

Stable Matchings in Metric Spaces: Modeling Real-World Preferences using Proximity

Hossein Karkeh Abadi
Stanford University
hosseink@stanford.edu

Balaji Prabhakar
Stanford University
balaji@stanford.edu

Suppose each of n men and n women is located at a point in a metric space. A woman ranks the men in order of their distance to her from closest to farthest, breaking ties at random. The men rank the women similarly. An interesting problem is to use these ranking lists and find a stable matching in the sense of Gale and Shapley. This problem formulation naturally models preferences in several real world applications; for example, dating sites, room renting/letting, ride hailing and labor markets. Two key questions that arise in this setting are: (a) When is the stable matching unique without resorting to tie breaks? (b) If X is the distance between a randomly chosen stable pair, what is the distribution of X and what is $E(X)$? These questions address conditions under which it is possible to find a unique (stable) partner, and the quality of the stable matching in terms of the rank or the proximity of the partner.

We study dating sites and ride hailing as prototypical examples of stable matchings in discrete and continuous metric spaces, respectively. In the dating site model, each man/woman is assigned to a point on the k -dimensional hypercube based on their answers to a set of k questions with binary answers (e.g., like/dislike). We consider two different metrics on the hypercube: Hamming and Weighted Hamming (in which the answers to some questions carry more weight). Under both metrics, there are exponentially many stable matchings when $k = \lfloor \log n \rfloor$. There is a unique stable matching, with high probability, under the Hamming distance when $k = \Omega(n^\epsilon)$, and under the Weighted Hamming distance when $k > (2 + \epsilon) \log n$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Furthermore, under the Weighted Hamming distance, we show that $\log(X)/\log(n) \rightarrow -1$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, when $k > (1 + \epsilon) \log n$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. In the ride hailing model, passengers and cabs are modeled as points on the line and matched based on Euclidean distance (a proxy for pickup time). Assuming the locations of the passengers and cabs are independent Poisson processes of different intensities, we derive bounds on the distribution of X in terms of busy periods at a last-come-first-served preemptive-resume (LCFS-PR) queue. We also get bounds on $E(X)$ using combinatorial arguments.

1 INTRODUCTION

The stable marriage problem was first introduced by Gale and Shapley [1962] as a way of modeling the college admissions process, in which students are matched with colleges, and the process of courtship leading to marriage, in which women and men are matched. They introduced two key properties of matchings: stability and optimality. These properties are quite well-known and we will recall them formally later; for now, we proceed informally. Stability captures the requirement that a matching should not pair a man M and a woman W with partners whom they *both* prefer less than each other. Should this happen, M and W are both incentivized to break up with their assigned partners and match with each other. Gale and Shapley [1962] show that there is always at least one stable matching and present the *deferred-acceptance algorithm* for finding it. Optimality refers to the quality of a matching in terms of the rank of men in their partners' preference lists, and vice versa. The stable marriage problem has also been studied in several other real world settings. One famous example is the National Resident Matching Program (NRMP) [Roth, 1984, 1996] where medical school students are matched to residency programs through a centralized stable matching mechanism. Other examples include online dating [Hitsch et al., 2010], sorority rush [Mongell and Roth, 1991], and school choice [Abdulkadiroglu and Sönmez, 2003].

Knuth [1976] initiated the theoretical analysis of large-scale instances of the stable marriage problem under the “random preference list” assumption, where the preference lists of each man and woman are drawn independently and uniformly from the set of all permutations. Knuth poses the question of estimating the average number of stable matchings when n , the number of men (equal to the number of women) grows large, and provides an integral formula for the probability that a given matching is stable. Pittel [1989, 1992] evaluated this integral and showed that the average number of stable matchings is asymptotic to $e^{-1}n \ln n$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and that any given woman (or man) has $\Theta(\log n)$ stable partners, on average. We mention a few other results under the random preference list assumption relevant to our work: Immorlica and Mahdian [2005] proved that if the preference list of each woman has only a constant number of entries, then the number of people with multiple stable partners is vanishingly small.¹ Ashlagi et al. [2015] studied the “unbalanced” case when there are n men and $n+k$ women, for $k \geq 1$. They show that, with high probability,² the fraction of men and women with multiple stable partners tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This line of work is theoretically very interesting, but preference lists in the real world are rarely drawn at random—there can exist a significant correlation in the choices people and organizations make. For example, Roth and Peranson [1999] empirically observed correlations in the NRMP preference lists; the applicants largely prefer the same programs and the programs tend to rank the applicants similarly (*i.e.*, a top applicant in one program was also top-ranked in other programs). They note that these correlations can result in a small set of stable matchings. Holzman and Samet [2014] make the previous observation mathematically precise by assuming each participant picks their preference list from a small set of permutations.

While the above correlations capture a “sameness” in the preferences of people and organizations, in this paper we consider correlations due to “proximity”. Proximity can arise from a coincidence of likes and interests between members of the two sides of a matching market. For example, each member of a matching market answers a questionnaire describing their likes, dislikes, interests or requirements. The questionnaire can either be the same for both sides of the matching market (*e.g.*, online dating) or different (*e.g.*, renters answer questions describing their preferred properties while lessors describe attributes of their preferred renters). The vector of answers can be viewed as points in a metric space and proximity is equated with distance in the metric space. Each participant in the market ranks members of the other side based on their proximity to the participant, from closest to farthest. Distance also arises naturally in the case of ride

¹Roth and Peranson [1999] also empirically observe this phenomenon in the context of candidates interviewing for jobs.

²We say a sequence of events E_n occur with high probability if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(E_n) = 1$.

hailing, where it is desirable to match a hailer with the closest available car. Thus, a wide variety of real world applications can be modeled in this framework; for example, dating sites,³ renting/letting,⁴ labor markets,⁵ and ride hailing.⁶

Our results. We analyze stable matchings in discrete and continuous metric spaces as the number of participants grows large. We make distributional assumptions on the distances between the participants (hence on the preference lists) and analyze the number and quality of stable matchings. The quality of a stable matching is captured by how small the distances are between stable partners in the matching. When the metric space is continuous, the stable matching is almost surely unique under very mild and natural distributional assumptions. However, this is not necessarily true in discrete metric spaces. An interesting finding of our work is that a participant (on either side of the market) is *at the same distance* from their partner in all stable matchings. Thus, it makes sense to consider X , the distance between a randomly chosen stable pair (regardless of which stable matching they're picked from, should there be more than one stable matching). We are interested in the distribution of X and $E(X)$ as the number of participants grows large. We explore these quantities in the dating sites and ride hailing settings.

Dating sites. Suppose the men and women of a community are seeking to get matched to a partner in a dating site. At the time of signing up, participants are usually asked to answer a fixed set of k yes/no questions about their preferences, (e.g., “Do you like pets?”, “Are you a morning person?”). We call the k -bit vector representing a participant’s answers to these questions the participant’s *profile*. Each profile can be modeled as a point on the k -dimensional hypercube, Q_k . The aim is to match a woman to a man whose profile is closest or most similar to hers. We consider two different metrics on Q_k for measuring this similarity: the *Hamming* distance and the *Weighted Hamming* distance. The Hamming distance between two profiles is equal to the number of entries at which they disagree. The Weighted Hamming distance weighs some disagreements more; the details are in Section 3. Since the distances are not necessarily distinct, we also assume that each person has a “tie-breaking preference list” for ranking members of the other side and uses this to break ties. One way to think of the actual preference list of a woman is that it ranks the men by distance, closest first. Men at the same distance are ranked according to her tie-breaking preference list. The men form their preference lists similarly.⁷

We consider the setting in which profiles are picked independently and uniformly at random from Q_k , and the tie-breaking preference lists are chosen independently and uniformly from the set of all permutations. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary positive number. We shall prove that under both the Hamming and the Weighted Hamming distances, for $k < (1 - \epsilon) \log n$, the fraction of people with multiple stable partners tends to zero, with high probability, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. However, if $k = \lfloor \log n \rfloor$, there are exponentially many stable matchings. We show that, with high probability, the stable matching is unique under the Hamming distance for $k = \Omega(n^6)$, and it is unique under the Weighted Hamming distance for $k > (2 + \epsilon) \log n$, without resorting to tie breaks.⁸ We derive a lower bound on X under the Hamming distance. Under the Weighted Hamming distance, we prove that if $k > (1 + \epsilon) \log n$, then $\log X / \log n \rightarrow -1$ in probability.

³Tinder (<https://www.gotinder.com>), Zoosk (<https://www.zoosk.com>)

⁴Airbnb (<https://www.airbnb.com>), Zillow (<http://www.zillow.com>)

⁵LinkedIn (<https://www.linkedin.com>)

⁶Uber (<https://www.uber.com>), Lyft (<https://www.lyft.com>)

⁷One way to generalize this model to matching markets with two different questionnaires (one for each side of the market) is to ask each participant to answer their questionnaire and also to indicate their best answers from participants on the other side of the market (e.g., renters and lessors answer their questions and that of an ideal response from the other side). The overall profile is then formed by concatenating the answers to both questionnaires.

⁸Tie-breaking represents *chance*, which, in the context of dating, could reasonably be thought of as being less preferable to *choice*. In other words, a participant would prefer to find his/her partner from their profile rather than through a process involving a coin flip.

Ride hailing. Consider the problem of matching passengers and cabs on a street. Let blue and red points on the real line represent the location of passengers and cabs, respectively. Suppose the blue and red points occur according to two independent Poisson processes with respective intensities λ and μ . Each point forms its preference list by ranking points of the other color in an increasing order of their Euclidean distance to it. Holroyd et al. [2009] studied translation-invariant matchings between the points of two d -dimensional Poisson processes with the same intensities ($\lambda = \mu$). They show the natural algorithm of matching mutually closest pairs of points iteratively yields an almost surely unique stable matching. They analyze the tail behavior of X , the distance between a typical pair of stable partners. In the 1-dimensional case, they derive power law upper and lower bounds for the tail distribution of X . In this paper, we study the stable matching problem between two Poisson processes on the real line in the unbalanced case where $\lambda < \mu$. We derive bounds on the distribution of X in terms of the busy cycles of a last-come-first-served preemptive-resume (LCFS-PR) queue.⁹ Using combinatorial arguments, we prove that $\mathbb{E}(X) \leq (1 + \ln \frac{\mu+\lambda}{\mu-\lambda})/(\mu - \lambda)$.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we define the stable matching problem, introduce relevant notation, and state some known results. In Section 3 we describe the stable matching problem on hypercubes and present our results in this model. In Section 4 we analyze the stable matching problem on the real line. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 BACKGROUND AND PREVIOUS WORK

A community of n men and n women is represented by sets \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{W} , respectively. Suppose each person x in the community has a strict preference list, \succ_x , which ranks members of the opposite gender. Thus, $y_1 \succ_x y_2$ means x prefers y_1 to y_2 . A matching μ is a mapping from $\mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{W}$ to itself, such that for each man m , $\mu(m) \in \mathcal{W} \cup \{m\}$, for each woman w , $\mu(w) \in \mathcal{M} \cup \{w\}$, and for any $m, w \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{W}$, $\mu(m) = w$ implies $\mu(w) = m$. A man or woman x is *unmatched* under μ if $\mu(x) = x$. A pair $(m, w) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{W}$ is called a *blocking pair* for a matching μ if $w \succ_m \mu(m)$ and $m \succ_w \mu(w)$. A matching is called *stable* if it does not have any blocking pairs. If a man m and a woman w are matched to each other in a stable matching, we say w and m are a *stable partner* of each other.

The problem of stable matching was first introduced by Gale and Shapley [1962]. They proved that there always exists a stable matching, which can be found using an iterative algorithm called the *deferred-acceptance algorithm*. This algorithm proceeds in a series of proposals and tentative approvals until there is a one-to-one matching between the men and women. When the women propose, they each end up with the best stable partner they can have in any stable matching. This matching, often called *woman-optimal*, also pairs each man with his lowest-ranked stable partner. The *man-optimal* stable matching, which results when the men do the proposing, may be distinct from the woman-optimal stable matching; thus, there may be many stable matchings. Under the random preference list assumption, Pittel [1989, 1992] proved that the average number of stable matchings is asymptotic to $e^{-1}n \ln n$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and each person has $\Theta(\log n)$ stable partners, on average. The stable marriage problem can be extended to the unbalanced case where the number of men and women is not equal. It is clear that for any stable matching in the unbalanced case, there are some people who remain unmatched. This may also happen in the balanced case if the preference lists of some men or women are not complete. We state the following theorems for ready reference.

THEOREM 2.1 (RURAL HOSPITAL). [McVitie and Wilson, 1970, Roth, 1986] *The set of men and women who are not matched is the same for all stable matchings.*

THEOREM 2.2. [Immorlica and Mahdian, 2005] *Consider the stable marriage problem with n men and n women. Suppose the preference lists of the women are drawn independently and uniformly at random from the*

⁹Such a queue is also called a *stack* [Kelly and Yudovina, 2014].

set of all orderings of men. For a fixed $k \geq 1$, let the preference lists of the men be drawn independently and uniformly at random from the set of all ordered lists of any k women. (The k women on two different men's preference lists may be different.) In this setting, the expected number of women who have multiple stable partners is $o(n)$.

THEOREM 2.3. [Ashlagi et al., 2015] Consider a stable marriage problem with n men and $n + k$ women, for arbitrary $k = k(n) \geq 1$. Suppose the preference lists of women are drawn independently and uniformly at random from the set of all orderings of men, and the preference lists of men are drawn independently and uniformly at random from the set of all orderings of women. The fractions of men and women who have multiple stable partners tends to zero, with high probability, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The independence of the randomly drawn preference lists is the key assumption in the analysis of both Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3. Under this assumption, Theorem 2.2 shows that if the preference lists of one side of the market is limited to a fixed $k \geq 1$ entries, the fraction of men and women with multiple stable partners is vanishingly small. Theorem 2.3 proves the same result for unbalanced markets where there is a size $k \geq 1$ discrepancy between the number of men and women. In the following section, we derive similar results for the matching markets with correlated preference lists where each person reveals $k \geq 1$ bits of information about their preference by answering k yes/no questions.

3 STABLE MATCHING ON HYPERCUBES

Consider a dating site with n men and n women, represented by sets \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{W} . Let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{W}$ and let k be a positive integer. For each $x \in \mathcal{S}$, let the k -bit vector representing their profile be denoted by $\mathbf{a}_k(x) = (a_1(x), \dots, a_k(x)) \in \{0, 1\}^k$, where $a_i(x) = 0$ if x 's answer to the i^{th} question is "no", and $a_i(x) = 1$ otherwise. Thus, each profile is a point on the k -dimensional hypercube, $Q_k = \{0, 1\}^k$. For simplicity, we shall suppress the subscript k from \mathbf{a}_k whenever it can be inferred.

In this setting, participants prefer to be matched to someone with a similar profile. Similarity is measured using two metrics on Q_k : The Hamming distance and the Weighted Hamming distance. The Hamming distance $d_h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}')$ between \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{a}' equals

$$d_h(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}') \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbf{1}(a_i \neq a'_i).$$

The Hamming distance assumes that all questions have the same weight. However, some questions may have higher importance than others. For example, "Are you allergic to cats?" will likely outweigh "Do you like caramel?". The Weighted Hamming distance,

$$d_w(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a}') \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^k 2^{-i} \mathbf{1}(a_i \neq a'_i),$$

addresses this by assigning different weights to different questions.

Remark. Our results for the Weighted Hamming distance (Theorem 3.4) can be extended to any exponentially decaying weights.

Remark. When making statements which apply to both metrics we shall use the notation $d(., .)$. We shall use $d(x, y)$ to denote the distance between the profiles of participants x and y .

The preference list of x is arranged according to distance, as follows: for $x, y, y' \in \mathcal{S}$,

$$y \succeq_x y' \iff d(x, y) \leq d(x, y').$$

Since distances are not necessarily distinct, a tie-breaking rule is needed to strictly order preference lists. As mentioned in the Introduction, participant x uses their “tie-breaking list”, T_x , to break ties. Thus, each woman w , ranks men in increasing order of their distance to her and arranges men at the same distance according to their order in her tie-breaking list, T_w .¹⁰ For any x and y in \mathcal{S} , T_x is not necessarily equal to T_y . Let the final *strict* preference list of user x be denoted by P_x . We shall use $>_x$ to indicate ordering in this list. We are now ready to state

The Profile Matching Problem (PMP). Given n men and n women and their strict preference lists, the profile matching problem seeks to find a stable matching between the men and the women.

A priori, it seems there may be many stable matchings and multiple stable partners for some women and men. However, we shall see in Lemma 3.1 that the multiple stable matchings, should they exist, are all essentially equal in quality. Suppose μ is a stable matching for the PMP. Let $d_\mu(x)$ be the distance between x and $\mu(x)$,

$$d_\mu(x) \triangleq d(x, \mu(x)).$$

LEMMA 3.1. *Let μ_1 and μ_2 be two stable matchings for the Profile Matching Problem. Then $d_{\mu_1}(x) = d_{\mu_2}(x)$ for every $x \in \mathcal{S}$.*

PROOF. See appendix A.1. □

According to Lemma 3.1, $d_\mu(x)$ does not depend on μ . Hence, we shall simply denote $d_\mu(x)$ by $d(x)$ and call $d(x)$ the *matching distance* of x . Let the random variable X denote the matching distance of a randomly chosen participant x . We analyze X in the following section.

3.1 The Random Profile Matching Problem (RPMP)

We now analyze the PMP under certain distributional assumptions of preference lists and profiles when the number of participants grows large. Our main goals are to understand the following questions: How many questions are needed to find a unique partner for each participant without resorting to tie-breaking? What is the matching distance, X ? These questions will be answered under the Hamming and the Weighted Hamming metrics.

Probabilistic assumptions. We assume each participant answers each of the k questions equally likely with a “yes” or a “no”. Further, the answers to all questions by all the participants are independent. Geometrically, this assumption places the k -bit profile vector of each participant (or, equivalently, the participant) at one of the 2^k vertices of Q_k , independently and uniformly at random. The preference lists are then generated based on the distances induced by the above placement and the tie-breaking lists T_x , $x \in \mathcal{S}$. We assume each T_x is generated independently and uniformly at random from the set of all orderings of men (or women, depending on x).

The RPMP- k . Given n men and n women, each of whose preference lists are generated according to the above probabilistic assumptions, the RPMP- k aims to find a stable matching between the men and the women.

Remark. Note that RPMP-0 is equivalent to the standard stable matching problem with randomly generated preference lists.

¹⁰If w breaks ties at random, then T_w is a random ordering of all the men.

3.2 Our results

In this section we present our main results for the RPMP- k . Theorem 3.2 considers the case where $k \leq \lfloor \log n \rfloor$ and Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 3.4 study larger values of k . Due to page limitation we moved all the proofs to appendix.

THEOREM 3.2. *Consider the RPMP- k for $k \geq 1$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Under any metric on Q_k , the following statements hold with high probability:*

- (i) *if $k < (1 - \epsilon) \log n$, the fraction of users with multiple stable partners tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so long as tie-breaking is used; and*
- (ii) *if $k = \lfloor \log n \rfloor$, there are $O(n)$ users with multiple stable partners and there are exponentially many stable matchings.*

THEOREM 3.3. *Under the Hamming distance, with high probability, we have the following:*

- (i) *if $k(n) = \Omega(n^3)$, the fraction of users with multiple stable partners tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$;*
- (ii) *if $k(n) = \Omega(n^6)$, the stable matching is unique without resorting to tie-breaking; and*
- (iii) *for any $\beta > 1$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X < \frac{k}{2} - \sqrt{\beta k \log n}\right) \leq n^{1-\beta}.$$

THEOREM 3.4. *Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Under the Weighted Hamming distance, with high probability, we have the following:*

- (i) *if $k(n) > (1 + \epsilon) \log n$, the fraction of users with multiple stable partners tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover,*

$$\frac{\log X}{\log n} \xrightarrow{p} -1,$$

where \xrightarrow{p} represents convergence in probability; and

- (ii) *if $k(n) > (2 + \epsilon) \log n$, the stable matching is unique, without resorting to tie-breaking.*

According to Theorem 3.2, in large instances of the RPMP- k , if users answer even one question ($k = 1$), the preference lists become skewed so that, with high probability, any given participant has a unique stable partner. This contrasts starkly with the case $k = 0$, where Pittel [1992] showed that each participant has, on average, $\Theta(\log n)$ stable partners. In Theorem 3.3 and 3.4 we distinguish the statements “the fraction of participants with a unique stable partner goes to 1 with high probability” from the statement “there is a unique stable matching”, since the former does not imply the latter. Moreover, our method of proving the latter consists of proving the following two steps: (i) if the distances of each man from a given woman are distinct, then she will have a unique stable partner (see Lemma A.4); and (ii) if this holds for all the women (or all the men), then the stable matching is unique. From a market design perspective the uniqueness of the stable matching is important to achieve a shape prediction of the market. Theorem 3.3 shows that under the Hamming distance, if $k(n) = \Omega(n^6)$, with high probability, there exists a unique stable matching without resorting to tie-breaking. However, asking that many questions from users is not feasible. On the bright side, Theorem 3.4 shows that if the answers to questions carry different weights, we can achieve a unique stable matching with $k(n) = O(\log n)$ questions.

These theorems also study the matching distance, X . It will be clear from the proof of Theorem 3.2 that $X = 0$, with high probability, when $k < (1 - \epsilon) \log n$. Theorem 3.3 establishes an upper bound on the matching distance X . Theorem 3.4 covers the case of the Weighted Hamming metric.

Remark. All above theorems can be extended to unbalanced markets with n men and $n + r$ women.

4 STABLE MATCHING ON THE LINE

Consider the problem of matching passengers and cabs on a street. Suppose the passengers and cabs are represented as blue and red points, respectively, on \mathbb{R} . Let \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{R} denote the set of blue and red points, respectively. Let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{R}$. A matching between \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{R} is a mapping \mathcal{M} from \mathcal{S} to $\mathcal{S} \cup \{\infty\}$, such that for every red point r , $\mathcal{M}(r) \in \mathcal{B} \cup \{\infty\}$, for every blue point b , $\mathcal{M}(b) \in \mathcal{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, and for every $b, r \in \mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{M}(r) = b$ implies $\mathcal{M}(b) = r$. A point $x \in \mathcal{S}$ is unmatched if $\mathcal{M}(x) = \infty$. The preference list of each point is based on its Euclidean distance to the points with a different color, closest first. A matching \mathcal{M} is stable if there is no pair $(b, r) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$b \neq \mathcal{M}(r) \text{ and } |r - b| < \min(|r - \mathcal{M}(r)|, |b - \mathcal{M}(b)|).$$

For any matching \mathcal{M} and any point $x \in \mathcal{S}$, let $I_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \subset \mathbb{R}$ denote the open interval which has x and $\mathcal{M}(x)$ at its end-points, and let $d_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$ represent the length of $I_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$, i.e., $d_{\mathcal{M}}(x) = |x - \mathcal{M}(x)|$. We call $I_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$ the *matching segment* of x , and $d_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$ the *matching distance* of x in \mathcal{M} .

With the above definitions, suppose that points in \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{R} occur according to independent Poisson processes with rates μ and λ , respectively, where $\lambda \leq \mu$. We call the matching problem defined above as the *Poisson Matching* problem and denote it by $PM(\lambda, \mu)$. As mentioned in the Introduction, Holroyd et al. [2009] studied translation-invariant matchings between two d -dimensional Poisson processes with the same intensities; in particular, they studied stable matchings. They showed that the following algorithm finds a unique stable matching: Each blue point simultaneously emits two rays, one in each direction, such that at any time t , each ray is at distance t from its emitter. Once a ray hits an unmatched red point r , the emitter b will be matched to r , and both points leave the system. Denote the unique stable matching by \mathcal{M}_s and let $x \in \mathcal{B}$ be an arbitrary blue point. Define the random variable X to be x 's matching distance in \mathcal{M}_s , i.e., $X \triangleq d_{\mathcal{M}_s}(x)$. Holroyd et al. [2009] proved that if $\mu = \lambda$, $\mathbb{E}(X^{1/2}) = \infty$.

THEOREM 4.1. [Holroyd et al., 2009] *Let \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{R} be independent 1-dimensional Poisson processes of intensity 1, and let X represent the matching distance of an arbitrary point in the stable matching between \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{R} . We have,*

$$\mathbb{E}(X^{1/2}) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(X > r) \leq Cr^{1/2} \quad \forall r > 0,$$

for some constant $C \in (0, \infty)$.

In this section we analyze the 1-dimensional $PM(\lambda, \mu)$ problem for $\lambda < \mu$. This models the situation in which there are fewer passengers than cabs and sheds light on the time it would take for a passenger to be picked up by the nearest cab that is assigned to pick up the passenger.¹¹ Thus, we shall be interested in the distribution (Theorem 4.5) and the expected value (Theorem 4.7) of X . However, in order to get at these quantities, we need to introduce various ideas such as the relationship among $PM(\lambda, \mu)$, last-come-first-served preemptive-resume (LCFS-PR) queue, and nested matchings. We believe these ideas are interesting in their own right.

4.1 Queue Matching

Red partners in a stable matching may be either to the left or to the right of the corresponding blue points. However, in queue matchings they are either only on the left or only on the right. Consider $PM(\lambda, \mu)$ with the constraint that each blue point can only be matched to red points that are on its *right*. In the passenger-cab scenario, this constraint can be the result of having a one-way street or a road divider, where each cab can only pick up passengers on its left. In order to find the stable matching, all the blue points

¹¹Note the nearest cab may not be able to pick up a passenger since it may be assigned to pick up another passenger who is nearer to the cab than the first passenger. Hence, stable matchings are quite natural in this setting.




Fig. 1. Different matchings between two point processes. Top: forward queue matching \mathcal{M}_s^+ , Middle: backward queue matching \mathcal{M}_s^- , Bottom: stable matching \mathcal{M}_s .

simultaneously emit a ray to their right at time 0. Once a ray hits an unmatched red point r , the emitter b will be matched to r . It is clear that this algorithm is equivalent to running an LCFS-PR queue where the time of job arrivals and departures in this queue are represented as blue points and red points, respectively. The arrival rate is λ and the service rate is μ (the service times are i.i.d. exponentials of rate μ). We call the resulting stable matching, \mathcal{M}_s^+ , the *forward queue matching*, corresponding to running the queue forward in time. Similarly, we can define a *backward queue matching*, \mathcal{M}_s^- , where each blue point is matched to a red point on its left, and can be found by running the LCFS-PR queue backward in time. Figure 1 shows \mathcal{M}_s^+ , \mathcal{M}_s^- , and \mathcal{M}_s for an instance of the problem. The following are well-known facts about LCFS-PR queues with rate λ Poisson arrivals and rate $\mu > \lambda$ i.i.d. exponential service times which are independent of the arrival process. Since $\lambda < \mu$, the queue is stable and each blue point in \mathcal{B} almost surely has a partner in \mathcal{R} . Let $x \in \mathcal{B}$ be an arbitrary blue point and let X^+ be x 's matching distance in \mathcal{M}_s^+ . It is clear that X^+ has the same distribution as the busy cycle in the corresponding LCFS-PR queue, where the *busy cycle* is the duration of time from the arrival of a job at an empty queue to the time the job leaves the queue. It is known [Gross and Harris, 1998] that the probability density function of the busy cycle is given by

$$f_{\lambda, \mu}(t) = \frac{1}{t\sqrt{\rho}} e^{(\lambda+\mu)t} I_1(2t\sqrt{\lambda\mu}), \quad t > 0,$$

where $\rho = \frac{\lambda}{\mu}$, and I_1 is the modified Bessel function of the first kind. Let $B(\lambda, \mu)$ represent this distribution. The average busy cycle duration is $\mathbb{E}(X^+) = 1/(\mu - \lambda)$. In the following section we introduce a class of matchings which includes both stable and queue matchings.

4.2 Nested Matching

For any interval $I \in \mathbb{R}$, represent its closure by \bar{I} . A matching \mathcal{M} is said to be *nested* if for any $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$, $x \in I_{\mathcal{M}}(y)$ implies $\mathcal{M}(x) \in \bar{I}_{\mathcal{M}}(y)$. Therefore, in any nested matching if $I_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \cap I_{\mathcal{M}}(y) \neq \emptyset$, then one of the matching segments is nested inside the other one.

Remark. Since the matching segment of an unmatched point x is (x, ∞) , there is no matching segment of a matched point in a nested matching which contains an unmatched point.

From the discussion in the previous section it is easy to see that any queue matching is nested. The following lemma proves that the stable matching \mathcal{M}_s is also nested.

LEMMA 4.2. *The stable matching \mathcal{M}_s is nested.*

PROOF. See appendix A.2. □

Let \mathcal{A} be the set of all nested matchings between points in \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{R} . We say a red point r is a *potential match* for a blue point b , if there exists a nested matching in which b is matched to r . For any blue point $b \in \mathcal{B}$ define $\mathcal{P}(b)$ to be the set of all potential matches of b ,

$$\mathcal{P}(b) = \{r \in \mathcal{R} : \exists M \in \mathcal{A} \text{ s.t. } M(b) = r\}.$$

The following lemma shows that the set of potential matches of any two blue points are either disjoint or the same.

LEMMA 4.3. *For any $b_1, b_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{P}(b_1) \cap \mathcal{P}(b_2) \neq \emptyset$ implies $\mathcal{P}(b_1) = \mathcal{P}(b_2)$.*

PROOF. See appendix A.2. □

Now define the relation \sim on points in \mathcal{B} as follow:

$$b_1 \sim b_2 \iff \mathcal{P}(b_1) \cap \mathcal{P}(b_2) \neq \emptyset.$$

According to Lemma 4.3, for any $b_1, b_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, if $\mathcal{P}(b_1)$ and $\mathcal{P}(b_2)$ are not disjoint, then they are the same. Therefore, \sim is an equivalence relation on \mathcal{B} . For any blue point $b \in \mathcal{B}$, define $[b]$ to be b 's equivalence class in \mathcal{B} , i.e.,

$$[b] \triangleq \{b' \in \mathcal{B} : \mathcal{P}(b') = \mathcal{P}(b)\}.$$

Let $N(b)$ represent the size of b 's equivalence class, i.e., $N(b) = |[b]|$. Also define $N^+(b) = |\{b' \in [b], b' \geq b\}|$ and $N^-(b) = |\{b' \in [b], b' \leq b\}|$. It is clear that $N(b) = N^+(b) + N^-(b) - 1$. In the following lemma we prove some facts about the structure of the equivalence classes.

LEMMA 4.4. *Suppose $\lambda < \mu$ and let \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{R} represent the set of blue and red points in a Poisson matching problem $PM(\lambda, \mu)$, respectively. For any given blue point $b \in \mathcal{B}$ we have*

- (i) *there exist $r_1, r_2 \in \mathcal{P}(b)$ such that $r_1 > b$ and $r_2 < b$, almost surely;*
- (ii) *there exists exactly one potential red point $r \in \mathcal{P}(b)$ between every two consecutive blue points in $[b]$;*
- (iii) *$|\mathcal{P}(b)| = N(b) + 1$ on $\{|\mathcal{P}(b)| < \infty\}$; and*
- (iv) *$N^+(b)$ and $N^-(b)$ are independent geometric random variables with parameter $1 - \lambda/\mu$.*

PROOF. See appendix A.2. □

Let $b \in \mathcal{B}$ be an arbitrary blue point. Since $\lambda < \mu$, then almost surely $|\mathcal{P}(b)| < \infty$. From Lemma 4.4, we can conclude that blue and red points in $[b] \cup \mathcal{P}(b)$ form a finite sequence $\{w_i\}$, for $-2N^-(b) + 1 \leq i \leq 2N^+(b) - 1$, where $b_0 = b$, $[b] = \{w_i : i \text{ is even}\}$, and $\mathcal{P}(b) = \{w_i : i \text{ is odd}\}$. In other words, this sequence starts with a potential red point, alternates between points in $[b]$ and $\mathcal{P}(b)$, and ends with another potential red point. We call the sequence $\{w_i\}$ b 's *potential wave* and denote it by $\mathcal{W}(b)$. Figure 2 shows potential waves of an instance of $PM(\lambda, \mu)$.¹² A key observation here is that in any nested matching, any blue point in $[b]$ should be matched to a red point in $\mathcal{P}(b)$. Therefore, a nested matching first partitions \mathcal{S} into potential waves and then matches points within each wave, separately. In the following section we present our results on the analysis of the matching distance X in the stable matching \mathcal{M}_s .

¹²This instance is the same as the instance in Figure 1. As we can see in all the matchings shown in Figure 1, each point is matched to a point within the same potential wave shown in Figure 2.




Fig. 2. Different potential waves of a sample problem.

4.3 Matching distance, X

The following theorem, proves bounds on the distribution of X , in terms of busy cycles.

THEOREM 4.5. *Consider an instance of a Poisson matching problem $PM(\lambda, \mu)$, where $\lambda < \mu$. Then we have*

$$\min\{B_1, B'_1\} < X < \max\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{2N-1} B_i, \sum_{i=1}^{2N'-1} B'_i\right\}$$

where B_i and B'_i are i.i.d. random variables with distribution $B(\lambda, \mu)$, and N and N' are i.i.d. geometric random variables with parameter $1 - \lambda/\mu$.

PROOF. See appendix A.2. □

Using Theorem 4.5 we can find the following upper bound for the expected matching distance $\mathbb{E}(X)$.

COROLLARY 4.6.

$$\mathbb{E}(X) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu + \lambda}{\mu - \lambda}\right) \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda}.$$

PROOF. See appendix A.2 □

Remark. Note that the results of Theorem 4.5 and Corollary 4.6 also hold if X is the matching distance in any nested matching.

In the next theorem we improve the upper bound given in Corollary 4.6 for the expected matching distance $\mathbb{E}(X)$. The proof of this theorem is extensive and requires some detailed combinatorial arguments. For more details see appendix A.3.

THEOREM 4.7. *For the stable matching \mathcal{M}_s , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}(X) \leq \left(1 + \ln\left(\frac{\mu + \lambda}{\mu - \lambda}\right)\right) \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda}.$$

PROOF. See appendix A.3. □

In order to evaluate the goodness of the bound in Theorem 4.7, note that for large values of μ ($\mu \gg \lambda$), with a high probability, each blue point will be matched to the closest red point to it. Therefore, as $\mu/\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, X converges to an exponential distribution with rate 2μ (minimum of two i.i.d. exponentials with rate μ) and $\mathbb{E}(X) \sim \frac{1}{2\mu}$. However, from Theorem 4.7, in the limit as $\mu/\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathbb{E}(X)$ is upper bounded by $\frac{1}{\mu}$.

5 CONCLUSION

This paper introduced a model for studying matching markets in which preference lists are drawn according to distances in appropriate metric spaces, either between the profiles of participants or between the participants themselves. The model naturally captures several aspects of real world matching markets. Various results regarding the uniqueness and quality of stable matchings were obtained. Specifically, for matchings on the hypercube under the Hamming and Weighted Hamming distances, lower and upper bounds were obtained on the dimension of the hypercube (equal to the number of questions a participant in a dating site needs to answer) so as to obtain unique stable partners or stable matchings. Furthermore, bounds on the distribution and the average value of the matching distance of a typical participant (a measure of the quality of the stable matching) were obtained for stable matchings on the hypercube and on the real line.

We view this work as a first step in studying matching markets in the metric space setting. Several obvious next steps suggest themselves, notably studying the problem under dynamic inputs; i.e., as participants arrive and depart.

A APPENDIX

A.1 Proofs omitted from section 3

Proof of Lemma 3.1: Assume, by contradiction, that there exist stable matchings μ_1 and μ_2 so that for some $z \in \mathcal{S}$, $r_1 = d_{\mu_1}(z) > d_{\mu_2}(z) = r_2$. Let $r = (r_1 + r_2)/2$. For each $x \in \mathcal{S}$, let $P'_x = \{y \in P_x : d(x, y) \leq r\}$ be the preference list P_x truncated to contain only those participants who are at a distance less or equal to r from x . Let the ordering in the truncated list P'_x be denoted by $>'_x$. Call the PMP restricted to the truncated preference lists as the “truncated matching problem”. In the truncated matching problem, each person prefers to remain unmatched than to match with a person at a distance greater than r from them. Let μ be a stable matching for the PMP which has stable partners with a matching distance greater than r . Construct the partial matching μ' from μ by removing all pairs with a distance greater than r . We show that μ' is a stable matching for the truncated matching problem. Suppose m and w are not matched to each other in μ' . If $d(m, w) > r$, then clearly (m, w) cannot form a blocking pair for the truncated matching problem. Suppose $d(m, w) \leq r$. Since m and w are not matched to each other in μ' , they cannot be matched to each other in μ . Moreover, since μ is stable, either $\mu(m) >_m w$, or $\mu(w) >_w m$. Without loss of generality, assume $\mu(m) >_m w$. Therefore,

$$d(m, \mu(m)) \leq d(m, w) \leq r \Rightarrow \mu(m) >'_m w.$$

This implies m is also matched to $\mu(m)$ in μ' ; i.e., $\mu'(m) = \mu(m)$. Therefore, $\mu'(m) >'_m w$ and (m, w) cannot be a blocking pair for μ' . This proves that μ' is a stable matching for the truncated matching problem. Now define $S_r(\mu)$ to be the set of all users who are matched to someone at a distance greater than r in μ ,

$$S_r(\mu) \triangleq \{x \in \mathcal{S} : d_\mu(x) > r\}.$$

It is clear that $S_r(\mu)$ is the same set of users who are not matched in μ' . By the Rural Hospital Theorem, the set of unmatched men and women in the truncated matching problem is the same in all stable matchings. This implies $S_r(\mu)$ does not depend on μ . This contradicts our initial assumption, since $z \in S_r(\mu_2)$ but $z \notin S_r(\mu_1)$, proving the lemma. \square

Consider the RPMP- k . Let \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{W} represent the set of n men and n women, respectively. For any profile $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in Q_k$, let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{a}}$ be the sets of all men and women whose profiles equal \mathbf{a} , respectively. Define $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{a}} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{a}} \cup \mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{a}}$.

LEMMA A.1. Fix $\mathbf{a} \in Q_k$ and without loss of generality assume $|\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a}| \leq |\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}|$. We claim that in every stable matching, each man in $\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a}$ will be matched to a woman in $\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}$.

PROOF. Suppose to the contrary that there is a stable matching μ and an $m \in \mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a}$ such that $\mu(m) \notin \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}$. Since $|\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a}| \leq |\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}|$, there should also exist a woman $w \in \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}$ such that $\mu(w) \notin \mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a}$. However, since $d(m, w) = 0$, $w \succ_m \mu(m)$ and $m \succ_w \mu(w)$. Therefore, (m, w) forms a blocking pair for μ , which is a contradiction. \square

Thus, for any $\mathbf{a} \in Q_k$, every stable matching should first try to match men in $\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a}$ with women in $\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}$ according to their tie-breaking preference lists. Any one unmatched woman in $|\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}|$ will be matched to someone at a further distance. Define $\mathcal{U}_\mathbf{a}$ to be the set of all users with profile \mathbf{a} , which are matched to someone with a profile different from \mathbf{a} . Note that according to the Rural Hospital Theorem, $\mathcal{U}_\mathbf{a}$ is the same for all stable matchings and $|\mathcal{U}_\mathbf{a}| = ||\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a}| - |\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}||$. Define $\mathcal{S}_\mathbf{a} = \mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a} \cup \mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}$. The following lemma shows that if k is constant, then for any $\mathbf{a} \in Q_k$, $|\mathcal{U}_\mathbf{a}| = O(\sqrt{n})$.

LEMMA A.2. For any arbitrary profile $\mathbf{a} \in Q_k$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{|\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a}| - |\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}|}{\sqrt{2p(1-p)n}} \xrightarrow{d} Z_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|\mathcal{S}_\mathbf{a}| - 2np}{\sqrt{2p(1-p)n}} \xrightarrow{d} Z_2,$$

where $p = 2^{-k}$, Z_1 and Z_2 are independent standard normal- $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ -random variables, and \xrightarrow{d} represents convergence in distribution.

PROOF. First note that $|\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a}|$ and $|\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}|$ are i.i.d. with a Binomial(n, p) distribution. From Central Limit Theorem (CLT) we have that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{|\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a}| - np}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \xrightarrow{d} N_1, \quad \frac{|\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}| - np}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \xrightarrow{d} N_2,$$

where N_1 and N_2 are two independent random variables with a standard normal distribution, i.e., $N_1, N_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Therefore, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{|\mathcal{M}_\mathbf{a}| - |\mathcal{W}_\mathbf{a}|}{\sqrt{2p(1-p)n}} \xrightarrow{d} \frac{N_1 - N_2}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \frac{|\mathcal{S}_\mathbf{a}| - 2np}{\sqrt{2p(1-p)n}} \xrightarrow{d} \frac{N_1 + N_2}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

Define $Z_1 = (N_1 - N_2)/\sqrt{2}$ and $Z_2 = (N_1 + N_2)/\sqrt{2}$. It is clear that $Z_1, Z_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Moreover, since N_1 and N_2 are independent, Z_1 and Z_2 are also independent. This completes the proof. \square

Since Lemma A.1 requires each stable matching μ to first match men and women in $\mathcal{S}_\mathbf{a}$ using their tie-breaking preference lists, the $O(\sqrt{n})$ discrepancy between the number of men and women in $\mathcal{S}_\mathbf{a}$ makes this sub-problem significantly unbalanced. Using the approach of Ashlagi et al. [2015], we prove some useful bounds on the number of stable partners in unbalanced matching problems which is true for every n .

LEMMA A.3. Let $r \geq 1$ and consider an unbalanced two-sided matching problem with n men and $n + r$ women represented by \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{W} , respectively. Suppose the men's preference lists are generated independently and uniformly at random from the set of all orderings of women in \mathcal{W} . Similarly, suppose the women's preference lists are generated independently and uniformly at random from the set of all orderings of men in \mathcal{M} . For any given $x \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{W}$, let $N(x)$ represent the number of x 's stable partners. We have that

$$\mathbb{P}(N(x) > 1) \leq \frac{1}{r+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}(N(x)) \leq 1 + \frac{1}{r}.$$

PROOF. Let μ_M represent the men-optimal stable matching found by running the men-proposing deferred acceptance algorithm, and let U be the set of all women who are not matched in μ_M . According to the Rural Hospital Theorem, the set of women who are unmatched is the same as U for all stable matchings. Let $w \in \mathcal{W} \setminus U$ be an arbitrary woman. In order to find all the stable partners of w , we employ the same algorithm that is used in McVitie and Wilson [1970], Immorlica and Mahdian [2005], and Ashlagi et al. [2015]. It has been proved by Immorlica and Mahdian [2005] that the following algorithm outputs all the stable partners of w .

Algorithm I

- (1) Run the men-proposing algorithm to find the men-optimal stable matching μ_M . If w is unmatched in μ_M , output \emptyset . Initialize $\mu = \mu_M$.
- (2) Set $m = \mu(w)$ and output m as one of the stable partners of w . Then have w reject m and remove the pair (m, w) from μ . Set $u = m$. (u represents the current unmatched man.)
- (3) Let w' be the next woman in u 's preference list whom he has not proposed to yet. If w' is unmatched in μ_M , terminate the algorithm.
- (4) (a) If w' has already received a proposal from someone better than, she simply rejects u and the algorithm continues to step 3.
 (b) If not, w' accepts u 's proposal. If $w = w'$, the algorithm continues to step 2. Otherwise, set $u = \mu(m')$ and the algorithm continues to step 3.

In order to analyze algorithm I, we use the principle of deferred decision which assumes that the random preference lists are not known in advance and rather unfold step by step in the algorithms when a proposal/rejection happens. Let t_i be the time of the i^{th} visit of the algorithm at step 3, and define u_i and w'_i to be the unmatched man and the next woman who u_i wants to propose to at time t_i . Also define X_i to be the set of all women who u_i has not proposed to yet at time t_i . Since we are using the principle of deferred decision, at any time t_i , rankings of women in X_i are not yet unfolded in u_i 's preference list. Therefore, at any time t_i , every woman in X_i has the same chance of $1/|X_i|$ to receive the next proposal from u_i . Define the events $E_i = \{w'_i \in \{w\} \cup U\}$. Since the algorithm has not been terminated by time t_i , $U \subseteq X_i$. Therefore, given E_i , the probability that u_i proposes to w is at most $1/(r+1)$, and the probability that the algorithm terminates is at least $r/(r+1)$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(w'_i = w \mid E_i) \leq \frac{1}{r+1},$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{The algorithm terminates at } t_i \mid E_i) \geq \frac{r}{r+1}.$$

As the algorithm progresses, woman w finds a new stable partner only if she receives a proposal from an unmatched man at step 3 of the algorithm. Let V_i be the total number of proposals received by woman w from time t_1 to time t_i . If E_i does not occur then $V_{i+1} = V_i$, and if E_i occurs then $V_{i+1} = V_i + 1$ with a probability of at most $1/(r+1)$ and the algorithm terminates with a probability at least $r/(r+1)$. Therefore, if V represents the total number of proposals received by w after time t_1 , V is stochastically dominated by a geometric random variable with rate $p = r/(r+1)$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}(V > 0) \leq \frac{1}{r+1},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(V) \leq \frac{1-p}{p} = \frac{1}{r}.$$

Since $\mathcal{N}(w) \leq 1 + V$, the proof is complete for any $w \in \mathcal{W}$. It remains to prove the inequalities for $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Fix $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Note that the two events $\{\mathcal{N}(x) > 1\}$ and $\{\mathcal{N}(\mu_{\mathcal{M}}(x)) > 1\}$ are equivalent. Therefore, Since $\mu_{\mathcal{M}}(x) \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}(x) > 1) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}(\mu_{\mathcal{M}}(x)) > 1) \leq \frac{1}{r+1}.$$

Moreover, since $\sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{N}(m) = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W} \setminus U} \mathcal{N}(w)$ (both are equal to the total number of stable partner pairs), from symmetry we have,

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{N}(x)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{N}(m)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W} \setminus U} \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{N}(w)) \leq 1 + \frac{1}{r}.$$

□

We now prove Theorem 3.2 by using Lemmas A.2 and A.3.

Proof of Theorem 3.2: Part (i). We prove this part of the theorem only for constant profile size $k \geq 1$. The proof for arbitrary profile size $k \leq (1 - \epsilon) \log n$ is similar. Fix n and consider an instance of the random profile matching problem with n men and n women represented by $\mathcal{M}^{(n)}$ and $\mathcal{W}^{(n)}$, respectively. Let $x \in \mathcal{M}^{(n)} \cup \mathcal{W}^{(n)}$ be an arbitrary user and let $\mathbf{a} \in Q_k$ represent his/her profile. Define $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{a}}^{(n)}$, $\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{a}}^{(n)}$, and $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{a}}^{(n)}$ as before. Also define $Z_1^{(n)} = (|\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{a}}^{(n)}| - 2np) / \sqrt{2np(1-p)}$ and $Z_2^{(n)} = (|\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{a}}^{(n)}| - |\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{a}}^{(n)}|) / \sqrt{2np(1-p)}$. According to Lemma A.2, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $Z_1^{(n)} \xrightarrow{d} Z_1$ and $Z_2^{(n)} \xrightarrow{d} Z_2$, where $Z_1, Z_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, and Z_1 and Z_2 are independent. For any $\epsilon > 0$ define subsets $A_{\epsilon}, B_{\epsilon} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ as follows,

$$A_{\epsilon} = [-\infty, -\frac{1}{\epsilon}] \cup [\frac{1}{\epsilon}, +\infty], \quad B_{\epsilon} = [0, \epsilon] \cup [\frac{1}{\epsilon}, +\infty].$$

Let $\delta > 0$ be an arbitrary positive number. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ small enough to have, $\mathbb{P}(Z_1 \in A_{\epsilon}) \leq \frac{\delta}{8}$ and $\mathbb{P}(|Z_2| \in B_{\epsilon}) \leq \frac{\delta}{8}$. Since $Z_1^{(n)}$ and $Z_2^{(n)}$ converge in distribution to Z_1 and Z_2 , respectively, there exists a large number N_1 such that for any $n > N_1$,

$$|\mathbb{P}(Z_1 \in A_{\epsilon}) - \mathbb{P}(Z_1^{(n)} \in A_{\epsilon})| < \frac{\delta}{8}, \quad |\mathbb{P}(Z_2 \in B_{\epsilon}) - \mathbb{P}(Z_2^{(n)} \in B_{\epsilon})| < \frac{\delta}{8}.$$

Therefore, for any $n > N_1$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Z_1^{(n)} \in A_{\epsilon} \text{ or } Z_2^{(n)} \in B_{\epsilon}) &\leq \mathbb{P}(Z_1^{(n)} \in A_{\epsilon}) + \mathbb{P}(Z_2^{(n)} \in B_{\epsilon}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(Z_1 \in A_{\epsilon}) + |\mathbb{P}(Z_1^{(n)} \in A_{\epsilon}) - \mathbb{P}(Z_1 \in A_{\epsilon})| \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(Z_2 \in B_{\epsilon}) + |\mathbb{P}(Z_2^{(n)} \in B_{\epsilon}) - \mathbb{P}(Z_2 \in B_{\epsilon})| \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with a probability of at least $1 - \delta/2$, the following event occurs:

$$E = \left\{ |\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{a}}^{(n)}| \in [2np - C_1\sqrt{n}, 2np + C_1\sqrt{n}] \text{ and } ||\mathcal{W}_{\mathbf{a}}^{(n)}| - |\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{a}}^{(n)}|| \in [C_2\sqrt{n}, C_3\sqrt{n}] \right\},$$

where $C_1 = \frac{\sqrt{2p(1-p)}}{\epsilon}$, $C_2 = \epsilon\sqrt{p(1-p)}$, and $C_3 = \frac{\sqrt{p(1-p)}}{\epsilon}$. Without loss of generality assume $|\mathcal{M}_a^{(n)}| \leq |\mathcal{W}_a^{(n)}|$ and define $r = |\mathcal{W}_a^{(n)}| - |\mathcal{M}_a^{(n)}|$. The problem of matching men in $\mathcal{M}_a^{(n)}$ and women in $\mathcal{W}_a^{(n)}$ according to preference lists given by \succ^P is an unbalanced matching problem with a discrepancy equal to r between the number of men and the number of women. Let $\mathcal{U}_a^{(n)}$ represent the set of unmatched women in the men-optimal stable matching for this unbalanced matching problem. Therefore, if $N^{(n)}(x)$ represents the number of x 's stable partners, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(N^{(n)}(x) > 1) &\leq \mathbb{P}(E^o) + \mathbb{P}(N^{(n)}(x) > 1|E) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(E^o) + \mathbb{P}(x \in \mathcal{U}_a^{(n)}|E) + \mathbb{P}(N^{(n)}(x) > 1|E, x \notin \mathcal{U}_a^{(n)}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(E^o) + \frac{r}{|\mathcal{S}_a^{(n)}|} + \frac{1}{r+1} \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{C_2\sqrt{n}}{2np - C_1\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{C_1\sqrt{n} + 1}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used the results of the Lemma A.3, and in the last inequality we used the bounds on r and $|\mathcal{S}_a^{(n)}|$ given by the event E . Pick N_2 large enough to have,

$$\frac{C_2\sqrt{n}}{2np - C_1\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{C_1\sqrt{n} + 1} < \delta/2, \quad \forall n \geq N_2.$$

Define $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$. Therefore, for any $n > N$, $\mathbb{P}(N^{(n)}(x) > 1) \leq \delta$. Since $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary,

$$\mathbb{P}(N^{(n)}(x) = 1) \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This implies that with high probability the fraction of users with multiple stable partners tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Part (ii). In order to prove the second part of the theorem, note that since $|\mathcal{M}_a|$ and $|\mathcal{W}_a|$ are Binomial random variables with parameters n and $p = 2^{-k} = 1/n$, according to the well-known Poisson limit theorem, both converge to the Poisson(1) distribution as n goes to infinity. Therefore, in the limit, with a positive probability of $c = e^{-2}/4$ there are exactly two men and two women whose profiles are equal to a . On the other hand, it is easy to see that in a random stable matching problem with two men and two women, the probability of having exactly two stable matchings is equal to $1/8$. Therefore, for any given profile $a \in Q_k$, with a positive probability of $\beta = c/8 > 0$, there are exactly two men and two women with profile a who have multiple stable partners. This proves that the expected number of users with multiple stable partners is $O(n)$. Moreover, since the number of such profiles is $O(n)$, in expectation there are exponentially many stable matchings. \square

The following lemma shows that if the preference list of a user is uniquely identified by profile distances and no further tie-breaking is required, then he/she has a unique stable partner.

LEMMA A.4. *In a profile matching problem, if the distances of a given user x from all the members of the opposite sex are distinct, then x has a unique stable partner.*

PROOF. By contradiction, suppose x has two different stable partners y_1 and y_2 . According to Lemma 3.1, y_1 and y_2 should be at the same distance from x . But, this contradicts with the assumption that x has different distances from y_1 and y_2 . Therefore, x has a unique stable partner. \square

In order to apply Lemma A.4, k should be large enough to have a unique stable matching without resorting to tie-breaks. Now we prove Theorems 3.3 and 3.4.

Proof of Theorem 3.3: Part (i). Let x be an arbitrary user and without loss of generality, assume $x \in \mathcal{W}$. Suppose x has multiple stable partners and let y and y' be two different stable partners of x . Since x has multiple stable partners, y also has another stable partner x' (different from x). According to Lemma 3.1, $d_h(x, y') = d_h(x, y) = d_h(x', y)$. For any $z \in \mathcal{M}$ define the following event

$$E_z = \{\exists x' \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \{x\}, \exists z' \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{z\}; d_h(x, z') = d_h(x, z) = d_h(x', z)\}.$$

Using the union bound we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(E_z) &= \mathbb{P}(\exists x' \in \mathcal{W} \setminus \{x\}; d_h(x, z) = d_h(x', z)) \mathbb{P}(\exists z' \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{z\}; d_h(x, z) = d_h(x, z')) \\ &\leq \left((n-1) \mathbb{P}(d_h(x, m) = d_h(x, z))\right) \left((n-1) \mathbb{P}(d_h(w, z) = d_h(x, z))\right) \\ &\leq n^2 \mathbb{P}(d_h(x, m) = d_h(x, z))^2 \end{aligned}$$

where m and w are a man and a woman who are chosen randomly from \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{W} , respectively. Note that in the last inequality we used the existing symmetry in the problem. Since $d_h(x, m)$ has a binomial distribution (as a function of the random variable m), the maximum value of $\mathbb{P}(d_h(x, m) = d_h(x, z))$ is at $d_h(x, z) = \lfloor k/2 \rfloor$. Using the Sterling approximation we have:

$$\mathbb{P}(d_h(x, m) = \frac{k}{2}) = \frac{k!}{\frac{k}{2}! \frac{k}{2}!} 2^{-k} \simeq \frac{\sqrt{2\pi k} (\frac{k}{e})^k}{\pi k (\frac{k}{2e})^k} 2^{-k} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(x \text{ has multiple stable partners}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\cup_{z \in \mathcal{M}} E_z) \leq n^3 \frac{2}{\pi k}.$$

Since $k = \Omega(n^3)$, the right hand side of the above inequality tends to zero as n goes to infinity. This implies that with high probability the fraction of users with multiple stable partners tends to zero as n goes to infinity. Note that using the union bound, we can conclude that if $k = \Omega(n^4)$, with high probability, there exists a unique stable matching.

Part (ii). Fix a woman $x \in \mathcal{W}$. For any $y \in \mathcal{M}$, define the event $E_y = \{\exists y' \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{y\}; d_h(x, y) = d_h(x, y')\}$. Also define A_x to represent the event that the distances of x from all men in \mathcal{M} are distinct. Similar to part (i) we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A_x^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(\cup_{y \in \mathcal{M}} E_y) \leq n^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{k\pi}}.$$

According to Lemma A.4, if the event A_x happens for every $x \in \mathcal{W}$, there is a unique stable matching without resorting to tie-breaking. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{There are multiple stable matchings}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\cup_{x \in \mathcal{W}} A_x^c) \leq n^3 \sqrt{\frac{2}{k\pi}}.$$

Since $k = \Omega(n^6)$, the probability that there are multiple stable matchings goes to zero as n goes to infinity.

Part (iii). Without loss of generality assume $x \in \mathcal{W}$ and let X_i represent the distance of x from man m_i , i.e., $d_i = d_h(x, m_i)$. Clearly, X_i 's are i.i.d. with Binomial distribution with parameters k and $1/2$. Define $Z = \min_i X_i$. Clearly $d_h(x) \geq Z$. Therefore, for any positive number $r > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(d_h(x) \geq r) \geq \mathbb{P}(Z \geq r) = \mathbb{P}(\min_i X_i \geq r) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(X_i \geq r) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \geq r)^n.$$

Now, according to the Chernoff's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 < r) \leq e^{-\frac{1}{k}(\frac{k}{2}-r)^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(d_h(x) \geq r) \geq (1 - e^{-\frac{1}{k}(\frac{k}{2}-r)^2})^n \geq 1 - ne^{-\frac{1}{k}(\frac{k}{2}-r)^2}.$$

Now if we set $r = k/2 - \sqrt{\beta k \log n}$ we have,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(d_h(x) \geq k/2 - \sqrt{\beta k \log n}\right) \geq 1 - n^{1-\beta}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.4: Part (i). Without loss of generality assume $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and suppose y is a stable partner for x . If x has multiple stable partners, then y should also have multiple stable partners. Let x' be another stable partner of y different from x . According to Lemma 3.1, x and x' should have the same distance from y . However, in the weighted hamming distance metric, if $d_w(\mathbf{a}(y), \mathbf{a}(x)) = d_w(\mathbf{a}(y), \mathbf{a}(x'))$, then x and x' should have the exact same profiles, i.e., $\mathbf{a}(x) = \mathbf{a}(x')$. Therefore, if a man x has multiple stable partners, there should exist another man x' with the same profile as him. However, by using union bounds we get

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists x' \in \mathcal{M}; \mathbf{a}(x') = \mathbf{a}(x)) \leq (n-1) \frac{1}{2^k} \leq n^{-\epsilon}.$$

This proves that the probability that x has multiple stable partners is vanishingly small.

Part (ii). We first show that if there are multiple stable matchings, then there are two men (or women) who have the same profile. If there are multiple stable matchings, there should exist a chain $\{c_i\}_{i=0}^{2s-1}$ of men and women such that $c_i \in \mathcal{M}$ if i is even, and $c_i \in \mathcal{W}$ if i is odd. Moreover, in this chain for every $i \in \{0, \dots, 2s-1\}$, $c_{i+1} \succ_{c_i} c_{i-1}$ ($i-1$ and $i+1$ are taken in mode $2s$). Define $d_i = d_w(c_i, c_{i+1})$, $0 \leq i < 2s$. Let j be the index at which d_i is minimum. Now, if the values of d_i are all distinct, then $c_j \succ_{c_{j+1}} c_{j+2}$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, There should exist an index i such that, $d_i = d_{i+1}$. Following our discussion in part (i), this implies that c_i and c_{i+2} should have the same profile. However, the probability that two randomly selected men (or women) have the same profile is 2^{-k} . Using union bound we can conclude that the probability that there are multiple stable matchings is upper bounded by $n^2 2^{-k} \leq n^{-\epsilon}$.

part (iii) In order to analyze X , fix n and let $\epsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary positive real number. Let μ be an arbitrary stable matching. With out loss of generality assume $x \in \mathcal{W}$ and define $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}(x)$. For any positive integer r , define $\mathcal{S}_a(r)$ as the set of all the users who have the same answers as x for the first r questions,

$$\mathcal{S}_a(r) \triangleq \{y \in \mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{W} : \mathbf{a}(y)[1:r] = \mathbf{a}[1:r]\}.$$

First note that for any given users $x, y \in \mathcal{S}_a(r)$ and $y' \notin \mathcal{S}_a(r)$,

$$d_w(x, y) \leq 2^{-r} < d_w(x, y') \implies y \succ_x y'.$$

Therefore, if we define $\mathcal{W}_a(r) = \mathcal{S}_a(r) \cap \mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{M}_a(r) = \mathcal{S}_a(r) \cap \mathcal{M}$, then the number of users in $\mathcal{S}_a(r)$ who are not matched to someone in $\mathcal{S}_a(r)$ in μ is $||\mathcal{W}_a(r)| - |\mathcal{M}_a(r)||$. Set $r = \lfloor (1 - \epsilon) \log n \rfloor$ and define $p_r = 2^{-r} \geq n^{\epsilon-1}$. Since $|\mathcal{W}_a|$ and $|\mathcal{M}_a|$ have Binomial distributions with parameters n and p_r , following the discussions in Lemma A.2, $|\mathcal{S}_a(r)| = O(p_r n)$ and $||\mathcal{W}_a(r)| - |\mathcal{M}_a(r)|| = O(\sqrt{p_r n})$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(d_w(x) > 2^{-r}) = \mathbb{P}(\mu(x) \notin \mathcal{S}_a(r)) = \frac{||\mathcal{W}_a(r)| - |\mathcal{M}_a(r)||}{|\mathcal{S}_a(r)|} = O(1/\sqrt{p_r n}) = O(n^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}}).$$

This proves that,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\log d_w(x)}{\log n} > -1 + \epsilon\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1)$$

On the other hand, if we set $r' = \lceil (1 + \epsilon) \log n \rceil$, then,

$$\mathbb{P}(d_w(x) \leq 2^{-r'}) = \mathbb{P}(\mu(x) \in \mathcal{S}_a(r')) \leq \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{M}_a(r')| > 0) \leq nP_{r'} = n^{-\epsilon},$$

where in the last inequality we used the union bound inequality. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\log d_w(x)}{\log n} < -1 - \epsilon\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2)$$

From (1) and (2) we can conclude that $\log d_w(x)/\log n$ converges to -1 in probability. \square

A.2 Proofs omitted from section 4

Proof of Lemma 4.2: Let $x, y \in S$ and suppose $x \in I(y)$. Assume, by contradiction, $\mathcal{M}_s(x) \notin \bar{I}(y)$. Therefore, either $y \in I(x)$ or $\mathcal{M}_s(y) \in I(x)$. Without loss of generality, assume $y \in I(x)$. If x and y have different colors, since

$$|x - y| < |I(x)| = |x - \mathcal{M}_s(x)|, \quad |x - y| < |I(y)| = |y - \mathcal{M}_s(y)|,$$

(x, y) will form a blocking pair for \mathcal{M}_s which is a contradiction. Now suppose x and y have the same color and without loss of generality, assume $|\mathcal{M}_s(y) - x| \leq |\mathcal{M}_s(x) - y|$. Since

$$|\mathcal{M}_s(y) - x| < |I(y)| = |\mathcal{M}_s(y) - y|, \quad |\mathcal{M}_s(y) - x| \leq |\mathcal{M}_s(x) - y| < |I(x)| = |x - \mathcal{M}_s(x)|,$$

$(\mathcal{M}_s(y), x)$ is a blocking pair for \mathcal{M} which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}_s(x) \in \bar{I}(y)$ and the proof is complete. \square

For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ where $x < y$, define $g(x, y)$ to be the difference between the number of red and blue points in the open interval (x, y) ,

$$g(x, y) \triangleq |\{r \in \mathcal{R} : r \in (x, y)\}| - |\{b \in \mathcal{B} : b \in (x, y)\}|.$$

For simplicity of notation, for $x > y$ let $g(x, y) = g(y, x)$. Let \mathcal{M} be a nested matching and let $b \in \mathcal{B}$ be an arbitrary blue point which is matched under \mathcal{M} . Since \mathcal{M} is nested, any red or blue point on x 's matching segment $I_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$, should be matched to a point on $I_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$. Therefore, there should be an equal number of red and blue points on $I_{\mathcal{M}}(x)$. This implies that $g(x, \mathcal{M}(x)) = 0$.

LEMMA A.5. For any $b \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\mathcal{P}(b) = \{r \in \mathcal{R} : g(b, r) = 0\}.$$

Moreover, for any $b_1, b_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{P}(b_1) \cap \mathcal{P}(b_2) \neq \emptyset$ implies $\mathcal{P}(b_1) = \mathcal{P}(b_2)$ and $g(b_1, b_2) = 1$.

PROOF. Let $Q(b)$ represent the right hand side of the equation in the lemma. We want to prove that $\mathcal{P}(b) = Q(b)$. For any $r \in \mathcal{P}(b)$, there exists a nested matching \mathcal{M} such that $\mathcal{M}(b) = r$. Therefore, $g(b, r) = 0$ and this implies that $\mathcal{P}(b) \subseteq Q(b)$. Now let $r \in Q(b)$. Let $\mathcal{S}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ represent the set of all the point in \mathcal{S} between b and r , and let $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S} \setminus \{\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \{b, r\}\}$. Since $r \in Q(b)$, \mathcal{S}_1 has an equal number of red and blue points. Let \mathcal{M}_1 represent the stable matching for points in \mathcal{S}_1 , and let \mathcal{M}'_1 represent the stable matching for points in \mathcal{S}'_1 . According to Lemma 4.2, both \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}'_1 are nested. Let \mathcal{M} be the matching in which b is

matched to r , and points in \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}'_1 are matched according to matchings \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}'_1 , respectively. It is clear that since \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}'_1 are nested, \mathcal{M} is also nested. Therefore, r is b 's potential match and $r \in \mathcal{P}(b)$. This proves that $\mathcal{Q}(b) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(b)$, and the proof for the first part of the lemma is complete. Now let $b_1, b_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be two arbitrary blue points. Without loss of generality assume $b_1 < b_2$. Let $r \in \mathcal{R}$ be an arbitrary red point. There are three different possibilities for r 's placement with respect to b_1 and b_2 :

- (1) $b_1 < b_2 < r \Rightarrow g(b_1, b_2) = g(b_1, r) - g(b_2, r) + 1$.
- (2) $b_1 < r < b_2 \Rightarrow g(b_1, b_2) = g(b_1, r) + g(r, b_2) + 1$.
- (3) $r < b_1 < b_2 \Rightarrow g(b_1, b_2) = g(r, b_2) - g(r, b_1) + 1$.

Now if $\mathcal{P}(b_1) \cap \mathcal{P}(b_2) \neq \emptyset$, there exists a red point r^* such that $r^* \in \mathcal{P}(b_1)$ and $r^* \in \mathcal{P}(b_2)$. Therefore, $g(b_1, r^*) = g(b_2, r^*) = 0$. According to the equations described above, we should have $g(b_1, b_2) = 1$ (in all these cases). Now since $g(b_1, b_2) = 1$, with a same argument, we can conclude that for any $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $g(b_1, r) = 0$ if and only if $g(b_2, r) = 0$. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}(b_1) = \mathcal{P}(b_2)$. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.4: Let $\{x_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ represent the sequence of all the points in $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{R}$, where $x_0 = b$, and for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let x_t and x_{-t} represent the t^{th} point to the right and the t^{th} to the left of b , respectively. Since, \mathcal{S} is the mixture of two Poisson processes with rates λ and μ , $\{x_t\}$ occurs according to a Poisson process with rate $\lambda + \mu$. Moreover for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, x_t is red with probability $p = \mu/(\lambda + \mu)$ and is blue with probability $q = 1 - p = \lambda/(\lambda + \mu)$, independent from the color of the other points. Note that since $\lambda < \mu$, $p > 1/2$. Define the sequence $\{g_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$, where $g_t = g(x_{-1}, x_t)$. It is easy to see that,

$$g_{t+1} = \begin{cases} g_t + 1 & \text{if } x_t \text{ is red} \\ g_t - 1 & \text{if } x_t \text{ is blue} \end{cases}.$$

Therefore, the sequence $\{g_t\}$ is equivalent to a random walk on \mathbb{Z} that starts at $g_1 = -1$ and moves to the right or left according to probabilities $\mathbb{P}(+1) = p$ and $\mathbb{P}(-1) = q$. Suppose this random walk hits 0 at some time $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, i.e., $g_t = 0$. If x_{t-1} is a red point then since $g(b, x_{t-1}) = g(x_{-1}, x_t) = g_t = 0$, then $x_{t-1} \in \mathcal{P}(b)$. If x_t is a blue point then since $g(b, x_t) = g(x_{-1}, x_t) + 1 = g_t + 1 = 1$, then $x_t \in [b]$. A geometric interpretation of these facts is the following: If the random walk at time t hits zero from below, then $x_{t-1} \in \mathcal{P}(b)$, and if it hits zero from above and then goes below zero, then $x_t \in [b]$.

Part (i). Since $p > 1/2$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} g_t = +\infty$, almost surely. Therefore, since the random walk starts at -1 , it hits 0 at some time $t > 0$, almost surely. Let t_1 be the first time that the random walk hits 0, i.e., $t_1 = \min\{t : g_t = 0\}$. Define $r_1 = x_{t_1-1}$. According to what we discussed above, $r_1 \in \mathcal{P}(b)$. Similarly, we can prove the existence of r_2 .

Part (ii), Let $b_1 = \min\{x \in [b] : x > b\}$. Therefore, b and b_1 are consecutive points in $[b]$. It is clear that it is sufficient to prove the statement for these two points. According to lemma 4.4, $g(b, b_1) = 1$. Therefore, $g(x_{-1}, b_1) = g(b, b_1) - 1 = 0$. Since t_1 (defined in part (i)) is the first time that the random walk hits 0, then $r_1 < x_{t_1} \leq b_1$. Therefore, r_1 is a potential match between b and b_1 . If there exists another potential match $r_2 = x_{t_2} \in \mathcal{P}(b)$ between b and b_1 , then since $g_{t_2+1} = 0$, $r_2 > r_1$. But $g_{t_1} = g_{t_2+1} = 0$ and $g_{t_2} = -1$. Therefore, there exists $t_1 \leq t' < t_2$ such that $g_{t'} = 0$ and $g_{t'+1} = -1$. Therefore, $b' = x_{t'} \in [b]$ which is a contradiction with the fact that b and b_1 are consecutive in $[b]$.

Part (iii). The third part of the lemma is an immediate result of part (ii).

Part (iv) Following the discussion we had at the beginning, the random walk finds a new blue point in $[b]$ if and only if it hits zero and then goes to -1 . However, starting from zero, the probability that the random walk visits -1 again is $q/p = \lambda/\mu$ [Kelly and Yudovina, 2014]. This proves that $N^+(b)$ has a geometric distribution with rate $1 - \lambda/\mu$. By symmetry, the same holds for $N^-(b)$. \square

LEMMA A.6. Let $\mathcal{W} = \{w_i\}$ be a potential wave. Define $u_i = w_i - w_{i-1}$ (for valid values of i). Then u_i 's are i.i.d. random variables with distribution $B(\lambda, \mu)$.

PROOF. Due to the existing symmetry, without loss of generality, assume $b = w_i$ is a blue point and $r = w_{i+1}$ is a red point. Now if we consider the forward queue matching described in section 2, it is easy to see that $u_i = r - b$ is equivalent to the busy cycle of the corresponding LCFS-PR queue. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.5: According to Lemma 4.2, the stable matching \mathcal{M}_s is nested. Let $b \in \mathcal{B}$ be an arbitrary blue point and let $N = N^+(b)$ and $N' = N^-(b)$. According to Lemma 4.4, N and N' are i.i.d. geometric random variables with parameter $1 - \lambda/\mu$. Now consider b 's potential wave $\mathcal{W} = \{w_i\}$, $-2N' + 1 \leq i \leq 2N - 1$ and define $B_i = w_i - w_{i-1}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, 2N + 1\}$, and $B'_i = w_i - w_{i-1}$ for $i \in \{-2N', \dots, 0\}$. According to Lemma A.6, B_i and B'_i are i.i.d. random variables with distribution $B(\lambda, \mu)$. Now since b should be matched with one of its potential partners in $\mathcal{P}(b)$, its matching distance cannot be less than $\min\{B_1, B'_1\}$ or more than $\max\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{2N-1} B_i, \sum_{i=1}^{2N'-1} B'_i\right\}$. \square

Proof of Corollary 4.6: Let b be an arbitrary blue point and let $\mathcal{W}(b) = w_i$, $-2N' + 1 \leq i \leq 2N - 1$, represent its potential wave. Define $u_i = w_{i+1} - w_i$ for $-2N' + 1 \leq i \leq 2N - 2$. Let c_i represent the number of matching segments in \mathcal{M}_s which contain the interval (w_i, w_{i+1}) . It is clear that c_i cannot be larger than the total number of points in $\mathcal{W}(b)$ to the left of w_{i+1} or the total number of points in $\mathcal{W}(b)$ to the right of w_i . In other words, if we define $a_i = \min(i + 2N', 2N - 1 - i)$ then $c_i \leq a_i$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(d_{\mathcal{M}}(b) | [b]) &= \frac{1}{|[b]|} \sum_{b' \in [b]} \mathbb{E}(d_{\mathcal{M}}(b') | [b]) = \frac{1}{|[b]|} \sum_{i=-2N'+1}^{2N-2} c_i \mathbb{E}(u_i) \leq \frac{1}{|[b]|} \sum_{i=-2N'+1}^{2N-2} a_i \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda} \\ &= (|[b]| + 1) \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda}. \end{aligned}$$


Since $\mathbb{E}([b]) = \mathbb{E}(N) + \mathbb{E}(N') - 1 = 2\mu/(\mu - \lambda) - 1$, the proof is complete. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 4.7

In this section we prove Theorem 4.7. Suppose $n = 2m > 0$ be an even positive integer and let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a sequence of n positive numbers. Let $C(\mathbf{x})$ represent the configuration of $n + 1$ red and blue points P_1, \dots, P_{n+1} which are placed in order on the real line such that the point P_1 is at the origin, and for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, $P_{i+1} = P_i + x_i$. Moreover, suppose P_i is blue if i is even and it is red if i is odd. Therefore, there are $m + 1$ red points and m blue points in $C(\mathbf{x})$. Since there is no assumption on the value of x_i 's, the stable matching between points in \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{R} is not necessarily unique. (as an example consider the case where $x_i = 1$). Let \mathcal{M} be a stable matching for this problem which is generated by the following algorithm. The algorithm repeatedly matches an unmatched blue point b and an unmatched red point r which have the minimum distance from each other, among all the remaining unmatched points, till no further matching is possible. Let $D_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x})$ represent the sum of all matching distances in \mathcal{M} ,

$$D_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \sum_{P \in C(\mathbf{x}) \text{ is blue}} |P - \mathcal{M}(P)|.$$

Define $D(\mathbf{x})$ to be the expected value of $D_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbf{x})$, where the expectation is taken with respect to the random stable matchings \mathcal{M} which is generated according to the algorithm. Let \prod_n represent the set of all

Fig. 3. $C(.1, .2, .3, .4)$

permutations of n items. For any $\pi \in \Pi_n$, let $D_\pi(\mathbf{x}) = D(\pi(\mathbf{x})) = D(\pi(x_1), \dots, \pi(x_n))$. Define $E(\mathbf{x})$ to be the expected value of $D_\pi(\mathbf{x})$, where the expectation is taken with respect to the random permutation π :

$$E(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi_n} D_\pi(\mathbf{x}).$$

Figure 1 shows $C(\mathbf{x})$ for $n = 4$ and $\mathbf{x} = (.1, .2, .3, .4)$. We can easily see that here $D(\mathbf{x}) = .4$ and $E(\mathbf{x}) = 11/30$. We will show later that $E(\mathbf{x})$ is a concave function of \mathbf{x} . First consider the following definitions.

Definition A.7. For any positive integer k , Define O_k to be the set of all sets of odd positive integers $\mathbf{o} = \{o_1, \dots, o_r\}$ where $\sum_{i=1}^r o_i = k$.

Definition A.8. Let $\mathbf{o} = \{o_1, \dots, o_r\} \in O_k$. Define the function $P : O_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ as follows:

$$P(\mathbf{o}) \triangleq \frac{2^{r-1}}{\prod_{i=1}^k i^{c(\mathbf{o}, i)} c(\mathbf{o}, i)!},$$

where $c(\mathbf{o}, i)$ represents the number of appearance of the number i in \mathbf{o} .

For example, for $k = 6$ we have $O_6 = \{\{1, 5\}, \{3, 3\}, \{3, 1, 1, 1\}, \{1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}\}$. Furthermore, $P(\{1, 5\}) = \frac{2}{5}$, $P(\{3, 3\}) = \frac{1}{9}$, $P(\{3, 1, 1, 1\}) = \frac{4}{9}$, and $P(\{1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}) = \frac{2}{45}$. In the following lemma, we prove that for any k the function P is a probability measure on O_k .

LEMMA A.9. The function P is a probability measure on O_k . In other words:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{o} \in O_k} P(\mathbf{o}) = 1.$$

PROOF. From Taylor series expansion of $\log(x)$, for $|x| < 1$ we have,

$$\log(1+x) - \log(1-x) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x^{2i+1}}{2i+1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1+x}{1-x} = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(2 \frac{x^{2i+1}}{2i+1}\right).$$

Now using the Taylor expansion of e^x , we have:

$$1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} 2x^k = \frac{1+x}{1-x} = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2x^{2i+1})^j}{(2i+1)^j j!}.$$

From definition A.8, it is easy to see that if we expand the right hand side of the above equation as $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k x^k$, then for any $k \geq 1$, $a_k = 2 \sum_{\mathbf{o} \in O_k} P(\mathbf{o})$. In Other words,

$$1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2x^k = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2x^{2i+1})^j}{(2i+1)^j j!} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(2 \sum_{\mathbf{o} \in O_k} P(\mathbf{o})\right) x^k.$$

This proves that for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{o} \in \mathcal{O}_k} P(\mathbf{o}) = 1.$$

□

Definition A.10. For any $\mathbf{o} = \{o_1, \dots, o_r\} \in \mathcal{O}_k$ and any $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, define $\Phi(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x})$ to be the set of all possible ways of splitting $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ into sets with sizes o_1, \dots, o_r .

For example for $\mathbf{o} = \{1, 1\} \in \mathcal{O}_2$ and $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$,

$$\Phi(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x}) = \{\{x_1, x_2\}, \{x_1, x_3\}, \{x_1, x_4\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \{x_2, x_4\}, \{x_3, x_4\}\}.$$

It's easy to see that

$$|\Phi(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x})| = \frac{n!}{(n-k)! \prod_{i=1}^r o_i! \prod_{i=1}^k c(\mathbf{o}, i)!}, \quad (3)$$

where $c(\mathbf{o}, i)$ is the number of appreance of the number i in \mathbf{o} .

Definition A.11. For any $\mathbf{o} = \{o_1, \dots, o_r\} \in \mathcal{O}_k$ and any $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, define $f(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x})$ as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{|\Phi(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x})|} \sum_{\phi \in \Phi(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x})} \min \left(\sum_{i=1}^{o_1} x_i^{(1)}, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^{o_r} x_i^{(r)} \right),$$

where in the summation it is assumed that ϕ is in the following form,

$$\phi = \left\{ \{x_1^{(1)}, \dots, x_{o_1}^{(1)}\}, \dots, \{x_1^{(r)}, \dots, x_{o_r}^{(r)}\} \right\}.$$

For example for $\mathbf{o} = \{1, 1\} \in \mathcal{O}_2$ and $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$,

$$f(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{6} (\min(x_1, x_2), \min(x_1, x_3), \min(x_1, x_4), \min(x_2, x_3), \min(x_2, x_4), \min(x_3, x_4)).$$

In the following theorem, we find a close expression for $E(\mathbf{x})$ based on $f(\mathbf{o}_k, \mathbf{x})$ for different values of \mathbf{o}_k .

THEOREM A.12. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}_n$,

$$E(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\substack{k \leq n \\ k \text{ is even} \\ \mathbf{o}_k \in \mathcal{O}_k}} P(\mathbf{o}_k) f(\mathbf{o}_k, \mathbf{x}),$$

PROOF. Let $n = 2m$. Suppose $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and without loss of generality assume that $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n$. Let π be a random permutation which is drawn uniformly from Π_n . In order to find a stable matching for $\pi(\mathbf{x})$, the algorithm should first find an index $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ where $P_{i+1} - P_i = x_1$, and then matches points P_i and P_{i+1} to each other. Since, π is drawn uniformly at random, i_1 is uniformly distributed over $\{1, \dots, n\}$, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(i_1 = i) = 1/n, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Due to the existing symmetry we can assume that $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Now, conditioning on i_1 we have,

$$E(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{E}(D_\pi(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}(D_\pi(\mathbf{x}) | i_1 = i). \quad (4)$$

For $i = 1$, by conditioning on the second segment at index 2, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(D_\pi(\mathbf{x}) | i_1 = 1) = x_1 + \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n} E(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}}), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}}$ represents the sequence of $n - 2$ positive numbers which is generated from \mathbf{x} by removing x_1 and x_i . For $i > 1$, by conditioning on the segments at indices $i - 1$ and $i + 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(D_\pi(\mathbf{x})|i_1 > 1) = x_1 + \frac{2}{(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{2 \leq i < j \leq n}^n E(\mathbf{x}^{\{i,j\}}), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{x}^{\{i,j\}}$ represent the sequence of $n - 2$ positive integers which is generated from \mathbf{x} by removing x_1 , x_i , and x_j and adding $x_1 + x_i + x_j$. We prove the theorem by induction on n . For $n = 2$, it is clear that $E((x_1, x_2)) = \min(x_1, x_2)$. Assume the theorems statement is valid for $n-2$. From equations (4), (5), and (6) and from the induction assumption it is clear that $E(\mathbf{x})$ can be written as a linear combination of terms with the following form,

$$A = \min \left(\sum_{x \in S_1} x, \dots, \sum_{x \in S_r} x \right), \quad (7)$$

where S_i 's are disjoint subsets of $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with an odd size. Suppose $S_i = \{x_1^{(i)}, \dots, x_{o_i}^{(i)}\}$ where $o_i = |S_i|$ and let $k = \sum_i o_i$. Define $S = \cup S_i$. Let C represent the constant factor of the the term A show in equation (7) in $E(\mathbf{x})$. According to equation 3, It is sufficient to prove that,

$$\begin{aligned} C &= P((o_1, \dots, o_k)) \times \frac{(n-k)! \prod_{i=1}^r o_i! \prod_{i=1}^k c(\mathbf{o}, i)!}{n!} \\ &= \frac{2^{r-1}}{\prod_{i=1}^k i^{c(\mathbf{o}, i)} c(\mathbf{o}, i)!} \times \frac{(n-k)! \prod_{i=1}^r o_i! \prod_{i=1}^k c(\mathbf{o}, i)!}{n!} \\ &= \frac{(n-k)! 2^{r-1} \prod_{i=1}^r o_i!}{n! \prod_{i=1}^r o_i!}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We Prove this by considering two different cases: (i) $x_1 \notin S$, and (ii) $x_1 \in S_i$ for some i .

(i) The term A , has the following constant factor C_1 in the equation 5,

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= \frac{n-k-1}{n-1} \frac{(n-2-k)! 2^{r-1} \prod_{i=1}^r o_i!}{(n-2)! \prod_{i=1}^r o_i} \\ &= \frac{n}{n-k} \frac{(n-k)! 2^{r-1} \prod_{i=1}^r o_i!}{n! \prod_{i=1}^r o_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The reason is that in order for term to appear in $E(\mathbf{x}_{\{i\}})$, it is sufficient to have $i \notin S$ which occurs with probability $\frac{n-k-1}{n-1}$. The term A also appear in $E(\mathbf{x}^{\{i,j\}})$ if $i \notin S$ and $j \notin S$ which occurs with probability $\frac{(n-k-1)(n-k-2)}{(n-1)(n-2)}$. Therefore, the term A has the following constant factor C_2 in the equation 6,

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &= \frac{(n-k-1)(n-k-2)}{(n-1)(n-2)} \frac{(n-2-k)! 2^{r-1} \prod_{i=1}^r o_i!}{(n-2)! \prod_{i=1}^r o_i} \\ &= \frac{n(n-k-2)}{(n-k)(n-2)} \frac{(n-k)! 2^{r-1} \prod_{i=1}^r o_i!}{n! \prod_{i=1}^r o_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Since, $C = \frac{2}{n} C_1 + \frac{n-2}{n} C_2$, it is easy to derive equation (8) from equations (9) and (10).

(ii) Without loss of generality assume $x_1 \in S_1$. First we consider the case where $o_1 > 1$, i.e., $|S_1| \geq 3$. It is clear that in this case the term A does not appear in equation (5), i.e., $C_1 = 0$. A appears

in $E(\mathbf{x}^{\{i,j\}})$ if and only if $i, j \in S_1$ which occurs with probability $\frac{(o_1-1)(o_1-2)}{(n-1)(n-2)}$. Therefore, it has the following constant factor C_2 in the equation (6),

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &= \frac{(o_1-1)(o_1-2)}{(n-1)(n-2)} \frac{(n-k)!2^{r-1}(o_1-2)! \prod_{i=2}^r o_i!}{(n-2)!(o_1-2) \prod_{i=2}^r o_i} \\ &= \frac{n}{n-2} \frac{(n-k)!2^{r-1} \prod_{i=1}^r o_i!}{n! \prod_{i=1}^r o_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Since $C = \frac{n-2}{n} C_2$, we can derive the equation (8) from (11). For $o_1 = 1$, the value of A is equal to x_1 . On the other hand if we consider all the terms A with $S_1 = \{x_1\}$, it is easy to see that the sum of all of their coefficient is equal to 1 which is consistent with the coefficient of x_1 in equation 4 (if we plug in equations (5) and (6)).

□

COROLLARY A.13. $E(\mathbf{x})$ is a concave function of \mathbf{x} .

PROOF. According to definition A.11 it is clear that $f(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x})$ is a concave function of \mathbf{x} (for any \mathbf{o}). Therefore, from Theorem A.12 we can conclude that $E(\mathbf{x})$ is a concave function of \mathbf{x} . □

Now define $\mathbf{x}_n = (1, \dots, 1)$, to be the sequence of n numbers all equal to 1. The following lemma proves an upper bound for $E(\mathbf{x})$ for arbitrary \mathbf{x} in terms of $E(\mathbf{x}_n)$.

LEMMA A.14. For any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, we have

$$E(\mathbf{x}) \leq E(\mathbf{x}_n) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i \right).$$

PROOF. For any $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, define $\mathbf{x}^{(i)} = (x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n, x_1, x_i)$. First note that $E(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}) = E(\mathbf{x})$, $\forall i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Since $E(\mathbf{x})$ is a concave function of \mathbf{x} , we have

$$E(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i E(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}) \leq E\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mathbf{x}^{(i)}\right) = E\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i, \frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i, \dots, \frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i\right) = E(\mathbf{x}_n) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_i x_i\right).$$

□

In the following lemma we prove an upper bound for $E(\mathbf{x}_n)$.

LEMMA A.15. Let $n = 2m$. We have,

$$E(\mathbf{x}_n) \leq m(1 + \ln m).$$

PROOF. Similar to the proof of Theorem A.12 conditioning on the value of the first index i_1 , we have

$$E(\mathbf{x}_n) = 1 + \frac{1}{m} E(\mathbf{x}_{n-2}) + \frac{m-1}{m} E(\mathbf{x}'_{n-2}), \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{x}'_{n-2} = (3, 1, \dots, 1)$ and has $n-2$ entries. According to Lemma A.14, $E(\mathbf{x}'_{n-2}) \leq \frac{n}{n-2} E(\mathbf{x}_{n-2})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} E(\mathbf{x}_n) &\leq 1 + \left(\frac{1}{m} + 1\right) E(\mathbf{x}_{n-2}) \\ &\leq 1 + \left(\frac{m}{m-1}\right) E(\mathbf{x}_{n-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{E(\mathbf{x}_n)}{m} \leq \frac{1}{m} + \frac{E(\mathbf{x}_{n-2})}{m-1}. \quad (13)$$

By induction on m , we have

$$\frac{E(\mathbf{x}_n)}{m} \leq \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{m-1} + \cdots + 1 \leq 1 + \ln m.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proof of theorem 4.7: Let b be an arbitrary blue point and let $\mathcal{W}(b) = w_i$, $-2N' + 1 \leq i \leq 2N - 1$, represent its potential wave. Define $u_i = w_{i+1} - w_i$ for $-2N' + 1 \leq i \leq 2N - 2$. Let $m = |[b]|$. Assume that u_i 's take their values from the set $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_{2m}\}$. According to the definition of $E(\mathbf{x})$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(X|m, \mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{m} E(\mathbf{x}) \leq (1 + \ln m) \left(\frac{1}{2m} \sum_i x_i \right),$$

where in the last inequality we used the results of Lemma A.14 and A.15. Since \mathbf{x} is arbitrary, we can conclude

$$\mathbb{E}(X|m) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(X|\mathbf{x}, m)) \leq (1 + \ln m) \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda}.$$

On the other hand, since $\ln(x)$ is a concave function, from Jensen inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(X|m)) \leq \mathbb{E}((1 + \ln m)) \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda} \leq (1 + \ln \mathbb{E}(m)) \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda} = \left(1 + \ln \left(\frac{\mu + \lambda}{\mu - \lambda} \right) \right) \frac{1}{\mu - \lambda}.$$

\square

REFERENCES

- Atila Abdulkadiroglu and Tayfun Sönmez. 2003. School choice: A mechanism design approach. *The American Economic Review* 93, 3 (2003), 729–747.
- Itai Ashlagi, Yash Kanoria, and Jacob D Leshno. 2015. Unbalanced random matching markets: The Stark effect of competition. *Journal of Political Economy* (2015).
- David Gale and Lloyd S Shapley. 1962. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly* 69, 1 (1962), 9–15.
- Donald Gross and Carl M Harris. 1998. *Fundamentals of queueing theory*.
- Günter J Hitsch, Ali Hortaçsu, and Dan Ariely. 2010. Matching and sorting in online dating. *The American Economic Review* 100, 1 (2010), 130–163.
- Alexander E Holroyd, Robin Pemantle, Yuval Peres, and Oded Schramm. 2009. Poisson matching. In *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, Vol. 45. 266–287.
- Ron Holzman and Dov Samet. 2014. Matching of like rank and the size of the core in the marriage problem. *Games and Economic Behavior* 88 (2014), 277–285.
- Nicole Immorlica and Mohammad Mahdian. 2005. Marriage, honesty, and stability. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 53–62.
- Frank Kelly and Elena Yudovina. 2014. *Stochastic networks*. Vol. 2. Cambridge University Press.
- Donald E. Knuth. 1976. *Mariages Stables et leurs relations avec d'autres problèmes combinatoires*.
- DG McVitie and Leslie B Wilson. 1970. Stable marriage assignment for unequal sets. *BIT Numerical Mathematics* 10, 3 (1970), 295–309.
- Susan Mongell and Alvin E Roth. 1991. Sorority rush as a two-sided matching mechanism. *The American Economic Review* (1991), 441–464.
- Boris Pittel. 1989. The average number of stable matchings. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 2, 4 (1989), 530–549.
- Boris Pittel. 1992. On likely solutions of a stable matching problem. In *Proceedings of the third annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 10–15.
- Alvin E Roth. 1984. The evolution of the labor market for medical interns and residents: a case study in game theory. *Journal of political Economy* 92, 6 (1984), 991–1016.

- Alvin E Roth. 1986. On the allocation of residents to rural hospitals: a general property of two-sided matching markets. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* (1986), 425–427.
- Alvin E Roth. 1996. The NRMP as a Labor Market: understanding the current study of the match. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 275 (1996), 1054–1056.
- Alvin E Roth and Elliott Peranson. 1999. The redesign of the matching market for American physicians: Some engineering aspects of economic design. (1999).