced edge. We also prove that when the restricted edges are either all forced or all forbidden, the optimization problem remains NP-hard even on very sparse instances, where the maximum degree of a vertex is 3.

Case (2), where the number of violated constraints on restricted edges is minimized while stability is preserved, is studied in Section 4. It is a rather straightforward observation that in SM, the setting can be modeled and efficiently solved with the help of edge weights. Here we show that on non-bipartite graphs, the problem becomes NP-hard, but 2-approximable. As in Case (1), we also discuss the complexity of degree-constrained restrictions and establish that the NP-hardness results remain intact even for graphs with degree at most 3, while the case with degree at most 2 is polynomially solvable.

For a structured overview of our results, see Table 1.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the notation used in the remainder of the paper and also define the key problems that we investigate later. A *Stable Marriage* instance (SM) $\mathcal{I} = (G, O)$ consists of a bipartite graph $G = (U \cup W, E)$ with n vertices and m edges, and a set O : the set of strictly ordered, but not necessarily

	stable marriage	stable roommates
min # blocking edges	NP-hard to approximate within $n^{1-\epsilon}$	NP-hard to approximate within $n^{1-\epsilon}$
min # violated restricted edge constraints	solvable in $O(n^{2.5})$ time	NP-hard 2-approximable

Table 1. Complexity table

complete preference lists. These lists are provided on the set of adjacent vertices at each vertex. The *Stable Roommates Problem* (SR) differs from SM in one sense: the underlying graph G need not be bipartite. In both SM and SR, a matching in G is sought, assigning each agent to at most one partner. An edge $uw \in E \setminus M$ *blocks* matching M if u is unmatched or it prefers w to its partner in M and w is unmatched or it prefers u to its partner in M . A matching that is not blocked by any edge is called *stable*.

As already mentioned in the introduction, an SR instance need not admit a stable solution. The number of blocking edges is a characteristic property of every matching. The set of edges blocking M is denoted by $bp(M)$. Usually, the goal is to find a matching minimizing $|bp(M)|$. For convenience, the minimum number of edges blocking any matching of an instance \mathcal{I} is denoted by $bp(\mathcal{I})$. Following the consensus in the literature, matchings blocked by $bp(\mathcal{I})$ edges are called *almost stable matchings*. This approach has a broad literature: so-called almost stable matchings (admitting the minimum number of blocking edges) have been investigated in SM [4,12,17] and SR instances [1,3].

The problems investigated in this paper always deal with at least one set of restricted edges. The set of forbidden edges is denoted by P , while Q stands for the set of forced edges. We assume throughout the paper that $P \cap Q = \emptyset$. A matching M satisfies all constraints on restricted edges if $M \cap P = \emptyset$ and $M \cap Q = Q$.

In Figure 1, a sample SM instance on four men and four women can be seen. The preference ordering is shown above or below the vertices. For instance, vertex u_2 ranks w_1 best, then w_2 , and w_4 last. The set of forbidden edges is marked by dotted gray edges and consists of two elements: $P = \{u_2w_2, u_3w_3\}$. The unique stable matching $M = \{u_1w_1, u_2w_2, u_3w_3, u_4w_4\}$ contains both forbidden edges. Later on, we will return to this sample instance to demonstrate approximation concepts on it.

The first approximation concept (Case (1) described in Section 1) is to seek a matching M that satisfies all restricted edges constraints, but amongst these matchings, it admits the minimum number of blocking edges. This leads to the following problem definition.

Problem 1 MIN BP SM RESTRICTED

Input: $\mathcal{I} = (G, O, P, Q)$; an SM instance on a complete bipartite graph, a set of forbidden edges P and a set of forced edges Q .




Fig. 1. A sample stable marriage instance with forbidden edges

Output: A matching M such that $M \cap P = \emptyset$, $Q \subseteq M$ and $|bp(M)| \leq |bp(M')|$ for every matching M' in G .

Special attention is given to two special cases of MIN BP SM RESTRICTED: in MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN, $Q = \emptyset$, while in MIN BP SM FORCED, $P = \emptyset$. Note that an instance of MIN BP SM FORCED or MIN BP SM RESTRICTED can always be transformed into an instance of MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN by forbidding all edges that are adjacent to a forced edge. This transformation does not affect the number of blocking edges.

According to the other intuitive approximation concept (Case (2) described in Section 1), stability constraints need to be fulfilled, while some of the constraints on restricted edges are relaxed. The goal is to find a stable matching that violates as few constraints on restricted edges as possible.

Problem 2 SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS

Input: $\mathcal{I} = (G, O, P, Q)$; an SR instance, a set of forbidden edges P and a set of forced edges Q .

Output: A stable matching M such that $|M \cap P| + |Q \setminus M| \leq |M' \cap P| + |Q \setminus M'|$ for every stable matching M' in G .

If $Q = \emptyset$, SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS is referred as SR MIN FORBIDDEN, while if $P = \emptyset$, the problem becomes SR MAX FORCED. If one or another type of restrictions is more important in an instance with both forced and forbidden edges, then we work with either of the following problems. In SR FORCED MIN FORBIDDEN, a stable matching M is sought such that M contains all forced edges, while the number of forbidden edges in M is minimized. Analogously, in SR FORBIDDEN MAX FORCED, the stable matching M (should it exist) avoids all forbidden edges, while the number of forced edges in M is maximized.

Just as in the previous approximation concept (referred to as Case (1) in Section 1), we separated the two subcases with forbidden and forced edges. In Case (1), the subcase with only forced edges could be transformed into the other subcase, simply by forbidding edges adjacent to forced edges. This straightforward transformation is not valid for Case (2). Suppose a forced edge was replaced

by an unrestricted edge, but all of its adjacent edges were forbidden. A solution that does not contain the original forbidden edge might contain two of the forbidden edges, violating more constraints than the original solution. Yet most of our proofs are presented for the problem with only forbidden edges, and they require only slight modifications for the case with forced edges. Another difference to Case (1) is that MIN BP SM RESTRICTED was defined on SM instances, while here in Case (2), we define SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS on SR instances. The reason being, for the SM case, weighted stable matchings immediately deliver an optimal solution, while in the SR case, several complexity results can be exploited.

In all discussed problems, n is the number of vertices and m is the number of edges in the graph underlying the particular problem instance. All missing proofs can be found in the Appendix.

3 Almost stable matchings with restricted edges

In this section, constraints on restricted edges must be fulfilled, while the number of blocking edges is minimized. Our results are presented in three subsections. Firstly, in Section 3.1, basic complexity results are discussed. In particular, we prove that the studied problem MIN BP SM RESTRICTED is in general NP-hard. Thus, restricted cases are analyzed in Section 3.2, where we assume that the number of forbidden, forced or blocking edges can be considered as a constant. Due to this assumption, two of the three problems that naturally follow from imposing these restrictions become tractable, but surprisingly, not all of them. Then, degree-constrained cases are discussed in Section 3.3. We show that the NP-hardness result for MIN BP SM RESTRICTED holds even for instances where each preference list is of length at most 3, while on graphs with maximum degree 2, the problems become tractable. Finally, in Section 3.4 we mention the problem MIN BP SR RESTRICTED and briefly elaborate on how results established for the bipartite case carry over to the SR case.

3.1 General complexity results

When minimizing the number of blocking edges, one might think that removing the forbidden edges temporarily and then searching for a stable solution in the remaining instance leads to an optimal solution. Such a matching can only be blocked by forbidden edges, but as the upcoming example demonstrates, optimal solutions are sometimes blocked by unrestricted edges exclusively. In some instances, all almost stable solutions admit only non-forbidden blocking edges. Moreover, a man- or woman-optimal almost stable matching with forbidden edges does not always exist.

Let us recall the SM instance in Figure 1. In the graph with edge set $E(G) \setminus P$, a unique stable matching exists: $M = \{u_1w_1, u_4w_4\}$. Matching M is blocked by both forbidden edges in the original instance. On the other hand, matching $M_1 = \{u_1w_1, u_2w_4, u_4w_3\}$ is blocked by exactly one edge: $bp(M_1) = u_4w_4$. Similarly,

matching $M_2 = \{u_1w_3, u_2w_1, u_4w_4\}$ is blocked only by u_1w_1 . Therefore, M_1 and M_2 are both almost stable matchings and $bp(\mathcal{I}) = 1$.

One can easily check that M_1 and M_2 are the only matchings with the minimum number of blocking edges. They both are blocked only by unrestricted edges. Moreover, M_1 is better for u_1, w_1 and w_3 , whereas M_2 is preferred by u_2, u_4 and w_4 .

We now present two results demonstrating the NP-hardness and inapproximability of special cases of MIN BP SM RESTRICTED.

Theorem 3. MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SM FORCED are NP-hard.

Theorem 4. Unless $P = NP$, MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SM FORCED are not approximable within a factor of $n^{1-\varepsilon}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

3.2 Parameterized complexity

Our results presented so far show that MIN BP SM RESTRICTED is computationally hard even if $P = \emptyset$ or $Q = \emptyset$. Yet if certain parameters of the instance or the solution can be considered as a constant, the problem can be solved efficiently. In Theorem 5 and Theorem 7 we give two FPT algorithms to solve MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN.

Theorem 5. MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN is solvable in polynomial time if $|P| = L$ is a constant.

In sharp contrast to the previous result on polynomial solvability when the number of forbidden edges is small, we state the following theorem for the MIN BP SM FORCED problem.

Theorem 6. MIN BP SM FORCED is NP-hard even if $|Q| = 1$.

On the other hand, a counterpart to Theorem 5 holds in the case of MIN BP SM RESTRICTED if the number of blocking pairs in an optimal solution is a constant.

Theorem 7. MIN BP SM RESTRICTED is solvable in polynomial time if the minimal number of edges blocking an optimal solution is a constant L .

3.3 Degree-constrained cases

For most hard SM and SR problems, the most common special case to investigate is the case of degree-constrained graphs. Here, we show that MIN BP SM RESTRICTED remains computationally hard even for instances with preference lists of length at most 3. On the other hand, the problem can be solved by identifying forbidden subgraphs when the length of preference lists is bounded by 2.

Theorem 8. MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SM FORCED are NP-hard even if each agent's preference lists consists of at most 3 elements.

Theorem 9. *MIN BP SM RESTRICTED is solvable in time $O(n)$ if each preference list consists of at most 2 elements.*

Even with the previous two theorems, we have not quite drawn the line between tractable and hard cases in terms of vertex degrees. The complexity of MIN BP SM RESTRICTED remains open for the case when preference lists are of length at most 2 on one side of the bipartite graph and they are of unbounded length on the other side. However we believe that this problem is solvable in polynomial time.

Conjecture 1 *MIN BP SM RESTRICTED is solvable in polynomial time if each woman's preference list consists of at most 2 elements.*

3.4 Stable roommates problem

Having discussed several cases of SM, we turn our attention toward non-bipartite instances. Since SM is a subclass of SR, all established results on NP-hardness and inapproximability carry over to the non-bipartite SR case. As a matter of fact, more is true. First of all, a stable solution does not necessarily exist. It can be decided in polynomial time whether a given instance admits a stable matching [13]. If not, finding a matching with the minimum number of blocking edges is NP-hard and not approximable within $n^{(1/2-\varepsilon)}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, unless $P = NP$ [1]. Therefore, in general, the following complexity results hold:

Remark 1. MIN BP SR FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SR FORCED are NP-hard and not approximable within $n^{(1-\varepsilon)}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, unless $P = NP$. Theorems 6 and 8 imply that MIN BP SR FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SR FORCED are NP-hard even if all preference lists are of length at most 3 or, in the latter case, $|Q| = 1$.

Theorem 2 establishes that there is a polynomial-time algorithm to find a stable matching satisfying all the constraints on restrict edges, or to report that none exists. If such a solution does not exist, producing an almost stable matching respecting all constraints on restricted edges is at least as hard as in the bipartite case. As for the polynomially solvable cases, the proofs of Theorems 5, 7 and 9 carry over without applying any modifications.

Remark 2. MIN BP SR FORBIDDEN is solvable in polynomial time if $|P|$ is a constant. MIN BP SR RESTRICTED is solvable in polynomial time if the minimal number of edges blocking an optimal solution is a constant.

4 Stable matchings with the minimum number of violated constraints on restricted edges

In this section, we study the second intuitive approximation concept. The sought matching is stable and violates as few constraints on restricted edges as possible. We return to our example that already appeared in Figure 1. As already mentioned earlier, the instance admits a single stable matching, namely

$M = \{u_1w_1, u_2w_2, u_3w_3, u_4w_4\}$. Since M contains both forbidden edges, the minimum number of violated constraints on restricted edges is 2.

As mentioned in Section 1, a weighted stable matching instance models SM MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS. Similar weight functions can be used to prove the tractability of two other SM problems.

Theorem 10. *Each of SM MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS, SM FORBIDDEN MAX FORCED and SM FORCED MIN FORBIDDEN is solvable in $O(n^{2.5})$ time.*

Regarding the SR context, finding a minimum weight stable matching is NP-hard [6], so the above technique for SM does not carry over to SR. Indeed special cases of SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS are NP-hard, as the following result shows.

Theorem 11. *SR MIN FORBIDDEN and SR MAX FORCED are NP-hard.*

In our proof, we reduce the Minimum Vertex Cover problem to these two problems. Minimum Vertex Cover is NP-hard and cannot be approximated within a factor of $2 - \varepsilon$ for any positive ε , unless the Unique Games Conjecture is false [16]. The reduction also answers basic questions about the approximability of these problems. Since any vertex cover on K vertices can be interpreted as a stable matching containing K forbidden edges in SR MIN FORBIDDEN and vice versa, the $(2 - \varepsilon)$ -inapproximability result carries over. The same holds for the number of violated forced edge constraints in SR MAX FORCED. On the positive side, we can close the gap with the best possible approximation ratio.

Theorem 12. *SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS is 2-approximable in $O(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. The NP-hard minimum weight SR problem is 2-approximable in $O(n^2)$ time [6]. A simple computation shows that the weight of the a stable matching M is $|Q \setminus M| + |P \cap M|$, if the following weight function is defined on the edges:

$$w(e) = \begin{cases} \frac{|Q|}{|M|} - 1 & \text{if } e \text{ is forced,} \\ \frac{|Q|}{|M|} & \text{if } e \text{ is unrestricted,} \\ \frac{|Q|}{|M|} + 1 & \text{if } e \text{ is forbidden.} \end{cases}$$

□

When studying SR MAX FORCED, we measured optimality by keeping track of the number of violated constraints. One might find it more intuitive instead to maximize $|Q \cap M|$, the number of forced edges in the stable matching. Our NP-hardness proof for SR MAX FORCED remains intact, but the approximability results need to be revisited. In fact, this modification of the measure changes the approximability of the problem as well:

Theorem 13. *For SR MAX FORCED, $|Q \cap M_{opt}|$ cannot be approximated within $n^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, unless $P = NP$.*

For SR FORCED MIN FORBIDDEN and SR FORBIDDEN MAX FORCED, it can be tested in polynomial time whether any matching is a solution, containing all forced edges, or avoiding all forbidden edges, respectively. If it is the case, the complexity result in Theorem 11 implies that SR FORCED MIN FORBIDDEN and SR FORBIDDEN MAX FORCED are both NP-hard problems. An analogous approximability result to that presented in Theorem 12 holds for each problem.

Theorem 14. *Each of SR FORCED MIN FORBIDDEN and SR FORBIDDEN MAX FORCED is 2-approximable in $O(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. In both problems, the approximation ratio can be proved by defining edge weight on a slightly modified graph. For SR FORCED MIN FORBIDDEN, the goal is to create an instance where stable matchings containing all forced edges have weight $|P \cap M|$. We also have to guarantee that stable matchings approximating the minimum weight solution within a factor of 2 contain all forced edges. Firstly, two new vertices connected by an edge of a large weight C are added to the underlying instance. They build a separate component, therefore, the edge is part of all stable matchings. On the edges of the original instance, the following weight function is defined:

$$w(e) = \begin{cases} -\frac{C}{|Q|} & \text{if } e \text{ is forced,} \\ 0 & \text{if } e \text{ is unrestricted,} \\ 1 & \text{if } e \text{ is forbidden.} \end{cases}$$

If there is a stable matching M such that $Q \cap M = Q$, then $w(M) = -\frac{C}{|Q|}|Q| + C + |P \cap M| = |P \cap M|$. On the other hand, any stable matching M' avoiding at least one forced edge, has a much bigger weight: $w(M') \geq -\frac{C}{|Q|}(|Q| - 1) + C + |P \cap M'| = \frac{C}{|Q|} + |P \cap M'|$. If C is big enough (e.g. $C = 2m^2 + 1$), then this sum is larger than $2|P \cap M|$, therefore, the 2-approximate solution found by the approximation algorithm for the minimum weight stable matching problem [6] outputs a stable matching containing all forced edges and at most $2|P \cap M|$ forbidden edges.

In the case of SR FORBIDDEN MAX FORCED, a combination of the weight functions already used in earlier proofs serves as a tool. Define the following weight function on the edges of the original graph:

$$w(e) = \begin{cases} \frac{|Q|}{|M|} - 1 & \text{if } e \text{ is forced,} \\ \frac{|Q|}{|M|} & \text{if } e \text{ is unrestricted,} \\ 2m & \text{if } e \text{ is forbidden.} \end{cases}$$

If there is a stable matching M with $P \cap M = \emptyset$, then the weight of the optimal solution of SR FORBIDDEN MAX FORCED is $|Q \cap M|(\frac{|Q|}{|M|} - 1) + |M \setminus Q| \cdot \frac{|Q|}{|M|} = |Q \setminus M|$. A 2-approximate solution M' is of weight at most $2|Q \setminus M| < 2m$. Therefore, M' does not contain any forbidden edges. \square

We now turn to the complexity of SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS and its variants when the degree of the underlying graph is bounded.

Theorem 15. SR MIN FORBIDDEN and SR MAX FORCED are NP-hard even if every preference list is of length at most 3.

Theorem 16. SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS is solvable in $O(n)$ time if every preference list is of length at most 2.

Proof. Since the set of matched vertices is the same in all stable matchings, finding a stable matching in $O(n)$ time in these very strongly restricted instances marks all vertices that need to be matched. In each component, there are at most two possible matchings satisfying these constraints. We choose the one that is stable and violates fewer constraints. \square

Theorem 17. SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS is solvable in polynomial time if the number of restricted edges or the minimal number of violated constraints is constant.

Proof. Suppose that the number of restricted edges is L . No stable matching can violate more than L constraints on restricted edges, therefore, it is sufficient to investigate the case when the target number of violated constraints in the sought solution satisfies $K \leq L$. Choose a set of restricted edges of cardinality K , where $K \leq L$. For all edges in this set, reverse the restriction: let forced edges become forbidden and forbidden edges become forced. With the modified set of restricted edges, stable matchings violate exactly K constraints on restricted edges. Checking all edge sets of cardinality at most K takes $O(m^K) = O(m^L)$ iterations. \square

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigated the stable marriage and the stable roommates problems on graphs with forced and forbidden edges. Since a solution satisfying all constraints need not exist, two relaxed problems were defined. In MIN BP SM RESTRICTED, constraints on restricted edges are strict, while a matching with the minimum number of blocking edges is searched for. On the other hand, in SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS, we seek stable solutions that violate as few constraints on restricted edges as possible. For both problems, we determined the complexity and studied several special cases.

The most striking open question is formulated as Conjecture 1: the complexity of MIN BP SM RESTRICTED is not known if each woman's preference list consists of at most 2 elements. A more general direction of further research involves the SM MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS problem. We have shown that it can be solved in $O(n^{2.5})$ time, due to the fastest known algorithm for maximum weight stable marriage. The following question arises naturally: is there a faster method for SM MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS that avoids reliance on Feder's algorithm?

References

1. D.J. Abraham, P. Biró, and D.F. Manlove. “Almost stable” matchings in the Roommates problem. In *Proceedings of WAOA '05: the 3rd Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms*, volume 3879 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–14. Springer, 2006.
2. P. Berman, M. Karpinski, and Alexander D. Scott. Approximation hardness of short symmetric instances of MAX-3SAT. Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity Report, number 49, 2003.
3. P. Biró, D.F. Manlove, and E.J. McDerimid. “Almost stable” matchings in the Roommates problem with bounded preference lists. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 432:10–20, 2012.
4. P. Biró, D.F. Manlove, and S. Mittal. Size versus stability in the marriage problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 411:1828–1841, 2010.
5. V.M.F. Dias, G.D. da Fonseca, C.M.H. de Figueiredo, and J.L. Szwarcfiter. The stable marriage problem with restricted pairs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 306(1-3):391–405, 2003.
6. T. Feder. A new fixed point approach for stable networks and stable marriages. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 45:233–284, 1992.
7. T. Feder. Network flow and 2-satisfiability. *Algorithmica*, 11(3):291–319, 1994.
8. T. Fleiner, R.W. Irving, and D.F. Manlove. Efficient algorithms for generalised stable marriage and roommates problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 381(1-3):162–176, 2007.
9. D. Gale and L.S. Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 69:9–15, 1962.
10. D. Gale and M. Sotomayor. Some remarks on the stable matching problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 11:223–232, 1985.
11. D. Gusfield and R.W. Irving. *The Stable Marriage Problem: Structure and Algorithms*. MIT Press, 1989.
12. K. Hamada, K. Iwama, and S. Miyazaki. An improved approximation lower bound for finding almost stable stable maximum matchings. *Information Processing Letters*, 109(18):1036–1040, 2009.
13. R.W. Irving. An efficient algorithm for the “stable roommates” problem. *Journal of Algorithms*, 6:577–595, 1985.
14. R.W. Irving, P. Leather, and D. Gusfield. An efficient algorithm for the “optimal” stable marriage. *Journal of the ACM*, 34(3):532–543, 1987.
15. R.W. Irving and D.F. Manlove. The Stable Roommates Problem with Ties. *Journal of Algorithms*, 43:85–105, 2002.
16. S. Khot and O. Regev. Vertex cover might be hard to approximate to within $2 - \epsilon$. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 74(3):335–349, 2008.
17. S. Khuller, S.G. Mitchell, and V.V. Vazirani. On-line algorithms for weighted bipartite matching and stable marriages. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 127:255–267, 1994.
18. D.E. Knuth. *Mariages Stables*. Les Presses de L’Université de Montréal, 1976. English translation in *Stable Marriage and its Relation to Other Combinatorial Problems*, volume 10 of CRM Proceedings and Lecture Notes, American Mathematical Society, 1997.
19. G. O’Malley. *Algorithmic Aspects of Stable Matching Problems*. PhD thesis, University of Glasgow, Department of Computing Science, 2007.

20. A.E. Roth. The evolution of the labor market for medical interns and residents: a case study in game theory. *Journal of Political Economy*, 92(6):991–1016, 1984.
21. A.E. Roth. Deferred acceptance algorithms: history, theory, practice, and open questions. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 36(3-4):537–569, 2008.
22. A.E. Roth and M. Sotomayor. *Two-Sided Matching: a Study in Game-Theoretic Modeling and Analysis*, volume 18 of *Econometric Society Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
23. D. Zuckerman. Linear degree extractors and the inapproximability of max clique and chromatic number. *Theory of Computing*, 3(6):103–128, 2007.

Appendix

Proof of Theorem 3

The NP-hard problem we reduce to MIN BP SM RESTRICTED is the following:

Problem 3 *perfect matching with incomplete preference lists*, MIN BP PSMI

Input: $\mathcal{I} = (G, O)$; an SM instance on an incomplete bipartite graph.

Output: A perfect matching M such that $|bp(M)| \leq |bp(M')|$ for every perfect matching M' .

MIN BP PSMI is NP-hard and unless $P = NP$, it is not approximable within a factor of $n^{1-\varepsilon}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ [4].

Theorem 3. MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SM FORCED are NP-hard.

Proof. We firstly show NP-hardness of MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN and then indicate how to adapt the proof to show a similar result for MIN BP SM FORCED. We reduce from MIN BP PSMI as mentioned above. Given an instance $\mathcal{I} = (G, O, K)$ of this problem we define the following instance $\mathcal{I}' = (G', O', P, K)$ of MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN. The vertices of graph G : $u_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ and $w_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ form a subset of $V(G')$. In addition, $K + 1$ new vertices representing women are introduced. They are denoted by q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{K+1} . Similarly, $K + 1$ new men are added to $V(G)$, denoted by p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{K+1} . Thus, each color class of G' consists of $n + K + 1$ vertices. Edges form a complete bipartite graph on them. The edges added to a sample edge $u_i w_i$ can be seen in Figure 2.




Fig. 2. The transformation from MIN BP PSMI to MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN

The preference lists of vertices already in $V(G)$ are structured in three blocks. Each man u_i of the original instance \mathcal{I} keeps his preference list in O at the top of

his new list in O' . After these vertices in W , the entire set of newly-introduced q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{K+1} women follows, in arbitrary order. Finally, the rest of the women are listed. The ordering within this last block is also arbitrary. A similar ordering is used when defining the preference list of each w_j . The original list in O is followed by the vertices p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{K+1} added to G , then the rest of the men follow.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
u_i: w \text{ listed in } O & q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{K+1} \text{ rest} \\
w_j: u \text{ listed in } O & p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{K+1} \text{ rest} \\
p_k : w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n & q_k \text{ rest} \\
q_k : u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n & p_k \text{ rest}
\end{array}$$

The added vertices have different preference orderings. Man p_k 's list consists of the set of w_j vertices from $V(G)$, followed by p_k , and then the rest of the women in G' , both in arbitrary order. On the other hand, q_k ranks all $u_i \in V(G)$ first, followed by q_k , and then the rest of the men in arbitrary order.

Having described G' and O' completely, all that remains is to specify the set of forbidden edges P . Each man u_i has $K + 1$ forbidden edges adjacent to him, namely, all edges to the newly-introduced q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{K+1} vertices. Similarly, edges between every w_j and all p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{K+1} vertices are also forbidden. In total, \mathcal{I}' has $2n(K + 1)$ forbidden edges.

Claim. If M is a perfect matching in \mathcal{I} admitting at most K blocking edges, then there is a matching M' in \mathcal{I}' with $M' \cap P = \emptyset$ admitting also at most K blocking edges.

The construction of M' begins with copying M to G' . Since M is a perfect matching, all vertices in $V(G)$ are matched to vertices in $V(G)$ and thus, no forbidden edge can be in M' . The remaining vertices q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{K+1} and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{K+1} are paired to each other: each $q_j p_j$ is added to M' .

M' is a perfect matching in G' , not containing any of the forbidden edges. Next, we show that no edge in $E(G') \setminus M'$ blocks M' that did not block M already. First of all, the forbidden edges do not block M' , because the preference lists of the vertices already in $V(G)$ were constructed in such a way that the vertices on preference lists in O are better than the added vertices and all u_i, w_j vertices were matched in the perfect matching M . The first n choices of any newly-added vertex are thus not blocking edges. At the same time, all these new vertices are matched to their first-choice partners amongst the newly-added vertices. Therefore no edge incident to them can block M' . All that remains is to observe that $u_i w_j$ edges blocking M' in \mathcal{I}' already blocked M in \mathcal{I} , because M is the restriction of M' to G . Therefore, the edges blocking M and M' are identical.

Claim. If M' is a matching in \mathcal{I}' with $M' \cap P = \emptyset$ admitting at most K blocking edges, then its restriction to G is a perfect matching M in \mathcal{I} admitting at most K blocking edges.

First, we discuss some essential structural properties of M' . The forbidden edges are not in M' , and at most K of them block it. Suppose that there is a man u_i not married to any woman w_j in graph G . Since w_j ranks exactly $K + 1$ forbidden edges after its listed partners in G , and forbidden edges are the first n choices of their other end vertex, all $K + 1$ of them block M' , regardless of the remaining edges in M' . Having derived a contradiction in our assumption that at most K edges block M' in total, we can state that each man u_i is matched to an vertex w_j in M' . Thus, the restriction of M' to G is a perfect matching with at most K blocking edges.

NP-hardness can be obtained for MIN BP SM FORCED by simply forcing all edges of the form $p_k q_k$ in the above reduction. \square

Proof of Theorem 4

The NP-complete problem we make use of in this proof is EXACT MAXIMAL MATCHING.

Problem 4 EXACT MAXIMAL MATCHING

Input: $\mathcal{I} = (G, K)$; a matching instance on a bipartite graph and an integer K .

Question: Is there a maximal matching M such that $|M| = K$?

EXACT MAXIMAL MATCHING is NP-complete even for graphs where all vertices representing men have degree two, while all vertices of the other color class have degree three [19]. We show that if there was a polynomial approximation algorithm within a factor of $n^{1-\varepsilon}$ to MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN, then it would also find an exact maximal matching in \mathcal{I} .

Theorem 4. *Unless $P = NP$, MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SM FORCED are not approximable within a factor of $n^{1-\varepsilon}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. In our proof, every instance \mathcal{I} of EXACT MAXIMAL MATCHING is transformed into an instance \mathcal{I}'' of MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN. Let n_1 and n_2 denote the size of each color class in \mathcal{I} , such that $m = 2n_1 = 3n_2$. We show that if there was a polynomial approximation algorithm within a factor of $n^{1-\varepsilon}$ to MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN, then it would also find an exact maximal matching in \mathcal{I} . To do so, another transformation is used, involving \mathcal{I}' , an instance of perfect matching with incomplete preference lists. In [4], an instance \mathcal{I}' of MIN BP PSMI is created to each \mathcal{I} of EXACT MAXIMAL MATCHING with special properties. One of them is that if G in \mathcal{I} has a maximal matching of cardinality K , then \mathcal{I}' has a perfect matching admitting exactly $n_1 + n_2$ blocking edges, where $n_1 + n_2$ is the number of vertices in \mathcal{I} . Otherwise, if G has no maximal matching of cardinality K , then any perfect matching in \mathcal{I}' is blocked by at least $n_1 + n_2 + C$ edges, where C is a huge number. To be more precise, let $B = \lceil \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \rceil$ and $C = (n_1 + n_2)^{B+1} + 1$. The number of vertices in each color class of \mathcal{I}' is $3n_1 + 2mC + 4n_2 - K$.

Now we describe how \mathcal{I}' is transformed into \mathcal{I}'' . Note that this method is very similar to the one we used in the proof of Theorem 3. First, C new men: p_i , $1 \leq i \leq C$ and C new women: q_i , $1 \leq i \leq C$ are introduced. Therefore, each

color class consists of $3n_1 + 2mC + 4n_2 - K + C$ vertices. The preference lists can be sketched in the following way:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
u \text{ in } \mathcal{I}': w \text{ listed in } O \text{ in } \mathcal{I}' & q_1, q_2, \dots, q_C \text{ all remaining women in } \mathcal{I}' \\
w \text{ in } \mathcal{I}': u \text{ listed in } O \text{ in } \mathcal{I}' & p_1, p_2, \dots, p_C \text{ all remaining men in } \mathcal{I}' \\
p_i: \text{ all women in } \mathcal{I}' & q_i \quad q_1, q_2, \dots, q_C \\
q_i: \text{ all men in } \mathcal{I}' & p_i \quad p_1, p_2, \dots, p_C
\end{array}$$

The set of forbidden edges comprises all edges of the form pw or uq . For MIN BP SM FORCED, the set of forced edges consists of all edges of the form p_iq_i . Due to this construction, if M is a matching in \mathcal{I}'' in which there is a man u_i not matched to a women he is adjacent to in \mathcal{I}' , then M is blocked by at least C edges.

We will show that if N is the number of vertices in \mathcal{I}'' , then $N^{1-\varepsilon} < C$. Therefore, any $N^{1-\varepsilon}$ -approximation of MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN guarantees a matching in \mathcal{I} admitting less than C blocking edges. This latter induces a perfect matching in \mathcal{I}' , which corresponds to a solution of EXACT MAXIMAL MATCHING.

With Inequalities 1-7 we give an upper bound for N , while with Inequalities 8-12 we establish a lower bound. Then, combining these two in Inequalities 13-16, we derive that $N^{1-\varepsilon} < C$. Explanations for the steps are given as necessary after each of the three sets of inequalities.

$$N = 2(3n_1 + 2mC + 4n_2 - K + C) \tag{1}$$

$$= 6n_1 + 8n_1C + 8n_2 - 2K + 2C \tag{2}$$

$$\leq 6n_1 + 8n_1((n_1 + n_2)^{B+1} + 1) + 8n_2 - 2K + 2(n_1 + n_2)^{B+1} + 2 \tag{3}$$

$$= 14n_1 + (n_1 + n_2)^{B+1}(8n_1 + 2) + 8n_2 + 2 \tag{4}$$

$$\leq 14n_1 + 14n_2 + (n_1 + n_2)^{B+1}(14n_1 + 14n_2) \tag{5}$$

$$\leq 14[(n_1 + n_2)^{B+1}(n_1 + n_2) + (n_1 + n_2)^{B+1}(n_1 + n_2)] \tag{6}$$

$$= 28(n_1 + n_2)^{B+2} \tag{7}$$

1: N is the number of vertices in \mathcal{I}''

2: $m = 2n_1$

3: $C = (n_1 + n_2)^{B+1} + 1$ by definition

4: omit $-2K$

5: $n_2 \geq 1$, increase all coefficients to the highest coefficient 14

6: multiply $14n_1 + 14n_2$ by $(n_1 + n_2)^{B+1}$

$$N = 6n_1 + 8n_1C + 9n_2 - 2K + 2C \tag{8}$$

$$> C \tag{9}$$

$$> (n_1 + n_2)^{B+1} \tag{10}$$

$$> n_1^B \tag{11}$$

$$\geq 28^B \tag{12}$$

- 8: N is the number of vertices in \mathcal{I}'
- 9: keep only C from the sum
- 10: $C = (n_1 + n_2)^{B+1} + 1$ by definition
- 11: keep only n_1^B from the sum coefficient 14
- 12: without loss of generality, we can assume that $n_1 > 28$

$$C > (n_1 + n_2)^B \tag{13}$$

$$\geq 28^{-\frac{B}{B+2}} N^{\frac{B}{B+2}} \tag{14}$$

$$\geq N^{1-\frac{3}{B+2}} \tag{15}$$

$$\geq N^{1-\varepsilon} \tag{16}$$

- 13: $C = (n_1 + n_2)^{B+1} + 1$ by definition
- 14: 1-7
- 15: 8-12
- 16: $B = \lceil \frac{3}{\varepsilon} \rceil$ by definition □

Proof of Theorem 5

Here we work with the decision version of MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN.

Problem 5 MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN-D

Input: $\mathcal{I} = (G, O, P, K)$; an SM instance on a complete bipartite graph, a set of forbidden edges P and an integer K .

Output: A matching M such that $M \cap P = \emptyset$ and $|bp(M)| \leq K$.

Theorem 5. MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN is solvable in polynomial time if $|P| = L$ is a constant.

Proof. Our first observation is that the problem is trivially solvable if the target value K satisfies $K \geq L$. In this case, deleting the L forbidden edges from $E(G)$ and finding a stable matching in the remaining graph delivers a matching that is blocked in the original instance by only a subset of the removed edges. Thus, a matching M with $M \cap P = \emptyset$ and $|bp(M)| \leq K$ always exists.

Otherwise, we assume that $K < L$. Suppose firstly that there is a matching M with $M \cap P = \emptyset$ and $|bp(M)| = k \leq K < L$. If those k blocking edges are deleted from $E(G)$, then there is a stable matching M' in the remainder of G that contains none of the forbidden edges. Note that we did not specify which edges block M : they can be both forbidden and unrestricted. Due to Theorem 1, deciding whether a stable matching with no forbidden edges exists is polynomially solvable. The last task is to check each possible set of blocking edges. Every edge set of size at most K is such a potential blocking set. During the execution of our algorithm, we try out all of these sets one by one. After such an edge set is deleted from G , a stable matching that avoids all of the remaining forbidden edges is searched for. If such a matching exists, then it admits at most

K blocking edges. It is sufficient to try out $\sum_{i=0}^K \binom{m}{i}$ sets of edges. In other words, $\sum_{i=0}^K \binom{m}{i} \leq \sum_{i=0}^L \binom{m}{i}$ subsets are generated to decide whether there is a matching that does not contain any of the L forbidden edges and admits at most K blocking edges. The number of rounds is thus at most $O(m^L)$, while each round takes $O(n^2)$ time to complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 6

Theorem 6. MIN BP SM FORCED is NP-hard even if $|Q| = 1$.

Proof. The NP-complete problem we reduce to MIN BP SM FORCED is EXACT MAXIMAL MATCHING on subdivision graphs of cubic graphs. In the EXACT MAXIMAL MATCHING instance \mathcal{I} , a subdivision graph $G = (U_0 \cup W_0, E)$ of a cubic graph and an integer K is given. In this proof, we construct a MIN BP SM FORCED instance \mathcal{I}' with a single forced edge in such a way that there is a maximal matching of cardinality K in \mathcal{I} if and only if there is a matching containing the forced edge and admitting exactly $|U_0| + |W_0|$ blocking edges in \mathcal{I}' . Our construction is based on ideas presented in [4].

First of all, we describe \mathcal{I}' . Since \mathcal{I} is defined on a subdivision graph of a cubic graph, G is a bipartite graph with color classes U_0 and W_0 . Without loss of generality we can assume that all vertices in U_0 are of degree two, whereas all vertices in W_0 have degree three. All vertices label their edges in an arbitrary but fixed order. We will refer to these labels when constructing \mathcal{I}' .

The vertex set of graph G' in \mathcal{I}' can be partitioned into seven sets: U, V, W, Z, S, X and Y . Specific subgraphs of G' are referred as u -gadgets, w -gadgets, a special gadget containing the forced edge. Aside from these, G' also contains some extra vertices, the so-called *garbage collectors*, partitioned into two sets: X and Y . Later we will see that these garbage collectors are paired to the vertices not covered by the matching in G . Therefore, $|X| = |W_0| - K$ and $|Y| = |U_0| - K$.




Fig. 3. A u -gadget, a w -gadget and the special gadget

Each u -gadget replaces a vertex $u \in U_0$ in G . It is defined on five vertices: $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in U$ and $z_1, z_2 \in Z$. Its edges and the preferences on them are shown in Figure 5. Two *interconnecting edges* connect the special gadget to u_3 . They are ranked as the last two edges by u_3 . It is described later which vertices of the special gadget are incident to these edges of u_3 . The u -gadget also has edges to all w -gadgets representing vertices in W_0 to which u was adjacent. After describing the w -gadget, we elaborate on the position of these edges, referred as *relevant edges*. Aside from these, every u_1 has edges to all garbage collectors in Y . These edges are all worse than the relevant edges of u_1 and they are ranked arbitrarily at the bottom of u_1 's list. The vertices in Y also rank all u_1 vertices arbitrarily.

The structure of w -gadgets is similar. A gadget consists of seven vertices: $w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4 \in W$ and $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in V$. Aside from the edges in the gadget, it has two interconnecting edges between w_4 and the special gadget (described in details later), and three relevant edges between w_1, w_2, w_3 and vertices in U of u -gadgets. These are the edges drawn in accordance with the edge labels. Suppose edge uw was ranked i th by u and j th by w , where $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then, u_i in the u -gadget is connected to w_j in the w -gadget. Therefore, each edge in \mathcal{I} is transformed into a single edge in \mathcal{I}' and each $u_i, i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $w_j, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, has exactly one relevant edge. All of these edges are second choices of both of their end vertices. In addition to these, if a u - and a w -gadget, for which $uw \in E(G)$ are not already connected by u_1w_1 , we add u_1w_1 , which is referred as an *adjacency edge*. This edge is ranked by both u_1 and w_1 after their relevant edges, but before their edges to garbage collectors. Similarly to u -gadgets, w -gadgets are also connected to garbage collectors. Each w_1 vertex has $|W_0| - K$ edges to the vertices in X , ranked arbitrarily at the bottom of w_1 's preference list. Also the vertices in X rank the w_1 vertices arbitrarily.

The special gadget is defined on only six vertices forming set S : $u_0, u'_0, u''_0, w_0, w'_0$ and w''_0 . The unique forced edge in the entire instance is u_0w_0 . Apart from u'_0 and w'_0 , they are connected to u - and w -gadgets. In each u -gadget, u_3 is adjacent to w_0 and w'_0 , while in each w -gadget, w_4 is adjacent to u_0 and u''_0 . These four vertices prefer their interconnecting edges to their edges inside of the special gadget. Moreover, u_0 and w_0 are connected to all garbage collectors of the opposite color class. These edges are ranked higher than u_0w_0 by these two vertices and ranked last by the vertices in X and Y .

Claim. To each maximal matching M in \mathcal{I} of cardinality K there is a matching M' in \mathcal{I}' containing u_0w_0 and admitting exactly $|U_0| + |W_0|$ blocking edges.

First, the set of relevant edges in G' corresponding to M is chosen. They cover exactly K of the $|U| = 3|U_0|$ vertices of U , and analogously, exactly K of the $|W| = 4|W_0|$ vertices in W .

In u -gadgets, where either of u_1 and u_2 has a relevant edge in M' , the other vertex in U is matched to its copy in Z . The remaining two vertices of the gadget are then paired to each other. In the other case, if u was unmatched in M , then $u_2z_2, z_1u_3 \in M$, and u_1 is matched to a garbage collector from Y . Given the set




Fig. 4. u and w are connected by an edge labeled second by both of them

of u_1 vertices to pair with the garbage collectors, we find any stable matching in this subgraph and add it to M' . Note that this step matches the $|U_0| - K$ u_1 vertices to the $|U_0| - K$ garbage collectors in Y .

The strategy is similar for the w -gadgets. Suppose that w_j is already matched to a vertex in U , because that relevant edge corresponds to a matching edge in M . We then connect w_4 to v_j and pair the remaining two vertices in W with their partners in V . Otherwise, if w was unmatched in M , then w_1 is matched to a garbage collector, and $w_2v_2, w_3w_3, w_4v_1 \in M'$. On the subgraph induced by the garbage collectors and w_1 vertices corresponding to unmatched w vertices we

construct a stable matching and add it to M' . This step matches the $|W_0| - K$ w_1 vertices to the $|W_0| - K$ garbage collectors in X .

In the special gadget, $u_0w_0, u'_0w'_0$ and $u''_0w''_0$ are chosen.

Now we investigate the number of blocking edges incident to at least one vertex in any u -gadget. The edges running to garbage collectors cannot block, because M' restricted to that subgraph is a stable matching and u_1 vertices not matched to garbage collectors have better relevant edges in M' . Since all u_3 vertices are matched to their first or second choices, their edges to the special gadget do not block either. Consider now a relevant edge u_iw_j . Since M was a maximal matching, at least one of the two gadgets are set so that it corresponds to a matched vertex in M . On that side, u_iw_j is dominated by the matching edge. Regarding the adjacency edges, they only block M' if both of their end vertices are matched to garbage collectors. But then, they both are unmatched and adjacent in G , which contradicts to the fact that M is maximal. The only edges remaining are in the u -gadgets. In each u -gadget, exactly one edge blocks M' : if the vertex was matched to its i th labeled edge in M , then u_iz_i blocks M' , otherwise u_1z_1 blocks M' . Therefore, up to this point, we have $|U_0|$ blocking edges.

Analogous arguments prove that amongst the edges incident to all w -gadgets, $|W_0|$ are blocking. In the previous paragraph we discussed that no relevant or adjacency edge blocks M' . The subgraph induced by the garbage collectors and w_1 vertices does not contain any blocking edge, because a stable matching was chosen and the unmatched w_1 vertices are all matched to a better vertex. Edges connecting w_4 vertices and the special gadget are last choice edges of the matched w_4 vertices. In the w -gadget, exactly one edge blocks M' : if w was matched and therefore $u_iz_i \in M'$, then w_jv_j , otherwise w_1v_1 .

It is easy to see that in the special gadget, none of the four non-matching edges blocks M' .

Claim. To each matching M' in \mathcal{I}' containing u_0w_0 and admitting at most $|U_0| + |W_0|$ blocking edges there is a maximal matching M in \mathcal{I} of cardinality K .

First we show that if $u_0w_0 \in M'$, then every u - and w -gadget is adjacent to at least one blocking edge. Since w_0 prefers all its edges to u_0w_0 , if a u -gadget is not incident to any blocking edge, then u_3 is matched to its first or second choice edge. But then, either of z_1 or z_2 is not matched to its first-choice edge, which is the best edge of its other end vertex as well. Since such edges block the matching immediately, we have found at least one blocking edge incident to the vertices of the u -gadget. The same argument applies to u_0 and w_4 . If w_4 is matched to a vertex in V , then that vertex has a blocking edge, otherwise u_0w_4 blocks M' . Therefore, if $|bp(M')| \leq |U_0| + |W_0|$, then each u - and w -gadget is adjacent to exactly one blocking edge.

In the coming two paragraphs, we investigate which edges can play the role of blocking edges. Trivial candidates are the edges u_iz_i , where $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and w_jv_j , where $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, because they are the first-choice edges of both of their end vertices. Suppose $u_1z_1 \notin M'$, therefore it blocks M' . Then, $u_2z_2 \in M'$, otherwise

it also blocks M' . But then $u_3z_1 \in M'$, otherwise u_3z_1 forms a blocking edge. This construction guarantees that the edges incident to vertices in the u -gadget are all dominated by matching edges, except for the edges of u_1 . The second option is that $u_2z_2 \notin M'$. Similarly, $u_1z_1 \in M'$ and $u_3z_2 \in M'$, moreover, the only edges incident to the gadget that might block M' are the edges of u_2 . The remaining case is that $u_1z_1, u_2z_2 \in M'$. Then, u_3 is either unmatched or matched to w'_0 and in both cases, u_3w_0 blocks M' . In all three cases, no edge incident to the gadget at u_1 or u_2 can block M' , because that would mean more than one blocking edge per gadget.

An analogous reasoning can be derived for w -gadgets. If $w_jv_j \notin M'$ for a $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then $w_{j-1}v_{j-1}, w_{j+1}v_{j+1} \in M'$, where addition and subtraction are taken modulo 3. In this case, w_jv_j blocks M' . In the very last case, if $w_jv_j \in M'$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then w_4u_0 forms a blocking edge. For all four matchings, no further blocking edge may occur.

At this point, we have proved that each u -gadget and each w -gadget has exactly one blocking edge and blocking edges never appear anywhere else in the graph. In particular, the special gadget contains no blocking edge. Moreover, if $u'_0w'_0 \notin M'$, then u'_0w_0 blocks M' . Therefore, $u'_0w'_0 \in M'$. This observation has an effect on the u -gadgets. If any vertex u_3 would be unmatched in M' , then it would immediately have two blocking edges, one to w_0 and another one to w'_0 . Therefore, u_3 is matched to z_1 or z_2 and either u_1 or u_2 is matched to a vertex outside of the u -gadget. From this follows that the number of relevant edges in M' plus the number of matching edges incident to garbage collectors in Y is $|U_0|$. Similarly, if $u''_0w''_0 \notin M'$, then $u_0w''_0$ blocks M' . Thus, all w_4 vertices are matched to a vertex in V and the number of relevant edges in M' plus the number of matching edges incident to garbage collectors in X is $|W_0|$.

Suppose now that there is an unmatched vertex $y \in Y$. This vertex has an edge to u_0 which blocks M' . Therefore, all $|U_0| - K$ vertices in Y are matched to u_1 vertices of various u -gadgets. Similarly, all $|W_0| - K$ vertices in X are matched to w_1 vertices. Therefore, there are in total K u -gadgets contributing a single relevant edge to M' . These edges therefore form a matching of size K in G . All that remains to show is that this matching is maximal. Suppose not, i.e. there are two gadgets corresponding to vertices u and w in G such that all their vertices in U and W in G' are matched to either garbage collectors or to their z - or v -copies. This is only possible if u_1 and w_1 are both matched to garbage collectors, but then, the adjacency edge u_1w_1 blocks M' . \square

Proof of Theorem 7

For the sake of simplicity, we use the decision version of MIN BP SM RESTRICTED.

Problem 6 MIN BP SM RESTRICTED-D

Input: $\mathcal{I} = (G, O, P, Q, K)$; an SM instance on a complete bipartite graph, a set of forbidden edges P , a set of forced edges Q and an integer K .

Output: A matching M such that $M \cap P = \emptyset$, $Q \subseteq M$ and $|bp(M)| \leq K$.

Theorem 7. MIN BP SM RESTRICTED is solvable in polynomial time if the minimal number of edges blocking an optimal solution is a constant L .

Proof. Let us consider all edge sets of cardinality L . Removing one of these sets from G yields a graph G' . If there is a matching in G blocked by a subset of the L removed edges and not violating any of the constraints on restricted edges, then the same matching is stable and still does not violate any constraint on restricted edges in G' . Therefore, it is sufficient to check whether there is a matching not violating any of the constraints on restricted edges in G' . There are $O(m^L)$ sets to remove and checking the existence of a stable matching with forced and forbidden edges can be done in polynomial time. \square

Proof of Theorem 8

The problem we reduce to our problem is (2,2)-E3-SAT. This satisfiability problem is NP-complete [2].

Problem 7 (2,2)-E3-SAT

Input: $\mathcal{I} = B$; a Boolean formula in CNF, in which each clause comprises exactly 3 literals and each variable appears exactly twice in unnegated and exactly twice in negated form.

Question: Is there a truth assignment to B ?

For convenience, let us denote the number of variables by n and the number of clauses by m . Our goal is to construct an instance \mathcal{I} of MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN so that $bp(\mathcal{I}) = m + n$ if and only if B is a satisfiable formula.

Our construction for such an instance combines ideas from two papers. To each Boolean formula, we introduce a variable gadget and a clause gadget. The first one is a slightly more sophisticated variant of the variable gadget used in Theorem 7 of [4], to show NP-hardness of finding a maximum cardinality almost stable matching. Our clause gadget is a simplified version of another clause gadget from Theorem 1 in [3]. There, the almost stable roommates problem is shown to be NP-hard. Both proofs investigate the case with bounded preference lists.

Theorem 8. MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SM FORCED are NP-hard even if each agent's preference lists consists of at most 3 elements.

Proof. Using the already described transformation, any MIN BP SM FORCED instance with short preference lists can be converted into a MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN instance with short preference lists. Therefore, it is sufficient to investigate MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN.

The problem we reduce to our problem is (2,2)-E3-SAT. For convenience, let us denote the number of variables by n and the number of clauses by m . Our goal is to construct an instance \mathcal{I} of MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN so that $bp(\mathcal{I}) = m + n$ if and only if B is a satisfiable formula.

Our construction for such an instance combines ideas from two papers. To each Boolean formula, we introduce a variable gadget and a clause gadget. The first one is a slightly more sophisticated variant of the variable gadget used in Theorem 7 of [4], to show NP-hardness of finding a maximum cardinality almost stable matching. Our clause gadget is a simplified version of another clause gadget from Theorem 1 in [3]. There, the almost stable roommates problem is shown to be NP-hard. Both proofs investigate the case with bounded preference lists.

When constructing graph G to a given Boolean formula B , we keep track of the order of the three literals in each clause and the order of the two unnegated and two negated appearances of each variable. Each appearance is represented by a so-called interconnecting edge.

The variable gadget. To each variable in B , a graph on 44 vertices is defined. The right hand-side of Figure 5 illustrates the essential part of a variable gadget, a cycle of length 24. This cycle contains no forbidden edge, but each vertex along it has degree 3 due to an additional, forbidden edge. There are four special vertices along the cycle: x_1, x_2, x_3 and x_4 , responsible for the communication between clause and variable gadgets. Each of these four vertices has its third, forbidden edge connected to a clause gadget. These edges are called *interconnecting edges* and ranked second on the preference list of both of their end vertices.

Consider the variable v . Due to the properties of MAX (2,2)-E3-SAT, v occurs twice in unnegated form, say, in clauses C_1 and C_2 . Its first appearance, as the i -th literal of C_1 is represented by the interconnecting edge between x^1 and a^i of the clause gadget corresponding to C_1 . Similarly, x^2 is connected to an a -vertex in the clause gadget of C_2 . The same variable, v , also appears twice in negated form. The variable gadgets representing those clauses are connected to x^3 and x^4 , respectively. The other end vertices of these two interconnecting edges mark where these two literals' appearances in their clauses.

Regarding the remaining 20 vertices of the cycle, there is a new vertex with a forbidden edge attached to each of them. This edge is their last choice. These edges guarantee that if any of these 20 vertices remains unmatched in the cycle, then it contributes a blocking edge.

Two special matchings are defined on a variable gadget: M_T , denoted by black edges and M_F , comprising the gray edges. While M_T is blocked by x_1u_1 , M_F is blocked by x_4u_8 .

Claim. Let M be a matching on a variable gadget. If M is not M_T or M_F , then it is blocked by at least two edges, one of them belonging to the variable gadget.

Since x_1u_1 and x_4u_8 are best-choice edges of both of their end vertices, they block any matching not containing them. If both of them are in M , then there is at least one unmatched vertex on the cycle between u_8 and u_1 and another unmatched vertex between x_4 and x_1 . The first path comprises vertices with a forbidden edge as their last choice, therefore, it already contributes a blocking




Fig. 5. A clause and a variable gadget with their special matchings

edge. The only way to avoid additional blocking edges on the second path is to leave a special vertex unmatched, namely x_2 or x_3 . But then, since they both are first choices of some other vertex along the cycle, edges of the cycle block M . Therefore, x_1u_1 and x_4u_8 cannot be in M simultaneously.

The remaining case is when exactly one of them is in M . If every second edge in the cycle belongs to M , then is it either M_T or M_F . Otherwise, for simple parity reasons, there are two unmatched vertices on the 24-cycle between u_1 and u_8 . They already induce two blocking edges, since their last-choice edges are the forbidden edges hanged to them.

The clause gadget. To each clause in B , a graph on 14 vertices is defined. Three of them; a_1, a_2 and a_3 , are connected to variable gadgets via interconnecting edges, all ranked second. There are three special matchings on a clause gadget, blocked by only a single edge. They can be seen on the left hand-side of Figure 5. The gray edges denote M_1, M_2 and M_3 , from the top to the bottom.

Claim. Let M be a matching on a clause gadget. If M is not M_1, M_2 or M_3 , then it is blocked by at least two edges, one of them belonging to the clause gadget.

First, suppose that there is a matching $M \neq M_i$ for all $i = \{1, 2, 3\}$ blocked by a single edge. Since all three edges connecting a and b -vertices are first choices of both of their end vertices, they block any matching not including them. Another restriction arises from the fact that the forbidden edges r_1p_3 and r_2q_3 ensure that if p_3 or q_3 are unmatched, they also contribute a blocking edge. Similarly, if p_1 or q_1 is unmatched, they contribute a blocking edge.

Suppose $b_i a_i \in M$ for all $i = \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then, p_2 is matched either to p_1 or to p_3 , leaving the other one unmatched. The same argument applies for the q -vertices on the other side of the gadget. Therefore, at least two edges block M .

In the remaining case, exactly one of the $b_i a_i$ edges is outside of M . Since we are searching for a matching blocked by only a single edge, no further blocking edge may occur. Therefore, p_1, q_1, p_3 and q_3 are all matched in M . From this point on, it is easy to see that all matchings fulfilling these requirements are M_1, M_2 and M_3 .

Claim 5 and Claim 5 guarantee that if a matching M 's restriction to any of the variable or clause gadgets deviates from their special matchings, then $|bp(M)| > n + m$.

Claim. In the MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN instance \mathcal{I} , $bp(\mathcal{I}) \leq m + n$ if and only if B is a satisfiable formula.

First, we construct a matching M with $|bp(M)| = m + n$ to a given truth assignment. On the variable gadgets, the edges of M_T are chosen if the corresponding variable is true, and the edges of M_F otherwise. There is at least one literal in each clause that is true in the truth assignment. If this literal is the i th in the clause, matching M_i is chosen, where $i = \{1, 2, 3\}$. Due to Claim 5 and Claim 5, each gadget contributes a single blocking edge. As a last step, we show that no interconnection edge blocks M . Suppose that $a_i x_j$ blocks M . Since it is the second choice of a_i , $b_i a_i \notin M$. But then, the i -th literal of the clause was true in the truth assignment. Therefore, x_i is matched to its first choice.

To prove the opposite direction, we again rely on Claim 5 and Claim 5. On one hand, these two statements prove that $bp(\mathcal{I}) \geq m + n$. On the other hand, $|bp(M)| = m + n$ occurs if and only if M 's restriction on variable gadgets are M_T or M_F and its restriction on clause gadgets are M_1, M_2 or M_3 . Then, assigning true to all variables with M_T in their gadgets and false to the rest results in a truth assignment. Since no interconnection edge blocks M , at least one literal per clause is true. \square

Proof of Theorem 9

Theorem 9. MIN BP SM RESTRICTED is solvable in time $O(n)$ if each preference list consists of at most 2 elements.

Proof. In this constructive proof, we describe an algorithm that produces an optimal matching. First, the input is simplified. Then, the graph is segmented so that each subgraph falls under a category with a specified choice rule for the edges of an optimal matching. As for previous cases, it is sufficient to tackle MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN, because instances of MIN BP SM FORCED can be transformed to this problem.

Due to the degree constraints, every component of the underlying graph is a path or a cycle. If any of these components is free of forbidden edges, then we simply fix a stable matching on it. This step is executed whenever such a component appears during the course of the algorithm. For those components with forbidden edges, we split all vertices having a first-choice forbidden edge and a second edge - unrestricted or forbidden - into two vertices. This change does not affect $|bp(M)|$, because in this case, both edges block the matching if and only if their other end vertex is matched to a worse partner or is unmatched. After this splitting is executed, all components contain forbidden edges that start paths or that are inside a path, being last choices of both of their end vertices.

Each component consists of segments of unrestricted edges, separated by forbidden edges. When talking about a segment, we always mean a series of adjacent unrestricted edges. Since unrestricted cycles have already been eliminated by fixing a stable matching on them, every segment is a path. Due to the Rural Hospitals Theorem, each path admits a unique stable matching. Fixing a matching on a segment induces blocking edges only amongst the unrestricted edges of the segment and the forbidden edges adjacent to the segment. We claim that in an optimal solution, each segment and the (at most two) forbidden edges surrounding it contribute at most two blocking edges. This is simply due to the fact that any stable solution on the unrestricted edges is blocked by at most both of the forbidden edges. Therefore, deviating from this solution might only pay off if the matching restricted to this segment is blocked by a single edge and covers both of its end vertices.

The unique stable matching M on a segment v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k falls into exactly one of the following categories:

1. M covers both v_1 and v_k ;
2. M covers either v_1 or v_k ;
3. M covers neither v_1 or v_k .

In each step of our algorithm, a segment is chosen and a matching is fixed on it. The segment and some of the forbidden edges adjacent to it is then removed from the graph. This is done in the following way in these three cases.

In case 1, an optimal solution arises from choosing M . If a forbidden edge e is incident to either v_1 or v_k , it cannot block M . Nor can it block any superset of M in the original instance, so e can be deleted. In case 2, again the optimal

solution arises from choosing M . Without loss of generality suppose that v_1 is covered. As in case 1, if a forbidden edge is incident to v_1 , it cannot block a superset of M in the original instance. Now suppose that a forbidden edge e is incident to v_k . Edge e may block M , and may also block a superset of M in the original instance, so it is retained.

The third class is divided into two subclasses, depending on whether there is a matching M' that is blocked by only one edge and covers both v_1 and v_k . Finding such a matching or proving that none exists can be done iteratively, assuming that a chosen edge is the single blocking edge and then constructing M' so that no more edge blocks it. If such an M' does not exist, then M is fixed, and the segment (but not the forbidden edges) is removed. At the end, the matching restricted to this segment will be blocked by at most the two forbidden edges. Suppose that changing the optimal matching to M' increases the number of blocking edges adjacent to this segment. This is only possible if at least one of the forbidden edges becomes blocking, assume without loss of generality that it is v_1 . Then, the optimal matching covered v_1 . Since no stable matching covers v_1 , the optimal matching is blocked by at least one unrestricted edge of the segment. This must still be less than the number of edges blocking M' , therefore, the forbidden edge at v_k blocks M' , but it does not block the optimal matching. This is only possible if the optimal matching covers v_k , which contradicts our assumption.

On the remaining components, M leaves v_1 and v_k unmatched in every segment. Therefore, all remaining forbidden edges block M . On the other hand, to each segment there is a matching M' , covering both v_1 and v_k and admitting only one unrestricted blocking edge. A chain of such segments - always connected by a forbidden edge - can be eliminated the following way. On the first segment, M' is fixed, then M , and so on, in alternating manner. Consider an arbitrary segment of a chain. A matching on this segment is blocked by at least one unrestricted edge or it leaves both v_1 and v_k unmatched. Take one of the optimal solutions in which the latter case occurs the least times. Then, neither of the forbidden edges incident to v_1 and v_k may block in the optimal solution, otherwise, fixing M' on the segment would lead to a solution at least as good as the optimal one. This is only possible if this segment is between two segments with at least one end point covered by the optimal matching. But then, their other end point also can be covered, because M' already minimizes the number of blocking edges on a segment, provided that at least one end vertex is covered. With this we showed that if M occurs on a component, then it must be between two components with M' on them. On the other hand, if M' occurs at least once, the two forbidden edges at the two end vertices do not block any more. Therefore, each of the two segments surrounding this segment is blocked by at most one edge in an optimal solution. Choosing M on these segments leads to at most one blocking edge. Therefore, the strategy of fixing M and M' in alternating manner eliminates as many blocking forbidden edges as possible. \square

Proof of Theorem 10

Theorem 10. *Each of SM MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS, SM FORBIDDEN MAX FORCED and SM FORCED MIN FORBIDDEN is solvable in $O(n^{2.5})$ time.*

Proof. For SM MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS, a stable matching of minimal or maximal weight can be found in $O(n^{2.5})$ time [6,14] by using rotations and edge weights:

$$w(e) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } e \text{ is forced,} \\ 0 & \text{if } e \text{ is unrestricted,} \\ 1 & \text{if } e \text{ is forbidden.} \end{cases}$$

With these weights, a matching M is of weight $|P \cap M| - |Q \cap M|$. An optimal matching minimizes this function. Alternatively, the weight function defined in the proof of Theorem 12 can be used. With that function, every matching M is of weight $|P \cap M| + |Q \setminus M|$.

In SM FORBIDDEN MAX FORCED, a slightly modified weight function must be used:

$$w(e) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } e \text{ is forced,} \\ 0 & \text{if } e \text{ is unrestricted,} \\ m & \text{if } e \text{ is forbidden.} \end{cases}$$

A matching of minimum weight will certainly avoid all forbidden edges if there is any matching satisfying that condition. Subject to that, it will also maximize the number of forced edges. Similarly, SM FORCED MIN FORBIDDEN can be converted into a weighted SM problem, with the help of another weight function:

$$w(e) = \begin{cases} -m & \text{if } e \text{ is forced,} \\ 0 & \text{if } e \text{ is unrestricted,} \\ 1 & \text{if } e \text{ is forbidden.} \end{cases}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 11

Here, we give two alternative proofs for the same theorem. On one hand, the complexity results in Theorem 11 can be derived by reducing the Minimum Vertex Cover problem to our current problems. Later, we will show another reduction from a different hard problem.

Problem 8 *Minimum Vertex Cover*, MIN VX COVER

Input: $\mathcal{I} = G$; a graph G on n vertices and m edges.

Output: A vertex cover $C \subseteq V(G)$ with $|C| \leq |C'|$ for every vertex cover C' .

MIN VX COVER is NP-hard and cannot be approximated within a factor of $2 - \varepsilon$ for any positive ε , unless the Unique Games Conjecture is false [16]. The set of vertices covered by any maximal matching in G gives a 2-approximation.

Theorem 11. SR MIN FORBIDDEN and SR MAX FORCED are NP-hard.

Proof. Given an instance (G, K) of the decision version of MIN VX COVER, the following instance (G', O, K) of the decision version of SR MIN FORBIDDEN is constructed. The entire graph G is copied, and then, a gadget is attached to each vertex $v_i \in V(G)$. It is a complete bipartite graph on four vertices: one of them is $v_i = p_i$, whilst the remaining three are denoted by \bar{p}_i, q_i and \bar{q}_i . Vertex p_i preserves v_i 's preference list and places \bar{p}_i at the top, and \bar{q}_i at the bottom of this list. The new vertices' orderings can be seen in Figure 6. In order to derive an instance with complete lists, all remaining vertices can be placed in arbitrary order to the bottom of the lists. Later we will see that these edges never appear in stable matchings, neither do they block them. The set of forbidden edges is formed by all $p_i\bar{p}_i$ edges corresponding to the dotted gray edges in our illustrations in Figure 6.




Fig. 6. Adding $K_{2,2}$ to each vertex of the MIN VX COVER instance

Claim. If M is a stable matching in G' , then for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ either $p_i\bar{p}_i \in M$ and $q_i\bar{q}_i \in M$, or $p_i\bar{q}_i \in M$ and $\bar{p}_i q_i \in M$.

This claim follows from the structure of the introduced gadget. First, we observe that in M , each \bar{p}_i is either matched to p_i or to q_i . Otherwise, $p_i\bar{p}_i$ blocks M , since \bar{p}_i is p_i 's first choice. Similarly, $q_i\bar{q}_i \in M$ or $q_i\bar{p}_i \in M$. Otherwise $\bar{p}_i q_i$ would block M . Finally, $p_i\bar{q}_i \in M$ or $q_i\bar{q}_i \in M$, otherwise $q_i\bar{q}_i$ blocks M . These three requirements imply that for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ either $p_i\bar{p}_i \in M$ and $q_i\bar{q}_i \in M$, or $p_i\bar{q}_i \in M$ and $\bar{p}_i q_i \in M$.

Claim. If there is a vertex cover $C \subseteq V(G)$ with $|C| \leq K$, then there is a stable matching M in G for which $|M \cap P| \leq K$.

The matching M is constructed based on the following case distinction:

$$\begin{aligned} \{p_i\bar{p}_i, q_i\bar{q}_i\} &\subseteq M \text{ if } v_i \in C \\ \{p_i\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_i q_i\} &\subseteq M \text{ if } v_i \notin C \end{aligned}$$

Clearly $|M \cap P| \leq K$. Moreover, no edge in the gadgets can block M , because the preferences inside the gadget are cyclic. Due to the vertex cover property, edges between two p -vertices have at least one end vertex in C , thus, at least one of their end vertices is matched to its first-choice partner \bar{p} in G' . For each vertex in G' , the edges in the sets 'rest' are worse than the edge in M .

Claim. If there is a stable matching M in G for which $|M \cap P| \leq K$, then there is a vertex cover $C \subseteq V(G)$ with $|C| \leq K$.

Claim 5 allows us to investigate only two cases per gadget. Exactly the same function is used to derive C from M , as above, in the opposite direction:

$$\begin{aligned} v_i \in C &\text{ if } \{p_i\bar{p}_i, q_i\bar{q}_i\} \subseteq M \\ v_i \notin C &\text{ if } \{p_i\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_i q_i\} \subseteq M \end{aligned}$$

Trivially, $|C| \leq K$. Suppose C is not a vertex cover. Then, there is an edge $v_i v_j = p_i p_j$ for which $\{p_i\bar{q}_i, p_j\bar{q}_j\} \subset \{p_i\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_i q_i, p_j\bar{q}_j, \bar{p}_j q_j\} \subseteq M$. But then, $p_i p_j$ blocks M .

To prove the complexity result for SR MAX FORCED, let $Q := \{p_i\bar{q}_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. \square

The second NP-hard problem we reduce to SR MIN FORBIDDEN is weighted-2-satisfiability.

Problem 9 *weighted-2-satisfiability*, W2SAT

Input: $\mathcal{I} = B$; a Boolean formula B with n variables in m clauses, each of them consisting of exactly 2 non-negated literals.

Output: A truth assignment that assigns at most as many variables to be true as any other assignment.

Proof. To each variable x_i in B we introduce four vertices in our SR instance: p_i, \bar{p}_i, q_i and \bar{q}_i . The complete preference lists are formed based on the clauses that appear in B . Their structure can be sketched in the following way:

p_i	\bar{p}_i	intermediate	p	vertices	\bar{q}_i	rest
\bar{p}_i	q_i	p_i				rest
q_i	\bar{q}_i	\bar{p}_i				rest
\bar{q}_i	p_i	q_i				rest

The block of intermediate vertices on p_i 's preference list consists of all p_j vertices in arbitrary order for which $(x_i \vee x_j)$ is a clause in B . All four preference lists are completed by the remainder of $V(G)$. To each variable x_i , a single forbidden edge $p_i\bar{p}_i$ is introduced.

Claim. If f is a satisfying truth assignment of B with at most K true variables, then there is a stable matching M in G for which $|M \cap P| \leq K$.

Let us define M in the following way. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned} \{p_i\bar{p}_i, q_i\bar{q}_i\} &\subseteq M \text{ if } f(x_i) = \text{true} \\ \{p_i\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_i q_i\} &\subseteq M \text{ if } f(x_i) = \text{false} \end{aligned}$$

Trivially, $|M \cap P| \leq K$. It also follows from the construction that every vertex in $V(G)$ is matched to a vertex better than any other placed in the last block on its preference list, denoted by rest above. Therefore, this block can also be omitted. Suppose that M is unstable, i.e. there is a blocking edge. This blocking edge must belong to either of the following groups:

- i) $p_i\bar{p}_i, p_i\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_i q_i$ or $q_i\bar{q}_i$: They are last-choice edges of either of their end vertices, therefore, they cannot block M
- ii) $p_i p_j$: The values of x_i and x_j are determined by the fact that $p_i p_j$ is better than p_i 's and p_j 's edges in M . Since $p_i\bar{q}_i \in M$ and $p_j\bar{q}_j \in M$, $f(x_i) = f(x_j) = \text{false}$. But then, since p_j appeared on p_i 's list as an intermediate vertex, $(x_i \vee x_j)$ appeared in B . Thus, f is not a satisfying truth assignment.

Claim. If there is a stable matching M in G for which $|M \cap P| \leq K$, then there is satisfying truth assignment f that has at most K true variables.

First, we observe that in M , each \bar{p}_i is either matched to p_i or to q_i . Otherwise, $p_i\bar{p}_i$ blocks M , since \bar{p}_i is p_i 's first choice. Similarly, $q_i\bar{q}_i \in M$ or $q_i\bar{p}_i \in M$. Otherwise $\bar{p}_i q_i$ would block M . Finally, $p_i\bar{q}_i \in M$ or $q_i\bar{q}_i \in M$, otherwise $q_i\bar{q}_i$ blocks M . These three requirements imply that for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ either $p_i\bar{p}_i \in M$ and $q_i\bar{q}_i \in M$, or $p_i\bar{q}_i \in M$ and $\bar{p}_i q_i \in M$. At this point, we are ready to construct the truth assignment, since either $\{p_i\bar{p}_i, q_i\bar{q}_i\} \subseteq M$ or $\{p_i\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_i q_i\} \subseteq M$.

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_i) &= \text{true if } \{p_i\bar{p}_i, q_i\bar{q}_i\} \subseteq M \\ f(x_i) &= \text{false if } \{p_i\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_i q_i\} \subseteq M \end{aligned}$$

Function f has at most K true variables. The last step in our proof is to show that f is a valid truth assignment. Suppose that an invalid $x_i \vee x_j$ is in B . Since both literals are false, $\{p_i\bar{q}_i, p_j\bar{q}_j\} \subset \{p_i\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_i q_i, p_j\bar{q}_j, \bar{p}_j q_j\} \subseteq M$. At the same time, p_i is listed on p_j 's preference list as an intermediate vertex and vice versa. Thus, $p_i p_j$ blocks M .

Our proof for the NP-hardness of the problem SR MIN FORBIDDEN can be converted easily to SR MAX FORCED. Instead of labeling all $p_i\bar{p}_i$ edges as forbidden, here we take all $p_i\bar{q}_i$ edges as forced edges. The set of stable matchings in G is not impaired by this modification.

The bijection between pairs of edges in M and truth values of variables in B implies that $|M \cap Q|$ equals the number of false variables. \square

Proof of Theorem 13

Theorem 13. *For SR MAX FORCED, $|Q \cap M_{opt}|$ cannot be approximated within $n^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, unless $P = NP$.*

Proof. We adapt the proof of Theorem 11 so that the reduction is from MAX IND SET, the problem of finding a maximum independent set in a given graph $G = (V, E)$. MAX IND SET is not approximable within $N^{1-\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, unless $P = NP$ [23], where $N = |V|$. In the modified reduction the forced edges comprise $Q = \{p_i\bar{q}_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. An independent set of vertices S in G corresponds to the matching

$$M = \{p_i\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_i q_i : v_i \in S\} \cup \{p_i\bar{p}_i, q_i\bar{q}_i : v_i \notin S\}$$

in the constructed instance \mathcal{I} of SR MAX FORCED. Suppose that A is an $n^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$ -approximation algorithm that approximates $|Q \cap M_{opt}|$ in \mathcal{I} , for some $\varepsilon > 0$, where M_{opt} is an optimal solution and n is the number of agents in \mathcal{I} . Note that $|S_{opt}| = |M_{opt}|$, where S_{opt} is a maximum independent set in G . Moreover $n^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon} = (4N)^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon} \leq N^{1-\varepsilon}$ since $n = 4N$ and without loss of generality we can assume that $N \geq 4$. We thus reach a contradiction to the inapproximability of MAX IND SET. \square

Proof of Theorem 15

Theorem 15. *SR MIN FORBIDDEN and SR MAX FORCED are NP-hard even if every preference list is of length at most 3.*

Proof. Let $\langle G, K \rangle$ be an instance of MIN VX COVER, where $G = (V, E)$, $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ and $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$. For each i ($1 \leq i \leq n$), suppose that v_i is incident to edges e_{j_1}, e_{j_2} and e_{j_3} in G , where without loss of generality $j_1 < j_2 < j_3$. Define $e_{i,s} = e_{j_s}$ ($1 \leq s \leq 3$). Similarly for each j ($1 \leq j \leq m$), suppose that $e_j = \{v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}\}$, where without loss of generality $i_1 < i_2$. Define $v_{j,r} = v_{i_r}$ ($1 \leq r \leq 2$).

Construct an instance I of SR MIN FORBIDDEN as follows. Let $V' = \{v_i^r : 1 \leq i \leq n \wedge 1 \leq r \leq 3\}$, let $E' = \{e_j^s : 1 \leq j \leq m \wedge 1 \leq s \leq 2\}$ and let $W = \{w_i^r : 1 \leq i \leq n \wedge 1 \leq r \leq 3\}$. The set $V' \cup E' \cup W$ constitutes the set of agents in I , and the preference lists of the agents are as shown in Figure 7. Let $F = \{\{v_i^1, w_i^1\} : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ be the set of forbidden edges in I .

In the preference list of an agent v_i^r ($1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq r \leq 3$), the symbol $e(v_i^r)$ denotes the agent $e_j^s \in E'$ such that $e_j = e_{i,r}$ and $v_i = v_{j,s}$. Similarly in

$$\begin{array}{ll}
v_i^1 : w_i^1 & e(v_i^1) & w_i^2 & (1 \leq i \leq n) \\
v_i^2 : w_i^2 & e(v_i^2) & w_i^3 & (1 \leq i \leq n) \\
v_i^3 : w_i^3 & e(v_i^3) & w_i^1 & (1 \leq i \leq n) \\
e_j^1 : e_j^2 & v(e_j^1) & e_j^4 & (1 \leq j \leq m) \\
e_j^2 : e_j^3 & v(e_j^2) & e_j^1 & (1 \leq j \leq m) \\
e_j^3 : e_j^4 & e_j^2 & & (1 \leq j \leq m) \\
e_j^4 : e_j^1 & e_j^3 & & (1 \leq j \leq m) \\
w_i^1 : v_i^3 & v_i^1 & & (1 \leq i \leq n) \\
w_i^2 : v_i^1 & v_i^2 & & (1 \leq i \leq n) \\
w_i^3 : v_i^2 & v_i^3 & & (1 \leq i \leq n)
\end{array}$$

Fig. 7. Preference lists in the constructed instance of SR MIN FORBIDDEN.

the preference list of an agent e_j^s ($1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq s \leq 2$), the symbol $v(e_j^s)$ denotes the agent $v_i^r \in V'$ such that $v_i = v_{j,s}$ and $e_j = e_{i,r}$.

Finally we define some further notation in I . For each i ($1 \leq i \leq n$), let $V_i^c = \{v_i^r, w_i^r\} : 1 \leq r \leq 3\}$ and let $V_i^u = \{v_i^r, w_i^{r+1}\} : 1 \leq r \leq 3\}$, where addition is taken modulo 3. Similarly for each j ($1 \leq j \leq m$), let $E_j^1 = \{e_j^1, e_j^2\}, \{e_j^3, e_j^4\}$ and let $E_j^2 = \{e_j^1, e_j^4\}, \{e_j^2, e_j^3\}$.

We firstly claim that I admits a stable matching in which every agent is matched. For, let $M = \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_i^c \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^m E_j^1$. It is straightforward to verify that M is stable, and hence Theorem 4.5.2 of [11] implies that every stable matching in I matches every agent in I . We next claim that G has a vertex cover C where $|C| \leq K$ if and only if I has a stable matching M where $|M \cap F| \leq K$.

For, suppose that G has a vertex cover C such that $|C| \leq K$. We construct a matching M in I as follows. For each i ($1 \leq i \leq n$), if $v_i \in C$, add V_i^c to M , otherwise add V_i^u to M . For each j ($1 \leq j \leq m$), if $v_{j,1} \in C$, add E_j^2 to C , otherwise add E_j^1 to C . Then $|M \cap F| = |C| \leq K$. It is also straightforward to verify that M is stable in I .

Conversely suppose that M is a stable matching in I such that $|M \cap F| \leq K$. We construct a set of vertices C in G as follows. As M matches every agent in I , then for each i ($1 \leq i \leq n$), either $V_i^c \subseteq M$ or $V_i^u \subseteq M$. In the former case add v_i to C . As $|M \cap F| \leq K$, it follows that $|C| \leq K$. Also, for each j ($1 \leq j \leq m$), as M matches every agent in I , either $E_j^1 \subseteq M$ or $E_j^2 \subseteq M$. Given these observations, it is then straightforward to verify that C is a vertex cover in G . □