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Abstract

Birkhoff’s theorem, which has also been called the fundamental theorem for finite distributive lattices, states that the elements of any such lattice \( L \) are isomorphic to the closed sets of a partial order, say \( \Pi \). We generalize this theorem to showing that each sublattice of \( L \) is isomorphic to a distinct partial order that can be obtained from \( \Pi \) via the operation of compression, defined in this paper.

Let \( A \) be an instance of stable matching, with \( L \) being its lattice of stable matchings, and let \( B \) be the instance obtained by permuting the preference list of any one boy or any one girl. Let \( M_A \) and \( M_B \) be their sets of stable matchings. Our results are the following:

- We show that \( M_A \cap M_B \) is a sublattice of \( L \) and \( M_A \setminus M_B \) is a semi-sublattice of \( L \).
- Using our generalization of Birkhoff’s Theorem, we give an efficient algorithm for finding the compression of \( \Pi \) that is isomorphic to the lattice of \( M_A \cap M_B \).
- Given a polynomial sized domain \( D \) of such errors (of permuting one of the preference lists), we give an efficient algorithm that checks if there is a stable matching for \( A \) that is stable for each such resulting instance \( B \). We call this a fully robust stable matching.
- If yes, the set of all such matchings forms a sublattice of \( L \) and our algorithm finds its partial order as well. Using the latter, we can obtain a matching that optimizes (maximizes or minimizes) the weight among all fully robust stable matchings.

1 Introduction

Birkhoff’s theorem [Bir37], which has also been called the fundamental theorem for finite distributive lattices, e.g., see [Sta96], states that any such lattice is isomorphic to the closed sets of a partial order. It is easy to see that the latter form a distributive lattice with the join and meet operations being union and intersection, respectively. In this paper, we state and prove a generalization of Birkhoff’s theorem.

Let \( L \) denote a finite distributive lattice and let \( P \) be a partial order whose closed sets are isomorphic to \( L \). We will say that \( P \) generates \( L \). We define the operation of compression of a partial order, which yields another partial order. We prove that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the sublattices of \( L \) and compressions of \( P \) such that if sublattice \( L' \) of \( L \) corresponds to compression of \( P' \) of \( P \), then \( P' \) generates \( L' \).
The theorem stated above was discovered in the context of the stable matching problem, which in turn is intimately connected to finite distributive lattices. Conway, see [Knu97], proved that the set of stable matchings always forms a lattice, with the join and meet of two stable matchings being the operations of taking the boy-optimal choices and girl-optimal choices, respectively, of the two matchings. Knuth [Knu97] asked if every finite distributive lattice is isomorphic to a stable matching lattice. A positive answer was provided by Blair [Bla84]; for a much better proof, see [GI89].

Very recently, [MV18a] initiated the problem of finding stable matchings that are robust to errors introduced in the input. As noted in that paper, the design of algorithms that produce robust solutions is already a very well established field, especially as pertaining to robust optimization [CE06, BTEGN09]; however, this issue had not been addressed in the context of the stable matching problem. The setting studied in [MV18a] was the following: They identified a polynomially large class of errors, $D$, that can be introduced in a stable matching instance. Given an instance $A$ of stable matching, let $B$ be the instance that results after introducing one error from $D$, chosen via a discrete probability distribution. They defined a robust stable matching as a matching that is stable for $A$ and maximizes the probability of being stable for $B$ as well. Via new structural properties, related to the lattice of stable matchings, they gave a polynomial time algorithm for finding such a matching.

The domain, $D$, of errors is defined via an operation called shift. For a girl $g$, assume her preference list in instance $A$ is $\{\ldots, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k, b, \ldots\}$. Move up the position of $b$ so $g$’s list becomes $\{\ldots, b, b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k, \ldots\}$, and let $B$ denote the resulting instance. An analogous operation is defined on a boy $b$’s list. The domain $D$ consists of all possible shifts for each girl and each boy.

Clearly, domain $D$ is very restrictive and [MV18a] left the open problem of extending the domain. Our attempt at extending the domain led us to seek deeper structural properties of the lattice of stable matchings which finally led to the generalization of Birkhoff’s Theorem, a result that transcends the original application and is of independent interest in the theory of finite distributive lattices. Using this generalization, we extend the domain of errors to all permutations of the preference list of any girl or any boy, to find a fully robust stable matching, as defined below.

Let us state the main algorithmic result formally. Let $A$ be a stable matching instance on $n$ boys and $n$ girls and let $T$ denote the set of all possible instances $B$ obtained by introducing one error of the following type in $A$: For any one girl or any one boy, permute of the preference list of the girl or the boy. Clearly $|T| = n^22^n$. Let $D \subset T$ be an arbitrary polynomial sized set. Define a fully robust stable matching to be a matching that is stable for $A$ and for each of the instances in $D$. We prove the following.

**Theorem 1.** For the setting given above, there is a polynomial time algorithm for checking if there is a fully robust stable matching. If the answer is yes, the set of all such matchings form a sublattice of $\mathcal{L}$ and our algorithm finds a compression of $P$ that generates this sublattice.
1.1 Overview of results and technical ideas

1.1.1 Generalizing Bhirkoff’s Theorem

For the lattice of stable matchings, the partial order $\Pi$ defined in Birkhoff’s Theorem, has additional useful structural properties. First, its elements are rotations. A rotation takes $r$ matched boy-girl pairs in a fixed order, say \{b_0g_0, b_1g_1, \ldots, b_{r-1}g_{r-1}\}, and “cyclically” changes the mates of these $2r$ agents, see Section 2.3 for details. The number $r$, the $r$ pairs, and the order among the pairs are so chosen that when a rotation is applied to a stable matching containing all $r$ pairs, the resulting matching is also stable. Moreover, there is no valid rotation on any subset of these $r$ pairs, under any ordering. Hence, a rotation can be viewed as a minimal change to the current matching that results in a stable matching. Rotations help traverse the lattice from the boy-optimal to the girl-optimal matching along all possible paths available.

The second special feature of $\Pi$ is that if $S$ is a closed set of $\Pi$ corresponding to stable matching $M$, then starting from the boy-optimal matching in the lattice and applying the rotations in set $S$, in any topological order consistent with $\Pi$, we will reach $M$.

In a recent paper [MV18b], we gave a combinatorial polynomial time algorithm for: given a stable matching instance, $I$, and a weight function over all boy-girl pairs, find a maximum weight stable matching. We also showed that the set of maximum weight stable matchings form a sublattice $L'$ of $L$, the lattice of stable matchings for $I$, and we showed how to obtain a poset $\Pi'$ from the poset $\Pi$ of instance $I$, such that $\Pi'$ generates the matchings of $L'$. We observed that the elements of poset $\Pi'$ are sets of rotations that partition the set of all rotations used in $\Pi$; however, at that point we did not have the notion of compression. This notion is introduced in the current paper; it arose in the process of seeking a better understanding in the relationship between $\Pi$ and $\Pi'$.

We prove our generalization (Theorem 3) in the context of stable matching lattices since they are easier to handle because of the additional structural properties mentioned above. As remarked above, stable matching lattices are as general as arbitrary finite distributive lattices. Let $L$ be a stable matching lattice which is generated by poset $P$. Our proof involves showing that each compression $P_f$ of $P$ generates a sublattice of $L$ (Section 3.1), and corresponding to each sublattice $L'$ of $L$, there is a compression $P_f$ of $P$ that generates $L'$ (Section 3.2).

The second part is quite non-trivial. It involves first identifying the correct partition of the set of rotations of $P$ by considering pairs of matchings, $M, M'$ in $L'$ such that $M$ is a direct successor of the $M'$, and obtaining the set of rotations that takes us from $M'$ to $M$. This set will be a meta-rotation for $P_f$. Consider one such meta-rotation $X$. To obtain all predecessors of $X$ in $P_f$, consider all paths that go from the boy-optimal matching in $L$ to the girl-optimal matching by going through the lattice $L'$. Find all meta-rotations that always occur before $X$ does on all such paths. Then each of these meta-rotations precedes $X$. These are the precedence relations between meta-rotations in $P_f$.

A second definition of compression: Having derived our generalization of Birkhoff’s Theorem using the definition alluded to above, we present a different, equivalent, definition of compression (Section 4). This definition is in terms of a set of directed edges, $E$, that needs to be added to $P$ to yield, after some prescribed operations, the desired partial order $P_f$. Let $L'$ be the sublattice generated by $P_f$. Then we will say that edges $E$ define $L'$. 
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The advantage of this definition is that it is much easier to work with for the applications presented later. Its drawback is that several different sets of edges may yield the same compression. Therefore, there is no one-to-one correspondence between sublattices of $L$ and the sets of edges that can be added to $\Pi$ to yield compressions. Hence this definition is not suitable for proving the generalization of Birkhoff’s Theorem.

1.1.2 Application to robust stable matchings

We start by giving a short overview of the structural facts proven in [MV18a]. Let $A$ and $B$ be two instances of stable matching over $n$ boys and $n$ girls, with sets of stable matchings $M_A$ and $M_B$, and lattices $L_A$ and $L_B$, respectively. Let $\Pi$ be the poset on rotations that is isomorphic to $L_A$. It is easy to see that the matchings in $M_A \cap M_B$ form a sublattice in each of the two lattices. For an instance $B$ that results from applying a shift operation, [MV18a] show that $M_{AB} = M_A \setminus M_B$ is also a sublattice of $L_A$. Using this fact, they show that there is at most one rotation, $\rho_{in}$, that leads from $M_A \cap M_B$ to $M_{AB}$ and at most one rotation, $\rho_{out}$ that leads from $M_{AB}$ to $M_A \cap M_B$; moreover, these rotations can be efficiently found. Furthermore, a closed set $S$ of $\Pi$ generates a matching that is stable for instance $B$ iff whenever $\rho_{in} \in S$, $\rho_{out} \in S$.

In order to extend the domain of errors, let us start by isolating out the essential structural fact stated above, namely, lattice $L_A$ can be partitioned into two sublattices $L_1$ and $L_2$ (Section 5). A natural question then is: Assume we are given an oracle which given a matching $M \in L_A$, tells us whether $M \in L_1$ or $M \in L_2$. Is there a polynomial time algorithm for finding a matching in $L_1$?

Using our generalization of Birkhoff’s Theorem, we first give a characterization of the set of edges $E_1$ and $E_2$ that define $L_1$ and $L_2$, respectively (Theorem 6). Using this characterization, we prove that there exists a sequence of rotations $r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_{2k}, r_{2k+1}$ such that a closed set of $\Pi$ generates a matching in $M \in L_1$ iff it contains $r_{2i}$ but not $r_{2i+1}$ for some $0 \leq i \leq k$ (Proposition 7). Furthermore, this sequence of rotations can be found in polynomial time, hence giving an efficient algorithm for the question asked (we do not give details of this since it is subsumed by the more general case described next). However, so far we have been unable to find an error pattern, beyond shift, which when introduced in instance $A$ yields $B$ such that $M_A \cap M_B$ and $M_{AB}$ partition lattice $L_A$ into two sublattices.

Next, we address the case that $M_{AB}$ is not a sublattice of $L_A$. We start by proving that if $B$ is obtained by permuting the preference list of any one boy or any one girl, then $M_{AB}$ must be a semi-sublattice of $L_A$ (Lemma 24). Again, using our generalization of Birkhoff’s Theorem, we obtain a (more elaborate) characterization of the set of edges that define the sublattice of $M_A \cap M_B$ (Theorem 8). Again, using this characterization, we give a (more elaborate) condition on rotations which is satisfied by a closed set of $\Pi$ iff the corresponding matching is in the sublattice (Proposition 7). Furthermore, we show how to efficiently find these rotations (Theorem 10), hence leading to an efficient algorithm for finding a matching in $M_A \cap M_B$.

Finally, consider the setting given in the Introduction, with $T$ being the exponential set of all possible erroneous instances obtained by permuting the preference list of one boy or one girl, and $D \subset T$ a polynomial sized set of instances which the algorithm needs to consider. We show that the set of all such matchings that are stable for $A$ and for each of these instances
in \( D \) forms a sublattice of \( \mathcal{L} \) and we obtain the compression of \( \Pi \) that generates this sublattice (Section 8.2). Each matching in this sublattice is a fully robust stable matching. Moreover, since we have obtained the poset generating it, we can go further: given a weight function on all boy-girl pairs, we can obtain, using the algorithm of [MV18b], a matching that optimizes (maximizes or minimizes) the weight among all fully robust stable matchings.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 The stable matching problem

The stable matching problem takes as input a set of boys \( B = \{b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n\} \) and a set of girls \( G = \{g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n\} \); each person has a complete preference ranking over the set of opposite sex. The notation \( b_i <_g b_j \) indicates that girl \( g \) strictly prefers \( b_j \) to \( b_i \) in her preference list. Similarly, \( g_i <_b g_j \) indicates that the boy \( b \) strictly prefers \( g_j \) to \( g_i \) in his list.

A matching \( M \) is a one-to-one correspondence between \( B \) and \( G \). For each pair \( bg \in M \), \( b \) is called the partner of \( g \) in \( M \) (or \( M \)-partner) and vice versa. For a matching \( M \), a pair \( bg \notin M \) is said to be blocking if they prefer each other to their partners. A matching \( M \) is stable if there is no blocking pair for \( M \).

2.2 The lattice of stable matchings

Let \( M \) and \( M' \) be two stable matchings. We say that \( M \) dominates \( M' \), denoted by \( M \preceq M' \), if every boy weakly prefers his partner in \( M \) to his partner in \( M' \). It is well known that the dominance partial order over the set of stable matchings forms a distributive lattice [GI89], with meet and join defined as follows. The meet of \( M \) and \( M' \), \( M \wedge M' \), is defined to be the matching that results when each boy chooses his more preferred partner from \( M \) and \( M' \); it is easy to show that this matching is also stable. The join of \( M \) and \( M' \), \( M \vee M' \), is defined to be the matching that results when each boy chooses his less preferred partner from \( M \) and \( M' \); this matching is also stable. These operations distribute, i.e., given three stable matchings \( M, M', M'' \),

\[
M \vee (M' \wedge M'') = (M \wedge M') \vee (M \wedge M'') \quad \text{and} \quad M \wedge (M' \vee M'') = (M \vee M') \wedge (M \vee M'').
\]

It is easy to see that the lattice must contain a matching, \( M_0 \), that dominates all others and a matching \( M_z \) that is dominated by all others. \( M_0 \) is called the boy-optimal matching, since in it, each boy is matched to his most favorite girl among all stable matchings. This is also the girl-pessimal matching. Similarly, \( M_z \) is the boy-pessimal or girl-optimal matching.

2.3 Rotations help traverse the lattice

A crucial ingredient needed to understand the structure of stable matchings is the notion of a rotation, which was defined by Irving [Irv85] and studied in detail in [IL86]. A rotation takes \( r \) matched pairs in a fixed order, say \( \{b_0g_0, b_1g_1, \ldots, b_{r-1}g_{r-1}\} \) and “cyclically” changes the mates of
Let $M$ be a stable matching. For a boy $b$ let $s_M(b)$ denote the first girl $g$ on $b$'s list such that $g$ strictly prefers $b$ to her $M$-partner. Let $next_M(b)$ denote the partner in $M$ of girl $s_M(b)$. A rotation $\rho$ exposed in $M$ is an ordered list of pairs \( \{b_0g_0, b_1g_1, \ldots, b_{r-1}g_{r-1}\} \) such that for each $i$, $0 \leq i \leq r - 1$, $b_{i+1}$ is $next_M(b_i)$, where $i + 1$ is taken modulo $r$. In this paper, we assume that the subscript is taken modulo $\rho$ whenever we mention a rotation. Notice that a rotation is cyclic and the sequence of pairs can be rotated. $M/\rho$ is defined to be a matching in which each boy not in a pair of $\rho$ stays matched to the same girl and each boy $b_i$ in $\rho$ is matched to $g_{i+1} = s_M(b_i)$. It can be proven that $M/\rho$ is also a stable matching. The transformation from $M$ to $M/\rho$ is called the elimination of $\rho$ from $M$.

**Lemma 1** ([GI89], Theorem 2.5.4). Every rotation appears exactly once in any sequence of elimination from $M_0$ to $M_z$.

Let $\rho = \{b_0g_0, b_1g_1, \ldots, b_{r-1}g_{r-1}\}$ be a rotation. For $0 \leq i \leq r - 1$, we say that $\rho$ moves $b_i$ from $g_i$ to $g_{i+1}$, and moves $g_i$ from $b_i$ to $b_{i-1}$. If $g$ is either $g_i$ or is strictly between $g_i$ and $g_{i+1}$ in $b_i$'s list, then we say that $\rho$ moves $b_i$ below $g$. Similarly, $\rho$ moves $g_i$ above $b$ if $b$ is $b_i$ or between $b_i$ and $b_{i-1}$ in $g_i$'s list.

### 2.4 The rotation poset

A rotation $\rho'$ is said to precede another rotation $\rho$, denoted by $\rho' < \rho$, if $\rho'$ is eliminated in every sequence of eliminations from $M_0$ to a stable matching in which $\rho$ is exposed. If $\rho'$ precedes $\rho$, we also say that $\rho$ succeeds $\rho'$. If neither $\rho' < \rho$ nor $\rho' \succ \rho$, we say that $\rho'$ and $\rho$ are incomparable. Thus, the set of rotations forms a partial order via this precedence relationship. The partial order on rotations is called rotation poset and denoted by $\Pi$.

**Lemma 2** ([GI89], Lemma 3.2.1). For any boy $b$ and girl $g$, there is at most one rotation that moves $b$ to $g$, $b$ below $g$, or $g$ above $b$. Moreover, if $\rho_1$ moves $b$ to $g$ and $\rho_2$ moves $b$ from $g$ then $\rho_1 < \rho_2$.

**Lemma 3** ([GI89], Lemma 3.3.2). $\Pi$ contains at most $O(n^2)$ rotations and can be computed in polynomial time.

A closed set of a poset is a set $S$ of elements of the poset such that if an element is in $S$ then all of its predecessors are also in $S$. There is a one-to-one relationship between the stable matchings and the closed subsets of $\Pi$. Given a closed set $S$, the corresponding matching $M$ is found by eliminating the rotations starting from $M_0$ according to the topological ordering of the elements in the set $S$. We say that $S$ generates $M$ and that $\Pi$ generates the lattice $\mathcal{L}$ of all stable matchings of this instance.
Let $S$ be a subset of the elements of a poset $P$, and let $v$ be an element in $S$. We say that $v$ is a minimal element in $S$ if there is no predecessors of $v$ in $S$. Similarly, $v$ is a maximal element in $S$ if it has no successors in $S$.

The Hasse diagram of a poset is a directed graph with a vertex for each element in poset, and an edge from $x$ to $y$ if $x \prec y$ and there is no $z$ such that $x \prec z \prec y$. In other words, all precedences implied by transitivity are suppressed.

### 2.5 Sublattice and Semi-sublattice

A sublattice $L'$ of a distributive lattice $L$ is subset of $L$ such that for any two elements $x, y \in L$, $x \lor y \in L'$ and $x \land y \in L'$ whenever $x, y \in L'$.

A semi-sublattice $L'$ of a distributive lattice $L$ is subset of $L$ such that for any two elements $x, y \in L$, $x \lor y \in L'$ whenever $x, y \in L'$. We note that in the mathematics literature, two types of semilattices are defined: meet semilattices and join semilattices, which are sets that are closed under the meet and join operation, respectively. For reasons of simplicity of notation, our definition of semi-sublattices has an asymmetry, since we only need those subsets of a lattice which are closed under the meet operation.

### 2.6 Robust Stable Matching

Let $A$ be a stable matching instance, and let $D$ be a discrete probability distribution over stable matching instances. A robust stable matching is a stable matching $M \in \mathcal{M}_A$ maximizing the probability that $M \in \mathcal{M}_A \cap \mathcal{M}_B$, where $B \sim D$. We denote $x >^I_y x'$ if $y$ prefers $x$ to $x'$ with respect to instance $I$. When the probability is 1, $M$ is said to be a fully robust stable matching. In other words, $M \in \mathcal{M}_B$ for all $B$ in the domain of $D$.

### 3 A Generalization of Birkhoff’s Theorem

Let $P$ be a finite poset. For simplicity of notation, in this paper we will assume that $P$ must have two dummy elements $s$ and $t$; the remaining elements will be called proper elements and the term element will refer to proper as well as dummy elements. Further, $s$ precedes all other elements and $t$ succeeds all other elements in $P$. A proper closed set of $P$ is any closed set that contains $s$ and does not contain $t$. It is easy to see that the set of all proper closed sets of $P$ form a distributive lattice under the operations of set intersection and union. We will denoted this lattice by $L(P)$.

Birkhoff’s Theorem states that every finite distributive lattice is isomorphic to the proper closed sets of some poset. On occasion we will also say that poset $P$ generates lattice $L$.

**Theorem 2.** (Birkhoff [Bir37]) Every finite distributive lattice $L$ is isomorphic to $L(P)$, for some finite poset $P$. 
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Figure 1: Two examples of compressions. Lattice $\mathcal{L} = L(P)$. $P_1$ and $P_2$ are compressions of $P$, and they generate the sublattices in $\mathcal{L}$, of red and blue elements, respectively.

Our generalization of Birkhoff's Theorem deals with the sublattices of a finite distributive lattice. First, in Definition 1 we state the critical operation of compression of a poset.

**Definition 1.** Given a finite poset $P$, first partition its elements; each subset will be called a meta-element. Define the following precedence relations among the meta-elements: if $x, y$ are elements of $P$ such that $x$ is in meta-element $X$, $y$ is in meta-element $Y$ and $x$ precedes $y$, then $X$ precedes $Y$. Assume that these precedence relations yield a partial order, say $Q$, on the meta-elements (if not, this particular partition is not useful for our purpose). Let $P_f$ be any partial order on the meta-elements such that the precedence relations of $Q$ are a subset of the precedence relations of $P_f$. Then $P_f$ will be called a compression of $P$. Let $A_s$ and $A_t$ denote the meta-elements of $P_f$ containing $s$ and $t$, respectively.

For examples of compressions see Figure 1. Clearly, $A_s$ precedes all other meta-elements in $P_f$ and $A_t$ succeeds all other meta-elements in $P_f$. Once again, by a proper closed set of $P_f$ we mean a closed set of $P_f$ that contains $A_s$ and does not contain $A_t$. Then the lattice formed by the set of
all proper closed sets of $P_f$ will be denoted by $L(P_f)$.

Our generalization of Birkhoff’s Theorem is as follows:

**Theorem 3.** There is a one-to-one correspondence between the compressions of $P$ and the sublattices of $L(P)$. Furthermore, if a sublattice $\mathcal{L}'$ of $L(P)$ corresponds to compression $P_f$, then $\mathcal{L}'$ is isomorphic to $L(P_f)$.

We will prove Theorem 3 in the context of stable matching lattices; this is w.l.o.g. since stable matching lattices are as general as finite distributive lattices. In this context, the proper elements of partial order $P$ will be rotations, and meta-elements are called *meta-rotations*. Let $\mathcal{L} = L(P)$ be the corresponding stable matching lattice.

Clearly it suffices to show that:

- Given a compression $P_f$, $L(P_f)$ is isomorphic to a sublattice of $\mathcal{L}$.
- A sublattice $\mathcal{L}'$ is isomorphic to $L(P_f)$ for some compression $P_f$.

These two proofs are given in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, respectively.

### 3.1 L($P_f$) is isomorphic to a sublattice of L($P$)

Let $I$ be a closed subset of $P_f$; clearly $I$ is a set of meta-rotations. Define $\text{rot}(I)$ to be the union of all meta-rotations in $I$, i.e.,

$$\text{rot}(I) = \{ \rho \in A : A \text{ is a meta-rotation in } I \}.$$

We will define the process of elimination of a meta-rotation $A$ of $P_f$ to be the elimination of the rotations in $A$ in an order consistent with partial order $P$. Furthermore, elimination of meta-rotations in $I$ will mean starting from stable matching $M_0$ in lattice $\mathcal{L}$ and eliminating all meta-rotations in $I$ in an order consistent with $P_f$. Observe that this is equivalent to starting from stable matching $M_0$ in $\mathcal{L}$ and eliminating all rotations in $\text{rot}(I)$ in an order consistent with partial order $P$. This follows from Definition 1, since if there exist rotations $x, y$ in $P$ such that $x$ is in meta-rotation $X$, $y$ is in meta-rotation $Y$ and $x$ precedes $y$, then $X$ must also precede $Y$. Hence, if the elimination of all rotations in $\text{rot}(I)$ gives matching $M_I$, then elimination of all meta-rotations in $I$ will also give the same matching.

Finally, to prove the statement in the title of this section, it suffices to observe that if $I$ and $J$ are two proper closed sets of the partial order $P_f$ then

$$\text{rot}(I \cup J) = \text{rot}(I) \cup \text{rot}(J) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rot}(I \cap J) = \text{rot}(I) \cap \text{rot}(J).$$

It follows that the set of matchings obtained by elimination of meta-rotations in a proper closed set of $P_f$ are closed under the operations of meet and join and hence form a sublattice of $\mathcal{L}$.  
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3.2 $\mathcal{L'}$ is isomorphic to $L(P_f)$, for a compression $P_f$ of $P$

We will obtain compression $P_f$ of $P$ in stages. First, we show how to partition the set of rotations of $P$ to obtain the meta-rotations of $P_f$. We then find precedence relations among these meta-rotations to obtain $P_f$. Finally, we show $L(P_f) = \mathcal{L'}$.

Notice that $\mathcal{L}$ can be represented by its Hasse diagram $H(\mathcal{L})$. Each edge of $H(\mathcal{L})$ contains a (not necessarily unique) rotation of $P$. Then, by Lemma 1, for any two stable matchings $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $M_1 \prec M_2$, all paths from $M_1$ to $M_2$ in $H(\mathcal{L})$ contain the same set of rotations.

**Definition 2.** For $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{L'}$, $M_2$ is said to be an $\mathcal{L'}$-direct successor of $M_1$ iff $M_1 \prec M_2$ and there is no $M \in \mathcal{L'}$ such that $M_1 \prec M \prec M_2$. Let $M_1 \prec \ldots \prec M_k$ be a sequence of matchings in $\mathcal{L'}$ such that $M_{i+1}$ is an $\mathcal{L'}$-direct successor of $M_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$. Then any path in $H(\mathcal{L})$ from $M_1$ to $M_k$ containing $M_i$, for all $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$, is called an $\mathcal{L'}$-path.

Let $M_{yf}$ and $M_{zr}$ denote the boy-optimal and girl-optimal matchings, respectively, in $\mathcal{L'}$. For $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{L'}$ with $M_1 \prec M_2$, let $S_{M_1,M_2}$ denote the set of rotations contained on any $\mathcal{L'}$-path from $M_1$ to $M_2$. Further, let $S_{M_0,M_{yf}}$ and $S_{M_{zr},M_2}$ denote the set of rotations contained on any path from $M_0$ to $M_{yf}$ and $M_{zr}$ to $M_2$, respectively in $H(\mathcal{L})$. Define the following set whose elements are sets of rotations.

$$S = \{S_{M_i,M_j} \mid M_j \text{ is an } \mathcal{L'}\text{-direct successor of } M_i, \text{ for every pair of matchings } M_i,M_j \text{ in } \mathcal{L'}\} \cup \{S_{M_0,M_{yf}}, S_{M_{zr},M_2}\}.$$

**Lemma 4.** $S$ is a partition of $P$.

**Proof.** First, we show that any rotation must be in an element of $S$. Consider a path $p$ from $M_0$ to $M_2$ in the $H(\mathcal{L})$ such that $p$ goes from $M_{yf}$ to $M_{zr}$ via an $\mathcal{L'}$-path. Since $p$ is a path from $M_0$ to $M_2$, all rotations of $P$ are contained on $p$ by Lemma 1. Hence, they all appear in the sets in $S$.

Next assume that there are two pairs $(M_1, M_2) \neq (M_3, M_4)$ of $\mathcal{L'}$-direct successors such that $S_{M_1,M_2} \neq S_{M_3,M_4}$ and $X = S_{M_1,M_2} \cap S_{M_3,M_4} \neq \emptyset$. The set of rotations eliminated from $M_0$ to $M_2$ is

$$S_{M_0,M_2} = S_{M_0,M_1} \cup S_{M_1,M_2}.$$

Similarly,

$$S_{M_0,M_4} = S_{M_0,M_3} \cup S_{M_3,M_4}.$$

Therefore,

$$S_{M_0,M_2 \lor M_3} = S_{M_0,M_2} \cup S_{M_1,M_2} \cup S_{M_0,M_1},$$

$$S_{M_0,M_1 \lor M_4} = S_{M_0,M_3} \cup S_{M_3,M_4} \cup S_{M_0,M_1}.$$

Let $M = (M_2 \lor M_3) \land (M_1 \lor M_4)$, we have

$$S_{M_0,M} = S_{M_0,M_3} \cup S_{M_0,M_1} \cup X.$$

Hence,

$$S_{M_0,M \lor M_2} = S_{M_0,M_1} \cup X.$$
Since \( X \subset S_{M_1,M_2} \) and \( S_{M_1,M_2} \cap S_{M_0,M_1} = \emptyset \), \( X \cap S_{M_0,M_1} = \emptyset \). Therefore,

\[
S_{M_0,M_1} \subset S_{M_0,M_1 \land M_2} \subset S_{M_0,M_2},
\]

and hence \( M_2 \) is not a \( \mathcal{L}' \)-direct successor of \( M_1 \), leading to a contradiction. \( \square \)

We will denote \( S_{M_0,M_0'} \) and \( S_{M_1,M_1} \) by \( A_s \) and \( A_t \), respectively. The elements of \( S \) will be the meta-rotations of \( P_f \). Next, we need to define precedence relations among these meta-rotations to complete the construction of \( P_f \). For a meta-rotation \( A \in S \), \( A \neq A_t \), define the following subset of \( \mathcal{L}' \):

\[
\mathcal{M}^A = \{ M \in \mathcal{L}' \text{ such that } A \subseteq S_{M_0,M} \}.
\]

**Lemma 5.** For each meta-rotation \( A \in S \), \( A \neq A_t \), \( \mathcal{M}^A \) forms a sublattice \( \mathcal{L}^A \) of \( \mathcal{L}' \).

**Proof.** Take two matchings \( M_1, M_2 \) such that \( S_{M_0,M_1} \) and \( S_{M_0,M_2} \) are supersets of \( A \). Then \( S_{M_0,M_1 \land M_2} = S_{M_0,M_1} \cap S_{M_0,M_2} \) and \( S_{M_0,M_1 \lor M_2} = S_{M_0,M_1} \cup S_{M_0,M_2} \) are also supersets of \( A \). \( \square \)

Let \( M^A \) be the boy-optimal matching in the lattice \( \mathcal{L}^A \). Let \( p \) be any \( \mathcal{L}' \)-path from \( M_0' \) to \( M^A \) and let \( \text{pre}(A) \) be the set of meta-rotations appearing before \( A \) on \( p \).

**Lemma 6.** The set \( \text{pre}(A) \) does not depend on \( p \). Furthermore, on any \( \mathcal{L}' \)-path from \( M_0' \) containing \( A \), each meta-rotation in \( \text{pre}(A) \) appears before \( A \).

**Proof.** Since all paths from \( M_0' \) to \( M^A \) give the same set of rotations, all \( \mathcal{L}' \)-paths from \( M_0' \) to \( M^A \) give the same set of meta-rotations. Moreover, \( A \) must appear last in the any \( \mathcal{L}' \)-path from \( M_0' \) to \( M^A \); otherwise, there exists a matching in \( \mathcal{L}^A \) preceding \( M^A \), giving a contradiction. It follows that \( \text{pre}(A) \) does not depend on \( p \).

Let \( q \) be an \( \mathcal{L}' \)-path from \( M_0' \) that contains matchings \( M', M \in \mathcal{L}' \), where \( M \) is an \( \mathcal{L}' \)-direct successor of \( M' \). Let \( A \) denote the meta-rotation that is contained on edge \((M', M)\). Suppose there is a meta-rotation \( A' \in \text{pre}(A) \) such that \( A' \) does not appear before \( A \) on \( q \). Then \( S_{M_0,M^A \land M} = S_{M_0,M^A} \cap S_{M_0,M} \) contains \( A \) but not \( A' \). Therefore \( M^A \land M \) is a matching in \( \mathcal{L}^A \) preceding \( M^A \), giving is a contradiction. Hence all matchings in \( \text{pre}(A) \) must appear before \( A \) on all such paths \( q \). \( \square \)

Finally, add precedence relations from all meta-rotations in \( \text{pre}(A) \) to \( A_t \) for each meta-rotation in \( S - \{A_t\} \). Also, add precedence relations from all meta-rotations in \( S - \{A_t\} \) to \( A_t \). This completes the construction of \( P_f \). Below we show that \( P_f \) is indeed a compression of \( P \), but first we need to establish that this construction does yield a valid poset.

**Lemma 7.** \( P_f \) satisfies transitivity and anti-symmetry.

**Proof.** First we prove that \( P_f \) satisfies transitivity. Let \( A_1, A_2, A_3 \) be meta-rotations such that \( A_1 \prec A_2 \) and \( A_2 \prec A_3 \). We may assume that \( A_3 \neq A_t \). Then \( A_1 \in \text{pre}(A_2) \) and \( A_2 \in \text{pre}(A_3) \). Since \( A_1 \in \text{pre}(A_2) \), \( S_{M_0,M^A_2} \) is a superset of \( A_1 \). By Lemma 5, \( M^{A_1} \prec M^{A_2} \). Similarly, \( M^{A_2} \prec M^{A_3} \). Therefore \( M^{A_1} \prec M^{A_3} \), and hence \( A_1 \in \text{pre}(A_3) \).
Next we prove that \( P_f \) satifies anti-symmetry. Assume that there exist meta-rotations \( A_1, A_2 \) such that \( A_1 \prec A_2 \) and \( A_2 \prec A_1 \). Clearly \( A_1, A_2 \neq A_f \). Since \( A_1 \prec A_2 \), \( A_1 \in \text{pre}(A_2) \). Therefore, \( S_{M_0,^A} \) is a superset of \( A_1 \). It follows that \( M^{A_1} \prec M^{A_2} \). Applying a similar argument we get \( M^{A_2} \prec M^{A_1} \). Now, we get a contradiction, since \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) are different meta-rotations.

**Lemma 8.** \( P_f \) is a compression of \( P \).

**Proof.** Let \( x, y \) be rotations in \( P \) such that \( x \prec y \). Let \( X \) be the meta-rotation containing \( x \) and \( Y \) be the meta-rotation containing \( y \). It suffices to show that \( X \in \text{pre}(Y) \). Let \( p \) be an \( L' \)-path from \( M_0 \) to \( M'' \). Since \( x \prec y \), \( x \) must appear before \( y \) in \( p \). Hence, \( X \) also appears before \( Y \) in \( p \). By Lemma 6, \( X \in \text{pre}(Y) \) as desired.

Finally, the next two lemmas prove that \( L(P'_f) = L' \).

**Lemma 9.** Any matching in \( L(P'_f) \) must be in \( L' \).

**Proof.** For any proper closed subset \( I \) in \( P'_f \), let \( M_I \) be the matching generated by eliminating meta-rotations in \( I \). Let \( J \) be another proper closed subset in \( P'_f \) such that \( J = I \setminus \{ A \} \), where \( A \) is a maximal meta-rotation in \( I \). Then \( M_J \) is a matching in \( L' \) by induction. Since \( I \) contains \( A \), \( S_{M_0, M_I} \supseteq A \). Therefore, \( M^A \prec M_I \). It follows that \( M_I = M_J \lor M^A \in L' \).

**Lemma 10.** Any matching in \( L' \) must be in \( L(P'_f) \).

**Proof.** Suppose there exists a matching \( M \) in \( L' \) such that \( M \notin L(P'_f) \). Then it must be the case that \( S_{M_0, M} \) cannot be partitioned into meta-rotations which form a closed subset of \( P_f \). Now there are two cases.

First, suppose that \( S_{M_0, M} \) can be partitioned into meta-rotations, but they do not form a closed subset of \( P_f \). Let \( A \) be a meta-rotation such that \( S_{M_0, M} \supseteq A \), and there exists \( B \prec A \) such that \( S_{M_0, M} \not\supseteq B \). By Lemma 5, \( M \succ M^A \) and hence \( S_{M_0, M} \) is a superset of all meta-rotations in \( \text{pre}(A) \), giving a contradiction.

Next, suppose that \( S_{M_0, M} \) cannot be partitioned into meta-rotations in \( P_f \). Since the set of meta-rotations partitions \( P_f \), there exists a meta-rotation \( X \) such that \( Y = X \cap S_{M_0, M} \) is a non-empty subset of \( X \). Let \( J \) be the set of meta-rotations preceding \( X \) in \( P_f \).

\((M_J \lor M) \land M^X\) is the matching generated by meta-rotations in \( J \cup Y \). Obviously, \( J \) is a closed subset in \( P_f \). Therefore, \( M_J \in L(P_f) \). By Lemma 9, \( M_J \in L' \). Since \( M, M^X \in L' \), \((M_J \lor M) \land M^X \in L' \) as well. The set of rotations contained on a path from \( M_J \) to \((M_J \lor M) \land M^X \) in \( H(L) \) is exactly \( Y \). Therefore, \( Y \) can not be a subset of any meta-rotation, contradicting the fact that \( Y = X \cap S_{M_0, M} \) is a non-empty subset of \( X \).
Figure 2: $E_1$ (red edges) and $E_2$ (blue edges) define the sublattices in Figure 1, of red and blue elements, respectively.

## 4 An Alternative View of Compression

In this section we give an alternative definition of compression of a poset; this will be used in the rest of the paper. We are given a poset $P$ for a stable matching instance; let $\mathcal{L}$ be the lattice it generates. Let $H(P)$ denote the Hasse diagram of $P$. Consider the following operations to derive a new poset $P_f$: Choose a set $E$ of directed edges to add to $H(P)$ and let $H_E$ be the resulting graph. Let $H_f$ be the graph obtained by shrinking the strongly connected components of $H_E$; each strongly connected component will be a meta-rotation of $P_f$. The edges which are not shrunk will define a DAG, $H_f$, on the strongly connected components. These edges give precedence relations among meta-rotation for poset $P_f$.

Let $\mathcal{L}'$ be the sublattice of $\mathcal{L}$ generated by $P_f$. We will say that the set of edges $E$ defines $\mathcal{L}'$. It can be seen that each set $E$ uniquely defines a sublattice $L(P_f)$; however, there may be multiple sets that define the same sublattice. Observe that given a compression $P_f$ of $P$, a set $E$ of edges defining $L(P_f)$ can easily be obtained. See Figure 2 for examples of sets of edges which define sublattices.

**Proposition 4.** The two definitions of compression of a poset are equivalent.

*Proof.* Let $P_f$ be a compression of $P$ obtained using the first definition. Clearly, for each meta-rotation in $P_f$, we can add edges to $P$ so the strongly connected component created is precisely this meta-rotation. Any additional precedence relations introduced among incomparable meta-rotations can also be introduced by adding appropriate edges.

The other direction is even simpler, since each strongly connected component can be defined to be a meta-rotation and extra edges added can also be simulated by introducing new precedence constraints. \hfill $\square$

For a (directed) edge $e = uv \in E$, $u$ is called the *tail* and $v$ is called the *head* of $e$. Let $I$ be a closed set of $P$. Then we say that:
• \(I\) separates an edge \(uv \in E\) if \(v \in I\) and \(u \notin I\).

• \(I\) crosses an edge \(uv \in E\) if \(u \in I\) and \(v \notin I\).

If \(I\) does not separate or cross any edge \(uv \in E\), \(I\) is called a splitting set w.r.t. \(E\).

**Lemma 11.** Let \(\mathcal{L}'\) be a sublattice of \(\mathcal{L}\) and \(E\) be a set of edges defining \(\mathcal{L}'\). A matching \(M\) is in \(\mathcal{L}'\) iff the closed subset \(I\) generating \(M\) does not separate any edge \(uv \in E\).

**Proof.** Let \(P_f\) be a compression corresponding to \(\mathcal{L}'\). By Theorem 3, the matchings in \(\mathcal{L}'\) are generated by eliminating rotations in closed subsets of \(P_f\).

First, assume \(I\) separates \(uv \in E\). Moreover, assume \(M \in \mathcal{L}'\) for the sake of contradiction, and let \(I_f\) be the closed subset of \(P_f\) corresponding to \(M\). Let \(U\) and \(V\) be the meta-rotations containing \(u\) and \(v\) respectively. Notice that the sets of rotations in \(I\) and \(I_f\) are identical. Therefore, \(V \subseteq I_f\) and \(U \notin I_f\). Since \(uv \in E\), there is an edge from \(U\) to \(V\) in \(H_f\). Hence, \(I_f\) is not a closed subset of \(P_f\).

Next, assume that \(I\) does not separate any \(uv \in E\). We show that the rotations in \(I\) can be partitioned into meta-rotations in a closed subset \(I_f\) of \(P_f\). If \(I\) cannot be partitioned into meta-rotations, there must exist a meta-rotation \(A\) such that \(A \cap I\) is a non-empty proper subset of \(A\). Since \(A\) consists of rotations in a strongly connected component of \(H_E\), there must be an edge \(uv\) from \(A \setminus I\) to \(A \cap I\) in \(H_E\). Hence, \(I\) separates \(uv\). Since \(I\) is a closed subset, \(uv\) can not be an edge in \(H\). Therefore, \(uv \in E\), which is a contradiction. It remains to show that the set of meta-rotations partitioning \(I\) is a closed subset of \(P_f\). Assume otherwise, there exist meta-rotation \(U \in I_f\) and \(V \notin I_f\) such that there exists an edge from \(U\) to \(V\) in \(E_f\). Therefore, there exists \(u \in U\), \(v \in V\) and \(uv \in E\), which is a contradiction.

**Remark 5.** We may assume w.l.o.g. that the set \(E\) defining \(\mathcal{L}'\) is minimal in the following sense: There is no edge \(uv \in E\) such that \(uv\) is not separated by any closed set of \(P\). Observe that if there is such an edge, then \(E \setminus \{uv\}\) defines the same sublattice \(\mathcal{L}'\). Similarly, there is no edge \(uv \in E\) such that each closed set separating \(uv\) also separates another edge in \(E\).

**Definition 3.** W.r.t. an element \(v\) in a poset \(P\), we define four useful subsets of \(P\):

\[
I_v = \{ r \in P : r \prec v \}
\]

\[
J_v = \{ r \in P : r \preceq v \} = I_v \cup \{v\}
\]

\[
I'_v = \{ r \in P : r \succ v \}
\]

\[
J'_v = \{ r \in P : r \succeq v \} = I'_v \cup \{v\}
\]

Notice that \(I_v, J_v, P \setminus I'_v, P \setminus J'_v\) are all closed sets.

**Lemma 12.** Both \(J_v\) and \(P \setminus J'_v\) separate \(uv\) for each \(uv \in E\).

**Proof.** Since \(uv\) is in \(E\), \(u\) cannot be in \(J_v\); otherwise, there is no closed subset separating \(uv\), contradicting Remark 5. Hence, \(J_v\) separates \(uv\) for all \(uv\) in \(E\).

Similarly, since \(uv\) is in \(E\), \(v\) cannot be in \(J'_v\). Therefore, \(P \setminus J'_v\) contains \(v\) but not \(u\), and thus separates \(uv\). \(\square\)
5 The Lattice Can be Partitioned into Two Sublattices

In this section we will prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 6.** Let $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ be sublattices of $\mathcal{L}$ such that $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ partition $\mathcal{L}$. Then there exist sets of edges $E_1$ and $E_2$ defining $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ such that they form an alternating path from $t$ to $s$.

Again, we give a proof in the context of stable matchings. To prove the theorem, we let $E_1$ and $E_2$ be any two sets of edges defining $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$, respectively. We will show that $E_1$ and $E_2$ can be adjusted so that they form an alternating path from $t$ to $s$, without changing the corresponding compressions.

**Lemma 13.** There must exist a path from $t$ to $s$ composed of edges in $E_1$ and $E_2$.

*Proof.* Let $R$ denote the set of vertices reachable from $t$ by a path of edges in $E_1$ and $E_2$. Assume by contradiction that $R$ does not contain $s$. Consider the matching $M$ generated by rotations in $P \setminus R$. Without loss of generality, assume that $M \in \mathcal{L}_1$. By Lemma 11, $P \setminus R$ separates an edge $uv \in E_2$. Therefore, $u \in R$ and $v \in P \setminus R$. Since $uv \in E_2$, $v$ is also reachable from $t$ by a path of edges in $E_1$ and $E_2$. \qed

Let $Q$ be a path from $t$ to $s$ according to Lemma 13. Partition $Q$ into subpaths $Q_1, \ldots, Q_k$ such that each $Q_i$ consists of edges in either $E_1$ or $E_2$ and $E(Q_i) \cap E(Q_{i+1}) = \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$. Let $r_i$ be the rotation at the end of $Q_i$ except for $i = 0$ where $r_0 = t$. Specifically, $t = r_0 \rightarrow r_1 \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow r_k = s$ in $Q$. We will show that each $Q_i$ can be replaced by a direct edge from $r_{i-1}$ to $r_i$, and furthermore, all edges not in $Q$ can be removed.

**Lemma 14.** Let $Q_i$ consist of edges in $E_\alpha$ ($\alpha = 1$ or 2). $Q_i$ can be replaced by an edge from $r_{i-1}$ to $r_i$ where $r_{i-1}r_i \in E_\alpha$.

*Proof.* A closed subset separating $r_{i-1}r_i$ must separate an edge in $Q_i$. Moreover, any closed subset must separate exactly one of $r_0r_1, \ldots, r_{k-2}r_{k-1}, r_{k-1}r_k$. Therefore, the set of closed subsets separating an edge in $E_1$ (or $E_2$) remains unchanged. \qed

**Lemma 15.** Edges in $E_1 \cup E_2$ but not in $Q$ can be removed.

*Proof.* Let $e$ be an edge in $E_1 \cup E_2$ but not in $Q$. Suppose that $e \in E_1$. Let $I$ be a closed subset separating $e$. By Lemma 11, the matching generated by $I$ belongs to $\mathcal{L}_2$. Since $e$ is not in $Q$ and $Q$ is a path from $t$ to $s$, $I$ must separate another edge $e'$ in $Q$. By Lemma 11, $I$ can not separate edges in both $E_1$ and $E_2$. Therefore, $e'$ must also be in $E_1$. Hence, the matching generated by $I$ will still be in $\mathcal{L}_2$ after removing $e$ from $E_1$. The argument applies to all closed subsets separating $e$. \qed

By Lemma 14 and Lemma 15, $r_0r_1, \ldots, r_{k-2}r_{k-1}, r_{k-1}r_k$ are all edges in $E_1$ and $E_2$ and they alternate between $E_1$ and $E_2$. Therefore, we have Theorem 6. An illustration of such a path is given in Figure 3(a).
Proposition 7. There exists a sequence of rotations $r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_{2k}, r_{2k+1}$ such that a closed subset generates a matching in $L_1$ iff it contains $r_{2i}$ but not $r_{2i+1}$ for some $0 \leq i \leq k$.

6 The Lattice Can be Partitioned into a Sublattice and a Semi-Sublattice

Let $L$ be a distributive lattice that can be partitioned into a sublattice $L_1$ and a semi-sublattice $L_2$. The next theorem, which generalizes Theorem 6, gives a sufficient characterization of a set of edges $E$ defining $L_1$.

Theorem 8. There exists a set of edges $E$ defining sublattice $L_1$ such that:

1. The set of tails $T_E$ of edges in $E$ forms a chain in $P$.
2. There is no path of length two consisting of edges in $E$.
3. For each $r \in T_E$, let
   \[ F_r = \{ v \in P : rv \in E \}. \]
   Then any two rotations in $F_r$ are incomparable.
4. For any $r_i, r_j \in T_E$ where $r_i \prec r_j$, there exists a splitting set containing all rotations in $F_{r_i} \cup \{r_i\}$ and no rotations in $F_{r_j} \cup \{r_j\}$.

A set $E$ satisfying Theorem 8 will be called a bouquet. For each $r \in T_E$, let $L_r = \{ rv : v \in F_r \}$. Then $L_r$ will be called a flower. Observe that the bouquet $E$ is partitioned into flowers. These notions are illustrated in Figure 3(b). The black path, directed from $s$ to $t$, is the chain mentioned in

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Examples of: (a) canonical path, and (b) bouquet.}
\end{figure}
in Theorem 3 and the red edges constitute $E$. Observe that the tails of edges $E$ lie on the chain. For each such tail, the edges of $E$ outgoing from it constitute a flower.

Let $E$ be an arbitrary set of edges defining $L_1$. We will show that $E$ can be modified so that the conditions in Theorem 8 are satisfied. Let $S$ be a splitting set of $P$. In other words, $S$ is a closed subset such that for all $uv \in E$, either $u,v$ are both in $S$ or $u,v$ are both in $P \setminus S$.

**Lemma 16.** There is a unique maximal rotation in $T \cap S$.

**Proof.** Suppose there are at least two maximal rotations $u_1,u_2,\ldots,u_k$ in $T \cap S$ where $k \geq 2$. Let $S_i = J_{u_i} \cup J_{v_i}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Since $u_i$ and $u_j$ are incomparable, $u_j \notin J_{u_i}$. Moreover, $u_j \notin J_{v_i}$ by Lemma 12. Therefore, $u_j \notin S_i$. It follows that $S_i$ contains $u_i$ and separates $u_j,v_j$. Since $S_i$ separates $u_j,v_j \in E$, the matching generated by $S_i$ is in $L_2$ according to Lemma 11.

Since $\bigcup_{i=1}^k S_i$ contains all maximal rotations in $T \cap S$ and $S$ does not separate any edge in $E$, $\bigcup_{i=1}^k S_i$ does not separate any edge in $E$ either. Therefore, the matching generated by $\bigcup_{i=1}^k S_i$ is in $L_1$, and hence not in $L_2$. This contradicts the fact that $L_2$ is a semi-sublattice. $\Box$

Denote by $r$ the unique maximal rotation in $T \cap S$. Let

$$R_r = \{v \in P : \text{there is a path from } r \text{ to } v \text{ using edges in } E\},$$
$$E_r = \{uv \in E : u,v \in R_r\},$$
$$G_r = \{R_r,E_r\}.$$ 

Note that $r \in R_r$. For each $v \in R_r$ there exists a path from $r$ to $v$ and $r \in S$. Since $S$ does not cross any edge in the path, $v$ must also be in $S$. Therefore, $R_r \subseteq S$.

**Lemma 17.** Let $u \in (T \cap S) \setminus R_r$ such that $u \succ x$ for $x \in R_r$. Then we can replace each $uv \in E$ with $rv$.

**Proof.** We will show that the set of closed subsets separating an edge in $E$ remains unchanged. Let $I$ be a closed subset separating $uv$. Then $I$ must also separate $rv$ since $r \succ v$.

Now suppose $I$ is a closed subset separating $rv$. We consider two cases:

- If $u \in I$, $I$ must contain $x$ since $u \succ x$. Hence, $I$ separates an edge in the path from $r$ to $x$.
- If $u \notin I$, $I$ separates $uv$.

$\Box$

Keep replacing edges according to Lemma 17 until there is no $u \in (T \cap S) \setminus R_r$ such that $u \succ x$ for some $x \in R_r$.

**Lemma 18.** Let $X = \{v \in S : v \succeq x \text{ for some } x \in R_r\}$.

1. $S \setminus X$ is a closed subset.
2. \( S \setminus X \) contains \( u \) for each \( u \in (T_E \cap S) \setminus R_r \).

3. \( S \setminus X \cap R_r = \emptyset \).

4. \( S \setminus X \) is a splitting set.

**Proof.** The lemma follows from the claims given below:

**Claim 1.** \( S \setminus X \) is a closed subset.

**Proof.** Let \( v \) be a rotation in \( S \setminus X \) and \( u \) be a predecessor of \( v \). Since \( S \) is a closed subset, \( u \in S \). Notice that if a rotation is in \( X \), all of its successor must be included. Hence, since \( v \notin X \), \( u \notin X \). Therefore, \( u \in S \setminus X \).

**Claim 2.** \( S \setminus X \) contains \( u \) for each \( u \in (T_E \cap S) \setminus R_r \).

**Proof.** After replacing edges according to Lemma 17, for each \( u \in (T_E \cap S) \setminus R_r \) we must have that \( u \) does not succeed any \( x \in R_r \). Therefore, \( u \notin X \) by the definition of \( X \).

**Claim 3.** \( (S \setminus X) \cap R_r = \emptyset \).

**Proof.** Since \( R_r \subseteq X \), \( (S \setminus X) \cap R_r = \emptyset \).

**Claim 4.** \( S \setminus X \) does not separate any edge in \( E \).

**Proof.** Suppose \( S \setminus X \) separates \( uv \in E \). Then \( u \in X \) and \( v \in S \setminus X \). By Claim 2, \( u \) can not be a tail vertex, which is a contradiction.

**Claim 5.** \( S \setminus X \) does not cross any edge in \( E \).

**Proof.** Suppose \( S \setminus X \) crosses \( uv \in E \). Then \( u \in S \setminus X \) and \( v \in X \). Let \( J \) be a closed subset separating \( uv \). Then \( v \in J \) and \( u \notin J \).

Since \( uv \in E \) and \( u \in S \), \( u \in T_E \cap S \). Therefore, \( r \succ u \) by Lemma 16. Since \( J \) is a closed subset, \( r \notin J \).

Since \( v \in X \), \( v \succeq x \) for \( x \in R_r \). Again, as \( J \) is a closed subset, \( x \in J \).

Therefore, \( J \) separates an edge in the path from \( r \) to \( x \) in \( G_r \). Hence, all closed subsets separating \( uv \) must also separate another edge in \( E_r \). This contradicts the assumption made in Remark 5.

**Lemma 19.** \( E_r \) can be replaced by the following set of edges:

\[ E'_r = \{ rv : v \in R_r \} \]
Proof. We will show that the set of closed subsets separating an edge in \( E_r \) and the set of closed subset separating an edge in \( E'_r \) are identical.

Consider a closed subset \( I \) separating an edge in \( rv \in E'_r \). Since \( v \in R_r \), I must separate an edge in \( E \) in a path from \( r \) to \( v \). By definition, that edge is in \( E_r \).

Now let \( I \) be a closed subset separating an edge in \( uv \in E_r \). Since \( uv \in E \), \( u \in T_E \cap S \). By Lemma 16, \( r \succ u \). Thus, I must also separate \( rv \in E'_r \). \qed

Proof of Theorem 8. To begin, let \( S_1 = P \) and let \( r_1 \) be the unique maximal rotation according to Lemma 16. Then we can replace edges according to Lemma 17 and Lemma 19. After replacing, \( r_1 \) is the only tail vertex in \( G_{r_1} \). By Lemma 18, there exists a set \( X \) such that \( S_1 \setminus X \) does not contain any vertex in \( R_{r_1} \) and contains all other tail vertices in \( T_E \) except \( r_1 \). Moreover, \( S_1 \setminus X \) is a splitting set. Hence, we can set \( S_2 = S_1 \setminus X \) and repeat.

Let \( r_1, \ldots, r_k \) be the rotations found in the above process. Since \( r_i \) is the unique maximal rotation in \( T_E \cap S_i \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq k \) and \( S_1 \supset S_2 \supset \cdots \supset S_k \), we have \( r_1 \succ r_2 \succ \cdots \succ r_k \). By Lemma 19, for each \( 1 \leq i \leq k \), \( E_{r_i} \) consists of edges \( r_i v \) for \( v \in R_{r_i} \). Therefore, there is no path of length two composed of edges in \( E \) and condition 2 is satisfied. Moreover, \( r_1, \ldots, r_k \) are exactly the tail vertices in \( T_E \), which gives condition 1.

Let \( r \) be a rotation in \( T_E \) and consider \( u, v \in F_r \). Moreover, assume that \( u \prec v \). A closed subset \( I \) separating \( rv \) contains \( v \) but not \( r \). Since \( I \) is a closed subset and \( u \prec v \), \( I \) contains \( u \). Therefore, \( I \) also separates \( ru \), contradicting the assumption in Remark 5. The same argument applies when \( v \prec u \). Therefore, \( u \) and \( v \) are incomparable as stated in condition 3.

Finally, let \( r_i, r_j \in T_E \) where \( r_i \prec r_j \). By the construction given above, \( S_j \supset S_{j-1} \supset \cdots \supset S_i \), \( R_{r_i} \subseteq S_j \setminus S_{j-1} \) and \( R_{r_i} \subseteq S_i \). Therefore, \( S_i \) contains all rotations in \( R_{r_i} \) but none of the rotations in \( R_{r_j} \), giving condition 4. \qed

Proposition 9. There exists a sequence of rotations \( r_1 \prec \cdots \prec r_k \) and a set \( F_{r_i} \) for each \( 1 \leq i \leq k \) such that a closed subset generates a matching in \( L_1 \) if and only if whenever it contains a rotation in \( F_{r_i} \), it must also contain \( r_i \).

7 Algorithm for Finding a Bouquet

In this section, we give an algorithm for finding a bouquet. Let \( L \) be a distributive lattice that can be partitioned into a sublattice \( L_1 \) and a semi-sublattice \( L_2 \). Then given a poset \( P \) of \( L \) and a membership oracle, which determines if a matching of \( L \) is in \( L_1 \) or not, the algorithm returns a bouquet defining \( L_1 \).

By Theorem 8, the set of tails \( T_E \) forms a chain \( C \) in \( P \). The idea of our algorithm, given in Figure 4, is to find the flowers according to their order in \( C \). Specifically, a splitting set \( S \) is maintained such that at any point, all flowers outside of \( S \) are found. At the beginning, \( S \) is set to \( P \) and becomes smaller as the algorithm proceeds. Step 2 checks if \( M_z \) is a matching in \( L_1 \) or not. If \( M_z \notin L_1 \), the closed subset \( P \setminus \{ t \} \) separates an edge in \( E \) according to Lemma 11. Hence, the first tail on \( C \) must be \( t \). Otherwise, the algorithm jumps to Step 3 to find the first tail. Each time
**Find Bouquet**($P$):

**Input:** A poset $P$.

**Output:** A set $E$ of edges defining $L_1$.

1. Initialize: Let $S = P$, $E = \emptyset$.
2. If $M_z$ is in $L_1$: go to Step 3. Else: $r = t$, go to Step 5.
3. $r = \text{FindNextTail}(P, S)$.
4. If $r$ is not NULL: Go to Step 5. Else: Go to Step 7.
5. $F_r = \text{FindFlower}(P, S, r)$.
6. Update:
   (a) For each $u \in F_r$: $E \leftarrow E \cup \{ru\}$.
   (b) $S \leftarrow S \setminus \bigcup_{u \in F_r \cup \{r\}} I_u'$.
   (c) Go to Step 3.
7. Return $E$.

**Figure 4:** Algorithm for finding a bouquet.

**Find Next Tail**($P, S$):

**Input:** A poset $P$, a splitting set $S$.

**Output:** The maximal tail vertex in $S$, or NULL if there is no tail vertex in $S$.

1. Compute the set $V$ of rotations $v$ in $S$ such that:
   - $P \setminus I_v'$ generates a matching in $L_1$.
   - $P \setminus J_v'$ generates a matching in $L_2$.
2. If $V \neq \emptyset$ and there is a unique maximal element $v$ in $V$: Return $v$.
   Else: Return NULL.

**Figure 5:** Subroutine for finding the next tail.

If a tail $r$ is found, Step 5 immediately finds the flower $L_r$ corresponding to $r$. The splitting set $S$ is then updated so that $S$ no longer contains $L_r$ but still contains the flowers that have not been found yet. Next, our algorithm continues to look for the next tail inside the updated $S$. If no tail is found, it terminates.

First we prove a simple observation.

**Lemma 20.** Let $v$ be a rotation in $P$. Let $S \subseteq P$ such that both $S$ and $S \cup \{v\}$ are closed subsets. If $S$ generates a matching in $L_1$ and $S \cup \{u\}$ generates a matching in $L_2$, $v$ is the head of an edge in $E$. If $S$ generates a matching in $L_2$ and $S \cup \{u\}$ generates a matching in $L_1$, $v$ is the tail of an edge in $E$.

**Proof.** Suppose that $S$ generates a matching in $L_1$ and $S \cup \{u\}$ generates a matching in $L_2$. By Lemma 11, $S$ does not separate any edge in $E$, and $S \cup \{u\}$ separates an edge $e \in E$. This can only happen if $u$ is the head of $e$.

A similar argument can be given for the second case. \hfill \qed
Algorithm 1: Finding a flower

**Input:** A poset $P$, a tail vertex $r$ and a splitting set $S$ containing $r$.

**Output:** The set $F_r = \{ v \in P : rv \in E \}$.

1. Compute $X = \{ v \in I_r : J_v \text{ generates a matching in } L_1 \}$.
2. Let $Y = \bigcup_{v \in X} J_v$.
3. If $Y = \emptyset$ and $M_0 \in L_2$: Return $\{s\}$.
4. Compute the set $V$ of rotations $v$ in $S$ such that:
   - $Y \cup I_v$ generates a matching in $L_1$.
   - $Y \cup J_v$ generates a matching in $L_2$.
5. Return $V$.

**Figure 6:** Subroutine for finding a flower.

**Lemma 21.** Given a splitting set $S$, $\text{FindNextTail}(P, S)$ (Figure 5) returns the maximal tail vertex in $S$, or $\text{NULL}$ if there is no tail vertex in $S$.

**Proof.** Let $r$ be the maximal tail vertex in $S$.

First we show that $r \in V$. By Theorem 8, the set of tails of edges in $E$ forms a chain in $P$. Therefore $P \setminus I_r'$ contains all tails in $S$. Hence, $P \setminus I_r'$ does not separate any edge whose tails are in $S$. Since $S$ is a splitting set, $P \setminus I_r'$ does not separate any edge whose tails are in $P \setminus S$. Therefore, by Lemma 11, $P \setminus I_r'$ generates a matching in $L_1$. By Lemma 12, $P \setminus J_r'$ must separate an edge in $E$, and hence generates a matching in $L_2$ according to Lemma 11.

By Lemma 20, any rotation in $V$ must be the tail of an edge in $E$. Hence, they are all predecessors of $r$ according to Theorem 8.

**Lemma 22.** Given a tail vertex $r$ and a splitting set $S$ containing $r$, $\text{FindFlower}(P, S)$ (Figure 6) correctly returns $F_r$.

**Proof.** First we give two crucial properties of the set $Y$. By Theorem 8, the set of tails of edges in $E$ forms a chain $C$ in $P$.

**Claim 1.** $Y$ contains all predecessors of $r$ in $C$.

**Proof.** Assume that there is at least one predecessor of $r$ in $C$, and denote by $r'$ the direct predecessor. It suffices to show that $r' \in Y$. By Theorem 8, there exists a splitting set $I$ such that $R_{r'} \subseteq I$ and $R_r \cap I = \emptyset$. Let $v$ be the maximal element in $C \cap I$. Then $v$ is a successor of all tail vertices in $I$. It follows that $I_v$ does not separate any edges in $E$ inside $I$. Therefore, $v \in X$. Since $J_v \subseteq Y$, $Y$ contains all predecessors of $r$ in $C$.

**Claim 2.** $Y$ does not contain any rotation in $F_r$.
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Proof. Since $Y$ is the union of closed subset generating matching in $L_1$, $Y$ also generates a matching in $L_1$. By Lemma 11, $Y$ does not separate any edge in $E$. Since $r \notin Y$, $Y$ must not contain any rotation in $F_r$.

By Claim 1, if $Y = \emptyset$, $r$ is the last tail found in $C$. Hence, if $M_0 \in L_2$, $s$ must be in $F_r$. By Theorem 8, the heads in $F_r$ are incomparable. Therefore, $s$ is the only rotation in $C$. FINDFLOWER correctly returns $\{s\}$ in Step 3. Suppose such a situation does not happen, we will show that the returned set is $F_r$.

Claim 3. $V = F_r$.

Proof. Let $v$ be a rotation in $V$. By Lemma 20, $v$ is a head of some edge $e$ in $E$. Since $Y$ contains all predecessors of $r$ in $C$, the tail of $e$ must be $r$. Hence, $v \in F_r$.

Let $v$ be a rotation in $F_r$. Since $Y$ contains all predecessors of $r$ in $C$, $Y \cup I_v$ can not separate any edge whose tails are predecessors of $r$. Moreover, by Theorem 8, the heads in $F_r$ are incomparable. Therefore, $I_v$ does not contain any rotation in $F_r$. Since $Y$ does not contain any rotation in $F_r$, by the above claim, $Y \cup I_v$ does not separate any edge in $E$. It follows that $Y \cup I_v$ generates a matching in $L_1$. Finally, $Y \cup J_v$ separates $rv$ clearly, and hence generates a matching in $L_2$. Therefore, $v \in V$ as desired.

Theorem 10. FINDBOUQUET($P$), given in Figure 4, returns a set of edges defining $L_1$.

Proof. From Lemmas 21 and 22, it suffices to show that $S$ is updated correctly in Step 6(b). To be precised, we need that

$$S \setminus \bigcup_{u \in F_r \cup \{r\}} J'_u$$

must still be a splitting set, and contains all flowers that have not been found. This follows from Lemma 18 by noticing that

$$\bigcup_{u \in F_r \cup \{r\}} J'_u = \{v \in P : v \preceq u \text{ for some } u \in R_r\}.$$

Clearly, a sublattice of $L$ must also be a semi-sublattice. Therefore, FINDBOUQUET can be used to find a canonical path described in Section 5.

8 Finding an Optimal Fully Robust Stable Matching

Consider the setting given in the Introduction, with $D$ being the domain of all erroneous instances $B$ under consideration. We show how to use the algorithm in Section 7 to find the poset generating all fully robust matchings w.r.t. $D$, and then use this poset to obtain a fully robust matching maximizing (or minimizing) any given weight function.


8.1 Studying semi-sublattices is necessary and sufficient

Let $A$ be a stable matching instance, and $B$ be an instance obtained by permuting the preference list of one boy or one girl. Lemma 23 gives an example of a permutation so that $M_{AB}$ is not a sublattice of $L_A$, hence showing that the case studied in Section 5 does not suffice to solve the problem at hand. On the other hand, for all such instances $B$, Lemma 24 shows that $M_{AB}$ forms a semi-sublattice of $L_A$ and hence the case studied in Section 6 does suffice.

The next lemma pertains to the example given in Figure 7, in which the set of boys is $B = \{a, b, c, d\}$ and the set of girls is $G = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Instance $B$ is obtained from instance $A$ by permuting girl 1’s list.

**Lemma 23.** $M_{AB}$ is not a sublattice of $L_A$.

*Proof.* $M_1 = \{1a, 2b, 3d, 4c\}$ and $M_2 = \{1b, 2a, 3c, 4d\}$ are stable matching with respect to instance $A$. Clearly, $M_1 \land M_2 = \{1a, 2b, 3c, 4d\}$ is also a stable matching under $A$.

In going from $A$ to $B$, the positions of boys $b$ and $c$ are swapped in girl 1’s list. Under $B$, $1c$ is a blocking pair for $M_1$ and $1a$ is a blocking pair for $M_2$. Hence, $M_1$ and $M_2$ are both in $M_{AB}$. However, $M_1 \land M_2$ is a stable matching under $B$, and therefore is it not in $M_{AB}$. Hence, $M_{AB}$ is not closed under the $\land$ operation.

**Lemma 24.** For any instance $B$ obtained by permuting the preference list of one boy or one girl, $M_{AB}$ forms a semi-sublattice of $L_A$.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assume that the preference list of a girl $g$ is permuted. Let $M_1$ and $M_2$ be two matchings in $M_{AB}$. Hence, neither of them are in $M_B$. In other words, each has a blocking pair under instance $B$.

Let $b$ be the partner of $g$ in $M_1 \lor M_2$. Then $b$ must also be matched to $g$ in either $M_1$ or $M_2$ (or both). We may assume that $b$ is matched to $g$ in $M_1$.

Let $xy$ be a blocking pair of $M_1$ under $B$. We will show that $xy$ must also be a blocking pair of $M_1 \lor M_2$ under $B$. To begin, the girl $y$ must be $g$ since other preference lists remain unchanged. Since $xg$ is a blocking pair of $M_1$ under $B$, $x >_B g$. Similarly, $g >_x g'$ where $g'$ is the $M_1$-partner...
of $x$. Let $g''$ be the partner of $x$ in $M_1 \lor M_2$. Then $g' \geq_x g''$. It follows that $g >_x g''$. Since $x >_y b$ and $g >_x g''$, $xg$ must be a blocking pair of $M_1 \lor M_2$ under $B$. 

**Proposition 11.** A set of edges defining the sublattice $L'$, consisting of matchings in $M_A \cap M_B$, can be computed efficiently.

**Proof.** We have that $L'$ and $M_{AB}$ partition $L_A$, with $M_{AB}$ being a semi-sublattice of $L_A$, by Lemma 24. Therefore, FindBouquet($P$) finds a set of edges defining $L'$ by Theorem 10.

By Lemma 3, the input $P$ to FindBouquet can be computed in polynomial time. Clearly, a membership oracle checking if a matching is in $L'$ or not can also be implemented efficiently. Since $P$ has $O(n^2)$ vertices (Lemma 3), any step of FindBouquet takes polynomial time. 


8.2 Optimizing fully robust stable matchings

Finally, we will prove Theorem 1. Let $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ be polynomially many instances in the domain $D \subseteq T$, as defined in the Introduction. Let $E_i$ be the set of edges defining $M_A \cap M_{B_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Clearly, $L' = M_A \cap M_{B_1} \cap \ldots \cap M_{B_k}$ is a sublattice of $L_A$.

**Lemma 25.** $E = \bigcup E_i$ defines $L'$.

**Proof.** By Lemma 11, it suffices to show that for any closed subset $I$, $I$ does not separate an edge in $E$ iff $I$ generates a matching in $L'$.

$I$ does not separate an edge in $E$ iff $I$ does not separate any edge in $E_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ iff the matching generated by $I$ is in $M_A \cap M_{B_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ by Lemma 11. 

By Lemma 25, a compression $P_i$ generating $L'$ can be constructed from $E$ as described in Section 4. By Proposition 11, we can compute each $E_i$, and hence, $P_i$ efficiently. Clearly, $P_i$ can be used to check if a fully robust stable matching exists. To be precise, a fully robust stable matching exists iff there exists a proper closed subset of $P_i$. This happens iff $s$ and $t$ belong to different meta-rotations in $P_i$, an easy to check condition. Hence, we have Theorem 1.

We can use $P_i$ to obtain a fully robust stable matching $M$ maximizing $\sum_{bg \in M} w_{bg}$ by applying the algorithm of [MV18b]. Specifically, let $H(P_i)$ be the Hasse diagram of $P_i$. Then each pair $bg$ for $b \in B$ and $g \in G$ can be associated with two vertices $u_{bg}$ and $v_{bg}$ in $H(P_i)$ as follows:

- If there is a rotation $r$ moving $b$ to $g$, $u_{bg}$ is the meta-rotation containing $r$. Otherwise, $u_{bg}$ is the meta-rotation containing $s$.

- If there is a rotation $r$ moving $b$ from $g$, $v_{bg}$ is the meta-rotation containing $r$. Otherwise, $v_{bg}$ is the meta-rotation containing $t$.

By Lemma 2 and the definition of compression, $u_{bg} \prec v_{bg}$. Hence, there is a path from $u_{bg}$ to $v_{bg}$ in $H(P_i)$. We can then add weights to edges in $H(P_i)$, as stated in [MV18b]. Specifically, we start with weight 0 on all edges and increase weights of edges in a path from $u_{bg}$ to $v_{bg}$ by $w_{bg}$ for all pairs $bg$. A fully robust stable matching maximizing $\sum_{bg \in M} w_{bg}$ can be obtained by
finding a maximum weight ideal cut in the constructed graph. An efficient algorithm for the latter problem is given in [MV18b].

9 Discussion

The structural and algorithmic results introduced in this paper naturally lead to a number of new questions, such as finding robust (with respect to a probability distribution on the domain of errors) rather than fully robust stable matchings, extending to more than one error, improving the running time of our algorithm, extending to the stable roommate problem, etc.

Considering the deep and pristine structure of stable matching, it will not be surprising if many of these questions do get settled satisfactorily in due course of time. As stated above some of our results, such as the generalization of Birkhoff’s Theorem, transcend the setting of stable matching and should be applicable more widely.
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