

The Three-Dimensional Stable Roommates Problem with Additively Separable Preferences^{*}

Michael McKay^[0000–0003–1496–7434] and David Manlove^[0000–0001–6754–7308]

School of Computing Science, University of Glasgow, UK
 m.mckay.1@research.gla.ac.uk, david.manlove@glasgow.ac.uk

Abstract. The Stable Roommates problem involves matching a set of agents into pairs based on the agents’ strict ordinal preference lists. The matching must be stable, meaning that no two agents strictly prefer each other to their assigned partners. A number of three-dimensional variants exist, in which agents are instead matched into triples. Both the original problem and these variants can also be viewed as hedonic games. We formalise a three-dimensional variant using general additively separable preferences, in which each agent provides an integer valuation of every other agent. In this variant, we show that a stable matching may not exist and that the related decision problem is NP-complete, even when the valuations are binary. In contrast, we show that if the valuations are binary and symmetric then a stable matching must exist and can be found in polynomial time. We also consider the related problem of finding a stable matching with maximum utilitarian welfare when valuations are binary and symmetric. We show that this optimisation problem is NP-hard and present a novel 2-approximation algorithm.

Keywords: Stable roommates · Stable matching · Three dimensional roommates · Hedonic games · Coalition formation · Complexity

1 Introduction

The Stable Roommates problem (SR) is a classical problem in the domain of matching under preferences. It involves a set of agents that must be matched into pairs. Each agent provides a *preference list*, ranking all other agents in strict order. We call a set of pairs in which each agent appears in exactly one pair a *matching*. The goal is to produce a matching M that admits no *blocking pair*, which comprises two agents, each of whom prefers the other to their assigned partner in M . Such a matching is called *stable*. This problem originates from a seminal paper of Gale and Shapley, published in 1962, as a generalisation of the Stable Marriage problem [15]. They showed that an SR instance need not contain a stable matching. In 1985, Irving presented a polynomial-time algorithm to either find a stable matching or report that none exist, given an arbitrary SR

^{*} This work was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (Doctoral Training Partnership grant number EP/R513222/1 and grant number EP/P028306/1)

instance [20]. Since then, many papers have explored extensions and variants of the fundamental SR problem model.

In this paper we consider the extension of SR to three dimensions (i.e., agents must be matched into triples rather than pairs). A number of different formalisms have already been proposed in the literature. The first, presented in 1991 by Ng and Hirschberg, was the *3-Person Stable Assignment Problem* (3PSA) [23]. In 3PSA, agents’ preference lists are formed by ranking every pair of other agents in strict order. A matching M is a partition of the agents into unordered triples. A *blocking triple* t of M involves three agents that each prefer their two partners in t to their two assigned partners in M . Accordingly, a *stable matching* is one that admits no blocking triple. The authors showed that an instance of this model may not contain a stable matching and the associated decision problem is NP-complete [23]. In the instances constructed by their reduction, agents’ preferences may be *inconsistent* [19], meaning that it is impossible to derive a logical order of individual agents from a preference list ranking pairs of agents.

In 2007, Huang considered the restriction of 3PSA to *consistent* preferences. He showed that a stable matching may still not exist and the decision problem remains NP-complete [19,18]. In his technical report, he also described another variant of 3PSA using *Precedence by Ordinal Number* (PON). PON involves each agent providing a preference list ranking all other agents individually. An agent’s preference over pairs is then based on the sum of the ranks of the agents in each pair. Huang left open the problem of finding a stable matching, as defined here, in the PON variant. He also proposed another problem variant involving a more general system than PON, in which agents provide arbitrary numerical “ratings”. It is this variant that we consider in this paper. He concluded his report by asking if there exist special cases of 3PSA in which stable matchings can be found using polynomial time algorithms. This question is another motivation for our paper.

The same year, Iwama, Miyazaki and Okamoto presented another variant of 3PSA [21]. In this model, agents rank individual agents in strict order of preference, and an ordering over pairs is inferred using a specific *set extension rule* [5,7]. The authors showed that a stable matching may not exist and that the decision problem remains NP-complete.

In 2009, Arkin et al. presented another variant of 3PSA called *Geometric 3D-SR* [1]. In this model, preference lists ranking pairs are derived from agents’ relative positions in a metric space. Among other results, they showed that in this model a stable matching, as defined here, need not exist. In 2013, Deineko and Woeginger showed that the corresponding decision problem is NP-complete [14].

All of the problem models described thus far, including SR, can be viewed as *hedonic games* [6]. A hedonic game is a type of *coalition formation game*. In general, coalition formation games involve partitioning a set of agents into disjoint sets, or coalitions, based on agents’ preferences. The term ‘hedonic’ refers to the fact that agents are only concerned with the coalition that they belong to. The study of hedonic games and coalition formation games is broad and many different problem models have been considered in the literature [17].

In particular, SR and its three-dimensional variants can be viewed as hedonic games with a constraint on permissible coalition sizes [25]. In the context of a hedonic game, the direct analogy of stability as described here is *core stability*. In a given hedonic game, a partition is *core stable* if there exists no set of agents S , of any size, where each agent in S prefers S to their assigned coalition [6].

Recently, Boehmer and Elkind considered a number of hedonic game variants, including 3PSA, which they described as *multidimensional roommate games* [8]. In their paper they supposed that the agents have *types*, and an agent’s preference between two coalitions depends only on the proportion of agents of each type in each coalition. They showed that, for a number of different ‘solution concepts’, the related problems are NP-hard, although many problems are solvable in linear time when the room size is a fixed parameter. For stability in particular, they presented an integer linear programming formulation to find a stable matching in a given instance, if one exists, in linear time.

In 2020, Brederick et al. considered another variation of multidimensional roommate games involving either a *master list* or *master poset*, a central list or poset from which all agents’ preference lists are derived [10]. They presented two positive results relating to restrictions of the problem involving a master poset although they showed for either a master list or master poset that finding a stable matching in general remains NP-hard or W[1]-hard, for three very natural parameters.

Other research involving hedonic games with similar constraints has considered Pareto optimality rather than stability [13]; ‘flatmate games’, in which any coalition contains three or fewer agents [9]; and strategic aspects [26].

The template of a hedonic game helps us formalise the extension of SR to three dimensions. In this paper we apply the well-known system of *additively separable preferences* [2]. In a general hedonic game, additive separable preferences are derived from each agent α_i assigning a numerical valuation $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_j)$ to every other agent α_j . A preference between two sets is then obtained by comparing the sum of valuations of the agents in each set. This system formalises the system of “ratings” proposed by Huang [19]. In a general hedonic game with additively separable preferences, a core stable partition need not exist, and the associated decision problem is strongly NP-hard [24]. This result holds even when preferences are *symmetric*, meaning that $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_j) = val_{\alpha_j}(\alpha_i)$ for any two agents α_i, α_j [3].

The three-dimensional variant of SR that we consider in this paper can also be described as an additively separable hedonic game in which each coalition in a feasible partition has size three. To be consistent with previous research relating to three-dimensional variants of SR [19,21], in this paper we refer to a partition into triples as a *matching* rather than a partition and write *stable matching* rather than *core stable partition*. We finally remark that the usage of the terminology “three-dimensional” to refer to the coalition size rather than, say, the number of agent sets [23], is consistent with previous work in the literature [1,10,21,25].

Our contribution. In this paper we use additively separable preferences to formalise the three-dimensional variant of SR first proposed by Huang in 2007 [19]. The problem model can be equally viewed as a modified hedonic game with additively separable preferences [3,24]. We show that deciding if a stable matching exists is NP-complete, even when valuations are binary (Section 3). In contrast, when valuations are binary and symmetric we show that a stable matching always exists and give an $O(|N|^3)$ algorithm for finding one, where N is the set of agents (Sections 4.1 – 4.4). We believe that this restriction to binary and symmetric preferences has practical as well as theoretical significance. For example, this model could be applied to a social network graph involving a symmetric “friendship” relation between users. Alternatively, in a setting involving real people it might be reasonable for an administrator to remove all asymmetric valuations from the original preferences.

We also consider the notion of *utility* based on agents’ valuations of their partners in a given matching. This leads us to the notion of *utilitarian welfare* [4,11] which is the sum of the utilities of all agents in a given matching. We consider the problem of finding a stable matching with maximum utilitarian welfare given an instance in which valuations are binary and symmetric. We prove that this optimisation problem is NP-hard and provide a novel 2-approximation algorithm (Section 4.5).

We continue in the next section (Section 2) with some preliminary definitions and results.

2 Preliminary definitions and results

Let $N = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{|N|}\}$ be a set of *agents*. A *triple* is an unordered set of three agents. A *matching* M comprises a set of pairwise disjoint triples. For any agent α_i , if some triple in M contains α_i then we say that α_i is *matched* and use $M(\alpha_i)$ to refer to that triple. If no triple in M contains α_i then we say that α_i is *unmatched* and write $M(\alpha_i) = \emptyset$. Given a matching M and two distinct agents α_i, α_j , if $M(\alpha_i) = M(\alpha_j)$ then we say that α_j is a *partner* of α_i .

We define *additively separable preferences* as follows. Each agent α_i supplies a *valuation function* $val_{\alpha_i} : N \setminus \{\alpha_i\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. Given agent α_i , let the *utility* of any set $S \subseteq N$ be $u_{\alpha_i}(S) = \sum_{\alpha_j \in S \setminus \{\alpha_i\}} val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_j)$. We say that $\alpha_i \in N$ prefers

some triple t_1 to another triple t_2 if $u_{\alpha_i}(t_1) > u_{\alpha_i}(t_2)$. An agent’s preference between two distinct matchings depends only on that agent’s partners in each matching, so given a matching M we write $u_{\alpha_i}(M)$ as shorthand for $u_{\alpha_i}(M(\alpha_i))$. Let $V = \bigcup_{\alpha_i \in N} val_{\alpha_i}$ be the collection of all valuation functions.

Suppose we have some pair (N, V) and a matching M involving the agents in N . We say that a triple $\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}, \alpha_{k_3}\}$ *blocks* M in (N, V) if $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{\alpha_{k_2}, \alpha_{k_3}\}) > u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M)$, $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_3}\}) > u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M)$, and $u_{\alpha_{k_3}}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) > u_{\alpha_{k_3}}(M)$. If no triple in N blocks M in (N, V) then we say that M is *stable* in (N, V) . We say that (N, V) *contains* a stable matching if at least one matching exists in (N, V) that is stable.

We now define the *Three-Dimensional Stable Roommates problem with Additively Separable preferences* (3D-SR-AS). An instance of 3D-SR-AS is given by the pair (N, V) . The problem is to either find a stable matching in (N, V) or report that no stable matching exists. In this paper we consider two different restrictions of this model. The first is when preferences are *binary*, meaning $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_j) \in \{0, 1\}$ for any $\alpha_i, \alpha_j \in N$. The second is when preferences are also *symmetric*, meaning $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_j) = val_{\alpha_j}(\alpha_i)$ for any $\alpha_i, \alpha_j \in N$.

Lemma 1 illustrates a fundamental property of matchings in instances of 3D-SR-AS. We shall use it extensively in the proofs.

Lemma 1. *Given an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-AS, suppose that M and M' are matchings in (N, V) . Any triple that blocks M' but does not block M contains at least one agent $\alpha_i \in N$ where $u_{\alpha_i}(M') < u_{\alpha_i}(M)$.*

Proof. Suppose that the triple $\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}, \alpha_{k_3}\}$ blocks M' . It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{\alpha_{k_2}, \alpha_{k_3}\}) > u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M')$, $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_3}\}) > u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M')$, and $u_{\alpha_{k_3}}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) > u_{\alpha_{k_3}}(M')$. Suppose for a contradiction that no $\alpha_p \in \{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}, \alpha_{k_3}\}$ exists where $u_{\alpha_p}(M') < u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ and hence $u_{\alpha_{k_r}}(M') \geq u_{\alpha_{k_r}}(M)$ for $1 \leq r \leq 3$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{\alpha_{k_2}, \alpha_{k_3}\}) > u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M)$, $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_3}\}) > u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M)$, and $u_{\alpha_{k_3}}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) > u_{\alpha_{k_3}}(M)$ and thus that $\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}, \alpha_{k_3}\}$ blocks M , a contradiction. \square

We also make an observation that unmatched agents may be arbitrarily matched if required. The proof follows from Lemma 1.

Proposition 1. *Suppose we are given an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-AS. Suppose $|N| = 3k + l$ where $k \geq 0$ and $0 \leq l < 3$. If a stable matching M exists in (N, V) then without loss of generality we may assume that $|M| = k$.*

Finally, some notes on notation: in this paper, we use $L = \langle \dots \rangle$ to construct an ordered list of elements L . If L and L' are lists then we write $L \cdot L'$ meaning the concatenation of L' to the end of L . We also write L_i to mean the i^{th} element of list L , starting from $i = 1$, and $e \in L$ to describe membership of an element e in L . When working with sets of sets, we write $\bigcup S$ to mean $\bigcup_{T \in S} T$.

3 General binary preferences

Let 3D-SR-AS-BIN be the restriction of 3D-SR-AS in which preferences are binary but need not be symmetric. In this section we establish the NP-completeness of deciding whether a stable matching exists, given an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-AS-BIN.

Given an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-AS-BIN and a matching M , it is straightforward to test in $O(|N|^3)$ time if M is stable in (N, V) . This shows that the decision version of 3D-SR-AS-BIN belongs to the class NP.

We present a polynomial-time reduction from Partition Into Triangles (PIT), which is the following decision problem: “Given a simple undirected graph $G = (W, E)$ where $W = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{3q}\}$ for some integer q , can the vertices of G be partitioned into q disjoint sets $X = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_q\}$, each set containing




Fig. 1. The reduction from PIT to 3D-SR-AS-BIN. Each vertex represents an agent. An arc is present from agent α_i to agent α_j if $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_j) = 1$.

exactly three vertices, such that for each $X_p = \{w_i, w_j, w_k\} \in X$ all three of the edges $\{w_i, w_j\}$, $\{w_i, w_k\}$, and $\{w_j, w_k\}$ belong to E ?" PIT is NP-complete [16].

The reduction from PIT to 3D-SR-AS-BIN is as follows (see Figure 1). Unless otherwise specified assume that $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_j) = 0$ for any $\alpha_i, \alpha_j \in N$. For each vertex $w_i \in W$ create agents a_i^1, a_i^2, b_i in N . Then set:

- $val_{a_i^1}(a_i^2) = val_{a_i^1}(b_i) = 1$
- $val_{a_i^2}(a_i^1) = val_{a_i^2}(b_i) = 1$
- $val_{b_i}(a_i^1) = val_{b_i}(a_i^2) = 1$ and $val_{b_i}(b_j) = 1$ if $\{v_i, v_j\} \in E$.

Next, for each r where $1 \leq r \leq 6q$ create $p_r^1, p_r^2, p_r^3, p_r^4, p_r^5$ in N . Then set:

- $val_{p_r^1}(p_r^2) = val_{p_r^1}(p_r^3) = val_{p_r^1}(p_r^5) = 1$
- $val_{p_r^2}(p_r^3) = val_{p_r^2}(p_r^4) = val_{p_r^2}(p_r^1) = 1$
- $val_{p_r^3}(p_r^4) = val_{p_r^3}(p_r^5) = val_{p_r^3}(p_r^2) = 1$
- $val_{p_r^4}(p_r^5) = val_{p_r^4}(p_r^1) = val_{p_r^4}(p_r^3) = 1$
- $val_{p_r^5}(p_r^1) = val_{p_r^5}(p_r^2) = val_{p_r^5}(p_r^4) = 1$.

We shall refer to $\{p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5\}$ as the r^{th} *pentagadget*. Note that $|N| = 39q$.

It is straightforward to show that the reduction runs in polynomial time. To prove that the reduction is valid we show that a partition into triangles $X = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_q\}$ exists in G if and only if a stable matching M exists in (N, V) . In Section 3.1 we consider the first direction and show that if a partition into triangles $X = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_q\}$ exists in G then a stable matching M exists in (N, V) . In Section 3.2 we consider the second direction and show that if a stable matching M exists in (N, V) then a partition into triangles $X = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_q\}$ exists in G . Note that the only instance discussed is (N, V) and hence we shorten “blocks M in (N, V) ” to simply “blocks M ”.

3.1 Correctness of the reduction: first direction

Lemma 2. *In the reduction, if a partition into triangles $X = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_q\}$ exists in G , then a stable matching exists in (N, V) .*

Proof. Suppose a partition into triangles $X = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_q\}$ exists in G . We will construct a matching M that is stable in (N, V) . For each triangle $X_p = \{w_i, w_j, w_k\} \in W$, add $\{b_i, b_j, b_k\}$ to M . For each pentagadget with index r where $1 \leq r \leq 6q$, add $\{p_r^1, p_r^2, p_r^3\}$ to M . This leaves agents a_i^1 and a_i^2 for each $1 \leq i \leq 3q$ and agents p_r^4 and p_r^5 for each $0 \leq r \leq 6q$. For each $1 \leq i \leq 3q$, add to M the triples $\{a_i^1, p_{2i}^4, p_{2i}^5\}, \{a_i^2, p_{2i-1}^4, p_{2i-1}^5\}$. Now, in M :

- For any pentagadget index $1 \leq r \leq 6q$:
 - $u_{p_r^1}(M) = u_{p_r^2}(M) = 2$, so neither p_r^1 nor p_r^2 belong to triples that block M .
 - $u_{p_r^5}(M) = 1$, so if $u_{p_r^5}$ belongs to a triple that blocks M then that triple must contain two agents α_k, α_l where $u_{p_r^5}(\{\alpha_k, \alpha_l\}) = 2$ and hence $val_{p_r^5}(\alpha_k) = val_{p_r^5}(\alpha_l) = 1$. Considering $val_{p_r^5}$, the only such agents are p_r^1, p_r^4, p_r^2 . From above, neither p_r^1 nor p_r^2 belong to triples that block M . It follows that no such α_k, α_l exist and hence p_r^5 does not belong to a triple that blocks M .
 - $u_{p_r^4}(M) = 1$, so if $u_{p_r^4}$ belongs to a triple that blocks M then that triple must contain two agents α_k, α_l where $u_{p_r^4}(\{\alpha_k, \alpha_l\}) = 2$ and hence $val_{p_r^4}(\alpha_k) = val_{p_r^4}(\alpha_l) = 1$. Considering $val_{p_r^4}$, the only such agents are p_r^3, p_r^5, p_r^1 . From above, neither p_r^1 nor p_r^5 belong to triples that block M . It follows that no two such α_k, α_l exist and hence p_r^4 also does not belong to a triple that blocks M .
 - $u_{p_r^3}(M) = 1$, so if $u_{p_r^3}$ belongs to a triple that blocks M then that triple must contain two agents α_k, α_l where $u_{p_r^3}(\{\alpha_k, \alpha_l\}) = 2$. Considering $val_{p_r^3}$, the only such agents are p_r^2, p_r^4, p_r^5 . From above, these agents do not belong to triples that block M , so no such α_k, α_l exist and hence p_r^3 also does not belong to a triple that blocks M .
- $u_{b_i}(M) = 2$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 3q$, so b_i also does not belong to a triple that blocks M .

We have shown above that no pentagadget agent belongs to a triple that blocks M and no b_i for any $1 \leq i \leq 3q$ belongs to a triple that blocks M . The remaining possibility is that a blocking triple exists that contains three agents $\{a_i^{s_1}, a_j^{s_2}, a_k^{s_3}\}$ for some $1 \leq i, j, k \leq 3q$ and $s_1, s_2, s_3 \in \{1, 2\}$. Since $a_i^{s_1}$ prefers this blocking triple to $M(a_i^{s_1})$, it must be that either $val_{a_i^{s_1}}(a_j^{s_2}) = 1$ or $val_{a_i^{s_1}}(a_k^{s_3}) = 1$, or both. For any $a_i^{s_1}$ where $s_1 \in \{1, 2\}$, the only agent for which $val_{a_i^{s_1}} = 1$ is $a_i^{3-s_1}$. Assume then, without loss of generality, that the blocking triple contains $\{a_i^1, a_i^2, a_k^{s_4}\}$ for some $1 \leq i, k \leq 3q$ where $i \neq k$ and some $s_4 \in \{1, 2\}$. Note that $i \neq k$ because $s_4 \in \{1, 2\}$. This leads to a contradiction, since $a_k^{s_4}$ must

prefer this triple to $M(a_k^{s_4})$, but $u_{a_k^{s_4}}(\{a_i^1, a_i^2\}) = 0$ for any $1 \leq k \leq 3q$ and any $s_4 \in \{1, 2\}$. \square

3.2 Correctness of the reduction: second direction

In this section we assume that M is a stable matching in (N, V) where $|M| = |N|/3$ (by Proposition 1). We analyse its structure and construct a corresponding partition into triangles in G .

Lemma 3. *For any r where $1 \leq r \leq 6q$, the pentagadget agents $p_r^1, p_r^2, p_r^3, p_r^4, p_r^5$ belong to exactly two triples.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that agents p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5 belong to four or five triples in M . It must be that three of these agents, say $p_r^{s_1}, p_r^{s_2}$, and $p_r^{s_3}$, belong to triples in M each containing no other agents from the r^{th} pentagadget. It follows that $u_{p_r^{s_1}}(M) = u_{p_r^{s_2}}(M) = u_{p_r^{s_3}}(M) = 0$. Each agent in the r^{th} pentagadget assigns a valuation of one to exactly three other agents in the same pentagadget. It follows that either $\text{val}_{p_r^{s_1}}(p_r^{s_2}) = 1$ or $\text{val}_{p_r^{s_1}}(p_r^{s_3}) = 1$, or both. It then follows that $u_{p_r^{s_1}}(\{p_r^{s_2}, p_r^{s_3}\}) \geq 1$. A symmetric argument shows that $u_{p_r^{s_2}}(\{p_r^{s_1}, p_r^{s_3}\}) \geq 1$ and $u_{p_r^{s_3}}(\{p_r^{s_1}, p_r^{s_2}\}) \geq 1$. The triple $\{p_r^{s_1}, p_r^{s_2}, p_r^{s_3}\}$ therefore blocks M , which is a contradiction.

Suppose then that the agents p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5 belong to three triples in M . Since there are five agents in p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5 , there are two possibilities:

- Two of the triples each contain exactly two agents in $\{p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5\}$ and the third triple contains exactly one agent in $\{p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5\}$. Due to the symmetry of the pentagadget, assume without loss of generality that p_r^1 is the sole agent from p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5 that belongs to the third triple. It follows that $u_{p_r^1}(M) = 0$. The four agents $\{p_r^2, \dots, p_r^5\}$ each have at most one partner in $\{p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5\}$ in M . It follows that the utility in M of each of these four agents is at most one. It follows that $\{p_r^1, p_r^4, p_r^5\}$ blocks M , since $u_{p_r^4}(\{p_r^5, p_r^1\}) = u_{p_r^5}(\{p_r^1, p_r^4\}) = 2$ and $u_{p_r^1}(\{p_r^4, p_r^5\}) = 1$. This is a contradiction.
- Two of the triples each contain exactly one agent in $\{p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5\}$ and the third triple contains exactly three agents in $\{p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5\}$. Suppose $p_r^{s_1}$ and $p_r^{s_2}$ are the two agents in the former two triples such that $s_1 \bmod 5 < s_2$. It follows that $u_{p_r^{s_1}}(M) = u_{p_r^{s_2}}(M) = 0$. Since there are five agents in $\{p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5\}$, there are two further possible cases:
 - Suppose $s_2 = (s_1 \bmod 5) + 1$. By the symmetry of the pentagadget, assume without loss of generality that $s_1 = 1$ and $s_2 = 2$. It follows that $\{p_r^3, p_r^4, p_r^5\} \in M$. Note that $u_{p_r^5}(M) = 1$. The triple $\{p_r^5, p_r^1, p_r^2\}$ blocks M since $u_{p_r^5}(\{p_r^1, p_r^2\}) = u_{p_r^1}(\{p_r^2, p_r^5\}) = 2$ and $u_{p_r^2}(\{p_r^1, p_r^5\}) = 1$. This is a contradiction.
 - Suppose $s_2 = ((s_1 + 1) \bmod 5) + 1$. By the symmetry of the pentagadget, assume without loss of generality that $s_1 = 1$ and $s_2 = 3$. It follows that $\{p_r^2, p_r^4, p_r^5\} \in M$. Note that $u_{p_r^2}(M) = 1$. The triple $\{p_r^1, p_r^2, p_r^3\}$ blocks M since $u_{p_r^1}(\{p_r^2, p_r^3\}) = u_{p_r^2}(\{p_r^1, p_r^3\}) = 2$ and $u_{p_r^3}(\{p_r^1, p_r^2\}) = 1$. This is also a contradiction.

In summary, we have shown that the five agents p_r^1, \dots, p_r^5 do not belong to three, four, or five different triples in M . It follows that these five agents belong to exactly two triples in M . \square

Lemma 4. *For any $1 \leq i \leq 3q$ and any $s \in \{1, 2\}$, $u_{a_i^s}(M) = 0$.*

Proof. Consider an arbitrary pentagadget index $1 \leq r_1 \leq 6q$.

By Lemma 3, the five agents $p_{r_1}^1, \dots, p_{r_1}^5$ belong to exactly two triples in M . It follows that one of these two triples contains exactly three agents in $\{p_{r_1}^1, \dots, p_{r_1}^5\}$ and the other triple contains the two remaining agents in $\{p_{r_1}^1, \dots, p_{r_1}^5\}$ as well as some third agent, say α_h . Note that $u_{\alpha_h}(M) = 0$.

Suppose $\alpha_h = p_{r_2}^t$ for some $1 \leq r_2 \leq 6q$ and some $1 \leq t \leq 5$. It follows that $r_1 \neq r_2$. Since the triple $M(p_{r_2}^t)$ contains $p_{r_2}^t$ and two agents in $\{p_{r_1}^1, \dots, p_{r_1}^5\}$, it follows that the four agents in $\{p_{r_2}^1, \dots, p_{r_2}^5\} \setminus \{p_{r_2}^t\}$ belong to at least two triples in M . In total, the five agents $p_{r_2}^1, \dots, p_{r_2}^5$ belong to three or more triples, which contradicts Lemma 3. It follows that $\alpha_h \neq p_{r_2}^t$ for any $1 \leq r_2 \leq 6q$ and any $1 \leq t \leq 5$.

Suppose then that $\alpha_h = b_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq 3q$. Consider a_j^1 and a_j^2 and their respective valuation functions. Since $a_j^1 \notin M(b_j)$ and $a_j^2 \notin M(b_j)$, it follows that $u_{a_j^1}(M) \leq 1$ and $u_{a_j^2}(M) \leq 1$. Recalling that $u_{\alpha_h}(M) = u_{b_j}(M) = 0$, it follows that $\{b_j, a_j^1, a_j^2\}$ blocks M , since $u_{b_j}(\{a_j^1, a_j^2\}) = u_{a_j^1}(\{b_j, a_j^2\}) = u_{a_j^2}(\{b_j, a_j^1\}) = 2$. This is a contradiction. It follows that $\alpha_h \neq b_j$ for any $1 \leq j \leq 3q$.

It remains that $\alpha_h = a_i^s$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 3q$ and some $s \in \{1, 2\}$. The initial selection of r_1 is arbitrary, and each $1 \leq r_1 \leq 6q$ identifies a unique pentagadget $\{p_{r_1}^1, \dots, p_{r_1}^5\}$ and therefore a unique agent α_h . There are therefore $6q$ unique agents $\alpha_h = a_i^s$ where $u_{a_i^s}(M) = 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 3q$ and some $s \in \{1, 2\}$. This shows that $u_{a_i^s}(M) = 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq 3q$ and every $s \in \{1, 2\}$. \square

Lemma 5. *$u_{b_i}(M) = 2$ for any $1 \leq i \leq 3q$.*

Proof. Suppose not and there exists some $1 \leq i \leq 3q$ such that $u_{b_i}(M) < 2$. Lemma 4 shows that $u_{a_i^1}(M) = u_{a_i^2}(M) = 0$. Considering the valuation functions of a_i^1 , a_i^2 , and b_i , it can be seen that $u_{b_i}(\{a_i^1, a_i^2\}) = u_{a_i^1}(\{b_i, a_i^2\}) = u_{a_i^2}(\{b_i, a_i^1\}) = 2$. It follows that $\{b_i, a_i^1, a_i^2\}$ blocks M , which is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 6. *For any b_i where $1 \leq i \leq 3q$, the triple $M(b_i)$ comprises $\{b_i, b_j, b_k\}$ for some $1 \leq j, k \leq 3q$ where $\{w_i, w_j\}, \{w_j, w_k\} \in E$.*

Proof. Lemma 5 shows that $u_{b_i}(M) = 2$. Suppose $M(b_i) = \{b_i, \alpha_k, \alpha_l\}$ for some $\alpha_k, \alpha_l \in N$. Since $u_{b_i}(M) = 2$, It must be that $val_{b_i}(\alpha_k) = 1$ and hence either $\alpha_k = a_i^s$ for some $s \in \{1, 2\}$ or $\alpha_k = b_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq 3q$ where $\{w_i, w_j\} \in E$.

Suppose first that $\alpha_k = a_i^s$ for some $s \in \{1, 2\}$. Since $val_{a_i^s}(b_i) = 1$, it follows that $u_{a_i^s}(M) \geq 1$, which contradicts Lemma 4. It follows that $\alpha_k = b_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq 3q$ where $\{w_i, w_j\} \in E$. Similarly, it can be shown that $\alpha_l = b_k$ for some $1 \leq k \leq 3q$ where $\{w_i, w_j\} \in E$. It follows that $M(b_i) = \{b_i, b_j, b_k\}$ for some $1 \leq j, k \leq 3q$ where $\{w_i, w_j\}, \{w_j, w_k\} \in E$. \square

Lemma 7. *A partition into triangles exists in G .*

Proof. Lemma 6 shows that for an arbitrary b_i where $1 \leq i \leq 3q$, $M(b_i)$ comprises $\{b_i, b_j, b_k\}$ for some $1 \leq j, k \leq 3q$ where $\{w_i, w_j\} \in E$ and $\{w_i, w_k\} \in E$. It follows that there are exactly q triples in M each containing three agents $\{b_i, b_j, b_k\}$, where the three corresponding vertices w_i, w_j, w_k are pairwise adjacent in G . From these triples of pairwise adjacent vertices, a partition into triangles X can be easily constructed. \square

3.3 Conclusion

Theorem 1. *Given an instance of 3D-SR-AS-BIN, the problem of deciding whether a stable matching exists is NP-complete. The result holds even if each agent must be matched.*

Proof. We have already shown that the decision version of 3D-SR-AS-BIN belongs to NP. We presented a polynomial time reduction from Partition Into Triangles (PIT) to 3D-SR-AS-BIN. If a partition into triangles exists in the PIT instance $G = (W, E)$ then a stable matching M exists in (N, V) where $|M| = |N|/3$ (Lemma 2). If a stable matching M exists in (N, V) where $|M| = |N|/3$ then a partition into triangles exists in G (Lemma 7). \square

4 Symmetric binary preferences

Consider the restriction of 3D-SR-AS in which preferences are binary and symmetric, which we call *3D-SR-SAS-BIN*. In this section we show that every instance of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN admits a stable matching. We give a step-by-step constructive proof of this result between Sections 4.1 – 4.4, leading to an $O(|N|^3)$ algorithm for finding a stable matching. In Section 4.5 we consider an optimisation problem related to 3D-SR-SAS-BIN.

4.1 Preliminaries

An instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN corresponds to a simple undirected graph $G = (N, E)$ where $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_j\} \in E$ if $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_j) = 1$, which we refer to as the *underlying graph*.

We introduce a restricted type of matching called a *P-matching*. Recall that by definition, $M(\alpha_p) = \emptyset$ implies that $u_{\alpha_p}(M) = 0$ for any $\alpha_p \in N$ in an arbitrary matching M . We say that a matching M in (N, V) is a *P-matching* if $M(\alpha_p) \neq \emptyset$ implies $u_{\alpha_p}(M) > 0$.

It follows that a *P-matching* corresponds to a $\{K_3, P_3\}$ -packing in the underlying graph [22]. Note that any triple in a *P-matching* M must contain some agent with utility two. A *stable P-matching* is a *P-matching* that is also stable.

We will eventually show that any instance of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN contains a stable P -matching.

In an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN, a *triangle* comprises three agents $\alpha_{m_1}, \alpha_{m_2}, \alpha_{m_3}$ such that $val_{\alpha_{m_1}}(\alpha_{m_2}) = val_{\alpha_{m_2}}(\alpha_{m_3}) = val_{\alpha_{m_3}}(\alpha_{m_1}) = 1$. If (N, V) contains no triangle then we say it is *triangle-free*. If (N, V) is not triangle-free then it can be reduced by successively removing three agents that belong to a triangle until it is triangle-free. This operation corresponds to removing a *maximal triangle packing* (see [12,22]) in the underlying graph and can be performed in $O(|N|^3)$ time. The resulting instance is triangle-free. We summarise this observation in the following lemma.

Lemma 8. *Given an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN, we can identify an instance (N', V') of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN and a set of triples M_Δ in $O(|N|^3)$ time such that (N', V') is triangle-free, $|N'| \leq |N|$, and if M is a stable P -matching in (N', V') then $M' = M \cup M_\Delta$ is a stable P -matching in (N, V) .*

Proof. The set M_Δ corresponds to a *maximal triangle packing* in the underlying graph [12], and thus can be found in $O(|N|^3)$ time. Let $N' = N \setminus \bigcup M_\Delta$. Construct V' accordingly. Since each triple in M_Δ corresponds to a triangle, any agent belonging to a triple in M_Δ gains utility two. It follows that if M is a stable P -matching in (N', V') then $M' = M \cup M_\Delta$ is a stable P -matching in (N, V) . \square

4.2 Repairing a P -matching in a triangle-free instance

In this section we consider an arbitrary triangle-free instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN. Since the only instance referred to in this section is (N, V) so here we shorten “is stable in (N, V) ” to “is stable”, or similar.

We first define a special type of P -matching which is ‘repairable’. We then present Algorithm **repair** (Algorithm 1), which, given (N, V) and a ‘repairable’ P -matching M , constructs a new P -matching M' that is stable. We shall see in the next section how this relates to a more general algorithm that, given a triangle-free instance, constructs a P -matching that is stable in that instance.

Given a triangle-free instance (N, V) , we say a P -matching M is *repairable* if it is not stable and there exists exactly one $\alpha_i \in N$ where $u_{\alpha_i}(M) = 0$ and any triple that blocks M comprises $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\}$ for some $\alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2} \in N$ where $u_{\alpha_{j_1}}(M) = 1$, $u_{\alpha_{j_2}}(M) = 0$, and $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{j_1}) = val_{\alpha_{j_1}}(\alpha_{j_2}) = 1$.

We now provide some intuition behind Algorithm **repair** and refer the reader to Figure 2. Recall that the overall goal of the algorithm is to construct a stable P -matching M' . Since the given P -matching M is repairable, our aim will be to modify M such that $u_{\alpha_i}(M') \geq 1$ while ensuring that no three agents that are ordered to different triples in M' block M' . The stability of the constructed P -matching M' then follows. We note that one way to achieve this aim would be to construct M' such that $u_{\alpha_i}(M') \geq 1$ and $u_{\alpha_p}(M') \geq u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$, from which it follows that M' is stable.




Fig. 2. Players and triples in M before a new iteration of the **while** loop

The algorithm begins by selecting some triple $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\}$ that blocks M . The two agents in $M(\alpha_{j_1}) \setminus \{\alpha_{j_1}\}$ are labelled α_{j_3} and α_{j_4} . We present two example cases in which it is possible to construct a stable P -matching.

First, suppose there exists some α_{z_1} where $val_{\alpha_{j_3}}(\alpha_{z_1}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_1}}(M) = 0$. Construct M' from M by removing $\{\alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}, \alpha_{j_3}\}$ and adding $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\}$ and $\{\alpha_{j_3}, \alpha_{j_4}, \alpha_{z_1}\}$. Now, $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_p}(M') \geq u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$. It follows by Lemma 1 that M' is stable. Second, suppose there exists no such α_{z_1} but there exists some α_{z_2} where $val_{\alpha_{j_4}}(\alpha_{z_2}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_2}}(M) = 0$. Now construct M' from M by removing $\{\alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}, \alpha_{j_3}\}$ and adding $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\}$ and $\{\alpha_{j_3}, \alpha_{j_4}, \alpha_{z_2}\}$. Note that $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_p}(M') \geq u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_3}\}$. It can be shown that α_{j_3} does not belong to a triple that blocks M' since no α_{z_1} exists as described. It follows again by Lemma 1 that M' is stable.

Generalising these two example cases, the algorithm constructs a list S of agents, which initially comprises $\langle \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_3}, \alpha_{j_4} \rangle$. The list S has length $3c$ for some $c \geq 1$, where $\{S_{3c-2}, S_{3c-1}, S_{3c}\} \in M$ and $val_{S_p}(S_{p+1}) = 1$ for each p ($1 \leq p < 3c$). The list S therefore corresponds to a path in the underlying graph. In each iteration of the main loop, three agents belonging to some triple in M are appended to the end of S . The loop continues until S satisfies at least one of six specific conditions (shown in the first **if/else** statement). We show that eventually at least one of these conditions must hold. The algorithm then constructs M' . The exact construction of M' depends on which condition(s) caused the main loop to terminate. Two of these conditions, and the corresponding constructions of M' , generalise the existence of α_{z_1} and α_{z_2} as described in the example cases.

The six stopping conditions correspond to seven different cases, labelled Case 1 – Case 7, in which M' is constructed. Each condition corresponds to a single construction except the first condition, which corresponds to two constructions (Case 1 and Case 3). Cases 1 and 3 generalise the first example case, described above, in which some α_{z_1} exists. Case 2 generalises the second example case described above, in which no such α_{z_1} exists but some α_{z_2} exists as described. Cases 4 – 7 correspond to similar scenarios. Like the two example cases, in each

of Cases 1 – 6 the algorithm identifies a number of agents divisible by three, and in each of these cases no agent identified by the algorithm, including α_i , is unmatched in M' . This fact greatly simplifies the proof that M' is stable in each of Cases 1 – 6. Case 7 is unique, since the number of agents identified is not divisible by three. In Case 7, the final agent in the list S , labelled S_{3c} , for which $u_{S_{3c}}(M) = 1$, is unmatched in M' . To show that this agent does not belong to a triple that blocks M' we rely on the fact that no condition relating to previous cases held in any previous iteration of the main loop. In this way, the six stopping conditions and seven corresponding constructions of M' are somewhat hierarchical. For another example, the proof that M' is stable in Case 4 relies on the fact that in no iteration did the condition for Cases 1 and 3 hold. A similar reliance exists in the proofs of each of the other cases. This dependence between

Algorithm 1 Algorithm repair

Input: a triangle-free instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN, repairable P -matching M in (N, V) (Section 4.2) with some such $\alpha_i \in N$.

Output: stable P -matching M' in (N, V)

```

 $\{\alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\} \leftarrow$  some  $\alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2} \in N$  where  $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\}$  blocks  $M$  and  $u_{\alpha_{j_1}}(M) = 1$ 
 $\{\alpha_{j_3}, \alpha_{j_4}\} \leftarrow M(\alpha_{j_1}) \setminus \{\alpha_{j_1}\}$  where  $u_{\alpha_{j_3}}(M) = 2$ 
 $S \leftarrow \langle \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_3}, \alpha_{j_4} \rangle$ 
 $c \leftarrow 1$ 
 $b \leftarrow 0$ 
 $\alpha_{z_1}, \alpha_{z_2}, \alpha_{y_1}, \alpha_{y_2}, \alpha_{w_1} \leftarrow \perp$ 
while true
     $\alpha_{z_1} \leftarrow$  some  $\alpha_{z_1} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$  where  $val_{\alpha_{z_1}}(S_{3c-1}) = 1$  and  $u_{\alpha_{z_1}}(M) = 0$ , else  $\perp$ 
     $\alpha_{z_2} \leftarrow$  some  $\alpha_{z_2} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$  where  $val_{\alpha_{z_2}}(S_{3c}) = 1$  and  $u_{\alpha_{z_2}}(M) = 0$ , else  $\perp$ 
     $\alpha_{y_1} \leftarrow$  some  $\alpha_{y_1} \in N$  where  $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_i) = val_{\alpha_{y_1}}(\alpha_i) = 1$  and  $u_{\alpha_{y_1}}(M) = 0$ , else  $\perp$ 
     $\alpha_{y_2} \leftarrow$  some  $\alpha_{y_2} \in N$  where  $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{j_2}) = val_{\alpha_{y_2}}(\alpha_{j_2}) = 1$  and  $u_{\alpha_{y_2}}(M) = 0$ , else  $\perp$ 
     $b \leftarrow$  some  $1 \leq b < c$  where  $val_{S_{3b}}(\alpha_{j_2}) = val_{S_{3c}}(S_{3b}) = 1$ , else 0
     $\alpha_{w_1} \leftarrow$  some  $\alpha_{w_1} \in N$  where  $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{w_1}) = 1$ ,  $u_{\alpha_{w_1}}(M) = 1$  and  $\alpha_{w_1} \notin S$ 
        and there exists some  $\alpha_{z_3} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$  where  $val_{\alpha_{w_1}}(\alpha_{z_3}) = 1$  and  $u_{\alpha_{z_3}}(M) = 0$ ,
        else  $\perp$ 
    if  $\alpha_{z_1} \neq \perp$  or  $\alpha_{z_2} \neq \perp$  or  $\alpha_{y_1} \neq \perp$  or  $\alpha_{y_2} \neq \perp$  or  $b > 0$  or  $\alpha_{w_1} = \perp$  then
        break
    else
         $\{\alpha_{w_2}, \alpha_{w_3}\} \leftarrow M(\alpha_{w_1}) \setminus \{\alpha_{w_1}\}$  where  $u_{\alpha_{w_2}}(M) = 2$ 
         $S \leftarrow S \cdot \langle \alpha_{w_1}, \alpha_{w_2}, \alpha_{w_3} \rangle$ 
         $c \leftarrow c + 1$ 
    end if
end while
    
```

continued overleaf

Algorithm 1 Algorithm repair

continued from previous page

```

if  $\alpha_{z_1} \neq \perp$  and  $\alpha_{z_1} \neq \alpha_{j_2}$  then
  ▷ Case 1
   $M_S \leftarrow \{\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\}\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq d < c} \{\{S_{3d-1}, S_{3d}, S_{3d+1}\}\} \cup \{\{\alpha_{z_1}, S_{3c-1}, S_{3c}\}\}$ 

else if  $\alpha_{z_2} \neq \perp$  then
  ▷ Case 2
   $M_S \leftarrow \{\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\}\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq d < c} \{\{S_{3d-1}, S_{3d}, S_{3d+1}\}\} \cup \{\{S_{3c-1}, S_{3c}, \alpha_{z_2}\}\}$ 

else if  $\alpha_{z_1} \neq \perp$  and  $\alpha_{z_1} = \alpha_{j_2}$  then
  ▷ Case 3
   $\alpha_{z_4} \leftarrow \text{some } \alpha_{z_4} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\} \text{ where } \text{val}_{S_{3c-2}}(\alpha_{z_4}) = 1 \text{ and } u_{\alpha_{z_4}}(M) = 0$ 
   $M_S \leftarrow \{\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_3}\}\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq d < c-1} \{\{S_{3d}, S_{3d+1}, S_{3d+2}\}\} \cup \{\{S_{3c-3}, S_{3c-2}, \alpha_{z_4}\}\}$ 
   $\quad \cup \{\{S_{3c-1}, S_{3c}, \alpha_{j_2}\}\}$ 

else if  $\alpha_{y_1} \neq \perp$  then
  ▷ Case 4
   $M_S \leftarrow \{\{\alpha_{j_2}, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_3}\}\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq d < c} \{\{S_{3d}, S_{3d+1}, S_{3d+2}\}\} \cup \{\{S_{3c}, \alpha_i, \alpha_{y_1}\}\}$ 

else if  $\alpha_{y_2} \neq \perp$  then
  ▷ Case 5
   $M_S \leftarrow \{\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_3}\}\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq d < c} \{\{S_{3d}, S_{3d+1}, S_{3d+2}\}\} \cup \{\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{j_2}, \alpha_{y_2}\}\}$ 

else if  $b > 0$  then
  ▷ Case 6
   $\alpha_{z_5} \leftarrow \text{some } \alpha_{z_5} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\} \text{ where } \text{val}_{S_{3b+1}}(\alpha_{z_5}) = 1 \text{ and } u_{\alpha_{z_5}}(M) = 0$ 
   $M_S \leftarrow \{\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_3}\}\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq d < b} \{\{S_{3d}, S_{3d+1}, S_{3d+2}\}\} \cup \{\{\alpha_{z_4}, S_{3b+1}, S_{3b+2}\}\}$ 
   $\quad \cup \bigcup_{b+1 \leq d < c} \{\{S_{3d}, S_{3d+1}, S_{3d+2}\}\} \cup \{\{S_{3c}, S_{3b}, \alpha_{j_2}\}\}$ 

else
  ▷ Case 7. Note that  $\alpha_{w_1} = \perp$ .
   $M_S \leftarrow \{\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_3}\}\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq d < c} \{\{S_{3d}, S_{3d+1}, S_{3d+2}\}\}$ 

end if
return  $M' = M_S \cup \{r \in M \mid r \cap S = \emptyset\}$ 

```

the cases, which is evident in the overall proof, helps show why all seven cases are required in this algorithm.

Algorithm **repair** is presented in Algorithm 1 in two parts. The first part involves the construction of S and exploration of the instance. The second part involves the construction of M' . In order to establish the correctness and complexity of this algorithm we use a number of lemmas. The following lemma shows that the **while** loop in Algorithm **repair** eventually terminates.

Lemma 9. *The while loop in Algorithm repair terminates after at most $\lfloor (|N| - 2) / 3 \rfloor$ iterations.*

Proof. Any three agents $\{\alpha_{w_1}, \alpha_{w_2}, \alpha_{w_3}\}$ added to S in a single iteration comprise a triple in M . Just before the addition of $\langle \alpha_{w_1}, \alpha_{w_2}, \alpha_{w_3} \rangle$ to S , we know that $\alpha_{w_1} \notin S$. It follows that $\alpha_{w_2}, \alpha_{w_3} \notin S$, so in general S contains any agent at most once. Since $\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2} \notin S$ it follows that $|S| \leq |N| - 2$ and thus the algorithm terminates after at most $\lfloor (|N| - 2) / 3 \rfloor$ iterations of the while loop. \square

In Case 3, the algorithm identifies some agent α_{z_4} in $N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$ such that $val_{S_{3c-1}}(\alpha_{z_4}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_4}}(M) = 0$. Proposition 2 shows that such an agent is guaranteed to exist.




Fig. 3. The structure of M' in Case 3

Proposition 2. *In Case 3 of Algorithm repair, some agent α_{z_4} in $N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$ exists where $val_{S_{3c-2}}(\alpha_{z_4}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_4}}(M) = 0$.*

Proof. Refer to Figure 3. We claim that the condition of Case 3 implies that $c \geq 1$. Suppose for a contradiction that $c = 1$. The condition shows that $\alpha_{z_1} = \alpha_{j_2}$ exists where $val_{\alpha_{z_1}}(S_{3c-1}) = 1$. Since $S_{3c-1} = \alpha_{j_3}$, the triple $\{\alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}, \alpha_{j_3}\}$ contradicts the fact that (N, V) is triangle-free.

Since $c > 1$ it follows that $c' = c - 1$ is the value of c in the second last iteration of the while loop. Consider the second last iteration of the while loop. In this iteration $\alpha_{w_1} = S_{3c-2}$ was identified where $val_{S_{3c'}}(\alpha_{w_1}) = 1$, $\alpha_{w_1} \notin S$ and there existed $\alpha_{z_3} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$ where $val_{\alpha_{w_1}}(\alpha_{z_3}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_3}}(M) = 0$. We refer to the agent labelled α_{z_3} in this iteration as α_{z_4} . It follows that $val_{S_{3c-2}}(\alpha_{z_4}) = 1$.

We claim that $\alpha_{z_4} \neq (\alpha_{z_1} = \alpha_{j_2})$ since otherwise the triple $\{\alpha_{z_4}, S_{3c-1}, S_{3c-2}\}$ contradicts the fact that (N, V) is triangle-free. It follows that $\alpha_{z_4} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$, completing the proof. \square

Likewise in Case 6, the algorithm identifies some agent α_{z_5} in $N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$ exists where $val_{S_{3b+1}}(\alpha_{z_5}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_5}}(M) = 0$. Proposition 3 shows that such an agent is guaranteed to exist.

Proposition 3. *In Case 6 of Algorithm **repair**, some agent α_{z_5} in $N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$ exists where $val_{S_{3b+1}}(\alpha_{z_5}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_5}}(M) = 0$.*

Proof. Refer to Figure 4. It follows from definition of b and the condition of Case 6 that $b < c$.




Fig. 4. The structure of M' in Case 6

Consider the $(b+1)^{\text{th}}$ iteration of the **while** loop. In this iteration $\alpha_{w_1} = S_{3b+1}$ was identified and the three agents in $M(\alpha_{w_1}) = \{S_{3b+1}, S_{3b+2}, S_{3b+3}\}$ were added to the end of S . By definition of α_{w_1} , in that iteration some agent $\alpha_{z_3} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$ was identified where $val_{\alpha_{w_1}}(\alpha_{z_3}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_3}}(M) = 0$. We refer to the agent labelled α_{z_3} in this iteration as α_{z_5} . It follows that $val_{S_{3b+1}}(\alpha_{z_5}) = 1$.

We claim that $\alpha_{z_5} \neq \alpha_{j_2}$ since otherwise the triple $\{S_{3b}, \alpha_{z_5}, S_{3b+1}\}$ contradicts the fact that (N, V) is triangle-free. It follows that $\alpha_{z_5} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$, completing the proof. \square

Lemma 10. *Algorithm **repair** returns a P -matching.*

Proof. By inspection of the construction of M' and Figures 5 – 9. \square

In the remainder of this section we will show that the returned P -matching M' is stable in (N, V) . The construction of M' is slightly different in each of Cases 1 – 7. In Lemmmas 11, 12 and 13 we show in each of the cases that no agent $\alpha_g \in N$ exists where $u_{\alpha_g}(M') < u_{\alpha_g}(M)$ and α_g belongs to a triple that blocks M' . It follows directly that M' is stable (shown in Lemma 14).

Lemma 11. *In Cases 1 and 3 of Algorithm **repair**, no agent $\alpha_g \in N$ exists where $u_{\alpha_g}(M') < u_{\alpha_g}(M)$ and α_g belongs to a triple that blocks M' .*

Proof. Refer to Figures 3 and 5. Suppose for a contradiction that some such $\alpha_g \in N$ exists. By the construction of M' in Cases 1 and 3, $u_{\alpha_p}(M') \geq u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N \setminus S$. It follows that $\alpha_g \in S$ and hence $u_{\alpha_g}(M') \geq 1$. Since $u_{\alpha_g}(M') < u_{\alpha_g}(M)$ it must be that $u_{\alpha_g}(M) = 2$. The only such agents in S are S_{3d-1} for $1 \leq d \leq c$.




Fig. 5. The structure of M' in Case 1

First consider S_{3c-1} . Since $u_{S_{3c-1}}(M') = 2$ it follows that S_{3c-1} does not belong to a triple that blocks M' and hence $\alpha_g \neq S_{3c-1}$. Now consider S_{3d-1} for $1 \leq d < c$. Suppose for a contradiction that triple $\{S_{3d-1}, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' where $\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2} \in N$. Since $u_{S_{3d-1}}(M') = 1$ it follows that $u_{S_{3d-1}}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 2$ and hence that $val_{S_{3d-1}}(\alpha_{k_1}) = val_{S_{3d-1}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$. Consider α_{k_1} and α_{k_2} . Since (N, V) is triangle-free, it must be that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{S_{3d-1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{S_{3d-1}, \alpha_{k_1}\}) = 1$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M') = 0$. By construction of M' , no agent $\alpha_p \in N$ exists where $u_{\alpha_p}(M') = 0$ and $u_{\alpha_p}(M') < u_{\alpha_p}(M)$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$. Recall the d^{th} iteration of the **while** loop. We have shown that two agents $\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}$ exist where $val_{S_{3d-1}}(\alpha_{k_1}) = val_{S_{3d-1}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$. It follows that some $\alpha_{z_1} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$ exists where $val_{\alpha_{z_1}}(S_{3d-1}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_1}}(M) = 0$, since either $\alpha_{z_1} = \alpha_{k_1}$ or $\alpha_i = \alpha_{k_1}$ and $\alpha_{z_1} = \alpha_{k_2}$. In this iteration, since $\alpha_{z_1} \neq \perp$ the break condition held and the **while** loop terminated. This is a contradiction since $d < c$. It follows, for $1 \leq d \leq c$, that no triple containing S_{3d-1} blocks M' . In summary, in Cases 1 and 3, no $\alpha_g \in N$ exists where $u_{\alpha_g}(M') < u_{\alpha_g}(M)$ and α_g belongs to a triple that blocks M' . \square

Lemma 12. *In Cases 2, 4, 5, and 6 of Algorithm **repair**, no agent $\alpha_g \in N$ exists where $u_{\alpha_g}(M') < u_{\alpha_g}(M)$ and α_g belongs to a triple that blocks M' .*

Proof. Refer to Figures 4, 6, 7, and 8. Suppose for a contradiction that some such $\alpha_g \in N$ exists. As before, by the construction of M' in Cases 2, 4, 5, and 6, $u_{\alpha_p}(M') \geq u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N \setminus S$. It follows that $\alpha_g \in S$ and hence $u_{\alpha_g}(M') \geq 1$. Since $u_{\alpha_g}(M') < u_{\alpha_g}(M)$ it must be that $u_{\alpha_g}(M) = 2$. The only such agents in S are S_{3d-1} for $1 \leq d \leq c$.




Fig. 6. The structure of M' in Case 2




Fig. 7. The structure of M' in Case 4




Fig. 8. The structure of M' in Case 5

Consider S_{3d-1} for $1 \leq d \leq c$. Note that $u_{S_{3d-1}}(M) = 2$ and $u_{S_{3d-1}}(M') = 1$. Suppose for a contradiction that triple $\{S_{3d-1}, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' where $\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2} \in N$. As before, since $u_{S_{3d-1}}(M') = 1$ it follows that $u_{S_{3d-1}}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 2$. Consider α_{k_1} and α_{k_2} . Since (N, V) is triangle-free, it must be that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{S_{3d-1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{S_{3d-1}, \alpha_{k_1}\}) = 1$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M') = 0$. By construction of M' , no agent $\alpha_p \in N$ exists where $u_{\alpha_p}(M') = 0$ and $u_{\alpha_p}(M) < u_{\alpha_p}(M')$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$. Recall the d^{th} iteration of the **while** loop. We have shown that two agents $\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}$ exist where $val_{S_{3d-1}}(\alpha_{k_1}) = val_{S_{3d-1}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$. It follows that some $\alpha_{z_1} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$ exists where $val_{\alpha_{z_1}}(S_{3d-1}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_1}}(M) = 0$, since either $\alpha_{z_1} = \alpha_{k_1}$ or $\alpha_i = \alpha_{k_1}$ and $\alpha_{z_1} = \alpha_{k_2}$. In this iteration, since $\alpha_{z_1} \neq \perp$ the break condition held, the **while** loop terminated, and the condition for either Case 1 or Case 3 was true. This is a contradiction. It follows that no triple containing S_{3d-1} blocks M' for $1 \leq d \leq c$. In summary, in Cases 2, 4, 5, and 6, no $\alpha_g \in N$ exists where $u_{\alpha_g}(M') < u_{\alpha_g}(M)$ and α_g belongs to a triple that blocks M' . \square

Lemma 13. *In Case 7 of Algorithm **repair**, no agent $\alpha_g \in N$ exists where $u_{\alpha_g}(M') < u_{\alpha_g}(M)$ and α_g belongs to a triple that blocks M' .*

Proof. Refer to Figure 9. Suppose for a contradiction that some α_g exists as above.




Fig. 9. The structure of M' in Case 7

First, consider any agent $\alpha_p \in N$ where $\alpha_p \notin S \cup \{\alpha_{j_2}, \alpha_i\}$. By the construction of M' , it can be seen that $M(\alpha_p) = M'(\alpha_p)$ so $u_{\alpha_p}(M) = u_{\alpha_p}(M')$ and hence $\alpha_g \notin S \cup \{\alpha_{j_2}, \alpha_i\}$.

Now consider α_i and α_{j_2} . Since $u_{\alpha_i}(M) = 0$ and $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = 1$ it follows that $\alpha_g \neq \alpha_i$. Similarly, since $u_{\alpha_{j_2}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{j_2}}(M') = 0$ it follows that $\alpha_g \neq \alpha_{j_2}$.

It remains that $\alpha_g \in S$.

Consider S_{3d-2} for $1 \leq d \leq c$. By construction of M' it follows that $u_{S_{3d-2}}(M') = 2$ so $\alpha_p \neq S_{3d-2}$.

Consider S_{3d-1} for $1 \leq d \leq c$. Suppose for a contradiction that triple $\{S_{3d-1}, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' where $\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2} \in N$. Since $u_{S_{3d-1}}(M') = 1$ it follows that $u_{S_{3d-1}}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 2$. Consider α_{k_1} and α_{k_2} . Since (N, V) is triangle-free, it must be that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{S_{3d-1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{S_{3d-1}, \alpha_{k_1}\}) = 1$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M') = 0$. By construction of M' it can be seen that $\alpha_p = S_{3c}$ is the only $\alpha_p \in N$ where $u_{\alpha_p}(M') = 0$ and $u_{\alpha_p}(M') < u_{\alpha_p}(M)$. It follows that either $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = 0$, $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$, or both. Suppose without loss of generality that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = 0$. Since $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = 0$ it follows that $\alpha_{k_1} \neq \alpha_i$. Recall the d^{th} iteration of the **while** loop. Since $val_{S_{3d-1}}(\alpha_{k_1}) = 1$, $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = 0$, and $\alpha_{k_1} \neq \alpha_i$, it follows that there exists some $\alpha_{z_1} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$, namely α_{k_1} , where $val_{\alpha_{z_1}}(S_{3d-1}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_1}}(M) = 0$. In this iteration, since $\alpha_{z_1} \neq \perp$ the break condition held, the **while** loop terminated, and either the condition for Case 1 was true or the condition for Case 3 was true. This is a contradiction. It follows that S_{3d-1} does not belong to a triple that blocks M' for any $1 \leq d \leq c$ and hence that $\alpha_g \neq S_{3d-1}$.

Consider S_{3d} for $1 \leq d < c$. By construction of M' it follows that $u_{S_{3d}}(M') = u_{S_{3d}}(M) = 1$ so $\alpha_g \neq S_{3d}$.

It remains to consider S_{3c} . As before, suppose for a contradiction that $\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2} \in N$ exist where $\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' . Since $\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' and $u_{S_{3c}}(M') = 0$ it must be that either $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_1}) = 1$ or $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$ or both.

Suppose that both $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_1}) = 1$ and $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$ and hence $u_{S_{3c}}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 2$. Since (N, V) is triangle-free, it must be that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_1}\}) = 1$. Since this triple blocks M' it must be that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M') = 0$. By the construction of M' it can be seen that $\alpha_p = S_{3c}$ is the only $\alpha_p \in N$ where $u_{\alpha_p}(M') = 0$ and $u_{\alpha_p}(M') < u_{\alpha_p}(M)$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$. Note that since $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = 1$ it follows that $\alpha_{k_1} \neq \alpha_i$ and $\alpha_{k_2} \neq \alpha_i$. It follows that either $\alpha_{k_1} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$, $\alpha_{k_2} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$, or both. Without loss of generality assume that $\alpha_{k_1} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$. In summary, there exists some $\alpha_{z_2} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$, namely α_{k_1} , where $val_{\alpha_{z_2}}(S_{3c}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_2}}(M) = 0$. In the algorithm, since $\alpha_{z_2} \neq \perp$ the condition of Case 2 holds. This is a contradiction.

The remaining possibility is that either $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_1}) = 1$ or $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$ but not both. Suppose without loss of generality that $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_1}) = 1$ and $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 0$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_1}\}) = 1$ and hence $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M') = 0$. Since $\alpha_p = S_{3c}$ is the only $\alpha_p \in N$ where $u_{\alpha_p}(M') = 0$ and $u_{\alpha_p}(M') < u_{\alpha_p}(M)$, it follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$. It must be that $val_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$ since $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_1}\}) = 1$ and $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 0$. In summary, since $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_1}) = 1$ and $val_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$ it follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 2$.

We have shown that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 2$. Either $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = 1$ or $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = 0$. Suppose for a contradiction that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = 0$. Since $\alpha_p = S_{3c}$ is the only $\alpha_p \in N$ where $u_{\alpha_p}(M') = 0$ and $u_{\alpha_p}(M') < u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ it follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = 0$. Consider two further possibilities. First, that $\alpha_{k_1} = \alpha_{j_2}$. Second, that $\alpha_{k_1} \neq \alpha_{j_2}$.

In the first, since $\alpha_{k_1} = \alpha_{j_2}$ then there exists some $\alpha_{y_2} \in N$, namely α_{k_2} , where $val_{\alpha_{S_{3c}}}(\alpha_{j_2}) = val_{\alpha_{y_2}}(\alpha_{j_2}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{y_2}}(M) = 0$. In the algorithm, since $\alpha_{y_2} \neq \perp$ the condition of Case 5 holds. This is a contradiction. Consider the second possibility that $\alpha_{k_1} \neq \alpha_{j_2}$. Since $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = 1$ it follows that $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_{k_1}$ and hence there exists some $\alpha_{z_2} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$, namely α_{k_1} , where $val_{\alpha_{z_2}}(S_{3c}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_2}}(M) = 0$. In the algorithm, since $\alpha_{z_2} \neq \perp$ the condition of Case 2 holds. This is also a contradiction. It remains that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = 1$.

In summary, we supposed that a triple $\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' . We showed that $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_1}) = val_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$, $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M') = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$, and $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = 1$. This is illustrated in Figure 10.




Fig. 10. In Lemma 13 we consider M' in Case 7. We suppose for a contradiction that some triple $\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' where $\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2} \in N$. We then show that $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{k_1}) = val_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$, $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M') = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$, and $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = 1$. We then show that this is a contradiction, and conclude that no such $\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}$ exist. This shows that S_{3c} does not belong to a triple that blocks M' .

By the condition of Case 7, in the algorithm $\alpha_{w_1} = \perp$. This means that no $\alpha_{w_1} \in N$ exists where $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{w_1}) = 1$, $u_{\alpha_{w_1}}(M) = 1$, $\alpha_{w_1} \notin S$, and there exists $\alpha_{z_3} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$ where $val_{\alpha_{z_3}}(\alpha_{w_1}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_3}}(M) = 0$. If $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = 1$ and $\alpha_{k_1} \notin S$ then some $\alpha_{w_1}, \alpha_{z_3}$, namely $\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}$, exist, which is a contradiction. It must be that either $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) \neq 1$ or $\alpha_{k_1} \in S$ or both.

Suppose that $\alpha_{k_1} \notin S$ and hence $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) \neq 1$. Recall that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = 1$. By construction of M' in Case 7, $u_{\alpha_p}(M') = u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N \setminus (S \cup \{\alpha_i\})$. It follows that $\alpha_{k_1} \in S \cup \{\alpha_i\}$. By assumption, $\alpha_{k_1} \notin S$, so it must be that $\alpha_{k_1} = \alpha_i$. In this case, there exists some $\alpha_{y_1} \in N$, namely α_{k_2} , where $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_i) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{y_1}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{y_1}}(M) = 0$. It follows that, in the algorithm, the condition for Case 4 is true. This is a contradiction. It must be that $\alpha_{k_1} \in S$.

From above, $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = 1$. Since $u_{S_{3d-2}}(M') = 2$ for any $1 \leq d \leq c$ it follows that $\alpha_{k_1} \neq S_{3d-2}$ for any $1 \leq d \leq c$. It follows that either $\alpha_{k_1} = S_{3d-1}$ or $\alpha_{k_1} = S_{3d}$ for some $1 \leq d \leq c$.

Suppose that $\alpha_{k_1} = S_{3d-1}$ for some $1 \leq d \leq c$. Recall the d^{th} iteration of the **while** loop. There exists some $\alpha_{z_1} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$, namely α_{k_2} , where $\text{val}_{\alpha_{z_1}}(S_{3d-1}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_1}}(M) = 0$. It follows that in the algorithm, after the d^{th} iteration of the **while** loop, $\alpha_{z_1} \neq \perp$, hence $d = c$ and either the condition for Case 1 was true or the condition for Case 3 was true. Both cases are a contradiction. It follows that no such $\alpha_{k_1} \neq S_{3d-1}$ for any $1 \leq d \leq c$.

Finally, suppose that $\alpha_{k_1} = S_{3d}$ for some $1 \leq d \leq c$. From above, $S_{3c} \neq \alpha_{k_1}$ so $d < c$. Recall the d^{th} iteration of the **while** loop. Since $\text{val}_{S_{3d}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$, $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$, and $\alpha_{k_2} \neq \alpha_i$, since $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = 1$, it follows that there exists some $\alpha_{z_2} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$, namely α_{k_2} , where $\text{val}_{\alpha_{z_2}}(S_{3d}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_2}}(M) = 0$. There are two possibilities. The first is that $\alpha_{k_2} \neq \alpha_{j_2}$. The second is that $\alpha_{k_2} = \alpha_{j_2}$. Suppose first that $\alpha_{k_2} \neq \alpha_{j_2}$. There exists some $\alpha_{z_2} \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_2}\}$, namely α_{k_2} , where $\text{val}_{\alpha_{z_2}}(S_{3d}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_2}}(M) = 0$. It follows that in the algorithm $\alpha_{z_2} \neq \perp$, the break condition held, and the **while** loop terminated after this iteration. This is a contradiction since $d < c$. Suppose then that $\alpha_{k_2} = \alpha_{j_2}$. It follows that there exists some $b = d$ where $1 \leq b < c$ and $\text{val}_{S_{3b}}(\alpha_{j_2}) = \text{val}_{S_{3c}}(S_{3b}) = 1$. It follows that, after the final iteration of the **while** loop, the condition for Case 6 is true, which is a contradiction. In summary, we have shown that $\alpha_{k_1} \neq S_{3d}$ for every $1 \leq d \leq c$.

To recap, we supposed that some α_g exists where $u_{\alpha_g}(M') < u_{\alpha_g}(M)$ and α_g belongs to a triple that blocks M' . We first showed that $\alpha_g \in S$. We then showed that $\alpha_g \neq S_{3d-2}$ and $\alpha_g \neq S_{3d-1}$ for any $1 \leq d \leq c$. We then showed that $\alpha_g \neq S_{3d}$ for any $1 \leq d < c$. We concluded that $\alpha_g = S_{3c}$. We supposed that some $\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2} \in N$ exist where $\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' . We then showed that $\alpha_{k_1} \in S$. Finally we showed that $\alpha_{k_1} \neq S_{3d-2}$ for any $1 \leq d \leq c$, that $\alpha_{k_1} \neq S_{3d-1}$ for any $1 \leq d \leq c$, and that $\alpha_{k_1} \neq S_{3d}$ for any $1 \leq d < c$. This contradicts $\alpha_{k_1} \in S$ and it follows that no such α_{k_1} exists where $\{S_{3c}, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' . This shows that S_{3c} does not belong to a triple that blocks M' and hence $\alpha_g \neq S_{3c}$. \square

Lemma 14. *Algorithm repair returns a stable P -matching M' .*

Proof. By Lemma 9 the algorithm terminates after at most $\lfloor (n-2)/3 \rfloor$ iterations of the main loop. By Lemma 10 the algorithm returns a P -matching.

Suppose M' is a P -matching returned by the algorithm. By Lemmas 11, 12, and 13, in Cases 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, no $\alpha_g \in N$ exists where $u_{\alpha_g}(M') < u_{\alpha_g}(M)$ and α_g belongs to a triple that blocks M' .

Suppose for a contradiction that M' is not stable and some triple $\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}, \alpha_{k_3}\}$ blocks M' . It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_r}}(M') \geq u_{\alpha_{k_r}}(M)$ for $1 \leq r \leq 3$, otherwise α_g exists as described above. By Lemma 1, it follows that $\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}, \alpha_{k_3}\}$ also blocks M . By assumption, any triple that blocks M contains α_i so assume without loss of generality that $\alpha_{k_1} = \alpha_i$.

In Case 4, $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = 2$ and hence α_i does not belong to a triple that blocks M' . This is a contradiction. It follows that no triple blocks M' and that M' is stable in Case 4.

In Cases 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7, $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = 1$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_i}(\{\alpha_{k_2}, \alpha_{k_3}\}) = 2$ so $\text{val}_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{k_2}) = \text{val}_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{k_3}) = 1$. Since (N, V) is triangle-free, it must be

that $val_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\alpha_{k_3}) = 0$ and hence $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_3}\}) = u_{\alpha_{k_3}}(\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 1$. Since $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_2}, \alpha_{k_3}\}$ blocks M , It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{k_3}}(M) = 0$, and thus that $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M . This contradicts our original assumption that any triple that blocks M contains $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\}$ where $\alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2} \in N$, $u_{\alpha_{j_1}}(M) = 1$, $u_{\alpha_{j_2}}(M) = 0$, and $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{j_1}) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{j_2}) = 1$. It follows that no triple blocks M' . \square

Lemma 15. *Algorithm repair has running time $O(|N|^2)$.*

Proof. The pseudocode above outlines the algorithm at a high level. To analyse the worst-case time complexity we describe a suitable system of data structures, which we combine with a preprocessing step. Relying on the unit cost of standard operations in these data structures, we analyse the worst case time complexity of Algorithm **repair** in terms of $|N|$.

Suppose that (N, V) is stored such that, for a given $\alpha_p \in N$, the algorithm can iterate through the set $\{\alpha_q \in N : val_{\alpha_p}(\alpha_q) = 1\}$ in $O(|N|)$ time. Suppose that M is stored such that the algorithm can iterate through each triple in $O(|N|)$ time. For example, (N, V) could be stored graphically using adjacency lists. It follows that, given three agents $\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3} \in N$ the algorithm can compute $u_{\alpha_{h_1}}(\{\alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\})$, $u_{\alpha_{h_2}}(\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_3}\})$, and $u_{\alpha_{h_3}}(\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}\})$ in $O(|N|)$ time.

The preprocessing step involves constructing two lookup tables. Each lookup table contains exactly $|N|$ entries and is indexed by some $\alpha_p \in N$. Each entry in each table contains some integer less than or equal to $|N|$. It follows that finding an entry given its index requires constant time. Each entry in L_1 will contain either zero, one, or two. For each agent $\alpha_p \in N$, the algorithm constructs L_1 so that the p^{th} entry contains $u_{\alpha_p}(M)$. By assumption, the algorithm can compute $u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N$ in $O(|N|)$ time. It follows that L_1 can be constructed in $O(|N|^2)$ time by iterating through M and computing $u_{\alpha_{h_1}}(M), u_{\alpha_{h_2}}(M), u_{\alpha_{h_3}}(M)$ for each $\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\} \in M$. Since $|M| = O(|N|)$ in total this step takes $O(|N|^2)$ time. It follows that we can use L_1 to look up $u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N$ in constant time. Each entry in L_2 contains either the label of some agent or \perp . Construct L_2 such that for any $\alpha_p \in N$, the p^{th} entry either contains some $\alpha_q \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$ where $val_{\alpha_p}(\alpha_q) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_q}(M) = 0$ if it exists and otherwise \perp . The algorithm will use L_2 primarily in the body of the loop to identify α_{w_1} , if it exists, using S_{3c} . The lookup table L_2 can be constructed in $O(|N|^2)$ time, as follows. For each $\alpha_p \in N$, look up $u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ in L_1 . If $u_{\alpha_p}(M) = 0$ then consider each $\alpha_q \in N$ where $val_{\alpha_p}(\alpha_q) = 1$ and $\alpha_q \neq \alpha_i$. If the q^{th} entry of L_2 is currently \perp then set that entry to α_p .

The list S can be stored using a linked list or any data structure in which a new element can be appended to the end of S in constant time and the iteration through S takes $O(|N|)$ time. The list S will be supplemented with a lookup table L_S . For any $\alpha_p \in N$, the table L_S can be used to test membership in S and look up the position of any agent in S in constant time. This is possible because the only modification that the algorithm makes to S is appending a single agent to the end of S in each iteration. As noted in Lemma 9, any agent is added to S at most than once. Like the tables L_1 and L_2 , the table L_S contains

exactly $|N|$ entries and is indexed by each $\alpha_p \in N$. Each entry in L_S contains some integer position less than or equal to $|S|$. Before the algorithm appends an element $\alpha_p \in N$ to the end of S , it can maintain L_S in constant time by setting the p^{th} entry to $|S|$.

The first step in the algorithm involves identifying agents $\alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}$ where $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\}$ blocks M in (N, V) and $u_{\alpha_{j_1}}(M) = 1$ as follows. Given any $\alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2} \in N$ where $u_{\alpha_{j_1}}(M) = 1$, $u_{\alpha_{j_2}}(M) = 0$ and $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{j_1}) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{j_2}) = 1$, the triple $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\}$ blocks M in (N, V) . It follows that some $\alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2} \in N$ can be found in $O(|N|)$ time, as follows. Consider each agent α_p for which $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_p) = 1$, and look up $u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ in L_1 . If $u_{\alpha_p}(M) = 1$ then look up the p^{th} entry of L_2 . By the construction of L_2 , if this entry is not equal to \perp then it contains some $\alpha_q \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$ where $val_{\alpha_p}(\alpha_q) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_q}(M) = 0$. In this case let $\alpha_{j_1} = \alpha_p$ and $\alpha_{j_2} = \alpha_q$. Since M is not stable in (N, V) , by the condition of M there must exist some such $\alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}$.

The second step in the algorithm involves identifying agents $\alpha_{j_3}, \alpha_{j_4}$ where $\alpha_{j_3}, \alpha_{j_4} \in M(\alpha_{j_1}) \setminus \{\alpha_{j_1}\}$ and $u_{\alpha_{j_3}}(M) = 2$. This can be done in $O(|N|)$ time, as follows. Consider each triple in M until $M(\alpha_{j_1})$ is found. This takes $O(|N|)$ time. Use L_1 to identify α_{j_3} and α_{j_4} .

The initialisation of $S, c, \alpha_{z_1}, \alpha_{z_2}, \alpha_{y_1}, \alpha_{y_2}$ and α_{w_1} in the algorithm takes constant time.

Consider the **while** loop. By Lemma 9, there are at most $\lfloor (|N| - 2) / 3 \rfloor = O(|N|)$ iterations. Setting up the lookup tables allows us to ensure that each iteration takes $O(|N|)$ time. It follows that the loop terminates in $O(|N|^2)$ time.

To identify α_{z_1} as described, first identify S_{3c-1} , in constant time. Consider each $\alpha_p \in N$ for which $val_{S_{3c-1}}(\alpha_p) = 1$. This takes $O(|N|)$ time. For each such α_p , if $\alpha_p = \alpha_i$ then continue. If $\alpha_p \neq \alpha_i$ then look up $u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ in L_1 . If $u_{\alpha_p}(M) = 0$ then set $\alpha_{z_1} = \alpha_p$. If no such α_p is found then no such α_{z_1} exists so set $\alpha_{z_1} = \perp$.

Similarly, to identify some α_{z_2} as described, first identify S_{3c} . Consider each $\alpha_{l_1} \in N$ for which $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_{l_1}) = 1$. This takes $O(|N|)$ time. For each such α_{l_1} , if $\alpha_{l_1} = \alpha_i$ or $\alpha_{l_1} = \alpha_{j_2}$ then continue. If not, look up $u_{\alpha_{l_1}}(M)$ in L_1 . If $u_{\alpha_{l_1}}(M) = 0$ then set $\alpha_{z_2} = \alpha_{l_1}$. If no such α_p is found then no such α_{z_2} exists so set $\alpha_{z_2} = \perp$.

To identify α_{y_1} as described, test if $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_i) = 1$. This takes $O(|N|)$ time. If $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_i) = 0$ then no such α_{y_1} exists. If $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_i) = 1$ then consider each $\alpha_p \in N$ for which $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_p) = 1$. Note that $\alpha_p \neq \alpha_{j_2}$ since otherwise $val_{\alpha_{j_2}}(\alpha_i) = 1$, from which it follows that $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{j_1}, \alpha_{j_2}\}$ is a triangle in (N, V) . Look up $u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ in L_1 . If $u_{\alpha_p}(M) = 0$ then set $\alpha_{y_1} = \alpha_p$. If no such α_p where $u_{\alpha_{l_1}}(M) = 0$ is found then no such α_{y_1} exists so set $\alpha_{y_1} = \perp$. The identification of α_{y_2} , if it exists, can be performed similarly in $O(|N|)$ time.

To compute $1 \leq b < c$ as described, if there exists some such S_{3b} where $val_{S_{3b}}(\alpha_{j_2}) = val_{S_{3c}}(S_{3b}) = 1$, consider each $\alpha_p \in N$ for which $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_p) = 1$. This takes $O(|N|)$ time. For each such α_p , determine its position b' in S if it belongs to S . If α_p belongs to S and b' is divisible by three and less than c then set $b = b'$. Otherwise, no such S_{3b} exists so set $b = 0$.

To identify some α_{w_1} as described, first identify S_{3c} in constant time. Consider each $\alpha_p \in N$ for which $val_{S_{3c}}(\alpha_p) = 1$. This takes $O(|N|)$ time. For each such α_p , test if α_p belongs to S using L_S . If so, then continue. If not, then look up the p^{th} entry in L_2 . If this entry is \perp then continue. If not, then suppose this entry is α_q . By the construction of L_2 , it follows that $\alpha_q \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$, $val_{\alpha_p}(\alpha_q) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_q}(M) = 0$. Accordingly, set α_{w_1} to α_p since the algorithm has identified $\alpha_{z_3} = \alpha_q \in N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}$ for which $val_{\alpha_{w_1}}(\alpha_{z_3}) = 1$ and $u_{\alpha_{z_3}}(M) = 0$.

Evaluating the **break** condition in the loop can be performed in constant time. If the break condition is true then α_{w_1} exists. The identification of α_{w_2} and α_{w_3} can be accomplished in $O(|N|)$ time, using the same process as for α_{j_3} and α_{j_4} . From above, adding three elements to S requires constant time.

Now consider the final **if/else** statement and the seven possible constructions of M' . In each of the seven cases, M' contains each triple in $\{r \in M \mid r \cap S = \emptyset\}$. This set can be constructed in $O(|N|)$ time by considering each triple in M and the three corresponding entries in L_S . In Cases 3 and 6, the agents α_{z_4} and α_{z_5} can each be identified in $O(|N|)$ time, using a similar process as for α_{z_1} in the loop body as described above. The remaining triples in M' can be constructed after one scan of S in $O(|N|)$ time. \square

Lemma 16. *Algorithm **repair** returns a stable P -matching in $O(|N|^2)$ time.*

Proof. By Lemmas 14 and 15. \square

4.3 Finding a stable P -matching in a triangle-free instance

In the previous section we supposed that (N, V) was a triangle-free instance of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN and considered a P -matching M that was repairable (Section 4.2). We presented Algorithm **repair**, which can be used to construct a stable P -matching M' in $O(|N|^2)$ time (Lemma 16). In this section we present Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** (Algorithm 2), which, given a triangle-free instance (N, V) , constructs a P -matching M' that is stable in (N, V) . Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** is recursive. The algorithm first removes an arbitrary agent α_i to construct a smaller instance (N', V') . It then uses a recursive call to construct a P -matching M that is stable in (N', V') . By Lemma 1, any triple that blocks M in the larger instance (N, V) must contain α_i or block M in (N', V') . There are then three cases involving types of triple that block M in (N', V') . In two out of three cases, M' can be constructed by adding to M a new triple containing α_i and two players unmatched in M . In the third case, M is not stable in (N, V) but, by design, is repairable (see Section 4.2). It follows that Algorithm **repair** can be used to construct a P -matching that is stable in (N, V) (Lemma 16). It is relatively straightforward to show that the running time of Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** is $O(|N|^3)$.

Lemma 17. *Given a triangle-free instance (N, V) , Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** returns a stable P -matching in (N, V) .*

Proof. The proof is by induction on $|N|$. When $|N| = 2$, the returned matching \emptyset is trivially stable in (N, V) . Suppose then that Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** returns a stable P -matching M given (N', V') where $|N'| < |N|$. It follows that the recursive call to Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** returns a P -matching M that is stable in (N', V') .

Consider the first branch of the **if/else** statement. By construction, $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = 2$ and $u_{\alpha_{l_1}}(M') = u_{\alpha_{l_2}}(M') = 1$. Since M is a P -matching, it follows that M' is also a P -matching. Suppose for a contradiction that some triple blocks the returned P -matching M' in (N, V) . Since $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = 2$, such a triple does not contain α_i . By construction, $u_{\alpha_p}(M') \geq u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N$, so it follows that such a triple also blocks M in (N', V') , a contradiction.

Consider the second branch of the **if/else** statement. By construction, $u_{\alpha_{l_3}}(M') = 2$ and $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = u_{\alpha_{l_4}}(M') = 1$. Since M is a P -matching, it follows that M' is also a P -matching. Suppose for a contradiction that some triple blocks M' in (N, V) . By construction, $u_{\alpha_p}(M') \geq u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N$. It follows that any such triple that blocks M' in (N, V) contains α_i , otherwise that triple blocks M in (N', V') , a contradiction. Suppose that some triple $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' in (N, V) . By construction, $u_{\alpha_i}(M') = 1$ so it must be that $u_{\alpha_i}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 2$ and hence $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{k_1}) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$. Since (N, V) is triangle-free, it follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_1}\}) = 1$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M') = 0$. Since $u_{\alpha_p}(M') \geq u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N$, it must be that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$. This contradicts the condition of the

Algorithm 2 Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree**

Input: an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN

Output: stable P -matching M' in (N, V)

if $|N| = 2$ **then return** \emptyset

$\alpha_i \leftarrow$ an arbitrary agent in N

$(N', V') \leftarrow (N \setminus \{\alpha_i\}, V \setminus \{val_{\alpha_i}\})$

$M \leftarrow \text{findStableInTriangleFree}((N', V'))$

if some $\alpha_{l_1}, \alpha_{l_2} \in N$ exist where $u_{\alpha_{l_1}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{l_2}}(M) = 0$
and $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_1}) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_2}) = 1$ **then**

return $M \cup \{\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{l_1}, \alpha_{l_2}\}\}$

else if some $\alpha_{l_3}, \alpha_{l_4} \in N$ exist where $u_{\alpha_{l_3}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{l_4}}(M) = 0$
and $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_3}) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_4}) = 1$ **then**

return $M \cup \{\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{l_3}, \alpha_{l_4}\}\}$

else if some $\alpha_{l_5}, \alpha_{l_6} \in N$ exist where $u_{\alpha_{l_5}}(M) = 1, u_{\alpha_{l_6}}(M) = 0$
and $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_5}) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_6}) = 1$ **then**

$\triangleright M$ is repairable in (N, V) (see Section 4.2). Note that $\alpha_{j_1} = \alpha_{l_5}$ and $\alpha_{j_2} = \alpha_{l_6}$.

return **repair** $((N, V), M, \alpha_i)$

else

return M

end if

first branch of the **if/else** statement, since two agents $\alpha_{l_1}, \alpha_{l_2}$, namely $\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}$, exist where $u_{\alpha_{l_1}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{l_2}}(M) = 0$ and $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_1}) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_2}) = 1$.

Consider the third branch of the **if/else** statement. It must be that the conditional expressions in the first and second branches of the **if/else** statement do not hold. It follows from this that every triple that blocks M in (N', V') comprises $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{l_5}, \alpha_{l_6}\}$ where $\alpha_{l_5}, \alpha_{l_6} \in N$, $u_{\alpha_{l_5}}(M) = 1$, $u_{\alpha_{l_6}}(M) = 0$, and $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_5}) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_6}) = 1$. Note that $u_{\alpha_i}(M) = 0$ and hence this is exactly the condition required by Algorithm **repair** (see Section 4.2). By Lemma 16, Algorithm **repair** returns a P -matching M' that is stable in (N, V) .

Consider the fourth branch of the **if/else** statement. It must be that the conditional expressions in the first, second, and third branches of the **if/else** statement do not hold. Suppose for a contradiction that some triple blocks $M' = M$ in (N, V) . By construction, $u_{\alpha_p}(M') = u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N$. It follows that any such triple that blocks M' in (N, V) contains α_i , otherwise that triple blocks M in (N', V') , a contradiction. Suppose that some triple $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' in (N, V) .

Suppose first that $u_{\alpha_i}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 2$. Since (N, V) is triangle-free, it follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_1}\}) = 1$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M') = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M') = 0$. Since $u_{\alpha_p}(M') \geq u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N$, it must be that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(M) = 0$. This contradicts the condition of the first branch of the **if/else** statement.

Suppose then that $u_{\alpha_i}(\{\alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 1$. It must be that either $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 2$ or $u_{\alpha_{k_2}}(\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_1}\}) = 2$. Suppose without loss of generality that $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_2}\}) = 2$. It follows that $val_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\alpha_i) = val_{\alpha_{k_1}}(\alpha_{k_2}) = 1$. There are two possibilities: either $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = 1$ or $u_{\alpha_{k_1}}(M) = 0$. The first possibility implies that the conditional expression of the second **if/else** branch holds, a contradiction. The second possibility implies that the conditional expression of the third **if/else** branch holds, also a contradiction. It follows that no such triple $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{k_1}, \alpha_{k_2}\}$ blocks M' in (N, V) . \square

Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** is recursive. We consider its asymptotic time complexity and prove that it has running time $O(|N|^3)$.

Lemma 18. *Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** has running time $O(|N|^3)$.*

Proof. The pseudocode for Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** gives an outline of the algorithm at a high level. As before, to analyse the worst-case time complexity we provide a more detailed description of certain steps in terms of the unit cost of operations in standard data structures. This description suffices to show that the running time of the algorithm is $O(|N|^3)$. Let $T(|N|)$ be the running time of the algorithm given an instance (N, V) . We will prove inductively that $T(|N|) = O(|N|^3)$.

Suppose that the input (N, V) is given such that, for a given $\alpha_p \in N$, the algorithm can iterate through the set $\{\alpha_q \in N : val_{\alpha_p}(\alpha_q) = 1\}$ in $O(|N|)$ time. For example, (N, V) could be stored graphically using adjacency lists. It follows that, given three agents $\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3} \in N$ the algorithm can compute $u_{\alpha_{h_1}}(\{\alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\})$, $u_{\alpha_{h_2}}(\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_3}\})$, and $u_{\alpha_{h_3}}(\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}\})$ in $O(|N|)$ time. In any

case, algorithm will return a P -matching M' stored as a linked list or similar data structure that allows a triple to be appended to the end of list in constant time.

By inspection, when $|N| = 2$ the algorithm returns immediately and hence $T(2) = O(1)$. In this case the algorithm will return an empty linked list or similar data structure.

The constructed instance (N', V') can be stored using adjacency lists or an equivalent data structure. A straightforward procedure to select α_i and construct (N', V') takes $O(|N|)$ time. By assumption, the recursive call to construct M' takes $T(|N| - 1)$ time.

After this call, the algorithm constructs a supplementary lookup table L_1 , with exactly $|N| - 1$ entries indexed by each $\alpha_p \in N'$. Each entry will contain either zero, one, or two. For each agent $\alpha_p \in N$, the algorithm constructs L_1 so that the p^{th} entry contains $u_{\alpha_p}(M)$. By assumption, the algorithm can compute $u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N$ in $O(|N|)$ time. It follows that L_1 can be constructed in $O(|N|^2)$ time by iterating through M and computing $u_{\alpha_{h_1}}(M), u_{\alpha_{h_2}}(M), u_{\alpha_{h_3}}(M)$ for each $\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\} \in M$. Since $|M| = O(|N|)$ in total this step takes $O(|N|^2)$ time. It follows that we can use L_1 to look up $u_{\alpha_p}(M)$ for any $\alpha_p \in N$ in constant time.

The construction of L_1 allows the algorithm to identify some $\alpha_{l_1}, \alpha_{l_2} \in N$ exist where $u_{\alpha_{l_1}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{l_2}}(M) = 0$ and $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_1}) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_2}) = 1$, if two such agents exist, in $O(|N|^2)$ time. One way to do this is to consider each pair $(\alpha_{l_1}, \alpha_{l_2}) \in N^2$ and look up $u_{\alpha_{l_1}}(M)$ and $u_{\alpha_{l_2}}(M)$ in L_1 . Since M is stored using a linked list or similar data structure, if such $\alpha_{l_1}, \alpha_{l_2} \in N$ exist then M' can be constructed by adding the triple $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_{l_1}, \alpha_{l_2}\}$ to M in constant time. Similarly, the identification of $\alpha_{l_3}, \alpha_{l_4} \in N$ where $u_{\alpha_{l_3}}(M) = u_{\alpha_{l_4}}(M) = 0$ and $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_3}) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_4}) = 1$ can be performed in $O(|N|^2)$ time and the corresponding construction of M' in constant time. In the third branch of the **if/else** statement, the identification of $\alpha_{l_5}, \alpha_{l_6} \in N$ where $u_{\alpha_{l_3}}(M) = 1, u_{\alpha_{l_4}}(M) = 0$ and $val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_3}) = val_{\alpha_i}(\alpha_{l_4}) = 1$ can be similarly performed in $O(|N|^2)$ time. By Lemma 15, the call to Algorithm **repair** also takes $O(|N|^2)$ time. It follows that the overall running time of Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** is $O(|N|^3)$. \square

Lemma 19. *Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** returns a stable P -matching in (N, V) in $O(|N|^3)$ time.*

Proof. By Lemmas 17 and 18. \square

4.4 Finding a stable P -matching in an arbitrary instance

In the previous section we considered instances of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN that are triangle-free. We showed that, given such an instance, Algorithm **findStableInTriangleFree** can be used to find a stable P -matching in $O(|N|^3)$ time (Lemma 19). In Section 4.1, we showed that an arbitrary instance can be reduced in $O(|N|^3)$

time to construct a corresponding triangle-free instance (Lemma 8). We define a subroutine, `eliminateTriangles`, which reduces an arbitrary instance in this way, and returns a pair containing the reduced instance and a set of triangles M_Δ . Algorithm `findStable` therefore comprises two steps. First, the instance is reduced with a call to `eliminateTriangles`. Then, Algorithm `findStableInTriangleFree` is called to construct a P -matching M' that is stable in the reduced, triangle-free instance.

Algorithm 3 Algorithm `findStable`

Input: an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN

Output: stable P -matching M' in (N, V)

$(N', V'), M_\Delta \leftarrow \text{eliminateTriangles}((N, V))$

$M' \leftarrow \text{findStableInTriangleFree}((N', V'))$

return $M' \cup M_\Delta$

Lemma 20. *Given an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN, Algorithm `findStable` returns a stable P -matching.*

Proof. A suitable implementation of the subroutine `eliminateTriangles` returns a pair $((N', V'), M_\Delta)$ where $|N'| \leq |N|$ and if M is a stable P -matching in (N', V') then $M' = M \cup M_\Delta$ is a stable P -matching in (N, V) (Lemma 8). By Lemma 19, Algorithm `findStableInTriangleFree` returns P -matching M' that is stable in (N', V') . It follows that $M' \cup M_\Delta$ is a P -matching that is stable in (N, V) . \square

Lemma 21. *Algorithm `findStable` has running time $O(|N|^3)$.*

Proof. By definition, Algorithm `eliminateTriangles` has running time $O(|N|^3)$ (Lemma 8). By Lemma 18, Algorithm `findStableInTriangleFree` also has running time $O(|N|^3)$. It follows that Algorithm `findStable` has total running time $O(|N|^3)$. \square

Theorem 2. *Given an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN, a stable P -matching, and hence a stable matching, must exist and can be found in $O(|N|^3)$ time. Moreover, if $|N|$ is a multiple of three then, if required, every agent can be matched in the returned stable matching.*

Proof. By Lemmas 20 and 21. If $|N|$ is a multiple of three, then if required the agents unmatched in $M' \cup M_\Delta$ can be arbitrarily matched into triples. By Lemma 1, the resulting matching is still stable in (N, V) . \square

4.5 Stability and utilitarian welfare

Given an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN and matching M , let the *utilitarian welfare* [4,11] of a set $S \subseteq N$, denoted $u_S(M)$, be $\sum_{\alpha_i \in S} u_{\alpha_i}(M)$. Let $u(M)$ be short for $u_N(M)$. Given a matching M in an arbitrary instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN, it follows that $0 \leq u(M) \leq 2|N|$. It is natural to then consider the optimisation problem of finding a stable matching with maximum utilitarian welfare, which we refer to as *3D-SR-SAS-BIN-MAXUW*. This problem is closely related to Partition Into Triangles (PIT, defined in Section 3), which we reduce from in the proof that 3D-SR-SAS-BIN-MAXUW is NP-hard.

Theorem 3. *3D-SR-SAS-BIN-MAXUW is NP-hard.*

Proof. A trivial reduction exists from Partition Into Triangles (defined in Section 3) to the problem of deciding if a given instance of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN-MAXUW contains a stable matching M with $u(M) = 2|N|$. \square

We note that the reduction from PIT to 3D-SR-SAS-BIN-MAXUW also shows that the problem of finding a (not-necessarily stable) matching with maximum utilitarian welfare, given an instance of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN, is also NP-hard.

In Section 4.4 we showed that, given an arbitrary instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN, a stable P -matching exists and can be found in $O(|N|^3)$ time. We now present Algorithm `findStableUW` (Algorithm 4) as an approximation algorithm for 3D-SR-SAS-BIN-MAXUW. This algorithm first calls Algorithm `findStable` to construct a stable P -matching. It then orders the unmatched agents into triples such that the produced matching is still stable in (N, V) (by Lemma 1) but is not necessarily a P -matching. The pseudocode description of Algorithm `findStableUW` includes a call to `maximum2DMatching`. Given an instance (N, V) and some set $U \subseteq N$, this subroutine returns a (two-dimensional) *maximum cardinality matching* Y in the subgraph of G , the underlying graph of (N, V) , induced by U . From Y , Algorithm `findStableUW` constructs a set X of pairs with cardinality $\lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor$. It also constructs a set Z from the remaining agents, also with cardinality $\lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor$. Finally, it constructs the matching M_2 such that each triple in M_2 is union of a pair of agents in X and a single agent in Z .

We consider Algorithm `findStableUW` with an arbitrary input instance (N, V) . The goal is to show that $2u(M_A) \geq u(M_{\text{opt}})$, where M_A is the stable matching returned by the algorithm, and M_{opt} is a stable matching in (N, V) with maximum utilitarian welfare. Recall that $|N| = 3k + l$ for some $k \geq 0$ and $0 \leq l < 3$ and by Proposition 1 we assume that $|M_{\text{opt}}| = k$.

The proof is broken down into two cases. The first case is proved in Lemma 24. In this case, the utilitarian welfare of any triple in M_A is at least two. The second case, in which some triple in M_A has utilitarian welfare zero, is considered in Lemmas 28 – and 31. At a high level, the proof in both cases is similar, and involves placing a lower bound on the welfare in M_A of the agents in each triple in M_{opt} .

Algorithm 4 Algorithm findStableUW

Input: an instance (N, V) of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN

Output: stable matching M_A in (N, V)

```

 $M_1 \leftarrow \text{findStable}((N, V))$ 
 $U \leftarrow$  agents in  $N$  unmatched in  $M_1$ 
 $Y \leftarrow \text{maximum2DMatching}((N, V), U)$ 
if  $|Y| \geq \lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor$  then
     $X \leftarrow$  any  $\lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor$  elements of  $Y$ 
else
    ▷ Note that since  $Y$  is a set of disjoint pairs, it follows that
       $|U \setminus \bigcup Y| = |U| - 2|Y| \geq \lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor - |Y|$ .
     $W \leftarrow$  an arbitrary set of  $\lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor - |Y|$  pairs of elements in  $U \setminus \bigcup Y$ 
     $X \leftarrow Y \cup W$ 
end if
 $Z \leftarrow U \setminus \bigcup X$ 
    ▷ Suppose  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor}\}$  and  $Z = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{\lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor}\}$ .
    ▷ Note that  $x_i$  is a pair of agents and  $z_i$  is a single agent for each  $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor$ .
     $M_2 \leftarrow \{x_i \cup \{z_i\} \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq \lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor\}$ 
return  $M_1 \cup M_2$ 
    
```

Let T_{opt}^y and T_A^y be the set of triples each with utilitarian welfare y in M_{opt} and M_A respectively. Recall that since the valuation functions are symmetric, $u_t(M) \in \{0, 2, 4, 6\}$ for any triple t in an arbitrary matching M . It follows that

$$M_{\text{opt}} = T_{\text{opt}}^6 \cup T_{\text{opt}}^4 \cup T_{\text{opt}}^2 \cup T_{\text{opt}}^0 \quad (1)$$

$$M_A = T_A^6 \cup T_A^4 \cup T_A^2 \cup T_A^0 \quad (2)$$

and hence

$$u(M_{\text{opt}}) = 6|T_{\text{opt}}^6| + 4|T_{\text{opt}}^4| + 2|T_{\text{opt}}^2| \quad (3)$$

$$u(M_A) = 6|T_A^6| + 4|T_A^4| + 2|T_A^2| \quad (4)$$

Lemma 22 shows that, by design, there are exactly l agents in N that are unmatched in M_A .

Lemma 22. $|M_A| = k$.

Proof. Recall that $|N| = 3k + l$ for $k \geq 1$ and $0 \leq l < 3$. Since U contains the agents unmatched in $|M_1|$,

$$\begin{aligned} |U| &= |N| - 3|M_1| \\ &= 3k + l - 3|M_1| \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor &= \lfloor (3k + l - 3|M_1|)/3 \rfloor && \text{by Equation 5} \\
&= \lfloor k + l/3 - |M_1| \rfloor \\
&= k + \lfloor l/3 \rfloor - |M_1| \\
&= k - |M_1| && \text{since } l < 3 \text{ by definition.} \quad (6)
\end{aligned}$$

Now consider $|M_A|$. By construction, $M_A = M_1 \cup M_2$ so it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|M_A| &= |M_1| + |M_2| \\
&= |M_1| + \lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor && \text{by construction} \\
&= |M_1| + k - |M_1| && \text{by Equation 6} \\
&= k .
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 23 demonstrates a relationship between T_A^6 and T_{opt}^6 .

Lemma 23. $|T_A^6| \geq |T_{\text{opt}}^6|/3$.

Proof. Consider an arbitrary triple $\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\} \in T_{\text{opt}}^6$. This triple is a triangle, meaning $\text{val}_{\alpha_{h_1}}(\alpha_{h_2}) = \text{val}_{\alpha_{h_2}}(\alpha_{h_3}) = \text{val}_{\alpha_{h_3}}(\alpha_{h_1}) = 1$. Recall that the first step of Algorithm **findStable** involved selecting a maximal set of triangles. In the pseudocode description of Algorithm **findStable**, we described this operation using Algorithm **eliminateTriangles**, which we refer to here. Since $\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}$ is a triangle in (N, V) , either Algorithm **eliminateTriangles** selected this triple, and $\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\} \in T_A^6$, or at least one of $\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}$ was added to a different triple in T_A^6 . In either case, any triple in T_{opt}^6 contains at least one agent that belongs to some triple in T_A^6 . Triples in T_A^6 are disjoint, hence the number of agents in triples in T_A^6 is at least $|T_{\text{opt}}^6|$. It follows that $|T_A^6| \geq |T_{\text{opt}}^6|/3$. □

In Lemma 24 we consider the case when $T_A^0 = \emptyset$.

Lemma 24. *If $T_A^0 = \emptyset$ then $2u(M_A) \geq u(M_{\text{opt}})$.*

Proof. We start by presenting an upper bound on $|T_{\text{opt}}^4| + |T_{\text{opt}}^2|$ in terms of k and $|T_{\text{opt}}^6|$. Recall that $|M_{\text{opt}}| = k$ by Proposition 1.

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_{\text{opt}}^6| + |T_{\text{opt}}^4| + |T_{\text{opt}}^2| + |T_{\text{opt}}^0| &= |M_{\text{opt}}| = k && \text{by Equation 1} \\
|T_{\text{opt}}^6| + |T_{\text{opt}}^4| + |T_{\text{opt}}^2| &\leq k \\
|T_{\text{opt}}^4| + |T_{\text{opt}}^2| &\leq k - |T_{\text{opt}}^6| . \quad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

We now place an upper bound on $u(M_{\text{opt}})$ only in terms of $|T_{\text{opt}}^6|$ and k .

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(M_{\text{opt}}) &= 6|T_{\text{opt}}^6| + 4|T_{\text{opt}}^4| + 2|T_{\text{opt}}^2| && \text{(Equation 3)} \\
 &\leq 6|T_{\text{opt}}^6| + 4(|T_{\text{opt}}^4| + |T_{\text{opt}}^2|) \\
 &\leq 6|T_{\text{opt}}^6| + 4(k - |T_{\text{opt}}^6|) && \text{by Inequality 7} \\
 &\leq 6|T_{\text{opt}}^6| + 4k - 4|T_{\text{opt}}^6| \\
 &\leq 2|T_{\text{opt}}^6| + 4k .
 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Considering M_A , the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
 |T_A^6| + |T_A^4| + |T_A^2| + |T_A^0| &= |M_A| && \text{by Equation 2} \\
 |T_A^6| + |T_A^4| + |T_A^2| &= |M_A| && \text{since } |T_A^0| = \emptyset \\
 |T_A^6| + |T_A^4| + |T_A^2| &= k && \text{by Lemma 22} \\
 |T_A^4| + |T_A^2| &= k - |T_A^6| .
 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Placing a lower bound on $u(M_A)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(M_A) &= 6|T_A^6| + 4|T_A^4| + 2|T_A^2| && \text{(Equation 4)} \\
 &\geq 6|T_A^6| + 2(|T_A^4| + |T_A^2|) \\
 &\geq 6|T_A^6| + 2(k - |T_A^6|) && \text{by Equation 9} \\
 &\geq 6|T_A^6| + 2k - 2|T_A^6| \\
 &\geq 4|T_A^6| + 2k .
 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

By Lemma 23 and Inequality 10 we obtain the following lower bound for $u(M_A)$ in terms of $|T_{\text{opt}}^6|$ and k :

$$\begin{aligned}
 u(M_A) &\geq 4|T_A^6| + 2k && \text{(Inequality 10)} \\
 &\geq 4(|T_{\text{opt}}^6|/3) + 2k && \text{by Lemma 23} \\
 &\geq 4|T_{\text{opt}}^6|/3 + 2k .
 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Thus, by Inequality 11:

$$\begin{aligned}
 2u(M_A) &\geq 8|T_{\text{opt}}^6|/3 + 4k \\
 &\geq 2|T_{\text{opt}}^6| + 4k \\
 &\geq u(M_{\text{opt}}) && \text{by Inequality 8.}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

We now consider the case when $|T_A^0| > 0$.

Lemma 25. *If $|T_A^0| > 0$ then $|Y| < \lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor$.*

Proof. We prove the contrapositive. Suppose $|Y| \geq \lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor$. By construction, $X \subseteq Y$ is a set of pairs where $val_{\alpha_p}(\alpha_q) = 1$ for each pair $\{\alpha_p, \alpha_q\} \in X$. It follows that each triple in M_2 contains two agents α_p, α_q for which $\{\alpha_p, \alpha_q\} \in X$ and hence $val_{\alpha_p}(\alpha_q) = 1$. We thus obtain $u_t(M_A) \geq 2$ for any triple $t \in M_2$. Since M_1 is a P -matching, it also holds that $u_t(M_A) \geq 2$ for any $t \in M_1$. This shows that $|T_A^0| = \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 26. *If $|T_A^0| > 0$ then $u_{\alpha_p}(M_A) \geq 1$ for any $\alpha_p \in \bigcup Y$.*

Proof. Suppose $|T_A^0| > 0$. Consider an arbitrary $\alpha_p \in \bigcup Y$. It follows that some $\alpha_q \in N$ exists where $\{\alpha_p, \alpha_q\} \in Y$ and hence $val_{\alpha_p}(\alpha_q) = 1$, by the definition of Y .

By Lemma 25, $|Y| < \lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor$. It follows that $\{\alpha_p, \alpha_q\} \in X$. It follows that there exists some i where $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor |U|/3 \rfloor$ for which $X_i = \{\alpha_p, \alpha_q\}$ and hence, by construction of M_2 , the triple $x_i \cup \{z_i\}$ belongs to M_2 . It follows that $\alpha_q \in M_2(\alpha_p)$ and hence $u_{\alpha_p}(M_A) \geq 1$. \square

Lemma 27. *Suppose $|T_A^0| > 0$. For any $\alpha_r, \alpha_s \in N$, if $val_{\alpha_r}(\alpha_s) = 1$ then $u_{\{\alpha_r, \alpha_s\}}(M_A) \geq 1$.*

Proof. Suppose $|T_A^0| > 0$.

Suppose for a contradiction that some $\alpha_r, \alpha_s \in N$ exist where $val_{\alpha_r}(\alpha_s) = 1$ and $u_{\{\alpha_r, \alpha_s\}}(M_A) = 0$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_r}(M_A) = u_{\alpha_s}(M_A) = 0$. It follows, by the definition of a P -matching, that α_r, α_s are unmatched in M_1 and hence $\alpha_r, \alpha_s \in U$. By Lemma 26 it follows that $\alpha_r \notin \bigcup Y$ and $\alpha_s \notin \bigcup Y$. It follows that $Y' = Y \cup \{\alpha_r, \alpha_s\}$ is a disjoint set of pairs of agents in U where $val_{\alpha_p}(\alpha_q) = 1$ for each pair $\{\alpha_p, \alpha_q\} \in Y'$. Since $|Y'| > |Y|$, this contradicts the maximality of Y returned by Algorithm `maximum2DMatching`. It follows that no such α_r, α_s exist where $val_{\alpha_r}(\alpha_s) = 1$ and $u_{\{\alpha_r, \alpha_s\}}(M_A) = 0$. \square

Lemma 28. *If $|T_A^0| > 0$ then $u_t(M_A) \geq 3$ for any $t \in T_{opt}^6$.*

Proof. Suppose $|T_A^0| > 0$. Consider an arbitrary $\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\} \in T_{opt}^6$. By definition, $val_{\alpha_{h_1}}(\alpha_{h_2}) = val_{\alpha_{h_2}}(\alpha_{h_3}) = val_{\alpha_{h_3}}(\alpha_{h_1}) = 1$. Since M_A is a stable matching, the triple $\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}$ does not block M_A . It follows that at least one of the following holds: $u_{\alpha_{h_1}}(M_A) = 2$, $u_{\alpha_{h_2}}(M_A) = 2$, or $u_{\alpha_{h_3}}(M_A) = 2$. Suppose without loss of generality that $u_{\alpha_{h_1}}(M_A) = 2$. By Lemma 27, it must be that $u_{\{\alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}}(M_A) \geq 1$. In total, $u_{\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}}(M_A) \geq 3$. \square

Lemma 29. *If $|T_A^0| > 0$ then $u_t(M_A) \geq 2$ for any $t \in T_{opt}^4$.*

Proof. Suppose $|T_A^0| > 0$. Consider an arbitrary $\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\} \in T_{opt}^4$ where $val_{\alpha_{h_1}}(\alpha_{h_2}) = val_{\alpha_{h_2}}(\alpha_{h_3}) = 1$ and $val_{\alpha_{h_1}}(\alpha_{h_3}) = 0$. Suppose for a contradiction that $u_{\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}}(M_A) < 2$.

If $u_{\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}}(M_A) = 0$, then $\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}$ blocks M_A in (N, V) . It must be that $u_{\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}}(M_A) = 1$. By Lemma 27, it must be that $u_{\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}\}}(M_A) \geq 1$ and also that $u_{\{\alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}}(M_A) \geq 1$. It follows that $u_{\alpha_{h_1}}(M_A) = u_{\alpha_{h_3}}(M_A) = 0$ and $u_{\alpha_{h_2}}(M_A) = 1$. In this case, $\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}$ blocks M_A in (N, V) , which is a contradiction. It follows that $u_{\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}}(M_A) \geq 2$. \square

Lemma 30. *If $|T_A^0| > 0$ then $u_t(M_A) \geq 1$ for any $t \in T_{opt}^2$.*

Proof. Suppose $|T_A^0| > 0$. Consider an arbitrary $\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\} \in T_{opt}^2$ where $val_{\alpha_{h_1}}(\alpha_{h_2}) = 1$ and $val_{\alpha_{h_1}}(\alpha_{h_3}) = val_{\alpha_{h_2}}(\alpha_{h_3}) = 0$. By Lemma 27, it must be that $u_{\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}\}}(M_A) \geq 1$ and hence $u_{\{\alpha_{h_1}, \alpha_{h_2}, \alpha_{h_3}\}}(M_A) \geq 1$. \square

Lemma 31. *If $|T_A^0| > 0$ then $2w(M_A) \geq w(M_{opt})$.*

Proof. Suppose that $|T_A^0| > 0$. Intuitively, in this lemma the utilitarian welfare in M_A is apportioned by considering the utilitarian welfare in M_A of each triple in M_{opt} . By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}
u(M_A) &= \sum_{t \in M_{opt}} u_t(M_A) \\
&= \sum_{t \in T_{opt}^6} u_t(M_A) + \sum_{t \in T_{opt}^4} u_t(M_A) + \sum_{t \in T_{opt}^2} u_t(M_A) \\
&\quad + \sum_{t \in T_{opt}^0} u_t(M_A) && \text{by Equation 1} \\
&\geq \sum_{t \in T_{opt}^6} u_t(M_A) + \sum_{t \in T_{opt}^4} u_t(M_A) + \sum_{t \in T_{opt}^2} u_t(M_A) \\
&\geq 3|T_{opt}^6| + 2|T_{opt}^4| + |T_{opt}^2| && \text{by Lemmas 28, 29, and 30.} \quad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Inequality 12:

$$\begin{aligned}
2u(M_A) &\geq 6|T_{opt}^6| + 4|T_{opt}^4| + 2|T_{opt}^2| \\
&\geq u(M_{opt}) && \text{by Equation 3.}
\end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 32. *Algorithm `findStableUW` has running time $O(|N|^3)$.*

Proof. Since the time complexity of Algorithm `findStable` is $O(|N|^3)$ and the time complexity of Algorithm `maximum2DMatching` is $O(|N|^2)$. \square

Theorem 4. *Algorithm `findStableUW` is a 2-approximation algorithm for 3D-SR-SAS-BIN-MAXUW.*

Proof. The absolute approximation ratio is shown in Lemmas 24 and 31. The running time is shown in Lemma 32. \square

In the instance of 3D-SR-SAS-BIN shown in Figure 11, Algorithm `findStableUW` always returns $M_A = \{\{\alpha_3, \alpha_5, \alpha_6\}\}$ while $M_{opt} = \{\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}, \{\alpha_4, \alpha_5, \alpha_8\}, \{\alpha_6, \alpha_7, \alpha_9\}\}$. Since $u(M_A) = 6$ and $u(M_{opt}) = 12$ it follows that $u(M_{opt}) = 2u(M_A)$. This shows that the analysis of Algorithm `findStableUW` is tight. Moreover, this particular instance shows that any approximation algorithm with a better performance ratio than 2 should not always begin, like Algorithm `findStableUW` does, by selecting a maximal set of triangles.




Fig. 11. An instance in which $u(M_{\text{opt}}) = 2u(M_A)$.

5 Open questions

In this paper we have considered the three-dimensional stable roommates problem with additively separable preferences. We considered the special cases in which preferences are binary but not necessarily symmetric, and both binary and symmetric. There are several interesting directions for future research.

- Does there exist an approximation algorithm for 3D-SR-SAS-BIN-MAXUW (Section 4.5) with a better performance guarantee than 2?
- In 3D-SR-AS, there are numerous possible restrictions besides symmetric and binary preferences. Do any other restrictions ensure that a stable matching exists? For example, we could consider the restriction in which preferences are symmetric and $val_{\alpha_i} \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ for each $\alpha_i \in N$.
- Additively separable preferences are one possible structure of agents' preferences that can be applied in a model of three-dimensional SR. Are there other systems of preferences that result in new models in which a stable matching can be found in polynomial time?
- The 3D-SR-AS problem model can be generalised to higher dimensions. It would be natural to ask if the algorithm for 3D-SR-SAS-BIN can be generalised to the same problem in $k \geq 3$ dimensions, in which a k -set of agents S is blocking if, for each of the k agents in S , the utility of S is strictly greater than that agent's utility in the matching. We conjecture that when $k \geq 4$, a stable matching need not exist, and that the associated decision problem is NP-complete, even when preferences are both binary and symmetric.

References

1. Arkin, E., Bae, S., Efrat, A., Mitchell, J., Okamoto, K., Polishchuk, V.: Geometric Stable Roommates. *Information Processing Letters* **109**, 219–224 (2009)

2. Aziz, H., Brandt, F., Seedig, H.G.: Optimal partitions in additively separable hedonic games. In: Proceedings of IJCAI '11: the 22nd International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence - Volume One. pp. 43–48. AAAI Press (2011)
3. Aziz, H., Brandt, F., Seedig, H.G.: Computing desirable partitions in additively separable hedonic games. *Artificial Intelligence* **195**, 316–334 (2013)
4. Aziz, H., Gaspers, S., Gudmundsson, J., Mestre, J., Täubig, H.: Welfare maximization in fractional hedonic games. In: Proceedings of IJCAI '15: the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence. pp. 461–467. AAAI Press (2015)
5. Aziz, H., Lang, J., Monnot, J.: Computing Pareto optimal committees. In: Proceedings of IJCAI '16: the 25th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence. pp. 60–66. AAAI Press (2016)
6. Aziz, H., Savani, R., Moulin, H.: Hedonic games. In: Brandt, F., Conitzer, V., Endriss, U., Lang, J., Procaccia, A.D. (eds.) *Handbook of Computational Social Choice*, p. 356–376. Cambridge University Press (2016)
7. Barberà, S., Bossert, W., Pattanaik, P.: Ranking sets of objects. In: Barberà, S., Hammond, P., Seidl, C. (eds.) *Handbook of Utility Theory*, vol. 2, chap. 17, pp. 893–977. Kluwer Academic Publishers (2004)
8. Boehmer, N., Elkind, E.: Stable roommate problem with diversity preferences. In: Proceedings of IJCAI '20: the 29th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence. pp. 96–102. IJCAI Organization (2020)
9. Brandt, F., Bullinger, M.: Finding and recognizing popular coalition structures. In: Proceedings of AAMAS '20: the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems. pp. 195–203. IFAAMAS (2020)
10. Bredereck, R., Heeger, K., Knop, D., Niedermeier, R.: Multidimensional stable roommates with master list. In: Proceedings of WINE '20: The 16th Conference on Web and Internet Economics. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12495, pp. 59–73. Springer (2020)
11. Bullinger, M.: Pareto-optimality in cardinal hedonic games. In: Proceedings of AAMAS '20: the 19th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems. pp. 213–221. IFAAMAS (2020)
12. Chataigner, F., Manić, G., Wakabayashi, Y., Yuster, R.: Approximation algorithms and hardness results for the clique packing problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **157**(7), 1396–1406 (2009)
13. Cseh, Á., Fleiner, T., Harján, P.: Pareto optimal coalitions of fixed size. *Journal of Mechanism and Institution Design* **4**(1), 87–108 (2019)
14. Deineko, V.G., Woeginger, G.J.: Two hardness results for core stability in hedonic coalition formation games. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **161**(13), 1837–1842 (2013)
15. Gale, D., Shapley, L.: College admissions and the stability of marriage. *American Mathematical Monthly* **69**, 9–15 (1962)
16. Garey, M., Johnson, D.: *Computers and Intractability*. Freeman, San Francisco, CA. (1979)
17. Hajduková, J.: Coalition formation games: a survey. *International Game Theory Review* **8**(4), 613–641 (2006)
18. Huang, C.C.: Two's company, three's a crowd: Stable family and threesome roommates problems. In: Proceedings of ESA'07: the 15th European Symposium on Algorithms. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4698, pp. 558–569. Springer (2007)

19. Huang, C.C.: Two's company, three's a crowd: Stable family and threesome roommates problems. Computer Science Technical Report TR2007-598, Dartmouth College (2007)
20. Irving, R.: An Efficient Algorithm for the "Stable Roommates" Problem. *Journal of Algorithms* **6**, 577–595 (1985)
21. Iwama, K., Miyazaki, S., Okamoto, K.: Stable roommates problem with triple rooms. In: *Proceedings of WAAC '07: the 10th Korea-Japan Workshop on Algorithms and Computation*. pp. 105–112 (2007)
22. Kirkpatrick, D.G., Hell, P.: On the complexity of general graph factor problems. *siam* **12**(3), 601–609 (1983)
23. Ng, C., Hirschberg, D.: Three-dimensional stable matching problems. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* **4**(2), 245–252 (1991)
24. Sung, S.C., Dimitrov, D.: Computational complexity in additive hedonic games. *European Journal of Operational Research* **203**(3), 635–639 (2010)
25. Woeginger, G.J.: Core stability in hedonic coalition formation. In: *Proceedings of SOFSEM '13: the 39th International Conference on Current Trends in Theory and Practice of Computer Science*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7741, pp. 33–50. Springer (2013)
26. Wright, M., Vorobeychik, Y.: Mechanism design for team formation. In: *Proceedings of the 29th Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. pp. 1050–1056. AAAI '15, AAAI Press (2015)