

# Stable marriage and roommates problems with restricted edges: Complexity and approximability

Ágnes Cseh<sup>1,\*</sup> and David F. Manlove<sup>2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Institute for Mathematics, TU Berlin*  
*Email: cseh@math.tu-berlin.de*

<sup>2</sup> *School of Computing Science, University of Glasgow*  
*Email: 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 acceptable 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. 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 as few as possible pairs, or (2) violate as few as possible constraints on restricted pairs.

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 non-bipartite stable roommates instances, case (2) yields an NP-hard but (under some cardinality assumptions) 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) [10], a bipartite graph is given, where one color class symbolises a set of men  $U$  and the other color class stands for a 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 [10], we know

---

\*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 Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council grant EP/K010042/1.

that the existence of such a stable solution is guaranteed and one can be found in linear time. Moreover, the solutions form a distributive lattice [20]. The two extreme points of this lattice are called the *man-* and *woman-optimal stable matchings* [10]. These assign each man/woman their best partner reachable in any stable matching. Another interesting and useful 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 [11].

One of the most widely studied extensions of SM is the *stable roommates problem* (SR) [10, 14], 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 [14]. 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 [12].

Both SM and SR are widely used in various applications. In markets where the goal is to maximise social welfare instead of profit, the notion of stability is especially suitable as an optimality criterion [22]. For SM, the oldest and most common area of applications is employer allocation markets [24]. 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 [23]. SR on the other hand has applications in the area of P2P networks [9].

Forced and forbidden edges in SM and SR open the way to formulate various special requirements on the sought solution. Such edges now form part of the extended problem instance: if an edge is *forced*, it must belong to a constructed stable matching, whilst if an edge is *forbidden*, it must not. 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. Deleted edges (corresponding to forbidden edges, or those adjacent to forced edges) 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 [20], 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 [12] 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 forced 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 1.1** (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 [12] 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, where  $Q$  is the set of forced edges. With the help of rotations, maximum weight stable matchings can be found in polynomial time [6, 7, 15, 19].

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 different methods 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 [16] and the transformation has the same time complexity as well. Forced edges can easily be eliminated by forbidding all edges adjacent to them, therefore we can state the following result.

**Theorem 1.2** (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 BP, all constraints on restricted edges must be satisfied, and we seek a matching with the minimum number of blocking edges. In case CV, 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 BP: that is, all constraints on restricted edges must be fulfilled, while the number of blocking edges is minimised. 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, but by contrast it is

	stable marriage	stable roommates
case BP: min # blocking edges	NP-hard to approximate within $n^{1-\varepsilon}$	NP-hard to approximate within $n^{1-\varepsilon}$
case CV: min # violated restricted edge constraints	solvable in polynomial time	NP-hard; 2-approximable if $ Q $ is large or 0

Table 1: Summary of results

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 CV, where the number of violated constraints on restricted edges is minimised while stability is preserved, is studied in Section 4. It is a rather straightforward observation that in SM, the setting can be modelled 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 if the number of forced edges is sufficiently large or zero. As in case BP, 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.

A structured overview of our results is contained in Table 1.

## 2 Preliminaries and techniques

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 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  $bp(M)$ . A natural goal is to find a matching minimising  $|bp(M)|$ . 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: almost stable matchings have been investigated in SM [4, 13, 18] and SR [1, 3] instances.

All problems investigated in this paper 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 on the edges. For instance, vertex  $u_2$  ranks  $w_1$  best, then  $w_4$ , and  $w_2$  last. The set of forbidden edges  $P = \{u_2w_2, u_3w_3\}$  is marked by dotted gray edges. The unique stable matching  $M = \{u_1w_1, u_2w_2, u_3w_3, u_4w_4\}$  contains both forbidden edges.




Figure 1: A sample stable marriage instance with forbidden edges

Later on, we will return to this sample instance to demonstrate approximation concepts on it.

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

**Problem 1.** MIN BP SR RESTRICTED

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

Special attention is given to two special cases of MIN BP SR RESTRICTED: in MIN BP SR FORBIDDEN,  $Q = \emptyset$ , while in MIN BP SR FORCED,  $P = \emptyset$ . Note that an instance of MIN BP SR FORCED or MIN BP SR RESTRICTED can always be transformed into an instance of MIN BP SR 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 CV 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  $G$ .

Just as in the previous approximation concept (referred to as case BP in Section 1), we separate the two subcases with only forbidden and only forced edges. If  $Q = \emptyset$ , SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS is referred as SR MIN FORBIDDEN, while if  $P = \emptyset$ , the problem becomes SR MAX FORCED. In case BP, the subcase with only forced edges can be transformed into the other subcase, simply by forbidding edges adjacent to forced edges. This straightforward transformation is not valid for case CV. 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.

A powerful tool used in several proofs in our paper is to convert some of these problems into a weighted SM or SR problem, where the goal is to find a stable matching with the

highest edge weight, taken over all stable matchings. Irving et al. [15] were the first to show that the weighted SM can be solved in  $O(n^4 \log n)$  time (where  $n$  is the number of vertices) if the weight function is monotone in the preference ordering, non-negative and integral. Feder [6, 7] shows a method to drop the monotonicity requirement. He also presents the best known bound for the runtime of an algorithm for finding a minimum weight stable matching in SM:  $O(n^2 \cdot \log(\frac{K}{n^2} + 2) \cdot \min\{n, \sqrt{K}\})$ , where  $K$  is the weight of an optimal solution. Redesigning the weight function to avoid the monotonicity requirement using Feder’s method can radically increase  $K$ . For weighted SR, finding an optimal matching is NP-hard, but 2-approximable, under the assumption of monotone, non-negative and integral weights [6]. These constraints restrict the practical use of Feder’s results to a large extent. Fortunately, linear programming techniques allow the majority of the conditions to be dropped while retaining polynomial-time solvability. Weighted SM can be solved to optimality with arbitrary real-valued weight functions [19], and a 2-approximation for weighted SR can be found for every non-negative weight function [25].

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. When considering the restriction of any of the above problems to the case of a bipartite graph SR is replaced by SM in the problem name.

### 3 Almost stable matchings with restricted edges

In this section, constraints on restricted edges must be fulfilled strictly, while the number of blocking edges is minimised. Our results are presented in three subsections, and most of the results are given for MIN BP SM RESTRICTED. 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 and very difficult to approximate. Thus, restricted cases are analyzed in Section 3.2. First 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. 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 3.3 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 and approximability results

When minimising 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




Figure 2: The transformation from MIN BP PSMI to MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN

$bp(\mathcal{I}) = 1$ . 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  $w_4$ .

In Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 we present two results demonstrating the NP-hardness and inapproximability of special cases of MIN BP SM RESTRICTED.

**Theorem 3.1.** MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SM FORCED are NP-hard.

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].

*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.

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.

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

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 1.** *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 among 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 2.** *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.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.2.** *Each of MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SM FORCED is not approximable within a factor of  $n^{1-\varepsilon}$ , for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , unless  $P = NP$ .*

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 [21]. We show that if there were 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  $\mathcal{I}$ .



*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 were 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  $B = \lceil \frac{3}{\varepsilon} \rceil$  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 3.1. 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:

$u$ in $\mathcal{I}'$ :	$w$ listed in $O$ in $\mathcal{I}'$	$q_1, q_2, \dots, q_C$	all remaining women in $\mathcal{I}'$
$w$ in $\mathcal{I}'$ :	$u$ listed in $O$ in $\mathcal{I}'$	$p_1, p_2, \dots, p_C$	all remaining men in $\mathcal{I}'$
$p_i$ :	all women in $\mathcal{I}'$	$q_i$	$q_1, q_2, \dots, q_C$
$q_i$ :	all men in $\mathcal{I}'$	$p_i$	$p_1, p_2, \dots, p_C$

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  $p_i q_i$ . 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  $(n_1 + n_2)^{B+1}$

$$N = 6n_1 + 8n_1C + 9n_2 - 2K + 2C \quad (8)$$

$$> C \quad (9)$$

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

$$> n_1^B \quad (11)$$

$$\geq 28^B \quad (12)$$

- 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  $n_1 > 28$

$$C > (n_1 + n_2)^B \quad (13)$$

$$\geq 28^{-\frac{B}{B+2}} N^{\frac{B}{B+2}} \quad (14)$$

$$\geq N^{1-\frac{3}{B+2}} \quad (15)$$

$$\geq N^{1-\varepsilon} \quad (16)$$

- 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 □

### 3.2 Bounded parameters

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 in polynomial time. Theorem 3.3 firstly shows that this is true for MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN.

**Theorem 3.3.** MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN is solvable in  $O(n^2m^L)$  time, where  $L = |P|$ , which is polynomial if  $L$  is a constant.

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  $|bp(M)| \leq K$ .

*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 1.1, 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.  $\square$

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 3.4.** *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. As previously mentioned, this problem 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 [21]. Hence suppose we are given an instance  $\mathcal{I}$  of this restriction, comprising a graph  $G = (U_0 \cup W_0, E)$  and an integer  $K$ . 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].

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  $\mathcal{I}'$ . We now describe  $\mathcal{I}'$ .

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  $|Y| = |U_0| - K$ .

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 3.2. 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,




Figure 3: A  $u$ -gadget, a  $w$ -gadget and the special gadget

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  $uv \in E(G)$  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 3.** *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 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.




Figure 4:  $u$  and  $w$  are connected by an edge labelled second by both of them

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  $u_i w_j$ . 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,  $u_i w_j$  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 labelled edge in  $M$ , then  $u_i z_i$  blocks  $M'$ , otherwise  $u_1 z_1$  blocks  $M'$ . Therefore, up to this point, we have  $|U_0|$  blocking edges.

Analogous arguments prove that among 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  $u_i w_j \in M'$ , then  $w_j v_j$ , otherwise  $w_1 v_1$ .

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

**Claim 4.** *To each matching  $M'$  in  $\mathcal{I}'$  containing  $u_0 w_0$  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  $u_0 w_0 \in M'$ , then every  $u$ - and  $w$ -gadget is adjacent to at least one blocking edge. Since  $w_0$  prefers all its edges to  $u_0 w_0$ , 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  $u_0 w_4$  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  $u_i z_i$ , where  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  and  $w_j v_j$ , where  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , because they are the first-choice edges of both of their end vertices. Suppose  $u_1 z_1 \notin M'$ , therefore it blocks  $M'$ . Then,  $u_2 z_2 \in M'$ , otherwise it also blocks  $M'$ . But then  $u_3 z_1 \in M'$ , otherwise  $u_3 z_1$  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  $u_2 z_2 \notin M'$ . Similarly,  $u_1 z_1 \in M'$  and  $u_3 z_2 \in M'$ , moreover, the only edges incident to the gadget that might block  $M'$  are the edges of  $u_2$ . The remaining case is that  $u_1 z_1, u_2 z_2 \in M'$ . Then,  $u_3$  is either unmatched or matched to  $w'_0$  and in both cases,  $u_3 w_0$  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  $w_j v_j \notin M'$  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,  $w_j v_j$  blocks  $M'$ . In the very last case, if  $w_j v_j \in M'$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , then  $w_4 u_0$  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  $u'_0 w'_0 \notin M'$ , then  $u'_0 w_0$  blocks  $M'$ . Therefore,  $u'_0 w'_0 \in M'$ . 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  $u''_0 w''_0 \notin M'$ , then  $u_0 w''_0$  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  $M'$ .  $\square$

A counterpart to Theorem 3.3 holds in the case of MIN BP SM RESTRICTED if the number of blocking pairs in an optimal solution is a constant.

**Theorem 3.5.** MIN BP SM RESTRICTED is solvable in  $O(m^{L+1})$  time, where  $L$  is the minimum number of edges blocking an optimal solution, which is polynomial if  $L$  is a constant.

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  $|bp(M)| \leq K$ .

*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  $O(m)$  time.  $\square$

Next we study the case of degree-constrained graphs, because for most hard SM and SR problems, it is the most common special case to investigate [3, 13, 21]. Here, we show in Theorem 3.6 that MIN BP SM RESTRICTED remains computationally hard even for instances with preference lists of length at most 3. On the other hand, according to Theorem 3.7, the problem can be solved by identifying forbidden subgraphs when the length of preference lists is bounded by 2.

**Theorem 3.6.** MIN BP SM FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SM FORCED are NP-hard even if each agent's preference list consists of at most 3 elements.

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 for  $B$ ?

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.

*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.




Figure 5: A clause and a variable gadget with their special matchings



**The variable gadget.** To each variable in  $B$ , a graph on 44 vertices is defined. The right hand-side of Figure 3.2 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 5.** *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 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 3.2. The gray edges denote  $M_1, M_2$  and  $M_3$ , from the top to the bottom.

**Claim 6.** *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 6 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 7.** *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 6, 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 6. 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.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.7.** *MIN BP SM RESTRICTED is solvable in  $O(n)$  time 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

among 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 minimises 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.  $\square$

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.

### 3.3 Stable roommates problem

Having discussed several cases of SM, we turn our attention to non-bipartite instances. Since SM is a restriction of SR, all established results on the NP-hardness and inapproximability of MIN BP SM RESTRICTED carry over to the non-bipartite SR case. As a matter of fact, more is true, since MIN BP SR RESTRICTED is NP-hard and difficult to approximate even if  $P = \emptyset$  and  $Q = \emptyset$  [1]. We summarise these observations as follows.

**Remark 3.8.** By Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, MIN BP SR FORBIDDEN and MIN BP SR FORCED are NP-hard and not approximable within  $n^{1-\varepsilon}$ , for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , unless  $P = NP$ . Moreover Theorems 3.6 and 3.4 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,  $|Q| = 1$ . Finally MIN BP SR RESTRICTED is NP-hard and not approximable within  $n^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}$ , for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , unless  $P = NP$ , even if  $P = \emptyset$  and  $Q = \emptyset$  [1].

As for the polynomially solvable cases, the proofs of Theorems 3.3, 3.5 and 3.7 carry over without applying any modifications, giving the following.

**Remark 3.9.** 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.

This section is structured as follows: in Section 4.1, complexity and approximability results are presented for SM MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS, SR MIN FORBIDDEN, SR MAX FORCED and SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS. In Section 4.2 we consider the complexity of SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS when the degree of the underlying graph is bounded.

## 4.1 General complexity and approximability results

As mentioned in Section 1, a weighted stable matching instance models SM MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS.

**Theorem 4.1.** SM MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS *is solvable in polynomial time.*

*Proof.* We convert SM MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS into a weighted SM problem so that a matching  $M$  is of weight  $|P \cap M| - |Q \cap M| = |Q| + |P \cap M| + |Q \setminus M|$  using the following weight function:

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

In 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 4.2.** SR MIN FORBIDDEN *and* SR MAX FORCED *are NP-hard.*

Here, we give two alternative proofs for the same theorem. On one hand, the complexity results in Theorem 4.2 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  $\varepsilon$ , unless the Unique Games Conjecture is false [17]. The set of vertices covered by any maximal matching in  $G$  gives a 2-approximation.

*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.

**Claim 8.** *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  $\bar{p}_i q_i \in M$ .




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

**Claim 9.** *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 10.** *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 8 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:

$$\begin{array}{llll} p_i: & \bar{p}_i & \text{intermediate } p \text{ vertices} & \bar{q}_i \quad \text{rest} \\ \bar{p}_i: & q_i & p_i & \text{rest} \\ q_i: & \bar{q}_i & \bar{p}_i & \text{rest} \\ \bar{q}_i: & p_i & q_i & \text{rest} \end{array}$$

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 11.** *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  $1 \leq i \leq n$

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

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)  $p_i\bar{p}_i, p_i\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_iq_i$  or  $q_i\bar{q}_i$ : They are last-choice edges of either of their end vertices, therefore, they cannot block  $M$
- ii)  $p_ip_j$ : The values of  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  are determined by the fact that  $p_ip_j$  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 12.** *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  $\bar{p}_iq_i$  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  $\bar{p}_iq_i \in M$ . 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  $\{p_i\bar{q}_i, \bar{p}_iq_i\} \subseteq M$ .

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

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.  $\square$

In our first proof above, we reduced MIN VX COVER to SR MIN FORBIDDEN and SR MAX FORCED. Since MIN VX COVER is NP-hard and cannot be approximated within a factor of  $2 - \varepsilon$  for any positive  $\varepsilon$ , unless the Unique Games Conjecture is false [17], the reduction also answers basic questions about the approximability of our two 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 if  $Q = \emptyset$  or  $|Q|$  is sufficiently large. To derive this result, we use the 2-approximability of weighted SR for non-negative weight functions [25]. Due to the non-negativity constraint, the case of  $0 < |Q| < |M|$  remains open.

**Theorem 4.3.** *If  $|Q| \geq |M|$  for a stable matching  $M$ , then SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS is 2-approximable in polynomial time.*

*Proof.* The NP-hard minimum weight SR problem is 2-approximable in polynomial time [6, 25] for all non-negative weight functions. The assumption  $Q = \emptyset$  or  $|Q| \geq |M|$  is needed to guarantee non-negativity. 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:

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

$\square$

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 maximise  $|Q \cap M|$ , 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 4.4.** *For SR MAX FORCED, the maximum of  $|Q \cap M|$  cannot be approximated within  $n^{\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon}$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , unless  $P = NP$ .*

*Proof.* We adapt the proof of Theorem 4.2 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  $P = NP$  [26], 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.  $\square$

## 4.2 Bounded parameters

We now turn to the complexity of SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS and its variants when the degree of the underlying graph is bounded or some parameter of the instance can be considered as a constant. With Theorems 4.5 and 4.6 we draw the line between NP-hard and polynomially solvable cases in term of degree constraints.

**Theorem 4.5.** *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  $I$ .

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

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

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 the preference list of an agent  $e_j^s$  ( $1 \leq j \leq m$  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 [12] 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  $G$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.6.** SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS is solvable in  $O(n)$  time if every preference list is of length at most 2.

*Proof.* Since the 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.  $\square$

Short preference lists are not the only case when SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS becomes tractable, as our last theorem shows.

**Theorem 4.7.** 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.

One of the most striking open questions is the approximability of SR MIN RESTRICTED VIOLATIONS if  $0 < |Q| < |M|$ . Our other 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 polynomial time, due to algorithms 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 or linear programming methods?

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments, which have helped to improve the presentation of this paper.

## References

- [1] D. Abraham, P. Biró, and D. Manlove. “Almost stable” matchings in the Roommates problem. In *Proceedings of WAOA’05*, volume 3879 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–14. Springer, 2006.
- [2] P. Berman, M. Karpinski, and A. D. Scott. Approximation hardness of short symmetric instances of MAX-3SAT. Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity Report, number 49, 2003.
- [3] P. Biró, D. Manlove, and E. McDermid. “Almost stable” matchings in the Roommates problem with bounded preference lists. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 432:10–20, 2012.
- [4] P. Biró, D. Manlove, and S. Mittal. Size versus stability in the marriage problem. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 411:1828–1841, 2010.
- [5] V. Dias, G. da Fonseca, C. de Figueiredo, and J. 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. Irving, and D. Manlove. Efficient algorithms for generalised stable marriage and roommates problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 381(1-3):162–176, 2007.
- [9] A.-T. Gai, D. Lebedev, F. Mathieu, F. de Montgolfier, J. Reynier, and L. Viennot. Acyclic preference systems in P2P networks. In *Proceedings of Euro-Par’07*, volume 4641 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 825–834. Springer, 2007.
- [10] D. Gale and L. Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 69:9–15, 1962.
- [11] D. Gale and M. Sotomayor. Some remarks on the stable matching problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 11:223–232, 1985.
- [12] D. Gusfield and R. Irving. *The Stable Marriage Problem: Structure and Algorithms*. MIT Press, 1989.

- [13] 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.
- [14] R. Irving. An efficient algorithm for the “stable roommates” problem. *Journal of Algorithms*, 6:577–595, 1985.
- [15] R. Irving, P. Leather, and D. Gusfield. An efficient algorithm for the “optimal” stable marriage. *Journal of the ACM*, 34(3):532–543, 1987.
- [16] R. Irving and D. Manlove. The Stable Roommates Problem with Ties. *Journal of Algorithms*, 43:85–105, 2002.
- [17] S. Khot and O. Regev. Vertex cover might be hard to approximate to within  $2 - \varepsilon$ . *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 74(3):335–349, 2008.
- [18] S. Khuller, S. Mitchell, and V. Vazirani. On-line algorithms for weighted bipartite matching and stable marriages. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 127:255–267, 1994.
- [19] T. Király and J. Pap. Total dual integrality of Rothblum’s description of the stable-marriage polyhedron. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 33(2):283–290, 2008.
- [20] D. 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.
- [21] G. O’Malley. *Algorithmic Aspects of Stable Matching Problems*. PhD thesis, University of Glasgow, Department of Computing Science, 2007.
- [22] A. 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.
- [23] A. Roth. Deferred acceptance algorithms: history, theory, practice, and open questions. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 36(3-4):537–569, 2008.
- [24] A. 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.
- [25] C.-P. Teo and J. Sethuraman. The geometry of fractional stable matchings and its applications. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 23(4):874–891, 1998.
- [26] D. Zuckerman. Linear degree extractors and the inapproximability of max clique and chromatic number. *Theory of Computing*, 3(6):103–128, 2007.