

Envy-freeness and Relaxed Stability under lower quotas

Prem Krishnaa¹

Cohesity Storage Solutions India Pvt. Ltd, India
premkrishnaa.jaganmohan@cohesity.com

Girija Limaye

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, India
girija@cse.iitm.ac.in

Meghana Nasre

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, India
meghana@cse.iitm.ac.in

Prajakta Nimbhorkar

Chennai Mathematical Institute, India and UMI ReLaX
prajakta@cmi.ac.in

Abstract

We consider the problem of matchings under two-sided preferences in the presence of maximum as well as minimum quota requirements for the agents. This setting, studied as the Hospital Residents with Lower Quotas (HRLQ) in literature, models important real world problems like assigning medical interns (residents) to hospitals, and teaching assistants to instructors where a minimum guarantee is essential. When there are no minimum quotas, *stability* is the de-facto notion of optimality. However, in the presence of minimum quotas, ensuring stability and simultaneously satisfying lower quotas is not an attainable goal in many instances.

To address this, a relaxation of stability known as *envy-freeness*, is proposed in literature. In our work, we thoroughly investigate envy-freeness from a computational view point. Our results show that computing envy-free matchings that match maximum number of agents is computationally hard and also hard to approximate up to a constant factor. Additionally, it is known that envy-free matchings satisfying lower-quotas may not exist. To circumvent these drawbacks, we propose a new notion called *relaxed stability*. We show that relaxed stable matchings are guaranteed to exist even in the presence of lower-quotas. Despite the computational intractability of finding a largest matching that is feasible and relaxed stable, we give efficient algorithms that compute a constant factor approximation to this matching in terms of size.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Mathematics of computing → Graph theory; Theory of computation → Design and analysis of algorithms

Keywords and phrases Matchings under preferences, Lower quota, Hardness of approximation, Approximation algorithms, Parameterized complexity

1 Introduction

Matching problems with two-sided preferences have been extensively investigated for matching markets where agents (hospitals/residents or colleges/students) have upper quotas that can not be exceeded. Stability [9] is a widely accepted notion of optimality in this scenario. An allocation is said to be *stable* if no pair of agents has an incentive to deviate from it. However, the case when the agents have maximum as well as minimum quotas poses new challenges and there is still a want of satisfactory mechanisms that take minimum quotas into account.

¹ Part of this work was done when the author was a Dual Degree student at IIT Madras.

Lower quotas are important from a practical perspective, since it is natural for a hospital to require a minimum number of residents to run the hospital smoothly. The setting also models important applications like course-allocation, and assigning teaching assistants (TAs) in academic institutions where a minimum guarantee is essential.

Ensuring stability and at the same time satisfying lower quotas is not an attainable goal in many instances. On one hand, disregarding preferences in the interest of satisfying the lower quotas gives rise to social unfairness (for instance agents envying each other); on the other hand, too much emphasis on fairness can lead to wastefulness [8]. Therefore, it is necessary to strike a balance between these three mutually conflicting goals – optimality with respect to preferences, feasibility for minimum quotas and minimizing wastefulness. The main contribution of this paper is to propose a mechanism to achieve this balance.

Envy-freeness [8, 10, 14, 15, 5] is a widely accepted notion for achieving fairness from a social perspective. Unfortunately, the two goals viz. envy-freeness and feasibility may not be simultaneously achievable; whether feasible envy-free matchings exist can be answered efficiently by the characterization of Yokoi [25]. Fragiadakis et al. [8] explore strategy-proof aspects of envy-freeness and the trade-off between envy-freeness and wastefulness; however their results are for a restricted setting of agent preferences. In our work, we thoroughly investigate envy-freeness from a computational view point both in the general and restricted settings. Our results show that computing envy-free matchings that match maximum number of agents is computationally hard and even such matchings can be wasteful. To circumvent these drawbacks, we propose a new notion called *relaxed stability*. We show that relaxed stable matchings are guaranteed to exist even in the presence of lower-quotas. We additionally show that a relaxed stable matching that is at least the size of the stable matching in the instance (disregarding lower quotas) exists and can be efficiently computed. On the other hand, if we insist for the largest size relaxed stable matching, computing such a matching turns out to be computationally intractable.

We state the problem formally in terms of assigning a set of medical interns (residents) to a set of hospitals where preferences are expressed by both the sets, and hospitals have upper quotas and lower quotas associated with them. This is called the **HRLQ** setting in literature. The input in the **HRLQ** setting is a bipartite graph $G = (\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}, E)$ where \mathcal{R} denotes the set of residents, \mathcal{H} denotes the set of hospitals, and an edge $(r, h) \in E$ denotes that r and h are mutually acceptable. A hospital $h \in \mathcal{H}$ has an upper-quota $q^+(h)$ which denotes the maximum number of residents that can be assigned to h . Additionally, h has a lower-quota $q^-(h)$ which denotes the minimum number of residents that must be assigned to h . Finally, every vertex (resident and hospital) in G ranks its neighbors in a strict order, referred to as the *preference list* of the vertex. If a vertex a prefers its neighbor b_1 over b_2 , we denote it by $b_1 >_a b_2$.

A matching $M \subseteq E$ in G is an assignment of residents to hospitals such that each resident is matched to at most one hospital, and every hospital h is matched to at most $q^+(h)$ -many residents. For a matching M , let $M(r)$ denote the hospital that r is matched to, and $M(h)$ denote the set of residents matched to h in M . If resident r is unmatched in matching M we let $M(r) = \perp$ and \perp is considered as the least preferred choice by any resident. We say that a hospital h is *under-subscribed* in M if $|M(h)| < q^+(h)$, h is *fully-subscribed* in M if $|M(h)| = q^+(h)$ and h is *deficient* in M if $|M(h)| < q^-(h)$. A matching is *feasible* for an **HRLQ** instance if no hospital is deficient in M . The goal for the **HRLQ** problem is to match residents to hospitals *optimally* with respect to the preference lists such that the matching is feasible. The **HRLQ** problem is a generalization of the well-studied **HR** problem (introduced by Gale and Shapley [9]) where there are no lower quotas. In the **HR** problem, *stability* is a

de-facto notion of optimality and is defined by the absence of *blocking pairs*.

► **Definition 1** (Stable matchings). A pair $(r, h) \in E \setminus M$ is a *blocking pair* w.r.t. the matching M if $h >_r M(r)$ and h is either under-subscribed in M or there exists at least one resident $r' \in M(h)$ such that $r >_h r'$. A matching M is *stable* if there is no blocking pair w.r.t. M .

Existence of Stable Feasible Matchings: Given an HRLQ instance, it is natural to ask “does the instance admit a stable feasible matching?” A stable matching always exists in an HR instance and can be computed in linear time [9]. In contrast, there exist simple HRLQ instances that may not admit any feasible and stable matching, even when a feasible matching exists.

For example, Fig. 1 shows an HRLQ instance with $\mathcal{R} = \{r_1, r_2\}$ and $\mathcal{H} = \{h_1, h_2\}$.

where both hospitals have a unit upper-

quota and h_2 has a unit lower-quota. We

denote the lower-quota and upper-quota of hospital h using $[q^-(h), q^+(h)]$ before hos-

pital h . The matching $M_s = \{(r_1, h_1)\}$ is

stable but not feasible since h_2 is deficient

in M_s . The matchings $M_1 = \{(r_1, h_2)\}$ and

$M_2 = \{(r_1, h_2), (r_2, h_1)\}$ are both feasible

but not stable since (r_1, h_1) blocks both of them. The existence question of a stable, feasible

matching for HRLQ can be answered by simply ignoring lower quotas and computing a stable matching in the resulting HR instance. From the well-known Rural Hospitals Theorem [23],

the *number* of residents matched to a hospital is invariant across all stable matchings of the instance. Hence, for any HRLQ instance, either all the stable matchings are feasible or all

are infeasible, and they have the same size.

Imposing lower quotas ensures that infeasible matchings are no longer acceptable, however, the presence of lower quotas poses new challenges as discussed above. In light of the fact that stable and feasible matchings may not exist, relaxations of stability, like popularity and envy-freeness have been proposed in the literature [20, 19, 25]. Envy-freeness is defined by the absence of *envy-pairs*.

► **Definition 2** (Envy-free matchings). Given a matching M , a resident r has a justified envy (here onwards called *envy*) towards a matched resident r' , where $M(r') = h$ and $(r, h) \in E$ if $h >_r M(r)$ and $r >_h r'$. The pair (r, r') is an *envy-pair* w.r.t. M . A matching M is *envy-free* if there is no envy-pair w.r.t. M .

Note that an envy-pair implies a blocking pair but the converse is not true and hence envy-freeness is a relaxation of stability. In the example in Fig. 1, the matching M_1 is envy-free and feasible, although not stable. Thus, envy-free matchings provide an alternative to stability in such instances. Envy-freeness is motivated by fairness from a social perspective. Importance of envy-free matchings has been recognized in the context of constrained matchings [8, 10, 14, 15, 5], and their structural properties have been investigated in [24].

Size of envy-free matchings: In terms of

size, there is a sharp contrast between stable

matchings in the HR setting and envy-free matchings in the HRLQ setting. While all

the stable matchings in an HR instance have the same size, the envy-free matchings in an

HRLQ instance may have significantly different sizes. Consider the example in Fig. 2

$$\begin{array}{ll} r_1 : h_1, h_2 & [0,1] \ h_1 : r_1, r_2 \\ r_2 : h_1 & [1,1] \ h_2 : r_1 \end{array}$$

■ **Figure 1** An HRLQ instance with no feasible and stable matching.

$$\forall i \in [n], \ r_i : h_1, h_2 \quad \begin{array}{l} [0, n] \ h_1 : r_1, \dots, r_n \\ [1, 1] \ h_2 : r_1, \dots, r_n \end{array}$$

■ **Figure 2** An HRLQ instance with two envy-free matchings of different sizes.

with n residents $\mathcal{R} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$ and two hospitals $\mathcal{H} = \{h_1, h_2\}$. The hospital h_2 has a unit upper-quota and a unit lower-quota. The instance admits an envy-free matching $N_1 = \{(r_1, h_2)\}$ of size one and another envy-free matching $N_n = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_1), \dots, (r_{n-1}, h_1), (r_n, h_2)\}$ of size n .

Shortcomings of envy-free matchings: It is interesting to note that a feasible, envy-free matching itself may not exist – for instance, if the example in Fig. 1 is modified such that both h_1, h_2 have a unit lower-quota, then M_2 is the unique feasible matching. However, M_2 is not envy-free since (r_1, r_2) is an envy-pair w.r.t. M_2 . If a stable matching is not feasible in an HRLQ instance, *wastefulness* may be inevitable for attaining feasibility. A matching is wasteful if there exists a resident who prefers a hospital to her current assignment and that hospital has a vacant position [8]. Envy-free matchings can be significantly wasteful. For instance, in the example in Fig. 2, the matching N_1 is wasteful. Therefore, it would be ideal to have a notion of optimality which is guaranteed to exist, is efficiently computable and avoids wastefulness.

Quest for a better optimality criterion: We propose a new notion of *relaxed stability* which always exists for any HRLQ instance. We observe that in the presence of lower quotas, there can be at most $q^-(h)$ -many residents that are forced to be matched to h , even though they have higher preferred under-subscribed hospitals in their list. Our relaxation allows these forced residents to participate in blocking-pairs,² however, the matching is still stable when restricted to the remaining residents. We now make this formal below.

► **Definition 3** (Relaxed stable matchings). *A matching M is relaxed stable if, for every hospital h , at most $q^-(h)$ residents from $M(h)$ participate in blocking pairs and no unmatched resident participates in a blocking pair.*

We note that in the example in Fig. 1, the matching M_2 (which was not envy-free) is feasible, relaxed stable and non-wasteful. In fact, we show that every instance of the HRLQ problem admits a feasible relaxed stable matching – thus addressing the issue of guaranteed existence. In terms of computation, a relaxed stable matching can be efficiently computed; however if we insist on the maximum size relaxed stable matching, we show that this problem is computationally hard.

$r_1 : h_1, h_3$	$[0, 1] \ h_1 : r_1$
$r_2 : h_2, h_3$	$[0, 1] \ h_2 : r_2, r_3$
$r_3 : h_2$	$[1, 1] \ h_3 : r_1, r_2$

■ **Figure 3** An HRLQ instance with two relaxed stable matchings of different sizes, one larger than stable matching

In order to ensure guaranteed existence of relaxed stable matchings, we need to allow upto $q^-(h)$ many residents per hospital to participate in blocking pairs. We remark that Hamada et al. [12] studied a similar notion of computing matchings with minimum blocking pairs. Such matchings (MINBP) are guaranteed to exist, however, computing them is NP-hard even under severe restrictions on the preference lists. Contrast this with relaxed stability which is guaranteed to exist and a relaxed stable matching at least as large as a stable matching (obtained by disregarding lower-quotas) is efficiently computable. In fact, a relaxed stable matching may be even larger than the size of the stable matching in the instance, as seen in the example in Fig. 3. In this instance, the stable matching $M_s = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_2)\}$ of size

² Our initial idea was to allow them to participate in envy-pairs. We thank anonymous reviewer for suggesting this modification which is stricter than our earlier notion.

two is infeasible. Matchings $M'_1 = \{(r_1, h_3), (r_2, h_2)\}$ and $M'_2 = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_3), (r_3, h_2)\}$ both are relaxed stable and feasible and M'_2 is larger than M_s . This is in contrast to maximum size envy-free matching which (as we will see in section 2.1) cannot be larger than the size of a stable matching.

Our contributions: In this paper, we study the computational complexity, approximability, parameterized complexity and the hardness of approximation for the notions of envy-freeness and relaxed stability. Throughout, we assume that our input HRLQ instance admits some feasible matching and our algorithms always aim to output a feasible matching that is optimal. We consider the problem of computing a maximum-size, feasible, optimal matching in an HRLQ instance when one exists. When the optimality criterion is envy-freeness, we denote this as the MAXEFM problem, and the equivalent problem of computing an envy-free matching that has the minimum number of unmatched residents as the MIN-UR-EFM problem. For exact solutions, the two problems are equivalent. When the optimality criterion is relaxed stability, we denote this as the MAXRSM problem.

Results on envy-freeness: We show that the MAXEFM problem is NP-hard, and in fact, is hard to approximate below a constant factor.

► **Theorem 4.** *The following hold:*

- (I) *The MAXEFM (equivalently MIN-UR-EFM) problem is NP-hard. Moreover, the MIN-UR-EFM problem has no α -approximation algorithm for any factor $\alpha > 0$ unless $P = NP$. Above hardness results hold when*
 - (a) *every resident has a preference list of length at most two (upper-quotas of hospitals can be arbitrary).*
 - (b) *every hospital has lower-quota and upper-quota at most one (resident preference lists can be longer than two).*
- (II) *The MAXEFM problem can not be approximated within a factor of $\frac{21}{19}$ unless $P = NP$ even when every hospital has a quota of at most one.*

In light of the above negative result, we consider MAXEFM problem on restriction on HRLQ instance, called the CL-restriction [12]. The restriction requires that every hospital with positive lower-quota must rank every resident, and consequently, every resident ranks every hospital with a positive lower quota. Note that in Fig. 1, the infeasibility of hospital h_2 could be resolved if h_2 and r_2 were mutually acceptable. In that case, the stable matching $\{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_2)\}$ is feasible and hence is a maximum size envy-free matching. The CL-restriction has been considered by Hamada et al [12] where the goal is to output a matching with minimum number of blocking pairs (MINBP) or blocking residents (MINBR). Hamada et al. [12] proved that even under the CL-restriction, computing the MINBP and MINBR problems are NP-hard. In contrast under the CL-restriction, MAXEFM (equivalently MIN-UR-EFM) is tractable.

► **Theorem 5.** *There is a simple linear-time algorithm for the MAXEFM (equivalently MIN-UR-EFM) problem for CL-restricted HRLQ instances.*

In practice it is common to have preference lists which are incomplete and in many cases the preference lists of residents may also be constant size. Krishnapriya et al. [19] present an algorithm that efficiently computes a *maximal* envy-free matching that extends a given feasible matching. Matching M is a *maximal envy-free matching* if addition of any edge to M violates either the upper-quota or envy-freeness. However, prior to this work, no approximation guarantee of a maximal envy-free matching was known. We prove following

guarantee on the size of a maximal envy-free matching. Let ℓ_1 be the length of the longest preference list of a resident and ℓ_2 be the length of the longest preference list of a hospital.

► **Theorem 6.** *A maximal envy-free matching is*

- (I) *an ℓ_1 -approximation of MAXEFM when hospital quotas are at most 1*
- (II) *an $(\ell_1 \cdot \ell_2)$ -approximation of MAXEFM when quotas are unrestricted.*

Besides the above results, we investigate the parameterized complexity of the problem. When the stable matching is not feasible, there is at least one lower-quota hospital that is deficient. *Deficiency* [12] of an HRLQ instance with respect to a stable matching M is defined as follows.

► **Definition 7.** *Let $G = (\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}, E)$ be an HRLQ instance and M be a stable matching in G . Then $\text{deficiency}(M) = \sum_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \max\{0, q^-(h) - |M(h)|\}$.*

We show that MAXEFM and MIN-UR-EFM are W[1]-hard when deficiency is the parameter. We also show a polynomial size kernel and present FPT algorithms for the MAXEFM problem. The respective parameters are defined in section 4.

► **Theorem 8.** *The following hold:*

- (I) *The MAXEFM and MIN-UR-EFM are W[1]-hard when deficiency is the parameter. The hardness holds even when residents preference lists are of length at most two or hospital quotas are 0 or 1.*
- (II) *The MAXEFM has a polynomial size kernel.*
- (III) *The MAXEFM admits FPT algorithms for several interesting parameters.*

Results on relaxed stability: We prove that the MAXRSM problem is NP-hard and is also hard to approximate, but has a better approximation behavior than the MAXEFM problem.

► **Theorem 9.** *The MAXRSM problem is NP-hard and cannot be approximated within a factor of $\frac{21}{19}$ unless $P = NP$. The result holds even when all quotas are at most one.*

We complement the above negative result with the following:

► **Theorem 10.** *Any feasible HRLQ instance always admits a relaxed-stable matching. Moreover, there is a polynomial-time algorithm that outputs a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation to the maximum size relaxed stable matching.*

We summarize our results in Table 1.

Related work: Various notions of optimality in the HRLQ setting have been studied in [8, 12, 25, 20, 19]. Hamada et al. [12] consider computing feasible matchings with minimum number of blocking pairs or blocking residents. However both these objectives are NP-hard even under severe restrictions. A trade-off between envy-freeness and non-wastefulness is considered in [8]. Another notion of optimality, namely *popularity* in the HRLQ problem has been considered in [20]. Popularity can be regarded as *overall stability*. It was shown in [20] that a matching which is popular amongst feasible matchings always exists. On the flip-side, a popular matching is not guaranteed to be either envy-free or even relaxed stable. Strategy-proof mechanisms for the lower quota setting are presented in [8]. In a different setting with lower quotas, in which hospitals either fulfill required lower quotas or are closed is studied in [2]. Lower quotas are also studied by [13] and [6] in the context of classified stable matchings (CSM). Parameterized complexity for the problem of computing maximum size stable matching with ties and incomplete lists (without lower quotas) is studied in [1].

Problem	Hardness and Inapproximability	Approximation and parameterized results	Restricted settings
MAXEFM	$\frac{21}{19}$ -inapproximability, W[1]-hard w.r.t. deficiency	$(\ell_1 \cdot \ell_2)$ -approximation, Polynomial kernel, FPT for several parameters	P-time for CL-restriction, ℓ_1 -approximation for 0/1 quotas
MIN-UR-EFM	α -inapproximability for any $\alpha > 0$, W[1]-hard w.r.t. deficiency	–	P-time for CL-restriction
MAXRSM	$\frac{21}{19}$ -inapproximability	$\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation	–

■ **Table 1** Summary of our results

Organization of the paper: In section 2, we present our results related to NP-hardness and hardness of approximation of MAXEFM and MIN-UR-EFM problems. In section 3, we present our algorithmic results for MAXEFM and MIN-UR-EFM and our approximation results for the MAXEFM problem. In section 4, we present our parameterized complexity results for the MAXEFM problem. In section 5, we present hardness of approximation of MAXRSM followed by an approximation algorithm. In section 6, we conclude and discuss open problems.

2 Envy-freeness: Hardness and Inapproximability

In this section we prove NP-hardness of the MAXEFM and MIN-UR-EFM problems for arbitrary preference lists. We also prove that MIN-UR-EFM problem cannot be approximated for any $\alpha > 0$ and that MAXEFM problem cannot be approximated for a factor within $\frac{21}{19}$ unless $P = NP$.

2.1 Hardness Results for MAXEFM and MIN-UR-EFM

In order to show the hardness result, we show a reduction from Independent Set (IND-SET) - a well-known NP-complete problem. Let $\langle G = (V, E), k \rangle$ be an instance of the IND-SET problem where $|V| = n$ and $|E| = m$. The goal in IND-SET is to decide whether G has an independent set of size k i.e. a subset of k vertices that are pairwise non-adjacent. We create an instance $G' = (\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}, E')$ of the MAXEFM problem as follows. For every vertex $v_i \in V$, we have a vertex-resident $r_i \in \mathcal{R}$; for every edge $e_j \in E$, we have an edge-resident $r'_j \in \mathcal{R}$. Thus $|\mathcal{R}| = m + n$. The set \mathcal{H} consists of $n + 1$ hospitals, one hospital per vertex (h_i for vertex v_i) in G and an additional hospital x . The hospital x has both lower-quota and upper-quota as k . A hospital h_i has zero lower-quota and an upper-quota equal to $1 + |E_i|$ where E_i denotes the set of edges incident on v_i in G . Let \mathcal{E}_i denote the set of edge-residents corresponding to edges in E_i .

Preference lists: The preferences (which also represent the underlying edge set E') of the residents and the hospitals can be found in Fig. 4. A vertex-resident r_i has h_i followed by x . An edge-resident r'_j has the two hospitals (denoted by h_{j1} and h_{j2}) corresponding to the end-points v_{j1}, v_{j2} of the edge e_j in any order. A hospital h_i has the resident r_i followed by the edge-residents in \mathcal{E}_i in any strict order. Finally the hospital x has all the n

vertex-residents in any strict order.

Stable Matching in G' : It is straightforward to verify that a stable matching in G' does not match any resident to x , thus making it infeasible. We remark that this property is necessary, otherwise as we prove (see Lemma 13) that if a stable matching M_s is feasible, then M_s is itself a MAXEFM.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \forall i \in [n], r_i : h_i, x & \forall i \in [n], [0, |E_i| + 1] h_i : r_i, \mathcal{E}_i \\ \forall j \in [m], r'_j : h_{j1}, h_{j2} & [k, k] x : r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n \end{array}$$

■ **Figure 4** Preference lists in the reduced instance G' of MAXEFM from instance $\langle G, k \rangle$ of IND-SET.

► **Lemma 11.** *G has an independent set of size k iff G' has an envy-free matching of size $m + n$.*

Proof. Let $S \subseteq V$ be an independent set of size k in G . We construct an envy-free matching of size $m + n$ in G' . If $v_i \in S$, match the resident r_i to the hospital x . When r_i is matched to x , any edge-resident r'_j such that edge e_j is incident on v_i cannot be matched to h_i , otherwise, r_i envies r'_j . If $v_i \notin S$, match the resident r_i to the hospital h_i . Since S is an independent set, at least one end-point of every edge is not in S . Thus, for an edge $e_j = (v_{j1}, v_{j2})$, the corresponding edge-resident r'_j can be matched to at least one of h_{j1} or h_{j2} without causing envy. Thus, every vertex-resident and every edge-resident is matched and we have an envy-free matching of size $m + n$.

For the other direction, let us assume that G does not have an independent set of size k . Consider any envy-free matching M in G' . Due to the lower-quota of x , exactly k vertex-residents must be matched to x in M . Let $V' = \{v_i \in V \mid M(r_i) = x\}$. Then, $|V'| = k$. Since V' is not an independent set, there exists an edge $e_j = (v_{j1}, v_{j2})$ such that $v_{j1} \in V', v_{j2} \in V'$ that is the residents r_{j1} and r_{j2} are matched to x in M . This implies that the edge-resident r'_j must be unmatched in M , thus $|M| < m + n$. ◀

Thus, MAXEFM is NP-hard. This implies that MIN-UR-EFM is also NP-hard. We observe the following for the MIN-UR-EFM problem. When G has an independent set of size k , there are zero residents unmatched in an optimal envy-free matching of G' , whereas when G does not admit an independent set of size k , every envy-free matching leaves at least one resident unmatched. This immediately implies that there is no α -approximation algorithm for MIN-UR-EFM problem for any $\alpha > 0$. Finally, note that in the reduced instance shown in Fig. 4, every resident has exactly two hospitals in its preference list. This establishes Theorem 4(I)(a).

Above NP-hardness and inapproximability results hold even when the hospital quotas are at most one. Below we prove this result, however the resident preference lists are no longer of length at most two. We modify above reduction from IND-SET problem as follows. We define the vertex-residents r_i , edge-residents r'_j and sets E_i, \mathcal{E}_i as done earlier. Let $q_i = |E_i| + 1$ for all vertices $v_i \in V$. For every vertex $v_i \in V$, let $H_i = \{h_i^1, h_i^2, \dots, h_i^{q_i}\}$ be the set of hospitals corresponding to v_i . Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ be also a set of k hospitals. Every hospital in set H_i has zero lower-quota and an upper-quota equal to 1. Every hospital $x_i \in X$ has both lower and upper-quota equal to 1.

Preference lists: The preferences of the residents and the hospitals can be found in Fig. 5. We fix an arbitrary ordering on sets X, H_i, \mathcal{E}_i . A vertex-resident r_i has the set H_i followed by

set X . An edge-resident r'_j has two sets of hospitals (denoted by H_{j1} and H_{j2}) corresponding to the end-points v_{j1}, v_{j2} of the edge e_j in any order. Every hospital $h \in H_i$ has the vertex-resident r_i as its top-choice followed by the edge-residents in \mathcal{E}_i in any strict order. Finally the hospitals in X have in their preference lists all the n vertex-residents in any strict order.

Stable Matching in G' : It is straightforward to verify that a stable matching in G' does not match any resident to any hospital in set X , thus making it infeasible. Recall that this property is necessary.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \forall i \in [n], r_i : H_i, X & \forall i \in [n], t \in [q_i], [0, 1] h_i^t : r_i, \mathcal{E}_i \\ \forall j \in [m], r'_j : H_{j1}, H_{j2} & \forall j \in [k], [1, 1] x_j : r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n \end{array}$$

■ **Figure 5** Reduced instance G' of MAXEFM from instance $\langle G, k \rangle$ of IND-SET.

Note that every vertex v_i has q_i many hospitals - each with an upper quota of 1, so the set of hospitals in H_i together have enough quota to get matched with the corresponding vertex-resident r_i and all the edge-residents corresponding to the edges incident on v_i . Lemma 12 proves the correctness of the reduction. Hence, MAXEFM and MIN-UR-EFM are NP-hard even if hospital quotas are at most one.

► **Lemma 12.** G has an independent set of size k iff G' has an envy-free matching of size $m + n$.

Proof. Let $S \subseteq V$ be an independent set of size k in graph G . We construct an envy-free matching in G' which matches all the residents in \mathcal{R} . Let T be the set of residents corresponding to the vertices $v_i \in S$ i.e. $T = \{r_i \mid v_i \in S\}$. Match T with X using Gale and Shapley stable matching algorithm [9]. Let T' be the set of residents corresponding to vertices v_i such that $v_i \notin S$ i.e. $T' = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\} \setminus T$. Let H' be the set of hospitals appearing in sets H_i such that $v_i \in S$ i.e. $H' = \bigcup_{i: v_i \in S} H_i$. Match $T' \cup \{r'_1, \dots, r'_m\}$ with $H' \setminus H' \setminus X$ using Gale and Shapley stable matching algorithm.

We now prove that the matching is envy-free. No pair of residents in T form an envy-pair because we computed a stable matching between T and X . No pair of residents in $T' \cup \{r'_1, \dots, r'_m\}$ form an envy-pair because we computed a stable matching between this set and $H' \setminus H' \setminus X$. Since, all hospitals in H' are forced to remain empty, no resident in set T can envy a resident in set $\{r'_1, \dots, r'_m\}$. A resident in T' is matched to a higher preferred hospital than any hospital in X , hence such resident cannot envy any resident in T . Thus, the matching is envy-free.

We now prove that the matching size is $m + n$. Every vertex-resident r_i is matched either with some hospital in X or some hospital in H_i . Since, S is an independent set, at least one end point of every edge is not in S . So for every edge $e_t = (v_{t1}, v_{t2})$, there is at least one hospital in sets H_{t1}, H_{t2} that can get matched with the edge-resident r'_t without causing envy. Thus, every edge-resident is also matched. Thus, we have an envy-free matching of size $m + n$.

For the other direction, let us assume that G does not have an independent set of size k . Consider an arbitrary envy-free matching M in G' . Due to the unit lower-quota of every $x_i \in X$, exactly k vertex-residents must be matched to hospitals in X . Let $S \subseteq V$ be the set of vertices v_i such that the corresponding vertex-resident r_i is matched to some hospital in X in M , i.e. $S = \{v_i \mid M(r_i) \in X\}$. So, $|S| = k$. Since, S is not an independent set, there

exists at least two vertex-residents v_s and v_t matched to some hospital in X such that the edge $e_j = (v_s, v_t) \in E$. Due to the preference lists of the hospitals, all the hospitals in both H_s and H_t sets must remain empty in M to ensure envy-freeness. This implies that the edge-resident r'_j must be unmatched. This implies that $|M| < m + n$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \blacktriangleleft

This establishes Theorem 4(I)(b). From Theorem 4(I) the NP-hardness holds for HRLQ instances in which the residents have preference list of length at most 2 *or* hospital quotas are at most one. In the case when *both* the restrictions hold, we show in section 3.3 that MAXEFM admits a polynomial time algorithm. Now, we prove our claim that a stable matching, when feasible is a maximum size envy-free matching.

► **Lemma 13.** *A stable matching, when feasible is an optimal solution of MAXEFM.*

Proof. We prove this by showing that an unmatched resident in a stable matching is also unmatched in every envy-free matching. Let M_e be an envy-free matching. Since, the set of residents matched in a stable matching is invariant of the matching (by Rural Hospital Theorem [23]), let's pick an arbitrary stable matching M_s . Suppose for the sake of contradiction that resident r_1 is matched to hospital h_1 in M_e and unmatched in M_s . Then, hospital h_1 must be full in M_s and $\forall r' \in M_s(h_1), r' >_{h_1} r_1$. In M_e at least one of the residents from $M_s(h_1)$ is not matched to h_1 . Let that resident be r_2 . Then envy-freeness of M_e implies that r_2 is matched in M_e such that $M_e(r_2) = h_2 >_{r_2} h_1$. By similar argument as earlier, hospital h_2 must be full in M_s and $\forall r' \in M_s(h_2), r' >_{h_2} r_2$. This process must terminate since there are finite number of residents and each is matched to at most one hospital. But, we prove that such process cannot terminate, implying that the claimed r_1 does not exist. Since M_e is envy-free, once the process hits a resident r_i , it must find a higher preferred hospital h_i than h_{i-1} . While at a hospital, the process always finds a new resident. While at a resident, it may hit some hospital more than once. We prove that in the latter case also, eventually it must find a distinct resident.

Assume that for some resident r_i , we have $M_e(r_i) = h_k \in \{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{i-2}\}$. Hospital h_k is matched to r_i and r_k in M_e and matched to r_{k+1} in M_s . If r_{k+1} is the only resident matched to hospital h_k in M_s , then (r_k, h_k) and (r_i, h_k) block M_s . Thus, there must exist another resident r' distinct from r_1 to r_i such that $r' >_{h_k} r_i$ and $r' >_{h_k} r_k$ and $r' \in M_s(h_k)$. Thus, we showed that even at the repeated hospital h_k , the process must find a distinct resident. \blacktriangleleft

2.2 Inapproximability of MAXEFM

In this section, we show a reduction from the Minimum Vertex Cover (MVC) to the MAXEFM which proves inapproximability when hospital quotas are at most one. We note that this result subsumes the NP-hardness result proved in section 2.1 when hospital quotas are at most one. Nevertheless the NP-hardness result proved in section 2.1 additionally hold for the instance when resident list is of length at most two. It also shows strong inapproximability for the MIN-UR-EFM problem and is also useful in showing W[1]-hardness when deficiency is the parameter (Section 4).

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an instance of MVC problem. The goal of MVC problem is to find a minimum size vertex cover i.e. a subset V' of vertices such that each edge has at least one end-point included in V' . Our reduction is inspired by the reduction showing inapproximability of the maximum size weakly stable matching problem in the presence of ties and incomplete lists (MAX SMTI) by Halldórsson et al. [11]. The template of our reduction in this section

(and also in section 5.1) is similar to that in [11]; however the actual gadgets in both the sections bear no resemblance to the one in [11].

Reduction: Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, which is an instance of the MVC problem, we construct an instance G' of the MAXEFM problem. Thus G' is an HRLQ instance. Corresponding to each vertex v_i in G , G' contains a gadget with three residents r_1^i, r_2^i, r_3^i , and four hospitals $h_1^i, h_2^i, h_3^i, h_4^i$. All hospitals have an upper-quota of 1 and h_3^i has a lower-quota of 1. Assume that the vertex v_i has d neighbors in G , namely $v_{j_1}, v_{j_2}, \dots, v_{j_d}$. The preference lists of the three residents and four hospitals, are as in Fig. 6. We impose an arbitrary but fixed ordering of the neighbors of v_i in G which is used as a strict ordering of neighbors in the preference lists of resident r_3^i and hospital h_1^i in G' . Note that G' has $N = 3|V|$ residents and $\frac{4N}{3}$ hospitals.

$r_1^i : h_1^i$	$[0, 1] \ h_1^i : r_2^i, r_3^{j_1}, \dots, r_3^{j_d}, r_1^i$
$r_2^i : h_2^i, h_1^i, h_3^i$	$[0, 1] \ h_2^i : r_2^i, r_3^i$
$r_3^i : h_4^i, h_2^i, h_1^{j_1}, \dots, h_1^{j_d}, h_3^i$	$[1, 1] \ h_3^i : r_3^i, r_2^i$
	$[0, 1] \ h_4^i : r_3^i$

■ **Figure 6** Preferences of residents and hospitals corresponding to a vertex v_i in G for MAXEFM.

► **Lemma 14.** *The instance G' does not admit any stable and feasible matching.*


Proof. The matching $M_s = \{(r_1^i, h_1^i), (r_2^i, h_2^i), (r_3^i, h_4^i) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ is stable in G' since every resident gets the first choice. Since M_s leaves h_3^i deficient for each i , it is not feasible. By the Rural Hospitals Theorem [23], we conclude that G' does not admit any stable and feasible matching. ◀

► **Lemma 15.** *Let G' be the instance of the MAXEFM problem constructed as above from an instance $G = (V, E)$ of the MVC problem. If $VC(G)$ denotes a minimum vertex cover of G and $OPT(G')$ denotes a maximum size envy-free matching in G' , then $|OPT(G')| = 3|V| - |VC(G)|$.*

Proof. We first prove that $|OPT(G')| \geq 3|V| - |VC(G)|$. Given a minimum vertex cover $VC(G)$ of G , we construct an envy-free matching M for G' as follows: $M = \{(r_2^i, h_3^i), (r_3^i, h_4^i) \mid v_i \in VC(G)\} \cup \{(r_1^i, h_1^i), (r_2^i, h_2^i), (r_3^i, h_3^i) \mid v_i \notin VC(G)\}$. Thus, for a vertex v_i in the vertex cover, M leaves the resident r_1^i unmatched, thereby matching only two residents in the gadget corresponding to v_i . For a vertex v_i that is not in the vertex cover, M matches all the three residents in the gadget corresponding to v_i . Hence $|OPT(G')| \geq |M| = 2|VC(G)| + 3(|V| - |VC(G)|) = 3|V| - |VC(G)|$.

▷ **Claim 16.** M is envy-free in G' .

Proof. It is straightforward to verify that there is no envy-pair consisting of two residents associated with the same vertex $v_i \in G$. Now, without loss of generality, assume that r_3^i envies a resident matched to hospital h_1^j . By construction of our preference lists, (v_i, v_j) is an edge in G . Thus, at least one of v_i or v_j must belong to $VC(G)$. If $v_i \in VC(G)$, then by the construction of M , r_3^i is matched to its top choice hospital h_4^i in M and hence r_3^i cannot participate in an envy-pair. Also, h_1^i is left unmatched, hence r_3^j can not form an envy-pair with $M(h_1^i)$. ◀



■ **Figure 7** Five patterns possibly caused by v_i

Now we prove that $OPT(G') \leq 3|V| - |VC(G)|$. Let $M = OPT(G')$ be a maximum size envy-free matching in G' . Consider a vertex $v_i \in V$ and the corresponding residents and hospitals in G' . Note that h_3^i must be matched in M for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence following two cases arise. Refer Fig. 7 for the patterns mentioned below.

Case 1: $M(h_3^i) = r_3^i$. Then either $M(r_2^i) = h_2^i, M(r_1^i) = h_1^i$ which is pattern 1 or $M(r_2^i) = h_1^i$ and r_1^i is unmatched (pattern 2), or $M(r_2^i) = h_2^i$ and $M(h_1^i) = r_3^j$ for some $(v_i, v_j) \in E$ (pattern 3).

Case 2: $M(h_3^i) = r_2^i$. Then $(r_1^i, h_1^i) \notin M$, otherwise r_2^i has a justified envy towards r_1^i . Also, $(r_3^i, h_2^i) \notin M$ otherwise r_2^i has a justified envy towards r_3^i . Hence $M(r_3^i) = h_4^i$ (pattern 5) or $M(r_3^i) = h_1^j$ for some $(v_i, v_j) \in E$ (pattern 4).

Vertex cover C of G corresponding to M : Using M , we now construct the set C of vertices in G which constitute a vertex cover of G . If v_i is matched as pattern 1 then $v_i \notin C$, else $v_i \in C$. From the following claim, it follows that C is a vertex cover of G .

▷ **Claim 17.** If $(v_i, v_j) \in E$, then the gadgets corresponding to both of them can not be matched in pattern 1 in any envy-free matching M .

Proof. Let, if possible, there exist an edge $(v_i, v_j) \in E$ such that the gadgets corresponding to both v_i and v_j are matched in pattern 1 in M . Thus $M(r_3^i) = h_3^i$ and $M(h_1^j) = r_1^j$. But then r_3^i has justified envy towards r_1^j (via hospital h_1^j), contradicting the envy-freeness of M . ◀

Size of C : Each gadget could be matched in any of the patterns. Patterns 3 and pattern 4 occur in pairs for a pair of vertices v_i, v_j , that is, $M(h_1^i) = r_3^j$ or vice-versa. It can be verified that there is no envy-pair among the six residents corresponding to the vertices v_i, v_j matched as pattern 3 and pattern 4 respectively. We say that pattern 3 contributes 2.5 edges to M and pattern 4 contributes 1.5 edges. Hence together they contribute to an average matching size of 2. Only pattern 1 contributes 3 edges to M . Now it is straightforward to see that $|OPT(G')| = 2|C| + 3(|V| - |C|) = 3|V| - |C|$. Thus $|VC(G)| \leq |C| = 3|V| - |OPT(G')|$. This completes the proof of the lemma. ◀

Now we prove the hardness of approximation for the MAXEFM problem. We assume without loss of generality that an approximation algorithm for the MAXEFM problem computes a maximal envy-free matching. Lemma 18 is analogous to Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.4 from [11]. Proof of Lemma 18 uses the result of Lemma 15. For the sake of completeness, we give the proof in Appendix A. This establishes Theorem 4(II).

► **Lemma 18.** *It is NP-hard to approximate the MAXEFM problem within a factor of $\frac{21}{19} - \delta$, for any constant $\delta > 0$, even when the quotas of all hospitals are either 0 or 1.*

3 Envy-freeness: Algorithmic results

Given the NP-hardness of MAXEFM and MIN-UR-EFM problems, we turn our attention to special cases of HRLQ instances which are tractable. One such restriction is the CL-restriction. Next, we prove an approximation guarantee of any maximal envy-free matching.

3.1 Polynomial time algorithm for the CL-restricted instances

In this section, we consider the MAXEFM problem on CL-restricted HRLQ instances with general quotas. We first note that every HRLQ instance with CL-restriction admits a feasible envy-free matching. This follows from the characterization result of Yokoi [25] for instances that admit a feasible envy-free matching. We now present a simple modification to the standard Gale and Shapley algorithm [9] that computes a maximum size envy-free matching. Our algorithm (Algorithm 1) is based on the ESDA algorithm presented in [8]. In [8], only empirical results without theoretical guarantees on the size of the output matching are presented. Their work also assumes that the underlying graph is complete. We prove that Algorithm 1 produces maximum size envy-free matching assuming only the CL-restriction. We start with an empty matching M . Throughout the algorithm, we maintain two parameters:

- d : denotes the deficiency of the matching M , that is, the sum of deficiencies of all hospitals with positive lower-quota.
- k : the number of unmatched residents w.r.t. M .

In every iteration, an unmatched resident r who has not yet exhausted its preference list, proposes to the most preferred hospital h . If h is deficient w.r.t. M , h accepts r 's proposal. If h is not deficient, then we consider two cases. Firstly, assume h is under-subscribed w.r.t. M . In this case h accepts the r 's proposal only if there are enough unmatched residents to satisfy the deficiency of the other hospitals, that is, $k > d$. Next assume that h is fully-subscribed. In this case, h rejects the least preferred resident in $M(h) \cup r$. This process continues until some unmatched resident has not exhausted its preference list.

We observe the following about the algorithm. Since the input instance is feasible, we start with $k \geq d$ and this inequality is maintained throughout the algorithm. If no resident is rejected due to $k = d$ in line 11, then our algorithm degenerates to the Gale and Shapley algorithm [9] and hence outputs a stable matching. Algorithm 1 is an adaptation of Gale and Shapley algorithm [9] and runs in linear time in the size of the instance. Lemma 19 proves the correctness of our algorithm and establishes Theorem 5.

► **Lemma 19.** *Matching M computed by Algorithm 1 is feasible and maximum size envy-free.*

Proof. We first prove that the output is feasible. Assume not. Then at termination, $d > 0$, that is, there is at least one hospital h that is deficient w.r.t. M . It implies that $k \geq 1$. Thus there is some resident r unmatched w.r.t. M . Note that r could not have been rejected by every hospital with positive lower-quota since h appears in the preference list of r and h is deficient at termination. This contradicts the termination of our algorithm and proves the feasibility of our matching.

Next, we prove that M is envy-free. Suppose for the sake of contradiction, M contains an envy-pair (r', r) such that $(r, h) \in M$ where $r' >_h r$ and $h >_{r'} M(r')$. This implies that r' must have proposed to h and h rejected r' . If h rejected r' because $|M(h)| = q^+(h)$, h is matched with better preferred residents than r' , a contradiction to the fact that $r' >_h r$. If h rejected r' because $k = d$, then there are two cases. Either r was matched to h when r' proposed to h . In this case, in line 11 our algorithm rejected the least preferred resident

Algorithm 1: MAXEFM in CL-restricted HRLQ instances.

Input: An HRLQ instance $G = (\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}, E)$ with CL-restriction
Output: Maximum size envy-free matching

```

1 let  $M = \phi$ ;  $d = \sum_{h: q^-(h) > 0} q^-(h)$ ;  $k = |\mathcal{R}|$ ;
2 while there is an unmatched resident  $r$  which has at least one hospital not yet proposed
  to do
3    $r$  proposes to the most preferred hospital  $h$ ;
4   if  $|M(h)| < q^-(h)$  then
5      $M = M \cup \{(r, h)\}$ ;
6     reduce  $d$  and  $k$  each by 1;
7   else
8     if  $|M(h)| == q^+(h)$  then
9       let  $r'$  be the least preferred resident in  $M(h) \cup r$ ;
10       $M(h) = M(h) \cup r \setminus r'$ ;
11     if  $|M(h)| < q^+(h)$  and  $k == d$  then
12       let  $r'$  be the least preferred resident in  $M(h) \cup r$ ;
13        $M(h) = M(h) \cup r \setminus r'$ ;
14     else
15       // we have  $|M(h)| < q^+(h)$  and  $k > d$ 
16        $M = M \cup \{(r, h)\}$ ;
17       reduce  $k$  by 1;
17 return  $M$ ;

```

in $M(h)$. This contradicts that $r' >_h r$. Similarly if r proposed to h later, since $k = d$, the algorithm rejected the least preferred resident again contradicting the presence of any envy-pair.

Finally, we show that M is a maximum size envy-free matching. We have $k \geq d$ at the start of the algorithm. If during the algorithm, $k = d$ at some point, then at the end of the algorithm we have $k = d = 0$, implying that, we have an \mathcal{R} -perfect matching and hence the maximum size matching. Otherwise, $k > d$ at the end of the algorithm and then we output a stable matching which is maximum size envy-free by Lemma 13. ◀

3.2 Approximation guarantee of a maximal envy-free matching

As mentioned earlier, Krishnapriya et al. [19] present an algorithm to compute a maximal envy-free matching that extends a given envy-free matching. However, their results are empirical and no theoretical guarantees are known about the size of a maximal envy-free matching. In this section we present approximation guarantee of a maximal envy-free matching. Below we prove the first part of the Theorem 6 for the restricted instance where hospital quotas are at most 1.

Proof of Theorem 6(I). Let M be a maximal envy-free matching and OPT be a MAXEFM. Let R_{OPT} and R_M denote the set of residents matched in OPT and M respectively. Let X_1 be the set of residents matched in both M and OPT . Let X_2 be the set of residents matched in OPT but not matched in M . Thus, $|R_{OPT}| = |X_1| + |X_2|$. Since $X_1 = R_{OPT} \cap R_M \subseteq R_M$, so $|X_1| \leq |R_M|$. Our goal is to show that $|X_2| \leq |R_M| \cdot (\ell_1 - 1)$. Once we establish that, it is immediate that a maximal envy-free matching is an ℓ_1 -approximation.

We show that for every resident $r \in X_2$ we can associate a unique hospital h_r such that h_r is unmatched in M and there exists a resident r' in the neighbourhood of h_r such that r' is matched in M . Denote the set of such hospitals as Y_2 . Note that due to the uniqueness assumption $|X_2| = |Y_2|$. Since each resident has a preference list of length at most ℓ_1 , any r' who is matched in M can have at most $\ell_1 - 1$ neighbouring hospitals which are unmatched in M . Thus $|X_2| = |Y_2| \leq |R_M| \cdot (\ell_1 - 1)$ which establishes the approximation guarantee. To finish the proof we show a unique hospital h_r with desired properties that can be associated with each $r \in X_2$. Let $r \in X_2$ such that $h = OPT(r)$. We have following two exhaustive cases.

Case 1: If h is unmatched in M , then due to maximality of M , there must exist a resident r' matched in M such that adding (r, h) causes envy to r' . Thus, h has a neighboring resident r' matched in M , and we let $h_r = h$.

Case 2: If h is matched in M , then since M and OPT are both envy-free, there must exist a path $\langle r, h, r_1, h_1, \dots, r_i, h_i \rangle$ such that $(r, h) \in OPT$, for each $k = 1, \dots, i$, we have $(r_k, h_k) \in OPT$, $(r_1, h) \in M$, for each $k = 2, \dots, i$, we have $(r_k, h_{k-1}) \in M$ and h_i is unmatched in M . Thus, h_i has a neighboring resident r_i matched in M , and we let $h_r = h_i$.

Uniqueness guarantee: For any $r \in X_2$ for which case 1 applies, the associated h_i is unique since hospital quotas are at most 1. For two distinct $r, r' \in X_2$ such that for both case 2 applies, the paths mentioned above are disjoint since all hospital quotas are at most 1, which guarantees uniqueness within case 2. The h_i associated in case 2 cannot be associated in case 1 to $OPT(h_i)$ since $OPT(h_i) = r_i \notin X_2$. This completes the proof of existence of the unique hospital. \blacktriangleleft

Now, we prove the second part of the Theorem 6 for the unrestricted quotas.

Proof of Theorem 6(II). We will use the R_M, R_{OPT}, X_1, X_2 sets as defined earlier in the proof of Theorem 6(I). It is clear that $|X_1| \leq |R_M|$. We will show that $|X_2| \leq |R_M| \cdot (\ell_1 \cdot \ell_2 - 1)$. Once we establish that, it is immediate that a maximal envy-free matching is an $(\ell_1 \cdot \ell_2)$ -approximation. We show that for every resident $r \in X_2$ we can associate a unique edge (h_r, r_t) such that h_r is under-subscribed in M and there exists a resident r_t in the neighbourhood of h_r such that r_t is matched in M . Denote the set of such hospitals as Y_2 . Because each hospital can have at most ℓ_2 edges (and all of them could be matched in OPT), thus $|X_2| \leq |Y_2| \cdot \ell_2$. Since each resident has a preference list of length at most ℓ_1 , any r' who is matched in M can have at most ℓ_1 neighbouring hospitals which are under-subscribed in M . Resident r' is matched to one of these hospitals, thus, $|X_2| \leq |R_M| \cdot (\ell_1 \cdot \ell_2 - 1)$ which establishes the approximation guarantee. To finish the proof we show a unique edge (h_r, r_t) at a hospital h_r with desired properties that can be associated with each $r \in X_2$. Let $r \in X_2$ such that $h = OPT(r)$. We have following two exhaustive cases.

Case 1: If h is under-subscribed in M , then due to maximality of M , there must exist a resident r' matched in M such that adding (r, h) causes envy to r' . Thus, h has a neighboring resident r' matched in M , i.e. we let $(h_r, r_t) = (h, r')$.

Case 2: If h is fully-subscribed in M , then since M and OPT are both envy-free, there must exist a path $\langle r, h, r_1, h_1, \dots, r_i, h_i \rangle$ (hospitals can repeat along this path) such that $(r, h) \in OPT$, for each $k = 1, \dots, i$, we have $(r_k, h_k) \in OPT$, $(r_1, h) \in M$, for each $k = 2, \dots, i$, we have $(r_k, h_{k-1}) \in M$ and all hospitals h, h_1, \dots, h_{i-1} are fully-subscribed in M and h_i is under-subscribed in M . Thus, h_i has a neighbouring resident r_i matched in M , i.e. we let $(h_r, r_t) = (h_i, r_i)$.

Uniqueness guarantee: For any $r \in X_2$ for which case 1 applies, the associated (h, r') edge is unique. For $r \in X_2$ such that case 2 applies for r , at each hospital $h' \in \{h, h_1, \dots, h_{i-1}\}$, if

h' has k OPT -edges incident on it, then h' must have at least k M -edges incident on it such that all M -edge partners are higher preferred than all OPT -edge partners. Thus, if h' is shared across paths starting at multiple residents in X_2 , there must exist a unique M -edge that extends the specific path for which leads to a unique OPT -edge to the next hospital, otherwise h' is under-subscribed in M , a contradiction. This guarantees uniqueness of edge within case 2. The (h_i, r_i) associated in case 2 cannot be associated in case 1 to r_i since $r_i \notin X_2$. This completes the proof of existence of the unique edge at a desired hospital and also the proof of the lemma. \blacktriangleleft

3.3 Polynomial time algorithm for MAXEFM for a restricted setting

We present an algorithm (Algorithm 2) that computes a maximum envy-free matching when the resident lists are of length at most two and hospitals quotas are at most one. At a high-level Algorithm 2 works as follows: It starts with any feasible envy-free matching (possibly output of Yokoi's EF-HR-LQ Algorithm [25]) and computes an *envy-free augmenting path* with respect to the current matching. An augmenting path P with respect to an envy-free matching M is envy-free if $M \oplus P$ is envy-free. To compute such a path, the algorithm deletes a set of edges from the graph. To define these deletions, we need the following definition from [19].

► **Definition 20.** [19] *Let h be any hospital in G , a threshold resident r' for h , if one exists, is the most preferred resident of h such that $h >_{r'} M(r')$. If no such resident exists, we assume a unique dummy resident d_h at the end of h 's preference list to be the threshold resident for hospital h .*

Algorithm 2: Algorithm to compute a maximal envy-free matching

Input: An HRLQ instance $G = (\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}, E)$
Output: A maximal envy-free matching in G

- 1 Let M be any feasible envy-free matching in G (assume that M exists);
- 2 **repeat**
- 3 Compute the threshold resident r' for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$ w.r.t. M ;
- 4 Let $G' = (\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}, E')$ be an induced sub-graph of G , where $E' = E \setminus (E_1 \cup E_2)$,
 $E_1 = \{(r, h) \mid (r, h) \in E \setminus M, r' >_h r\}$,
 $E_2 = \{(r, h) \mid (r, h) \in E \setminus M, r >_h r' \text{ and } M(r) >_r h\}$;
- 5 **if** there exists an augmenting path P w.r.t. M in G' **then**
- 6 $M_P = M \oplus P$;
- 7 $M = M_P$;
- 8 **else**
- 9 Exit the loop.
- 10 **until** *true*;
- 11 Return M ;

In every iteration of our algorithm, we compute the threshold resident for every hospital. Observe that unless the threshold resident r' is matched to h or to a hospital $h' >_{r'} h$, no resident $r'' <_h r'$ can be matched to h . Thus, in our algorithm, we delete the set of edges E_1 (see Step 4) which correspond to lower preferred residents than the threshold resident for a hospital. If $r >_h r'$ such that $M(r) \neq h$ and $M(r) >_r h$ then we delete edge (r, h) (set of E_2 edges). Note that both these deletions ensure that after augmentation, a resident never gets

$r_1 : h_1, h_4$	$[0, 1] \ h_1 : r_1$	$r_1 : h_1, h_2$	$[0, 2] \ h_1 : r_1, r_2$
$r_2 : h_2, h_3, h_4$	$[0, 1] \ h_2 : r_2$	$r_2 : h_1$	$[1, 1] \ h_2 : r_1, r_3$
$r_3 : h_3$	$[0, 1] \ h_3 : r_2, r_3$	$r_3 : h_3, h_2$	$[0, 1] \ h_3 : r_3$
	$[1, 1] \ h_4 : r_1, r_2$		
$M = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_4)\}$		$M = \{(r_1, h_2), (r_3, h_3)\}$	
$M' = \{(r_1, h_4), (r_2, h_2), (r_3, h_3)\}$		$M' = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_1), (r_3, h_2)\}$	

(a) Quotas at most one, but resident preference lists longer than two.

(b) Resident preference lists at most length two, but quotas more than 1

■ **Figure 8** HRLQ instances and envy-free matchings M and M'

demoted (matched to a lower preferred hospital). It is easy to see that the algorithm has at most n iterations each taking $O(m + n)$ time, thus the overall running time is $O(mn)$.

As the proof of Theorem 4(I) mentions, the NP-hardness applies to the HRLQ instances in which either the residents have preference list of length at most 2 or hospital quotas are at most one. The HRLQ instance in Fig. 8a has quotas at most one but a resident with a three-length list. The example instance in Fig. 8b has lengths of all residents at most two but the quotas are not at most one. In both the examples, we have an initial envy-free matching M and a larger envy-free matching M' . However, there is no envy-free augmenting path w.r.t. M . In contrast, when we impose the restriction that all quotas are at most one *and* every resident's list is of length at most two (denoted as 01-HRLQ-2R restriction), we have the desired envy-free augmenting paths. We prove this guarantee below.

► **Lemma 21.** *If M and M^* are envy-free matchings in a 01-HRLQ-2R instance and $|M^*| > |M|$, then M admits an envy-free augmenting path.*

Proof. Consider the symmetric difference $M \oplus M^*$. There must exist an augmenting path $P = \langle r_1, h_1, r_2, h_2, \dots, r_n, h_n \rangle$ w.r.t. M where r_1 is unmatched and h_n under-subscribed in M . Further, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, $M^*(r_i) = h_i$. We note that r_1 prefers M^* over M (being matched versus being unmatched) and since M^* is envy-free, it must be the case that h_1 prefers r_2 over r_1 (else r_1 envies r_2 w.r.t. M^* .) Since M is also envy-free, we conclude that every resident r_i in P prefers $M^*(r_i)$ over $M(r_i)$; and every hospital h_i prefers r_{i+1} over r_i .

If $M \oplus P$ is envy-free, we are done. Therefore assume that $M' = M \oplus P$ is not envy-free. Let r have justified envy towards r' w.r.t. M' . We first note that if both r and r' belong to P , then M^* is not envy-free. Similarly if both r and r' do not belong to P , then M is not envy free. Thus exactly one of r or r' belong to P .

We now claim that no resident r_i , for $i = 1, \dots, n$ belonging to the path P can have justified envy to any resident outside the path. Note that every resident in P gets promoted in M' as compared to M . Thus if some $r_i = r$ envies r' w.r.t. M' , the same envy pair exists w.r.t. to M , a contradiction. Thus it must be the case that a resident r not belonging to P envies a resident $r' = r_i$ belonging to P . We argue that r must be unmatched in M . First note that since r envies r_i , there exists an edge (r, h_i) in the graph. Note that the edge (r, h_i) neither belongs to M nor to M^* , because every h_i except h_n is matched in both M and M^* along residents in P . Consider $M^*(r) = h$, then there exists an edge (r, h) . Since $h_i \neq h$ and the length of preference list of r is at most two, we conclude that r must be unmatched in M . Thus any resident r that envies a resident r' along P is unmatched in M .

We now show that if $M \oplus P$ is not envy-free, we can construct another path P' starting at such an unmatched resident such that $M \oplus P'$ is envy-free. Recall the augmenting path $P = \langle r_1, h_1, r_2, h_2, \dots, r_n, h_n \rangle$ w.r.t. M . Let h_i be the hospital closest to h_n along this path such that there exists an unmatched resident r such that (r, h_i) is in the graph and r envies r_i w.r.t. M' . If there are multiple such residents, pick the one that is most preferred by h_i . Now consider the path $P' = \langle r, h_i, r_{i+1}, \dots, r_n, h_n \rangle$. Note that by the choice of the hospital h_i , $M \oplus P'$ is envy-free. This gives us the desired path P' . ◀

► **Lemma 22.** *Matching M produced by Algorithm 2 is an envy-free matching.*

Proof. We first argue that M is envy-free. Assume not. Consider the first iteration (say i -th iteration) during the execution of the algorithm in which an envy-pair is introduced. Call the matching at the end of iteration i as M_i . Let that envy-pair be (r, r') w.r.t. M_i where $M_i(r') = h$, and $r >_h r'$ and $h >_r M_i(r)$. We consider two cases depending on whether or not the edge (r', h) belongs to M_{i-1} .

Case 1: Assume $(r', h) \in M_{i-1}$. In this case, $M_{i-1}(r) >_r h$, otherwise r envies r' w.r.t. M_{i-1} , a contradiction. Now since the algorithm never demotes any resident, it implies that $M_i(r) >_r h$, contradicts that r envies r' w.r.t. M_i .

Case 2: Assume $(r', h) \notin M_{i-1}$. If $M_{i-1}(r) <_r h$ then either r or a higher preferred resident than r is a threshold for h . Thus the edge $(r', h) \in E_1$ and hence gets deleted. Else $M_{i-1}(r) >_r h$. In this case by the same argument as above, r does not envy r' .

Thus, M is an envy-free matching in G . ◀

► **Lemma 23.** *Algorithm 2 produces maximum size envy-free matching if every resident's preference list has length at most 2 and all the quotas are at most 1.*

Proof. Let M be the output of Algorithm 2 on a restricted instance G . Lemma 22 shows that M is envy-free. For the sake of contradiction, assume that M is not maximum size envy-free. Let M^* be an envy-free matching in G with $|M^*| > |M|$. Consider the symmetric difference $M \oplus M^*$. There must exist an augmenting path $P = \langle r_1, h_1, r_2, h_2, \dots, r_n, h_n \rangle$ w.r.t. M where r_1 and h_n are unmatched in M . Moreover $M \oplus P$ is envy-free by Lemma 21. Further, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, $M^*(r_i) = h_i$. We note that r_1 prefers M^* over M (being matched versus being unmatched) and since M^* is envy-free, it must be the case that h_1 prefers r_2 over r_1 (else r_1 envies r_2 w.r.t. M^* .) Since M is also envy-free, we conclude that every resident r_i in P prefers $M^*(r_i)$ over $M(r_i)$; and every hospital h_i prefers r_{i+1} over r_i . If all the M^* edges in this path belong to E' in the final iteration of Algorithm 2, then we arrive at a contradiction. Hence there exists some edge $(r_i, h_i) \in M^* \cap P$ such that $(r_i, h_i) \notin E'$; that is (r_i, h_i) was deleted either as an E_1 or E_2 edge in Step 4 of Algorithm 2.

Suppose $(r_i, h_i) \in E_1$, then there exists a threshold resident for h_i , say r' which h_i prefers over r_i . Note that, by definition of threshold resident, r' is matched in M to some hospital h' that it prefers lower over h_i . Since preference lists of residents are at most length two, r' is not adjacent to any other hospital. We now contradict that M^* is envy-free by observing that $q^+(h_i) = 1$ and $M^*(r_i) = h_i$. Thus for M^* to be envy-free, r' must be matched in M^* to some hospital that is higher preferred than h_i . However, no such hospital exists, which implies that r' must remain unmatched in M^* and thus envies r_i . This implies that M^* is not envy-free; a contradiction. Now, let $(r_i, h_i) \in E_2$. It implies that r_i was higher preferred by h_i than its threshold resident in the last iteration and $M(r_i)$ was higher preferred by r_i than $h_i = M^*(r_i)$. This is a contradiction to the fact that each r_i in P prefers its $M^*(r_i)$ over $M(r_i)$. This completes the proof. ◀

4 Envy-freeness: Parameterized complexity

In this section, we investigate parameterized complexity of the MAXEFM and MIN-UR-EFM problems. We refer the reader to the comprehensive literature on parametric algorithms and complexity [4, 22, 7] for standard notation used in this section. Since the difficulty of MAXEFM lies in the instances where stable matchings are not feasible, we choose the parameters related to those hospitals which have a positive lower quota (denoted by H_{LQ}). In particular, the deficiency of a given HRLQ instance (see Definition 7 from Section 1) is a natural parameter. Unfortunately, the problem turns out to be $W[1]$ -hard for this parameter.

Proof of Theorem 8(I). Consider the parameterized version of IND-SET problem i.e. a graph G and solution size k as the parameter. Let (G', k') be parameterized reduced instance of MAXEFM, where k' is the deficiency of G' and let k' be the parameter. From the NP-hardness reduction given in section 2.1, we already saw that the stable matching in G' has deficiency k . Then, with $k' = k$, the same reduction is a valid FPT reduction. It implies that that MAXEFM and MIN-UR-EFM are $W[1]$ -hard, otherwise it contradicts to the $W[1]$ -hardness of IND-SET [4]. ◀

4.1 A polynomial size kernel

In this section, we give a kernelization result for HRLQ instances with hospital quotas either 0 or 1. We consider the following three parameters.

- ℓ : The size of a maximum matching in a given HRLQ instance.
- p : The highest rank of any lower-quota hospital in any resident's preference list.
- t : Maximum number of non-lower-quota hospitals shared by the preference lists of any pair of residents.

Given the graph G and k we construct a graph G' such that G admits an envy-free matching of size k iff G' admits an envy-free matching of size k .

Construction of the graph G' : We start by computing a stable matching M_s in $G(V, E)$. If $|M_s| < k$, we have a "No" instance by Lemma 13. If $|M_s| \geq k$ and M_s is feasible, we have a "Yes" instance. Otherwise, $|M_s| \geq k$ but it is infeasible. We know that $|M_s| \leq \ell$. We construct the graph G' as follows.

Let X be the vertex cover computed by picking matched vertices in M_s . Then, $|X| \leq 2\ell$. Since, M_s is maximal, $I = V \setminus X$ is an independent set. We now use the marking scheme below to mark edges of G which will belong to the graph G' .

Marking scheme: Our marking scheme is inspired by the marking scheme for the kernelization result in [1]. Every edge with both end points in X is marked. If $h \in X$ is a hospital, we mark all edges with other end-point in the independent set I if the number of such edges are at most $\ell + 1$. Otherwise we mark the edges corresponding to the highest preferred $(\ell + 1)$ residents of h . If $r \in X$ is a resident then we do following: Let p_r denote the highest rank of any lower-quota hospital in the preference list of r . Every edge between r and an hospital at rank 1 to p_r is marked. There can be at most p edges marked in this step. We now construct a set of hospitals C_r corresponding to r . The set C_r consists of non-lower-quota hospitals which are common to the preference list of r and some matched resident in M_s . That is,

$$C_r = \{h \in \mathcal{H} \mid q^-(h) = 0 \text{ and } \exists r' \in X, r' \neq r \text{ and } h \text{ is in preference list of both } r \text{ and } r'\}.$$

Mark all edges of the form (r, h) where $h \in C_r$, if not already marked. Now amongst the unmarked edges incident on r (if any exists) mark the edge to the highest preferred hospital h . We are now ready to state the reduction rules using the above marking scheme.

Reduction rules: We apply the following reduction rules as long as they are applicable.

1. If $v \in G$ is isolated, delete it.
2. If (r, h) edge is unmarked, delete it.

Thus, we obtain an instance $G' = (V', E')$ where $V' = X \cup I$ and $E' = E(X, X) \cup E(X, I)$, where $E(A, B)$ is the set of edges with one end point in A and other in B .

Lemma 24 below bounds the size of the kernel G' .

► **Lemma 24.** *The graph G' has $\text{poly}(\ell, p, t)$ -size.*

Proof. We know that $|X| \leq 2\ell$. Thus, $E(X, X) = O(\ell^2)$. Let $X_H \subset X$, be the set of hospitals in X and $X_R \subset X = X \setminus X_H$ be the set of residents in X . Then, $|X_H| = |X_R| \leq \ell$. For a hospital $h \in X_H$, we have at most $\ell + 1$ marked edges having its other end-point in the independent set I . For a resident $r \in X_R$, we retained edges with at most $p + t(\ell - 1) + 1$ hospitals in independent set I . Hence, $|E(X, I)| \leq |X_R| \cdot (p + t\ell - t + 1) + |X_H| \cdot (\ell + 1) = O(\ell(p + t\ell - t + 1) + \ell^2)$. Since I is independent set, $|I| = |E(X, I)|$. Thus, the size of G' is $O(\ell^2 + \ell(p + t\ell - t + 1))$. ◀

Safeness of first reduction rule is trivial. Lemma 25 and Lemma 26 prove that the second reduction rule is safe. So, G' is a kernel.

► **Lemma 25.** *If G' has a feasible envy-free matching M' such that $|M'| \geq k$ then M' is feasible and envy-free in G .*

Proof. Since, $M' \subseteq E' \subseteq E$, so feasibility in G follows. Suppose for the contradiction that M' is not envy-free in G . Then there exists a deleted edge (x, y) such that it causes envy. By the claimed envy, x prefers y over $M'(x)$ and y prefers x over $M'(y)$.

Suppose x is a hospital. Since, (x, y) is deleted, there are $\ell + 1$ marked neighbors of x , all more preferred than y . Since size of maximum matching is at most ℓ , there exists a marked neighbor of x , say y' who is unmatched in M' . Since, x prefers y' over y it implies, x prefers y' over $M'(x)$ implying that in G' , y' envies $M'(x)$ – a contradiction since M' is envy-free.

Suppose x is a resident. Given that (x, y) was deleted, y is non-lower-quota hospital. Since x participates in an envy pair, there are at least two residents x and $M'(y)$ which have a common hospital y in their preference list. Thus by our marking scheme, (x, y) is not deleted – a contradiction. ◀

► **Lemma 26.** *If G has a feasible envy-free matching M such that $|M| \geq k$ then there exists a feasible envy-free matching M' in G' such that $|M'| \geq k$.*

Proof. If all the edges in M are present in G' then $M' = M$ and we are done. Suppose not, then there exists an edge $(x, y) \in M \setminus E'$. Let x be a hospital, then since (x, y) was deleted $y \in I$. Note that y is unmatched in M_s in G . By Lemma 13 y cannot be matched in any envy-free matching, which contradicts that $(x, y) \in M$. Thus x must be a resident. Since (x, y) is deleted, then there exists a hospital h present only in preference list of x such that $(x, y) \in E'$. By the marking scheme, x prefers h over y . Thus, let $M' = M \setminus (x, y) \cup (x, h)$, which is envy-free since there is no other resident in the preference list of h other than x . ◀

This establishes Theorem 8(II).

4.2 A maximum matching containing a given envy-free matching

The MAXEFM problem has a polynomial-time algorithm when either there are no lower-quota hospitals or when all the lower-quota hospitals have complete preference lists. This fact suggests two parameters – number of lower-quota hospitals in a given instance (q), and maximum length of the preference list of any lower-quota hospital (ℓ). Our parameterized algorithm for the parameters q and ℓ and other parameterized algorithms, described in Section 4.3, make crucial use of an algorithm to *extend* an envy-free matching M to a maximum size envy free matching M^* , such that $M \subseteq M^*$. This algorithm was presented in [19] where it was proved that it produces a *maximal* envy-free matching containing the given envy-free matching M . We present the algorithm of [19] for completeness and prove that it outputs a *maximum* size envy-free matching containing M .

We recall their algorithm below as Algorithm 3. However, unlike Algorithm 2 in [19], where they start with Yokoi's output [25], we start with any feasible envy-free matching M . Since M need not be a minimum size envy-free matching, in line 4, we set $q^+(h)$ in G' as $q^+(h) - |M(h)|$. Lemma 13 proves that a stable matching is a maximum size envy-free

Algorithm 3: Maximum size envy-free matching containing M [19]

Input: Input : $G = (\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}, E)$, $M =$ a feasible envy-free matching in G

- 1 Let \mathcal{R}' be the set of residents unmatched in M
 - 2 Let \mathcal{H}' be the set of hospitals such that $|M(h)| < q^+(h)$ in G
 - 3 Let $G' = (\mathcal{R}' \cup \mathcal{H}', E')$ be an induced sub-graph of G , where
 $E' = \{(r, h) \mid r \in \mathcal{R}', h \in \mathcal{H}', h \text{ prefers } r \text{ over its threshold resident } r_h\}$
 - 4 Set $q^+(h)$ in G' as $q^+(h) - |M(h)|$ in G
 - 5 Each h has the same relative ordering on its neighbors in G' as in G
 - 6 Compute a stable matching M_s in G'
 - 7 Return $M^* = M \cup M_s$
-

matching in an HR instance. This is used to prove that the output of the above algorithm is a maximum size envy-free matching containing M .

► **Lemma 27.** *The matching M^* output by Algorithm 3 is a maximum size envy-free matching with the property $M \subseteq M^*$.*

Proof. Assume for the sake of contradiction that M' is an envy-free matching in G such that $M' = M \cup M_x$ and $|M'| > |M^*|$. We first claim that $M_x \subseteq E'$. If not, then there exists $(r, h) \in M_x$ where $(r, h) \notin E'$. However, note that (r, h) does not belong to E' implies that there is a threshold resident r_h such that r_h prefers h over $M(r_h)$ and h prefers r_h over r' . Thus, r_h has justified envy towards r w.r.t. M' – this contradicts the assumption that M' is envy-free.

Recall that G' is an HR instance and M_s is a stable matching in G' . To complete the proof it suffices to note that a stable matching in G' is a maximum size envy-free matching in G' by Lemma 13. ◀

4.3 FPT algorithms for MAXEFM

In this section, we give FPT algorithms for the MAXEFM problem on several sets of parameters. Our first set of parameters is the number of lower-quota hospitals q and the maximum length of the preference list of any lower-quota hospital ℓ . The algorithm is simple: it tries all possible assignments M_e of residents to lower-quota hospitals. If some assignment is not

envy-free we discard it. Otherwise we use Algorithm 3 to output a maximum size envy-free matching containing M_e . Since our algorithm tries out all possible assignments to lower-quota hospitals, and the extension of M_e is a maximum cardinality envy-free matching containing M_e (by Lemma 27) it is clear that the algorithm outputs a maximum size envy-free matching.

► **Lemma 28.** *The MAXEFM problem is FPT when the parameters are the number of lower-quota hospitals (q) and length of the longest preference list of any lower-quota hospital (ℓ).*

Proof. For an lower-quota hospital h , there are at most 2^ℓ possible ways of assigning residents to h . Since the number of lower-quota hospitals is q , our algorithm considers $2^{\ell \cdot q}$ many different matchings. Testing whether a matching M_e is envy-free and to extend it to a maximum size envy-free matching containing M_e using Algorithm 3 needs linear time. Thus we have an $O^*(2^{\ell \cdot q})$ time algorithm for the MAXEFM problem. Here O^* hides polynomial terms in n and m . ◀

We give the following FPT result when the quotas are at most one. Let R_d be the set of residents that are acceptable to at least one deficient hospital. Let $s = |R_d|$. We denote the deficiency of the given HRLQ instance by d . We prove that the MAXEFM problem is FPT if parameters are s and d .

► **Lemma 29.** *The MAXEFM problem is FPT when the number of deficient hospitals (d) and the total number of residents acceptable to deficient hospitals (s) are parameters.*

Proof. We use bounded branching algorithm presented in Algorithm 4. Matching in line 2 is computed using EF-HR-LQ algorithm in [25]. For every deficient hospital h (w.r.t. stable matching), we branch on every resident r in the preference list of h . Any matching computed along the branch r of h has (r, h) . In every branch, we prune the preference lists such that possible envy-pairs w.r.t. current matching are removed. If we run out of preference list at a particular level, we mark the branch as “invalid” and do not progress on that branch. This generates a bounded branching tree that has at most d levels and s branches at each level. We process each valid leaf l as follows. Let A_l be the partial matching (assignment) we have computed along the branch that connects l with the root. We compute a stable matching M on the pruned instance G_l . Since we removed possible envy-pairs at each level, it is guaranteed that M_l is envy-free. If M_l is not feasible, we discard it otherwise we choose the largest size such matching across all valid leaf nodes as the output.

Correctness: At every step, the instance is pruned to remove future envy, so it is easy to see that the matching output is envy-free. For the sake of contradiction, assume that there exists another larger envy-free matching M^* than the matching M output by Algorithm 4. There must exist at least one hospital $h \in H'$ which has at least one different partner in M and M^* . But, since we are considering all possible assignments to deficient hospitals, we must have considered the assignment in M^* as well. So, we could not have missed out a larger envy-free matching.

Running time: It is clear that there are at most s^d possible leaf nodes. Removing future envy and computing stable matching takes $O(m)$. So, overall running time is $O(m \cdot s^d)$.

Hence, MAXEFM is FPT if parameters are number of deficient hospitals (d) and the total number of unique residents acceptable to deficient hospitals (s). ◀

Now we consider total number of residents acceptable to lower-quota hospitals as a parameter and present a parameterized algorithm when quotas are at most one.

Algorithm 4: FPT algorithm for MAXEFM parameterized in s, d

Input: Input: HRLQ instance containing feasible envy-free matching
Output: Output: Maximum size feasible envy-free matching

- 1 Let $H' = \{h \in H \mid h \text{ is deficient in a stable matching}\}$
- 2 $M^* = \text{Yokoi's matching}$
- 3 **while** H' is not empty **do**
- 4 Pick $h \in H'$
- 5 **if** Preference list of h is empty **then**
- 6 Mark the branch “invalid”
- 7 For every resident r in h 's preference list, create a branch and match (r, h)
- 8 In every branch l , prune the instance by removing future envy i.e.
 $E = E \setminus \{(r', h') \mid h' \text{ is more preferred by } r \text{ than } h \text{ and } r' \text{ is less preferred by } h' \text{ than } r\}$
- 9 **foreach** valid leaf l **do**
- 10 Let A_l be the assignment to deficient hospitals
- 11 Let G_l be the pruned instance
- 12 Compute a stable matching M in G_l
- 13 Let $M_l = M \cup A_l$
- 14 **if** M_l is not feasible **then**
- 15 Discard M_l
- 16 **if** $|M_l| > |M^*|$ **then**
- 17 $M^* = M_l$
- 18 **return** M^* ;

► **Lemma 30.** *The MAXEFM problem parameterized on the total number of residents acceptable to lower-quota hospitals is FPT.*

Proof. Consider $R' = \{r \in R \mid \exists h \in H_{LQ} \text{ such that } (r, h) \in E\}$. Thus, R' is the set of residents acceptable to at least one lower-quota hospital. Algorithm 5 is FPT for the parameter $|R'|$. Yokoi's matching in line 1 is computed using Yokoi's EF-HR-LQ algorithm [25]. Matching in line 6 is computed using Algorithm 3.

Correctness: We consider all possible assignments to residents in R' using branching. We discard an assignment that is infeasible or not envy-free. Thus, we consider all possible envy-free and feasible assignments and extend them using Algorithm 3. By Lemma 27, M is maximum size envy-free matching that contains A and we pick the largest among them.

Running time: There are $|R'|!$ possible assignments to check. Finding if an assignment is feasible and envy-free takes $O(m)$. Computing maximum size envy-free matching containing a given assignment takes $O(m)$. So, overall running time is $O(m \cdot |R'|!)$.

Hence, MAXEFM is FPT if parameter is the number of residents acceptable to lower-quota hospitals. ◀

This establishes Theorem 8(III).

Algorithm 5: FPT algorithm for MAXEFM parameterized in $|R'|$

Input: HRLQ instance containing feasible envy-free matching**Output:** Maximum size feasible envy-free matching

```

1  $M^* = \text{Yokoi's matching}$ 
2 foreach assignment  $A$  between  $R'$  and  $H_{LQ}$  do
3   if  $A$  is not feasible or not envy-free then
4     discard  $A$ 
5   else
6     Compute maximum size envy-free matching  $M$  containing  $A$ 
7     if  $|M| > |M^*|$  then
8        $M^* = M$ 
9 return  $M^*$ 

```

5 Relaxed Stability

In this section, we present our results related to the relaxed stability in HRLQ instance. We prove that MAXRSM is NP-hard and hard to approximate within a factor of $\frac{21}{19}$ unless $P = NP$. Then we present a simple efficient algorithm which gives a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation guarantee for MAXRSM.

5.1 NP-hardness and inapproximability of MAXRSM

In this section, we show a reduction from the Minimum Vertex Cover (MVC) to the MAXRSM.

Reduction: Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, which is an instance of the MVC problem, we construct an instance G' of the MAXRSM problem. Let $n = |V|$. Corresponding to each vertex v_i in G , G' contains a gadget with three residents r_1^i, r_2^i, r_3^i , and three hospitals h_1^i, h_2^i, h_3^i . All hospitals have an upper-quota of 1 and h_3^i has a lower-quota of 1. Assume that the vertex v_i has d neighbors in G , namely v_{j_1}, \dots, v_{j_d} . The preference lists of the three residents and three hospitals are shown in Fig. 9. We impose an arbitrary but fixed ordering on the vertices which is used as a strict ordering of neighbors in the preference lists of resident r_1^i and hospital h_2^i in G' . Note that G' has $N = 3|V|$ residents and hospitals.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
r_1^i : h_3^i, h_2^{j_1}, h_2^{j_2}, \dots, h_2^{j_d}, h_1^i & [0, 1] \ h_1^i : r_1^i \\
r_2^i : h_2^i, h_3^i & [0, 1] \ h_2^i : r_2^i, r_1^{j_1}, r_2^{j_2}, \dots, r_2^{j_d}, r_3^i \\
r_3^i : h_2^i & [1, 1] \ h_3^i : r_3^i, r_1^i
\end{array}$$

■ **Figure 9** Preferences of residents and hospitals corresponding to a vertex v_i in G .


► **Lemma 31.** *Let G' be the instance of the MAXRSM problem constructed as above from an instance $G = (V, E)$ of the minimum vertex cover problem. If $VC(G)$ denotes a minimum vertex cover of G and $OPT(G')$ denotes a maximum size relaxed stable matching in G' , then $|OPT(G')| = 3|V| - |VC(G)|$.*

Proof. We first prove that $|OPT(G')| \geq 3|V| - |VC(G)|$. Given a minimum vertex cover $VC(G)$ of G we construct a relaxed stable matching M for G' as follows. $M = \{(r_1^i, h_3^i), (r_2^i, h_2^i) \mid v_i \in VC(G)\} \cup \{(r_1^i, h_1^i), (r_2^i, h_3^i), (r_3^i, h_2^i) \mid v_i \notin VC(G)\}$. Thus, $|OPT(G')| \geq |M| = 2|VC(G)| + 3(|V| - |VC(G)|) = 3|V| - |VC(G)|$.

▷ Claim 32. M is relaxed stable in G' .

Proof. When $v_i \in VC(G)$, residents r_1^i and r_2^i both are matched to their top choice hospitals and hospital h_2^i is matched to its top choice resident r_2^i . Thus, when $v_i \in VC(G)$, no resident from the i -th gadget participates in a blocking pair. When $v_i \notin VC(G)$, hospitals h_1^i and h_3^i are matched to their top choice residents and we ignore blocking pair (r_2^i, h_2^i) because r_2^i is matched to a lower-quota hospital h_3^i , thus there is no blocking pair within the gadget for $v_i \notin VC(G)$. Now suppose that there is a blocking pair (r_1^i, h_2^j) for some j such that $(v_i, v_j) \in E$. Note that either v_i or v_j is in $VC(G)$. If $v_i \in VC(G)$, r_1^i is matched to its top choice hospital h_3^i , thus cannot participate in a blocking pair. If $v_i \notin VC(G)$, it implies that $v_j \in VC(G)$. Then for v_j 's gadget, h_2^j is matched to its top choice r_2^j , thus cannot form a blocking pair. ◁

Now we prove that $OPT(G') \leq 3|V| - |VC(G)|$. Let $M = OPT(G')$ be a maximum size relaxed stable matching in G' . Consider a vertex $v_i \in V$ and the corresponding residents and hospitals in G' . Refer Fig. 10 for the possible patterns caused by v_i . Hospital h_3^i must be matched to either resident r_1^i (Pattern 1) or resident r_2^i (Pattern 2 to Pattern 7). If $(r_1^i, h_3^i) \in M$, then the resident r_2^i must be matched to a higher preferred hospital h_2^i in M . If $(r_2^i, h_3^i) \in M$ then h_2^i may be matched with either r_3^i or r_1^i of some neighbour v_j or may be left unmatched. Similarly, r_1^i can either be matched to h_1^i or h_2^i of some neighbour v_j . This leads to 6 combinations as shown in Fig. 10b to Fig. 10g.



(a) Pattern 1 (b) Pattern 2 (c) Pattern 3 (d) Pattern 4 (e) Pattern 5 (f) Pattern 6 (g) Pattern 7

■ **Figure 10** Seven patterns possibly caused by vertex v_i

▷ Claim 33. A vertex cannot cause pattern 5.


Proof. Assume for the sake of contradiction that a vertex v_i causes pattern 5. Then, there must exist a vertex v_j adjacent to v_i such that v_j causes either pattern 4 or pattern 7.

Case 1: If vertex v_j causes pattern 4, then (r_1^j, h_2^i) form a blocking pair, a contradiction.

Case 2: If vertex v_j causes pattern 7, then there must exist vertices v_{j+1}, \dots, v_t such that there are following edges in G : $(v_i, v_j), (v_j, v_{j+1}), (v_{j+1}, v_{j+2}), \dots, (v_{t-1}, v_t)$ and vertices v_j to v_{t-1} cause pattern 7 and v_t causes pattern 4. See Fig. 11. In the vertex ordering, we must have $v_{j+1} > v_i$ otherwise (r_1^j, h_2^i) form a blocking pair. But, since h_2^j is matched to r_1^i , $v_{j+2} > v_j$. Continuing this way, $v_t > v_{t-2}$ but this causes (r_1^t, h_2^{t-2}) form a blocking pair. Thus, the claimed set of edges cannot exist. ◁

▷ Claim 34. A vertex cannot cause pattern 3 or 6 or 4.

Proof. In pattern 3 and 6, r_3^i participates in a blocking pair (r_3^i, h_2^i) , contradicting that M is relaxed stable. If a vertex v_i causes pattern 4, then there exists a set of t vertices



■ **Figure 11** Pattern combination that is not relaxed stable if v_i causes pattern 5.

v_{i+1}, \dots, v_{i+t} such that for $0 \leq k < t$, (v_{i+k}, v_{i+k+1}) is an edge in G and v_{i+t} causes pattern 6. But, since pattern 6 cannot occur, pattern 4 cannot occur. \triangleleft

Thus, a vertex can cause either pattern 1 or 2 and thus match all the residents and hospitals within its own gadget or pattern 7 and match r_1 and h_2 outside its own gadget. Accordingly there are following cases.

Case 1: A vertex that causes pattern 7 can be adjacent to another vertex that causes pattern 7, which together give matching size 4 i.e. 2 per vertex.

Case 2: It is clear that a vertex causing pattern 1 or 2 contributes to matching size of 2 or 3 respectively.

Vertex cover C of G corresponding to M : Using M , we now construct the set C of vertices in G which constitute a vertex cover of G . If v_i causes pattern 2, we do not include it in the C ; Otherwise, we include it. We prove that C is a vertex cover. Suppose not, then there exists an edge (v_i, v_j) such that both v_i and v_j cause pattern 2. But, this means that (r_1^i, h_2^j) and (r_1^j, h_2^i) form a blocking pair, a contradiction since M is relaxed stable. Now, it is easy to see that $|OPT(G')| = 2|C| + 3(|V| - |C|) = 3|V| - |C|$. Thus, $VC(G) \leq |C| = 3|V| - |OPT(G')|$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \blacktriangleleft

Now we prove the hardness of approximation for the MAXRSM problem. Similar to Lemma 18, Lemma 35 is analogous to Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.4 from [11]. Proof of Lemma 35 uses the result of Lemma 31 and can be reproduced in a similar manner as done in Appendix A for Lemma 18. This establishes Theorem 9.

► **Lemma 35.** *It is NP-hard to approximate the MAXRSM problem within a factor of $\frac{21}{19} - \delta$, for any constant $\delta > 0$, even when the quotas of all hospitals are either 0 or 1.*

5.2 A $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation algorithm for MAXRSM

In this section, we present Algorithm 6 that computes a relaxed stable matching in an HRLQ instance and prove that it is a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation to MAXRSM. Our algorithm is simple to implement and hence we believe is of practical importance. Furthermore, we show that the output of Algorithm 6 is at least as large as the stable matching in the instance (disregarding lower-quotas). Our algorithm is inspired by the one proposed by Király [17].

We say a feasible matching M_0 is *minimal* w.r.t. feasibility if for any edge $e \in M_0$, the matching $M_0 \setminus \{e\}$ is infeasible for the instance. That is for a minimal matching M_0 , we have for every hospital h , $|M_0(h)| = q^-(h)$. Algorithm 6 begins by computing a feasible matching M_0 in the instance G disregarding the preferences of the residents and hospitals. Such a feasible matching can be computed by the standard reduction from bipartite matchings to flows with demands on edges [18]. Let $M = M_0$. We now associate levels with the residents – all residents matched in M are set to have level-0; all residents unmatched in M are assigned level-1. We now execute the Gale and Shapley resident proposing algorithm,

with the modification that a hospital prefers any level-1 resident over any level-0 resident (irrespective of the preference list of h). Furthermore, if a level-0 resident becomes unmatched during the course of the proposals, then it gets assigned a level-1 and it starts proposing from the beginning of its preference list. Amongst two residents of the same level, the hospital uses its preference list in order them. Our algorithm terminates when either every resident is matched or every resident has exhausted its preference list when proposing hospitals at level-1. It is clear that our algorithm runs in polynomial time since it only computes a feasible matching (using a reduction to flows) and executes a modification of Gale and Shapley algorithm. We prove the correctness of our algorithm below.

Algorithm 6: Algorithm to compute $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation of MAXRSM

Input: Input: HRLQ instance $G = (\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{H}, E)$

Output: A relaxed stable matching that is a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation of MAXRSM

```

1  $M_0$  is a minimal feasible matching in  $G$ . Let  $M = M_0$ ;
2 For every matched resident  $r$ , set level of  $r$  to level-0;
3 For every unmatched resident  $r$ , set level of  $r$  to level-1;
4 while there is an unmatched resident  $r$  which has not exhausted his preference list do
5    $r$  proposes to the most preferred hospital  $h$  to whom he has not yet proposed;
6   if  $h$  is under-subscribed then
7      $M = M \cup \{(r, h)\}$ ;
8   else
9     if  $M(h)$  has at least one level-0 resident  $r'$  then
10       $M = M \setminus \{(r', h)\} \cup \{(r, h)\}$ ;
11      Set level of  $r'$  to level-1 and  $r'$  starts proposing from the beginning of his
        list;
12   else
13      $h$  rejects the least preferred resident in  $M(h) \cup r$ ;
14 Return  $M$ ;

```

► **Lemma 36.** *Matching M output by Algorithm 6 is feasible and relaxed stable.*

Proof. We note that M_0 is feasible and since Algorithm 6 uses a resident proposing algorithm, it is clear that for any hospital h , we have $|M(h)| \geq |M_0(h)| = q^-(h)$. Thus M is feasible.

To show relaxed stability, we claim that when the algorithm terminates, a resident at level-1 does not participate in a blocking pair. Whenever a level-1 resident r proposes to a hospital h , resident r always gets accepted except when h is fully-subscribed and all the residents matched to h are level-1 and are better preferred than r . When a matched level-1 resident r is rejected by a hospital h , h gets a better preferred resident than r . Thus, a level-1 resident does not participate in a blocking pair. We note that every unmatched resident is a level-1 resident and hence does not participate in a blocking pair. Recall that all residents matched in M_0 are level-0 residents and M_0 is minimal. This implies that for every hospital h , at most $q^-(h)$ many residents assigned to h in M_0 participate in a blocking pair. We show that in M , the number of level-0 residents assigned to any hospital does not increase. To see this, if r is matched to h in M , but not matched to h in M_0 , it implies that either r was unmatched in M_0 or r was matched to some h' in M_0 . In either case r becomes level-1 when it gets assigned to h in M . Thus the number of level-0 residents assigned to any hospital h in M is at most $q^-(h)$, all of which can potentially participate in blocking pairs. This completes the proof that M is relaxed stable. ◀

► **Lemma 37.** *Matching M output by Algorithm 6 is a $\frac{3}{2}$ -approximation to the maximum size relaxed stable matching.*

Proof. Let OPT denote the maximum size relaxed stable matching in G . To prove the lemma we show that in $M \oplus OPT$ there does not exist any one length as well as any three length augmenting path. To do this, we first convert the matchings M and OPT as one-to-one matchings, by making *clones* of the hospital. In particular we make $q^+(h)$ many copies of the hospital h for every h where the first $q^-(h)$ copies are called *lower-quota copies* and the $q^-(h) + 1$ to $q^+(h)$ copies are called *non lower-quota copies* of h .

Let M_1 denote the one-to-one matching corresponding to M . To obtain M_1 , we assign every resident $r \in M(h)$ to a unique copy of h as follows: first, all the residents in $M(h)$ who participate in blocking pair w.r.t. M are assigned unique lower-quota copies of h arbitrarily. The remaining residents in $M(h)$ are assigned to the rest of the copies of h , ensuring all lower-quota copies get assigned some resident. We get OPT_1 from OPT in the same manner.

Suppose that (r, h) is a one length augmenting path w.r.t. M in $M \oplus OPT$ such that r is unmatched and h is under-subscribed in M . Recall that an unmatched resident is a level-1 resident, hence r is a level-1 resident. Thus, r must have proposed to h during the execution of algorithm. Since, r is unmatched, it implies that h must be fully-subscribed in M , a contradiction. Thus, there is no one length augmenting path in $M \oplus OPT$.

Next, suppose there exists a three length augmenting path w.r.t. M which starts at an under-subscribed hospital, say h_j and ends at an unmatched resident in M . Since h_j is under-subscribed in M , and there is an augmenting path starting at h_j , it implies that there exists a copy h_j^d such that (i) h_j^d is matched in OPT_1 and unmatched in M_1 , say $OPT_1(h_j^d) = r_d$ and (ii) the resident r_d is matched in M_1 (otherwise there is a one length augmenting path w.r.t. M_1 , which does not exist); let $M_1(r_d) = h_i^c$, and (iii) the copy h_i^c is matched in OPT_1 and $OPT_1(h_i^c) = r_c$ is unmatched in M_1 (else the claimed three length augmenting path does not exist).

We first note that h_i^c and h_j^c are not copies of the same hospital, that is, $i \neq j$, otherwise there is a one length augmenting path (r_c, h_i) w.r.t. M . Since r_c is unmatched in M_1 (and hence M), the resident r_c is a level-1 resident. Therefore, r_c must have proposed to h_i during the course of the algorithm. Thus, h_i is fully-subscribed and is matched to all level-1 residents all of which are better preferred over r_c . This implies that $r_d >_{h_i} r_c$ and r_d is a level-1 resident. Since r_d is a level-1 resident, it proposed to hospitals from the beginning of its preference list. Since h_j is under-subscribed, it must be the case that $h_i >_{r_d} h_j$. Thus, (r_d, h_i) is a blocking pair w.r.t. OPT . By the construction of OPT_1 from OPT , we must have assigned r_d to a lower-quota copy of h_j . However, copy h_j^d is a non lower-quota copy, since it is unassigned in M_1 , a contradiction. Thus, the claimed three length augmenting path does not exist. ◀

We note that the analysis of our Algorithm 6 is tight. Consider the HRLQ instance in Fig. 12 and a minimal feasible matching $M_0 = \{(r_3, h_2)\}$. Algorithm 6 computes matching $M = \{(r_3, h_2), (r_2, h_1)\}$. Maximum size relaxed stable matching in this instance is $OPT = \{(r_1, h_1), (r_2, h_2), (r_3, h_3)\}$ and $M \oplus OPT$ admits a five length augmenting path $\langle r_1, h_1, r_2, h_2, r_3, h_3 \rangle$. We also show that every resident matched in stable matching (ig-

$r_1 : h_1$	$[0, 1] \ h_1 : r_2, r_1$
$r_2 : h_1, h_2$	$[1, 1] \ h_2 : r_2, r_3$
$r_3 : h_3, h_2$	$[0, 1] \ h_3 : r_3$

■ **Figure 12** A tight example for Algorithm 6

noring lower quotas) is also matched in M that is output by Algorithm 6, implying that M is at least as large as any stable matching.

► **Lemma 38.** *A resident matched in a stable matching is also matched in M . Hence M is at least as large as any stable matching in that instance.*

Proof. Let M_s be a stable matching. By Rural Hospitals theorem, we know that the same set of residents are matched in all the stable matchings. Hence, it is enough to prove that a resident r matched in M_s is also matched in M . Suppose not. Then r must be a level-1 resident. Let $M_s(r) = h$. Since M is relaxed stable, h must be fully-subscribed in M with residents who are level-1 and better preferred over r . All these residents in $M(h)$ must be matched and matched to a higher preferred hospital than h in M_s otherwise they form a blocking pair w.r.t. M_s . But, since they are level-1, their matched partners in M_s must be fully-subscribed in M with residents who are level-1 and better preferred than them. Thus, a path starting at r who is claimed to be unmatched in M cannot terminate at either a resident or a hospital, a contradiction since there are finite number of hospitals and residents. Hence, every resident matched in M_s is matched in M . ◀

6 Discussion

In this paper we consider computing matchings with two-sided preferences and lower-quotas. A thorough investigation of the notion of envy-freeness from a computational perspective reveals that the MAXEFM problem is NP-hard, and hard to approximate within a constant factor $\frac{21}{19}$. In future, it will be nice to improve the approximation guarantee for the MAXEFM problem. For the new notion of relaxed stability, we show desirable properties like guaranteed existence, and an efficient constant factor approximation for the MAXRSM problem. However, the gap between the approximation guarantee and hardness of approximation remains to be bridged.

References

- 1 Deeksha Adil, Sushmita Gupta, Sanjukta Roy, Saket Saurabh, and Meirav Zehavi. Parameterized algorithms for stable matching with ties and incomplete lists. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 723:1–10, 2018.
- 2 Péter Biró, Tamás Fleiner, Robert W. Irving, and David Manlove. The college admissions problem with lower and common quotas. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 411(34-36):3136–3153, 2010.
- 3 Irit Dinur and Shmuel Safra. The importance of being biased. In *Proceedings on 34th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, May 19-21, 2002, Montréal, Québec, Canada*, pages 33–42, 2002.
- 4 Rodney G. Downey and M. R. Fellows. *Parameterized Complexity*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2012.
- 5 Lars Ehlers, Isa E. Hafalir, M. Bumin Yenmez, and Muhammed A. Yildirim. School choice with controlled choice constraints: Hard bounds versus soft bounds. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 153:648 – 683, 2014.
- 6 Tamás Fleiner and Naoyuki Kamiyama. A matroid approach to stable matchings with lower quotas. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 41(2):734–744, 2016. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.2015.0751>, doi:10.1287/moor.2015.0751.
- 7 J. Flum and M. Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory (Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. An EATCS Series)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006.

- 8 Daniel Fragiadakis, Atsushi Iwasaki, Peter Troyan, Suguru Ueda, and Makoto Yokoo. Strategyproof matching with minimum quotas. *ACM Trans. Economics and Comput.*, 4(1):6:1–6:40, 2015. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2841226>, doi:10.1145/2841226.
- 9 D. Gale and L. S. Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 69(1):9–15, 1962. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2312726>.
- 10 Masahiro Goto, Atsushi Iwasaki, Yujiro Kawasaki, Ryoji Kurata, Yosuke Yasuda, and Makoto Yokoo. Strategyproof matching with regional minimum and maximum quotas. *Artificial Intelligence*, 235:40 – 57, 2016.
- 11 Magnús M. Halldórsson, Kazuo Iwama, Shuichi Miyazaki, and Hiroki Yanagisawa. Improved approximation results for the stable marriage problem. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 3(3):30, 2007.
- 12 Koki Hamada, Kazuo Iwama, and Shuichi Miyazaki. The hospitals/residents problem with lower quotas. *Algorithmica*, 74(1):440–465, 2016. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-014-9951-z>, doi:10.1007/s00453-014-9951-z.
- 13 Chien-Chung Huang. Classified stable matching. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2010*, pages 1235–1253, 2010. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973075.99>, doi:10.1137/1.9781611973075.99.
- 14 Yuichiro Kamada and Fuhito Kojima. Efficient matching under distributional constraints: Theory and applications. *American Economic Review*, 105(1):67–99, January 2015.
- 15 Yuichiro Kamada and Fuhito Kojima. Stability concepts in matching under distributional constraints. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 168:107 – 142, 2017.
- 16 Subhash Khot and Oded Regev. Vertex cover might be hard to approximate to within 2-epsilon. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 74(3):335–349, 2008.
- 17 Zoltán Király. Linear time local approximation algorithm for maximum stable marriage. *Algorithms*, 6(3):471–484, 2013. URL: <https://doi.org/10.3390/a6030471>, doi:10.3390/a6030471.
- 18 Jon Kleinberg and Eva Tardos. *Algorithm Design*. Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., Boston, MA, USA, 2005.
- 19 A. M. Krishnapriya, Meghana Nasre, Prajakta Nimbhorkar, and Amit Rawat. How good are popular matchings? In *17th International Symposium on Experimental Algorithms, SEA 2018*, pages 9:1–9:14, 2018. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.SEA.2018.9>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.SEA.2018.9.
- 20 Meghana Nasre and Prajakta Nimbhorkar. Popular matchings with lower quotas. In *37th IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2017*, pages 44:1–44:15, 2017. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.FSTTCS.2017.44>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.FSTTCS.2017.44.
- 21 George L. Nemhauser and Leslie E. Trotter Jr. Vertex packings: Structural properties and algorithms. *Math. Program.*, 8(1):232–248, 1975.
- 22 R. Niedermeier. *Invitation to Fixed-Parameter Algorithms*. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and Its Applications. OUP Oxford, 2006.
- 23 Alvin E. Roth. On the allocation of residents to rural hospitals: A general property of two-sided matching markets. *Econometrica*, 54(2):425–427, 1986.
- 24 Qingyun Wu and Alvin E. Roth. The lattice of envy-free matchings. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 109:201–211, 2018.
- 25 Yu Yokoi. Envy-free matchings with lower quotas. *Algorithmica*, 82(2):188–211, 2020. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-018-0493-7>, doi:10.1007/s00453-018-0493-7.

A Missing proofs from section 2.2 and section 5.1

As stated earlier, Lemma 18 is analogous to Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.4 from [11]. For completeness, we reproduce the proof below.

► **Proposition 39.** [3] For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $p < \frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}$, the following statement holds: If there exists a polynomial time algorithm that, given a graph $G = (V, E)$, distinguishes between the following two cases, then $P = NP$.

1. $|VC(G)| \leq (1 - p + \epsilon)|V|$
2. $|VC(G)| > (1 - \max\{p^2, 4p^3 - 3p^4\} - \epsilon)|V|$

Proposition 39, Lemma 15 and $N = 3|V|$ together imply following lemma.

► **Lemma 40.** For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $p < \frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}$, the following statement holds: If there exists a polynomial time algorithm that, given a MAXEFM instance G' consisting of N residents and $\frac{4N}{3}$ hospitals, distinguishes between the following two cases, then $P = NP$.

1. $|OPT(G')| \geq \frac{2+p-\epsilon}{3}N$
2. $|OPT(G')| < \frac{2+\max\{p^2, 4p^3-3p^4\}+\epsilon}{3}N$

Proof of Lemma 18. As in [11], we substitute $p = \frac{1}{3}$ in Lemma 40 to obtain the simplified cases as follows.

1. $|OPT(G')| \geq \frac{21-\epsilon}{27}N$
2. $|OPT(G')| < \frac{19+\epsilon}{27}N$

Now, suppose we have a polynomial-time approximation algorithm for the MAXEFM problem with an approximation factor of at most $\frac{21}{19} - \delta$, $\delta > 0$. Consider the above two cases with a fixed constant, $\epsilon < \frac{361\delta}{40-19\delta}$. For an instance of case (1), this algorithm outputs a matching of size $\geq \frac{21-\epsilon}{27}N \frac{1}{\frac{21}{19}-\delta}$, and for an instance of case (2), it outputs a matching of size $< \frac{19+\epsilon}{27}N$. By our setting of ϵ , we can easily verify that $\frac{21-\epsilon}{27}N \frac{1}{\frac{21}{19}-\delta} > \frac{19+\epsilon}{27}N$. Hence using this approximation algorithm, we can distinguish between instances of the two cases, implying that $P = NP$. This completes the proof of the lemma. ◀

Following remark is also analogous to Remark 3.6 from [11].

► **Remark 41.** A long standing conjecture [16] states that MVC is hard to approximate within a factor of $2 - \epsilon$, $\epsilon > 0$. We obtain a lower bound of 1.25 on the approximation ratio of MAXEFM, modulo this conjecture.

Proof. Suppose we have an r -approximation algorithm for the MAXEFM problem. Let $G = (V, E)$ be such that $|VC(G)| \geq \frac{|V|}{2}$. Approximability of MVC for general graphs is equivalent to the approximability of MVC for graphs with this property [21]. Using reduction provided obtain a MAXEFM instance G' . We showed that $|OPT(G')| = 3|V| - |VC(G)|$. Suppose we are given a maximal envy-free matching, M for G' , obtained using this algorithm, we can construct a vertex cover C for G with $|C| \leq 3|V| - |M|$. Since M is an r -approximation to $OPT(G')$, we have $|M| \geq \frac{|OPT(G')|}{r}$. Combining these constraints we get,

$$\begin{aligned} |C| &\leq 3|V| - |M| \\ &\leq \left(6 - \frac{5}{r}\right)|VC(G)| \end{aligned}$$

On substituting $r = 1.25 - \delta$ in the above equation ($0 < \delta \leq 0.25$), we see that $1 \leq 6 - \frac{5}{r} < 2$. Thus, effectively we have constructed a vertex cover C , which is a k -approximation to $VC(G)$, where $1 \leq k < 2$. This contradicts the conjecture that MVC is hard to approximate within a factor of $2 - \epsilon$, $\epsilon > 0$. This completes the proof. ◀

Proof of Lemma 35 can be reproduced in a similar manner as the proof for Lemma 18 and using the result from Lemma 31 in place of Lemma 15.