

# Characterizing a Set of Popular Matchings Defined by Preference Lists with Ties

Tomomi Matsui and Takayoshi Hamaguchi

Graduate School of Decision Science and Technology,  
Tokyo Institute of Technology,  
Ookayama 2-12-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8552, Japan

January 13, 2016

**Abstract** In this paper, we give a simple characterization of a set of popular matchings defined by preference lists with ties. By employing our characterization, we propose a polynomial time algorithm for finding a minimum cost popular matching.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we give a characterization of a set of popular matchings in a bipartite graph with one-sided preference lists. The concept of a popular matching was first introduced by Gardenfors [5]. Recently, Abraham et al. [1] discussed a problem for finding a popular matching and proposed polynomial time algorithms for problem instances defined by preference lists with or without ties. McDermid and Irving [10] discussed a set of popular matchings defined by strict preference lists. One of a remained open problems raised in [8, 10] and [9] (Section 7.7) is a characterization of a set of popular matchings when given preference lists have ties. This paper solves the above open problem affirmatively and gives an explicit characterization of a set of popular matchings defined by preference lists with ties. By employing our characterization, we can transform a minimum cost popular matching problem, discussed in [8, 10], to a simple minimum cost assignment problem.

## 2 Main Result

An instance of popular matching problem comprises a set  $A$  of *applicants* and a set  $P$  of *posts*. Each applicant  $a \in A$  has a preference list in which she ranks some posts in weak order (i.e., ties are allowed). Given any applicant  $a \in A$ , and given any posts  $p, p' \in P$ , applicant  $a$  *prefers*  $p$  to  $p'$  if both  $p$  and  $p'$  appear in  $a$ 's preference list, and  $p$  precedes  $p'$  on  $a$ 's preference list. We assume that each applicant  $a \in A$  has a specified post  $l(a)$ , called *last resort* of  $a$ , such that  $l(a)$  appears only in  $a$ 's preference list and  $l(a)$  is a unique, most undesirable post of  $a$ . The existence of last resorts implies that  $|A| \leq |P|$ . We say that a

pair  $(a, p) \in A \times P$  is *acceptable* if and only if post  $p$  appears in  $a$ 's preference list. We denote the set of acceptable pairs by  $E \subseteq A \times P$ . This paper deals with a bipartite graph  $G = (A \cup P, E)$  consisting of vertex set  $A \cup P$  and edge set  $E$ . Throughout this paper, we denote  $|A| + |P|$  by  $n$  and  $|E|$  by  $m$ .

A subset of acceptable pairs  $M \subseteq E$  is called a *matching* if and only if each applicant and post appears in at most one pair in  $M$ . We say that  $v \in A \cup P$  is *matched* in  $M$ , when  $M$  includes a pair  $(a, p)$  satisfying  $v \in \{a, p\}$ . A set of matched nodes of  $M$  is denoted by  $\partial M$ . For each pair  $(a, p) \in M$ , we denote  $M(a) = p$  and  $M(p) = a$ .

We say that an applicant  $a \in A$  prefers matching  $M'$  to  $M$ , if (i)  $a$  is matched in  $M'$  and unmatched in  $M$ , or (ii)  $a$  is matched in both  $M'$  and  $M$ , and  $a$  prefers  $M'(a)$  to  $M(a)$ . A matching  $M'$  is *more popular* than  $M$  if the number of applicants that prefer  $M'$  to  $M$  exceeds the number of applicants that prefer  $M$  to  $M'$ . A matching  $M$  is *popular* if and only if there is no matching  $M'$  that is more popular than  $M$ . The existence of the set of last resorts implies that we only need to consider applicant-complete matching, since any unmatched applicant can be allocated to her last resort. Throughout this paper, we deal with popular matchings which are applicant-complete.

For each applicant  $a \in A$ , we define  $f(a) \subseteq P$  to be the set of  $a$ 's most-preferred posts. We call any such post  $p \in f(a)$  an *f-post* of applicant  $a$ . We define the *first-choice graph* of  $G$  as  $G_1 = (A \cup P, E_1)$ , where  $E_1 = \{(a, p) \in E \mid \exists a \in A, p \in f(a)\}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{M}_1$  be the set of maximum cardinality matchings of  $G_1$  and  $k_1^*$  be the size of a maximum cardinality matching of  $G_1$ . Let  $P_1 \subseteq P$  be a subset of posts which are matched in every matching in  $\mathcal{M}_1$ . For each applicant  $a \in A$ , define  $s(a)$  to be the set of most-preferred posts in  $a$ 's preference list that are not in  $P_1$ . Every post in  $s(a)$  is called an *s-post* of applicant  $a$ . We define  $E_2 = \{(a, p) \in A \times P \mid p \in f(a) \cup s(a)\}$  and  $G_2 = (A \cup P, E_2)$ .

Abraham et al. [1] showed the following characterization of popular matchings.

**Theorem 1** (Abraham et al. [1]). *An applicant-complete matching  $M \subseteq E$  of  $G$  is popular if and only if  $M$  satisfies (i)  $M \cap E_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$  and (ii)  $M \subseteq E_2$ .*

Now, we describe our main result. A *cover* of a given graph  $G_1 = (A \cup P, E_1)$  is a subset of vertices  $X \subseteq A \cup P$  satisfying that  $\forall (a, p) \in E_1, \{a, p\} \cap X \neq \emptyset$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Assume that a given instance has at least one popular matching. Let  $X \subseteq A \cup P$  be a minimum cover of  $G_1$ . We define  $\tilde{P} = P \cap X$  and*

$$\tilde{E} = \left( E_1 \cap (X_A \times \overline{X_P}) \right) \cup \left( E_1 \cap (\overline{X_A} \times X_P) \right) \cup \left( E_2 \cap (\overline{X_A} \times \overline{X_P}) \right)$$

where  $X_A = A \cap X$ ,  $X_P = P \cap X$ ,  $\overline{X_A} = A \setminus X$ , and  $\overline{X_P} = P \setminus X$ . Then, an applicant complete matching  $M$  in  $G$  is popular if and only if  $M \subseteq \tilde{E}$  and every post in  $\tilde{P}$  is matched in  $M$ .

### 3 Characterization of a Set of Popular Matching

First, we introduce a maximum weight matching problem on  $G_2$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{MP : maximize} \quad & |A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x(e) \\
 \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{p \in \delta_2(a)} x(e) \leq 1 \quad (\forall a \in A), \\
 & \sum_{a \in \delta_2(p)} x(e) \leq 1 \quad (\forall p \in P), \\
 & x(e) \in \{0, 1\} \quad (\forall e \in E_2), \tag{1}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta_2(v) \subseteq A \cup P$  denotes a set of vertices adjacent with a vertex  $v \in A \cup P$  on  $G_2$ .

**Lemma 1.** *An applicant-complete matching  $M \subseteq E$  is popular if and only if  $M \subseteq E_2$  and the corresponding characteristic vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{E_2}$  defined by*

$$x(e) = \begin{cases} 1 & (\text{if } e \in M), \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}), \end{cases}$$

*is optimal to MP.*

**Proof.** First, consider a case that a given applicant-complete matching  $M$  is popular. Theorem 1 states that  $M \subseteq E_2$  and  $M \cap E_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$ . Thus, we only need to show that the characteristic vector  $\mathbf{x}$  is optimal to MP. The corresponding objective function value is equal to

$$|A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x(e) = |A|k_1^* + |A|$$

where  $k_1^*$  denotes the size of a maximum cardinality matching of  $G_1$ . We show that the optimal value of MP is less than or equal to  $|A|k_1^* + |A|$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}'$  be a feasible solution of MP and  $M' = \{e \in E_2 \mid x'(e) = 1\}$ . Since  $M' \cap E_1$  is a matching of  $G_1$ , the objective function value corresponding to  $\mathbf{x}'$  satisfies

$$|A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x'(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x'(e) = |A||M' \cap E_1| + |M'| \leq |A|k_1^* + |A|$$

which gives an upper bound of the optimal value of MP. Thus,  $\mathbf{x}$  is optimal to MP.

Next, we consider a case that  $M \subseteq E_2$  and the corresponding characteristic vector  $\mathbf{x}$  of  $M$  is optimal to MP. Obviously, we only need to show that  $M \cap E_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$ . Assume on the contrary that  $M \cap E_1 \notin \mathcal{M}_1$ . Let  $M^* \in \mathcal{M}_1$  be a maximum cardinality matching of  $G_1$  and put  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \{0, 1\}^{E_2}$

be the corresponding characteristic vector. The above assumption implies that  $|M \cap E_1| + 1 \leq |M^*|$ . Obviously,  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is feasible to MP and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x^*(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x^*(e) &= |A||M^*| + |M^*| = (|A| + 1)|M^*| \\ &\geq (|A| + 1)(|M \cap E_1| + 1) > |A||M \cap E_1| + |A| \\ &= |A||M \cap E_1| + |M| = |A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x(e), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts with the optimality of  $\mathbf{x}$ . From the above, we obtain that  $M \cap E_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$ . Theorem 1 implies that  $M$  is popular.  $\square$

Now we introduce a linear relaxation problem (LRP) of MP, which is obtained from MP by substituting non-negative constraints  $x(e) \geq 0$  ( $\forall e \in E_2$ ) for 0-1 constraints (1). It is well-known that every (0-1 valued) optimal solution of MP is also optimal to LRP [3]. A corresponding dual problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{D: minimize} \quad & \sum_{a \in A} y(a) + \sum_{p \in P} y(p) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & y(a) + y(p) \geq |A| + 1 \quad (\forall (a, p) \in E_1), \\ & y(a) + y(p) \geq 1 \quad (\forall (a, p) \in E_2 \setminus E_1), \\ & y(v) \geq 0 \quad (\forall v \in A \cup P). \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\mathbf{y}^*$  be an optimal solution of D. We define  $\tilde{P} = \{p \in P \mid y^*(p) > 0\}$  and*

$$\tilde{E} = \{(a, p) \in E_1 \mid y^*(a) + y^*(p) = |A| + 1\} \cup \{(a, p) \in E_2 \setminus E_1 \mid y^*(a) + y^*(p) = 1\}.$$

*An applicant-complete matching  $M \subseteq E$  is popular if and only if (i)  $M \subseteq \tilde{E}$ , and (ii) every posts in  $\tilde{P}$  is matched in  $M$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $M \subseteq E$  be an applicant-complete matching satisfying (i) and (ii). Clearly, (i) implies that  $M \subseteq \tilde{E} \subseteq E_2$ . From property (ii), every post  $p$  unmatched in  $M$  satisfies that  $y^*(p) = 0$ . The characteristic vector  $\mathbf{x}$  of  $M$  indexed by  $E_2$  satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} |A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x(e) &= (|A| + 1) \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2 \setminus E_1} x(e) \\ &= \sum_{e \in M \cap E_1} (|A| + 1) + \sum_{e \in M \cap (E_2 \setminus E_1)} 1 \\ &= \sum_{(a, p) \in M \cap E_1} (y^*(a) + y^*(p)) + \sum_{(a, p) \in M \cap (E_2 \setminus E_1)} (y^*(a) + y^*(p)) \\ &= \sum_{v \in \partial M} y^*(v) = \sum_{a \in A} y^*(a) + \sum_{p \in P \cap \partial M} y^*(p) = \sum_{a \in A} y^*(a) + \sum_{p \in P} y^*(p), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\partial M$  denotes a set of vertices of  $G_2$  matched in  $M$ . Since  $\mathbf{x}$  is feasible to LRP, the weak duality theorem implies that  $\mathbf{x}$  is optimal to LRP. Clearly,  $\mathbf{x}$  is feasible to MP,  $\mathbf{x}$  is also optimal to MP. Then, Lemma 1 implies the popularity of  $M$ .

Conversely, consider a case that an applicant-complete matching  $M \subseteq E$  is popular. Lemma 1 implies that  $M \subseteq E_2$  and the corresponding characteristic vector  $\mathbf{x}$  is optimal to MP. Dantzig [3] showed that  $\mathbf{x}$  is also optimal to LRP. The strong duality theorem implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left( \sum_{a \in A} y^*(a) + \sum_{p \in P} y^*(p) \right) - \left( |A| \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2} x(e) \right) \\
&= \sum_{(a,p) \in M} (y^*(a) + y^*(p)) + \sum_{p \in P \setminus \partial M} y^*(p) - \left( (|A| + 1) \sum_{e \in E_1} x(e) + \sum_{e \in E_2 \setminus E_1} x(e) \right) \\
&= \sum_{(a,p) \in M \cap E_1} (y^*(a) + y^*(p) - (|A| + 1)) \tag{2} \\
&+ \sum_{(a,p) \in M \cap (E_2 \setminus E_1)} (y^*(a) + y^*(p) - 1) + \sum_{p \in P \setminus \partial M} y^*(p). \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbf{y}^*$  is feasible to D, each term in (2) or (3) is equal to 0, i.e., we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
y^*(a) + y^*(p) &= |A| + 1, \quad \forall (a,p) \in M \cap E_1, \\
y^*(a) + y^*(p) &= 1, \quad \forall (a,p) \in M \cap (E_2 \setminus E_1), \\
y^*(p) &= 0, \quad \forall p \in P \setminus \partial M.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, conditions (i) and (ii) hold.  $\square$

Now we prove Theorem 2. Let us recall the following well-known theorem.

**Theorem 4** (König [7]). *The size of a minimum cover of  $G_1$  is equal the size of a maximum cardinality matching in  $G_1$ .*

When we have a minimum cover, we can construct an optima solution of dual problem D easily.

**Lemma 2.** *Assume that a given instance has at least one popular matching. Let  $X \subseteq A \cup P$  be a minimum cover of  $G_1$ . When we define a vector  $\mathbf{y}^* \in \mathbb{Z}^{A \cup P}$  by*

$$y^*(v) = \begin{cases} |A| + 1 & (\text{if } v \in A \cap X), \\ 1 & (\text{if } v \in A \setminus X), \\ |A| & (\text{if } v \in P \cap X), \\ 0 & (\text{if } v \in P \setminus X), \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

then  $\mathbf{y}^*$  is optimal to D.

**Proof.** First, we show that  $\mathbf{y}^*$  is feasible to D. Obviously,  $\mathbf{y}^*$  satisfies non-negative constraints. For any edge  $(a, p) \in E_2 \setminus E_1$ ,  $y^*(a) + y^*(p) \geq y^*(a) \geq 1$ . For any edge  $(a, p) \in E_1$ , the definition of a cover implies that  $\{a, p\} \cap X \neq \emptyset$ , and thus  $y^*(a) + y^*(p) \geq |A| + 1$ . From the above discussion,  $\mathbf{y}^*$  is a feasible solution of D.

Since there exists a popular matching, the optimal value of MP is equal to  $|A|k_1^* + |A|$ . König's theorem says that  $|X| = k_1^*$  and thus the optimal value of MP is equal to  $|A|k_1^* + |A| = |A||X| + |A|$ . The weak duality implies that  $|A||X| + |A|$  gives a lower bound of the optimal value of D. Since  $\mathbf{y}^*$  is feasible to D and the corresponding objective value attains the lower bound  $|A||X| + |A|$ ,  $\mathbf{y}^*$  is optimal to D.  $\square$

Lastly, we describe a proof of our main result.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** When a given instance has at least one popular matching, dual solution  $\mathbf{y}^*$  defined by (4) is optimal to D. Thus, Theorem 3 directly implies Theorem 2.  $\square$

In the rest of this section, we describe a method for constructing sets  $\tilde{P}$  and  $\tilde{E}$  efficiently. First, we apply Hopcroft and Karp's algorithm [6] to  $G_1$  and find a maximum cardinality matching and a minimum (size) cover  $X$  of  $G_1$  simultaneously. Next, we employ an algorithm proposed by Abraham et al. [1] and check the existence of a popular matching. If a given instance has at least one popular matching, then we construct sets  $\tilde{P}$  and  $\tilde{E}$  defined in Theorem 2. The total computational effort required in the above procedure is bounded by  $O(\sqrt{nm})$  time.

## 4 Optimal Popular Matching

Kavitha and Nasre [8] studied some problems for finding a matching that is not only popular, but is also optimal with respect to some additional criterion. McDermid and Irving [10] discussed these problems in case that given preference lists are strictly ordered, and proposed efficient algorithms based on a specified structure called “*switching graph*.” Their algorithms find (P1) a maximum cardinality popular matching in  $O(n + m)$  time, (P2) a minimum cost maximum cardinality popular matching in  $O(n + m)$  time, (P3) a rank-maximal popular matching in  $O(n \log n + m)$  time, or (P4) a fair popular matching in  $O(n \log n + m)$  time. They also showed that all the above problems are reduced to minimum weight popular matching problems by introducing appropriate edge costs  $w : E_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ .

In the following, we discuss a minimum cost popular matching problem defined by preference lists with ties. As shown in Theorem 2, we can characterize a set of popular matchings by a pair of sets  $\tilde{P}$  and  $\tilde{E}$ . Thus, we can find a minimum cost popular matching by solving the following minimum cost assignment

problem

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{MCP: minimize} \quad & \sum_{e \in E_2} w(e)x(e) \\
\text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{e \in \delta_2(a)} x(e) = 1 \quad (\forall a \in A), \\
& \sum_{e \in \delta_2(p)} x(e) = 1 \quad (\forall p \in \tilde{P}), \\
& \sum_{e \in \delta_2(p)} x(e) \leq 1 \quad (\forall p \in P \setminus \tilde{P}), \\
& x(e) = 0 \quad (\forall e \in E_2 \setminus \tilde{E}), \\
& x(e) \in \{0, 1\} \quad (\forall e \in E_2).
\end{aligned}$$

A well-known successive shortest path method solves the above problem in  $O(n(n \log n + m))$  time (see [2] for example).

## 5 Discussions

In this paper, we give a simple characterization of a set of popular matchings defined by preference lists with ties. By employing our characterization, we can find a minimum cost popular matching in  $O(n(n \log n + m))$  time.

When we deal with a problem for finding a popular matching with a property (P1), (P2), (P3) or (P4), there exists a possibility to reduce the time complexity, since the corresponding edge cost has a special structure. However, we need a detailed discussion, since problem MCP has both equality and inequality constraints.

We can construct an algorithm for enumerating all the popular matchings by employing an idea appearing in [4]. The required computational effort is bounded by  $O(\sqrt{nm} + K(n + m))$  where  $K$  denotes the total number of popular matchings. We omit the details of the enumeration algorithm.

## References

- [1] D. J. Abraham, R. W. Irving, T. Kavitha, and K. Mehlhorn, “Popular matchings,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, **37** (2007), pp. 1030–1045.
- [2] R. K. Ahuja, T. L. Magnanti, and J. B. Orlin, *Network Flows: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications*, Prentice-Hall, 1993.
- [3] G. B. Dantzig, “Application of the simplex method to a transportation problem,” *In: Activity Analysis of Production and Allocation*, T. C. Koopmans, ed., Wiley, New York, pp. 359–373, 1951.
- [4] K. Fukuda and T. Matsui, “Finding all the perfect matchings in bipartite graphs,” *Applied Mathematics Letters*, **7** (1994), pp. 15–18.

- [5] P. Gardenfors, “Match making: assignments based on bilateral preferences,” *Behavioral Science*, **20** (1975), pp. 166–173.
- [6] J. E. Hopcroft and R. M. Karp, “An  $n^{5/2}$  algorithm for maximum matchings in bipartite graphs,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, **2** (1973), pp. 225–231.
- [7] D. König, “Graphs and matrices,” *Matematikai es Fizikai Lapok*, **38** (1931), pp. 116–119 (in Hungarian).
- [8] T. Kavitha and M. Nasre, “Optimal popular matchings,” *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **157** (2009), pp. 3181–3186.
- [9] D. F. Manlove, *Algorithmics of Matching Under Preferences*, World Scientific, 2013.
- [10] E. McDermid and R. W. Irving, “Popular matchings: structure and algorithms,” *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, **22** (2011), pp. 339–358.