

CSE 421: Introduction to Algorithms

Stable Matching

Shayan Oveis Gharan

Propose-And-Reject Algorithm [Gale-Shapley'62]

```
Initialize each side to be free.
while (some company is free and hasn't proposed to every
applicant) {
    Choose such a c
    a = 1st applicant on c's list to whom c has not yet
proposed
    if (a is free)
        assign c and a
    else if (a prefers c to her current c')
        assign c and a, and c' to be free
    else
        a rejects c
}
```

First step: Properties of Algorithm

Observation 1: Companies propose to Applicants in decreasing order of preference.

Observation 2: Each company proposes to each applicant at most once

Observation 3: Once an applicant is matched, she never becomes unmatched; she only "trades up."

2) Correctness: Output is Perfect matching

Claim. All Companies and Applicants get matched.

Proof. (by contradiction) First, notice each company/applicant is matched to at most one other agent.

Suppose, for sake of contradiction, that c is not matched upon termination of algorithm.

Then some applicant, say a , is not matched upon termination.

By Observation 3 (only trading up, never becoming unmatched), a was never proposed to.

But, c proposes to everyone, since it ends up unmatched.



2) Correctness: Stability

Claim. No unstable pairs.

Proof. (by contradiction)

Suppose c, a is an unstable pair: each prefers each other to the partner in Gale-Shapley matching S^* .

Case 1: c never proposed to a .

$\Rightarrow c$ prefers its S^* partner to a .

$\Rightarrow c, a$ is stable.

Obs1: companies propose in decreasing order of preference

Case 2: c proposed to a .

$\Rightarrow a$ rejected c (right away or later)

$\Rightarrow a$ prefers her S^* partner to c .

$\Rightarrow c, a$ is stable.

Obs3: applicants only trade up

In either case c, a is stable, a contradiction.



Summary

Stable matching problem: Given n companies and n applicants, and their preferences, find a stable matching if one exists.

- **Gale-Shapley algorithm:** Guarantees to find a stable matching for **any** problem instance.
- **Q:** If there are multiple stable matchings, which one does GS find?
- **Q:** How to implement GS algorithm efficiently?
- **Q:** How many stable matchings are there?

Understanding the Solution

Q. For a given problem instance, there may be several stable matchings. Do all executions of Gale-Shapley yield the same stable matching? If so, which one?

An instance with two stable matchings:

- $(c_1, a_1), (c_2, a_2)$.
- $(c_1, a_2), (c_2, a_1)$.

| | 1 st | 2 nd |
|-------|-----------------|-----------------|
| c_1 | a_1 | a_2 |
| c_2 | a_2 | a_1 |

| | 1 st | 2 nd |
|-------|-----------------|-----------------|
| a_1 | c_2 | c_1 |
| a_2 | c_1 | c_2 |

Company Optimal Assignments

Definition: Company c is a **valid partner** of applicant a if there exists some stable matching in which they are matched.

Company-optimal matching: Each company receives the best **valid** partner (according to his preferences).

- Not that each company receives its most favorite applicant.

Example

Here

$\text{Valid-partner}(c_1) = \{a_1, a_2\}$

$\text{Valid-partner}(c_2) = \{a_1, a_2\}$

$\text{Valid-partner}(c_3) = \{a_3\}$.

Company-optimal matching $\{c_1, a_1\}, \{c_2, a_2\}, \{c_3, a_3\}$

| | favorite ↓ | | least favorite ↓ |
|-------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| | 1 st | 2 nd | 3 rd |
| c_1 | a_1 | a_2 | a_3 |
| c_2 | a_2 | a_1 | a_3 |
| c_3 | a_1 | a_2 | a_3 |

| | favorite ↓ | | least favorite ↓ |
|-------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| | 1 st | 2 nd | 3 rd |
| a_1 | c_2 | c_1 | c_3 |
| a_2 | c_1 | c_2 | c_3 |
| a_3 | c_1 | c_2 | c_3 |

Company Optimal Assignments

Definition: Company c is a **valid partner** of applicant a if there exists some stable matching in which they are matched.

Company-optimal matching: Each company receives the best **valid** partner (according to its preferences).

- Not that each company receives its most favorite applicant.

Claim: **All** executions of GS yield a company-optimal matching, which is a stable matching!

- So, output of GS is unique!!
- No reason a priori to believe that company-optimal matching is perfect, let alone stable.

Applicant Pessimality

Applicant-pessimal assignment: Each applicant receives the worst **valid** partner.

Claim. GS finds **applicant-pessimal** stable matching \mathbf{S}^* .

Proof.

Suppose (c, a) matched in \mathbf{S}^* , but c is not the worst valid partner for a .

There exists stable matching \mathbf{S} in which a is paired with a company, say c' , whom she likes less than c .

Let a' be c partner in \mathbf{S} .

c prefers a to a' .  **company-optimality of \mathbf{S}^***

Thus, (c, a) is an unstable in \mathbf{S} .



Company Optimality

S

(c, a)

(c', a')

...

Claim: GS matching **S*** is company-optimal.

Proof: (by contradiction)

Suppose some company is paired with someone other than its best partner. Companies propose in decreasing order of preference
 \Rightarrow some company is rejected by a valid partner.

Let c be the **first** such rejection, and let a be its best valid partner.

Let **S** be a stable matching where c and a are matched.

In building **S***, when c is rejected, a is assigned to a company, say c' whom she prefers to c .

Let a' be c' partner in **S**.

In building **S***, c' is not rejected by any valid partner at the point when c is rejected by a . Thus, c' prefers a to a' .


But a prefers c' to c .

Thus (c', a) is unstable in **S**.

since this is the first rejection by a valid partner



Summary

- **Stable matching problem:** Given n men and n women, and their preferences, find a stable matching if one exists.
- **Gale-Shapley algorithm** guarantees to find a stable matching for **any** problem instance.
- **GS algorithm** finds man-optimal woman pessimal matching 
- **GS algorithm** finds a stable matching in **$O(n^2)$** time.
- **Q:** How many stable matching are there?

Induction: Intro 1

Prove that for all $n \geq 1$,

$$1 + 2 + \dots + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}.$$

Def $P(n) = 1 + 2 + \dots + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$

Base Case: $P(1)$ holds: $1 = 1(1+1)/2$

IH: $P(n-1)$ holds for some $n \geq 2$

IS: Goal to prove $P(n)$.

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \dots + n &= (1 + \dots + n - 1) + n \\ &= \left(\frac{(n-1)n}{2} \right) + n && \text{By IH} \\ &= \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Induction: Intro 2

Prove that if $n+1$ balls are placed into n bins then one bin has at least two balls.

Def: $P(n)$: For **all** placements of $n+1$ balls into n bins there exists a bin with at least two balls.

Base Case: $P(1)$ holds. Two balls into one bin

IH: $P(n-1)$ holds for some $n \geq 2$

IS: Goal is to prove $P(n)$. Suppose $n+1$ balls are placed into n bins **arbitrarily**. Need to show a bin has ≥ 2 balls. Look at bin 1.

Case 1: Bin 1 has at least two balls. Then we are done.

Case 2: Bin 1 has 1 ball. Then, we have placed n balls into bins $2, \dots, n$. So, by IH one bin has at least two balls.

Case 3: Bin 1 has 0 balls. Remove an arbitrary ball. Then, we have n balls in bins $2, \dots, n$. So, by IH a bin has ≥ 2 balls